

Selections.

A CHAPTER ON TOBACCO.—BY AN ANTI.

It was thought by many in England at the time of the introduction of tobacco, that the nation would be ruined by it. Like all novel tastes, the newly imported leaf maddened all ranks of the people. 'The money spent in smoke is unknown,' says a writer of that day, who feared there were more than seven thousand houses in the trade of tobacco. We are informed that in England not less than thirty-three millions and a half pounds weight of tobacco is annually consumed; nearly as much as the weight of tea used among its population. Assuredly, not less is used in the United States. To the disgrace of Spain, tobacco is one of the royal monopolies. It is manufactured in a palace 680 feet long, and 480 in breadth, in which 5000 men and women are constantly employed. We are sorry to say that nearly all the Spaniards smoke.

Johnson was by no means either the only or the strongest enemy to tobacco. Stowe, the historian, calls it, 'a stinking weed, much abused to God's dishonor.' In the year 1616, one Peter Campbell bequeathed to his eldest son all his household goods 'towards housekeeping,' on condition 'that if thereafter any of his brothers or sisters should find him smoking tobacco, that he or she, so finding him, should be entitled to the said goods, or the value in money.' Governments, as we have already seen, have opposed and punished it; and we might have added to what we said before, that for a long time smoking was prohibited in Russia, and in some parts of Switzerland it was also made the subject of public prosecution,—they placed the practice of smoking in the prohibitions of the ten commandments, next to that of adultery. In Russia the penalties for transgression was the knout for the first offence, and death for the second; and in Constantinople, if a Turk was seen smoking, he was led through the streets with his pipe thrust through his nose.

Even a king has condescended to write a 'Counter-blast' against tobacco. James I. accounted it a sad extravagance, and something worse. His Majesty endeavoured to terrify his liege children by saying 'that they were making sooty kitchens in their inward hearts, soiling and infecting them with an unctuous kind of soot, as hath been found in some great tobacco eaters, that after their death were opened.' He graciously adds, 'The smoking of tobacco is a custom loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs, and in the blacke and stinking fume thereof, nearest resembling the horrible Stygian smoke of the pit that is bottomless.' In spite of all, however, thousands will yet smoke, and chew, and inhale its powder into the nose.

Yet it is a vile and dirty habit, the very description of which is enough among sensitive people to produce nausea. Dr. Southey, in his autobiography, tells us that a quid of tobacco commonly goes through two editions; for after it is done with the first time, it is taken out of the mouth, and reserved for a second regale. In its intermediate state, he tells us that it is called an *old sager*. On the face of the practice of smoking or of chewing, every one sees an impropriety, for every one who does either the one or the other, feels it necessary to be prepared with an excuse. We have often smiled as we have heard the half-timed smoker gently apologizing, and have been reminded of an anecdote we have read in history to this effect:—in the days of James I., the boys of a large school acquired the habit of smoking, and indulged in it day and night, using the most ingenious expedients to conceal the vice from their master; till one luckless evening, when they were huddled together round the fire of the dormitory, involving each other in vapours of their own creation, lo, in burst the master, and stood in awful dignity before them.

'How now,' quoth the dominie to the first lad, 'how dare you be smoking tobacco?'

'Sir,' said the boy, 'I am subject to headaches, and a pipe takes off the pain.'

'And you? and you? and you?' enquired the pedagogue, questioning every boy in his turn.

One had a 'raging toothache,' another colic; a third a cough; in short, they all had something.

'Now, sirrah,' bellowed the doctor to the last boy, 'what disorder do you smoke for?'

Alas, all the excuses were exhausted; but the interrogated urchin, putting down his pipe, after a farewell whiff, and looking up in the master's face, said, in a whining, hypocritical tone, 'Sir, I smoke for corys.'

This is by no means the only amusing anecdote

which has been connected with the history of tobacco. Sir Walter Raleigh, the great father of the English school of smoking, seems at first to have indulged only in a pipe privately in his study, and on the first time of his so doing, his servant entered his room with his accustomed tankard of ale and nutmeg; observing the smoke pour forth in clouds from his mouth and nostrils, he concluded he was on fire, and threw the contents of the tankard in his face, then ran down stairs exclaiming that his master was on fire, and that before they could get to him he would be burnt to ashes.

It has been the case,—we really blush to write it,—but it has been really true,—we hope in very, very few instances, that ladies have used the pipe. Among these was the proud Queen Elizabeth. She thus indulged herself; sitting on a wooden seated chair, and enjoying the ease of her carpet made of rushes, she would call for her pipe and her cup of ale. It is said that on one occasion, Sir Walter Raleigh laid a wager with the Queen that he would weigh all the smoke that came from her pipe; this he did by first weighing the tobacco, and then the ashes.—The Queen on paying the wages, remarked that though she had known many laborers who turned gold into smoke, he was the first she had found who could turn smoke into gold.

Dean Aldrich's excessive fondness for his pipe was so notorious among the students under his charge, that on one occasion a wager was laid between two of them that the Dean, who was at that time in his study, it being ten o'clock in the morning, would be found in the act of smoking. On their being admitted to his room, and stating the object of their visit, the Dean, with perfect good humour, replied, addressing the party who gave the challenge, 'You see, sir, you have lost the wager, for I am not now smoking, but filling my pipe.'

An amusing anecdote is told also of the late Dr. Parr, who, like his friend Robert Hall, would puff off twenty pipes a-day. The doctor was invited to dine with a wealthy family; a pipe after dinner was with him a *sine qua non*; this fact soon became evident to the eagle eye of the fastidious lady of the house by his restlessly looking about him, and finally boldly asking for it. 'Dr. Parr,' said the lady, 'I hope you will excuse what I am going to say, but I cannot permit smoking in my drawing-room.' 'And why not, madam,' replied the disappointed doctor. 'I have smoked a pipe with my king, and it surely can be no offence or disgrace to a subject to permit me the like indulgence.' 'Notwithstanding that, sir,' was the response, 'I will never allow my drawing room to be defiled with the nauseous smoke of tobacco.' 'Madam!' 'Sir!' 'Madam, you are—' quickly echoed through the room. 'I hope, sir, you will not express any rudeness,' rejoined the inexorable lady; when the doctor raising his voice to full-concert pitch, cried out, 'Madam, you are the greatest tobacco-stopper in all England!' This sally caused a loud laugh, though poor Parr was deprived of the pleasure of his pipe.

But alas, we fear we have tired our readers with our subject, or we meant to have told of a Virginian, who knew so little of the habits of a city as to defile the carpets of a splendid room, even though a spittoon was again and again put before him to his great annoyance, till at last he threatened to spit in it if it was not taken away. We meant, too, to relate an anecdote from Southey, how a 'squire' took the opportunity when his servant was asleep to take away his quid, and to put in its place a dead mouse, which did not relish quite so well. But we must close with a very few serious words.

A recent English paper very wisely says: 'Tobacco has spoiled and utterly ruined thousands of boys, inducing a dangerous precocity, developing the passion's softening and weakening the bones, and greatly injuring the spinal marrow, the brain, and the whole nervous fluid. A boy who early and freely smokes, or otherwise largely uses tobacco, never is known to make a man of much energy of character, and generally lacks physical as well as mental energy. To older people who are naturally nervous, and particularly to the phlegmatic, tobacco may be comparatively harmless; but even to these it is worse than useless. We would particularly warn boys who strive to be any body in the world, to shun tobacco as a deadly poison.'

Have we said too much on this subject? We think that the kindest, most elegant, and the most highly cultivated wife, will say 'No!' One thing at least is certain, that we have written with the kindest feelings, only to state what we believe to be the truth, without reference to any person on earth.—*Watchman and Reflector*.

THE BEST SERMON.—That is not the best sermon which makes the hearers go away talking to one another, and praising the speaker, but which makes them go away thoughtful, and serious and hastening to be along.—*Ep. Burnet*.

Correspondence.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

MR. EDITOR,—I perceive that your correspondent Rustic, after an "absence from home," and some attention to rather, "more business" than he had usually been accustomed to, has had, of late, sufficient quiet, to enable him to give to the public the fruits of two months' study and research; and thus afford to the Clergy generally, and others of the Alumni of King's College, some further information, as to quantity, accent, sound, pronunciation, &c.

In my last I gave him credit for his former remarks, as being "good, and carefully expressed,"—but he really now appears so self-opinionated, and so self-satisfied as a Lexicographer, far superior to Walker, Johnson and others, that I shall not tempt him by any remarks of mine, to reply to this.—lest I may be compelled unwillingly, to change the good opinion I have formed of him.—I will therefore not disturb his satisfaction and repose.—I will merely say, that, when next about to report his "absence from home," I trust he will extend his journey thro' different parts of the Province, as he might then be introduced to some clergymen and others, educated at King's College, Windsor, (a college he appears to think lightly of,) who might, in addition to the highly respectable and talented individuals he alludes to from Oxford and Cambridge,—give him some useful lessons in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and other languages.

If however, Mr. Editor, I even had the time and inclination to criticise his lengthy communication, upon which much might be said,—his last sentence would at once check the attempt;—as he so decidedly declares, that in defiance of all the Lexicographers in the world, he is, "content to hold his own opinion," that it is Rabbini and not Raloni. Some writer has informed us, (and I leave it to Rustic in the depth of his researches to find out the author,) that it is folly, to attempt to "convince a man against his will," because, "he will have the same opinion still."—I therefore leave him to himself,—and now inform him that I shall take no further notice, of any future communication from him on this subject. As however, I believe Rustic to be a young man just commencing to make his way thro' the world, and as he is one, against whom I would not wish to entertain any angry feeling, I would kindly give him this advice,—to read his Bible in future more with a view to Scriptural improvement; and as St. Paul in the 4th chapter of 1st Thessalonians and 11th verse, advises, "Study to be quiet, and to do your own business."

Dec. 21st, 1852.

OPPIDANUS.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

MR. EDITOR.—There is an observation of Arch. Bp. Secker, in reference to the Liturgy, the wisdom of which I have seen abundantly verified during three and twenty years experience in the ministry. It is this. "We should remember that our concern is much more to improve by every thing, than to object against any thing." This principle of modest deference to the authority of the Church, and to the godly recommendations of those set over us in the Lord, is that alone by which uniformity of worship can be preserved. Hoping not to transgress against the above wholesome rule, I wish to offer a few remarks upon the collection of Psalms and Hymns lately set forth. Touching the Hymns I shall only say that I feel thankful that a collection so "well adapted for general use" has been provided and shall most gladly introduce them into my Church. I know not who the compilers were, and most freely acknowledge they have done their part well. I trust therefore, Mr. Editor, it may not be considered impertinent to ask, for the sake of *scripture*, "by what authority they did these things, and who gave them this authority." Verily, Mr. Editor, or one shall be happy to see Mr. Gladstone's bill become a law and acted upon in this Diocese.

With respect to the selection of Psalms there are grave objections. It was not required, and is entirely useless to say the least. It increases the price of the book, I suppose 1s. 3d., and makes us pay for what we have already. The whole of the Psalms are in our prayer books, and the whole must be better than a mere selection. True, a few from the old version are added to the present book, but these might have had a place among the Hymns. But why make a selection? Are not the Clergy capable of doing this for themselves; You Mr. Editor have been doing this for a quarter of a century. And I would ask you, if you would not rather have the whole than a part from which to choose? In the present book too I miss some old favourites; altogether, the 4th, 26th 78rd and 88th, are these not worth retaining? But I go against a mere selection in toto, it is drawing a distinction between one Psalm and another, and, altho I fully believe the compilers to be incapable of such an idea, it brought forcibly to my memory the sentiment of Rev. John Wesley, that some of the Psalms were unfit for the mouths of a Christian congregation, and yet it was God who spake by the mouth of His servant David, Acts 4th chap. 24, 25. I hope therefore, when another edition is called for, if it cannot be done now, a large number of copies may be provided of the Hymns alone, and thus one object (cheapness) of the compilers will be attained, uniformity equally preserved, and at the same time we shall retain the whole Psalms which have been used in the Diocese from its very foundation.

A LOVER OF THE PSALMS.