

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1841.

No. II.

J. Addison Alexander

- ART. I.—1. *Des Propheten Jesaja Weissagungen. Chronologisch geordnet, übersetzt und erklärt von Carl Ludwig Hendewerk, Doctor der Philosophie, Licentiat der Theologie und Privatdocent an der Universität zu Königsberg. Erster Theil. Die protojesajanischen Weissagungen. Königsberg. 1838. 8vo. pp. cxxxii. 731.*
2. *Notes: Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah; with a New Translation. By Albert Barnes. Boston and New York. 1840. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 517, 438, 770.*
3. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, translated from the original Hebrew: with a Commentary, Critical, Philological and Exegetical: to which is prefixed an Introductory Dissertation on the Life and Times of the Prophet; the Character of his Style; the Authenticity and Integrity of the Book; and the Principles of Prophetic Interpretation. By the Rev. E. Henderson, D. Ph., Author of "Lectures on Divine Inspiration," "Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia," "Iceland," etc. London: 1840. 8vo. pp. xxxvi. 450.*

HERE are three books on Isaiah, published within as many years, and in as many different countries. This shows,

pretation, there is no safe cure except the union of concordances and lexicons, exhibiting at one view all the meanings of the word, and then all the places where the word occurs, leaving the reader to determine for himself, where he feels it to be necessary, how far the deductions of the lexicon are accurate. To know that the data, upon which the lexicographer's own judgment rests, are all before us, is in every case highly satisfactory, and sometimes of the last importance. We are therefore pleased to know that the authors have determined to retain this feature of Fürst's plan, without any augmentation of the price which they at first proposed. The other point in which they have departed from their first design is, that instead of printing by subscription, they propose to sell the numbers one by one. This will make it the more necessary that the work should meet upon its first appearance with a warm reception, as we trust it will, for the authors' sake, and still more for the sake of Hebrew learning, which, we feel persuaded, will be sensibly promoted by the speedy execution of so excellent a plan. Among our own readers we have no doubt there are many who will not allow this enterprise, in which some successful progress has been made already, to be either suspended or abandoned for want of prompt and cordial patronage. The first publication, we believe, may be looked for early in the summer.

John Maclean

- ART. V.—1. *Bacchus. An Essay on the Nature, Causes, Effects, and Cure of Intemperance.* By Ralph Barnes Grindrod. First American, from the third English edition, edited by Charles A. Lee, A. M., M. D. New York: J. & H. G. Langley. pp. 512.
2. *Anti-Bacchus. An Essay on the Evils connected with the use of Intoxicating Drinks.* By the Rev. B. Parsons, of Stroud, Gloucestershire, England. Revised and amended, with an Introduction, by the Rev. John Marsh, Cor. Secretary of the American Temperance Union. New York: Scofield & Voorhees. pp. 360.

THESE Essays owe their origin to an offer of one hundred sovereigns as a premium "for the best Essay on the Benefits of Total Abstinence from all Intoxicating Drinks."

The premium was awarded to Mr. Grindrod, yet in the

opinion of one of the three adjudicators M. Parsons was entitled to that distinction.

The comparative merit of the two Essays we shall not undertake to discuss, as our purpose is merely to examine some of the positions assumed, and to show that they are utterly untenable, being contrary to the word of God and the testimony of antiquity. So far as the object of these Essays is to promote temperance, we cordially approve it; and we only regret that in the prosecution of an object so important, and so benevolent, the authors have not confined themselves to arguments which will stand the most rigid scrutiny.

With them we can rejoice in the triumphs of the temperance cause, in our own and other lands; and according to our ability, we will cheerfully unite in efforts to give an increased impulse to this cause. The intelligence respecting the success of the Rev. T. Mathew, in Ireland, and of our much esteemed friend the Rev. Robt. Baird, on the continent of Europe, gives us unfeigned pleasure. We could indeed wish in the case of the Catholics in Ireland, there had been a total freedom from superstition, as well as total abstinence from intoxicating drinks: and we indulge the hope, that as the people become more temperate, they will also become less superstitious. But, while we make this declaration of our interest in the temperance cause, we must enter our protest against the perversion of scripture and of fact which is found in these and like publications. This perversion constitutes our chief objection to the Essays under review, and it is the only objection which could have induced us to notice them. Had those who favour the views they contain contented themselves with urging *the expediency* of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, they would have met with no opposition from us, although we might differ from them in opinion, on some points pertaining to the question of expediency itself. But when they invade the sanctuary of God, and teach for doctrine the commandments of men; when they wrest the scriptures, and make them speak a language at variance with the truth; when they assume positions opposed to the precepts of Christ, and to the peace of his church; when, in reference to wine, which the Saviour made the symbol of his shed blood, in the most sacred rite of his holy religion, they assert that it is a thing condemned of God and injurious to men, and use the language of the Judaizing teachers in the ancient

church, "touch not, taste not, handle not,"* when Christ has commanded all his disciples to drink of it in remembrance of him, we cannot consent to let such sentiments pass without somewhat of the rebuke which they so richly deserve. That we are fully warranted in making these remarks, we expect to show to the satisfaction of all who do not first determine, what the Saviour ought to have done, and what the scripture must teach, and then seek to confirm their fancies by an examination of the sacred writings, and by an inquiry into the conduct of the Redeemer. On such persons we expect to make no impression. They reverse all the rules that ought to guide us in our inquiries respecting duty, and pursue a course most directly at variance with that of the apostles, who always refer to the example of our Saviour, not as being in conformity to what is proper and right; but as being in itself the standard of true excellence. Did Christ perform any act? This is sufficient evidence that the act is right. We are not at liberty first to decide whether a thing is right or wrong, and then, in accordance with that decision, determine what Christ either did or did not do. And yet this mode of reasoning and judging, a mode to which all heretics invariably have recourse, is the very one employed by the writers of these Essays, and other distinguished advocates of the total abstinence scheme. On what principle is it that the Universalist rejects the doctrine of future punishment? He first decides that it is inconsistent with the goodness of God, and he then infers that the scriptures, which are from God, cannot teach any such doctrine, and that they are to be understood in a sense different from that usually put upon them. Thus with the Socinian, he decides that the doctrines of the incarnation, and of the atonement, are inconsistent with reason and justice, and he then infers that the scriptures cannot teach these doctrines.

Thus too with the Encratites, Aquarians, and other heretics in the *second, third, and fifth* centuries, who rejected the use of wine, in celebrating the Lord's Supper: the Aquarians, substituting *water* for *wine* and that too on the pretext of temperance. They appear to have had no knowledge of the wonderful discovery in our day, that our Saviour did not use wine, but merely the unfermented juice of

* By a strange misconception of the design of the sacred writer in employing these expressions, "touch not," "taste not," "handle not," they are often quoted by advocates of the total abstinence scheme as if they were divine precepts.

the grape, mixed with water. Following in their steps, our Authors, and some of their worthy co-adjutors having ascertained, as they suppose, that the use of wine, called by them "fermented wine," is always injurious, that it is destructive to the morals, and the lives of men, and that it is impossible for God to approve a drink so vile and worthless, have satisfied themselves, that the Saviour never used it, nor provided it for the use of others; and that when the scriptures speak of his making, and drinking wine, they must be understood as referring to the unfermented juice of the grape.

That it may be seen, that we do not mis-represent their views, we quote the following passages—*Bacchus*, p. 364; "His (i. e. man's) tendency to estrangement from God would certainly not be lessened by even moderate indulgence in strong drink: and it is INCONSISTENT WITH DIVINE GOODNESS to suppose that he would institute festivals commemorative of his own glorious power and benevolence, which would offer any kind of temptation to his fallible creatures to deviate from the paths of rectitude and sobriety."

Again, p. 390: "Chemical and physiological knowledge, therefore, sufficiently demonstrates that the nature of fermented wines is such as to render them, as *articles of diet*, *unwholesome* and *dangerous*. The stronger the alcoholic properties which they possess, the less nutritious matter do they contain. In other words, they become *stimulants*, and not *nutritives*. IN REGARD TO THE SCRIPTURES therefore, reference must be made to wine possessing qualities dissimilar to those under consideration, and such as might be WORTHY OF DIVINE COMMENDATION. Again, p. 417; IT CAN SCARCELY BE SUPPOSED that this object (viz. the object of the Saviour's mission,) would be promoted by its great and divine Author, who was the holiest of men, partaking and sanctioning the use of intoxicating wine." "We may indeed rest assured, that so holy a being as the son of God would not partake of any thing improper in itself, or calculated to lead his followers into sin."

Anti-Bacchus, p. 267: In examining the expressions, "wine that maketh glad; or that cheereth the heart of man," we must not forget that they were spoken by the Holy Ghost. Now God the Spirit is distinguished for truth, knowledge, and benevolence. His veracity would not allow him to affirm that a fermented, pernicious drink, which actually poisoned and scorched the body, and corrupted the morals, was

a drink which "cheered the heart of man." And his perfect knowledge of the physiology of our frame, and his benevolent regards for the human family would equally prevent him from commending what is baneful. But we know that all intoxicating drinks are pernicious, and therefore the wine spoken of in the text in question was not an alcoholic liquor. Other passages of similar import might be quoted from this essay. Would that such sentiments were peculiar to these writers, but they are not: they have been avowed by other advocates of the Total Abstinence Scheme, and by individuals too, for whom we entertain great personal respect, and among them Edward C. Delavan, Esq., whose zeal in the cause of Temperance, deserves the highest commendation. In a letter to the Editors of the New York Observer, Mr. Delavan says: "Previous to my tour abroad, I had imbibed the strong conviction that our Saviour never made or drank intoxicating wine. I am ready to admit that my early conclusions on this point were founded on reasonings drawn from my estimate of the character of the Saviour of the world, as the best and most benevolent of all beings, having at heart the universal interest of the human family. I found it impossible to bring my mind to think that he would make and use a beverage which, since its introduction, has spread such an amount of crime, poverty, and death, through this fair world. He came to save, not to destroy, and could I believe, with my views of alcoholic wine, that he would make or use it?"

The passages above cited fully sustain our assertion, that their authors first decide what it was proper for the Saviour to do, and for the scriptures to teach, in regard to the use of wine, and then go to work to seek for evidence in support of their already formed opinions. First trust to their own unaided reason, to ascertain what is right, and then go to the scriptures to have their opinions confirmed. Are these the persons most likely to ascertain the truth? even if they can say with Mr. Delavan, "so far as I am able to sit in impartial judgment, in what passes on my own mind, the desire that *truth* may be established on this, as on every other subject of Christian morals, is paramount." We give full credit to this declaration, and we believe Mr. Delavan to be perfectly honest, and so with the other gentlemen named, but this does not render their mode of inquiring after the truth less dangerous or less censurable. Would it not have been more becoming in sincere inquiries after the truth, to seek

first what the Saviour did, and from his practice to determine, whether it was proper or not to use fermented drinks of any quality or description, diluted with water or pure? To this mode of investigating scripture truth, we do totally object: it is arrogant and dangerous and a fruitful source of mischievous error.* The result of their investigations is, what might have been expected from the course pursued, a mixture of truth and error.

Our authors searched the scriptures, and other ancient writings, not to discover what the truth was; for this they knew already. The goodness of God, the holiness of the Redeemer, and the nature of man, furnished conclusive evidence to their minds that the scriptures do not sanction even the most moderate use of fermented liquor. All they wanted, therefore, was to find evidence that would satisfy the minds of others; and, by *dint of false criticism, misstatement of facts, and inconclusive reasoning*, they have accumulated no small amount of testimony in favour of their opinions. Our authors speak freely, and we do the same. Their pretensions to extensive learning, and thorough research, are certainly not slight. This, in the case of the author of *Bacchus*, is evident from the wide range of subjects he has discussed, and his quotations from the writings of the learned, in ancient and modern times. Criticisms on the use of Greek and Hebrew terms, with occasional reference to the corresponding words in the Arabic and Syriac, abound. The history of intemperance, and of intoxicating liquors, in savage and civilized lands, is given in more or less detail. The effects of intemperance on the prosperity of nations, and on the welfare of the church, are brought to view. The moral and physical causes of intemperance are discussed; also, the diseases and other evils arising from the free use of intoxicating drinks. The nature and combinations of alcohol, the nature of fermentation, and the adulteration of intoxicating liquors, are examined at large; also, the customs of the Hebrews, and of the primitive Christians, in regard to the use of wine.

In examining this wide range of subjects, the author of *Bacchus* has certainly collected a large number of interesting

* That reason has a proper province for its exercise, in all enquires respecting duty, we without hesitation admit, but with persons who receive the scriptures as containing the revealed will of God, and as an infallible standard of right and wrong, the office of reason is simply to ascertain what they teach: and when we ascertain this, we know what is right.

facts, the perusal of which will amply repay one for the time that may be necessary to peruse the work : and yet it might not unfrequently be difficult to suggest any reason why they are classed under one head rather than another. The claims of the author of *Anti-Bacchus* to attention, are thus set forth by himself: "I examined every text of scripture in which wine is mentioned: I inquired very minutely into the laws of fermentation; into the character of the grapes and the wines, and the drinking usages of antiquity: the result of these inquiries was, that I came to the firm conclusion that few, if any, of the wines of antiquity were acoholic. I examined Homer, Aristotle, Polybius, Horace, Virgil, Pliny, Columella, Cato, Palladius, Varro, Philo Judaeus, Juvenal, Plutarch, and others. I read each in the original language, and therefore have not been misled by any interpreter; and in every instance, I have carefully examined the context, that I might not give an unfair representation to any of my authorities." On this passage, we shall at the present simply remark, that Mr. Parsons would probably have made fewer blunders had he not attempted to "read each in the original language."

These Essays have received from various sources the highest commendation, and by many they are considered unanswerable. They are "to produce in our country a new era in the cause of temperance," and one of them at least is regarded by the American Editor of *Anti-Bacchus* as the production of a "giant mind."

It may therefore be regarded as rather hazardous to encounter giants so fully harnessed for the conflict as are our authors; yet we shall venture on the execution of our purpose. The positions which we intend to examine are the following:

I. That for the most part the ancient wines were not fermented.

II. That a strong wine could not be produced from the grapes of Palestine.

III. That the Hebrew term, translated in our English version of the Bible "strong drink," is inaccurately rendered, and should be "sweet drink."

IV. That wines which could produce intoxication were not allowed to be used at any of the Jewish festivals.

V. That the law, which prohibited the use of leaven at the feast of the Passover, included a prohibition of all fermented drinks.

VI. That, as our Saviour instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper at the Passover, he could not have used the fermented juice of the grape.

VII. That our Saviour, on no occasion, used fermented wine, or furnished it for the use of others.

VIII. That it is an offence against God and man to affirm, that the scriptures ever speak with approbation of the use of fermented wine.

After examining these several positions, we shall notice sundry criticisms on different passages and terms found in the sacred writings.

The proposed examination we shall pursue in the order mentioned, beginning with the position No. 1: *That for the most part the ancient wines were not fermented.*

This position is most distinctly assumed by Mr. Parsons: "We have," says Mr. P. *Anti-Bacchus*, p. 206, "the most unquestionable evidence, that the *wines of the ancients* were *thick* and *sweet*, or, in other words, were syrups; but you cannot make a syrup out of a *fermented* wine." Again, p. 207: "And hence you have a proof equal to any demonstration of Euclid, that if the ancient wines were *thick* and *sweet*, they were *NOT fermented.*" Again, p. 234: "In a word, from science, philosophy, and history, I have demonstrated, that a large proportion of the wines of old were *not* produced by *vinous fermentation.*" "The popular wine of the ancients, and that of the moderns, are, in their characters, as wide apart as the poles."—p. 234. These extracts clearly indicate the views of the author of *Anti-Bacchus*.

It is but justice to Mr. Grindrod to remark that his views on this point do not accord entirely with those of Mr. Parsons. On the subject of ancient wines, Mr. G. observes, (*Bacchus*, p. 200,) "Some of the wines of the ancients were exceedingly strong; indeed, among the sensual part of the community, the celebrity of these wines, in a great measure, depended on their alcoholic strength." "As alcohol is the product of fermentation, these exceedingly strong wines must have been fermented." Mr. Grindrod does, indeed, quote, apparently with approbation, the following, as the remarks of Chaptal: "The *celebrated ancient wines,*" observes Chaptal, "appear in general to have rather deserved the name of *sirups* or *extracts* than wines. They must have been sweet and little fermented. Indeed it is difficult to suppose how they could contain any spirit whatever, or possess in consequence any intoxicating properties."—*Bac-*

chus, page 196. These are not the words of Chaptal, but of the writer of the article "Wine," in Rees' Cyclopædia, who, in referring to an observation made by M. Chaptal, respecting the accounts given by Aristotle, Pliny, and Galen, of the wonderful consistency of *some* of the ancient wines, applies the observation to "the celebrated ancient wines in general." Of their not possessing any intoxicating properties, Chaptal says not a word; and, in quoting the language of the writer in the Cyclopædia, Mr. Grindrod omits the words "and consequently have contained *a very small proportion of alcohol.*" Mr. Grindrod, too, in copying the words of the writer in the Cyclopædia, has of course made the same mistake; and also another, which is his own, in referring to "Chaptal's Elements of Chemistry" instead of his "Traité sur les Vins," as authority for his statement.—(See Annales de Chimie—No. xxxvi. p. 245. M. Chaptal's remark we shall have occasion to notice further in our subsequent discussions. Mr. G. and M. P. both inform us, (Bacchus, p. 194; Anti-Bacchus, p. 237): that "the Egyptians, at an early period, made use of must, or unfermented wine;" and, in proof of it, refer to the dream of Pharaoh's butler, and Mr. G. adds a remark of Dr. Adam Clarke's: "From this we find that wine anciently was the *mere expressed juice* of the grape, without *fermentation*. The saky or cup bearer took the bunches, pressed them into the cup, and instantly delivered it into the hands of the master. A very philosophical mode of reasoning this, to infer a general custom from a particular instance, and that not said to have occurred in real life, but in the visions of the butler while dreaming! We think it perfectly idle to infer any thing in regard to the character of the wine, from the account given by the butler of his dream. Why not infer from Pharaoh's dream that the cows in Egypt were carnivorous, for it is said that "the lean and ill-favoured kine did eat up the first seven fat kine." The only legitimate inferences from the dream of the butler, so far as the customs of the ancient Egyptians are concerned, are: 1. That it was the office of the butler to hand to the king the cup from which he drank his wine, and: 2. That the wine drunk by the king was usually the product of the vine. In confirmation however of his remark, Mr. G. adds "this wine of nature" is called by Herodotus, *ὄνως ἀμπέλινος*, literally "*wine of the vine,*" and he refers to Lowth's Isaiah, vol. ii. ch. v. 2, as authority for the statement. M. P. makes the same reference. It is true that it may be inferred from the words of Bishop

Lowth, that the "fresh juice pressed from the grape," was called by Herodotus *δίνος ἀμπέλιος*, and if he meant so to say, it is also true that the learned Bishop was mistaken, and that Herodotus employed this phrase, *δίνος ἀμπέλιος*, not to designate "the fresh juice of the grape," but to distinguish it from the *δίνος κριθίνος*, the wine or beer made from barley, a common drink among the ancient Egyptians, *οἶνω δ' ἐκ κριθέων πεποιημένῳ διαχρέωνται· οὐ γάρ σφι εἰσὶ ἐν τῇ χώρῃ ἀμπελοι,* "they use a wine made from barley, nor have they vines in the country." Herodotus ii. 77. Can any one who recollects the account given by Herodotus, Book ii. 60, of the yearly feast in honour of Diana, at Bubastos, believe that the *δίνος ἀμπέλιος* was the fresh juice of the grape and unfermented? For the disorderly and shockingly licentious scenes witnessed on these occasions, Herodotus accounts by saying, that at this festival, they use more of the *δίνος ἀμπέλιος* than they do in all the rest of the year.

In support of the position that the ancient wines were for the most part not fermented, Mr. P. says, p. 205: "In Greece, Rome and Palestine, it was *customary* to boil down their wine into a kind of a sirup. Mr. Buckingham tells us that the wines of Helbon, and the wine of Lebanon, mentioned in scripture, and which exist in the Holy Land at this very day, are boiled wines, and consequently are thick, sweet, and sirupy. Columella, Pliny and other Roman writers, tell us, that in Italy and Greece, it was *common* to boil their wines." Again, p. 265: "The chief wines mentioned in scripture are those of Lebanon and Helbon, and these, Mr. Buckingham says, are the principal wines of Palestine at the present day: the former, he adds, are boiled wines made of grapes as large as plums. "The wine of Helbon," mentioned by Ezekiel, Mr. Buckingham observes, is a rich sweet wine: the name of Helbon signifies "sweet or fat," this wine was made at Damascus, was exported, was a part of the merchandize of Tyre, and in the time of Richard III. was brought to England under the name of the "wine of Tyre."

Mr. Grindrod too observes, Bacchus, p. 375, that "Ezekiel speaks of this wine in his magnificent description of the merchandize of Tyre:" "The *wine* (tirosh) of *Helbon* is classed with other nutritious articles, the produce of Judah and the land of Israel. . . . The "*wine* of Tyre" was exported from Palestine into this country so late as the reign of Richard III." Of wine of Lebanon, Mr. G. thus speaks, p.

374: "The wine of Lebanon is made in the present day, exactly as it was prepared in ancient times. *The juice of the grape immediately after it is expressed*, is boiled down to a greater or less consistence. In this state it could not possess alcoholic qualities. It remained the *healthful juice of the grape*, deprived only of its watery particles.

Keraswân and Mount Libanus, (or Lebanon,) states a modern traveller, produce the best wines in Syria. The wines of Syria are most of them prepared by boiling immediately after they are expressed from the grape, till they be considerably reduced in quantity, when they are put into jars or large glass bottles, and preserved for use."

From these extracts it is evident that our authors would have us believe respecting wines of Helbon and Lebanon, the only two wines, the names of which are given in the scriptures.

1st. That they were boiled wines.

2d. That they were unfermented.

3d. That they were not intoxicating.

In support of these positions, M. Parsons adduces the testimony of Mr. Buckingham. As to the sources of information enjoyed by Mr. B., Mr. Parsons says nothing, and from some information which we have on this subject, we shall have no difficulty in showing that Mr. B. is mistaken. If the extracts given by Mr. Parsons contain all that is said on this subject, it is only of the wines of Lebanon Mr. B. speaks when he says they are boiled. Of the wine of Helbon he says merely that it is a "rich sweet wine." Yet Mr. Parsons says, "hence it is evident that the two wines most esteemed in the Holy Land were boiled wines, were thick and sweet, and consequently were not alcoholic." But granting they were boiled, does this prove that they were not allowed to ferment after boiling. Mr. W. G. Brown, the authority of Mr. Grindrod, for asserting that the wines of Mount Lebanon are prepared by boiling, says, "that this mode of boiling is still retained in some parts of Provence, where it is called *vin-cuit* or *cooked wine*, but there the method is to lodge the wine in a large room, receiving all the smoke arising from several fires on the ground floors, an operation more slow, *but answering the same purpose*. The Spanish *Vino Tinto* or *Tent* is prepared in the same way." Bacchus, *Note*, p. 374. Now this very *Vino Tinto* contains more than 13 per cent of alcohol, *the product of its fermentation*. See Brande's Table. The phrase *Vin Cuit* ordinarily de-

notes a wine, "which has had a boiling before fermentation, and which by this means still retained its native sweetness." Rees' Cyclopædia, Article, Wine. We say ordinarily, for we find that Chaptal speaks of the sapa and defrutum and even of the Passum of the ancients as belonging to the class of *Vins-Cuits*. See Traite sur les Vins. Ch: iii. Annales de Chimie, No. 35, p. 290. Stum wine, a species of Rhenish must, a very intoxicating drink, is first boiled and then fermented. See Rees' Cyclo. Article Rhenish must. Henderson, in his treatise on wines, p. 189, tells us that in preparing the *sweet wines* of Spain, the must is often boiled, and by this operation the saccharine matter becomes concentrated, and the *proportion of alcohol is increased*. Is alcohol obtained without fermentation?

Chaptal, ch. iv. 4, 2, says: "When the must is very watery, the *fermentation* is slow and difficult, and the wine which comes from it is weak and very susceptible of decomposition. In this case, the *ancients* were acquainted with the advantage of boiling the must. By this means they evaporated the superabundant water, and brought back the liquid to a suitable degree of thickness. This method, constantly advantageous in northern countries, and in general wherever the season has been rainy, is yet followed in our day. Nevertheless, this process is useless in warm countries; at the most, it is not applicable except in cases when the rainy season has not permitted the grape to come to a suitable degree of maturity; or forsooth when the vintage has been gathered in a foggy or rainy season."

Grant, then, that the wines of Lebanon are boiled wines; does it follow that they are not fermented, when it is a fact not to be denied, that it is customary, in certain cases, to boil the must, in order that it may the better ferment, and that the *strength* and *sweetness* of the wine may be increased? But, further, Mr. Brown does not say that the wines of Keraswân and Lebanon are not fermented, but merely that they are boiled; and he also says, that they are prepared in a way that answers the same purpose as the mode employed in preparing the *vins-cuits*, or *cooked wines* of Provence, and the vino-tinto of Spain.

Of the *vins-cuits* of Provence, M. Jullien, in his "Topographie de tous Les Vignoble," p. 273, thus speaks: "These wines, newly made, are luscious, a little clammy, and gorging; but when they are old, they become delicate and very agreeable, retaining entirely their sweetness. M. Grimod de la

Reynie're, whose judgment is of great weight in this matter, gives to them the preference over the *luscious wines* (vins de liqueur) of Spain, Italy, and Greece." Again, p. 276, speaking of these same *vins cuits* of Provence, he remarks: "Those which are prepared at Aubagnes, Cassis, and Ciotat, when old rank among the *vins deliqueur* of the second class." They are not in general as much esteemed as the *vins de liqueur* of Spain; the mode of preparing which is thus described by Jullien, p. 333: "the must is concentrated by boiling, and acquires the consistency of a sirup. After this, it is put into casks, *where it is fermented enough to acquire the necessary degree of spirituousity*; but having been deprived by the fire of a large portion of its phlegm, the fermentation ceases before the entire dissolution of its sugary parts. These wines remain sweet, and are very clammy during the first years. It is not till they are old that they become delicate, pleasant, and fragrant."

Volney, another of Mr. Grindrod's authorities, says, that "the wines of Lebanon are of three sorts, the red, the white, and the yellow. The white, which are the most rare, are so bitter as to be disagreeable; the two others, on the contrary, are too sweet and sugary. This arises from their being boiled, which makes them resemble the baked wines of Provence. The general custom of the country is to reduce the must to two-thirds of its quantity. *It is improper for common drink at meals, because it ferments in the stomach.* In some places, however, they do not boil the red, which then acquires a quality almost *equal* to that of Bordeaux. The yellow wine is much esteemed among our merchants, under the name of Golden wine, (vin d'or,) which has been given to it from its colour."

Here observe 1. that the must, when reduced to two-thirds, is *improper for common drink at meals*; therefore, when thus reduced, it must be designed for some other purpose. What that purpose is we shall show presently. 2. The reason assigned for it being an improper drink, viz: "it ferments in the stomach;" and yet Mr. Grindrod tells us, that "it remained in fact the *healthful juice of the grape*, deprived only of its watery particles." 3. That the red and yellow wines reminded Mr. Volney of the baked wines of Provence, which are first boiled and then fermented. 4. That the red wine of Lebanon, when not boiled, acquired a quality almost equal

to that of Bordeaux, a fermented liquor, containing about *thirteen* per cent. of alcohol. 5. That the white wines of Lebanon were not boiled.

With respect to the *vin d'or*, mentioned by Mr. Volney, M. Jullien says expressly, that it is not boiled: "Cependant le plus estimé, que l'on nomme *vin d'or*, n'est pas bouilli." p. 474.

Mr. John Carne, in his "Syria, the Holy Land and Asia Minor Illustrated," speaks of the *white wines* of Lebanon as distinguished for their strength, and the *red wines* as the Champagne of the East. How could he thus describe unfermented liquors?

Mr. Grindrod, in further confirmation of his statement respecting the wines of Lebanon, says: "Two travellers,* of great celebrity, particularly investigated the manners and customs of the modern inhabitants of Judea, and record that the vines of Hermon and Lebanon yield wine of a red colour, very generous and grateful, and so light as *not to affect the head though taken freely.*" Wherein does this account differ from the account of the *red wine* of Lebanon, by Messrs. Volney and Carne, one of whom compares it to the *red wine* of Bordeaux; the other, to the *red wine* of Champagne; *both light wines; both fermented wines;* and although, according to Henderson, p. 183, "the quantity of alcohol which the finer sorts of the Bordeaux wines contain is inconsiderable," yet that quantity has been found by analysis, to be not less than *thirteen* per cent. In the red Champagne it is somewhat less. The phrase "though taken freely" is somewhat ambiguous, and by no means proves the wine is not an intoxicating one.

Mr. Parsons, as if in confirmation of his own and of Mr. Buckingham's statements, says: "M. La Roque, in his Itiner. Syr. and Libanus, remarks, 'It would be difficult to find any other wine so exceedingly choice as that which was presented to us, and which led us to conclude that the reputation of the wine of Lebanon mentioned by the prophet is well founded.' Is there any intimation in these words that the wine of Lebanon, "so exceedingly choice," was the "unfermented juice of the grape?" Is it probable that M. La Roque would speak thus of the boiled wine of Lebanon, which Volney says is too sweet and sugary to be pleasant? Mr. Parsons does not give the name of this wine.

* Van Egmont and Prof. Hyman.

M. La Roque says that the best is called *Golden wine*, *Vin d'or*, which we have already shown is not a *boiled wine*.

We have thus far confined our attention almost exclusively to an examination of the authorities cited by the authors of *Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus*, and have shown from their own witnesses, that the wines of Lebanon were not unfermented wines, whether *boiled or not boiled* before fermentation, and consequently, that they contained more or less alcohol. Let us now examine the authorities adduced in support of the assertion, that the wine of Helbon was unfermented. We have already mentioned the fact, that even Mr. Buckingham, in the passages cited by Mr. Parsons, does not say of this wine, that it was boiled. It is only of the wines of Lebanon he makes this statement. Of the wine of Helbon he says, that "it is a rich sweet wine." And because Nehemiah says, "*eat the fat and drink the sweet*," Mr. P. infers that this wine too must have been a boiled wine, and, consequently, according to his theory respecting wines, not containing any alcohol.

Mr. Henderson, p. 188, speaking of the Spanish wines, says: "The Spaniard, when he drinks wine as an article of luxury, gives the preference to such as is 'rich and sweet,' " employing the very terms that Mr. B. does respecting the wine of Helbon; and he instances, among the favourite wines of the Spaniard, the Malaga. Shall we, therefore, infer that the Malaga is an unfermented wine? With just as much reason as infer that the wine of Helbon is an unfermented wine. The Malaga contains upwards of seventeen per cent. of alcohol, and we have no evidence as yet that the wine of Helbon contains any less.

Mr. Grindrod observes of this wine, that "It is classed with other nutritious articles, the produce of Judah and the land of Israel." But what has this to do in determining the question whether it was fermented or not; whether it was itself nutritious or otherwise? Judas Iscariot was reckoned among the twelve apostles, but this does not prove that he was either a good man or a true disciple. All such reasoning is idle. Did the sacred writer profess to give a list of nutritious articles of diet, the circumstance mentioned by Mr. G. might be of some importance.

In this very description of the articles of merchandize of Tyre, referred to by Mr. G. the prophet says, "Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, they were thy merchants; they traded in the *persons of men* and vessels of brass in thy market." Why

not infer that the *slave trade* is a useful and honourable employment? for this trading *in the persons of men* is just as much classed with the wheat, and the honey, and the oil of the land of Israel, as is the wine of Helbon. But into such extravagance will men run in order to carry out a favourite theory.

Both Mr. Parsons and Mr. Grindrod mention the fact that the wine of Helbon under the name of the "wine of Tyre," was imported into England, as late as the reign of Richard III. but this determines nothing in regard to the character of this wine. If the statement of Sir John Fortescue, a cotemporary of Richard III. that, "they drink no water except when they abstain from other drinks, by way of penance, and from a principal of devotion," given in *Bacchus*, p. 42, be correct, there is very little reason for believing, that the English at that time would be pleased with wine of such a description as Mr. G. imagines the wine of Helbon was.

Mr. Grindrod also observes, that "Athenaeus, upon the authority of Posidonius, states that the Persians planted vineyards at Damascus, on purpose to prepare this celebrated article of commerce. The kings of Persia drank no other." Athenaeus, Lib. I. Strabo, Lib. 15. "This fact," says Mr. G. "tends to show that *sweet and thick wines* were held in most esteem by the ancients," but in our humble judgment it has somewhat of a different tendency, as we shall at once show. And first compare the statement, that the kings of Persia drank no other wine, with the anecdote related by Mr. G. of Cambyses, king of Persia, and son of Cyrus, by whom Damascus was subjected to the Persian sway. *Bacchus*, p. 129: According to this anecdote, related originally by Herodotus, Cambyses was a monster of *drunkenness and cruelty*, and as such is referred to by Mr. G. If Cambyses drank no other wine, surely the wine of Helbon must have been a very nutritive article! Again, if the kings of Persia drank no other wine, the wine of Helbon must be the wine called in the book of Esther i. 7. "royal wine," and in the use of which Ahasuerus the Persian monarch became so far intoxicated, that contrary to the customs of the country, he commanded his chamberlains to bring Vashti the queen, that he might exhibit her beauty to the people and princes, who on occasion of a great feast, made for them by the king, were drinking of the royal wine, furnished in abundance for their entertainment. The phrase, "when the *heart of the king was merry* with wine," found in Esther i. 10: is the same as that used in reference to Nabal. 1 Samuel xxv.

36: "and Nabal's heart was merry, for he was very drunken," and also the same with that which occurs 2 Samuel xiii. 28, respecting Ammon, whom Absalom commanded his servants to kill when he should be so far overcome with wine as to be incapable of resisting.

From the statement of Mr. Grindrod, respecting the use of this wine by the kings of Persia, compared with the account in the book of Esther, the reader may perceive how very harmless this wine of Helbon was, especially when drunk in large quantities. We have now examined at great length all the authorities cited by our authors, that the wines of Helbon and Lebanon were not fermented, and not intoxicating, and have shown that they have failed to make good their assertions in regard to the character of these wines. We shall now produce such testimony as will, we think, set this point at rest. Upon reading the statements of Messrs P. and G., we addressed a note to the Rev. Eli Smith, of the Syrian Mission, who has resided in Syria for a number of years, and who is perfectly familiar with the language and the customs of the country, and enquired of him whether the wines in common use in Palestine, were fermented and produce intoxication, and whether the wines of Lebanon were boiled. Mr. Smith, who was at that time in the city of New York, very kindly furnished the following answer to the inquiries, which were made of him. We give the letter entire, that there may be no doubt as to the views of Mr. Smith.

" *Kinderhook, Nov. 10, 1840.*

"Dear Sir—I was prevented from replying to your note of the 6th immediately, by being called to leave New York the day it was received. You inquire whether the wines in common use in Palestine, and particularly the wines of Lebanon, are fermented, and produced intoxication? and, whether the wines of Lebanon are usually boiled?

"The wines now in common use in Palestine, in Mount Lebanon, and in all the countries around the Mediterranean that I have been in, *are fermented, and do produce intoxication.* They vary in strength, but are on an average, I am confident, (especially the wines of Lebanon,) a good deal stronger than our cider. Of their strength, compared with the wines used in this country, my knowledge of the latter is too slight to enable me to judge with certainty. The wines of Syria are stronger than those I have tasted farther north, in Georgia and Hungary. Of the inebriating effects of the

wines of the Mediterranean, we have often painful evidence. On first going to Malta, at the beginning of the temperance reformation, with the impression I had received here, that there was no danger from the pure wines of those countries, I fell in with what I found to be the prevailing custom, and took a little wine with my dinners. At length I found an intimate friend falling into habits of intoxication, in consequence of habitually using the common Marsala wine of Sicily. I then gave up my wine; and, so far as I know, all my brethren abstain from the habitual use of it, as a temperance measure. In preparing a Tract on Temperance, for circulation in Syria, we have included wine with brandy as one of the causes of intemperance to be avoided.

“In doing this, we make no distinction between brandied wines and those which are not brandied, for no such distinction, so far as I am informed, is thought of among the natives. Nor do we make any exception of unfermented wines. *I have never found any such wines now used in those countries.* I recollect, indeed, that in travelling through Asia Minor, I frequently quenched my thirst with an infusion of raisins. But it was never called sherâb, the name given in Turkish to wine, but üzüm sâyû, “raisin water.” Even in the house of the chief rabbi of the Spanish Jews at Hebron, I was once treated with fermented wine during the feast of unleavened bread. I knew it was fermented, not merely from its taste, but because I had a discussion with him on the inconsistency of having it in his house at a time when he had professedly banished every thing that was leavened. The principal word, indeed, in Arabic, for wine, *khamr*, is derived from the verb *khamar*, which means to ferment. From the same root comes also *khamireh*, the word for leaven.

“As to boiled wines, I have never found them in Mount Lebanon, nor in any of the countries around. The unfermented juice of the grape, is indeed boiled down to a thick sirup, of the consistency of molasses, or thicker. And this, I think, is the principal use made of the juice of the grape, throughout Syria and Palestine. The best of it in Mount Lebanon is even made so thick that the mountaineers boast that they can carry it a day’s journey on a piece of bread, without its running off. But this sirup is no more looked upon now as wine, than molasses is regarded by us as the same thing with rum. I am not aware that it is ever diluted for drink.

“You will perceive that I am no apologist for wine drink-

ing, on the ground that the present wines of Palestine are fermented. These wines tend to intoxication, and therefore we banish even them from our tables, though they are the wines of Palestine. Nor do I wish what I have written to be regarded as in any way aimed against the principles of the Am. Temp. Union. Indeed, I am happy to find that any apparent discrepancey between the *testimony* here given, and that of Mr. Delavan in his letter to the editors of the New York Observer, of August 24th, *so far as facts are concerned*, is chiefly if not entirely verbal. He testifies that the unfermented juice of the grape *can* be preserved from fermentation by boiling. My testimony goes farther, and proves not only that it can be, but *is in fact* thus preserved to a great extent. The difference is, that *he calls this sirup wine*; *I have not found it bearing the name, nor used in the place of wine.* Of his *opinion*, that it was anciently regarded and used as wine, and is the wine approved of in the Bible, but has gone into disuse in consequence of an increased taste for alcoholic drinks, a person who has never been in Palestine, is perhaps as capable of judging as myself. This point is not included in the questions your letter proposes, and I leave it untouched. You will not therefore consider my letter as containing any opinion respecting the nature of the wines used and approved by our Saviour and the writers of the scriptures. That discussion is one in which I wish not to take any part.

“With much respect, I remain,

“Most truly yours,

“ELI SMITH.”

From this letter, it is evident—

1. That the wines now in common use in Palestine and in Mount Lebanon are *fermented, and do produce intoxication.*

2. That the wines of Syria are *stronger* than those farther north, in Georgia and Hungary.

3. That in Asia Minor it is common to use as a drink “an infusion of raisins,” but that this is *never* denominated *wine*, but “*raisin water.*”

4. That *boiled* wines, as distinguished from *fermented* wines, are scarcely if at all known in Palestine. Whether the wines were boiled before fermenting was not a matter included in our inquiries, nor is it included in the answers of Mr. Smith.

5. That the unfermented juice of the grape is frequently boiled until it acquires the consistence of molasses, or until it becomes even thicker than molasses; but this sirup is no more looked upon as wine than molasses with us is considered the same thing as rum; and that this sirup is not diluted for drink, but is eaten with bread.

Mr. Volney, as we have seen, says, it is unfit for common drinks at meals, but does not mention for what purpose it is used. From Mr. Smith's letter it appears, that it is used in Palestine in the same way that in this country we use molasses or honey; and, in fact, it is the very substance called in the English version of the Bible, "*honey*," as in Ezekiel xxxii. 17. In this verse, it is spoken of as a part of the merchandise of Tyre, and as something distinct from the *new wine* (tirosh) of Helbon mentioned in the succeeding verse. It is not improbable, that in rainy seasons, when the grape did not contain its usual quantity of saccharine matter, that they mixed with the juice of the grape, before it was fermented, a small quantity of this *boiled must*, in order to give the wine greater strength and sweetness, as is common in other wine countries. See Henderson and Chaptal.

If it be true, as the author of *Bacchus* says, and we do not question its truth, that "the wine of Lebanon is made in the present day exactly as it was prepared in ancient times," then it is abundantly evident that the *ancient* wine of Lebanon was a fermented and an intoxicating drink.

There are one or two points in Mr. Smith's letter, which we shall notice under another head. Let us now examine the witnesses of our authors, in relation to the ancient wines of Greece and Italy.

"Columella, Pliny, and other Roman writers," says Mr. Parsons, "tell us that it was common to boil their wines. The sapa and defrutum of the Latins, and the "Εψημα and Σιγαρον of the Greeks, which Pliny calls 'siraeum and hepsema,' and adds that they answered to the sapa and defrutum of the Latins, were boiled wines. In making the 'sapa' the juice was boiled to one half, and in defrutum to one third."

But is this all that Pliny says about them? His very next words, indicating for what purpose they were chiefly prepared, are not even noticed by our author, notwithstanding "in every instance he carefully examined the context, that he might not give an unfair representation to any of his authorities." The words immediately following the above

passage are these: "*Omnia in adulterium mellis excogitata,*" showing clearly that for certain purposes at least they were expressly designed to supply the place of honey. Pliny, ch. vi. in treating of the famous Maronean wine, a product of Thrace, had previously mentioned that Aristaeus was the first person in Thrace, who taught the mixing of honey with wine. And how any one who has read Pliny, Columella, Varro and Cato, and that too without being "misled by any translator," should overlook the fact, that the principal use of these preparations was to sweeten and to increase the strength of weak wines, we are utterly at a loss to understand. Mr. Parsons does not give the least intimation that they were used for this purpose. That in some Latin authors we find allusions to the use of *sapa* and *defrutum*, as drinks, by the old women of Rome, we do not deny; but is no evidence that the *sapa* and *defrutum* were ordinary drinks among the Greeks and Romans.

Although Pliny, in treating of the different sorts of wine, makes mention of *sapa* and *defrutum*, also products of the vine, yet he most clearly distinguishes them from *wine properly so called*, and classes them among the *dulcia*. He also distinguishes both classes from the ἀειγλεύκος of the Greeks. "Intermediate between the *dulcia* and *vinum* (*wine*) is what the Greeks call *aigleucos*, that is *always must*. It is the result of care, inasmuch as it is not suffered to ferment: thus they call the *passage of must* into *wine*.*

What words can show more clearly that Pliny understood by *wine* something different from the mere unfermented juice of the grape, whether boiled or not boiled† Again in book

* "Medium inter dulcia vinumque est, quod Graeci aigleucos vocant, hoc est, semper mustum," and adds, "Id evenit cura, quoniam *fervere* prohibetur, sic appellant *musti in vina transitum*."

† It is to be presumed that such of our total abstinence friends as object to the use of wine because "it is not eliminated from any living or natural process," but a liquor prepared by "interfering with the operations of nature," see Bacchus, p. 241, or in the words of Mr. Parsons, because, "no where in nature is alcohol produced by the hand of God," Anti-Bacchus, p. 265, will never say another word in favour of drinking "aigleucos," the *always must*, since *must* is first obtained by subjecting the grapes to a very unnatural pressure, and then, oh! horrible to mention, to prevent its turning to wine or to vinegar, "the operations of nature are interfered with!" "Id evenit cura, quoniam *fervere* prohibetur," and this is said too by Pliny, a favourite authority with Mr. Parsons. Of *sapa* too Pliny says, "ingenii non naturae est opus." 'It is the work of art not of nature.' Why not object also to the use of *bread*? It may be said of bread as of wine, and with the same propriety, "it is not eliminated from any living or natural process." "No where in nature is it produced by the hand of God."

xxiii. c. 30. "Sapa is a thing *allied* to wine, the must having been boiled, until a third part remains."* The same distinction between *dulcia* and *vina* occurs, Book xiv. 15.† "From which it appears that murrhina," a drink flavoured with myrrh, "is classed not only with *wines* but also with the *dulcia*."

In Book, xiv. c. 24, Pliny treats of the different condiments used in the preparation of wine: "And also from *must itself* medicaments are made, it is boiled in order that it may wax sweet by a portion of its strength. In some places they boil the *must* to *sapa*, and having poured it into the wine, they allay its harshness.‡

"Cato," says Pliny, "directs wines to be prepared with the fortieth part of the lye of ashes boiled with *defrutum*, for a culeus,"§ a Roman measure containing about one hundred and forty gallons. The two passages last quoted show what use was made by the ancient Romans of *sapa* and *defrutum* as condiments for their wines.

Columella, another writer mentioned by Mr. Parsons, treats of the preparing of *defrutum*, and of its uses, more at large than Pliny. See Book xii. cc. 19, 20, 21. "Some boil away a fourth and some a third of the must, nor does it admit of a doubt, that should one reduce it to a half he would make the better *sapa*, and on that account more fit for use, so that must from old vineyards may be cured with *sapa* instead of *defrutum*."|| "Although carefully made *defrutum* like *wine* is wont to become sour, we should therefore recollect to season *wine* with *defrutum* of a year old, whose good quality has been ascertained." c. 20.¶

But does this prove that they are neither of them gifts of God? If the argument is good for any thing, it amounts to this, and proves the same thing of bread, that it does of wine.

* "Vino cognata res sapa est, musto decocto donec tertia pars supersit."

† "Quibus apparet non inter vina modo murrhinam, sed inter dulcia quoque nominatum."

‡ "Verum et de apparatu vini dixisse conveniat," and among other things he says, "Necnon et ex ipso musto fiunt medicamina: decoquitur, ut dulcescat portione virium. . . . Aliquibus in locis decoquunt ad sapa musta, infusisque his ferociam frangunt."

§ "Cato jubet vina concinnari, cineris lixivii cum defruto cocti parte quadragesima, in culeum."

|| "Quidam partem quartam ejus musti, quod in vasa plumbea conjicerunt, nonnulli tertiam decoquunt, nec dubium, quin ad dimidium si quis excoxerit, meliorem sapa facturum sit, eoque usibus utiliorem, adeo quidem, ut etiam vice defruti sapa mustum, quod est ex veteribus vineis, condire possit." c. 19.

¶ "Quinetiam diligenter factum defrutum, sicut vinum, solet acescere; quod cum ita sit, meminimus anniculo defruto, cujus jam bonitas explorata est vinum condire."

Then, after giving some directions as to the mode of preparing the defrutum, he says, "of this defrutum, thus boiled, a single *sextarius* is sufficient for a single amphora." c. 20.*

Ch. xxi: "Let must of the sweetest taste be reduced by boiling, to the third part, and when boiled, it is called, as I said above, *defrutum*, which, when it has become cool, is transferred into vessels, and set aside, that it may be used at the end of a year. It can, however, in nine days after it has cooled be put into wine, yet it is better not to be used for a year. One *sextarius* is sufficient for two ounces of must, if the must be from vineyards on a hill, but if from vineyards in the plain, three *heminae* must be added. When the must is taken from the vat, we suffer it to cool for two days, and to become clear; and, on the third day, we add the defrutum."†

These extracts show most clearly that the principal use of *sapa* and *defrutum* was to improve the quality of weak wines. For additional evidence, see Cato, chap. cxiii. and Palladius, chap. xi. 14; also, the *Γεωπονικα*, edited by Needham, Lib. vii. 13, page 178: "Some, boiling the must and reducing it to a third, mix it with the wine;" *τινες δε γλευκος ἐψοῦντες καὶ ἀποστριβοῦντες, μιγνύουσι τῷ οἴνῳ*. This mode of improving them is practised at this day. See Chaptal's "Traité sur les Vins," ch. iv. art. 3.—"Annales de Chimie," T. 36, p. 43.‡ In strong and sound wines, in which the saccharine matter was sufficient to preserve the wines in a perfect state, the *sapa* and *defrutum* were not used. "We regard that as the best wine which will last without any condiment, nor should any thing be mixed with it by which its natural taste may be spoiled. That is the choicest wine which can please by its

* "Ex hoc defruto, quod sic erit coctum, satis est singulos sextarios singulis amphoris immiscere."

† "Mustum quam dulcissimi saporis decoquatur ad tertias, et decoctum, sicut supra dixi, *defrutum* vocatur. Quod cum defrixit, transfertur in vasa et reponitur, ut post annum sit in usu. Potest tamen etiam post dies novem, quam re-frixerit, adjici in vinum; sed melius est, si anno requieverit. Ejus unus *sextarius* in duas urnas musti adjicitur, si mustum ex vineis collinis est: sed si ex campestribus, tres *heminae* adjiciuntur. Patimur autem, cum de lacu mustum sublatum est, biduo defervescere, et purgari, tertio die *defrutum* adjecimus," &c.

‡ Il est encore possible de corriger la qualité du raisin par d'autres moyens qui sont journellement pratiqués. On fait bouillir une portion du mout dans une chaudière, on le rapproche à moitié, et on le verse ensuite dans la cuve: par ce procédé, la partie aqueuse se dissipe en partie, et la portion de sucre se trouvant alors moins délayée, la fermentation marche avec plus de régularité, et le produit en est plus généreux.

own quality.”* And this passage follows immediately the one first quoted from Columella, in which he tells us how *sapa* is prepared, and that it may be used instead of defrutum to season must obtained from old vines.

In all these quotations from Columella, the distinction between wine and the boiled juice of the grape, whether called *sapa* or *defrutum*, is carefully observed. The object of Columella, in treating of wines, was to point out the various modes employed in his day to preserve and improve them, by increasing their strength, sweetness, and durability, and by imparting to them a more agreeable taste. His object was not to treat of the mode of making unfermented wine, and all the directions which he gives in regard to the preparing of *sapa* and *defrutum* have reference to their being used as condiments for the preservation and improvement of the weaker wines. This is distinctly admitted by the author of Bacchus, and the admission shows, that he understood better than Mr. Parsons the design and import of Columella's observations on wines. “Columella,” says Mr. Grindrod, Bacchus. p. 373, “although not writing concerning unfermented wine, the mode of making which he does not describe, except so far as was connected with the preservation of wines of a weak or watery quality,” &c.

We shall now take our leave of Mr. Parsons's *sapa* and *defrutum*, of which he has made so much, and to so little purpose.

We will now notice a passage in Columella, Book xii. 27, quoted and translated by Mr. Parsons: *De vino dulci faciendo*: “Gather the grapes and expose them for three days to the sun; on the fourth, at mid-day, tread them; take the mustum lixivum (that is, the juice) which flows into the lake before you, (use the press,) and when it HAS SETTLED, add one ounce of pounded iris; strain the wine from its feces, and pour it into a vessel. This wine will be sweet, firm or durable, and healthy to the body.”

But what means the expression, “has settled? Does it convey the precise meaning of ‘*deferbuit*,’ the term used in the original passage? Does not the Latin word imply a previous fermentation; and should it not have been rendered, “has become cool,” or, “ceased to ferment?” Is this

* Quaecunque vini nota sine condimento valet perennare, optimam esse eam censemus, nec omnino quidquam permiscendum, quo naturalis sapor ejus infusetur. Id enim praestantissimum est, quod suapte natura placere poterit.

not the proper and legitimate meaning of the word, which Mr. P. has rendered by the ambiguous phrase "has settled?" Columella says nothing in this passage of boiling, by the application of external heat, and consequently "*deferbuit*" can refer only to the cooling consequent on the heat produced by the intestine motion of the must during the time of its passing into the state of wine. Of the propriety of our comment, any one may satisfy himself by consulting any Latin Dictionary that may be at hand. But perhaps Mr. Parsons is as much afraid of being led astray by the Lexicographer as he is by the translator, and therefore deemed it best to define the term to suit himself. It would not have answered his purpose to have rendered "*deferbuit*" "has cooled," or, "ceased to ferment;" for his avowed object in quoting the passage was to afford the reader an idea of the ancient way of preserving the juice of the grape from *fermentation*.

So, alas, we see that even in the making of sweet wine among the ancient Romans, the must was fermented. It is true that the strength of this sweet wine was diminished by depriving it of its lees, but this was not done until the first fermentation had ceased, by which in all wines by far the greater part of the alcohol is produced.

"When the fermentation in the vat has ceased," says Henderson, p. 18, "the wine is drawn off into casks, where it undergoes a new elaboration, which renders it again turbid, and produces a repetition, *in a slight degree*, of all the phenomena marked in the former process."

To this two-fold fermentation, Columella alludes in c. 24, in which he treats of the mode of preparing the condiment, called "*Pix Nemeturica*," "*et vina cum jam bis deferbuerint.*" Perhaps Mr. Parsons would render this passage, "and wines, when they have now *twice settled.*" That Columella understood the difference between settling and ceasing to ferment, is evident from the sentence immediately preceding, in which the following words occur: "*deinde patiemur picem considerare, et cum sederit aquam eliquabimus.*"

In Book xii. c. 25, treating of the *flavouring* of wine after the Grecian mode, with salt or sea water, Columella thus says, near the close of his remarks, "Before you take the must from the vat, fumigate the vessels with rosemary,

laurel, or myrtle, and fill the vessels full, that *in fermenting*, the wine may purge itself well.”*

The distinction between *wine* and *must* is most distinctly marked in this passage, and the difference is shown to consist in the *fermenting of wine*. We have already noticed the fact, that in its application to wines, Pliny mentions, as the definition of *fervere* (to ferment) “*transitus musti in vinum*,” the passing of *must* into *wine*.

Varro is another writer on Rural Economy mentioned by Mr. Parsons, among those authors he had read in the original. Could he ever have read the following passage? “*Quod mustum conditur in dolium, ut habeamus vinum, non promovendum dum fervet, neque etiamdum processit ita, ut sit vinum factum.*” The *must* that is put into a *dolium*, in order that we have wine, should not be drawn *while it is fermenting, and has not yet advanced so far as to have been converted into wine.*

Can it admit of a doubt that by the term *wine*, Pliny, Columella, and Varro meant *the fermented juice* of the grape? We presume that not even Mr. Parsons himself will venture to affirm that his favourite authorities, (Pliny and Columella,) used the term *vinum* (*wine*) in a sense different from its common acceptation among the Romans. That in treating of wines, these writers have mentioned modes of preserving the juice of the grape other than by fermenting it, we without the least hesitation admit; and that this unfermented juice, whether inspissated or not, was some times used as a drink, we do not question; but we do maintain that the *common* and *almost universal* acceptation of *vinum*, the Latin term for *wine* is the *fermented juice* of the grape, and that when the term is applied to any other preparation of grape juice it is connected with some word qualifying the import of *vinum*. Whether the above quotations sustain us in making this statement, let the reader judge.

The same remark may be made of the Greek term οἶνος, corresponding to the Latin *vinum*, and the English *wine*; and there is not a particle more of ambiguity in the use of the Greek οἶνος, than there is in the use of the Latin *vinum*, or of the English term *wine*.

The following passage from the Poet Alexis indicates the

* “*Mustum antequam de lacu tollas, vasa rore marino vel lauro vel myrto suffragato, et large repleto, ut in effervescente vinum se bene purgat.*”

true import of οἴνος. “Poetae Graeci Minores,” by Winter-ton, p. 527:

Ὅμοιότατος ἄνθρωπος οἴνω τὴν φύσιν
 Τρόπον τιν' ἔστι τὸν γὰρ οἴνον τον νεον
 Πολλή γ' ἀνάγκη καὶ τον ἀνόξ' ἀποζέσαι.

‘In a certain respect *man* much resembles *wine*, for both new wine and man must needs ferment.’ The verb ἀποζέει signifies rather to *give over fermenting* than to *ferment*; but in this acceptation it includes the idea of fermentation.

In further confirmation of our remark on the import of οἴνος, we quote the following passage from Diophanes, a Greek writer, who is mentioned with commendation by Columella and Varro, and who is referred to by Pliny as one of his authorities. Diophanes was cotemporary with Julius Cæsar. “Before the must is put into the πιθοί (vessels made of clay) they should be sponged with pure brine, and fumigated with frankincense. They ought not to be filled completely, nor should there be a deficiency, but we must conjecture what increase the *fermenting* must will probably make, so that it may not overflow, and that the foam being elevated to the edges, it may cast out only that which is impure.” . . . ἀλλ' εἰκάζειν ὅσον εἰκὸς το γλεῦκος ὑποζέον ἀυξήσιν ποιεῖν, ὥστε μὴ υπερχεισθαι, καὶ ὥστε τῶν ἀφροῦ ἕως τῶν χειλῶν μετεωρισθέντος, τὸ μὴ καθαρόν μόνον ἀποπτυσεν. *Geoponics*, p. 160.

This direction is not given concerning any wine in particular, but of the management of wine in general.

Democritus, another writer, also much commended by Columella, and quoted by Varro, Pliny, and Palladius, and who flourished 460 years B. C., gives the following directions respecting the management of wines in cases where the grapes have been much exposed to rain, and where the must is ascertained to be watery. “When the wine, ὁ οἴνος, has been lodged in the dolium, and has undergone the first fermentation, τὴν πρώτην ζέσιν ζέση, let us immediately transfer it to other vessels (for all the feculence on account of its weight remains at the bottom) and add to the *wine* three cotylæ of salt for ten metretæe.”

This passage, with some variation, is cited by Palladius, Lib. xi. 9 and 14, who says: “The Greeks direct, when the grape has been too much exposed to the rain, that the *must* (*mustum*) be transferred to other vessels, after it has undergone its first fermentation, *primo ardore fervebit*. On account of its weight the remaining water will sink to the bot-

tom, and the removed wine (*vinum*) will be preserved pure. Observe here that before the fermentation the juice of the grape is called *must*; after the fermentation, *wine*. That the terms ζέω and *ferveo* refer here to the *vinous fermentation*, and not to boiling, is evident from the passage in Democritus immediately following, in which he says: "Some, pursuing a better course, *boil*, ἐψῶσι, the must till the twentieth part is consumed," a method used also at the present day, as before shown, to increase the fermentation and the strength of the wine.

These directions, it is perceived, are general, not having reference to any particular kind of wine; and they show that among the Greeks, as well as among the Romans, the terms corresponding to our term *wine* were employed to denote the fermented juice of the grape, just to the same extent that the word *wine* does with us. And it would be as rational to argue, that the term *wine* in English and *vin* in French denote in general an unfermented liquor, as to maintain that οἶνος and *vinum* do.

Do not the French boil their must? Do they not reduce it by boiling to even the consistence of the ancient *defrutum*? Do they not preserve must from the external air, and thus keep it sweet and unfermented? Have they not wines so light "that a person may drink three or four bottles in the course of the day, without intoxication being produced?" (See Bacchus, p. 391.) And, consequently, as innocent as any ancient wine? Why not argue from the *vin cuit*, the *raisine'*, the *vin muet*, &c. of the French, that the term *vin* for the most part denotes an unfermented liquor, as Mr. Parsons does in reference to the word *vinum*? which, according to Mr. P.'s understanding of Pliny, does only in one instance denote a fermented liquor, containing sufficient alcohol to emit a flame. It would not be a particle more absurd than the reasoning of Mr. P., and not very much more so than that of Mr. Grindrod, as to the general character of the ancient wines.

Before concluding our remarks on this subject we must give a few more specimens of the critical acumen, accurate statements, and logical inferences of our authors, and especially of Mr. Parsons.

"Pliny, Columella, Cato, and others," says Mr. P., "give us receipts for making almost every variety of wine then in use; such as wine from hore-hound, wine from worm-wood, hyssop, southern wood, myrtle, &c. Myrtle appears to have

been a great favourite." But what of all that? Does the mere mention of them by these writers prove that they were not fermented? Were they not all made by fermenting the juice of the grape, with some one of these articles thrown in before the fermentation began? Columella alludes to their fermentation; and in the case of the myrtle wine, the only one of these of which Cato speaks, he expressly mentions its fermentation. His words are: "Vinum murteum sic facito. Ubi desierit *fervere* mustum, murtam eximito." "Myrtle wine make thus: when the must has ceased to *ferment* take out the myrtle." Cato, ch. cxxv.

Mr. Parsons quotes from Pliny the following words: "Utilissimum vinum omnibus sacco viribus fractis;" and thus translate them, "The most useful wine is that which has *all its strength* broken or destroyed by the filter." That the reader may see how carefully Mr. P. examined the context, as he says he did in every instance, we will quote the passage, L. xxiii. 24: "Nunc circa aegritudines sermo de vinis erit, saluberrimum *liberaliter genitis*, Campaniae quodcumque tenuissimum: *vulgo* vero, quod quemque maxime juverit validum. Utilissimum *omnibus* sacco viribus fractis. Meminerimus succum esse, qui fervendo vires e musto sibi fecerit. Misceri plura genera, omnibus inutile."

A bare inspection of this passage will satisfy the reader who has any knowledge of Latin, that Mr. Parsons has mistaken the meaning of Pliny, and that the word *omnibus* *all*, has no reference to the strength of the wine, but to the persons drinking it, and the reader will perceive the same from the following translation: "Our discourse will now be of the use of wines in maladies. For *gentlemen*, the thinnest Campanian wine is the most wholesome; but for the *commonalty*, the wines which please each when in firm health. The most useful for *all persons*, is that whose strength is diminished by the filter. We should remember the juice to be that which by fermenting acquires for itself strength from the must. The mingling of different wines is useless to all."

The reason, doubtless, for directing invalids of the higher ranks in society to use wines of Campania in preference to others was, that the choicest Italian wines, and those most esteemed by the Roman nobility and gentry, were from Campania, as it is witnessed by Strabo, Lib. v. 14: *Και μὴν τὸν οἶνον τὸν χρᾶτιστον ἐντῆυθεν ἔχουσι Ῥωμαῖοι, κ. τ. λ.* "From hence also they have the best wine," and among them he enume-

rates the Falernian, Statan, Calenum, and Surrentine. He mentions also the fact that the Surrentine had of late become the rival of the others. Pliny says of it, that it does not affect the head. "Surrentina vina caput non tentant." Not, however, for the reason assigned by Mr. Grindrod, p. 392, who translates *tenuitatem*, applied by Pliny to this kind of wine, by *weakness*; whereas *tenuitas* has reference to the *perfect fluidity* of the wine, and is perfectly consistent with a considerable degree of strength. The *vinum tenue* of the Romans is the opposite of the *vinum crassum* or *pingue*, which we presume neither of our authors would be willing to render by the phrase "*strong wine*." Mr. Grindrod has himself translated *tenuis*, *thin*, and correctly so. Bacchus, p. 371 :

—————" *tenuisque lageos*
Tentatura pedes olim, vineturaque linguam."—*Virgil's Georg.*

—————" and the *thin* lageos
Will try the feet at length, and bind the tongue."

Dioscorides, too, speaks of *very old thin white* wines as producing headache: Και κεφαλαλγείς οί σφρόδρα παλαιοί, και λεπτοί και λευκοί. Liber v. c. 785. The *tenuity*, therefore, of the Campanian wine recommended by Pliny, is no proof of its weakness. That the Surrentine wines were of a very durable quality, is evident from the testimony of Virgil, who styles them "*firmissima vina*;" and Athenaeus, on the authority of Galen, says of the Surrentine wine, that "it begins to be fit for use as a drink after it is twenty-five years old, for wanting fatness and being very harsh, it ripens with difficulty." That it was inferior in strength to the Falernian is doubtless true, but it was not on account of its *weakness* that it is recommended to invalids, or that it was compared by Tiberius Cæsar to vinegar, but for its thinness in the one case, and its rough taste in the other. In the opinion of the ancient physicians, the thin and harsh were more agreeable to the stomach, and more easy of digestion, than the thick wines: "Οι δὲ παχείς και μελάνες κακοστόμαχοι, φυσώδεις; . . . Οι μέντοι λεπτοί και άυστηροί ευστόμαχοι. Dioscorides, Lib. v. c. 785. This writer had previously mentioned, as characteristics of the white wines, that they were *thin, easy of digestion, and suited to the stomach*. Εστι μὲν οί λευκός λεπτός τε και ευαναδότος και ευστόμαχος ύπάρχει. Lib. v. 782. And among the austere and white wines, he enumerates the Falernian, Sur-

rentine, the Cecuban, the Signinum, the produce of Campania. Also, the Chian and Lesbian.

The object of filtering was to render it free from its lees, which were regarded by the ancients as the source of strength in wine, and the removal of which rendered the wine at the same time better fitted to the stomach, and less affecting the head. See Plutarch's *Symposiaes*, Liber vi. 7, in which the question is discussed, "Whether wine should be filtered." This filtering of wines, for the purpose mentioned, is practised by the modern Persians, as appears from Thevenot's *Travels*. Part ii. p. 126. "The wine of Schiraz is an excellent stomach wine, but very strong. . . . They have both red and white, but the red is the best; it is full of lees, and therefore very heady; to remedy which they filtrate it through a cloth, and then it is very clear and free from fumes." The very filtering of the wine, for the purpose of diminishing its strength, shows that the wine was fermented; and it is expressly said by Pliny, and that too immediately after the words quoted by Mr. Parsons, that this strength, *vires*, is acquired by the fermenting of the must. As the direction respecting filtering is not given in reference merely to the thin wines of Campania, but to *any* wine which might be used, "quod quemque maxime juverit," it furnishes additional evidence, if it were wanted, that the ancient wines were fermented, and that it was from their fermentation they derived their strength.

On the subject of filtering wines, Mr. Parsons farther quotes from Pliny the following words: "Ut plus capiamus sacco franguntur vires;" which he thus renders: "That we may be able to drink a greater quantity of wine, we break or deprive it of *all* its strength or spirit." What word in the original corresponds to the very unimportant word *all* in this translation? Why not insert *omnes* in the original, and thus make both agree?

"It seems," says Mr. P., "that the filtering mentioned in the passages quoted above, was generally performed before the wine was allowed to ferment." But from what does it thus seem? From Pliny's own statement of the case? No; for Pliny most plainly shows, that the contrary was the fact. It appears to be a conclusion from the laws of fermentation, into which Mr. P., according to his account of the matter, "inquired very minutely." "Chemistry informs us," says Mr. P., "that gluten is as essential to fermentation as sugar. But gluten is a most insoluble body, and therefore the fre-

quent filtering of the must would deprive it of this principle so essential to fermentation." Pliny says nothing of *frequent* filterings; nor do Horace and Plutarch, to whom reference is made by Mr. Parsons. *They* had not inquired so very minutely into the laws of fermentation; and had they filtered the *must* instead of the wine, they would have found from actual experiment, that their object would not have been attained. If the ancients were acquainted with so very simple a method of preventing the fermentation of the must, would it not be surprising that they adopted the very troublesome methods they did with this end in view? On this subject, we presume, the authority of Berzelius, confessedly at the head of the chemists of the present day, will be regarded as more conclusive than any reasonings of our author. Berzelius informs us, that if the fermenting liquor be filtered after the fermentation has advanced to a certain point, say to a fourth part, the fermentation will be checked; but after some time it will be renewed, and will be more gentle than before; but if the liquor be filtered when the operation is more advanced, then the fermentation will be completely arrested. It is not until the fermentation is considerably advanced, that the gluten is precipitated in such quantity, that it can be so separated by the filter as to prevent entirely the further fermentation of the liquor, and of course before fermentation it cannot thus be separated.

These words of Pliny, respecting the Falernian wine, ("solo vinorum flamma accenditur,") Mr. Parsons understands as asserting that the "Falernian wine was the only one which, in the time of Pliny, would emit a flame. "Here then," says our author, "we have the most remarkable evidence, that the Latin wines were not alcoholic, or at least, contained so little that only one out of three hundred and ninety would *emit a flame*:" A very extraordinary fact this, if it be one; but we are somewhat distrustful of Mr. Parsons's inference from the statement of Pliny. The exact

* Si l'on filtre la liqueur qui fermente, quand elle est arrivée à un certain point, par exemple, au quart de l'époque de la fermentation, le liquide transparent, qui passe au travers du filtre, ne fermente pas; mais au bout de quelque temps, il recommence à se troubler et à fermenter, quoique plus lentement qu'auparavant. Si l'on filtre la liqueur quand l'opération est plus avancée, la fermentation s'arrête complètement."

. . . "En outre, il résulte de l'expérience, dont je viens de parler, que la portion précipitée du gluten est seule propre à développer la fermentation, et que si tout ce qui pouvait être précipité l'a été avant filtration, le sucre que reste dans la liqueur n'est plus détruit." See *Traite de Chimie*, par B. Vol. vi. pp. 405, 406.

rendering of Pliny's language is: "It is the only wine by which a flame is kindled;" and the obvious import of which is, that it is the only wine which will of itself support a flame, which circumstance shows it to have been a wine of extraordinary strength. This Mr. Grindrod also regards as the meaning of Pliny. His words are: "Faustian wine," remarks Pliny, "*will take fire and burn.*" Bacchus, p. 200. The Faustian was a species of the Falernian wine. Dr. Henderson, in his "History of Ancient and Modern Wines," refers to this same passage in Pliny, (c. xiv. 6,) and thus expresses the meaning: "They continue, however, in the greatest estimation; and are, perhaps, the strongest of all wines, as they burn when approached by a flame." In giving this translation of the passage, Dr. Henderson, though he does not quote the Latin, appears to have adopted as the true reading of the original, and one that is given in the margin of the Delphin Classics, as found in some copies, and most probably the correct one: "Solum vinorum accenditur flamma;" the obvious meaning of which is, that is the only wine of sufficient strength to take fire by being brought in contact with a flame; and in this respect it must have resembled the brandies and other spirituous liquors of modern times. If the true reading be the one usually found in the copies of Pliny, its meaning must be that which we have assigned to it. And the Falernian must, in this case, have been a very strong wine, to support a flame, or to continue burning when once ignited. To satisfy himself of this, let any one take some common Madeira wine and make the attempt to set it on fire. Let him bring into contact with it any ignited combustible he pleases, and it will be found that as soon as the burning substance is removed there will be no flame visible on the surface of the wine, as there will be in the case of brandy that is pure or but little diluted. It will probably be found, that no wine will take fire, and continue to burn, if it contain less than 30 per cent. of alcohol. Whereas any liquor containing alcohol, however weak, if thrown upon a hot flame will emit a flash, and that this was the case with the *ancient wines in general*, we shall establish by authority that Mr. Parsons himself will not venture to impugn, as he quoted parts of the passage; omitting such parts as are most directly at variance with his view of the passage in Pliny, on which we have just been commenting.

Διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ἔλαιον οὐχ ἔψεται, οὐδὲ παχύνεται, ὅτι θυμιατὸν ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀτμιστὸν ὕδωρ δ' οὐ θυμιατὸν ἀλλ' ἀτμιστὸν. Οἴνός δ', ὁμῶς

γλυκὺς θυμιάται· πίων γὰρ· καὶ γὰρ τὰυτα ποιῆι τῷ ἐλαίῳ· οὔτε γὰρ ὑπὸ ψύχους πήγνυται, καίεται τε. Ἔστι δὲ ὀνόματι οἴνος, ἔργῳ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐ γὰρ ὀινώδης ὁ χυμός. Διὸ καὶ οὐ μεθύσκει. Ὁ τυχῶν δ' οἴνος μικρὰν ἔχει ἀναθυμιάσιν. Διὸ καὶ ἀνίησι φλόγα. *Aristotle's Meteorology.*

“Therefore oil is not boiled and it is not congealed, because it turns to smoke and not to vapour, but water turns to vapour not to smoke. And wine, the *sweet* is reduced to smoke, for it is fat, and possesses the qualities of oil, for it is not congealed by cold, and it is consumed by fire. It is a wine *in name* but *not in fact*, for the liquor is *not vinous*, (possesses not the qualities of wine), *therefore also it does not intoxicate*, but *wine in common*, contains little that escapes in smoke, and therefore *emits a flash.*” The English term flash is derived from the word used in the Greek, and expresses the precise result of throwing wine or any fermented liquor into a fire sufficiently hot to disengage its alcohol; a flash or transient flame is produced. And this Aristotle says is a common property of wine. Is it not strange that Mr. Parsons, in culling from this passage the words which signify, “sweet wine does not intoxicate,” should overlook the fact that Aristotle says, that this sweet wine, οἴνος γλυκὺς though called a wine is not a wine, and the other no less important fact, that wine, properly so called, and in common use, when cast into the fire, does not consume away in smoke, but vanishes with a flash? Which fact is of itself sufficient to show the fermented and intoxicating character of the ancient wines in general, and their similarity to the wines of our own times. We wish not to impugn the honesty of Mr. Parsons in making his quotations, yet his mode of making them, viewed in the most favourable light, argues the grossest carelessness.

Mr. Parsons tells us from Polybius, (and it is but little that he says on the subject), that the ancient Romans did not allow their women to drink wine, though they permitted them to use *Passum*, a drink which was so slightly fermented, that there was no danger of its intoxicating. And why did they not permit them? Dionysius Halicarnassensis says it was from fear lest becoming intemperate, they should prove unfaithful? But what danger could there be of their becoming intemperate, if the Roman wines were not intoxicating? Ah! but, says Mr. Parsons, the ancients drugged their wines, and thus made them intoxicating. How does this meet the ease? Was it not just as easy to drug the *lora* and the *Passum*, which were allowed to the women as any of the wines? And again was it not as easy

to drug fermented as unfermented liquors? Has not the greatest clamour been raised, of late, and very justly so too, against the vile practices of many venders of wine, for mixing deleterious drugs with their wines? The fact therefore, that the ancients drugged their wines, proves nothing in regard to the question whether or not they were fermented. Had it been proved, that the ancient wines were not fermented, then the fact of their being drugged would be important, as showing the manner in which they were rendered intoxicating. But as this has not been proved, cannot be proved, and is contrary to the fact, as we have already shown, we pass this point without further remark.

The famous Maronean wine also attracts the attention of Mr. P. and he seems to regard the poetic description given of it by Homer as if it were more worthy of credit, than the other fables respecting the one eyed Cyclops, to whom this wine was given by Ulysses, and upon whom it produced such marvellous effects.

We might speak farther of the *lora* and the *passum* and Cato's *family wine*, all of which were indeed very weak drinks, but all of them to some extent fermented, but it must be unnecessary after what has already been said on the character of the ancient wines, concerning which Mr. Parsons speaks with so much confidence and yet manifests so little knowledge. It was our purpose before we closed our remarks on the point under consideration, to examine at large Mr. Grindrod's quotations from the Latin Poets, but we must content ourselves with a brief notice of two or three of them, and before doing this, we ought perhaps to make our acknowledgments for the information he gives us respecting Horace, who according to Mr. G., lived in the latter part of the 1st. Century. This statement follows a quotation from this poet, and from the translation given by Mr. G., we learn that *mulsum* and *mustum*, or in English *mulse* and *must* are the same thing, the one being made from honey mixed with wine or water, and the other being the fresh juice of the grape.

“Aufidius forti miscebat mella Falerno
Mendose; quoniam vacuis committere venis
Nil nisi lene decet, leni prae cordia *mulso*
Pro lueris melius.”

“Aufidius first, most injudicious, quaffed
Strong wine and honey for his morning draught
With lenient beverage fill your empty *veins*
For lenient *must* will better cleanse the reins.”

After this quotation and translation, Mr. Grindrod adds. "In the above striking passage, *must* is evidently considered as a nutritious article of diet, and proper on that account to be taken in the morning."

And in this connexion he says, that "Juvenal also sufficiently testifies, that *must* was viewed by the ancients not only as a nutritious substance, but as peculiarly favourable to longevity. This writer flourished in the latter half of the second century." A little nearer the mark than in the case of Horace, yet not much.

"Rex Pylius (magno si quicquam credis Homero)
Exemplum vitæ fuit a cornice secundæ :
Felix nimirum, qui tot per secula mortem
Distulit, atque suos jam dextra computit annos,
Quive novum toties mustum bibit."

Juvenal x. 246—250.

These lines Mr. G. thus translates: "The Pylian king, if you at all believe great Homer, was an example of life, second from a raven. Happy, no doubt, who through so many ages deferred death, and now computes his years with the right hand, *and who so often drank new must.*" How *quive* comes, in this passage, to signify "and who," we know not, and we presume that almost any Latin scholar would render it "*or who,*" thus showing that he understands the words of Juvenal, "Quive novum toties mustum bibit," as merely expressing, in poetic style, the fact that Juvenal regarded Nestor as peculiarly happy in so often reckoning a new year added to his life: the treading of grapes marking as distinctly as any thing can do it, the revolution of the year.

"A frugal man that with sufficient *must*
His casks replenished *yearly.*"—Philips.

That *must* was not always regarded so wholesome a drink as Mr. G. supposes, is evident from the remarks respecting it made by Hippocrates, who says of it, "that it produces flatulence, purges, and causes commotion, by fermenting in the stomach, Γλεῦκος φουσᾶ, καὶ ὑπάγει, καὶ ἐκταράσσεται ζέον ἐν τῇ κοιλίῃ. *Hippocrates, Sect. iv. p. 26.*

Again after giving two lines from Virgil's *Georgics* he adds, "It is absurd to suppose that Virgil would recommend fermented wine to bees as a means of restoring their health." Yes surely, and Virgil says nothing about giving them wine

fermented or unfermented, new or old; but *must boiled to the consistence of honey.*

“Arentesque rosas, aut igni pinguia multo
Defruta, vel Psythiâ passos de vite racemos.”

Virgil's Georg. iv. 269, 270.

We shall advert once more to the remarks of our authors on the thick and sirupy character of the ancient wines. They seem to regard it as an almost universal characteristic of the ancient wines, and we have seen that Mr. Grindrod has represented Chaptal as describing the celebrated ancient wines as being in general little else than sirups or extracts. It is only, however, of the wines of Arcadia, mentioned by Aristotle; of the Opimian wines, mentioned by Pliny, and of some wines of Asia, mentioned by Galen, that Chaptal speaks, when he says, of the statements made respecting them, “But all these facts can pertain to none other than wines sweet, thick, and *little fermented*, or to juices not changed and concentrated; they are rather extracts than liquors, and were perhaps no other than *raisiné*, very analagous to that which we make at the present day, by the thickening and concentration of the juice of the grape.”* Now, admitting that the remarks of Chaptal concerning these wines are in all respects correct, would they prove any thing more than that among the hundreds in the varieties of the ancient wines, there were a few preparations of the grape-juice, so concentrated by boiling, or by being lodged in *fumaria*, and so little fermented that they deserved the name of *extracts* rather than of *liquors*, and that though classed with wines, (from the circumstance of their being made from the juice of the grape,) they were not in fact wines, as Aristotle says respecting the οἶνος γλεῦκος.

Are not these wines mentioned by Aristotle, Pliny, and Galen, on account of their wonderful consistency? And does not this very circumstance show that they were different from the wines in common use? Nothing is said by these writers in regard to the mode of preparing them, though, with respect to some, the mode of preserving them is mentioned. The wines of Arcadia, Aristotle says, were

* “Mais tous ces faits ne peuvent appartenir qu'à des vins doux, épais, peu fermentés, ou à des suc non altérés et rapprochés; ce sont des extraits plutôt que des liqueurs; et peut-être n'étoit-ce qu'un raisiné très analogue à celui que nous formons aujourd'hui par l'épaississement et la concentration du suc du raisin.” *Annales de Chimie.* xxxv. p. 245.

placed, while new, in skins, and dried by smoke;* and those mentioned by Galen were treated in the same way. Were the original juices very rich in saccharine matter, they may have been fermented, and yet there would have remained after the fermentation, a considerable portion of the sugar unchanged. Then, by exposing them, when deposited in skins, to the action of hot smoke, the watery parts would have been evaporated through the pores of the skins, and the sugar and other more solid ingredients would have remained. And farther, this result might have taken place without any diminution of the alcohol. For it is a well established fact, that there are some substances which permit the aqueous parts to pass through them more freely than they do the alcohol, and there are others through which alcohol escapes, while the water remains. Henderson, p. 325, mentions this experiment: "Dr. Soemmering filled a common Bohemian wine-glass with Ausmanshäuser, covered it with ox-bladder, and allowed it to remain for eighty-one days undisturbed, in a warm and dry room. During this time, one half the quantity enclosed had evaporated; and the residue had acquired a more spirituous, and at the same time more mellow and agreeable flavour and aroma than the wine originally possessed. The colour was considerably heightened; a *crystalline coat*, or *film*, had formed on the surface; a *deposit of crystals* had also taken place, at the bottom of the glass, and the proportion of alcohol was exactly doubled—the areometer showing an increase from 4.00 to 8.00."

The crystals which were thus formed were crystals of sugar, which had been held in solution by the evaporated water, and they would doubtless have been increased in number, if the remaining water had also been dissipated, and the result would have been in entire accordance, we think, with the result of the evaporation mentioned by Ga-

* As a specimen of Mr. Grindrod's accuracy in quoting his authorities, we give the following sentence from *Bacchus*, p. 197: "Aristotle states, that either by their *natural consistence* or by *boiling*, or by *adulteration*, the wines of Arcadia were so *thick* that they dried up in the goat skins." Now Aristotle says not one word about natural consistence, boiling, or adulteration, (as the reader may see by examining the original;) and on the subject of their consistence, he says merely, that new wine possesses more of the nature of earth than of water, and refers to the wines of Arcadia as furnishing a striking example of the fact.—(*Meteor*: iv. 10.) Mr. G. appears to have fallen into this error from a misapprehension of some remarks in Rees' *Cyclopædia*.

len, viz. that the wines acquired, in consequence of it, the hardness of salt.* Having no knowledge of sugar as it exists at this day, he could not well have made a more apt comparison with respect to the crystals of sugar which were formed in consequence of the evaporation. This process is well known to the Chemists, under the name of *exosmose*.

The fact mentioned by Aristotle, that the wines of Arcadia were scraped from the skins, shows that the bulk of the dried product must have been exceedingly small in comparison with the original bulk of the wine, and such as might well be the product of a very sweet wine, and one but little fermented; at the same time the strength of the wine must doubtless have been increased by the process employed.

The fact that the quantity was diminished, and that the *strength* of the wine increased with its age, did not escape the attention of the ancients, it being distinctly mentioned by Plutarch, in his Symposiacs, L. III. c. vii. *καὶ γίνεται μέτρω μὲν ἐλάττων ὁ οἶνος, δυνάμει δὲ σφοδρότερος.*

In the year that Opimius was Consul of Rome, the vintage was remarkable for its excellence; the grapes were perfectly ripened, and the juice exceedingly rich. The quantity of saccharine matter in it must have been large, and hence the generous quality of the wine, its durability, and its great reputation. It was preserved in the Amphora, an unglazed earthen vessel, and consequently more or less porous, and through the pores it may well be supposed that no inconsiderable portion of the aqueous particles would escape in the course of almost two hundred years, intervening between the consulship of Opimius and the age of Pliny; also, that the wine would have the consistence of honey, and that at the same time have lost its original sweetness, and acquired a bitter taste. That the wines most esteemed by the ancient Greeks and Romans were thin wines, and yet thoroughly fermented, we have evidence the most indubitable. Dioscorides, as we have already shown, gives it as a characteristic difference between the *white* and *red* wines, that the former are *thin*, and the latter *thick*.

The dark and thick wines as a class were considered by the ancients, as more intoxicating than those which were white and thin, yet some of the latter, when old, become very troublesome to the head. Among the white wines, Dioscorides mentions as before stated the Falernian, the Surrentine, the Cecuban,

* See Chaptal's *Traite sur les Vins*, Annales de Chimie, xxxv. p. 245.

the Chian, and the Lesbian; than which there were no wines held in higher repute. That the Falernian was a *fermented* and intoxicating wine is admitted even by Mr. Parsons, and if we are not mistaken, we have furnished conclusive evidence, that this was the general character of the ancient wines; or in other words, that among the ancient Greeks and Romans, the words corresponding to our term *wine* denoted a *fermented* and intoxicating liquor, just as much as the word *wine* does with us.

Near the conclusion of his letter respecting the modern wines of Palestine, the Rev. Mr. Smith remarks, that he is "happy to find that any apparent discrepancy between him and Mr. Delavan, *so far as facts are concerned*, is chiefly if not entirely verbal." But when the matter in question has respect to the signification of a word, a verbal distinction is everything. Mr. Smith says distinctly, that he never found the boiled and *unfermented juice* of the grape *bearing the name, or used in the place of wine*.

We have now finished our examination of the statements made by the authors of *Bacchus and Anti-Bacchus*, in support of their opinions respecting the ancient wines; and we feel bound to apologise for occupying so much time and space with comments upon statements so inaccurate, and arguments so idle. We should have confined ourselves to much narrower limits, had not these Essays been highly commended by individuals whose standing and character have served to impart to the productions of Messrs Grindrod and Parsons, an importance which their intrinsic worth could never have given them. Persons who ought to have known better, and among them instructors in some of our Colleges have given their countenance to these productions, and have spoken of them as containing views which merit the most serious consideration.

The discussion of the other matters proposed to be examined, we must defer to a subsequent number.