

it is put in jars and glass bottles." He then adds:—"This mode of boiling wine is not peculiar to the inhabitants of that country, but was in great use among the ancients." (Essay, page 46.) Now this is precisely the way to form an extract or syrup, and prevent fermentation.

In Adams' Roman Antiquities, we find the following passages:—"In order to make the wine keep, they used to boil (*decoquere*) the must down to one-half, when it was called DEFRICTUM, to one-third SAPA" (p. 441). Again:—"The wine was mixed with water, in a large vase or bowl called CRATER, whence it was poured into cups" (p. 442).

Here again we see the process of inspissating the juice to preserve it in its unfermented state; and the subsequent mixing it with water, to liquify and render it drinkable.

Now, in all books that treat of fermentation, *Ure*, for instance, or "*McCulloch on the Art of Wine Making*," we find it stated that the vinous fermentation leaves the juice a clear liquid. We cannot, therefore, suppose that these thick wines had undergone that process. So that after all, we may perhaps find that a great part of the wines celebrated by Anacreon and other ancient poets, were the natural nutritious and pleasant juice of the grape, preserved in different ways and seasoned with various perfumes, spices and condiments; and that the absurdity of making poetry in praise of alcoholic or poisonous drinks, was chiefly reserved for modern times. The very fact that the greater part of the ancient wines were perfumed, spiced, or seasoned with different herbs, tends to prove that it was not on account of their alcoholic or intoxicating principle that they were used; for these adventitious circumstances are usually little regarded by those who drink for the sake of the stimulus.

Certain it is, whatever they were, the wines commonly used in ancient times, could contain little or no alcohol: for we read of one Tergilius, who boasted that he usually drank two gallons at a draught; and of a gigantic man named Maximin, who could drink six gallons (I suppose at a sitting). We also read of Novellius Torquatus, who was knighted by Tiberius Claudius by the title of Tricongus, or three gallon knight, because he drank three gallons of wine at a draught. Now the Roman gallon contained, it is said, seven pints of our measure, and if their wine had been as strong as the *weakest* of ours, which, according to Brande's table, contain from eight to ten per

cent. of alcohol, Tricongus must have swallowed two pints of pure spirit of wine, equal to two quarts of Brandy, a conclusion evidently absurd.

In investigating the manners and customs of Rome and Greece, more especially the latter country, antiquaries and learned men have often observed the most striking similarity between them and those prevalent among the Jews; so much so, that they are constrained to believe that the Grecians borrowed largely from the Hebrews. And we shall shortly see that this holds good in their wines and mode of drinking, as well as other things.

But first I shall advance one or two general considerations. If the vine be extensively cultivated in any country, and its produce be converted into intoxicating drinks, one of two things must necessarily follow, I imagine; either the people of that country must export a great deal of wine, or drunkenness will be a prevalent vice among them. Now neither of these conditions held good, as far as we know, with the Jews, although we know for certain that they cultivated the vine very extensively, therefore we are left to conclude that its produce was not generally converted into intoxicating drinks.

Again, how could wine be praised by so many prophets and holy men amongst them, if it tended to produce intoxication—a state which all mankind, except the inhabitants of northern climates, agree in condemning in the most unqualified manner?

Unless we suppose that they had two distinct kinds of wine, and that one of them was nutritious and harmless, and the other intoxicating and destructive, how shall we reconcile passages which make mention of wine along with corn as a blessing—as a precious and important part of the produce of their country, and a wholesome article of food—how shall we reconcile these passages, I say, with others, which denounce and condemn the use of wine in the most unqualified manner?

It may be answered that the moderate use was sanctioned, and only the immoderate use or abuse condemned. But in the condemnatory passages, there is generally no allusion whatever made to quantity.

"Look not thou upon wine when it is red,† when it giveth its colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright; for at last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."—*Proverbs*, xxiii 31, 32.

"Wine is a mocker; strong drink is raging;

† This is a very important passage, for we learn from "*McCulloch on the Art of Wine making*," that "even the juice of red grapes, or of elder berries, produces a colourless wine, if it be separated from the husks before fermentation: it is only when the colouring matter in the skins has been exposed to the act of fermentation with the juice, that the wine is tinged."—page 87. Solomon's words are therefore equivalent to "look not upon fermented wine," &c.

and whosoever is deceived thereby, is not wise."—*Prov.* xx. 1.

These and other texts, which unlimitedly condemn the use of wine, afford a strong contrast to such passages as the following:—

"Therefore, God gave thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine."—*Genesis* xxvii. 28.

"Thou hast put gladness in my heart; more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased."—*Psalms* iv. 7.

And many others, which evidently refer to it as a valuable part of their ordinary sustenance.

These apparent contradictions can only be reconciled by supposing that the articles mentioned in the conflicting passages, were of an entirely different nature. And this supposition is heightened almost to certainty, when we find different and perfectly distinct words applied, in the original, to designate the two articles. Thus, where wine (in our translation) is mentioned as a blessing, or good article of diet, it is called by one name (*tirosch*); when mentioned as a curse, or productive of bad consequences, it is called by another name (*yayin*).‡

Our Saviour's words, in Luke 5, 37—"No man putteth new wine into old bottles, else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles will perish"—have been brought forward as a triumphant proof that the wine was fermented, else it would not burst the bottles; but they appear to me to be susceptible of quite a different interpretation.

We may understand that the new wine, after it had been properly prepared, was bottled before fermentation took place, and if the bottles or skins were new, and consequently sweet and clean, that process would be effectually prevented; but on the contrary, if they were old, and had been employed to hold wine before, there would necessarily remain upon the skin some sour or yeasty matter, which would cause the new wine to ferment and burst the bottles: a natural and inevitable consequence.

If wine necessarily fermented after being put into any kind of bottle, it is not likely that a new bottle could contain it any more than an old one, since even a strong barrel may be burst by the process. Besides it is not apparent why bottles should be selected as a proper vessel in which to carry on the process of fermentation.

We may therefore, perhaps, consider these words to mean that "No man putteth new (or unfermented wine) into old bottles, else

‡ It is objected that this does not invariably hold good; but as far as I have seen of the controversy, I think it perfectly established. It would not be strange, however, if people who never heard of alcohol or chemistry, should sometimes be uncertain whether alcohol were present or not, and consequently write in an ambiguous manner.

* Morewood, page 16. If this were intoxicating wine, our modern three and six bottle men must hide their heads.