

under the reign of Emperor Titus they drank more than 170 different kinds of wines. The early settlers in America thought themselves lucky to be able to sip *one* stimulent; to-day the "swell" in New York may ask for more than 288 "mixed drinks" (true to Dean Kirwan of Killaloe, who said, that the happiness which is attainable in this life must ever be of the mixed kind).

A glass of good beer is undoubtedly an excellent stimulant when we have only a simple beefstake, but our appetite and our digestion will greatly suffer if, when partaking of a modern dinner, we confine ourselves to beer as a beverage only. The stomach (in high esteem with Shakespeare) directs also here our intelligence. It does not require much experience to teach us, that with oysters a light white wine is needed, Sherry or Madeira with soups, with fish a German wine and with entrees a good Burgundy; roasts require champagne or another kind of the best French wines while Malaga, Malmsey, Sherry and Condrieux assist to agreeably wash down the *entrémets de ducœur*.

Still in spite of these universally recognized facts there are people who at fine dinner-parties undertake to eat from each course in turn, but from what they call "principle" decline to partake of the spiritious liquids. They thus damage their health with one such dinner more than a habitual drunkard could in a regular eight-day spree.

Modern, or let me say, *higher cookery without liquids necessarily entails a bad stomach and destroys the*