SOME NEW BOOKS.

Another Assailant of Shakespeare.

In a book called *Our English Homer, or Shakespeare Historically Considered*, Mr. THOMAS W. WHITE joins the ranks of those who contend that the plays attributed to Shakespeare were the work of other men. Mr. White differs, however, from some of his fellow-heretics in that he does not attribute all, or even most of the plays to Bacon, and he avows himself unable to make any use of Mr. Ignatius Donnelly's Great Cryptogram. He does not assert that there is no cryptogram in the Shakespearean plays, but he is sure that Mr. Donnelly errs in thinking that he has discovered one. To outline succinctly in a sentence opinions that will presently be stated in detail, we may say that Mr. White's investigations have led him to the conclusion that Shakespeare, the actor and manager, had nothing to do with the composition of the plays that pass under his name except to pay for it; that Bacon began the series by writing "Hamlet" and was afterward employed to revise those which Shakespeare bought of other playwrights. The pertinence of the title, "Our English Homer," is defended on the following grounds: The old-fashioned idea of Homer, a blind beggar unable to read or write, who, impelled by a divine inspiration, wandered through the cities of Asiatic Greece, chanting the epic which delights the world, has long since been abandoned by classical scholars; so that, unless Shakespeare be the sole example, the history of mankind affords no instance of a man devoid of education producing a literary work of the highest excellence. This is, however, what we are required to believe in the case of Shakespeare, but Mr. White declines to credit it.

I.

For a man who quotes extensively from the Greek and Latin literatures, and who professes to subject the text of Shakespeare to a rigorous scrutiny from the viewpoint of a thorough scholar, Mr. White makes some strange mistakes in history. Thus we read on his very first page that "the reënlightenment of Europe began with the invention of printing in the middle of the fifteenth century, and was greatly accelerated by the overthrow of the lower empire a century later (1543), when the treasures of Greek literature were carried into the West by the fugitives from Constantinople." Everybody knows that Constantinople was taken in 1453, but the context of the passage quoted shows that the blunder is no mere misprint. On page 85-6 we read: "Toward the close of the seventh century the great Saracen invasion [of the Iberian peninsula] took place, when the south of Spain was seized by Abdulrahma of Mauritania, one of the confederate Saracen princes, whose followers were thenceforth known as the Moors. * * * It was in these days that the Spanish drama arose and obtained its highest degree of excellence. The principal dramatists at that time were Jews invited from Alexandria by the Moorish rulers, and who became the fathers of Spanish literature." This passage is full of errors. The Arab invasion of Spain took place not toward the close of the seventh century, but in the first quarter of the eighth. Abdurrahman cannot be described as "one of the confederate Saracen princes;" he was simply the delegate and General of the Caliph of Damascus. His followers were mainly Arabs, and it was much later when the African invaders of Spain became known as Moors. There is not a shred of evidence that "in these days"—the period of some three centuries covered by the Emirate and Caliphate of Cordova—"the Spanish drama arose and obtained its highest excellence." Neither is there any proof that Jews were invited from Alexandria by the Arabic or the subsequent Moorish rulers of the Iberian peninsula. The Spanish cities were full of Jews at the time of the first Mohammedan invasion, and the rapidity of the contest was largely due to their disaffection, caused by the persecution which they had suffered after the Visigoth kings had been converted from the Arian heresy to the orthodox Athanasian creed. We may point out another egregious error on page 100, in the author's attempt to explain the combination of Greek names, like Theseus and Hippolyta, with the fairies, characteristic of the Teutonic mythology in the "Midsummer Night's Dream." Mr. White says that this admixture is quite natural, because "the Goths, having become masters of Italy toward the close of the sixth century, would, like true barbarians, have insisted on those they spared adopting their rude superstitions, in which fairies occupied a conspicuous place." It was in the latter part of the fifth century that the Ostrogoths became masters of Italy, and before the close of the sixth they had been expelled from it by the Generals of Justinian.

II.

Now let us examine in detail what Mr. White imagines himself to have established. He starts with the two inquiries, first, are the plays attributed to Shakespeare original compositions, and secondly, who were or was the authors or author? His attempt to answer these questions is summed up in some fifteen propositions. He avers that English literature, when the plays appeared, was extensively tinctured with classical learning. This is true enough, but it proves nothing. According to the author's own admission, London toward the close of the sixteenth century was flooded with cheap translations of Greek and Latin plays, histories, biographies, and essays, from which such classical knowledge as is evinced in the Shakespearean dramas could have been obtained at second hand by a self-educated actor. In the next place, Mr. White asserts that the drama which had just come into fashion was formed on classical models, and that the characteristics of the plays show them to have been written by learned men. It is true that some of the Shakespearean comedies seem to have been composed with translations of Plautus or Terence before the writer's eye, but the tragedies point rather to Spanish than classical exemplars. As for the so-called learning exhibited in the plays, it is full of gaps and blunders of which Bacon or any university man, like Chapman, Daniel, Nash, Lodge, Peele, or Marlowe would have been incapable. The dramas contain no evidence of first hand, comprehensive, and accurate erudition. Mr. White goes on to argue that the plays are not only not original, but that their originals are to be found respectively in the Greek, Roman, Spanish, and Italian drama. He succeeds, as we have just said, in showing that two or three comedies may be described as adaptations or paraphrases of Latin originals. That is the sum of his demonstration. The attempt to connect Macbeth with the Agamemnon, and Hamlet with the Electra, is visionary and futile. There is not even any pretence of producing the Spanish or Italian original of any Shakespearean play. That the plots of some of the dramas were taken from Italian stories has long been known.

The author contends that the incidents connected with the publication of the dramas do not reveal the author. It is true that Shakespeare himself was very careless about claims of authorship, and about the collection and revision of his writings, but it is impossible for Mr. White to explain away the address prefixed by the players Hemyge and Condell to the first folio edition of 1623 (seven years after the poet's death), in which they unequivocally represent Shakespeare as the author of the thirty-six dramas contained in the folio copy. The same declaration is made unmistakably in the laudatory verses composed for the same edition by Ben Jonson. The assertion that Shakespeare's literary character, as gathered from contemporary opinion, was not such as became the author of the plays, is built mainly on the absurd assumption that Ben Jonson's eulogistic testimony was purchased. Not indeed that anyone affirms that the Shakespearean plays were as highly appreciated at any period in the seventeenth century as we now think they should have been. None of them was as popular during Shakespeare's lifetime as some other dramas now forgotten. It is evident from Milton's "L'Allegro" that he prized Shakespeare chiefly as a writer of comedies; and Dryden records that in his day the works of Beaumont and Fletcher were acted far oftener than Shakespeare's.

The charge that Shakespeare's personal character was consistent with the theory that he was a literary impostor whose wealth enabled him to make use of needy scholars will be found to rest almost solely on the sneering imputation made in Greene's "Groat's Worth of Wit." This has been exhaustively discussed, and Mr. White is probably the only surviving person who supposes that the sneer settles the question of Shakespeare's character and capabilities. No one disputes that poor scholars were numerous in London in the Elizabethan and Jacobean age, as, indeed, they have been ever since, but, although he devotes three chapters to the purpose, Mr. White does not succeed in proving that any particular poor scholar was employed by Shakespeare to write any given play. As to the contemporary assertion (made in 1589) that the author of "Hamlet" was a lawyer, Mr. White argues that, while Shakespeare was none, Francis Bacon was the only lawyer of the time likely to engage in playwriting and the only one capable of composing "Hamlet." But Bacon was a very great lawyer; indeed, he declared his willingness to let posterity judge whether he or Coke were the greater. Now, it is well known that Lord Campbell carefully reviewed the Shakespearean plays with a view of seeing whether the legal acquirements exhibited would even justify the theory that they were written by a lawyer's clerk. His verdict was "not proven."

Mr. White has the courage of his convictions, and does not confine himself to generalities. He does not hesitate to attribute to Robert Greene, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nash, George Peele, Samuel Daniel, Thomas Lodge, George Chapman, and Francis Bacon, respectively, the authorship of "Love's Labor's Lost" and "The Comedy of Errors;" the second and third parts of "Henry VI." and "Richard III.;" "The Winter's Tale;" "A Midsummer Night's Dream;" "Romeo and Juliet;" "As You Like It;" "Macbeth" and "The Tempest," and "Hamlet." He further maintains that, in consequence of the great favor with which "Hamlet" was received, Shakespeare engaged Francis Bacon under a promise of secrecy to revise the plays he had obtained, or should obtain, from other authors, and that Greene and others, ascribing the revision to Shakespeare himself, taunted him with pretending he could "bombast out a blank verse as well as the best of them." That Bacon wrote "Hamlet" is pronounced proved by the parallel passages found in his acknowledged works. His revision of the other Shakespearean plays —except "Titus Andronicus," "Love's Labor's Lost," and "The Comedy of Errors"—is deduced not only from parallel passages, but from the presence of Bacon's tone of thought, mode of illustration, and personal experience. Not only "Hamlet," but "Julius Cæsar," "Antony and Cleopatra," "Coriolanus," "Timon of Athens," and "Henry VIII.," are alleged to have been entirely composed by Bacon. What Mr. White deems conclusive evidence does not seem to us worth reciting in detail. We will only point out what he overlooks, viz., that the only manuscript copy of "Henry VIII." in existence was destroyed at the burning of the Globe Theatre, and that scarcely any Shakespearean scholar doubts that Fletcher, at all events, and perhaps Massinger, had a hand in the reconstruction of the piece.

Mr. White's final conclusion is that, so far as the Shakespearean dramas are not reproductions of more archaic plays, but have original beauties of their own, Francis Bacon, with some assistance from Samuel Daniel, was the genius of Shakespeare. He will not even credit the actor-manager with the lyrical and descriptive poems commonly ascribed to him. The Sonnets are declared to be the productions of Anthony and Francis Bacon, and of some of the latter's friends; while to Christopher Marlowe are attributed "Venus and Adonis" and the "Rape of Lucrece."

It is to be expected that, since we know very little about Shakespeare's private or professional life, his claims to the authorship of the dramas will be from time to time disputed. But above all that the mass of controversial literature on the subject can be said to have established, is the probability that among the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights there was some secret as well as some avowed collaboration. It is therefore possible, though scarcely proven, that in other plays of Shakespeare, besides "Henry VIII.," we have, neatly pieced together, the work of several hands. It seems equally incontrovertible that most of the best work and the final masterly revising touch should be ascribed to Shakespeare.

M. W. H.

What Mankind Drinks.

It would perhaps be well for human beings if they had never drunk anything but water, but inasmuch as their preference for something else was disclosed in prehistoric times and has never ceased to show itself, it seems to be a proper subject of inquiry and discussion. It is not with a controversial, but with a purely inquisitive purpose that Messrs. JAMES MEW and JOHN ASHTON have collected the curious and comprehensive materials presented in a stout octavo volume entitled *Drinks of the World* (Scribners). Beginning with the earliest allusions to the products of fermentation in Pharaonic, Assyrian, Hittite, Judæan, Indian, and Chinese records, the compilers pursue the thread of investigation through Greek, Roman, and mediæval times down to the present day. Not only do they outline the methods of preparing the innumerable wines, beers, and liquors invented by man, but they outline the real or alleged reasons of connoisseurs for pronouncing a favorable verdict on this or that particular product of the vat or the still. On the other hand, no effort is made to recite the varied opinions of the medical faculty with respect to the hygienic value of drinks, their supposed uses in health and disease, and their chemical constituents. The question of price is not examined, neither is very much said on adulteration. The compilers have also shown good sense by avoiding for the most part the trade jargon, including such terms as "full," "fruity," "full of body," "character," &c.

I.

The whole process of wine making is delineated in Egyptian pictures. We see the vines very carefully trained in bowers formed by columns and rafters; the vineyards were walled in and frequently supplied with a reservoir of water, together with a building which contained the wine press. The grapes when gathered were put into deep wicker baskets, and conveyed on the heads and shoulders of men to the press, where the wine was squeezed out of a bag by means of two poles turned in contrary directions, an earthen pan receiving the juice. The Egyptians also had large presses in which they trod the fruit with their naked feet, supporting themselves by ropes suspended from the roof. The grape juice having fermented, it was put into earthen jars resembling the Roman amphoræ, which were closed with a lid covered with pitch, clay, mortar, or gypsum, and sealed, after which they were moved to the storehouse and there placed upright. The Egyptians had a habit, which afterward became general in Italy and Greece, and still obtains in the islands of the archipelago, that, namely, of putting a certain quantity of resin, or bitumen, at the bottom of the jar before pouring in the wine. This was supposed to preserve it, but it was also added to give an acceptable flavor. As early as the fourth dynasty (which, according to the reckoning of Mariette, should be referred to upward of 6,000 years ago), the Egyptians are known to have had four kinds of wine. The soil which lay beyond the reach of the alluvial deposits suited the vine, and extensive remains of vineyards near the Qasr Karoom show whence the ancient Egyptians obtained their grapes. Pliny cites the Sebennytic wine as one of the choice Egyptian crus, and says that it was made of three different sorts of grapes. Athenæus says that the Mareotic grape was remarkable for its sweetness, and he thus describes the wine made from it: "The color of it is white, the quality excellent, and it is sweet and light, with a fragrant bouquet. It is by no means astringent, nor does it affect the head." He adds, however, that it is inferior to the Teniotic. The latter's color "is pale and even white, and there is such a degree of richness in the wine that when mixed with water it becomes diluted only gradually, much in the same way as Attic honey does when a liquid is poured into it. Besides the agreeable flavor of the Teniotic its fragrance is so delightful as to render it perfectly aromatic, and it has the property of being slightly astringent." Nevertheless, in Egypt wine was the drink of the wealthy or well-to-do. The poorer people had a beer which can be traced as far back as the fourth dynasty, and, according to Diodorus, was scarcely inferior to the juice of the grape. This beer was made from barley, but hops being unknown, it was flavored with lupins and other vegetable substances. The Egyptians also had palm wine, and another wine called *baga*, which was made from dates or figs; they likewise made fermented beverages from pomegranates and other fruits and from herbs, such as rue, hellebore, and absinthe, which apparently answered the purpose of our modern bitters.

The Assyrian bas-reliefs bear witness to the prevalence of wine drinking among the ancient Assyrians. The well-known Assyrologist, W. St. Chad Boscawen, has furnished the compilers of this book a list of ten wines found engraved upon a terra-cotta tablet from the palace of Assur Banipal, the Sardanapalus of the Greeks. Wines constantly figure in the Assyrian inscriptions among the booty carried off from conquered countries or among the products received as tribute. Nor were the Assyrians contented with the fermented juice of the grape; they, too, had palm wine, date wine, and beer, as the Egyptians had. There is likewise evidence of a knowledge of fermented liquors on the Hittite rock carvings. That wine, and even the abuse of it were well known to the Hebrews is clear from their sacred writings. Only two varieties, however, are specified, viz.: The wine of Helbon, a fat, luscious, syrup-like liquor which was an article of merchandise at Damascus, and the wine of Lebanon which was celebrated for its bouquet. That the Hebrews mixed water with their wine may be inferred from two verses in Proverbs: "She hath mingled her wine;" "Drink of the wine that I have mingled." Their grapes used to be trodden in the press, and the juice after fermentation was put into bottles or wine skins.

II.

The only wine upon which Homer dilates with enthusiasm is one produced upon the coast of Thrace. This, we are told, was red and honey sweet, so strong that it was mingled with twenty times its bulk of water, and so fragrant that even when diluted it filled the house with perfume. The most important Greek wines of later times were those of the islands Chios, Thasos, Cos, and Lesbos, and of a few places on the opposite coast of Asia Minor. Wine was the ordinary Greek drink. There is no evidence to show that beer made from barley was ever introduced into Greece. Different sorts of wines were sometimes mixed together, and wine was almost always mingled with either cold or hot water before drinking. To quaff wine undiluted was looked upon as a barbarism. The Spartans fancied their King (Cleomenes) had gone mad from having contracted among the Scythians a habit of drinking wine neat. The proportions of the mixture varied, but there was always more water than wine, and half and half was repudiated as disgraceful. Straining, usual among the Romans, seems to have been rare among the Greeks.

The process of wine making was essentially the same in Greece and Italy. The grapes were gathered, trodden, and submitted to the press. The juice which flowed from the grapes before any force was applied was reserved for the manufacture of a particularly rich species of wine. The Greeks recognized in wines three colors—black or red, white or straw color, and tawny brown. When wine was to be transported from one place to another bags of goatskin were used, daubed over with pitch to make them seam tight. A spice wine is noticed by Athenæus. Into the so-called medical wines drugs, such as horehound, squills, wormwood, and whortleberries were introduced to produce hygienic effects. Essential oils were also mixed with wine. The most popular of the compound beverages was the honey wine, said by Pliny to have been invented by Aristæus. Greek wines as a rule required a long time to ripen. It is suggested that the sweet wines of the Greeks were probably somewhat like modern Cyprus and Constantia; the dry wines, such as the Pramnian and Corinthian, were remarkable for their astringency, and these particular products were only drinkable after being preserved for many years.

Of Roman wines Campania boasted the most celebrated growths. The Cæcuban, Massic, Falernian, and Surrentino wines were all the produce of the Campanian soil. The Cæcuban is described by Galen as a generous wine, ripening only after a long term of years. The Massic closely resembled the Falernian, of which more presently. The Setine was a light wine, and, according to Pliny, the favorite drink of Augustus, though Horace never mentions it. The Surrentine was dismissed by Tiberius as being no better than fine vinegar. The wines of Xeres and Madeira have been fixed upon by Dr. Henderson as those to which the celebrated Falernian bears the nearest resemblance. Both are straw colored, acquiring a deeper tint from age. Both present the varieties of dry and sweet. Both are strong and durable. Both require keeping. It is moreover to be noticed that if Madeira or sherry were kept in earthen jars till reduced to the consistence of honey, the taste would become so bitter as to be to us intolerable. The fact that not only resin or pitch, but sea water was commonly added to the Roman wines, would make their taste disagreeable to the modern palate. Columella advises the mixture of one pint of salt water with six gallons of wine, and he says that four ounces of crude pitch together with certain aromatic herbs should be put into two amphoræ containing collectively about thirteen gallons. It was likewise the custom of the Romans to expose their wines in smoky garrets until they were reduced to a thick syrup, when they had to be strained before they were drunk. They were, of course, diluted with water, the common proportion being three or four parts to one of wine. The Roman banquet, like the Greek, began with the mulsum, of mingled wine and honey. The dessert wines among the Romans were the Alban, Cæcuban, and Falernian, until they began to import Chian and Lesbian. Pliny and other authors mention a number of mixed drinks used by the Romans. Among these were hydromeli, made of honey and five-year-old rain water; oxymeli, made of honey, sea salt, and vinegar; hydromelon, made of honey and quinces; hydro-rosatum, a similar compound with the addition of roses; omphacomeli, a mixture of honey and verjuice; myrtites, a compound of honey and myrtle seed; rhoites, a drink in which the pomegranate took the place of the myrtle; sycites, wine of figs; phœnicites, wine of palms; abrotonites, wine of wormwood, perhaps the original of vermouth; and adynamon, a weak wine for the sick. Pliny also mentions drinks made of medlars, mulberries, and other fruits, of asparagus, and of thyme and other herbs. Hippocrates enters on a detailed description of the virtues of wine, and explains in what diseases they were, in his opinion, beneficial.

III.

It is in the Scandinavian records that we encounter the most frequent references to the early use of malt liquors. Beowulf discriminates between the drinkers of ale and of beer. Neither beverage was despised by the leaders of men, but wine drinking was a mark of social distinction. In one of the Cotton MSS., a lad having been asked why he does not drink wine, says: "I am not so rich that I can buy me wine, and wine is not the drink of children nor the weak minded, but of the elders and the wise." The old English grew the vine for wine-making purposes, and indeed very good wine can now be made from English grapes. Every Anglo-Saxon and mediæval monastery had its vineyard, and to this day London has six Vine streets and one Vineyard Walk. Mead, a fermented beverage, made from honey and water, was considered by the Northmen and the early English a glorified liquor fit for heroes. It is plain from a passage of Henry of Huntington that besides ale, beer, wine, and mead, the Anglo-Saxons had other liquors, including cider, morat (honey diluted with the juice of mulberry), and pigment, a liquor made of honey, wine, and spice. The wine drunk in Scandinavia was imported from Spain, Italy, France, and Germany. Olaus Magnus gives a receipt for making hydromel, or mead. This was composed, it seems, of one part honey and four of boiling water; the mixture was well stirred, boiled, and skimmed; hops were then added, after which the liquor was then casked and some brewer's yeast was inserted. It was fit for drinking in eight days. There was, it seems, a precedent for the Duke of Clarence's death by drowning in a tun of Malmsey wine. We learn from Olaus Magnus that one King Hunding, being grieved at the loss of his brother-in-law, called all his nobility around him to a great feast, and had a large tun filled with hydromel placed in the middle of the hall. When his guests were sufficiently inebriated he threw himself into the liquor and died sweetly.

The weak point of this book is the meagre attention given to American wines. Less space is allotted to this subject than to the products of the grape pertaining to Australia. We quote the fourteen lines devoted to the northern half of the continent. "The first attempt to cultivate the vine in North America was made, we are informed by Drs. Thudichum and Dupré, in 1564. Some of its best-known wines at the present time are the Catawba (still and sparkling), red *Aliso*, and *Angelico*. Wine has been made from the vines on the Ohio said to resemble Bordeaux in quality. In several parts of Mexico, as Paso del Norte, at Zalaya, and St. Louis de la Paz, wines are made of tolerable flavor. The red wine of California is agreeable. In Florida, according to Sir John Hawkins, wine was made from a grape like that of Orleans as far back as 1564. According to Redding, the island of Cuba possesses a light, cool, sharp wine." In a subsequent part of this volume rather less than a page is conceded to American beers, but among them neither ale nor the so-called lager beer, made, or supposed to be made of barley malt and hops, is mentioned. There is just a word about the Mexican pulque, and a cursory reference to the Brazilian beer, made from the batata root. The wines of South America receive a little more consideration than those of the United States. Thus we are told that wine was made long ago in Paraguay, and that a sweet wine resembling Malaga is now made at Mendoza, at the foot of the Andes, and is found to improve by transportation some thousand miles across the pampas. Both white and red wines are made in Peru and Chili, and the latter country has lately taken Paris medals for the products of its vineyards. Its muscatel and wine of Pisco are particularly esteemed. Among the wines of Australia several are described in detail. Thus Carbinet is said to resemble Burgundy, and Verdailho is said to be like Maderia. The so-called Frontignac is a thin white wine, with a slight taste of the muscat grape; Adelaide is a white wine, made mainly from Riesling grapes with a *soupçon* of muscatel. Many varieties of pretended clarets, such as Emu and St. Hubert, and of alleged hock, such as Heron and Royal Reserve, are imported into England from Australia. The Conatto is an Australian liqueur which combines the flavors of curaçoa and rum shrub.

IV.

It is naturally the wines of France with regard to which the compilers have tried to collect the most copious and accurate information. What they have to record, however, is very concisely presented in about fourteen pages. Beginning with champagne, they enumerate the principal establishments of the Rheims district, subsequently referring to those of the region whose commercial centre is Epernay. The wines of the province of Champagne have for centuries been coveted: Henry VIII., Charles V., and Leo X., as well as Francis I., all had vineyards of their own in that famous locality. The wine, however, that they obtained thence was not sparkling. The process of charging a still wine with carbonic acid gas and then applying a cork and string is said to have been the invention of the cellarer of St. Peter's Monastery at Hautvilliers. The same cellarer is averred to have been particularly skilful in his blends of the wine subjected to the aerating process.

Champagne owes its merit, in the first place, to the soil on which the grapes are grown, which is unique in its mixture of chalk, silica, light clay, and oxide of iron, and in the second place to the very great care and delicate manipulation which the grapes and their juice receive. Every doubtful grape is discarded, and the carts conveying the grapes from the vineyards go at a funeral pace, so that none of their contents may get bruised. If these little grapes—they are not much larger than currants—get at all crushed or partly fermented in carriage, the fruit is rendered worthless for the production of champagne. Very great care, too, is exercised in the pressing. The grapes are laid in stacked heaps upon the floor of the press, where they are left for a time and then subjected to a first gentle but firm, sustained squeeze. The juice thus extracted is the cream of the grape, and is used only for the finest brands. There are six of these squeezes applied, each more powerful than the last; and the outcome of each is of course inferior in quality to its predecessor till the sixth, called the rebêche, is reached, which produces a coarse wine, reckoned only fit to be given to the workmen. It is just this rebêche, however, which is purchased by people manufacturing and exporting cheap champagne. Mixed with other wines of very light complexion, the product of the sixth squeeze of good grapes gives them body and makes a stuff which can be sold at a low price.

The must begins to ferment in the casks more or less quickly, according to the temperature—usually at the end of ten or twelve hours, and the process continues for a considerable time, in which the color changes from a pale pink to a light straw tint. About three months are allowed to elapse, when the fermentation stops through repeated rackings and the cold of the season. Now other serious difficulties in the manufacture of champagne are confronted. First, there is the blend, which varies in the case of each manufacture. The produce of the vineyards is mixed in enormous vats, according to the receipt in vogue in the particular establishment, and to this mixture is added a proportion of some old wine of a superior vintage. A most thoroughly trained, subtle and exquisite taste is required to discern when the wine in this crude state has acquired the proper flavor and bouquet. Next comes the process of charging with carbonic acid gas, which is a source of great anxiety to the manufacturer, as the utmost vigilance is needed to regulate the quantity of gas. If there be too little the wine will be flat, while if there be too much the bottles will burst by the thousands. An instrument called a glucometer, or saccharometer, is applied at this point to measure the amount of saccharine matter in the wine; and if the necessary percentage be not indicated the deficiency is supplied by the purest rock candy. To the ordinary palate at this stage champagne differs in no respect from still white wine of a somewhat tart flavor. It is now drawn off into other casks and passed through the next phase of the process, viz.: the "fining," to make it bright and to remove what is known to connoisseurs as ropiness. Once "fined," the wine is ready for bottling, and the danger to be avoided is the bursting of the bottles, for the pressure of the gas is tremendous; hence it is that the champagne bottle is the most massive in use. The bottling takes place, as a rule, in about eight months after the grapes have been first pressed, and the precautions against breakage are of the most minute description. The risk of breakage is generally almost passed by the end of October, and the bottles are then kept in the cellars for a period ranging from eighteen months to three years, according to the custom of the establishment. Even now all is not over, for during this period a sediment, resulting from the fermentation of the wine, has been deposited, which must be removed before the wine is ready for consumption. The bottles, therefore, are placed in a slanting direction, with the necks downward, and the angle of inclination is altered from time to time till they stand almost perpendicular. Eventually the deposit collects in a ball in the neck of the bottle, whence it is blown out when the original cork is removed. A temporary stopper is inserted, until the liqueur which is to give the wine its distinctive character, dry or sweet, is introduced. This liqueur is a combination of the finest rock candy, the best champagne, and the oldest and purest cognac. In the final stage of the process the bottles receive their permanent corks and are carefully wired. They are then allowed to rest for two or three months, in order that the wine and liqueur may properly amalgamate; but some of the best wines are kept for years to mature, and thus acquire, of course, a far higher value. It is interesting to learn that a sweet champagne can be made of any wine, but a dry champagne must be a good wine, as, if it be not sound, its acidity is detected at once.

V.

Next to champagne, the French wine which Americans most care to hear about is Bordeaux, ostensibly the product of the region watered by the rivers Dordogne, Garonne, and Gironde. As a matter of fact, the quantity shipped from Bordeaux to all parts of the world, compared to the acreage of growth, entirely precludes the supposition that it could all have been the outcome of the Medoc district. The compilers enumerate the red wines of Medoc comprised in the first five classes, or "growths," but disregard the more inferior grades, whose name is legion. We believe the compilers to be right in asserting that the *premiers crus* are still only four, viz., Chateau Lafitte, Chateau Latour, Chateau Margaux, and Chateau Haut-Brion; but it has been for some time supposed that the official classifiers would soon transfer Chateau Mouton from the head of the second growths to the small group of first growths. We are reminded that the *premiers crus* are not always good. For instance, in 1809 a very large parcel of Chateau Margaux was sold at auction for about thirty shillings per dozen. There was no doubt that it was genuine wine bottled at the chateau; but of such a low quality was it, or it deteriorated so rapidly, that when sold again in 1871 it only averaged eighteen shillings per dozen.

Of the white wines of the Medoc and adjoining districts only two receive particular attention. One of these, the well-known Chateau d'Yquem of the Marquis de Lur Saluces, is said to owe its exquisite bouquet and delicious flavor to the presence of mannite, which, according to the French chemist Berthelot, has the peculiar quality of not becoming transformed into alcohol and carbonic acid during the process of fermentation. The other wine deemed worthy of notice is the La Tour Blanche, which among the liqueur-like sauternes ranks after Chateau d'Yquem. The characteristic qualities of the last named wine are the results of an extremely complicated and delicate process.

Passing to the wines of Burgundy, the compilers note that the vine growers divide the district of Côte d'Or into two sections, the Côte de Nuits and the Côte de Beaune, the first of which produces the finest wines. Of all the Burgundies, Romanée Conti is pronounced the king, and naturally Clos-Vougeot is placed next. It is pointed out, however, that there are plenty of good Burgundies to be bought at moderate prices, as, for example, Chambertin and Volnay. The compilers say that Chablis is chief among the white Burgundies; they mean, of course, the best known in England and the United States; Montrachet is incomparably superior. They do not, on the other hand, make the mistake of referring red and white Hermitage to the Côte d'Or. These admirable wines belong to the products of the Côtes du Rhone. As to the vintages of Languedoc, the compilers content themselves with saying that Roussillon is nearly as good as Burgundy, and after being manipulated at Cette is often palmed off for Port. The luscious liqueur-like wine known as Muscat of Lunel is also worthy of mention.

VI.

On the Rhine or on its tributary rivers, between Coblentz and Mayence, all the most celebrated wines of Germany are grown. The grape preferred for cultivation in this region is the Riesling, a small white, harsh species. The reputed characteristics of German wines are generosity, dryness, fine flavor, and endurance of age. It is averred that even the strongest are never saturated with brandy. The whole eastern bank of the Rhine to Lorich —a tract called the Rheingau, about fourteen miles in extent—has been famous for its wines for ages. Here is Schloss-Johannisberger, once nearly destroyed by Gen. Hoche. To Steinberger is assigned the next rank. Gräfenberg is thought to produce wine equal to Rüdesheimer, which is a wine of the first Rhine growths. Marcobrunner, Roth, and Königsbach are highly esteemed, but Bacharach has lost its former celebrity. We have thus far spoken only of the white wines of the Rhine country; its red wines are deemed inferior. Red Asmannshäuser is pronounced the best. The most celebrated of Moselle wines is the Brauneberger, of which there are numerous varieties. One of these, known as Gruenhäuser, used to be styled the nectar of the Moselle. In Würtzberg is grown Steinwein, produced on a mountain so called, and named by the hospital to which it belongs Wine of the Holy Ghost.

We obtain from this book very little information about the wines of Hungary beyond the statement that they possess considerable body and a certain amount of astringency. The compilers might as well have mentioned the interesting fact that the Hungarian methods of dealing with the grape have been handed down straight from the Romans, one of the Angevin Kings having transferred from Italy not only vines, but vine growers and wine makers. With regard to the Tokay essence, we are reminded that it should be very old, and we are assured that when fifty years in bottle it costs (presumably in Vienna) some fifteen dollars for a small flask. The compilers of this volume think that the value of Tokay essence is due to the caprice of fashion. They assert that the Muscadine of Syracuse or the Lagrima of Malaga is equal to it in richness, and that all buyers would think so if they dared to have a taste of their own. It seems that Ausbruch, also a sweet wine of Hungary, should be old. Maszlacz is of four kinds, the best of which does not get into trade. Meograd, Erasso, and Villany, from the west of Hungary, are cited as good examples of the second class. Wines of the third class are very numerous.

According to Redi, a great authority on the subject, the best Italian wine is Monte Pulciano, which is of a purple hue, sweet, and slightly astringent. The wine of Chianti, near Siena, is well known, and we are told that Artiminio, Poncino, Antella, and Carmignano, though of less wide repute, are not greatly inferior. The best Verdea, so called from its green color, comes from Arcetri, near Florence. The principal wines of Piedmont are Barolo, Barbera, Nebbiolo, and Braccheto. As to Asti, Chaumont, Alva, and Montferrat, these are said to have had reputation thrust upon them. Central Italy furnishes Montefiascone, which possesses a delicious aroma; Albano, which resembles Lacryma Christi, and finally Orvieto. The principal wine of Naples, produced on the foothills of Vesuvius is Lacryma Christi, a rich, red, exquisitely flavored product. The white and red wines produced on the island of Capri in the Bay of Naples, are of good ordinary quality. It is said that the disagreement of travellers about the merits of Italian wine arises in some measure from the fact that different wines bear the same names in different districts. We scarcely needed to be reminded that most Italian wines are still bottled in the old Roman style, in flasks with oil on the top and wool over it.

VII.

The chief renown of the modern Spaniards is derived from the preparation of the white, dried, fortified wines known as sherries. These wines are, or ought to be, the products of districts near Cadiz, as, for instance, Xeres de la Frontera, San Lucar de Barrameda, Trevujena, and Puerto de Santa Maria. The celebrated wine known as Manzanilla is made in San Lucar de Barrameda. The product of the province of La Mancha, known as Val de Peñas, is, in the opinion of some experts, equal to any red wine in the world. To Alicante is credited an excellent red wine, strong and sweet, which when old is called Fondellol. Much Catalonian wine is sent to England under the name of Catalan Port. The most famous wine-growing district in the province of Granada is that of Malaga, to which we owe the so-called Malagas, Muscatels, and Malvoisies. The red wines of this district, called Tinto de Rota and Sacra, are unfermented, with only enough spirit added to preserve them. The wine known as Guindre derives its name from the cherries with which it is flavored; the Spaniards are wont to put in it roasted pears in the belief that it is thereby improved in taste and rendered more wholesome. Malaga Xeres is, it seems, often sold in England under the name of Amoroso as a pale gold dry sherry. The so-called Amontillado sherry is said to be frequently the outcome of accident. Out of a hundred butts from the same vineyard some will turn out Amontillado without the manufacturers being able to account for it. It is well known that much of the Marsala wine grown in Sicily is sold in England for sherry.

The wines known in England and elsewhere as port are produced in the Alto Douro district of Portugal, which is bounded by Villa Real on the north, Lamego on the south, S. João da Pesqueira on the east, and Mezâofrio on the west. It is, perhaps, significant that this district is unhealthful and is but thinly populated. We are told that the vine in Portugal is cultivated in four ways: first, by being trained around oak or poplars; secondly, by the terrace system; thirdly, in rows of bushes, with the intermediate ground ploughed; and fourthly, on trellises. The first liquor drawn from the *lagar*, or press, due to the weight of the grapes alone, is called Lacryma Christi. After that a gang of men jump into the *lagar* and tread the grapes to the sound of the fife. As the weather is warm and the work hard the resultant compound is better conceived than expressed. Of white ports the best are said to be Muscatel do Jesus, considered the prince of all; the Dedo de Dama, the Ferral Branco, and the Malvazia, the English Malmsey, although another product of the same name, is brought from Funchal in Madeira. Of the black ports the finest is Touriga, and the sweetest Bastardo. Other dark ports are Souzao, Aragonez, and Pegudo.

Great quantities of wine are produced on Portuguese estates outside the conventional line of demarcation, and we are assured that some of these are equal to those made in the district of Alto Douro itself. No port, it seems, will keep good in the cask for more than two years without the addition of alcohol. The Oporto merchants use a pure spirit distilled from the wine itself. We may add that the few lines devoted to the products of the Portuguese island of Madeira are strangely inadequate. Not a word is said about the sweeping destruction of the vines in the present century, or about the subsequent replanting.

VIII.

Proceeding from fermented to distilled liquor, the compilers of this book agree with other authorities in ascribing our knowledge of the process of distillation to the Saracenic alchemists. The first trustworthy mention of alcohol distilled from wine was made by the French physician, Arnaud de Villeneuve, who died in 1313. It was he who gave alcohol the name of aqua vitæ, and his first pupils supposed it to be the elixir of life. We derive our word brandy from the Dutch *brande-wijn*, or the German *brannt-wein*, that is, burned or distilled wine, and in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was generally spoken of as brandy wine. During the same period it was also commonly known near England by the name of Nantz, from the town (Nantes) whence it came. When the trade left Nantes and went to the Charente district, of which Cognac was the centre, the liquor got the name which it now bears. We must again note some serious shortcomings in the chapter on Cognac. Nothing is said about the almost complete loss of the vines in the Charente district through the phylloxera, and of the present greatly reduced yield of the spirit. Indeed, the tests made some years ago by the well-known chemist, Dujardin-Beaumetz, showed it to be well-nigh impossible to procure such a thing as pure Cognac in any Parisian hotel or restaurant.

After noting that gin is an alcoholic drink, distilled either from malt or from unmalted barley or other grain, the authors of this volume draw a needed distinction between Hollands and the British product, acknowledging that the former is commonly purer than the latter. We are informed that the distillery of De Kuypers is the best known, not only in Holland, but all over the world.

Good Scotch and Irish whiskey is made solely from the finest barley malt, but the small distillers use all kinds of refuse grain and produce a spirit which, if drunk new, is rank poison. The amount of whiskey consumed by Irishmen and Scotchmen without any apparently hurtful effect is astounding. In a lawsuit reported by J. W. Croker, the witness deposed that for eighteen years he had been in the nightly habit of imbibing twenty-four tumblers of whiskey punch. He would not say that he had never taken more, but he swore that he had never taken less. The distillation of whiskey in Ireland on a large scale is of comparatively modern date, the "poteen" having been manufactured in illicit stills in inaccessible places. Scotch whiskey, like the Irish, is or should be made from pure malted barley. Up to the time of the Young Pretender it was hardly known in the lowlands, being a drink confined strictly to the Highlanders. There is, however, a tradition of a certain St. Thorwald who was said to have possessed a wonderful elixir famous for curing all diseases, and consequently in great request. It is suggested that this elixir may have been whiskey. It will seem incredible to American readers that in a dissertation on this liquor no mention should be made of the rye and Bourbon whiskies of the United States.

It is an interesting fact that sugar or molasses if distilled will produce alcohol, but this will have none of the characters of rum. The peculiar odor of rum is imparted to it by the addition in distillation of the so-called "skimmings," which are the matters separated from sugar in clarifying and evaporation. They contain all the necessary factors of fermentation, and when mixed with molasses and "dunder," which is the fermented wash left from distillation, are distilled into rum. Like all alcohol, rum, when distilled, is white, a color being given to it by the addition of caramel. The raw spirit is extremely injurious, but it improves so much by age that at a sale in Carlisle in 1865 rum known to be 140 years old brought more than $15 a bottle.

We have confined ourselves for the most part to wine and spirits, but the reader will find a good deal about ale and beer in this volume, as well as chapters on tea, coffee, and cocoa, and all other beverages used by man.

One Way to Keep an Umbrella.

From the Philadelphia Press.

A prominent young club man of this city, who is noted for his faultless attire, was exhibiting a costly, gold-mounted handled silk umbrella, which was ingeniously fastened with a tiny silver padlock, to a number of friends, with the remarks:

"If it had not been for this locking device I would have lost this valuable umbrella long ago. Picking up the wrong umbrella on a rainy day is as time-honored a habit as the borrowing of your neighbor's lead pencil and returning it back to your own pocket. To test this question to my full satisfaction I strolled into the lobby of a well-known hotel one wet, stormy day, and, snapping the little lock through the wire spring under the folds of the umbrella, I placed it in a prominent rack among a number of others. On looking over a morning newspaper I pretended to be deeply interested in its columns. I had hardly turned my eye when a respectably dressed gentleman picked up my umbrella and off he went. It was raining in torrents, he couldn't open it, and in a moment or two he returned, ramming it back and muttering something about a 'mistake,' took another one from the rack, and was gone for good. You may not believe me, but for one hour that umbrella came and went every five minutes, men, women, and children, old and young, grave and gay. The performance was kept up until it tired me out. I took charge of it finally and sauntered off home."

IF THERE SHOULD BE WAR.

The Ease with Which English Ironclads Might Command Our Harbors.

From the Washington Post.

The surest and the cheapest way for the United States to avoid war is to be prepared for it. Congress is doing well in what may be called the hand-to-mouth method of providing guns, ships, and fortifications—that is, in giving at one time somewhat stinted sums for one year's work. But when it comes to considering the wise proposition of making liberal permanent or continuing appropriations, such as will lead prudent firms to establish costly plants and increase the capacity of those already in existence, and such as will also enable the chief of engineers to energetically push the most important works without being constantly retarded by insufficient funds, those making the proposition are met with the jaunty assertion, "Oh, no one is going to attack the United States. They all know too much for that." And this frivolous and unreflecting style of talk has long had far too much influence in Congress.

The present situation of our controversy with England is surely one which demands thoughtful attention. Those responsible for the management of national affairs, both in Congress and in the executive departments, would be trifling with most serious duties if they did not recognize this fact, and give it their most serious consideration. They would be failing in their duty if they did not keep the fact in view that war is one of the contingencies of the controversy now in progress.

Lord Salisbury's note refusing to renew the *modus vivendi* now in operation in the Behring Sea, but about to expire, was little short, if indeed it fell short in any degree, of an open insult. The prompt, firm, and dignified manner in which President Harrison met it commands the respect and support of the nation. As is well known, the most active preparations are in progress to maintain the President's position at all hazards.

The entire fleet of revenue steamers, with the Pacific squadron at its back, will be ready before the poaching season opens to deal with all poachers, Canadian or American, with whatever degree of force is found necessary to stop their stealing. The question of war over this matter, therefore, rests to-day solely with England. It is safe to say that President Harrison will not hold his hand. The nation could not afford to have him do so, even if his firmness should cost every undefended city on our coasts and on the northern frontier. The situation is this: England must yield now or a few weeks hence, when an American fleet in Behring Sea begins to capture poachers flying England's flag, or war is certain. No armed ship of England can fire on a vessel of our fleet in Behring Sea with any other result than war. The question of peace is out of the hands of the United States. And it is out of our hands because a surrender of our position is impossible. There are some things worse for a nation than war, and the national humiliation which properly attaches to any failure to maintain its rights is one of these.

With such a situation confronting us, with hurried preparations in our revenue and naval fleets on the Pacific coast to be ready for offensive operations when the poaching season in Behring Sea opens, with Canadian poachers openly preparing in great numbers to renew their trespassing, it certainly cannot be considered sensational writing to look forward and try to forecast the possible, if not the probable, events of the early summer.

The season for active seal poaching begins in our northwestern waters the last week in June. By that time our armed vessels will be there, and probably among them the Charleston, the Boston, and the Yorktown. The English North Pacific squadron has more and heavier ships than we can send, and some which are faster than ours. For instance, the Warspite is an armored ship of 8,400 tons, carrying 14 modern guns and a crew of 470, and with 10,000 horse-power engines its usual speed is 16½ knots.

It is easy to see what the situation will be three months hence unless England makes satisfactory reply to President Harrison's recent notes. What the situation may be, stripped of every element which can be fairly regarded as sensational, can, perhaps, be best set forth in a series of supposed specials in regard to the events of the next Fourth of July:

"SAN FRANCISCO, July 4, 1892—[Special].—The United States revenue steamer Rush arrived this evening, bringing news of a general and severe engagement between the American and English fleets in the vicinity of the Pribyloy Islands, which opened ten days ago. The Charleston had seized the well-known poacher Sayward, and a demand was soon after made by a vessel of the English fleet for her release. This was refused, and fire was soon after opened upon the Charleston. This vessel was sunk in the course of the day by ramming. Later in the day the Boston and the Yorktown became warmly engaged, but night and fog put an end to the engagement. The Rush was immediately despatched to take the news to Port Townsend, but when within a day's steaming of that point she spoke a sailing vessel, whose Captain reported two English men-of-war cruising off the mouth of Puget Sound, and the Captain of the Rush deemed it prudent to change his course for this port. The news has created the wildest excitement, and this has been increased by the posting of bulletins from Tacoma and Seattle announcing that two English ironclads have to-day entered Puget Sound."

"*Later.*—SAN FRANCISCO, 9 P. M.—The signal station reports what appears to be a foreign ironclad steaming into the mouth of the harbor. The Captain of the Rush also reports that an American fishing vessel gave him the information that a swift English gunboat from Behring Sea had been passed a short distance off Victoria the evening of June 30."

From the news columns of the Post of July 2.

"A cipher telegram was received at the State Department yesterday, saying that the despatch boat of the English fleet in Behring Sea had arrived at Victoria the night before, but it had been impossible to gain the least knowledge of the news she brought. No one but the commanding officer had left the ship. It is known, however, that four of the iron-clads, which were anchored yesterday at Esquimaux, put to sea at an early hour of the day."

"DETROIT, July 4, 1892—[Special].—Fourth of July festivities came to a sudden end here this forenoon upon its becoming generally known that the English ironclads passed up the river early this morning, and one of them is reported at anchor just above Belle Isle. Telegrams from Port Huron, St. Clair, and other points on the rivers and canals above announce that two artillery companies, supported by infantry, were found this morning stationed at all points on the Canadian side commanding the canals, having evidently been brought in by trains from Toronto during the night. The three ironclads which went up the river this morning are reported to have passed the St. Clair canal without trouble, and to have proceeded up the lake. It was ascertained at the locks from some of the seamen that these ships left Montreal the evening of July 1, and that they had come through the Canadian canals by night, and kept out of sight on the north shores of the lakes for two days."

"PORTLAND, Me., July 4, 1892—[Special].—There was considerable excitement in the city to-day over the arrival of two large class English ironclads. They cast anchor about sunset, but held no communication with the shore."

"BOSTON, July 4—[Special].—Four English ironclads of the first class arrived off this harbor at dusk and anchored. They were a little late to take part in the most general and enthusiastic celebration of the Fourth which Boston has witnessed in many years. There is considerable curiosity concerning their appearance."

"NEW YORK, July 4, 10 P. M.—[Special].—A fishing excursion steamer, returning from off Rockaway, reports passing at dusk off Coney Island, moving slowly toward the Narrows, six ironclads, each fully as large as any in the white squadron. Their course had evidently been outside the range of the signal station at Fire Island, as they were not reported from that point."

"FORT MONROE, July 4, 1892—[Special].—At 8 o'clock this evening three large ironclads entered this harbor, and are now anchored beyond the Rip-raps. A lighter vessel, which seemed to be moving with the rest, did not anchor, but proceeded up the Chesapeake, whether bound for Baltimore or Washington could not be determined. An officer from one of the ships came ashore and sent a cipher despatch addressed to Ottawa, Canada. One of the seamen at the wharf, who brought the officer off in a small boat, let drop the fact that they were four days from Bermuda."

"CHARLESTON, S. C., July 4, 1892—[Special].—Two ironclads of the first class came in through the main channel just at sunset, and anchored just inside of Fort Sumter at dusk. Thus far they have held no communication with the shore."

Will any one say that there is anything impossible in the situation of affairs here supposed to exist at the close of our national exercises over the American eagle on the 4th of next July? Is there anything in the conditions now known to exist to make an outbreak impossible, or even improbable? If a conflict of arms should occur in Behring Sea—a question which now rests with England alone —is there anything sensational in the supposition that English officials would first hear of it at Victoria, and so, hearing of it, be able to hold it confidential till telegraphic orders should be sent along England's entire line of land and naval investment of these United States from Victoria to Halifax, and from this latter point through the Bermudas and to Santa Lucia and Jamaica?

The fact that all this, or something even approximating it, is not impossible must be admitted. Being admitted, the whole subject, in all its numerous and important branches, demands the most serious attention which Congress can give it. Such trouble may not come. But, as things now are on both our coasts and on the lakes, it is possible. It could not come if the United States were prepared for war.

H. V. BOYNTON.