

Apostolos L. Pierris

OINOΛΟΓΙΚΑ

On Wine and Vineous Liquors in Classical Antiquity

[A complementary study to “On Maturation and Decay”, Appendix I of:
Apostolos L. Pierris, *Mystery and Philosophy*,
Vol. I of “The Emergence of Reason from the Spirit of Mystery. An Inquiry into
the Origin and Nature of Ancient Greek Rationality”]

Written in Spring 1986

With regard to the various types of wine products, as defined by the different degrees of condensation achieved, we revert to Pliny's determinations. [Cf. A. L. Pierris, *Religion and Mystery*, (vol. I of "The Emergence of Reason from the Spirit of Mystery. An Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of Ancient Greek Rationality", 2006), pp. 398 – 9, and Appendix I "On Maturation and Decay". - Pliny, e.g. XIV, 9 (11), 80, explaining the various dulcia (sweet wines) that are produced by the cooking of the must, calls sapa the heavy liquid that remains when must has been boiled down to one third of its initial quantity, while defrutum is the result of the process when it is carried through only to half the original volume. He further identifies siraeum with the Greek ἔψημα and the latin sapa]. - As we do with the account of Palladius (running parallel to Isidorus with a difference in the etymology of *defrutum*), *De Agricultura* XI (October) 18: nunc defrutum, cavoenum, sapam conficies. cum omnia uno genere conficiantur ex musto, modus his et virtutem mutabit et nomina. nam *defrutum* a *deferrendo* dictum, ubi *ad spissitudinem fortiter despumarevit*, effectum est. cavoenum, cum tertia perdita duae partes remanserint. sapa, ubi ad tertias redacta descenderit; quam tamen meliorem facient cydonia simul cocta, et igni supposita ligna ficulnea. I am puzzled at the apparent contradiction with what was quoted elsewhere on sapa; moreover "to thicken itself out forcefully by despumation", "to strongly digest, work down and defoam itself to a dense substance" may connote maximal rather than middle condensation; yet it more appropriately would refer to the abundant expumation at the initial stages of the heating rather than to the later and final actual "boiling".

Columella, the great technical authority on agriculture reverses the nomination of the musteous products. Thus, talking about ways to preserve for a longer time the must, he explains in *de Re Rustica*, XII, 19: quidam *partem quartam* eius musti, quod in vasa plumbea (itself causing slight adulteration or medication of the must) conjecerunt, nonnulli *tertiam decoquunt*. Nec dubium, quin ad *dimidium* si quis excoxerit, *meliolem sapam* facturus sit, eoque usibus utiliolem, adeo quidem, *ut etiam vice defruti, sapa, mustum quod est ex veteribus vineis, condire posit*. And in XII, 21: mustum quam dulcissimi saporis decoquatur *ad tertias*, et decoctum, sicut supra dixi, *defrutum* vocatur. And in XII, 20 he contemplates an even bigger reduction of the volume of the must in boiling, (if the product of the pressing is weak), below that of the two thirds that gives the normative defrutum (according to him), this being a liquor reduced to the one third of its initial volume (cf. also XX : "cum deinde ad tertias subsederit coctura, subtrahe ignem et plumbeum subinde agitabis, ut defrutum et medicamenta coeant"; and "... item ad tertias decocti defruti...") : deinde si natura tenue mustum erat, cum ad tertiam partem fuerit decoctum, ignis

subtrahendus est, et fornax protinus aqua refrigeranda. quod etiam si fecerimus, nihilominus *defrutum infra tertiam partem vasis considit*. Sed id quamvis aliquid detrimenti habeat, prodest tamen; nam quanto plus decoquitur (si modo non est adustum) *melius and spissius fit*.

For Columella it is *defrutum* that eminently helps as chief condiment of wines. He elaborately describes its decoction (XII, Chapters 19 – 21). Among the separate rooms in the storehouses of an estate he mentions: *torculariam, cellam vinariam, defrutariam*, etc. (I, 6). There were *vasa defrutaria* (XII, 19), not “*saparia*”; the boiling vessel was also called *defrutarium (ibid.)*. In II, 21 he speaks of *defrutum quoque facere et defrutare vinum licet* (sc. in feasts and festal days, according to the pontifical injunctions); *defrutare vinum* clearly is to employ *defrutum* as medicament or condiment in wine fermentation. In the same sense is the word to be understood in Cato, *de Re Rustica*, 24. It is significant that the verb utilized, even antiquely, to signify wine-adulteration or tampering by cooked musts is derived from *defrutum*. According to Columella, *sapa* can be used instead of *defrutum* as condiment of must coming from old wines; the sense must be that with such potent vintage less powerful, milder medication is needed. Thus, e.g., after having explained that the wine which can be made unadulteratedly and last perennially is the perfectest (the *ἀντίτης οἴνος* of the Greeks), he adds (XII, 19): *caeterum, cum aut regionis vitio, aut novellarum vinearum mustum laborabit etc.* The must selected for wine-medication has to come preferably from particular varieties of vine, or, if not, from the best available vines and especially from those oldest and in driest environment; as he continues: *eligenda erit pars vineae, si est facultas, Amineae, si minus, quam bellissimi vini, quaeque erit et vetustissima et minime uliginosa.*-

Pliny speaking of wine medicaments mentions the musteous kind, though not in any emphatic way, (XIV, 19 (24), 120 – 1), but he treats the subject in a manifestly cavalier fashion, obviously detesting wine adulteration of any kind, and relishing the excellence of pure and self-sustainable wine : *nec non et ex ipso musto fiunt medicamina. decoquitur ut dulcescat portione virium, nec durare ultra annum spatium tale proditur. aliquibus in locis decocunt ad sapa musta, infusisque iis ferociam frangunt*. Clearly Pliny here mentions the use of *sapa* as a strong agent to break the ferocity of strong wines and mollify agreeably their robustness. [Thus, analogously, raw *resina* has a more vehement action, and thus is used contrarily to irritate weak and lean wines; while again: e diverso *crapula* (i.e. decocted *resina*) *compesci feritatem nimiam, frangique virus; aut, ubi pigra lenitas torpeat, virus addi* (an additional, very natural, function of the cooked medicament), etc. ... *utilitas*

discernitur hoc modo: pugnacibus mustis crapulae plus inditur, lenibus parcius. XIV, 20 (25), 124 – 5.

The real, besides the nominal, difference here as between Pliny and Columella stems from their respective and diverse viewpoint. The latter considers the necessities and possibilities of the local estate vintage, the requirements of any given producer of wine regarding its amelioration; he is concerned in most cases with an ordinary stock and needs powerful means in attempting to keep it sound and improve it. On the other hand Pliny envisages the best crops internationally and, with the connoisseur's refinement of taste and attitude, finds that some excellent but wild, unconquerable liquid requires stronger and fuller treatment to tame and mellow it down for its own perfection. – However, we are stuck with the initial problem: for Columella still reverses Pliny's appellations in the case of *sapa* and *defrutum*. And I opt for Pliny. Although a simple assumption, borne out by our *Columella*, would solve the crux: he uses the term *defrutum* *senso latiore* all decoctions produced by the boiling of fresh must to a high degree of condensation – above half of the original volume of must remaining in the end of the process.

Consistent in his reversal of appellations Pliny seems to imply *defrutum* to be more winish and *sapa* more congealed: cf. e.g. XIV, 21 (27) §135: *numquam implenda (sc. dolia), et quod supersit passo aut defruto perungendum admixto croco pistave iri cum sapa*. And in XVIII 31 (74) §318 he defines the proper time for *defrutum coquendi* (obviously the same with the production of the unmentioned *sapa*). *Defrutum* is also mentioned as a basis for the taking of imula, XIX, 5 (29) §91; as also for being medicinized by lupines, XXII, 25 (74) §155: *et alio genere tosti (sc. lupini) vel in defruto poti vel ex melle sumpti*. Clearly *defrutum* was more easily “drinkable” and more winish than *sapa*. Which latter was on the contrary more of a φάρμακον in itself, being the stronger substance, although it could be still be said to be “drunk”; v. Plinius, XXIII (30): *usus (sc. sapa) contra cantharidas, buprestim, pinorum erucas, quas pityocampas vocant, salamandras, et contra mordentia venenata. secundas partusque emortuos trahit, cum bulbis potum*. Fabianus auctor est *venenum esse si quis jejunos a balineis id bibat*. (Cf. XXIII, (33)). *Sapa* was a preservative for fruits like sorbs or pears (Cato, *de re rustica*, 7, 4; 143, 3; Varro, *de re rustica*, I, 59, 3; Palladius II, 15, 5; Pliny, XV 21 (23) §85). *Sapa* appears generally as a medicinal basis, not the *defrutum*; v. Pliny, XX 20 (81) §213; and XXII 13 (15) §32; §33. Fulvius Lippinus fed his snails in the important vivarium he constructed *sapa et farre*, among other fattening foods; Pliny, IX 56 (82) §174. I have already referred to the passage where *sapa* is mentioned as a strong medicament and conditor breaking wine's excessive ferocity (Pliny, XIV 19 (24) §121).

The Plinian combination of *passum* with *defrutum* appears enlarged in Plautus, *Pseudolus*, 740 sqq.:

Quid, si opust ut dulce promat indidem, ecquid habet? – Rogas?

Murrinam, *passum*, *defrutum*, *mella*, *mel* quojusmodi.

That the italicized is the correct reading is clear from the evidence of the *vetustissimus palimpsest A* (whose reading is: *MEILAMMELQUOIUSMODI*) in conjunction with Plinius' quotation [but for the which one might read *me(i)lam(m)el* (sweet applewine) or even *meilim(m)el* (from *μελίσιω*)] in XIV 13 (15) §93: *Scaevolam quoque et L. Aelium et Ateium Capitonem in eadem sententia fuisse video* [namely that – Plautus' at least – *murrina* was a sweet rather than an aromatic wine. The anthesis relies on the view Plinius XIV 9 (11) §80: *vinum omne dulce minus odoratum; quo tenuius, eo odoratius*. Which is exactly what the Aristotelian *Problemata*, Γ, 873a1 tell us: *ἔτι δὲ ὁ μὲν γλυκὺς ἀνοδμος, ὁ δὲ αὐστηρὸς οὐ*. Although the subtle wine is not exactly the austere one. But perhaps Pliny wanted to render the standard Greek opposition between the *γλυκὺς* and the *αὐστηρὸς* wine], *quoniam in Pseudulo sit*:

Quod si opus est, ut dulce promat indidem, equid habet? – Rogas?

Murrinam, *passum*, *defrutum*, *mella* -----

quibus apparet non inter vina modo murrinam, sed inter dulcia quoque nominatum. Pliny simply stops at *mella* as honey which follows is not to the point, being not drinkable in the way an even thick winish stuff is. This ancient practice in quotations is notorious and causes much frustration and error in the moderns.

Mella might be what Columella (*de agricultura*, XII, 11) describes it to be, but I think it rather low; some kind however of *aqua mulsa* or *hydromel* will do (cf. e.g. Plinius, XIV 17 (20) §113).

Murrina was a precious potion, exquisitely sweet; indeed, it was called *νέκταρ* in Greek. [Festus, s.v. *Murrina*: *genus potionis quae graece dicitur nectar; hanc mulieres vocabant muriolam, quidam murratum vinum; quidam id dici putant ex uvae genere murrinae nomine* (which was used in its preparation, not as extracted from it, evidently). Maybe the Lydian nectar is meant, of which Ariston speaks apud Athenaeus, II, 38F: *καλῶς οὖν Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖός φησιν ἴδιον ποτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄμα μὲν γλυκότητος, ἄμα δ' εὐ<ω>δίας κοινωνοῦντα. διὸ καὶ τὸ καλούμενον νέκταρ κατασκευάζειν τινὰς περὶ τὸν Λυδίας Ὀλυμπον οἶνον καὶ κηρία συγκιρνάντας εἰς ταυτὰ καὶ τῶν ἀνθῶν <τὰ> (add. Wilamowitz) εὐωδέστατα (Desrousseaux and Astruc, for the manuscript εὐώδη). It is very well conceivable that suchlike might be the temperament of the finest *μελιχρός*. Chaereas (apud Athenaeus I, 32B) ἐν Βαβυλῶνι οἶνόν φησι γενέσθαι, τὸν καλούμενον νέκταρ.] It (or a worthy kind of*

it), under the appellation *murrata potio*, was religiously employed (even at later times, particularly by the Aediles at the *pulvinaria*) while its being offered to the dead was prohibited by the XII Tables (Festus s.v.). It was a kind of wine (in the more natural, broader sense and not in that according to which Pliny opposes *dulcia* to *vina*) in whose preparation myrrh was involved either as *berry* or as *wood* – but not as unguent. Plinius XIV 16 (19) §107: aromatiten [we find in the *Glossaria* an entry: ἀρωματεῖον, murina. Is it pro: ἀρωματίτης, murrina? Or is it some preparation or unguent-cist?] quoque invenio factitatum *non unguentorum compositione* [not of course that such procedure was nonexistent or unpopular. To the contrary, we have the weighty testimony of Aristotle, *Parva Naturalia*, *De sensu*, 443b26sq.: αἱ δὲ καθ' αὐτὰς ἡδεῖαι τῶν ὀσμῶν εἰσιν, οἷον αἱ τῶν ἀνθῶν. οὐδὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον οὐδ' ἦττον πρὸς τὴν τροφήν παρακαλοῦσιν, οὐδὲ συμβάλλονται πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον μᾶλλον. ἀληθὲς γὰρ ὅπερ Εὐριπίδην σκώπτων εἶπεν Στράτις (Fr. 47, PCG vol. VII p.645) “ὅταν φακῆν ἔψητε, μὴ ‘πιχεῖν μύρον”. οἱ δὲ νῦν μειγνύντες εἰς τὰ πόματα τὰς τοιαύτας δυνάμεις βιάζονται τῇ συνηθείᾳ τὴν ἡδονήν, ἕως ἂν ἐκ δυ' αἰσθήσεων γένηται τὸ ἡδὺ ὡς ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ μιᾶς], primo ex *murra*, ut diximus, mox et nardo Celtico, calamo, bitumine, offis in *mustum aut dulce vinum* deiectis etc.

In his energetic negation of “unguentation” Pliny is contradicted by Pollux, VI, 17: ἦν δέ τις καὶ μυρίνης οἶνος (*murrina*), *μύρω κεκραμένος*. And by Aelianus, *Varia Historia*, XII, 36 sub fin.: μύρω γὰρ οἶνον μινύντες οὕτως ἔπινον καὶ ὑπερηγάγοντο τὴν τοιαύτην κράσιν. καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ οἶνος *Μυρρινίτης*. μέμνηται δὲ αὐτοῦ Φιλιππίδης ὁ τῆς κωμωδίας ποιητής (Fr. Inc. XVII, vol. IV p.478 Meineke). The correct form, as Meineke observes, was *μυρίνης* as in Pollux. Cf. Diphilus, *Ἀπολιποῦσα*, Fr. I.10, vol. III p. 381M (apud Athenaeus, IV p. 132 C) and Posidippus Fr. Inc. VIII, vol. IV p. 526M = Fr. 36, PCG vol. VII, p.579 (apud Athenaeus, I p. 32 B), who condemns its costly quality:

διψηρὸς ἄτοπος ὁ μυρίνης ὁ τίμιος.

It was out of use then. Still, I shall allow the Roman to be better informed in Latin “Archaeology” – on the which the Greeks in general rarely paid any serious or sustained attention. Besides Pollux adds an embarrassingly general divergent signification ascription: οἱ δὲ τὸν γλυκὺν οὕτως (sc. μυρίνην) οἶονται κεκλήσθαι. We obviously are on uncertainer ground here, which I promptly quit.

“Ut diximus”, in Pliny supra, refers to XIV, 11 (15) 92: *lautissima apud priscos vina errant murræ odere condita, ut apparet in Plauti fibula, quae Persa inscribitur, quamquam in ea et calamum addi jubet*. In Plautus’ *Persa* I, 3, 7 sqq. (88 sqq.) Pliny must have read a different text, probably. But although aromatic, this wine was also

singularly sweet, as we have attested, despite the generally holding inverse relationship between these two qualities; for we have here to do with artificial spicing and not natural, autogenous odorosity. Sweetness came to it by the boiling of the must, as is detailed by Columella, *de agricultura*, XII, 20, 5. (This agrees with the preparations enjoined in *Persa*, *loc. cit.*, though the word is missing from our received text). –

Nonius Marcellus in his (XVIII) *De generibus ciborum vel potionum* gives important but corrupt information drawing from Varro. Thus (551.7 sqq.) : Murrina. potio confecta. Varro *Anthropopoli* (40): “non modo vinum dare, sed etiam, ut Plautus ait (*Pseudolus*, 741) ‘murrinam, passum, defritum (sic)’ ”; the distinction, Plinian as well, rests on the unfermented nature of the sweet potions resulting from the cooking of the must. But when we read next: “Varrro *De vita Populi Romani* lib. I: ‘tu autem murrina; loram dicebant in vindemia cum expressissent acinis mustum et folliculos in dolium coniecissent’ ” – one is tempted to assume a lacuna before *loram*; for there cannot be any connection between the rich *murrina* and the weak, thin *lora* (cf. Varro, *De re rustica*, I, 54, 3; Cato, *De re rustica*, 25). For although one of the three kinds of *lora* mentioned by Pliny XIV, 10 (12), 86 – the one the Greeks utilized as their δευτερίας οἶνος – does fulfill the requirement of a rather concentrated, sweetish potion given the way of its production; still it could not bear any significant resemblance to what bore the name of the potion of the gods: non possunt iure dici vina quae Graeci *deuteria* appellant, Cato et nos *loram*, macerates aqua vinaceis, sed tamen inter *vina operaria* numerantur. tria eorum genera: decima parte aquae addita quam musti expressa sit et ita nocte ac die madefactis vinaceis rursusque prelo subiectis; alterum, quo modo Graeci factitavere, *tertia parte eius quod expressum sit addita aquae expressoque decocto ad terias partes*. tertium est faecibus vini expressum, quod faecatum Cato appellat (v. Cato, *De re rustica*, 153). [A more complex process for the first type is given by Columella, *De agricultura*, XII, 40]. –

But the same problem which seems to postulate the lacuna in the passage above, reappears in 551.14 sqq. : LORA, confectae potionis genus, grandaevus aptum. Varro *De vita Populi Romani* Lib. I : “antiquae mulieres maiores natu bibebant loram aut saram aut defretum aut passum; quam murrinam quidem Plautum appellare putant (referring to the Aldine reading but for the better attested *quidem* for the last clause; Lindsay has: quidem Pl. a. *solet*, naively postulating an archetypal fictitious *polet*.) The text as it stands, and with the required semi-colon after *passum*, signifies *loram*, the entry-word, as the reference of *quam*. (Popma, and I independently, had thought of *quam* <*loram*> *murrinam* etc. but it is unnecessary). The explained difficulty in the preposterous identification again tempts one to assume a lacuna before *quam*. –

However the problem reappears once more, and desperate. 551.25 sqq.: *moriolam*. Varro De vita Populi Romani I: ‘vino addito loram, passum vocare coeperent; muriolam nominabant *quom* (L.Mueller, certainly correct, pro *quod*; the ancient editions had *cum*) ex uvis expressum erat passum et ad folliculos reiculos et vinacia adiiciebant’ (Iunius, pro *ea dicebant*) *sapam* (*aquam* in older editions e.g. in Varro’s Bipontina p. 240 (Popma)). The first piece of information can be made meaningful only on the supposition (unmentioned in *lora*’s Varronian explanation supra or in his *de Re Rust.*, but possibly invocable from elsewhere in the Varronian work quoted from) that *lora* was already sweet either in the *defrutum* or the *passum* way – in which case its strengthening by real vine made it approach real *passum*. The former possibility has been testified by Pliny above, the latter seems to be envisaged by Varro if *muriola* is the same thing with *moriola* as is to be assumed. In any case, *muriola*, says he, was produced from *raisin* husks infused by *sapa* (interesting combination of the two roads to sweetness) and then treating the resulting juice either towards wine proper or cooked *dulcium* (less probable in view of the preexistence of *sapa*). –

Now *murriola* was, according to Festus, the evidently ὑποκοριστικόν name women gave to the glorious *Murrina*. Thus, unless Varro flatly contradicted Festus by dissociating completely *murrina* from *mur(r)iola*, the Varronian *Murrina* must have proceeded from grape-skins basically, whatever the further process was: which makes it a kind of special *lora* indeed, thus obviating the need for lacunae in the two previous passages. – Still, in view of Pliny’s and Festus’ testimonies, I shall not lessen the august prestige of nectar-like *murrina* by ascribing to it so low an origin. Probably, such sophisticated, and no doubt sweetest, *lorae* as indicated by Varro, would be mere substitutes of the noble original. Certainly, in any case, they were really distinct: *Aulus Gellius, Noces Aticae*, X, 23 2: *bibere autem solitas* (the women in Rome and Latium) *ferunt loream* (another form of *loram*), *passum, murrianam* (in order of increased value) *et quae id genus sapiant potu dulcia* (and not real wine). –

Defrutum is, it appears, for Plautus a winish liquid – but there is no mention of *sapa* in his extant writings. Both are mentioned by Cato in his concise and authoritative *de Re Rustica*, and they are clearly distinguished in their function, albeit without any specific proportion of evaporation and conglutination ascribed to them – exactly as one should expect from an antique and, I say, more Hellenic attitude. *Defrutum* of the exquisitiest available quality (*de musto lixivo coctum*) is used as one of the chief condiments of good wine (*de R.R.* 23). One thirtieth part of *defruti veteris* is further used in the production of *helvolum-vinum* (24). And, in general, all musteous medication of reputable wines is done by *defrutum*, as the very verb

indicating the process signifes: *quidquid vini defrutabis, partem tricesimam defruti addito*. On the contrary, *sapa* is used in the preparation of an inferior wine of rather inhibited fermentation, meant for slave and servant consumption during the winter, hardly keeping up to the next solstice, and in whose mixture *vinegar* is added in equal quantity with the *sapa* (104): *vinum familiae per hiemen qui utatur. Musti Q. X in dolium indito, aceti acris Q. II eodem infundito, sapae Q. II, aquae dulcis Q. L. Haec rude misceto ter in die dies quinque continuos. eo addito aquae marinae veteris sextarios LXIII et operculum in dolium inponito et oblinito post dies X. Hoc vinum durabit tibi usque ad solstitium. siquid superfuerit post solstitium, acetum acerrimum et pulcherimum erit*. The liquid signified by *sapa* must have been a potent substance indeed to govern the activity of an equal quantity of strong vinegar, and to excite the must's power over and above such prefermentative dilution in water. The same condensed efficacy is implied in Cato's prescription for the remedying of a sharp wine by the use of flour from vetch with *sapa* (109): *de ervo farinam facito libras IIII et vini cyathos IIII conspargito sapa. postea facito laterculos. sinito conbibant noctem et diem. postea conmisceto cum eo vino in dolio et oblinito <post> dies LX. id vinum erit lene et suave et bono colore et bene oderatum*. The preparation applied in coating the brime of wine jars is described in 107: *quo labra doliorum circumlinas, ut bene odorata sint et nequid viti in vinum accedat. sapae congios VI quam optimae infundito in ahereum aut in plumbeum et iris aridae contusae heminam et sertam Campanicam P. V bene odoratam una cum ivi contundas quam minutissime, per cribrum cernas, et una cum sapa coquas sarmentis et levi flamma. conmoveto, videto ne aduras. usque coquito, dum dimidium excoquas*. A slow fire is required as *sapa* has already undergone seething and boiling and further cooking; thus one must be particularly careful with this substance that has much suffered already lest it be burnt and scorched thereby destroying flavour and odour. And why should one take the *thinner* liquid and then *thick it down to its half*, as there was no need of decoction at all as such according to what we have learnt from Pliny (XIV, §135), and in any case much less heating would be needed should the purpose be of a finer commixture of the grinded molecules with the liquid? Evidently a more congealed material is recommended than the densest boiled-must production, which thus must be *sapa*.

In all probability, then, for Cato, *defrutum* was more *drinkable and noble*, while *sapa* *heavier and stronger stuff*.¹

¹ In §7 grapes are recommended to be preserved in *sapa*, as in grape-pulp, in must or in *lora* (the inferior wine we have noticed – obviously the sweet type). And *sapa* is also the preservative for sorbs and pears. A thick and deeply sweet liquid is evidently implied.

Virgilius mentions the process of boiling the must, without giving any special name to it, in *Georgica* I, 295-6, in a winter² night by the *materfamilia*:

Aut dulcis musti Volcano decoquit humorem,
et foliis undam trepidi despumat aheni.

But in IV, 264 sqq., in detailing the measures to be taken with ailing bees, he specifies:

Hic jam galbaneos suadebo incendere odores,
mellaque arundineis inferre canalibus, ultro
hortantem, et fessas ad pabula nota vocantem.
Proderit et tunsum gallae admiscere saporem,
aventisque rosas, aut igni pinguia multo
defruta, vel psythia passos de vite racemos,
cecropiumque thymum et grave olentia centaurea.

Honey is to be infused in which all these condiments have been mixed. There is no doubt both from the expression *igni pinguia multo defruta*, and from the meaning requirement of a medicament of honey, that *defrutum* here is a pretty thick and condensed substance.

This is more serious than Varro's reversed order in the proportions of condensation. But it gives also a valuable clue to the solution of our difficulties. For it emerges that a major factor in the distinction between the two decoctions was the general and intrinsic quality of the liquids. Thus *defrutum*, being the nobler word, signified also the more drinkable, and exquisite, potion; whereas *sapa*, of a lowerly sound and formation, was appropriated to the less potionable substance; and it kept, so to speak, a rustic roughness, as against the smoother skin of *defrutum*. Thus nicely to the Virgilian passage is balanced Ovid, *Fasti* IV 779-8:

² Not quite winterly of course, as it is done upon vintage, mostly in October. Unless he means by *mustum*, *vinum*; or by *humor musti*. Both unlikely and vain. For, particularly as to the former, sweetness is an essential quality of must as is observed by *Quintilian* VIII, 2, 10. Cf. the Aristotelian *Προβλήματα*, 23, 925 b16: τοῦ γλεύκου ὄντος φύσει ἠδέος. And against both, Virgil, both ponderous on the one hand and deeply accurate and exact on the other, means every word he writes. The watery liquid is de-cooked and extracted from the juice by evaporation thus concentrating its substance (Servius *ad loc.* tells us: bene autem ait decoquit humorem, id est, rem superfluum; sicut supra (112) posuit: luxuriam segetum tenera depascit in herba). The foam is skimmed with leaves from the violently boiling must which makes the copper vase to quiver; the transaction taking place, further, in the night. All these are precise features of must-cooking as reported by the writers treating of these subjects. (Only a lead vessel was recommended in later times (v. Columella), as its condimental quality was regularly observed in its effects. Cato enjoins the use of either of the two metals. Given Virgil's exactitude, we can unhesitatingly deduce that in his time copper was still the acknowledged better quality for the boiling vessel).

tum licet, apposita veluti cratera camella,
lac niveum potes, *purpureamque sapa*.

The ritual of the *Palilia* or *Parilia* is described, this agrarian festival for the purification and protection of Pastoralty – of herbs and flocks, cattle and shepherd, of animals and people involved in Shepherdry and of its necessary environment – as well as for the nativity of the City – both activities, the pastoral and the civic, constituting a human interference in the physical order of things, and thus requiring an appeasement offered to the Power of the Wild Nature for such encroachments upon the open and pure Countryside and the disruption of its natural life, as well as an invocation for the blessing of this extension of human life by the potent rustic Deity. A potion mixed from *milk* and *sapa* in a wooden, rough vessel (for *camella* v. Petronius 135 (bis), 64 *sub fin.*, 137) and offered to Pales in field-rites of agrarian simplicity is revealing. The deep purple hue of *sapa* is so, too. The mixture is called *Burrana potio* by Festus s.v. *Burrana potio appellatur lacte commixtum sapa: a ruso colore, quem burrum vocant.* (And s.v. *burrum dicebant antiqui quod nunc dicimus rusum; unde rustici burram appellant buculam, quae rostrum habet rusum; pari modo rubens cibo ac potione ex prandio burrus appellatur*). *Rusum* is here used generically, in the broad acceptance of which Favorinus speaks and complains, apud *Aulus Gellius* II, 26, 4 sqq; (5): quippe qui ‘rusus’ color a *rubore* quidem appellatus est, sed cum aliter rubeat ignis, aliter sanguis, aliter ostrum, aliter crocum, <aliter aurum>, has singulas rusi varietates Latina oratio singulis propriisque vocabulis non demonstrat omniaque ista significant una ‘ruboris’ appellatione, cum ex ipsis rebus vocabula colorum mutuatur et ‘igneum’ aliquid dicit et ‘flammeum’ et ‘sanguineum’ et ‘croceum’ et ‘ostrinum’ et ‘aureum’. ‘Russus’ enim color et ‘ruber’ nihil a vocabulo ‘rusi’ differunt (the vulgate lectio pro the mss. *dicuntur*) neque proprietates eius omnes declarant, ξανθός autem et ἐρυθρός et πυρρός et κίρρός et φοῖνιξ habere quasdam distantias coloris rusi videntur vel augentes eum vel remittentes vel mixta quadam specie temperantes. (In the sequel Fronto tries to indicate the wealth of the Latin tongue in this respect in a rather biased way yet not without some success).

We see the field of *redness*, as expressed in corresponding Greek: it extends from the *bright fair to the deep purple*. *Burrus* belonged no doubt to it; a more precise determination of its hue is given by Servius ad Virgilius, *Aeneas*, II, 469 where he observes on Pyrrhus: A colore comae dictus: qui latine *byrrus* dicitur: He was called, that is, Πύρρος from the Greek πυρρός, which is equivalent to the latin *byrrus* or *burrus* (the later form is the best; it exists also in *Quintilian* I, 4, 15 in the discussion of letters and their pronounciation). And similarly the *LatinoGraecae glosses* s.v. *Burrum; ξανθόν, πυρρόν*. And s.v. *Barus; burrus, πυρρός*. We should imagine a hue between

the flavish fair and the rosy, the common denomination of the bright yellowish and the light reddish of fire: something of an ochre; which is precisely what one gets from the mixture of milk with a preparation which has been produced by must protractedly and repeatedly boiled and purified and condensed to approximately the one third of its initial quantity. This preparation is the modern Greek *πετιμέζι*. Such therefore must also *sapa* have been.

To conclude then. Defrutum was more delicate, whereas *sapa* was tasting somehow rough and rustic. Principally the difference was due to the more careful and relatively less insistent cooking of the must for the former potion (the precariousness of its preservation over a year is implied by Cato's call for *defrutum veterum*) as opposed to the commoner, harder, persistent and perhaps repeated boiling of the latter. Initially, I believe, there was not so much a question of thickness and congelation of the resulting liquid, as of its character as determined by and from the quality of the vintage and the mode of production. But as *it was more easy to keep longer what was produced with less care by more decoction*, the rustic dulcium tended to be the more condensed. Stil, and as I have explained from the spirit of Greek antiquity, there was no rigorously settled mathematical proportion to govern these activities; it simply depended on the experience and knowledge of the producer in handling a given must with its specific qualities in a particular year *either the more elaborate or the cruder way*. Today, the women in Greece who know how to prepare *πετιμέζι* (boiling of must, with ashes as condimental purgative, defoaming, cooling, draining, and repeated boiling) are unaware of any proportion to be kept in the final reduction of the initial quantity of must. Given a method of production, it is a question of judgment how far the process will continue in any particular case. The expert who knows what to do, will also know where to lead and when to stop – and his produce will last.

We meet with something analogous in the case of *lora*. This is the *δευτερίας οἶνος* of the Greeks, its essential inferior character consisting in its coming from a *second* treatment of what has been left over once the grapes have been done with, *calcatae* and *sub prelo*: it is a *second* rate wine. But very different methods are employed in its production as we have seen from Pliny (XIV, 10 (12), 86 – quoted and commented upon supra, p.4). The thin, sour wine of the first method; the rather thick bitter-sweet of the Greek way; and the opaque, astringent-sweet potion of the third; they have in common a definite quality of inferiority that their generation from sorts of refuse imparts onto them; this “substratival” dominant character being nonetheless modified along the directions suggested.

Similarly with *sapa*. Its chief feature being of a simple rusticity; which would be tuned either towards a light-sweet potion, of a bouquet somehow in between must and wine and more or less for immediate use; or to a heavy-weight, subbiter-sweet preserve liquid, of multiple and pretracted usefulness³. This sufficiently accounts for the possibility of the converse ascriptions we have been occupied with so extensively. But as the second application was more stable and characteristic (especially as the time went on and the bad quality of most first-hand wines rendered the δευτερείας οἴνου, the *vina operaria* and the rustic drinkable *dulcia* more or less obsolete) Pliny was more to the real and natural point than Varro. Which will be confirmed by the etymological analysis to follow.

But before proceeding to it, beginning with the Plinian passage from which we began this wine inquiry, let there be noticed the equalizing entries in the *Glossae Graeco-Latinae*: thus in *Philoxenus* (LG) we find *Defrutum*· ἀπόβρασμα, ἔψημα; and again: *sapa*· ἔψημα; whereas in *Cyrrillus* (GL) we meet only σταφιδίτης οἴνος· *sapa*.⁴ The *Onomasticon Latino-Graecum* has both equivalences of ἔψημα with *sapa* and *defrutum*⁵. Which was natural enough as there were no words in Greek to differentiate according to the later Latin separation, and probably no generally valid practices existed either, of more or less standardized must-concentration, this being

³ Thus particularly appropriate and as a gift, *Martialis* VII, 53, 6.

⁴ Answered in the LG by: *Passum*, σταφιδίτης (the correct reading, pro σταφυλίτης in Labbaeus)· γλυκύ (from the *Onomasticon* LG; on the γλυκύ and γλυκὺς (οἴνος) cf. what I said elsewhere)· ἔψημα (from the *Excerpta*). The last, and the middle, equivalences are a mistake, mediated by the sweet quality of both *passum* and the boiled *dulcia*. Similarly the G-L gloss by itself would have to be considered inaccurate, although (unless we could simply correct *sapa* to *passum*) perhaps significant for our purpose at hand. Σταφιδίτης οἴνος is the one produced by first allowing the grapes to dry in the sun for several days – from σταφίς or *passa uva*. But it is a sweet wine – like the decocted musts. However, that the *Graeco-Latin* glossary could fall into this inadvertence would indicate that *sapa* could be more wine-like, in later times too, and thus of *lesser* condensation. But we shall see Hesychian authority clarifying the muddle of the bilingual glosses. For the meaning τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς σταφίδος ἔψημα is given as one of the significations of σίραιον. Thus not *passum* itself, but a combination of the *passum* technique with subsequent boiling of the raisin-must, would be called σίραιον in one acceptance of the term; and in view of the general equivalence of σίραιον with ἔψημα (especially as that product was in truth ἔψημα as well) might be called actually, or taken inappropriately as named, ἔψημα.

⁵ That Charisius, *de Arte Grammatica*, I p. 34K = p. 38.24 Barwick gives, in a list of substantives used only in the singular, the equivalence *defrutum* ἔψημα, without any compensating mention elsewhere of *sapa*, means in the circumstances nothing more drastic than the general rendering of both Roman boiled musts as *cooked* liquids.

left free to gravitate towards the point of single optimal yet multiple *usefulness* and appropriateness, with individual variations in the application of the norm to particular types or particulars of exigencies – a state of affairs as consonant correspondingly with Roman formalism and Greek spirituality as one should expect – and as one expression signifying the result of decoction could do nicely justice to both Roman expressions with regard to their referendum.

Returning now to Pliny's *siraeum* and *hepsema*, a subject that I have also treated elsewhere. Pollux VI, 16: καὶ σίραιον δὲ ἐκάλουν τὸν ἐκ γλεύκους ἠψημένον γλυκὺν (sc. ἄοινον οἶνον so to speak). And so Photius s.v. Σίραιον· τὸν ἠψημένον οἶνον καὶ γλυκὺν. Regarding ἔψημα, Pollux VI, 17 has: καὶ μελίκρατον δέ, τὸ νῦν οἰνόμελι. ἧ που δὲ καὶ τὸ νῦν ἔψημα ὀνομαζόμενον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν οἶνος ἐξεψημένος εἰς γλυκύτητα. καὶ τοῦτ' ἂν τις οἴοιτο εἰρημένον ἐν τῇ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τοῦ κωμικοῦ Συμμαχίᾳ (= Fr. IV, vol. II p. 666 M = Fr. 163, PCG vol. VII, p.498):

τὸ δὲ ἔψημά σου
γευόμενος ἔλαθον ἐκροφῆσας.

Does this imply that it was unusually thin and thus, in *tasting* it, he *drank* it all? It may well however be metaphorical, as has been supposed.

The notion that μελίκρατον could mean οἰνόμελι or ἔψημα is singular. I shall not expand on the matter, but only refer to Eustathius ad *Odysseam*, K, 519, p. 1668.22: Μελίκρατον γὰρ οἱ παλαιοὶ μίγμα φασι μέλιτος καὶ γάλατος ἐνταῦθα· οἱ μέντοι μεθ' Ὀμηρον μέχρι καὶ ἐς ἄρτι, κράμα μέλιτος καὶ ὕδατος τὸ μελίκρατον οἶδασι. On the other hand it is readily acceptable that certain wine-preparations would approach closely οἰνόμελι, just as the λώτινος οἶνος did; v. Polybius XII, 2, 7 (apud Athenaeus XV, p. 651F). – Hesychius gives s.v. ἔψημα· ὅπερ ἔνιοι σίραιον καλοῦσιν· ἄλλοι γλυκὺν (sc. οἶνον, pro γλυκύ, which also can be retained). Cf. s.v. γλυκίννας· διὰ γλυκέος οἴνου πλακοῦς, or more exactly Athenaeus, XV 645F: γλυκίνας· ὁ διὰ γλυκέος καὶ ἐλαίου πλακοῦς παρὰ Κρησίν· ὡς φησιν Σέλευκος ἐν Γλώσσαις. S.v. σίραιον Hesychius explains: τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς σταφίδος ἔψημα· οἱ δὲ τὸ γλυκύ (i.e. τὸ ἔψημα from the must boiled down)· καὶ ἠψημένον οἶνον (or, τὸν γλυκὺν καὶ ἔψ. οἶνον). On the whole, I do not suppose that there was a substance called γλυκύ distinct from both ἔψημα and γλυκὺν (sc. οἶνον). It must have been either the one or the other; and very likely and naturally and commonly the latter, in which case we must normally read and understand ὁ γλυκύς. (The neuter substantively appears also in Nicander, *Alexipharmaca*, 386). Cf. the epistle of Diocles to Antigonos, apud *Paulus Aegineta*, I, 100, 2 (p. 69.14-5 Heiberg): καὶ ἀναζέσας ἐν χυτρίδιῳ μετὰ γλυκέως ἢ ἐψημάτος ἡμικοτυλίον etc. But of course the ἔψημα was γλυκύ, and so Galenus explains σίραιον as γλυκὺ ἔψημα [ex Comm. in *Vesp.* p. 501]

or even γλυκύ, ἔψημα. Plutarch, in his *Aetia Physica*, KZ' 918^E, refers to the γλυκύ, but in a desperate, probably corrupt, passage: διὰ τί τὸ γλεῦκος, ἂν ὑπὸ ψύχους περιέχεται τὸ ἀγγεῖον γλυκὺ διαμένει πολὺν χρόνον; πότερον ὅτι πέψις ἐστὶ τοῦ γλεύκου ἢ εἰς τὸ οἰνώδες μεταβολή, κωλύει δὲ τὴν πέψιν ἢ ψυχρότης, ὑπὸ θερμοῦ γὰρ ἢ πέψις· ἢ τουναντίον, οἰκειὸς ἐστὶ τῆς σταφυλῆς χυμὸς ὁ γλυκὺς, διὸ καὶ +πεπαίνεσθαι λέγεται τὸ γλυκὺ κιρνώμενον+ (?). ἢ δὲ ψυχρότης οὐκ ἐῷσα διαπνεῖν ἀλλὰ συνέχουσα τὸ θερμόν, τὴν γλυκύτητα διατηρεῖ τοῦ γλεύκου. The sense requires either that the grape ripens when it becomes sweet; (we would expect then e.g. τοῦ γλυκέως κιρνώμενου); or that the sweet must and the γλυκύ itself is matured when boiled, cooked (ἐψώμενον for κιρνώμενον); or that τὸ γλυκύ, when mixed, acts as controller of fermentation or digestion, causes maturation (πεπαίνειν pro πεπαίνεσθαι). The third hypothesis is remote, unlikely and biased; the first less fitting overall and demands some major and difficult to be accounted for change. The second I prefer, reading: ἢ τουναντίον, οἰκειὸς ἐστὶ τῆς σταφυλῆς χυμὸς ὁ γλυκὺς <καὶ θερμός>, διὸ καὶ πεπαίνεσθαι λέγεται τὸ γλυκὺ ἐψώμενον: far from τὸ θερμόν being the external cause of fermentation (and thus transformation of must into wine) it is the natural quality of γλεῦκος together with sweetness; so that must when further *heated matures* further, condensing into the γλυκύ in itself.

The Hesychian gloss s.v. γλυκύ· μελιχρόν must be understood primarily in the reverse order; what was a very characteristic epitheton of wine in the archaic times, is the γλυκὺς οἶνος of the later. Athenaeus (X p. 430A sqq.) speaking of the renowned Alcaeus' φιλοινία writes: κατὰ γὰρ πᾶσαν ὥραν καὶ πᾶσαν περίστασιν πίνων ὁ ποιητῆς οὗτος εὕρισκεται. χειμῶνος μὲν, ἐν τούτοις· (Fr. 30 Diehl = 34 Bergk):

ὔει μὲν Ζεὺς, ἐκ δ' ὠρανῶ (vel. ὀράνω) μέγας
χειμῶν, πεπάγασιν δ' ὑδάτων ρόαι.
κάββαλλε τὸν χειμῶν', ἐπὶ μὲν τιθεῖς
πῦρ, ἐν δὲ κίρναις οἶνον ἀφειδέως
μέλιχρον, αὐτὰρ ἀμφὶ κόρσα
μάλθακον ἀμφι<βαλῶν> γνόφαλλον.

.... τοῦ δὲ ἔαρος ... καὶ προελθῶν (Fr. 97 Diehl = 45 Bergk)

ἐν δὲ κίρναις τῷ μελιάδεος ὅτι τάχιστα
κρατῆρα.

(Μεληιδῆς is also called by him in Fr. 100 Diehl = 47 Bergk, apud Athenaeus II, 38e: ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ μέθην δὲ καταστήματος καὶ ταύρῳ παρεικάζουσιν τὸν Διόνυσον, καὶ παρδάλει, διὰ τὸ πρὸς βίαν τρέπεσθαι τοὺς ἐξοινωθέντας. Ἀλκαῖος:

ἄλλοτε μὲν μελιάδεος, ἄλλοτε

δ' ὀξύτερου τριβόλων ἀρυτήμενοι.

Wine moves in the area between the sweetness of honey and the sharpness of vinegar so to speak. Correctly Eusthathius, in *Odysseam*, p.1910.18: κατὰ γὰρ τὴν Ἀλκαίου μοῦσαν ἄλλοτε μὲν μελιαδῆς ὁ οἶνος, ὃ δὴ ἔφη καὶ Ὅμηρος, ἄλλοτε δ' ὀξύτερος τριβόλων... ὄρα δὲ καὶ τὸ ὀξύτερος τριβόλων, δι' οὗ δηλοῦται ὡς ὁ λεγόμενος κοινῶς ὀξύς οἶνος τῷ μελιηδεῖ ἀντιδιαστέλεται⁶). Μεληδῆς is, of course, an almost standing epitheton of wine in Homer.

Μελιχρὸς οἶνος occurs also in Anacreon Fr. 58 Diehl = 32 Bergk = 110 Gentili apud Athenaeus XI, 475 f:

Ὀινοχόει δ' ἀμφίπολος μελιχρὸν
οἶνον, τρικύαθον κελέβην ἔχουσα.

The expression appears also in Comic Poetry: Teleclides in *Πρωτάνεις* Fr. II vol. II p. 368 Meineke = Fr. 27 PCG vol. VII, p.678, apud Athenaeus XI, 485f: Νίκανδρος δ' ὁ Θυατειρηνός (Fr.Gr.Hist. 343 F 15), κύλιξ φησί μείζων (sc. ἐστὶ ἢ λεπαστή), παρατιθέμενος Τηλεκλείδου ἐκ Πρωτάνεων:

καὶ μελιχρὸν οἶνον ἔλκειν
ἐξ ἠδύπνου λεπαστῆς,
τυρίον ἐπεσθίοντα,

where we find something difficult to be achieved, but artficially induced and particularly appreciated in Attica, namely the combination of fragrance and sweetness in wines. –

We discover also the expression in the Hippocratic corpus, *Περὶ Παθῶν*, II 189 Littré = II 418 Kühn, where the μελιχροὶ παλαιοί are distinguished from the γλυκέες not only because the common cooked musts do not ordinarily keep for long; for in II 193 L. = II 423 Kühn we read γλυκὺς οἶνος καὶ μελιειδῆς (or perhaps we should read μεληδῆς; in any case it is not a mere question of hue, but of nature and character: there can be little doubt that this is our μελιχρός) ἄμφω καὶ κομιστικοὶ καὶ διουρητικοὶ καὶ φλεγματώδεις. οἱ δὲ αὖστηροί etc. Μελιχροὶ are then the thicker, more honey-like wines – οἱ πολὺ τὸ ἔψημα ἔχοντες; on the other hand γλυκεῖς can be thin, λεπτοὶ οἶνοι, v. *Περὶ Διαίτης* B I, 224 L. = I 684 K. Thus the γλυκεῖς include every grape product that by *nature or artifice* has a sweet taste, whereas μελιχροὶ are specifically rather dense, honey-taste potions – In *Γυναικείων* A' II 479 L. = II 696 K. οἶνω μελιχρῷ must be read and not μελιχρόω; for besides it being not a question of colour in general, we have the hue mentioned in the next word: κίρρω. That it is also ὑδαρῆς does not imply essentially thinness but relates to

⁶ The Hippocratic *Περὶ Διαίτης*, B', I 685K = I 224L speaks of ὀξίναι or ὀξίναῖοι οἶνοι.

constitution. Besides, the expressions, each or the last one, may signify a different type. In any case honey-hued is not included in the triple or quadruple classification of the wines according to colour: λευκός – κίρρος – (έρυθρός) – μέλας.

Here we meet in Greek dress the two ways of producing sweet wine – potions observed supra. The cooking-way gave what antiquely they called, from γλεῦκος, γλεῦξις and γλῦξις. Hesychius s.v. γλεῦξις· οἶνος (vel. οἴνου) ἔψημα. Eustathius, *In Odysseam*, p.1385.14: καὶ τὸ γλυκὺ ἐκ τοῦ γλεῦκος. ὅθεν (sc. from γλεῦκος) καὶ γλεῦξις κατὰ Πausanίαν, οἶνος πολὺ ἔψημα ἔχων, ὁ νῦν, φησι, σίρινος· ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ σίραιον οὐδετέρως. - οἶνος πολὺ ἔψημα ἔχων is must which have been boiled down to a considerable condensation. For it is unpragmatic to construe it *in general* as normal fermented wine in which a lot of ἔψημα has been used as medicament; the identification with τὸ σίραιον οὐδετέρως refutes such an idea for the present case at any rate.

On the other hand, such condiments were indeed used in the preparation of wines, as we have seen e.g. from Pliny. More often they were used chiefly to improve poor wines by admixture – a quantity of sweet boiled wines being added to the inferior, for example sourish or acetish, stuff. The poured in improver was called παράχυμα or παρέγχυμα, and the pure wine, alien to such manipulations, and self-produced, so to speak, freely was in all probability called αὐτίτης οἶνος, although other less likely explanations of the term were also current in later times. Thus in the *Etymologicon Magnum*, s.v., we read: αὐτίτης· ὁ χωρὶς παραχύματος οἶνος, οἶον ἐσήματος· ἢ ὁ ἐπιχώριος (according to Pollux, VI, 18)· ἢ ὁ ἀμιγής· ἢ, ὡς ἔνιοι, ὁ δευτερίας· ἢ ὁ ἐπέτειος (as Galenus in his *Lexicon Hippocraticum*, s.vv. αὐτίτης – resolved as αὐτοετίτης – and περσύας). By ἀμιγής one understands the absence of the two kinds of additive interference to the natural process and product of must-fermentation, namely (a) the infusion of condiments, especially during that process, and (b) the impouring of other wines; mixture with water is not relevant here, and only secondarily can be connoted, by an extension of the stricter sense. Cf. *Erotianus* Δ 23 s.v. οἶνον αὐτίτην· τὸν ἀπαράχυτον, and *Athenaeus* I, 27A: ὁ Οὐελίτερος (sc. οἶνος) δὲ ἡδὺς πινόμενος, εὐστόμαχος· ἴδιον δ' αὐτοῦ τὸ μὴ δοκεῖν ἀπαρέγχυτος εἶναι· ἐμφαίνει γὰρ ὡς ἐμμεμιγμένου αὐτῷ ἔτερου. Galenus reserves ἀπαράχυτον for a narrower application signifying absence of mingling a small quantity of seawater for the fermentation. Thus X p. 832: λαμβάνειν δ' ἀπαράχυτους (sc. οἴνους) – οὕτω δὲ ὀνομάζουσιν οἷς οὐ μέμικται θάλασσα, μεγίστην βλάβην ἡγουμένους ἐφ' ὧν μέμικται γενήσεσθαι. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ εἰώθασιν τοῖς εὐγενέσιν οἴνοις, ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ λόγος ἐστὶ, μιγνύναι τῆς θαλάσσης ἐν Λέσβῳ (this not being strictly accurate, at least in older times, as we have seen e.g. from Phantias. And, XIII p. 721: τὸν

ἀπαράχυτον οἶνον, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ᾧ μὴ μέμικται θάλασσα. That this was one way of *seasoning* the wine we have already observed, and in fact Phantias (*loc.cit.* apud Athenaeus, I p. 37f) uses the word *παρεγχεῖται* to signify the pouring in of some sea-water to γλεῦκος. – On the mixture of wines v. e.g. Theophrastus apud *Athenaeus* I, 32b; and on seasoning cf. *idem.* I, 32a. – The ἀντόκρατος Ἀριούσιος of Chios was (*Athenaeus*, I, 32f) in all probability such an ἀντίτης οἶνος. It was matured by itself without condiment or mixture.

As I noticed above, there is no indication in Greek of a mechanical tabulation of degrees in evaporation like the triple Roman division. Athenaeus I, 31e observes also: Τιμαχίδης δὲ ὁ Ρόδιος ὑπόχυτόν τινα οἶνον ἐν Ρόδῳ καλεῖ, παραπλήσιον τῷ γλυκεῖ. καὶ γλυξίς δ' οἶνος καλεῖται ὁ τὸ ἔψημα ἔχων. (On the specific nature of ὑπόχυτος, I shall speculate below). Both appear in Phrynichus (*Fab. Inc.* XIII, vol. II p. 605 Meineke = Fr. 68 PCG vol. VII, p. 422) apud Diog. Laertius IV, 20: ἦν δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφοκλῆς (sc. Polemon) καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ἐκείνοις ὅπου κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν (sc. Aristophanes, Fr. 958) τὰ ποιήματα αὐτῶ

κύων τις ἐδόκει συμποιεῖν Μολοττικός,
καὶ ἔνθα ἦν (sc. Sophocles) κατὰ τὸν Φρύνιχον
οὐ γλυξίς οὐδ' ὑπόχυτος ἀλλὰ πρᾶμνιος.

(cf. Suidas s.v. ὑπόχυτος οἶνος where the verse is applied mistakenly to Polemo). Marvellously illustrates the Cratinian point Athenaeus in I, p. 30b-c: ἔστι δὲ οὔτος (sc. ὁ Πράμνιος) γένος τι οἴνου· καὶ ἔστιν οὔτος οὔτε γλυκὺς οὔτε παχύς (as the condensed must-wines are), ἀλλ' ἀσπηρὸς καὶ σκληρὸς καὶ δύναμιν ἔχων διαφέρουσιν (having such strength and robustness as to cause an erection, Aristophanes, Fr. 334, PCG vol. III 2, p. 188)· οἶω Ἀριστοφάνης οὐχ ἤδεσθαι Ἀθηναίους φησι, λέγων «τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον οὔτε ποιηταῖς ἤδεσθαι σκληροῖς καὶ ἀστεμφέσιν, οὔτε Πραμνίοις σκληροῖσιν οἴνοις, συνάγουσι τὰς ὀφρὺς τε καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν· ἀλλ' ἀνθοσμία καὶ πέπονι νεκταροσταγεῖ» (Aristophanes, Fr. 688, PCG vol. III 2 p.353). As Erotianus explains, o, 45: οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας, ὁ εὐώδης καὶ ἠδύς, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατράχοις (v. 1150) καὶ ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις (in the second edition and version, cf. Fr. 334). Cf. Phrynichus, *Praeparatio Sophistica*, p. 37, 1. In *Ranes*, 1150, Aristophanes indeed contrasts the strong proper wine that can cause ebriety to the lighter ἀνθοσμίας: Διόνυσσε, πίνεις οἶνον οὐκ ἀνθοσμίαν, meaning “you are talking nonsense, like a drunken man, you are intoxicated”. In the same spirit Hesychius comments s.v. Γλυξίς· ὁ ἀνευμένοσ οἶνος καὶ ἄτονος (so splendidly Salmasius pro ἄγονος), ὃν ἔνιοι μὲν ἀπαλόστομον, οἱ δὲ γλεῦξιν (sc. καλοῦσι). The *relaxed* and *enervated*, “*nerveless*”, qualities of *dulcia*, of the unfermented, as it were, wines, are emphasized – characteristics that made them alone suitable to the gravity

of old Roman matrons. We are reminded of the basic Hippocratic distinction (*Περὶ διαίτης ὀξεῶν* II 288L = II 53K) between the *γλυκὺς οἶνος* and the *οἰνώδης οἶνος*, we may say between *honeyish wine* and *winish wine*. Whether and when we employ such a division or speak instead (occasionally) with Pliny of *dulcia* versus *vina* is, after the foregoing explanations, a sheer stylistic matter.

Ἐψημα and σίραιον must have been in Classical Greece pretty dense, thick, quasi-congealed liquids. The σίραιον is mentioned among the seasonings or condiments by Antiphanes in *Leucadius* (Fr. I, vol. III p. 78 Meineke = Fr. 140 PCG vol. II, p. 388) apud Athenaeus II p. 68a (cf. Pollux VI, 66): ἀρτύματα ταῦτα καταλέγει Ἀντιφάνης.

ἀσταφίδος, ἀλῶν, σιραίου, σιλφίου, τυροῦ, θύμου,
σησάμου, νίτρου (vel. λίτρου), κυμίνου, ροῦ, μέλιτος, ὀριγάνου,
βοτανίων, ὄξους, ἐλαῶν, εἰς ἀβυρτάκην χλόης,
καππάριδος, ὠῶν, ταρίχους, καρδάμων, θρίων, ὀποῦ

– substances each with specific singular strength even in small quantities. Σίραιον also appears in the very similar catalogue of ἡδύσματα given by Alexis in *Λέβης* (Fr. II, vol. III p. 437 Meineke = Fr. 132 PCG, vol. II, p. 96) apud Athenaeus IV p. 170a; and in his similar list in *Παννυχίς ἢ Ἐριθος* (Fr. III vol. III p. 465 Meineke = Fr. 179, PCG vol. II, p. 124) apud Athenaeus IV, 170b. He also mentions it in *Πονήρα* (Fr. II, vol. III p. 471 Meineke = Fr. 193 PCG, vol. II, p. 131) apud Athenaeus IV p. 170c, where it is used in the preparation of a νεανικὴ λοπάς, a shining dish. By contrast, in another gourmet preparation from the same comedy Alexis qualifies the wine infused as white, λευκὸν οἶνον (Fr. 191.8, PCG vol. II, p. 130). The heavy-sweet wines on the other hand were dark-hued, like nowadays the Porto or the Santorini Vinsanto.

In Aristophanes' *Vespa* 877 sq. the decent, sensible young man despairing at his father's democratic infatuation with trials and condemnations, prays, having instituted the appropriate new rite, to Apollo Agyieus:

παῦσόν τ' αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ πατρός) τουτὶ τὸ λίαν στρυφνὸν καὶ πρίνινον ἦθος
ἀντὶ σιραίου μέλιτος μικρὸν τῷ θυμιδίῳ παραμίξας·

mingling a bit of honey instead of σίραιον into his heartlet. But since σίραιον belonged to the *dulcia*, there is a difficulty in accounting for the old man's "sour and tough" character. Reiske of course noticed this, felt the little stylistic awkwardness in the beginning of the second verse, saw the smoothness produced by the existence of an adjective before μέλιτος qualifying it, judged that one should thus read ἀντισιραίου as one word, and deemed that he would read ἀντικυραίου, from Ἀντίκυρα in Phocis, if he only knew of some renowned honey from that district. And wonderfully enough, there indeed was, not a honey, but a dulcium from Aigosthena,

not far from Anticyra on the northern coast of the Corinthian gulf (v. infra). Unnecessary, although ingenious, complications. The old man naturally, according to the habits of his age, is to be supposed as taking a lot of sweet, unwinish wines, and σίραιον must have figured prominently among them. But as the scholiast observes *ad loc.* must boiled down is sweetened eminently indeed, but acquires a certain subbitter taste especially if it is cooked considerably: μὴ σίραιον, ἀλλὰ μέλι παραμιξας. σίραιον δὲ τὸ ἐψημένον γλεῦκος, βραχὺ δ' ἔχον παράπικρον ὅταν καθεψηθῆ. Σίραιον is something like the modern Greek πετιμέζι. Thus exquisitely Βδελυκλέων asks that the poor old man should take in his breast a bit of unmitigated, satiating, thoroughly dulcinizing, eminently smoothening and unloosening sweetness represented by honey – the only capable of modifying his sour and tough manners.

The ἔψημα is also segregated even from the dulce wines in the Hippocratic *Περὶ Διαίτης Β' I 224 L. = I 685 Kühn*, a winish substance rather than wine (but remember that even a general category of οἰνώδεις οἶνοι is recognized by Hippocrates v. supra). Its function is thus described there: ἔψημα θερμαίνει καὶ ὑγραίνει καὶ ὑπάγει. θερμαίνει μὲν ὅτι οἰνώδες, ὑγραίνει δὲ ὅτι τρόφιμον, ὑπάγει δὲ ὅτι γλυκύ. A singular employment of its eminent nutritiousness we have learnt from Pliny above, regarding the worthy Roman who fed and fattened snails by this means; and also occurs in medicinal applications meant for a higher animal. – What is near it, what has more of it, is οἶνος (σίρινος, σίραιος, μελιχρός).

It is remarkable that Pliny's reference to σίραιον - ἔψημα as a considerably condensed liquid squares with the Greek (classical) usage. I notice also that Aretaeus speaks of σίραιος ἑλληνικός sc. οἶνος (the σίρινος of Pausanias apud *Eustathius* above quoted. And Hippocrates speaks of σιραῖος οἶνος, *Γυναικείων πρῶτον II 479 L. = II 696 Kühn*). Aretaeus, *Ὀξέων Νούσων Θεραπευτικόν*, A, 1 p. 194; 198; ed. Kühn; cf. also *Χρονίων Παθῶν Θεραπευτικόν* A p. 322 where we must certainly read σιραίω τῷ Κρητί, cf. p. 194 σίραιον ἑλληνικόν ἢ Κρήτα. There was also a *passum Creticum* (Plinius XX, 19 (79) §208; and in XIV, 9 (11) §81 where *passum a Cretico Cilicium probatur* etc. must be read with Ian-Mayhoff instead of *Graeco* (or *Greco*) of the mss.). The Greco-Latin gloss, if sound textually, σταφιδίτης οἶνος: sapa (p. 9 Labbeus), and especially Hesychius (pp. 9; 10), must not be used to identify the two potions despite the formal attraction of the supposition. Aretaeus means an ἔψημα from Cretic *passum* (further concentrated). The *passum* of Crete was particularly renowned, *Martialis XIII, 106*:

PASSUM

Gnossia Minoae genuit vindemia Cretae

hoc tibi, quod mulsum pauperis esse solet,

(cf. XIII, 107 for *Mulsum Ganymedeian*, the famous nectarean Falernian wine thickened by renowned Attic honey); Juvenalis XIV, 270 writes:

Qui gaudes *pingue* antiquae de litero Cretae
passum et municipes Iovis advexisse lagenas -

(*pingue*, thick, dense, naturally, for, *Columella*, XII, 39, ex uvis passis in praelo compressis effluit et conditum vasculo *mellis more* servatur - much more if it was boiled afterwards as well). Cf. Polybius apud Athenaeus X, 440E affirming the similarity in taste of Roman πάσσον (*passum*) to Αίγιοσθενίτη γλυκεῖ καὶ τῷ Κρητικῷ.

We have further seen from Nonius that what he considers as *sapa* was later and in his time called *mellacium*. This last word reminds us of the μελιχρός and μελιθής and (possibly) μελιειδής οἶνος.

Finally we resort to etymology. Σίραιον (which is written *σειράιον* in Nicander *Alexipharmaca*, 153) belongs to the same meaning field with the group of words Σείριος (perhaps Σειρήν), σειριόεις, σειριόκαυτος, σειρίασις, σειριάω, σειράζω, σειριάζω. They principally signify exceptional, annihilating heat, scorching, but the insistent underlying implication is of drying up, consuming the watery ingredients, rendering arid. (That *σειριάζω* denotes rather sparkle or twinkle apud *Theon Smyrnaeus*, p. 146H relates to the astral employment of the root in Σείριος as Κύων, the Dog-Star, as the Sun and as Stars (πλανήτες καὶ ἀπλανεῖς) in general, on each of which application there is ample documentation. That sparkling gives evidence in fact of the *movement of fire* that constitutes the stars as the fires of the firmament, cf. Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi*, 33). Thus these forms are connected with *σειραίνω* which the *Etymologicon Magnum* s.v. (p. 710.22 sqq.) explains as *ξηραίνω* according to Orus, the Milesian grammarian: Σειραίνω σημαίνει τὸ ξηραίνω, ὡς λέγει Ὀρος ὁ Μιλήσιος: παρὰ τὸν Σείριον τὸν ἀστέρα. Σείριος δὲ ὁ Κύων ἐστὶν ἀστήρ καὶ εἴρηται παρὰ τὴν ζέσιν, ζέριος. Ἡ παρὰ τὸ ἐκκενοῦν ἡμᾶς ἰδρῶσι ρεομένους (sweating by reason of the excessive heat during the period of the Dog-Waves): *σειρεῖν γὰρ τὸ ἀποκενοῦν λέγεται*. We can smell now our road to *σίραιον* through that *ζέσιν*. But it is made more explicit by the final gloss in the passage quoted. (Which is repeated confusedly in the *Etymologicon Gudianum*, p. 497, 50 sqq.: Σείριος ὁ ἥλιος, οἶονεὶ τείριος, κατὰ τροπὴν τοῦ τ εἰς σ, ἐπειδὴ τείρει καὶ καταπονεῖ ἡμᾶς τῷ καύματι. Καὶ ὅτι ἀποσειεῖ ἡμᾶς καὶ κενοῖ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδρῶτος, οἶονεὶ σείριος ὁ ἐκζέων ἡμᾶς καὶ θερμαίνων ταῖς ἀκτίσιν). Which gloss is fortunately confirmed by a *χρεία* in the Hippocratic *Περὶ χυμῶν* I 321L = I 127K: τοὺς μὲν οὖν χυμοὺς εἰδέναι ἐν ἧσιν ὠρησιν ἀνθέουσι, καὶ οἷα ἐν ἐκάστοισι νοσήματα ποιέουσι, καὶ οἷα ἐν ἐκάστῳ νοσήματι παθήματα. τὸ δὲ σῶμα τὸ ἄλλο

εἰς ὅ,τι μάλιστα νόσημα ἢ φύσις ρέπει, οἶον τί σπλήν ἐνοιδέων ποιέει. τούτων τι καὶ ἡ φύσις. σχεδόν τι καὶ χρώματα κακίω καὶ σώματα σειροῖ, καὶ εἶ τι ἄλλο, ταῦτα διαγεγυμνάσθω. Which expression Galen in his Commentary on the work (ed. Coraes, *Πρακτικὰ Ἀκαδημείας Ἀθηνῶν*, p. 92.21-2) renders: ὡς τὰς τῶν χρωμάτων κακώσεις, τοῦ σώματος κένωσιν, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας διαθέσεις etc. This *σειροῦ* then (or *σειρέω* according to another variant identical with the form in the *Etym. M.*⁷) means empty, drain, dry up. What is implicit in the main group becomes chief denotation here; and what was principal content there (heating, scorching, boiling) is here submerged.

But this connects to a third use of the same root meaning *filtering, straining*. E.g. in Paulus Aegineta, III, 26 (vol. I p. 134.5 sqq. Heiburg) we read: ...πάντα (medicinal substances) βαλῶν εἰς ἀγγεῖον ὑελοῦν (*vel.* ὑέλινον) ἕα βρέχεσθαι ἐπὶ ἡμέρας θ κινῶν δις τῆς ἡμέρας. ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς χρήσεως σειρῶν τὸ αὐταρκές (= filtering a sufficient quantity out of it) καὶ τούτῳ σπόγγον βρέχων ἀνάτριβε τὰς τρίχας etc., with a view to giving them a bright golden tinge. The whole chapter, belonging to some corpus of *Cleopatra's* cosmetics, contains elaborate processes of hair-care. The high authority of Hesychius, further, confirms the antiquity of the use: s.v. *Διηθήσεως* he explains *σειρώσεως*. *Διηθῶ* and *διυλίζω* mean percolate, strain through, filter; only the first word signifies the passing through some *strainer* or *filter* of whatever kind, while the latter denotes the removal of the sedimentary gross matter contained in the liquid. The sediment itself, accordingly, is referred to as *σίρωμα* in *Aetius* I, 135, making, as it often is, light of the interchange between *ι* and *ει*. The *Glossae GraecoLatinae*, finally, have: *σιρωτήης* (or *σιρωτήρ*?) οἴνου ἢ ἄλλου τινος ὑγροῦ· *simissator*. Whatever that curious *simissator* means, a *σιρωτήης* must be a strainer – like the metallic ones that have survived from antiquity; the word has been transformed in modern Greek demotic to *σουρωτήρι*.

In older times sacks acted as filters, and suchlike normally was the impeccable *τρύγοιπος* (and the later *ύλιστήρ*); cf. Pollux X, 75 (where in the fragment of Hipponax [Fr. 57 West = Fr. 59 Degani], *τροπήϊος* or rather, better, *τραπήϊος*, is the wine, either as being pressed out of the grapes or as suffering fermentative transformation; cf. Hesychius s.vv. *τραπεῖν*· *ληνοπατεῖν* and *τραπητός*· ὁ οἶνος. Hipponax' point is of course obscene, as West suspected. But instead of the dripping from a heavy-wine strainer suggesting vaginal secretion, as West surmised, the metaphor is more aptly applied to the dribbling of a tumescent phallus swelling with

⁷ In the Galenian lemma we have *συρεῖ* in Kühn and *συρῶροῖ* in Coraes. We must correct evidently to *σειρεῖ* or, significantly, *σιρεῖ*.

lust before eruption. Read the verse as follows: στάζουσαν (pro the mss. στάζουσιν - sc. ψωλήν) ὡσπερεὶ τραπήϊον (vel τραπήϊου vel τρυγοίπιον pro mss. τροπήϊον vel τροποῖον) σάκκος); I, 245; VI, 19; Phrynichus, *Ecloga*, 270 Rutherford = p. 303 Lobeck: ὑλιστήρ· τρύγοιπον τοῦτο καλοῦσιν οἱ δοκίμως διαλεγόμενοι; and for classical usage Aristophanes, *Pax* 535; *Plutus* 1087. - Among scorching (and making arid), emptying (by drying up) and filtering through a strainer, the common denominator is *deliquidation, removal or reduction of humours*. This then is the root-meaning of the entire field – and this fits nicely to the requirements of our *σίραιον*, which is a *thickened, dewaterised, concentrated wine-product*, freed from most of the watery ingredient through vaporization caused by *slow boiling*, and in view of the naturally rather excessive leeches and sediment contained in it, *filtered* before drink (like Eupolis' *σακκίας οἶνος καὶ σακτός* (*Fr. Inc.* CVII vol. II p. 574 Meineke = *Fr.* 476 PCG vol. V, p. 534), sc. ὁ διῦλισμένος (διὰ σάκκου) as Pollux VI, 18 explains. This was the purified wine meant to be kept for future use, and thus of a lasting quality. Thus I harmonize Hesychius' lemma s.v. *σακτός, ὁ τεθησαυρισμένος, ὁ πολυχρόνιος καὶ ἤδη ἀποκείμενος*). We see in *σίραιον* the *root-sense*, together with all its various meaning-appendages or growths. –

To conclude. *Ἐψημα* is the ultra qua non product of ἔψησις, its proper result. And *sapa* is the perfected concoction, the completely “digested” humour with the taste par excellence in singular condensation. No doubt, then, *sapa* is the *ἔψημα*, and thus the *σίραιον*. *Defrutum* is a noble dulcium, enjoyment and the *thing all-enjoyed*. Thus *sapa* must correspond, in its chief and dominant kind, to the thicker liquid, as I have argued above.

The essential nature of *γλεῦκος* as of something immature, which requires the imposition of a further form in order to reach its perfection, is (as was to be expected in view of their organic foundation and tendency) nicely rendered and represented in Aristotelian apparatus and formulations, *Meteorologica* Δ, 379.b10 sqq. Cf. especially b24 sqq.: ἀλλ' ἢ γε ἀρχή (of all “digestion”, assimilation, assimilative incorporation) ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ θερμότης ἐστίν. τὸ δὲ τέλος τοῖς μὲν ἢ φύσις ἐστί, φύσις δὲ ἦν λέγομεν ὡς εἶδος καὶ οὐσίαν· τοῖς δ' εἰς ὑποκειμένην τινὰ μορφήν (ὑποκειμένην with regard to the overall *forma essentialis* of the entity in question) τὸ τέλος ἐστὶ τῆς πέψεως, ὅταν τοιονδὶ γένηται καὶ τοσονδὶ τὸ ὑγρὸν ἢ ὀπτώμενον ἢ ἐψόμενον ἢ σηπόμενον ἢ ἄλλως πως θερμαινόμενον· τότε γὰρ χρήσιμον ἐστί καὶ πεπέφθαι φαμέν, ὡσπερ τὸ γλεῦκος καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς φύμασι συνιστάμενα, ὅταν γένηται πῦον, καὶ τὸ δάκρυον, ὅταν γένηται λήμη. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τᾶλλα.

συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο πάσχειν ἅπασιν ὅταν κρατηθῆ ἡ ὕλη καὶ ὑγρότης· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ὀριζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν φύσει θερμότητος. ἕως γὰρ ἂν ἐνῆ ἐν αὐτῇ ὁ λόγος, φύσις τοῦτ' ἐστὶν. διὸ καὶ ὑγιείας σημεῖα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ οὖρα καὶ ὑποχωρήσεις καὶ ὅλως τὰ περιπτώματα. καὶ λέγεται πεπεφθαι, ὅτι δηλοῖ κρατεῖν τὴν θερμότητα τὴν οἰκείαν τοῦ ἀορίστου. ἀνάγκη δὲ τὰ πεπτόμενα παχύτερα καὶ θερμότερα εἶναι· τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἀποτελεῖ τὸ θερμόν, εὐογκότερον καὶ παχύτερον καὶ ξηρότερον, etc. (Of course the proper subdivision of πέψις applicable to *must fermentation* is ἔψησις, v. *Meteorologica*, Δ, 380b31: καὶ τὰ ὑγρὰ δὲ ἔψεσθαι λέγομεν, οἶον γάλα καὶ γλεῦκος, ὅταν ὁ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ χυμὸς εἰς εἶδος τι μεταβάλλῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ κύκλω καὶ ἔξωθεν πυρὸς θερμαίνοντος (the environmental heat), etc.).

That γλεῦκος can be called new *wine* must not obscure the marked differences between wine proper (after full *fermentation*) and must (and the products of prevented or inhibited natural fermentation). Thus Aristotle, after having explained that liquids which do not fully vapourize and thicken by heat are of an essentially composite nature, mixed from the watery and some other principle (as earth or air), proceeds (*Meteorologica* Δ, 388a33 sqq.: ἀπορήσειε δ' ἂν τις περὶ οἴνου τῶν ὑγρῶν. τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐξατμισθεῖν ἂν (wine proper), καὶ παχύνεται, ὥσπερ ὁ νέος. αἴτιον δ' ὅτι οὔτε ἐνὶ εἶδει λέγεται ὁ οἶνος, καὶ ὅτι ἄλλος ἄλλως. ὁ γὰρ νέος μᾶλλον γῆς ἢ ὁ παλαιός· διὸ καὶ παχύνεται τῷ θερμῷ μάλιστα καὶ πήγνυται ἥττον ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ⁸. ἔχει γὰρ καὶ θερμόν πολὺ καὶ γῆς· ὥσπερ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ οὕτως ἀναξηραίνεται ὑπὸ τοῦ καπνοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀσκοῖς ὥστε ξυόμενος πίνεσθαι. εἰ δὲ πᾶς (sc. οἶνος) ἰλὺν ἔχει (sediments), οὕτως ἐκατέρου ἐστὶν (ἢ γῆς ἢ ὕδατος), ὡς ταύτης (sc. τῆς ἰλύος) ἔχει πλῆθος (the more leeches subsist, the more earthly the wine is). Another criterion of mixed constitution in liquids (as against the purely or eminently *aquatic ones*) is whether they *thicken by both cold and heat*. Thus Aristotle continues (388b8): ὅσα δὲ ὑπὸ ψυχροῦ παχύνεται, γῆς, ὅσα δ' ὑπ' ἀμφοῖν (sc. ψυχροῦ and θερμοῦ), κοινὰ πλειόνων (sc. ἀρχῶν, στοιχειῶν, principles), οἶον ἔλαιον καὶ μέλι καὶ ὁ γλυκὺς οἶνος. There is no need to be reminded that the boiled *dulcia* are, so to speak, *more must than wine*, and are consequently regularly opposed to wines, as we have observed from Hippocrates and Pliny. The same antithesis is forcefully expressed by Aristotle in *Meteoroogica*, Δ, 387b9 sqq., in a discussion of the quality

⁸ Thus is naturally resolved the seeming discrepancy between 384a4: οἶνος γὰρ τις καὶ πήγνυται καὶ ἔψεται, οἶον τὸ γλεῦκος, and 385b1 sqq.: ἀπηκτα δὲ ὅσα μὴ ἔχει ὑγρότητα ὕδατώδη, μηδ' ὕδατός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πλείον θερμοῦ καὶ γῆς, οἶον μέλι καὶ γλεῦκος (ὥσπερ ζέοντα γὰρ ἐστί). It is clearly a question of more or less in the proportion of the mixture. Besides the context shows that in the latter passage the question is rather of freezing (πήγνυσθαι) by the action of cold, whereas in the former the point lies more into the making solid, thickening and stiffening (πήγνυσθαι) by heating.

θυμιατόν (fuming, fumigatory, capable of rendering incencious exhalation): οἶνος δ' ὁ μὲν γλυκὺς θυμιάται· πίων γάρ, καὶ ταῦτ' ἀποιεῖ τῷ ἐλαίῳ· οὔτε γὰρ ὑπὸ ψύχους πήγνυται (but rather thickens), καίεται τε. ἔστι δ' ὀνόματι οἶνος, ἔργῳ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐ γὰρ οἰνώδης ὁ χυμός, διὸ καὶ οὐ μεθύσκει⁹. As Hippocrates distinguished, there are οἶνοι γλυκεῖς and οἶνοι οἰνώδεις. Γλεῦκος and γλυκὺς are etymologically connected, we have seen, by the *Etymologicon Magnum*; and in any case it is of the essence of grape liquid to be sweet (as e.g. the Aristotelian *Προβλήματα* pointedly have: K 23, 925 b16: τοῦ γλεῦκος ὄντος φύσει ἡδέος), being the putrefactory perfection and maturity of the vine juices: ripeness being intrinsically mellow.

There was, besides, a special use of γλεῦκος attested by the Glossographers. For the grapes when gathered and reposed become moistened and even extremely wet on their skins by their own juice. This is why they then taste sweeter than when taken directly from the vine (so in the Aristotelian *Προβλήματα* K, 23, 925b14 sqq.: ἢ καθάπερ καὶ αἱ ράγες τετραυγημέναι τῶν βοτρύων γλυκύτεραί εἰσι τῶν ἀτραυγῆτων; ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῦ γλεῦκος ὄντος φύσει ἡδέος αἱ μὲν τετραυγημέναι ράγες ὥσπερ εὐόκασιν ἡδυσμέναι (ἀνάπλεω γάρ εἰσι καὶ ἔξωθεν), αἱ δὲ τῶν βοτρύων ἀνήδυντοι... ὥσπερ αἱ ράγες οὖν ὅταν θλιφθῆ, ἀναπίμπλαται ἀπὸ τῆς ἐντὸς γλυκύτητος καὶ ἔξωθεν διαφαίνεται γλυκύτερα ὄντα (sc. τὰ μύρτα).

When a sufficient quantity of grapes are put together in a large vat, that process of moistening is intensified, and without any external action, by the sheer working of their own weight a liquid is trickled down marvelously sweet and exquisitely rich. Thus the *Etymologicon Magnum*, (234.8) s.v. Γλεῦκος· τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ληνοῦ ἀπόσταγμα, αὐτομάτως καταρρέει ἀπὸ τῆς σταφυλῆς. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο γλυκύτερον καὶ λιπαρώτερον. And so, verbatim, in the *Lexicon 5* s.v. (*Anecdota Graeca*, Bekker, p. 227.19). Hesychius s.v. γλεῦκος· τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθῆ. So Suda, with ἀποστάλαγμα pro ἀπόσταγμα and Cyrillus' *Lexicon* with πρὶν πατηθῆναι pro πρὶν πατηθῆ. This wonderful must, and the wine coming from it, was called πρότροπος, ἄτροπος or ἀπότροπος, all signifying *absece of forced pressing and squeezing* according to the grammarian Orus apud *Etymologicon Magnum*, s.v. ἄτροπος (p. 162.25): ὁ οἶνος· τραπεῖν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ πατῆσαι· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς ἄτροπος οἶνος καὶ ἀπότροπος λέγεται. οὕτως Ὀρος. A previous source and an antecedent testimony, is given by the *Etymologicon Gudianum* s.v. ἀπότροπος οἶνος (p. 69.42 sqq.): τραπεῖν γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτὸ τὸ πατῆσαι. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς

⁹ This again assimilates γλυκὺς and γλεῦκος since (Fr. 211 p. 1516a39): τὸ γλεῦκος ἥκιστα μεθύσκει. The two are identical, cf. *Προβλήματα*, KB' 12. 931a18; 16.

σταφυλῆς ἀπότροπος οἶνος λέγεται. οὕτως Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήσει Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου (v. 301, v. infra). Hesychius testifies and explains s.v. πρότροπος· οἶνος τις τοῦ γλεύκους τὸ πρόρυμα (there is no compelling reason to change to πρόχυμα with v.d. Linden or πρόρευμα with Heinsius; although Linden's proposal squares with *Georonica* VI, 16: πρὶν θλιβῆναι τοὺς βότρυνας τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν αὐτομάτως ἀποστάζον γλεύκος, ὃ πρόχυμα τινες καλοῦσι). And so *Moeris*: πρότροπος οἶνος· ὁ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι τὴν σταφυλὴν ρεύσας. And *Pollux* VI, 16: καὶ πρότροπος δ' ἦν τις οἶνος, ὁ πρὶν ἀποθλίβεσθαι ἐκρυσίς. Οἶνος in the sense both of must and of the ensuing proper wine, νέος and παλαιὸς οἶνος.

Besides this sense, πρότροπος signified also a kind of wine, says Hesychius, not necessarily connected with that proto-must we must assume. And indeed we find in *Athenaeus* mention of a Lesbian sweet wine, called precisely πρότροπος; I, 30B: ὅτι Μιτυληναῖοι τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς γλυκὺν οἶνον, πρόδρομον καλοῦσιν· ἄλλοι δὲ πρότροπον. And in II, 45E, where (after condemning previous wine drinking in advance) the correct hygienic procedure before eating is circumscribed – temperate and judicious gymnastics, baths, moderate water drinking, to predispose advantageously our frame and alleviate the influence of the wine to follow – or ἐὰν δέ τις ἡμῶν τοῦτο (sc. inbibing enough of water) δυσκόλως ποιῆ γλυκὺν ὕδαρῆ θερμὸν προλαμβάνετω, μάλιστα δὲ τὸν καλούμενον πρότροπον, τὸν γλυκὺν Λέσβιον (*Wilamowitz* athetised the Lesbian as a gloss – unnecessarily), ὄντα εὐστόμαχον. As to its mode of preparation *Pliny* mentions one, but if *austerum* is sound in the characterization of the wine produced thus, it cannot be that of the Lesbian sweet. *Plinius* XIV, 9 (11), §85: e *dulci* genere est et melitetes (i.e. μελιτήτης); distat a mulso, quod fit e musto, cum quinque congiis *austeri musti* congio mellis et salis cyatho subfervefactis. *Austerum* sed inter haec genera poni debet et *protropum*; ita appellatur a quibusdam mustum sponte defluens antequam calcetur uvae. hoc protinus diffusum in lagonis suis defervere passi, postea in sole XL diebus torrent aestatis secutae ipso canis ortu. This is *Ian-Mayhoff's* interpunction; previously *austerum* was taken with the preceding sentence: it should perhaps be deleted. But it could be of an austere sweetness, congenial somehow to the taste of pomegranate, only more mellowed down - distinct thus from the aforementioned Lesbian. One is thinking of the Santorinian Vinsanto. (*Plinius* mentions in XIV, 7(9) §75, in a list of renowned wines, *protropo Cnidio*, which should be read with comma in between, as he does not give any hint that he connects his protropus with any specific locality). *Columella* in XII, 27 describes the production of dulce vinum from must coming from grapes treaded down but not pressurized mechanically: Vinum dulce sic facere oportet. Uvas legito, in sole per triduum expangito, quarto die meridiano tempore calidas

uvas proculcato, *mustum lixivum*, hoc est, antequam prelo pressum sit, quod in lacum musti fluxeuit tollito: cum deferbuerit, in sextarios quinquaginta irim bene pinsitam nec plus unciae pondere addito, vinum a fecibus eliquatum diffundito. Hoc vinum erit suave, firmum, corpore salubre. We are in the local producers' farm and learn practical recipes for wines imitating and substituting the exquisite and profligate potions of old or the luxurious international varieties of the later times.

I turn back to the wine-τροπαί. And Hesychius has, in agreement and amplification to the information from the Etymologicon Magnum supra, s.v. τραπέουσι πατοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῇ ληνῶ. And s.v. τραπεῖν ληνοπατηῆσαι. The corrupt Hesychian gloss: θρεφθῆναι: τραφῆναι πατηῆσαι, is the confused combination of two entries one in, one out of place: (1) θρεφθῆναι: τραφῆναι (from τρέφω) and (2) τρεφθῆναι: τραπῆναι: πατηῆσαι (from τρέπω), this one of the discussed group. Consonantly to these determinations, *wine proper*, and not the special kind above mentioned, was called distinctively *τραπητός*. So Hesychius s.v. τραπητός: ὁ οἶνος. And s.v. τροπέοντο: ἐπάτουν: ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ ὁ οἶνος λέγεται τραπητός. This has nothing to do with τραπίας and ἐντροπίας or ἐκτροπίας οἶνος, second rate wines, in which the second fermentation from wine to vinegar has commenced and progressed. (Cf. Hesychius, s.vv.; s. v. τροπίας οἶνος, μεταβεβληκῶς καὶ ἔκλυτος; Pollux I, 248; VI, 17; Suda; Moeris). V. Photius and Suda *Lexica* s.v. τροπίας οἶνος: ὁ τετραμμένος καὶ ἐξεστηκός. Ἀριστοφάνης *Δαιταλεῦσιν* (Fr. 223 Blaydes = 13 Dindorf = Fr. 219 PCG vol. III 2 p.132)

ταχύ νυν πέτου καὶ μὴ (μοι Elmsley) τροπίαν οἶνον φέρε.

This set in of the second process was also signified in all probability by the *δικαμπίας οἶνος* (δὶς καμφθείς so to speak) of Hesychius s.v. δικαμπίας οἶνος: ὁ δύο τροπὰς ὑπομείνας, who has suffered two processes of change, two turns one to proper wine, the other to vinegar.

Indeed *τραπέω* in the sense of tread grapes is Homeric; *Odyssey* H, 125¹⁰. On which *Eustathius* opportunely comments (1574.2 sqq.): τὸ δὲ τραπέουσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ πατοῦσιν. ὅθεν φασὶ καὶ τραπηταί, οἱ πατοῦντες τὰς σταφυλάς¹¹. γίνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ τρέπειν ἢ λέξις, ἐπεὶ πατουμένη τρέπεται εἰς ἄλλο τι ἢ σταφυλή, εἰς οἶνον γάρ, τρεπομένη ἀπὸ πηκτοῦ εἰς ρυτόν, from the fleshy moisture of the grape to the liquid juice of the must, and then to the exhilarating fluidity of the wine. Thus Hesychius

¹⁰ Where the scholiast, embarrassed as to the underlying etymology, comments: τραπέουσι πατοῦσιν. ἢ εἰς πίθους βάλλουσι. παρὰ τὸ ἐξ ὀπώρας εἰς οἶνον τρέπειν. The last remark hits precisely the mark.

¹¹ And Hesychius s.v. πατηταί: οἱ τραπηταί (with reversed explanatory flow).

s.v. τραπέοντο· ἐπατοῦντο, παρὰ τὸ τροπήν λαμβάνειν τὸν βότρυν πατηθέντα. The Homeric imitation in the Hesiodic *Scutum* does comprise ἐτρόπεον in our sense (301). That Ananias (Fr. 5.4 Diehl, apud Athenaeus VII, 282B) has:

δέλφακος δ', ὅταν τραπέωσι καὶ πατέωσι, ἐσθίειν

need not cause any anxiety, as it did to some *docti* of Casaubon (*Commentaria ad loc.*) who would correct to τρυγέωσι (τρυγῶσι) καὶ πατέωσι. (Thus Dalecampius verted: *Uvas post vindemiam cum calcaverint*). For *τραπεῖν* signifies the *squeezing* of the grapes *by calcation* rather than *treading and trumpling* as such and in itself. And so *τροπεῖον* could be (part of) some mechanism or appliance through which the pressing was effected or improved. Thus I believe we must read *τροπεῖον* instead of *τοπεῖον* in *Lexicon 5 (Anecdota Graeca, Bekker, p. 308.18 sqq.)* s.v. τροπεῖον τι ἐστὶ καὶ τριπτῆρες... οἱ¹² δὲ τροπεῖον θύραν εἶναί φασὶ τὴν ἐπιβαλλομένην ταῖς σταφυλαῖς, ὥστε ἐξηθῆσαι τὸν οἶνον. Θύραι, if sound, is in the sense of *tabula oblonga*, cf. in Herodotus II, 96; VIII, 31 – just as *σανίς* signifies door, the fold(s) of the door and plank, board, panel, in short a long, broadish but relatively thin piece of wood in the form of a low parallelepiped, just what the modern-greek acceptance of the word is. For ἐξηθῆσαι (cf. ἐκ-θλίβω) cf. δι-ηθῆσαι. As ἐξηθέω means *filter out* (v. the Aristotelian *Problemata* ΛΗ, 5, 967a13 sqq.: ἢ διότι ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ μετρίου πόνου τὸ θερμὸν (sc. ἐν τῷ σώματι) ἐκκάεται καὶ ἐπιπολάζει, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξηθεῖται μετὰ τοῦ ἰδρῶτος καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἀραιουμένου τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ πονεῖν), the *τροπεῖον* must have been instrumental in exercising pressure for the grape juice to be strained through some purificatory filter – and thus a sack. And this is precisely what we find in Hipponax (Fr. 53 Diehl = 57 Bergk = 59 Degani) apud Pollux X, 75 (a passage and fragment I have already quoted and utilized above): he speaks of the various straining appurtenances of the ancients for wine-filtering, cf. VI, 19): Ἴππώναξ δὲ φησιν:

στάζουσαν ὥσπερ εἰ τροπήϊον σάκκος (vel σάκος)¹³

¹² Before *οἱ* there may be a lacuna giving another interpretation of the word in question, as everything that proceeds relates to τριπτῆρες.

¹³ It is lexicographically attested that *σάκος* is the Attic form, whereas *σάκκος* is the κοινή-form, which may have originated in this case from a dialectical *Doric* prototype. Thus Phrynichus, *Eclogae*, 229 (Rutherford) = 225 (Fischer) = p. 257 Lobeck, says: *σάκκος*: Δωριεῖς διὰ τῶν δύο κκ, οἱ δὲ Ἀττικοὶ δι' ἑνός; while *Moeris* s.v.: *σάκος* Ἀττικοί, *σάκκος* διὰ δύο κκ Ἑλληνες; and Thomas Magister *Ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν Ἐκλογή*, s.v. *σάκος* Ἀττικοὶ δι' ἑνός κ. Ἑλληνες δὲ διὰ δύο. Photius *Lexicon* s.v. professes the atticity of *σάκος*, while *Suda* confirms it by referring to Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 1211: *σάκουσ* ἔχων καὶ κωρύκουσ, where indeed the manuscript tradition unanimously gives the required form. (The critical Bentley uncritically changed it to *σάκκουσ*, and some of the subjectivistic philologists followed him). Eustathius ascribes the correct view to *Aelius Dionysius*: in *Iliadem* N, p. 940.16 sqq.: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι

οὐ μόνον τὸ πολεμικὸν σκεῦος (sc. the shield), ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ κοινὸς λεγόμενος σάκκος δι' ἐνὸς κάππα προεφέρετο παρ' Ἀθηναίους, καθὰ φησὶν Αἴλιος Διονύσιος. ὅθεν καὶ *σακεύειν*, φησί, τὸ ὑλίζειν, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος. «Χρήμαθ' ὑποσακίζομενος», καὶ «ὑποσακίζειν τῆς ὁδοῦ» τὸ προκόπτειν καὶ ὑφαιρεῖσθαι τοῦτο δὲ ἴσως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐκκενουμένου σάκου (clearly, a strainer-sack). The Herodotean reference must be to IV, 23; the Schythians use as chief food the products from a tree fruit: τοῦτο ἐπεὰν γένηται πέπον, σακκέουσι ἱματίοισι, ἀπορρέει δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παχὺ καὶ μέλαν etc. They filter it through cloths. *Σακκέουσι* is the mss. reading (with *σακκέουσιν* in R and V, slightly thus attested, which anyway does not point in another direction). But Aelius Dionysius read *σακεύουσι*; and so Suda s.v. *σακεύουσι* τὸ ὑλίζουσι παρ' Ἡροδότῳ. And similarly Photius. These testimonies are not simply to be repelled on the ground that Herodotus wrote Ionic and not Attic; for the influence of the Athenian splendor in the 5th century B.C. was such as to affect the language of writers and poets, whatever their dialectal basis was. This is indispensable in correctly appreciating the literary productions of that century, wheresoever they came from. (The *text* of older writers was also somehow Attically normalized – especially those on whose remains considerable Athenian activity was generously expended, as, for example, in the known cases of Homer and the Orphic Corpus). Besides, the greater affinity of the Ionian and the Attic between themselves than to any other dialect; and the notion that the double kappa form was originally Doric (though of this some ground of scepticism will be adduced in a moment); both of these considerations also tend to unnervate the objection. Nevertheless, in view of the unanimous mss. tradition, I prefer to view *σακκέουσι* as the ancient vulgate reading preserving the wide, and not necessarily or mainly Attic, tradition of the classical text, with *σακεύουσι* the corrective conjectural intrusion of an Alexandrine overcritic, which has passed into the text of some “purified” learned edition used by Aelius Dionysius. But to confess my judicious prejudice: I am inclined with ample reason to be rather suspicious of what proceeds from the *overatticizing* zeal of the second century A.D. Renaissance. The linguistic purists tend always and in all ages to be foolst.

I shall end this digression by a brief examination of the Aristophanic and comic usage. I mentioned the *σάκους* of *Lysistrata* supra. In *Ecclesiazousae*, 502, both the mss. tradition entire and the scholiast have *σάκον* (which is also postulated by the meter). In *Acharnenses*, 745, *σάκκον* is the correct reading (metrically, too, required), attested by R (and B, C; contra, *σάκον* A teste Blaydes); but a *Megarian* is speaking. While in 822, where an Athenian sycophant goes into his habitual *πολυπραγμοσύνη*, *σάκον* must be read (with most mss. and according to metre; though R has *σάκκον*). As the scholiast observes: *σάκος νῦν δι' ἐνὸς κ' ἀνωτέρω δὲ (obviously in v. 745) διὰ δύο*.

[I cannot but entertain the possibility that the Phrynichian subtlety of a Doric dialectal basis for *σάκκος* may derive from this very discrepancy in *Acharnenses*. The rather dull acuteness and false delicacy of the puristic grammarians and philologists is nowhere better exhibited than in such dim clevernesses. If this be so, and the Acharnensian distinction was the sole foundation for Phrynichus dictum, then we must cautiously reject it. For Aristophanes might have jested at the Megarian's rusticity and block-heaviness, in pronouncing roughly and crowingly *σάκ-κος*].

The reputed Attic use is also observed in Fr. 305 Dindorf = 333 Blaydes = 343 PCG vol. III,2 p.193, apud Pollux X, 152: ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. θυλακίου vel. βαλαντίου) δὲ καὶ σακίον (no doubt ὑποκοριστικὸν of *σάκος*) ὅταν φῆ ἐν Θεσμοφοριαζούσαις (β', the second presentation evidently as it does not occur in the extant text of the comedy):

σακίον, ἐν οἷσπερ τὰργύριον ταμιεύεται

(so the mss., though metrically could be either κ or κκ. The singular σακίον can be defended in a couple of ways, as against the plural οἴσπερ, but a possible correction to σακίων has been thought of by Blaydes and Kaibel).

From Menander we have Δεισιδαίμων Fr. IV.4 (vol. IV p. 103 Meineke) apud Porphyrius, *De Abstinentia*, IV, 15 (p. 253.6 sqq. Nauck):

_____ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὴν γαστέρα
οἰδοῦσιν, ἔλαβον σακίον, εἶτ' εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν
ἐκάθισαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ κόπρου etc.

The Mss., teste Nauck, have σακκίον (corrected to σακίον by Porson and Meineke) but the apparently corrupt tradition, precaviously, selectively and defectively reported, respecting this work is well noted (v. Nauck, in his edition, *Praefatio* pp. XIII-XIV). Metrically, both forms are admissible. If σακκίον is to be retained, it may well be an instance of the adulteration of classical Attic towards the emergence of Hellenistic κοινή. The step is consolidated in the next generation, some four decades later, in the manuscriptly testified and metrically required σακκόπηρα of Apollodorus Carystius in his *Amphiaraios* Vol. IV p. 440 Meineke = Fr. 1 PCG vol. II, p 487, apud Pollux X, 161: σακκοπήραν δὲ (sc. ἔστιν εὐρεῖν), ὡς εἶθισται τοῖς ἰδιώταις λέγειν, ἐν Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ Καρυστίου Ἀμφιαράω:

_____ ἐμβαλόντες, ᾧ πονηρὲ σὺ,
εἰς σακκοπήραν αὐτὸν ἐπιθήσουσί που
ἐφ' ὑποζύγιον.

The word, moreover, was demotic and vulgar. (The ordinary expression would be σάγματα ὑποζυγίων, as Pollux observes just before in this passage citing Theopompus FrGrHist 115 F 58).

That Demosthenes speaks of ἀνδράποδα οἱ σακχυφάνται (kind of sackcloth weavers, from σάκκος and ὑφαίνω, with the second κ aspirated because of the υ-aspiration), *Contra Olympiodorum*, §12 (p. 1171), appears to have entertained some sort of singularity and notoriety: v. Pollux VII, 191: σακχυφάντας δὲ Δημοσθένης εἶρηκε ἐν τῷ κατ' Ὀλυμπιοδώρου. καὶ σάκκον μὲν καὶ σακκίον ἢ κωμωδία^(*), Ὑπερίδης δὲ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Μίκας (Fr. 125 Blass-Jensen) ἔφη «ἐμισθώσατο τυλυφάντας». Σοφοκλῆς δ' ἔφη (Fr. 415^c Dindorf = Fr. 468 Radt) «λινορραφῆ τυλεῖα» (thus the corrupt κλινοραφῆς τυλία to be corrected from X, 39), Εὐπολις δὲ Κόλαξι (Fr. XXI vol. II p. 496 Meineke = Fr. 170 PCG vol. V, p. 389) «κεκρῦφαλλοί τε καὶ τύλη», Ἀντιφάνης δὲ ἐν Φάωνι (vol. III p. 124 Meineke = Fr. 213 PCG vol. II, p. 438) «στρώματα/ κλίνας, τύλας». - Cf. Pollux, X 39-40; where one observew that what was not strictly Attic^(**) – τύλη instead of τυλεῖον or, better, κνέφαλλον (or κνέφαλον) – but Ionic (for Pollux *loc. cit.* says: καὶ τύλη δὲ παρ' Εὐπόλιδι ἔστιν ἰάζοντι (= imitating the Ionian dialect) ἐν τοῖς Κόλαξι), becomes the vulgate so to speak and common usage beginning already with the time of Middle Comedy: ἐν δὲ Ἀντιφάνους Φάωνι κατὰ τὴν κοινήν χρῆσιν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν τὰς τύλας etc.

Τύλος in classical Attic was any knob-like protuberance; τυλεῖα sorts of cushions; perhaps τύλη, in special use, as an artifice by which one could carry weight by raising it on the shoulders (the chief appurtenance being of a knotty appearance); Aristotle Fr. 63 Rose = Diogenes Laertius IX, 53, where the story is given of Protagoras inventing it. Probably the word got currency in Attic, in a specific employment, as a result of this particular invention of an Ionian. Connectedly, (τύλος and) τύλα was the callous hardness that thereby developed on the weight-carriers' shoulders or the callous shoulder itself; v. *sch.* ad Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 860; Suda s.v. τύλα; Hesychius s.v. τύλαι and τύλοι; Pollux VII, 133. Suda s. v. aptly explains the phaenomenon as νενεκρωμένη σάρξ. It

could be significant that the classical passages that contain the word in this special sense have the Doric form *τύλα*. Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 860; 954. The Boeotian speaks in both cases. Cf. Telecleides *Fab. Inc. Fr. XVIII*, vol. II p. 377 Meineke = Fr. 53 PCG vol. VII, p. 688, apud Scholia ad Aristophanes, *Acharnenses*, 860 a. The origin of this use might have been Doric, as that of calling *τύλη* cushions and mattresses Ionic. For as the latter was also Lesbian (being Sapphic according to Pollux X, 40), so the former is appropriated to Atticity by Aelius Dionysius apud Eustathius in *Odysseam*, A, p. 1390.54 sqq.: Αἴλιος δὲ Διονύσιος παρασημειούμενός τινα ὅπως κατὰ γένη προφέρονται, φησὶν οὕτω: ... ἔτι θηλυκῶς καὶ ἡ τύλη, τὸ φύμα τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀυχένος... δῆλον δὲ ὅτι Ἀττικῆς ταῦτα πάντα. ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἀττικαῖς λέξεσιν ὁ ρηθεὶς Διονύσιος ἐπεξέρχεται.

As the Attic *κνέφαλον* or *τυλεῖον* became the common *τύλη*, so concomitantly it would appear, the Attic *τύλη* was changed to a vulgate *τύλος*. For Suda s.v. *τύλα* καὶ *τύλος* ἀρσενικῶς (referring to the Aristophanean and Telecleidean passages he comments only on *τύλα*, not *τύλη*), after giving the explanation: τοῦ ὤμου τὸ τετυλωμένον καὶ πεπιλημένον τῆς σαρκός, ὅποιον πολλάκις ἐπὶ τοῦ ὤμου γίνεται τοῖς ἀχθοφόροις ἐκ τοῦ βαστάζειν τι συνεχῶς, he adds, together with the classical passages, a *Polybian* χρῆσις: τῆς πέτρας αὐτοῖς δυσχρηστίαν παρεχούσης διὰ τὸ δεῖν τροῖμα ποιεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ, τοῖς *τύλοις* κρατοῦσι τὴν σύριγγα τὴν προσαγομένην, bearing it on their rough shoulders.

But *τύλος*, on the other hand, as a callus or any protruding, thickened development on the human skin, was eminently pure and Attic, Xenophon, *Memorabilia* I, 2, 54. The comic use of *τύλα* got probably then its point from its signifying the shoulders, either because of the callouses developed there by habitually carrying weights, or by reason of the manly hill-like protuberance that is formed there as a raising connecting the extremities of the shoulders with the neck (though these have certainly more to do with the liberal athletic exercises in gymnastics than with a labourer's work). That comic use became then, Polybius shows, a *λογία* χρῆσις, part of the erudite language. –

As examples of the Koine *τύλη*, meaning also mattress, one may cite Ammianus *Epigramma* XIX (Jacobs vol. III p. 96 = Reiske II p. 388) and Artemidorus *Oneirocriticon* V, 8 (where *κνάφαλα* also appears as the *filling*) referred to by Suda also s.v. *τύλη*: ἡ *στρωμνή* (latiore sensu), οἶον etc. By contrast the erudite Aelianus, *De Natura Animalium*, II, 11 (p. 40 Hercher) repeats, no doubt purposefully, Antiphanes (v. supra): χαμαιζήλων κλινῶν στιβάδες ἐν τῇ ψάμμῳ τοῦ θεάτρου τεθειῖσαι, εἶτα ἐδέξαντο *τυλεῖα* καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις *στρωμνὴν* ποικίλην etc., thus distinguishing stricto sensu mattresses etc. from cushions and pillows. But see in a moment the classical antecedent of the broadening of sense: a cushion can be large enough to be a mattress. –

Κνέφαλον (with one or two λ, or *κνάφαλλον* or *γνάφαλλον* (v. Hesychius s.v. *γνάφαλλον*) – according to the famed variation of *κνάπτω*, *κναφεῖον* / *γνάπτω*, *γναφεῖον* – and *γνόφαλλον* in Lesbian Aeolic (Alcaeus 90 Diehl = 34 Bergk)) was wool torn off in carding or fulling cloth for use as stuffing in cushions, pillows, mattresses. By grammatical homonymity, the container took up the word for the contained, as Herodianus explains, *Περὶ μονήρου* *Λέξεως*, p. 39.15 = II p. 944.23 Lenz, *τύλη*, ὅπερ σύνηθες Ἀττικοῖς *κνέφαλλον* καλεῖν, ὁμωνύμως τῷ περιεχομένῳ τὴν περιέχουσιν. Ἀριστοφάνης Ἀμφιάρεω (Fr. 27 Blaydes = 84 Dindorf = Fr. 18 PCG vol. III, 2, p. 42; cf. for the second verse analytically Pollux X, 40; and cf. Sophocles, Fr. 468 Radt, *λινορραφῆ τυλεῖα*):

καὶ νῆ Δι' ἐκ τοῦ δωματίου γε νῶν φέρε
κνέφαλλον ἅμα καὶ προσκεφάλαιον τῶν λινῶν.

Here *κνέφαλλον* is a large cushion doing for a/or mattress, whereas *προσκεφάλαιον* the pillow.

For cushions in general cf. Eupolis, *Πόλεις* XXXVI vol. II p. 520 Meineke = Fr. 218.3 PCG vol. V, p. 425, apud Pollux X, 192. –

For the use of κνέφαλλον for the contents themselves of a cushion, for flocks, v. Plato *Πείσανδρος* IV vol. II p. 650 Meineke = Fr. 104 PCG vol. VII, p. 476 (apud Herodianus *Περὶ Μονήρ. λέξ.* loc.cit.); and Theopompus in *Πανταλέων* II vol. II p. 809 Meineke = Fr. 46 PCG vol. VII, p. 730, apud Pollux X.41: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ κνέφαλλον μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ τυλείου τις ἀκούειν βούλοιο, ὥσπερ ἢ πολλή χρῆσις (i.e. ἢ Ἀττική of course) ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐμβαλλομένου πληρώματος, ὃ γνάφαλον καλοῦσι, προσχρησεται τῷ ρηθέντι ἐν Παντελέοντι Θεοπόμπου, εἰ καὶ ἀμφισβητεῖται τὸ δρᾶμα. προειπὼν γὰρ ὁ ποιητὴς «ὠνητιῶν <τὸ> δέρμα τοῦ θηρός» ἐπήγαγε «ράψας ὅλον σάξαι κνεφάλ(λ)ων (or κνεφάλ(λ)ω)» - adopting Bentley's simple and righteous solution of the problems posed by the transmission of the text, especially the "ρ. ὅλον κνέφαλον σάξαι γνεφάλω», which is an obvious tampering caused by a misunderstanding of Pollux' meaning above. What Pollux says was the word for the stuffing occurs in Lucianus, *Judicium Vocalium*, 4 (*sch.* γνάφαλα δὲ τὰ ἀποξύσματα). But it is of course another form of the very same word. In the latter usage it signified the stuffing; thus *Glossae GraecoLatinae*, s.v. γνάφαλον tomentum, and s.v. κνάφαλον tomentum. The *Glossae LatinoGraecae*, s.v. tomentum: κνάφαλλον. The *Onomasticon* has the equivalence γνάφαλον tomentum. Correspondingly τύλη = culcita appears bothways in the Glosses.-

To return to the Demosthenic σακχυφάνται. It need not testify the more, the more unique and maybe ad hoc coined it was, the commoner vogue of σάκκος; for σακχυφάνται is κακόηχον and vulgar. And even if it did bespeak the incipient prevalence of that form with the double κκ, it would unreproachfully accord to the general character of the 4th century B.C. as period of *softer and freer (more naturalistic and more expressive) classicism* – the link (as I still hesitate to call it a transition-era) between *high classicism and hellenisticity*. – As to the meaning of the word, there were those in antiquity who interpreted it in a peculiar and specific way matching the singularity of the form. At the very end of his work, Pollux observes (X, 192): ὅταν Δημοσθένης εἶπη σακχυφάντας, τοὺς πλέκοντας ταῖς γυναιξὶ τοὺς κεκρυφάλους ἀκούουσιν^(*). This appears in the midst of a recension of equipments of various kinds (implements and appliances and accoutrements).

^(*) He means that the *words* were *demotic and comic*, not the particular form with the two κκ. Pollux, according to the manuscript tradition, utilized both forms, but those with one κ appear uniformly in quotations except for X, 186 (σάκκος σπάρτινος); while he writes κκ when speaking ex propria persona. Naturally enough: For although he emphasized correctness and propriety, he was no puristic fowl. Contrary to the false Atticism which condemned de facto most of the classical attic glory itself by means of a pharisaic narrow (say Lysianising) norm, he utilized all major literary production though occasionally condemning prestigious authentications. The decisive terms of such attitude are δόκιμον-ἀδόκιμον (tested and enrolled, that is, as proven by authoritative testimonies); not attic - nonattic.

^(**) So Moeris (p. 201.20 Bekker): κνέφαλον Ἀττικοί, τύλη Ἑλληνες. Any cushion or pillow. And Phrynichus imperatively, *Ecloga*, (145 Fischer = 151 Rutherford = p. 173 Lobeck): τύλην εἰ καὶ εὖροις που, σὺ κνέφαλον λέγε. And Thomas Magister *Ecloga*, s.v. κνέφαλον Ἀττικοί λέγουσιν, οὐ γνέφαλον· ἔστι δὲ ἢ τύλη (which was standard in Κοινή). The glossographical prince has s.v. κνέφαλον· τύλη. ἦν δὲ ἡμεῖς τύλην (in the wider and more proper sense, any protuberance, esp. of the skin), Ἀτικοί τύλον (vel τυλεῖον; *pro ms.* τυλίον). καὶ πῖλος καὶ προσκεφάλαιον ἢ (? *pro ἦ*) τύλη. Consonantly, the "technical" prince, Herodianus, v. supra.

^(***) The view is adopted by the Scholia *ad loc.* (vol. VI p. 340 ed. Dobson; omitted accidentally it appears in Müller's Didotiana): σακχυφάνται· οἱ πλέκοντες ταῖς γυναιξὶ τοὺς κεκρυφάλους, the

to keep to the manuscripts, or, perhaps, we may read, with Dobreus, Meineke and Bekker *τροπήϊου*, in this case taken substantively, while in the former, as in the text, adjectively. (*Τροπήϊον* is Ionic for *τροπεῖον*, natural for Hipponax). At any rate, Hipponax refers to a filtering *sack* of (or belonging with) a *pressing* equipment. What was that which dripped and trickled like a wine-press sack is not very difficult to surmise: a tumescent virilium crying in the agonies of pleasure just before or after the fiery explosion, or in the frustrated expectation of the divine consummation; there is an exquisite Stratonian epigram on this latter condemnation.

Varro envisages the possibility that the Latin *trapetes* or *trapetum* or *trapetus* (olive-mill)¹⁴ may be Greek (*τραπήτες, τραπητόν, τραπητός*): *de Lingua Latina* V, 138: *trapetes molae oleaviae; vocant trapetes a terendo, nisi graecum est*. The Latin derivation is evidently imaginary; the Greek obviously correct. Another Latin etymology (*Scholia* in Virgilius *loc.cit.*) is forced and besides not quite apposite: nominativus *trapetum*. *trapeta autem sunt saxa a trahendo dicta, quibus frangitur oliva*. (The significative element is not that they may be drawn or pushed, but that they squeeze the olive). *Τροπεῖον* and *τραπήτης* or *τραπητός(ν)* is the same word in different but similar applications, wine and olive oil pressing respectively .

women's sacklike, dense hair nets, those latter called *κροκυφάντους* (from *κροκύς*, flock of wool). If so, we have more surely to do with a (Demosthenian or borrowed) case of word coinage.

¹⁴ V. Virgilius *Georgica* II, 519:

Venit hiems, teritur Sicyonia bacca trapetis

(maybe a reminiscence, on the part of the erudite καὶ κυριολεκτοῦντος poet, of *trapetum* from *tero*. A reverse tacit allusion would be finer. Probably there were those who propagated or liked the fictive derivation). The *Glossae LatinoGraecae* have *trapetum, ἐλαιῶν μύλος· ἐλαιουργεῖον* (by extension of the meaning) and similarly we find in the *GraecoLatinae Glossae* *ἐλαιοτριβεῖον· trapetum*, and *μύλος ἐλαιῶν· trapetum*. And so Isidorus, *Etymologiarum*, XX, 14, 12: *trapetum mola olivarum*. Servius *ad Vergilii loc.* has more specifically: *trapetis autem, molis mobilibus olivavibus. et declinatur trapetum sicut templum*. Terentianus:

Quos super insidens trapetos signa gyris temperat.

Quod metrum aptum est olivam teentibus. The olive pressing apparatus that is called *trapetum* is fully described by Cato, *de Re Rustica*, 20, cf. 22; 18. Cf. Varro, *de Re Rustica*, I, 55, 5. V. Columella XII, 52, 6 for various appliances used in extracting oil. *Trapetum* is distinguished there from *molae*: *oleo autem conficiendo molae utiliores sunt quam trapetum; trapetum quam canalis et solea*. That would bring us even closer to the wine-pressing *τροπεῖον*. Plinius XV, 6 (6), 23 distinguishes a preliminary breaking of the olives by the *trapetum* from the proper press: *protinus prelo subicerentur solidae – ita enim amurca exprimitur; mox trapetis fractae premerentur iterum ... quod vero post molam primum expressum est, flos* (sc. *vocatur et est, the flower of olive oil*). This would equate again *trapetum with mola*; the flower of oil could not include *amurca*.

Another word to signify that exquisite must that dripped from the self-squeezed grapes, was, according to Hesychius s.v. *πρόουρον*: τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθῆ, from *πρὸ* and *ὀρούω* (*ὀρέομαι*, *ὄρνυ-μι*, *ὀρίνω*, *ὀρμάω*), that which comes down before the main dart, rush.

Now whether *γλεῦκος* is to be understood in the peculiar, glossematic sense above evidenced, or in the normal signification of must, it can only refer to the grape juice either *before or during* fermentation. This will carry us to about 9 (or at most, say, 40) days after the *vindemia*.¹⁵ .

¹⁵ A difficulty is apparently presented by *Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων* II, 13. On the *Pentecost*, the Apostles, inspired by the Holy Ghost, speak fluently in the diverse languages of Man. People were stunned and wondered at the enormity. Some scientificists (enlightened and rationalistic) of the day *διαχλευάζοντες* ἔλεγον ὅτι *γλεύκους* μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν. To whom Petrus replied (§15): οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσιν, ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας. - It cannot of course be a question of proper must. But grape juice was preserved artificially through the whole year. So Cato, *de Re Rustica*, 120: *mustum si voles totum annum habere, in amphoram mustum indito et corticem oppicato, demittito in piscinam (to inhibit the process of fermentation). post dies XXX eximito. totum annum mustum erit.* The same injunction is given by Columella *De Re Rustica*, XII, 29, only he advises the amphorae to be totally submerged into water for 40 days. This product was called *ἀείγλευκος* by the Greeks. So Plinius XIV 9 (11), 83: *medium inter dulcia vinumque est quod Graeci aigleucos vocant, hoc est semper mustum. id evenit cura, quoniam fervere prohibetur – sic appellant musti in vina transitum –; ergo mergunt e lacu protinus aqua cados, donec bruma transeat et consuetudo fiat algendi.* - Plutarchus in *Aetia Physica* κζ', 918 E-F examines διὰ τί τὸ γλεῦκος, ἂν ὑπὸ ψύχους περιέχεται τὸ ἀγγεῖον, γλυκὸν διαμένει πολὺν χρόνον. – The various dulcia produced by decoction of must, might also in an extended sense be appellated *γλεῦκος*. – Still the question remains why the author of *Acta* should use this word instead of *οἶνος*, which one would ordinarily and normally expect. However loosened their (wine and must) distinction might have become in the Greek vulgate of Palaestine at the time of Jesus, we must account by something more than this hypothesis for the particular choice. I suggest the reason is that as must, being sweet and unfermented, is less intoxicating than full-blown wine (v. supra), it is consequently apter, when taken in plenitude (notice the *μεμεστωμένοι γλεύκους*, full to the brim, so to speak, satiated), to be considered the cause of an unexpected effervescence and ebullition in people, of an insightful exuberance rather than a torporous dullness and a sickening distemper – the unavoidable results of a *filling* oneself with wine.