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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 siraemia with the Greek ἐψημα 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 conficiis. cum omnia uno genere confiantur 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) congenerunt, nonnulli tertiam decoquunt. Nec dubium, quin ad dimidium si quis excozerit, meliorem sapam facturus sit, eoque usibus utiliorem, adeo quidem, ut etiam vice defruti, sapa, mustum quod est ex veteribus vineis, condire positis. 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 acqua refrigeranda. quod etiam si fecerimus, nihilominus defrutum infra tertiam partem vasis condemnit. 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 αύτίτης οίνος 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 manifestely 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 annuum spatium tale proditur. aliquibus in locis decocunt ad sapas musta, infusisque is 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.

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, inconquerable 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 perunguendum 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 φάρμακος in itself, being the stronger substance, although it could be still be said to be “drunk”; v. Plinius, XXIII (30): usus (sc. sapae) 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 opus ut dulce promat indidem, ecquid habet? – Rogas?

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

That the italicized is the corрект reading is clear from the evidence of the vetustissimus palimpsest A (whose reading is: *MEILAMMELQUOIOUSMODI* 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 *μειλίσσω*) in XIV 13 (15) §93: Scaevolam quoque et L. Aelium et Ateum Capitonem in eadem sententia suisse video [namely that – Plautus’ at least – murrina was a sweet rather than an aromatic wine. The anithesis relies on the view Plinius XIV 9 (11) §80: vinum omne dulce minus odoratum; quo tenuius, eo odoratus. Which is exactly what the Aristotelian *Problemata*, Γ, 873a1 tell us: ἐτί δὲ ὁ μὲν γλυκύς ἀνοδόμος, ὁ δὲ αὐστηρός οὐ. Although the subtle wine is not exactly the austere one. But perhaps Pliny wanted to render the standard Greek opposition between the ἀνυκύς and the αὐστηρός wine, quoniam in Pseudulo sit:

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

Murrinanam, passum, defrutum, *mella* -------

quibus apparret 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: καλὸς οὖν Αρίστων ὁ Κηίως φησιν ἥδιστον ποτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄμα μὲν γλυκύτητος, ἄμα δ' εὖ<ω>δίας κοινωνύντα. διο καὶ τὸ καλούμενον *νέκταρ* κατασκευάζειν τινάσπερι τὸν Λυδίας Ὁλυμπὸν οἶνον καὶ κηρία συγκυριάντας 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 Βαπυλώνι οἶνον 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: ἀρωματίτις, murrina? Is it pro: ἀρωματίτις, murrina? Or is it some preparation or unguent-cist?] quoque invenio factumatum *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*, 443b26sqq.: αἱ δὲ καθ’ αὐτάς ἤδεια τῶν ὀσμῶν εἰσίν, οίον αἱ τῶν ἄνθων. οὐδὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον οὐδ’ ἔττον πρὸς τὴν τροφὴν παρακαλοῦσιν, οὐδὲ συμβάλλονται πρὸς ἔπιθημιαν οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ τούναντιον μᾶλλον. ἀληθὲς γὰρ ὅπερ Ἐυριπίδην σκώπτων εἶπεν Στράττις (Fr. 47, PCG vol. VII p.645) “ὅταν φακήν ἐφητε, μὴ ‘πιχεῖν μύρον’. οἱ δὲ τὸν μειγνύντες εἰς τὰ πόματα τὰς τοιαύτας δύναμεις βιάζονται τῇ συνηθεία τὴν ἔδονήν, ἐως ἂν ἐκ δυ’ αἰσθησεων γένηται τὸ ἢδυ ὡς ἂν καὶ ἀπὶ μᾶς”, primo ex *murras*, ut diximus, mox et nardo Celtico, calamo, bitumine, offis in *mustum aut dulce vinum* delectis etc.

In his energetic negation of “unguementation” Pliny is contradicted by Pollux, VI, 17: ἢν δὲ τις καὶ μυρίνης οἶνος (murrina), μύρω κεκραμένος. And by Aelianus, *Varia Historia*, XII, 36 sub fin.: μύρω γὰρ οἶνον μιγνύντες ὀυτῶς ἔπινον καὶ ύπερηγάγοντο τὴν τοιαύτην κράσιν. καὶ ἐκάλείτο ὁ οἶνος Μυρρίνης. μέμηναι 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, Ἀπολιπώουσα, 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 ἀτοπος 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 al ascription: οἱ δὲ τῶν γυλυκῶν ὀωτῶς (sc. μυρίνην) οἰονται 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 *murrae odere* condita, ut apparat in Plauti fibula, quae Persa inscribitur, quamquam in ea et calamin 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
singly 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 odorousness. 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: “Varro De vita Populi Romani lib. I: ‘tu autem murrina; loram dicebant in vindemia cum expressissent acinis mustum et folliculos in dolium conieciissent’ “ – 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 noce ac die madefectis vinaceis rursusque prelo subjectis; alterum, quo modo Graeci factitavere, tertia parte eis 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, grandaevis aptum. Varro De vita Populi Romani Lib. I : “antiquae mulieres maiores natu bibeabant loram aut sapam 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 invokable 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 dulciun (less probable in view of the preexistence of sapa). –

Now muriola was, according to Festus, the evidently ύποκοκοιστικόν name women gave to the glorious Murrina. Thus, unless Varro flatly contradicted Festus by dissociating completely murrina from murr(i)ola, 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, lora 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 lorem (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 conglutinization ascribed to them – exactly as one should expect from an antique and, I say, more Hellenic attitude. Defrutum of the exquisistest 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 signifies: *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 *aqua marinae veteris* sextarios LXIII et operculum in dolium inponito et Oblinito post dies X. Hoc vinum durabit tibi usque ad solstition. siquid superfluerit 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 sapae.* postea facito laterculos. sinito conhibant 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 circunlinas, ut bene odorata sint et nequid viti in vinum accedat. sapae congis 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 cibrum 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 In §7 grapes are recommended to be preserved in *sapa,* as in grape-pulp, in must or in *lorae* (the inferior wine we have noticed – obviously the sweeter 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 winter\(^2\) 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,
ecropiumque 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 wintery of course, as it is done upon vintage, mostly in October. Unless he means by \textit{mustum, vinum}; or by \textit{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 \textit{Προβλήματα}, 23, 925 b16: τοῦ γαλάκτους ὄντος φόντει ἡδέος. 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 \textit{ad loc.} tells us: bene autem ait \textit{decoquit humorem}, id est, \textit{rem superfluum}; sicut supra (112) posuit: luxuriem segetum tenera depascit in herba). The foam is skimmed with \textit{leaves} from the \textit{violently boiling} must which makes the \textit{copper} vase to quiver; the transaction taking place, further, in the \textit{night}. All these are precise features of must-cooking as reported by the writers treating of these subjects. (Only a \textit{lead} vessel was recommended in later times (v. Columella), as its \textit{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 cratere camella,
lac niveum potes, purpureamque sapam.

The ritual of the Palilia or Parilia is described, this agrarian festival for the purification and protection of Pastorality – of herbs and flocks, cattle and shepherd, of animals and people involved in Shepherdrory 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 Burranica potio by Festus s.v. Burranica potio appellatur lacte commixtum sapa: a ruso colore, quem burrem vocant. (And s.v. burrem dicebant antiqui quod nunc dicimus rucus; unde rustici burram appellant buculam, quae rostrum habet rusum; pari modo rubens cibo ac potione ex prandio burram appellatur). **Rusum** is here used generically, in the broad acception 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’ appellazione, 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 κυρρός 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 lattin byrrus or burreus (the later form is the best; it exists also in Quintiliam 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; burreus, πυρρός. We should imagine a hue between
the flavidus 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 πετυμέζι. 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 dulciun 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 πετυμέζι (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 δευτεριας
oivos 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 “substratal” 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, subbitter-sweet preserve liquid, of multiple and pretracted usefulness. 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 δευτερίας οἶνος, 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, ἐψήμα; and again: sapa ἐψήμα; whereas in Cyrillus (GL) we meet only σταφύλιτὶς οἶνος· sapa. The Onomasticon Latino-Graecum has both equivalences of ἐψήμα with sapa and defrutum. 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, σταφύλιτης (the correct reading, pro σταφυλιτης in Labbaeus); γάλακτο (from the Onomasticon LG; on the γάλακτο and γάλακτος (οἶνος) cf. what I said elsewhere) ἐψήμα (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. Σταφύλιτης οἶνος 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 inadverrence 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 σταφύλιδος ἐψήμα is given as one of the significations of σιραίον. Thus not passum itself, but a combination of the passum technique with subsequent boiling of the raisin-must, would be called σιραίον in one acceptation of the term; and in view of the general equivalence of σιραίον with ἐψήμα (especially as that product was in truth ἐψήμα as well) might be called actually, or taken inappropriately as named, ἐψήμα.

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 ἐψήμα, 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 γλυκοῦς ἐψημένων γλυκῶν (sc. ἀοίνων οἶνον so to speak). And so Photius s.v. Σίραιον τὸν ἐψημένων οἶνον καὶ γλυκῶν. Regarding ἐψημα, Pollux VI, 17 has: καὶ μελίκρατον δέ, τὸ νῦν οἰνόμελι. ἣ που δὲ καὶ τὸ νῦν ἐψημα ὀνομαζόμενον, ὅτε ἔστιν οἶνος ἐξεψημένος εἰς γλυκύτητα. καὶ τούτῳ ἄν τις οἴστι εἰσημένον ἐν τῇ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τοῦ κωμικοῦ Συμμαχία (= Fr. IV, vol. II p. 666 M = Fr. 163, PCG vol. VII, p.498):

tὸ δὲ ἐψημᾶ σου

γευόμενος ἔλαθον ἐκφοβήσας.

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 ἐψημα is singular. I shall not expand on the matter, but only refer to Eustathius ad *Odyssean*, K, 519, p. 1668.22: Μελίκρατον γὰρ οἱ παλαιοί μίγμα φασὶ μέλίτος καὶ γάλατος ἐνταθθ’ αἰ μέντοι μεθ’ Ὀμηρον μέχρι καὶ ἐς ἄρτι, κράμα μέλίτος καὶ ὀδατός τὸ μελίκρατον οἶδας. On the other hand it is readily acceptable that certain wine-preparations would approach closely οἰνόμελι, just as the λάτινος οἶνος did; v. Polybius XII, 2, 7 (apud Athenaeus XV, p. 651F). – Hesychius gives s.v. ἐψημα: ὅπερ ἐνιοῦ σίραιον καλούσιν ἄλλοι γλυκῶν (sc. οἶνον, pro γλυκ onHide, which also can be retained). Cf. s.v. γλυκίνας: διὰ γλυκέος οἶνου πλακούσ, or more exactly Athenaus, XV 645F: γλυκίνας: ὁ διὰ γλυκέος καὶ ἐλαιοῦ πλακοῦσ παρὰ Κρησίν ὡς φησίν Σέλευκος ἐν Γλώσσαια. S.v. σίραιον Hesychius explains: τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς σταφίδος ἐψημα: οἱ δὲ τὸ γλυκό (i.e. τὸ ἐψημα from the must boiled down) καὶ ἐψημένον οἶνον (or, τὸν γλυκῶν καὶ ἐψ. οἶνον). On the whole, I do not suppose that there was a substance called γλυκό distinct from both ἐψημα and γλυκῶν (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 γλυκός. (The neuter substantively appears also in Nicander, *Alexipharmacac*, 386). Cf. the epistle of Diocles to Antigonus, apud *Paulus Aegineta*, I, 100, 2 (p. 69.14-5 Heiberg): καὶ ἀναξέσας ἐν χυτρίῳ μετὰ γλυκέως ἢ ἐψηματος ἡμικουτιλίον etc. But of course the ἐψημα was γλυκό, and so Galenus explains σίραιον as γλυκό ἐψημα [ex Comm. in *Vesp.* p. 501]
or even γλυκό, ἔψιμα. Plutarch, in his *Aetia Physica*, KZ’ 918°, refers to the γλυκό, but in a desperate, probably corrupt, passage: διὰ τί τὸ γλεύκος, ἂν υπὸ ψύχους περιεχθηται τὸ ἄγγειον γλυκό διαμένει πολὺν χρόνον; πότερον ὅτι πείψει ἐστὶ τοῦ γλεύκους ἢ εἰς τὸ οίνῳδες μεταβολή, κωλύει δὲ τὴν πείψιν ἡ ψυχρότης, υπὸ θερμοῦ γάρ ἢ πείψις ἢ τουναντίον, οἰκείως ἐστὶ τῆς σταφυλῆς χυμός ὁ γλυκός, διὸ καὶ +πεπαίνεσθαι λέγεται τὸ γλυκό κιρνώμενον+ (?) ἢ δὲ ψυχρότης οὐκ ἐώσα διαπνεῖν ἀλλὰ συνέχουσα τὸ θερμόν, τὴν γλυκύτητα διατηρεῖ τοῦ γλεύκους. The sense requires either that the grape ripens when it becomes sweet; (we would expect then e.g. τοῦ γλυκέως κιρνώμενον); or that the sweet must and the γλυκό itself is matured when boiled, cooked (ἔψιμενον for κιρνώμενον); or that τὸ γλυκό, 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: ἡ τουναντίον, οἰκείως ἐστὶ τῆς σταφυλῆς χυμός ὁ γλυκός <καὶ θερμός>, διὸ καὶ πεπαίνεσθαι λέγεται τὸ γλυκό ἔψιμενον: far from τὸ θερμόν being the external cause of fermentation (and thus transformation of must into wine) it is the natural quality of γλεύκος together with sweetness; so that must when further heated matures further, condensing into the γλυκό in itself.

The Hesychian gloss s.v. γλυκός μελιχρόν must be understood primarily in the reverse order; what was a very characteristic epitheton of wine in the archaic times, is the γλυκός οἶνος of the laters. Athenaeus (X p. 430A sqq.) speaking of the renowned Alcaeus’ φιλονία writes: κατὰ γὰρ πάσαν ὤραν καὶ πᾶσαν περίστασιν πίνων ὁ ποιητής οὖτος εὑρίσκεται. χειμῶνος μὲν, ἐν τούτως; (Fr. 30 Diehl = 34 Bergk):

> ἔι μὲν Ζεύς, ἐκ δ’ ὄρανω (vel. ὀράνω) μέγας χειμών, πεπάγασον δ’ ὑδάτων φόαι. κάββαλλε τὸν χειμῶν’, ἐπὶ μὲν τιθεῖς τῦρ’ ἐν δὲ κίρναις οἴνον ἄφειδέως μέλιχρον, αὐτάρ ἀμφί κόροσα μᾶλθακον ἄμφι <βαλῶν> γνόραλλον. .... τοῦ δὲ ἔαρος ... καὶ προσελθέν (Fr. 97 Diehl = 45 Bergk)
> ἐν δὲ κίρνατε τῷ μελιάδεος ὅτι τάχιστα κρατήραι.

(*Μελιθής* 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 βιαν τρέπεσθαι τοὺς ἐξοινωθέντας. Ἀλκαῖος:
> ἀλλοτε μὲν μελιάδεος, ἀλλοτε
δ' ὀξυτέρον τριβόλων ἀρωτήμενοι.

Wine moves in the area between the sweetness of honey and the sharpness of vinegar so to speak. Correctly Eustathius, in *Odyssey*, p.1910.18: κατὰ γὰρ τὴν Ἀλκαίον μουσαν ἄλλοτε μὲν μελιαδὴς ὁ ὀίνος, ὁ δὴ ἐφή καὶ Ὁμήρος, ἄλλοτε δ' ὀξυτέρος τριβόλων... ὅρα δὲ καὶ τὸ ὀξυτέρος τριβόλων, δι' οὗ δηλοῦται ὡς ὁ λεγόμενος κοινῶς ὀξές ὀίνος τῷ μελιθεῖ ἀντιδιαστέλεται(6). Μελιθήςς is, of course, an almost standing epitheton of wine in Homer.

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

Ωμορθεὶ δ' ἀμφίπολος μελιχρόν ὀίνον, τρικύθηνε κελέβην ἐχουσα.

The expression appears also in Comic Poetry: Teleclides in *Πρωτάνεςς* Fr. II vol. II p. 368 Meineke = Fr. 27 PCG vol. VII, p.678, apud Athenaeus XI, 485f: Νίκανδρος δ' ὁ Ὀνατειρηνός (Fr.Gr.Hist. 343 F 15), κύλει φησί μειζών (sc. ἐστι ἡ λεπαστή), παρατιθέμενος Τηλεκλείδου ἐκ Πρωτάνων:

καὶ μελιχρόν ὀίνον ἐλκεῖν
ἐξ ἡδύπνου λεπαστής,
τυρίον ἐπεσθίοντα,

where we find something difficult to be achieved, but artificially 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 Littre = II 418 Kühn, where the μελιχροί 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 γλυκύς ὀίνος καὶ μελειδής (or perhaps we should read μελιθήςς; 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) ἀμφῶ καὶ κομιστικοὶ καὶ διορθητικοὶ καὶ φλεγματώδεις, οἱ δὲ αὐστηροὶ etc. Μελιχροί are then the thicker, more honey-like wines – οἱ πολὺ τὸ ἐφήμα ἐχοντες; on the other hand γλυκείς can be thin, λεπτοί ὀίνοι, v. *Περὶ Διαίτης* B I, 224 L. = I 684 K. Thus the γλυκείς include every grape product that by nature or artifice has a sweet taste, whereas μελιχροί are specifically rather dense, honey-taste potions – In *Γνακείων* A´ II 479 L. = II 696 K. ὀίνῳ 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: κιρρῷ. That it is also ὑδαρής does not imply essentially thinness but relates to

---

6 The Hippocratic *Περὶ Διαίτης*, B, I 685K = I 224L speaks of ὀξῖναι or ὀξύναιοι ὀίνοι.
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 – κιορός – (ἐρυθρός) – 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 γλεύκος, γλευέν and γλυέιν. Hesychius s.v. γλευέξις oynos (vel. oinos) ἐψιμα. Eustathius, In Odysseam, p.1385.14: καὶ τὸ γλυκὸ ἐκ τοῦ γλεύκος. ὅθεν (sc. from γλεύκος) και γλευέξις κατὰ Παυσανίαν, οἶνος πολὺ ἐψιμα ἔχων, ὁ νῦν, φησι, σίρινος· ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ σίραίον οὐδετέρως. - oinos polu' epsima echon 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 ἐψιμα 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 acetic, 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 Etymologicicon Magnum, s.v., we read: αὐτίτης: ὁ χωρίς παραχύματος οἶνος, οἰνὸν ἐψιματος· ἢ ὁ ἑπιχώριος (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 περσῶν). 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 Οὐελίτερνος (sc. οἶνος) δὲ ἥδες πινόμενος, εὐστόμαχος· ἰδιὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ μῆ δοκεῖν ἀπαρέγχυτος εἶναι· ἐμφαίνει γὰρ ὡς ἐμμεμιγμένου αὐτῷ ἐτέρου. Galenus reserves ἀπαράχυτον for a narrower application signifying absence of mingling a small quantity of seawater for the fermentation. Thus X p. 832: λαμβάνειν δὲ ἀπαραχύτους (sc. οίνους) – οὕτω δὲ ὀνομάζονται οἷς ὑμέμκεται θάλασσα, μεγάστερα βλάβην ἤγομένους ἐφ' ὅν μέμκεται γενήσθαι. οὐ μὴν οὖδε εἰσώθαι τοῖς εὐγενέσιν οἶνοις, ὕπερ ὧν ὁ λόγος ἐστί, μιγνύναι τῆς θαλάσσης ἐν Δέσβῳ (this not being strictly accurate, at least in older times, as we have seen e.g. from Phanius. And, XIII p. 721: τὸν
ἄπαραχτων οἶνον, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ὁ μή μέμκεται θάλασσα. That this was one way of seasoning the wine we have already observed, and in fact Phanius (loc.cit. apud Athenaeus, I p. 37f) uses the word παρέγχειται to signify the pouring in of some seawater to γλυύκος. – On the mixture of wines v. e.g. Theophrastus apud Athenaeus I, 32b; and on seasoning cf. idem. I, 32a. – The αὐτόκρατος Αριούσιος of Chios was (Athenaeus, I, 32f) in all probability such an αὐτίτης 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 υπόχυτον τινα οἶνον ἐν Ρόδῳ καλεῖ, παραπλήσιον τῷ γλυκεῖ. καὶ γλυύκες δ’ οἶνος καλεῖται ὁ τὸ ἐψήμα ἑχων. (On the specific nature of υπόχυτων, 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. Laeritis IV, 20: ἦν δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφοκλῆς (sc. Polemon) καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ἐκείνοις ὅπου κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν (sc. Aristophanes, Fr. 958) τὰ ποιήματα αὐτῷ
κύων τις ἔδοκε συμποιεῖ Μολοττικός,
καὶ ἐνθὰ ἦν (sc. Sophocles) κατὰ τὸν Φρύνιχον
οὐ γλυύκες οὔδ’ υπόχυτος ἀλλὰ πράμνιος.

(c.f. Suidas s.v. υπόχυτος οἶνος where the verse is applied mistakenly to Polemo). Marvellously illustrates the Cratinian point Athenaeus in I, p. 30b-c: ἐστι δὲ οὕτος (sc. ὁ Πράμνιος) γένος τι οἶνον καὶ ἔστιν οὕτος οὔτε γλυκὸς οὔτε παχύς (as the condensed must-wines are), ἀλλὰ αὐτής ὁ καὶ σκληρός καὶ δύναμιν ἔχων διαφέρουσαν (having such strength and robustness as to cause an erection, Aristophanes, Fr. 334, PCG vol. III 2, p. 188): οὐ δέ Αριστοφάνης ὅχι ἱδεῖται Ἀθηναίοις φησι, λέγων «τὸν Ἀθηναίων δήμον οὔτε θρήνης ἱδεῖται σκληροῖς καὶ ἀστεμφέσιν, οὔτε Πραμνίως σκληροῖσιν οἶνοις, συνάγους τὰς ὀρθὰς τε καὶ τὴν κολίαν’ ἀλλ’ ἀνθοσμία καὶ πέπονι νεκταροσταγεῖ» (Aristophanes, Fr. 688, PCG vol. III 2 p.353). As Erotianus explains, ο, 45: οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας, ὁ εὐώδης καὶ ἡδύς, ὡς Αριστοφάνης ἐν Βατράχοις (v. 1150) καὶ ἐν Θησευφοριαζούσας (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: Διόνυσος, πίνεις οἶνον οὐκ ἀνθοσμίαν, meaning “you are talking nonsense, like a drunken man, you are intoxicated”. In the same spirit Hesychius comments s.v. Γλύύκες ὁ ἀνεμένος οἶνος καὶ άτονος (so splendidly Salmasiūs pro ἀγωνος), ὃν ἔνιοι μὲν ἄπαλόστομον, οἱ δὲ γλυύκειν (sc. καλούσι). 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 ὁδέων II 288L = II 53K) between the γλυκὸς 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.

Έψημα and σίφαιον must have been in Classical Greece pretty dense, thick, quasi-congealed liquids. The σίφαιον 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 Αντιφάνης.

ασταφίδος, ἀλών, σιφαίον, συλφίον, τυροῦ, θύμου,
σησάμον, νίτσου (vel. λίτσου), κυμίνου, ροῦ, μέλιτος, ὁριγάνου,
βοτανίων, ὀξείων, ἐλαῤῥ, εἰς ἀβυτάκην χλόης,
καππάριδος, ωίων, ταρίχου, καρδάμου, θρίων, ὅποι
– substances each with specific singular strength even in small quantities. Σίφαιον also appears in the very similar catalogue of ἕδυσματα 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 ἡ Ἐρίθος (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 νεανική 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’ Vespae 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:

παύσον τ’ αὐτῷ (sc. τοῦ πατρός) τοιτί τὸ λίαν στρυφνόν καὶ πρίνινον ἥθος
ἀντὶ σιφαίου μέλιτος μικρὸν τῷ θυμιδῷ παραμέλας;
mixing a bit of honey instead of σιφαίον into his heartlet. But since σιφαίον 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 ἀντισιφαίον as one word, and deemed that he would read ἀντικυραίον, from Αντίκυρα 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 emphatically indeed, but acquires a certain subbitter taste especially if it is cooked considerably: μὴ σίραιον, ἀλλὰ μέλι παραμίξας. σίραιον δὲ τὸ ἐφημένον γλεύκος, βραχὺ δὲ ἔχον παράσικρον 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 ἐψήμα is also segregated even from the dulce wines in the Hippocratic Περὶ Διαίτης B’ I 224 L. = I 685 Kühn, a winish substance rather than wine (but remember that even a general category of οἴνωδες οἶνοι is recognized by Hippocrates v. supra). Its function is thus described there: ἐψήμα θερμαίνει καὶ υγραίνει καὶ υπάγει. θερμαίνει μὲν ὅτι οἴνωδες, υγραίνει δὲ ὅτι τρόφιμον, υπάγει 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 - ἐψήμα as a considerably condensed liquid squares with the Greek (classical) usage. I notice also that Aretaeus speaks of σίραιος ἐλληνικός σκ. οἶνος (the σίρινος of Pausanias apud Eustathius above quoted. And Hippocrates speaks of σιραίος οἶνος, Γυναικείων πρῶτον ΙΙ 479 L. = II 696 Kühn). Aretaeus, Ὀξέων Νοσσών Θεραπευτικόν, Α, 1 p. 194; 198; ed. Kühn; cf. also Χρονίων Παθών Θεραπευτικόν Α p. 322 where we must certainly read σιραίος τῷ Κρητῇ, cf. p. 194 σίραιον ἐλληνικόν ἢ Κρητῆ. There was also a passum Creticum (Pliniius XX, 19 (79) §208; and in XIV, 9 (11) §81 where passum a Cretico Cilicum 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 ἐψήμα 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 Ganymedeans*, 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 effluvit et conditum vasculo *mellis more* servatur - much more if it was boiled afterwards as well). Cf. Polybius apud Athenaeus Χ, 440Ε affirming the similarity in taste of Roman *πάσσον* (*passum*) to Αἰγοσθενίτη γλυκεί 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 *μελιχώρος* and *μελιηδής* and (possibly) *μελειείδης οἶνος*.

Finally we resort to etymology. Σίφαιον (which is written *σείραιον* in Nicander *Alexipharmacæ*, 153) belongs to the same meaning field with the group of words Σέιριος (perhaps Σειρήν), *σειρίσεως, σειρίκαυτος, σειρίσας, σειριάω, σειράξω, σειρίαξω*. They principally signify exceptional, annihilating heat, scorching, but the insistent underlying implication is of drying up, consuming the watery ingredients, rendering arid. (That *σειρίαξω* denotes rather sparkle or twinkle apud Theon Smyrnaeus, p. 146H relates to the astral employment of the root in Σέιριος as Κύων, the Dog-Star, as the Sun and as Stars (*πλανήτες καὶ ἄπλανεῖς*) 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 *σείραινον* which the *Etymologicum Magnum s.v.* (p. 710.22 sqq.) explains as *ἐξηραίνω* according to Orus, the Milesian grammarian: *Σειράνω* σημαίνει τὸ ἐξηραίνω, ὡς λέγει Ἡρος ὁ Μιλήσιος: παρά τὸν Σέιριον τὸν ἀστέρα. Σείριος δὲ ὁ Κύων ἔστιν ἀστήρ καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ τὴν ζέσιν, ζέριος. Ἡ παρὰ τὸ ἐκκεννὸν ἡμᾶς ἱδρώσει φιεμένους (sweating by reason of the excessive heat during the period of the Dog-Waves) *σειρέιν γὰρ τὸ ἀποκεννὸν λέγεται*. We can smell now our road to σίφαιον through that ζέσιν. But it is made more explicit by the final gloss in the passage quoted. (Which is repeated confusedly in the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, p. 497, 50 sqq.: Σείριος ὁ ἡλίος, οἵονει τείριος, κατά τροπήν τοῦ τ εἰς σ, ἐπειδή τείρει καὶ καταπονεῖ ἡμᾶς τῷ καύματι. Καὶ ὅτι ἀποσείει ἡμᾶς καὶ κενοὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἱδρώτους, οἴονει σείριος ὁ ἐκζέων ἡμᾶς καὶ θερμαίνον ταῖς ἀκτίουν). Which gloss is fortunately confirmed by a χρεία in the Hippocratic *Περὶ χυμῶν* I 321L = I 127K: τοὺς μὲν οὖν χυμοὺς εἰδέναι εἰ ἤσιν ὄρθος ἀνθέους, καὶ οίᾳ ἐν ἕκαστῳ νοσήματα ποιέουσι, καὶ οίᾳ ἐν ἕκαστῳ νοσήματι παθήματα. τὸ δὲ σῶμα τὸ ἄλλο
eis ὁ,τι μάλιστα νόσημα ἡ φύσις φέπει, οίνον τι σπλήν ἐνοιδέων ποιέει. τούτων τι καὶ ἡ φύσις. σχεδὸν τι καὶ χρώματα κακῶ καὶ σώματα σειρεῖοι, καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο, ταύτα διαγεγυμνάσθω. Which expression Galen in his Commentary on the work (ed. Coraes, Πρακτικά Ακαδημείας Αθηνών, p. 92.21-2) renders: ὡς τὰς τῶν χρωμάτων κακώσεις, τοῦ σώματος κένωσιν, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας διαθέσεις etc. This σειρεῖον 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) βαλόν εἰς ἀγγεῖον ύελον (vel. ύελλον) εἶα βρέχεσθαι ἐτὶ ἡμέρας θ κινῶν δις τῆς ἡμέρας. ἐτὶ δὲ τῆς χρήσεως σειρῶν τὸ αὐτάρκες (filtering a sufficient quantity out of it) καὶ τούτῳ σπόγγῳ βρέχων ἀνάτυβε 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 σειρόσεως. Διηθῶ and δινλίζω 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 Actius I, 135, making, as it often is, light of the interchange between τι and εἰ. The Glossae GraecoLatinae, finally, have: σιρωτής (or σιρωτήρ;) οἶνον ἢ ἄλλον τινος ύγρού σιμίσσατο. Whatever that curious simissator means, a σιρωτής 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], τροπήιος or rather, better, τραπήιος, is the wine, either as being pressed out of the grapes or as suffering fermentative transformation; cf. Hesychius s.vv. τραπείν· ληνοπατείν 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 οὐρεῖ in Kühn and οὐρήει in Coraes. We must correct evidently to σειρεῖ or, significantly, σειρεῖ.
lust before eruption. Read the verse as follows: στάζουσαν (pro the mss. στάζουσιν - sc. ψωλήν) ὠσπερεῖ τραπῆμον (vel τραπῆμον vel τρυγοίπιον pro mss. τροπῆμον vel τρυποίμον) σάκκος); I, 245; VI, 19; Phrynilchus, Ecloga, 270 Rutherford = p. 303 Lobeck: ὑλιστήρι τρύγοιπτον τοῦτο καλούσιν 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 οίνος καὶ σακτός (Fr. Inc. CVII vol. II p. 574 Meineke = Fr. 476 PCG vol. V, p. 534), sc. ὁ διυλισμένος (διὰ σάκκων) 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 ἡδη 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 ἐψησις, 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 Ἐψημα, 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 γλεύκος 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.: ἀλλὰ ἐγε ἀρχή (of all “digestion”, assimilation, assimilative incorporation) ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ θερμότης ἔστιν. τὸ δὲ τέλος τοῖς μὲν ἡ φύσις ἐστι, φύσις δὲ ἢν λέγομεν ὡς εἶδος καὶ σύσιαν τοῖς δ’ εἰς ὑποκειμένην τινὰ μορφὴν (ὑποκειμένην with regard to the overall forma essentialis of the entity in question) τὸ τέλος ἐστὶ τῆς πέψεως, ὅταν τοιοῦδε γένηται καὶ τοιοῦδε τὸ ὕγρον ἢ ὑπτώμενον ἢ ἐψόμενον ἢ σηπόμενον ἢ ἄλλως πῶς θερμαινόμενον τότε γάρ χρήσιμον ἐστι καὶ πεπέφθαι φαμέν, ὡσπερ τὸ γλεύκος καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς φύμασι συνιστάμενα, ὅταν γένηται πῦν, καὶ τὸ δάκρυν, ὅταν γένηται λήμη, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τάλλα.
symbaínei de to touto páseinein ἀπασίν ὅταν κρατήθη ἡ ὕλη καὶ ύγρότης: αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ὀριζόμενη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν φύσει θερμότητος. ἦς γάρ ἂν ἐν αὐτῇ ὁ λόγος, φύσις τουτέ ἐστιν. διὸ καὶ ύγιείας σημεῖα τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ οὖρα καὶ ύποχωρήσεις καὶ ὅλως τὰ περιπτώματα. καὶ λέγεται πεπέρθαι, ὅτι δηλοὶ κρατεῖν τὴν θερμότητα τὴν οἰκείαν τοῦ ἀορίστου. ἀνάγκη δὲ τὰ πεττόμενα παχύτερα καὶ θερμότερα εἶναι τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἀποτελεῖ τὸ θερμόν, εὐνοκέτερον καὶ παχύτερον καὶ ἐπρότερον, etc. (Of course the proper subdivision of πέψις applicable to must fermentation is ἐψής, v. Meteorologica, Δ, 380b31: καὶ τὰ υγρὰ δὲ ἐψεσθαι λέγομεν, οἶον γάλα καὶ γλεύκος, ὅταν ὁ ἐν τῷ υγρῷ χυμός εἰς εἰδὸς τι μεταβάλλῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ κύκλῳ καὶ ἑξωθεὶν πυρὸς θερμαίνοντος (the environmental heat), etc.).

That γλεύκος 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.: ἀπορήσεις δ’ ἂν τις περὶ οἴνου τῶν υγρῶν. τούτῳ γάρ καὶ ἐξατμισθεὶς ἂν (wine proper), καὶ παχύνεται, ὡσπερ ὁ νεός. αὐτίνων δ’ ὅτι ὁὐτὲ ἐν τῇ εἰδει λέγεται ὁ οἶνος, καὶ ὁτι ἀλλος ἀλλος. ὁ γάρ νέος μᾶλλον γῆς ἢ ὁ παλαιὸς: διὸ καὶ παχύνεται τῷ θερμῷ μάλιστα καὶ πήγνυται ἤττον ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ8. ἔχει γάρ καὶ θερμόν πολὺ καὶ γῆς ὡσπερ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ οὕτως ἀναξεραίνεται ὑπὸ τοῦ καπνοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀσκοῖς ὡστε ἐνόμενοι πάνεσθαι. ἐι δὲ πάς (sc. οἶνος) ἄλοι ἔχει (sediments), οὕτως ἐκατέρου ἐστὶν (ἢ γῆς ἢ ὑδατος), ώς ταύτης (sc. τῆς ἄλυσος) 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): ὡσα δ’ ὑπὸ ψυχροῦ παχύνεται, γῆς, ὡσα δ’ ὑπ’ ἀμφοῖν (sc. ψυχροῦ and θερμοῦ), κοινὰ πλειώνων (sc. ἄρχων, στοιχείων, principles), οἶνον ἐλαυνόν καὶ μέλι καὶ ὁ γάλακτος οἶνου. 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 Meteorologica, 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 ἑψεται, οἶνον τὸ γλεύκος, and 385b1 sqq.: ἀπήρτα δὲ ὡσα μὴ ἔχει ὑγρότητα ὑπατώδης, μηδ’ ὑδατῶς ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πλειών θερμῶν καὶ γῆς, οἶνον μὲλὶ καὶ γλεύκος (ὡσπερ ζέωντα 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 incensory exhalation): οἶνος δ’ ο μὲν γυλκύς θυμιάται πιὼν γάρ, καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τῷ ἐλαύω σοῦτε γὰρ ὕπο ψῦχος πήγνυται (but rather thickens), καὶ ταῦτα ποιεῖ τῇ ἐργῷ. δ’ ἐστὶ οἶνος ὑπὸ γὰρ συνόδης ὁ χυμός, διὸ καὶ οὐ μεθύσκει. As Hippocrates distinguished, there are οἶνοι γυλκύες and οἶνοι οἰνώδεις. Γλεῦκος and γυλκύς 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 γλεύκους 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 Κ, 23, 925b14 sqq.: ἡ καθάπερ καὶ αἱ φάγες τετρυγημέναι τῶν βοτρύων γυλκύτεραι εἰσὶ τῶν ἀτρυγήτων; ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῦ γλεύκους ὄντος φύσει ἡδέος αἱ μὲν τετρυγημέναι φάγες ὠσπερ οὐκασιν ἤδυσμέναι (ἀνάπλεω γάρ εἰσί καὶ ἤξωθεν), αἱ δὲ τῶν βοτρύων ἀνηδυντο... ὠσπερ αἱ φάγες οὖν ὅταν θλυφθῇ, ἀναπτυμπλαται ἀπὸ τῆς ἐντὸς γυλκύτητος καὶ ἤξωθεν διαφαίνεται γυλκύτερα ὅντα (sc. τὰ μῦρτα).

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 αὐτὸ τῆς ληγοῦ ἀπόσταγμα, αὐτομάτως καταρφέον ἀπὸ τῆς σταφυλῆς. ἦστι δὲ τούτῳ γυλκύτατον καὶ λαπαρώτατον. And so, verbatim, in the Lexicon 5 s.v. (Anecdota Graeca, Bekker, p. 227.19). Hesychius s.v. γλεῦκος: τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὸς πατηθῆ. So Suda, with ἀποστάλαγμα πρὸς ἀπόσταγμα and Cyrillics’ Lexicon with πρὸς πατηθῆναι πρὸς πρὸς πατηθῆ. This wonderful must, and the wine coming from it, was called πρότροπος, ἀτροπος or ἀπότροπος, all signifying absece of forced pressing and squeezing according to the grammarian Orus apud Etymologicon Magnum, s.v. ἀτροπος (p. 162.25): ο οἶνος: τραπείν γάρ ἐστί τὸ πατῆσαι ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς ἀτροπος οἶνος καὶ ἀπότροπος λέγεται. οὗτος Ωρος. A previous source and an antecedent testimony, is given by the Etymologicon Guidianum s.v. ἀπότροπος οἶνος (p. 69.42 sqq.): τραπείν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτὸ τὸ πατῆσαι. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς

---

9 This again assimilates γλυκός and γλεῦκος since (Fr. 211 p. 1516a39): τὸ γλεῦκος ἤκοστα μεθύσκει. The two are identical, cf. Προβλήματα, KB' 12. 931a18; 16.
σταφυλῆς ἀπότροπος οἶνος λέγεται. οὕτως Ἑπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήσει Ἀσπίδος Ἡσίόδου (v. 301, v. infra). Hesychius testifies and explains s.v. πρότροπος οἶνος τίς τοῦ γλεύκους τὸ πρόχυμα (there is no compelling reason to change to πρόχυμα with v.d. Linden or πρόχυμα with Heinisius; although Linden’s proposal squares with Geoponica VI, 16: πρόχυμα τοῦ γλεύκους τὸ ἔκαθεν αὐτῶν αὐτομάτως ἀποστάξατ' γλεύκους, ὁ πρόχυμα τίνες καλοῦσι). And so Moeris: πρότροπος οἶνος ὁ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι τὴν σταφυλὴν γεύσας. And Pollux VI, 16: καὶ πρότροπος δ’ ἢν τις οἶνος, ὁ πρὶν ἀποθλίβεσθαι ἐκφεύεις. Οἶνος in the sence both of must and of the ensuing proper wine, νέος and παλαιῶς 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 Ἔντυληναι τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῖς γλυκῶν οἶνον, πρόδρομον καλούσιν 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 δὲ τὶς ἡμῶν τοῦτο (sc. inbibing enough of water) δυσκόλως ποιή γλυκῶν ὦδαιθερμὸν προλαμβανέτω, μάλιστα δὲ τὸν καλούμενον πρότροπον, τὸν γλυκῶν Λέσβιον (Wilamowitz atheised 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 melitete (i.e. μελιτήτης); distat a mulso, quod fit e musto, cum quinque congiis austeri musti congio mellis et salis cyatho suberverfactis. Austerum sed inter haec genera poni debet et protropum; ita appellatur a quibusdam mustum sponte defluens antequam calsentur 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 proculato, *mustum lixivum*, hoc est, antequam prelo pressum sit, quod in lacum musti fluxuit tollito: cum deferberuit, in sextarios quinquaginta irim bene pinsitam nec plus unciae pondere addito, vinum a fecibus eliquatam 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. τραπεύων πατοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῇ λήψει. And s.v. τραπείνη ληνοπατήσαι. The corrupt Hesychian gloss: θρεφθήναι: τραφήναι: πατήσαι, is the confused combination of two entries one in, one out of place: (1) θρεφθήναι: τραφήναι (from τρέφω) and (2) τρεφθήναι: τραπήσαι (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 ὀίνος. And s.v. τροπεόντος ἐπάτουν: ἀπὸ τοῦτου καὶ ὁ ὀίνος λέγεται τραπητός. This has nothing to do with τραπίας and ἐντροπίας or ἐκτροπίας ὀίνος, second rate wines, in which the second fermentation from wine to vinegar has commenced and progressed. (Cf. Hesychius, s.v.v.; s. v. τροπίας ὀίνος, μεταβεβληκός καὶ ἐκλυτος; Pollux I, 248; VI, 17; Suda; Moeris). V. Photius and Suda *Lexica* s.v. τροπίας ὀίνος: ὁ τετραμμένος καὶ ἔξεστηκός. Αριστοφάνης *Δαιταλεύσιν* (Fr. 223 Blaydes = 13 Dindorf = Fr. 219 PCG vol. III 2 p.132)

tαχύ νυν πέτου καὶ μή (μου Elmsley) τροπίαν ὀίνον φέρε.

This set in of the second process was also signified in all probability by the δικαμπίας ὀίνος (δῖς καμψθεὶς so to speak) of Hesychius s.v. δικαμπίας ὀίνος: ὁ δύο τροπάς ύπομείνας, 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, 125. On which Eustathius opportunely comments (1574.2 sqq.): τὸ δὲ τραπέων, ἀντὶ τοῦ πατοῦσιν. θέν φασί καὶ τραπητά, οἱ πατοῦντες τὰς σταφυλὰς, γίνεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ τρέπειν ἡ λέξις, ἐπεὶ πατομένη τρέπεται εἰς ἄλλο τι ἡ σταφυλή, εἰς ὀίνον γάρ, τρεπομένη ἀπὸ πηκτοῦ εἰς ρυτῶν, 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: τραπέων πατοῦσιν. ἢ εἰς πιθοὺς βάλλουσι. παρὰ τὸ εἶ ὀπόρας εἰς ὀίνον τρέπειν. The last remark hits precisely the mark.

11 And Hesychius s.v. πατήται: οἱ τραπητά (with reversed explanatory flow).
s.v. τραπεώντο ἐπατοῦντο, παρὰ τὸ τροπήν λαμβάνειν τὸν βότρυν πατηθέντα. The Homeric imitation in the Hesiodic Scutum does comprise ἑτράπεον in our sense (301). That Ananias (Fr. 5.4 Diehl, apud Athenaeus VII, 282B) has:

δέλφακος δ', ήταν 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 (τρυγώσι) καὶ πατέωσι. (Thus Dalecampion verted: Uvas post vindemiam cum calcaverint). For τραπεῖον signifies the squeezing of the grapes by calcation rather than treading and trampling as such and in itself. And so τραπεῖον could be (part of) some mechanism or appliance through which the pressing was effected or improved. Thus I believe we must read τραπεῖον instead of τοπεῖον in Lexicon 5 (Anecdota Graeca, Bekker, p. 308.18 sqq.) s.v. τραπεῖον ti ἐστι καὶ τριττήρες... οἱ12 δὲ τραπεῖον θύραν εἶναι φασὶ τὴν ἐπιβαλλομένην ταῖς σταφυλαίς, ὥστε ἔξηθήσαι τὸν οἶνον. Θύρα, if sound, is in the sense of tabula oblonga, cf. in Herodotus II, 96; VIII, 31 – just as σαβίς 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 ἔξηθήσατi (cf. ἐκ-θλίβω) cf. ἐ-θήσατι. As ἔξηθέω means filter out (v. the Aristotelian Problemata ΛΗ, 5, 967a13 sqq.: ἡ διότι ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ μετρίου πόνου τὸ θερμόν (sc. ἐν τῷ σώματι) ἐκκάται καὶ ἐπιπολάζει, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν ἐξηθεῖται μετά τοῦ ἰδρώτος καὶ τοῦ πνεῦματος, ἀραιομενού τοῦ σώματος ἐν τῷ πονεῖν), the τραπεῖον 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):

Ἰππάναξ δὲ φησιν:

στάξουσαν ἡσπερεί τροπήιον 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 τριττήρες.

13 It is lexicographically attested that σάκκος is the Attic form, whereas σάκκος is the koivή-form, which may have originated in this case from a dialectical Doric prototype. Thus Phrynichus, Elogae, 229 (Rutherford) = 225 (Fischer) = p. 257 Lobeck, says: σάκκος· Δωρίσεις διὰ τῶν δύο κκ, οἱ δὲ ἀττικοὶ δὲ ἐνός; while Moeris s.v.: σάκκος Αττικοι, σάκκος διά δύο κκ Ἐλληνες; and Thomas Magister Ονομάτων Ἀττικῶν Ἐκλογῆς, s.v. σάκκος Αττικοι δι’ ἐνός κ. Ἐλληνες δὲ διὰ δύο. Photius Lexicon s.v. professes the atticity of σάκκος, while Suda confirms it by referring to Aristophanes, Lysistrata, 1211: σάκκως ἔχον καὶ κυρφίκους, where indeed the manuscript tradition unanimously gives the required form. (The critical Bentley uncritically changed it to σάκκους, and some of the subjectivist philologists followed him). Eustathius ascribes the correct view to Aelius Dionysius: in Iliadem Ν, p. 940.16 sqq.: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι
οὐ μόνον τὸ πολεμικὸν σκέυος (sc. the shield), ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ κοινὸς λεγόμενος σάκκος δε’ ἕνος κάπτα προεφέρετο παρ’ Αθηναίως, καθα ϕησίν Αἴλιος Διονύσιος. ὅθεν καὶ σακενείν, ὅτι, τὸ ὑλίζειν, ὡς Ηρόδοτος, ἕχει ὑποσταίκευμα, καὶ ὑποσταίζειν τῆς ὕδους ὁ προκόπτειν καὶ ὑψαίρεται τῶν δὲ ἕως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐκκενουμένου σάκκου (clearly, a strainer-sack).

The Herodotean reference must be to IV, 23; the Scythians use as chief food the products from a tree fruit: τούτο ἔπειτα γένηται πέπων, σακκέουσι ἰματίσοι, ἀπορρέει δὲ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ παχύ καὶ μέλαν etc. They filter it through cloths. Σακκέουσι is the ms. reading (with σακκέουσιν in R and V, slightly thus attested, which anyway does not point in another direction). But Aelius Dionysius read σακκέουσι; and so Suda s.v. σακκέουσι τὸ ὑλίζουσι παρ’ Ἱρόδοτῳ. 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 ms. 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 σακκέουσι 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 foolest.

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

[I cannot but entertain the possibility that the Phrynichian subtly 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 Acharnian 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, p.193, apud Pollux X, 152: ἐτί τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. θυλακίου vel. βαλαντίου) δὲ καὶ σάκκον (no doubt ύποκοριστικὸν οἱ σάκκος) ὅταν φη ἐν Θησευμοφοριαζούσαις (β’, the second presentation evidently as it does not occur in the extant text of the comedy):

σάκκον, ἐν οἴσπειρ τάρχυσον ταμιεύεται
(so the mss., though metrically could be either κ or ςκ. The singular σακίων can be defended in a couple of ways, as against the plural οἴσπεο, but a possible correction to σακίων has been thought of by Blaydes and Kaibel).

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

\[
\text{τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὴν γαστήρα οἴδονυ, ἔλαβον σακίων, εἰτ’ εἰς τὴν ὠδόν ἐκαθίσαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ κόπτονικατ.}
\]

The Mss., testē Nauck, have σακκιον (corrected to σακίων 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, Prefatio pp. XIII-XIV). Metrically, both forms are admissible. If σακκιον is to be retained, it may well be an instance of the adulteration of classical Attic towards the emergence of Hellenistic koine. The step is consolidated in the next generation, some four decades later, in the manuscriptly testified and metrically required σακκότηρα of Apollodorus Carystius in his Amphiaras Vol. IV p. 440 Meineke = Fr. 1 PCG vol. II, p 487, apud Pollux X, 161: σακκοπῆραν δὲ (sc. ἔστιν εὐφέιαν), ὡς εἰθυταὶ τοῖς ἵδωταις λέγειν, ἐν Ἀπολλοδώρῳ τοῦ Καρνοτίῳ Αμφιαρῶι:

\[
\text{ἐμβαλόντες, ὅ πονηρὲ σύ, εἰς σακκοπῆραν αὐτοῦ ἐπιθήσουσι που ἐφ’ ὑποκύνιον.}
\]

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

That Demosthenes speaks of τάνιμα ἀπὸ οἱ σακχυφάνται (kind of sackcloth the weavers, from σάκκος and υφαινω, with the second κ aspirated because of the u-aspiration), Contra Olympiodorum, §12 (p. 1171), appears to have entertained some degree of singularity and notoriety: v. Pollux VII, 191: σακχυφάντας δὲ Δημοσθένης εἰρήκε ἐν τῷ κατ’ Ὀλυμποδώρῳ. καὶ σάκκον μὲν καὶ σακκιόν ἢ κομώδιαν(τ) Ὡτερίδης δὲ ἐν τῷ υπέρ Μύκας (Fr. 125 Blass-Jensen) ἔρθη «ἐμισθώσατο τυλιφάντας» Ἐφορκήσῃ δὲ ἐρή (Fr. 415c Dindorf = Fr. 468 Radt) Ἰονιοσφαγή τυλιεύ (thus the corrupt κλινοφαγῆ τυλία to be corrected from X, 39), Ἐπίσκοπος δὲ Κόλαζ (Fr. XXI vol. II p. 496 Meineke = Fr. 170 PCG vol. V, p. 389) «κεκρύφαλλοι τε καὶ τύλη, Ἀντιφάνης δὲ ἐν Φάιωνι (vol. III p. 124 Meineke = Fr. 213 PCG vol.II, p. 438) ἰστρομάτα/ κλίνας, τύλας». - Cf. Pollux, X 39-40; where one observeth that what was not strictly Attic(τ) – τυλί instead of τυλιεύν or, better, κνέφαλλον (or κνέφαλον) – but Ionic (for Pollux loc. cit. says: καὶ τύλη δὲ παρ’ Ἐνπόλει ἕστιν ἰάζεται (= imitating the Ionian dialect) ἐν τοῖς Κόλαζεν), becomes the vulgar to speak and common usage beginning already with the time of Middle Comedy: ἐν δὲ Ἀντιφάνους Φάιωνι κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν χρήσαι ἐστίν εὐφέιαν τὰς τύλας ετ
c

Τύλας in classical Attic was any knob-like protuberance; τυλεία 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, (τύλας 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 τύλου; Pollux VII, 133. Suda s. v. aptly explains the phenomenon as γενεκρωμένη σάρξ. It
could be significant that the classical passages that contain the word in this special sense have the Doric form τῶλα. Aristophanes, Acharnenses, 860; 954. The Boeotian speaks in both cases. Cf. Telecleides Fab. Inc. Fr. XVIII, vol. II p. 377Meineke = 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 Odysseum, A, p. 1390.54 sqq.: Αἰλίος δὲ Διονύσιος παρασημειώμενος τινα ὅπως κατὰ γένε προφέροντα, φησιν οὖτω: ... ἐτὶ θηλυκῶς καὶ ἡ τύλη, τὸ φύμα τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐχένος... δήλον δὲ ὅτι Αττικῆς ταύτα πάντα. ἐπεὶ καὶ Αττικαὶ λέξεισιν ὁ σημεῖος Διονύσιος επεξέχεται.

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 ἀρσενικός (referring to the Aristophanean and Telecleidean passages he comments only on τύλα, not τύλη), after giving the explanation: τοῦ ὀμοῦ τὸ τετυλιμένον καὶ πεπελημένον τῆς σαρκὸς, ὅποιον πολλάκις ἐπὶ τοῦ όμοον γίνεται τοῖς ἀχθοφόροις ἐκ τοῦ βαστάζειν τι συνεχῶς, he adds, together with the classical passages, a Polvbian χρήσις: τῆς πέτρας αὐτοῦ δυσχρηστῶς παρεξήχησα διὰ τὸ δεῖν τῆμα ποιεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ, τοῖς τύλοις κρατοῦσι τὴν σύργηγα τὴν προσσαγομένην, 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 χρήσις, 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 κνέφαλο also appears as the filling) referred to by Suda also s.v. τύλη ἢ στρωμή (latrie sensu, οἴον etc. By contrast the erudite Aelianus, De Natura Animalium, II, 11 (p. 40 Hercher) repeats, no doubt purposefully, Antiphanes (v. supra): χαμαίζωλον κλίνων στήβαδες ἐν τῇ φύσιμῳ τοῦ θεάτου τεθεῖσαι, εἶτα έδέξατο τυλεῖα καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτοι στρωμῆν ποκίλην 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 κνάφαλον or γνάφαλλον (v. Hesychius s.v. γνάφαλλον) – according to the famed variation of κνάττω, κναθεῖν / γνάττω, γναθεῖν – 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 μονήρως Λέξεως, p. 39.15 = II p. 944.23 Lenz, τύλη, ὅτερ σύνθεις Αττικὸς κνέφαλον καλεῖν, ὠμονύμως τῷ περιεχομένῳ τὴν περιέχουσαν. Ἀριστοφάνης Αμφάρεω (Fr. 27 Blaydes = 84 Dindorf = Fr. 18 PCG vol. III, 2, p. 42; cf. the second verse analytically Pollux X, 40; and cf. Sophocles, Fr. 468 Radt, Λινόροσφη τυλεῖα): καὶ νῆ Ἁϊ ἐκ τοῦ δωματίου γε νῶν φέρει κνέφαλον ἀμα καὶ προσκεφάλαιον τῶν λινῶν.

Here κνέφαλον is a large cushion doing for a/or mattress, whereas προσκεφάλαιον the pillow.
For cushions in general cf. Eupolis, Πολεις 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 flecks, v. Plato Πεισιάτρδς IV vol. II p. 650 Meineke = Fr. 104 PCG vol. VII, p. 476 (apud Herodianus Περί Μονηρ. λέξ., loc.cit.); and Theopompos in Πανταλέων II vol. II p. 809Meineke = Fr. 46 PCG vol. VII, p. 730, apud Pollux Χ:41: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ κνέφαλλον μὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ τυλείον τις ἀκούειν βούλει, ὡσπερ ἡ πολλή χρήσις (i.e. ἡ Ἀττική of course) ἔχει, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐμβαλλόμενον πληρώματος, ὁ γνάφαλον καλοῦσι, προσχρήστηκαι τῷ φηθέντι ἐν Παντελέοντι Θεοπόμπου, καί καὶ ἀμιθοσβητεῖται τὸ δράμα. προειπών γὰρ ὁ ποιητὴς «ἀντιον <τό> δέρμα τοῦ θηρός» ἐπήγαγε «φάφας ὅλον σάξαι κνεφάλλ(λ)ον (ο᾽ κνεφάλ(λ)ον)» - adopting Bentley’s simple and righteous solution of the problems posed by the transmission of the text, especially the "ο᾽ 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. κνέφαλον tomentum. The Glossae LatinoGraecae, s.v. tomentum: κνέφαλλον. The Onomasticon has the equivalence γνάφαλον tomentum. Correspondingly τύλη = culcita appears bothways in the Glosses.-

To return to the Demoethenic ασκιφυάνται. It need not testify the more, the more unique and maybe ad hoc coined it was, the commoner vogue of σάκκος; for σακυφάνταί is κακοχόν and vulgar. And even if it did bespeak the incipient prevalence of that form with the double κκ, it would unapproachfully 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 εἶπε σακυφάντας, τοὺς πλέκοντας ταὶς γυναιξὶ τοῖς κεκυφάλλοις ἀκούσσοιν"". 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 Χ, 186 (σάκκος σπάρτινος); while he writes κκ when speaking ex proprië persona. Naturally enough: For although he emphasized correctness and propriety, he was no puristic foul. Contrary to the false Atticism which condemned de facto most of the classical attic glory itself by means of a phrasical narrow (say Lysianising) norm, he utilized all major literary production through 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 Αττικοί, τύλη Ἐλληνες. Any cushion or pillow. And Phrynichus imperatively, Ecloga, (145 Fischer = 151 Rutherford = p. 173 Lobeck): τύλην εὶ καὶ εὐφορίς που, οὐ κνέφαλον λέγε. And Thomas Magister Ecloga, s.v. κνέφαλον Αττικοί λέγουσιν, οὐ γνέφαλον: ἐστὶ δὲ ἡ τύλη (which was standard in Κοινῆ). The glossographical prince has s.v. κνέφαλον: τύλη, ἤν δὲ ἡμεῖς τύλην (in the wider and more proper sense, any protuberance, esp. of the skin), Αττικοί τύλον (vel τυλεῖον; pro ns. τυλίον), καὶ πῦλος καὶ προσσεφάλαιον ἡ (?) pro ἡ 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): σακυψάνται οἱ πλέκοντες ταῖς γυναιξὶ τούς κεκυφάλλους, the
to keep to the manuscripts, or, perhaps, we may read, with Dobreus, Meineke and Bekker τροπηίον, in this case taken substantively, while in the former, as in the text, adjectively. (Τροπηίον is Ionic for τροπείον, 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 (τραπητες, τραπητον, τραπητος): 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). Τροπείον and τραπητες or τραπητος(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 κροκοφάντως (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 Sicinia bacca trapetis
(maybe a reminiscence, on the part of the erudite και κυριολεκτοτας 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 Latinae Graecae have trapetum, ἐλαιών μύλος· ἐλαιοφυτεύειν (by extension of the meaning) and similarly we find in the Graecolatinae Glossae ἐλαιωτρηπεῖον· trapetum, and μύλος ἐλαιών· 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 τροπείον. 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 murca 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. πρόσωρον τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθῆ, from πρό and ὄρου (ὀρέομαι, ὄρνυ-μι, ὄρινω, ὀρμᾶω), that which comes down before the main dart, rush.

Now whether γλεύκος 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 vindemια.\(^\text{15}\).

\(^{15}\) A difficulty is apparently presented by Πράξεις Αποστόλων 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 scientists (enlightened and rationalistic) of the day διαχλεύσοντες ἐλέγον ὅτι γλεύκος μεμειστωμένοι εἰσίν. To whom Petrus replied (§15): οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὕτω μεθυσθέντω, ἔστων γὰρ ὡρα τέιτη 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 Actia Physica κζ, 918 E-F examines διὰ τί τὸ γλεύκος, ἀν ὑπὸ ψύχως περιέχεται τὸ ἀγγείον, γλυκὺ διαμένει πολὺν χρόνον. – The various dulcia produced by decoction of must, might also in an extended sense be appellated γλεύκος. – 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 μεμειστωμένοι γλεύκος, 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.