

any thing; but these are exceptions to the general rule—they do not affect the truth of the rule itself.

PHILOSOPHICAL COOKERY.—COUNT ROMFORD.

The first person, perhaps, with any pretensions to learning and philosophy, who studied the dressing of meat, for food, as a science, was a gentleman of the name of Thompson, who was afterwards created Count Romford, by one of the German princes. This excellent and ingenious individual lived in the last century. He demonstrated, by experiments, the principles which in our foregoing remarks we have merely asserted. We are about to give an abstract of some of his observations and experiments on this subject, which are so simply and clearly detailed, that they are perfectly intelligible to every common intellect, and we are sure will be read with interest and advantage, not only by cooks, but also by all classes of persons interested in the health and welfare of society at large.

The process by which food is most commonly prepared for the table—**BOILING**—is so familiar to every one, and its effects are so uniform, and apparently so simple, that few have taken the trouble to inquire *how*, or in *what manner*, these effects are produced; and whether any and what improvements in that branch of cookery are possible. So little has this matter been made an object of inquiry, that few, very few indeed, it is believed, among the *millions of persons* who for so many ages have been *daily* employed in this process, have ever given themselves the trouble to bestow one serious thought on the subject.

The cook knows *from experience*, that if his joint of meat be kept a certain time immersed in boiling water it will be *done*, as it is called in the language of the kitchen; but if he be asked *what* is done to it? or *how*, or by what agency, the change it has undergone has been effected? if he understands the question, it is ten to one but he will be embarrassed; if he does not understand it, he will probably answer, without hesitation, that "*the meat is made tender and eatable by being boiled.*" Ask him if the boiling of the water be essential to the success of the process? he will answer, "*without doubt.*" Push him a little farther, by asking him whether, *were it possible* to keep the water *equally hot* without *boiling*, the meat would not be cooked *as soon* and *as well*, as if the water were made to boil? Here it is probable that he will make the first step towards acquiring knowledge, by learning to doubt.

When you have brought him to see the matter in its true light, and to confess, that *in this view of it*, the subject is new to him, you may venture to tell him (and to prove to him, if you happen to have a thermometer at hand,) that water which *just boils* is as hot as it can possibly be made *in an open vessel*. That all the fuel which is used in making it boil with violence is wasted, without adding in the smallest degree to the heat of the water, or expediting or shortening the process of cooking a single instant: that it is by *the heat*—its *intensity*—and the *time of its duration*, that the food is cooked; and not by *boiling*