

Introduction

The 19th century was a time of social change in America. Changes were to affect almost every area of American life. These social movements changed the way the nation looked at slavery, women's suffrage, child labor, treatment of the mentally ill, social relief and welfare, enforcement of abortion laws, and the use of alcoholic beverages.

The ferment out of which these changes occurred came from two completely diverse sources. The first was a revitalized biblical Christianity. Following on the heels of the revival of the late 18th century, and reinforced by revivals in the 19th century, some biblical Christians were willing to act to influence public policy in ways they believed consistent with the ethics of Christ. The abolitionist movement, though certainly not universally endorsed within the church, is an example. The outcry against slavery came first from Christian circles and was successful not because it became a majority issue, but because the small minority was vocal and unmoved in their position.¹

The second source of the changes came from liberal Christianity, which redefined the essence of Christianity as the ethical teachings of Christ. For 19th century liberals, the great doctrines of the faith had little meaning and were replaced by the vague and unsubstantiated idea of the ethical progress of mankind towards perfection. Added to this was a liberally supported movement toward the secularization of society, which buttressed the concept of progress and fueled these great 19th century social movements.

Oddly enough, it was the uneasy alliance between these two positions which produced the social agenda of the century. However, it was not long until the liberal support for a secular, pluralist society eventually caused a split with more biblically oriented groups. In an effort to separate from a liberal "social gospel," Bible-believing Christians emphasized the personal, subjective commitment of Christianity and withdrew from the social sphere. In a further attempt to avoid contamination by society, the mark of spirituality increasingly began to be defined by certain sociological boundaries. Good Christians were not only judged by doctrine and clearly delineated biblical norms of conduct, but by whether they attended theater, danced, smoked, drank, and whether the ladies wore makeup.

Then the middle of the twentieth century produced a new evangelical movement. Led by such people as Carl F. H. Henry, Edward John Carnell and others, the evangelical

community questioned the validity of evaluating spirituality by sociological factors and insisted on a clear biblical standard.

One of the areas of re-evaluation involved the use of alcoholic beverages. For many evangelical groups, it was time to review their membership restrictions in this area. This involved asking hard, uncomfortable questions such as: What does the Bible say regarding drinking? Is the use of alcoholic beverages essential enough to divide fellowship?

For some the evaluation process has been painful. One pastor who called a meeting to discuss dropping the issue from membership requirements was confronted by some of his people calling him a drunkard, even though he was a teetotaler. Another denomination has found their total abstinence clause to be detrimental to their evangelism and church growth efforts, and some of their pastors have been known to respond to potential members who question their stand by saying, “Don’t worry about that, just ignore it, it’s not important.”

The issue is too important to just ignore. As in all cases of controversy in the church, it should be faced head on; a biblical stand should be taken and a resolution achieved which follows upon the biblical material.

This study is an attempt to do just that. The approach will involve three different areas. Part one will survey the abstinence movement to set it in its historical perspective. Part two involves brief word studies from the Scripture to give a general understanding of the biblical terms. Part three will look at specific arguments in the debate and evaluate them with a close look at the passages involved.

Finally we will attempt to offer a statement of conclusion summarizing all the material surveyed. As with all discussions which might cause division, we pray that reader as well as writer will be guided by the direction the Biblical material takes and be motivated by love for the brethren.

I. ABSTINENCE IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

American believers visiting other countries are often startled to find Christians in those countries consuming alcoholic beverages without giving it a second thought. Evangelical groups in this country have often taken it for granted that total abstinence is one of the marks of a true believer and have assumed that this is a universal standard.

Yet the abstinence position is primarily an Anglo/American phenomenon, with a definite emphasis on American. Both Britain and the United States had very strong temperance movements in the 19th century,² but the greatest triumph was the American period of prohibition in the early part of the 20th century, when through legislation, the entire nation was officially dry.³

With abstinence very much a part of the social movements in America and England, evangelicals are often perplexed at finding that many of their heroes in the faith over the centuries did not share their conviction. More than one, for example, have pondered the fact that **Mere Christianity**, which has brought so many to Christ, was written by one who was an unabashed lover of port.⁴

Nor is C.S. Lewis by any means an exception. A survey of church history will show that until the 19th century, no significant orthodox Christian group ever required total abstinence as a test for fellowship, or even an example of godly virtue.⁵

There were, from time to time, splinter groups that required total abstinence from all wine and strong drink, but they were clearly outside the mainstream. Perhaps the best known of these was the “Encratites.” This second century sect practiced an extreme asceticism that included complete abstinence from marriage, eating of meat, and drinking of wine.

To the orthodox church, this bordered on Gnosticism and required a serious response. The importance attached to the issue may be seen in the attention directed to it in the **Apostolic Constitutions**, which devote two of its canons to this thinking:

Canon LI If any Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon or any one of the Sacerdotal list, abstain from marriage, or flesh, or wine, not by way of religious restraint, but as abhorring them, forgetting that God made all

things very good, and that He made man male and female, and blaspheming the work of creation, let him be corrected, or else be deposed, and cast out of the church. In like manner a layman.⁶

Canon LIII If any Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon does not on festival days partake of flesh and wine, from abhorrence of them, and not out of religious restraint, let him be deposed as being seared in his own conscience, and the cause of offense to many.⁷

There was no penalty more severe than the proscribed excommunication. The raw authority of the church, however, was not its only way of fighting the issue. To prevent people from falling into the error, leaders preached and taught on the subject. Oftentimes the argument involved poking fun at the logical conclusions of such a position.

In his 62nd Epistle, St. Cyprian dismissed the movement by declaring, “But how perverse and contrary it is that although the Lord at the marriage made wine of water, we should make water of wine.”⁸ The great preacher St. Chrysostom added his voice to the fray in his 57th Homily by arguing:

For instance, I hear many say, when excesses happen, “Would there were no wine.” O folly! O madness! When other men sin, dost thou find fault with God’s gifts? And what great madness is this? What? Did the wine, O man, produce this evil? Not the wine, but the intemperance of such that take an evil delight in it. Say then, “Would there were no drunkenness, no luxury;” but if thou say, “Would there were no wine,” thou wilt say, going on by degrees, “Would there were no steel, because of the murderers; no night, because of the thieves; no light because of the informers; no women, because of adulteries;” and in a word, thou wilt destroy all.

But do not say so; for this is of a satanical mind; do not find fault with the wine, but with the drunkenness; and when thou hast found this self-same man sober, sketch out all his unseemliness, and say unto him, Wine was given, that we might be cheerful, not that we might behave

unseemly; that we might laugh, not that we might be a laughingstock; that we might be healthful, not that we might be diseased; that we might correct the weakness of our body, not cast down the might of our soul.⁹

There were Christians in the early church who recommended total abstinence as a personal choice. In all of these cases, they insisted that wine and strong drink were good and should not be despised. The degree with which they practiced abstinence was directly proportional to the degree with which they were drawn to the monastic and ascetic lifestyle and connected spirituality with total denial of self. Most moderate voices in the church could agree with St. Chrysostom when he wrote about temperance:

I say this not to hinder you from having pleasure but to keep you from committing sin, not to hinder you from drinking, but to keep you from getting drunk. Wine is not evil, but immoderate use is; wine is a gift of God, drinking too much of it is a device of the devil.¹⁰

Nor can Protestants find justification for abstinence as a test for fellowship in the Reformation. Martin Luther's love of beer is too well known to require documentation here, but few realize his wife operated a home brewery.¹¹ John Calvin does not take us far in that direction either, as part of his salary as pastor at Geneva was paid in wine.¹²

Even in America the abstinence position was completely out of the mainstream in the early years when Puritans and Separatists were the dominant forces in both religious and secular spheres. This early attitude is seen by the prevalent use of the phrase "the good creature" in colonial law as a linguistic substitute for all forms of alcoholic beverages. The phrase emphasized a strong reformation attitude that all things were created good and were to be handled appropriately as part of man's "cultural mandate" as steward over the earth and its resources.

Their attitude towards drink cannot be seen as begrudging acceptance of its presence, but rather an open support for proper use of all types of alcoholic refreshment. Many regulations of the day actually insisted that provisions be made for places to dispense "wine and strong water,"¹³ and throughout the colonies alcoholic refreshments were to be served at "all significant ferries and toll bridges."¹⁴ Places of employment

often provided rum or other drink on work breaks, as a means of refreshing and stimulating workers.

Two exceptions to this generally positive attitude existed: Drunkenness and the Indian problem. Drunkenness was universally condemned in the colonies, for it not only violated direct commands of scripture, but it also ran counter to the idea of good stewardship, which was so crucial to the Calvinist work ethic. Early accounts reveal periodic bouts with drunkenness and some early legislation exists limiting the amount of liquor to be sold at one time in one place, to one person.¹⁵ These solutions were an attempt to keep a lid on drunkenness, while providing open access to the beverages for moderate use.

Secondly, there was the Indian problem. Without the religious framework, which condemned drunkenness, the Indians frequently overindulged and committed violent acts against themselves and the colonists. This became more of a problem towards the period of the French and Indian War, when the French exploited the native weakness by providing great quantities of rum and whiskey, while agitating the Indians to attack the American settlements.

As a result of the Indian's frequent misuse of liquor, laws restricting sale to Indians began as early as 1629. In some areas, providing Indians with liquor carried the penalty of being sent back to Europe, and many of the very early colonists had prices on their heads that would see them incarcerated at their return.

In general, however, the colonial attitude in both religious and secular realms was that all forms of spirits, beer, and wine were a great gift from God to be enjoyed in moderation. Legislation of this period was centered on providing access to all responsible consumers, while at the same time protecting society from those who would drink in excess.

How did the attitude of believers in America change from open endorsement to total rejection of all forms of alcoholic beverages? The change itself was very gradual, moving from attempts to curb sales to Indians, to early Quaker attempts (as early as 1721) to require abstinence from "ardent spirits" (hard liquors such as rum, gin, and whiskey), to the 1830s movement of total abstinence, and finally the wine/juice communion controversy of the late 1800s.

Tracing the factors that led to this position is not easy. As with most movements in history, a vast number of factors—sociological, historical, and philosophical—converge to explain one “simple fact” of history. In the case of the abstinence movement, however, four factors stand out as crucially important.

Factor One: The Increased Availability of Cheap Hard Liquors

The 18th century gave rise to a greater use of distilling as a process to produce liquor. Although distilling goes back many centuries, it was a rather expensive and therefore exclusive process.

When distilling became more widely understood and used in the 18th century, the process which had until then produced mostly cordials which were drunk in extremely small quantities, was now turned towards production of ardent spirits, which were cheap enough to be consumed in large quantities by almost anyone.

The availability of cheap, highly intoxicating drinks such as gin and whiskey made it easier for the common man to indulge liberally and often. By the time of the American Revolution, yearly consumption in the colonies has been estimated as equal to 3.5 gallons of pure 200 proof alcohol *per capita*. Nor did it stop there. By the 1830s, at the height of the temperance movement, the total equaled nearly 4 gallons *per capita*.¹⁶

The significance of this can be seen in the direction taken by the early temperance societies, which was to condemn spirits while exempting cider, beer and wine. A clear distinction was made in principle between beer and wine, which were clearly allowed, and hard spirits, which were seen to exist only to cause drunkenness. A quick examination of some of the temperance milestones supports this interpretation:

1721 Philadelphia Friends movement to prevent the sale of ardent spirits and to replace them with beer and wine.

1753 The American Methodist Society condemns drunkenness, buying or selling spiritous liquors, or using them except in case of extreme necessity.

1784 Publication of Dr. Benjamin Rush’s **Inquiry into the Effects of Spiritous Liquors On the Human Body and Mind**, which

attempted to catalog the physical dangers of distilled beverages, but allowed for use of beer and wine.

1787 The Friends yearly meeting resolves to refrain from dealing in spiritous liquors.

1789 Litchfield Covenant in Connecticut starts a voluntary association against serving workers distilled spirits on breaks and encourages substitution of beer or cider.

1816 The Methodist Church General Conference passes a resolution requiring all clergy to refrain from selling or using spiritous liquor.

In all cases, the use of spirits was condemned but uses of lighter drinks were supported. It was not until 1829, that groups began broadening their condemnation to include all forms of alcohol. The earlier arguments all centered on curbing the destructive influences on society caused by drunkenness, and did not attempt to read into the Bible any requirement of total abstinence. Indeed, most of the material argued not from scripture, but from social pragmatism: Drunkenness interrupted peaceful society. A syllogism of the argument at this point would look like this:

Drunkenness is an evil.

Spirits exist to cause drunkenness.

Therefore, Spirits exist to cause evil.

Spirits exist to cause evil.

Causes of evil should be avoided.

Therefore, spirits should be avoided.

The argument was not generally applied beyond spirits. One exception was the Union Temperance Society of Moreau and North Cumberland in New York, which in August of 1808 passed this statement for its membership: “No member shall drink rum, whiskey, wine or any distilled spirits or composition of same, except for medicinal purposes.”¹⁷ A general move to broaden the movement to abstinence on a wider scale

dates to an article by Calvin Chapin in the **Connecticut Observer**, Jan 1, 1826, which argued that if drunkenness was the problem then outlawing ardent spirits was not enough. For Chapin, “Total abstinence is the only infallible antidote.”¹⁸

After 1829, the distinction between spirits, which were considered evil, and wine, beer and cider, which were still considered good, became increasingly blurred, and literature of the time began to argue that all forms of drinking were evil.

Factor Two: An Eroded Understanding of the Fall

Most of the early colonists came from solid Christian backgrounds. Included in their thinking was an understanding that the government and community should be built into the type of society advocated by the New Testament. Sometimes this was channeled in sound directions, but other times it was accompanied by a sort of arrogance that saw previous history as a preparation for them.

Almost everywhere in the colonies was the idea of divinely guided progress, that the colonists were at the summit of human history. As groups drifted towards more liberal theology, they lessened their emphasis on the fallenness of man, yet retained the concept of human progress. The result of this was to see men as basically good, and to see sin as embodied in external things. Worldliness was not a problem of the internal sinfulness of man, but because he was surrounded by evil things. For some Anabaptist groups, the solution was a community that shunned use and possession of things that embodied worldly desires.

A more important illustration for our purposes is the Quakers. The Quakers tended toward a doctrine which saw all mankind as having the inner light of God within, and their general operating principle in society was that all men are basically good and can live peacefully together in harmony.

This doctrine was to create problems for the Quakers and eventually led to the rejection of Quaker rule in Pennsylvania in 1756. The problem was their utopian view of man that was confronted by reality in the massacres of 1755. The Indians began a series of attacks on settlements in western Pennsylvania. Many settlements were burned, settlers killed, crops destroyed, and children butchered or taken captive. When reports

reached the Quaker legislature, they simply refused to believe them and denied the attacks. Clearly their view of the innate goodness of mankind was at stake. Eventually they were forced to admit the continued massacres, but in keeping with their theology, their response was that the settlers must have been mistreating the Indians, and they set up a commission to look for examples of this.¹⁹

It is significant that Quakers dominated much of the early temperance movement. Their refusal to take seriously the fallen nature of man required them to place the blame for drunkenness on the spirits, to keep intact their view of man. Therefore, to restore man's goodness, remove the external problem. In the case of the alcohol, the drink is the evil, so remove it and man is restored.²⁰

The result of this type of thinking is a form of modern Manichaeism that sees certain physical or material things as intrinsically evil. This stands in contrast to orthodox Christian belief, which draws from scripture the principle of a good material creation that became cursed as a result of man's sin. The "good creature" of Puritan America had become the source of evil in a mankind that was basically good. Yet this theology is clearly at odds with biblical principles such as total depravity and the goodness of original creation.

Again Jesus called the crowd to Him and said, "Listen to me everyone, and understand this. Nothing outside a man can make him 'unclean' by going into him. Rather it is what comes out of a man that makes him 'unclean.'"

And after he had left the crowd and entered the house, his disciples asked him about the parable. "Are you so dull?" he asked. "Don't you see that nothing that enters a man from the outside can make him 'unclean'? For it doesn't go into his heart, but into his stomach and then out of his body."

Mark 7:14-19 (NIV)

Factor Three: The Increasingly Sinful Nature of the Tavern Environment

The third crucial factor in the movement towards abstinence was the increasing tendency of the taverns to attract activities that were, by all Christian standards, sinful. The local tavern became the center for drunkenness, gambling, and prostitution. It was natural that the tavern began to be seen as the temple of those opposed to Christ:

The tavern was the most important gateway to the primarily male world of drink and disorder: in sight of the village church in most American communities, observed Daniel Drake, a Cincinnati physician who wrote a reminiscence of his Kentucky boyhood, stood the village tavern and the two structures, “did in fact represent two opposing principles.”²¹

How and why did the shift from Puritan tippling houses to taverns of ill repute occur? The answer lies with a general movement away from the earlier society that was primarily centered on biblical principles to a more secular society. Accompanying this and contributing to its direction was an increase in leisure time that came as cities grew from outposts to thriving towns. Early colonists worked long and hard, with their sparse leisure centered on church and family. Later society had more leisure, and less of it centered on these two institutions.

Also contributing to this shift was the greed with which expansion occurred in the New World. Earlier attempts to establish settlements under God’s leadership were replaced by those simply seeking their fortune. Many of these pioneers were more than willing to leave behind wives, families, social conventions, and especially the church.

Factor Four: The Development and Effective Use of Abstinence Propaganda

Finally, there was in the abstinence movement the development of widely distributed literature, provided by the movement in support of its positions.

In the early years this literature centered on the medical arguments against “ardent spirits,” or passionate accounts of the effects of drunkenness on self and family. Biblical

arguments played almost no role in the discussions. One of the most important was Dr. Benjamin Rush's **Inquiry into the Effects of Spiritous Liquors**, which argued that distilled spirits provide innumerable health problems.²² Another widely distributed book was Rev. George Cheeves' **Deacon Gile's Distillery**, which portrayed, in highly emotional terms, the distillery as a sort of Dante's inferno, where demons manufactured murder, suicide, and death.²³

Later the National Temperance Society (NTS) and other groups began to find justification in the Bible itself. NTS president Eliphalet Nott, in his "Lectures on Temperance," put forward the "two wine theory," which suggested that an analysis of biblical terms translated as "wine," showed that all intoxicating beverages were condemned, while passages commending use of wine were referring to grape juice.²⁴

The NTS pumped out thousands of tracts, pamphlets, and other pieces of literature in support of its position. It even produced its own Bible commentary, **The Temperance Bible Commentary** in 1870, since it found no support in any commentaries put out by others.

This output of materials was quickly grabbed up by church members all over the country and appealed to in Sunday school classes far and wide. Its reception was not as cordial in academic circles. One typical response was the publication of **The Two Wine Theory Discussed by 286 Clergymen on The Basis of Communion Wine by Edward Jewett S.T.D.** Dr. Jewett had written a scholarly response to several temperance tracts. This article was then sent to hundreds of clergymen and theologians with a circular letter inviting response. The overwhelming number supported Jewett and the few dissenting voices offered nothing in response that was more profound than, "I can't believe God would ever endorse wine!"²⁵

Nor was the criticism limited to just the academic community. In Tennessee, Primitive Baptist churches countered the temperance movement by excommunicating anyone who joined a temperance society.²⁶ In Georgia, Virginia, and the Carolinas, clergy marched condemning the temperance societies' tendency to accept direction from non-Christians and Catholics.

Yet the mass of propaganda that was produced from 1829 to 1835 induced 3,000 clergy to sign abstinence pledges, and the communion controversy later in the century persuaded many denominations to remove alcohol from Christian use completely.

Summary

The early concern of the temperance movement was just that: temperance. Responding to the increasing problem of drunkenness in society, they rightly argued that it should be curbed. Several factors, however, moved them from this stand to the position that alcoholic drinks were intrinsically evil. It is important to note that this change did not come from some new discovery in biblical interpretation, even though supporters later turned to the scriptures to bolster its position.

Much of the later discussion of the Bible centered on the “two wine theory,” which, in turn, depends on a correct understanding of the biblical terms for wine. This is where we shall next turn our attention.

II. YAYIN, TIROSH, AND THE “TWO WINE THEORY”

As the temperance movement grew it inevitably faced the problem of those Biblical passages that seem to endorse the use of alcoholic beverages. For the theological liberal there was no problem. He simply understood that the biblical writers were limited by their cultural perspective and ignorance, and wrote those passages off to the frailties of earlier times. All natural law informs us that these beverages are evil and that is sufficient.

Those with a more conservative theology, however, were forced to find another solution. This came with the publication of George Duffield’s **The Bible Rule of Temperance**, which first posited what was to become known as “the two wine theory.”²⁸

Duffield argued that two of the Hebrew words for wine, *yayin* and *tirosh*, should be seen as two entirely different substances. *Yayin*, according to Duffield, was the Hebrew word for intoxicating wine, which was always condemned in scripture, while *tirosh* was fresh or preserved grape juice or must be in an unfermented state.

Although a number of other temperance writers immediately seized upon this novel solution as a way out of their difficulty, it had very little support in terms of lexical evidence. On top of that, numerous verses commending *yayin* could be found throughout the entire Old Testament.

Still, the idea seemed worth refinement and other writers did so with a great deal of intensity. A slightly modified argument developed which became a rallying cry for portions of the abstinence movement for a number of years.²⁹

In its revised form, both *yayin* and *tirosh* were presented as generic names for all liquid products of the vine, from juice to mature wine.³⁰ Therefore, when the Bible commended use of *yayin* or *tirosh*, it referred to grape juice, and when it condemned use, it referred to intoxicating wine.

Much of the support for this view centered on attempting to prove that the traditional definitions of these two Hebrew words were entirely incorrect. This form of argument was never convincing to the majority of biblical scholars. Despite its continued popularity among popular temperance preachers of the 19th century, even the monumental **Temperance Encyclopedia**, the *magnum opus* of the abstinence movement,

felt obliged to include a devastating critique of the position alongside a second entry endorsing it.³¹

It remains an argument that is frequently forwarded by fundamentalists even today, therefore requiring a quick look at the Biblical evidence.

Yayin

The most common word for wine in the Old Testament is *yayin*. It is used 141 times, and the **LXX** always translates it as *oinos* with the exception of one instance.³² **Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon** points out that the root word *yon* means “to boil up, to be in a ferment.”³³ Some of the abstinence writers attempted to formulate a different definition. They argued from a different lexicon (Furst’s) which traced the word to a root, which though obsolete, supposedly meant “to stamp or press.” They argued, therefore, that *yayin* could be any product of the grape and not just intoxicating wine.

This argument falls short at several levels. First, the standard in Hebrew lexicography is clearly Gesenius. Furst’s work was chastised even by a neutral source such as the **Encyclopedia Britannica**, which suggested that the work as a whole “proceeds on very faulty etymological principles and must be used with extreme caution.”³⁴

Secondly, even if Furst were correct, which he clearly is not, we are a long way from arriving at the conclusion that the “two wine theory” advocates. There simply is no principle by which one could operate in order to distinguish passages that are referring to wine from passages that refer to grape juice. One is guided only by one’s presuppositions, a dangerous proposition in Biblical hermeneutics.

This position has never gained any support among biblical scholars in the 20th century. Raymond was able to say with authority in 1927, “All who have studied the meaning of this word appear to be unanimous in considering *yayin* an intoxicating beverage.”³⁵ The attempt to argue otherwise is an exercise in pure eisogesis.³⁶

Clearly there are passages which indicate *yayin* is an intoxicant: Gen. 9:21 and 19:32-35; Isa. 28:7; and Jer. 23:9, among others. More important for our examination are those passages which, to the surprise of many, commend the use of *yayin*:

God's permission to use and enjoy

Deut. 14:26

Use the silver (from the tithe) to buy whatever you like: cattle, sheep, wine (*yayin*) or other fermented drink, or anything you wish. Then you and your household shall eat there in the presence of the Lord your God and rejoice.

Provided by God

Ps. 104:14-15

He makes grass grow for the cattle,
and plants for man to cultivate—
bringing forth food from the earth:
wine (*yayin*) that gladdens the heart of man,
oil to make his face shine,
and bread that sustains his heart.

Used in Godly worship:

Ex. 29:40

With the first lamb offer a tenth of an ephah of fine flour mixed with a quarter of a hin of oil from pressed olives, and a quarter of a hin of wine (*yayin*) as a drink offering.

Lev. 23:13

...together with its grain offering of two-tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil—an offering made to the Lord by fire, a pleasing aroma—and its drink offering of a quarter of a hin of wine (*yayin*).

Num. 15:5,7,10

With each lamb for the burnt offering or the sacrifice, prepare a quarter of a hin of wine (*yayin*) as a drink offering.

...and a third of a hin of wine (*yayin*) as a drink offering. Offer it as an aroma pleasing to the Lord.

Also bring half a hin of wine (*yayin*) as a drink offering. It will be an offering made by fire, an aroma pleasing to the Lord.

Dispense in charity:

Prov. 31:6

Give beer to those who are perishing,
wine (*yayin*) to those who are in anguish.

God withdraws wine in judgement:

Deut. 28:39

You will plant vineyards and cultivate them but you will not drink the wine (*yayin*) or gather the grapes, because worms will eat them.

Given by Melchizidek (a type of Christ) to Abram:

Gen. 14:18

Then Melchizidek king of Salem brought out bread and wine (*yayin*). He was a priest of God the Most High.

All reliable evidence indicates that *yayin* is both an intoxicating substance and a beverage commended to man by God, even to the point of being called a blessing or gift of God.

Tirosh

The second most frequent word for wine in the Old Testament is *Tirosh*. It occurs 38 times, and the LXX renders it *oinos* thirty of those times. The usual English translation is “new wine,” and as such it is the equivalent to the New Testament word *gleukos*. The Hebrew root is “*yarash*” meaning “to take, to seize, to get possession of.”³⁷

Abstinence writers such as W. Ritchie have attempted to argue that *tirosh* is not a liquid but a vine fruit (*i.e.* grapes), because it is often grouped with other natural products.³⁸ Yet this argument too has failed to provide a way out, as Raymond writes:

The attempt by Ritchie and others of the total abstinence group to prove the *tirosh* is not a beverage but a vine fruit, that is, some solid product of the vine like grapes, errs both in logical reasoning and careful exegesis. That *tirosh* is a liquid and an intoxicating drink is evident from several passages in the Old Testament. In Hosea 4:11 *tirosh* is associated with whoredom and wine (*yayin*) as something which takes away the heart, a clear instance of its intoxicating properties, for otherwise it would not have been grouped with such company.³⁹

Additionally, the rabbinic uses of the word *tirosh* would support the perception of its intoxicating nature, as this passage from McClintock and Strong indicates:

The testimony of the rabbins is to the same effect. They say, “*Tirosh* is new wine, the liquor of the grape first pressed out, which easily takes possession of the mind of man” (Sanhedr. lxxvi,I). “If thou abuse it, thou shalt be poor; if thou rightly use it, thou shalt be head (Yoma, lxxvi,2).” Again in the Gemara, “wherefore is it called *tirosh*? Because all who are drawn to it shall be poor.” Such is the testimony of the rabbins, “who ought to know something of their own language.” In accordance with this, the Targumists Onkelos and Jonathan render *tirosh* in every instance of its occurrence (except in those cases where there is no word, or the word for vineyard), by the word *chamar* (see TeHan, Reply; pg 5, 6).⁴⁰

Other Rabbinic references also support this view of *tirosh*. The **Mishna** declares that *tirosh* cannot be used in the sanctuary until it has fermented at least 40 days,⁴¹ and taxation on it began when the first scum appeared, both further indications that its value was associated with its fermented state.⁴²

As with *yayin*, there are numerous passages in the Old Testament which speak of *tirosh* as a positive substance:

Permitted to enjoy

Deut. 14:23

Eat the tithe of your grain, new wine (*tirosh*) and oil, and the firstborn of your herds and flocks in the presence of the Lord your God at the place he will choose as a dwelling for his Name, so that you may learn to revere the Lord your God always.

Reward for obeying God

Deut. 7:13

He will love you and bless you, and increase your numbers. He will bless the fruit of your womb, the crops of your land—your grain, new wine (*tirosh*) and oil—the calves of your herds and the lambs of your flocks in the land that he swore to your forefathers to give you.

Deut. 11:14

...then I will send rain on your land in its season, both autumn and spring rains, so that you may gather your grain, new wine (*tirosh*) and oil.

Prov. 3:9-10

Honour the Lord with your wealth,
with the firstfruits of all your crops;
then your barns will be filled to overflowing,
and your vats will brim over with new wine (*tirosh*).

In Judgement God withdraws *tirosh*

Deut. 28:51

They will devour the young of your livestock and the crops of your land until you are destroyed. They will leave you no grain, new

wine (*tirosh*) or oil, nor calves of your herds or lambs of your flocks until you are ruined.

Isa. 62:8-9

The Lord has sworn by his right hand
and by his mighty arm:
“Never again will I give your grain
as food for your enemies,
and never again will foreigners drink
the new wine (*tirosh*)
for which you have toiled.
but those who harvest it will eat it
and praise the Lord,
and those who gather the grapes will drink it
in the courts of my sanctuary.

Once again the evidence is clear. At the least, *tirosh* is fermented *must* (grape juice) and most commonly refers to intoxicating wine. Just as significantly, it is considered a blessing God bestows upon the righteous and removes from the unrighteous.

Other Hebrew words for wine carry similar endorsements and are summarized in Appendix 1. From this evidence it would seem there is little support for a “two wine theory.”

III. OTHER ABSTINENCE ARGUMENTS

The demise of the “two wine theory” does not end the possibility for an abstinence position. There are several other arguments that have been put forth over the years that must be examined.

Diluted Wine

The first of these arguments draws its case from rabbinic sources that speak of drinking wine only after it has been diluted with water. According to this view, wine was consumed, but only after it had been watered down beyond intoxicating levels.⁴³

Although this type of argument shows promise on the surface, it fails on several counts. First there is no indication in the Old Testament that such was the practice, nor is there any commandment by God that this be done, despite the thoroughness of the Law. The earliest reference we have of this practice within a Jewish tradition is in the intertestament period, during the Maccabean revolt. II Maccabees 15:39 states, “It is hurtful to drink wine or water alone, but wine mingled with water is pleasant.”

This was written long after the completion of the Old Testament canon and after Judaism had been subjected to a process of hellenization. There is no indication that before this time there was any such practice. In fact, selling diluted wine was an example of the **corruption** of the nation in Isaiah’s time (Isa. 1:22):

Your silver has become dross,
your choice wine is diluted with water ...

Preserved Grape Juice

Another argument put forth is that the ancients had secret recipes for preserving grape juice in an unfermented state. The writings of Cato, Pliny, and Columella are often used as examples of such recipes. Typical of all these “secret formulae” was the placing of grape juice into a bottle or flask, which was then sealed with pitch and submerged in water for several months.⁴⁴ Cato, for example, says:

If you wish to keep grape juice [must] through the whole year, put the grape juice [must] in an anphora, seal the stopper with pitch and sink in the pond. Take it out after thirty days, it will remain sweet the whole year.⁴⁵

Several problems with this type of argument need to be observed. First, Cato uses the term “must” rather than grape juice, as in the abstinence version quote above.⁴⁶ Also, Pliny in his recipe specifically calls the finished product *aigleucos, semper*, or “always must.” A close examination of all these “secret recipes” reveals that they are for keeping the must from turning sour and not for preserving grape juice.

It is important to note that each passage quoted by abstinence writers clearly distinguishes wine from must, in the original context. There is no way to superimpose these recipes on the biblical words for wine found in the Old Testament.

A further problem is that of translating a practice from a water-rich Roman society to the desert culture in Israel. Dr. Jewett addressed this nearly a hundred years ago:

Neither in the apocrypha nor in the Targums, in the writings of Philo or Josephus, can one word or sentence be found to prove that the customs were either known or practiced in Judea.⁴⁷

Other related arguments, such as the boiling down of *must* and wine to make a jelly-like substance, or the adding of chemicals to retard fermentation, also fail both by lack of positive evidence that they were used by the Jews, and a misunderstanding of their purpose. In any case these arguments have been dealt with adequately elsewhere.⁴⁸

Not God’s Ideal

Another argument for consideration suggests that God tolerated drink, but it was not His ideal. Those advocating this position point to several groups in the Old Testament such as the Priests, the Nazirites and the Recabites, as proof that the righteous

should always refrain from drinking. Each of these examples will be examined individually, yet it should be noted in passing that the verses in which wine is specifically called a blessing of God would seem to militate against this argument *a priori*. In what sense could that which is portrayed in the inerrant Word as God's blessing be viewed as falling short of God's ideal?

Nevertheless, we will look at each example individually, beginning with the priests in Lev. 10:9:

“You and your sons are not to drink wine or other fermented drink whenever you go into the Tent of Meeting, or you will die. This is a lasting ordinance for the generations to come.

Clearly, even here there is no prohibition in general, but only while serving in that one capacity. At other times the priests were permitted to enjoy wine, as were the other Israelites. The act of consecration for service involves other prohibitions which are not considered normative, but merely the act of setting oneself apart for a special task, much the same way as fasting sets oneself apart for service in prayer. To argue that food is not God's ideal because of this points out the failure of this approach when applied to the question of alcohol.

A second group which is often held up as an example is the Nazirites. Num. 6:3-4 states:

As long as he is a Nazirite, he must abstain from wine and from other fermented drink and must not drink vinegar made from wine or from other fermented drink. He must not drink grape juice or eat grapes or raisins. As long as he is a Nazirite, he must not eat anything that comes from the grapevine, not even the seeds or skins.

This example, like the first, also fails for several reasons. First, the abstinence was only during the period of the vow, as verse 20 points out:

After that, the Nazirite may drink wine.

Secondly, if the Nazirite vow embodies normative behavior for the righteous, abstinence supporters would also be required to avoid the things prohibited for the Nazirites: grapes, grape juice, raisins, meat, funerals, and haircuts! Although no one advocates this, no principle has been offered to justify holding abstinence from wine as universally applicable while ignoring the rest of the vow.

Interestingly enough, according to the Jewish Talmud, the sacrifice required of the Nazirite at the end of the vow period (Num. 6:11) is to atone for withholding himself from the blessings of God—**specifically wine!**⁴⁹

Finally, the Recabites are considered. Jeremiah 35 presents the Recabites as exemplary in holding to the restrictions set forth by their fathers. This is contrasted to the Jews, who fail to hold on to their commitments to their heavenly Father. Quite clearly, the example they afford is their faithfulness, and not the specific prohibitions. If this were not the case, we would also have to hold to the other restrictions of the Recabites, including no building of houses, no sowing of seed, and no grapevines. So much for the universal application of the Recabites! None of these groups presents a case for abstinence as God's universal ideal. We will need to look elsewhere.

Scarcity of Water in Middle East

According to this position, the Jews drank wine because there was little water in desert areas, and by drinking bottled wine they were able to survive in situations where containing water would be difficult.

This is without a doubt the weakest argument for abstinence. In light of the verses in the Old Testament, which present wine as a blessing from God, are we to assume that God could not have provided water as a blessing if it represents this ideal? Perhaps God had an excess of wine and was out of water? Clearly this argument will not do.⁵⁰

The Weaker Brother

By the process of elimination we have come to the most promising of the abstinence arguments: the principle of the weaker brother. This position holds that the Bible requires total abstinence from alcohol because we should not do anything that might “offend” another believer. The main text is Romans 14, which discusses a conflict between those who eat meat and those who abstain from meat. Very probably the original setting refers to conflicting positions on meat or wine that had been consecrated to idols, a problem area which is addressed several times in the New Testament. A close examination of the text reveals several important points relevant to our discussion.

First, the real topic is not abstinence but judging. Paul insists that each side is to stop sitting in judgment on the other. This can be seen in verses like these:

Verse 1: Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing judgment on disputable matters.

Verse 3: The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not and the man who does not eat everything, must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him.

Verse 4: Who are you to judge someone else’s servant?

Verse 10: You, then, why do you judge your brother?
Or why do you look down on your brother?

Verse 13: Therefore let us stop passing judgment on one another.

The central command for the passage is found in verse one: Accept him who is weak, without passing judgment on disputable matters. The rest of the text develops more fully the rationale for the commandment.

Secondly, Paul identifies the partaker as the stronger party and suggests that the abstainer is weak in the faith. It is doubtful that Paul is recommending that the brother whose faith is stronger adopt the practice of the weaker. Clearly, and this is most

important, the command to stop judging implies the continuation of the practices of both positions, for if the stronger is also to abstain, there would be no conflict and therefore no judging. The entire passage, then, assumes the continuation of the differences!

Thirdly, we have the question of what Paul meant by “offending” a brother. The abstinence position holds that a believer must not do anything that another believer objects to or feels is wrong. Yet there are reasons to believe that the passage is speaking of something quite different. The use of strong words such as “destroy,” “stumbling block,” and “offend” point to something much stronger:

A stumbling block is an impediment in the way over which a person may stumble. An occasion of falling refers literally to a trap. Here these terms are used metaphorically and convey the same thought, namely, that which becomes the occasion of falling into sin.⁵¹

Paul’s constant insistence throughout the passage is that whatever position a believer takes over a disputable matter, he is answerable to God and not man (see verses 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, and 13). Three more times (verses 12, 22, and 23) he emphasizes that one must obey his own conscience. All of this suggests that the issue is that one must not pressure another into going against his understanding of God’s standard. The picture is of those stronger brothers who belittle a weaker brother to the point at which he goes against his own standard and therefore sins. Most likely in context, several recent Jewish converts still found the eating of meat consecrated to idols repulsive. Older converts who knew better were trying to get them to partake before admitting them to fellowship. Paul would have none of it and commands them not to force the issue.

In Paul’s conclusion to the matter, he commands that **whatever** a believer does it must be in accordance with faith. There is no implication here or elsewhere in the passage that the stronger brother is to abstain from partaking. To the contrary, Paul calls the one who can partake in good faith “blessed” (vs. 22). The only prohibition in this passage is against making the kingdom of heaven a matter of eating or drinking! He does not say that you must not partake, but that you must not partake in a way that looks down on one who disagrees with you.

Finally, the question of abstinence as a requirement for local church membership must be raised in light of the explicit instructions of this chapter. If verse one commands us not to judge on disputable matters, how can we demand conformity on disputable matters before accepting another into fellowship? This is even more disturbing in verse 3: "...the man who does not eat everything (abstains) must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him." If this passage is to be obeyed, we must not overlook the clear implications of such a conflicting position in our own church polity.

CONCLUSION

What has our study shown us, and what lessons may we learn as we consider applying our study to the church today? Although these are not easy questions, we offer the following suggestions:

1. All doctrinal statements and positions must come from Scripture and not our own sociological history. The evangelical community has had a long and intense association with the abstinence movement, but we cannot and must not allow that to dictate our understanding of Scripture. After all, our study has shown us that the temperance movement arose out of considerations other than Scripture and only turned to the Bible later. The abstinence question must be judged by Biblical truth and not by cultural distinctives.

2. Any doctrinal statement that declares all alcoholic beverages evil is in error. Scripture affirms that all things are good (Rom. 14:14; I Tim. 4:4; Mark 7:15) and specifically refers to all types of wine as a blessing permitted by God (Deut. 14:26; Ps. 104:14-15; Deut. 7:13; Deut. 32:14; Isa. 25:6; Joel 3:18 *etc.*)

3. All drunkenness must be condemned as sin (Prov. 23:29-35; I Peter 4:2-3; I Cor. 5:11; Eph. 5:18-21) and as an evil it is to be fought in any way that does not violate God's character and self-revelation.

4. Limiting membership to nondrinkers is a direct violation of Scripture. Since we are not to judge on disputable matters (Rom. 14:1), it places the church in the dangerous position of rejecting those whom God has accepted (Rom. 14:22). If consistently applied, this position, that abstinence be required of membership, would have eliminated many in the New Testament Church, and perhaps even our Lord Himself (Matt. 11:19; Luke 7:33-34; John 2:2-10; John 4:46). Can it ever be deemed correct for a local church to be more exclusive than heaven? Can we turn away from membership those whom God has accepted?

The problem is not just eating or drinking, which is easily set aside if considered on its own merits. What is at stake are two larger issues that are connected: one of principle and one pragmatic.

The point of principle is this: Do we believe the Bible even when it challenges beliefs that we hold dear? We must take seriously those Old Testament passages in which God says that He considers wine and strong drink a blessing He has provided. We do not want to be in the position of telling God He's wrong! If we believe the Bible to be the inerrant Word of God and the only authority for the believer, then the time has come to courageously stand behind that belief, and against any tradition (however pious) that subverts the clear teachings of Scripture. We will stand before God and answer for how we have handled the word of truth: with lip service or with faithfulness. God help us be faithful stewards.

The pragmatic issue raised is acceptance into fellowship of those whose personal views disagree with ours on peripheral issues. If Romans 14 is to be followed, the one who abstains must not condemn the one who does not, "**for God has accepted him** (vs.3)." If God accepts them, we must accept them. It is a precarious position to be more exclusive than God! Let us not be those who are "making the kingdom of God a matter of eating and drinking"(Rom. 14:17).

Appendix I: Major Biblical Terms for Alcoholic Beverages

<u>Word/English</u>	<u>Passages reflecting intoxicating nature</u>	<u>Passages commending or allowing use</u>
<i>Yayin/wine</i>	Gen. 9:21, 19:32-35 Isa. 28:7; Jer. 23:9	Permitted to enjoy: Deut. 14:26 Provided by God: Ps. 104:14-15 Used in worship: Ex. 29:40; Lev. 23:13 Num. 15:5,7,10 God withdraws in judgement: Deut. 28:39
<i>Tirosh/new wine</i>	Hosea 4:11 NT equivalent: Acts 2:13	Permitted to enjoy: Deut. 14:23 Reward for obedience: Deut. 7:13, 11:14 Prov. 3:10 God withdraws in judgement: Deut. 28:51; Isa. 62:8
<i>Shekar/strong drink</i>	I Sam. 1:12-15	Permitted to enjoy: Deut. 14:26 (also absent during wilderness: Deut. 29:6)
<i>Chamar/wine</i>	Daniel 5	Blessing: Deut. 32:14; Isa. 25:6
<i>Asis/sweet wine</i>	Isa. 49:26 Joel 1:5	Blessing: Joel 3:18; Amos 9:13

Other Old Testament terms for wine are not included because conclusive references are lacking and the issue of intoxicating/commending must rest elsewhere.

Appendix II: Abstinence and the United Brethren in Christ

Over the years the United Brethren in Christ have taken strong moral positions on a number of issues. In some cases their stand has been costly, as in the case of their rejection of slavery and even later the dispute over membership in secret societies.

In the case of abstinence, the evolution of their position over the years is typical of many American denominations, but would probably surprise many of their members today.

In the early years the denomination was, as euphemistically described by one abstinence author, “a thoroughly German movement.”⁵² The stance of the church was clearly temperance and not abstinence. Although Bishop Otterbein took a strong stand against drunkenness and even recommended total abstinence to those who were known drunkards,⁵² he himself was known to take alcoholic refreshment.⁵⁴

Also apparent in those years was the denominational acceptance of even those who were engaged in manufacturing and selling ardent spirits:

Total abstinence from even distilled liquors was not required, nor were the manufacture and selling of ardent spirits considered inconsistent with the profoundest piety. The organization of the denomination in 1800 took place in a dwelling situated over the storeroom of a distillery owned by the Christian layman whose hospitality the members of that conference were enjoying.⁵⁵

The first impact of the abstinence movement came only after Otterbein’s death. His successor, Christian Newcomer, introduced the first written discipline of the denomination to the Hagerstown Conference in 1814. Newcomer, who had worked closely with the Methodists, had apparently been influenced by the strong abstinence sentiment in the Methodist Church,⁵⁶ and his discipline contained a clause forbidding use of distilled spirits:

Every Member shall abstain from strong drink and use it only when necessity requires it as medicine.⁵⁷

The discipline was accepted by vote of the Hagerstown Conference, but significantly the resolution did not find its way into the Discipline adopted by the first General Conference in the next year, 1815. The membership at large was not yet ready for accepting such a new doctrine.

The issue surfaced again in 1821 at the third General Conference, when conferees passed the following:

Resolved: That neither preachers nor lay members shall be allowed to carry on a distillery...and that it shall be the duty of the preachers to labor against the evils of intemperance.⁵⁸

Again, as an indication of where the church stood, the resolution was not printed in the minutes distributed to the denomination at large,⁵⁹ and it was not until 1833 that the first abstinence measure passed into the denomination. This sixth General Conference forbade, on pain of expulsion, “an exhorter, preacher, or elder to manufacture or sell ardent spirits,”⁶⁰ and provided a one-year grace period for those involved to divest their interests. From this point on, the church increasingly followed an abstinence agenda. Some of the milestones are:

1837 Advises all members to abandon the business of ardent spirits

1841 Makes the advice of 1837 mandatory for all.

1848 The rule is extended to the use of ardent spirits as well as manufacture.⁶¹

After 1848 the church continued to pass abstinence agendas and repeatedly supported the call for prohibition from the 1870s on. It wasn't until the 1870s that the church first abolished all alcoholic beverages.⁶² By 1889 the conference was to condemn anyone who actively or **passively** allowed the licensing or taxing of the liquor trade.⁶³

It seems clear that although abstinence sentiment was around from the mid-1700s, the United Brethren Church continued to allow the uses of alcohol, even to the extent of accepting those who made and sold “ardent spirits.” It was not until the founding fathers and their generation had passed on that abstinence teaching became the position of the church. It seems ironic that Philip Otterbien and the other early lights would either be disciplined or excluded were they to find themselves transported into their church today.

Appendix III: The New Testament and Abstinence

We have intentionally avoided a discussion of the New Testament and wine, because the Old Testament provides the most material on the subject and was therefore the most obvious choice in establishing God's view. The lack of abstinence support is clearly seen in the New Testament as well, as a quick look at the major points will attest:

1. In contrast to John the Baptist, who abstained (Luke 7:33), Jesus came both eating and **drinking** (vs. 34) and on that fact was falsely accused of being a glutton and drunkard (vs. 34).

It is interesting to note in passing that, to the law-conscious Jew, John the Baptist's abstinence seemed to indicate demon possession (vs. 33), further enforcing the historical evidence that even the zealous experts in Old Testament law accepted the drinking of intoxicating wine as the norm.

2. Jesus provided wine for a wedding feast as his first miracle (John 2:1-11). To those who suggest that the wine at the feast was really juice, we point out that in context, the governor of the feast states that most people saved the bad wine for when the guests have had too much to drink (vs. 10) and could no longer distinguish the good from the bad. The host's comments are unintelligible if the wine were not intoxicating.

3. When some in the Corinthian church satisfy their appetite for wine at the love feast (I Cor. 11:21), Paul doesn't say, "Stop drinking wine," but, "What! Do you not have houses in which to eat and drink?"

4. There is no requirement of abstinence among the qualifications for church leadership (I Tim 5:23, 3:3), but only that they not be given to "much wine."

Notes

1. For a wonderful survey of the abolition movement and the minority nature of the struggle see Merton L. Dillon, **The Abolitionist: The Growth of a Dissenting Minority** (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1974).
2. There is a difficulty with the two terms temperance and abstinence, because what is known as the Temperance movement became, from 1836 on, an abstinence movement. I have tried to retain the term Abstinence movement throughout the body of this paper.
3. The Volstead act prohibited the sale and manufacture of alcoholic beverages and not their consumption. The nation may have been officially dry, but not in reality.
4. There is a story, probably apocryphal, about Bob Jones Sr. commenting on Lewis: “Even though he drinks and smokes, I think that he **might** be a Christian.”
5. The best survey of historical attitudes in the first few centuries of the early church may be found in Irving Woodsworth Raymond, **The Teaching of the Early Church on the Use of Wine and Strong Drink** (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927).
6. Wm. Andrew Hammond, trans., **The Definitions of Faith and Canons of Discipline** (Oxford: Parker, 1843), pp. 184-85.
7. Hammond, p. 185
8. St. Cyprian, **Epistles**, “Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. v,” (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 361.
9. St. Chrysostom, **Homilies on St. Matthew**, “Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Vol. 10” (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 357.
10. St. Chrysostom, **Baptismal Instructions**, “Ancient Christian Writers” (New York: Newman Press, 1963), p. 254.
11. C.A. Windle, **The Heresy of Prohibition** (Chicago: Iconoclast Publishing, 1925), p. 26. Windle is quoting from a biography of Luther written by Costlin. I have been unable to locate a copy.
12. Windle, p.26. Windle again quoting, this time from Paul Henry’s life of Calvin.
13. John Allen Krout, **The Origins of Prohibition** (New York: Knopf, 1925), p. 4.
14. Krout, p. 4. The extent with which the colonies used alcohol may be seen in the Puritan practice of starting the day with a glass of beer. In the New Netherlands, even the children drank beer at mealtimes. For these in other details on the eating practices of the colonies, see Lila Perl, **Slumps, Grunts, and Snickerdoodles: What Colonial America Ate and Why** (New York: Clarion Books, 1975).
15. Krout, p. 14.
16. Jack Larkin, “The Secret Life of a Developing Country (Ours),” **American Heritage** (Sept/Oct 1988), p. 55.
17. P.T. Winskill, **The Temperance Movement and Its Workers** (New York: Sheldon Blakman, 1857), p. 33.
18. Winskill, p. 33.
19. For an amazing account of this whole experience, see Daniel Boorstin, **The Americas: The Colonial Experience** (New York: Random House, 1958), pp. 33-69.
20. This general liberal attitude was definitely behind the founder of the Abstinence movement, Dr. Benjamin Rush. Rush was from Quaker stock and later became a Presbyterian. Four years before his temperance tract was published, he became involved in the founding of the Universalist Church and several years after the tract was published

resigned from the Presbyterians to affiliate with the Universalists entirely. **Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition** (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1899), p. 601.

21. Larkin, p. 54.

22. **Cyclopedia of Temperance**, p. 601. The medical case is now more complicated today, with new evidence that moderate drinking may actually reduce heart attacks as well as cut down on some types of strokes. See for example Marilyn Elias, "A Daily Drink May Lower Stroke Risk," **USA Today** (June 27, 1989).

23. John McClintock and James Strong, **Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature Vol. IX-X, Rh-Z** (New York: Arno Press, 1969), p. 246.

24. Eliphalet Nott, **Lectures on Temperance** (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman, 1857).

25. Edward H. Jewett, **The Two-Wine Theory Discussed by Two Hundred and Eight-six Clergymen on the Basis of "Communion Wine"** (New York: E Steiger & Co., 1883).

26. Krout, p. 119.

27. The bias of some of the most vocal of the Abstinence writers can be seen in statements like that of leading British abstinence proponent Frederick Lees, who stated that if the Bible contradicted the abstinence principle, he would reject it (the Bible). For this and other examples see the treatment in John L. Merrill, "The Bible and the American Temperance Movement: Text, Context, and Pretext," **Harvard Theological Review** 81, No.2 (1988), pp. 168-169.

28. Merrill, pp. 153-164.

29. There was much diversity of opinion over arguments for abstinence. When the National Temperance Conference first added the total abstinence position at their conferences in 1836, they couldn't find an argument that everyone present could agree on, so they decided to present the pledge without detailing the justifications for the new policy. This includes any biblical justification as well! Merrill, p. 151.

30. **Cyclopedia of Temperance**, pp. 50-56.

31. **Cyclopedia of Temperance**, pp. 48-50.

32. Job 32:19

33. Quoted in Jewett, p.120.

34. Quoted in Jewett, p.120.

35. Raymond, p. 19.

36. Merrill, p. 163, says, "Virtually all contemporary biblical scholars, conservative as well as liberal in orientation, are united in their rejection of the two-wine interpretation."

37. McClintock and Strong, p. 1011.

38. John D. Davis, **Westminster Dictionary of the Bible** (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1944), p. 940-1.

39. Raymond, p. 20.

40. McClintock and Strong, p. 1012.

41. James Hastings, **Dictionary of the Bible** (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), p. 974.

42. Raymond, p. 20.

43. For a modern example of this argument see John MacArthur, **Living in the Spirit** (Chicago: Moody Press, 1981). MacArthur seems to argue that there is no clear biblical prohibition against drinking, but then proceeds to offer all the weak points as if to say,

these aren't good arguments, but there are so many." Ten poor arguments stacked together do not make a good case, just a pile of bad arguments.

44. Andre Bustanoby, **Wrath of Grapes: Drinking and the Church Divided** (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), pp. 33-34.
45. Bustanoby, p. 33.
46. See Jewett, p. 137; and Bustanoby, p. 34.
47. Jewett, p. 139.
48. Bustanoby, pp. 32-39.
49. A. Cohen, **Everyman's Talmud** (New York: E.P.Dutton, 1949), p. 232.
50. For a modern example of someone who takes this argument seriously, see MacArthur, p. 32.
51. John Murray, **The Epistle to the Romans**, New International Commentary on the New Testament, editor F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 190.
52. For this and other historical facts, I'm indebted to Rev. Lorenz, who was the United Brethren in Christ representative to the National Temperance Conference in 1885. His honesty in dealing with the evidence fairly, despite his strong abstinence bias, is exemplary. Two of his addresses to the conference are found in **One Hundred Years of Temperance: A Memorial Volume of the Centennial Conference Held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Sept 1885** (New York: National Temperance Society Publishing House, 1886).
53. Ibid, pp. 348-49
54. Ibid, pp. 348-9.
55. Ibid, pp. 349.
56. An excellent account of the connection between the UBIC and the Methodists may be found in Paul Fetters, **Trials and Triumphs: A History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ**, (Huntington, IN: Church of the United Brethren in Christ Dept. of Church Services, 1984).
57. **One Hundred Years**, p. 349.
58. Ibid
59. Ibid
60. Ibid, p. 350.
61. Ibid
62. Fetters, p. 232.
63. **Cyclopedia of Temperance**, p. 634. If this official declaration is to be believed, this means that the United Brethren in Christ has been in sin every year since the repeal of Volstead. Not exactly the most careful statement.