

# Social Drinking: Wine In The Early Church

Introduction:

## **I. Objective of the study**

### **A. Overall study of The Problem of “Social” Drinking**

1. *This study conference is designed to provide an overall objective to the issue of “Social Drinking.”*
  - a) The problem of Social Drinking
  - b) The meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words translated “wine” in the Bible
  - c) The process of preserving grape juice
  - d) Jesus and Wine
  - e) Wisdom as it pertains to wine

### **B. This study specifically pertains to Wine In The Early Church**

1. *This study will not set out to explore or prove the meaning of the words translated “wine.”*
  - a) This will be covered thoroughly in another lecture.
  - b) However, there will be some supportive definitions offered for the sake of argument
2. *This study seeks to explore the passages that mention “wine” after the church was established, in an effort to discern whether these passages authorize the moderate (or “social”) consumption of intoxicating wine or beverage for the N.T. Christian.*

## **II. Child of God Must Have Positive Divine Authority**

### **A. Whatever you do in word or in deed...**

1. *It is crucial that we remember that “whatever we do” as children of God and servants of Christ, we must “do all in the name of the Lord” (Col.3:17)*
2. *We must have either a command, direct statement, approved example or necessary inference from the inspired word of God to authorize our doctrine and deeds. Otherwise we practice “lawlessness” (Matt.7:21-23).*
3. *We must remember that the burden is not upon a bible student to find where a thing is explicitly condemned in God’s word, but rather, the burden is upon the bible student to find where a thing is positively authorized in God’s word.*
4. *Where is the scriptural authority for social or moderate consumption of intoxicating beverage?*

### **B. Six N.T. passages are put forth as authority for social drinking**

1. *Acts 2:13*
2. *Romans 14:21*
3. *1 Timothy 3:8*
4. *Ephesians 5:18*
5. *1 Corinthians 11:21*
6. *1 Timothy 5:23*

## **III. Honest Seekers Must Examine The Proof Texts**

### **A. Receive the word with all readiness (Ac.17:11)**

1. *Study the scriptures provided to see if they authorize moderate consumption of intoxicating beverage*
2. *Test all things (1Thess.5:21-22)*

### **B. Let us examine the passages provided and test the arguments in favor of social drinking**

Discussion:

## **I. Acts 2:13**

### **A. The text in context**

1. *(Acts 2:13-15) <sup>13</sup> Others mocking said, “They are full of new wine.” <sup>14</sup> But Peter, standing up with the eleven, raised his voice and said to them, “ Men of Judea and all who dwell in Jerusalem,*

*let this be known to you, and heed my words.* <sup>15</sup> *For these are not drunk, as you suppose, since it is only the third hour of the day.*

**2. The apostles are accused of being filled with new wine (gleukos).**

- a) The miracle of tongue speaking by the apostles on the day of Pentecost caused the people to be amazed and perplexed at what they were seeing and hearing.
- b) Some who were present chose to mock them rather than genuinely seek an explanation or meaning for this miracle. These men, who were not genuinely seeking truth, sought to make a joke of the miracle and claimed that the apostles were filled with new wine (gleukos).
- c) The word translated "mocking" is cheluzo (5512). Thayer defines it as *to deride, mock, jeer*. BDAG defines it as *1. To engage in mockery; 2. To make fun of, maliciously.*
- d) The accusation of being filled with gleukos is not a reasonable charge based on evidence, but rather, an effort to maliciously destroy the validity and message of the inspired apostles by making a joke out of the miracle.

**3. Peter immediately raised his voice and answered their heckling assertion with truth and reason.**

- a) Peter explained that their assertion was ridiculous and unreasonable based on the fact that it was the third hour of the day. This meant that it was approximately 9:00 am and obviously well before anyone would be "filled" with wine of any sort.
- b) According to Lenski and other commentators, the Jews did not even eat a meal until after the first hour of prayer which is the third hour mentioned by Peter. It was usually about 10:00 am before they ate their first meal and that was bread. They did not eat meat or drink wine until the evening meal (RCH Lenski: The Acts of the Apostles p.72).
- c) Paul seems to imply this well established custom when he notes that even drunkards do not become drunk in the daytime (1Thess.5:7).
- d) It is likely that the mockers were not making a serious charge of drunkenness, but rather making fun of them. Peter takes the air out of their fun by appealing to the evidence of their well-established custom. He treats their joke as a serious charge and tosses it away with reason and logic. The way that he responds to the mocking further proves their sobriety and the miracle being performed.
- e) Peter's argument concerning the third hour of the day is the first of a one-two punch that would stop the mouths of the mockers. The second punch came by revealing that the unexplainable tongue speaking was, in fact, the fulfillment of the well-known prophecy of Joel. With this reasonable explanation of the miracle, the people listened attentively to Peter's sermon and the mockers were silenced.

**B. Does this text give positive divine authority for consumption of alcoholic beverage?**

**1. Remember that we must have a command, a direct statement, an approved example or a necessary inference that authorizes social drinking or moderate consumption of intoxicating beverage.**

- a) We are not required to have all four, nor even more than one. Just one of these methods of authority will suffice.
- b) There is certainly no command or direct statement regarding social drinking or moderate consumption in the passage – only a statement concerning drunkenness.
- c) There is no example whatsoever of social drinking in the text – approved or otherwise.
- d) There is nothing that would necessarily imply that social drinking is authorized by Christ.

**2. However, some would argue that because Peter only denied being drunk, he thus implied that he and the other apostles drank wine in moderation.**

- a) The argument is made that if Peter and the apostles did not drink intoxicating wine at all, why didn't he just say that were not drinkers of intoxicants instead of making his case on the time of day. That by denying that they were filled with wine at the third hour, he implied that there were other times of the day that they DID drink but not in the morning.

**C. Testing the argument**

**1. In order for a thing to be necessarily implied, it must, in fact, be NECESSARY to infer the idea that is supposed to be implied.**

- a) In other words, we are *forced* to the conclusion. *Necessary* inference means that it can't be any other way. Does Peter's exclusion of a non-drinker statement *force* us to the conclusion that he and the other apostles were drinkers of intoxicating wine? Certainly not!

**2. Consider this: Peter only argued that they would not reasonably be drunk at 9:00 am. He did not state that they were not drunkards or that they did not get drunk at night. Why not?**

- a) If they believed that it was permissible to drink socially but that it was sinful to get drunk, why didn't Peter say "We never get drunk because we believe it is sinful"?



- b) If Peter's exclusion of a statement to the effect that they did not drink intoxicants would necessarily imply that they DID drink intoxicants, then his failure to state that they never drank to drunkenness would necessarily imply that they occasionally or regularly were "filled with wine." This is a faulty (even absurd) conclusion because it is not NECESSARY to infer that conclusion and it does not fit the character of the disciples of Christ.
- c) Likewise, the conclusion that Peter implied that they were social drinkers is NOT necessarily implied and it is contrary to the character of the disciples of Christ.

3. *On one occasion (Jn. 10:20), Jesus' enemies said "You have a demon!" Jesus, however, did not deny that he had a demon on that occasion. He simply addressed the problem behind their accusation. Was his silence concerning His asserted demon-possession tacit admission that He DID have a demon? Of course not!*
  - a) But if Acts 2:13-14 necessarily implies social drinking, then Jesus' silence in John 7:20 implies demon possession. God forbid!
  - b) Such a conclusion is not necessary – it is absurd.
4. *The fact that Peter gave one particular reason that the apostles were not drunk, did not necessarily imply that there were no other reasons that they would not be drunk.*
  - a) Peter gave the reason that was best suited to meet the irreverent mockers.
  - b) He did not have to give a list with every reason that they were not drunk in order for all of the reasons to be true and valid. He simply used the argument that best fit the situation.

#### D. Silence does not imply consent in God's word

1. *The argument that Peter necessarily implied approval of social drinking by failing to state his disapproval of such, is essentially an argument that "Silence Implies Consent."*
2. *This is a faulty method of interpretation and one that has left countless men without a scriptural compass.*
3. *"Where does the Bible say 'not to'?" This is the argument that is used in an effort to authorize:*
  - a) Instrumental music in worship
  - b) Gambling
  - c) Church recreation and entertainment
4. *To follow this argument, we might ask "Where Does The Bible Say Not To...":*
  - a) Offer animal sacrifice
  - b) Baptize infants
  - c) Offer Pepsi and Twinkies as the Lord's Supper
5. *The Bible clearly teaches that silence does NOT give consent or authority.*
  - a) Acts 15:24 cf. Matt.28:20
  - b) Hebrews 7:14
6. *A thing does not have to be explicitly condemned to be sinful – just not authorized!*

#### E. Is gleukos intoxicating wine?

1. *This is really not a part of the issue and it does not pertain to the argument but it is a matter of interest.*
  - a) Whether gleukos is intoxicating or not, Peter made a brief argument regarding the fact that they were not intoxicated. Therefore the argument pertaining to necessary inference and silence giving consent has to be addressed. The alcoholic content of gleukos is likely a non-issue in this study.
  - b) It is likely that the meaning of this word will be discussed with much more scholarship in another lecture. But just a few points to mention.
2. *The word translated new wine is gleukos. This word is defined as follows:*
  - a) Thayer: *must*, the sweet juice pressed from the grape;
  - b) BDAG: γλεῦκος, οὐς, τό (Aristot. et al.; Plut.; Lucian, Philops. 39; Galen XII p. 88, 6 K., XIII p. 45, 18 al.; Athen. 1, 31e; GDI 4993; PPetr II, 40 [b], 8 [277 B. C.]; PSI 544, 2; PGrenf II, 24, 12 al.; s. Preis.; Job 32:19; Jos., Ant. 2, 64) sweet new wine (schol. on Nicander, Alexiph. 493 γλεῦκος, ὃ λέγεται ἐν συνηθείᾳ μούστος = γλεῦκος, commonly referred to as must'; cp. PStras 1, 7 [V A. D.] Ac 2:13. –DELG s. v. γλυκύς. M
  - c) LEH: γλεύκος,- οὐς +N3N 0- 0- 0- 1- 0- 1 Jb 32:19 sweet new wine
  - d) Vine: 2. gleukos (γλεύκος, 1098) denotes sweet "new wine," or must, Acts 2:13, where the accusation shows that it was intoxicant and must have been undergoing fermentation some time. In the Sept, Job 32:19.
  - e) Strong: g1098. γλεῦκος gleukos; akin to 1099; sweet wine, i. e. (properly) must (fresh juice), but used of the more saccharine (and therefore highly inebriating) fermented wine.— new wine. AV (1)- new wine 1; the sweet juice pressed the grape, sweet wine
3. *You will notice that Thayer, BDAG and LEH simply define the word without commentary. However Strong and Vine add their commentary after the simple definition of the word.*

4. *The word simply means "sweet wine" and they all consistently define it that way. It's fermentation or lack thereof is not a part of the meaning of the word. Obviously sweet wine could "become" fermented. But this was not the necessary state of gleukos.*
5. *It is also worthwhile to note that the word is translated "new wine" in the KJV, NKJV, ESV and ASV. That is a total of over 320 Greek scholars who chose this as the most accurate translation. The NASB translates it as "sweet wine" and the NIV as just "wine."*
  - a) Certainly, sweet wine could ferment and become intoxicating. But both Thayer and BDAG define the word to mean "the juice pressed from the grape" and "new."
  - b) Many have argued that it could not be "new" wine because the vintage time had passed by many months. However, with the ability to preserve the wine, it is possible for freshly preserved wine to be considered "new sweet wine" in the same condition as when it was "pressed from the grape."

#### **F. No N.T. authority for social drinking in Acts 2:13**

1. *Whatever the case of the meaning of this word in the context of Acts 2:13, there is nothing in the context that would authorize social drinking for the Christian.*
2. *Peter's argument pertaining to the third hour of the day does not necessarily imply that the apostles or any of Christ's faithful disciples were social drinkers.*

## **II. Romans 14:21**

### **A. The text in context**

1. *(Rom. 14:21) "It is good neither to eat meat nor drink wine nor do anything by which your brother stumbles or is offended or is made weak."*
2. *The fourteenth chapter of Romans addresses the problem of unity in a spiritual kingdom, household or family composed of Jews and Gentiles with extremely different religious backgrounds and prior conviction.*
  - a) The specific problem addressed involved those whose conscience would not allow them to eat certain meats, based on past religious conviction, and also those who felt compelled by conscience to observe certain days based on their past religious conviction. The problem arose because, in this diverse group of Jew and Gentile Christians, there were also those who (accurately) believed that they were authorized to eat these same meats and they did not feel compelled to observe these same days.
  - b) It is made clear in vs. 3-6 and in v. 14 that the issues addressed were matters of indifference to God – He "received" the one who ate and He also "received" the one who did not eat; He "received" the one who observed the day and He "received" the one who did not observe the day.
  - c) Some Christians had a conscience that was stricter (more restrictive) on certain matters than God was. This immediate context taught them that their personal conviction was not bound by God (v. 3-6, 14). They were undoubtedly taught on many occasions concerning their freedom from the Old Law and the liberty that is in Christ. However, this is a case where one's conscience has not caught up with their intellect – they knew that a certain thing was acceptable to God, but it didn't *feel* acceptable in their conscience. Others exercised their liberty in Christ pertaining to these particular meats and days without any guilt in their conscience. They were "assured" or convicted in these matters that they had liberty, both in intellect and in conscience.
  - d) Those with the more restrictive conscience were charged not to judge (condemn) those who ate or who did not observe the day. Those who excised their liberty were charged not to look down on those who were more restrictive than God required. They were all exhorted to strengthen their fellowship and unity in love for one another.
  - e) It is important that we understand that Romans 14 did not teach that God would accept those who are looser in their conscience and conduct than God allows or authorizes, nor that we are encouraged or authorized to accept them into our fellowship. This is a misapplication of the principle taught in this chapter and it is in contradiction to multiple passages of scripture in the immediate and remote context (Rom. 13:11-14; 16:17-19; Gal. 5:19-21; 2Cor. 6:14-18; Eph. 5:11; 1Jn. 9-11)
3. *The context of Romans 14 is parallel with 1 Corinthians 8, 9 and 10.*
  - a) The context of 1 Corinthians 8, 9 and 10 addresses the same principle as Romans 14, but from the standpoint of one whose conscience will not allow them to eat meat that has been sacrificed to idols (8:7).
  - b) While the specific personal conviction differs in the two contexts, the principle is the same. Paul makes it clear that the issue addressed in 1 Corinthians 8, 9 and 10 is a matter of indifference to God (8:8) and that eating or not eating the meat sacrificed to idols was "lawful" (10:23). However, those who had "knowledge" of their liberty in this matter (8:7,9) were not to exercise that liberty in Christ with disregard to the effect it might have on their brethren who might not have their conscience grounded in this particular liberty.
  - c) The instruction pertains to the unity and building up of one another in love (8:1). The primary injunction in 1 Corinthians 8-10 is that Christians who have clear conviction of their liberty, should be willing to forego that liberty, if necessary, in a loving, patient and sacrificial effort to avoid causing another brother to sin against their

conscience (8:9-13) and to provide an environment where the faith, knowledge and conscience of brethren could grow. Paul gave several examples in chapter 9 of his willingness to forego certain liberties in an effort to bring about their salvation – refraining from marriage (9:5-6); preaching without receiving financial support from them (9:7-14). The point is that we may have to forego some liberties at times in an effort to win others (10:24-33). Nowhere in this text or in Romans 14 is the principle taught that we can ever be less restrictive than God allows or that we are to be in fellowship with those who are less restrictive than God allows.

4. *The context of Romans 14 is clearly limited to pertain to...*
  - a) “all things” that “indeed are pure” (v.20)
  - b) “nothing” that is “unclean of itself” (v.14)
  - c) things that are “good” (v.16)
  - d) things that can be done “to the Lord” (v.6)
5. *Whatever we understand about the mention of “oinos” in Romans 14:21, it must comply with, and fit within, this context.*

**B. Does this passage authorize the moderate consumption of alcoholic wine or beverage?**

1. *Paul is discussing things that are matters of indifference to God.*
  - a) We are authorized to do these things or to refrain from doing them.
2. *In this context Paul mentions wine in the same context with meat.*
3. *Remember, we must have positive divine authority for all that we do (Col.3:17)*
4. *The argument would have to be that drinking alcoholic wine is authorized here by necessary inference in that wine is mentioned in the same context as eating meat. The context applies to things that are authorized liberties that sometimes should be refrained from. Therefore wine is an authorized liberty like the eating of meat.*
5. *The problem with this argument is that it assumes what is not proven.*
  - a) Alcoholic wine has to first be proven in order for this passage to authorize consumption of alcoholic beverage.

**C. Is the “oinos” in Rom.14:21 alcoholic?**

1. *The burden of proof is on the one who seeks to authorize drinking alcohol from this passage.*
2. *The word (oinos) itself does not tell us whether it is alcoholic or not.*
3. *While the meaning of ionos will be studied and discussed in another lecture, it is necessary to make some general observation about its meaning here.*
4. *Oinos is a general term like groceries or fruit. The word simply means grape juice in the New Testament. It can be fermented or non-fermented grape juice.*
  - a) The proper definition of the term does not necessitate the fermentation of the juice, nor presence of alcohol in the juice.
  - b) This word is used in the N.T. to refer to both fresh grape juice (Matt.9:17) and also to alcoholic wine (Eph.5:18).
  - c) The fermentation or non-fermentation of the juice does not inhere in the definition of the word.
  - d) We cannot assume that it is intoxicating. The definition does not prove nor determine if it is intoxicating – only the context can provide the proof.
5. *So is the “ionos” of Rom. 14:21 intoxicating?*
  - a) In order for this passage to “necessarily imply” (or provide approved example or direct statement) that drinking alcohol is authorized by God, it has to be proven that the oinos in this passage is alcoholic – otherwise it is NOT necessarily implied.
  - b) Necessary implication means that *it can't be any other way* – thus “necessary.” In other words, we are forced to the conclusion – the words *necessitate* the conclusion.
6. *The context of Romans 14 determines whether the wine (oinos) mentioned here is alcoholic or unfermented grape juice.*
  - a) The context certainly does not demand or necessitate that this wine (oinos) contains alcohol.
7. *It is certainly possible that the wine mentioned is unfermented grape juice.*
  - a) The context deals with some who were more restrictive than they had to be as pertains to the law of Christ. They did not eat certain meats that were perfectly pure, because it was their opinion (conviction) that it was better in God's eyes not to eat the meat.
  - b) Some Christians take the same approach today. For instance, some see the danger and sin involved in mixed swimming, therefore they resolve that they will not swim at all. Some will not own a swimming pool because of its association with immodesty.
  - c) It is certainly possible that some Christians in the first century could see the scriptural warnings regarding the dangers and sin pertaining to alcoholic wine (Prov.23:29-35) and determine that they should not even drink unfermented grape juice. This would be no more extreme than eating “only vegetables” (Rom.14:2) and refraining completely from meat.

- d) This is not only possible, it is practical and we have examples of some who did not drink grape juice. Timothy drank “only water” (1Tim.5:23). John the baptizer drank no oinos at all (Lk.1:15). This may have been a Nazarite vow – I can’t prove it either way. The bottom line is that John was filled with the Holy Spirit rather than oinos.
- e) Nothing in the context forces us to the conclusion that the wine mentioned is alcoholic, while unfermented grape juice fits the context perfectly.

#### D. What proves too much...

1. *In order for the wine mentioned in Romans 14:21 to be alcoholic, then it must “fit” within:*
  - a) “All things” that “indeed are pure” (v.20)
  - b) “nothing” that is “unclean of itself” (v.14)
  - c) “good” (v.16)
  - d) something that can be done “to the Lord” (v.6)
2. *So this would necessitate that we could drive by a liquor store and tell our children that...*
  - a) “All things” in that liquor store are “indeed pure”
  - b) “Nothing” in there (that is beverage alcohol) is “unclean”
  - c) As a matter of fact, every alcoholic beverage in there is “good”!
  - d) We are going to go in that store, get a 12 pack of Budweiser and drink a cold one “to the Lord”
3. *If the oinos in Romans 14:21 is alcoholic then this conclusion must be true.*
  - a) We could not refuse the dad who said this to his children nor could we withdraw fellowship from him.
4. *What proves too much proves nothing at all*
  - a) In light of God’s inspired instruction in Proverbs 20:1; 23:29-35; 31:3-7, it is absurd to argue that beer, wine, whiskey, vodka, etc. could be indeed pure, good and something that we would regularly drink to the Lord.
  - b) To place alcoholic wine in Romans 14:21, we would turn the chapter on its head, do violence to the context and contradict a host of other scriptures.
  - c) Remember that when Jesus said to Satan, “it is also written...” (Matt.4:7) He was teaching the law of harmony. No passage of scripture is to be interpreted so that it is in direct contradiction with another clearly interpreted scripture.
5. *Note that v.21 is parallel with v.17 – “eating and drinking”*
  - a) The “eating” pertained to food that was wholesome – but that some abstained from for religious purpose.
  - b) Note also the parallel context in 1Cor.10:31 – “Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God.”
  - c) The wine (oinos) in Rom.14:7 must be such that we can refrain from drinking it, but if we drink it, we are doing it “to the glory of God.”
  - d) Alcoholic wine does not fit this context in any way.

#### E. What is “necessarily” implied?

1. *There is not a command or direct statement in Rom.14 to the effect that consumption of beverage alcohol is authorized.*
2. *There is no approved apostolic example to authorize such in this passage.*
3. *There is certainly no “necessary” inference of any kind that the wine in verse 21 is alcoholic.*
4. *Alcoholic wine in this passage would contradict other passages pertaining to alcohol.*
5. *Therefore I submit to you that it is not possible that the oinos in verse 21 is alcoholic and thus “necessarily implies” that it is unfermented grape juice.*

### III. 1 Timothy 3:8

#### A. The text in context

1. *(1Tim.3:8) Likewise deacons must be reverent, not double- tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy for money,*
2. *The context of 1Timothy 3:1-13 pertains to the qualification of elders and deacons.*
  - a) Our text states that a deacon is not to be given to much wine.
  - b) The seriousness of the office of both elder and deacon require sobriety on all occasions (2Tim.4:5)

#### B. Authority for social drinking in 1 Timothy 3:8?

1. *It is argued that since the qualification for an elder is that he must not be “given to wine,” but the deacon must not be “given to much wine,” it must follow that the deacon may drink a little wine.*
2. *This argument does not pose a command, direct statement or approved example to authorize social drinking. As with the other passages, it is suggested that authority for social drinking is “necessarily implied.”*
  - a) In this case, it is supposed that the word “much” qualifies what is prohibited thus “some” is allowed.
3. *Definition of “given to” (paroinos) in v.3*

- a) Strong: g3943. πάροινος paroinos; from 3844 and 3631; staying near wine, i. e. tipping (a toper):— given to wine
  - b) BDAG: πάροινος, ον pert. to one who is given to drinking too much wine, addicted to wine, drunken 1 Ti 3:3; Tit 1
  - c) Vine: 1. paroinos (πάροινος, 3943), an adjective, lit., “tarrying at wine” (para, “at,” oinos, “wine”), “given to wine,” 1 Tim. 3:3 and Titus 1:7, kjv, probably has the secondary sense, of the effects of wine- bibbing, viz., abusive brawling. Hence rv, “brawler
4. *Definition of “given to” (prosecho) in v.8*
- a) Strong: g4337. προσέχω prosechō; from 4314 and 2192; (figuratively) to hold the mind (h3563 implied) towards, i. e. pay attention to, be cautious about, apply oneself to, adhere to:— (give) attend (- ance,- ance at,- ance to, unto), beware, be given to, give (take) heed (to unto); have regard
  - b) BDAG: προσέχω ‘have in close proximity to’; freq. act. as mostly in our lit. of mental processes ‘turn one’s mind to’
  - c) Vine: 1. prosecho (προσέχω, 4337), “to take heed, give heed,” is said of the priests who “gave attendance at the altar,” Heb. 7:13. It suggests devotion of thought and effort to a thing
5. *Paroinos conveys the idea of being addicted to and prosecho conveys the idea of giving one’s mind over to. Similar words in application. Prosecho might be a more general word whereas paroinos is a more specific word (When a person is “addicted,” their mind is “given over to a thing,” but that is not the only way that a person’s mind might be “given over to a thing”)*
6. *First, let us notice that the Greek words in v.3 and v.8 are used as synonyms:*
- a) paroinon and prosecho. Different words but their meaning is synonymous. Both convey the idea of: “to be addicted or given over to.”
  - b) Are we to believe that the elder is not to be addicted to wine, but the deacon may be addicted to a little wine? How can one be addicted to much wine without being addicted to wine in general – much or little?
  - c) These two verses are not different but synonymous.
7. *“It is not affirmed that it would be proper for the deacon, any more than the bishop, to indulge in the use of wine in small quantities, but it is affirmed that a man who is much given to the use of wine ought not, on any consideration, to be a deacon” (Albert Barnes).*
8. *The difference in wording between v.3 and v.8 does not imply anything – the words are synonymous and convey the same idea for both offices – The men who lead and serve the church are not to be addicted to wine in any way.*

### C. Authorizing the moderate by condemnation of the extreme or excess

1. *Just because God condemns addiction to wine or addiction to “much” wine, this condemnation of the excess does not translate into authority for moderate use.*
  - a) Consider the problem of using this method of authorizing in light of other passages.
2. *James 1:21 condemns the “overflow of wickedness.” Does this statement inherently reveal necessary implications that authorize moderate wickedness?*
  - a) This is the argument regarding 1 Timothy 3:3, 8. Supposedly, since God prohibits addiction (alcoholism) to much wine (and other passages condemn drunkenness), then moderate drinking is authorized by necessary implication.
3. *Ecclesiastes 7:17 states “Do not be overly wicked.”*
  - a) Does this verse necessarily imply that we are authorized to be moderately wicked?
4. *Romans 6:12 says “Do not let sin reign in your mortal body.”*
  - a) Does this verse inherently reveal necessary implications that authorize a moderate amount of sin in our life as long as the sin doesn’t control us?
5. *We might say “stop your incessant lying!”*
  - a) Does this necessarily imply that we approve of moderate lying?
6. *We might teach children about the dangers and life changing consequences of alcohol, including alcoholism, and then make the exhortation “don’t follow the wrong path in life and end up becoming a drunk.”*
  - a) Would this exhortation imply that we were fine with social drinking and drinking parties? Of course not! It would be clear to our children that social or casual drinking and drinking parties are the very things that “pave” the “wrong path” that leads to drunkenness and alcoholism.
  - b) God tells us not to be a drunkard, but reveals in other instruction that even to look at the wine when it is intoxicating can be the beginning of the wrong path. Therefore, we are admonished to stay completely away from it (Prov.23:29-35).
  - c) The prohibitions of God against drunkenness or addiction to alcohol do not necessarily imply approval of the very thing that leads to these sins, which is consumption of alcohol.
7. *Hopefully we can see from the passages considered, that the condemnation of the extreme does not necessarily authorize the moderate*

- a) This is not a sound, reliable or consistent method of biblical interpretation.

**D. No N.T. authority for social drinking in 1Tim.3:3,8**

1. *1 Timothy 3:3,8 does not authorize anything other than which men are qualified to serve as elders and deacons.*
2. *The argument for social drinking based on this passage is unsustainable and not sound. There is simply nothing in the context that would authorize social drinking for the Christian.*

**IV. Ephesians 5:18**

**A. The text in context**

1. *(Eph.5:18) And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation; but be filled with the Spirit,*
2. *This text is set in a context that exhorts Christians to imitate God as their Father, to cast off the works of darkness and to walk as children of light, "finding out what is acceptable to the Lord." They are urged to walk circumspectly and to be wise in understanding God's will.*
3. *As God urges saints to redeem the time in understanding and obeying God's will, he emphasizes the necessity and importance of being filled with the Spirit and it is in contrast with this that Paul warns them not to be drunk with wine.*

**B. Authority for social drinking?**

1. *There is certainly not an approved example of socially consuming intoxicating wine here in this passage. It is obvious that no command or direct statement pertaining to social drinking exists in this context.*
2. *But some would argue that Paul's command to not be drunk, stops short of exhorting us to not drink any intoxicating drinks, therefore the moderate or social consumption of alcohol is necessarily implied.*
3. *Once again, the unsound and worn out attempt to "Authorize The Moderate By Condemnation of The Excess or Extreme."*
  - a) This principle is unscriptural and will not provide legitimate authority.
  - b) See our discussion on this in the examination of 1 Timothy 3:3,8.
4. *It is interesting however, that it would be in this context – one exhorting us to be pure, walk as children of light and strive for wisdom in order to know God's will - that some would seek to find authority for social consumption of something that God says will "bite like a serpent... sting like a viper" and cause one to lose discernment and wisdom (Prov.23:29-35; 31:4-7).*
5. *It is obvious that Paul is emphasizing the one (filled with the Spirit) by providing the opposite extreme (drunk or filled with wine).*
  - a) "in which" is referring to the wine – "in which is dissipation."
  - b) Dissipation is translated from ἀσωτία asōtia (g.0810). This word is defined as: unsavedness, profligacy, wastefulness, reckless abandon, debauchery, riot, etc. Therefore, these things are "in" wine! No wonder God tells us not to be filled with wine!
  - c) It is amazing that someone would turn to this passage, which states that all of these ungodly things are in wine, and use it to authorize the consumption of wine!
  - d) The more that we are "filled" with wine, the more that we are filled with wastefulness, reckless abandon, debauchery and riot.
  - e) Note the fact that the one who seeks to defend and authorize social drinking, would have to argue that it is sinful to have a "full tank" of wine (filled, drunk), but it is permissible to have a quarter tank of wine (in which is wastefulness, reckless abandon, debauchery and riot). We can be moderately filled with debauchery and riot, but not completely filled.
6. *Paul reveals that it is "one or the other". If we are "filled" with the spirit, there is no place for wine and visa versa. Therefore, to the degree that we are being moderately filled with wine (in which is dissipation), we are devoid of the Spirit to that same degree.*

**C. No N.T. authority for social drinking in Ephesians 5:18**

1. *There is nothing in the text that would authorize social drinking in any way.*
2. *The effort to authorize the moderate by condemnation of the excess is not scriptural.*

**V. 1 Corinthians 11:21**

**A. The text in context**

1. *(1Cor.11:21) For in eating, each one takes his own supper ahead of others; and one is hungry and another is drunk.*

2. *The context of 1 Corinthians 11:20 addresses three problems in the assemblies of the Corinthian church (v.17):*

- a) They were not properly discerning the Lord in His memorial supper (v.20, 23-29)
- b) They were not properly discerning their brethren (v.21, 33)
- c) They were not properly discerning the nature of the church (v.22, 34)

3. *They were not discerning the Lord in His memorial supper but were using the assembly of the church to accommodate a common meal (v.22). But they were also excluding certain brethren when they came together (v.21, 33).*

4. *Paul is addressing their abuse of the Lord's supper, abuse of the assembly and essential abuse of their brethren in verse 21.*

- a) Instead of all partaking of that one bread and cup of the Lord together, they were eating their "own supper" and it was being done exclusive of other brothers.
- b) Thus some were without anything to eat or drink and others were filled.

5. *It is in this context that Paul uses the word "drunk" (μεθύω methyō) to describe a part of their conduct.*

#### **B. Does this passage authorize social drinking of alcohol?**

1. *Once again, we test it with the valid forms that would authorize.*

- a) There is certainly no approved example of any kind in this context.
- b) There is not command or statement that would authorize social drinking.
- c) There is nothing that would necessarily imply that social drinking is authorized.

2. *The argument that is made concerning this verse is that they must have drunk intoxicating wine if some were drunk (necessarily implied), therefore drinking intoxicating wine is approved of because Paul only condemned their drunkenness.*

#### **C. Were they inebriated?**

1. *If not, then the argument falls apart.*

2. *One might wonder how we could even entertain the idea that they were not inebriated when Paul said that they were "drunk."*

3. *The word translated "drunk" is μεθύω methyō and is defined as follows:*

- a) Thayer: *to be drunken*
- b) BDAG: *to drink to a point of intoxication; be drunk*
- c) Strong: g3184. μεθύω methyō; from another form of 3178; to drink to intoxication, i. e. get drunk:— drink well, make (be) drunk
- d) Vine: 2. methuo (μεθύω, 3184), from methu, "wine, to be drunk," is used in John 2:10 in the passive voice, and is translated in the rv, "have drunk freely"; kjv, "have well drunk." See drunk.
- e) All of these definitions tell us that the word means to be drunken.

4. *However the word is sometimes used to mean "full" and "satiated" and can have nothing to do with intoxication or inebriation. Note how the word μεθύω methyō was used in the LXX.*

- a) (Isa.34:5) For my sword has **drunk its fill** in the heavens; behold, it descends for judgment upon Edom, upon the people I have devoted to destruction. (ESV)
- b) (Isa.34:5) For My sword is **satiated** in heaven, Behold it shall descend for judgment upon Edom And upon the people whom I have devoted to destruction. (NASB)
- c) (Ezek.39:19) So you will eat fat until you are glutted, and drink blood until you are **drunk**, from My sacrifice which I have sacrificed for you. (NASB)
- d) None of these passages have anything to do with inebriation, but speak only of being full or satiated. The word methyō is used in the LXX to translate and convey this idea.
- e) Note also (Isa.58:11) 11 The Lord will guide you continually, And satisfy your soul in drought, And strengthen your bones; You shall be like a **watered** garden, And like a spring of water, whose waters do not fail.
- f) This passage uses methyō to translate a Hebrew word that meant "a watered garden" (NKJV), "a well-watered garden" (NIV). This clearly has nothing to do with intoxication but conveys being satiated or full.

5. *Macknight said, "And another is filled."] – So the Greek word μεθύω signifies here, being opposed to "one is hungry." The word is used in this sense by the LXX. (Macknight on the Epistles, p.181).*

6. *While the word means to be filled or full, it is obvious that if a person is filled or full of intoxicating wine, then they will be drunk or intoxicated. So the word applied to an intoxicating beverage would necessarily imply intoxication.*

- a) But the word can be used in relation to things which are not intoxicating, in which case it does not imply anything about intoxication.

7. *The context of 1 Corinthians 11:21 is not about inebriation, revelry or debauchery, it is about inconsiderate selfishness.*

- a) In this context, Paul stated three primary problems in their assembly and then supplied the solution to each one. It is hard to imagine that Paul would observe that brethren were getting inebriated in their assemblies and then not say another word about it!
- b) They were not getting drunk on intoxicating drink – they were eating common meal for social purposes in their assembly. It was in regard to this common meal that Paul said that one was “hungry” and “another is drunk.”
- c) Whatever they were doing in verse 21, Paul told them to do it at home – “What! Do you not have houses to eat and drink in?” If they were actually getting intoxicated in their assemblies, Paul would not tell them to do this at home!

8. *Once again, in this context, methyo is used in contrast to “hungry” and it means full or satiated.*

9. *Therefore, if these people were not literally inebriated, then there is nothing in the context that would even reference or touch the idea of social drinking – much less authorize it.*

#### **D. Authorizing the moderate by condemnation of the excess**

1. *For the sake of argument, even if we allowed that methyō means inebriated in this context, the passage still does not authorize social drinking. It would only reveal God’s disapproval of drunkenness.*

2. *The argument for social drinking suggests that social or moderate consumption of alcohol is authorized because Paul only condemned their drunkenness. Therefore he approved of drinking that was short of drunkenness.*

3. *This is a faulty method of interpretation that is essentially “Authorizing The Moderate By The Condemnation of The Excess”*

- a) Note the fallacy of this approach to authorization in our examination of 1 Timothy 3:3,8.

## **VI. 1 Timothy 5:23**

### **A. The text in context**

1. *(1Tim.5:23) No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for your stomach’s sake and your frequent infirmities.*

2. *This context is a part of Paul’s first letter to Timothy, instructing him as to how he ought to conduct himself in the house of God as he labored with the church in Ephesus.*

- a) Chapter 5 address a number of issues including the proper relationship with the members, church support of widows, the proper esteem for elders and church discipline.
- b) It is in the midst of these issues that Paul expresses concern for Timothy’s spiritual health (v.22) and his physical health (v.23).
- c) Many preachers have neglected their own physical health as they spend and are “spent” for the brethren’s sake. Paul wanted Timothy to pay attention to his own health so that he could remain effective in his work there in Ephesus.

3. *In this regard, Paul instructs Timothy to use a little wine for his stomach’s sake and frequent infirmities.*

### **B. Authority for social drinking?**

1. *If there were ever a passage of scripture that authorized moderate drinking of alcohol, this would seem to come the closest on the surface, since Paul tells Timothy to use a “little wine.”*

2. *There is no doubt that the word of God here authorizes the use of a little wine.*

3. *The important issue is what does this mean and what does it authorize specifically?*

### **C. Is the oinos in this passage alcoholic?**

1. *In order for this passage to authorize anything regarding social drinking, the ionos discussed in the passage would have to contain alcohol sufficient to cause intoxication with a reasonable amount of consumption.*

- a) Can the presence of alcohol be conclusively proven in this passage?

2. *While the meaning of ionos will be studied and discussed in another lecture, it is necessary to make some general observation about its meaning here.*

3. *Oinos is a general term for grape juice in the New Testament. It can be fermented or non-fermented grape juice.*

- a) The proper definition of the term does not necessitate the fermentation of the juice, nor presence of alcohol in the juice.
- b) This word is used in the N.T. to refer to both fresh grape juice (Matt.9:17) and also to alcoholic wine (Eph.5:18).

- c) The fermentation or non-fermentation of the juice does not inhere in the definition of the word.
  - d) We cannot assume that it is intoxicating. The definition does not prove nor determine if it is intoxicating – only the context can provide the proof.
4. *Could the ionos that Paul prescribed for Timothy's frequent infirmities be fresh grape juice?*
- a) Certainly it could. Oinos is a general term like "groceries" or "fruit."
  - b) Unfermented grape juice would easily fit the context.
  - c) The health benefits of grape juice have been clearly established.
  - d) Every valid health benefit attributed to alcoholic wine can also be equally attributed to grape juice.
  - e) It is clear that Timothy drank no grape juice because Paul stated that he drank "water only." It is just as likely that Paul instructed Timothy to drink a little grape juice for his stomach's sake and his frequent infirmities.
  - f) While there might be some points made as to why one believes that the oinos in this passage is alcoholic, it certainly cannot be proven by the context.
  - g) I certainly cannot prove that it was grape juice but I do not need to prove anything because I don't have the practice that needs to be authorized. The burden of proving is upon the one who seeks to authorize an item or action.
  - h) Since it cannot be proven either way – pure or alcoholic – then nothing can be authorized regarding social drinking.

#### **D. Specifics Limit The General**

1. *In a study of Bible authority, we learn that when God specifies a thing, all other things in that class are excluded.*
  - a) When God told Noah to build an ark, He specified gopher wood. This excluded all other kinds of wood in the construction of the ark. The thing specified was the ONLY thing authorized.
  - b) When God told the Israelites to observe the Passover, He specified that the animal slain was to be a lamb of the first year. All other animals were excluded.
2. *This is how we know that when God specifies "sing," He excludes "play." When God specifies "fruit of the vine" in the L.S., he excludes Pepsi.*
3. *This is sometimes referred to as "The Law of Exclusion."*
  - a) We observe this principle in contracts and judicial decrees regularly.
4. *In other words, God doesn't have to tell us everything that is disallowed. When He specifies a thing, all other things of its kind are excluded. We often use the following illustration:*
  - a) If a mother tells her son to go to the grocery store and buy a loaf of wheat bread and a gallon of whole milk, she has necessarily excluded white bread, 2% milk and any other grocery item in the store, and her son has no authority to buy anything other than the items that she specified.
  - b) Had she simply told him to buy some groceries, he would be at liberty to buy whatever he believed was needed. But if she specified the items to be bought, her son would be limited in the authority that he had to purchase.
5. *Even if we allow that the ionos in 1 Timothy 5:23 is alcoholic (which cannot be proven), we still have the issue of "The Law of Exclusion."*
  - a) This passage undeniably gives positive authority for the moderate consumption of ionos. But God specified that it was for "medicinal" use – "for your frequent infirmities."
  - b) So when God specifies that moderate consumption (a little for your stomach's sake) is for medicinal use, then all other moderate use (i.e. social) is excluded and without authority.
6. *Social drinking of intoxicating wine is excluded from the life of a Christian just as instrumental music is excluded from our worship to God.*
  - a) There is an authorized use of intoxicating wine and there is an authorized use of instrumental music. But the authorized use of the intoxicating wine is not social and the authorized use of instrumental music is not in worship to God.

#### **E. No N.T. authority for social drinking in 1 Timothy 5:13**

1. *The ONLY thing authorized here is the moderate medicinal use of ionos.*
2. *There is absolutely no authority commanded, stated, exemplified or implied in this passage.*

### **VII. The N.T. Command To Be "Sober"**

#### **A. Sober: nepho**

1. *Strong: g3525. νήφω nēphō; of uncertain affinity: to abstain from wine (keep sober), i. e. (figuratively) be discreet:— be sober, watch. AV (6)- be sober 4, watch 2; to be sober, to be calm and collected in spirit to be temperate, dispassionate, circumspect*
2. *Thayer: to be sober. To be calm and collected in spirit; to be temperate, dispassionate, circumspect.*

3. *BDAG: νήφω 1 aor. ἐνήψα (Soph., Pla., X. et al.; ins, pap) prim. 'be sober'; in the NT only fig. =be free fr. every form of mental and spiritual 'drunkenness', fr. excess, passion, rashness, confusion, etc. be well- balanced, self-controlled.*

4. *Vine: 1. nepho (νήφω, 3525) signifies "to be free from the influence of intoxicants"; in the NT, metaphorically, it does not in itself imply watchfulness, but is used in association with it, 1 Thess. 5:6, 8; 2 Tim. 4:5; 1 Pet. 1:13; 4:7, rv (kfv, "watch"); 5:8. Cf. eknepho and ananepho, under AWAKE, No. 3 and Note*

## B. Be "sober"!

1. *Throughout the N.T. the Lord calls upon us to "be sober" or to exemplify sobriety.*

- a) The very meaning of this word is "to be free from the influence of intoxicants." This word that appears so often in the description of a Christians character is wholly opposed to and in contradiction to a social drinker. How can a rational child of God argue for the consumption of intoxicants?
- b) Many would argue that a person is either sober or drunk, and if they are not drunk (a subjective and vague measure) then they are sober. But the definition of "sober" reveals that it means to "abstain from wine" and "to be free from the influence of intoxicants." One does not have to be too drunk to drive in order to lose the characteristic of sober (νήφω νεῦφῶ).
- c) It is more accurate to say that a person is either drunk or sober and that if one is not sober (abstaining from wine and free from the influence of intoxicants) he is drunk. The common determination of "drunk" is so subjective that it is impossible to rule one drunk unless they are stumbling and have lost complete control of themselves. But the Bible gives us a word - νήφω νεῦφῶ - that provides a clear and objective definition of "sober." Therefore it is more reasonable to say that if one is not "sober," he is "drunk."
- d) A person begins to be affected by ethyl alcohol as soon as it enters their body. Therefore a social drinker is not free from the influence of intoxicants and thus not "sober" as per the word used by the Holy Spirit.

## C. 1 Timothy 4:5

1. *(2Tim.4:5) But you be watchful in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, fulfill your ministry.*

- a) The word nepho is translated by the English word "watchful" here.

2. *The command is to be sober (nepho) "in all things"! That includes an evening dinner, a baseball game, a night at home with the family or even (and especially) when alone.*

3. *"In all things" we are "to be free from the influence of intoxicants."*

4. *This does not allow for any opportunity where a Christian would socially or moderately consume intoxicating wine or beverage and be moderately intoxicated.*

## D. 1Thess.5:6-8

1. *(1Thess.5:6-8) <sup>6</sup> Therefore let us not sleep, as others do, but let us watch and be sober. <sup>7</sup> For those who sleep, sleep at night, and those who get drunk are drunk at night. <sup>8</sup> But let us who are of the day be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and as a helmet the hope of salvation.*

2. *This passage emphasizes the need for Christians to be sober by exhorting us twice in the same context "to abstain from wine" and "to be free from the influence of intoxicants."*

3. *It is interesting that the word sober is used here in opposition to the state of mind that is under the influence of intoxicants – "drunk."*

4. *How can we argue for the liberty to be moderately influenced by intoxicants in a social setting or otherwise?*

## E. 1Pet.1:13; 4:7; 5:8

1. *(1Pet.1:13) Therefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and rest your hope fully upon the grace that is to be brought to you at the revelation of Jesus Christ;*

- a) The context of this passage exhorts us to be holy as God our Father is holy and to refuse to be conformed to the former lusts that we were ruled by before becoming a Christian.
- b) The consumption of alcohol is wholly antagonistic to this exhortation to "gird up the loins of our mind"! Alcohol progressively lets the mind blow in the breeze.
- c) There is no possible way that a person can "loosen up" with a social drink and be in submission to this passage of scripture!

2. *(1Pet.4:7) But the end of all things is at hand; therefore be serious and watchful in your prayers.*

- a) Nepho is translated "watchful" in this passage.
- b) Once again, alcohol progressively dulls our perception and watchfulness. It causes the serious to become jovial. Alcohol wars against the spiritual effort of a Christian to obey this command.

- c) It is interesting that this exhortation follows immediately after the context of 1 Peter 4:1-4 which addresses and forbids not only drunkenness, but also “potos” (drinking parties v.3) which is the equivalent of social drinking!
- d) Social drinking and sobriety are not congruent – they are in opposition to one another!
- 3. (1Pet.5:8) *Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil walks about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.*
  - a) Our spiritual survival depends on our sobriety – abstinence from wine; freedom from the influence of intoxicants – and the serious danger of our adversary demands that we be sober in all things at all times.
  - b) There is never a time when Satan is not seeking to devour us! Social drinking dulls the senses and opens the door for the roaring lion.

**F. No place for social drinking in the “sober” saint**

- 1. *The command to be “sober” necessarily implies that a Christian cannot drink intoxicants socially.*

**VIII. Other Scriptural Principles and Exhortations That Reject Social Drinking**

**A. Make no provision for the flesh to fulfill it’s lusts**

- 1. (Rom.13:13-14) <sup>13</sup> *Let us walk properly, as in the day, not in revelry and drunkenness, not in lewdness and lust, not in strife and envy.* <sup>14</sup> *But put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh, to fulfill its lusts.*
- 2. *Verse 14 tells us to make NO provision for the flesh to fulfill its lusts.*
  - a) We understand what it means to make provision for something – We make provision for guests who stay at our home – we provide for their needs to make their stay lengthy and pleasant.
  - b) The word translated “provision” is *pronoia* – *forethought, provident care or supply.*
  - c) Does alcohol or intoxicating beverage “make provision” for fleshly lusts or for spiritual desire?
- 3. *Verse 13 addresses the sins of revelry, drunkenness, lewdness, lust, strife and envy and then tells us to make NO provision for these things or any lust of the flesh.*
  - a) I cannot think of anything that “provides” for revelry, drunkenness, lewdness, lust and strife any more than what drinking alcohol does!
  - b) Of all the contributing factors, drinking alcohol makes possibly the single greatest (contribution, supply) provision for lying, filthy speech, sexual immorality, incest, adultery, physical and sexual abuse, etc.
- 4. *This inspired passage of scripture – expression of the mind and will of Christ – enjoins upon us the command to make NO provision for fleshly lust.*
  - a) How, in any honest mind, can we argue that drinking intoxicating beverage is authorized and that the only limit is a vague, subjective line of no drunkenness?
  - b) Every single sip of intoxicating beverage “provides” further and further for the lusts of the flesh! Drinking intoxicating beverage is the exact supply and provision for drunkenness!
- 5. *Social drinking, private drinking or any other consumption of alcohol makes provision for the flesh to fulfill its lusts and is clearly forbidden and prohibited here.*

**B. Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul**

- 1. (1Pet.2:11) *Beloved, I beg you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul,*
- 2. *Is the desire to drink intoxicating wine or beverage a fleshly or a spiritual desire?*
  - a) The desire to drink intoxicating drinks is absolutely a desire of the flesh so it fits the first part of the equation.
- 3. *Does the consumption of alcohol “war against the soul”?*
  - a) When considering the statistics, facts, and connection between alcohol and drunk driving, filthy speech, sexual immorality, rape, spousal abuse, child abuse, alcoholism, further substance abuse, spiritual demise, etc., no reasonable mind can argue that alcohol does not war against one’s soul.
  - b) How can we read passages like Prov.20:1; 23:29-35; 31:3-7 and try to deny that alcohol wars against the soul!
  - c) I cannot think of many things that would war against the soul more than the alluring and addictive nature of intoxicating drink.
- 4. *Intoxicating drink fits every part of the equation given in 1Pet.2:11 and therefore we are to “abstain” from it.*
- 5. *Not only is social drinking without divine authority and thus sinful, it is forbidden by necessary implication in 1 Peter 2:11.*

## **I. "Test Results"**

**A. Having "tested" the proof-texts, I submit to you that they all fail to authorize the moderate consumption of intoxicating beverage based on one or more of the following reasons**

- 1. Assuming intoxicating wine without it being proven*
- 2. Assuming that silence gives consent*
- 3. Authorizing the moderate by the condemnation of the excess or extreme*
- 4. Failing to allow specifics to govern and limit the general*

**B. There is no positive divine N.T. authority for social drinking**

**C. Acting without authority is "lawlessness" (anomia) and is sinful (Matt.7:21-23)**

## **II. Social Drinking is Forbidden By Necessary Implication**

**A. The requirement of sobriety is transgressed when we drink socially or moderately**

**B. Social drinking makes provision for the flesh to fulfill its lust, wars against the soul and is thus prohibited from the life of a Christian**

**C. Rejecting God's expressed will and transgressing His commands is sinful**

**D. Social drinking is sinful**