

Par. 8.
Paul and Allegedly the Sabbath
The Three “Parallel” Scriptures

No translation of the so-called three “parallel” Scriptures considered here could be trusted. Traditional translations should rather be seen for the **manipulations of the text** that they are to suite the Church and its **observance of Sunday**. The Church is disobedient in offering *Corban* through Sunday-observance in the **Sabbath’s** stead. In the same proud spirit it parades **disrespect for the Word** with translation of passages bearing on the Sabbath and **Sunday** issue: Concerning the chronology of the crucifixion and resurrection, Mk.15:42, Mt.27:57, Lk.23:48, Mt.28:1; about allegedly the keeping of the First Day, Acts 20:7, Jn.20:19; about allegedly the keeping of the Sabbath, these “parallel” texts, Ro.14:5-6, Col.2:16-17 and Gal.4:10. The time is past that one could sympathise with the Church for its renderings and interpretations with respect to these passages. The Church no longer can be accidentally mistaken. Its attempts to present the Scriptures’ own meaning in these Scriptures are not honest, but regularly are calculated misrepresentations.

Wrote Tyndale, “*I take God, which alone seeth the heart, to record to my conscience, beseeching Him that my part be not in the blood of Christ, if I wrote of all that I have written throughout all my books, aught of an evil purpose ... or to stir up any false doctrine or opinion in the Church of Christ ... As concerning all I have translated ... I beseech all men to read it for that purpose I wrote it even to bring them to the knowledge of the Scripture. And as far as the Scripture approve it, so far to allow it; and if in any place the Word of God disallow it, then to refuse it, as I do before our Saviour Christ and his congregation.*” Quoted from J.H. Merle d’Aubigné, *The Reformation in England*, Volume Two, p. 190/191, Banner of Truth 1972.

How sad then, that **it has become a safe rule for interpretation of our passages of Scripture, to look for just the opposite meaning their accepted translations offer**. Thus for Romans 14:5-7 look for the “weak” to be the “strong” and the “strong” to be the “weak”. Look for the problem to be a Christian one and not a Jewish. Don’t look for the Sabbath, but for “food and drink”. For Colossians 2:15-17 again don’t look for the Sabbath, but for “food and

drink”. Look for the judging to come under Paul’s judgement and not the ones usually judged. Look for Paul’s condoning and defence of those who keep the Sabbath, and not their condemnation! For Galatians 4:9-10 look for the problem to be a heathen one and not a Christian. Look for Sunday and not the Sabbath as the “weak and beggarly principle”! Look for the problem to be one of backsliding to **idoltrous** principles and not to **Old Testament** practices.

8.1.
Romans 14:5
8.1.1.

Freedom of Discipleship

Dr W.D. Jonker’s caption for the section Romans 14:1 to 15:13 reads, “*Love and the Weak Brother*”.

The Old Afrikaans Bible (1933) summarises the message of Romans 14, “*Forbearance with the weak in faith*”.

The NAB’s heading is, “*Do not condemn your brother*”.

But the Authorised Version, - **even it**, comes with, “**Limits of Christian Liberty**”!

E.C. Hoskyns’ “*impression*” of Karl Barth, “*Die Krisis des freien Lebensversuchs*” (*Der Römerbrief*). Reverend Robert A. Lotzer calls the “*problem of division*” in the Church at Rome, “*the Crisis of human freedom and detachment*”.

In this “*krisis*” of Christian freedom Romans 14 speaks about, the danger exists **to lord it over** one’s neighbour and **not to allow one’s neighbour the freedom one, as a Christian, claims for oneself**.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters Paul’s concern is not **only** about the **individual** freedom of forgiven man, but also not **only** about mutual **congregational** respect and compassion. Paul’s view and understanding of the congregational acceptance and support of one another reflects his **broader concept wherein God adopts and justifies the weak** – wherein **God** takes ownership and the **only Holy Lord** justifies **all, sinners, unconditionally. If God so love us**, how should not we love one another? If **God** does not condemn the weak, how could **we**? If **we** (who, when saved were sinners and although saved are sinners still) are righteous in the sight of **God** because justified in **Jesus the**

Lord, how could we judge **one another**? How could we judge one another on “**minor issues**” or “**grudgingly**” (14:1)? “**Therefore thou art inexcusable, o man, whosoever thou art that judgest. For wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. For thou that judgest doest the same things ... things worthy of death**”, 2:1 and 1:32! “Judging” and “despising” one another – **Christians** doing so – betray **pride and jealousy, sins, “worthy of death**”. Then to judge one another on things like “food” and the “regard” for “days”, things **not** ‘worthy of death’ (14:1, “*adiaphora*”: “**trivialities**” / “*indifferent things*”), is unimaginable!

Commentators, in fact, the **Church, today**, no different than the Church at Rome, focus on “**foods**” and **factions** for no **purpose** but to **judge** people who “regard” and “esteem” “days”, and to **despise** people who do not even “regard” or “esteem” “days”, but keep the **Sabbath!** But Paul draws the attention inescapably to the **essential sin** that so to speak is worthy of his plainest condemnation – no other sin than is condemned by the “greatest” Freedom Charter, the Law to “love thy neighbour as thyself”. (Chapter 13)

“Paul’s exhortation ends – and its ending concludes the whole Pauline ‘conversation’ – with a warning to all who find themselves in entire agreement with what has been said and are persuaded that their own opinions have been fully confirmed. Once again these busy hands are held back; once again the energy of partisans is damped down, and their oratory interrupted. ... Once again it is the fact of the existence of our fellow men – the ethical problem – by which we are brought face to face with the great disturbance”. (Barth, *Romans*)

Paul discusses “food and drink” and the Christian “regard” of “days” and **discovers** “*the great disturbance*”! The “food and drink” and “regard” of “days” is nothing wrong with or, rather, was nothing wrong with. Even the different **opinions** on these things should be accepted and be tolerated in good Christian spirit **because of the moment in history. Fellow Christians then** allowed one another no **free** “regard”. They “**judged**” and “**despised**” each other’s **deeds, motives** and **sincerity**, missing the Freedom of being servant of Christ, passing by the fact of His having come and died and having been raised ... “for us”, not even seeing it! Fellow Christians **today** act no different.

The Church’s was a **controversial** spirit. **Distrust** of fellow Church members’ sincerity and genuineness of confession and faith lay beneath the **spirit of judgement** that ruled in the Congregation at Rome. **‘You are not a (good) Christian** if you **don’t** eat the meat of our traditional feast-meals’, the one party challenged. **‘You are not a (good) Christian** if you **do**’, the other party retorted. “**You quibble and fight amongst yourselves**”, says Paul. “**You judge and despise**”, which is not Christ’s way. Paul in **Christian spirit** reminds the Church, “**He is grateful to God** who while regarding the day regards it to the Lord’s honour, and while eating eats to the Lord’s honour”, 14:6. **You may not despise!** ... **you may not judge!** ... **God** receives and accepts the weak. Who are **you** who judge the **Master’s** servant? The servant stands with his **Master!** Yea, the weak brother **shall be kept upright because God** makes him stand! ... We are the **Lord’s**. Christ **died and rose** again in order **to be Lord** of his own, dead or alive (weak or strong). **Why** then do you judge your brother and humiliate him? We shall **all** stand before the judgement seat of **Christ** as it is written, As I live says the Lord, every knee shall bow to **Me** and every tongue shall confess (**Me**) **God** (verses 10-11). Each of us will give account, of **himself, to God** (not on behalf of anyone else and not **to** the strong in the Church, 14:12)! **Stop condemning** one another and rather take a stand that no one shall be the cause of his brother’s offence! (13)

Paul **accepts** the state of affairs that the Church differentiates and “**regards**” **some days above others**. He has no word to say against the practice. The fact that Paul could live with it shows **of what nature** the “estimation / regard” of certain days was. It was “Lawful”, it was in accordance with the principle of love that is – the very principle the Church **violated by judging one another**. The “estimation / regard” of certain days was the **usual** and happened according to the **custom** of **Christian Faith**, but Christian Faith was weak and human, deplorable and violent, brother despising and judging brother.

“*The problem of division*” even, was only **symptomatic** of the real problem of **pride** and **want of love**. Paul’s **uncompromising condemnation** cannot be overlooked. But Paul’s is **not** a condemnation of the **regarding of days or the regard for days or of the eating of certain foods**; his is the condemnation of Christians’

judging and despising one another. There is no justification for this **great sin**. This **sin** was “*beggary*” because it reveals the Church’s **basic want of love - the breaking of God’s Law**.

Believers were divided over “**food and drink**”, no doubt. But they were not thus divided over “days” and the “esteem” of days though. “Esteem of **days**” wasn’t their **sin** or as much as a **symptom** of their **real** sickness, the **sin** of **self-“esteem”**. Nevertheless, “food and drink” were symptomatic of their sickness. “Food and drink”, was made the **excuse** for **division**, while the **cause** of division, **haughtiness** – was **the real sin**.

Every faction at Rome “regarded” whatever they “regarded” and “esteemed” “**unto the Lord (Jesus’ honour)**”. **Or that was what Paul supposed** every faction **would!** But did they? No! They at Rome “regarded” and “esteemed” “days” **unto lord Self** as they ate and drank or abstained meticulously **unto lord Self!**

Paul’s tolerance of the **observance of “days”** astonishes not. He accepts a **fact**, the fact of the Christian Church’s “regard” and “esteem” for “days”. He shows **no antipathy** towards the practice. **But he waits no moment** to denounce in simplest language the **actual** malady. “**Who art thou?**” “Days” are not **intended** for **self-“esteem”** and “food” for a “**stumbling block**”. They are meant unto charity and humble faith. The problem lay with **man** – with the **Church** – with the **heart**. Nothing was wrong with the whole Church’s “regard” for and “esteem” of “days” **had the brethren at Rome only “regarded” and “esteemed” one another!**

8.1.1.1.

“Free Indeed”, John 8:36

We Christians of **later** centuries have no right to judge or despise the Church of **Paul’s day** for the “regard” and “esteem” it paid its “days”. We should have sympathy with them and show them the same charity that Paul pleaded for when he wrote his letter to the Romans. We stand under greater obligation not to judge or despise them because we today stand at greater distance and can discern clearer the obsolescence of “regarded” and “esteemed” “days”. **Thanks to the passing of time** we are able to obtain a truer perspective on Christ’s fulfilment of all “days” that could possibly have had “regard” and “esteem” for their cultural as

well as religious value in the early times of a predominantly Jewish Church. But we cannot accept the following as a confession of uncompromised faith in Jesus Christ who for the believer is the end as well as the meaning of all things:

*“Exiled, without an altar and without sacrifice, the Jewish people felt a deep need to remember and rehearse the great things Jehovah had done for them in days past. They clung to the hope that once again He might do marvellous things for his people. It is fitting that this hope should continue to burn in the hearts of God’s chosen people, for ‘the gifts and calling of God are without repentance’ (Romans 11:29). Against all odds, through centuries of oppression and struggle, the Jewish people survived. They nurtured the memories of the past and fervently looked for a future deliverance. Each Jewish family, each small community, bore the responsibility of keeping a spark of faith alive in the darkness and despair of exile. The holidays and traditions – links in the chain of survival – became more important than ever. So the celebration of ‘Seasons of our deliverance’ (Passover) took on new meaning and a new setting.” (Ceil and Moische Rosen, *Christ in the Passover*, p. 60)*

Jesus Christ is the altar and sacrifice of God, the great thing Jehovah had done, the hope, gift and calling of God without repentance.

Jesus Christ burns in the hearts of God’s chosen people. The memories of the past are Jesus Christ crucified and resurrected.

Jesus Christ is fervently looked for as the future deliverance. Each Christian family, each small Christian community bears the responsibility of keeping a spark of faith alive in the darkness and despair of exile.

The holidays and traditions **no longer** are links in the chain of survival but **Christ Jesus** is the Life and the Way, the hope of glory, the survival of his chosen People, the **Church**.

Christ Jesus has become more important than ever. So the celebration of ‘Seasons of our deliverance’ – “God’s Rest” – has taken on new meaning and a new setting because it took on new meaning and a new setting in Jesus Christ being resurrected from the dead ... “in the Sabbath”!

8.1.1.2.
A Most Practical Solution to the Threat of
Christian Freedom

Paul **proposes a most practical solution** to the issue at Rome, and his proposal leaves no doubt what the **real** trouble was. Paul proposes **compromise**. His proposal involves habits or rather customs – customs of **food, simply: “It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine** nor to do anything whereby your brother may stumble or might be offended or might be weakened.”

If “**regard**” of “**days**” had been “anything whereby thy brother might stumble or be offended or weakened”, why doesn’t Paul **include “days”** with the **specific things** whereby “thy brother might stumble or be offended or weakened” – why doesn’t he **include “days”** with “**to eat flesh**” and “**to drink wine**”? **Because no one** was offended, weakened or led to stumble by the Church’s “**regard**” of “**days**”, Paul does not include it with “**to eat flesh**” and “**to drink wine**”. The issue wasn’t “**days**”, **or, about “days”**. The issue **wasn’t even** “meat” – food, **itself**, but **about** food! It was **about** food, **because**, the **differences** revolved around foods, and it revolved around foods, **because**, deep down **beneath the spewing crater** there was the **seething bowls of the earth**. “Food” was the appearance; lack of love the cause.

Verse 22 tells about the **inner** sickness, “**Hast thou faith?**” Faith isn’t to **parade** and **compare**. “Have it **to thyself before God!**” “Happy is he that **condemns** not **himself** in that thing which he **admires** (in himself).” Christian **faith** is not **affectation**. “Charity **suffers long** and is **kind**; charity **envies** not, is not **jealous**; charity **vaunts** not itself, does not **intimidate**; charity is not **puffed up**”, “but **bears the infirmities of the weak**”. **Pride** affects one’s own **condemnation!**

The problem at Rome is **universal and timeless**. It is judged in the light of Romans 13:8. If **we of today** lived then, we with **our proud heart** would have done no better than the poor Christians of Rome. Paul pleaded for one thing only: Remember how God loved you and so love one another. God when He saved you did not judge and condemn **you or us** no matter how low He had to reach for **you or us**. Don’t judge and condemn one another. Keep your “days” and make “feast” and everything will be just fine as long as it all is “to the honour of the Lord”, and you “thank God” in humble

remembrance of your own lost state when He found and saved you. *Cf.* 1Cor.5:7-8.

Jewish scruples and parochialism is not Paul’s concern. For Paul the whole problem revolves around one’s **motive**, whether one’s “**beliefs**” - “*persuasions*”, are to the **honour of God** and to the best interest of peace and **brotherly harmony**. And the **life’s situation** of Paul’s time was a Christianity that on the one hand was still in the process of accommodating itself ‘theologically’ to **New Testament** customs and concepts. On the other hand the **life’s situation** of Paul’s time was a Christianity that was still in the process of accommodating itself **socially!** Jews and Gentiles actually became one People of Jesus Christ, which sounds nice and easy today but at the time spelled innumerable obstacles to **unity**. Part of Paul’s and the Church’s life’s situation of course was **human nature**. Anybody disagreeing is judged. Paul says, No! A Christian is **servant of his Lord Jesus**, and a judging spirit is most undesirable in a situation of such diverse lineage, tradition, culture and opinion! (The scene today still exists.)

The weak as the strong of whom Paul speaks in Romans 14 were God’s Kingdom. They all stood with the Lord. Christ was the King of all, of the strong as well as of the weak. The problem with the Church at Rome was that they could not or would not accept the fact. The one regarded himself better than the other - was **jealous of another’s salvation!** The one couldn’t stand the idea that this one or that one could belong to the Church of Christ. **Their sin was the sin of the Church today**. Paul’s concern is with deep-rooted **self-righteousness**, the source of **arrogance**. Paul addresses these **inherent human propensities** manifested in the Church at Rome through **practical congregational issues**. Some (in effect everybody) take upon themselves the **prerogative of Christ and act the judge** over fellow-believers. In the Kingdom of God, “**righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit**” is the antipode of “judging” and “belittling” one another. Paul exposes and points out directly the causal source of **resentment** in the Church at Rome - God is pleased with the **external** – with “**meat and drink**”, but is **offended** by the **central** – with **pride and prejudice**.

**8.1.1.2.1.
The “Weak”**

Paul has in mind the conflict **within the Church** when he calls on the brethren, “**Don’t avenge yourselves**” but “**him that is weak** in the faith **receive ye ...**”. “Weak” may indicate the **minority in the Church**. If the problem at Rome manifested itself through **Jewish custom**, then naturally the lines between opposing **parties** should be drawn between **Jew and Gentile**. But Paul does not suppose **only two** parties, and he doesn’t suppose any party to **exclusively consist** of Jews or Gentiles. **Paul labelled no “party” “Gentile” or “Jewish”, “weak” or “strong”**.

In **chapter 14** Paul supposes persons known as and being called the “**weak**”. He mentions **two distinctive preferences** of the “weak”. The “**weak**” do **not** eat “**flesh**” and do “**drink wine**”. The “**weak**” are associated with the eating or not eating of certain “**foods**” / “**meats**” **and the use of wine**. No “**weak**” person or party is mentioned or suggested that “*does not drink wine*” / “*abstain from wine*” (Lotzer). On the contrary, those who “do **not** eat” are **identified as those who “drink wine”!** (14:21)

Although **indirectly**, Paul through these two distinctive practices of the “weak” leaves no room for doubt that **they also, like** their “opposition”, “**regarded**” and “**esteemed**” “**days**”. The “**weak**” “regard **all days** / **every day** (alike)”:

<u>15:1</u>	<u>We who are strong</u>	<u>Those who are weak</u>
<u>14:2</u>	One believes that he may eat all things	Another who is weak eats herbs (only)
<u>3</u>	Who eats must not despise who eats not	Who eats not must not judge who eats
<u>5</u>	One esteems one day above another / others	Another esteems every day
	It (may therefore be) good	
<u>21</u>	(for him who with regard to the days eats flesh), to eat no flesh (at all)	and (for him who with regard to the days drinks wine), to drink no wine (at all)

Paul’s remedy for the conflict-situation is **compromise**. His advice for the **strong**: “**Don’t eat flesh**”;

his advice for the **weak**: “**Don’t drink wine**”. (He tells nobody not to “regard” “days”!) **Why and when** should one not eat flesh or drink wine? **When and because** “It is good not to do anything whereby **thy brother stumbles or is offended or is weakened** ... for whatsoever is **not done out of faith** is sin!” (14:21 and 23) In First Corinthians Paul says, “I will not eat flesh as long as the world stands **lest I make my brother to offend!**” (Ro.8:13) **How** would the brother offend, that is, transgress? By also to eat and also to drink? No, because if not an offence for the one it cannot be an offence for the other. The brother is made to offend being **misled to judge and despise! It is the least one can do** for the sake of peace and reconciliation **not to tempt unto doubt** thy brother - for “what is not done of faith is sin”. Listen, Paul pleads, I wanted to visit you, “but I wish I by the will of God may come to you with joy and may with you be refreshed!” (15:32) *I want to experience with you your freedom and brotherly Christian love. Don’t spoil it for me. Get your problems sorted out in the spirit of Christ our Lord before I come! What is the Kingdom of God? It isn’t what you eat when you worship but how you eat. Do you honour the Lord Jesus Christ with gratitude in your hearts toward God? That is the Kingdom of God, joy and peace in the Holy Spirit! Or do you fall out of line with God’s Kingdom and eat with malice in your hearts and spoil the whole meaning and message of the “days” you “regard” with your eating?*

8.1.1.2.1.1.

The Weak the Weak

“The same items that the WEAK abstained from were the very same that Daniel and his friends chose to abstain from (Dan. 1:8-16). Both groups abstained from meats and wine. Could it be that this group of Jewish Christians, living in Rome, thought of themselves as once again in exile under Babylonian control?” (Reverend Robert A. Lotzer)

Christians in Rome – Jewish Christians – experienced an **identity crisis**. They felt strangers in a hostile country, firstly as Christians and then as Jews. Paul had to address an issue of **Christian** nature, and not of “*Mosaic*” nature so to speak. Jewish scruples weren’t the problem but **bad Christian allegiance**. What Paul noticed in the Church at Rome didn’t look like the Church, the **Kingdom of God!**

“Both groups abstained from meats and wine”, Lotzer suggests. The whole issue in Rome revolved around the

Christians' mutual differences exactly over the fact that some "abstained" while others **did not**. So, No, *both groups did not abstain from meats and wine. The items that the WEAK abstained from were NOT the very same that Daniel and his friends chose to abstain from.* Daniel and friends abstained through **strength of faith**; the "weak" of the Congregation in Rome abstained through **weakness of faith**. The "weak" did in fact not eat "flesh", but not because they were "strong" or vegetarians or Nazarites, but **because the "flesh" was associated with the "days" and because the wine they drank was associated with the same "days" they regarded.** The "weak" among the Christians ate no "flesh" but they **drank wine** and abstained not from wine as did Daniel and friends. Daniel and friends didn't have to do with the "regard" of "days". The Christians' reason for not eating was not **idolatry or gluttony** (the Babylonian King's table) **but pride. Christians - Jew and Gentile - not heathen** like in the case of Daniel and his friends - "esteemed" these "days" and "ate" the associated "food" – or abstained **and in their practice took such a pride that they judged and despised any Church members who might not do things so perfectly as they.**

8.1.1.2.1.2.

The Weak Divided

"Him that is **weak** in the faith receive ye, without grudging!" There is **no break between verses one and two.** Paul continues without interruption of any kind, "Him that is weak in the faith **receive ye!** And, without grudging ... because **one** believes he may eat all things, **another**, being weak, eats vegetables". The participle *asthenohn* – "being weak", in verse 2, relates to the clause, "**him receive** ye that is weak in the faith!" **Just so** does the clause, "one believes he may eat **all** things", relate to the clause, "**him receive** ye that is weak in the faith!" The criterion for "being a weak in the faith" is neither to be a Gentile, nor to be a Jew. The criterion for "being a weak in the faith" also is **not to only eat vegetables.** One may eat **all things** and **still** be one of the **weak.** The crux of the matter is, "him that is weak in the faith **receive ye!**" **regardless** whether he eats all things or only vegetables. He is weak, **and therefore**, should be accepted among his brethren! That is how Christians should behave! Don't think you're so good because "you have faith – keep it to yourself!" "Accept the one who does **not** have as much

faith as **you** have – who, in comparison with **you**, is weak in the faith!" **That** is the Kingdom of God, the freedom of discipleship! Weakness or strength in **God's** Kingdom isn't measured to **anything** else, like food and wine. Paul speaks of them whom the Church general - "**ye**", must receive! The ultimate criterion to be a "weak" is to be a "weak in the **faith**"! "You – Jewish and Gentile – brethren, should receive the weak – Gentile and Jewish – brethren, whether they are Jew or Gentile **without grudging, because they** Jewish and Gentile **are weak** in the faith! You should **allow them their freedom and preferences as you** Jewish and Gentile brethren **allow yourselves yours.** If the weak Jew or Gentile brother chooses to eat all the food on your tables of feasting, **let him eat!** If he chooses only to eat the trimmings because he is weak in the faith then **let him!**" So Paul supposes **both** parties, both **Jews and Gentiles, both Christians**, to eat **all** things, but **also** acknowledges those (**perhaps** Gentile) **Christians** who for reasons of faith, prefer **not** to eat all things.

8.1.1.2.1.3.

The Weak the Strong

"The one person", at the common feast table, "ate all", says Paul. But "the other", at the common feast table, "only ate the 'green trimmings' ". Paul leaves one without a clear-cut impression of who the weak and who the strong are. But he doesn't leave one in the dark concerning their **wrongs.** The weak **hesitatingly**, even perhaps **hypocritically**, **partake** of the "food". But then again, perhaps **defiantly**, the "weak" "**drink wine**" while the "opposition" drinks no wine ('but only' Passover grape juice)! Paul recommended that the "weak" should rather not drink wine lest they offend their brethren or cause them to offend. In 14:23 he says, "whatsoever is (done) **not of faith** or not "**fully convinced**" "**to the honour of the Lord**", is sin". How much more is something that is done **to** "offend", **sin** - the sin **both** 'parties' at Rome were guilty of? **Weak in the faith but strong in defiance!**

Paul could have used the description "**weak**" in a **stronger** sense than merely **sympathetically** and thus could have sided further with the "strong". He could have meant, *These peevish or offensive Christians only eat the herbs served on the tables. But we the stronger in the faith (who are the stronger for our charity and meekness), should*

nevertheless not judge, despise or reject them for it. We must still support them in their weak and “dubious” (14:1) faith so that they will have greater freedom and not be fettered by “trivialities” and “doubtful disputations”.

Paul unambiguously states that the weak “drink wine”. He may imply that they do so **to the annoyance** of the “strong” who ate and drank “all things”. Not only the strong dominated and intimidated. The weak were as proficient in offending. But both “weak” and “strong” were **so easily** offended. They were **equally resentful**, they equally **violently exchanged reproach!** The traditional portrait of the pitiable **weaklings** is as far from reality as the same tradition’s portrait of the “weak and beggarly” **villains** (who kept the Sabbath).

8.1.1.2.2.

The “Strong”

We have said above that the clause “one believes he may eat **all** things” relates to the clause “**him receive** ye that is weak in the faith!” But since Paul **unambiguously calls** “the one who does **not** eat flesh but **only** vegetables” the “**weak**”, it is just logical that “he who **eats**”, must be the “**strong**”. That should imply that Paul meant the phrase “he who **eats**” to refer to the **subject** of the clause, “him that is weak in the faith receive **ye!**” Paul does not in chapter 14 call “ye”, the “strong”; the word “strong” does not occur in the fourteenth chapter. It only appears in chapter **15** when Paul has **finished** speaking about foods and days.

Paul classes himself with the “strong”, “**we** who are strong”. The “**strong**”, supposed in chapter **fourteen**, “while regarding the day, regards it to the Lord’s honour”. The “strong”, believes he may “eat any of the food”. The “strong” **abstains** from the use of wine – both things according to the “regard” of the “days” (15:1). But that is not so important. The “strong” – as also the weak – must be “**honestly persuaded**” about their preferences of “days” - **that they “to the honour of the Lord”** Jesus Christ, “regard” it. **That is important.**

8.1.1.2.2.1.

The Jews the “Strong”!

When Paul says, “Let **us** not judge one another”, he means, ‘*Us, the strong, Jewish servants of the Lord and now as Christian Jews, servants to both Jewish and Gentile believers*’. **Jews regard certain days** above others, **Jews eat**

foods that had become tradition, and **Jews don’t drink wine** when it comes to Feast of Passover and Days of Unleavened Bread. Paul clearly argues and acts from the standpoint of the **Jew**.

To infer that Paul supposed a grouping of persons who were known as the “strong” is sound logic. They ate “all things”, that is, all the “food” served for the meal of the (Jewish feast) table. Christians – Jews **and** Gentiles – shared “all foods”, but it may naturally be assumed that mostly the **Jews – Christian Jews** – “observed” their festal “meats” **unscrupulously!** They distinguished not between “flesh” and “trimmings” / “greens” / “garnish” / “vegetables”. The **Jews**, the “**scrupulous**”, **were the unscrupulous!** The **Jews** – the **alleged** “weak” Jews – were the “**strong**”!

Paul salutes his readers in the letter to the Romans, “**All** that be **in Rome**”, 1:7. “I long to see you” says he “... that I may be comforted ... by the mutual faith of both of **you** and **me** ... that I might have some fruit among **you** also even **as** among the **other Gentiles**. I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians – to both the wise (Greeks) and **unwise** (non-Greeks like the Jews)”, 1:11 to 14. It appears Paul addresses a Congregation of **Gentiles**. Paul addresses the Church of Rome as a Gentile Congregation **because of its geographic and demographic position**. The Church is a foreign, “Gentile” Church because in a foreign, Gentile **country and city**. It is clear from the **letter** that Rome’s was actually a Congregation consisting of mostly **Jews**. Even if the word “**other**” – *loipos*, is **omitted** from the clause, “that I might have some fruit among **you** also even **as** among the (**other**) **Gentiles**” (1:13), it conveys the idea that Paul addresses a **Jewish** Congregation. *Loipos* quite often is almost meaningless and could simply be translated, “**those**”, as in Phi.4:3, 1Th.4:13, Eph.4:17, Gl.2:13, 1 Cor.13:2. In fact, if translated “others” an opposite impression might be created, as in 1Th.4:13, “I would not have you to be ignorant ... even as **others who have no hope**” which implies the Thessalonians **also** are supposed as if without hope.

Paul in Romans 14 and 15 **as a Jew identifies** with the addressees. The fact that Paul discusses “days” and “meats” corresponding to the practices of the “**Jewish**” **feasts** shows that the addressees were **Jewish** Christians. That the Congregation at Rome consisted mostly of Jews is confirmed **historically**. When Nero banned the Jews from Rome he

made no distinction between them and the Christians. Historians estimate there were more Jews in Rome at the time than in Jerusalem. What contingent of the Jews was Christian is impossible to say except that the Christians made a greater impact than the Jews upon the history of the Empire. From these Scriptures it is inevitable to conclude that the relations between **Jews** and the state also existed between the **Christian Jews** and the state – between the **Church** and the state. The fact was that when the Jews were expelled from Rome **no distinction** was made between **Jews general** and **Christians general**. The Church – **the whole Christian Church** – was expelled **with the Jews**.

In 14:1 Paul admonishes, “Him that is weak in the faith receive **ye**”. Who are “ye”? They were **conversant with the Law**, 13:9-10 – the **Jews**. Then Paul addresses them in 12:19, “Dearly beloved, **avenge** not yourselves”. In 13:1 Paul warns them, Let every soul be subject unto the **higher powers**”. That pictures the **contemporary historic situation** in Rome of the **Jews** and tense relations with the state authorities. Paul tells the **Jews**, the “**strong**”, *submit to the civil powers and don’t try to be so strong and avenge yourselves on the authorities*.

8.1.1.2.2.2.

A Congregation of Jews the Majority

The Christian community in Rome as a whole found itself in a **minority**-position in a singular way. “Let every soul be subject to the **higher powers** (of state).” They were not only of comparatively **few** numbers (Not so **few** compared to Jewish populations elsewhere – it is estimated the Jews counted about 60,000 in Rome.) but also of little or no political **power**. The **Christians as Jews** not only demographically formed a minority, but as **Christians** they formed a minority within a minority of **unbelieving Jews**. They were **estranged** from their **kin**. They were insignificant in **every respect**. In such an **isolated and vulnerable** community as in Rome each Jewish Christian thought it his sacred duty to protect his nationality and cultural heritage, as he thought best.

After having reasoned about “**man**” without distinction, 2:1 to 16, Paul in verse 17 returns to addressing the **Congregation** ... this time as if they are **Jews!** “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and resteth in the law ... an instructor of the **foolish** (Gentiles)”, 2:17, 20. “The Name of God is

blasphemed among the Gentiles through **you** (Jews)”, verse 24! In 3:9 Paul **contrasts** himself and the Congregation with Gentiles: “What then, are **we** (**Jews**) better than **they** (the Gentiles)? No! ... Because we have proved to both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin”.

The first time Paul mentions the word “strong” is in **15:1**. He **associates** with the “strong”, “Let **us** ...”. “We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbour for good and to edification”. Paul **repeats** ... just **in other words**, what he has said in **14:1**, “him that is weak in the faith receive ye”!

Paul speaks as one of the “strong” “in the **faith**” regardless of **nationality**, regardless of “**food**”, regardless of “**days**”! But he undoubtedly also speaks as one of those “strong” in the faith of “**the fathers**” – the **Jews!** “Christ **also** received **us** (**Jews**) to the glory of God” ... “therefore receive ye one another (Jew and Gentile to the glory of God)” (15:7) as ye “eat” and “regard days” “to the honour of the Lord” (14:6). “Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the **circumcision** for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto **the** (Jews’) **fathers**, that the **Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy**”, 15:8-9.

Paul says this thing has come true. Just look at them as they regard days and eat all things or only vegetables, “**to the honour of the Lord (Jesus Christ) and thank God!**” “I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God ...”, 14:16. Undoubtedly, Paul siding with the “**strong**”, sides with the **Jews**, and the **Jews** as the “**strong**” are to receive the **Gentiles**, and receive them as the “**weak**”! **The reverse of the traditional interpretation!**

Now if that is true – which it is – then the “strong” “regard” “and “esteem” “days”; then it is not “weak” or a “beggarly principle” and a “denial of Christ” to “regard” and “esteem” “days”. Then “to the honour of the Lord unto gratitude to God” to “regard” and “esteem” “days” is an act of the “strong” **and** of the “weak in the faith”, who, while being “**weak** in the faith” are “**in the faith**” notwithstanding! Whether as “one” of the “strong” or as “one” of the “weak” is not the deciding factor, **but “to stand with his Lord”**: to be “**in the faith**”!

“**We** then who are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves ... For even Christ (the Strongest, the Only Strong) pleased not Himself, but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached Thee (o God) fell on Me ... Now the God of patience and consolation grant you (brethren) **to be like-minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus**. (“Who “took our infirmities upon Himself”, Mt.8:17.) That ye may with one mind and one mouth (in worship) glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefor receive ye one another (to the feast tables), as Christ received **even us** to the glory of God.” (15:1-7) Paul lets speak the spirit of Christ loudest ... Do as Christ did one to another! He also found Himself in a “far country” He was “a man of sorrow; He was despised and acquainted with grief”. He never hit out, but turned the other cheek. That is what the issue in the Congregation at Rome was about in the eyes of Paul.

Paul identifies with the strong **and with the weak**: “**We** who are strong” are you, fellow Jews, and I, Paul. But, “**Christ** received **even us**”, us, the weakest and “greatest of sinners”. If Christ, the Strong, received “even us”, how should we not “receive one another”? Who is not weak? Who can say that he and his kind are strong or the only strong? If then there can be no strong that are not the weak and no weak who cannot be the strong, how could **anyone be judged and despised** because of his “sincere conviction” that **what he does he does “to the honour of the Lord”**?

8.1.2.1. The Text

We who are strong

One believes that he
may eat all things
Who eats must not
despise who eats not
One esteems one day
above another

Everyone must in his own heart be sure **while he regards the day**

that he regards it to (the honour of) the Lord –
he who eats,
(that he) eats to (the
honour of) the Lord
thanking God!

For none of us lives to himself and no man dies to himself, for
whether we live or die, (in the
end) we die (to give account) to the Lord. But we, whether we
live or die, belong to the Lord!

**If be grieved with thy
meat**

destroy not him with thy meat

Let not then your good be evil spoken of

**The kingdom of God is not meat and drink,
but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit**
Because he who serves Christ in these things God accepts and
men approve

**Food does not destroy God’s work. Food is pure but is
turned evil by men**

whose eating is a stumbling block (to his brethren)

It (must therefore be) better

(for him who regards the
days and its
customs) **not to eat**
flesh (at all)

and (for him who)
drinks wine (on the
regarded days) **not to
drink** wine (at all)

or (for both parties) to do anything that one’s brother is offended
by.

(The rule, **Rather abstain than offend**, applies to both parties –
see 1Cor.8:13.)

Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he
alloweth.

Whatsoever is not of faith is sin

8.1.2.2.

A Literal Translation

What the passage Romans 14:5-6 says about the observance of the Sabbath, says:

1. One man indeed esteemeth one day above another day

hos men gar krinei hehmeran par' hehmeran

..... 1 **2** 3 4 5 6 7 8

(e.g., only Passover Sabbath of eight days of Passover)

2. another esteemeth every day

hos de krinei pahsan hehmeran

..... **1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8**

(e.g., keep all of the eight days of Passover Season)

3. Let every man in his own mind be fully persuaded

Hekastos en tohi idiohi noi plehrophoreisthoh

4. while he regarding the day regards (it) to the Lord

ho fronohn tehn hehmeran Kyriohi phronei

“Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind that while regarding the day, he regards it unto the Lord... not unto doubtful disputations”.

It says not,

1. One man esteems the Sabbath— 1 2 3 4 5 6 **7**.

2. another esteem ALL days alike, or, all days like a Sabbath— 777777777777777777

3. another esteems NO day / no days, or, no Sabbath

.....

(Mark how I changed my views in the ‘Conversation’ – appended!)

- 1, **The text says NOT, Let every man decide for himself** whether or not to observe a day; Let every man **make peace within his own mind** about the observance or non-observance of days. (What **the text says** is that every man should be fully persuaded **his regard of the day is to the Lord’s honour.**)

- 2, **The text says NOT, He who regards all days** irrespective and alike do so to the honour of God. (**It says, “He who regards every day (of the “days” “regarded”), regards it to the honour of God”.**)

- 3, **The text says nothing about the Sabbath.**

- 4, **The text says nothing of “he who does not regard the day, to the honour of God does not regard it.”**

- 5, The text **read continuously** does **not contrast** him “that regards the day” and him “that eats” but **assimilates** the things the one “that regards the day”, does – he **both** “regards the day”, **and**, “eats all things”!

8.1.2.3.

Tradition Has Had It The Wrong Way Round

The original text does not at the beginning of 14:6 contain the clause, “he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it”. The clause is corrupt and was transmitted through the Textus Receptus from a late Byzantine “Koine” manuscript. Most modern translations omit it.

The popular versions of this Scripture gave cause to two corrupt ideas. First, that the “weak” were those who “observed days” while the “strong” were those who did not observe days. Second, that to “regard / esteem every day” means to “deem all days equal” as of no Christian significance, or, as to devote all days like a Sabbath to the Lord. (See Appendix, p 328, ‘Manuscripts’)

8.1.2.4.

The Text Is Not Divided

The original text then, does not contain the clause, “he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it”. This addition was inserted into the text whereby the meaning of the context is reversed. The text **read continuously, contrasts “the one who regards the day and who eating eats to (the honour of) the Lord”, and, “the one who to (the honour of) the Lord eats not”.** The “weak” and the “strong” are **directly associated with eating and drinking of “food” and through their observance of “food”, are associated with the “regard” of “one day”, or, with “all days”.** The “weak” - as are the “strong” - are **not distinguished** as to whether they “regard” “days” or “one day” or as to whether they “do not regard the day” or “days”. **Without the addition no suggestion exists of any “one” person or party that does not “regard” or “esteem” “one day” or “all the days”.** The “weak” do not “regard” the “food” / “meat” of Old Testament Feasts. But **like everybody else**, they “regard” “days” whether only the “one” and main day or “all the days” / “every day” of whatever “feast” or occasion.

The last phrase of verse 5 and the first phrase of verse 6 **should not be separated**. *Hekastos en tohi idiohi noi plehrophoreisthoh ho phronohn tehn hehmeran kuriohi phronei* – “Each in his own mind must be convinced fully that while he is serious about the day his intentions honour the Lord”.

With the added clause gone, the text in contextual relation reads that “**he who regarding the day regards it unto the Lord, who eating, eats unto the Lord, gives God the thanks**”. He so behaves as to ultimately let his thankfulness be known to God! His “regarding the day and indeed his eating” is for the single purpose and with the single motive to honour his Lord Jesus with whom he stands! Paul wants to **encourage such** “esteem” of “days”, of “food” or of **whatever service** of servants of the Lord. Paul’s highest expectations would come true could he “persuade” the Church at Rome **to unite in such worship!** Unfortunately Paul was confronted with parties opposing one another in the most regrettable spirit.

The “weak” and the “strong” cannot be divided into parties that “**regarded**” “days”, and, that did **not** “regard” “days” because **all the Church** “regarded” “days” – and **Paul says as much**. Paul doesn’t categorise the “**weak**” and the “**strong**” as those who ‘keep the Sabbath’ and those who “despise” the Sabbath and make of it a “beggarly principle”. Such labelling and libelling precisely was the Church at Rome’s sin and Paul doesn’t join the Church in its sinning but reprimands it for its sin. There’s no reprimand from Paul for the Church’s “regard” and “esteem” of “days”.

8.1.3.

What the Issue at Rome was Not About

One, It was **not** a matter of ethical distinction between **clean and unclean foods** or of **days of fasting**

Two, It was **not** a matter of conscience over eating the flesh of **idolatrous sacrifices**

Three, It was **not** a matter of eating the flesh of **Old Testament sacrifices**

Four, It was **not** a matter of observing “**days**”

Five, It was **not** a matter of **food**

Six, It was **not** a matter of observing the **Sabbath**

Seven, It was **not** a matter of “adiaphora” – “**indifference**”

What was the problem then? It was the **single** problem that Paul **actually denounces, the prevailing fastidious sentiment of judging**.

After having considered several **impossible** interpretations of the “disturbance” in the Church at Rome, Charles Hodge (*Romans*) concludes, “Every thing in the context is consistent with the supposition that Jewish scruples were the source of the difficulty; and as those were by far the most common cause, no other need be here assumed.”

Through the process of elimination only “Jewish scruples” remain as **mechanical** explanation for the problem in the Church at Rome. **But**, “Jewish scruples” *per se* were **not** “the source of the difficulty” but the **channel**. “Jewish scruples” was not the **issue itself**. “Jewish scruples” were **relevant** and practically **involved** while things like “mystic ascetic philosophy”, “the peculiar opinions of the Essenes” and “Stoic indifference” were **irrelevant** and strange to the tenor and scope of the topical **section** as well as of the **whole letter**.

8.1.3.1.

Days of Fasting and Unclean Foods

“Jewish ceremonial ritual made various contacts with the diet of the Jews. There were days of fasting, for example. It is easy to see how some Jews who had just accepted Christianity might still feel to honour such days, and hence to refrain from food on those days or to obey other related ceremonial requirements. ... As various commentators bring out, the Jews who were dispersed abroad, as was true of those at Rome, could not be sure that what they bought at the market place was clean, according to Jewish standards; even ‘clean’ meat might not be ceremonially clean. Hence some Jews might refrain from eating any meat at all.” (*Questions on Doctrine*, “Objection 102”, F.D. Nichol. Emphasis CGE)

This assumption makes one correct correlation, that the “**days**” Paul wrote of to the Church at Rome were associated with the “**regard**” certain “days” received.

But if these “**days**”, when “some ... might refrain from eating any meat at all”, were “days of fasting”, then certainly it would not have been a matter of abstaining simply from “**flesh**” as the Roman Catholic Church centuries later corrupted the discipline of fasting. Besides, the phenomenon in the Christian Church at Rome **while** it for “some” was the refraining from eating “flesh” it for the same group or party

meant to “**drink** wine”, *i.e.*, **not to abstain from wine!** If it was a matter of **fasting** “according to Jewish standards” on **certain “days”** and if the **Old Testament** is meant by “Jewish standards”, then it is strange that the Old Testament knows **no** special dates or recurring and set “seasons” of “days” for fasting. Paul also doesn’t say, “One **fasts** one day”, *etc.* The notion that Paul meant fasting in Romans 14 is arbitrary.

If “commentators” mean **fasting** on the Sabbath, they are wrong because “according to Jewish standards” the Jews **never** fasted on the **Sabbath**, and the **Bible**, enjoins no fasting on the Sabbath.

Paul claimed he never “spoke other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say” (Acts 26:22) and ever “taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers” (Acts 22:3). How, “according to Jewish standards” could he not have objected to the contention that “all things” **clean and unclean** should be eaten – as “various commentators” claim? And how could Paul be so bigoted as to allow “some” “**all things**” **clean and unclean** while permitting “some” others to **discriminate** between clean and unclean foods? The notion that Paul in Romans 14 spoke out against the distinction between clean and unclean foods is as arbitrary as the notion that he spoke out against or for fasting.

In the 14th chapter of Romans “**food** (and drink)” is discussed, but not “food” as **nourishment or staple food** - concerning which the Bible **does** make distinction between “clean” and “unclean”. In Romans 14 food **customs** or food **ceremonies** are involved in the issue. The principles **behind** the customs and ceremonies are **also** supposed. The “**food** (and drink)” undoubtedly has to do with Jewish uses, in fact with **Old Testament feasts** – feasts of “**foods**” and of eating and drinking **ceremoniously and celebrating**. The particulars noticeable in Romans 14 in fact allows for one possibility only, the **Feast of Passover Season**.

8.1.3.2.

Flesh of Idolatrous Sacrifices

“In using a comparable passage of Scripture, 1 Corinthians 8 and 9, we discern immediately that Paul is not speaking of the matter of clean and unclean foods, but rather is discussing a problem that was tremendously acute for the early Christians living in Greek cities. This problem arose

primarily because pagan priests and others frequently sold in the market place for food, animals that had previously been offered in the temples as sacrifices to the gods. Some Christians maintained that if a believer ate food, even of a clean animal, that had been offered before these heathen gods, it would be the acknowledging the existence of such a god, and having communion with him. Since they could not tell for sure whether meat purchased in the market place had been offered before idols, some of the Christians maintained that they would not eat any meat at all, but to be sure, would eat only vegetables. Other Christians believed that there was no other god except the Lord, and therefore they didn’t care whether animals had been offered before the heathen idols or not. They would eat them anyway. Over such a matter as this the apostle urged the believers not to judge one another or engage in extended acrimonious debates about it, but each was to honor the convictions of the other on this matter concerning which God had not spoken. In the same way the apostle said, verse 5, “One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind”.” (Doctrinal Discussions, Chapter 8, R&H Publishing Association)

The passages “1 Corinthians 8 and 9” and “verse 5” of Romans 14, are comparable **only in certain respects**. But Paul does **not** speak about the **same** issue in these Scriptures, otherwise he would have **identified** the matter in the Church at **Rome** with the matter in the Church at **Corinth**. To the Corinthians Paul says, “**Now as touching things offered unto idols ...**” (8:1). At **Corinth** the problem was the eating of things **offered unto idols**. At **Corinth** the eating of things offered unto idols “touched” not, as at **Rome**, Christians’ “**regard**” for “**days**” (like the eating of things of “Jewish scruples”, does).

In **Romans** Paul says, “One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike”, and thereby acknowledges something **legitimate**. Paul, while he **accepted** the “regard” Christians at Rome paid “days”, **also accepted the fact that Christians associated** the eating of certain “**food**” with the “regard” they paid certain “**days**”. The “flesh” the “weak” won’t eat certainly did not come from **idolatrous sacrifices** – which is totally **another matter** that Paul dealt with elsewhere ... not here! The “flesh” the “weak” won’t eat certainly did not come from **idolatrous**

sacrifices because “one”, that is, “some” “ate all” and are blameless, while the other, that is, “some” “eat not”, and are also blameless. At Rome, no **slaughter** and no **blood** are involved. Here, people eat or do not eat “flesh” for the purpose of “meat” - be it the **meals of memorial- and feast-“days”**. The “vegetables” Paul mentions and which the “weak” ate, could very well have been the “herbs” **on the Feast tables whereon was served “flesh” and “vegetables”**.

As at Corinth, Paul at Rome points out unambiguously the **true** problem. The Church may have been “*engaged in*” “*extended acrimonious debates*”, but certainly **not** over the question *if a believer who eat food of an animal that had been offered before heathen gods acknowledge the existence of such a god and commune with him*. According to this chapter, **not at Rome!**

What “*extended acrimonious debates*” then, was the Church at **Rome** “*engaged in*”? Paul asks, “**Why dost thou judge thy brother?** Because he **regards** only one **day**, or, all the **days** “esteemed”? Paul asks, “**Why dost thou set at nought thy brother?** Because he **eats** all things, or, because he only **eats** the vegetables regard of the day requires? The true problem superficially revolved around “**foods**” of “**days**” and not foods from **sacrifices** as such **or** from sacrifices to **idols**. The real problem was one of the **heart** and not of the **stomach**.

“The Kingdom of God is **not meat and drink**” says Paul, “but **righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit**”. This is the main and comprehensive theme of Romans 14. It reveals what the problem at Rome **in essence** was. Who in **these things, righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit – things of the heart – “serves Christ ... while he regards the day**, regards the day **unto the Lord**”. **This is Paul quoted!** He “is accepted of God and approved of men” because he “regards the day **unto the Lord**” in “**righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit**”. 14:17-18

“Because no one of us lives for **himself**, and no man dies to **himself** merely, for, whether we live or die, we live or die with the view to giving account to the **Lord**. And whether we live or die, we live or die for exactly this reason that we might **belong to the Lord and be His**. Christ also for exactly this purpose died and rose and received all power **that He might be Lord** and Master of the dead and living.” Christ

through his death, resurrection and exaltation became the **only One** qualified to be **Lord and Judge**. No man may usurp Christ’s position or steal his honour. What is it to “regard” “days” and even to “**esteem**” “days”, that is, to consider them important? (What is it to eat meat from sacrifices to idols?) It is **not** idolatry. Compared to eating meat from sacrifices to idols – the issue at Corinth – eating “food” to “regard” “days” – symptom of the problem at Rome – “**is nothing, it’s a triviality**”, 14:1. **In reality** the problem at **Rome** was **more** serious than the one at Corinth with its sacrifices and all. The trouble at Rome **entailed more** than just “regard” of “days” and “eat” of “foods”. The “**days**” and the “**regard**” for “days” were not of “heathen” or “natural” religious observance. It entailed **subtle idolatry**, the idolatry of **pride** and **self-“esteem”**. At Corinth the cautious are prudent. At Rome the implacable are proud.

8.1.3.3.

Old Testament Sacrifices

8.1.3.3.1.

Sacrifices for Sin

Commentators who identify the “food” of which Paul speaks in Romans 14 with “Jewish” or Old Testament “Feasts” and “Ceremonies” suppose that by “food” and “meat” Paul meant the “**flesh**” derived from the Jewish or Old Testament **sacrificial** system. They agree that the Christians, with the Jews, **kept on** to “regard” these “traditional” “days” for quite some time **into the first century**. Some of the commentators say that the **Christians - like the Jews - “observed”** both the “**days**” and the “**meat**” for the same **purpose** and with the same **importance attached**. That purpose and importance was **sacrifice for sin**. Now **nowhere** in the New Testament and **definitely not** in Romans 14, exists reason for these commentators to so conclude. The New Testament allows continuance with **sacrifices of any kind in no way and for no moment**. No word or notion in the New Testament will be found that Christians in any one case attended the “days” of Old Testament Feasts or used “food” or “flesh” **for the principle of the shedding of blood and taking of life for atonement of sin**. There is the world’s difference between eating an animal’s flesh for **food or feasting** and killing it for **sacrifice!** The thing that would be to the greatest **dishonour**

of the Lord Jesus Christ would be to “regard” and “esteem” “days” and “foods” **for the Old Testament principle of the shedding of blood and taking of life for atonement of sin!**

What sort of “days” and “food” / “meat” that Paul could silently and expressly **approve** could **Christians** “regard” and “esteem” with “**honour to the Lord**”? **It could not** be the “regard” and “esteem” of “days” and “foods” **for the Old Testament principle of the shedding of blood and taking of life for atonement of sin! It could not** because Paul would not have approved and it would not have been to the Lord’s honour. It would have meant a return to Old Testament **principles** and a **denial** of the New Testament **principle** of righteousness – the righteousness by the **faith** of the **sacrifice of Christ for sin - once for all!** The **very first** thing the apostles proclaimed was this absolutely revolutionary and uncompromising fact to be accepted or rejected with finality, **the sacrifice of Jesus for sin and the end of all sacrifice** for sin henceforth. Such a message could not be delivered but by the omnipotent power of the Holy Spirit and by the power of Jesus’ **resurrection from the dead – the end of all dying for sin.** It was the Christian Faith, the Kingdom of God, **come.** It was God **with** man, peace **on** earth at last and forever. Nothing, absolutely nothing short of this, immediately and at once. That was Pentecost. No Christian and no Christian at Rome, indulged in sacrifices for sin or devoted days for the purpose of sacrifice for sin! The Church at this stage in its history had not sunk into **such** depths of apostasy or it would have **showed** in its New Testament history. (God the glory, the Church never has sunk into such depths of apostasy ... or did it? What horrible thing “transubstantiation” is!) The Old Testament ceremonial economy of “days” and “meats” **as sacrificial oblation** must be ruled out completely as a possible meaning of the Church’s “regard” and “esteem” of “days” and “food” according to Romans 14.

But **what sort** of “days” and “food” could Christians “regard” and “esteem” **while they so pride themselves of it** that they actually **judge and despise one another? No, it’s not the sort** of “days” and “food” or its “regard” and “esteem”. It is **what frame of mind** that so prides itself of “days” and “food” and the “regard” and “esteem” of it that one actually **judges and despises any who might just superficially differ!**

8.1.3.3.2. Meat Meet for Feast

Another side of Old Testament and “Jewish” Feasts and ceremonies of “days” and “foods” **survived** the transition of dispensations from Old to New Testament. That side of it had its **nationalistic** aspect without doubt. The **Christian Church**, because it consisted mainly of **Jewish** converts, **inevitably** retained some **nationalistic** character – a character that was determined by the Old Testament “traditions”. Not even Paul, the “apostle to the **Gentiles**”, shod Old Testament or “Jewish” tradition. He, like the Church in general, attended Passover, for example. Paul “**longed**” / “decided determinedly” to be at Jerusalem for Pentecost (Acts 20:16). Why at Jerusalem and why specifically for Pentecost if these things **for its own sake** were of no consequence for Paul? It is nonsense that he attended Old Testament Feasts **only for the sake of opportunity** to reach his kin with the Gospel. (See answered in Part Three.)

The Biblical, “Mosaic”, “**observed**” “days” were **all** associated with the “food” or with the “eating” of meats not only of sacrificed animals but of other “vegetable” offerings. In fact, all **usual** days had their offerings and sacrifices. The offerings and sacrifices of Feast days were just increased. **Other** foods than that of sacrifices and offerings were **also** stipulated for use with specific feast days.

But after Christ for Christians the **slaughter** of the animals for the “feast” occasions was no longer regarded a **sacrifice** or an offering with any propitiating or expiating meaning or value. If served on **Christian feast tables** the killing was not sacrificing but a domestic slaughter for the traditional occasion. It was no blood-offering and the meat was for **feast** and not for **sacrifice in any form.**

Some Christians (being Jews more probably) had no scruples and ate “**everything**” (verse 2) put on the Congregational table on such feast days, for example **unleavened bread** – which was not as much an offering as it was the staple **food = “meat”** for the Season of Passover (“Easter”). See the story of the exodus. Many Christians did not think that they jeopardised their Christian confession by their **festive** festal observances. Others though, would “**not eat**” imagining they might deny their Christian faith if they ate **like** the Jews. (Peter would not even eat **with** the heathen brethren, which shows the prevalent **prejudice.**)

Some of the feast days – as in the case of the most important of all Jewish Feasts, the **Passover** – were associated with the **abstaining** from **wine**. Some Christians would think nothing of this rule. They might even **purposely** have used wine on **“every”** as on all Days of Unleavened Bread - as they would keep on using ordinary bread. It is inconceivable that friction would not result between the progressive and conservative nationalistic sectors within the Church. It simply is a fact that the Christian Church as a whole – not only locally but universally – still “regarded” the “days” of Old Testament “tradition” and still “ate” the “foods” “regard” of the “days” “esteemed” required. Exactly herein lies the solution to the problem under consideration. **The very unscrupulous eating of “everything” of some Christians and the very scrupulous not eating flesh is surest proof that the Church did not sacrifice to make propitiation or expiation for sin.** The **Christians’** was not the **Old Testament “observance”** for the sake of the **Old Testament purpose and meaning** - for the **principle of the shedding of blood for atonement of sin and taking of life for forgiveness and justification!** **Christians** – Jewish as well as Gentile converts – **“respected”** these Feasts and the “days” and “foods” connected with it only **traditionally**. They slaughtered an animal **for food and feast**, yes, but they slaughtered **no sacrifices** and they slaughtered not at all for recompense of sin. They poured no blood on altars. They burned no offerings either animal or herbal. They prepared the traditional meals or food of flesh as well as of trimmings (“vegetables”), and, wine. They formally congregated for the purpose of the enjoyment of these feasts – an enjoyment “in the Holy Spirit”. They celebrated privately (in Church – whether home, Synagogue or Temple) **with no connection** with the ‘centralised’ Jewish sacrificial system. They prayed (“said thanks”) to God over the food – all “to the honour of the Lord” Jesus! But then at this stage in the Church at Rome manifested itself a spirit of gravest sin. Particulars invaded the realm of basics. And the **reason and cause** was a lack of **Christian love**. Christians **“despised”** one another and **“judged”** one another. Paul denounces this, but nothing but **this sin** in the Church of Christ - **not “trivialities”** (14:2) like “one day”, “every day”, “all foods”, “only vegetables” (trimmings), “wine”, no wine, but **sins ... “worthy of death”!**

8.1.3.4.1. “Days”

The problem at Rome addressed by Paul suggests no demographic, no politically social, and no nationalistic social issue. The matter was not between a minority and majority in the Church; it was not an issue of Gentile Christian versus Jewish Christian. It also was no private or domestic problem.

It was an **endemic Christian** issue, and that a specific Christian issue of **worship**. It affected the **Church** and **relations** within the **Church**. It was a specific issue of **congregational, communal** worship. **When the Church assembles** for worship, “one *brother* eats everything while another *brother* only eats what is vegetarian”. **When** on certain “days” the **Church, assembles for worship**, this issue of **discriminating eating** crops up.

Had everybody **not actually** come together on the “days”, the question: What to eat or not to eat **on the “days”**, would never have surfaced! **Nevertheless** the relevancy and Paul’s mention of the “days” is **incidental**. Had no issue on the matter: **what to eat or not to eat** on these “days”, arisen, Paul would **not** have mentioned “days” **at all!** **At Rome**, what met the eye was the **eating or not eating of “food”** (served for and connected with “regarded” “days”— “days” as also at **Colossus** in the **Church** there). **At Corinth “food”** also caused trouble, but a **domestic, every day**-problem. **At Rome because of** the issue about “food”, the “days” became relevant to the issue because it was a **congregational** problem. But the “days”, **as such**, had not been the problem! **“Days” were incidental.**

“One man esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike”, says Paul. The **“regard”** of “days” was not even the **superficial** issue! “The one **regarded** the one day”. “The other **regarded** every day ... *like the one*”. **Everybody “regarded” “days”** whether only by the main day or by all the days of the supposed feast period. But **“regarded” the “days” they did!**

He who regards **every day** but does not regard “every day” **alike**, can only regard “every day” (*pasan hehmeran*) if “every day” belongs to a specific “time” or “**season**” of **several** (special) “days”. “He therefore who unto the Lord’s honour regards **every day alike** ... regards every day” **even while** he regards **every day above any normal days**. **PAUL SUPPOSES NOBODY WHO DOES NOT REGARD DAYS.**

8.1.3.4.2.

The Addition and “Days”

Verse 5 to 6 without a hitch, may read, “The first person (or party) may esteem one day above other days, the second person (or party) may reckon every day alike. Let each (whether he regards just one day or every and all the days of the feasts) be fully convinced that he regards the day (or days) to the Lord’s honour. The one, when he eats (**according** to the customs of the “day / days” he “regards”), let him be convinced that he eats to the Lord’s honour and thank God for it. The other, let him be convinced that when he refrains from eating (**against** the customs of the “day” he “regards”), refrains to the Lord’s honour and thank God.”

An addition turns everything upside down. “*The person who does not regard the day, to the honour of the Lord does not regard the day*” – *kai ho meh phronohn tehn hehmeran kuriohi ou phronei*.

Without the addition

1, there is **no** conflicting interests over the “**regarding**” of “days” but only over the “**meats**” pertaining to the observance of the “days”!

2, “**regarders**” of “one day above other days” “**eat all things**” in accordance with the observance of “days” and therefore it is the **regarders of days** who are the “**strong**”.

Insert the addition, and the passage reads,

“The **first** person (or party) may esteem one day above other days, the **second** person (or party) may reckon every day alike. Let each of them be fully convinced. The **first** person who regards the day, regards the day to the Lord’s honour. But *the person who does not regard the day, to the honour of the Lord does not regard the day while he eats* (all things) to the Lord’s honour and gives God the thanks. **He**, however, who **refrains from eating all things** (and only eats vegetables – the “weak”), to the Lord’s honour eats not and gives God the thanks.”

With the addition

1, non-“regarders” of “days” “**eat all things**” in **opposition** to the observance of “days” and therefore

2, it is the non-“regarders” who are the “**strong**”.

The addition contradicts the **basic supposition** of Paul’s argument, namely that **tolerance** and a Christ-like **attitude** should prevail for believers who positively “**regard the day**” “**to the Lord**”. The conflict concerned matters

exactly based on everybody’s observance of the “days”! Their differences revolved around the observance of these days, namely the differences with respect to the “meats” and the “eating” of the “meats” that belonged to these days’ observance. **Without the reality** in the Church of the “esteem” there was for “days”, there would have been no **manifestation** of the basic problem ... through **foods!** The **basic problem of malice** would have manifested itself **notwithstanding** and **in any other way** had no “days” been “regarded” and were no “meats” associated with the “days”. An **actual** conflict over observance and non-observance of “days” though was non-existent.

8.1.3.4.3.1.

The Sabbath

The Sabbath or its keeping had nothing to do with the issue in the Church at Rome no matter how the problem is explained. The issue in the Church at Rome had so much to do with the keeping of the Sabbath that **not even a suggestion** as to the Sabbath exists.

With the phrase, “regard / esteem of a day / days” Paul does not mean the observance of the Sabbath. The practices that Paul **denounces**, he as clearly **identifies**. He wants his readers to **recognise** their **sins**; he wishes not to confuse or to play with words. Had Sabbath-keeping been **the**, or **one**, of the undesired and **denounced** practices, Paul would simply have said, “**Sabbath-keeping**”, as clearly as he does say what the **real** evils that he actually denounces, were. But **nothing** of the sort concerning the Sabbath - or even concerning the “days” which he does mention - can be found there. Paul’s practical proposal as a possible solution to the deeper problem at Rome was simple and straightforward, “Don’t eat flesh! Don’t drink wine if thereby your brother might be offended”! It would have been just as simple, just as straightforward if the Sabbath had been the problem or just an aspect of the problem, to say, “Don’t **keep the Sabbath** if thereby thy brother might be offended”.

The **real** problems that Paul **by definition** addresses are problems of **relationship** and **attitudes** and **not of observances** and **institutions** – which makes them **intrinsically** and **essentially** problems of **Law** – of **morals**, morals addressed by the “*Mosaic Law*” of Ten Commandments.

If “observes one day **above another day**” (*krinei hehmeran par’ hehmeran*) meant the specific day **because**

“observed”, were the **Sabbath**, then, by the same principle, to “observe **every** day” (*krinei pasan hehmeran*) must mean that “**all** days alike”, because “observed”, were observed **Sabbaths**.

It is fanciful to suppose that “all days (are) **alike**” because “alike” means they all are **Sabbath** Days. “A day” as the **sort** of “day” of which “some regard one day more important than the rest and others regard all equally important” makes **nonsense**. If *pahan hehmeran* does **not** mean “every day” of **limited festive seasons**, then it **must** indicate **all days without distinction**.

Paul uses the term *hehmera* – “**day**” in Romans 14. *Hehmera* is the Greek word for **any** day of any period of days. Paul does not say **which** “day” or “days” are involved. **Five** things indicate of what **nature** these “days” were. **1, Negatively:** Paul does **not** say “**Sabbath**” in any manner. The fact that he does not **say** “**Sabbath**” rules out the possibility that he **meant** the Sabbath. The Sabbath, in any case, is “put apart from all ‘days’”, that is, is “**holy**”. **2,** The fact that Paul in no way **opposes or denounces** the Church’s “regard” and “esteem” of the “days”. **3, Positively:** The fact that the issue concerns the **Christian Church** and its **congregational worship** and **personal interrelationships**. **4,** the fact that Paul refers to **Christians’** “regard” and “esteem” of these “days”. And **5,** the fact that the Church “regarded” the “days” “**to the honour of the Lord (Jesus)**”. The “days” were of a **kind**, “some observe **every** day *of the kind*; others observe **one** above the other *of these days supposed*”.

Paul knew the name “Sabbath”. Seeing the **judging and intolerant atmosphere** in the Church at Rome the fact that Paul uses the word “day” and not “Sabbath” to make clear what he is talking about, it is clear that he did not **mean** the Sabbath. Suppose that in Acts 13:43 the Gentiles requested Paul “that these words might be preached to them the next “**day**”. Would they have gathered on the next **Sabbath**? No, they would have met the **First** Day of the week! So they asked “that these words might be preached to them the next **Sabbath**”, and Paul and everybody else returned to the same place of Church-assembly the next **Sabbath** Day! Then how would the word “day” mean the Sabbath in Romans 14:5? Many similar examples could be given to show that Paul would **write** “Sabbath” and not “day” if he had the Sabbath in mind – as in fact in each and every

instance of its use in the New Testament the Sabbath is called. In the New Testament the descriptions for the Seventh Day Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, are found,

“**Sabbath**” – in Greek in the singular or plural, *sabbaton / sabbata (sabbatohn)*. The plural is used only in the genitive as a plural or as a singular.

“**The Day of the Sabbath**” – *hehmera tohn sabbatohn*.

“**The Seventh Day**” – *hebdomos / hehmera heh hebdomeh*.

“**A keeping of the Sabbath**” – *sabbatimos*, Hb.4:9

“**The Lord’s Day**” – *hehmera kyriakeh*, Rv.1:10

The **New Testament** and the **Old Testament** do **not** know the word “**day**” – *hehmera, per se*, for the Sabbath.

‘Liberal’ **tradition** regards the person or group of persons who “keep the day” as to keep the **Sabbath**, and as narrow-minded and “Judaistic”. “Liberal” **tradition** regards keeping of **the Sabbath** as a “beggarly principle” and a “yoke of bondage”. What liberal enthusiasm then, “*keeps all days as a Sabbath*”? “*Every day for the Christian must be like a Sabbath*”, they say, and increase the weight of bondage they themselves argue for, seven times. **They** stack “law upon law” (Isaiah), and **theirs** is nothing but the “tradition of men”. This very ‘liberal’ judgement of the issue explains the spirit that Paul wrote **against**; it does not explain the **days** Paul wrote **about**.

While the “regard” of “**days**” was **not** the issue the **Sabbath** and its keeping **by no means** came into the picture. That must be why Paul does **not** say the “days” were “**observed**”. He says they were “**regarded**” and “**esteemed**”.

8.1.3.4.3.2.

“**Weak and Beggarly Principle**”

Whereas **with the addition**, and traditionally, the **non-**observer “eats all things”, **he, therefore**, is the “**strong**”. Because it is the **Jews** who “**observe** days”, **they**, therefore, are the “**weak**”. Because it is the **Gentiles** who do **not** “observe days”, **they**, therefore, are the “**strong**”. Because it is “**weak**” and “**Jewish**” to “observe days”, the **observance of the Sabbath** (in terms of Galatians 4:9), therefore, is a “**weak and beggarly principle**”! That is the ‘**logic**’ of Sunday-protagonists. Whereas **without** the addition the **observer** of the “day” “eats all things”, **he**, therefore, by the same principle of logic, must be the “**strong**”!

The clause, “*the person who does not regard the day, to the honour of the Lord does not regard the day*” being inadmissible, Paul only allows **abstinence** from “eating” of “flesh”. He allows no **absenteeism** from “regarding of every day” or from “regarding of one day above another day”. Paul allows “regard” of “days”, but no disregard. Paul allows and demands respect for Christians’ “esteem of days”, but excuses no persons’ scorn on it. Paul admits and condones the “esteem” of “days” “to the Lord(’s honour)”. Paul does not support despising of the Sabbath or of any Feasts still “esteemed” by the Apostolic Community to the Lord’s honour. He opposes the very **spirit of subversion** in the Church at Rome that posed a threat to the spirit of brotherly love and tolerance in regard to the observance of “days”.

For exactly to prevent the conclusion that the “strong” “regards days”, copiests for prejudice towards the Sabbath Day inserted the clause, “... *and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.*” They inserted the clause despite the fact – **or for the very reason!** – that the Sabbath is irrelevant to Paul’s discussion. And they inserted it despite the fact that the clause **only negates** esteem of **any** day and does not make an **exception** of “the Lord’s Day”, Sunday. The traditional and popular view that those who observed days were the “weak” Christians simply is a delusion cultured in the mired waters of the evolution of Sunday-observance.

This **added** clause in Romans 14:6 **to my mind** is evidence of a **Sunday-veneration** that in early Christianity (not first century Christianity) opposed the “validity of a keeping of the Sabbath for the People of God”. The idea behind its inclusion into the text may have had its beginnings in the second century and times of **Justin** who was the chief propagandist of Sunday-keeping then. (See reference to Justin also under Galatians 4:10.) Even the style of this clause smacks of **Gnosticism**. I have also shown in Part 3 how the name, “Lord’s Day” in Revelation **1:10**, seems to have been so applied as the Christian’s reply to the Lord Emperor’s Day of Sunday.

(Says Oscar Cullmann in *The Christology of the New Testament* SCM Press 1973, p. 228, “*The lordship of Christ must extend over every area of creation. If there were a single area excluded from his lordship, that lordship would not be complete and Christ would no longer be the Kyrios.*”

*For that reason the realm of the state also – precisely that realm – must fall under his lordship. Precisely on the basis of the confession **Kyrios Christos as opposed to the confession Kyrios Kaisar, this conviction must necessarily be a central part of faith in Christ as Lord.**” “A central part of faith in **Christ as Lord**” must apply to those **two special** Institutions of the **Christian Faith, The Lord’s Supper and The Lord’s Day - Kyriakeh Hehmera – The Lord Jesus’ Day** as opposed to the lord **Caesar’s Day.**)*

Both texts could reflect the kingdom of the world within which the Kingdom of heaven existed and both texts could reflect the veneration of opposed “days”. I argue for a much **earlier** dating for the emergence of Sunday observance (late **first** century) than Sabbath-protagonists usually take for granted, namely **late second** century. (See on Galatians 4:10, Par. 8.3.3, especially.) **Not** Romans 14:5, but the **redactorial clause** of verse **6**, (besides Rv.1:10 and Gl.4:10) reflects a **first century** observance of Sunday in opposition to the Church’s observance of the Sabbath. A fourth Scripture leaves the impression of some correlation between “the mystery of iniquity (that) doth already work” of which Paul writes to the Thessalonians (2:7), and the “little horn that “shall speak words against the Most High and shall think to change (God’s) times and laws”, Dan.7:25-26. If that power operated “**already**” in Paul’s day and if the Sabbath had to be replaced by Sunday as a way in which that power would tamper with God’s “times” and “laws”, then that power must **already** have operated in **Paul’s own day**. And the influence of Sunday-veneration must have left these unintentional fingerprints on the New Testament.

(The “**Sabbath**” not merely is “one day among others”. **God “spoke** concerning the **Seventh Day**!” God never “**thus spoke concerning**” the First or any other “day”. The “**Sabbath**” is “the **Seventh Day, the Sabbath of the Lord thy God**”. The Seventh Day is “**holy**”, “devoted” and “separated unto **Yahweh**”. He calls The Seventh Day “**My Sabbaths**” and “**My Holy (Day)**”. Its “keeping is **still valid**”. It is “still valid for **God’s People**”.

Sabbath **keeping** not merely is “one man’s regard” for “a day”. The Sabbath for its keeping depends on no **human** “esteem” or “regard”. “According to the **Scriptures**”, Sabbath-keeping implies **God’s own “keeping” – keeping Word in Jesus Christ**. The Sabbath as such is not dependent

on **man's** doing all the things of **Providence** and **Promise** because the Sabbath depends on **God's** doing all the things **He as Lord of the Sabbath covenanted** to do. "He concerning the Seventh Day thus spoke"! God's Word of Providence and Promise concerned the Sabbath **as the only day thus involved with his Word made flesh**, Jesus Christ. The Sabbath is exempted from all other days by **this** - God's providential **election of it**, for the **prophetic** and **New Testament fulfilment** of his Promises, **as for the resurrection of our Lord from the dead**.

The Sabbath rests. It rests on God's finishing of his own works. Man is simply invited to share the earnings and enjoy the benefits earned not by himself but which **God** earned through Jesus Christ – which God "finished" earning and paid to the last instalment **by raising Christ from the dead**.

The Sabbath's **keeping, as its Day**, is the **gift of God** for to be returned to God and for God. Sabbath keeping is obedient honouring "**unto the Lord**" of "his own **Rest**"-Day – the "**Sabbath-Day**". "Sabbath-keeping" implies man's rest from his own and wearisome **clamour at righteousness**. Man needs **rest in Jesus** – which means that God has acted and will act **first** and that man will act and **shall act by the act of God**.

"Sabbath-keeping" implies more than just **personal** and "*detached*" celebration of "a day" or "days". (No Stoicism, no nationalism, no religion!) "Sabbath-keeping" is **the corporate and involved Christian duty** as "the-Sabbath:-made-for-man". It should be "honoured", "remembered", "kept fast", "held high" and "observed" ... "according to the **Scriptures**" ... by "the People of God"!

Jesus calls Himself "**Lord of the Sabbath**". The **Church** calls the Sabbath the **Lord's Day**. One day is specifically **distinguished** in the New Testament from all other days **by the Lord** - pertaining **his Lordship** over and of it; and **by the Apostles** - pertaining their **keeping and veneration** of it. It is the **Sabbath Day**. **God** declares the Seventh Day his "**Rest-Day**" - "because **in it** God finished all his works" – **finished** them in **Jesus Christ** "the Word who in the **beginning** was". And **Jesus** being **resurrected** "**in the Sabbath**", **He** is "the Amen of the creation of God" – **God's Rest** by reason of which He, **God in Christ**, created the Seventh Day his Sabbath Day. Before and after **man's**

freedom comes the freedom of **God**. The Sabbath **was made** ... for man, it being Day of **God** who, **resting, made** it ... for man. Before it is man's Day of Rest the Sabbath is God's Day of Rest.

This being the nature of the Sabbath and its keeping it is obvious that Paul did not have it in mind when speaking of the "days" involved in the Church's problems over members' "judging" and "despising" one another over "food" the "regard" and "esteem" of these required.)

8.1.3.4.4.

The Lord's Day

Says Adam Clarke, Methodist scholar,

"Perhaps the word 'hemera', 'day', is here taken for 'time', 'festival', and such like, in which sense it is frequently used. Reference is here made to the Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals; such as the passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, new moons, jubilee, etc. ... The converted Gentile esteemeth every day – considers that all 'time' is the Lord's, and that each day should be devoted to the glory of God; and that those festivals are not binding on him. We (who translated) add here 'alike', and make the text say what I am sure was never intended, viz. That there is no distinction of days, not even of the Sabbath; and that every Christian is at liberty to consider even this day to be holy or not holy, as he happens to be persuaded in his own mind."

From where does Clarke get the idea that "*the converted Gentile esteemeth every day*" but not the converted **Jew**? It is far more logical that the **Jewish** Christian would still "esteem" "*Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals*". But Paul doesn't even say the Jewish Christians are the ones who "*esteem every day*". Paul addresses the **Christian Church** - at Rome (**and** outside Rome). The possibility that the Jewish contingent might have been the majority in the Church at Rome - **as elsewhere** - only confirms that the **Jewish** converts "regarded" "days" – and, and as, "all days", whether one, main day, or, every day of "*Jewish institutions and festivals*" ... "**alike**"! And because the Jews were the majority as well as by nature and descent domineering "party", the **whole Church** would have "regarded" "days" like they did. But things didn't go so smoothly for any one 'party' that "regarded" "days" – of **whomever** it may have consisted and regardless of whether

or not they formed the **majority**. All ‘parties’ opposed each other and no ‘party’ was the “winner”. To New Testament principle, the Lord rules. But opposition ruled the day - opposition from those who regarded just one day, or every day; and from those who ate, or ate not. The “regarding” parties **within themselves** were divided between those who “ate all things” and those who “only ate vegetables”. And so it is **impossible to tell** what the cultural or national constituency of any ‘party’ was. And so it also becomes impossible to tell of what nationality or nationalities the “**strong**” or the “**weak**” were – whether they were the Gentile Christians or the Jewish Christians. Paul made no attempt at a political analysis of the situation. He discerned matters of **worship** that concerned him as Pastor as well as Teacher. The “**honour of the Lord**” was at stake and that was the main – and only – thing of importance. Paul distinguished between the “**strong**” and the “**weak**” on **one basis only**, the basis of “**the faith**” in Jesus Christ, Lord and Saviour of the **undivided** Church. Lord and Saviour is He of “**us**”, the “strong” **and** the “weak”, of **us** who have our differences on things the eye may see and the Church may “esteem” **but the grace of God surpasses**.

“Every Christian is at liberty to consider even this day (the “Sabbath”, i.e., Sunday) to be holy or not holy, as he happens to be persuaded in his own mind”, says the above writer.

Paul uses the **imperative** – he doesn’t merely make an observation. He allows nobody and everybody **an own opinion** on the issue. **That exactly is where all the trouble started!** On the contrary, Paul demands that **everybody** must be “fully convinced” to the **advancement of the unity** of the Church and the **overcoming of factions**. Paul **noticed** the Church’s “regard” of and “esteem” for “days” of communal and congregational and devotional importance – even of cultural and traditional importance – and **upon his recognition built his remonstrance for anti-factionalism**. He would have built a straw man to himself make it go up in flames had he now to allow everybody to play judge and to decide for himself either to despise or respect the Sabbath Day.

Clarke is right and he also is not right. *Krinei pasan* *hehmeran* idiomatically correct **does** mean “to consider all days **alike**”. But that does not make the text say “*that there is*

no distinction of days, not even of the Sabbath”. The text **cannot** say **that**, simply because the Sabbath is contextually **irrelevant** and the “days” implied are Jewish **fast**-days. Matthew Henry on the basis of the **assumption** that the **First Day** was universally observed during Apostolic times, is persuaded that “*the Lord’s Day*” (Sunday) ought to be exempted from the principle that “*all days should be considered equal*”. He cannot argue for his own persuasion from the **Law** because the principle that all days be considered equal relies on the assumption that the “*Mosaic*” Law of Ten Commandments is **abrogated**. He cannot argue from any **logical** basis because there is no logic in his rule to prove the exception. “*Those who knew that all these things* (all religious “days”) *were abolished by Christ’s coming esteemed every day alike. We must consider it with an exception of the Lord’s Day, which all Christians unanimously observed* (in Apostolic times) ... *Art thou satisfied that thou mayest eat all meats, and observe all days (except the Lord’s day) alike?*” While reasoning for equality of all days Matthew Henry argues for exception of one day on the basis of one’s own *satisfaction* or “persuasion” and **nothing more**.

(We have shown beyond doubt (Part Three) that the keeping of the First Day is nowhere seen in the Acts of Luke. We have seen that the single instance of the mention in Acts of the First Day implies the Apostolic Church’s proper ‘keeping’ of the (Seventh Day) Sabbath and not of the First Day.)

“From this passage about the observance of days, Alford unhappily infers that such language could not have been used if the sabbath-law had been in force under the Gospel in any form. Certainly it could not, if the sabbath were merely one of the Jewish festival days; but it will not do to take this for granted merely because it was observed under the Mosaic economy. And certainly if the sabbath was more ancient than Judaism; if, even under Judaism, it was enshrined amongst the eternal sanctities of the Decalogue, uttered, as no other parts of Judaism were, amidst the terrors of Sinai; and if the Lawgiver Himself said of it on earth, ‘The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day – it will be hard to show that the apostle must have meant it to be ranked by his readers amongst those vanished Jewish festival days, which only ‘weakness’ could imagine to be still in force – a

weakness which those who had more light ought, out of love, merely to bear with.” (Commentary, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown.)

These scholars, **absolutely taking for granted** that the Sabbath was transferred to the First Day of the week, the Fourth Commandment to the “Lord’s Day” and God’s sanctification of the Seventh Day to Sunday, argue for exactly the same sentiments on the “*Sabbath*” as Matthew Henry. Their argument *in toto* is irrelevant to the subject matter of Romans 14-15.

Paul **excuses** no one for a lack of “*light*”. He **accuses** both “weak” and “strong” of slinging mud and being braggers. He in so many words refers to “the one” as to “the other”. He does not say the one who judges does not despise, or the other despises but does not judge. No, Paul says, “You”, the one, weak or strong, Jew or Gentile, **and**, “You” the other, weak or strong, Jew or Gentile, are **equally guilty of all offence**. The strong betray the weaknesses of the weak and the weak are just as good at despising the strong. Paul argues for no equality of all days or no status of any day or days, but for the equality of all **men** and the **lack** of status of any one man or men before the judgement seat of **Christ**. To argue for the preference of Sunday and the abnegation of the Sabbath from this Scripture is to miss its point altogether.

8.1.3.4.5.

“Days” “Regarded”

“He observes the **day**” - *krinei hehmeran*. “He observes the one day **above the other day**” - *krinei hehmeran par’ hehmeran*. “He observes **every** day (alike)” - *krinei pasan hehmeran*. One out of certain others is the most important “day”. A cyclic recurrence of **this** “day” among **others** within a **greater** cyclic period of “days” is supposed. **One** (high) day of several (seasonal Feast days) is observed **like no other** of these Feast days, **when** (the Feast yearly) **recurs**. Or, **Every** day of several (seasonal Feast days) is “esteemed” **equally** (to custom) **when** (the feast yearly) **recurs**. The “every day” (= “all days”) Paul supposes must be **definite religiously grouped** days.

The New Testament has a word **preferred** to convey the idea to “**observe**”. That word is *tehreoh*. “This man is not of God because he does not **keep** the Sabbath Day”, Jn.9:16. To ‘*tehrein*’ the Sabbath – “to **observe** the Sabbath”, is the **opposite** of “to **break** the Sabbath” – *luein to sabbaton*,

Jn.5:18. In almost every instance of its use in the New Testament the word *tehreoh*’s meaning is one of devotion, observance, keeping holy. But this word is conspicuously **not** used in Romans 14!

The meaning of the word actually used in Romans 14:5, *krinoh* - in contrast with the word *tehreoh*’s **specific** meaning - is **broad** and **general**. *Krinoh* can mean to prosecute, to adjudicate, to determine, to compare, to deem, or to judge. **Primarily** it has a **judiciary** use and **not** an ethical or **religious**.

Paul identifies the verb he uses in verse 5, *krinoh* – “to regard”, with the word *phroneoh* in verse 6. *Phroneoh* means “to be observant” / “particular” / “strict”. The person who “regards the day” – *krinei hehmeran* (5), “respects” / “regards” / “esteems” the “day” important – *tehn hehmeran phronei* (6). *Phroneoh*, though, is mostly used for “to be **unanimous**”. For a Christian to “regard” something “seriously” means the thing is approached and accepted “single minded” by the **undivided Church**. “He who, esteems a day, does so unto the Lord (Jesus’ honour)” – *ho phronohn tehn hehmeran Kuriohi phronei* – and thereby acts in **conformity** with the Christian Church. The Church’ unanimous “regard” of the “days” is belied by its faction fighting.

Take into account that Jesus never introduced additional or new “days” for the Church to “regard”, “esteem” or “observe”, and it must be assumed that these “days” “regarded” were Old Testament Feast “days” or Feast-“seasons” as for example the Passover Season that included the Days of Unleavened Bread. “Regard” of this specific “Season” or “days” of “esteem”, without any difficulty fits the situation in the Congregation at Rome where there were so many Jews.

The fact also that the Christian Church up to the **present** day greatly “esteems” the Passover (or “Easter”) festive season should strengthen the feeling that the “days” Paul wrote about and which the Church “regarded”, were the “days” of Passover Season.

A most **practical explanation** for the “esteem” among Christians of the Apostolic era of “one day above / more important than another”, or, for the “regard” among other Christians (even in the same Congregation) of “every day (alike)”, could be found in the observance of the

“**Eucharist**”. The Christian “who regards the day / every day regards it unto the Lord and while he eats, *thank* God” - *eucharistei*. The Holy Communion - “**Eucharist**”, for Christians replaced the Passover Feast **Meal**. Some Christians “regarded” only the Day of the **Meal** important. They did not “regard” “all the days” of the Passover Season equally important - as did others of the same fundamental Christian conviction and Assembly. Those who “esteemed” the “**one day**” of the Passover Feast **Meal** might on Passover Feast **Day** have enjoyed the **Lord’s Supper**. A dish of the Feast-animal might be served – like Christmas turkey nowadays is served by Christians. The (unfermented) wine for celebration of Passover might also have been served for the Lord’s Supper. **Others** would “regard” “**all the days**” of Passover Season. They might have eaten Unleavened Bread (“every thing”) for “every day” of Passover Season while abstaining from (fermented) wine and instead might have drunk ordinary unfermented grape juice.

The motivation and reason of Christians – Jewish and Gentile – for incorporating Passover into their **Christian** worship simply was their **Old Testament** and **Jewish heritage** and **culture**. (I don’t insist on this association nor see it as an example for Christians to celebrate Passover Meal as the Lord’s Supper. It simply seems likely and practical that the Church during its “Jewish” age would more likely than any other feast or “days” have “regarded” the “days” of Passover and Unleavened Bread.)

8.1.3.5.1.

Food

“For the Kingdom of God is **not meat and drink** but **righteousness, peace** and **joy** in the **Holy Spirit**. This is the main and comprehensive concept of Romans 14. Who in **these things, righteousness, peace** and **joy** in the **Holy Spirit**, serves Christ – **who “regards” these things “unto the Lord”** – “is accepted of God and approved of men”. (14:17-18)

A certain brother by meticulously eating all food the regarding of the preferred day requires regards one day above the other relevant days. Another brother by meticulously eating all food the regarding of every relevant day requires, regards all the days equally meticulously.

But then still other conscientious persons – **Jewish and Gentile** – while **they also** “esteemed the **one day**”, or, “**all**

the days”, would “**not eat meat**” of “**flesh**” but “**only greens / trimmings** (of the Meal)”, **and**, would “**use** (normal “fermented”) **wine**”. **These** Paul in no manner identifies as Jews **or** as Gentiles despite the conclusion that they acted so scrupulous **precisely to be distinguished from the Jews**. Their Jewish **and** Gentile brothers in the faith “**who ate all things**” brandished **them** – **also Jewish and Gentile** brothers – “who would not eat **flesh** and **drank wine**” as the “**weak**”. But they were as strong in judging as were the strong.

This situation created a very fertile soil for conflict. Paul intervenes and says, 14:2, “**It is all the same, really, it’s trifling**” – *diakriseis dialogismohn*, “You (“the strong” 15:1) must also receive the weak” (14:1). “For we shall all stand before the judgement seat of Christ ... therefore let not us judge one another”. Don’t forget the important thing and don’t fall prey to your real weakness: Don’t judge! Don’t despise! Jesus is the Lord of us all!

Difference over whether only one day or all the days alike should be regarded indicates **two parties**. The parties were **not exclusively Jew and Gentile**. They differed **not over the “days”** as such or over whether the “days” should be “**regarded**”. They differed whether “regard” of the days **also meant eating like the Old Testament-Tradition prescribed the “food” pertaining to the “days”**. How was the “**food**” to be “**observed**” or how was the “**food**” **not to be “observed”** on these Traditional Days? “Days” were **secondary** and **resulted** from the **actual** (but superficial) issue of **eating or not eating**. The dispute concerned not the “**days**” but – **indirectly**, because even the eating as such wasn’t the real problem – the dispute concerned the “**meat**” and “**wine**” that distinguished the “esteemed” or “regarded” “days”. The dispute about “**meat and drink**” presupposes **important** “days”, days the Church “regarded” and “esteemed” “above others”. What actually was “**observed**” ceremoniously - in the true sense of the word “**observe**” - was “**food**”, “food” of “**flesh**”, “food” of “**trimmings**”, and “food” of “**wine**”. The “**foods**” **by being eaten** and **by being drunk or not** were “observed” and thus “certain days” were “respected” and “distinguished”.

Even the most biased of exegetes acknowledge the fact that **Paul finds no fault** with the Church’s practice to “esteem” or to “regard” “days”. But the **Assembly** or **Congregation** of the Church implied by the “days” is

marred by judgement and despising one another over things eaten and drunk on the “days”. Some regard the “days” of Church-worship **by eating and drinking** of wine. Others in just the opposite way regard the “days” **by abstaining** from certain foods and **by not to abstain** from wine that characterises the “regarding” of the “days”. For **those** who do not eat and do drink wine **as for those** who do eat but drink no wine, “**food and drink**” had become so important it for them constituted the whole meaning of **God’s Kingdom!** For them it had become the means to pass **judgement**, the way to receive **pardon for sin**, had become the **object** of reverence! (Christian worship had become a form of idolatry!) But, says Paul, “The Kingdom of God is **not** meat and drink but **righteousness, peace and joy** in the **Holy Spirit.**” And the Kingdom of God being his Church, God saved his Church through Jesus Christ by the righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

While some brothers **ate “all things”**, others “**only ate the vegetable foods**” and abstained from “foods” of “**flesh**”. These, who “ate no flesh”, “**drank wine**” while the “opposition” abstained. It is impossible to tell how this category of “regarders” divided between the party that regarded only one day and the party that regarded all the days. They all displayed the most unchristian spirit of intolerance – their **only common distinction! The acute malaise went deeper than superficial differences.** The superficial differences and disputes were no more than **symptomatic** of the Church’s need of a true Christ-like attitude towards one another. Paul aims at this deeper and spiritual problem: the issue of the Church’s **need of Christian love** – the issue that concerned God’s **moral Law** and not merely religious and traditional - and of less importance, ceremonial - preferences of “food”. **Superficially** the problem concerned **Jewish traditions**, but **Christian relations** that involved principles of **divine Law** – the “**Law of Love**” that allows the brother his freedom in matters of secondary importance – constituted the **fundamental** problem.

8.1.3.5.2.

Passover for the Strong And the Weak

The “**strong**” is the one who **1, “regards one day** above the other days”, who, **2, eats all the foods** but **3, who abstains from wine** - **exactly as Passover and the Days of Unleavened Bread** used to be “regarded” traditionally!

The “**weak**” is he who **1, “regards every day alike”**, who, **2, eats only vegetables** and **3, who drinks wine** - as he, being weak in the faith as a Christian, **is able** to “regard” Passover and the Days of Unleavened Bread!

The **only** group of “regarded” or “esteemed” “**days**” that could possibly fit or accommodate the preferences of **both** the “weak” **and** the “strong”, of both the regard of “days” **and** “foods”, and of both Jewish **and** Gentile Christians, is the **Passover** Feast Season that included the **Days of Unleavened Bread**. The Passover among all feasts or “days” known of Biblical times was traditionally “regarded” **by a meal** of “**flesh**” and **unleavened bread**, and of **vegetable** trimmings and of **unfermented** grape juice. The Passover’s were the only possible Feast “days” when Christians could purposely drink wine and not eat flesh in order to distinguish themselves from the Jews. These negative as well as positive implications confirm the supposition that Paul addresses the **Church** that “regarded” and “esteemed” the “**Jewish**” traditional Feasts and “**days**” in its **Christian**, congregational and formal **worship**.

That however is still **no reason** that the Church should **continue** to observe any of the “Jewish” Feasts, not even the Passover, **in its own right**. The **Bible** has provided – or rather, **God in his Providence** has provided - for the **Passover** specifically to be celebrated and indeed to be “observed” and “hallowed” by the **Church**. For the Christian and the Christian Congregation the **Passover** commemoration “still applies” - vigorously and clearer than before the death and resurrection of Jesus - **through the Fourth Commandment**. Since **Jesus Christ** fulfils “**God’s** Passover” He also accomplishes the **People’s** Passover. “**THEREFORE** the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the **Sabbath Day**”, Deuteronomy 5:15. Paul says Christ is “**our**” Passover (Lamb), meaning the Christians’ and not (only) the Jews’. But he certainly has in mind that Christ, **while** He is “the **Lamb of God**” (John), is “for **us Christians**, for Christ’s **Church**”, the “Passover of God”. Christ for our

redemption (cf. Ex.12:11) “is Yahweh’s Passover”.

“O Lord, till thy **People** *pass over* which thou hast purchased”, Ex.15:16.

Keeping the **Sabbath** “still valid for the People of God”, the Church keeps the **Passover** as a commemoration “forever” of the redemption God wrought in Jesus Christ through resurrection from the dead.

“Some well-meaning, albeit misinformed, Christians today have accused Jewish Christians of ‘Judaizing’ and ‘Galatianism’ because they choose to celebrate Jewish holidays and remember their cultural roots. Nothing is further from reality. The Jewish believer in Jesus finds deeper significance and reinforced faith in seeing God’s commandments and the customs of his people Israel in the new light of salvation in Christ. These things are relevant to our faith, not in opposition to it. We gain no merit with God in observing the festivals; but if we ignore them, we miss the blessings of a deeper appreciation of the heritage that is the cradle of our faith and subsequent salvation. The apostle Paul dealt with this subject when he wrote by the moving of the Holy Spirit in Romans 14 ...”. (Ceil and Moishe Rosen, *Christ in the Passover*, p. 60)

I disagree with these Jewish Christians, but with two thousand years gone by since Paul’s day, I am still not allowed to judge them or to doubt their sincerity or even the acceptability “unto the Lord” of their devotion. Nevertheless I believe there is a great difference between the *status quo* of today and that of two thousand years ago. The Jews no longer are the majority in the Church. They have had these many years to consider that all these feasts **are celebrated in Jesus Christ** because they all were **fulfilled** by Christ and **in** Him. Moreover it must have become clear in the meantime that nationalism no longer is of importance, for “there is no more Jew nor Gentile but we are all one in Jesus Christ”. Actually it must have become clear after so long time that nationalism as such only breeds conflict and disappointment. The only true nationalism of all times owes its existence to God’s direct rule – the “time of the Jews”. It was unique and now no longer can be reconciled with God’s design. The Theocratic era was the only nationalistic era but is gone and it now is the time of the Kingdom of God and “the times of the Gentiles”. The life we now live we no longer live to the flesh but by the faith of Jesus. The New Testament on strength of Jesus’

fulfilling all prophecy and promise, indeed on strength of Jesus’ accomplishing and confirming of God’s Eternal Covenant of Grace, concludes and thus invites his People out of every people to “a keeping of the Sabbath still valid for Gods People”. Jesus did bring his People rest by having entered into his own rest from his own work. **In celebrating Christ** in faith and the Sabbath in practice *the cradle of our faith* and eternal salvation is *appreciated and reinforced* by “a **better** Covenant”. We remember our **greater** beginnings, in fact our very creation and redemption in Christ Jesus. That is why “the Sabbath remains in force”, for indeed as in Christ all these feasts were fulfilled by Christ and in Him, they **providentially** were all fulfilled **on the Sabbath in that Jesus Christ rose from the dead “in the Sabbath”!** **By observing the Lord’s Sabbath Day, “all the days” receive their due “regard” and “esteem”.** Whether Jew or Gentile Christians as sixty years after Christ so two thousand years after Christ live near the cradle of their faith (as if a thousand years were one day). They live near the cradle of their faith **because they live by the faith of Jesus Christ** Crucified and Risen, Exalted at the right hand of the power of God in heavenly realms, King, Prophet and Priest of the Kingdom of God. Christians “regard” all days and all foods “unto the Lord”. But while they “eat all meat” “unto the Lord”, the Christian nation **observes the Lord’s Supper** especially, “unto the Lord”; and while they “esteem all days unto the Lord”, the Christian nation **observes the Lord’s Day** especially, “unto the Lord”. For the life of the Church is a life of **Worship** “unto the Lord”.

8.1.4.

An Attempt at an Accommodating Approach That Failed

Refer, Dr. Samuele Bacchiocchi, *the Sabbath in the New Testament*, Biblical Perspectives, 1990 – used **without** permission, my fear for the consequences notwithstanding, trusting Prof. Bacchiocchi’s forgiving character.

“The Sabbath is not specifically mentioned in Paul’s Epistle to the Romans. However, in chapter 14, the Apostle distinguishes between two types of believers: the “strong” who believed “he may eat anything” and the “weak” who ate only “vegetables” and drank no wine (Rom 14:2,21). The difference extended also to the observance of days, though it is not clear which of the two esteemed “one day as better

than another” and which esteemed “all days alike” (Rom 14:5).”

“... the “weak” who ate only “vegetables” and drank no wine (Rom 14:2,21).” The association which Paul supposes, Bacchiocchi reverses. The “weak”, while he / they *“ate only “vegetables”* and no “meat”, did drink wine. Paul addresses the whole Congregation and both opposing *“types of believers”*. His single proposition should satisfy both. *“(For you who eat flesh) it is better not to eat flesh, and (for you who drink wine) it is better not to drink wine, nor for both of you to do anything whereby your brother may stumble or may be offended, or may be weakened in the faith”, 14:21.*

“The difference extended also to the observance of days, though it is not clear which of the two esteemed “one day as better than another” and which esteemed “all days alike” (Rom 14:5).”

There is no indication whatsoever that *“the difference extended also to the observance of days”* but for the **false addition**, “and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it”. All “parties” and *“types of believers”* “esteemed” and “regarded” “days”. The *“types of believers”* only differed as to whether **“every day”** of “(all the) “days” “esteemed” and “regarded” should be “esteemed” and “regarded”, **“alike”**, or as to whether **“(one) day (only) above the other”** of “(all the) “days” “esteemed” and “regarded”.

“Many (commentators?) have maintained that the weekly Sabbath comes within the scope of this distinction respecting days. They presume that the “weak” believers esteemed the Sabbath better than other days while “the strong” treated the Sabbath like the rest of the week-days. ... Can the Sabbath be legitimately read into this passage? In my view this is impossible for at least three reasons. First, the conflict between the “weak” and the “strong” over diet and days can hardly be traced back to Mosaic law, because nowhere does the Mosaic law prescribe strict vegetarianism, total abstinence from wine, or a preference over days presumably for fasting.”

Bacchiocchi is quite correct generally speaking. But as has just been explained above, *“Mosaic law”* fits the context like a glove while **nothing else** does. The “days” as well as the “food” resembles **Jewish** feasts and **particularly**, the

Passover Feast-period when certain specific foods and days and times used to be of **special and different** meaning and importance. And although wine as such did not **originally** make out part of *“Mosaic law”* in this respect, it **traditionally** became one of the most important aspects of the Passover that **fermented** wine (like **leavened** bread), was **not** drunk during the “Days of Unleavened Bread” of *“Mosaic law”*. Some Christians – **who then somehow still “regarded” and “esteemed” the “days” of Passover**, went to the **extreme** of *“strict vegetarianism”* and **acted against** what Jewish tradition *“prescribed”* pertaining the use of **wine**. **They**, are referred to as the “weak”. The “strong” Christians **who also then somehow still “regarded” and “esteemed” the “days” of Passover**, went to the other **extreme** and “ate **everything**” that *“Mosaic law”* as well as **Jewish tradition** *“prescribed”* – they also **abstained** from wine!

The Passover, moreover, had its “Sabbaths”:- **1**, The **second** day of Passover **Season** which also is the first of the (seven) Days of Unleavened Bread, “regarded” an “High Day” and called “the Sabbath” of the Passover in Lv23:11; **2**, the **third** day of Passover Season, the Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering, **not called a Sabbath**, but which – by its Providential nature in the last Passover in the life of our Lord – fell on the **weekly Sabbath**; **3**, the **eighth** day of the Feast Season and seventh day unleavened bread is eaten; **4**, the Fiftieth Day or “Pentecost” – 52nd day of Passover **Season**, which necessarily by its Providential nature in the last Passover in the life of our Lord would fall on the Sabbath.

Since Jesus fulfilled each and all of these “days” they by Christians should be “regarded” as such, and as such - **being fulfilled by Jesus and in Him** – be “esteemed”, appreciated and appropriated by Christians. Which **exactly and fully explains** leaving no shadow of a doubt **Paul’s attitude** toward the issue pertaining “days” in the Church in Rome. And since Jesus’ fulfilment of each and all of **these** “days”, “according to the Scriptures”, so minutely fulfils and confirms that **different** day the Sabbath Day for what it in God’s design was, would become and now is, Christians should “celebrate” and “keep” it “holy”.

“The conflict between the “weak” and the “strong” over diet and days” must indeed “be traced back to Mosaic law”. But **certainly not**, except for inference such as I have made above, *“can the **Sabbath** be legitimately read into this*

passage” - in which happy respect *my view* fully agrees with Prof. Bacchiocchi’s.

“That the Mosaic law is not at stake in Romans 14 is also indicated by the term “koinos – common” which is used in v. 14 to designate “unclean” food. This term is radically different from the word “akathartos” – impure” used in Leviticus 11 (Septuagint) to designate unlawful foods.”

As has been explained above (Par. 8.2.1.3.1.) the Romans 14 issue is not over “clean” and “unclean” foods. Ro.14:14 plainly states that “nothing” – *ouden*, is *koinon*, i.e., “common”, “*per se*” – *di’ heautou*. It implies precisely what would fit the circumstance of Passover Season during the early years of Christianity. Paul argues that any food that otherwise used as “common” food, would **just as it is** do for the special “regarded and “esteemed” “days”. But as ‘beauty is in the eye of the beholder’, Paul argues that “to him that esteemeth anything to be ordinary, to him it is ordinary”. **He is free to eat whatever he likes on any day.** Remember that Paul realised that Passover was an institution of the Old Testament times and of a bygone dispensation **despite** the fact that it was in a certain way still observed by the early Church. One may see this remark of Paul as a **preparatory suggestion** for his practical proposal a little further on in verse 21, **that the best thing would be for any party to surrender his own preferences for the sake of the other.** With this remark Paul removes any doubt that the “days” he discusses were specifically **associated with the food eaten thereon**, and were therefore **not the Sabbath** which is distinguished **independent of foods.**

“This term (“koinos – common”) is radically different from the word “akathartos – impure” used in Leviticus 11 (Septuagint) to designate unlawful foods.” But Bacchiocchi’s “unlawful foods” are nothing but “unclean” food”.

This term “koinos – common” is radically different from the word “akathartos – impure” used in Leviticus 11 for the simple reason that it indicates a radically different meaning, namely “to designate”, “ordinary” food.

“Apparently the dispute was over meat which per se was lawful to eat but because of its association with idol worship (cf. 1 Cor 8:1-13) was regarded by some as “koinos – common”, that is, unfit for human consumption.”

Nothing is “apparent” in this. Idol worship and the foods associated with it is not a matter in Romans 14. (See

above Par. 8.2.1.3.2.) And the “food” “eaten” or not “eaten” obtained its meaning not from strange uses and abuses, but from familiar “**common**” **custom** = the “regard” and “esteem” certain “**days**” enjoyed - **among Christians!** Due to the Christian’s internal preferences and dislikes occasion arose for the judging and despising of one another. If idol worship were relevant it was the **idol of self**. Besides, it is impossible that the issue in the Congregation in Rome could have raged over mutually **exclusive influences** and causes such as Old Testament sacrifices, distinction between clean and unclean foods, and idolatrous left-overs. The issue was not syncretism but factionalism. The Church was not (as at Colossus) “enticed”, allured, by “philosophy” and “mystery”. It was not the in-thing to be broad- minded, “man”, “of the world”, but to be prudish and unbending.

“The whole discussion in Romans 14 is not about freedom to observe the law versus freedom from its observance, but concerns “unessential” scruples of conscience dictated not by divine precepts but by human conventions and superstitions. Since these differing convictions and practices did not undermine the essence of the Gospel, Paul advises mutual tolerance and respect in this matter”.

How could “superstitions” “not undermine the essence of the Gospel”? Otherwise Bacchiocchi observation is true in every respect. (Return to “superstition” further on.) And because of Paul’s “advice” of “mutual tolerance and respect” a concept such as “**hypocrisy**” could replace that of “superstitions”. But hypocrisy must more than “superstitions” “undermine the essence of the Gospel”. Paul does not address the differences in the Church over days and foods as the **first and real “difficulty”**, ^(Hodge) but exactly the very serious and inexcusable **sin of pride and intolerance** - sins that “**destroy the work of God**”! Paul’s remonstrance really concerns the “**Kingdom of God**” which “**is not food and drink**”. “**For meat does not destroy the work of God**” but “**evil**”, that “evil as far as that man that **eats with offence** is concerned” (verse 20) **does** destroy God’s work and Kingdom. “**Common**” and without meaning, for no reason distinctive and offensive “**food and drink**”, **through its use** by “that man” (“that man” **you** of the Church in Rome!) make of God’s Kingdom a Kingdom and of God’s Work (which is Christ) a work of “food and drink”. It makes of

Christ's Church a *power and principality* and a "worldly" realm where **"one man lords it over another"** **"who is Christ's"!** That, is Paul's complaint. The Church should hear this while it judges and condemns brothers who "regard" and "esteem" "days" (even the Sabbath) "unto the Lord and thank God". **"Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died"**. (Destroy not him with **thy day** for whom Christ died?)

"... Paul applies the basic principle "observe it in honor of the Lord" (14:6) only to the case of the person "who observes the day". He never says the opposite, namely, "the man who esteems all days alike, esteems them in honor of the Lord"."

Paul's reasoning supposes **every** party's **devout intentions** with its preferences and scruples. 'What the "one man" does', Paul reasons, 'he does with the same motives you have'. "Therefore, who are you to despise him; who are you to judge him?" – verse 10. **Nevertheless**, the Church comes under Paul's **uncompromising judgement** for its **hypocrisy** because it is **this** very religious and pious Church that "judges" and "despises" "one another", that "destroys God's work" and that makes of God's Kingdom nothing more or better than "common" "food and drink"!

"In other words, with regard to diet, Paul teaches that one can honor the Lord both by eating and by abstaining (14:6) but with regard to days, he does not even concede that the person who regards all the days alike does so to the Lord. Thus Paul hardly gives his endorsement to those who esteemed all days alike."

Maybe Bacchiocchi administers overkill. The same answer applies to the same argument just put in other words. Nevertheless other aspects of the matter emerges from Bacchiocchi re-statement. As just shown, Paul implicitly **does give his endorsement to those who esteemed all days alike**. But here one must ask, **"all days" in what sense?** Does Paul have in mind **"all days" without distinction** as commentators almost without exception allege? Or does he have in mind **"all days" of the contextually relevant period or season of days?** Keeping in mind that Paul in fact supposes "days" of **"Mosaic law"**, and most specific and obviously the "days" of the **Passover Season**, it comes as no surprise that he literally does not say **"all days"**, but the **singular, "every day"**. **"Every day" of what?** is the natural

question. **"Every day" of the season**, feast or period implied, is the natural answer. And simply **no other** feast-time **naturally complies** with the oddities implied and mentioned in the passage but the **Passover Feast Season!** Says Paul, *"One man esteems one day above another day; another man esteems every day (pahsan hehmeran)"*. He in fact does not use the express word, **"alike"** which is a meaningful fact that makes the phrase "every day" imply a definite **group of relevant** days. Nevertheless Paul **intends to convey** the idea that some "regard" "every day" of **all these days, "alike"!** (See Par. 8.2.1.3.4.3.1; 8.2.1.3.4.4 above.)

"If, as generally presumed, it was the "weak" believer who observed the Sabbath, Paul would classify himself with the "weak" since he observed the Sabbath and other Jewish feasts (Acts 18:4, 19; 17:1, 10, 17; 20:16). Paul, however, views himself as "strong" ("we who are strong" – 15:1); thus, he could hardly have been thinking of Sabbathkeeping when he speaks of the preference over days".

If Paul as a Sabbath-keeper is "strong", then "he who regards a day" must be considered the "strong" **"type of believer"**. And as there were **no** persons who did **not** "regard" "days" and as **everybody, "regarded"**, "days" – "one man" only "one day", and "another man", "every day" – the latter was the "weak" "man" who refused "meat", did not "eat everything" but "only vegetables" and did "drink wine". And **in line with this negative attitude** of his, **he** was the "one who" did **not** "regard one day" of the feast period **"above the other"** days of the feast period which he **in fact "regarded"**. Paul *could hardly have been thinking of Sabbath-keeping when he speaks of these several and diverse* preferences of "days". "Days" and "sabbath days", **in any case**, were not the issue, not the problem, and not the subject of Paul's discussion, but **that which constituted the Kingdom of God** for some of the Church at Rome: **"food and drink"!**

"The preference over days in Romans presumably had to do with fast-days rather than feast days, since the context deals with abstinence from meat and wine (Rom 14:2, 6, 21)."

It is difficult to understand how Bacchiocchi could accommodate the full array of the popular explanations for the problem implied in Romans 14. It's just not possible that *Mosaic law, vegetarianism, clean and unclean food, and*

fasting can independently or syncretistic present the answer or just part of the answer to the problematic of the passage.

Fasting cannot in Romans 14 be relevant. Nobody ate nothing. Those who did not eat meat still ate vegetables and still drank wine. Even their eating “only vegetables” does not mean some were vegetarians. Their preferences of eating and drinking applied **only** for the several “days”, that is, for “**every day**” of the period supposed. Afterwards eating returned to “normal” (“common” - *koinos*). Also does the word for “vegetables” not necessarily define **plant**-food. It can also mean “trimmings” or “garnish”, even “**side dish**” of whatever source. Again the Passover meal and the food for the whole Feast traditionally became **lavish** with much more **served** than the original “**flesh**” of the sacrificial lamb “**only**”, or, “**bare**” / “**bitter**”. (See Part One.) Of neither vegetarianism nor fasting is there any question.

“If the conflict in the Roman Church had been over the observance of holy days, the problem would have been even more manifest than the one over diet. After all, eating habits are a private matter, but Sabbath-keeping is a public, religious exercise of the whole community. Any disagreement on the latter would have been not only noticeable but also inflammatory.”

*The conflict in the Roman Church – in fact - had been over the observance of holy days, not only noticeable but also inflammatory. Very much so. It was so “inflammatory” that the “one man” was surrounded with categorised “parties”, the “Strong and the Weak”. It indeed was a matter of political lobbying and emotions and slandering no scarcity. And Paul addresses exactly such a “conflict”. These “eating habits” were no “private matter”, but clearly and obtrusively, irritatingly “a public, religious exercise of the whole community”. “Disagreement” “over diet” went hand in hand with “the conflict over the observance of holy days”. The two aspects were inseparable, and the fact implies that the problem was one of and within the **Church**. It was an issue of **worship**, and it had to do not with “private” but with **congregational** worship – which is worship on certain **days** and **periods** of days – **without exception**. Church worship does not exist without its days of worship. That is reality. And it is reality not purely as factual, but because it is **God’s dispensation**. Show me where does a people worship God not on God’s days for to be worshipped on by his People! At*

Rome the “*conflict*” had **nothing** to do with “*diet*”. And exactly this perspective of the “*conflict*” explains quite satisfactorily “*the fact that Paul devotes 21 verses to the discussion of food and less than two verses (Rom 14:5-6) to that of days*”. The eating problem concerned the out of the ordinary, the against the spirit of the “days” – which were the ordinary, acquainted “days” of traditional and Old Testament origin and standing as “days” of Congregational Christian worship! “*Days (were) a very limited problem for the Roman Church*” is an understatement. The Rome congregation would have had **no** problem **whatsoever** concerning “days” of feast and worship had it not the problem **practically realised by, in and through customs concerning “food and drink” that belonged to those days**. And even if the “*difficulty*” were one over “days” as “days” of worship or feast – it is an eternity from being a difficulty over the **Sabbath Day!** And if anything could be more remote from relevance it would have “*had to do with private conviction on the merit or demerit of doing certain spiritual exercises such as fasting on specific days*”.

We have above taken notice of Prof. Bacchiocchi’s attempting the impossible by trying to explain the problematics of Romans 14 **at the hand of every imaginable whim**. Yet he finds **still another** “*possible*” explanation for the Rome Church’s “*conflict*”. Says he, “*In the Roman world there was a superstitious belief that certain days were more favourable than others for undertaking some specific projects. The fathers frequently rebuked Christians for adopting such superstitious mentality. It is possible that Paul alludes to this kind of problem, which at his time, however, was still too small to deserve much attention. In the light of the above consideration, we conclude that it is hardly probable that the Sabbath is included in the “days” of Romans 14:5*”. (Emphasis CGE)

“*In the light*” of his disparate stew of “*possible*” impossible “*considerations*” and typical “*conclusions*”, Prof. Bacchiocchi claims “*it is possible that Paul alludes to this kind of problem*”, which “*at (Paul’s) time*” posed itself the problem of the “*superstitious mentality*” and “*superstitious belief*”. Though not “*much*”, it, says Prof. Bacchiocchi, “*deserved*” **enough** “*attention*” to explain what Paul meant with the concept of “days” in the “*conflict*” in the Church in Rome. Now that would be worse an association of ideologies

and a bleaker marriage of practices in this Scripture than for Paul to have “*alluded*” to the Sabbath in it!

Conclusion

If in our day it is a “*weak and beggarly principle*” to keep the Sabbath but “**strong**” to **venerate Sunday** it is not to say that in Paul’s day it was the case. For Paul the **Jewish Christians** – who were the bearers of the Light of the Gospel before and after Christ **and** who were the keepers of the Sabbath – were the “strong” in the **Christian Faith. As Christians, the Jews’** “advantage” was “great in every respect” (Ro.3:1). (As **unbelieving Jews**, they were a rejected and dismembered nation and individuals.) They – **as Christians** – were children and not strangers to the promises of God. To **them – as Christians** – belonged the Covenant and the Promises, belonged the “inheritance of the saints” and **God to them – as Christians – kept Word** in Jesus Christ! The **Jews – as Christians** – were **natural** branches of the olive tree and not grafted in like the heathen (Ro.11:17). Only as a “**strong**” could Paul the **Jewish Christian** declare, “I seek not my own profit but that of many, that **they** may be saved” (1Cor.10:33). “Him that is weak in the faith receive ye (“strong” Jewish Christians), and not grudgingly! ... For we (Jewish Christians) that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak (Gentile Christians), and ought not to please ourselves” (Ro.14:1, 15:1).”

“*The narrower people*” says William Barclay, “*make a great deal of the observance of one special day. That was a special characteristic of the Jews ... people who made a fetish of observing days ... The Jews had made a tyranny of the sabbath ... It was not that Paul wished to wipe out the Lord’s Day – far from it: but he did fear an attitude which in effect believed that Christianity consisted in observing any particular day.*” (Letter to the Romans)

We have noticed that the **Jews** were not the culprits in the Church at Rome **for being Jews**. The culprits were among them as among the Gentile ... **Christians!** We have noticed that the **Sabbath** is irrelevant to the subject Paul discusses in this Scripture. We have noticed in fact that the matter **had nothing to do** with “*the observance of one special day*” or “*any particular day*”! Contextually anything “*that*” whatever Paul might have “*wished*” about “*the Lord’s Day*” – **Sunday**, is as relevant as is the “*Stoics’ indifference*” Barclay attempts to read into the context of Romans 14.

Paul makes an exception of the Lord’s Day as much as he makes a point in case of the Sabbath. If Paul had argued against the “observance” of “days”, he argued against the observance of **all days**. And if such an argument could possibly have been valid, there would have been **no** “Lord’s Day” to make an **exception** of, and **no Sabbath** to make an **example** of!

Barclay claims “*that Paul wished (not) to wipe out the Lord’s Day*” (Compare Matthew Henry above) and thereby insinuates *that Paul wished to wipe out the Sabbath!* Paul writes of the “day” and “days” “regarded” and “esteemed” “unto the Lord” – but has the “*wiping out*” of “days” in mind? If Paul were that eagerly “*wiping out*” why does he not **say so** and why does he not show the same determination to **introduce** the Lord’s Day (Sunday)? Should Paul not have **mentioned** the immutability of the Lord’s Day (Sunday) **if he had any** “regard” or “esteem” for it “*the Lord’s Day*”, “unto the Lord”?

Says **Paul**, “**one (of us, our Christian brother)** regards the day”, and “**esteems it unto the Lord!**” Says **Barclay**, “*The narrower people*” make of the day a “*fetish*”, a “*tyranny*”. If that isn’t twisting the Scriptures, what is it?

“Avoid foolish questions ... and strife and fights **about the law** – for such things are unprofitable and proud. A **factionalist** (after one or at most two admonitions) avoid – he, knowing that he has been subverted, **sins**, and is **self-condemned**”. (Titus 3:9-10) So serious is it to **divide the People** of God. **That**, was the Church at Rome’s **sin – not** it’s **undivided** regard and esteem of days.

“**One of us**” (14:7, 12) “regards” and “esteems” “days” (5-6), says Paul. “He (only) must be **confident** that he **to the Lord’s honour**, devotes his regarding the day”. (6a) Because “none of us lives to himself (7) ... for **we live unto the Lord ... We are the Lord’s!**” (8) “Let us then no longer judge one another ... **but judge this**, that no one puts a stumbling block or brings in his brother’s way occasion to fall”. (13) **The regard and esteem of days is no sin but is the undivided Church’s confident devotion unto the Lord. But woe to him who divides Christ’s Church! To divide Christ’s Church is sin, and a person who divides Christ’s Church has brought himself under the judgement of God.** Was Sunday at first introduced into the Church without dividing the Church, and without the process ever having **manifested** as this sin?

Renewed After the Image of Him

The Church has always had to admit the historic fact that the Apostolic Congregation (first century) underwent a transition from its nationalistic and Old Testament character to that of a truly Christian and universal Church. The Church has always admitted the fact very reluctantly, however. It has never given that process and that period due recognition or consideration. And it has never given Paul due credit for being the champion of that transition because that would be too “Jewish”. The Church has always held Paul for the **proselytiser** of the **heathen** while he actually led the Jewish Church into the universal Church, being its first apologist, teacher and professor of “**the Scriptures**” – **the Old Testament!** See Part 3 / 1.

The Church has never given due recognition to the fact of the Apostolic Congregation’s emancipation not only from its **Jewish past**, but also from **its heathen present**. As the Church of the first century had to gradually become the **full fledged Christian Community**, it simultaneously had to face the vehement onslaught of the “**world**” and its “human wisdom”, “doctrine”, “principles” and “philosophy”. Paul in his Letter to the Colossians sees in this process and progression **the path of Christ’s victory**. The Church undergoes a trial-period, and attains **full marks ... “in Him”!** Paul wrote no Letter more positive than the Letter to the Church in Colossus. The Church features colossal. But the Church so glorious in its quest is not complete yet or otherwise than “**in Christ**”! Any other “**principality or power**” compares insignificant with “the Body **being Christ’s**” – so **even its own** in view of what “**is near and nearing**”. The “principalities and powers” of the “world” are “made a laughing stock”. But the Church as “rule and power” of which “Christ is the Head” is the heraldry of “fullness” ... “in Him”! Its own past as its own present (as in its “eating and drinking”) is **no static sign-post** that is left behind, but as a “shadow” **stays with the Body**. Now, being “**but a shadow of what is to come**”, “**the Body is Christ’s**”, **nevertheless!**

Even the then triumphant Church of transition is **but an indication** – a mere shadow – of Christ’s Church in the “**still coming**” end-time. The Church has **not yet** fully attained, has not as yet reached and arrived at its triumphant goal and destination, **nevertheless now in Christ** and in Him

as its **Representative**, **has** obtained fully, **has** reached that end-mark and stature **God envisaged** and set the standard for in Christ.

The Church has always taught a beginning with the Christian observance of the First Day from “that day the First Day of the week the disciples *assembled*” (Jn.20:19) **as though the process of transition never occurred**. Which in any case was no transition from an observance of the Sabbath to an observance of the First Day. Just so the Church has used Colossians 2:16 to show an alleged **antagonism towards the Sabbath Day within the Christian Community** and to imply the First Day’s alleged pre-eminence over the Sabbath. The **Sabbath’s growth, with, from, in and into** that Body and its Head - which is Jesus Christ - the Church has come to ignore completely.

Addendum

Dear Doctor Bryant-Abraham,

You write (*Restore!* Summer 1999) on the subject of the so-called *Judenfrage*. I admit, the One General Christian Church has erred concerning the Jews. The Germans were a Christian people who, only by forsaking their Christianity, were able to commit genocide on the Jewish people. But note, exactly through nationalism could they go so far. Any person if called to the Faith in Jesus must and shall “leave father, mother, brother and sister and follow” Jesus. I used to be a staunch nationalist, and only after nationalism had cost me dearly, I came to realise that it is an either or situation. One cannot serve two masters if Christ is the Lord of one’s life. No matter how beautiful, how miraculous, how divine the history of the nation Israel, Israel no longer is the People of God, just as no other nation may claim to be God’s chosen People. There never will be a people “after the flesh” that will be God’s again, for we “no longer know Christ after the flesh” – and “God knows who are his”: “Those who believe”! **Jesus saves nobody by merit of the fact that he is a Jew. He might save a Jew despite the fact that he is a Jew.** But He saves the elect by merit of the fact that He became God incarnate: “God with us” – **man!** Jesus asks everyone who wants to be his, **to leave his nation.** That is most important and absolutely conditional to be a true Christian, whether Englishman, German or Jew. As long as one protests to this, forget to follow Him.

The Jews should stop to pride themselves of their history. They were a sinful people and in no respect better than other nations. Paul says so plainly, “**There no longer is Jew nor Greek**”, not even, man or women, but Christ is all in all. You are a Christian exclusively to the very painful last ounce of nationalistic blood. The day the Jews will renounce – yes, renounce their nation and nationality, there may be hope that they would become Christians. If the Englishman must do so, and the German, and the Afrikaner, why not the Jews? Because they were better, holier, because theirs used to be a “great advantage in every respect”, because theirs used to be “the covenants and the promises of God”? Let me tell the Jews, God did keep word and did make true every promise and so his one everlasting Covenant of Grace which He covenanted with **them**. God **had done** it all in Jesus Christ.

Now allow me to point out some problems with your interpretations of the Scriptures in your article *All Israel Shall be Saved*. I nowhere can find the Scripture that reads, “*if the first dough be holy, the whole loaf is also holy ...*”. Romans 11:16 reads, “If the **first fruit** be holy the lump (of dough) is also holy”. **Christ** was raised from the dead the First Sheaf of First Fruit of Passover. Fifty days after, the **First Loaves** were waved before the Lord, and Pentecost gave birth to the **Church**. “*If Christ being the First Fruit is holy, therefore shall the Church being the First Loaves be holy*”. To make Israel to the flesh stand for the First Fruit and call it the “**first dough**” is to make it both Christ and Christ’s Church.

You continue, “*... and if the root be holy [Israel’s sacred history and destiny], so are the branches [individual Jews]*.” Your statement contradicts Paul. He speaks of Christ as the First Fruit. So does he speak of Christ as the Root. “Some of them”, Israel were **branches** just as the heathen were branches. The first difference is the Jews were **natural** branches of the olive tree “**some of them**” “**broken off**” whereas the heathen are “**wild olive**” branches “**some of them**” “**grafted in**” on the same “root”: “Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee”. (18b) “For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things”. (36) The second difference is this, that the natural, Jewish branches were “**broken off**”, (17), while the “wild” heathen branches were “grafted in **among** them, and **with** them, partake of the root and the fatness of the olive tree”.

The Gentiles were grafted in among the natural branches **that were left** on the root and trunk of the olive “**tree**”. “I have reserved to myself men ... even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace”, 4-5. Obviously and simply the branches left intact were individual **Jews** who “at this present time” of Paul’s writing were believers in **Jesus Christ**. “Because of **unbelief** they (the unbelieving **Jews**) were broken off, and thou (the grafted in **heathen**) standest by **faith**” (20) ... **in Jesus Christ!**

The wonderful mystery of God’s love can clearly be seen in this, that the Jewish **nation** is not portrayed as the **trunk or root or as a branch**, but as **branches**, so that “**some of them** ... might (be) save(d)” ... who also, like the Gentiles, **according to the election of God**, “**stand by faith**” and are “**spared**” because of “the goodness of God”, “if you

(individually) continue"! (20, 22) "And so shall all Israel (one by one as each may be found in Christ) be saved". **No Jew** shall be saved because the **Jewish nation** might be saved. **All** Israel shall be saved because all Israel consists of Jews **and** Gentiles. Verse 26 says this, and from this text on Paul explains **how** all Israel will be saved, "**through the obtaining of grace**" (30) – through obtaining that grace through which God's grace is believed unto salvation in Christ. "God's own olive tree", is **not** "Israel", but the **Church** – "spiritual Israel" of which Christ is **Head, Root and Trunk**, and Gentiles, as Jews, are the branches. "Until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in ... then all Israel shall be saved" means just this, that until every individual Gentile that shall be saved had been saved the number of all Israel will not be completed. The numbers that should fill up the outstanding numbers of all Israel consist of Gentiles and Jews not converted yet and not of Jews for being Israelites to the flesh. **Only** Israelites **become Gentiles** might again be grafted in on their original tree. "For God hath included **them all** (Gentiles and Jews) in **unbelief**, that He might have mercy upon all", and none shall be saved but by the sure mercies of David. **Only** Gentiles of Gentiles and Jews **become Israelites** shall be saved (as the Acts clearly show).

Conversation on Romans 14:4-5

SS – Sunday-sabbatharian

SDA – Law-sabbatharian

OTS – Old Testament-sabbatharian

A-S – A- or anti-sabbatharian

NTSS – New Testament-Sabbath-Sabbatharian

A-S:

If one says the early Christians knew about the 'days' Paul refers to in Romans 14: 4 and 5, '*from reading the Law*', then they would read about the weekly sabbath as well. So when we read "all days" with **NO QUALIFIER listed anywhere in THIS text**, the only thing we can assume is it is all days, generally, in comparison. So all days are esteemed one way or another. Some are esteemed above the others by being "observed".

NTSS:

Do you say we do not read about the Sabbath "in Romans 14:4 and 5", because we are not "*reading the Law*" in there? If that is what you say, I must agree with you. We do not read about the Law or the Sabbath in Romans 14:4-5!

OTS:

I do not see any option for not observing **all** the feasts of the LORD. Israel was commanded to keep them all. Paul describes in Romans 14 (KJV):

4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

5 One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that

eateth not to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

10 But why dost thou judgest thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

11 For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

12 So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

13 Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way.

SS:

I choose the Lord's Day. It's decline in our times is most disturbing.

NTSS:

Quoting OTS, "I do not see any option for not observing **all** the feasts of the LORD. Israel was commanded to keep them all. Paul describes in Romans 14..." Therefore you – unlike A-S, maintain one does read about the Law and the Sabbath in Romans 14?

Quoting A-S, "...when we read "all days"...". No; you mean, when actually you, read, "all days"! Paul did not write 'all days'.

Quoting A-S, "...with NO QUALIFIER listed anywhere in THIS text...". Please qualify what you mean with 'qualifier'? I understand under 'qualifier' in this text, Romans 14:5 and 6, inter alia the following, "*One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike*". The statement is specific – it 'qualifies'; it 'qualifies' who observes; and what is observed.

Quoting A-S, "So all days are esteemed one way or another. Some are esteemed above the others by being "observed"." It all depends on which days you mean "all days" to be! Are they all days of the year or week – the days normally not observed religiously, or all days of the relevant and specific period or feast obviously alluded to

and implied by Paul writing in reaction to the circumstance ruling in the Church, at the time?

SDA:

In Romans 14 Paul argues of the Lev 23 ceremonial holy days "Some OBSERVE one day ABOVE another while others OBSERVE EVERY day". What Paul does not say is "Some OBSERVE NO day" from the list of the Lev 23 Ceremonial Sabbaths.

NTSS:

What Paul also "does not say ... in Romans 14", is, "the Lev 23 ceremonial holy days"! He also does not write of any "Ceremonial Sabbaths", and albeit the 'days' he writes of were 'ceremonial days' they were not (all) "Sabbaths". SDA, "Paul argues of the Lev 23 ceremonial holy days..." Is he? Yes he is, but does he mean with 'days', the 'feasts', or does he mean the 'days' of, the feasts, or even the 'days' of, just one of the feasts? He means the 'days', of, feast, no doubt – 'days' of "*holy convocation*". But Paul does not have the feasts – 'unqualified'–, in mind, but only 'days' – some or all – of one feast that will answer the detail that he does give in the passage of contextual interest, Romans 14.

'In Romans 14 Paul argues' a certain 'problem' that was not the Sabbath or any 'day', or any feast 'observed', as such. The 'problem' was nothing but a haughty, judging spirit. That spirit showed, in worship through, days and the 'food and drink' great freedom about should have been maintained but was not. Christian feasts deteriorated to the level of its Jewish counter-part. The Kingdom of God was reduced to "food and drink" -- to ceremonial strictness : cultured in a cold, proud and intolerant heart. Romans 14 condemns the spirit and the attitude, and justifies the 'keeping' as well as the preferment of the 'days' referred to. If at all therefore it had to do with it, Romans 14 would underwrite Sabbath-keeping.

SS:

Is the Creator subject to the time zones we have created? and if so, which does he go by? For that question to make sense those questions need to be asked.

SDA:

It is pretty hard to pretend that we do not know the 7th day of the week observed in Palestine in 1st century AD – the days of Christ. We have no excuse in that regard sir.

NTSS:

Legitimate question, SS! ... or would have been, were the weekly Sabbath coupled with or were it dependent on 'time zones'. But it is not.

"...the time zones we have created...?" When we mortals have reached all the perimeters of all our potential and mental prowess and power, we haven't come nearby God, what He is, or who He is. But Christ brought all the perimeters of God, into our human sphere, and the Law being the Law of God, reached its 'expansion' and magnification, in Him. Only in Christ, could we, yes, may we –wondrous freedom!–, "*call the Sabbath a DELIGHT*". So, in Christ only, please understand, can we, must we, and may we, delighters in the Sabbath of the Lord our God, "*cease from speaking (our) own word*" -- *cease from speaking our own word* about the Sabbath! Notice, the People of God, "*calling the Sabbath a DELIGHT*".

The One who created the universe is the Only who created 'time zones'. 'Time zones' cannot exist without created 'bodies'. Where there is no matter there is no space. And without bodies of matter and their movements one cannot speak of energy or time. It's not our 'creation' – 'time zones' are God's, created by Him. "*He spake, and it was.*" The sun, "*ruled*" neither the First Day of creation, or the Seventh! Appointed God not the sun, it would not have 'ruled' the days, seasons and years, and for no moment since its appointment, has the sun's 'rule' become a 'natural phenomenon'. If God withdrew his hand, then everything will implode to nothingness again. (*Ex nihilo in nihilum*)

But the Seventh Day Sabbath has absolutely no relationship with the cycles God ruled should be ruled by nature. From where then the Seventh Day but from God's will? He numbers cycles and He, GAVE the Seventh Day-Cycle (the 'week') 'existence', entity, essence, content – as it were the right to be! If not for God's act of rest upon it, the Seventh Day would not have been this mysterious reality 'whereon' God

manifested His Rulership or Lordship, 'the Sabbath' – "*Sabbath of the LORD your God*". Had it not been for the power and strength and might of God's Sabbath-Deed-of-Rest, the Seventh Day Sabbath would not have been. That is why the Seventh Day is so peculiar, so exclusively uniquely, the New Testament Lord's Day. And that too, is why the 'week' –the Sabbath leading and ruling the six other days of the 'cycle' of seven days, the week– is so impossible to explain from any standpoint than that of faith – 'Bible-faith'.

How does creation effect the Sabbath? The sun rules the days, seasons and years. The moon rules the months. And the Sabbath Day 'rules' the 'week-cycle', but not like the sun rules. So how does the Sabbath Day 'rule'? By no 'rule' of created-ness. The fact the 'weekly' cycle does not depend on created things, must make us look for God's personal involvement. And we find it in the Rest of God. The only way the Sabbath Day could relate with created 'time-zones', is God's Rest upon it. God's Act of the creation-Sabbath was His Rest of and upon the Day the Seventh of His creating. But that is how far as we are able to describe or explain the week conceptually. God's Rest on the Seventh Day of creation, for us, must remain cerebral and unsuccessful for as long as we have not taken cognisance of the New Testament, of Salvation, And with its fullness, and of Jesus Christ.

SS:

The "letter" of the law is confining in its incompleteness.

NTSS:

Yes, but then the "Giver of the Law", "came", and with Him 'came' the completion – yea in fact The Completeness of the Law. And with its Fullness, arrived and stayed its Comprehension and Revelation. God gave us the Sabbath Day through Jesus Christ, but more importantly, in Jesus Christ.

SDA:

You say, SS, that "thou shalt not murder" is too confining? but "you shall not hate" gives us much more freedom?? Isn't it more correct to say that "you shall not hate" is EXPANDING the scope of the commandment so that it is far MORE restrictive on what we are allowed to do. I.e., no hating-yet-not-murdering. It

would be like saying of THE Seventh-day Sabbath, "NOT ONLY MUST you NOT work on Sabbath BUT you MUST ALSO call the Sabbath a DELIGHT and cease from speaking your own word". In other words the broader the deeper - EXPANDING direction would be to view the "no work" restriction as the very LEAST requirement which MUST be kept (just as not murdering is STILL a requirement that is fully met WHILE ALSO not hating). Or did I miss something there?

NTSS:

Ja, you did. You ended up where you started from, the Law; you missed "*the End of the Law*". For in the first place and before the People, the Subject of man's action of 'keeping' the Sabbath, is Jesus Christ "*the Son of Man*", "*Lord of the Sabbath Day*". See the Day of the New Testament Sabbath of the LORD your God, "*in Christ*". Or 'miss out on something' great!

For the first time the creation of God sees the Seventh Day, in the "*Son of Man, Lord of the Sabbath Day*"; for the first time, in Christ, "*the Sabbath, made, for man*". From this vista, see "*a keeping of the Sabbath Day remaining valid for the People of God*" - "*the Lord's Day*"! "*Behold, the Lamb of God!*", "*in Whom I-AM, Well-Pleased*". Behold, God, "*delight(ing) in and calling the Sabbath, a delight!*"! The creation of God for the first time witnesses the creation of the Sabbath Day "*in Christ*"; for the first time derives and experiences the '*sabbatismos*' from God's '*Anapausis*': "*in Him*", through Him, and for Him - to the delight of God, in the exaltation of Jesus Christ, "*far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come*". Christ, with "*all things being put under His feet, the Head, over all things given to the Church ... the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*"

Why did Christ become incarnate? God not only accepted our flesh in Jesus Christ; He accepted and made our time His time! "*The Sabbath was made ...*" by

the Word of God. God "*thus speaking of the Seventh Day*" when "*in the beginning*" He created, is God "*speaking in the Son*", "*the Word (that) in the beginning was*". "*God has spoken to us in these last days in the Son*"; "*He thus concerning the Seventh Day spake*", "*in the Son*". Thus "*speaking*", 'created' God, the 'time-zone' of the, "*Seventh Day ... Sabbath of the LORD your God!*"

Only now do we begin to speak of the Sabbath and the mystery of it, revealed in the Son who acting, working, "*exercised*", "*His own Rest*". God has made our time, His time; His Rest, our rest; His Sabbath, ours - as the People of God, in Jesus Christ! Where we from the creation-Sabbath were unable to recognise Jesus Christ, we now can, and may, because God has revealed Himself through Christ and in Christ.

No new or unknown elements or factors or powers from outside or from within came to our assistance when Jesus Christ discovered Himself "*to us-ward*". God "*in Sabbath's-time*", "*exalted Him and set Him at the right hand of the power of God in heavenly glory when He raised Him from the dead*", "*the King set upon the throne of the Kingdom ... to rule for ever and ever*". He as it were stepped out from the Sabbath Day, into our world and time - the world and time of the Church.

Where we could not progress any further in explaining the Sabbath Day-'time-zone' of the Scriptures or the seven days-'week', we now have taken one step forward - the giant leap of faith. For now we are able to see! And we are enabled to behold the work of God of the Sabbath Day, on the Sabbath Day, more fully. In fact, we are enabled to see it in the fullness of *God's glory in the face of Jesus Christ!* Behold the Rest of God, on the Sabbath Day, all the works of God Completed, in New Testament Sabbath's-Day-time-zone! "*The King, as He goeth out and as He cometh in!*" It is Jesus, "*exalted far above all principality and power and might, and dominion, and every name*" - indeed God, "*in the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward according to the working of his mighty power which He worked when He raised Christ from the dead.*" We discover the Sabbath here, in the sphere in which created reality and the Reality of Divinity, interlocked.

God in many ways and "at sundry times", "thus concerning the Seventh Day spake", and you can check up, He "thus", each time, "spake", when and while, He showed and made known, His Great Salvation! The Bible beyond a doubt for any who believe, proves the Creator subjected Himself to 'our' time zones (just like He subjected Himself to our flesh and nature) -- time zones HE, created, and to which He, subjected US; then made OUR time, HIS TIME. No; He is Master to, and Creator and Ruler of, 'the time zones' -- it's not "the time zones we, have created".

Said SDA, "In Romans 14 Paul argues of the Lev 23 ceremonial holy days "Some OBSERVE one day ABOVE another while others OBSERVE EVERY day". What Paul does not say is "Some OBSERVE NO day" for the list of the Lev 23 Ceremonial Sabbaths."

Yes, Paul says no word of the Sabbath nor alludes to it, directly or indirectly. We perhaps may reach conclusions that would not be what Paul said or taught, but nevertheless would not be contrary or against it.

Paul indisputably condoned the practices with regard to the 'regarding' / 'esteeming' and / or 'observance' of the 'days', himself showing the best of Christian patience towards and interest in the life of the Church. He even tolerated and accepted what to us (as well as to him) might have looked like petty differences, like the one reckoning certain of the observed days of greater importance than the other. ("For the Jews I am a Jew.") What he rejected without compromise though, was the haughty spirit of intolerance, self-esteem, own regard, and ego-worship.

Whatever, I think Paul has specifically the Passover in mind in Romans 14, because only it from the OT Feasts possessed all the detail like wine and food and days the one more important than the other. Romans 14 is the best example in the NT of the **transitional stage** between OT and NT Christianity. But I still don't like the concept of a 'Jewish' Christianity, and reject the concept of a 'Judaistic' Christianity being implied in this Scripture.

OTS:

I believe that Paul is addressing the differences between the Jewish and Gentile believers in the church of Rome.

Gentiles who did not grow up keeping the feast days or the weekly sabbath would be more inclined to esteem every day alike. The Jewish believers would still be keeping the feast days and the weekly sabbath, so they would esteem one day above another.

SDA:

The problem is that the word "ALIKE" is not even in the letter. Paul argues that ONE group "OBSERVES ONE day ABOVE another" and the other group "OBSERVES EVERY DAY" in that "list of days" given by God in scripture (Lev 23)

Also Paul says nothing in Rom 14 about this being an issue BETWEEN Jews and Gentiles. We know in Acts 13 and Acts 17 and Romans 2 that Paul has no problem identifying problem-Jews vs. Christian Gentiles - but in Rom 14 that is not the problem and so he never mentions it. Rather it is a problem for ALL Christians that HAVE THE BIBLE and READ IT in the Romans 14 age of the first century NT church.

NTSS:

OTS has made it a Jew / Gentile issue. It was not. His "every day alike" also makes it either OT religious days or all and any other days. Also wrong, though I think he didn't actually intend to say it!

SDA:

All of the First century NT church leaders were Christian Jews and EVEN the Gentiles were looking to the Acts 15 Jerusalem council to solve their disputes. Paul was not in a "death to Jews" mode in Romans 14 and he clearly was not saying "JEWS observe EVERY DAY in Lev 23 because they are Jews. Gentiles OBSERVED NO DAY". That argument is not in Romans 14 at all.

A-S:

Sorry, but the books of Galatians and Colossians agree with me. Judaisers came

in and tried to get the Gentiles to live as the Jew under the Law in order to be saved. Paul wrote to them to confront that error and get them back to faith in Christ and not the keeping of the Law.

NTSS:

A-S claiming, "the books of Galatians and Colossians agree with me", but I think it's you who rather agree with the commentaries. However, wouldn't it have been better if you agreed with these books rather than they with you? But sorry, A-S. it's just the reverse! I'm sure they do not agree with you! In any case, we are discussing Romans 14 now. In short, for your better information on these two Scriptures, the following:

Colossians is the Manifesto of Christian Liberty, the Church against the whole world free! In chapter two you will find the Sabbath (Seventh Day) the very test-case of this freedom and sovereignty. Paul, says there, "*Do not you allow yourselves be condemned or judged by any of the world* (its powers or authorities or gods or wisdom) *pertaining your feasting ("eating and drinking") "... of Sabbaths' Feast"*. "*Because Christ has triumphed in it* – "*in it*" -- in His resurrection from the dead! (12 to 15)!

In Galatians Paul nowhere speaks to Jews. ("*... these who seemed to be somewhat – whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man's person!*") Throughout the Letter he addresses heathen believers – he writes to Galatians doesn't he?! And he tells THEM, that they had returned to their former gods or "*pathetic principles*". He went on, to sternly condemn the Galatians' apostasy from Christ with having had themselves circumcised. He tells them, he not only "*laboured in vain*" for them, but they thus by having themselves circumcised (actually, "*mutilated*") – trying to force the arm of God! – had themselves "*cut off from Christ*". They had fallen back into the worship of their former heathen idolatry, the worship of the '*gods*' or '*first principles*' ('*stoicheia*') **of time**: "*days, months, seasons, years*". The land of Galatia was steeped in these idolatrous practices - peaked by the heathen and idolatrous mystery of circumcision. There was NOTHING Christian OR, 'Old Testament', or even 'Jewish', in or

about their backsliding. Their circumcision appears like Judaism because circumcision is so typically, 'Judaism'. But their ritual of circumcision actually was a universal heathen and idolatrous 'mystery'. Circumcision was not peculiarly Jewish, or even peculiarly Judaistic, because it always in the first place has been superstitiously carnal!

Two further huge mistakes in this remark of yours, A-S. You mistake Colossians and Galatians for Acts 15, obviously. In Acts heathen Judaist proselytes – heathen become Judaists, not become 'Jews'! – infiltrated the Church and tried to upset it. We find the whole story in the prelude to the Jerusalem Council. But you won't find that in either Colossians or Galatians the case, where the battle raged between heathen Christians and Christian Faith on the one hand, and heathen power and wisdom and philosophy on the other. That heathen 'wisdom' and 'philosophy' mustn't be misunderstood for modern or 'scientific' 'method', because it wasn't at all so much mental or intellectual, as religious and ascetic, yes, carnal and superstitious!

Then you err in saying Paul wrote to them to get them not to keep the Law. Paul hoped to get the faithful back to God's Law, to get them back to faith in Christ! Never are the Law of God, and Christ, exclusive of one another. The Law's honour is to honour Christ, and Christ's honour, is to honour the Law of God. The mere fact you oppose Christ and God's Law against one another, should tell you, you are wrong! Under the Christian dispensation the Law of God and Christ Jesus are indistinguishable; they are one and the same, and in one and the same, are the One and only Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen! (Don't get me wrong, I don't say Christ is lost in the OT Law. I say the OT is gone into oblivion once it is lost in Christ. One could project Christ into the Law of the OT Scriptures, and in Him will find its worth. If one found not Jesus Christ in the OT Law, one hasn't found the worth of it or any worth for it. If the Law showed not forth Jesus Christ it is become useless except for self-delusion. Therefore the Law should also be projected onto Christ and be focussed in the inmost being of Him.

A-S:

Where on earth do you get that? Circumcision was strictly the covenant sign given specifically to Abraham, and kept by the Children of Promise, Israel. Now, you're calling it a heathen

idolatrous practice? :eek: Is that what God in the Law calls it? I know of no non Abrahamic people who keeps it. Paul uses "uncircumcision" as *synonymous* with "Gentile", so he did not know of any Gentiles keeping it that had not been influenced by Jewish Proselytizers and Christian Judaizers.

NTSS:

Quite right. "Paul uses "uncircumcision" as *synonymous* with "Gentile"", and both, as synonymous with "*uncircumcision of (the) heart*". But how do you get "Christian Judaizers"? Isn't that synonymous with uncircumcision of the heart? A Judaizer is a heathen, a Gentile, a pagan; no Christian, but an uncircumcised of the heart. A Judaizer whether Greek or Jew is '*of the uncircumcision*'! In falling for these pagans, the 'Christians'-proselytised, severed themselves from Christ and Christianity, and placed themselves under 'bondage' of the unbelieving world and dominion of wisdom and philosophy, the 'bondage' of the 'uncircumcision'. Through their very circumcision they brought themselves under 'uncircumcision' and under its bondage no less than when, and no less than if, they adopted heathen idols for the objects of their worship – which they in fact did do when they again started to worship their old gods, "days, months, seasons, years"!

Heathen peoples of all centuries, cultures and countries, notwithstanding that Paul 'sorted' all non-Jews under 'the uncircumcised', practiced circumcision – to this very day they do. Circumcision has been practiced by all – Jews and Gentiles alike – as a physical covenantal sign and seal of holiness and belonging. The only difference was where the allegiance lay. Thus circumcised or not, for Paul all unbelievers and back-sliders –heretics– were 'the uncircumcised'. He thought of Jews as 'the circumcision', only because he thought of the Old Testament and Scriptural Institution of circumcision as ordained by the only true God, in covenantal relationship with Israel, as the Covenanted "People of God", "according to the flesh". Paul's presupposition for speaking of the 'Gentiles' as 'the uncircumcised', is no undoing of the fact of the existence of the pagan and heathen circumcision that was universally rife in his day and world, that was a sign of belonging - the belonging of idolatrous superstition.

So absolutely yes! circumcision was strictly the covenant sign given specifically to Abraham, by God Himself, the only and true, God; and was "kept", by the Children of Promise, Israel, and by them, only. An unbridgeable chasm gapes between this, and the circumcision of the world. No wonder Paul told the Galatians who had themselves circumcised – to forswear their return to idolatry and worship of the 'gods' that ruled the "days, months, seasons, and years" (most importantly the sun) – that they were "cut off from Christ"; that "Christ availed (them) nothing"!

Nobody was better acquainted with the concepts of "uncircumcision" or "circumcision of the flesh" than Paul, who, throughout his deaconate, had to combat the evil within and without the Church. Wherever he refers to it, Paul thinks of that spiritual unregenerate state of darkness "*in / of the world ... without God and without hope*". He never thinks in physical sense. He only contemplates on being not circumcised in physical sense without its evil connotation, as when Abraham had been under grace before he was circumcised ... in the flesh, that is, literally. (So Abraham was of "the circumcision of Christ", before he became 'of the circumcision'.) For Paul the New and Eternal Covenant-sign of spiritual re-birth is "*the circumcision of Christ*" – whether one has been literally circumcised or not. For Paul the sign of unregenerate apostasy is "uncircumcision", an "uncircumcision of (the) heart", whether one was circumcised in the flesh or not. And being born of the Spirit for Paul is to belong to "*the circumcision of Christ*", a "*circumcision of the heart*" – a Citizenship of the Kingdom of heaven.

A-S:

Galatians 2 (NKJV)

11 Now when Peter had come to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed; 12 for before certain men came from James, he would eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. 13 And the rest of the Jews also played the hypocrite with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy.

14 But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all, "If you, being a Jew, live in the manner of Gentiles and not as the Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews? 15 We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, 23 knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.

17 "But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is Christ therefore a minister of sin? Certainly not! 18 For if I build again those things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. 19 For I through the law died to the law that I might live to God. 20 I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me. 21 I do not set aside the grace of God; for if righteousness comes through the law, then Christ died in vain."

We see here that Paul disagrees with you.

NTSS:

I fully believe this Scripture, just like you do, except I don't read into it aversion in the Lord's Day (the Seventh Day Sabbath) as you do.

SDA:

As far as Romans 14 is concerned, there is no "esteem alike" in the text in the sense of "esteem NONE to be of value". Rather one group OBSERVES all the feast days and the other OBSERVES one ABOVE the other, but there is NO example

of "some do not OBSERVE ANY of them". Recall that to OBSERVE a day as Holy meant to refrain from secular pursuits on that day in both NT and OT. It is true that some of the Jewish Christians were arguing that Gentile Christians had to ALSO become Jewish (see Acts 15). But it is NOT true that Paul taught Christians to reject the WORD of God.

Notice that in Eph 6:1-4 Paul argues that the Ten Commandments REMAIN authoritative as does James. And in Romans 3 Paul argues against the view that the Law has been abolished, explicitly, "Do we then abolish the Law of God? God forbid! In fact we ESTABLISH the Law of God."

NTSS:

Quoting SDA, "... Rather one group OBSERVES all the feast days and the other OBSERVES one ABOVE the other..."

We must just make sure for future reference, '... one group observes all the feast **days**', 'and the other observes one feast **DAY**, above the other feast **DAY**. Not, one group observes all the feast days (of every or some of the feasts) while the other group observes one FEAST above another FEAST. For that is how I have understood you up till now.

Quoting SDA, "It is true that some of the Jewish Christians were arguing that Gentile Christians had to ALSO become Jewish (see Acts 15)." Yes, in 15:5, it was the Pharisees in Acts 15. But they were living in Jerusalem. They were not the instigators who from Judea went into Antioch. They are –noteworthy– not said to have been Jews! The fact is significant because ever before through chapters 13 (e.g. verse 50) and 14 (verse 2) when the Jews 'were arguing', Luke makes sure to say that they were Jews. Why does he not in 15:1 call them Jews? Because they more likely were heathen Judaist proselytes. The same situation could have ruled in the Church at Rome.

The whole chapter three of Romans (summed up in 21-26a), tells how and why God –not 'we'– establishes the Law. How does God then, establish the Law of God?

Read these verses! In Christ Jesus we have the whole Law of God, indeed all the Scriptures, every particular of it, so that we eventually have the Fourth Commandment "in Him"! *"But now the righteousness of God (His Law) without the Law* (in whichever form temporary – in writing or in keeping – "*without*" it!), *is manifested*". ... *"Manifested ... The Righteousness of God by faith of JESUS CHRIST"*. (Ro3:25) The "*Law*" that is "*the righteousness of God*" and that "*Righteousness*", '*manifested*', is Christ. This '*Law*' then (encompassing all 'the Law' and including the 'Ceremonial', Law), is that '*Law*', "*GOD, has set forth*". This '*Law*', "*God has set forth ... IN HIM*", even "*in Christ*". This '*Law*', even Christ, "*God has set forth a PROPITIATION*" – an "*Atonement*". This '*Law*', even Christ the Law of God, "*God has set forth a propitiation THROUGH FAITH IN HIS BLOOD*". This '*Law of God*', even Christ, "*God has set forth a Propitiation / Atonement*", "*FOR SIN*" (*dia tehn paresin tohn hamartehmatohn*) ("*For sin*" – 'sin' – by this '*Law*', Jesus Christ, "*For He hath made Him to be sin for us.*" 2Cor5:21)

This '*Law of God*', even Christ, "*God has set forth THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD*". This '*Law of God*', even Christ, "*God has set forth the righteousness of God WITHOUT the Law*". This "*Law Given*", "*God has set forth*" the '*Law*' that in truth "*gives LIFE*" – the '*Law*' which "*without*", there is no, '*LIFE!*' (Gl3:21)

That "*Law*" (whether 'pre-cross' or 'post-cross') is that "*Law*" "*by (whom) verify Righteousness should be*". "*Should be*" – that is, "*should be manifested*" – "*manifested*" in Christ. (As well as = '*should be reckoned and effected*' "*to us-ward*", in Christ.) That "*Law*" even "*the Righteousness of God by faith of ...*", is the "*Law*" of God in the Person and work of Christ. God "*declare(s)*" Christ "*His Righteousness*", His '*Law*', the "*Propitiation for sin*", that is, '*LIFE*' – indistinguishable, inseparable, One in the One, Jesus Christ! "*If there were a law given that could give life*", it is the '*Law*' Paul has here found and discovered, in fact, is Christ!

The 'old' Law surrendered and surrenders, all the glory it had and still has, to Christ; it had and it still has, no honour but to offer up to the glory of God in Christ. The law that does not vanish in surrendering all its own glory and own identity and own dignity, to Christ, is not the Law of God, but the law of own righteousness and self-justification – it is "*the law unto death*", "*the law of death*". "*He who wants to save his life, shall loose it.*"

A-S:

Haven't you criticized SDA in the past for keeping the Sabbath because of the Law, and made that different from the new meaning in Christ?

NTSS:

I did.

A-S:

"Krino" is "**decide**", which is closer in meaning to "esteem", not "observe". It is also translated elsewhere as "conclude", "condemn", "**decree**", "**determine**", "judge", "go to (sue at the) law", "ordain", "call in question", "sentence to", "think". Nothing anywhere near "observe". If Paul wanted to say "observe", he would have used *tereo* ("watch", used in Mt.23:3 (2x), 28:20), or *phulasso* (used in Mk.10:20) both of which, regarding "observing" of Laws.

SDA:

Every now and then, A-S. you make a good bullet-proof point... but this is not one of them.

SDA:

All of their First century NT church leaders were Christian Jews and EVEN the Gentiles were looking to the Acts 15 Jerusalem council to solve their disputes. Paul was not in a "death to Jews" mode in Romans 14 and he clearly was not saying "JEWS observe EVERYDAY in Lev 23 because they are Jews, Gentiles OBSERVE NO DAY".

Well we know they are not "going to law against one day over another". When it comes to God's word in Lev 23, we know they are not "condemning one day above another". When it comes to Lev 23 we know they are not exercising god-like authority OVER scripture and "judging, or decreeing" one day above another.

NTSS:

Quote, A-S: "'Krino" is "**decide**", which is closer in meaning to "esteem", not "observe". ... Nothing anywhere near "observe"."

You should not have added, "Nothing anywhere near "observe"! No dictionary will say that! But why go to dictionaries and commentaries if Paul explains himself, **declaring of both** "the one man who (hos men ...) values / decides / esteems (krinei) one day above another day ... and the other one man who (hos de ...) values / decides / esteems (krinei) every day" (verse 5) --- **declaring of both**, as follows (verse 6): "**He observing the day, to the Lord's honour observes!**" That should be clear, 'krinoh' and 'phroneoh' are used absolutely equivalently; that 'krinoh', just like 'phroneoh', **means**, 'to observe'! And that should make clear, the **clause**, "he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord doth not regard it", is spurious – because it is superfluous. Paul needed to say nothing more about non-observers because every, "one man", "observed", and has been given the green light, 'It's all right, they each and both and all 'observe to the Lord's honour'!

A Christian serves God through faith and in Christ. Any Christian since this incident in the Church at Rome should have learned from it, and is supposed to know better than those first Christians did. The Church should keep no one of those days, while it should respect and regard them all, having received them all converged, collected and concentrated, first, temporarily, within the confines of the Seventh Day Sabbath thereto appointed of God, and, simultaneously, spiritually, magnified within the Person and Work of our Saviour Lord thereto "*Man Appointed*" of God, Jesus Christ.

SDA:

As we note in this case (as with the case regarding meat offered to idols), SDAs do not have a horse in this race, other than to observe and admit to the first century controversy without trying to SPIN it into a Seventh-day Sabbath question. Unfortunately those opposed to Christ the Creator's Seventh-day memorial of HIS creative act in Gen 1-2:3 do not often share that same level of objectivity.

NKJV

6He who [b]observes the day, observes[/b] it to the Lord; and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe it. He who eats, eats to the Lord, for he gives God thanks; and he who does not eat, to the Lord he does not eat, and gives God thanks.

NASB

6He who [b]observes the day, observes it for the Lord[/b], and he who eats, does so for the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who eats not, for the Lord he does not eat, and gives thanks to God.

Amplified Bible

6He who observes the day, observes it in honor of the Lord. He also who eats, eats in honor of the Lord, since he gives thanks to God; while he who abstains, abstains in honor of the Lord and gives thanks to God.

English Standard Bible

6The one who observes the day, observes it in honor of the Lord. The one who eats, eats in honor of the Lord, since he gives thanks to God, while the one who abstains, abstains in honor of the Lord and gives thanks to God.

Oh no "wait" -- now you're going to say that all these Bible scholars doing those translations were "SDA"?

Adam Clark's commentary

Chapter 14

*In things indifferent, Christians should not condemn each other, 1. Particularly with respect to different kinds of food, 2-4. And **the observation of certain days**, 5,6. None of us should live unto himself, but unto Christ, who lived and died for us, 7-9. We must not judge each other; for all judgment belongs to God,*

Verse 5. One man esteemeth one day above another

Perhaps the word ημεραν, day, is here taken for time, festival, and such like, in which sense it is frequently used.

Reference is made here to the Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals; such as the passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, new moons, jubilee, Jew still thought these of moral obligation.

OTS:

NIV - One man considers one day more sacred than another; another man considers every day alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind.

NASB - One person regards one day above another, another regards every day alike Each person must be fully convinced in his own mind.

NLT - In the same way, some think one day is more holy than another day, while others think every day is alike. You should each be fully convinced that whichever day you choose is acceptable.

KJV - One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

ESV - One person esteems one day as better than another, while another esteems all days alike. Each one should be fully convinced in his own mind.

ASV - One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind.

TNIV - Some consider one day more sacred than another; others consider every day alike. Everyone should be fully convinced in their own mind.

HCSB - One person considers one day to be above another day. Someone else considers every day to be the same. Each one must be fully convinced in his own mind.

8 out of 9 Bibles say some esteem or consider every day alike.

1 out of 9 Bibles say some consider every day to be the same.

NTSS:

SDA, "... in this case ... SDAs do not have a horse in this race..." It's really a pity SDAs don't have a horse in this race. Their horse has but a few lame donkeys in the field to race against. What an opportunity wasted!

The commentaries ... It should be this passage taken, not so isolated, but in all its context, until Paul's words are seen in the light of the resembling, relating and reflecting passages of all the Scriptures. Then only will one see, that the NT Church at Rome, without a hitch and without saying worshipping on the Sabbath, was greatly frustrated in godly service and worship by a haughty spirit, that bragged food and drink of days, instead of boast the Bread and Water of Life.

The Church at Rome found the 'holy days' with all their paraphernalia of food and drink, 'mandatory'. Everybody did better than the next, and penalised and despised competition. Such was the 'judging / destroying'- *diákrisis* of one another in 'the battle of the wits'- *dialogismós* going on!

Lord's Day – quietly, peacefully and gently constraining and persuading – patient servant in the service of the Lord and Communion of the saints – still was kept. Uninterruptedly worship and proclamation went on. The Sabbath came from much deeper, by divine appointment and purpose, powerfully and convincingly, vindicating itself in the continuing life of

the Body that is Christ's. That one must assume, and how could deny?

The Sabbath nor its keeping is questioned in the Letter to the Church at Rome, who just kept on observing it, not even thinking how the spirit of the Sabbath was disavowed through the un-Christ-like attitude of the Congregation with regard to its 'days' and 'food and drink'. The Sabbath, as the 'Day-of-God's-Rest', should have been a constant reminder to the Church of the anomaly; but the Church didn't heed its voice.

So Paul showed them how they should commune with their preferences and all – "*food and drink*" ... "*one day above, the other*" ... "*every one like, the other*" ... The solution was neither yet another alternative of 'days or ways', but the stern reminder, "*We shall all stand before the judgement seat of God.*" "*Receive the weak without judgment, derision or scathing!*"

Despite no word of or about the Sabbath is found in Paul's Letter, the very existence and trials of the Church witness to its continued observance. The Sabbath's present truth – 'Day' of peace, of mutual acceptance and worship-rest, holy, God-toward, rest – contrasted sharply with rampant prejudice. Here is the point of contention that in the Church at Rome just as well could have befallen the Sabbath Day, BUT OBVIOUSLY DID NOT.

Setting: God the last Judge; and man, unlawfully playing judge. The real sin, not even the 'main issue' of "food and drink" that Paul said, "*the Kingdom of God does not, consist of*", but the spirit and attitude of the Congregation – of the Congregation as a whole - Paul makes no difference between Jew and Gentile.

There is no wrong or sinful in being '**days**' of the Law and distinction under the Old Dispensation. (So with the Sabbath.) There also is no sin or unlawfulness in the '**food and drink**' that under the 'Old Covenant' were of God's, ordination. (So with the Sabbath.) So, even further, there was no sin (not yet) in the fact the Church **kept on** keeping both the 'days' and the 'food and drink', 'after the cross' and into the Christian era. Its maintained 'observance' was due to the ignorance of the first Congregations of the infant Church. We the Christians of later times are supposed to know better in this regard than the first generation of Christians did or were able to, and for us today to have kept on observing

these 'days' and to have connected them with 'food and drink', would without doubt have meant a token of unbelief – it would show that we do not believe in Christ or in His Sacrifice or Resurrection! Therefore for us, today, without a doubt, to keep on keeping the 'days' or the 'food and drink' associated with them, will be plainly sin – sin of unbelief in Christ. It was not the case with the early Christians. I think nobody disagrees on that. And then the moment any would agree on that, how could they keep on saying the Church at Rome did not 'observe' these 'days' of 'food and drink'?

So what is the point with all this? To show that the Church at Rome in fact religiously 'observed', the 'days' Paul wrote about in his Letter to the Church there.

Now we have the 'days', the 'food and drink', and their distinction, all God's. But now we also have the human doing of it. That too is well and good. God commanded; we obey(ed). No sin – not until ... we sever our doing of obedience from God's doing! Now we make our attainment standing on its own feet and no longer with the Master. No sooner we assume an attacking attitude. "*Who are you who condemn your brothers?*" That is pride! We have become arrogant; we start 'judging'. Now our obedience have become, our sin! We have gone past the limits. (It could be just so with the Sabbath!) Now ours no more is an acceptable keeping and observing, but in the sight of God, works of self-righteousness.

Now the 'things' Paul reprimands the Church for, may be expressed for one and the same thing, "*food and drink is not the Kingdom of God*". (He could have said the same of the Sabbath. But did not. That must prove something!) The practical has become one with the spiritual. One cannot say it was the 'food and drink', and not the 'days', or vice versa, one cannot say it was the 'days' but not the 'food and drink'. It was both. Neither the 'days' or the 'food and drink' was anything wrong with, or could be the cause of 'judging'. The cause of the judging was the heart. The heart resorted to most innocent and blameless things as an excuse for provocation. 'Judging' / 'distinction' of 'days' and 'food and drink', became a 'judging' of pride, of 'condemning' and 'belittling'. A big difference. The 'problem' was attitude; self-esteem the only 'differentiation'.

From this then we are able to make the seemingly irrelevant conclusion, that the Sabbath wasn't mandatory, or forcing, or accusing and attacking; it

wasn't 'judging' or threatening; it wasn't a medium of self-distinction, self-esteem or pride (in contrast with the other practices of 'days' and 'food and drink') – it was believed, in Christ, because of Christ, for the service of Christ. But intolerance sprung up from an own judgment and an esteem of self – which sprung up from pride of the heart – from the nature of fallen, sinful man. The identical basic cause that prompted Cain to kill Abel.

[It is my personal conviction, that Cain and Abel brought their offerings before the face of the LORD on the Sabbath Day, the Seventh Day of the week. Coming before the LORD was a practice of, and for, the Sabbath Day. (Just like today.) Because of sin, from the beginning, food and drink as an offering for sin, had become attached to the Day of Worship-Rest. And we saw how soon the proud heart of man sinned exactly through, and by, his attempt at propitiation and atonement for sin – by his very own works of self-righteousness! You may take or leave this, it's up to you, but I see this very scenario here in Romans 14. Exactly so then...]

The NT Sabbath is present in Paul's Letter being the quiet and humble servant of the Body – being the quiet and humble servant of the Lord, 'The Lord's Day!' (At thy service, my **Lord!**) The 'Day' of the Lord, is the Lord's servant, the servant in the Lord's service, the Day for, and of, 'Divine **Service**' ... 'Day of **Worship**'...

"One man this day especially, the other man it like every (other) observes ... Who are you judging your brother?!"

A-S:

Of course, nobody "judges", "condemns", or "goes to law against" about one day over another. That was just showing the different things the word krino is translated into and they all convey in some way a sense of ESTEEMING, **not** "observing". Just because those words would not make sense does not give us the license to plug any ol' word in there.

SDA:

This is the part where you explain why you think the NASB was written by ME?? Paul used krino in this verse. The literal meaning is "**to distinguish**". "Esteem" is the best meaning that fits it in this context. The point remains --

Krino in vs 5 shows a selection or preference "to approve, esteem, to prefer" to OBSERVE ("Preference to OBSERVE") as we can see in vs 6. IT is ALL the same chapter the same letter the same author the same subject. You are trying to mince words and parse verses apart when in fact they go together In Context.

NTSS:

Why would 'krinoh' not mean 'to observe' in verse 5? Would Paul have written chapter 14 if what you say were true?

A-S:

Let me make it even simpler for you – HERE we have an author (commentator) who AGREES with SDA on the need to avoid Christ the Creator's Seventh-day Sabbath BUT STILL this well known Bible scholar cannot bring himself to bend things around in Romans 14 as SDA seems to want to do. I don't have to say those scholars and translations are SDA. All I have to point out is that that is their particular translation, and as SS just showed, the overwhelming majority (beginning with the faithful KJV) use "esteem", as that is closer to the Greek meaning. And again, the words in v.6 are different from the words in v.5. You can't ignore that and attempt to interpret the Greek by an English translation. That is what the worst of the KJVO's do. So you either judge one day as more special than ("above") another, or you judge them all alike. Even if Clarke's interpretation were right, that principle would still include the weekly sabbath.

SDA:

You almost have it right, A-S. The ISSUE Paul is addressing is between those who OBSERVE one day ABOVE another in the Lev 23 annual holy day list and those who

OBSERVE EVERY DAY in that LIST of annual holy days.

NTSS:

Now I understand you even less, A-S. Say you, with reference to 'judge'-'krinoh', "So you either judge one day as more special than ("above") another, or you judge them all alike. ... that principle would still include the weekly sabbath..." The weekly Sabbath ... yet, not 'observed'? Isn't that what you have said?

Quoting A-S. "...the faithful KJV) use "esteem" [in verse 5], as that is closer to the Greek meaning..." which Greek meaning is explained – yes defined – straight away in verse 6: "*the one man esteems-(hos men krinei) ... the other man esteems-(hos de krinei)... he OBSERVING-phronon" ... "to the Lord's honour observerves-phronoi." Verses 5 and 6 are one statement, one derivation. How can you still say the "meaning" of 'krinoh' is so "different" it comes not 'close' to the meaning of 'phroneoh', which is 'to observe'? (Why don't you take in any position with regard to the meaning of 'phroneoh'? You never state its meaning for you?)*

Re SDA, "... who OBSERVE EVERY DAY in that LIST of annual holy days...". No, not in 'that list', but in that feast; not 'that list in Lev 23', but that feast supposed in and alluded to, in Romans 14.

A-S:

And that "list" is nowhere in the context, it is talking about ANY days the Jews esteem or judge as holy over others.

NTSS:

The people 'judged', two directions, two things: They judged one another – esteemed themselves better than the rest. And they judged days. That's what you insist should ONLY mean "ANY days the Jews esteem" or 'value' – not 'observe'. You are only pretending; you should surely be aware of the fact of the legitimate meanings the word 'judge' also has besides to 'esteem' – like 'observe'? To 'judge' ('krinoh'), means, – as pertains people, 'judging one another', to blame, condemn, wish ill, etc., to flatten out as low as possible and without any distinction of dignity left. That is what

'judge' means with regard to and between people. That was the great ill in the Church at Rome. That was what Paul wrote – AGAINST! You now want that same meaning – verily the last, 'to flatten out as low as possible and without any distinction or dignity left' – for the 'judging' of the 'days'?! And that, despite Paul having declared, the observance of each person, was to the Lord's honour? I closed my case!

SDA:

Paul addresses conflict over a very specific issue. A conflict that SDAs do NOT engage in. The text is not "TEACHING us to observe no day". The purpose of the text is to settle a dispute between those that OBSERVE ONE day ABOVE another and those that OBSERVE every day. You keep trying to "spin this" into something else –and your SPIN efforts have failed you so far. I thought you would have noticed, since it is incredibly obvious at this point. Perhaps it is so blatantly obvious that once again we can simply appeal to the "objective reader" to see it for himself instead of playing this game where you "pretend" not to see something no matter how obvious and then suppose my goal is to take a "you can't make me" response like you are giving and "convince the unwilling" -- which has never been my goal. My objective is fully reached as soon as the issue is so blatantly obvious to the objective reader that the point speaks for itself. The issue that is so blatantly obvious is that you are forcing the text to say what you want it to say.

A-S:

I have shown you straight from the Greek that krino is NOT "observe", and that a "list" of Lev. 23 days ONLY is not in the context. But you think repeating it over and over makes it so. And as to your commentators, these guys are not

Sabbath keeping scholars -- THEY still see the truth of Rom14.

NTSS:

'Straight from the Greek'? ... that we'll have to see yet!

SDA:

Now - trying to avoid the Rom 14:5-6 point that days from the Lev 23 list are being selected, considered, chosen ABOVE another or else ALL the days are being selected for (as vs 6 states) OBSERVANCE.

A-S:

The fact that "alike" is not in the Greek still does not change the meaning of "krino". In fact, it is krino that forced the translators of all those versions to add "alike". You have to add something. They added "alike" to conform to the meaning of the Greek word chosen. You add a "list of Lev 23 days" that is nowhere in the text, and a practice of observing some but not all of them that was unheard of, to conform to your need to explain the passage away.

NTSS:

It's the **context and circumstance** mainly, and firstly, that show that the 'issue' Paul dealt with, was one of the Christians' 'observance' of 'days': "One (Christian) observing one day (of the 'days'-'observed') above the other day (or other days of the 'days' observed); another (Christian) observes every day (of the days observed)".

Paul's meaning is "Every-through-observance-distinguished-'krinein'-to judge-day, above-'para', the other-through-observance-distinguished-'krinein'-to judge-day". (Or, as if Plural, "Every-of-the-through-observance-distinguished-'krinein'-to judge", days.)

His meaning is not, 'as, on par, one and the same / alike / usual days', **but**, "(This)-through-observance-distinguished-phronohn-day". (Or, as if Plural, "(These)-through-observance-all-put-aside-together-distinguished-phronohn", days.) --'A day' in each instance "'phronohn'-through-observance-distinguished / holy-day like-'par'-the-other holy-day". Or, as if Plural -- 'Days' in each instance "'phronohn'-through-observance-

distinguished / holy-days like-'par'-the-other holy", days. The second word explains the first, further – further than it explains itself. They are not contrasted in the least or in any smallest detail. They are mutually contributing self-explanatory words both meaning, to observe.

Paul never means days indiscriminately judged the-usual. He in verse 5 with '*krinoh*' as with '*phroneoh*' in verse 6, means nothing else than religiously to observe, 'days', or 'holy days'.

A-S makes it ...'days-the-usual from all the rest of days-the-usual-valued'! SDA makes it feasts – every special occasion 'listed in Leviticus 23', recognised in Romas 14.

A-S is no doubt mistaken in that he attributes '*krinoh*' an opposite its true meaning, meaning, making it mean 'value alike', while it actually means, "distinctively to distinguish". A-S misunderstands – I suspect, ignores – Paul's use of the Comparative, '*krinei hehmeran par hehmeran*', "*judges a day above another day*", from which it must following be, the next person, '*hos de*', might not, but rather would, '*krinei pasan hehmeran*', "*judge every day*", '*alike*'!

It is '*krinoh*' and '*krinoh*', Paul used for comparing the 'valuation' attached to 'days'. Paul doesn't use '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*', as if only a 'day' '*phronein*'- '(religiously) observed', could be a day '*phronein*'- '(religiously) observed' "above another". No, it is exactly where Paul used the word '*krinoh*', that he intended the 'by comparison' meaning of 'religiously observed above religiously observed' – '*krinei hehmeran par hehmeran*' ; and, in contrast, '*krinei pasan hehmeran*' – 'religiously observe one day like the other religiously observed day'. If we had to do with no distinction or non-observance, Paul's contrasting would have been senseless. And therefore, Paul while using '*krinoh*', cannot logically be thinking of any and all days 'alike'! The 'alike' should limit the 'days' concerned to those days religiously observed only.

Paul accordingly departs from differently 'religiously observed'-'*krinein*'- '*krinein*'-days, and concludes from exactly there, that "*The one so-observing / thinking-'ho phronohn' the day, thinks / observes-'phronei' it to the Lord*". There follows no, 'not-to-the-Lord', because it is logically already decisive there cannot follow such a thing. It would have made no sense, and some writers of the manuscripts already have realised it. Just the Participle-use of '*phroneoh*', '*phronohn*', shows (and

proves), Paul thought of '*krinoh*' in the exclusive sense of 'observe (religiously)'.

A-S should have known the implications of all this from the start and from the nature of the case, because it was the Congregation, the religiously days observing Congregation, who so 'valued' 'days', that the '*krinein*'- 'valuation' would be in 'religious' sense, and therefore would be in the sense of 'observe', and not in the sense of 'as secularly one and the same/alike value'. He should have been alert and honest enough, to see Paul used '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*' virtually identically and synonymously, and definitively, equivalent, in my mind, without a doubt!

Yet I have sympathy with A-S's delusion. We have all been kept in the dark of ignorant trust in our leaders and opinion-makers. Who will doubt the impeccable character of men so devout and esteemed as to write commentaries on the Word of God, who form doctrine and establish discipline in the Church? None but the biased and mischievous!

SDA:

"Alike" is not in the text because the focus of vs 5 is that ONE regards ONE day ABOVE another and the other person holds in high regard ALL of the days in the Lev 23 list. And as Vs 6 states the holding them in high regard is for the purpose of OBSERVING them. The facts have basically exposed the flaws in A-S's debate tactics.

NTSS:

And I feel compelled already to agree with you there.

A-S:

So you refuse to acknowledge that **the Greek word in v6 is completely different from v5.**

NTSS:

Absolutely!

A-S:

You cannot deal with the meaning of krino, so you keep trying to dodge the issue, and turn to people's translations from centuries later. You pair Clarke's interpretation of v. 5 with those translations' use of the word "observe"

in v6, and you rewrite the Greek text based on that. And I only thought the most radical KJVO's did that. Sure gives them a point that we should stick with the KJV, which correctly translates the words closer to their actual meaning! The actual FOCUS of the passage is not to judge based on diet and days, because "for to this end Christ both died and rose...that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living" (v.9, 10ff). But you're so busy rewriting it, to try to get around this instruction, that you cannot see this clear focus.

NTSS:

"The actual focus of the passage is, not to judge based on diet and days", correct! because that is exactly what happened! Instead, Paul admonishes, "*For to this end Christ both died and rose...that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living*" – of both the OT Church and the NT Church; Lord of both the Jews and Gentiles – one Church, no judging, no cause for judging. Hold high the banner of **Christian liberty, unity and love!** We may recognise in the days it observed the unity of the Church; we may recognise in the ways it observed its days, the freedom of the Church; and we should have recognised in its esteem of God's Kingdom, the Church's acceptance of and love for one another. But we found instead (as did Paul), their unforgiving and intolerant heart of pride and works of self-righteousness.

"The actual focus of the passage is, not to judge based on diet and days", WRONG! Paul uses 24 words (the Greek words counted) – two short verses, verses 5 and 6a – for the 'matter of days'. For the 'issue' of 'food and drink', he (before the 'day'-verses) uses 30 words in verse 2 and 3, and again (after the 'day'-verses), 20 words in verse 6, about 60 words in 14-17, and at least 30 words in verses 21 and 23 – a relation in favour of 'food and drink' bigger than 5 to 1 for the words, and 4 to 1 for the number of times paid attention to. But still we are told "the 'main issue' is not 'food and drink', but 'days'".

Paul uses 7 different nouns and verbs with regard to the 'food and drink'-side of 'the issue'. (*phagoh, isthioh, brohma, brohsis, krea, pinoh, oinon*) – 75 times between them. He uses one noun, 'hehmera', and two verbs, for the 'day-side' of 'the issue' – against 75! He refers to 'this side', 'days', once in all his Letters, here in 14:5-6a. There is scarcely any Letter in which he does not refer to some 'food issue'.

Still, 'food and drink', is not the main issue, not the 'focal point' – but 'days'! Despite, Paul from no point of view attaches a negative connotation to the 'days-issue'; Despite, the fact he brings 'food and drink' into direct, negative, relation with weakness (2) and as the direct outflow of "doubtful disputations" (1b). He brings 'food and drink' into negative relation with judging / despising (3b); and as the opposite of, inducement to, and departing from, the encouraging section 7 to 13. Paul says 'food and drink' "commendeth us not to God"; He contrasts 'food and drink' with living for God, and associates it with "living unto oneself"; He says 'food and drink' "destroys not the work of God" – in other words, it may be applied in such a manner as to aim at destroying the work of God. Paul says through 'food and drink' we may "grieve" our brother; even "destroy" him. Of the good of 'food and drink', "evil is spoken" of; And through it, the one "speaks evil" of the other; "Charity" is not followed; "Offence" is given; and of 'food and drink' a "stumbling block" is made. Paul says this twice, as verse 13 goes into verse 14, and in verse 21. All put together, and Paul declares of 'food and drink', that it "is not the Kingdom of God". Whereby it is undeniably implied that if anything other than the heart of man had been the focus of Paul's disapproval and sternest rebuke, it must have been the matter or 'problem' of 'food and drink'! But no! It's the observance of 'days' that's the evil (Yeah, according to A-S. the everyday valuing of days.) But there's the offence and stumbling block that stands in the way of all charity and Godliness!

Paul spends the whole of chapter 12 on "*love without dissimulation / unassumed love*" = hypocrisy = pretence; the whole of chapter 13 on lawlessness; both chapters 14b to 15 and many passages in between the 'food and drink' sections, on **pride and self-esteem**. But 'days observed' was the great evil; Sabbath-keeping the actual sin! Right here compressed into the few lines of verse 5 and 6a.

But let's get back on track! The true sin mentioned in the nearer context of the 'food and drink' and 'days' 'issues', you will find concentrated in 14:1b in two words, – '(*meh eis*) *diakriseis dialogismohn!* 'Critical argument' ('higher criticism'), the 'first principle' in Greek wisdom and philosophy the prerogative of the enlightened and initiated. Ordinary people – "*the weak*" – are barred from the intimacy and mysteries of the cult; they aren't fit for the conversation of the '*strong*'. Simply, conceited superiority – pride!

Paul reproofs the '*strong*' – the influential, the pure, the enlightened, at Rome. Jews? Possibly. Judaists? Probable. Gentiles? Also likely! With ***diákrisis dialogismós*** peculiarly a Greek (heathen) 'faculty'? (See etymology; also Ro1:21, Mk7:21, Js2:4, Lk3:15, 5:21; Acts 19:9, Jude 9) ("*In Wortgefechte über die Gedanken einzutreten*", W Bauer.) "*Who are you after all?*" (4a) You behave as were you God! The Church is no secret society; does not belong to only the privileged few! Receive as your equal "*the weak*" – the simple, poor and lowly you so despise but whose *Master he stands with*, is Christ and God! "***He observing the day to the Lord observes!***" Here Paul gives us his final answer – a decision that tells us what the problem was **not**, but we 'tear it apart' and add, and ignore, and force it until the answer has become the problem! For centuries, all 'Sabbath-texts' by the *diákrisis dialogismós* of Sunday-superstition have been 'torn apart' and 'eaten' wholesale (Ez44:31) for the Gospel! 'The problem' in the Church at Rome, it seems to me, was one of human nature after all, just like in Galatians it had been, and from the start, most likely, never, had been a distinguishable 'Jewish problem'!

SDA:

I showed that the evaluation being done in vs 5 is for the PURPOSE of OBSERVANCE in vs 6. Either in OBSERVING ONE in the LIST of days in Lev 23 ABOVE the others OR in OBSERVING all of them. The one who values one above the others is observing the one but not the others. The one who VALUES THEM ALL is observing ALL.

NTSS:

I almost fully agree. The difference between your interpretation and mine is that I 'focus' on the one collection or 'festival of days', supposed in Romans 14, the days and food and drink of Passover Feast, while you reckon the (religious) 'days', were all the different festivals, "listed in Lev 23".

Paul uses the latter word to explain the former, and not the other way round. Verse 5 has '*krinoh*'-'judge', verse 6 has, '*phroneoh*'-'mind' / 'observe' / 'appreciate'. '*Phroneoh*'-'mind' / 'observe' / 'appreciate' explains the nature of the 'judging' mentioned and meant in verse 5. It means to 'distinguish (religiously)', which is, 'to observe'. It does not in any verse mean 'condemn', obviously, but just so obviously, does not mean, to 'value'-'place on par' / 'not to distinguish'. Which would be silly, to say the least. A-S is the first and only person I have come across who gives '*krinoh*' the meaning of 'value alike' and denies its universally acknowledged meaning of 'esteem' / 'regard' in the sense of 'distinguish' – in the same sense 'distinguish' as in the word '*phroneoh*', which is, to "observe".

Isn't it saying much the fact, again, the negative of 6a "he who regards not the day to the Lord does not regard it", is not authentic? Everybody 'esteemed' days; there was no one who 'regarded not days'! On this we, NTSS and SDA, seem to agree.

The real contention in the Church at Rome was **not that**, everybody 'esteemed' / 'observed' the days; the real contention was **not about**, "*One man the one day above the other day observes ('krinei') and the other every day alike*" – the fact that they differed! The real contention in the Church was **not even how**, they 'observed' the 'days' having "food and drink" made much fuss of!

Paul notices that "*One man the one day above the other day observes ('krinei') and the other every day alike observes ('krinei')*" ... and he **justifies** the practice of each and everyone, **declaring**, "*While he is observing ('phronohn') the day he observes / dedicates ('phronei') (it) -- to the Lord*". So stop the **discriminating and insulting self-interest of men**. Instead of building up the *Kingdom of God*, you turn it into a **court of injustice**, '*eis diakriseis dialogismohn*'!

It is of utmost importance to realise that Paul in the face of this totally unacceptable condition and attitude of the Church, could still find, and could still decide – could still 'judge' –, that "*He observing the day, to the Lord observes!*" Which means, This is final! Verdict: Stop your pride which is the only problem, and begin to accept one the other just as he is, in brotherly love to the furtherance of the Kingdom of heaven! 'Esteem' or 'observe' your 'days' in the Christian spirit of tolerance, recognition and empathy.

For Paul the hating pride, formed the unacceptable and inadmissible essence of the whole 'issue' – not the days or the food and drink that went with it.

A-S:

The text says that everyone "esteems" days, yet not everyone "observes" (regards) days. That right there tells you that "esteem"≠"observe", and the person who "observes" NO days is the one who "ESTEEMS" them all "[ALIKE]".

The addition of "alike" was made necessary by the grammar in the translation to English. The same thing is then done with food and drink. Paul mentions both; which does not mean that "days only referred to feasting/fasting practices" as some claim. People judge others over days of worship and/or food and drink, and both were being condemned here, regardless of what we try to make the words mean.

NTSS:

Quite the opposite, as I have shown, "... both were being condemned here ... is not true, regardless of what you, may try force the words to mean. It is missing Paul's 'point' altogether! Show us where Paul "condemns", "People ... over days of worship ... or food and drink"! He Never, does! You asserting, stating, claiming for fact he did, is purely taking a looong chance!

Let's get it straight, Paul condemns neither the 'days', nor the 'food and drink'. On the contrary, he took exception to the very reason the members took exception to each other's 'keeping' of 'days' and of "food and drink". You would have concluded differently if you

stuck to the thrust of Paul's whole argumentation of chapters 14 and 15. You would not have claimed, "The text says that everyone "esteems" days", because it doesn't use the word 'everyone' to start with. (It implies "every day"-'*pahsan hehmeran*'.) And you would not have affixed the 's' for a Singular to 'esteem', while 'every-one', 'esteemed' for a fact. So far for "the text" – Romans 14:4-5. The 'texts' - the NA and the TR – don't have "everyone "esteems" days" either! They agree in verse 4 and in verse 5a, "*The one, one day above the other day esteems / observes; the one, every day alike – (so) he observing / esteeming to the Lord observes / esteems it*" 'it' (correctly supplied word), i.e., "*esteems / observes*" every day or all the days "*esteem(ed) / observe(d)*", "*alike*"! Not "*alike*" or "*it*" is really a 'supplied' word, because both are absolutely implied. But the thing not to miss is Paul's identical, equivalent, parallel use of the words '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*'. His reasoning in these two verses goes over the differences in observance of the people made. With both words he therefore keeps the focus on one and the same observance of days.

"The one who 'esteemed a day' ... **the-(same)-man-'ho'**-observing, to the Lord's glory observe(d)"! The same man, the same distinction and dedication of the same day, or, all Observed, days, to the honour of the same Lord Jesus Christ! What a recommendation! So, if one insist Paul means to condemn, he is mistaken; Paul means to justify and exempt from blame, both, Observance, and, Observer! But then, if one insist Paul meant to condemn Sabbath-keeping, he shoots himself point blank in the foot. For if it were the Sabbath is implied, then Paul justifies, exempts from blame, and in fact condones Sabbath keeping.

"... **the-(same)-man-'ho'-observing**"... '*ho*': Personal Pronoun of verse 6, for none other than "the-one-(man)-'*hos*'", who "observes-'krinei'" in verse 5, whether "'*hos men*...'" the one (who) observes one day above the other (observed) day" (5a), or "'*hos de*...'" the (other) one (who) observes every (observed) day alike" (5b).

Verse 6 has the same Subject as verse 5, whether the first '*hos*' (5a), or the second '*hos*' (5b). As follows:

(5a) "*One observes (krinei) a day above the other day*" ... (6a) *he observing (phronohn) the day, to the Lord observes (phronohn) it*";

(5b) "*one every day alike observes (krinei)*" (5b) ... (6a) *he observing (phronohn), the day, to the Lord observes (phronohn) it*".

'*Hos*' and '*ho*' in 5a and 6 is the same person; '*hos*' and '*ho*' in 5b and 6 is the same person. '*Phroneoh*' in verse 6 clearly explains and defines the meaning of '*krinoh*' in both cases in verse 5 for being an "observing", for being a religious "esteeming" or "regarding" – for being a Christian, "worshipping", in fact! A 'worshipping' not of 'days', but of the Lord, and to His honour. Paul commends such 'worship' or 'observance'. He absolutely undeniably does not judge the 'keeping of days' of the Church unacceptable or condemnable. He defends the observance, of the 'days', commending it, as 'while being observed'– 'phronohn', 'being observed to the honour of the Lord'. He defends its observers, commending them, as "while observing"–'phronohn', 'worshipping and honouring the Lord – the Lord of the 'days' thus 'esteemed' / 'regarded' / 'observed' – Master and Lord of them both. (The Lord and Master of course "*also of the Sabbath Day*"!)

A-S:

I say it again, The text says that everyone "esteems" days, yet not everyone "observes" (regards) days. That right there tells you that "esteem"≠"observe", and the person who ""observes" NO days is the one who "ESTEEMS" them all "[ALIKE]".

NTSS:

One man 'esteemed' / 'valued' one day over the other day of the 'days' "observed", while the next, 'esteemed' / 'valued' every day of the 'days' "observed", alike -- Paul's 'comparison'; he has looked at both 'sides'. Now Paul's friendly nod of approval: "*He observing the day, to the Lord observes it*"! Can I go simpler? And this here tells you, there is No, "person who "observes" NO days"! And at the same time it tells you, the negating clause must be omitted.

But what would a judging amongst the believers have sprung from? That's the BIG question! From a religious distinction of days based upon the food and drink attached to them? Still not from any of these! The 'krinein'-'estimation' / 'distinction' of 'days' was made because of those 'days' having been OT 'Feast'-days, i.e., "food and drink"-'Days', particularly the OT 'food and drink'-'Days' of Passover's-Feast. No one in his right mind would try to deny it. But that still does not answer the BIG one! The real cause and fountain of the wrong – the wrong itself– that Paul unmistakably condemned, was neither and nothing of these, but singularly and only, man – the People themselves, their heart; their attitude; their hate; their judging one another over days they all observed, or the food and drink they all attached to these days only differently. Their spirit and pride. Nothing else.

What the text does imply – "*the one ... the other ...*" – is that everyone 'esteemed' days as in 'observed' them. There was nobody who did not do the one or the other of either observed the 'days' alike, or, observed the one day above the other – with greater meaning than the rest attached to the very same collection of 'religious' 'days'. ('Greater meaning attached inter alia through "food and drink".) Everyone would have 'esteemed' these days, yet not everyone would have 'observed' / 'regarded' / 'esteemed' them EVERY ONE DAY THE SAME. (The exact opposite of what you say, A-S.) That right there tells you that esteem="observe" ('*krinoh*'='*phroneoh*'), and that though certain persons 'observed' these – observed – 'days' the "one above the other", everyone without exception / alike / regardless, 'observed' them. So you're talking against yourself, and I am convinced, against your own better knowledge and conscience.

A-S:

The evaluation being done in vs 5 is for the PURPOSE of OBSERVANCE in vs 6. The person who evaluates days, and judges one as special OVER another thus "OBSERVES" the day, and the one who evaluates the days, to all be alike, is the one who "DOES NOT" observe "the day".

NTSS:

You can twist words and their meanings! No, not words or meanings; you can garble your own hallucinations intertwined and twisted. Why? O why?

How have you 'evaluated' the 'days' to the point of non-observance, disobedience and antinomianism ... to the point of pure rebellion!

A-S:

That's how the words in the two verses connect; even though they are still two different words with two different meanings. Still nothing about any "list of days".

SDA:

The one who values ONE ABOVE another OBSERVES the one and does NOT observe the other. The one who VALUES THEM ALL -- observes ALL. There is NO "VALUES NONE" of the days in Romans 14.

NTSS:

SDA is right. Everybody observed the days – only differently emphasised the observed days. The difference was the preferences each (or each group) made of the observed days. Most important aspect to keep in mind for understanding just this 'issue' and Scripture, is that it reflects the bridging period in the development of the New Testament Church from OT to NT-worship. Those (like the Churches of God) who keep on teaching these 'days', should be observed, haven't come further than this long gone intermediate phase. They also – more importantly – have not yet learned that whosoever Feast Christ through keeping the one and only Lord's Day Sabbath of the Lord your God for evermore, Feast all Old Testament Feast-'Days' -- 'IN HIM'.

A-S:

Again, you're assuming "value" equates "observe", but again, every single one of us VALUES every single day: --in some way or another. Some value certain days as *special*, (and thus "observe" them) and some don't. Those who don't therefore place very little "value" on all days, and therefore, "every day *alike*", even though that "value" is **low**. That is the sense being conveyed there, and why "alike" was added.

NTSS:

And you go far beyond Paul's intended meaning with using the two words '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*'.

'Somehow or another' was not how the Church at Rome 'evaluated' every single day – every single day of 'every day', or, of every single day of the 'days'-in-question, the 'days'-observed'. No. You're going outside the contextual relevance. Lk12:23a, "*Life is more than meat.*" Ro14:17, "*The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy, in the Holy Ghost, for HE (the Holy Spirit) that in these things (righteousness and peace) SERVEETH CHRIST (the Holy Spirit witnessing of Christ) is well-pleasing to God and notable among men.*" This together with the Church as *the Body of Christ's Own* without the Day of Christian Worship-Rest is unimaginable whichever way. Paul could not have thought of a Church "*in these things serving Christ*" without the Day for, "*servicing Christ in these things*"!

My point is (Paul's), that food and drink received importance among the believers more than we nowadays could imagine or what was good for the '*edification*' or '*growth*' or '*upbuilding*' of '*the Body*', the Church "*of Christ's Own*". Food and drink received importance to the point of getting toxic to the Body and their belly their god! 'Days', whereon "food and drink" received prominence (without everything being made religious pretence), meant, the 'days' 'concerned', or 'esteemed', or 'regarded', or, 'observed', were days 'listed' (SDA) and were traceable to their roots in Mosaic Law. They were not every day or all the days or some of every day life. That is sheer nonsense.

SDA:

Nothing in the text speaks of those who "value no day" nor of those who "observe no day". In the one case a person "values ONE day in the list ABOVE another" -- and so OBSERVES the one VALUED but not the others for they are not VALUED. In the other case one person "VALUES THEM ALL" and so "OBSERVES" all that are VALUED. In NO case does Paul address the person who "VALUES NO DAYS" and so "OBSERVES NO DAYS" in that Lev 23 list of annual holy days.

NTSS:

Yes! Only, Distinguish carefully!: "In the one case a person...", "In the other case one person ..." (verse 5a and b), in both cases (5a and b) "*the (same) person observing, to the Lord observes*" (6a)!

A-S:

Read again what I said. I didn't say that anybody VALUED NO days, but I in fact denied that and said that everyone "values" every day one way or another; either "high" as a special day they "observe" religiously, or low, as any regular day. You're still confusing "value" and "observe".

NTSS:

You are still exaggerating and stretching the meaning of words beyond tolerance of words or patience.

A-S:

There is no "list" mentioned. Just days in general. And while it is true that a person valuing a day over another means "observing" the day in this case; where the argument lies is that Paul nowhere explains that "what a person values he observes". Everyone values or esteems every day as either a special, holy day, or as just a regular day. "Holy day" versus "regular day" is an "ESTEEMING" or JUDGMENT. It's only the person who values one ABOVE another who "observes" it. So Paul starts off speaking comparatively of the preferences people may or may not have for certain days, and then he takes a case of a hypothetical day one person observes that another does not. The fact that two totally different words are used for "esteem" and "observe" shows this transition. There is no license to imagine discussion of a "list" of days that is nowhere mentioned.

And don't forget, if it was a "list" of annual days only, you are one of those who "observes NO[ne of those] days".

NTSS:

"Holy day" versus "regular day" is an "ESTEEMING" or JUDGMENT. It's only the person who values one ABOVE another who "observes" it", is a contradiction in terms, that if you cannot spot the contradiction, reveals how futile your proposition is. "ESTEEMING" or JUDGMENT", already is, "value one ABOVE another", and therefore already means, "observes" it" – 'it' whatever, whether days or food and drink – which things you have long since forgotten about. No, you depart from certain word-values of your own imagination, and conform the meaning of Paul's words, to your meanings.

SDA:

I don't deny that I am not observing ANY of the annual holy days in the LEV 23 list. But that was not the PROBLEM Paul had to deal with -- The real problem was between those who selected ONE ABOVE the other days observing IT but did NOT OBSERVE the others -compared to those who VALUED ALL OF THEM and so OBSERVED ALL.

NTSS:

You're going above my head. Or no, you're plain wrong and confused, SDA.

SDA:

IF I could wrench bend and twist the text and context around to say "some are like SDA and they do not VALUE any of the annual days of LEV 23 while SOME OTHERS DO value one above the others" then I would be happy to do it. I cannot bring myself to such an abuse of the text! OTHERS seem to have no problem at all with it.

A-S:

Problem is, there was no practice of keeping only some of the holy days, and being judged for not keeping all. Jews kept them all, Gentiles either did not keep them, or were influenced by the Jews who did keep them. All we see is a distinction between some who observe certain days as special, and others who

esteem all days as the same.

NTSS:

No, the "Problem" was not, that "there was no practice of keeping only some of the holy days". On the contrary, it was exactly the scenario which Paul condoned and for no moment condemned, that there was the practice of keeping only some of the holy days more important than others of the holy days of the same feast-period. "All we see is a distinction between some who observe certain days as special, and others who esteem all days as the same." Your own words. Just keep in mind the 'distinction seen' was not condemned, but accepted, even commended. And that the "distinction between some" wasn't a distinction between some persons, but between some, 'distinguished' / 'judged' / 'observed', 'days'. Or let me qualify, this was not the side condemned; it was the side condoned. But when it turned to the one man judging the other man, then it became the moment that evil made its appearance. This judging of one another, that was what Paul rejected and anathema-ised!

The question is then, "all days" of what? "All days" of all days? or "all days" of the 'days' 'observed' / 'kept' / 'distinguished'? That is, we see a distinction being made of certain special days out of certain days observed. These certain special days are observed above the other esteemed / observed days. All the 'days' *krinein*-kept' / 'distinguished', were '*phronein*'-'observed'-'days'. Everybody observed at least some of them, but only some persons made of some of these days, exceptional days, like the 'first-' or 'head-' days of all the Passover Feast days.

So, sorry to differ, but here's another of your smooth, lazy stretching of truth into lie, A-S! You say, "Problem is, there was no practice of keeping only some of the holy days, and being judged for not keeping all. Jews kept them all, Gentiles either did not keep them, or were influenced by the Jews who did keep them." But the very status quo at Rome (No 'problem' yet!) was, some members (Jews or not Jews) kept one day above another, and some members every day like the other 'Days kept'.

Envy, intolerance and 'judging' of the one man the other for not doing the same and for not observing like 'I do' – there's your 'problem', A-S! Gentiles-became-Christians just like Jews-became-Christians kept those feasts, and tried to be just like the Jews, and became very successful at it, even at observing the greater distinction between days whether through 'food and drink' (and wine) of some of the 'days' 'observed' or not. And so they thought they could make of 'food and drink', 'the Kingdom of God' – as were the very life of the Church dependent upon their distinctions. But it isn't what goes into you that makes you what you are, clean, or unclean; it's what goes out. Whose saying was it? An old 'problem' coming from the days of Jesus; a not so old as persistent 'problem' if considered encountered long after Jesus' day and even Paul's by the writers of the Gospels. But we do not find this written in Romans 14 verse 5 or 6! We find it in the whole context implied.

SDA:

There were THREE mandatory days out of the list in Lev 23 that Jews were required to keep the others were pretty much optional. The GENTILES we SEE IN the synagogues WORSHIPPING with the Jews in Acts 13 EVEN in cases where Christian EVANGELISM is the focus!

The GENTILES have their issue with Jewish Christians submitted to the JEWISH COUNCIL in Acts 15 to decide the matter. Clearly the CREATOR, the Scriptures, the MESSIAH, were all coming FROM Jewish Teaching. Scripture, etc TO the Gentiles -- Christ HIMSELF was a Jew. For your argument to work, your premise had to hold water – it does not.

NTSS:

SDA is wrong insisting only but all OT 'holy days'. It was just the Passover. A-S is wrong insisting Paul meant all days the usual everyday days, being 'esteemed' 'alike'.

But the way of 'esteeming' or 'valuing' was the way of 'observing' all the days **concerned** (Passover season) by one person unevenly, "one day above the other"; by another person "every day alike". It was the way things were; nothing, wrong with! In fact, Paul said, "*such person observing the day* (whether a, day above the

other, or, whether every day, alike) – "*to the Lord's honour does he observe it!*" So don't condemn any man, any other! The Kingdom of God is not food and drink!

Passover had some more important days and several more, less important days. All importance of days was closely connected with the food and drink connected with it. The believers made such an issue of this 'food and drink'-stuff, they condemned one another because each thought his way of observing, was so much superior to the others', they forgot "*the Kingdom of God is not food and drink*", "*but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit*", even "*all joy and peace in believing*". (15:13), (14:17)

SDA:

As usual – my references are all from non-Sabbath keeping Bible commentary authors. (I believe this level of objectivity is in some cases available to those who take the opposing view – but seldom seen in this conversation.) ---

John Gill Commentary

Luke 2:Verse 41. Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year,.... **Joseph was obliged to go three times** a year, as were all the males in Israel, at the feasts of the **passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, Deuteronomy 16:16** ... The sum of the matter is, our wise men, on whom be peace, have determined and say, that **there is no obligation but to males, who are arrived to maturity.**" So that this was a [b]voluntary thing in Mary; which discovers her piety and religion, and her great regard to the ordinances and appointments of God.

Jamieson Fausset Brown

5. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day--The supplement "alike" should be omitted, as injuring the sense. **Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind**--be guided in such matters by conscientious conviction.

A-S:

SDA forgets that all we have in the text in discussion, is DAYS, being "esteemed" and "observed". Each of the annual days was a *sabbath*, or at least had annual sabbaths associated with them. These were to be "observed" by ALL (males and females), by following the general rules for sabbath observance, plus whatever additional commands associated with it, whether a male pilgrimage, or unleavened bread, or sacrifices or living in tabernacles. You have absolutely NO warrant to turn "observe" in Romans into a reference to the pilgrimage only; (on top of making it the same as the word "esteem"). Even Clarke's commentary does not exclude the weekly sabbath. He said "especially the festivals", which he specified as parts of "**Jewish institutions**" and "**observance of days**". You're having to define "observance" as only a "pilgrimage", shows you do not have any kind of argument.

SDA:

Some may observe ALL the Lev 23 annual feast days - or some may have chosen to honor only the 3 mandatory ones listed in Exodus 23. But after the end of all animal sacrifices (HAS 10) with the death of Christ. The shadows ceased to be mandatory. Paul points this out in general in Col 2 and then specifically for Passover in 1Cor 5 "**Christ our Passover has been slain**" 1Cor 5.

Matthew Henry Ex 23:14

IV. Their solemn religious attendance on God in the place which he should choose is here strictly required, Exodus 23:14-17. 1. Thrice a year ... The passover, pentecost, and feast of tabernacles, in spring, summer, and autumn, were the three times appointed for their attendance: not in winter, because

travelling was then uncomfortable; not in the midst of their harvest, because then they were otherwise employed; so that they had no reason to say that he made them to serve with an offering, or wearied them with incense."

The NT issue defined: It is the Annual feast days - the annual Sabbaths. One person observes ONE of them above the other - while another "observes every day" - all of them. Paul is arguing that BOTH practices are valid, in fact Paul himself observed all of them as we find in Acts 21, 23, and 24. And as Paul says of those observing these feast days (in Romans 14).

Every commentary found so far - acknowledges that these are the Lev 23 festival days and that "esteem" is in fact a reference to "OBSERVING" them.

NTSS:

This is no conversation; everyone engages in monologue, he doesn't even hear or see that someone else has something to say. It's awful! If someone must read these minutes he would think it's lunatics babbling.

I say for those who did not hear, It's not all the feasts or, all and any days Paul meant in Romans 14. But whether all feasts or just the Passover in Romans 14, you are correct, SDA, in that an observance in fact of 'Old Testament Feast 'days', and no mere 'valuation' of 'ordinary' days, is what Paul is writing about.

SDA:

In no case is it "observing NO day" though - or "regarding NO day". (Notwithstanding the hopes of those today who might wish that such was the case). There is no OT command to "observe every day".

A-S:

So they did not have to observe the Passover (Nisan 14th, which was separate from the days of unleavened bread ...

NTSS: (interrupting)

Hear yourself! You are using our arguments!

A-S:

... though Henry calls the whole period "Passover"), the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and the Last Great Day? Are you sure you want to claim that? Let's go back to Lev.23. There, God calls ALL of them "holy convocations", (v.2), and then reiterates individually that they are holy convocations: **Feast of Trumpets: v24; Day of Atonement: v27; Last Great Day: v36.** And the Passover was established in Ex.12, where it also was a separate event of "the whole assembly".

Where does God say that these other four days were optional? Let alone, where does Paul say that in contrast to the three being mandatory? So the three days had a pilgrimage of males, and you equivocate the concept of "mandatory" as referring to the *pilgrimage* only, yet all of those days were "holy convocations", to be OBSERVED in ONE WAY or another by ALL. You are really straining to prove your point.

SDA:

There is no mention at all of the 7th day Sabbath of Creation week - of the 4th commandment. BOTH practices (and both Examples) are being defended in Rom 14.

EVEN if you - A-S and, NTSS - Inject God's own Seventh-day Sabbath INTO the Romans 14 text - that would mean that keeping the 10 commandments IS allowed such that the arguments made AGAINST Sabbath Keeping (saying that it places us under the law) are void. Because if such arguments were true - you could not "defend" such an outcome. You could not argue "For those who want to be back under the law - let them believe it - its ok - they do so for the Lord". That is extreme opposite of the Galatians 5 position and you end up with an

internally - self-conflicting - text.

A-S:

I don't say that you can't keep the sabbath, or that you are going back under the Law if you do. Just don't judge others for not keeping it. That's what brings you back under the Law. But you have to fight tooth and nail to rewrite this chapter to say something that never existed, because your whole MO would fall if you admitted its plain meaning.

NTSS:

What brings you back under the Law? - according to you now? Judging others, or, keeping the Sabbath? Obedience or disobedience? Doesn't Paul say all are under the Law for as long as they live? (Ro7:1) I can see how you are the one who "fight(s) tooth and nail to rewrite this chapter to say something that never existed, because your whole MO would fall if you admitted its plain meaning". (whatever "MO" means!)

OTS:

I have already showed you that all Israel was commanded to observe all the feasts of the LORD from Leviticus 23. You read what you want into the scripture instead of simply believing the scriptures as they are written. I do not care how many commentators you quote from, I only care what the Bible says. Commentators are not infallible.

SDA:

The flaw in your response, A-S. is that Deut 16:16 and Lev 23 are not "Bible commentaries that can be ignored" Having said that - you have unwittingly made the case worse by your argument -- because you insist that in the TWO cases we have

1. Those who OBSERVE ALL -- (and you say this is the only option for Jews)
2. Those who observe ONE ABOVE the others (which according to your logic could only

be done by GENTILES since Jews have to OBSERVE ALL)

You guys seem to continually insist that we ignore these texts "as if this part of scripture is just uninspired Bible commentary" and then say "Jews would ALWAYS be observing EVERY day in the LIST of Lev 23 days". Which means the ONLY ones (in YOUR model) that COULD have been "selecting ONE of the days to observe ABOVE the others so as NOT to observe the OTHER days when selecting the ONE day they CHOOSE" would be Gentiles! Does that really make your case better?? Why do you argue that? Did I miss something??

A-S:

In the view of SDA that would be "ALL must appear before me on ALL these Annual holy days - but three times a year the males must appear before Me on 3 of these annual holy days" (as strained as such an interpretation would be....)

So that means that using your view, SDA, when you read Romans 14 those who "observe ALL of the days" those who highly value and highly regard THEM ALL "every day" in that list of holy days have to be the Jews.

In that case those who conversely "Value ONE of the days ABOVE another" could not be the Jews as in Ex 23 or Deut 16 but would have to be among the Gentile Christians because in your view no Jew could be doing that.

As much as I don't agree with what you are saying - I still don't see how your solution gets you out of the weekly Sabbath and I don't see how it gets you to "Value NO DAY" in the list of Lev 23 as the topic of Romans 14.

OTS:

I think you are just being obtuse and misrepresenting what other people say on

purpose. You just don't like it that the Bible calls all the feasts of the LORD holy convocations and commands the Israelites to observe all of them.

SDA:

I am simply pointing out that the direction you are taking here - does not solve your problem in Romans 14, A-S. and I do that by showing what happens when we insert your "all Jews OBSERVE EVERY day" idea into the text. I think the objective unbiased reader can easily see that.

A-S:

So do those two passages contradict and override Lev.23, which calls ALL the days "holy convocations"? You are the one who ignores Lev.23 (except to bring it into Rom.14; then you trash it in favor of both commentaries and these other passages). But we are not to use one passage to try to get around another. They must harmonize. And the harmony in this case is simple. All of the days are holy convocations for all, and three of them include a special appearance of the males.

SDA:

No contradiction at all. One is a subset of the other. And it is ALL a form of "OBSERVANCE" of the days.

A-S:

Yet you have absolutely no scriptural warrant to claim "observance" is the male pilgrimages only. Your just made that up when confronted with Rom.14, because it was the only way to get around it.

NTSS:

It's no way to get around it; an unhappy comfort! In any case, Nobody here tries "to claim "observance" is the male pilgrimages only". More important, you confuse 'holy convocations' for 'Sabbaths'. Being a 'holy convocation' doesn't make it a 'Sabbath'. Of the Passover-'holy convocations', only the second 'head-day', was a 'Sabbath'-extraordinaire.

The 'tenth day' of Tishri of the Feast of Trumpets – the 'Great Day of Atonement', was called 'a sabbath', but the 'seventh day' of both these Feasts of 'holy convocation', are not said to be 'sabbaths'. You don't know or don't want to understand these things, which, if you could grasp, would put right your misconceptions about Romans 14.

A-S:

If Deut.16 and Ex.23 are supposed to be SDA's biblical answer, and "are not commentaries to be ignored" and prove his point on their own, then why does he keep quoting them to prove his interpretation of those passages? Why can't you let the scriptures stand on their own?

NTSS:

SDA doesn't try to 'interpret those passages' – he tries to interpret Romans 14 with the help of them – nothing wrong with and dead right – in any case, not his method!

A-S:

The irony is that the commentaries do not even prove that Paul was referencing ONLY the pilgrimages in Rom.14. You paste both of them together, but one is only pointing out the annual days (which we have not denied are part of what Paul is talking about), and the other is only pointing out the pilgrimages (which are part of the "observance" of the days). Nowhere do they even tie the pilgrimages with Rom.14.

NTSS:

Irrelevant beating about the bush at the same time misrepresenting SDA's arguments and falsely separating pilgrimages from the other observed days.

OTS:

The males appearing before the LORD three times a year was a part of keeping those days specified. It does not mean that they can ignore the other feast days – they are **all holy convocations** per Leviticus 23.

NTSS:

Exactly!

A-S:

No – the contradiction rests with those who imagine that no matter what Deut 16 and Ex 23 say – ALL were required to attend ALL of the annual holy convocation events in Israel. The point of Deut 16 and Ex 23 is that for SOME of those holy convocations they would not be required to travel to Israel and present offerings.

NTSS:

It is by far not the only or the most important point! Tedious!

A-S:

The point remains – they had a LIST OF DAYS and in some cases it is not doubted that as SDA suggests they observed ALL OF THEM. But even in the OT Deut 16 and Ex 23 show that they did not ALL always have to observe ALL the days in the LIST. So no wonder the FIRST century primarily Jewish Christian church had to address this as more and more Gentiles joined the group and as more and more Jews started re-thinking whether they wanted to participate in ALL the days or "one above the others".

SDA:

So you are saying that the Bible point is "You ALL have to appear before the Lord at ALL annual feasts but you MEN have to appear before the Lord at these THREE feasts"? And you are comfortable with that spin? Ok – But you can see why most Bible scholars and commentaries would not go that path with you correct? If we say that your family must ALL appear in court ALL 5 working days this week -- we could have no sensible way to add "but on Mon-Wed-Friday the boys must show up". I guess wild-imagination gets a big workout in your Bible study events, A-S. I have no idea how you are able to spin and re-spin like that.

Now back to Rom 14. Here you are arguing that those keeping ALL the days "observing EVERY DAY" are the Jews because they have to do it. But the GENTILES are the ones that are selectively "choosing ONE ABOVE the others" and observing the ONE but not the others? You have missed the point entirely or are simply trying to divert it. The point is to find a BIBLE CONTEXT for the LIST of days from which some are picking "ONE ABOVE THE OTHERS" and another person is picking "ALL OF THEM" to value (favor, honor) in observance.

NTSS:

There are no 'selective criteria' given in Romans 14 that hints at "a Bible context for the LIST of days", but rather indications to which Feast (from the 'list' of Leviticus 23), played the major part in the 'judging' that went on in the Church. And reading verse 6 keeping in mind the 'he', 'ho', of verse 6 is each one of the 'hos's': 'hos men... hos de...', in verse 5, it is clear Romans 14 provides no 'Bible-context for the list of days' from which your supposed "picking "ONE ABOVE THE OTHERS"" etc. is going on. It cannot, the 'days', 'lifted out above' being 'days' and not complete feasts in themselves.

SDA:

The point is that SUCH A BIBLICAL LIST exists!

NTSS:

It exists; Paul takes its existence for granted, I granted that! But in Romans 14 it is obvious which of those Feasts he not only takes for granted, but was specifically thinking of as having been specifically involved through its observance, and which he wrote about.

A-S:

NOW, you finally acknowledge the point I have been making. So the issue is, you have to PROVE that in Romans 14, "observance" referred to ONLY the male pilgrimages, and not to the holy convocation required of all.

NTSS:

I can't see that that was ever the 'point' anybody but you have been trying to make. It's not for anybody now 'to prove "observance" referred to only the male pilgrimages' – it's your self-undertaken task. And the outcome wouldn't interest me, for one.

To p-r-o-v-e, '*krinoh*'-'esteem' in 14:5 does not also mean '*krinoh*'-'observe'; and that '*phroneoh*'-'observe' cannot mean just what '*krinoh*' means -- stick to answering that, if you can. You seem to have no inkling of what the conversation is about – which at this moment already is far off track! Wasn't the point, the meaning '*krinoh*' has? – whether it means 'observe' in verse 5, the same as '*phroneoh*' in verse 6, or just 'to value' as with all 'usual' days as you say? Can't we stop the 'pilgrimages' now?

A-S:

There are TWO "lists" in consideration, the list of all seven feasts in Lev. 23, and this list of SDA's of only the days the males had to appear. You would need to show Paul referencing male pilgrimages in Romans, but he doesn't; he is very general regarding "observance" of "days".

NTSS:

Nobody "need(s) to show Paul referencing male pilgrimages in Romans"! It's irrelevant! Paul also isn't 'very general' as with regard to which "observance" of "days" he meant in Romans 14. He is specific, because he mentions several particulars that can only fit the Passover. But that's besides the point of our conversation at this moment, please!

A-S:

SDA ignores the context; not I. He ADDS the assumption of "the three days with male pilgrimages ONLY" to the text, to support his "keeping some or keeping all but not keeping none".

NTSS:

I should say you are right here, A-S. SDA would not have had to face his own dilemma had he accepted Paul supposes only the Passover, not 'lists' or the full 'list' of Lev23.

A-S:

The clear Bible context is that Jews had special days that they esteemed over all other days, while most Gentiles regarded all days as non-special, and neither side was to judge the other. You have to twist and turn and bring this "male pilgrimages" argument in here even though it is nowhere even referenced in Romans, because it is the only way to excuse yourself for judging others for not observing a particular day.

NTSS:

No A-S! You are the one now 'adding assumption!' "The clear Bible context is that Jews had special days that they esteemed over all other days." That's a given. That's what I say. The Church had special days that they esteemed over all the other days of the Feast presupposed in Romans 14. That is the given. You assume notwithstanding, that it was "Gentiles", who "regarded all days as non-special". Since you assumed that "Gentiles regarded all days as non-special" you assumed a difference in meaning of the words '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*', which you neither contextually nor linguistically can demonstrate.

SDA:

The point remains - They had a LIST OF DAYS and in some cases it is not doubted that as you suggest they observed ALL OF THEM. But even in the OT Deut 16 and Ex 23 show that they did not ALL always have to observe ALL the days in the LIST.

NTSS:

Much ado about nothing!

SDA:

Apparently A-S believes that pounding on the pulpit would prevent the distinction between what ALL have to do on all days, and what SOME have to do on SOME of those days. EVEN if you take the failed conclusion that Jewish Christians would value ALL the Holy Days - holding

ALL of them to be sacred and to be OBSERVED -- one can hardly argue that the Gentiles would necessarily insist on OBSERVING ALL of them. At best they would select ONE ABOVE the others to OBSERVE the one but NOT the others. And hence - you have the RESULT seen in Romans 14. This is nearly impossible to miss EVEN if we take the wild notion A-S offers us of insisting that the Jews would "OBSERVE ALL OF THEM" judging ALL of them to be sacred and not ONE ABOVE the others.

I don't know where you can go with your argument at this point A-S. You seem to have run out of answers and the Bible is clearly not supporting your speculation at this point. Perhaps a more direct and obvious solution is that these texts are telling the truth. Some may observe ALL the Lev 23 annual feast days - or some may have chosen to honor only the 3 mandatory ones listed in Exodus 23. But after the end of all animal sacrifices ... with the death of Christ, the shadows ceased to be mandatory. Paul points this out in general in Col 2 and then specifically for Passover in 1Cor 5 **"Christ our Passover has been slain" 1Cor 5**. And so that means that while some Christian in the early first century church might indeed value ALL OF THE DAYS - selecting ALL OF THEM to hold in high regard and so to OBSERVE them -- there is clear precedence for some who would select at least THREE OF THEM ABOVE the others even in the OT.

NTSS:

Have you now reduced the quantity of the 'list' to just the three from the 'list'? Perhaps that's what A-S gets upset about?

Then I also see why Seventh Day Adventists think the Sabbath did not stop "after the end of all animal sacrifices", because "with the death of Christ, the shadows ceased to be

mandatory", and they maintain, the Sabbath was not one of those 'shadows'! But that is besides the point now.

SDA:

It is easy to see how that would be the case for these Biblically established LIST of annual holy days.

A-S:

Your argument is all speculation. "while some might...there is a clear precedent...". Meanwhile, what does the TEXT of Rom. 14 actually SAY? It mentions NOTHING about Gentiles might keep only the three male pilgrimages, or even better yet, just ONE of the holy days? Why would they? Gentiles influenced by the Jews would be persuaded by them to keep ALL seven days, and others who were not influenced by them would keep NONE of them. Hence, no day would be esteemed over another, and thus all days would be esteemed alike.

NTSS:

Irrelevant!

A-S:

The Gill commentary even mentions the days being "shadows". If they were shadows, then wouldn't ALL of them no longer be mandatory? SDA's argument seems to suggest that the three pilgrimage days were still mandatory. If they were not still mandatory, why would Gentiles, or anyone, according to Paul's instruction keep them "over" the other four days? Why would they keep only one of them over the other six? While the principle Paul was teaching would allow a person to do this, you are trying to make it some specific instance of days, rather than general. Why does the actual text not mention this? These are the questions you must answer, instead of calling someone else's argument failed, and repeating the same commentary, which no one is disputing.

You have no argument at all here, and as usual, substitute tough talking to the other side. How can you think to be so right when you are clearly making the Bible say whatever you want it to say?

NTSS:

Paul teaches no 'principle' of a 'general' 'instance of days'. The actual text in so many words mentions "*keep / observe a day*" (or more), from those implied, 'days', "one over the other". These are the facts you deny and keep on denying!

A-S:

Citing "the other side" does not prove one's point, and I don't see how you come to rely on that tactic as if it is the ultimate, infallible.

NTSS:

You read very shallowly if you think I cite you. But I think you find yourself behind the door!

SDA:

You (A-S) even reject THESE pro-Sunday anti-Sabbath sources as THEY point to the REALITY of the fact that the Romans 14 list of "DAYS" is in fact that Lev 23 list of Holy days.

NTSS:

You go over-board!

A-S:

How could they be saying that when **there is no "list" in Romans 14** at all. It just presumes "days". And only one of your sources denies that the "days" could include the weekly sabbath.

SDA:

You forget that all we have in the text in discussion, is DAYS, being "esteemed" and "observed". They CANNOT be twisted around to apply to all other or normal work days as you have tried to do!

A-S:

Normal work days are the ones "esteemed [alike]", or the ones that the other days are esteemed "OVER".

NTSS:

Here we go again!

SDA:

I have told you this every time. Each of the annual days was a sabbath, or at least had annual sabbaths associated with them. These were to be "observed" by ALL (including females), by following the general rules for sabbath observance, plus whatever additional commands associated with it, whether a male pilgrimage, or unleavened bread, or sacrifices or living in tabernacles. You have absolutely NO warrant to turn "observe" in Romans into a reference to the pilgrimage only; (on top of making it the same as the word "esteem"). You are just adding more and more to the text that is JUST NOT THERE!

A-S:

Even Clarke's commentary does not exclude the weekly sabbath. He said "especially the festivals", which he specified as parts of "**Jewish institutions**" and "**observance of days**". Your having to define "observance" as only a "pilgrimage", shows you do not have any kind of argument.

NTSS:

Weekly Sabbaths were not included. The esteem or regard of days - whether by '*krinoh*' or '*phroneoh*' - was not the issue in this Scripture. As pointed out before, everybody 'observed' the 'days' - I mean, as in 'observe' religiously. The issue was people's attitude -- of all things their attitude -- which they assumed upon - - of all things, their valuation of "food and drink" which they assumed upon -- of all things, 'days' 'observed'! We never read it in so many words; we only can't but figure it out by implication in the context.

One must not generalise and say the 'days' involved were all, or simply, Jewish feasts. As far as I make out, only the Passover answers all the indications. E.g., wine was either drunk or not drunk. Just with the Passover wine was not, drunk. With Passover certain days were esteemed above the other esteemed days, the three first days namely, the seventh of Unleavened Bread (or eighth day, Day of Preparation included), and

the fiftieth day from the third first day (Day of First Sheaf Wave Offering). Then only on Passover the eating of meat coincided with the abstention from wine. But to say it again, this was not the real problem. Therefore the Sabbath couldn't have had anything to do with the whole issue.

A-S:

Food and drink was ONE problem Paul addresses in the chapter, and observance of days was ANOTHER.

NTSS:

They were the two sides of the same coin - but only the outside, visible imprints - superficial, it scarcely reflected what was going on 'inside'. Was it gold inside, or dross? And neither the 'days', nor the 'food and drink' was the inside. Neither was The, "problem"!

A-S:

BOTH were issues. Christians *judged* one another OVER, and THAT was the issue of the Chapter, not just "an attitude about food and drink". Paul does not say "By observance of days, I mean eating food and drink on one or the other". Yours seems to be similar to the tactic used by those who believe the annual days are still in effect (such as Armstrongism; and OTS here). They can't allow for the text to be addressing even the annual days, so they somehow claim it is about "fasting", IIRC. but the issue is clearly JUDGING. Funny how there's all these different ways to interpret this passage by sabbatarians.

NTSS:

"Christians *judged* one another OVER, and THAT was the issue of the Chapter...". No: Christians judged one another. That, was the issue of the chapter(s). The fact they judged one another 'OVER' certain impeccable, blameless, honest to the Lord observed things, just made their judging so much the worse.

I too have said how many times - in your words now, "the issue is clearly JUDGING"! But I would like to know why you say, "They can't allow for the text to be addressing even the

annual days"? Paul doesn't denounce any keeping of any days; he not even as much as utters one word against it. In fact, he comes to the justification and defence of both the Keeping, of days and the Keepers, of those days, and says, they do it all to the Lord! So why would anybody not allow the text –verses 5 and 6, which is the whole 'text'– why would anybody not allow it to 'address the annual days'?

And funny how only A-S's way is the only one right. It's nobody's 'tactics' that are evaluated here, it's the end-result of those tactics. The different tactics are our own; the question is have we reached conclusion that may correspond with Paul's?

SDA:

The list of days referenced in Romans 14 has to be the "Bible list" given in Lev 23 of annual holy days -- days that were "to be observed". Some Christians apparently observed all of them and others observed one day ABOVE the others.

NTSS:

How many times have you said the same thing? Why can't the 'days' "referenced in Romans 14" be from, "the "Bible list" given in Lev 23"? Some Christians still may have observed all of the 'listed' feasts, whether every day of each feast, the same or not the same. But, more likely, as far as it can be made out from Romans 14, the Church at Rome observed at least the Passover, "*the one man the one day* (of the Passover) *above the other* (of it), *the other, every day* (of the Passover) *with the same special meaning as each day* (of it)", Obviously everybody (in the Church at Rome) regarded / esteemed / observed / kept holy somehow, these specific days, obviously, the various days and/or outstanding, 'head'-days, of Passover. But 'the issue is clearly JUDGING' in the end, as said A-S. I put it another way, having called it an 'attitude' -- yes, too mildly! Of course you are quite right about that! So yes, A-S pointing out, "Christians *judged* one another over (and that was the issue of the Chapter) not just "an attitude about food and drink", is exactly correct. That is verse 3. There are other places in the Scriptures about this very 'issue', like Luke 12. Verse 3, word for word, "*Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let him that*

eateth not, judge him that eateth!" Why not? "*For God hath received him*". BUT WHAT HAVE YOU DONE? YOU, "*in reasoned criticism*" – attitude – haughtiness, pride, "*received him*" ... NOT, verse 1! You "*think / judge / estimate*" yourselves higher than God, because God accepted him! That's the first point; that's the 'issue'!

The next point, Verse 3 uses 'judge' / '*krinoh*' in b and 'despise' / '*eksoutheneitoh*' in a, hundred percent with the same meaning. Which shows, how wrong your opening statement was, when you confidently claimed, "That was just showing the different things the word krino is translated into and they all convey in some way a sense of ESTEEMING, not "observing"." This just shows '*krinoh*' never meant 'despise' where used to say 'days' were 'judged' / 'regarded' / 'esteemed'. In other words, where used in this context, '*krinoh*' in effect meant the 'days' were 'honoured' – and that without a doubt, implies when '*krinoh*', the days were 'observed' – 'observed' in the sense you deny and Paul affirms, when he in verse 6 concludes from the meaning he twice attached to '*krinoh*' in verse 5, that "*he observing (phronohin) the day to the Lord observes (phronein)*". The 'days' were days of and for 'worship', 'holy convocation' – every one of them; only sometimes some more than others of them. And that meaning is contained in exactly, '*krinoh*' – '*krinoh*' in yet another illustration from the context, understood as the opposite of 'despise' / '*eksoutheneitoh*'.

"NOT ... just ... "observing"" – that's the key! Because nowhere in chapters 13 to 15 do we read about any judging OVER days observed – in fact not even, 'judging OVER food and drink'! The 'judging' / 'observance' / 'esteeming' / 'distinction' OF, 'days', we find. We do Not, find the practice, – or any who, so practiced – 'judged' / 'condemned' or even reprimanded for so doing! On the contrary, as I've shown several times, Paul justifies and even recommends the practices as well as the observers in verse 6. But of the real sin-'problem', he in verse 13a says, "*Let us not therefore judge one another any more!*" In other words, for no reason at all! It doesn't matter what 'over'; Paul has already judged those what-over's, all, all right!

Days' are the direct Object of the action of 'observing' – the innocent, respectful, commendable, action of "regarding" / "esteeming". The 'judging' condemned by Paul though, is **another** than the judging 'over', these! The 'judging' condemned by Paul was that of, one **man**, judging his **brother**, each judging the other vainly and superstitiously, causing him to fail and fall, and condemning him for it! Nowhere is that the case in verses 5 and 6. In verse 5 and 6 Paul is still defending and justifying 'another man's servant' – verse 4 – who was condemned and despised –verse 3– in what? verse 1b, "*in doubtful disputations*"! Declaring against such "*doubtful disputations*" – not against any observance or observer of 'days' –, "*He observing observes to the Lord's honour*"! Paul Defends, the "weak" and Refutes, the wisdom and pride of the strong, and receiving and accepting the weak(14:1), bears his infirmities (15:1).

"One (who) believes that he may eat all things, (and) another ... (who believes) he should only eat vegetables", Paul finds – even of this person or persons – "*God received him ... for God ... his Master ... is mighty to make him stand*". Verdict? Innocent, acceptable to God! Are we going to judge God and say, no but food and drink must be the factor that polluted the worship of the Congregation? Like with the esteeming / worshipping of the 'days', the Congregation also with regard to its 'food and drink'-convictions and practices, stood unblameable. In the end everyone had just himself and his own innermost being to blame for the sinful ongoing judging.

Sin itself is the cause of sin. "*Sin increased.*" Sin breeds sin; sinfulness hatches evil. "*Who art thou that judgest / condemns / sentences / brings down someone or anyone who is servant of another!*" 'Another' – even "*God who is mighty (to) hold him up (and) make him stand (up from where you, proud nothing, have floored him) ... Who are you?!*" "*Who art thou?*" You are the cause of your own destruction; you are the fountain of your own sin. "*Destroy not him for whom Christ died!*" (15)

"*Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye.*" People – newcomers to the faith, babies in the fear of God – they were rejected, found unworthy, the strong destroying. Destroyed by Food? Destroyed Over, food? "*For meat*

destroys not the work of God!" (14:20) And this is how "*the work of God*", the Church, is built up: "*Wherefore receive ye one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God.*" (15:7)

Because they were weak the weak were condemned and destroyed. Because they were judged unworthy. By puffed up by their fleshly mind weaklings themselves, who thought they were better. (Sounding familiar?) The only, the real, the true, 'problem'? Pride! And only a man who is himself the justifier of himself, is proud. And only a man who is proud, judges and condemns another. Because his inferiority complex makes him think himself superior. Because he assumes the powers and prowess of God as if to protect his own weakness. That was the sin in the Church at Rome. The practices have long since been stopped. But the sin rules this very hour, still; in the Church of Christ; in the heart of each believer.

Then, Paul, in verse 16, says this, by saying which, he once again Justifies, the "*meat*" in itself, and condemns the Person who, "*in diakriseis dialogismohr*", "*destroys*", and "*accepts / receives*" not, but rejects, his weak brother. Paul then, saying this, "*Let not then your Good, be evil spoken of!*" "*The good*" – the Food! Now of the food, evil is being spoken of while it is the Person, who is evil! It is not 'days' that are aimed at; not even food; but the man.

As for SDA, I agree with him in that "Some Christians apparently observed all of them and others observed one day ABOVE the others". But, 'days', aren't 'feasts' as a whole; they are 'days' of, or days from, the feasts or from the one feast. I do not restrict those 'days' as belonging to the days of Passover only, too seriously either. Also the Days of Jubilee had the Great Day of Atonement attached to it as the most important day to be observed over the rest of the days to be observed of that Feast. But Passover was markedly a Feast of 'food and drink'. SDA at all cost must find the **whole** 'list' "listed in Lev23" in Romans 14, I don't know why. (Or do I? It's for me to keep quiet about.)

A-S:

Another one changing the meaning of the text, and also judging another's

motives. Why should I have a guilty conscience, when the text in question clearly says I am not to be judged for not esteeming one day over another or observing the day?

NTSS:

Paul says why do you judge your brother; he doesn't say why do you judge days. Immediately he follows on saying one man esteems one day above another, another man esteems every day like the other. Nobody judged any brother for esteeming of these days they all esteemed, but differently esteemed. Yes, indeed it was about and for esteeming of these days that everybody judged everybody else over. Then one wonders, Over days? And marvel, How is it possible? ... until you discover it's exactly my own and personal experience, my own weakness, my own failing and sin.

'*Krinoh*' – 'value', or, 'observe'? Paul used '*krinoh*' with the meaning of 'condemn' when in connection with 'the real issue' (the heart), verse 3b; he uses it with the meaning of 'observe' in connection with the inanimate unblameable – be it, OT – norm. Paul confirming states that the Kingdom of God is "not meat or drink" – in 17a. Food and drink is not Paul's concern at all, verse 20, "*For meat destroy not the work of God – all food in fact is pure and something wherewith one may edify another!*" Food serves to the edification of the Church. The Kingdom of God is Paul's concern – his only, concern! That also explains the 'esteeming' / 'observance' of 'days'. **It should serve the edification of the Body of Christ's Own.** How could it, had there been no such 'esteem of days'? How could it, were not such 'esteem' and such 'days', unblameable? How could it, were not such 'esteem' verily an 'observance', and such days, verily days of worship?

Paul '*krinein*' -'judged' / 'reproved' everybody for everybody's '*krinein*'-'judging' / 'condemning' one another! His heart and motives and attitude were honourable – his, 'judging', was good. But their heart and motives and attitude were evil – they 'judged' / '*krinein*' unjustly, un-righteously. We have had the word 'judge', meaning, 'to condemn' / 'to criticise'. We have had it meaning, 'to observe' / 'to respect'. The context in each case? 'Condemn', and evil people 'judge' / 'try' / 'weigh' / 'eye' / 'condemn' one another; 'Observe', and

pure things are 'esteemed' / 'distinguished' / 'respected' / 'valued' / 'observed'.

A-S, "Both practices were a stumbling block". Does Paul say it? One may cast an innocent child in front of another's feet and make of him a stumbling block. The stumbling block was not days observed; it was not days differently observed. It wasn't even food and drink in itself. That should be clear at once. And it at once clearly was no case of the Sabbath being observed (as some would have it) that was a stumbling block to any. Paul did not condemn the 'food and drink' or the 'observance' of 'food and drink'. You will not even find in there, that Paul condemned the Church! He condemned the Sin, a sin of '*thoughts and mind*' – '*diakrisis dialogismós*'.

So all the confusion comes from confusing the meaning of '*krinein*' in verse 5a, for, the meaning of '*krinetoh*' in 3b, while at the same time, confusing the meanings of both instances, for the meaning of '*eksoutheneitoh*'-'despise' in 3a. Or something. Because we try to think what we in confusion think (typically, "*in doubtful disputations*"). Moral of the story is, '*krinoh*'-'judge' has widely different meanings depending on the context.

A-S:

In 13-15, Paul is summarizing what he has been discussing since v.1. The whole CONTEXT is things people do differently from others, and judge them over. That is BOTH "food and drink", and, observance of days.

NTSS:

"Paul", "judges", "people", "over", "things they do differently from others"? Do I quote you correctly? What did Paul do in verse 6a? Did he not say, "*He observing the day to the Lord observes it?*" Did he not say this with immediate reference to and applicability upon "*The one (who) esteems one day above another; and the one (other who) esteems every day alike?*" Was not this the '*things they did differently from others?*' You call this, how Paul 'judged' them? Do you insinuate Paul 'condemned' them, with this declaration of his – his Only, with regard to 'Days', anywhere!? Well, I deny what you so effortless and masterly claim for fact and whole. The simple truth is, Paul did not 'judge' the

people for "observance of days" – never, nowhere, no how! I reject the connotation – the only possible connotation – you use "judge", with – the connotation of 'condemn'. Even if you used "judge" with its 'normal' meaning of 'value distinctly', I reject your intention, because your intention can only be indistinct and saying nothing. (For so have you argued all along the word 'judge'-'krinoh' means!) And I reject your intention because the only possibility of meaning for the word "judge" in the context you employed it, that could be true to the intentions of Paul, is that Paul justified the people over their keeping of the days, their differences non the less! --- which is exactly what you, reject and refuse to accept!

The whole context – as well – is not "both "food and drink" and, observance of days". I repeat, nowhere (and I say 'no-where' with full confidence) did the 'keeping', of days as such, or of any day, pose an 'issue' FOR PAUL. It indirectly was made, an 'issue' of! The evil, the 'issue', exactly and directly, was the 'judging'. That it went 'over', the unblameable, the acceptable and even the commendable (practices from the God-given Old Testament), was like the tsunami engulfing everything in its way! Caused deep inside the earth, its destruction only becomes real on the surface.

But according to Paul there had not been a tsunami and there had not been damage. Paul went to estimate and evaluate the damage, and did not find any to 'days'. 'People did differently from others', found he – Innocent! and "*everyone to the Lord's honour*"! As far as the 'days observed' were concerned, Paul found nothing unacceptable or to the dishonour of the Lord.

Neither Paul's verdict, nor the 'days observed', could be approved and, disallowed at once. At the root the People's very judging, and not the 'days', caused the differences over which they judged one another – 'differences' in the sense of fights and demeaning attitude; not in the sense of 'days' being 'observed differently' <'krinein'. 'Disputes' and 'condemnations' weren't caused by or resulted from 'days' (or from 'food and drink' for that matter). "*Stone upon stone*", says the OT, "*makes the sparks fly*".

The unacceptable, the unjustifiable, sinful, thing – the 'issue' –, was, the 'judging', the judging over, the

issue or judging of, whatever! Not the acceptable and the perfectly justifiable ... not the practices! The practices of 'observing days' and of 'observing' them differently, even of observing them with 'food and drink', were, 'observed' / 'practiced' / 'respected'! Paul finds no fault with it or with the Church practicing it, but actually encourages the Church in its practice. The unacceptable, unjustifiable, sinful, 'issue' OF 'judging', was exactly the thing 'over', which Paul blamed, the Church, and warned it, against. The true and only 'issue', was the heart; neither "food and drink" nor, "observance of days".

A-S:

The whole chapter stands together. Paul earlier mentioned "judging" in v.4 also. Verse 5 is not to be torn out of the passage, because it mentions something other than food and drink. People judge over food and drink, and they judge over days, and both practices are a "stumbling block". Is that hard to understand?

NTSS:

No! Neither of "both practices" were the "stumbling block". "People judg(ing)" and the judging of people, was (one thing) the "stumbling block". '*Is that hard to understand?* No! It's the only possibility; it is the only 'alternative'; it is the directly called to understanding by Paul, "*Who are you to judge?*"; "*Do not despise*"! That was the "stumbling block", the 'issue', the 'problem', the sin. Both 'food and drink' and 'observing days' were Made, a stumbling block of; they were not in themselves a stumbling block whatsoever! Neither, were the 'issue', the sin, the inadmissible, the undesirable! (At that stage in the history of the Church.) (Parents killing each other over their child — to use the illustration again. Both may have spoiled it rotten, have made it a stumbling block. Yet, does that make the child their sin? "Everyone shall carry his own pack" – Paul.)

And finally, where Paul in 14:13-23 several times refers to food being made a stumbling block of, he not once refers to 'days' being made a stumbling block of. Which gives an indication what more than anything else, was taken exception to. Paul never even looks in the direction of the days observed while thus dealing with the real issue of the judging of one another. (E.g. 13/14;

15; 20; 23)

Is it hard to understand the clause, "he who observes not the day to the Lord observes it not", is unauthentic (in the first place)? And contextually in the Letter (in the second place) is completely inopportune? Is it hard to understand while geographically in Rome as well as in the whole Church universally (in the third place) everybody 'observed (the) days'?

A-S:

You are "wangling" your way out of something--the clear meaning of the text, in order to justify your JUDGING another over a day of observance. I have no reason to oppose your sabbath; especially when you have before said I would not even have to cease my job. Stop judging people's motives!

NTSS:

"...in order to justify your JUDGING another over a day of observance ..." You mean, in order to justify 'my' judging you, over a non-observance of a day, the Sabbath? Why call the Sabbath of the Lord your God, 'your' -that is, 'my'- 'sabbath' if you don't have a motive about the Sabbath? Your motive is one of negativity, and "your Sabbath", is intended derogatory. Objectivity without involvement somehow is impossible, and you know that deep down. If you have a positive feeling about something then it surely will manifest. I only see your 'tale', let the other doggy chase its 'neutral' tail. Who am I to expect anything, anyway! It is between you and your Saviour - Whom I also hold dear for mine. But I don't hesitate to be an enthusiast for the Lord's Day because it is an enthusiasm for Truth, and for the Truth of Jesus Christ. Especially within the context of the ongoing conflict between this Truth and the lie of Sunday worshipping in the Church of Christ. It cannot be a stale or stale-mate state of affairs.

There is only, "*a keeping of the Sabbath still valid for the People of God*" - that indispensable, life-necessary, "*spectre of things a coming*", namely, of "*the Body of Christ's Own ... growing with the growth of God*", "*Wherein no one you let yourselves be judged!*" NOTHING, 'neutral', nothing 'optional'; the old was to make way for the new, once for all and totally. We keep ALL OT feasts who in these last days because of Christ keep the Seventh Day

God thus concerning through the Son did speak – through action, "*through the works of God*", "*did speak*".

A-S:

NTSS says, "*Paul says why do you judge your brother; he doesn't say why do you judge days.*" But No, they judge their brother OVER days. "Esteem" does not mean the same thing as "observe", which is how you, like SDA, are reading it. Esteem is more like "reckon". We all reckon each day as either special or just a plain day, like all the others. That's all it says.

NTSS:

I have told you there' nothing neutral or optional in this whole issue. "They judge their brother", Exactly! "They judge their brother OVER days", Wrong! You have injected your own story in there. Their judging was wrong and in an un-Christian spirit in itself, to be warned against and to be confessed a sin and to be stopped. Not the 'days' 'over' which they judged one another.

"You must needs be subject, not only for (reason of) wrath, but also for conscience sake. ... Owe no man anything, but to love one another, for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law. ... Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, not to doubtful disputations (though)." (13:5, 8, 14:1)

O yes; there was, "doubtful disputations"; but why? Because there is fault with the Law?, because to observe days is wrong?, or because their was fault with the heart? Yes, "they judge their brother over" – the fault was with the heart and in the judging! Meanwhile man pretends his heart is clean! This 'judging' of the judgmental spirit – this is Paul's concern; this is no 'judging of days'; this is not the 'esteem that "mean(s) the same thing as "observe"'"; this is the judging ... OF ONE ANOTHER! ... that "*destroys*" one another! This was no mere "... more like "reckon", "value", of 'days'; this was the 'judging' (from '*krinoh*') that could '*destroy the Kingdom of God!*'

Something little, in passing; small, but a lie not less perfect for its smallness, in here. Quote: "But No, they judge their brother OVER days." Truth:

Paul said the Church judged one another over food. Truth: Paul did Not, say, over 'days'! He never even hinted in the direction of the 'days' 'observed' anywhere where he dealt with the 'judging' that went on that was condemnable and damnable.

A-S:

No, that (food) explains ONE of the things they were condemning each other over.

NTSS:

So the other thing they were condemning each other over, Has, to be, 'days'? While the 'food and drink', 'explain(ed) ONE of the things they were condemning each other over', naturally, as it were, because Paul does say, "Don't judge him that eats", is it something intrinsic evil in 'days', that they could 'explain the thing they condemned each other over'? Paul never says, Don't judge him that observes days! You want to deny it? Yes, Paul in no manner insinuated or implied 'days observed' were the object of the people's condemning one another. Not even – in fact, least – in verses 5 and 6 where he actually writes about 'days' 'esteemed' or 'observed' – where he, Paul, makes the observation the 'days' were observed differently, and justified and accepted and condoned everyone's preferences of observance – where he, Paul, took for granted the days being observed even before deciding anything!?

Exactly where the Church would not accept the Differences, but judged one another 'over' the Differences (not over the 'days' which everyone anyway without exception took for granted and observed unquestioned), exactly there, did the Church go wrong. The thing Paul almost condemned them over was their condemning one another (over indifferent differences)! But not even that; he judged their heart and condemned its attitude.

If the practices were a stumbling block, Paul would have called the practices stumbling blocks, and the practices, would have been the direct object of his condemnation. He would have said, 'What are these Days, you observe? What Observing, is this of yours that you observe days? What rubbish, food and drink you take?' But now he calls the members, the stumbling blocks, and their actions, and condemns them (almost) for being 'stumbling blocks' in the way of "*righteousness*

and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit". "He (God) finds fault with THEM!", says the writer of Hebrews. And so did Paul with the members of the Church at Rome. You cannot repeat this statement, using 'days', instead of 'them', the People. You cannot say, 'But now Paul calls the days (and the food and drink), the stumbling blocks, and what is so sinful in them, and condemns the lot for being 'stumbling blocks' in the way of "*righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit*".' You cannot say, "*God finds fault with the DAYS!*" That you can't say. You're not allowed to. Paul and God, forbid you to say it.

A-S:

Paul said they judge their brother OVER days. Just because he didn't include "days" in "the Kingdom of God is not..." doesn't mean that was not a part of what he was discussing.

NTSS:

To be part of what Paul discussed, doesn't make that "part of what he was discussing", the object(s) of his wrath or condemnation. The true 'stumbling blocks' and objects of Paul's condemnation, were not days observed or food and drink observed; they were the people who observed the days and who 'observed' food and drink – themselves!

A-S:

No it is not. You too are adding something completely foreign to the text. First SDA adds a "list" of male pilgrimages, and now you add "something they were doing ON the days". But that was nowhere in there. They judge each other over days that some observed and others didn't. They also judge each other over eating and drinking. (Remember, there were Judaizers trying to get the Gentile converts to keep the whole Law of Moses. All of these other disputes you all try to add to the text never existed).

NTSS:

Yes, the "something they were doing ON the days", was their sinning – their judging one another. And by every indication they did it on every and

all days alike. But that is something you say I added; meanwhile it was you who added it – accusing me falsely of it. You said, “They judge each other over days that some observed and others didn't.”

If the sin was “something they were doing ON the days”, it was their judging one another. Paul doesn't say that “They judge(d) each other over days”, and he did not blame or reproof them “over days”, or, over the supposition, that “They judge(d) each other over days”. He observed the fact the Church ‘judged days’. He does not, warn them! He offers no alternatives. He finds Nothing, wicked. I don't “add “something they were doing ON the days””, you do! To what Paul ‘judged’ / ‘condemned’ the Church over – their heart –, you add, he judged them ‘over’, “valuing days”! So one should understand Paul condemned them for ‘valuing days’. That was not so! First SDA ‘adds’ male pilgrimages, and now you make Paul condemn the poor people ‘over days’ ‘valued’; and you further add that Paul condemned them ‘over days’ they ‘valued not’! Could Paul edify the Church by confusing them like that?

The offence for Paul lay in the Congregation's pride in their religious pettiness – with a heart as cold and hard as stone for the unity and warmth and joy and fellowship of the Church of Christ which implies and presupposes the God-appointed Day for, and of, such unity and warmth and joy and fellowship in and for the Church of Christ, even the Sabbath Day, which therefore, could not have been at issue at all. If not even the ‘days’ were made the bone of contention!

The fault, for this reason, was exactly that “They **judged** each other”. “... over days that some observed and others didn't”, which you, have ‘added’. “That” –namely, “days that some observed and others didn't”–, ‘was nowhere in there’. Once again, everybody, observed ‘days’. They only put the emphasis on different days. And this very difference was what Paul defended – not denounced –, warning the Church not to judge one another over this difference – the difference of each taking more seriously one day than the other of the observed days.

I for one, do not ‘add’ “to the text” ‘these other disputes’ that ‘never existed’. You are the one who

says, “Remember, there were Judaizers trying to get the Gentile converts to keep the whole Law of Moses.” I do not read that in the text, or find it there implied.

What I read and find in Romans 14-15, is the Christian Church – composed of Whomsoever – making un-Christian issue of “food and drink” as were “food and drink” “the Kingdom of God”. I even recognise ja for sure, ‘food and drink’ in this admonition of Paul's do receive a negative connotation. But the same never happens with the ‘days’.

A-S:

If he's telling them not to judge one another over days, then that would include the weekly sabbath. But you all have to change the text every which way to get around that.

NTSS:

“If (Paul) is telling them not to judge one another over days, then that would include the weekly Sabbath”, most definitely! If ‘proof’ of anything, you have noticed the ‘proof’ of the Sabbath in the life of the Church, right in Romans 14! You reached conclusion I, was unable to reach. Nevertheless your conclusion poses no problem to me; it is you who must answer the challenge of the implication which you, have discovered, Yourself!

Paul reprimands the Church at Rome “not to judge one another over days”. How possibly “would (that) include the weekly sabbath”? If Paul wanted to tell the Church not to judge one another over the Sabbath, he would have said so in words of letters! But ‘every which way’, you are the one who has to change what Paul actually said – who has to add to ‘the text’ to get it, ‘your way’. And why? for No Reason of Paul's or Christ's, but because you don't like the Sabbath and have closed covenant of peace with Sunday-observance.

SDA:

1. The Sabbath is never mentioned in Rom 14 – – no not even once.
2. If the list of annual holy days is the context for Paul's instruction -- as the non-SDA non-Sabbath-promoting Commentaries quoted so far have allowed –

then the case of "some observing" one day above another by valuing that one day above the others (and so observing one but not the others) vs. the case of those who value ALL days and so OBSERVE all is easy to understand. And the judging over those issues would not be allowed – but CHOOSING among the various days in the Lev 23 list of annual holy days is allowed. In no case does this argument in Romans 14 sanction sabbath breaking.

NTSS:

"The Sabbath is never mentioned in Rom 14 – – no not even once." Correct; we have not disputed the fact. We dispute the implication of the fact. In no case does this argument in Romans 14 cast a shadow of a doubt over Sabbath-keeping or over the Sabbath as God's Sabbath Day – Christ the Lord's Day, quite right. Yet, "choosing among the various days", supposed, "in the Lev 23 list of annual holy days", is not, "allowed" or possible, seeing it isn't 'days', but 'feasts', 'listed' 'in the Lev 23 list'. And not only feasts of "annual holy days" – the weekly Sabbath is also 'listed' among the 'holy days' mentioned in the Lev 23 'list'. So if you are able to find the 'Lev 23 list' in Romans 14, you must, also find the Sabbath in Romans 14. It's your way of deducing; not ours! How can you now come and deny the Sabbath is 'in there'? I think I have said it before, you don't want the Sabbath 'in there' because you don't see the Sabbath as a 'shadow' or figure pointing to Christ, and you don't ... because ...? I shall again keep silence!

"If the list of annual holy days is the context for Paul's instruction"... This is a groundless assumption. Nothing indicates "the list of annual holy days is the context for Paul's instruction". The context is the context of the place and time and circumstance of the Church at Rome – a 'New Testament' situation, a Christian circumstance, a different setting and 'problem'-scenario than eight hundred years before in the time of Moses.

Then too there is no "instruction" of Paul's or from Paul; there is only his expressing his displeasure with the people's judging and judging spirit; and his

admonition that they should improve, comparing theirs with Christ and God's loving and "undisputed"! acceptance and protection of his servants.

So that then brings me to the mostly forgotten and neglected statement of Paul's in our passage, where he writes, verse 1, "*Him that is weak in the Faith accept ye, but not to doubtful disputations!*" "... *but not to doubtful disputations!*" "*Criticising arguments*"-'*meh eis diakriseis dialogismohn*'.
dialogismohn'.

Here was the true 'wrong' in all its unholy glory! The concept of "*critical argument*"-'*diákrisis dialogismós*' was a 'first principle' of worldly philosophy and wisdom, the debating of the initiate, the grandiose verbosity of the play for the stand. (Faith was not enough or good enough. Reminds me of the Pentecostals.) If the initiate fail the test, he is refused brotherhood.

Notice the synonymous meanings of '*diakrisis* / '*diakrinoh*' and '*krinoh*' – a meaning anonymous the meaning of '*krinoh*' in the context of 'esteem' / 'regard' / 'observe' / 'recognise' / 'respect'. I '*krinoh*' a person in a Christian way, I respect him, I do not, judge him. But I '*krinoh*' a person in the sense of '*diakrinoh*', I weigh him and I find him too light, I despise him, I judge, him, I destroy him.

So is language, what intriguing thing. "*The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity... therewith bless we God... and therewith curse we men*". It is James also who says, "*From whence come wars and fightings among you? ... My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ the Lord of glory with respect of persons! ... For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man...*" Unmistakably we see ... "*from whence*" the root of all evil and the cause and fountain of men's "*fightings among*" themselves and judgements against one another made, "*come*". It "*comes*" from man himself, ... "*We, offend*"; "*man offend(s)*"! Because man is totally depraved, "*perfect*" in no respect. His sole '*glory*', is, "*with respect of persons*".

The 'issue' in the Church at Rome! Not, 'days', 'days observed', 'days' differently, 'observed'; in no way or manner, 'days'!

If "In the one case a person "values ONE day in the list (mentioned in Lev 23)

ABOVE another", and if it not only applied to annual holy days in Romans 14, but also to the Sabbath, then what? Does that make the Sabbath evil or sinful? Does that make the Sabbath evil while it does not even make those other 'days' evil or the subject of Paul's displeasure? With none of the practices being found fault with, only with the judging and condemning of men of one another, in fact, only with the heart, does that not make the Sabbath also, good, and unblameable and commendable?

A-S:

I'm 'negative' to you in any case, because you keep accusing me of opposing the sabbath. In another conversation, I was even defending SDA and the SDA's over Sabbath-keeping being "misusing the Law" and you making that church a cult, and you still show up there taking pot shots at both of us (Even calling the SDAs a cult like the other person!)

NTSS:

I commended you for your keen observation. I didn't retract on saying you are negative about the Sabbath. That remains as it was (or, factually, still is). I can't see how anybody can be neutral towards the Sabbath.

SDA:

Indeed - we "should" be able to discuss doctrines and even differences over doctrines without leaping off into those tangents.

NTSS:

Exactly what I was talking of! Shall we ever be able to? And I cannot make truce with error, in whichever technicolour.

SDA:

All one has to do (to 'defend' the Sabbath) is observe that the Gentiles are the ones asking for the Gospel to be preached AGAIN to them "on the next SABBATH" in Acts 13. It is for the benefit of the GENTILES that James notes in Act 15 that "Moses is being read every Sabbath in the Synagogues". These Gentiles are encountering TRUE Scriptures

and the God of the Bible in Sabbath sessions. There they find that the scriptures contain the Lev 23 list.

NTSS:

That means you endorse A-S's point above? However, 'Believers-In-Christ' no longer are able to resort to the "*criticising arguments*" so unconditionally condemned by Paul as being a grave sin.

We no longer are able to resort to shallower arguments than the profoundest and most sublime, which is Christ and He, in resurrection from the dead, if we want to take notice of the Sabbath Day. Of course it's true and technically and spiritually correct, "that the **Gentiles** are the ones asking for the Gospel to be preached again to them "on the next Sabbath" in Acts 13". Just so, is it true and technically and spiritually correct that the **apostles** believed the Sabbath and therefore preached the Gospel on it. Just so is it true, and technically and spiritually correct the apostles, **because the Law** says the Sabbath should be kept holy, on the Sabbath, preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. It was true and is true, and technically and spiritually correct, that the apostles '*have been encountering Scriptures*' in this regard, and therefore on the Sabbath preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. But none of these are the true Reason, the Grounds, or the Origin of the true, Christian, Sabbath and Sabbath-keeping - not one, The One, the True, the Only. In true Sabbaths'-worship being "confronted" by God. Confronted by "the God of the Bible" -the God and Father of Jesus Christ-, the Church, is being confronted by the *God* who "*thus concerning the Seventh Day spake*", "*in the Son*", "*in these last days*", in that, and "*when, He raised Him from the dead*", "*in Sabbath's fullness*"!

Why then, and by what authority and through which power, did the apostles preach the Gospel to the Gentiles in the first place, and in the second place preached it on the Sabbath Day? Because they did it by the authority and in the power and to the glory of the God of the Bible, in the Faith of Jesus Christ. As Karl Barth has unfoundedly claimed for Sunday, because of "*what happened on this Day*". What happened on the Sabbath Day, happened to it and with it: Christ, after that He had been crucified, and died, and was interred, "*the third day according to the (Passover)-Scriptures*" rose from the dead again "*On the Sabbath Day's fullness being*

in the epicentre of light". (Mt28:1) [I was thinking of how 'epifohskousehi' and the brightness of the angel from heaven as of lightning not only corresponded, but coincided!]

A-S:

The "list" of annual days is not mentioned in the text of Rom.14. It just specifies "days" that some observe or not observe. It's obvious that we have to fill in the blanks as to what days it is talking about. If you can add the annual days, then there is no reason to exclude the weekly day as well. Nothing is either specified or excluded, and precisely your oft repeated point, they would have learned about the weekly sabbath in the synagogues on the sabbath along with the annual ones. But "learning about", and "observing" are two different things. It was the Jews who tried to get them to keep ALL the days.

NTSS:

All right now, both of us, SDA and I, have (I believe) admitted your insight; but don't think it means you can now stretch things too far. "Learning about", and "observing" are two different things", well said, and maybe even the Christians at Rome through comparison and deduction were able to 'learn about' the Sabbath from Romans 14. But then ...at the end of the day... it was from the Scriptures that they thus learned, and wasn't it "the Jews who tried to get them to keep ALL the days"! And, as I have said before, the First Church not even from the Scriptures learned about the Sabbath; not consciously, but unawares – like a baby learns to speak at first – from Christ Himself, from His life and living, and from His respect for the Scriptures and for the Sabbath.

In the very last analysis, the Church at Rome – like and while themselves being the Church Universal the Body of Christ's Own and Apostolic Church –, 'learned about the Sabbath', from the life, suffering, death, resurrection and exaltation of the Lord of their Faith first and, directly. Then from nobody and nothing but from their own creation, existence and life in the suffering and

joy of being this Body -- "*They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: For they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them .*" Jr31:34 "*For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them, God; and they shall be to Me, my People.*" (Hb8:10)

The Church at Rome found itself midst in a stage of transition from the Old to the New Law: "*In that He saith, A New Covenant, He hath made the First Covenant, old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.*" (To "retire", as Paul said.) It is the intermediate, trans-ascending stage in the evolution of the New Testament Church. The 'days' of Romans 14 have 'vanished', for us. "Now therefore then ('ara) there remains valid ('apoleipetai) for the People of God, keeping of the Sabbath Day ('sabbatismos')!" How, and Why, and on strength of What? Read verses 8 and 10!

"*Write them in their hearts*"; "*New Covenant*" – clear allusions to the written, Old Testament Law. "*Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant*". "*The Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, is counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as HE WHO HAS BUILT THE HOUSE has more honour than the House ... His Own House ... whose house we are*". "*We*", the Church; "*own Master / Teacher / Tutor*" (Rm14:4a) of the Church, "*Christ as Son over it*". (Hb3:1-6) "*He that built all things is God!*" That's how the New Testament Church happened to know about the Sabbath Day,

Christ worshipped God and Master! – Then becomes obvious how and why the First Church of Jesus Christ learned of the Sabbath Day -- always, "according to the Scriptures", never, by the Scriptures or even from the Scriptures. "The Giver of the Law", Jesus Christ, He taught us. The First Church this day standing never knew another Teacher, another Head, another Master. Its Master Teacher has never been Moses. "*I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them, God; and they shall be to Me, my People.*" That's how it happened the Church came to believe and

live according to the Scriptures.

SDA:

The context in Romans 14 is "Christians" whose single authority for all doctrine faith and practice is scripture alone.

NTSS:

Ja, but not 'Source!' Single Source is Christ.

SDA:

As we find in Acts 17:11 even the non-Christian Jews were using scripture to "see if those things spoken to them by Paul were so". The only "list of days" we have in scripture to be "observed" are the annual holy days list of Lev 23.

A-S:

And the weekly sabbath as well, and new moons. So the general mention of "days" means any of these days. Again, none are specified or excluded.

NTSS:

Have we not reached finality? Romans 14 does not, 'specify "days" that some observed or not observed'; it only specifies, **everybody** kept (by way of 'esteeming' or by way of 'observing' – whichever, **everybody** 'kept'! It's the same thing, they 'observed': "days, the one above the other"; they observed, "days, one like the other". Nobody did not observe 'days'; everybody did.

A-S:

It's obvious that we have to fill in the blanks as to what days it is talking about. If you can add the annual days, then there is no reason to exclude the weekly day(s) as well.

NTSS:

"If you can add the annual days, then there is no reason to exclude the weekly Sabbath", is logically indisputable. "If you can add the annual days, then there is no reason to exclude the weekly day(s) as well", is nonsense. You cannot just 'add' or 'fill in the blanks' as to what you might think are 'blanks'! Paul is precise, and he is exhaustive. He carefully deals with detail. My viewpoint is we here have to do with the Passover

specifically and only because of the many and convincing specifics Paul does give us. SDA's viewpoint is we have all the OT 'holy days' of 'feasts'. But the details won't fit them all, impossible. Yours is, the Sabbath too is 'included'. Now you make it any day or all days, days, one above, all alike. What next?

A-S:

Then if the JEWS are the ones who highly regard ALL the days in the list and so OBSERVING ALL of the days -- who are the ones selecting ONE of the days in that list ABOVE the others? And so OBSERVING that ONE but NOT OBSERVING the others? Gentiles?

NTSS:

Now you 'add' the Jews ... and the Gentiles ... a differentiation of 'days' nowhere hinted at in Romans 14. Pure speculation!

SDA:

Again, you still assume "esteem=observe". The Jews kept all of the days, the Gentiles originally didn't, until influenced by the Jews.

NTSS:

What's it got to do with Romans 14? There's nothing of the kind in it like "The Jews kept all of the days, the Gentiles originally didn't, until influenced by the Jews." It's your assumptions only; assumptions that in itself may be correct, but in context is irrelevant and therefore wrong. Romans 14 does not deal with 'the Jewish problem'!

SDA:

Yes, unlike Romans 2 -- There is no "Jew vs Gentile " discussion in Romans 14. If Romans 14 is addressing a Jew vs Gentile issue such as A-S describes, it would have to say something like, "one man observes EVERY one of the days and another OBSERVES NO day.

A-S:

The Church was never commanded to meet only once a week. They met EVERY day (Acts 2:46), and this would include in the synagogue on the synagogue's day of worship, the sabbath, and also sometimes

Sunday is mentioned (Acts 20:7, etc). Both sides take both sets of scripture to try to prove that the Church met only once a week on one day or the other, but that is never taught in the NT.

SDA:

To "meet" for an hour is "not to keep the day" in Biblical terms NOR to "OBSERVE" the day NOR to "highly esteem" or "highly regard the day". Romans 14 says nothing about "having no regard for any day". The point remains - he is undercutting the argument for highly regarding Christ's own memorial of HIS Creative work AND you undercut the significance of Sunday as the resurrection day as you seem to argue that NONE of them should be "highly regarded" or "esteemed" above any other normal work day. In all cases in scripture - to "keep the day" to "observe ONE above the others" is to do normal work on a regular "work day" and to refrain from work on days that are highly esteemed. "Remember the Sabbath day to KEEP it HOLY".

A-S:

It doesn't have to address Jew vs. Gentile . There were Jews who no longer kept the Jewish practice and Gentile former proselytes who still did. So it addresses ANYONE who either observes a particular day or doesn't, to not judge one another.

NTSS:

So what are you saying?

A-S:

Oh wow! You're the ones always trying to say that the Gentiles coming to hear the apostles in the synagogue on the sabbath proved they "KEPT" it. I've been trying to tell you otherwise for years! But this all the more proves my point that there are no mandatory days

commanded to be observed in the NT. So now you finally accept that observing one day and esteeming it above others means keeping it holy as a sabbath, (while the other days not so esteemed are simply regular work days). Now, if you would only do what this chapter says regarding others who do not keep it.

NTSS:

Stop the drawling. I for myself accept, that observing one day and esteeming it above others means keeping it holy, but not necessarily "as a Sabbath". And I for myself reject, that "the other days not so esteemed are simply regular work days". Reason? Because that is only what A-S has added to the text.

SDA:

I have always stated that those who OBSERVED the annual Sabbath feasts were keeping them holy - sanctified - set apart by refraining from work-a-day pursuits on those days. There is NO JEW vs Gentile argument in Rom 14 as there is in Rom 2. There are only TWO cases listed in Rom 14 -- those who highly regard ALL the days in the list (and so OBSERVE them ALL) and then those who "highly regard- esteem -- ONE ABOVE the others" in the list of days given in Lev 23. And so OBSERVING the one but NOT the others.

NTSS:

We had finished with this! Once more you make the old mistake, SDA, by 'adding!' Don't add, "... in the list of days given in Lev 23". What can you gain? Like you, I also cannot see how A-S cannot see 'OBSERVING the one' means 'NOT observing the others' ... 'alike!' You cling to your all the feasts. A-S clings to his all days just days. I stick to some days of the observed feast-days above the other observed feast days, or every of the observed feast-days, like the other observed feast day. I cannot see how you say all the feasts of your 'list', instead of only the days of just the one feast.

But yes, it wasn't a 'Jew vs. Gentile' issue. It was an issue – a sinful in-fight amongst Christian brethren equal. So Paul addresses EVERYONE who either observes ONE OF the particular days or ALL OF the particular days, and he tells them all, Don't judge one another over one's preferences BECAUSE "the Kingdom of God is not FOOD OR DRINK"! Which shows the real issue on the **outside** was "food and drink" – "food and drink" the reason why the different parties 'observed' differently – differently due to the different days, each assigned the different food and drink to – and then **condemned** one another over it – the inside of the real issue: an unchristian **heart!**

"The Gentiles coming to hear the apostles in the synagogue on the sabbath proved they "KEPT" it", in fact, because that, was, and is, New Testament 'keeping', of the Lord's Day the Sabbath, which "*a keeping of remained valid for the People of God*".

A-S:

If we can stop trying to change the meaning of this passage long enough; we can finally read what it teaches regarding this issue. If a person wants to observe the day, let him observe it unto the Lord and not judge the person who does not observe it. Even if they observe no other day. It doesn't say "as long as they are keeping some other day".

NTSS:

"If a person wants to observe the day, let him observe it unto the Lord..." is not what Paul **says**. He does not **propose**, that 'If a person wants to...' He does not **suppose**, that 'If a person might, or might want to...' He doesn't say everybody **may** do just what they liked. He departs from the cognisance and acknowledgement of the fact the Church **observed days**. He departs from the cognisance and acknowledgement of the fact the Church observed days **to the honour of the Lord**. Paul doesn't **warn** the Church, 'If a person wants to observe the day, let him observe it unto the Lord!...' He doesn't **ask**, that, 'If a person wants to observe the day, let him please, observe it unto the Lord?' Paul doesn't give a **choice**, that 'If a person wants to observe the day, he may...'

Paul states the **facts** of an ongoing practice – a **practice** according to the Law, correct and unblameable. This passage does not claim, or, suggest, any did **not** 'keep' the 'days' involved. Everybody 'kept days'. That you won't admit, and so will not, "stop trying to change the meaning of this passage". But since Romans 14 does not deal with the Sabbath-Seventh-Day, your speculations are not only useless, but damaging to faithful obedience to, and trust in, the Lord.

SDA:

The CONTEXT for Rom 14 is Paul writing to Christians who READ scripture. It is in that context that we find the basis for the OBSERVANCE of a list of annual Holy Days "as unto the Lord". Some people get confused when they see me quote from anti-Sabbath sources like John Gill on a subject relating to the Sabbath. But my point is not "everything Gill says must be believed" rather my point is that even an anti-Sabbath commentator admits to the obvious point about the 3 mandatory feasts instead of simply lumping them all together as mandatory.

NTSS:

Alright, we understand by now!

SDA:

Trying to argue for NO DAY of worship during the week NO day kept holy to the Lord is a pretty wild leap. In Is 66 we see that EVEN in the New Heavens AND New Earth "From Sabbath to Sabbath" ALL MANKIND comes before God to worship. You are trying to bend Rom 14 into saying that "REJECTING ALL weekly worship" as a day kept holy to the Lord -- is a rejection "done unto the Lord" as IF it pleases God to SEE NO day of worship each week.

A-S:

And that includes New Moons and priest and Levites. But in no way can we use this passage to infuse annual days and pilgrimages into Romans 14, because

"that's all it can refer to". You take one passage and misuse it, and then use it to misinterpret another passage. I refute one misuse over here, and then you go and bring up another misuse, and then I address that one, and you dig up another. That is why these discussions drag out so long. You have constructed your doctrine and its system of arguments like a slippery snake that wiggles out of your hand wherever you grab it. And you think just the number of proof-texts that can fill in for one that is being debunked proves your position.

SDA:

By contrast in Heb 4 we have "There REMAINS therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God" and in Exodus 20 we have God Himself saying "REMEMBER the Sabbath day to keep it holy". Your argument is "FORGET the Sabbath day - DON't keep it holy NOR any other week day holy and thus honor Me". An exact contradiction of the Word of God. There were plenty of other things than doing nothing to be done on the holy feast days, and that was all "OBSERVANCE".

NTSS:

-- I like this!

A-S:

I have shown clearly where SDA has made up his idea of only three of the days being "mandatory", and this is what he bases his whole interpretation of Romans 14 on. So with that refuted, and no "lists" of days even mentioned in the text, and "observed OVER" never used; only "ESTEEM above or alike"; the only logical meaning is that some regard some days as special, and thus observe them, and others regard all days as the same, and thus don't observe special days.

NTSS:

In 'Passover' – one day, seven days, eight days, 57 days – not all the days were 'observed' or 'esteemed' 'alike'. Only one (15 Nisan) is called a 'sabbath'; only the first, second and third, were 'first' or 'head'-days. The seventh day (which also was the eighth day, depending on the 'first' day counted from) was exceptional; and the fiftieth, which were all, 'esteemed' or 'regarded', 'above'. Just like under the OT, everybody in the Church at Rome, 'regarded' / 'observed' these days. Where the same **days**, of the Old Testament, there the same **ways**, of the Old Testament.

And just like in the OT, here in Romans 14, everybody is supposed, as practicing observance of days without 'respect of person' whatsoever - from Paul's point of view, and, from God's point of view. So it was right at this point where the trouble started, because right here everybody began to 'reckon' / 'judge' HIMSELF above the others, "*having men's persons in admiration because of advantage*". (Jd16) The 'food and drink' and 'days' began to feature foremost, and skirmishes sprang up, and hate, and judgments. Then Paul came to hear of it, and wrote this Letter.

SDA:

Heb 4 - "There REMAINS therefore a Sabbath rest for the people of God"
Isaiah 66 "From Sabbath to Sabbath shall ALL MANKIND come before Me to Worsihp"
(speaking of the New heavens and New earth)

Mark 2:27-28 "The SABBATH was MADE for MANKIND not mankind MADE for the Sabbath -- the Son of Man is LORD of the Sabbath".

Exodus 20:8-11 "REMEMBER the Sabbath day to KEEP IT Holy... For in SIX DAYS the LORD MADE the heavens and the earth and all that is in them and RESTED the Seventh day therefore the Lord BLESSED it".

Genesis 2 New American Standard Bible (NASB)

1 Thus the **heavens and the earth were completed**[/b], and all their hosts.

2 By the **seventh day God completed** His

work which He had done, and **He rested on the seventh day** from all His work which He had done.

3 Then **God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because in it He rested** from all His work which God had **created and made**.

4 This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made earth and heaven.

NTSS:

I believe the Sabbath, Seventh Day Sabbath of the LORD your God, the Lord's Day - which is, Christ's Day - Day of His Triumph through Resurrection from the dead. Therefore too, I believe "a keeping of the Sabbath Day remaining for the People of God" : "Therefore do not you (Body of Christ's Own) let yourselves be judged and condemned by any (of the world and its powers or wisdom) with regard to Feasting of Sabbaths'-Feast!"

SDA:

The point remains - A-S has no way to show that "highly esteem" ALL the days in the Lev 23 BIBLICAL list means "ignore all of them".

A-S:

Oh, so now SDA adds the word "**highly esteem**" to the text. More additions to the text, and anything but let it speak as it is written. So you have no way to show that it is "highly esteem ALL days", from any "list", either. You have to keep adding more and more to the text, to get it to say this. To "ESTEEM ALL DAYS [alike]" does mean to ignore any special days. Because they are "esteemed" the same as any other day. Unless the person observes all 365 days of the year, that is the only way he could 'esteem' all days [alike] and still be keeping them. The word 'above' is what is giving you your "preference", and hence value of the day in comparison. Without it, "esteem" is a neutral relator.

NTSS:

No, it's not - not that simple, in any case. We have been over this. The idea of 'above' comes from the placing side by side, 'comparing' -if I'm using the right word for the construction-, '*hehmeran par' hehmeran*', 'day above day'. And the idea of 'alike' comes from the construction '*krinei pasan hehmeran*', 'judge every day ... -by ellipsis or / and implication, '... judge every day alike'.

A-S:

Also, while many people may look up to Moody as a good leader of the past, we do not follow him, and I have never really read or had much to do with him, so his reasoning for the Sabbath, **which he held as Sunday**, does not prove anything to me. (So if you want me to follow Moody, then do you want me to start keeping Sunday as the Sabbath?)

SDA:

No, he believed that Sunday superseded Saturday as "the sabbath", and thus applied the commandment to it.

A-S:

The question is, are you saying that Moody taught Christians to keep Saturday? For you know good and well better than that, and you used to acknowledge that, but still figure you could use his points regardless (which was already a desperate measure on your part to begin with!) . Isn't the whole point of the SDA's message that the Sunday "sabbath" is false, anti-scriptural, and from paganism? So then why do you quote from someone who believed in it? If he's wrong on which day it is, then maybe his entire exposition of scripture on that issue is wrong.

SDA:

Krino in vs 5 shows a selection or preference "to approve, esteem, to prefer" to OBSERVE ("Preference to OBSERVE") as we can see in vs 6. IT is ALL the same chapter the same letter the same author

the same subject. Some people have tried to splice, mince and parse these verses apart when in fact they go together IN Context. Vs 5 "One esteems one day ABOVE another while another esteems ALL" vs 6 "SO The one who OBSERVES the day OBSERVES it for the Lord"!! We cannot split these verses into separate topics. It is all one point.

NTSS:

Well said! "Vs 5 "One esteems one day ABOVE another while another esteems ALL" vs 6 "SO The one who OBSERVES the day OBSERVES it for the Lord"!!"

A-S:

It is not separate topics. Again, this RIDICULOUS argument that two separate words in the same passage must mean the same thing because it's the same passage. So then when he uses "krino" in v3, 10 and 13 "do not judge ", does that mean "observe" ("*phroneo*") as well? It's the same passage, same topic, same author. (Why did he even bother to use a different word?)

NTSS:

Now am I stupid? : SDA, "We can not split these verses into separate topics"; A-S, "It is not separate topics"??

SDA:

No reputable Bible commentary takes the context for "Krino" the term for "REGARD" "Esteem" in Rom 14 as meaning "DISREGARDS" in the way you have speculated. Your twist on this is "one man regards one day ABOVE another while another DISREGARDS all the days" in the list.

Hint: That is not because all Bible scholars and commentaries are "SDAs". The point remains - you have no way to show that "highly esteem" ALL the days in the Lev 23 BIBLICAL list means "ignores all of them".

Your argument has failed every time on this point. The arguments D.L. Moody makes are 100% opposed to every objection you have raised against Christ the Creator's memorial of HIS creative act in Gen 1-2:3. The point remains. The argument I have made regarding the 4th commandment that you DO agree with is that the commandment "is not editable" -- that seems like an odd place for you to object.

A-S:

You're still twisting the meaning of words, and refusing to get the point. I never said "krino"="disregard".

NTSS:

You used ""esteem" \neq "observe"", A-S. and that's "krino"="disregard".

A-S:

Krino is a NEUTRAL action, where one DECIDES or CHOOSES (other meanings of the word) the value of something.

NTSS:

'*Krinoh*' is no "neutral action" here in Romans 14. Were it, Paul would not have got so upset the fact the Congregation 'judged one another'. 'Observe', 'regard', and, 'esteem', may equally validly be used to translate both '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*'. But '*phroneoh*' won't be used to say 'condemn' or 'judge-in-the-sense-of-sentence-or-condemn', which '*krinoh*' could, and sometimes, must. This is getting ridiculous.

SDA:

Quote, Adam Clarke, "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day--The supplement "alike" should be omitted, as injuring the sense. **Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind**--be guided in such matters by conscientious conviction."

NTSS:

However right the commentaries be, they haven't dealt with 'our' points of difference. Like Clarke here, who really has no grounds for his claim "The supplement "alike" should be omitted".

'Alike' is no mere 'supplement'; it is implied as strongly as were it mentioned.

A-S:

And I see right here where SDA pulled the switcheroo on me. "Regard" is the word the KJV translated "*phroneo*" (observe) as; NOT *krino*! (Caught that one just in time!).

NTSS:

I showed you that long ago; check back! You '*krineis*' you have 'caught that one'? I don't think you have! If '*krinoh*' translates 'esteem' / 'regard' / 'value', and the KJV translated 'regard' from '*phroneoh*'? Then? Then '*phroneoh*' and '*krinoh*' translates the same!

A-S:

So v. 6 tells us that some do "disregard" (*phroneo* me) days, showing clearly that not everything that is "esteemed" is "observed".

NTSS:

I also showed you that – '*krinoh*' may even mean 'condemn' or 'sentenced' – just like 'judge' in English. But something that is 'distinguished'-'*krinein*' can be 'distinguished'-'*krinein*' 'above'-'*para*' another thing 'distinguished'-'*krinein*'. Then '*krinoh*' meant 'observe', in the context of Romans 14 and the 'days'!

A-S:

You're just going around in circles with this "esteem to be nothing" business. Esteem is neutral, so it CAN refer to what you call "nothing", which is really simply "average" in comparison with the "higher' esteemed days in this case.

NTSS:

Somebody here is totally confused. Weren't you the person who argued "this "esteem to be nothing" business"? And what's the difference between "esteem to be nothing" and "Esteem is neutral" and "it CAN refer to "nothing"?" Who called '*krinoh*' 'nothing', but you, A-S?

A-S:

Just because you think "esteem" must mean some HIGH "value" doesn't give you the license to stick the annual days and

pilgrimages in there, when they are not mentioned anywhere in the context. Even if you were right, the 'lost of days from the Law' would include ALL of them, not just the annual ones, and it does not even tell us WHICH were esteemed "over" the others. Your attempt to fill in the blanks with annual days and pilgrimages ONLY is totally without any basis.

NTSS:

Why you go on whining on the same string so tirelessly? That was SDA, not me.

SDA:

I am arguing that the USE in Romans 14 SHOWS that what is "esteemed" is being "OBSERVED". I simply expose the weakness in your argument by leaving this glaringly obvious point up to the objective unbiased reader to conclude. Your heels-dug-in tactics here in the "deny-all-points-at-any-cost" format is fine for the biased subjective approach that you are using. I don't claim to budge you from that position. I certainly would think that you would at least "hope" some unbiased reader might be willing to bend the point as far as you have. We will see.

A-S:

Who's diggin in their heels? Every single passage we debate, you do the same exact thing. You reinterpret the clear meaning to get around the scripture's instruction to YOU about judging others over days and other points of the OT. Then you take other passages as proof-texts, many of them not saying what you claim they're saying, or they don't even deal with the present. When all of that fails to work, then you just cite the same passage or commentary over and over, and then add the colors and stuff (edited), as if it really says what you want it to say just because you say so. I

can read this passage, and it means like what it appears to say. You have to explain it away; that "days" really means "annual days", and that "esteem" is "observe", and that the ones "esteemed above" were pilgrimages for males only. Where do you get all of that from? You try to cite commentaries; but the final authority is the scripture itself...

"Observation of certain days", "Jewish institutions, and especially [i.e. not only] their festivals". Is this not this what I have been talking about? Just reading these commentaries, we get the sense that the issue is people keeping Jewish institutions or not keeping them, and judging each other. That supports *my* argument, not your attempt to redirect it to certain days exclusively.

NTSS:

Hokaai for a moment! Quote: ""Observation of certain days", "Jewish institutions, and especially [i.e. not only] their festivals"." 'Observation', or, 'observance'?

There's a mighty big difference! 'Observation' (from '*paratehreh*') is what the pagan practice of "observing days, new moons, seasons, years", the "first-principle-gods" of superstition and idolatry was! We are not now dealing with Galatians 4! Please, another time, another place?

A-S:

... and then the utter irony is that these commentaries do not even say what you claim they say! You cited all of them, but they were discussing other passages such as Exodus, Leviticus or Deuteronomy. NOT ONE of them mentioned Romans 14, or in any way linked it to those passages on the annual days and pilgrimages. NOT ONE!!! So your whole grand claim to prove your point because "Sunday keeping scholars agree" with you is shown to be a total farce. You have

just heaped together scraps of arguments that do not even fit together. Not one scriptural proof, and none of the commentaries you cited. You or your group just made that up as a "quick fix" to get out of being in violation of the scripture. Why should I "budge" off of the solid foundation of the *scripture's actual words*, and into your shifting sand rationalizations?

Once again, all you have to do is stop trying to rewrite the passage, and just do what it says! But no; you have too much at stake. Your whole doctrine and reason of being of your group (you are the most obedient Christians over everyone else, keeping the "one forgotten command", etc) would fall if you admitted what the passages says. So again; who's "digging in their heels"?

SDA:

Why do you keep pretending not to follow the discussion? TWO points were shown from anti-Sabbath pro-Sunday commentaries.

#1. That the CONTEXT in Romans 14 DOES apply to the Lev 23 list of Holy Days.
#2. That the LAW only demanded a mandatory observance of THREE of those annual Holy Days -- the others were optional. You keep going to the quotes about the SECOND point and pretending that these are the quotes that showed the FIRST point. Why do you resort to such antics?

Rom 14:6, "He who observes the day, observes it for the Lord, and he who eats, does so for the Lord, for he gives thanks to God; and he who eats not, for the Lord he does not eat, and gives thanks to God." Notice there is no "HE who does not observe a day - is not doing so for the Lord".

A-S:

I see you and NTSS using these translations that omit that statement.

NTSS:

Objection! "HE who does not observe a day - is not doing so for the Lord" - SDA's words! Show me where I claimed the validity of this, the in the text and context of Romans 14 non-existent 'statement', "HE who does not observe a day - is not doing so for the Lord"? I have been in debate with SDA up till now on my premises there is no clause "*kai ho meh phronohn tehn hehmeran kurioh ou phronehi*" - "*HE who does not observe the day to the Lord does not observe*" in the better choice of manuscripts in this case, through translation 'added' upon poor internal and external manuscript support in this case. Best reason why the sentence should be left out, is the **thrust of the passage** itself. Verse 5 gives the two 'groups' ("*one man ... one man*") and how they differed as far as it concerned the 'days' they observed. Both 'observed', 'days', with only different days lifted out from among the days observed. Verse 6 then gives Paul's verdict / decision / judgement: "*He who observes (phronohn) the day, to the Lord's honour observes (phronei) it*" (- to the honour of that Lord with whom he stands! verse 4). To now suppose or argue there were other 'groups' whom we have not encountered before, falling as it were out of the sky, who 'observed' no way or day, will not make sense! But without the supplied sentence, the passage makes perfect sense. The following clause (6b) then gives Paul's decision about food and eating and completes the logical sequence and outcome of Paul's argumentation - his deliberate and systematic analysis of and answer to the disputes and charges made - an 'argumentation'.

Therefore verse 6 does not refer to yet another 'group' of observers or yet another way of observing; it refers back to the two 'groups' of observers mentioned in verse 5. Verse 6a states, the distinction each 'groups' makes, is good, because EVERYONE, does as he does to the Lord's praise and honour. (*'Do what you do, do well boy!*') The clause about non-observance of days injected in between, brakes the thought-rhythm and logic.

As SDA pertinently actually has said, "Vs 5 "One esteems one day ABOVE another while

another esteems ALL" vs 6 "SO the one who OBSERVES the day OBSERVES it for the Lord"!!" Paul in 6 further concludes about these (two) 'days-observing', 'groups', and further justifies them, declaring of them, "who eats (observing days), to the Lord eats ... and who does not eat (observing days) to the Lord's honour eats not." (3 October 2007)

A-S:

I don't know which text that omission is coming from, but I do not trust these other texts newer versions are based on. (Many of them are "Alexandrian", and that place was a nesting ground of pagan influence in the Church.

NTSS:

Yes, like Sunday observance.

A-S:

You should know, because the Bacchiochi and the SDA's are always pointing out that they were among the first to ban the sabbath and enforce Sunday). So if the Received Text has the phrase; I see no reason to question it. It does not even have the footnote like 1 John 5:7 has.

NTSS:

I also share your reservations regarding 'these other texts' - to an extent... In this instance you should take into consideration the total context, however. I have throughout tried to harmonise all aspects of the context not only with the rest of chapters 14 and 15, but also with the OT 'texts' that certainly get implied. There are more facts and facets than came to the fore in this conversation. (But see the first book of 'Book 4, Part, Romans 14' ... the first section of the present edition.)

I think because your standpoint is, the early Church regarded no days whatsoever because Sabbaths or any other 'religiously observed days' were not special for them. That is thinking in a circle. I think that's what, and how you, think. Now if it could be decided you are wrong, then Romans 14 must prove and leave no doubt the early (Apostolic) Church 'kept holy', 'days' - 'days' of all kinds Old Testament Feasts and Convocations - even pilgrimages -, including the Seventh Day Sabbath although it isn't mentioned in the passage. [It is here

SDA is wrong – as I see it.] But also, vice versa! If it could be decided Romans 14 proves and leaves no doubt the early (Apostolic) Church 'kept holy', 'days' - 'days' of Old Testament Feasts etc., including the Seventh Day Sabbath although it isn't mentioned in the passage, then A-S is in a fix.

The only problem is, there are no, 'if's' nor 'If it could be's', Romans 14 proves and leaves no doubt the early (Apostolic) Church 'kept holy' 'days' – 'days', not necessarily all, Old Testament feasts, unnecessary to say. There are no 'if's' or 'If it could be's', otherwise Paul would not have written the whole passage in the first place! So the idea some did not 'esteem' or 'regard days', is an a priori impossibility, and in this case, the TR from its own nature cannot support its inclusion, which must be seen as an enigma!

I do not build my thesis on the omission of this clause; the fact of it's absence in as good as any manuscripts just lends further credulity to the fact everybody esteemed days as nobody observed no days, as typical of contemporary Christian custom in Paul's day, right or wrong!

A-S:

Even if I was wrong, it wouldn't prove that the Early Church observed days. Paul is addressing practical conflicts where people were judging others over doing things differently.

NTSS:

Thanks for saying, "differently". To 'judge', is to indicate and imply 'difference', ever before anything else or more.

A-S:

If he's telling people not to judge over days, then whether he mentions annual days, or pilgrimages, or not, the point is not to judge each other over Days, which were assigned to the Old Covenant Israel.

NTSS:

Thanks for saying it.

A-S:

As I was saying, If he's telling people not to judge over days, then whether he mentions annual days, or pilgrimages, or not, the point is not to

judge each other over Days, which were assigned to the Old Covenant Israel, when we are all in Christ now, and "none of us lives unto himself or does unto himself...we are the Lord's...we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (v.7-10) If you insist that proves the Church observed MANDATORY days, then the pilgrimages were mandatory, and are STILL mandatory! But neither of you are arguing for that!

NTSS:

So why keep on with this?

A-S:

There is no way you can leave the weekly sabbath out by claiming "it was referring to annual days with mandatory pilgrimages only", but then say "it proves there were still mandatory days, but only the weekly day is mandatory, not the annual ones".

NTSS:

If we had this text only, you might have been right. One cannot build a dogma or doctrine of the Sabbath on this verse only. And nobody tries to, except A-S, who tries to build a contra-Sabbath dogma upon it.

SDA:

Paul says nothing about "Old Covenant" or "Just assigned to Israel" in Rom 14. Your argument that this is the "major point" of the chapter has the "major point not mentioned even ONCE".

A-S:

Well, aren't they "Old Covenant" days "Assigned to Israel"? Are they New Covenant days? Do you observe the ["mandatory"] pilgrimages? What are you arguing here?

NTSS:

Well, you might just as well have struck the right key! Maybe it was the problem the Church at first was not too sure either! I have not heard as yet of any 'scholar' who would deny the possibility! The ones I have read without exception say this was the very scenario, the Christians didn't yet fully realise what pure

Christianity implied with regard to the OT rituals and ceremonies. The first Christians were Jews, most of them, that's why this 'problem' shot up in the Church at Rome.

But you might just as well have struck the right key with your question, "Are they New Covenant days?" The New Covenant received all the God-given and God-instructed Feasts and ceremonies under the Old Testament, anew, in and through Christ – in and through His death and resurrection from the dead! The New Testament believer even undertakes the OT pilgrimages through Faith, and receive them all by grace, in Christ. The believer obeys every obligation and or Law of the Old Dispensation if he follows Jesus Christ, is co-crucified with Him and is co-raised with Him, and, "*IN HIM*".

A-S:

If you argue that these days were to be "observed and esteemed", AND that they do not include the weekly sabbath, then **do YOU keep any of them?** If not, why?

NTSS:

They all culminated in Christ – "*Christ is the end of the law*"; its Glorious End. They all culminated in Christ, and through Him and in Him through and in his resurrection, came to rest upon "*the Seventh Day, Sabbath of the LORD your God!*"

SDA:

Lev 23 SHOWS that it is THAT list of days that is being esteemed -- and OBSERVED in Rom 14 where some highly regarded ALL of the days (EVERY DAY in the list) and some regarded/esteemed ONE ABOVE the other days in the list. IN NO case does Romans 14 address the group that ESTEEMS NO days or "DISREGARDS ALL days" in the list. This is a point you (A-S) have been trying to ignore this entire conversation!

NTSS:

Romans 14 must prove and leave no doubt, the early (Apostolic) Church 'kept holy', 'days' - 'days' of Old Testament 'distinction'. That these included the Seventh Day Sabbath is no more than an inference no matter how inevitable it appears to be. The fact remains, that Paul does not deal on all or just any 'holy days' in

Romans 14, but specifically on the Passover, it being the only festival of 'holy days' that fits the specifics mentioned in the chapter.

A-S:

The Passover is *not even mentioned in this passage!* I don't see how you can just by fiat add something that is not there! Where is this "LIST" mentioned in the passage?

NTSS:

I didn't say 'the 'list' in the passage'. That implies all the feasts mentioned in Lev23 – SDA's view. The Passover needs no mention by name; it is proven the subject through elimination. Every specific fits the Passover and the Passover only. There is no property supposed or mentioned that alludes to the Seventh Day Sabbath. That this passage does not treat on the Christian duty of Sabbath-observance, proves nothing in the line of no Sabbath-validity for the Christian Church. There are many other Pauline and Lukan statements to the effect the Sabbath remained indispensable fibre of Christian coherency and mission. The Gospels came much later than any of these documents that without variance presuppose Christian Sabbath's-belief and practice, and they, take the Seventh Day Sabbath for granted as an a priori Reality, Necessity and Prerogative of no one less than the Son of Man Himself, let alone of His followers both disciples and Apostles.

SDA:

Paul deals with ALL of the annual Biblical holy days in Romans 14 showing that ONE person OBSERVES them ALL while another OBSERVES one ABOVE another.

NTSS:

Food and drink was the main issue: "*The Kingdom of God is not food and drink!*" Only the Passover had food as the determining aspect of the feast. The food (or / and drink) was for specific days, the days of "unleavened Bread" (and unfermented 'wine'). The wine was a later and optional aspect. Some drank wine while they did not eat the 'food' / 'meat' - unleavened Bread (nor long since the feast-lamb). Some ate the 'trimmings' only. That's what the passage says. Harmonise this with any other feast?

A-S:

Why can't the passage be allowed to speak for itself? It just mentions "DAYS", and the reader is left to think of special days.

NTSS:

Once more, thanks for saying. But in Romans 14 Paul does not say "just" "days"! How, is the reader "left to think of special days"? Just by Paul's mention of 'days'? No, by the specifics of the behaviour of those who "observed" 'days', the one, "every day alike observing", the other, "the one day (out of them all) above the other". What's so difficult to understand?

A-S:

How can it "SHOW" this "list", when it is not even mentioned? Again, the Passover is not even mentioned in this passage!

NTSS:

Again, to find the Passover indicated, does not mean all the feasts of Lv23 are indicated. I don't say a 'list' ... SDA says it!

A-S:

I don't see how you can just by fiat add something that is not there, whether only the Passover or not! I never said the "list of days" (from the OT) is not given in the Bible. What I said is that that "list" is NOT **reiterated** in this passage, so that one should assume it was exclusively the "days" being discussed. Rom.14 is *including* "the list" and **more**. ANY days one esteems OVER others, are not to be used to judge the others. Again, you have to make this so much more complicated than it is.

NTSS:

Now A-S includes SDA's 'list', I see! "Rom.14 is *including* "the list" and **more**. ANY days one esteems OVER others, are not to be used to judge the others." Who or what do you mean with "the others" - 'days', or persons?

SDA:

To "ESTEEM" the day does not lead to "OBSERVING" the day but rather "COMPLETELY DISREGARDING THE DAY" in A-S's story telling replacement for exegesis in Romans 14.

NTSS:

In other words, A-S and his thesis stand or fall with Romans 14; this one text is pivotal for him. Meantime, I have not held the passage 'shows' the Sabbath or 'the list', for that matter. The chapter doesn't directly allude to either (the Sabbath or 'the list')! But while the Passover's 'uses' are in chapter 14 of Romans referred to specifically, 'the list' of Lv23 is implicated while 'the list' contains the Sabbath too. So one should admit at long last, that the Christian Church, at long last, 'observed' 'days' - whatever and whichever, including, at long last, the Sabbath. **Then, there remains no escaping the inference the Church observed the Sabbath too, to the horror of A-S!** For me the only problem with this is that then we must assume the Church through an inadequate understanding of the Old, Testament Scriptures, and by default, (still) kept the Sabbath - both things which to me cannot be substantiated. For I believe the Early Church believed and observed the Sabbath by the Faith of Christ and to, the evolution (or appearance) of the New, Testament Scriptures - not from, the devolution (or disappearance), of the OT Scriptures!

A-S:

The passage isn't pivotal for me; it is pivotal for SDA, because he is the one trying to judge others over a day, and this one passage by itself floors his whole church's purpose of coming into existence. Don't you see what he's doing and the lengths he's going to protect his position? He's claiming over half of the Biblical feasts were "optional", just to fit his theory into this passage! I even gave him the original commands in Lev. and it clearly said that ALL SEVEN were "holy convocations" and "sabbaths" that had to be OBSERVED by all!

NTSS:

Sorry to interrupt, but 'holy convocations' were not automatically 'sabbaths'. When 'sabbaths', they are thus

distinguished each time by being called, 'sabbaths' – 'sabbaths' of, the 'holy convocations'. Like Nisan 15, the Passover's very own "*day of the Sabbath*".

A-S:

It's not "disregarding" the day if there is nothing special about the day **to the person** in question to regard. If one man esteems all days alike, then that includes today. Is he "disregarding" today? No, because today is not a holiday on anyone's calendar, so there is "nothing" to disregard. So in a couple of months will be the Feast of Tabernacles, and this person does not keep it, nor is he obligated to. So again, it is nothing to him to even "disregard". He is only "disregarding" it *from the perspective of the person who keeps it*, but precisely Paul's point here, none of us have the right to force our perspective on others in issues like that, "for none of us lives unto himself and none of us dies to himself" (v.7). Again, if you would just read it **objectively** (without trying to explain away something), you would ...

NTSS:

In answer, your first point, "It's not "disregarding" the day if there is nothing special about the day **to the person** in question to regard." Just the opposite! It's not 'disregarding' or the 'regarding' the day if there is nothing special **to the CHURCH** with regard to the DAY or DAYS in question to be regarded. And that makes all the days and any of them, special, "distinguished", 'holy days'.

Your second point, "If one man esteems all days alike, then that includes today." 'All days' in relation to 'the Leviticus list' or Romans 14, are obviously not 'including today'; they already are selected, separated, 'observed' 'days' as units of several days (of one feast) each. Paul nowhere says any, regarded or esteemed "all days" or "all days alike". He says "one man", "esteems / observes", "every (one) day", in verse 5a, or, "one day above another one day" in 5b – "every day" / "every day alike". At this point Paul

decides, judges, declares, finds, the following, conclusively, closing, final verdict: "*He observing the day, to the Lord observes it!*" For the umpteenth time, showing, '*krinoh*' in verse 5 is 'to observe' as '*phroneoh*' in vs 6.

A-S:

No matter; SDA brushes it aside, and goes back to his commentaries that don't even say what he is saying! Am I doing anything like that to any text? (NTSS, Tch-tch!) All I'm doing is taking it at what it says, and he is the one who keeps saying "no, that doesn't mean that, it means *this*", and what he says is not even mentioned there! But there are many other passages that we stand on as well, and SDA tries just as hard to rewrite and reinterpret them to justify his judgment of others. But this one is one of the clearest. It is too much for his doctrinal comfort zone to just do what it says.

NTSS:

Like 'not to judge others'? So what have you – and I - been doing?

A-S:

I once fell into that trap. "If the day is optional, and I can't judge others over it, then man; I can't go preaching how everyone else is wrong for not keeping it anymore. That's no fun! What's the point of it then? EGW and her "visions" about how this would become the Mark of the Beast were wrong. All of her writings, the premise of the founding of our church, and the entire Church's writings; all for naught! He has a lot to lose, not me. He doesn't even believe that those who do not keep the sabbath will be judged over it, "until the issue is made clear" at the endtime "3rd Angel's message", as EGW said. (Which *right there* is an admission that it is not "clearly taught" in the NT!) So none of us have anything to lose right now,

like he does.

NTSS:

What have you me confounded for? You are the ones who lean on the commentaries. Have you not read them on this clause? Have you forgotten the Translations already are commentaries? Any translation of late while from the NA 'Text' will have the clause "he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe *it*", **omitted**. The whole context as well as the relevant OT Scriptures indicate it couldn't be authentic.

A-S:

Of course. You simply cut it right out of the verse, right before "he who eats". What are you trying to pull here? He who observes the day, observes *it* to the Lord; and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe *it*. He who eats, eats to the Lord..

NTSS:

First: A-S's argument is '*krinoh*' (in verse 5), only means, 'to esteem' or 'to value' -- without (never necessarily with) the meaning 'to observe' religiously.

Quoting A-S to substantiate, "...the different things the word krino is translated into ... they all convey in some way a sense of ESTEEMING, **not** "observing"." --- "I have shown you straight from the Greek that krino is NOT "observe"" --- "Krino is a NEUTRAL action, where one DECIDES or CHOOSES (other meanings of the word) the value of something."

Next: A-S maintains when Paul means 'observe' religiously, he uses the word '*phroneoh*' (in verse 6) – not just '*krinoh*'-'value' / 'esteem'.

Quoting A-S to substantiate, "So you refuse to acknowledge that **the Greek word in v6 is completely different from v5.**" --- "...all we have in the text in discussion [verses 5 and 6], is days being "esteemed" and "observed"." ["... days being "esteemed" from '*krinoh*', and "days being "observed" from '*phroneoh*'.] --- "You have absolutely NO warrant to turn "observe" in Romans [14:6, '*phroneoh*'] into a reference ... of making

it the same as the word "esteem" [from '*krinoh*', 14:5]." --- "'Esteem" [from '*krinoh*', verse 5] does not mean the same thing as "observe" [from '*phroneoh*', verse 6]" --- "... Rom.14. It just specifies "days" that some observe [*phroneoh*', verse 6] or not observe [*krinoh*', verse 5]." --- "'Regard" is the word the KJV translated "**phroneo**" (observe) as; NOT **krino!**". [Note that A-S shrewdly never says straight forward, '*phroneoh*' means 'to observe'! Thought we would not notice?]

Three:

Just after SDA noted, "Notice there is no "HE who does not observe a day – is not doing so for the Lord ... and A-S replied, "I see you and NTSS: using these translations that omit that statement", A-S further says,

"I don't know which text that omission is coming from, but I do not trust these other texts newer versions are based on. Many of them are "Alexandrian", and that place was a nesting ground of pagan influence in the Church." ... "And I see right here where SDA pulled the switcheroo on me. "Regard" is the word the KJV translated "**phroneo**" (observe) as; NOT **krino!** (Caught that one just in time!)."

Now, The text the older King James Version was based on and that did not omit the statement, "*he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it*", has this in the Greek: "*kai ho meh phronohn tehn hemeran kuriohi ou phronei*". According to A-S. **not** to observe' must be from '*krinoh*'! Why has this 'text' not used '*krinoh*' then? It refers back to the according to A-S non-observance of non-observed 'days', where Paul used '*krinoh*' for the idea of 'non observance' – according to A-S!?

Even if valid, the clause does only what the affirmative clause of 6a has done – completed Paul's conclusion with regard to the 'days' of verse 5 'esteemed'-'*krinoh*'. Using '*phroneoh*' to say not everyone 'esteemed'-'*krinoh*', implies '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*' have the same meaning, which in context is

'to observe! The very mention or inclusion of the negative clause shows its irrelevancy; while at the same time it shows the equivalent meaning of '*krinoh*' and '*phroneoh*'.

A-S, contradicting himself: "... The person who evaluates days, and judges one as special OVER another thus "OBSERVES" the day, and the one who evaluates the days, to all be alike, is the one who "DOES NOT" observe "the day"." 'Observe'-'*phroneoh*' and "evaluate"- '*krinoh*' is "'OBSERVE(S)'"', or, is, "'DOES NOT" observe". So unnecessary! You said it yourself, quote, "'Esteem ABOVE" is what corresponds to "observe"! And that inference you base on verse 5's "*krinei hemeran par' hehmeran*"! So, '*krinoh*' is what corresponds to, I quote you, "observe"!

SDA:

It is clear to the unbiased objective reader from the vs 5 6 sequence that what is "esteemed" is being "OBSERVED". Many Bible commentaries (With a Pro-Sunday and Anti-Sabbath bias) come to Rom 14 and admit that the Lev 23 ANNUAL Holy Days were the BIBLICAL CONTEXT for Christians that chose to ESTEEM and OBSERVE some of those days OVER the others. I have already pointed that out in triplicate. My objectivity in showing the fact that even scholars on YOUR SIDE of the fence admit to this glaringly obvious point - has yet to be matched in any of your responses so far. You just keep circling back to the fact that you yourself refuse to budge. I admit - you do refuse to budge. That is a given.

A-S:

The only other who sees it your way is NTSS:, and even he disputes you on some points. So who are these "objective readers" you keep talking about who agree with you? All the others who participated earlier said the same things I'm saying. Romans 14 is telling us not to judge one another over observance of days. You

refuse to obey what the passage tells us. So do you think YOU are the "objective" one? Your whole doctrine and sectarian modus operandi is at stake, not mine, because this is not the only passage that supports our position. (Even though you have similarly ridiculous reinterpretations and rewordings of every other passage as well). So you have reason to be **very** subjective!

Quoting v.6 in all the translations you can, does not prove to the unbiased reader that "what is esteemed is observed". Those are two different statements. "Esteem ABOVE" is what corresponds to "observe". There are days you observe, and then there are all other days, esteemed as the same. The ones observed are "esteemed *above*" the others. Why try to force anything else in there?

NTSS:

Romans 14 is Not, 'telling us not to judge one another over observance of days'. It tells us not to judge one another. Then by further implication it may tell us not to judge one another over our Differences - whichever differences, whether about food and drink of 'days' 'observed' or even further remotely, over our differences in observing 'days' 'observed'. It never tells us 'not to judge one another over observance of days'. How many times have I said it, everybody observed days; how would they judge one another over something they all did and enjoyed consensus over? Over a 'neutral' matter, the fact and status quo that everybody 'observed' 'days'? Over the inconsistency everybody did not keep every of the 'observed' 'days' with equal 'value' attached? Paul does not say it! Over they judged each other 'there-over'? Paul does not even say that! Did they judge one another? "Why try to force anything else in there?" That's exactly what Paul said!

The very judging one another that went on in Paul's day is raging on still, I see, over a completely 'neutral' matter! Yes, it's you, A-S. who tries to force something in, and that is, that 'to esteem' - in the context of 14:5 - cannot also mean, and must also

mean, 'to observe'! Then the moment you find it difficult thinking out another excuse, you switch over to the judging business.

SDA:

Another point to be left up to the unbiased objective reader -Romans 14- facts to be noted,
 A- Sabbath is not explicitly mentioned in Rom 14,
 B -NEITHER practice regarding days is said to be strong OR weak in Romans 14
 C -NO JEW vs. GENTILE discussion appears in the text
 D - IF one wants to eis-exegetically inject the Seventh-day Sabbath into Romans 14:
 E.THEN we still find that it is given without qualification in the text.
 F.It is not listed in the text as a Jew or GENTILE issue (all had scripture)
 G.NOT identified in Rom 14 as a WEAK vs STRONG practice

NTSS:

A good statement, unnecessarily weakened by your reference to what actually does not exist in Romans 14, namely, "whoever ... keeps them not". I would use this then as a model answer to the anti-Sabbatharians with credit to you!

SDA:

As for the example that shows BOTH the case of esteeming ONE day in the Biblical List of annual holy days (Lev 23) ABOVE the other days in that list - vs. -- esteeming ALL the days in that list to be just as sacred and observing them all -- I don't see how this helps your case at all since you have been trying to argue for "esteem to be nothing" as the meaning for esteem in that case.

NTSS:

Yet, it is not true the esteeming one day in the Biblical List of annual holy days, was an esteeming above the other days in that list. Paul does not in Romans 14 compare the various OT 'holy days' or

periods. He does not think of the esteeming one of the feasts above the others in that list, to be just as sacred as observing all the feasts in that list. Neither things are his mind. Paul minds the minding of all the days of one OT feast-period, "(by some) one man (unequally...) a (certain feast) day above an other (certain feast) day; (by some other) one man (equally...) every one (feast) day (like every other feast day)". That was Paul's mind; he paid attention to 'days' within their local context with regards to their OT setting, of having been 'days' 'feasted', that is, 'days' of 'food and drink', which "food and drink" (not the 'days' as such) the Believers made the essence of the Kingdom of God - wrongly, because proudly, and while judging one another over it. Which judging one another actually, was the only 'issue', in the Rome Community of Christians.

SDA:

No practice regarding days is said to be strong OR weak in Romans 14.

NTSS:

Take out the non-canonical phrase, "he who does not observe the day to the Lord does not observe it", and you get that in fact the 'strong' were those who regarded days and, ate, but drank not wine! Only the Passover!

SDA:

No reputable Bible commentary takes the context for "Krino" the term for "REGARD" "Esteem" in Rom 14 as meaning "DISREGARD" in the way A-S have speculated. His twist on this is "one man regards one day ABOVE another while another DISREGARDS all the days" in the list."

NTSS:

I understand. He is wrong. I thought A-S would have agreed. I think he disagrees because his standpoint is the early Church regarded no days whatsoever, as were the Sabbath or any other 'special days' a non-entity.

SDA:

Romans 14 DOES show that OBSERVING the day comes from holding the day in ESTEEM or high "REGARD".

A-S:

It does not show that. That is what you have to do all of this twisting and turning to try to get it into that passage.

NTSS:

What about the "days of any kind" SDA refers to; aren't they exactly the days you talked of, saying, "all days, generally, in comparison. So all days are esteemed one way or another"?

A-S:

There are a lot of different commentators and interpretations out there. So who would say something different. Why do you claim to prove your whole view on just two or three commentators? Again, do we need them to read the Bible for us, like the Catholics say about their leaders?

NTSS:

When A-S hasn't got one commentator to boast with – not even the 'text' itself.

A-S:

Nowhere in the New Testament is anyone ever judged (called "disobedient", etc) for failing to keep any days. This passage and others telling us not to judge over days goes right along with this.

NTSS:

It was the most natural thing, everybody unanimously and without asking questions kept, the days the Church were keeping. In Romans 14 the situation was exactly the same. There was no issue over the days being observed per se. There was no issue even over food and drink attached to the days because they were 'observed' 'days'. None at all! You lost focus! "This passage and others telling us not to judge over days goes right along with this." No passage in Scripture, and not this passage Romans 14, "tell(s) us not to judge over days". All Scripture, and this passage Romans 14 along with it, tell us not to judge, not to condemn, not to despise, not to destroy one's neighbour, one's brother, the Church, the Kingdom of God – not for or 'over',

anything! 'Days' may and never can, be the cause of judging, nor food and drink. Jesus cursed the tree, and the tree for bearing no fruit! It's the man himself (the tree itself) – the sinner that himself is the reason for and cause of his own judging, that is warned, and even judged, and even condemned, for, or 'over', his judging; it's the sinner who is taken to task for and over his own sin and sinfulness. It is of no use one has focussed in perfectly, but operates on the spleen when the heart should be operated on!

The preferences and practices are accepted, and 'un-judged', and 'un-condemned', "observed", "days" of the Church. (Not of the OT or of the Jews, but of the NT Church.) The fact reduces the application of Paul's admonition to the Church at Rome in the days of its infancy, so that it can't even be said of us, that this passage tells us, not to judge our brethren over their preferences, because the specific circumstance, no longer suits the Church, us, today. We should speak in the Third Person and Past Tense, that this passage told the Congregation at Rome in the days of Paul, not to judge one another, full stop. For the servant stands with his Master, and the Master shall make him stand up and keep him standing up. The rest is of no account: it cannot and is not permitted, to be judged, because it is not permitted to judge at all. Only now do we perceive how this Passage also applies to us, today!

But, May I steer this conversation back to its origin, 'The decline of the Sabbath', and turn it over and destroy its very intent, by reminding everyone participating, that in the eyes of God no 'decline' of the Sabbath in whatever way, could incur, seeing "*God concerning the Seventh Day (Sabbath) thus SPEAK*" ... "*in these last days*" ... "*through the Son*" ... "*and God the Seventh Day rested from all His works*". Now that, cannot be the 'decline' of the Sabbath, but must be its utmost elevation and honouring by none less than God Himself, in the Son, through the Son, by the Son, and for the Son, the Son of Man – The Man, "for" whom, "the Sabbath was made", since God NEVER, 'rested', BUT, in the Son and through the Son and by the Son "*in Whom I AM well pleased*". And the acme of this dignifying of the Day of God's Sabbath – which is a dignifying by the very fact of its being "*the Sabbath of the Lord your God*" – the acme of it, consists in that God – quoting Matthew 28:1 literally – in that and "*WHEN*" God, "*In the Sabbath's*

fullness of daylight being", "by the EXCEEDING greatness of His power which He WORKED ... RAISED Christ from the dead"!

Gerhard Ebersöhn
Suite 324
Private Bag X43
Sunninghill 2157
Johannesburg
biblestudents@imagnet.co.za
<http://www.biblestudents.co.za>

ISBN 978-0-620-41731-0; 978-0-620-41743-3