

The Ten Commandments - Part 21: Sabbath Apologetics in Romans 14 (8/27/2022)

The following text is a message from Corner Fringe Ministries that was presented by Daniel Joseph. The original presentation can be viewed at <https://www.cornerfringe.com/media/dzpcxsg/the-ten-commandments-part-20>

***Portions of this document have been edited from the video message to better present a comprehensive, written document. Special attention was given to preserving the original context, but this document is not verbatim. Scripture verses are in the red text with other quotes in blue. Therefore, it is recommended that this document is printed in color. The Hebrew words are generally accompanied by the transliterate, English word. In most cases, the Hebrew is to be read from right to left.**

We are currently looking at what I would call the most controversial commandment found anywhere in the decalogue. In fact, if you've been with us for the last couple weeks, you know that for generations, all-out war has erupted regarding this commandment. It's caused more debate, more controversy, more division, and even persecution.

If I knew nothing else about what was going on and I was on the outside looking in at Christianity and what was going on with the Sabbath, it would be enough for me to say, "For whatever reason, the devil has this thing in his crosshairs."

Why has the Sabbath been the subject of so much debate? Why have Christians throughout the centuries clung to it and said, "We need to keep the Sabbath commandment of God. We need to fear God." Why do we have other Christians saying, "You need to reject the Sabbath commandment and if you don't, you're rejecting Christ; you're not serving Him; you're putting yourself under bondage."

When you look at the history of the Sabbath, it demands investigation. So, today we will do a little bit of Sabbath apologetics specifically regarding one passage found in the New Testament. It's a passage that Paul brought to the Romans. It serves as a premier defense for Christians that want to say, "Guess what? As a Christian, you are not obligated to keep the Sabbath." That passage is found in Romans 14:5.

Romans 14:5-6 – ⁵ One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind. ⁶ 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.

Traditionally speaking, this is a passage that many Christians will cite and say, "Don't make a big deal out of this. If I want to keep the Sabbath; I can. If I don't want to keep it; it's not a big deal. If you want to esteem every day alike; *mazel tov*/that's wonderful. If you don't want to identify with any day; no problem. We're all good."

This is the passage that's used to defend that ideology. But, is this what Paul is conveying? Is this the idea? When you read scripture, you want to extract the original intent of the authors. You want to make sure you "get it". So, we will practice some good Biblical exegesis today.

To read the Bible responsibly, you can't just read a verse and walk away and say, "I totally get it. I got the divine download. I know what he's talking about." That's very dangerous and could put you in a very precarious situation. A lot of people get very creative and extract one particular verse and create an entire doctrine and theology out of it.

So, lest we do that, what do we need to do? We need to get some context. Good Biblical exegesis will look at the broader context and the historical context. Good Biblical exegesis will allow other witnesses to confirm that how I'm reading this is correct or whether I'm misguided. I must be misunderstanding the text if other parts of the Bible contradict what I am understanding. So, we will get into good Biblical exegesis. Let's get some context by going back to verse 1.

Romans 14:1 – ¹Receive one who is weak in the faith,

Paul had one particular group in mind, at least for now. He gave this particular group instructions. What particular group am I talking about? I'm talking about those who are strong in the faith. They are developed and mature in the faith. They've been tested. Paul instructed them to receive one who is weak in the faith. To be weak in the faith means that you are underdeveloped and not mature in the faith.

As you think about this, it may prompt a question, "Well, Daniel, what really determines who is strong in the faith and who is weak in the faith?" It's fascinating that Paul already answered that question in Romans 10:17 – ¹⁷Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God.

If you want to increase your faith, start receiving the word. The more you receive it, the more empowered you will become. The more you chew on His word, the more wisdom and understanding you will receive because the word is the mind of Christ. If you spend time with His mind and His heart, you receive discernment.

What does it say in Hebrews 4:12? – ¹²The word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing the division of soul and spirit, joints and marrow, and is a discerner of thoughts and intents of the heart.

It can do things; you cannot do in the flesh. It has a power that you do not have on your own. When you tap into that power you become empowered according to His heart and His will, and you get strong.

As you read about His promises, they start to become tangible. As you read through the scriptures, you realize that when God says something, it comes to pass. You read that God promised Israel He would take them out of Egypt by an outstretched hand, by many wonders, and bring them into the promised land; then guess what? You read that it happened.

You discover that there is not a word that comes out of His mouth that returns to Him void. It will accomplish the thing it is sent for. (Isaiah 55:11)

That builds my faith. I get strong. With every page that I turn, I believe more in Him. I believe in His word.

These were the strong in faith. These were the ones who were well versed. They had an intimate relationship with the Lord. Paul instructed them to bear with the weak: the ones who are

underdeveloped and not as far on their journey as they were. Paul says later, in Romans 15 that those who are strong are to bear with the weak.

Romans 14:1 continued – ¹ **Receive one who is weak in the faith, but not to disputes over doubtful things.** (Emphasis added).

If you look at this in the Greek, a better way to say “**not to disputes over doubtful things**” would be, “don't bring harmful judgment upon their opinions (thoughts)”. Watch yourselves. Use the discernment that God has given you. Be careful in how you respond to the weak in faith.

Now, I ask, “What was going on in Romans 14? Why was it necessary to bring these instructions to the strong in the faith? Paul tells us in verse two. Check this out:

Romans 14:2 – ² **For one believes he may eat all things, but he who is weak eats only vegetables.**

Let's dissect this. **One believes** – Who is Paul talking about? The strong believes they can eat all things. What does he mean by **all things**? It means they're omnivores. They're comfortable eating meat and vegetables; the whole diet is all good. The weak and undeveloped in the faith, don't believe that.

Now, here's the difference. The strong know what the word of God says. They're confident in the word. For example, in Deuteronomy 12:15, the Lord told Israel that when you come into the land that I'm going to give you (this beautiful promise that I promised you), you may eat as much meat as your heart desires. That is literally what it says. In fact, if you miss that verse, He says it multiple times in that chapter: you may eat as much meat as your heart desires. This is what the strong know. They're strong in the word.

Unfortunately, not everyone has that knowledge. So, these weak ones are struggling. They're only eating vegetables.

Please pay attention to what I'm about to share because you will miss the entire thing today if you don't get this. These vegetarians are not vegetarians because they saw a documentary on Netflix that absolutely terrified them. How many people do you know who saw this documentary of the unsanitary conditions and the awful treatment of these animals (and it was just awful), literally, an hour later said they were a vegetarian? This has nothing to do, well obviously, with Netflix. It has nothing to do with health. Nothing! If you don't get that component and are trying to read this through the lens of what you experience in modern America, you will totally miss the whole thing.

This has everything to do with spiritual context. The reason these vegetarians are withholding from meat is because they see this in a spiritual context as something that could be their demise. This is why you need to understand the historical context. It is important to note that across the spectrum, vegetarianism, in a spiritual context, was a very real thing in Paul's day. This was a big deal even before Paul and for centuries following Paul.

I can think of different groups: the Orphic cult; branches of Zoroastrianism; Manichaeism; the Greek philosopher, Pythagoras loved his vegetables and totally abstained from meat; the Roman philosopher, Seneca; and Plutarch. Before we go further in paganism, understand that some pagans, in order to venerate their gods, abstained from eating meat as an act and expression of their worship and adoration to their fake gods.

Let's get back into the historical context of the first century and look at the reality of what was happening at that time. The gospel of Yeshua, a Jewish Messiah who came to Israel, is now through Messianic Jews being spread throughout the world to who? Pagans, some of whom absolutely clung to their vegetables. And I ask you, is it plausible (and we already know this is true from the New Testament) that some of these pagans who were coming into the beautiful faith of Messianic Christianity continued with the way they, for their whole life, were accustomed to worshiping and adoring their gods? For example, abstaining from meat, which is how they venerated their gods. Is it possible that they clung to some of this stuff as they came in and said, "Well now, I'm going to serve Yeshua of Nazareth?" Absolutely.

If you've ever led someone to the Lord, you know it's a time of sanctification. It takes time. There are things you have to shed that you're used to, especially if you're coming out from a different faith such as Islam or Buddhism. It's interesting, so this is something that you need to be aware of as we look at this passage.

I will take this a step further. I want you to understand that there were Christian groups that absolutely held tightly to their veggies. They were not into eating meat for specifically spiritual reasons.

I will give you some insight, so you can appreciate what Paul was talking about. The first commentary I want to share with you comes from Dr. Bart Ehrman who's considered by many to be the foremost New Testament scholar in the world. As irony would have it, he's an agnostic. So, don't go to Mr. Ehrman's site and think you will get some good theology. But the man knows his Greek and knows church history well. His interpretation of some things is less than to be desired. I want to share with you what he has to say about a specific group known as the Ebionites, an early Jewish Christian group:

After the New Testament by Dr Bart D. Ehrman:

Some of the Ebionites' distinctive concerns were embodied in their Gospel. For example, since they believed that Jesus'/Yeshua's sacrifice on the cross had put an end to all animal sacrifice in fulfillment of the Mosaic law, **they appear to have abstained from meat.** (*Emphasis added*).

In other words, Dr. Ehrman is saying that the Ebionites leveraged the awesome sacrifice of Yeshua (It's one sacrifice for all. The sacrifices were done. If you've ever read the book of Hebrews, there's no more sacrifice. It is finished). The Ebionites leveraged that reality and said that because Christ did away with the sacrifices, now that means that no Christians are to eat meat. This was their mindset. I would add, it's very creative because it looks like these early Jewish Christians were paying homage to Yeshua.

After the New Testament by Dr Bart D. Ehrman continued:

Their convictions on this score are evident in their Gospels account of the diet of John the Baptist, where the canonical statement that John ate locusts and wild honey is modified by the change of one letter. So that now (John) the Baptist, in anticipation of the Ebionites themselves, maintains a strictly vegetarian cuisine, eating pancakes and wild honey.

I'll give you a backdrop to this statement. We know the diet of John the Baptist was locust and wild honey. That is the gospel's testimony. That doesn't work with Ebionite ideology because locusts were considered meat. Locust in the Greek is *akris*. All they did was slightly change the Greek to *enkrís*, and now John was eating cake instead of locusts. Now, the world was just fine because this lines up with their ideology and their conviction. Do you understand that these early Jewish Christians were so

serious about this diet of abstaining from meat that they were willing to change the word of God ever so slightly? Do you understand how passionate they were? The Apostle Paul does.

Let me put this into further perspective by introducing you to Epiphanius, who was a radical apologist in the fourth century. When these early church fathers, whether it's Eusebius, Tertullian, or Epiphanius came out against heretics, the gloves came off. They didn't have this whole cog of political correctness. They didn't care who they offended or what you thought about them. They came at it, directly.

Epiphanius was one of those guys, as you will see in a moment, who didn't mince words. *The Panarion* is a litany of all these heretics and heresies. He went off on each one, one of which was against the Ebionites. Listen to his words:

Epiphanius, The Panarion; Against the Ebionites:

22:1 – ¹And how can their stupidity about the eating of meat not be exposed out of hand?

Tell me how you really feel, Epiphanius. I appreciate the straightforward nature of the early church fathers. He continues and gives his assessment:

Epiphanius, The Panarion; Against the Ebionites continued:

22:1-5 – ¹... First of all, because the Lord [Himself] ate the Jewish Passover. Now the Jewish Passover was a sheep and unleavened bread—sheep's flesh roasted with fire and eaten, ...

³ the Lord Himself says, “With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you.” – Luke 22:15 – And he did not simply say “Passover” but “this Passover,” so that no one could play with it in his own sense. A Passover, as I said, was meat roasted with fire and the rest.

⁴ But to destroy deliberately the true passage **these people have altered its text**—which is evident to everyone from the expressions that accompany it and represented the disciples as saying, “Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?” **and he** (Yeshua) **supposedly saying, “Did I really desire to eat meat at this Passover with you?”** (*Emphasis added*).

⁵ But how can their tampering go undetected, when the passage cries out that the “mu” and the “eta” – two Greek letters – are additions? Instead of saying “*epithymia epethymesa*” – which means, “with desire I have desired”, Luke 22:15 – they have put in the additional “mu” and the “eta”. Christ truly said, “With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you”. But they misled themselves by writing in meat and making a false entry, and saying, “Did I really want to eat meat with you at this Passover?” But it is plainly demonstrated that he both kept the Passover, and as I said, ate meat.

This is another example of the Ebionites altering scripture. They didn't just alter scripture to change the diet of John the Baptist, they altered scripture to change Luke 22:15 to make it look like Yeshua conveyed to His disciples that He was not going to eat this Passover with them; He was not going to eat meat. This is how passionate certain Christian groups were about their vegetables. They changed scriptures to promote this belief.

Let me give you a bonus. Epiphanius talks about another Jewish group known as the Nazarenes. This will give you an idea of how prevalent this was. This is what he said:

Epiphanius, The Panarion; Against the Nasaraeans:

1:4 – And so, though they were Jews who kept all the Jewish observances, they would not offer sacrifice or eat meat; in their eyes **it was unlawful to eat meat** or make sacrifices with it. (*Emphasis added*).

So, as we come back to Romans 14:1-2, understand what Paul was bringing to the table. Moving into the historical context, feel the weight of it. This was absolutely an issue. There was an issue with some of the pagans, who observed this kind of diet, coming in to Christianity. And there was an issue of Christian groups adhering to this, religiously, to the point that they altered scripture. So, reread this:

Romans 14:1-3a – ¹Receive one who is weak in the faith, but not to disputes over doubtful things. ² For one believes he may eat all things, but he who is weak eats only vegetables. ^{3a} Let not him who eats despise him who does not eat.

Again, who did Paul instruct? He instructed the mature; the learned; the well-versed in the word of God; and the strong in the faith. He specifically told them not to fall into the trap of despising their weak brother. Then he instructed the weak in the faith:

Romans 14:3b – ^{3b} **and let not him who does not eat judge him who eats; for God has received him.** (*Emphasis added*).

Incredible words! He was not done addressing them. He went on to say something, but before we get into that, I need to point out something. This whole discussion today will never come full circle for you until you hear what I'm about to say. I want to ask a question. Regarding eating meat, is there anything in the Torah prohibiting people from eating as much meat as they want? No, nothing.

Let's jump to the other side. Is there anything prohibiting those who are weak in the faith from not eating meat? Does the Torah say that you have to eat meat every day? No, it doesn't; only in certain circumstances with the priesthood. The priests were to partake of the sacrifices of the *khata*/sin offering and the *shelamim*/peace offering. During certain sacrifices, there was eating of meat, but there is not a verse throughout the Torah, or in the Prophets, telling people on a regular basis that they had to eat meat. There's one exception for the general public: Passover. Other than that, nobody's commanded to eat meat.

So, think about this situation. This is what's important. On one hand, there are those who eat as much meat as their heart desires; it is not prohibited in the Torah; it is not sin. On the other hand, the fact that if you want to abstain from meat, it is not sin.

The dialogue in Romans 14 would be radically different if there was sin in the camp. We can talk about the motives for abstaining from meat and say, "There's some growth that needs to happen, but these people abstaining from meat is not sin." Keep that in mind because you will need that in a moment.

Listen, because Paul just said, "**Let not him who does not eat judge him who eats.**" Then, Paul continued to talk to the weak in faith:

Romans 14:4 – **Who are you to judge another's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. Indeed, he will be made to stand, for God is able to make him stand.**

It's interesting that Paul took a very strong position against the weak in faith and gave a very strong warning: don't you judge them because they're eating meat; it's not sin. Check yourselves; watch yourselves in this matter.

Then we get to our passage in question:

Romans 14:5 – **One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind.**

Today, from pulpits all across the world, this is the passage that they use as the proof text that Christians don't need to keep the Sabbath. What is the problem with that interpretation?

First, please look at the passage carefully. Where do you find the word “Sabbath” or any variation thereof? Do you see seventh day Sabbath rest or any idea of the Sabbath? It doesn't exist. That's the first problem.

Second, what is the context? In Romans 14, from beginning to end, and even going into chapter 15, Paul doesn't even take a breath. It is all about food: eating and not eating. Period. There is a real problem, when you look at the context and get into the historical context.

What do the scholars have to say about this? Now, none of us will emphatically hang our hats on what the Christian scholars say, but in regard to this discussion, it is important to keep in mind that these Christians devote themselves to the study of the word. They are supposed to be the learned; the strong in the faith.

So, what are they saying about this passage? Because all these pulpits are filled with the exact same mantra, “This passage is explicitly talking about the Sabbath.” My guess is that this is what the scholars are teaching. Well, let's look at some commentaries. This will fascinate you.

Commentary on Romans 14:5 by Barclay Moon Newman and Eugene Albert Nida:
[It is impossible to state definitely what days Paul has in mind.](#)

Think about the strength of that statement. If you are a scholarly buff and read a lot of scholarly commentary, you know that scholars are very reserved in using strong terms. There's an art of discipline in being a scholar. Reading something like this should hit you in the face. It's bold.

Commentary on Romans 14:5 by Barclay Moon Newman and Eugene Albert Nida continued:
[It is impossible to state definitely what days Paul has in mind. He may – “may, not, or is” – be referring to the tendency of the Jewish Christians to continue to observe the Sabbath day, but it is also possible that he is referring to special days which other groups felt must be observed for religious purposes.](#)

Isn't that fascinating. This scholar says that it may be possible, and it might mean this. This particular scholar's approach is that we will never know. I don't necessarily agree with that concept that “we'll never know” because everything that God has preserved in the scripture is for his children to know. We may not get everything, but at some point, you know what? We come to the revelation with the gift of the Holy Spirit. Let me show you another commentary:

Commentary on Romans 14:5 by Dr Leon Morris, *The Pillar New Testament Commentary*:

This has often been taken to mean that the weak brother observes the Jewish Sabbath. Again, this is commentary on Romans 14:5 explicitly. This scholar recognizes what the mantra is that is coming from the pulpits. He knows we are dealing with the Jewish Sabbath. Look at what he says next:

But Paul does not say this – This is a Christian scholar, and he said that Paul doesn't say this – **and it is equally possible that he is referring to feast days and fast days, either those laid down in the Jewish law or those derived from other sources. Some refer to lucky and unlucky days deriving from pagan life.** *(Emphasis added).*

Some scholars have said that this could refer to pagan celebration days because pagans were getting saved and coming into the faith, but after a while, they started worshiping on specific days to honor their false gods. Other scholars have dismissed this whole idea simply because of what Paul said, **“Let each be fully convinced in their own mind.”** Paul would never justify returning to pagan ways. He wouldn't do it. So, even Christian scholars recognize that's total nonsense. This particular scholar is simply bringing it out because he knows some scholars have brought it to the table.

Let me show you another commentary. We could do this all day, but I will show you just one more:

Commentary on Romans 14:5 by William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker:

Again, since the very subject of foods, to which Paul made reference in verses 2-4, – This scholar recognizes that this is about food – **brings up that of fasting, it has been suggested that the apostle is here referring to days of fasting, after the manner indicated in Luke 18:12.** *(Emphasis added).*

He's absolutely right. He's not the only scholar declaring this. There are scholars that look at this and recognize the context is about food, and the only thing Paul could really be talking about is fasting. That is absolutely fundamentally correct. This entire chapter is all about food. It's about eating and not eating.

Paul started off talking about omnivores versus vegetarians. He had this issue, which is why he wrote Romans 14:5. Then he jumped into fasting. Why? Paul was seeking to bring greater clarity and understanding to the issue he was dealing with. I want you to think about what I just said because it will make more sense as we go on.

To help you understand where Paul was coming from, and the point I'm trying to make, I want to give you a little backdrop. Let's get some historical context on fasting. I think you will appreciate this. Luke 18:11-12 – **¹¹ The Pharisees stood and prayed thus with himself, ‘God, I thank You that I am not like other men—extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this tax collector. ¹² I fast twice a week; I give tithes of all that I possess’.** *(Emphasis added).*

I'm not going down the road of this guy was puffing himself up, and Yeshua rebuked him because he was boasting of his works before the Lord. What I want you to focus on is the fact that fasting was an intimate part of the faith; it was a massive expression in the faith; it was ingrained in the faith.

You might say, “Well, Daniel, this was a Pharisee. “Well, hold on a second. When Yeshua was confronted by the disciples of John, they were upset and said – **¹⁴ ...” Your disciples do not fast.”** – Yeshua said to them, – **¹⁵ ... “But the days will come when the bridegroom will be taken away from them, and then they will fast.”** (Matthew 9:14-15). Yeshua predicted that His disciples that followed Him and heard His voice would fast.

In 2 Corinthians 11:27, Paul said that he was in fasting often. Why does Yeshua give a prescription to fast in Matthew 6? Because fasting is one of the primary expressions of the faith.

Here's my point. In modern day evangelical Christianity, fasting is not one of the primary expressions of the faith, so when you read Romans 14, you don't even have the thought of fasting. Since fasting is not part of your faith, you can read and play with this in a totally different context. It's amazing to me, but let me push forward:

Matthew 9:14 – ¹⁴Then the disciples of John came to Him/Yeshua, – what I was just referring to – saying, “Why do we and the Pharisees fast often, but Your disciples do not fast?”

Think carefully about that statement. Pay attention. Judgment was shot across the bow from John's disciples, who are men of God. The disciples of John cast judgment because they looked at the disciples of Yeshua who were eating and drinking, while they were suffering.

When it comes to fasting, it's not appropriate to shoot across the bow because someone is not fasting. There can be days when I'm fasting and some of you are not, and you eat your ice cream, treats, or whatever in front of me. That's not a situation where I get to judge you and say, “This is ridiculous. I'm over here suffering while you're eating all these treats in front of me.” That's totally inappropriate.

Let's go back to the late first century, early second century, and look at a Christian document known as the *Didache*. It is non-canonical, but it is very valuable because the *Didache* was church order. This was the commission to organize the church. If you put this in the New Testament (which I wouldn't), you would put this among the pastoral epistles. It is making sure that there's good community rule. And in the *Didache*, they pick up on the issue of fasting. Listen to what this says:

Didache 7:8

But let not your fast coincide with those of the hypocrites. They fast on Monday (second day) and Thursday (fifth day), so you must fast on Wednesday (fourth day) and Friday (the Preparation Day).

Interesting. Go back to Luke 18 and notice what the Pharisees said: “I fast twice a week.” The Pharisees were fasting on Monday and Thursday. Whoever authored this said not to fast with the hypocrites, but instead fast on Wednesday and Friday.

Now, here's the problem I have with this statement. There are times, as a community, we ask people to fast because we're doing spiritual warfare and fasting needs to be done. There is nothing in the Torah or anywhere in scripture mandating that you fast on Wednesday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, one day a week, or three days a week. There is nothing.

Yet, when you see people throw out commands to do this (and I want you to take this in) that's where judgment starts to come in. According to *Didache 7:8*, I can't fast on Monday. If I want to fast on Monday, there will be judgment. Are you following me?

Let's go back, and we will come full circle: Romans 14:5 – One person esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind.

Understand something. When you fast, you esteem the day. It is not a day you go golfing or go to the gym. It's day you humble yourself before the Lord. It is your observance to the Lord. It is very special when you fast. If I am fasting and you are not, look at what Paul said:

Romans 14:5 – ⁵ One esteems one day above another; another esteems every day alike. Let each be fully convinced in his own mind.

You may not fast at all, while I fast twice a week. Should there be judgment going back and forth? I want you to understand that this was the real thing. This was ingrained in the faith early on.

Here's my point. Paul talked about the whole issue of eating and not eating meat and vegetables. Look at the brilliance of what Apostle Paul does. To help them understand his point, Paul brought something tangible to every one of them. He brought something that they can all hold on to regarding those who fast and those who don't. Just like with the issue between "meatatararians" and vegetarians, there is nothing in Tora, prohibiting or forcing them to fast. Isn't that interesting? Paul said to look at fasting: there's not to be any judgment in whether you fast or don't fast. Therefore, learn from that and understand, there should be no judgment in regard to: if you want to eat meat or if you don't.

Absolutely mind-blowing! This was Paul at his best! It is incredible to me to see how prolific a teacher Paul is. He will school you every day of the week that you read his writings. How he lays this out is an inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Romans 14:6a – ^{6a} He who observes the day, observes it to the Lord; – this is talking about fasting – and he who does not observe the day, to the Lord he does not observe it.

Let's not get involved in judgment. This is miraculous because next Paul took these two issues of eating meat and not eating meat, fasting and not fasting, and spoke of both issues in one verse. Paul said:

Romans 14:6b – ^{6b} He who eats, eats to the Lord, – meaning whether you fast or don't fast; whether you eat meat or you don't – for he gives God thanks; and he who does not eat, to the Lord he does not eat, and gives God thanks.

I give God thanks for the brilliance of Paul, but I don't care how many times you read Romans 14, you will find nothing, not a fragment, not a sentence, about the Sabbath.

We will close here.