

ROMANS 14 AND THE DIETARY LAWS

by Avram Yehoshua

The SeedofAbraham.net

Romans 14 is often cited as a place where the Apostle Paul spoke of the Mosaic dietary laws as not binding on Christians.¹ That ‘Moses’ or ‘the Law’ or ‘the dietary laws’ or ‘unclean meats’ are never once mentioned in the chapter, fails to influence the popularity of this false Church doctrine. The issue with Romans 14 isn’t the eating of biblically unclean meat, but the eating of meat ceremonially defiled (contaminated) by it being offered or sacrificed to pagan deities. One group said they could eat it, while the other group said that it was defiled and shouldn’t be eaten because it had been offered to idols.

There are four verses in Romans 14 that are used to support the justification for eating pig and other unclean animals, fish and birds that Leviticus 11 speaks of. The four verses are:

1. Romans 14:2—‘One person has faith that he may eat all things.’
2. Romans 14:14—‘nothing is unclean in itself.’
3. Romans 14:17—‘the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace in the Holy Spirit.’
4. Romans 14:20—‘All things indeed are clean.’

Like the vision of Peter in Acts Ten, these verses, taken by themselves out of context, are interpreted by the Pharisaic Church to mean that the dietary laws are done away with. Placed within their context, however, they don’t have anything to do with God’s dietary laws of clean and unclean meats, but with an argument over if the meat had become ceremonially defiled, having been dedicated or blessed by pagan priests to their pagan gods. Although some pagans sacrificed pigs, this isn’t what the Apostle is addressing. In other words, the animal meat in question is biblically clean meat.

Romans 14:2—Faith to Eat All Things

The central theological theme of Romans 14 is love and forgiveness for both the strong ‘meat eaters’ and the weak in the faith ‘veggie-only’ eaters. At no point does Paul write about clean meats versus unclean meats. At no point does Paul say that unclean meats are now clean and acceptable to eat. He does say:

²‘One person has faith that he may eat *all things*, but he who is weak eats vegetables only.

³‘The one who eats is not to regard with contempt the one who does not eat, and the one who does not eat is not to judge the one who eats, for God has accepted him.’ (Romans

¹ F. F. Bruce, D.D., F.B.A., The Rev. Canon Leon Morris, M.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., General Editor, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Romans* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 2000), p. 230, ‘Some Christians (like Paul himself) had no qualms of conscience about taking any kind of food.’ Bruce defines the “weak in faith” as ‘Not yet mature enough to grasp that all kinds of food are equally kosher (‘fit’)’ p. 231. Bruce also writes that, ‘Jesus, on one occasion, made a pronouncement about food which, as later reflection on it showed, had the effect of abrogating the Jewish food laws: ‘he declared all foods clean’ (Mk. 7:19). Peter, in his noonday vision on the roof of Simon the tanner’s house in Joppa, learned not to count as unclean any person that God has pronounced clean,’ p. 234. Also, in his comment on Romans 14:14, Bruce writes, ‘For Paul all food was kosher,’ p. 237.

Harrison, *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, p. 1222, ‘The stronger Christian was the one who believed he could eat all things.’ In speaking of Paul, it states, ‘He knows that nothing is unclean of itself.’

14:2-3)

Verse two mentions that one man believes that he can ‘eat all things’ or ‘everything.’ In context, ‘all things’ is in contrast with one who only eats veggies, and so Paul is speaking about being able to the meat sacrificed to a pagan god or goddess (but obviously, not at the pagan sacrifice).

Although Paul is only relating what ‘one man,’ or in this case, a group believes (which would seem to include pig and catfish, etc.), Paul will qualify what ‘all things’ means to him. It’s important, in trying to understand the Scriptures, that we come to the knowledge of what the author (Author) meant. As we’ll see, Paul meant that all (clean) meat could be eaten, even if sacrificed to a pagan god. Verse 20 will reveal this as the Apostle uses the same phrase, ‘all things,’ there.

Verse three deals with the accusations that the groups charged one another with, and Paul’s admonition to both of them. To the one who is eating sacrificial meat, which is basically the only meat that a pagan could buy, Paul tells them not to despise those who think that they can’t eat this meat. To those who think that eating (biblically clean and ‘sacrificed to a pagan god’) meat is wrong or sinful, Paul tells them not to judge (condemn) their brethren who think it to be right, thinking themselves as purer or holier than them.

Paul addresses the issue of condemnation again in vv. 10-11: only Yeshua can condemn, and these brothers shouldn’t condemn one another, but love one another. Paul quotes Scripture from the prophet Isaiah (45:23) saying that all shall bend the knee before Yeshua. Paul teaches them to give way to His Way of seeing and forgiving each other.

Paul brings the concept of oneness and judgment down to a practical level in v. 12, saying that we should, in our hearts, not judge to condemn another. If we despise someone in our heart, we must deal with it now. This specifically addresses those believers who were condemning and despising their brothers for living in a way that they didn’t think they should, whether meat eaters or meat abstainers.

That neither group was sinning, in that one ate the meat and the other wouldn’t, we see in that Paul doesn’t correct or try to change either group’s way of thinking. If one of them had been sinning he would have spoken about it. On the contrary, Paul is bringing divine tolerance of things that are not sin.

That the ‘veggie-only’ group weren’t Jewish believers is obvious in that Jews know that God ordained biblically clean meats to be eaten and they would have known where to get clean meat that hadn’t been offered to an idol. Also, vegetarianism is not a Jewish (biblical) practice.

If either group was sinning by eating something like pig, Paul would have addressed it. By speaking of a stumbling block in v. 13, after v. 12, which speaks of everyone having to give an account to God, it would seem that Paul is saying that one’s attitude can also be a stumbling block. For if someone despises another in his heart, then the other will pick up on this, even if no words are spoken. This is a further admonition ‘to get right’ before the Lord, for all knees shall bow—no one walks in all the Truth, and Yeshua is the Judge.

Verse five has particulars changing from food to days, but the concept of not judging remains constant. Paul never brings up the Sabbath, so one cannot really insert it here because it’s not speaking of the Sabbath, but of fasting. Christian theologian James Denney writes of the verse, ‘It is not probable that there is any...reference to the Jewish Sabbath.’²

Be that as it may, Romans 14:5-6 speak of the veggie eaters, who were the weak ones in the faith (v. 2), setting aside (esteeming) certain days to God to fast. That’s why they were special days to the ‘veggie-only eaters,’ and why Paul speaks of ‘esteeming one day above another (while) another esteems every day

² James Denney, D.D., Author; W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor, M. A., LL. D., *The Expositor’s Greek Testament: St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Romans*, vol. two (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 702.

alike’ (v. 5). The one who esteemed every day alike didn’t take days to fast (which was probably a weekly occurrence), but ate food on every day. That Paul is speaking of fasting is confirmed in the very next verse:

“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.” (Rom. 14:6)

Romans 14:5-6 has absolutely nothing to do with the altering of the seventh day Sabbath so that Christians can choose any day ‘to be their Sabbath.’ It also doesn’t negate the holiness of the 7th day Sabbath so that it is ‘the same’ as the other six days of the week.

Interesting to realize is that the word Sabbath, as well as meaning ‘holy rest,’ also means ‘end,’ as in ‘the end of the week.’³ It is the seventh or last day of the seven day week established at Creation by God (Gen. 1:31–2:3). Just from these two perspectives, one cannot have a ‘Christian Sabbath’ on any other day of the week except the day that God ordained—the last day of the week, the seventh day.⁴

Verses 7-8 speak of unity in the Body, despite if one is a veggie-only eater or a meat eater. Paul points to Yeshua as the One who makes us one. Thinking that Paul was speaking of the Sabbath, without ever mentioning it in the chapter, is an unjustifiable presumption.⁵ It would be unreasonable to assume that, especially when he’s not told us *why* the Sabbath had been disposed of its *holy* position in God’s Word, and that Paul would dismiss such a major biblical institution with only a nebulous reference to it, at that.

Romans 14:14—Nothing is Unclean in Itself

In Romans 14:14, most English translations have Paul writing that ‘nothing is *unclean* in itself,’ etc., and many Christians point to this verse and say that God’s dietary laws are obviously done away with. It would seem that way in English, but the Greek word for biblically *unclean* animals is not found once in the verse (nor anywhere else in Romans 14). A sample English text, with the Greek word, is:

“I know and am fully convinced by the Lord Jesus Christ, that nothing is unclean (*koinon κοινόν*) in itself, but to him who considers anything to be unclean (*koinon κοινόν*), to him it is unclean (*koinon κοινόν*).”

Three times the Greek adjective *koinon* is translated as unclean, **but *koinon* never means ‘unclean’** in terms of biblically unclean animals. *Koinon* applies to animals that have become *ceremonially defiled*.⁶

³ R. L. Harris, editor; Gleason Archer, Jr. and Bruce Waltke, associate editors, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), n.p. “The basic thrust of the verb is, when transitive, ‘to sever, put an end to,’ and when intransitive, ‘to desist, to come to an end.’ This may possibly indicate that the Sabbath is the day which ‘puts a stop to’ the week’s work...The translation ‘to cease, desist’ can be illustrated in the following verses: ‘Day and night shall not cease’ (Gen. 8:22); ‘The seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation’ (Jer. 31:36); ‘So these three men *ceased* to answer Job’ (32:1).”

⁴ Ibid. ‘Something of the importance of this institution can be gauged by observing that of the ten commandments the fourth commandment is treated more extensively than any of the others.’ In other words, the Sabbath commandment has 95 words to it, while the other nine combined only have 218. The fourth commandment has 30% of the words, while the other nine have 70% (and this counts v. 2 as part of the Ten Commandments).

⁵ Presumption—an act or instance of taking something to be true or adopting a particular attitude toward something, esp. at the start of a chain of argument or action.

⁶ Walter Bauer, augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (third edition, 2001), p. 552: *κοινός* (Accordance Bible Software). There are other meanings for *koinon*, but this is the meaning that applies to Romans 14.

This is exactly what the Apostle Paul is dealing with in Romans 14—the issue of alleged ceremonially defiled meat because it had been sacrificed to a pagan god. The meat eaters rightly thought they could eat it, but the veggie-only eaters thought the meat was ceremonially defiled due to the animals being sacrificed to idols.

This phrase, ceremonially defiled, should be found in v. 14 (three times). The translators have erred greatly, no doubt due to their theological bias against Mosaic Law, and in this they cause Christians to sin, thinking that Paul is telling them they can eat biblically unclean animals and fish, etc. The proper interpretation for Rom. 14:14 is this:

“I know, and am fully convinced by the Lord Jesus Christ, that nothing is ceremonially defiled (*koinon*) in itself, but to him who considers anything to be ceremonially defiled (*koinon*), to him it is ceremonially defiled (*koinon*).”

The meat eaters were seen as being ‘defiled’ (or ‘unclean’) by the veggie eaters, even though the sacrificial meat they were eating had been bought at the meat market. Meat was primarily gotten from the overabundance of pagan sacrifices, which were sold to the vendors in the meat market, or from ‘butchers’ in the marketplace who would have a pagan priest ‘bless’ the slaughter of the meat to their god. Eminent Christian scholar F. F. Bruce saw that those weak in the faith referred to those who thought the meat at the market place was defiled or ‘unclean’ by it having come from a pagan sacrifice. Therefore, it was unacceptable for them to eat:

“The buying of butcher-meat in a pagan city presented some Christians with a problem of conscience. Much of the meat sold in the market came from animals which had been sacrificed to a pagan deity. The deity received his token portion; the rest of the carcass would be sold by the temple authorities to the retail merchants. Among resident Christians there would be some with a robust conscience who knew that the meat was neither better nor worse for its association with a pagan deity and who were quite happy to eat it; others were not so happy, feeling that somehow the meat had been ‘infected’ by its idolatrous association.”⁷

Paul uses the principle that ‘the earth is the Lord’s and all that is in it,’ to say that it was alright to eat that meat. This is how he dealt with the same issue at Corinth, a couple of years earlier,⁸ concerning meats offered to idols and then brought to the market for common consumption.⁹ Of course, this doesn’t mean the Christian meat eaters in Rome were taking part in an idolatrous sacrifice, but as Bruce brought out, the pagan priest would ‘bless’ the meat in the name of his god, sacrifice it (the idolaters would eat of it), and what was left over would make its way to market. Paul allows for Christians to eat this meat.¹⁰

Koinon can be translated into English with other words, one of which is ‘common,’ as in common ground, or common (profane) vs. holy, etc.¹¹ but the meaning which best suits Paul’s context is obviously

⁷ Bruce, *Romans*, p. 235.

⁸ First Corinthians was written about 52 AD and Romans was written about 54 AD.

⁹ 1st Cor. 10:26, 28; cf. Ex. 9:29; Ps. 24:1 for where Paul got the concept from.

¹⁰ Of course, if Christians ate the meat *at the time of the sacrifice* they would have been taking part in the actual ceremony of idolatry, which would make them idolaters. Paul condemned that (1st Cor. 10:14-22).

¹¹ Joseph Thayer, *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Accordance Bible Software), paragraph 5657. ‘Common...ordinary, belonging to the generality...levitically *unclean* (in classical Greek *bebēlos*, which see...Mark 7:2, 5; Rom. 14:14; Heb. 10:29; Rev. 21:27; common people.’ The verb means ‘*to make (levitically) unclean, render unhallowed, defile, profane.*’ To make levitically unclean speaks of ceremonial defilement, whether of animals or humans.

Geoffrey W. Bromiley, General Editor, Everett F. Harrison, Roland K. Harrison and William Sanford LaSor, As-

ceremonial defilement because this is what the passage is about. Paul isn't speaking about unclean animals, but animals sacrificed that had become defiled or 'unclean' in the eyes of the veggie-only eaters.

The word that is translated as unclean, three times, in Romans 14:14, *is not the word for unclean animals* in Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14. It should be translated as *ceremonially defiled*. The veggie eaters said that all the meat sacrificed to pagan gods wasn't fit to place in the temple of God (their bodies) because it had been sacrificed to a pagan deity. Paul didn't agree with them, but told the meat eaters not to judge the veggie eaters for their weak 'veggie-only eating' faith (Romans 14:2-4). The issue in Romans 14 is one of *ceremonial defilement*. It's not about unclean meats being acceptable to those 'strong in the faith.' Romans 14 has nothing to do with *unclean* meats being declared clean.

The Greek word for biblically *unclean* meats is *ακαθαρτος* *ahkah'thartos*, but Paul *never* uses it in all of Romans 14. Therefore, Paul cannot be speaking of nullifying the Mosaic Law's dietary restrictions on unclean meats (e.g. Lev. 11; Dt. 14). However, Paul, will use the Greek word for *clean* that is used for biblically clean meats. In a moment we'll see how he brings this out in verse 20.

Romans 14:17—'the Kingdom of God is Not Eating and Drinking

We know from Acts 21:20 that there were literally tens of thousands of Jewish believers *and they were all zealous for the Law of Moses*. This only makes good biblical sense because one of the specific reasons why God gave the New Covenant to Israel was so Mosaic Law could be placed upon our hearts and minds (Jer. 31:31-34), which the writer of Hebrews literally confirms (Heb. 8:10; 10:16).¹²

If we take Romans 14:15 and apply it to those Christians who eat pig, in front of us who don't, then they should realize that they shouldn't flaunt their pig eating in front of us, if they truly love us, because it grieves us. In First Corinthians Paul says that if his eating meat is *offensive* to another he won't eat any meat, so as not to be a stumbling block to that person (1st Cor. 8:13). In Romans 14:21 he says that if our eating or drinking make a brother stumble then we shouldn't do it. How many 'Grace only people' would not eat pork chops or bacon in front of us because it offends us? Not many, I'm sorry to say. They don't walk in *that* kind of Grace:

'For if because of food your brother is hurt, you are no longer walking according to love.

sociate Editors, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. one (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), p. 751. "In the OT *common* as opposed to *holy*...is 'common bread' (1st Sam. 21:4; NEB 'ordinary bread'), i.e., other than the showbread or bread of the Presence." In other words, the Bread in His Presence was holy, not common/ordinary bread. In its ordinary use, the Greek word for common can be 'common food,' which was any food, meat or otherwise, that wasn't holy (dedicated to God), and so, was eaten by the Jewish people.

Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* חָלָל (Accordance Bible Software), n.p. The Hebrew word used for common in 1st Sam. 21:4 is חָלָל (*hol*). It means that which is, 'profane, *common*...anything non-holy, i.e. in distinguishing between the holy and the common.' (Profane: relating or devoted to that which is not sacred...secular rather than religious.) Also, in the New Testament the standard Greek word for 'common' is '*koinos*, from the verb *koino*, indicating what is public, general, universal, as contrasted with '*idios*,' which pertains to that which is peculiar, individual, not shared with others.'

Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, p. 552: κοινός (Accordance Bible Software). 'Of mutual interest, communal, common...pertaining to being of little value because of being common, ordinary, profane...specifically, of that which is ceremonially impure' (defiled) '*nothing is unclean of itself*, Rom. 14:14a...*I have never eaten anything common or unclean* (1st Macc 1:62) Acts 10:14.'

¹² The Hebrew word for Law in Jeremiah 31:33 is תּוֹרָה (Torah), which is the specific word for Mosaic Law. Some read 'law' in English and say it's (just) the Ten Commandments, but Torah refers to all Mosaic Law.

Do not destroy with your food, him for whom Christ died' (Rom. 14:15).

'for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit' (Rom. 14:17).

Many 'Grace-only people' use v. 17 to nullify the dietary laws, but the context of Romans 14 has nothing to do with God's dietary laws, and neither does v. 17. It has to do with offending our brother by not considering his feelings in things of conscience, not biblical commandments. None of the biblically unclean meats of the air, the land and the sea (Lev. 11; Dt. 14) are ever mentioned, let alone declared as acceptable now. Moses is not brought up once and neither is the Law. Paul is not talking about clean versus unclean meats or that unclean meats are now clean, but here in v. 17 he is redirecting our focus to the eternal things, and not the temporal things. Of course, no one in the Church would interpret v. 17 to mean that because the Kingdom of God is not about food or drink, that they shouldn't eat food or drink anymore.

In Romans 14:18-19, Paul again returns to his theme of love and unity. He writes of not squabbling over minor personal issues, but to love one another. This cannot be used by those who eat pig, shrimp and catfish to silence those who don't, as the dietary laws of God show us what is *sinful* to eat:

"For he who serves Christ in these things is acceptable to God and approved by men. Therefore, let us pursue the things which make for peace and the things by which one may edify another." (Romans 14:18-19)

In Romans 14:20 Paul qualifies just what meats are acceptable and also closes the argument that 'all meats are defiled' with his ingenious use of the Greek word for biblically clean meats:

'*All things* indeed are clean (καθαρα *kathara*), but evil to the man who by eating, *causes one to stumble.*' (Rom. 14:20)

To both the meat eaters and the veggie eaters, Paul said that 'all things' (the sacrificial meats) are clean. The word he uses for *clean* is the word used for clean animals in the Mosaic dietary laws (Lev. 11; Deut. 14). This is a definitive way of laying to rest the issue of ceremonial defilement, and also declaring that the meats in question were biblically clean according to Mosaic Law. The meat eaters are not defiled for eating clean meat that had been sacrificed to idols. Paul is not declaring that all unclean meats are now clean, but what the veggie eaters, in their weak faith, called 'common' or 'defiled' is biblically *acceptable* for the meat eaters to eat; they must not, however, flaunt their understanding in the face of the veggie-only people.

All things refers to the context of Romans 14:2 where Paul began the teaching by saying the exact phrase *all things* (which is actually just one word in Greek, *panta*). *All things* signifies the veggie attitude toward *all* meats, not specifically the unclean meats of Lev. 11 and Dt. 14. Paul is acting as a mediator between two groups of Christians—the meat eaters (v. 3), who despise the veggie eaters because they are weak in their faith for not eating meat sacrificed to idols, and the veggie eaters, who think themselves superior and condemn the meat eaters for eating 'defiled' meat (v. 3).

Also, as for Romans 14 nullifying Mosaic dietary law, there is,

1. no place in the New Testament that can be seen as a 'second witness' to lead us to understand that 'all things' includes biblically unclean meats or,
2. that a believer can break the dietary laws 'because they are no more' or,
3. even a second witness that *explains* that the dietary laws are 'done away with.'¹³

¹³ Please see my article, *Law 102* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Law-102.pdf>, for the sections dealing with Jesus 'de-

Moving on, Romans 14:21 speaks again of considering one's brother more than one's self:

'It is good not to eat meat or to drink wine, or to do anything by which your brother stumbles.'

This is Paul's conceptual theme of loving one another and giving way to the other in matters of conscience. This verse should be taken to heart by 'Grace people' who eat pig in front of us who know it to be sin, but try and convince us, without much success, that their understanding of eating pig is part of God's New Covenant. When we don't come over to their side they usually flaunt their 'liberty' in front of us, instead of humbling themselves to walk in Yeshua's love toward us and not eat it in our presence. This is sin for them. They are not loving us and this is the underlying concept of what Paul is speaking about in Romans 14. We, though, must forgive them and love them, in His precious name.

In v. 22 Paul again speaks to the meat eaters that their liberty doesn't give them the right to strut about in front of the veggie eaters. That Paul would lump both the eating of meat and the drinking of wine together (v. 21), not having even mentioned wine before (except by inference; *drinking*, v. 17), again tells us that the chapter is not dealing with biblically unclean meats, but with meat that a particular Gentile group in Rome considered 'defiled' because of their understanding of defilement. Romans 14 is not talking about the intrinsic nature of the meat in relation to the dietary laws, but the defilement that would take place if a pagan priest blessed and sacrifice the animal to his god, in the eyes of the veggie-only eaters.

In the closing sentence it seems that Paul is dealing with the veggie-only crowd:

'But he who doubts is condemned if he eats because his eating is not from faith. And whatever is not from faith is sin' (Rom. 14:23).

If a veggie person eats meat, believing that it will defile him, his conscience condemns him and he is not living 'in faith.' This would be sin for him. Paul says to the meat eaters, the strong ones of the faith, let the veggie eater live that way. It's not a sin to live on veggies. Neither Paul, nor the meat eaters, have to bring the veggie people out of their personal belief system. It doesn't effect their salvation. Let them eat veggies! Don't force them to eat meat!

Conclusion

The issue in Romans 14 is of one group of believers who think they can eat meat offered to idols that was sold in the market versus another group who thought the meat was defiled, and so, didn't eat any meat. It's not about biblically clean meat versus unclean meat.

If Romans 14 had something to do with biblically *unclean* meat being eaten by the meat eaters, the veggie eaters wouldn't have just been eating only veggies, they would have been eating biblically clean meat, too, and *Paul would have made reference to the biblical difference in the meats* (clean versus unclean). There is no biblical support to think that biblically unclean meats are being validated in this chapter, specifically at verse 14.

clarifying all foods clean,' Peter's vision and 1st Tim. 4:4-5, to understand that what many Christians uphold as justification for eating pig and other unclean meats is not valid. Christian interpretation of the three 'food' texts of Jesus, Peter and Paul speak just the opposite when biblically understood.

See also *The Feasts of Israel as Time Markers After the Resurrection* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Feasts-of-Israel-as-Time-Markers.pdf> as this complements Law 102 by revealing that the Feasts were still being celebrated by all Christians.

Also, this is not a conflict of Jewish believer versus Gentile believer, but rather of Gentile believer versus Gentile believer. Romans 14 deals with settling a dispute over conscience and misperceived ceremonial defilement. The ‘weak faith’ people saw the meat sacrificed to idols as ‘unclean’ or ‘defiled.’ According to their understanding anyone eating that meat was sinning. Paul settled the issue by saying that the meat in question wasn’t defiled, and therefore, could be eaten. Yet, if one thought that it was defiled then they shouldn’t eat it, and the others shouldn’t argue with them to try and dissuade them or to flaunt their understanding in their face. It wasn’t sin for the veggie-only eaters to abstain from meat.¹⁴

¹⁴ Revised on 8 Feb 2017.