

- 14:13-23 Pursue Peace and Edification: As outlined on p.269, we are continuing the fifth and final of Romans' five major sections, "Righteousness Practiced" (Romans 12:1-15:13), continuing the third and final of its three subsections, "Specific Encouragements to Christians in Rome about Relationships to Other Christians" (14:1-15:11), with the second of three sub-subsections given the sub-subheading "Pursue Peace and Edification" (14:13-23). With the sub-subheading of the preceding sub-subsection "Welcome One Another" a quotation from 15:7 in the following sub-subsection, sub-subheaded "Praise God with One Voice", we recognize the difficulty of distinguishing between the sub-subsections, especially given verbal overlaps and continued discussion of the strong and weak through the following sub-subsection of 15:1-13 (Grothe says the division between 14:1-12 and 14:13-23 "is very weak"). In the critical edition of the Greek text that I usually use, 14:13-23 is formatted essentially as one paragraph, with something less than a paragraph break between v.18 and v.19 (ESV breaks paragraphs between v.19 and v.20). Previously we noted that *TLSB* suggests that in 14:13-23 Paul "gives counsel on how mature [strong; confer *CSSB*] Christians use their freedom" ... **V.13 Therefore let us not pass judgment on one another any longer**, (the coordinating inferential conjunction seems to draw a logical conclusion from the preceding discussion [Franzmann says Paul is looking back to what he said to both strong and weak; Sanday-Headlam refers to making the transition to the second question by summing up the first question; Cranfield suggests that what follows sums up the preceding and is the conclusion of vv.10c-12 and that, v.13a at least, is best understood addressed to both strong and weak]; the Greek text has a simple adverb "no longer", which the ESV breaks into "not ... any longer"; though masculine in grammatical gender, the reciprocal pronoun "one another" in application includes everyone, male and female; the Divinely-inspired St. Paul continues the first-person plural address from v.12; the particular use of the verb in the subjunctive mood may be called "hortatory" [not simply a "permissive" "let" but exhorting others to join the speaker/writer in the action; the "no longer" makes clear that it is not a command not to begin an action or an emphatic negative future but to stop the action {confer Grothe}]; "passing judgment" is what St. Paul back in v.3 said the one who abstains was doing, though the "despising" of the one who abstained by the one who ate essentially was parallel [in this case the strong, the one eating, seems to be addressed as the one passing judgment; St. Paul is taken as identifying himself with the strong, as explicitly in 15:1, stating their obligation, Roehrs-Franzmann says, negatively in 14:13-23 and positively in 15:1-6 and then, Franzmann says, St. Paul appeals to both strong and weak again in 15:7-13, as he did in 14:1-12]; the verb comes last in this Greek clause and so ties more closely to what follows, in which the same Greek verb is used, though the ESV translates it differently [Grothe notes the play on words at this point]; *TLSB* quotes Formula of Concord Epitome X:5 that "Special care should be taken to exercise patience toward the weak in faith", and sometimes the weak can be those who need or want the liturgy and such for its pedagogical and

other beneficial effects) ... **but rather decide** (the coordinating conjunction is a strong adversative, and Cranfield sees what follows as a fresh aspect of the subject under discussion, that effect of the strong's conduct on the weak [Grothe frames it as a choice between setting up a stumbling block and pursuing peace/edification]; the Greek uses the pronoun "this" as a placeholder that is unpacked in the following clause; lost in the ESV is that St. Paul shifts from the first-person plural to the second-person plural in commanding the hearers/readers what to "judge" [as noted above, the same Greek verb as in the preceding clause, though the ESV translates it differently; Sanday-Headlam remarks on the play on words {confer also Cranfield}]; he says to judge "more", presumably as "more favorable" [the present-tense imperative can be used for commands to continue to do an action or to do it repeatedly; the context goes against the sense of "continue" in this clause and so favors "repeatedly"] ... **never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a brother.** (the Greek adverb "not" is not usually translated "never", but perhaps in the context moving forward from a "no longer" the paraphrase is fair; an infinitive preceded by the article is used to express the idea of "putting" or "placing"; the word that the ESV translates "stumbling block" is used six times in the New Testament [confer vv.21-22], while the word that the ESV translates "hindrance" is used 15 times in the New Testament [it gives us our English words "scandal" and "scandalize"; Sanday-Headlam refers to the Lord's teaching in Matthew 18:6-7 as the basis for St. Paul's word use and thought of this passage], though apparently both can mean something that causes someone to fall into sin or from faith [confer and compare the end result of "destruction" below in v.15 and v.20; Grothe notes the same essential meaning and that the second word is used of Christ Crucified, for example, in 1 Corinthians 1:23]; the dative case is used for the "brother" likely with the sense "to" or "for" as a dative of disadvantage; the "brother" would be a fellow believer, male or female [in the verses that follow, as well; Luther asks, "Why then does a person favor his belly and his gullet, which are going to perish, over his brother, who will live forever?"]; confer the categorical moral statement in v.20; Franzmann calls the strong in their freedom a threat to the faith of the weak; reflect on how not putting a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a brother or sister can effectively remove the opportunity to pass judgment or despise him or her) ... **V.14 I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus** (perhaps strikingly there is no connective in the Greek; Sanday-Headlam remarks, "In order to emphasize the real motive which should influence Christians...the indifference of all such things in themselves is emphatically emphasized" [Grothe seems to favorably quote Luther noting Paul's bold confidence in contrast to the others who were timid and weak]; the perfect tense is used for St. Paul's "knowing", accenting his having come to know at some point in the past with the ongoing result of knowing [notably, he has reverted to first-person singular]; the conjunction "and" can have an explanatory force as if what follows explains how St. Paul came to know; the "am persuaded" is also perfect tense with past action producing an ongoing result, only in this case the voice is passive, and the

prepositional phrase that follows “in” or perhaps “by” the Lord Jesus [Grothe seems to like both] likely explains how St. Paul was persuaded and so came to know, though Sanday-Headlam says, “the indifference of all meats in themselves is a natural deduction from his faith and life in Christ”, or some suggest specific teaching of the Lord; regardless, as Cranfield notes, great weight is given to what follows) ... **that nothing is unclean in itself**, (“nothing” is predicated without a verb as “common”, as opposed to holy or set apart or “clean” as in v.20 [Sanday-Headlam refers to it as the technical term for those customs and habits “common” to the world but forbidden to pious Jews]; “through” or “on account of” or “because of” itself [Sanday-Headlam says “in its own nature”; Cranfield “objectively”, but rejects the interpretation in the words of Hamlet to Rosencrantz that nothing is good or bad “but thinking makes it so”]; confer St. Paul’s statement in v.20; *TLSB* refers to Mark 7:19, where the Divinely-inspired St. Peter if dictating the account or the evangelist interprets a statement of the Lord this way, and we might recall St. Peter’s experience with Cornelius and his household in Acts 10:1-48) ... **but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean.** (the ESV paraphrases a good bit, as the Greek might more-literally be rendered, “except for the one reckoning/considering something common to be, for that person *it is common*”; Cranfield says the conjunction and negative particle can be “but”; the verb reckoning/considering is used elsewhere in Romans for God’s reckoning us to be righteous [for example, Romans 4:3], and Grothe refers to Paul’s recognizing that not all people have the knowledge he just described, both setting the truth forth and taking their opinion into account; as Cranfield contrasts, the preceding “objectively” is now “subjectively”; Franzmann explains, “if a man eats it in the conviction that it is unclean and that he disobeys the Lord in eating it, he is thereby made unclean”, and Franzmann describes a scenario where the weak person is perhaps shamed into eating what his or her conscience tells him or her is forbidden, and Franzmann says the stronger person’s eating has become an act that destroys the brother; we should not wrongly conclude from what is said that each person decides morality for him or herself, but we should remember this passage’s specific context of discussing things that are neither commanded nor forbidden [confer *CSSB*]) ... **V.15 For if your brother is grieved by what you eat**, (the explanatory coordinating conjunction “for” can express cause, explanation, inference, or continuation [Sanday-Headlam says the conjunction “implies a suppressed link in the argument, namely, “You must have respect for his scruples, although you may not share them”, but Cranfield prefers a connection between v.13b and v.15, with v.14 understood as a parenthesis]; the conditional introduced by “if” would appear to be a present condition of fact, with the assumption that the given condition is true; the preposition has the sense “through” or “on account of” or “because of”; the Greek uses a simple noun for “food” [confer and compare the related noun in v.17], but the ESV paraphrases the sense with “what you eat” [confer and compare the last clause in this verse]; “the brother of you” [second-person singular {Cranfield discusses the change as reflecting the earnestness of the exhortation}] is a

fellow believer as in v.13 [particularly the weak]; the verb “is distressed” or “is grieved” is a present-tense passive-voice, indicating an ongoing state induced by someone else, in this case indicated by the prepositional phrase that precedes in the Greek word order; how exactly the brother is grieved by what you eat is not clear: whether by your eating it or by his being pressured to eat it, as Sanday-Headlam suggests, commenting “His conscience is injured and wounded, for he willfully and knowingly does what he thinks is wrong, and so he is in danger of perishing”; and that perishing of vv.15 and 20 seems to be equated to the grief in this verse, which makes it more than just hurt feelings [confer Cranfield and Grothe]; Luther considers eating a minor matter and says, “It would be less offensive if you did it for the sake of gold or honor or at least for your own life and the health of your body or some other permanent matter rather than for food, which is of only momentary use and pleasure”, and Luther calls the rebuke sharp) ... **you are no longer walking in love.** (the “if” in the preceding clause leads us to expect an implicit if not explicit “then”; “no longer” is a compound adverb similar to that in v.13; the Greek preposition is more “according to” than “in”; “love” is “agape”, the self-sacrificial love of God for us in Christ Jesus; “walking” is present-tense second-person singular; we might reflect on St. Paul’s singling out the so-called “strong” from the previous section; Grothe discusses some of the shifting from second-person plural to singular and back and says the reason for the shifting is unclear) ... **By what you eat, do not destroy the one for whom Christ died.** (the Greek has the negative particle “not” first in the clause; the Greek more-literally might be “by the food of you” [confer and compare the first clause in this verse]; “that one” clearly refers to the brother earlier in the verse; “destroy” is a present-tense imperative, so the sense with the negative would be “do not continue to destroy” [confer Grothe, and confer “destruction” as the result of the stumbling block or hindrance of v.13; Cranfield seems to favorably quote Luther calling the strong a murderer and despiser of the death of Christ in the brother {confer Grothe’s same quotation from Luther}; the Greek next has the prepositional phrase “for whom”, with the preposition that is rich in substitutionary atonement meaning; “Christ” is, of course, the “Anointed One” and so a Messianic title that reinforces the idea of the substitutionary atonement; “died” is a simple past tense for the all-important death on the cross; for the verse overall, confer the similar statement in v.20, noting the essentially equivalent expressions “for whom Christ died” and “work of God”; Franzmann refers to Christ’s dying for the brother making the brother “in his foolish weakness, a brother infinitely precious in the eyes of all for whom Christ died”; *CSSB* comments, “Christ so valued the weak brother as to die for him. Surely the strong Christian ought to be willing to make adjustments in his own behavior for the sake of such brothers”, and we might remember that such are fruits of faith that the Holy Spirit at work in us bring about; Sanday-Headlam contrasts Christ’s death with the strong’s giving up some favorite food; Luther notes that Paul’s comparing the matter of food with the death of Christ for the other person makes the exhortation very strong) ... **V.16 So do not let what you regard as**

good be spoken of as evil. (more-literally, the Greek might be translated, “therefore, not let-be-blasphemed of you-all the good-thing”; “therefore” is the usual coordinating inferential conjunction; the negative particle “not” again is used with a present-tense imperative for the sense of not continuing to do the action; while the verb is passive-voice and third-person singular, St. Paul seems to be suggesting that the hearers or readers of the Epistle [the second-person singular of v.15 has become a second-person plural in v.16] have a role to play in whether or not the good-thing is blasphemed or slandered [the “regard” idea is not explicit in the Greek of v.16 as it was the Greek of v.14, and whether or not it should be paraphrased into this verse as the ESV does might be debated]; Cranfield characteristically discusses at length the matters of those addressed [strong or weak or both], the specific good [for example, Christian freedom or the Gospel], and the identity of the blasphemers [people inside or outside of the Church]; Franzmann discusses whether the blasphemy is the weaker brother’s calling the food a Satanic snare or whether the blasphemy is the outsiders’ calling the Kingdom of God only something of eating and drinking, as follows [see also Sanday-Headlam; for his part, Luther seems to see the Gentiles speaking evil against the believers because of the dissension]) ... **V.17 For the kingdom of God is not a matter of eating and drinking but of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.** (the coordinating explanatory conjunction “for” can express cause, explanation, inference, or continuation [Cranfield suggests v.17 provides support for vv.15b and 16, appealing to the nature of the Kingdom as proof of the absurdity of the strong’s readiness to ruin the weak for the sake of food and possibly cause the Gospel to be blasphemed by unbelievers]; the Greek places the negative particle “not” forward in the clause, likely with emphasis; the usual verb “is” is used in the verse for predicating what follows [the ESV adds in the “matter of”]; “the kingdom of God” can recall Jesus’s own teaching about it, often in figures that involve eating and drinking; the noun translated “eating” is related to the noun for “food” used twice in v.15, though this noun apparently first means the act of eating, and the noun translated “drinking” can mean the act of drinking as well as “drink” itself [we might think that the simple nouns serve as better parallels to what follows, but the change in nouns from v.15 to v.17 seems to be in order to take in the act]; the coordinating conjunction is the strong adversative “but”; righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit are things that at this point in Romans we might have come to expect as characterizing the Kingdom of God [Grothe mentions specifically Romans chapters 4, 5, and 8; confer the mention of peace in v.19, though Sanday-Headlam thinks that the description is of relationships between believers, not between believers and God [Grothe notes that each gift has a horizontal dimension]; Cranfield suggests a distinction between joy given by the Holy Spirit and joy that “is merely the temporary result of the satisfaction of one’s own selfish desires”]; the statement of v.17 would be misapplied to rule out any and all eating and drinking, such as that in the Holy Supper, from having a role in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit) ... **V.18 Whoever thus serves Christ is acceptable to God and approved by men.**

(the Greek text has the coordinating explanatory conjunction “for” [the ESV omits the connective; following Käsemann, Cranfield says the conjunction connects it with the preceding v.17, underlining what is said there]; forward in the Greek clause is “the one in this serving Christ”; the “one serving” is present-tense; the meaning of the Greek “in this” is variously debated [as Cranfield characteristically treats, preferring a singular collective reference to righteousness, peace, and joy {confer Grothe}], but the expression could take in the whole discussion, perhaps going back to 14:1 and extending to 15:13 [the specific referent to the ESV’s “thus” serves is not immediately clear; Franzmann mentions the alternate translation of “in Him” referring to the Holy Spirit from the end of v.17, as the Holy Spirit there is grammatically neuter, and the adjectival demonstrative pronoun is masculine or neuter]; “Christ” as the object of the service is perhaps striking, though perhaps less so when we recall the idea of service to the least of the brothers as service to Christ as expressed in Matthew 25:31-46’s judgment of the sheep and goats; the word translated “acceptable” is used only nine times in the New Testament and can be “well-pleasing” [we note that St. Paul is not saying anything about righteousness before God in this case]; there is contrast between God and people, but we might assume the people in this case are those who are brothers and sisters in Christ are passing judgment rightly as St. Paul is describing in this passage; the “approval” is that which comes after testing [confer the related verb in v.22; Sanday-Headlam contrasts the blasphemy in v.16 {confer Cranfield}]; Grothe refers back to Christian service as well-pleasing to God in Romans 12:1-2 and to the Christian’s discerning the good and acceptable will of God there; we noted above the Greek text’s break between v.18 and v.19 [and the ESV’s break between v.19 and v.20, each of which approach can put v.19 in a somewhat different light) ... **V.19 So then let us pursue what makes for peace and for mutual upbuilding.** (the Greek has both a coordinating inferential conjunction and a coordinating continuative conjunction [Cranfield refers to drawing a practical conclusion from what has just been said]; “the things of peace” are forward in the Greek clause, likely with some degree of emphasis [confer peace in v.17]; “let us pursue” is again a first-person-plural present-tense active-voice subjunctive-mood used as exhortation [confer v.13’s “let us not pass judgment”; Cranfield calls the form milder exhortation than an imperative, but discusses a variant reading that would put the verb in the indicative mood and so a statement of what is being done, but ends up saying the subjunctive fits better {see also Grothe, who seems to think the indicative should be read but also finds an application of it in encouragement}]; “and the building-up” or “edification” as promoting growth and development [compare the destroying or “tearing down” in v.20]; “for one another” [confer v.13; Cranfield discusses the concept of building-up as having both individual and corporate aspects but being one process]; *TLSB* comments, “Paul calls us to avoid divisive judgmentalism wherever possible; it is the opposite of peace”; Grothe refers to Christ’s messengers bringing peace to households and to the authority of the Lord’s ministry being for the edification of people) ... **V.20**

Do not, for the sake of food, destroy the work of God. (the Greek text puts first, “not on account of food”, using a different preposition than that used earlier and returning to the noun for food used in v.15; the Greek verb for “destroy” is a different verb than that used in v.15, apparently unrelated despite appearances, though both are present-tense active-voice second-person-singular imperative-mood forms [again with the sense “stop”; compare the building up in the preceding verse; Cranfield notes the shift to the second-person singular]; *TLSB* construes “the work of God” as the faith given a fellow Christian, but the expression could be taken more broadly, as destroying the fellow Christian’s faith ultimately leads to the eternal destruction of the fellow Christian; confer the similar statement in v.15, noting the essentially equivalent expressions “for whom Christ died” and “work of God”; *CSSB* comments, “The weak Christian brother who as a redeemed person is God’s work and in whom God continues to work”) ... **Everything is indeed clean,** (the Greek construction would appear to be setting up a contrast between “on the one hand” and “on the other hand”, but the construction is not completed, at least not in the usual manner [the first particle on its own can be “indeed”]; the Greek might be more literally “all things” [Cranfield again restricts the meaning to the resources of the created world that are available and appropriate for human consumption]; the predication is done without a verb; the adjective “clean” in contrast to “common” or “unclean” in the passage; on the statement as a whole, confer what St. Paul in v.14 said he was persuaded of in or by the Lord; Grothe calls the two statements “counterparts” and discusses “clean” as the bridge between “holy” and “unclean”, the whole system of which, he says, was God’s gracious institution to work redemptively to bridge the gap between His holiness and the world’s sinfulness) ... **but it is wrong for anyone to make another stumble by what he eats.** (the Greek uses the strong adversative “but” [the lesser “but” would have been the normal completion of the on-the-one hand/on-the-other-hand construction]; Sanday-Headlam says a subject must be supplied from the preceding “all things”, and [but compare Cranfield] that is not to mention that there is no finite verb or noun in the nominative case to suggest a predication without a finite verb [Cranfield supplies the verb “to eat” as the subject]; the Greek construction puts the accusative adjective “bad” or “evil” forward in the clause [in contrast to “well” or “good” in v.21?]; “for a man” uses the dative case of the usual Greek word for “man”, though it can be generic of a person, but “anyone” or an unspecified one might usually be expressed differently; the dative “by eating” [present active participle] sandwiches the genitive “through stumbling” [on the word for stumble, confer v.13 and v.21; Cranfield says the preposition is said to introduce attendant circumstances {confer Grothe}]; the syntax is difficult, [the ESV perhaps understandably paraphrases in “to make” and “another”; Grothe translates, “ill is to the man who eats with stumbling”, but, though he mentions the noun clauses, he does not explain the predication of the accusative adjective and the dative noun and participle with the genitive noun {the “clean” of the preceding clause is not parallel in case, at any rate}]; Sanday-Headlam says the words may be

addressed to the strong whose eating gives offense to others [so Luther] or to the weak whose eating injures their own consciences and takes offense, and sees the address to the strong as making a better transition to v.21 [confer Cranfield, though compare Grothe]; the statement as a whole seems to be the basis for the command/encouragement given in v.13) ... **V.21 It is good not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that causes your brother to stumble.** (forward in the Greek construction is “beautiful” or “well”, likely with some degree of emphasis, or at least contrast to the “bad” or “evil” of v.20 [confer Cranfield]; next is “the not to-eat meats”, where the word for “meats” is introduced into the passage at this point [and only used elsewhere in the New Testament in 1 Corinthians 8:13]; next is “nor [“and not”] to-drink wine”, where “wine” is also introduced into the passage at this point [and not used anywhere else in Romans; commentators such as Cranfield refer to it as possibly a hypothetical example, though Grothe says that its being hypothetical is not likely and suggests there may have been a question of whether or not wine sold in the market was dedicated to foreign gods]; next is “nor [“and not”] in-or-by which the brother of you stumbles”, where the ESV perhaps understandably paraphrases in “do anything”, though there would have been a way for the Divinely-inspired St. Paul to have said precisely that [Cranfield notes the expression indicates the comprehensiveness of the pronouncement’s scope and underlines the requirement of Christian love]; the stumbling is present-tense active-voice [confer the related stumbling in v.13 and v.20]; Franzmann discusses how the strong can adapt him or herself to the weak, but the weak cannot adapt him or herself to the strong, and how the strong’s doing so might even help the weak find the strength to do as the strong; Grothe makes use of Genesis 4:9 and being one’s brother’s keeper; we have discussed in the past and can discuss again, if desired, the general principal of Christian freedom and how we might do what others think is wrong when they insist against clear Scripture that it is wrong) ... **V.22 The faith that you have, keep between yourself and God.** (again the ESV seems to wrongly have a comma separate the object and verb; the Greek more-literally might be translated, “the faith which you yourself-are-having according to yourself have before God”; the same verb for “having” is used twice, first in the present-tense indicative and second in the present-tense imperative [sense of continue or repeatedly]; of course, the statement in v.22 is not to rule out our telling other people about our forgiveness of sins by grace through our faith in Jesus Christ; however, Franzmann suggests that the strong may regret losing an opportunity to witness to freedom in Christ and that St. Paul is assuring the strong that no faith-produced work is ever lost before God; Sanday-Headlam remarks, “Your faith is sufficient to see that all these things are a matter of indifference. Be content with that knowledge, it is a matter for your own conscience and God.”; however, Cranfield says faith should be understood as confidence that a particular thing is allowed [Grothe is similar]) ... **Blessed is the one who has no reason to pass judgment on himself for what he approves.** (the ESV paraphrases a bit, as the Greek might be more-literally translated, “blessed the one not judging himself in/by

which he is approving”; the “blessed” is the usual word in other beatitudes; the one is not present-tense judging, with the same verb used throughout for passing judgment [Cranfield notes the word play]; on the self as the object of the judging, note the contrast to passing judgment on others as earlier in the passage; on the approving, confer the related adjective in v.18; there is no conjunction between this clause and the preceding clause, but we might reflect on how keeping one’s faith between one’s self and God might keep one from putting stumbling blocks before fellow believers and so not needing to judge one’s self over what one is approving; Grothe comments, “Living in the confidence of the forgiveness of sins has marvellous [*sic*] liberating ramifications for one’s view of the ‘evaluations’ which others impose”) ...

V.23 But whoever has doubts is condemned if he eats, because the eating is not from faith. (the conjunction can be “and” or “but”; the one having doubts is divided in his or her mind, at variance with him or herself, hesitating, or doubting [the verb is a compound including the verb that has been translated “pass judgment” throughout the passage; Grothe again notes the play on words]; that which is being eaten presumably is that which the doubter thinks perhaps he or she should not eat; the condemnation is also a compound of the verb being translated “pass judgment”; the Greek is more concise in the last portion, “because not of faith”; on faith, confer v.22 and what follows in v.23 [including the “not of” phrasing]; on the statement as a whole, perhaps confer v.5 about each being fully convinced in his or her own mind; Luther comments that the weak “judges what ought not be done, and thus he has a law. And yet he does it and thus sings against the law”; Sanday-Headlam remarks, “If a man doubts or hesitates and then eats, he is, by the very fact that he doubts, condemned for his weakness of faith. If his faith were strong he would have no doubt or hesitation” [presumably in these matters under discussion, anyway]; Grothe refers to the weak’s possibly falling into despair that he cannot be forgiven but notes that he would not be thinking correctly, since one, Grothe says, does not need to be certain a sin was done in weakness or ignorance or consciousness of wrong or deliberate willing in order to be repentantly praying for mercy) ... **For whatever does not proceed from faith is sin.** (the Greek conjunction is usually “and” or “but”, translated as “for” only four times by the AV; the Greek text is more-literally “every thing which” than “whatever”; “not of faith” in this clause repeats the expression used in the preceding clause [Sanday-Headlam discusses “faith” as subjective, “the strong conviction of what is right and of the principles of salvation” [Grothe refers to the trust of the heart in grace and the forgiveness of sins]; the Greek word order is “sin is”, perhaps surprising for not ending with “sin” so emphasized; *CSSB* explains “everything” as “The matters discussed above, namely, conduct about which there can be legitimate differences of opinion between Christians”, but the maxim expressed in this clause is often applied more-broadly than its context here, sometimes in keeping with the statement of Isaiah 64:6 that all of our righteous acts are like filthy rags [NIV84]; Apology of the Augsburg Confession IV:35, for example, refers to Romans 14:23 after saying “men really sin even when they do

virtuous things without the Holy Spirit; for they do them with a wicked heart”; Luther refers to sinning against conscience, and reference is made to Luther’s words at the Diet of Worms that acting against conscience is neither safe nor salutary”; Sanday-Headlam for its part says the maxim is not concerned with the usual conduct of unbelievers and must not be extended to cases other than those St. Paul is considering; Cranfield characteristically has a comprehensive treatment of the statement’s generality, sense of “faith”, and “is sin”; Grothe comments, “As God *continually* pours the forgiveness of sins over him the Christian sees his venturing into action as a sort of *forgiven adventure*, an *attempt* to show the will of God in his daily life.”) ...