**despise**, for his weakness of faith,—**judge,**  
for his laxity of practice.—**For God hath  
received** (adopted into his family) **him**  
(i.e. the *eater*, who was *judged*,—his place  
in God’s family doubted: *not the abstainer,*   
who was only despised, set at  
nought,—and to whom the words cannot.  
by the construction apply).

**4.**] **Who  
art thou** (see ch. ix. 20) **that judgest the  
servant of another** (viz. of *Christ,*—for  
**the lord** in this passage is marked, verses  
8, 9, as being Chirst,—and the Master is  
the same throughout. “*God,*” mentioned  
before, is unconnected with this verse)**?**  
**to his own lord** (i.e. ‘it i own master’s  
matter, and his alone, that’) **he standeth**  
(remains in the place and estimation of  
a Christian, from which thou wouldest  
eject him;’ not, ‘stands hereafter in the  
judgment,’ which is not in question here:  
see 1 Cor. x. 12) **or falleth** (from his place,  
see above). **But he shall be made to stand**  
(notwithstanding thy doubts of the correctness   
of his practice)**: for the Lord** (or,  
*his Lord,* in allusion to the words “*to his  
own Lord*” above) **is able to make him  
stand** (in faith and practice. These last  
words are inapplicable, if standing and  
falling at the great day are meant).—  
Notice, this argument is entirely directed  
*to* the *weak*, who uncharitably judges the  
*strong*,—not vice versâ The *weak* imagines   
that the *strong* cannot be a true  
servant of God, nor, retain his   
amidst such temptation. To this the  
Apostle answers, (1) *that such judgment  
belongs only to Christ, whose servant he  
is:* (2) *that the Lord’s almighty Power  
is able to keep him up, and will do so.*

**5.**] **One man** (the weak) **esteemeth**   
(selects for honour) **one day above  
another** [day]**: another** (the strong) **esteemeth**   
(worthy of honour) **every day.**  
**Let each be fully persuaded in his own  
mind.**—It is an interesting question, what  
indication is here found of the observance  
or non-observance of days of obligation in  
the apostolic times. The Apostle *decides  
nothing:* leaving *every man’s own mind*  
to guide him in the point. He classes  
the observance or non-observance of particular   
days, with the eating or abstaining  
from particular meats. In both cases, he  
is concerned with things which he evidently   
treats as of *absolute indifference*  
*in themselves*. Now the question is, supposing   
the divine obligation of one day  
in seven to have been “recognized by him  
*in any form,* could he have thus spoken?  
The obvious inference from his strain of  
arguing is, that he *knew of no such obligation,*   
but believed *all times and days to be,*to the Christian strong in faith, ALIKE. I  
do not see how the passage can be otherwise   
understood. If any one day in the  
week were invested with the sacred character   
of the Sabbath, it would have been  
*wholly impossible* for the Apostle to commend   
or uphold the man who judged *all*  
*days worthy of equal honour,*—who, as in  
ver. 6, paid *no regard* to the (any) day. He  
must have visited him with his strongest,  
disapprobation, as violating a command of  
God. *I therefore infer, that sabbatical  
obligation to keep any day, whether seventh  
or first, was not recognized in apostolic  
times.* 1t must be carefully remembered,  
that this inference docs not concern the  
question of the observance of *the Lord’s  
Day as an institution of the Christian  
Church, analogous to* the ancient Sabbath,  
binding on us from considerations of *humanity*   
and *religious expediency,* and *by  
the rules of that branch. of the Church in  
which Providence has placed us,* but *not  
in any way* inheriting the divinely-appointed