

AAM Mention was made of the Sabbath. I would say that the principle of one day in seven of rest, and the principle of part of your time given over to the Lord's service -- that's a moral principle and that's binding on all people at all times. Then I'd say there is the civil law of the Sabbath. That in the days when people lived on farms and did hard physical labor during the week that kind of rest was not to rest or engage in physical exercise. Today it's opposite. That's civil law. It changes with ~~today's~~ the days' conditions. Then the Sabbath was also ceremonial law because it looks forward to the completion of God's work, to the coming of Christ. Whereas now, we have our one day in seven which looks back to the resurrection of Christ and looks forward to His return. So we still have the ceremonial law, or civil law changed to fit our particular conditions in different countries, but our moral principle remains permanent forever.

Aldrich How about the principle underlying the dietary restrictions?

AAM In those days without refrigeration, and under the circumstances in which they lived, those were very important for their health. Today we have circumstances that don't make them any longer ~~necessary~~ necessary.

Taylor The dietary principle brings out something that goes beyond -- so that the naming of particular things. They bring out the principle which I think is binding, even though the application of it may not be limited to crows and what not. ~~The~~ The principle is, when you sit down to eat think about your God. That principle I would say is a binding principle, even though the application to crows, buzzards, or turtles might be varied with the culture thing. The idea of thinking about God when you get ready to eat is not a bad idea.

Dillard an interesting question because to the church, as you look at it historically has not always given the same answer to this kind of question. Sometimes the church has handled the question, how is it that ~~the church~~ of the Old and New Testaments are the canon of Scripture yet obviously we don't obey the dietary laws and we don't offer sacrifices, etc. So that we have a continuity, we have both canons, and yet we have a discontinuity because obviously we don't live by OT law. Theologians in the history of the church have answered this in a variety of ways. Some making a distinction between moral and ceremonial law which may or may not be valid; others have tried to deal with it historically. That God gave His covenant with His people in successive stages.

Aldrich That word "covenant." I think that's a word some of our listeners may know very well, and others may find it a little bit esoteric!

Dillard Well, I guess that's funny when you use your theological vocabulary so much you don't think of it so much as being so esoteric. I'd say it's a relationship which we could (nt)? define more specifically between God and man, as a covenant between individuals as a relationship. There are a variety of different