

Q&A: Does 1 Tim 4:10... provide an escape clause for humanists?

Reverend Mother asks: *Tim 1, ch 4, v 10 says "...who is the Saviour of all men and especially of those who believe..." Is this the verse to quote to people who have lost a non-believer... or perhaps an escape clause for humanists?*

Thanks for the question. The text of 1 Tim 4:10 in its most immediate context is (ESV):

8 For physical training is of some value, but godliness has value for all things, holding promise for both the present life and the life to come. 9 This is a trustworthy saying that deserves full acceptance. 10 That is why we labor and strive, because we have put our hope in the living God, who is the Saviour of all people, and especially of those who believe.

But to begin with, some basic principles: Your question is an exegetical one. That is to say, it is asking for an interpretation, an "get-meaning-out" question. Good exegesis attempts to disrobe the reader of current frameworks and asks the question "What did this mean for the person to whom it was originally communicated?" Once that question has been considered the question of "so what does it mean for me (or for a humanist etc.)" can be asked, and hopefully answered, to some extent.

We must give attention to semantical range of words. We know what we mean by, for instance, the word "Saviour" but is that the meaning that is intended? Paul, who wrote the original letter, knew nothing of modern day humanism. And before we collide a passage with a specific question such as "Does this

comfort those who have lost a person of no faith?" we have to consider whether or not the text is actually relevant to that question at all.

In my mind the sticking point is the phrase "Saviour of all people?" What does this mean? Do the applications you suggest apply?

The word "Saviour" is in the original Greek σωτήρ which certainly means "saviour" or "deliverer" but also "preserver."

It is a word that applies to the general sense of divine preservation of human life and the providential giving of all that is required for sustenance. It is telling that the word references the sense of God's preservation in the OT, but it is not a word that applies to the messianic figures of David (and others) where the more specific sense of "salvation" in terms of rescue or vicarious victory is present. Jesus is the first "Messiah" to also be "Saviour."

The word "Saviour" implies an object – who or what is actually saved? The natural object is "the world." When we talk about "the Saviour of the World" we do not intend some sort of exhaustive/universalist scope (in terms of individuals) the scope of the meaning is two-fold: this person has the capacity to save the world; this world has a Saviour, it is this person.

Therefore, based on this lexical analysis, my conclusion would be that the phrase "Saviour of all people" does not imply a universalism. It implies that Jesus has the divine attributes of being "saviour/preserver/benefactor" of all people.

This conclusion is supported by looking at the immediate context. What is the purpose of this passage? Well, in verse 8, the direct point is to encourage godliness. This godliness is like "physical training" which has benefit both for the "present life" and the "life to come." In fact, through godliness, we could say we are saved/preserved for this life

and the next. The argument that is being made is that the godliness is worth pursuing (for salvation/preservation) because it is shaped around the character, nature and demonstration of the one who saves and preserves. We strive for godliness because we hope/trust in this Saviour, even to the extent of recognise the preserving benefit of following Christ's example in this life.

However, for those whose hope in Christ extends to the eschatological hope of belonging to the age to come (the more specific sense of "salvation") there is even more reason to pursue the path of godliness because it is the path that pertains to the preservation of *eternal* life. Thus, in my opinion, the original audience of 4:10 would have heard something like this: *godliness is good for all people because it pertains to the preservation of all people in this world, and it is especially good for those who believe, because it especially pertains to the "life to come."*

How, then, does this apply to the applications you suggest?

a) Escape clause for humanists? Well, yes and no. It confirms the value of "godliness" for present-day preservation of human life. I think the Pope said something similar recently about the value of "good works" even the "good works" of atheists. Such good works are, well, good. Does that give them an "escape" – well, perhaps.

b) Comfort those who have lost a person with no faith? Perhaps, depending on the person. I would think that passages that refer to the holiness and justice and compassion of God would be of more application.

Q&A: Communion – For you and for many?

From **Dave0**:

The last two times I've had Communion... I've pondered a detail in the liturgy which to me looks like it is strongly based on the Luke account.

(Luke 22:19) And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 20 And likewise the cup after they had eaten, saying, "This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. 21 But behold, the hand of him who betrays me is with me on the table.

My Anglican heritage has me "hearing" the old (well old for me) liturgy as "for you, and for many"

(Matthew 26:26) Now as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and after blessing it broke it and gave it to the disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body." 27 And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, "Drink of it, all of you, 28 for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins. 29 I tell you I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

(Mark 14:22) And as they were eating, he took bread, and after blessing it broke it and gave it to them, and said, "Take; this is my body." 23 And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. 24 And he said to them, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. 25 Truly, I say to

you, I will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

So a question of the Greek... rendered into English as "for you" in Luke. The other two gospels have "for many". What does Luke actually say in the Greek? I like the community (across time and space) and the evangelistic impulse which "for you, and for many"' has, and have been jarred by the intensely personal and private "for you". And been adding an inside voice of "and for many".

Thanks for the question Dave0,

As an aside, the other Last Supper account is, of course, in 1 Corinthians 11 where we read:

23 For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, 24 and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, "This is my body which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 25 In the same way also he took the cup, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." 26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.

Which also excludes the "for many" that Mark and Matthew apply as the indirect object of the pouring out of the blood of the new covenant. So it's a 50% split between the "for many" usage and not!

Matthew and Mark both have the pouring out "τὸ περὶ πολλῶν" (Matthew, Mark has a different preposition) where "the many" is literally *hoi polloi* (which does not mean the upper crust classes) which has a sense of 'the masses', 'the rest', 'the majority'.

Matthew has an additional phrase before the pouring out

comment, in the imperative “Drink of it, all of you;” in which “all of you” is simply the word “all”, the “you” comes from the factor that the imperative “drink” (πίετε) is in the 2nd person. In my mind this actually should lead us to de-emphasize the “you” pronoun and almost take the “all” as a vocative

Luke, however, simply has “τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν” where the indirect object is “you” (plural).

The distinction then, if there is any, is not between “private” (you singular) and “communal” (many) but between the specific participants in the last supper (you (plural) disciples) and the broader participants (the many who will come to faith) in the new covenant.

It seems there is a covenantal connotation of *polloi* with the word rendering the Hebrew *rabbim* which is associated with the non-Israelite peoples. Therefore the distinction would be Luke’s emphasis of the application of the new covenant to the Jewish disciples, and Matthew and Mark’s would include application to the gentiles that would also enter that covenant. Perhaps Jewish-focussed Matthew wishes to retain the emphasis on gentile inclusion, whereas for gentile-focussed Luke such a notion was less scandalous and needed less emphasis. (Consider article in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology for ‘All, Many’*)

In sum, both emphases are correct, and “for you, and for many” would seem to be a decent liturgical expression of it.