

(For access to all available commentaries and written sermons of Charlie's click HERE)

For Adam was formed first, then Eve. 1 Timothy 2:13

Paul will now give a logical and reasonable explanation for why women are not to be teachers of men, nor to have authority over them. He says, "For Adam was formed first." Adam was created directly by God out of the dust. This is recorded in Genesis 2:7 –

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being."

Because of this, Adam is the head of the human race. He stands then as a type of Christ who is the Head of the church. That Adam is a pattern of Christ to come in this regard is explained in 1 Corinthians 15 and elsewhere. Only after creating Adam does the Bible then record the creation of the woman. As Paul says, "then Eve." This is recorded in Genesis 2 as well –

"And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place. ²² Then the rib which the Lord God had taken from man He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man."

Genesis 2:21, 22

Eve was not formed from the ground, but rather from the man. If only chronology of formation was considered, beasts would be above men because they were formed before Adam. However, not only was man formed before the woman, but what formed her was taken from the body of man,. Thus she is the weaker vessel, and the one who was to be in subordination to the man. The typology seen here looks forward to Christ and the church. As woman came from man who was in a deep sleep (typical of Christ's death), so the church

issued forth from the death of Christ. Thus there is a set typology which was ordained from the beginning concerning men and women. To violate this typology is to then usurp what the typology points to, the rule of Christ as Head of the church. Paul explains this in 1 Corinthians 11. An incorrect argument for women to be preachers and teachers today issues from the words of Paul which state in Galatians 3:28 –

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus."

The argument is that because Paul says "there is neither male nor female," and that all are one in Christ Jesus, that it is now acceptable for women to preach and teach, in direct contradiction to Paul's words here in 1 Timothy 2. The verse in Galatians is speaking of spiritual position in Christ. Just as Jews once alone held the spiritual blessings, now Gentiles do as well. The very fact that Paul uses categories – Jew, Gentile, male, female – indicates that there is a difference between them, even if there is no distinction in spiritual blessing. A Gentile does not become a Jew when he comes to Christ. And both men and women remain as men and women when they come to Christ. In other words, the logic in using Galatians 3:28 is a category mistake.

Charles Ellicott wisely and correctly states, "This teaching of St. Paul's respecting the public position of woman as regards man, in which he shows that she is to hold a subordinate place — is based upon no arbitrary human speculation, but upon God's original order in creation—that divine order which first created man, and after man's creation, formed woman as his helpmeet."

The divine order set by God, when overturned by the church, violates what God has ordained. It ignores His divine will, and it is in direct disobedience to the prescriptive writings of the New Testament. How terrifying it will be for such disobedient women – and those men who ordained them in disobedience to the word of God – when they stand before Him for judgment. It will not be a day of accolade and praise for their willful ignoring of His word.

<u>Life application:</u> The Bible is a book of logic. There is no logic in violating God's word. The emotional decisions which authorize a violation of God's word in order to justify the ordination of women are thus illogical. As we will be judged based on a reasonable, logical, and moral application of our adherence to the word of God, our emotions should always be ignored when making theological decisions. How unfortunate that this is wholly ignored in the ordination of women in the church today.

And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. 1 Timothy 2:14 Paul continues with the Genesis account in order establish the "why" of instructing that women are not to teach or have authority over men. He says, "And Adam was not deceived." This is recorded right in Genesis 3 –

¹Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said to the woman, "Has God indeed said, 'You shall not eat of every tree of the garden'?"

² And the woman said to the serpent, "We may eat the fruit of the trees of the garden; ³ but of the fruit of the tree which *is* in the midst of the garden, God has said, 'You shall not eat it, nor shall you touch it, lest you die.'"

⁴Then the serpent said to the woman, "You will not surely die. ⁵For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."

⁶So when the woman saw that the tree *was* good for food, that it *was* pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make *one* wise, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband with her, and he ate. ⁷Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they *were* naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves coverings.

The account is recorded for a multitude of reasons, but one of them is to show exactly what Paul is referring to. The devil went to the woman, not the man, in order to bring about his deceptive plan. It is this act which brought all of humanity to ruin. Paul's logic is that the serpent went to the one he knew was susceptible to being deceived. If this were not so, then the Bible wouldn't have bothered with telling us this.

What the Bible implicitly declares, and what is obvious from human nature, is the truth that women are beings which are formed differently from men, and who follow different internal guidelines in order to make decisions. And so in order to avoid the error of what first occurred at the fall, meaning falling into deception, being repeated in the church, Paul gives specific directives to which there are no exceptions. The problem with exceptions is that they eventually become the rule. This is not how affairs are to be handled, and so rules of conduct are set and fixed. The woman was deceived and fell into transgression. Lesson learned; guidelines are established based on this. Doctrine set.

This is then fully confirmed in the words, "but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression." It is a fast and notable distinction which the Bible calls out to us. Adam was not deceived, Eve was. The implication is that it was based on her nature as a woman that this came about. It is implied in Genesis, and it is made explicit in this epistle. There is an immense amount of theology tied up in what occurred in the garden, but Paul is here solely focused on this particular issue at this time. Both sinned, but Eve alone was deluded. To keep the church

from repeating this cataclysmic mistake, Paul reasonably, without chauvinistic bias, and based on a proper understanding of both human nature and Scripture, lays down his guidelines.

And as has been unfortunately seen, Paul's requirements (and thus the Lord's requirements) here have been violated time and again, and the church has very quickly turned from sound theology. It is the churches which have accepted a rejection of Paul which have devolved into perversion, contempt of the word, and hatred of all things biblically moral and sound. The problem is that because these things have crept in over time, there is the feeling that it is not because of the ordination of women. However, the pattern has remained unchanged in one major denomination after another. Once the precepts of Paul are violated in this particular aspect, all other areas slowly but surely devolve as well.

<u>Life application</u>: Ignore Paul's prescriptive writings, and your church will quickly start building diving boards for a leap into hell.

Nevertheless she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control. 1 Timothy 2:15

As noted in the previous verses of this particular subject, Paul has set strict boundaries on women in the church as to what is not permitted. The reason for his guidelines was then based on the pattern set at the very time of the creation of man on earth, and which was then highlighted by the fall of man. It was the woman, not the man, who was deceived. Both were disobedient, but the devil went to the one he knew was susceptible to deception. This nature remains, and it is a trait which thus excludes women from teaching or having authority over a man.

However, Paul next says something which seemingly makes no sense at all unless the context is maintained, "Nevertheless, she will be saved in childbearing if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control." First to note here is that the translation is incorrect, and so no wonder it makes no sense.

There is an article in front of "childbearing" which is left out in almost all translations. A direct translation says, "She will be saved, moreover, through **the** childbearing." Paul's context is the creation and fall of man. From there, he immediately went to the idea of salvation – "she will be saved." The Genesis account comes alive once again at the hand of Paul – Creation/Fall/Salvation. It is all there waiting to be unpackaged.

What is Paul speaking of here? A woman will be saved in the childbearing? If they don't have children, will they go to the fiery furnace forever? Will they be "more" saved if they have lots of children? Isn't a woman saved in the same way as a man? Aren't people saved by grace through faith? Isn't it a gift and not of works? How can Paul say that a woman is saved by

doing certain things? That seems completely contrary to what the epistles say elsewhere. Such things are debated among scholars, and none of these things apply.

The second thing to notice is that the account goes from the singular to the plural. It says, "She (singular) will be saved, moreover, through the childbearing, if they (plural) abide in..." Obviously two things are on Paul's mind, which are completely overlooked by angry women who want to be deacons and elders in the church, despite being told it is not allowed. Paul has explained why, and now he tells them that for them there is a great honor which they possess anyway.

In order to contemplate what is going on, let's see how difficult this verse is when one is trying to force theology into it instead of drawing it out. Below are various translations of the verse. See how they attempt to translate their way out of a theological dilemma –

- Women will be saved through childbearing.
- She will be saved through childbearing.
- Women will be preserved through the bearing of children.
- Even though she will be saved through the birth of the Child.
- She shall be saved in childbearing.
- She will be delivered through childbearing.
- She [and all women] will be saved through the birth of the child.
- But she lives by her children.
- She shall be saved through the childbearing. (literal)
- Yet a woman will be brought safely through childbirth.

These pretty much represent all of the translations. Only one is literal, the one which includes the article before "childbearing." A couple of them are so wrong it's hard to imagine what they were thinking. Of the two paraphrases that get the intent of what Paul is saying, the ISV does the best job. It reads as follows -

"...even though she will be saved through the birth of the Child, if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, along with good judgment." ISV

Paul has already taken us back to Genesis 3. He has shown us what happened at the fall, after the creation, and he then explains how that is corrected in the same passage. In Genesis 3:15, the Lord spoke to the woman. And then while cursing the serpent, He said what is now known as the Protoevangelium, or "the first gospel." There, a promise was made that One would come who would destroy him and his works –

¹³ And the Lord God said to the woman, "What *is* this you have done?" The woman said, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate."
¹⁴ So the Lord God said to the serpent: "Because you have done this, You *are* cursed more than all cattle, And more than every beast of the field; On your belly you shall go, And you shall eat dust All the days of your life.
¹⁵ And I will put enmity Between you and the woman, And between your seed and her Seed; He shall bruise your head, And you shall bruise His heel." Genesis 3:13-15

The Lord promises the woman will bear, and from her would issue the Messiah who would crush the head of the serpent. So who was Paul speaking of when he said, "and she shall be saved through the child-bearing,..." Who is "she?" The nearest antecedent is found in the previous verse when speaking of "the woman" who was deceived, meaning Eve. Therefore, Paul is referring to her. That is why it is in the singular. She, Eve, will be saved through the bearing of a Child. Not directly, but through her, because she stands as representative of all women.

That is why Paul then switches to the plural by saying "if they continue in faith, love, and holiness, with self-control." It is the call of the gospel – to live in faith. And in living in faith, the woman will be saved, just as the man will be saved. And this faith is based on the grace which was given to humanity in the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is nothing sinister here. There is nothing chauvinistic in Paul's mind. There is the logical doctrine that women are more easily deceived and are thus not to be teachers of men. However, they have a great honor in being the gender through whom would come the Savior of the world! God has ordained all things according to His knowledge of what is right and proper. It is right and proper that Christ would be born of a woman. It is also right and proper that a woman is not to teach or have authority over a man.

<u>Life application:</u> It cannot be said enough that to stick to one translation of the Bible will normally end in very sad theology. In realizing that a single article is left out of a translation, and in noting a simple move from the singular to the plural, a complete change one's understanding of what is being presented can come about. Further, to stick to the commentary of one individual is just as bad. We are to study, evaluate, contemplate, and decide. And we are to do so without injecting our emotions or presuppositions into the text. Let us stand approved in our study and application of the word of God.