1 Timothy 2v14 **Woman First in the Transgression** 12th June 2025

"*And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression*"

A Contrast is drawn between the two sexes and their experience in the garden and the consequences of those actions upon subsequent generations.

The woman was made for the man as a companion by God even before the fall. She was not an afterthought but a deliberate choice within all creation. The animals were also sexed with male and female being part of the reproduction cycle which God set in motion right from the very beginning. Even some plants are sexed with male and female represented in the world of flora not just fauna. This complimentary aspect to creation underlines the intention for similar companionship which God had provided, we are not meant to be isolated individuals but part of a plural society which interacts. "*It is not good for man to be alone*". Both psychologically and spiritually mankind needs to be part of a larger community, even the person of Jesus was planned as someone to fit in and thrive within that paradigm – "*first for himself then for the people*".

"*Adam was formed first*". The design of God, as having the male lead and the female play a supporting role, was enshrined from the beginning. The male has an added degree of association to the Father which is not the same of that of the woman, see the passage in 1 Corinthians 11v7 "*For a man indeed ought not to cover his head forasmuch **as he is** the image and glory of God: **but** the woman is the glory of man*". This is not a criticism but a reality, the woman is not so much inferior, as different. She was made to reproduce and the maternal aspects of her physicality and sexuality are there for all to see. "*She shall be saved by childbearing, if they continue in faith and love and holiness with sobriety*". The wording used emphasises that she is not a physical baby machine but that there must always be a behavioural and spiritual aspect to her involvement with her progeny to take the process forward, and that she neglects this at her peril. Together they are both elements of a divine partnership and stronger for it.

When a woman confronted him in the crowd Jesus did not negate her assertion but added to it. Luke 11v27,28 "*A certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto him Blessed is the womb that bear thee and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said Yea rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it*". The gift of the physical elements of femininity which are the glory of mankind, enhancing the mere strength of the male with beauty and compassion, must not be an end in themselves but a means to spirituality. The nurturing emphasis of the female, which is hardwired inside her, should make her both easier to love and be loved. That she was more vulnerable to the lies of the serpent was not because she was more gullible than her husband Adam, but because she was deceived as the one who had received the information about God's requirements indirectly. There is a school of thought saying that the woman was more intrinsically prone to such temptation but there is no evidence for such in scripture. The woman was made subservient to the man only after the fall. If that resulted from her created condition than that would make God immoral for punishing her for the weakness He had put into her. God never does that. We receive the results of weakness but not as punishment but because it is cause and effect. A weaker vessel will break sooner than a stronger vessel. Weakness in the female is only physical not spiritual. There is no scriptural doctrine that women are less spiritual!

The man was her leader, her teacher, she did not teach him in the garden, he should have taught her, but what was the quality of his teaching. He named all the animals without her and was made in the image of God in a way that she was not. When two walk in file one must lead and the other follow, it is just a fact. Often the one leading is more vulnerable and militarily the one who issues the orders does not assume point, but another takes that responsibility. Different roles not different worth.

A good leader will do everything to enhance and protect his team. Adam failed Eve on a number of counts. When God said "*of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shall not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die*" Eve learnt "*but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden God hath said ye shall not eat of it neither shall ye touch it lest ye die*". She learnt this from Adam so either he taught her badly or he failed to check that her understanding was correct. Eve was not the main issue here.

Comparing these two statements there are some vital differences. First the matter of the identification of the tree. God labelled the tree with its characteristics, "*the tree of the knowledge of good and evil*". Through Adam this became "*the tree which is in the midst of the garden*", labelled by its position. Using God's nomenclature is always better to avoid the consequences of something, it often helps to know what is at stake. Rather than just a being a tree located somewhere, this was the tree that could make you understand the difference between good and evil, a godly characteristic. God was not hiding this, as the serpent may have implied, but it was Adam who failed to teach Eve God's warning label. Perhaps he thought that by not reminding her of what it could do, he was protecting her from God's condemnation, but as ever, changing the precise language of the Eternal to our own interpretation is dangerous. He had failed to teach!

Secondly God had said not to eat of it, not the root, not the leaf, not the bark, not the fruit. Eve had learnt that it was the **fruit** that was to be avoided. She did not eat of any other part but what if she had tried eating the leaves but not the fruit would she have escaped the condemnation? We are not told what the consequences would have been but why alter the degree of divine warning by changing the language of explanation! Again, potentially a deadly mistake. Do we learn the lesson or repeat such mistakes?

Thirdly, God had said **not to eat** of it. Adam seemed to have taught Eve that she should **not touch** it either. This was not prohibited by God and the reason why it might have been enjoined by her husband is because we often overlay God's commands with our own added restrictions which we sadly think are even more protective than His dictates. Again, a grave mistake as when she touched it and did not die, as Adam had warned her or she had erroneously learnt, then this would bring immediate doubt into her mind. This is the danger of additional man-made rules and regulations when given greater emphasise then they should have. We should always limit our protestations when they are based upon our own reasoning and opinions rather than being God's actual law.

Fourthly, and perhaps the worst of all, there is a contrast in what God had said about the effects of eating of the tree; "*in the day that you eat thereof thou shalt surely die*". The Hebrew here is "muth temuth" or "dying thou shalt die", It is used in 1 Kings 2v37 about Shimei to mean not instantaneous death but legal condemnation, that he would ultimately die under the full weight of the King's displeasure. Eve did not understand

this clearly at all. She told the serpent that they were to avoid the fruit "*lest ye die*". The Hebrew word translated lest is pen, otherwise rendered "lest peradventure" implying "might" or "being at risk of". It is used by Abraham of his wife, in Genesis 26v9 "*Because I said lest I die for her*". The absolute certainty of death is not present in Eve's answer; she had not learnt the truth of the matter! How vital it is to be exact and precise in language and therefore granting understanding in matters of the Spirit. Loose language kills. The certainty of God's punishment was not appreciated, why was this?

Adam is the greater culprit here and therefore it is Adam who is cursed with the sentence of death, that is legal condemnation. He was not deceived in the transgression. Eve was deceived and thereby sinned. She did not realise that she had been deceived by the serpent, but the door was left ajar because of the limitations in what she had learnt from her husband. Rather than taking responsibility for her dangerous condition having eaten of the tree, Adam did not offer to die because of his shortcomings, not instead of her but because he had let her down. Like Abraham he was afraid to die for her! Not so with the Christ. It was because Adam was not deceived but then knowingly partook of the fruit as she had already done, that he entered into the transgression. Eve did not sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression and even though she was first in the transgression she did not have the lion's share of the responsibility for that grave mistake. Romans 5v14 sets out the unique nature of Adam's failure. Adam thought he knew what he was doing and was not deceived by the lies of the serpent. This makes him the bigger fool and the results of his sin still remain.

Eve was punished for her part in the transgression. "*Unto the woman He said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee*". Subservience to the man was not part of the original order but a consequence of transgression. It is not scriptural to say that the woman was cursed because she was gullible, but because like so many of her descendants she began to doubt God's word and acted outside of faith. *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin*, Romans 14v23. Adam should have taught her faith!

The restrictions over the woman to be in silence and not to have authority over, or to teach her man, were not part of the natural order of creation but rather part of the divine punishment because of sin. Her desire towards her husband was altered and that became part of her curse. Over sentimentality in sexuality is part of the curse and is not how God made us in the beginning. The woman's desire to her husband is part of her punishment, just as much as the extra pain and suffering in childbirth.

The element of silence is not explicitly explained in these verses. It is stated twice that she **learn in** silence and **be in** silence, and yet she is to ask her husband at home so it is clear that she is not commanded **never** to speak on any occasion but "*Let your women keep silence in the ecclesias*: *for it is not permitted unto them to speak*" see the section in 1 Corinthians 14v34. It is in the assembly of others or "in Ecclesia" that she must be particularly reticent and not to blurt out her emotional opinion. Part of her curse. All this will be corrected in the Kingdom era when all saints regardless of sex, maturity, nation or culture will be glorified together with Christ as their head, Galatians 3 v27,28.