

For tonight, we are in the middle of a series entitled, “**Lies women believe.**” Again, not a title I came up with, but one I liked so much that I was willing to hijack it from others.

So far, we have covered two of these lies:

The first lie: **my unbelief or disobedience is justified because of how difficult my life is.** And we primarily looked at 1 Corinthians 10:13 to address that lie.

Then secondly, **I need God to change this about my life in order to be satisfied, in order to be content.** And we primarily looked at Paul’s teaching on contentment in Philippians 4.

That brings us to lie number 3 women tend to believe. And remember in my introduction I said I reserve the right to modify my series as we go.

And I will apply that modification tonight. Because I am adding a new lie I did not originally give you.

Here is the lie we are talking about tonight: **If the leadership in my life is weak, imperfect, ungodly, or I simply disagree with it, it’s ok to seek control.**

Now, let me frame this one up in a few different ways so we can understand a little more specifically what this is referring to.

If he’s not going to lead, someone’s got to do it.

If I don’t dig in and resist that leadership, I’m *complicit* in it.

If I don’t dig in and resist that leadership, it means I *condone* it.

If I don’t assert myself and challenge this kind of leadership, it’ll be like this forever, nothing will change.

Now, before we narrow in on women, we should begin tonight by noting that this is a vulnerability for anyone under any kind of authority.

You’re obviously aware that women are not the only ones called to submit to imperfect or even ungodly leadership.

You’re obviously also aware that women are not the only ones who struggle to submit to imperfect or ungodly leadership.

For instance, submission to the government is a struggle for many believers today. And in my experience, it would appear to be far more of a struggle for men than women.

Why is that a struggle? Not because the Lord hasn’t been clear in His Word, but because of the very lie we are talking about tonight:

If leadership is unreasonable, I don't have to come under it.

If a leader is ungodly in his ideology, if he is a promoter of evil, I don't have to come under it because then I'm condoning or even complicit in it.

So, everyone is vulnerable to this because everyone is called to submission. Let me just read a few texts to show you this:

Romans 13:1, "Every person is to be in subjection to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God."

Titus 2:9, "Bondservants are to be submissive to their own masters in everything; they are to be well-pleasing, not argumentative"

1 Peter 2:13, "Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether to a king as the one in authority, or to governors as sent by him to punish those who do evil and to praise those who do good."

1 Peter 2:18, "Servants, be submissive to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and gentle, but also to those who are unreasonable."

1 Peter 5:5, "you younger men, likewise, be subject to your elders; and all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, for GOD IS OPPOSED TO THE PROUD, BUT GIVES GRACE TO THE HUMBLE."

It's important to note that in all of those examples, the submitting is done not because the person in authority is greater in essence or personhood, but rather for the sake of order and structure. It's a *functional* reason.

And the authority is a delegated authority. We submit to those in authority not because they, in and of themselves, possess any intrinsic authority, but rather because God has delegated his authority to them in their position.

Now, even though everyone is called to submit to various authority structures in their life, we do know that this is a particular vulnerability for women. Because they have an *additional* authority structure in their lives that men do not have, that of marriage.

Just narrowing it down to that marriage relationship, how many times are women called to be submissive in the Scriptures?

Ephesians 5:22, Colossians 3:18, Titus 2:5, 1 Peter 3:1.

Just one command, one reference, one passage, would indicate that the flesh would naturally go against it, but *several* imperatives in several different letters in the NT, stressing the importance of submission.

What is that telling us? Your flesh is vulnerable to resisting the leadership God has placed in your life.

You are vulnerable to using your own wisdom and your own strength to fight for control. You are vulnerable to manipulating leadership in order to get your way.

We're going to look at several passages tonight to address this tendency and draw out *why* that tendency is there, to resist the leadership God has placed in your life.

There's going to be an emphasis on the marriage relationship tonight, because not only is that the context of some of these passages, but that's also speaking to the majority of you in this room.

But if you're not married, don't tune out. Because these principles are going to apply to the various authorities you do have in your life.

You're going to be vulnerable to the same lies as a married woman is, in the context of her marriage.

Let's begin by looking at Ephesians 5:22, "**Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord.**"

Now, let's begin by defining submission here, what it means to be subject to your own husbands.

Notice first, it's an act of the will. Wives, be subject. So it is something you are willing, you are putting yourself in a particular position.

And therefore we could define it this way: It is the voluntary response to God's will in giving up one's independence to come under the leadership of another.

John Piper provides an additional definition: Submission is the divine calling of a wife to honor and affirm her husband's leadership and help carry it through according to her gifts.

Pastor Todd Murray defines it this way: "willingly following a husband's leadership, believing that his authority has been delegated to him by God."

What I like particularly about that definition is those two words: willingly, and believing.

Willingly coming under his leadership, and then the faith required to do that in a biblical manner. *Believing* that his authority (however imperfect) has been delegated to him by God.

Todd also has a really helpful statement with this, and I think from a practical perspective, it really sums up the *essence* of what this means:

Todd uses this language: a *demeanor* of endorsement of your husband's leadership. A supportive endorsement of his leadership.

That would include one's attitude, verbal communication, tone, nonverbal communication, body language, facial expressions, your actions.

And this command here in verse 22 is in the present tense: Continually be submissive. It is a way of life. There's never a time when you aren't to be submissive.

Now, with that said, let's talk for a minute about what submission isn't:

=not a gag order. It's not being quiet in the sense of not talking or sharing your perspectives.

=it's also not equated with agreeing with your husband. The question isn't if you will disagree at times with his leadership, you most definitely will.

The question is, what does the Lord call you to when you do disagree? Or better yet, *how* are you supposed to interact and relate to your husband when you disagree with his leadership?

=it's not a command to follow your husband indiscriminately, as in, into sin. In other words, submission is not blindly, mindlessly following every directive or leadership course your husband takes you down.

When a human authority God has placed in your life, leads you to violate God's authority, then in the language of Acts 5:29, you obey God rather than man.

So there's a few things to help clarify what submission isn't.

Notice back in the text in 5:22, this submission is to **"your own husband."** Not every man.

But be careful that you don't compare him to others. Longing to be under the leadership of another.

Buying into this lie: I would be a more submissive wife if I had a different husband. No you wouldn't.

Isn't it interesting how we flatter ourselves by always imagining that if we were in different circumstances we would be more godly, more obedient?

No, you wouldn't. Because the Lord works every detail of your life to promote your Christlikeness. There isn't a set of circumstances where you could be more godly than the circumstances you are in.

Submission is in obedience to God. It's an act of faith. And by your lack of obedience to God in this circumstance, you are demonstrating that I will only trust and obey God if it makes sense. If circumstances are reasonable enough to compel me to obey.

So notice that language, **"your own husband."** The Lord did not make a mistake in placing that particular leader over you.

The Lord has not failed you. He didn't have a blind spot when he gave you the husband or the authority you have in your life.

Now, notice also in this text how it begins: "wives." This applies to every Christian wife, regardless of her social standing, education, intelligence, spiritual maturity or giftedness, age, experience, or any other consideration.

Nor is it qualified by her husband's intelligence, character, attitude, spiritual condition, or Whether or not he is leading the way he is supposed to.

What is it qualified by? Notice that phrase there, "**As to the Lord.**"

This is crucial because it gives you the motivation. You're not looking to your husband to find the motivation and perspective to submit.

Often, a wife is tempted to evaluate whether her husband is fulfilling his end of the deal. And then, if he is demonstrating love and is worthy enough to follow, she will follow him.

But that is not submission, that's disobedience. She is called to submit not because her husband is worthy but because Christ is worthy. "**As to the Lord.**"

Notice in verse 23 as Paul explains this, he doesn't say, "submit because your husband will always lead you well, wisely, faithfully."

No, what does he say? Verse 23, "**For the husband is the head of the wife,**

The husband is the head, that is to say the one who is in a position to lead. We can think about headship practically like this: The head gives direction and the body responds.

And it's not that the husband makes himself the head, rather, he is. He is the leader. He is the one with authority.

He is the one who was created first and given the divine mandate to lead. This is patterned after the creation account.

But also patterned after redemption. "**as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body.**"

The Savior of the body means he provides the church with everything she needs and protects the church from everything she needs protection from.

So, among other things, we can see that the role of women and men in marriage has nothing to do with ancient cultures which viewed women as inferior. It has to do rather with creation and redemption. Both of which transcend time and cultures.

Notice the extent of a wife's submission. Verse 24, **“But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be subject to their husbands in everything.”**

Every area of life. No part of her life should be outside of her relationship to her husband and outside of her submission to him.

Sometimes we look at this passage and are quick to say, “Yeah, but verse 24 isn't true all the time because my husband might prevent me from obeying Christ and try to lead me into sin.”

“And I can't follow him and submit to his leadership in those instances. So verse 24 has some exceptions.”

Well, that is certainly true. The Apostle Paul is certainly not telling wives that they are to follow their husbands into sin, but if you look at the verse carefully, you don't even need to qualify it like that or worry about the exception because its built into the verse.

Notice the comparison - **as the church submits to Christ, so also wives ought to be subject to their husbands in everything.**

Christ would never lead the church into sin, and never prevent the church from obeying Him.

All that to say, wives there is a protection for you in these very verses for you. You are coming under the leadership of a fellow sinner, but you are not following that sinner into sin.

Now, skip over to 5:33 where Paul sums up his exhortation to husbands and wives:

Nevertheless, each individual among you also is to love his own wife even as himself, and the wife must see to it that she respects her husband.”

So you see that Paul has seemingly interchanged “submission” with a word he hasn't used yet. “respect.”

Submission and respect are not synonyms, but biblical submission is not happening when there is no respect.

This is why I think that lanugae we talked about earlier is so helpful: submission is really a *disposition or demeanor* of endorsement of your husband's leadership.

That's a critical clarification because the Lord leads you through a weak, imperfect man who won't always lead you in the way that is best. In fact, he may often lead in foolish ways. He may be lazy, passive, sinful, unbelieving.

Submission is not an endorsement of his leadership, but rather a *demeanor* of endorsement.

You don't have to agree with his leadership, you often won't, you can express concerns, but you must be resolved to respect his position, to honor it, and to follow it, except in cases of sin.

Now, before we move on to the next passage, I want you to notice a very important detail here.

Back up to verse 21 says, **“submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.”**

And then in verse 22, Paul gives a prime example of this very submission. **Wives, submit to your own husbands.”**

What’s interesting is that in most of the earliest manuscripts the word “submit” doesn’t even appear in verse 22.

It literally reads, **“wives to your own husbands.”** The idea of submitting is carried down, appropriately so, from verse 21. **“submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.”**

But for the grammarians in the room, you notice that verse 22 can’t stand by itself. Wives to your husbands. There’s no verb, that’s not a complete thought.

Verse 21 is not a complete thought either. “submitting” is a participle so we know it is modifying another verb.

So, where is this main statement, the main verb? Go all the way back to the end of verse 18, **“but be filled with the Spirit.”**

And then he just launches with a bunch of participles, which are the results, the evidences of being filled with the Spirit.

19 speaking to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord; 20 always giving thanks for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God, even the Father; 21 and be (being) subject to one another in the fear of Christ.”

Wives to your own husbands.

Notice that connection: A Spirit filled Christian is a singing Christian, a giving thanks Christian, and a *submitting* Christian.

What does this detail tell us about a wife? She doesn’t have the resources within herself to do what God has called her to do. It is only as she is filled with the Spirit.

In other words, it’s not natural. It won’t make sense to the flesh, and it won’t be accomplished in the flesh.

Now, you say, but my husband is either an unbeliever, or he certainly seems like one. What am I supposed to do when the leadership God has placed in my life isn’t merely weak or imperfect, like all ladies have to deal with, it’s ungodly, it’s unbelieving.

Well, the Lord has accounted for your very situation. And here's your answer – you're called to the same standard that a wife with a Christian husband is called to.

1 Peter 3:1-6 is a passage that is speaking of a Christian wife married to an unbeliever. But it also applies to a marriage where you are equally yoked as well.

Because Abraham and Sarah are used as an example to illustrate the principle Peter is teaching. And so, you are called to submit to imperfect leadership, like Abraham's leadership, or unbelieving leadership, like the husbands in verse 1.

1 Peter 3:1, **“In the same way,”**

That language of comparison there is speaking to what came previously in the context. As Peter was speaking of submission to authority and giving honor to those who are in authority.

“in the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands

Same exact term and construction as Ephesians 5. Continually be submissive. Line up under God's delegated authority.

But unlike Ephesians 5, Peter highlights different purpose, an *additional* reason for your submission.

“so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word,”

When you see the word *if* think of the word *when*. It is conditional language but it assumes the condition is true.

And that language of disobedient isn't talking about a Christian who falls into sin, who sometimes disobeys.

This is referring to one who continually, characteristically is disobedient to the Word. It's referring to an unbelieving husband. [[See earlier use in 2:8]]

But notice now how Peter highlights the value and significance of submission in a context like this:

“they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives,” “won” as in saved, converted. [[see other uses in 1 Cor. 9:19-22]]

You can see how this speaks directly to the lie we're addressing tonight.

The natural tendency when one is under imperfect or ungodly leadership is to nag, to argue, to resist an ungodly leader.

But notice how Peter tells you to influence your unbelieving husband. In the words of one pastor, “allow the eloquent silence of your life to be a powerful testimony.”

This isn't a gag order. It's not talking about being quiet, as in never speaking to him.

This is with reference to the truth and his leadership. He is disobedient to the word. Hardened against the truth. Doesn't want to interact, won't dialogue about the truth.

And Peter is saying, when he silences the message of your lips, influence him with something he can't silence, your life. Your behavior.

Notice verse 2, **“as they observe your chaste and respectful behavior.”**

Your pure, holy life. a life that has no explanation apart from the Spirit's work.

And respectful. To respect and honor your husband, even an unbelieving husband, is not the same as affirming his leadership or condoning it.

The Lord will use your godly life as a powerful testimony in his life.

It's interesting what comes next here in this context: Verse 3, **“Your adornment must not be merely external—braiding the hair, and wearing gold jewelry, or putting on dresses;**

That language there about braiding the hair, wearing gold jewelry, putting on dresses, doesn't mean you are violating this passage if you have braided hair, if you are wearing any gold jewelry, or if you tend to put on dresses.

These are terms depicting a lavish, excessive amount of time and energy and focus on your appearance.

Notice the plural – putting on of dresses. garments in the plural.

So this is referring to an excessive and lavish preoccupation with outer beauty. An inordinate amount of time and focus on outer beauty.

He's not prohibiting trying to look nice and wearing nice things. Not forbidding external beauty. He's talking about your priorities.

Notice the word **“merely.”** Don't let your adornment *merely* be these things.

Look at the contrast in verse 4, **“but let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the imperishable quality of a gentle and quiet spirit,”**

Naturally, you'll tend to be consumed with and preoccupied with what comes natural for women: external beauty.

Peter isn't calling women to neglect or avoid any attention to their bodies and external beauty, but he is wanting them to shift their focus predominantly to dressing up on the inside.

Because unlike physical beauty and make up and clothing, a godly heart is imperishable. Notice that language – the *imperishable* quality.

Now, this isn't measured in hours and minutes. But you do need to consider how much time, effort and energy and focus goes into that which is perishable, your body, your clothing, your makeup, versus how much time, effort and energy goes into what is imperishable, your inner godliness.

Specifically, Peter says a gentle and quiet spirit. This has nothing to do with being audibly quiet. This has nothing to do with noise.

Notice, it is a *spirit*, a disposition. As we mentioned earlier. A spirit of endorsement of your husband's leadership.

It's the exact opposite of the fleshly tendencies that come out when you seek to gain control.

What are the fleshly tendencies toward your husband when you don't want to come under his leadership for whatever reason it may be:

Here would be the signs: You get quarrelsome and argumentative and contentious.

You get accusatory and use superlatives to indict him. You *never* do this. You *always* do that.

You project your fears onto him. Demanding that he validates your fears and joins you in your anxiety.

You criticize his leadership. His provision.

Let me remind you of a few Proverbs describing what a wife looks like who doesn't have this gentle and quiet spirit, this submissive spirit.

Proverbs 21:9, **“It is better to live in a corner of a roof than in a house shared with a contentious woman.”**

Why? Maybe because she can't be reasoned with. She's irrational. She's quarrelsome. Doesn't have the gentle and quiet spirit Peter is talking about.

Proverbs 21:19, **“It is better to live in a desert land than with a contentious and vexing (provoking) woman.”** [[better translated “than with the vexation (sorrow, grief) of a contentious woman]]

Commentator John Kitchen writes this: “The husband's preferable dwelling of verse 9 (corner of the roof) has now become a desert land.”

“This is describing an uninhabited area, devoid of fruit, water supply or anything desirable and necessary.”

“Such a place is completely undesirable and normally considered nearly uninhabitable yet compared with a contentious woman, the desert land looks like a well watered oasis to this frustrated man.”

Proverbs 27:15, **“A constant dripping on a day of steady rain and a contentious woman are alike;”**

What’s the idea here? Unrelenting. Constant state of pushing back and resisting and becoming an irritant to her husband.

These Proverbs are speaking to the vulnerabilities you have. And Peter is showing you the pathway to guard yourself from these vulnerabilities.

Notice back in 1 Peter 3:4, **“which is precious in the sight of God.”**

Extremely valuable. Highly esteemed in the eyes of God.

Notice, not in the sight of your husband. He may not recognize its worth. Others aren’t around to see your humble submission in the context of your home.

And so Peter reminds wives in these kinds of situation, God is near and aware. And He is very pleased when you live this out in the presence of an unbelieving husband.

Verse 5, Peter gives examples: **5 For in this way in former times the holy women also, who hoped in God, used to adorn themselves, being submissive to their own husbands;**

You’re not being called to anything that all godly ladies for all time have been called to do.

Notice verse 6, **“just as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, and you have become her children if you do what is right without being frightened by any fear.”**

Lord, as in master. That’s an example of the language of respect and honor in the ancient culture. [[only example is Gen. 18:12]]

But what I really want to highlight for you in verses 5-6 is the relationship between hoping in God and fear.

In verse 5, the holy women hoped in God. They had a confident expectation in the promises of God.

They didn’t hope in their circumstances changing for the better, or hope in their husbands, or hope in their own wisdom to manipulate and achieve some temporary relief or outcome.

Their hope and confidence was in God. Which means unbelief is the enemy of submission. Specifically the unbelief of fear.

“if you do what is right without being frightened by any fear.”

Frightened by anything at all that burdens you, that terrorizes, that makes you anxious.

Fear is often the enemy of submission.

This tells you that when you're afraid, you won't have the quiet and gentle spirit. You won't be able to submit the way you're called to.

When you're afraid, you need to hope in God. When you're hope is in God, you'll be able to submit even when that leadership isn't wise or ungodly.

Ladies, you have to recognize this connection between fear and a lack of submission.

This would be a good exercise for you to think about in your own life the times that you have sought control, or become quarrelsome about your husband's leadership, or nagging him about a particular issue.

Try to identify the fear that is motivating you to act like that. Is it a fear about finances, a fear about children, a fear about reputation, or your spiritual health.

Whatever it might be, you have to identify that fear and take it to the Lord and hope in Him.

Otherwise, you will not be operating in a way in your marriage that will lead to ultimate blessing for you.

Let's look at one more passage for tonight. 1 Timothy 2:9, **“Likewise, I want women to adorn themselves with proper clothing, modestly and discreetly, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly garments, 10 but rather by means of good works, as is proper for women making a claim to godliness.”**

Back up to verse 9 and look at that word for “adorn” (κοσμεῖν). Κοσμέω. It has the idea of placing things in order or arranging things in an ordered way.

You can probably hear a word we use that comes from this word, “cosmetic.” It is the drawing out of the natural beauty of something by ordering and arranging it to look its best.

Paul says this is to be done with “with proper clothing.” Appropriate, well-ordered.

And he gives two descriptions of that: **“modestly and discreetly.”** Modestly refers to the idea of having a regard for others. A regard for decency, the freedom from vanity and pride of life.

The second word “discreetly” is more the idea of self-control, moderation. This is the idea of self-mastery. Having passions and desires under control so as not to draw attention to yourself.

Paul goes on now to give a *culturally relevant* application of this principle in the middle of verse 9, “**not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly garments.**”

So similar to what we just saw in 1 Peter 3. That term for “braided hair” refers to hair that is braided or interwoven in elaborate, even excessive fashion, in order to create a stylish impression. [[Braided hair - Hapax]]

This was an extravagant hairdo that would cause others to be distracted, it would draw unnecessary focus and attention to oneself.

This hairstyle would even incorporate gold jewelry, or even pearls, which were about three times the value of gold.

And then you add in “costly garments,” which were highly luxurious clothing. (Luke 7:25)

This is the pride of life. The flaunting of one’s status or wealth, desiring to draw attention to yourself.

So, again, not forbidding attention given to your appearance. But rather speaking to the issue of arranging yourself externally with the goal of attracting men, or outshining other women. Competing with other women.

Sometimes a parent or a husband, or even another lady might give counsel to a woman about their appearance sounds something like this: “You need to dress modestly, and don’t dress in a way to draw attention to yourself because men have lust issues.”

Certainly, that should be one of the main principles in mind when considering how to adorn oneself.

But, that’s only half of the matter. As I’ve heard it put by a pastor friend of mine: It’s not merely, “Ladies, dress modestly because men have lust issues,” it’s also, “ladies dress modestly or you have *pride* issues.”

Back in our passage here, Paul gives a contrast now. If the ladies are not to be preoccupied with *attention seeking adornment*, what is to be their focus?

Verse 10, “**but rather by means of good works, as is proper for women making a claim to godliness.**”

If a woman is making a profession of faith, a claim to godliness, her whole life should be brought into submission to that claim, which includes her appearance.

Her beauty cannot be limited to her physical appearance. She is to adorn herself with good works.

Good works is just generally referring to the whole spectrum of Christian obedience springing from faith in Christ Jesus.

So Paul is saying to ladies in a culture very much like ours: Don't be known for your wealth, your looks, your status, instead, if people are drawn to you, if people are attracted to you, may it be your good works. Your godliness.

Now, notice the direction the text goes now in verse 11, **“A woman must quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness.”**

Now, you see that word “quietly” there in verse 11? Go back to 2:1, **“First of all, then, I urge that entreaties and prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, be made on behalf of all men, 2 for kings and all who are in [a]authority, so that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and [b]dignity.**

“Quiet” does not mean Christians don't ever talk in society or make any noise.

Rather, in that verse it has the idea of an undisturbed, peaceful life in contrast to the difficulties one experiences as a result of agitating authorities, rebelling against civil authorities.

It's a similar idea here in our passage. This is not saying that when the church is gathered women cannot make noise or talk at all.

The context here clearly supports that this is the idea of quietness in the sense of *free from contention, self-assertion*. It's the same idea Peter was talking about in 1 Peter 3.

It is the *quietness* of joyfully and willingly coming under authority with a demeanor of endorsement.

Notice the end of verse 11, “with entire or complete submissiveness.” With entire willingness to come under and be led.

In verse 12, he applies verse 11. **“But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet.”**

We must keep in mind the context here: Paul is referring to public worship, the gathering of God's people to worship. And the other key qualifier to notice is “over a man.”

So, the particular *context* and *gender* become two crucial interpretive items.

That's important because there's nothing forbidding women to teach at all. Paul even says in his letter to Titus in 2:3, they are to teach what is good to the younger women.

But the word for “teach” in our passage is not the same word as in Titus 2.

In fact this verb for “teach” when used in the Pastoral epistles is always used to refer to teaching authoritatively to the church. (4:11, 6:2)

It is the authoritative, public, doctrinal instruction. Nowhere in the NT is a woman in such a role or functioning in this way.

You have women teaching one another, you have women teaching their children, you have Priscilla and Aquila taking aside Apollos privately and helping to round out some of his theology in Acts 18.

But it is the corporate, authoritative, doctrinal instruction of God’s word when the church meets, that’s the context here.

So, Paul says they are not to teach or exercise authority over a man. That is to say, they aren’t to teach or lead, govern.

In other words, they aren’t to be an elder or function like an elder. That’s basically what he’s saying here.

Instead, end of verse 12, **“she is to remain quiet.”** This is the same word as before. It’s not the quiet of no noise, this is the quiet of not teaching and leading the church.

Now, the Spirit of God’s wisdom is shown here in that He knew that a statement like this would need some extra backing, some theological rationale to prove the point.

And so Paul, under the inspiration of the Spirit of God went to great lengths to ensure no one could rationally edit this passage.

He gives the theological defense for this principle. And it is grounded first in the creation account. Notice verse 13, **“For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve.”**

This statement shatters any attempt to restrict this instruction to the ancient context because the argument is grounded in creation, *prefall*.

Before the existence of sin. By God’s perfect and good design. Authority and submission are not the result of the fall.

God created man first, put him in the garden, gave him the responsibility over the garden. (we read that in our Scripture reading earlier in Genesis 2)

He then created woman as his partner and helper to assist him carrying out his responsibility. She was made to follow his lead.

Now, think about it: It would have been nothing for God to create Adam and Eve *at the exact same time*. The fact that He didn’t demonstrates there was a good and wise design in his actions.

What’s the point here in verse 13? God desires the order of creation to be reflected in his church.

So let not a woman enter into the sphere of activity for which God has not designed for her.

And next Paul says, let me show you what happens when men fail to lead and women enter into a role they were never designed for.

Verse 14, “And (as if to say, here’s another reason for my statement in verse 12), and it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.”

Now, here’s what this is not saying:

“Women shouldn’t be elders, teachers, have significant spiritual influence in the church over men, because women are simply more vulnerable to deception. Therefore, they would be terrible candidates to preach and teach the Word of God and protect the church from error.”

That’s how some treat this passage: As if Paul is given us a testimony on the *gullible nature* of women? They just aren’t as smart, they aren’t as intuitive, they aren’t as wise and discerning as men.”

But that’s not the case at all. First of all, that idea can’t even match our experience, our own observations.

When I was in school, who messed up the grading curve more often? Girls, who were typically smarter than most of the boys. The boys were so dumb we always appealed for our own grading curve, separate from the girls.

One author said this: “What man has not been out-thought, out-talked, and outdone by his female counterparts? Your experiences need be no larger than your family to know women who are superior to their fathers, brothers, and husbands.” He’s right.

If Paul is saying that women are more prone to deception, they aren’t spiritually discerning, sitting ducks for doctrinal error, why would we possibly give women any spiritual influence at all?

Why would we ever want a woman teaching another woman? Or children? Why would we ever read a book written by a Christian woman?

That’s not what this means. Remember, Paul is drawing from the Genesis account. Let’s turn back there and fill in some details.

Genesis 3:1, “Now the serpent was more crafty than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said to the woman...”

So he targets the woman because Satan wants to attack God’s design.

“Indeed, has God said, ‘You shall not eat from any tree of the garden?’” 2 The woman said to the serpent,

What should she have done right here: “Hey serpent, hold that thought, let me grab Adam and you can talk to him, because he is actually responsible for keeping the garden.”

Instead, she dialogues further with the serpent in 3:2 **“From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat; 3 but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden, God has said, ‘You shall not eat from it or touch it, or you will die.’”**

This demonstrates that the original instruction the Lord gave to Adam he had passed on to the woman after she was created. She knew God’s instruction.

Verse 4, **“The serpent said to the woman, ‘You surely will not die! 5 For God knows that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.’ 6 When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was desirable to make one wise, she took from its fruit and ate; and she gave also to her husband *with her, and he ate.***

Now, that last phrase, “her husband with her.” That could mean that Adam was either with her the whole time, or some time had passed between verses 5-6.

I lean toward the view that some time had passed between verse 5 and verse 6. Why do I say that?

Because if Adam was there with Eve, listening to the serpent, then he was deceived right along with her by the serpent.

But remember what our passage in 1 Timothy says: Adam was *not* deceived, but the woman was deceived.

And it also means that Adam stood by and said nothing. He just sat there and watched Eve and the serpent interact.

But we’re not told Adam listened to the voice of the serpent. We’re told that Adam listened to the voice of his wife.

For instance, fast forward to 3:17, after Adam and Eve sinned and the curses are being laid out: Verse 17, **“Then to Adam He said, ‘*Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded you.*’”**

This is why Adam is ultimately responsible for the fall. The Fall was the result of disobeying God’s command not to eat the fruit. But that disobedience was the result of violating the divinely appointed role of men and women.

“Because you have listened to the voice of your wife...” Because you allowed her to lead. Because you allowed her to function in your role.

So what happened in Genesis 3, as it relates to Paul's point in 1 Timothy? The woman assumed leadership, she entered into the role of the leader, and man followed.

With that in mind, back to 1 Timothy 2:14, "**And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.**"

Adam was not deceived, that is, by the deceiver, by Satan. Adam did not deal directly in that account. He listened to his wife, not the serpent.

But the woman was deceived. That is, through her direct interaction with the deceiver she was led into transgression.

What's the point? When *God's design is abandoned*, it brings devastating consequences.

Eve's sin involved overturning the order of creation and leading her husband. Similarly, Adam's sin came from 'listening to his wife, in the sense of heeding and following her instruction.

He was taught by her, thereby putting himself under her authority and reversing God's good ordering of creation.

Now, let's remember now why Paul is bringing this up in our passage? He is giving a reason for why do I not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man.

Because the neglect of the divine design leads to transgression. A woman is more prone to deception *when she comes out from under God's appointed role for her life*.

When she grasps for authority, when she tries to lead, when she seeks to get control, when she functions in positions she was not designed to be in, *then* she is vulnerable to deception.

Paul shows Timothy, in the account of the fall, a tragic illustration of what happens when a wife usurps authority and leads in the place of man.

We're not going to look at the rest of this passage tonight, but if you're curious about the verses right after this, you can look on our website when I taught through 1 Timothy and get all the details from that sermon.

Let's revisit the lie we began with tonight: **If the leadership in my life is weak, imperfect, ungodly, or I simply disagree with it, it's ok to seek control.**

If he's not going to lead, someone's got to do it.

If I don't dig in and resist that leadership, I'm *complicit* in it.

If I don't dig in and resist that leadership, it means I *condone* it.

It's ok to usurp and rebel against authority God has placed in my life, if it's weak, unreasonable, ungodly, or I simply don't agree with it.

When you're tempted with thoughts like these, you go back to the passages we looked at tonight and crush those temptations with the truth.

God makes no mistakes in giving you the leadership He has given you in your life.

And he makes no mistakes in calling you to come under that leadership as well.

And anytime you challenge that design and attempt to seek control, it will never lead to blessing for yourself.