

1 TIMOTHY 2:13–15: PAUL’S RETELLING OF GENESIS 2:4–4:1

ANDREW B. SPURGEON*

I. INTRODUCTION

1 Timothy 2:15 is one of the most difficult passages to interpret in the NT.¹ One reason is its placement within the contexts where Paul was instructing how men and women ought to pray (2:8–10), and how a γυναίκα (“woman” or “wife”) and an ἄνδρας (“man” or “husband”) interact (2:11–12)—the latter passage being a greatly debated passage on the topic of women’s role in ministry. Another reason is the verse division between verses 14 and 15 that imply Paul might have left the discussion of Eve and was now speaking of Christian women, a presupposition supported by the presence of the plural verb μέινωσιν (“if they remain”) and Christian terminologies of faith/faithfulness, love, holiness, and clear-mindedness. Another reason is Paul’s supposedly odd statement, “A woman is saved by childbirth,” and the connotations associated with it. The proposal of this paper is that Paul was still narrating Adam and Eve’s stories in all three verses (1 Tim 2:13–15), that is, Paul was retelling of Adam and Eve’s creation (Gen 2:13), fall (Gen 2:14), and restoration (Gen 2:15). And they together form an illustration for his main discussion on prayer, especially as it relates to γυναίκα-ἄνδρας interactions.

The verses may be subdivided so as to see the connection:

1 Timothy 2:13–15: (a) Adam was created first, (b) then Eve. (c) Adam was not deceived; (d) but his wife, being deceived, came into transgression (e) but she [Eve] would be saved through bearing children, (f) provided they [Adam and Eve] remained in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness.

Genesis 2:4–4:1: (a) The LORD formed the dust from the ground [into] a man, (b) then the LORD built the “side” he took from the man as a woman. (c) When [Eve] gave [the fruit] to her man who was with her, he listened to her and ate [the fruit]. (d) When the LORD enquired the woman, “Why did you do this?” she replied, “The serpent deceived me, and I ate.” (e) Then the LORD said to the

* Andrew Spurgeon is professor of NT studies at ACA-Evangelical Theological Seminary in Hosur, Tamil Nadu, India.

¹ A. Duane Litfin, “1 Timothy,” in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament* (ed. Roy B. Zuck and John F. Walvoord; Wheaton: Victor, 1986) 736; David R. Kimberley, “1 Tim 2:15: A Possible Understanding of a Difficult Text,” *JETS* 35 (1992) 481; and Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary* (INTC 14; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 77. Robert W. Wall says, “This is easily the most-commented-upon passage in 1 Timothy since the nineteenth century” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15 Reconsidered [Again],” *BBR* 14 [2004] 82, n. 2). But Ronald W. Pierce writes, “The most difficult part of any interpretation of the 1 Timothy passage is not 2:15, as so many claim, but rather Paul’s enigmatic reference to creation and fall narrative in vv. 13–14, especially the reference to Adam’s priority in creation” (“Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990s: 1 Tim 2:8–15: A Test Case,” *JETS* 36 [1993] 350).

woman, “I will greatly increase your pain; in pain you will give birth to sons”; (f) “toward your husband you will long for [“return,” LXX] and he will rule you”; and Adam knew Eve (his wife), she conceived, she bore Cain, and she said, “I received a man from the LORD” (cited verses are 2:7, 22; 3:6, 13, 16; 4:1).

II. CREATION, FALL, AND RESTORATION

Paul’s statement—“Adam was created first [πρῶτος], then [εἶτε] Eve”—was clearly drawn from the Genesis account of humanity’s creation. Whereas Genesis chapter 1 states that God created humanity both as “male and female” (Gen 1:27), the following chapter outlines the process in which he first created Adam from the dust (2:7, *ha’adam* from *ha’adamah*), and then created Eve from Adam’s “side” (2:18–25, *isha* #from *ish*). By sequencing “Adam first, then Eve,” Paul most likely referred to the order of sequence in creation rather than prominence of Adam over Eve (cf. Mark 4:28: “the soil bears fruit—first [πρῶτος] stalk, then [εἶτε] the head, and then [εἶτε] the full kernel in the head”; 1 Tim 3:10: “Deacons ought to be first [πρῶτος] tested and if found blameless then [εἶτε] they might serve”).²

Paul’s statement—“Adam was not deceived; Eve, being deceived, came into transgression”—was his summary of the fall of humanity. Elsewhere Paul placed the blame of humanity’s sinfulness on Adam: “Through one man sin entered into the world” (Rom 5:12); “In the transgression of one man, many died” (Rom 5:15).³ The apparent discrepancy of holding either Eve or Adam accountable for transgression is resolved when proper stress is placed on *deception*: whereas Adam was not *deceived*, Eve was *deceived* (1 Tim 2:14). Adam’s disobedience was willful, a violation of the direct command that he received from God. Eve’s transgression was deception, that is, the serpent’s false statements deceived her. She said so to the LORD when he asked her why she ate from the tree: “It was the serpent. He deceived me, and I ate” (Gen 3:13).⁴ So following the “creation” account (1 Tim 2:13), Paul summarized the “fall” account in this verse but with the added emphasis on deception (1 Tim 2:14).

² Contra Ann L. Bowman who says, “When Paul appealed to Adam’s chronological priority, he was possibly asserting that Adam’s status as the oldest carried with it the leadership fitting for a firstborn son” (“Women in Ministry: An Exegetical Study of 1 Timothy 2:11–15,” *BSac* 149 [1992] 205). Alan Padgett sees a spiritual prominence of the men in Ephesus and says, “Formed first,” not in a physical but in a spiritual sense of being older in the faith and having a sound understanding of the Old Testament” (“Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:8–15 in Social Context,” *Int* 41 [1987] 27).

³ William Adams’s conclusion, “In responsibility for mankind’s sin and ruin, [Eve] takes priority over Adam,” is unwarranted (“Exposition of 1 and 2 Timothy,” *RevExp* 56 [1959] 376). R. W. L. Moberly makes an interesting observation: “It is noteworthy that the serpent never tells the woman to transgress God’s prohibition. He simply calls into question both God’s truthfulness (by denying his warning) and God’s trustworthiness (by impugning his motives), and leaves the woman to draw her own conclusions” (“Did the Serpent Get it Right?,” *JTS* 3 [1988] 7).

⁴ C. John Collins writes, “In [Genesis 3] verse 6, as [Eve] regards the tree and sees that it was ‘good for food, a delight to the eyes, and desirable for giving insight,’ the irony of the parallel with 2:9 (in the Garden was already ‘every tree desirable to the sight and good for food’) should not escape us: she already had everything she could possibly want, and she even has the resources to get everything she thought the tree had to offer. Hence now she is clearly under the sway of the snake’s deception” (“What Happened to Adam and Eve? A Literary-theological Approach to Genesis 3,” *Prebyterion* 27 [2001] 29).

Paul's statement—"She will be saved through bearing children, provided they remain in faithfulness, love, holiness with clear-mindedness" (1 Tim 2:15)—has been mostly seen as Paul's conclusion and application of the present discussion in 1 Timothy, dealing with the women in the congregation.⁵ As such, several theories have been advanced to address the myriads of problems within such an understanding,⁶ such as, Christian women would be kept safe during childbirth,⁷ Christian women's salvation would come by bearing children,⁸ Christian women would be saved through *the* childbirth (i.e. the birth of the Messiah),⁹ Christian women would find deliverance and receive "a partial healing from the judgment on the first woman [Eve] through childbirth,"¹⁰ Christian women would be delivered "from the theological condition which outlaws her teaching" though childbearing,¹¹ and Christian women would be saved through proper family role of raising children.¹²

The premise of this paper is that in 1 Tim 2:15 Paul was retelling the "restoration" story of Eve and Adam, which accompanied their creation and fall (1 Tim 2:13–14).¹³ In other words, 2:13–15 ought to be read together as, "Adam was creat-

⁵ E.g. Karen W. Hoover, "Creative Tension in 1 Timothy 2:11–15," *Brethren Life and Thought* 22 (1977) 163, 165. Kenneth L. Waters Sr.'s work is an exception: he understands "childbirth" metaphorically as referring to the Christian virtues mentioned later in 1 Timothy 2:15b ("Saved through Childbearing: Virtues as Children in 1 Timothy 2:11–15," *JBL* 123 [2004] 703–35). Similarly, Catherine Clark Kroeger's essay is an exception: she thinks childbearing "might refer either to the woman's social and economic salvation in marriage and family or to a concern for children brought into the world as a result of immoral practice" ("Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *Reformed Journal* 29 [1979] 12–15, esp. p. 15).

⁶ For detailed analysis of various views and historical interpretations see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Ascertaining Women's God-ordained Roles: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15," *BBR* 7 (1997) 107–44; Joel N. Lohr, "Sexual Desire? Eve, Genesis 3:16 and *tshvkt*," *JBL* 130 (2011) 227–46; and Douglas J. Moo, "1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance," *TrinJ* NS 1 (1980) 71.

⁷ Bruce Barron, "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership," *JETS* 33 (1990) 457.

⁸ Adams, "Exposition of 1 and 2 Timothy" 376; Doug Heidebrecht, "Reading 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in Its Literary Context," *Direction* 33 (2004) 181; R. Kent Hughes, "Living Out God's Order in the Church," *Master's Seminary Journal* 10 (1999) 110; Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus" 28–30; and Stanley E. Porter, "What does it mean to be 'Saved by Childbirth' (1 Timothy 2:15)," *JSNNT* 49 (1993) 87–102.

⁹ Aida Dina Besançon Spencer, "Eve at Ephesus," *JETS* 17 (1974) 220. The theory that Paul was referring to *the* childbirth is based on the fact that there is an article, concerning which Köstenberger writes, "The presence of the definite article in the original Greek (τῆς τεκνογονίας) merely indicates the generic nature of childbirth rather than pointing to a specific birth of a child" ("Ascertaining Women's God-ordained Roles" 118).

¹⁰ Pierce, "Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990s" 351.

¹¹ Mark D. Roberts, "Woman Shall Be Saved: A Closer Look at 1 Timothy 2:15," *Reformed Journal* 33 (1983) 20.

¹² Robert Alexander Falconer, "1 Timothy 2:14,15: Interpretative Notes," *JBL* 60 (1941) 376–77; Royce Gordon Gruenler, "The Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15," *JETS* 41 (1998) 217, 223; Moo, "1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance" 71; and Grant R. Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church," *JETS* 20 (1977) 247.

¹³ Wall makes a similar point when he says, "[Paul] rather recalls the relevant moments of Eve's story in Genesis as typological of God's redemptive purpose for all women. In this sense, Eve's creation (2:13; cf. Genesis 2), her deception and sin (2:14; cf. Gen 3), and ultimately her restored relationship with God envisaged when bearing her first children (2:15a; cf. Gen 4:1–2) is prospective of every wom-

ed first; then Eve. His wife [Eve], being deceived, fell into transgression [with Adam and with God] but would be restored [to fellowship with Adam] through bearing children, provided they [i.e. Adam and Eve] remained in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness [and thus restored to fellowship with God].” Paul had not finished talking about Eve and Adam until 2:15 when he referred to their “restoration” back to each other (2:15a) and back to God (2:15b). To substantiate this reading, God’s conversation with Eve (Gen 3:16) needs a fresh look.

III. GENESIS 3:16—A FRESH LOOK

When Adam and Eve transgressed, the LORD God acted like a detective and searched for the root of the problem.¹⁴ Since blame ultimately rested on the serpent, the LORD first punished the serpent with a “curse” (Gen 3:14–15). Then the LORD said to the woman, “(a) I will greatly increase your labor and in great pain you will give birth to your children; (b) and to your husband you will long for and (c) he will rule you” (Gen 3:16).

A portion of the first part of the verse—“you will give birth to your children”—was God restating his earlier command to Adam and Eve: “Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth” (Gen 1:28). The other portion—“I will greatly increase your labor, and in great pain”—was an added element.¹⁵ Noteworthy is that the LORD did not use the “curse” terminology.¹⁶ But, as a consequence of Eve subjecting to the deception, the LORD would increase her childbirth pain, possibly physically and certainly emotionally.¹⁷ She would witness her sons toil the field in vain and ultimately die (she would even experience the pain of one son murdering the other, which was a consequence of death that she and Adam brought into the world; cf. Rom 5:12).¹⁸ Truly her childbearing and childrearing would be painful. Walton writes, “‘Pain in childbearing,’ is a hendiadys ... and thus conveys something like ‘conception anxiety’ This includes anxiety about whether she will be

an’s religious experience with God” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 83). Later he writes, “Significantly, a fallen Eve apprehends that her relationship with God remains intact when giving birth to her first child (*sullabousa eteken*, LXX Gen 4:1)” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 95). But Wall does not extend his study to include 1 Timothy 2:15b as also part of their [Adam and Eve’s] restoration plan.

¹⁴ For a narrative reading of Genesis chapters 2–3 see Collins, “What Happened to Adam and Eve?” 12–44.

¹⁵ Collins writes, “There is a play between the use of the root *r-b-b* in [Gen] 3:16 (‘I will surely *increase* your painfulness in childbearing’) and its use in the commission of 1:28 (‘be fruitful and *increase in number*’). Whereas procreation had previously been the sphere of blessing, now it is to be the arena of pain and danger” (“What Happened to Adam and Eve?” 26).

¹⁶ The serpent and the ground were cursed (3:14, 17) but Eve and Adam were not. For a discussion see John H. Walton, *Genesis* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001) 236–39. Also, Donald M. Joy, “Toward a Symbolic Revival: Creation Revisited,” *Religious Education* 80 (1985) 407. Others, however, assume that Eve was cursed. For example, Gruenler writes that Eve was “cursed with the pain of childbearing” (“Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15” 221).

¹⁷ Allen P. Ross, *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of the Book of Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988) 146.

¹⁸ The Messiah’s mother would also face a similar pain related to childrearing, just as Simeon prophesied, “a sword would pierce your heart” (Luke 2:35).

able to conceive a child, anxiety that comes with all physical discomfort of pregnancy, anxiety concerning the health of the child in the womb, and anxiety about whether she and the baby will survive the birth process A resulting paraphrase of verse 16a is ‘I will greatly increase the anguish you will experience in the birth process, from the anxiety surrounding conception to the strenuous work of giving birth.’”¹⁹ After the fall, the initial blessing proclamation, “Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth,” would have anxiety and pain associated with it—both in childbirth and in childrearing.²⁰ Pain in childbearing and pain in childrearing were Eve’s punishments, partly self-inflicted (she and Adam let “death” in; Rom 5:12) and partly God-inflicted (“I will greatly increase your labor, and in great pain,” Gen 3:16a). So Eve’s tendency would be not to give birth to children. But God had a restoration solution.

The second part of the verse—“And to your husband you will desire (*tshuk-tik*)”—is understood as either Eve would “want to control” her husband (New English Translation) in light of Gen 4:7,²¹ or, Eve would have “strong sexual desires” for her husband in light of Song 7:10.²² Those are the only three places where that word *tshukb* is used in the OT. Walton, based on lexical category and finding a common denominator between all three usages, concludes that the word (*tshukb*) refers to

... one’s basic or inherent instincts. Song of Songs refers to the male sexual drive, a basic instinct. Genesis 4:7 refers to the basic driving instinct of sin, which is to deprave. In 3:16, then, since the context has already addressed the issue of reproduction, that can easily be identified as a basic instinct of woman. If reproduction is going to be so fraught with anguish, why do it? The answer is found in the woman’s instinct, her desire to have children. The text sees that desire as ‘for [her] husband’ because such a desire cannot be fulfilled without his cooperation.²³

¹⁹ Walton, *Genesis* 227. Lucien Ouellette objects to seeing a hendiadys here and sees two separate pains: “pain in general, subsequent to the hard lot of woman in the East, and pain in child-birth” (“Woman’s Doom in Genesis 3:16,” *CBQ* 12 [1950] 391). Brant James Pitre sees “divinely initiated infertility and bereavement” are also examples of “reproductive tribulations” (“Blessing the Barren and Warning the Fecund: Jesus’ Message for Women Concerning Pregnancy and Childbirth,” *JNT* 81 [2001] 69–71). Tzvi Novick proposes a novel idea: “God is telling Eve that he will lengthen the gestational period, so that she will have to endure prolonged pregnancy (an onerous if not quite a painful condition) in addition to birth pangs” (“Pain and Production in Eden: Some Philological Reflections on Genesis iii 16,” *VT* 58 [2008] 241).

²⁰ Amy Kalmanofsky illustrates how the Bible portrays childbirth as a vulnerable time and concludes, “In ancient Israel, childbirth was a precarious endeavor—often resulting in the death of the mother, the child, or both” (“Israel’s Baby: the Horror of Childbirth in the Biblical Prophets,” *BibInt* 16 [2008] 66).

²¹ Susan T. Foh, “What is the Woman’s Desire,” *WTJ* 37 (1975) 376–83; Gruenler, “The Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15” 221; and Bruce K. Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001) 94.

²² Gordon J. Wenham refers to it as “sexual appetite” (*Genesis 1–15* [ed. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker; WBC 1; Waco, TX: Word, 1987] 81).

²³ Walton, *Genesis* 228. Walton further points out that just as man needed woman in chapter 2, woman needed the man in chapter 3 (*Genesis* 229), a principle that Paul referred to elsewhere (1 Cor

Although there would be increased anxiety in childbirth, Eve would still desire to have children and would long for her husband to fulfill that task. God may have placed that desire in Eve (in order to fulfill the command of Gen 1:28) since disobedience caused tensions between Adam and Eve, as expressed in Adam blaming Eve for the disobedience and Adam renaming Eve (from *ʿishab* “woman” to *hawab* “mother of living things”).²⁴ Instead of dissention and separation, Eve’s desire to procreate would drive her back to Adam; she would long for Adam. Interestingly, the Septuagint uses ἀποστροφή (“return”)—“You will return to your husband.”²⁵ Lohr suspects that the *Vorlage* might have had *tshwbb* (“return”) than *tshwkb* (“long for”) in light of the Septuagint’s usage and Church fathers’ frequent reference to Eve returning to Adam.²⁶ Basically, God instructed Eve saying, “I will increase your anxiety associated with childbirth, but yet²⁷ you will long for [*tshwkb*] and return to [*tshwbb*] your husband to fulfill the command to fill the earth.” Eve’s desire to have children would drive her back to her husband. As such, it was more of a blessing—uniting the primal parents after dissension—than a curse.²⁸ Eve’s deliverance from the strain caused by the fall was returning back to her husband, not turning away from him. Whereas the pain associated with childbirth and childrearing might drive Eve away from Adam, God implemented desires in her to procreate that would drive her back to Adam.

The third part of the verse—“and he will rule over you (*yimshal-bak*)”—is almost always understood as Adam would dominate Eve.²⁹ Ross writes, “This word

11:11). See also Cuthbert A. Simpson, “The Book of Genesis: Introduction and Exegesis,” in *The Interpreter’s Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible in Twelve Volumes: Volume 1* (ed. George Arthur Buttrick; New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1952) 510.

²⁴ Waltke and Fredricks, however, think that Adam’s renaming was “the beginning of hope. Adam shows his restoration to God by believing the promise that the faithful woman will bear offspring that will defeat Satan” (*Genesis* 95). Wenham disagrees (*Genesis 1–15* 1:84). Walton thinks that renaming was Adam’s way of usurping his authority wrongly (*Genesis* 239).

²⁵ The Aquila version has συνάπτω “to join together” and the Symmachus version has ὁμη, concerning which Lohr writes, “In my reading of the literature, the term ὁμη is never used of a sexual desire but rather signifies a ‘strong movement toward,’ often of the mind, though also in the sense of an attack” (“Sexual Desire?” 232).

²⁶ Lohr “Sexual Desire?” 244–45. He concludes by saying that man and woman were returning to their place of origin: “Just as the *ʾadam* is said ... to return (*tshwb*) to the *ʾadamā* from which he was taken, so too is the *ʾišā* ... said to return (*tshwkb*); or be driven to return) to the *ʾiš* from which she was taken” (Lohr, “Sexual Desire?” 246).

²⁷ Ouellette understands the *waw* as “waw adversivum.” Woman, knowing that she will suffer from child-bearing, shall nevertheless long for marital intercourse” (“Woman’s Doom in Genesis 3:16” 392).

²⁸ Gruenler, too, sees Eve’s reunion with her husband as the key to their survival (“Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15” 216).

²⁹ Foh writes, “These words mark the beginning of the battle of the sexes” (“What is the Woman’s Desire” 382). Phyllis A. Bird sees this verse as “the Bible’s first statement of hierarchy within the species” (“‘Bone of My Bone and Flesh of My Flesh,’” *TToday* 50 [1994] 527). Pierce refers to this as “the curse of male domination” (“Evangelicals and Gender Roles in the 1990s” 353). Robert I. Vasholz, instead, translates the phrase with a feminine noun, “she will rule you” and connects it back to the feminine noun “desire,” implying that the woman’s desire to have children would rule her (“He (?) will Rule Over You?: A Thought on Genesis 3:16,” *Presbyterian* 20 [1994] 52).

[*mshl*] cannot be weakened to mean leadership alone, as many expositors wish to do. It is a term that describes dominion, mastery, lordship. It can have a rather harsh application. The significant point about this verse is that it is part of the punishment oracle for sin. To attempt to make it teach the submission of the woman to her husband and the loving leadership of the husband to his wife completely misses the point.³⁰ Wenham sees only “harsh exploitive subjugation” and not mere “female subordination” as the result of this punishment.³¹ Walton sees Adam’s dominion as “a by-product of biological inevitability, not a cultural, social, or psychological stereotype.”³² In other words, Eve’s desire to have children would be so overwhelming that it would drive her to Adam and to subject herself to Adam’s domination and rule.

But *mshl* also has the positive connotation of “governorship.”³³ In the creation account it says, “Then God placed lights on the skies upon the earth in order to *govern* (*mshl*) the day and the night, and to separate light from darkness. And God saw that it was good” (Gen 1:17–18). When Abraham was old, he called “the senior most in his house, one who *governed* (*mshl*) all Abraham’s possessions” and commissioned him to find his son a wife (Gen 24:2). Joseph acknowledged that it was not his brothers but God who appointed him to *govern* (*mshl*) Pharaoh’s house and the entire land of Egypt (Gen 45:8, 26). Such benevolent governorship is often attributed to God as he ruled his people. David writes, “Let the oppressed eat and be filled! . . . For the LORD is king and rules [*mshl*] over the nations” (Ps 22:26–28; cf. Ps 105:20; Jer 33:26).

In all these examples, the governorship was not dictatorial as much as dedicational, that is, providing for the need. The light in the sky during daytime, sun, provides all that the plants and animals need—heat and energy—for sustaining life. Its dedication is to provide heat and energy. Moon, the light in the sky during nighttime, provides coolness and sufficient light for sleep and yet protection from total darkness (in addition, it helps with tides, seasons, etc.). Eleazer, the *mshl* in Abraham’s family was entrusted with the most significant of tasks—finding a suitable wife for Isaac, the heir. His work was dedicational; he was to preserve his master’s family by finding the suitable wife. Joseph, by his careful and wise government, protected Pharaoh’s family and the nation of Egypt from the dangers of starvation

³⁰ Ross, *Creation and Blessing* 146.

³¹ Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* 1:81. Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen argues that humanity was installed with the right to rule, but the fall intensified it: “as a result of the fall there will be a propensity in man to let dominion run wild—to impose it in cavalier and illegitimate ways not only upon the earth and upon other men . . . but also upon the person who is ‘bone of [his] bones and flesh of [his] flesh—the helper corresponding to [his very] self’” (“The Christian Mind and the Challenge of Gender Relations,” *Reformed Journal* 37 [1987] 20).

³² Walton, *Genesis* 251.

³³ William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Based upon the Lexical Work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971) 219. Collins writes, “The verb ‘rule’ (Hebrew *māšal*) does not carry the negative connotation ‘dominate’ (cf. 1:16; 2 Sm 23:3); if that is present, it comes from the nature of the things talked about” (“What Happened to Adam and Eve?” 36).

and extinction. The LORD protected the poor by providing food and safety—a task of a dedicational ruler (*msbh*).

Could it be, then, as Eve longed for her husband to have children, Adam would provide—as a governor/manager—for her to have children and restore the broken relationship? As the narrative progressed, Adam did just that: “Adam knew his woman, she conceived, and gave birth to a son” (Gen 4:1).³⁴ She named him Cain saying, “I have a son from the LORD”—a phrase that possibly has double meaning, “I have a son from LORD’s help of restoring me to my *lord* (one who *rules* me, κυριεύω, and provides the seed), husband, Adam.”³⁵ The Hebrew sentence offers such a possibility: “I have produced a man as well as Jahveh.”³⁶ Such lordship—providing Eve the seed needed for her to bear children—affirms Adam’s dedication to Eve and provision for the need. Could it be, then, Gen 3:16b is a *restoration* narrative (followed by Gen 4:1, the fulfillment of restoration)?³⁷

A similar concept is found in Sarah bringing forth a son with the help of the LORD and Abraham. Sarah’s barrenness led to extreme anxiety associated with childbirth—humility because of her barrenness, offering of her slave girl to her husband, the slave girl’s mockery of Sarah’s inability to conceive, and a constant reminder of her barrenness as the slave girl’s son was growing each day and ready to take the inheritance that rightfully belonged to Sarah’s son. But the LORD promised her that she would have a son (Genesis 18). Then the Scripture says, “The LORD visited Sarah just as He promised, she conceived, and she bore a son for Abraham in his old age at the time God promised him” (Gen 21:1–2). The first part—“LORD visited Sarah”—was a reminder that this was a promise fulfilled; the second part—“she bore a son for Abraham in his old age”—was a reflection that Sarah needed Abraham for the promise to fulfill and Abraham *governed* the situation (this would also explain why Sarah called Abraham her κύριος—he, as a *governor* of her relationship, provided her a son; 1 Pet 3:6).

³⁴ Wall, too, makes this connection: “Not only does the grammar of [1 Tim] 2:15a suggest that Eve’s story continues there from 2:14b, more significantly the reference to ‘childbearing’ echoes the conclusion to the biblical narrative of Eve in LXX Gen 4:1, where the name ‘Eve’ is mentioned a second and final time (cf. Gen 3:20), when at the birth of her first child she exclaims her partnership with God” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 94).

³⁵ Wall observes, “The interpreter of Eve’s story might wonder what lingering effect her deception and transgression have on her relationship with her Creator, whether God’s relationship with her can ever be restored. And so, when the ‘fallen’ Eve exclaims with her last words in the biblical narrative, ‘*Ἐκέτισαν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*’ (LXX Gen 4:1b), not only does she recognize God’s presence with her in childbearing, but the reader is made to realize that God has not abandoned her and that she is someone with whom God can do business” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 97).

³⁶ Paul Haupt, “Hebrew Mašāl,” *JBL* 36 (1917) 142. Also, Rieckle Borger, “Genesis 4:1,” *VT* 9 (1959) 85–86. For other interpretations of this sentence and discussions on (a) whether the verb *knb* means “acquire” or “create”; (b) the translation of two words, *at-yhwh* “from the Lord,” or object statement, “the Lord”; and (c) whether “with the help of” or “from” see Walton, *Genesis* 260.

³⁷ Gruenler also sees these three verses as “creation/fall/promise” themes, but associates the promise with Genesis 3:15, the birth of the Messiah (“Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15” 215).

Similarly, Hannah's story acknowledged both Elkanah's *lordship* of providing a seed and the LORD's *lordship* of keeping a promise. The Scripture says, "Elkanah knew his wife Hannah, and the LORD remembered her" (1 Sam 1:19).

Church father Chrysostom understood ἀποστροφή (Eve returning to Adam) as Eve returning to her "place of refuge" (καταφυγή), "harbor" (λιμὴν), and "protection" (ἀσφάλεια), and explained that Eve would return to Adam for refuge from her difficulties and that the man would protect her and care for her. He saw such reciprocal love of the husband based in Ephesians 5:33.³⁸

In Ephesians 5, Paul saw the role of the husband Χριστός ("Christ") as loving the church and giving himself (παραδίδομι) for her rather than lording over her (Eph 5:25). And Paul expected Christian husbands to imitate such devotional love toward their wives (5:33).

In the story of Cain also, the reality was that Cain yielded to sin's longing over him rather than controlling it. When he saw that his brother's sacrifice was accepted and his was not accepted, his countenance fell (Gen 4:1–6). The LORD cautioned him: "Sin is crouching at the door. It is longing for you" (4:7a).³⁹ The next phrase could be either "You must rule it" or "You will rule it" (4:7b). In the Masoretic Text, it is a simple qal imperfect (*timsbal*) that could be modal or simple future.⁴⁰ But the Septuagint translated it as a simple future indicative (ἔρχεῖς "you will rule"). The implication is that the LORD was telling Cain the end result of his attitude, since his countenance had already fallen. As predicted, Cain *provided for the desires of sin* and killed his brother Abel (4:8).⁴¹

If *lordship*, then, meant "governorship that provides," God's speech with Eve could be reread as follows: "(a) I will greatly increase your anxiety in association with childbirth/rearing [the punishment declaration] but (b) your natural desire would be to return to your husband so as to have children with him, and he will provide you children [the restoration declaration]." As the narration unfolds, Eve and Adam did just that: "And Adam knew his wife, she conceived, and bore him a son" (Gen 4:1). They were restored to each other, just as God had instructed them

³⁸ Cited in Lohr, "Sexual Desire?" 239. Chrysostom saw that God dealt with Eve graciously. For example, concerning Genesis 3:16, he writes, "See the Lord's goodness, how much mildness he employs despite such a terrible fall" [*Homily* 17 no. 30]. Concerning labor pain, he writes, "the loving God offered comfort with the pain, so that the satisfaction of bearing the child equally matched those pangs that tortured the womb all those months" [no. 32]. Concerning husband's rule, he writes, "Do you see the exceeding care? Do you see punishment accompanied by admonition? 'In pain you will bear children;' then 'Your yearning will be for your husband, and he will be your master' ... 'I want you to have yearning for him and, like a body being directed by its head, to recognize his lordship pleasurably'" [no. 35–36] (St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Genesis* [<http://www.docstoc.com/docs/19376312/Homilies-on-Genesis---Saint-John-Chrysostom>]).

³⁹ Walton explains that "sin" here could be understood in terms of a well-known Mesopotamian demon or Akkadian judicial administrator. If the former is preferred, "'Sin' is then being portrayed as a doorway demon waiting for its victim to cross the threshold" (*Genesis* 264). Also Ross, *Creation and Blessing* 158.

⁴⁰ Cf. Allen P. Ross, *Introducing Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001) 132.

⁴¹ The connection between Gen 3:16 and 4:7 is uncanny and yet none of the translations in 3:16 say, "Your desire is for your husband and he must rule over you" (as if it was an imperative), although they translate 4:7 as, "you must rule over it" (e.g. HCSB and NIV).

(finally, an act of obedience). Instead of seeing, then, Genesis 3:16 as a “curse,” it is best to see it as a “punishment plus restoration commission.”⁴² Paul’s retelling of Genesis seems to affirm this: “Adam was created first, then Eve. Adam was not deceived; his wife—being deceived—fell into transgression [with her husband and God]. But she would be restored [to her husband] through childbirth [Gen 3:16]; provided they [Adam and Eve] remained in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness [i.e. obedience to God; Gen 4:1 confirms that they did remain in obedience]” (1 Tim 2:13–15).

The serpent’s deception brought division between Eve and Adam. But God’s restoration pronouncement/prediction (a “blessing” in the midst of curses against the serpent and the land) brought Eve and Adam together again, so that they might have Cain and fulfill the command of “be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth.” Eve’s longing for her husband and Adam’s provision for his wife would reunite them. In 1 Tim 2:13–15, in the same way, only wives’ leaning on their own husbands and learning the orthodox teachings of the apostles from their husbands could protect them from false teachers’ deceptive heterodoxy (1 Tim 1:3). That was why Paul cited Genesis’s account of creation-fall-restoration as an illustration. Wall writes, “The tragic experience of a fallen Eve—‘the woman’ of [1 Tim] 2:14—is most assuredly no longer applicable to the Christian woman addressed by 2:9–12.”⁴³ That is true; Paul was not citing the fall (1 Tim 2:14) as his primary illustration; he was citing the *restoration* promise and fulfillment of Eve (1 Tim 2:15a, “she would be delivered through childbirth”) and Adam and Eve (2:15b, “they would be delivered by remaining in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness”) primarily as examples for his readership.

IV. PRAYER, FAMILY ONENESS, AND AN ILLUSTRATION

Paul began his letter with a reminder that he had left Timothy in Ephesus with the instruction of commanding certain people not to teach false teachings, heterodoxy (1 Tim 1:3, παρεκάλεσα “I exhorted”). Chapter 1 retold his former instructions. Now Paul continued his instruction to Timothy (1 Tim 2:1 παρακαλῶ “I am exhorting”) as to how Christian men and women ought to pray (chap. 2) and live godly lives (chaps. 3–6). In chapter 2 Paul explained that Christians must pray for all leaders since God wished people of all ranks to be saved (1 Tim 2:1–7). Such prayer must accompany good behavior: men praying with proper hand gestures and

⁴² In an unrelated context, Collins too calls it, “divine words of judgment-and-grace” (“What Happened to Adam and Eve?” 31).

⁴³ Wall, “1 Timothy 2:9–15” 93.

without quarreling (1 Tim 2:8),⁴⁴ and women praying with all modesty and internal holiness (2:9–10).⁴⁵

Paul, then, addressed a woman/wife's speech (1 Tim 2:11–12), possibly because proper speech reflected internal beauty and proper γυνή-ἄνδρος behavior fostered prayer (cf. 1 Pet 3:7).⁴⁶ This passage is fraught with problems and various proposals.⁴⁷ The basic tenor of the passage is (a) γυνή must learn (μανθανέτω) in silence (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ)—a phrase repeated twice—and in obedience (ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ), and (b) Paul would not permit that same γυνή to teach (διδάσκειν)⁴⁸ or to master man (αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρος).⁴⁹ Paul was addressing either a particular lady⁵⁰ or a gnomic married couple (meaning, “a wife and her husband”), both of which could be expressed by the singular γυνή and ἄνδρος.⁵¹ He wanted γυνή to *learn*. Perhaps Paul was thinking of younger wives⁵² whom false teachers were already snatching by

⁴⁴ Padgett (“Wealthy Women at Ephesus” 22) and Wall (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 84) also connect 1 Tim 2:8 with 2:1, the theme of prayer. For arguments that Paul was instructing how men ought to pray “in the Christian assemblies” see Everett Ferguson, “Τόπος in 1 Timothy 2:8,” *ResQ* 33 (1991) 65–73. For arguments “raising holy hands” was a figure of speech for “a cleaned conscience” see Bowman, “Women in Ministry” 196.

⁴⁵ Paul's instruction to women simply said, “women likewise” (ὡσαύτως [καί] γυναῖκαί). Translations substitute “dress” (NIV) or “adorn” (KJV). But neither verb is present. Recent discussions have suggested either the verb (βούλομαι “I wish”) alone can be used (as in New English Translation and Moo, “1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance” 63) or the verb-verbal pair (βούλομαι προσεύχασθαι “I wish to pray”) be used. The latter is to be preferred: “*I wish women likewise to pray*” because of immediate context (1 Tim 2:8) and the emphasis on prayer in the extended context (2:1–7). For discussions see Kenneth L. Cukrowski, “An Exegetical Note on the Ellipsis in 1 Timothy 2:9,” in *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (ed. J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker; *Texts & Studies*. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006) 232–38; Gordon P. Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2:8–15,” *JETS* 35 (1992) 343; and Korinna Zamfir and Jozef Verheyden, “Text-critical and Intertextual Remarks on 1 Tim 2:8–10,” *NovT* 50 (2008) 376–89.

⁴⁶ For arguments that Paul was addressing women in general see Bowman (“Women in Ministry” 197) and Moo (“1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance” 64); for arguments that Paul was addressing husbands and wives see Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office” 350–60.

⁴⁷ For six different approaches to this passage see Hughes, “Living Out God's Order in the Church” 103–6. Also, Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office” 341–60.

⁴⁸ For a discussion on the nature of “teaching” see Robert L. Saucy, “Women's Prohibition to Teach Men: An Investigation into Its Meaning and Contemporary Application,” *JETS* 37 (1994) 79–97.

⁴⁹ For a thorough study on the meaning of αὐθεντέω see George W. Knight III, “AUTHENTEIO in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12,” *NTS* 30 (1984) 143–57; Carroll D. Osburn, “ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ (1 Timothy 2:12),” *ResQ* 25 (1982) 1–12; Armin J. Panning, “AUTHENTEIN—A Word Study,” *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78 (1981) 185–91; and Andrew C. Perriman, “What Eve Did, What Women Shouldn't Do: The Meaning of ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in 1 Timothy 2:12,” *TynBul* 44 (1993) 129–42. For an evaluation of Kroegers' definition of this word as, “to proclaim herself author of” see Steven M. Baugh, “The Apostle Among the Amazons,” *WTJ* 56 (1994) 153–71. For arguments that αὐθεντεῖν does not mean murder see David K. Huttar, “ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΙΝ in the Aeschylus Scholium,” *JETS* 44 (2001) 615–25.

⁵⁰ Spencer, “Eve at Ephesus” 219.

⁵¹ For arguments that Paul meant “women” and “men” in general see Dorothy Patterson, “Why I believe Southern Baptist churches should not ordain women,” *Baptist History and Heritage* 23 (1988) 59–60.

⁵² γυναικάρια is just the diminutive form of γυνή (Thayer's, BAGD); as such “younger women” (either in age or Christian faith) would be a better translation compared to “weak-willed women” (NIV).

their deceptive teachings (2 Tim 3:6a),⁵³ or “new” Roman wives,⁵⁴ or women teaching gnostic teachings,⁵⁵ or uneducated wives speaking improperly or teaching heresies.⁵⁶ Regardless, Paul wanted the *γυνή* to be informed, that is, educated in the orthodox teachings of the apostles. If a *γυνή* were educated, she would not be deceived; the antidote to deception was in learning.⁵⁷ A commitment to praying for all people (1 Tim 2:1–7), modesty in prayer (1 Tim 2:8–10), and family oneness in orthodox learning would keep the husbands and wives of Paul’s audience away from the deceptive teachings of the false teachers. So Paul cited the story of Adam and Eve as an illustration—although Eve was deceived, her reunion with Adam (her longing for him) and Adam’s faithful provision (governing the situation as God intended) would restore them back to each other and to God.⁵⁸

Paul retold the story of creation, fall, and *restoration* in a succinct form.⁵⁹ As such he swiftly shifted from Eve (“she will be saved/restored through childbearing”⁶⁰) to Adam and Eve (“if they remain in faith/faithfulness, love, holiness with clear-mindedness”). Collins sees a similar movement in Genesis of Adam’s leadership soon after the fall. He writes, “The man is presented to us as the leader in this account from this point on: in [Gen] verse 8, though ‘they’ heard the sound of the Lord God walking, the man himself is the subject of ‘hid’; we might render the Hebrew: and they heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden in the

⁵³ Gruenler, “Mission-lifestyle Setting of 1 Tim 2:8–15” 234. For the nature of false teachers see Adams, “Exposition of 1 and 2 Timothy” 370–73; Barron, “Putting Women in ‘Their Place’” 453–54; Gordon D. Fee, “Reflections on Church Order in the Pastoral Epistles, with Further Reflections on the Hermeneutics of ad hoc Documents,” *JETS* 28 (1985) 144; Heidebrecht, “Reading 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in Its Literary Context” 173–74; and Padgett, “Wealthy Women at Ephesus” 21.

⁵⁴ Bruce W. Winter, “The ‘New’ Roman Wife and 1 Timothy 2:9–15: The Search for a *Sitz im Leben*,” *TynBul* 51 (2000) 285–94.

⁵⁵ Roberts, “Woman Shall Be Saved” 18–22.

⁵⁶ An analysis of various theories see Bowman, “Women in Ministry” 194.

⁵⁷ Perriman makes a vital observation: “Paul is interested not in the subjective aspect of the deception (he is not imputing gullibility to women) but in the objective activity of the serpent in deceiving Eve. This is evident from the statement that ‘Adam was not deceived’—not because he was able to see through the deception but because the serpent did not attempt to deceive him. The point is that transgression came about *through deception*, through the activity of the serpent in persuading Eve to believe something that was not true” (“What Eve Did, What Women Shouldn’t Do” 139).

⁵⁸ Perriman makes a similar argument but more negatively: “So Paul appeals to the creation story for a specific reason: he fears that through the fallacious arguments of heretical teachers women, because of their ignorance (remember that Eve knew of the commandment not to eat of the tree of knowledge only second hand), will again be deceived and fall into transgression and in turn lead the men astray” (“What Eve Did, What Women Shouldn’t Do” 139).

⁵⁹ Wall calls it a Midrash reading of Genesis (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 81–103). Padgett sees it as a typology (“Wealthy Women at Ephesus” 26).

⁶⁰ Perriman also connects *τεκνογονία* with Eve: “ἡ τεκνογονία is at one level an allusion to, and has been determined by, the judgment of Genesis 3:17 LXX (ἐν λύπαις τέξῃ τέκνα), but as a figure for the contemporary situation it stands as a synecdoche for a whole set of domestic activities” (“What Eve Did, What Women Shouldn’t Do” 140). Similarly, Wall views 1 Tim 2:15a as a reference to Eve and her restoration: “Even though the narrator mentions her sexual relations with Adam, her commentary on ‘childbearing’ is that *she* (not ‘they’) had created a man ‘with God’ (not ‘with [the help of] Adam’)” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 98).

cool of the day, and the man hid himself, along with his wife.”⁶¹ Paul switched quickly from Eve’s restoration with Adam to both Adam-and-Eve’s restoration with each other and with God (ἐὰν μείνωσιν “if they remained”). If both Adam and Eve remained in their faith/faithfulness to God and to each other, love for God and for each other, and holiness with clear-mindedness (the opposite of deception), then they would be restored to fellowship with each other (would have a son, Gen 4:1) and fellowship with God. In other words, Paul was saying, “Adam was created first, then Eve [the creation account]. Adam was not deceived; Eve—being deceived—fell into transgression [the fall account] but she [Eve] would be delivered through childbirth [the restoration proclamation, Gen 3:16a], provided they [Adam and Eve] remained together in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness [the restoration proclamation, Gen 3:16b; the restoration fulfilled, Gen 4:1]” (1 Tim 2:13–15).

The verse division between verses 14 and 15 of 1 Timothy 2, not original with Paul, is unfortunate and misleading.⁶² Paul was still talking about Adam and Eve: Eve was the subject of σωθήσεται (“will be saved”; 2:15a);⁶³ Adam and Eve together (of 1 Tim 2:13–14) were the subjects of μείνωσιν (“they remain”; 2:15b). Whereas Eve fell into transgression, her salvation/deliverance would be in her reunion with her husband, that is, in her longing to bring forth children with his help. As the “restoration blessing” predicted, Adam would oblige, know her, and she would conceive. Their (Adam and Eve’s) restoration with each other and with God would occur “if they would remain in faith/faithfulness, love, and holiness with clear-mindedness.” The danger of their separation from both each other and God was so real that Paul phrased them with conditional clause (ἐὰν μείνωσιν). That is, *if* they would adhere to God’s restoration plan for them, get back together, and procreate as God intended for them, then they would survive both marital dissension and ultimate separation from God. And they obeyed, just as Gen 4:1 narrated. Even for Paul’s audience (and Timothy’s church members), husband and wife unity—in prayer, in learning orthodox teachings, and in growing together in faith/faithfulness,

⁶¹ Collins, “What Happened to Adam and Eve?” 30.

⁶² Such unfortunate verse division draws the conclusion verse 15 is an “awkward grammar” (Bowman, “Women in Ministry” 193). Wall, instead, explains that “the retelling of her biblical story does not conclude with 2:14’s negative echo but climaxes with 2:15a and Eve’s salvation” (“1 Timothy 2:9–15” 94).

⁶³ The future tense σωθήσεται is often seen as referring to future from the time of Paul’s writing and thus future salvation (e.g. Bowman, “Women in Ministry” 193, 209). Porter argues, “Eve as the subject of the future verb in v. 15 does not carry great conviction. The attitudinal force of the future form of the verb in v. 15 is one of expectation, that is, it grammaticalizes or conveys not a temporal conception (past, present or future) but a marked and emphatic expectation toward a course of events. Since Eve’s fortunes have already been determined, they are beyond any further expectation, so this solution is unlikely” (“What does it mean to be ‘Saved by Childbirth’” 92). But if Paul were retelling the fall by the phrase “she fell into transgression” (1 Tim 2:14; Gen 3:1–7) and the restoration by the phrase “she will be delivered through childbirth” (1 Tim 2:15a; Gen 3:16), then σωθήσεται “expects” childbirth that would be fulfilled in Gen 4:1. That is, Eve’s childbearing would be future to her transgression.

love, and holiness with clear-mindedness—was the only true antidote to false teaching.⁶⁴

This exhortation of husband-wife oneness (especially marrying, giving birth to children, and raising godly children) was probably necessary because the false teachers were prohibiting marriages (1 Tim 4:3; cf. 3:12), making light of raising children (cf. 1 Tim 3:4, 12; 5:10), and taking advantage of younger-women/widows in their homes (2 Tim 3:6; cf. 1 Tim 5:14). They were contradicting the restoration proclamation. Instead, they were promoting the fall pattern where the serpent deceived Eve with heterodoxy, Eve followed and instructed Adam, and he listened (Gen 3:1–17). Paul’s proposal was that believers follow the “restoration” pattern of Genesis, that is, younger women/widows marry, have children, and be *lords* of their house (οἶκος “house” + δεσπότης, “ruler”) so that the adversary would have no opportunity (1 Tim 5:14). They learn with their husbands the orthodox teachings of the apostles and watch their godliness (1 Tim 2:13–15). Husbands pray with sincerity and godliness, teaching their families the Word of God. Wives and husbands lean on each other just as Eve and Adam did, just as the restoration proclamation instructed. When Eve and her daughters (the δεσπότης) unite with Adam and his sons (the κυρίος), then creatures—serpent, Satan, and his workers (false teachers)—and their deceptions do not stand a chance.

V. CONCLUSION

In 1 Timothy 2, Paul instructed Timothy how he would like Christians to be prayer warriors. Paul wanted them to pray for people of all ranks (1 Tim 2:1–7). He wanted them to pray properly, that is, without quarreling and self-glorification (2:8–10). Above all, he wanted them to pray without breaking family unity (2:11–15; cf. 1 Pet 3:7). Whereas false teachers were sneaking in and capturing families with their deceptive teachings and creating enmity between husbands and wives, Paul wanted families to be united in prayer and learn God’s word together. After the fall, God’s restoration plan was family oneness—Eve longing for Adam, Adam fulfilling that longing, and together they produce offspring. Their oneness would restore them not only to each other but also to God. In the same way, the oneness of husbands and wives in prayer and learning would protect Paul’s audience from the deceptions of false teachers. Therefore, Paul cited Adam and Eve’s creation, fall, and *restoration* as illustrations.

⁶⁴ Interestingly, this passage begins (2:9) and ends (2:15) with an exhortation to have clear-mindedness (σοφροσύνη) (Winter, “‘New’ Roman Wife” 293). False teachers would hate such clear-mindedness that would question and object their deception.