

1 Timothy 2:8-15 (*but starting our reading back at chapter 2, verse 1*)

¹ First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all people, ² for kings and all who are in high positions, **that we may lead a peaceful and quiet life, godly and dignified in every way.** ³ This is good, and it is pleasing in the sight of God our Savior, ⁴ who desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. ⁵ For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, ⁶ who gave himself as a ransom for all, which is the testimony given at the proper time. ⁷ For this I was appointed a preacher and an apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth.

⁸ I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling; ⁹ **likewise** also that women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly attire, ¹⁰ but with what is proper for women who profess godliness – with good works. ¹¹ Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. ¹² I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. ¹³ For Adam was formed first, then Eve; ¹⁴ and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. ¹⁵ Yet she will be saved through childbearing--if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control. (ESV) TITWOTL

It's been said that there has been more material written about these verses than all of the *rest* of 1st, and 2nd Timothy as well as Titus...*combined*.

Now trust me. If preaching here at Hope was simply up to me, I wouldn't preach on this. I actually fantasized this week about what would happen if we just jumped over this passage and I picked up at chapter 3. Would anyone notice? Because here is the thing: I want everyone, all of you, to like me.

But my problem is this, and you heard it just last month when we ordained Matt Harmon: My vows were the same as his, and at that ordination I promised to preach the full counsel of God. Which means I have to take to heart, and then also teach, the Bible's wisdom on *everything*.

Now, the only way I feel like I have a hope of having you all still like me, and still preach the full counsel of God, *is by simply preaching through books of the bible, chapter by chapter*. In Titus 1:5 Paul says that a qualified elder must "hold firm to the trustworthy word, *as taught*, so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to rebuke those who contradict it." I must hold fast to the trustworthy word as taught – which certainly includes Paul's own words in 1st Timothy about the right ordering of the church.

So here we are. I am constrained by all of this, and so today is the day.

But remember this, too: The reason certain passages ARE so controversial is that they are *important*. If they weren't important – if they didn't really impact us at the level of who we are – they wouldn't be controversial! There are all sorts of skirmishes in the church, both small and large, worldwide on this subject of the role of women in the offices of the church. People, I know, decide whether or not to join a church based simply on this one issue. Entire denominations have fractured over this issue. And I know there are quite a few of you who get looks when you tell people where you worship, because this is the issue in the back of their minds – "How could you worship in a church that does not ordain women?" This IS important!

J. Gresham Machen, the NT scholar, once said that "in the sphere of religion, as in other spheres, the things about which (people) are agreed are apt to be the things that are *least* worth holding; the really important things are the things about which (people) will fight." Let's put it this way: If you never looked at or wrestled with controversial passages in the bible, I have to wonder if you're looking at controversial and difficult issues in your *own* heart and life.

So let's look at this subject together **guided by two truths** that I think we *all* hold in common: **First, it's here.** It's in God's word. And **second** that we believe that God's word is authoritative. God's word is our only infallible guide for faith and practice. Christ alone, through his word, is able to regulate his church, so that if the bible teaches this, we must concur, no matter how much it rubs us the wrong way and no matter how much it pushes against the views of the culture.

And the culture is huge here in its interpretive influence! We **DO** have to do some interpretation of the bible, right? Not all passages are equally clear! But on *what* will our interpretation be based? Will it *be* the culture?

Robert W. Yarbrough, chair of the New Testament Department at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and whose expertise is New Testament background and culture, recently surveyed all the scholarly articles on 1st Timothy 2:11-15 in the standard biographical reference tool, *New Testament Abstracts*, and determined that it was only in 1969 that this new, progressive, revisionist view began to appear in the literature of the academy.¹ But since then, there has been a flood of articles that almost entirely hold to these newer readings. Yarbrough's conclusion? This new interpretive movement that starts in the 60's is "indebted significantly, and at times probably culpably, to the prevailing cultural climate rather than to the biblical text." In other words, when opinions and convictions suddenly undergo dramatic changes – and even though nothing new has been discovered about Greco-Roman culture with regard to wider practices of gender around Ephesus, and the only thing that **HAS** changed is the spirit of **OUR** age – it's really difficult to avoid the conclusion that that spirit of the age has a really important role to play in this shift, rather than the Spirit of God.

Friends if we don't invite the Biblical text to define the church and its culture, the culture will. Just this week I was in Hopewell and came upon a bumper sticker with that ancient symbol of Christianity – the fish, the Ichthus² with the intersecting arcs that reminds of Jesus feeding with fish, bringing in the great catch of fish, and now our being fishers of men. But filling the space between the arcs was the very modern symbol of the GLBT community – the rainbow colors. You

¹ In R. Kent Hughes, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus: To Guard the Deposit (Preaching the Word), Crossway, 2000.

² **Ichthys** or **Ikhtus** (Greek: ἰχθύς, capitalized ΙΧΘΥΣ or ΙΧΘΥC) is the ancient and classical Greek word for "fish." In English it refers to a symbol consisting of two intersecting arcs, the ends of the right side extending beyond the meeting point so as to resemble the profile of a fish, and used by early Christians as a secret symbol and now known colloquially as the "**sign of the fish**" or the "**Jesus fish**." Ichthus (ΙΧΘΥΣ, Greek for fish) can be read as an acrostic: It compiles to "Jesus Christ, God's son, savior," in ancient Greek

"Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ", Iēsous Khristos Theou Huios, Sōtēr.

see, *that's* the spirit of the age swamping the Spirit of God's word! We must not let that happen because it turns everything upside down.

Paul says in Ephesians that at one time we were darkness, but now (we) are *light in the Lord*." Friends we are to be children of light and therefore *we* are to be the light to the culture. The culture is not to be the light by which we are led!

Now, before we get some answers from the passage, I want to lay out the academic and secular interpretations, out there at the moment, that *are* culturally influenced. What kind of influences are there in the academy and how do they play out? Well there is one overarching and primary view, and that is egalitarianism. And this view is very simple. Egalitarianism means that we see one another without any distinction or difference. Egalitarianism is simply the pursuit of what they believe to be pure, unadulterated equality.

Now, we all love equality. The bible loves equality! The church loves equality! The church has long confessed that God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are equal. They are one God. For instance, The Westminster Confession written back in 1646, says that "The Son of God (is) the second person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, **and equal** with the Father." And the bible also says that all people, before God, men and women, white and black, Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, all have equal worth and equal value.

But let me ask you this: do all interpretations of any given subject really have equal value? Grace studies the piano. Before God we are equal. She is doing doctoral work in performance and pedagogy. Are *my* musical opinions and theories equal to *hers*? I don't think so! We'll come back to this idea of radical equality. But here are some of the interpretations of this passage in 1st Timothy.

- 1) Paul is fallible. So when Paul forbids women from ordained office, this absolute and perpetual prohibition is made like any proclamation you and I make – we make claims as fallible people. And since Paul is fallible, his words here can be disregarded. This is a way of making Paul equal to you. You are as authoritative as he is, if he is fallible even when his words are enscripturated. Of course one problem with this – among a few – is why you can't just ignore *all* of Paul's writings, including those that explain the gospel itself.
- 2) Paul IS an inspired apostle, but his exclusion is temporary because it's only made necessary or is made solely by circumstances unique to the time of the original reader. So this means that the exclusion of the office is temporary, and is only binding to some unspecified time period in the early church... but now, or at least since 1969... it can be dropped. Now some things in scripture ARE temporary. I don't know of any church stoning these days. So the idea here is this is just like that. It made sense in that culture, but not in this one. There is one particular problem with this and we'll get to it in a minute, but every time Paul talks about gender in terms of roles, he roots it in God's creation of male and female, *before the fall into sin*.
- 3) Paul is inspired, but he doesn't intend here to exclude women from the ordained pastoral office. The idea is that the ordained pastoral office isn't in view here at all. Except, of course, that it *is* in the verses right after these!

Now what are the secular interpretations and those that come from outside the walls of the universities? They usually start this way: "That's your interpretation of this passage. Not mine."

Now this interpretation has all sorts of assumptions behind it. First it presupposes that all interpretations are equally valid, equally defensible, equally clear and equally rational. It also presupposes that there is no way that we can be unified because there is no way that we can agree on just one interpretation of the text. This can also be a way of saying, "I don't like what God is saying here, and I certainly don't like what *you* are saying God says." I have been told on a variety of biblical issues, "That's your interpretation of the text," but rarely is this ever followed by a well reasoned critique of the position I'm holding. As a fellow Presbyterian pastor says, this "that's your interpretation not mine" position on gender usually leads in one of two culturally influenced directions. He calls one interpretation the Thelma and Louise approach, and the other the Archie Bunker interpretation.³

You remember the film, *Thelma and Louise*. Thelma and Louise were sick and tired of being abused by men – drunk, authoritarian and self-centered men. And so Thelma and Louise get together and come to the conclusion that since *some* submission is bad, *all* submission is bad. We're not going to submit, they said, to men, and we're not going to submit to the law or morality, or anything. And you may even remember at the end of the film – after they spend a lot of time taking revenge – it concludes with these two women not even wanting to submit to gravity. If *some* submission is bad, *all* submission is bad. It's a logical fallacy, that if you hold to it, will lead to all sorts of problems. I know guys that have been treated poorly by women, who say they will never marry because "all women are like that."

The other pop interpretation is the "Archie Bunker" view – you all have some sense of Archie and *All in the Family*. With Archie, his view is that if *some* submission is *good*, then *all* submission is good. Archie is one of those self-centered guys! Edith was to submit, and so was his daughter Gloria, and Meathead, and blacks, and Hispanics, and it went on and on. If *some* submission works and is good, well then *all* submission is good.

Now both of these views are a disaster, but I think if we generally have sympathy with one, it's the Thelma and Louise view. Christians are used to being abused or oppressed or at least disregarded. But also, as a counselor, I have counseled women who have been abused and counseled people who were abused as children. I have felt the rage! I have wanted to grab the baseball bat and take revenge against those abusers myself.

But here is the thing. Role distinctions in scripture never imply value distinctions. Never! The Holy Trinity itself is indicative of this distinction in function, but no difference in value. In the relationship between the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, there is a functional subordination of the Son to the Father. The Son submits to the Father but they share an identity of being. They are both equally God. We hear Jesus say, "I have come from heaven not to do my will, but the will of the Father."⁴ Or "let not my will be done but yours."⁵ Or how about this: "When all things are subjected to him (that is, God), *then the Son himself will also* be subjected to him who put all things in subjection under him, that God may be all in all."⁶ There is a definite distinction in function and role, but no distinction at all in value among the persons of the trinity. And this

³ Pastor Tom Allen, First Evangelical Presbyterian Church Renton, WA.

⁴ John 6:38

⁵ Luke 22:42

⁶ 1 Corinthians 15:28

design, this configuration, is what is right and true, the bible says, in those institutions of God's design, the church and the home.

Why? I am going to give you one word. Holiness. You see, there is a way to read this – I think like most of us do – as a negative-vocational passage. "Thou shalt not!" But, what if this passage is about what I *really* think it's about. Holiness? *Shalom*?

Look at the first verse in our passage: "I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands *without anger or quarreling*."

As Craig Keener has said, "apparently men were bringing their dissensions into public worship"⁷ (you see this over in chapter 1:6 where teachers are wandering off into vain discussions); So why lifting up hands? It's not an injunction about posture. In fact, Tom Oden says that if we think this whole section is primarily "an instruction to men on the posture of prayer or an instruction to women on the adornment of the body," you've diminished the passage and missed the point. The raised hands are a pointer to being single-minded, being in worship without hypocrisy – praying to God but being angry and quarreling at the same time. It's about worshipping wholeheartedly. It's about *holiness*.

And you see, when we move to verse 9, we see two words that connect this idea of shalom to this new focus on the women: "*likewise also*... women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control..." This is about shalom, too!

Now before we lay this out, there is one sidetrack we must take. Some of you are probably holding onto Galatians 3:28. People don't know the 10 Commandments anymore, but they DO know Galatians 3:28! This is that famous verse that says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are ... heirs according to promise." This is a text that many have used to say that Paul has done away with gender in the bible. But no, the entire point of the bible on humanity is not that Jesus is taking us *out* of creation, but rather Jesus is redeeming and restoring – making holy, giving shalom – to the creation that he has made. In Galatians, Paul isn't talking about gender, but *inheritance*. Paul still thinks there are genders. Right here in 1st Timothy he will say some things to men, and then other things to women in many places. In fact Galatians 3 and 4 says that we are all – men AND women – are all sons of God and co-heirs in Jesus Christ. We are absolutely equal in terms of our inheritance in salvation, in terms of our place in God's heart, in terms of our creation, in terms of our imaging God and his glory. The New Testament affirms this everywhere. But this has nothing to do with the roles we have in the church. Even in a place like 1st Peter 3 where it says wives, be subject to your husbands, Peter will come back and say, "likewise, husbands," show "honor to the woman... since they are *heirs with you* of the grace of life." He's not creating division, but wholeness. *Holiness*.

The gospel way to gender and relationships is not Thelma and Louise OR Archie Bunker, but rather it is a third way, the way of Shalom. Remember when God created Adam and Eve and he

⁷ From the *IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, by Craig S. Keener Copyright © 1993 by Craig S. Keener. Published by InterVarsity Press.

looked upon all he had made and he said, "it is good." It is shalom. It's God's way of saying, "This is exactly how it ought to be."

So, now back to verse 8 and 9. What is this about? Well certainly it's about worship and life in the church, but it's primarily about restoring peace, holiness and shalom IN our worship in the church. Now let's work from Chapter 1. What is the problem in this church? False Teachers. The teaching has gone off the rails. But off the rails where? They don't understand the law *or* the gospel. Remember when Paul said in chapter 1:8 "Now we know that the law is good, if one uses it lawfully, understanding that the law is not laid down for the just, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners." These false teachers thought that law was only the way to be made holy, but weren't using the law to show us where we are *un*holy. That the law should break us. And these teachers don't get this – or the men wouldn't be arguing, and the women wouldn't be flaunting the latest fashions. Remember how we said that the law was like a mirror, showing us who we really are? That's the point! Paul says, "that's what happened to me!" I was shown who I was, the chief of sinners. Unholy, and in need of the mercy and ransom of Jesus Christ. In need of HIS holiness.

But then remember last week, where we spoke of how the gospel makes the church like a rescue station, rescuing the lost. That we are to pray for ALL people. To pray for even the Neros and the Hitlers, because you never know who God will save when you know he will save the chief of sinners. We are to be facing outward! Looking not to ourselves, but at others. The lost. Praying for them.

And that's the problem here! Men are angry and quarreling with each other, and the women are self-focused as well. And Paul says, the world is watching. So why focus on the women's dress? Well first, it's ostentatious. It's clear that Paul does not condemn the desire of girls and women to adorn themselves, and to be "in good taste." *But*, if a woman's dress IS to be in good taste, it will be express modesty. What is modesty? Big subject! But the word for "modesty" (αἰδώς) indicates a sense of shame. It's the opposite of saying "that person is shameless." No, the Christians, because of God's holiness, CAN be shamed. They CAN know they have violated God's command. They CAN know that they are showing off, or drawing attention to themselves. Because the purpose of worship is to draw attention to *Jesus*. And by the way, I have seen women go too far the other direction, and it's just as bad! Women who read this and they look decidedly *old*-fashioned, or awkward, or strange, like they are from another time and place, usually Mayberry of the 1950's. It's just as bad because it is distracting and self-conscious. It says, "I am the modest one. It's *THEY* that are shameless." And once again, folks are looking at oddly adorned people and not at Jesus.

But there is another reason. Independence. One of the things that prostitutes did by adorning their braids with jewels and dressing in hottest fashions is say with their dress, essentially, "I am beholden to no man." There are scholars who think that the false teachers actually ended up encouraging the women to do this because the false teachers spoke out against marriage, and they spoke against childbearing. This is why Paul keeps saying throughout this letter, "No, it's fine to be married." And "No, it's fine to have children." This is why when Paul says a woman "will be saved through childbearing – if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control," he's not saying they will literally, salvifically, save themselves, but that by having

children, this shows they care more about God and imaging God and living the gospel than they do about the world. They care about *holiness*. More on childbearing later!

This takes us to verses 11 and 12. Somehow, the nature of leadership is ALSO related to holiness and shalom for the church. And the brief time we have left is focused on this.

Now here is what you have to know as you read this. Paul started this problem. You might even say that when he set up the church in Ephesus, it seemed like things were slanting in that *Thelma and Louise* direction. Because Paul must have seemed like a quasi-feminist as a Jew. Because when it says in v. 11, "Let a woman learn," that upset the whole applect of Judaism when it came to women. You can still see this today in Hasidic circles. Or remember Barbra Streisand covering over her femaleness in *Yentl*. Women were not instructed. No rabbi would consider having a female student. That's part of the backdrop of the shock over Mary washing the feet of this rabbi Jesus. She was learning about holiness, and doing a better job than the men! No, Paul DOES want women to learn. Don't do it ostentatiously! Don't be noisy about it. Because again, people won't see Jesus, and there will be no shalom! But *learn*.

But what about teaching. Well look. Cards on the table. This denomination does not allow women to be ordained to the teaching office of Elder or Pastor. And this passage is the reason. We believe first – and I could support this from other places in these letters, the pastoral epistles – the infallibility of God's Word. That because it is God-breathed it is our rule for faith and practice. But also, we believe that Paul is writing these letters so that the church could be biblically and properly ordered then, but also in the future when he was gone – after the apostolic era had ended. And because these roles are rooted in creation. I can't say that enough! This is not a matter of who has "Reverend" in front of their name. It's not even a matter of who's in charge. It is a matter of creational and gospel order and design. It something that is *shalom* to the family and the church. His holiness.

So what about teaching? Well, we're talking here only about a certain kind of teaching – the authoritative doctrinal instruction that is tied to the office of elder. That's the restriction – authoritative doctrinal instruction that is tied to the elder. Paul isn't talking about any and all teaching. We all know that Paul commands women to teach! In Titus 2 he wants them to teach other women. He commands them to teach their children including their sons in 2 Timothy 1 and Acts 16. And he is not talking generally about all kinds of leadership. In Paul's own ministry we see prominent women teaching and instructing men. You remember when Apollos – who was a man that was "eloquent" and "competent in the scriptures" started teaching in this very city of Ephesus, and Priscilla as well as Aquilla took him aside and explained – they taught him – the way of God more accurately.⁸ Paul says that a famous preacher is taught by a woman the correct way to understand the gospel! Lydia, too, ran a company. No one is saying that women can't be lions of industry, and he isn't even saying that women cannot lead ministries in the church. He is only talking about authoritative doctrinal instruction that is tied to the elder. Preaching and church discipline is another way to put it.

And I have to say, you don't have to agree with this to even be a member of Hope Presbyterian Church. We have had – still have – former women elders be members of this church simply

⁸ Acts 18:24-27

because they like the vision or they want a church that takes the scriptures seriously. But you should agree! *We* should. It's in the bible! You see, Paul says in verse 8, "I desire then that in every place, everywhere, men should be like this, and women be like that. He's always saying,

"In *all* the churches." But second, Paul DOES qualify things culturally when something culturally qualified! Remember when he tells this same Timothy, "You're coming with me on this missionary journey." And Timothy says, "great." Paul says, "Good, now drop your drawers." Huh? Paul explains that circumcision was a cultural condescension that a Greek like Timothy had to make to get a hearing with Jews. He could easily say here, "Look Timothy, the people in Ephesus are misogynistic and for awhile, you can't let a woman teach." Or, "Look Timothy, the people in Ephesus lift women up on pedestals and are tempted to worship them. So for awhile, you can't let a woman teach." But we don't see that. No, what do we see?

Again, he appeals to creation. Look some of these things are mysterious, but I have lived with this book long enough to know that God is not a misogynist. God created Adam, he named him, and then when God created Eve, he told Adam to name her. In other words, before there was sin, he was teaching Adam what Trinitarian love looks like. You are equal – you will both rule over the earth, but one of you will be submissive to the other. If you'll allow me to put words in God's mouth, "Men, you kinda get the God as Father role, and women, you get the God as Jesus role. But you ARE like God in some way because you both have my image equally." You see, the biblical pattern of headship and submission is *neither* the Thelma and Louise modernist view OR the Archie Bunker traditionalist view. The modernist rejects the idea that subordination can *ever* co-exist with equality (though this is the *basis* of the trinity's relationship)! And the traditionalist believes that subordination *assumes* inequality, and yet the trinity will have none of that! **No**, men and women are equal like the Son is fully equal to the Father. I hope you see the irony – both the Thelma and Louise group and the Archie Bunkers agree! They both reject the biblical concept of headship and submission as inconsistent.

But it *is* consistent. It is consistent with who God is in and of himself. Equality AND submission held together in perfect love. THAT is what we are called to in the church.

And let's say this. No one is saying this is easy. In fact, the egalitarian project tries to make all of this easier by flattening the differences and ignoring them... and it doesn't work. No, it's not easy. Adam could tell you. After Eve sins, and then Adam. But who ends up in trouble? Not Eve. He doesn't take Eve alone out to the woodshed. (The Lord actually saves that for the snake!). No, when Adam and Eve are hiding out, he doesn't call for the name of the one first tempted and who ate first, but to the one he left in charge: Adam. "Where are you?" Adam bears responsibility for the fall. Eve might have been deceived, but Adam was right there with her and gave up his role of leadership and protection by being silent during the whole conversation with the snake. Friends, this is not about Eve being dumb or particularly open to deception. Texts like this one in 1st Timothy have been abused by men to exclude women from appropriate service in the church. This is shameful. This is sinful. They've been used to say that women simply cannot read the bible rightly, or they have no ability to teach or that they shouldn't have any theological education. And a lot of these churches DO squelch the ministry and gifts of women. This can happen in our circles, which is why we promoted and supported those that attended the Women

in the Word conference last month. We also have to say that there is almost nothing worse than religious tyranny because when it happens – it goes under – the name of God.

But that is not what Genesis 1 and 2, or 1st Timothy 2 is about. This pointing to creation, and this command to a perpetual teaching office restricted to men, is really about pointing to what the second Adam did. What did the first Adam do? Nothing! What did the second Adam do? Once again the snake is on the loose in the NT! He has been telling Israel from the time of the fall, you cannot trust God so pretend you ARE God. But this time, the second Adam steps in between the bride – the church – and the Evil One and does what the first Adam should have done. He says, "She is my beautiful bride. And you will NOT rule over her. You DO hate women, AND men. You hate humanity because they are mine. But you cannot have them. This beautiful woman is critical to the birthing of God's kingdom throughout the world. I will impregnate her with my mighty word, and I will pursue her even when she goes astray. And he promises to crush Satan, even as his own head is bruised.

Do you see what headship is all about? It's about the gospel! It's about shalom for all men and women everywhere! There is your radical egalitarianism! Men and women ontologically equal! But you know, men and women are fully equal in their sinfulness. Radically equal. And so they could not be saved without a cost. That ransom we spoke of last week.

Friends, the reason we have this headship – only in the home and the church – is because in the home, our children need to see the gospel. They need to see how the Father and Son work together to save us in the way Mother and Father complement each other. They need to see men sacrificing for their wives unto death, to show their children how Christ loved the church. It's because in the church, the seeker needs to see the gospel, and how we complement each other the way Christ served the church, and gave up his life even as the Father was faithful to keep his word.

I pray that you're seeing the beauty of this. Do you now even see the beauty of that last verse 15? We have a tendency to cut verse 15 off from the previous messages and say that ALL women are saved by having children, which really makes no sense of the rest of the bible, and it even disagrees with what Paul says elsewhere about how it's good to be single. No, Paul is STILL talking about Eve. Eve will be saved, you see, by ultimately giving birth, all those generations away, to the second Adam will redeem all her sin, and serve her with his own life.

Wow. That is headship. That is the love of God. That's holiness.

Let's pray.