

Eve was Deceived, Adam was not

By Cheryl Schatz ©2008

This article is a refutation of [Matt Slick's article](#) that he has written in an attempt to refute my teaching on 1 Timothy 2:11-15. ****While Matt Slick refuses to debate these teachings in writing on this blog, stating that he is concerned that I would possibly edit his statements (I have promised I would not edit his writings and I certainly do not need to do that to refute him!), my offer extends to another neutral web site that would host the debate where neither one of us would be accused of editing the other's words. I find it quite odd that someone would use so many excuses to avoid a written debate. Matt has already provided his argument in writing on his web site. Why would I need to edit it? I have no problem in refuting what Matt has already written. I can understand why he would not want to enter into a written debate. He doesn't do as well in a written form of debate. His style is to verbally attack his opponent and that is much harder to do with a written debate. A written debate would hold him accountable to keep his words respectful since it would be open to be viewed by his peers and the church as a whole. If he continues to refuse a written debate I would suggest that it is time for Matt to stop attacking egalitarians as if they are enemies of the gospel of Christ and go on to something else.****

1 Timothy 2:13, 14 makes it very clear that Adam was first created/Adam was not deceived AND Eve was second created/Eve was deceived. We need to pay attention to what Paul said and to understand how this deception and (no deception) relates to the prohibition of 1 Timothy 2:12. See my related articles [Why Adam was not deceived](#); [Why was the sin of Adam more serious than the sin of Eve? part one](#) [Why was the sin of Adam more serious part two](#)

In Matt Slick's article he says:

The argument from the egalitarians is that Eve was deceived and Adam was not. Therefore, sin entered the world through her because her sin was not as bad as Adams.

This is a misrepresentation of my view. Adam's sin and Eve's actual sin were the same. Both of them ate the fruit and both of them sinned in this way. However their **reasons** for sinning were not the same and my articles listed above show what scripture says about the reasons.

Matt continues:

First of all, even if it were true that her sin was not as bad as Adams, by what logic is it necessary that sin must enter the world through Adam and not Eve? At best, it's a theory, an opinion.

It is not a theory nor an opinion when scripture tells us about the heart attitude. While scripture says that Eve was **thoroughly** deceived (2 Cor. 11:3), the scripture also says

that Adam acted treacherously against God and the Hebrew term also means to deal treacherously with, to be traitorous, to act unfaithfully, to betray God (Hosea 6:7).

Adam's motive for sinning was not the same as Eve's and God held Adam accountable in a greater way because of his motive. God is the one who reads the hearts and he judged between Adam and Eve differently. The sin nature comes through Adam alone. What I would like to ask Matt is where in scripture does it say that sin came through Adam because Adam was given an authority over all mankind and it was his authority that brought sin into the world? Please show me a verse that speaks about Adam's authority. The fact is there is nothing of the sort in scripture. The only thing that shows a difference between Adam and Eve and their sin is their motive. The one who sinned willfully and with knowledge also was responsible for bringing willful sin into the world. I noticed that in Matt's article he completely ignored Hosea 6:7. Why does Matt ignore the verse that gives God's reason for holding Adam accountable for bringing sin into the world? Adam was the one who has betrayed God. It is because it doesn't fit in with Matt's "theory" that man was created as a leader, and has an authority that belongs only to the male.

Next Matt writes:

Second, being deceived doesn't excuse a person... I searched through the Bible examining all 179 occurrences of deceive, deceived, deceit, deception, etc., and I found none that support the idea that being deceived is less an offense to God or somehow excuses a person from the consequence of that deception.

What Matt has failed to answer is Paul's argument in 1 Timothy 1:13. Paul shows that one who acts in unbelief can receive mercy from God just as he received mercy from God when his violent actions were the result of his ignorance and unbelief.

1 Timothy 1:13 even though I was formerly a blasphemer and a persecutor and a violent aggressor. Yet I was shown mercy because I acted ignorantly in unbelief;

When Eve became completely deceived (the Greek in 2 Cor. 11:3 shows that Eve's deception was full and complete) she was lead astray (spoiled, ruined, corrupted) and she no longer believed God's truth. Once the truth was taken from her and she believed the lie, she took the fruit fully believing that it was not wrong to eat the fruit. It was in this full and complete deception that she acted in unbelief.

Just as Eve strayed from the truth through deception, so too are the false teachers in Ephesus teaching error because of their ignorance and unbelief:

1 Timothy 1:6 For some men, straying from these things, have turned aside to fruitless discussion,

1 Timothy 1:6 Amplified version But certain individuals have missed the mark on this very matter [and] have wandered away into vain arguments and discussions and purposeless talk.

1 Timothy 1:7 wanting to be teachers of the Law, even though **they do not understand** either what they are saying or the matters about which they make confident assertions.

In 1 Timothy 1:6 the NASB says “some men”. The Greek is literally “tis” meaning “some”. It is a generic term that can mean males and females not just men. These false teachers are deceived regarding the truth just as Eve was deceived and they have been taken spoil by their error. Paul said that one who sins in such a way through their ignorance and unbelief can receive God’s mercy in spite of such terrible sin. While I have never claimed that deception excuses a person from the consequences of their actions, what I have claimed is that God is able to break into their lives to give these deceive people mercy that they do not deserve. Paul received such mercy (1 Timothy 1:13) and Eve received such mercy (the “seed” which is the Messiah was promised through her and not through the man).

Once again Matt Slick completely ignores the verses that I have brought up to prove my point from scripture. He is not able to disprove the point of the verses and thus has chosen to ignore my argument rather than to deal with it.

Matt Slick asks:

Therefore, are we to conclude that Eve was somehow excused from her sin or that its severity was lessened because she was deceived?

Eve is not excused from her sin; she received **mercy** because she did not sin willfully. Eve sinned because she was deceived by the deceiver and **not** because her attitude was deliberate betrayal and God to give her mercy by promising to bring the Messiah through only the woman. Through her the Messiah would destroy the deceiver. What a merciful God we have!

Matt’s next point is that Esau was deceived out of his blessing and he had to suffer the full consequences:

The point is that the effects wrought through deception are powerful and not lessened in consequence upon the one deceived even though it is from deception.

Matt’s use of Esau as an example of someone being deceived appears to be ill advised. Esau sold his birthright to Jacob and the Bible describes his actions as immoral and godless:

Heb 12:16 that there be no immoral or godless person like Esau, who sold his own birthright for a single meal.

While Jacob may have deceived his Father, he did not deceive Esau. Esau willingly sold his birthright for a single meal because he despised his birthright.

Gen 25:34 Then Jacob gave Esau bread and lentil stew; and he ate and drank, and rose and went on his way. Thus Esau despised his birthright.

Esau did not receive mercy because he sold his birthright willingly and with his eyes wide open to what he was doing.

Gen 25:32 Esau said, “Behold, I am about to die; so of what use then is the birthright to me?”

Heb 12:17 For you know that even afterwards, when he desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place for repentance, though he sought for it with tears.

God rejected Esau and he did not find mercy. He was not deceived. Matt’s application of Esau shows a faulty application and a clear misunderstanding of deception.

Matt ends his article with these words:

Saying that Adam had a greater offense and that is why sin entered the world is nothing more than guesswork. It is an opinion not substantiated by Scripture and not required by logic. Therefore, the argument has no weight.

Matt has not dealt with my argument nor has he dealt with the scriptures that I quoted. So while he ignores my scriptural argument, he can turn a blind eye to that argument and say “that it is an opinion not substantiated by Scripture”. What Matt should have done is **deal with the scriptural argument** and **not ignore the scriptures** and then claim victory. Matt’s argument is not convincing neither does it refute my claims.

Also what Matt does not do is give a scriptural proof that Adam was given an authority over humanity and this authority is why sin entered the world. I would encourage Matt to:

1. Show from scripture where it says that sin came into the world because Adam was given special authority.
2. Deal with my scriptural proof or admit that he does not have an answer to the reason why Paul applies the first created/not deceived vs second created/deception of the woman, to the prohibition in 1 Timothy 2:12.