

APPENDIX G

THE USAGE OF A GREEK LEXICON

A CONSIDERATION OF THE WORD “EXPOUNDED” IN ACTS 18:26

Introduction

I wrote an explanation of how lexicographers define words in Fox (Vol. I, 2003, pp. 217-220). It would be helpful for the reader to read this brief discussion prior to reading this appendix. However, it is not necessary to read this prior discussion in order to understand this material. I applied some principles of lexicography to the Greek word *arrabōn* in Fox Vol. I, 2003 (pp. 216-ff.). I would also suggest that the reader study the preface of whatever lexicons that he may possess for more information.

The word εκτιθημι (pronounced “*ektithēmi*”) is translated: “(E)xpounded” in Acts 18:26. This word is equated to the word: “Teach” by many commentators. The KJV has five different words translated “teach.” These words are: διδασκω, καταγγελλω,¹ κατηχεω,² μαθητευω,³ and παιδευω.⁴ Is there any basis for making the word: “expounded” *ektithēmi* equal to the word: “Teach” (*didaskō*)? Why not equate *ektithēmi* to one of the other four words (above) or to none of these words? This point was discussed extensively in Chapter 12 and Appendix A (cf. the Scripture index for pages where Acts 18:26 is discussed). This discussion will be used to illustrate how to use a Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.⁵

Thayer’s Definition

εκ-τιθημι: 1 aor. pass. ptc. εκτεθεις; Mid., impf. εξετιθεμην; 2 aor. εξεθεμην; *to place or set out, expose*; 1. prop.: an infant, Acts vii. 21; (Sap. xvii. 5; [Hdt. 1, 112]; Arstph. nub. 531; Ael. V. h. 2, 7; Lcian. de sacrif.. 5, and often). 2. Mid. metaph. *to set forth, declare, expound*: Acts xi. 4; τι, Acts xviii. 26; xxviii. 23; ([Aristot. passim]; Diod. 12, 18; Joseph. antt. 1, 12, 2; Athen. 7 p. 278 d.; al.).* (p. 200)

Let us explain the format of the entries in Thayer’s lexicon (and generically in most lexicons). Thayer’s entry (above) begins with the word (in this case εκτιθημι – this is a verb and it is given in the 1st person – singular number – present tense – indicative mood – active voice format). Note that it is given as: εκ-τιθημι, the hyphen breaks the word into the two component parts. This word is a compound word derived from the preposition εκ and the verb τιθημι. This word was formed by the process of joining together two different words into a new word.

This word is found in: Acts 7:21, 11:4, 18:26, and 28:23. The symbol * at the end of the entry tells the reader that all of the passages where this word is found, in the New Testament, are listed in the entry.

¹ Translated “teach” in Acts 16:21.

² Translated “teach” (1 Cor. 14:19) and taught and teacheth (Gal. 6:6).

³ Translated “teach” (Mt. 28:19) and “had taught” (Acts 14:21).

⁴ Translated “taught” (Acts 22:3) and “teaching” (Tit. 2:12).

⁵ I have set forth other aspects of using lexicons in Fox, Vol. I (2003), pp. 10-25, 78, 95, 217-220, 303, and 470; Fox, Vol. II (2005), pp. 367, 580, and 612; and this present Vol. p. 180 and p. 255.

In Acts 7:21 the form is: εκτεθεντα, this is an accusative case, singular number, masculine gender, first aorist tense, and passive voice participle. In Thayer's lexicon, he gives the nominative case, singular number, masculine gender, first aorist tense, and passive voice form of the participle (εκτεθεις). In Acts 11:4 and Acts 28:23 the form is: εξετιθετο, this is a 3rd person, singular number, imperfect tense, middle voice, and indicative mood verb. In Thayer's lexicon, he gives the 1st person, singular number, imperfect tense, middle voice, and indicative mood form of the verb (εξετιθεμην). In Acts 18:26 the form is: εξεθεντο, this is 3rd person, plural number, 2nd aorist tense, middle voice, and indicative mood. In Thayer's lexicon, he gives the 1st person, singular number, 2nd aorist tense, middle voice, and indicative mood form of the verb (εξεθεμην). The forms given are the standard form (1st person singular etc.); the standard form enables the student of Greek to conjugate the verbs. Thayer does not give the present, future, perfect, and pluperfect forms of this verb because they are not found in the New Testament.

The definitions are always placed in italics (in Thayer and in most other lexicons). This word is defined as: "...to place or set out, expose." First, Thayer gives examples of the literal usage of this word. Thayer gives an instance where he claims that the exposing of a child is being considered (Acts 7:21). He also sets forth other sources where the word is used in this manner (Sap. Hdt. Arstph. Ael., Lcian. de sacrif., Aristot. Passim, Diod., Joseph. antt., and Athen. are all references to extra-biblical sources where this word is used). Second, Thayer gives the metaphorical⁶ (abbreviated "metaph.") usage of this word: "...to set forth, declare, expound."

The reader should remember that any time that Thayer places any passage into a category, he is nothing more than a denominational commentator. This means that his theological bias may influence how he categorizes any passage. A study of Thayer's lexicon will reveal that Thayer often cites Old Testament passages from the LXX where a word is employed. However, when defining the word εκτιθημι, he does not cite any passages from the LXX. The word εκτιθημι is found in the LXX in: Est. 3:14, 4:3, 8, 8:13, 14, 17, 9:14,⁷ Job 36:15, Dan. 3:29, 6:8,⁸ and Zech. 1:16.⁹ In fact, if Thayer had given consideration to the usage of the word εκτιθημι in the LXX, he might have given a different definition of this word. Note that this word refers to something that was posted or to some kind of notice from a ruler or other person. Lust, et. al. define εκτιθημι as: "to make manifest ... to publish ... to expose ... to set forth ... to publish" (p. 188). This is evident from the usage of this word in the LXX:

Est. 3:14 A copy of the writing, that the decree should be given out (εξετιθετο) in every province, was published unto all the peoples, that they should be ready against that day.

Est. 4:3 And in every province, whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came (εξετιθετο), there was great mourning among the Jews, and fasting, and weeping, and wailing; and many lay in sackcloth and ashes.

Est. 4:8 Also he gave him the copy of the writing of the decree that was given out (εκτεθεν) in Shushan to destroy them, to show it unto Esther, and to declare it unto her, and to charge her

⁶ The reader should remember that sound hermeneutics requires that the language of Scripture be interpreted as literal language (particularly in narratives), unless there is a compelling reason to interpret it as a figure of speech. (cf. Chart RW-35) This rule particularly applies to historical sections of books (such as the book of Acts).

⁷ There is a textual variant in Est. 9:14 (with a different word in some MSS).

⁸ There is a textual variant in Dan. 6:8 (with a different word in some MSS).

⁹ There is a textual variant in Zech. 1:16 (with a different word in some MSS).

that she should go in unto the king, to make supplication unto him, and to make request before him, for her people.

Est. 8:13 A copy of the writing, that the decree should be given out in every province, was published unto all the peoples, and that the Jews should be ready against that day to avenge themselves on their enemies.

Est. 8:14 So the posts that rode upon swift steeds that were used in the king's service went out, being hastened and pressed on by the king's commandment; and the decree was given out (εξετεθη) in Shushan the palace.

Est. 8:17 And in every province, and in every city, whithersoever the king's commandment and his decree came (εξετεθη), the Jews had gladness and joy, a feast and a good day. And many from among the peoples of the land became Jews; for the fear of the Jews was fallen upon them.

Est. 9:14 And the king commanded it so to be done: and a decree was given out (εξεθηκε) in Shushan; and they hanged Haman's ten sons.

Job 36:15 He delivereth the afflicted by their affliction, And openeth their ear in oppression.

Dan. 3:29 Therefore I make (εκτιθεμαι) a decree, that every people, nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill; because there is no other god that is able to deliver after this sort.

Dan. 6:8 Now, O king, establish the interdict, and sign (εκθες) the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.

Clearly in most of these passages, the word εκτιθημι refers to a written document (decree). BAG wrote: "As for the influence of the LXX, every page of this lexicon shows that it outweighs all other influences on our literature." (p. xviii) However, BAG did not cite a single passage from the LXX where the word εκτιθημι is found. Did they have a bias against translating it as the LXX used it? This word could easily refer to a written document in, at least, some of the N. T. passages where it is found: Acts 7:21, 11:4, 18:26, and 28:23. Moulton and Milligan state:

The verb is common = "post up" a notice etc., e.g. P Hib. I. 299 (c. B.C. 265) ... "and the tax-farmer shall write this document upon a notice board in large letters and expose it in front of the agoranomus-office every day" ... "that this be posted up in the chief towns" ... εκθες ουν εκθεμα και προκηρυξον, "issue a public notice and have it cried." (p. 199)

Note this last part of the quote of Moulton and Milligan where he commands them to post it (issue a public notice in writing - εκθεμα) and to orally cry it προκηρυξον. It is evident from this usage that εκτιθημι is used in a way that is distinct from an oral proclamation. This second word προκηρυξον is from the word προκηρυσσω (to preach beforehand or proclaim beforehand). For example, in Acts 7:21 Pharaoh had decreed that the male children of the Hebrews were to be put to death (cf. Ex. 1:15-22). Note how Pharaoh had: "... charged all his people" (Ex. 1:22), but it is almost certain that he did not speak personally to every single person, but posted¹⁰ a decree that the male children should be killed. The word translated: "(C)harged"¹¹

¹⁰ The English word "post" means: "**1 a:** to publish, announce, or advertise by or as if by use of a placard **b:** to denounce by public notice **c:** to enter on a public listing **d:** to forbid (property) to trespassers under penalty of legal prosecution by notices placed along the boundaries ... **2:** to affix to a usual place (as a

(הַרְצָא - Ex. 1:22) can be either a written or an oral charge. It is clear that Amram and Jochebed did not “kill” their son as Pharaoh decreed, but they hid him (Ex. 2:1-10). The expression: “(H)is people” (Ex. 1:9 & 22) does not refer to the Children of Israel, but to the Egyptians. The Egyptians were killing the sons of the Children of Israel, by throwing them into the river. God had told Amram and Jochebed what to do with Moses (Heb. 11:23 [Rom. 10:17]). The normal word that is translated: “Cast out” is εκβαλλω (pronounced *ekballō*).¹² The usage of this word (εκτιθημι) in Acts 7:21 can be easily explained as Pharaoh posting a notice and God telling Moses’ parents to hide him and to put him in a basket and to have Miriam to watch for him. The translation of Acts 7:19 is awkward and confusing because it does not follow the Greek text (*The translators translated an adjective as a verb.*). It reads:

Acts 7:19 (ASV) The same dealt craftily with our race, and ill-treated our fathers, that they should cast out their babes to the end they might not live.

The adjective translated “cast out” in this verse is: εκθετα (acc. plur. neut. of εκθετος [pronounced *ekthetos*]) and it is from the same root as *ektithēmi*. Thayer defines this word as:

εκ-θετος, -ον, (εκτιθημι), *cast out, exposed*: ποιειν εκθετα (equiv. to εκτιθεναι) τα βρεφη, Acts vii. 19. (Eur. Andr. 70; [Manetho, apoteles. 6, 52].)* (Thayer, p. 195)

Lexicons give the form of an adjective (cf. above) in the following format: Nominative singular masculine (the complete word), then the nominative singular feminine ending, and then the nominative singular neuter ending. The word εκθετος does not have a feminine form, therefore it is omitted (only the masculine and neuter forms are given). This word εκ-θετος is also hyphenated which reveals that it is a compound word (the preposition εκ and θετος). The noun form of this word (εκθεσις) is defined by Moulton and Milligan: “The subst. εκθεσις¹³ is common = ‘list,’ ‘schedule,’” (p. 194) This noun form is not found in the NT.

The reader should note that this word (*ekthetos*) is an adjective (as can be determined by the entry in Thayer). (Note that the article is not given [as it would be for a noun], but the ending of the masculine gender is first given and then the neuter gender ending is given. [There is no feminine gender ending because this adjective does not have a feminine gender form.]) This passage should be translated:

(Fox’s translation) Acts 7:19 The same dealt craftily with our race, and ill-treated our fathers, to work the end *result* that the posted babes might not live.

How should Acts 7:21 be translated? This verse reads:

Acts 7:21 and when he was cast out, Pharaoh’s daughter took him up, and nourished him for her own son.

This verse would be better translated:

Acts 7:21 and when he was posted,¹⁴ Pharaoh’s daughter took him up, and nourished him for her own son.

The decree forced Moses’ parents to hide him and then (after three months [Heb. 11:23]) to put him in the river (as per God’s instructions). However, Moses’ parents did not: “... cast him out,” but it was Pharaoh who: “... cast him out” or better translated: “... posted him (*issued a written decree to kill the babies*).”

wall) for public notices: PLACARD” (Merriam – Webster) This definition is essentially the same as Moulton and Milligan’s definition of εκτιθημι.

¹¹ Strong’s number 6680 (it is found in 475 verses in the O.T.).

¹² Strong’s number 1544 (it is found in 76 verses in the N. T.).

¹³ The Greek word εκθεσις is not found in either the N. T. or the LXX.

¹⁴ A decree was written demanding that the male children be killed.

Heb. 11:23 By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months by his parents, because they saw he was a goodly child; and they were not afraid of the king's commandment.

The word *εκτιθημι* is found in Acts 11:4, where Luke writes:

Acts 11:4 But Peter began, and expounded *the matter* unto them in order, saying, Some claim that this verse certainly could not be speaking of a written document. This claim "begs the question" because we have the written document in Acts 11. Certainly, a written document came into existence at some time (either before the book of Acts was written or when the book of Acts was written). The reader should note that the book of Acts included at least some documents that were written before the book of Acts. Certainly Acts 15:19-21 and 23-29 constitutes a document that was first written and then read to the churches (Acts 15:30-31). This document was distributed in written form (Acts 16:4). It is possible that some parts of Acts 11 (parts of verses 5-16) were put in written form by Peter and that it was read to the church (with Peter's inspired comments) during the meeting at Jerusalem. Peter probably wrote this down for the churches that were in Joppa and in the areas around Joppa. One might ask: "Why do we not have copies of this in some written form?" The answer is that we do have copies (in the book of Acts). There are no copies of the passages in Acts 15 (above), except in the book of Acts. The most reasonable explanation of this incident is that Peter wrote (by inspiration) the account of what occurred in Acts 10 and 11 and sent these copies to the various churches in order to inform them of the truth that Gentiles were acceptable as members of the Lord's church. It is clear that some began preaching to the Greeks in Acts 11:20. The only rational reason for their beginning preaching to the Greeks was that they had been informed (either in writing, orally, or both orally and in writing) of the events at the household of Cornelius. A written treatise (written by an apostle [Peter in this instance]) would be sufficient to cause the church to begin preaching to Gentiles. Word of mouth instructions would not be as effective as a written document. Therefore, it seems likely that this refers to a written document.

The word is found in Acts 28:23 where it reads:

Acts 28:23 And when they had appointed him a day, they came to him into his lodging in great number; to whom he expounded *the matter*, testifying the kingdom of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses and from the prophets, from morning till evening.

It is possible that Paul made copies of the various O. T. prophecies that he was going to interpret to the audience. These copies could also contain his notes, explaining the prophecies. There is no reason why this could not be a written document from which Paul taught. It is more likely that it was some of the N. T. books that existed at that time (Matthew, Mark, Luke, Romans, Galatians, etc.) that Paul used to: "... expound *the matter*." It appears that the noble people in Berea (Acts 17:11) took their copies of the Scriptures with them to the studies (or perhaps Paul supplied them with copies for them to keep in their studies).

This brings us to Acts 18:26 which reads:

Acts 18:26 and he began to speak boldly in the synagogue. But when Aquila and Priscilla heard him, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more accurately.

This passage has been discussed extensively in Chapter 12 and Appendix A. Upon what basis could we claim that Aquila and Priscilla expounded by means of a written document or written documents?¹⁵ First, the books of Matthew, Mark, and Luke existed at this time.¹⁶ Second, Apollos

¹⁵ I wish to thank Gary Smith for suggesting this interpretation to me.

¹⁶ I have, for many years, thought it likely that the books of Matthew and James were the first two New Testament books written and that the early church used them to help to convert the Jews. I have even

was not able to speak by inspiration and neither Aquila nor Priscilla had the ability to impart a gift to him.¹⁷ Third, without either a spiritual gift or a copy of the N. T. Scriptures, he was not able to preach the gospel. Fourth, he preached the gospel without a spiritual gift (Acts 18:27-28), therefore Apollos had copies of parts of the New Testament.

It is not only possible, but it is almost certain that Aquila and Priscilla had copies of several N. T. books (Matthew, Mark, Luke, etc.) and that they provided Apollos with a copy of them for his study.¹⁸ This interpretation is demanded for five reasons: (1) The translation of this as “expounded” takes the interpretation that the word *ektithēmi* (εκτιθημι) is figurative, but figurative language is the exception and literal language is the rule (CHART RW-35), (2) The primary meaning of this word is: “...to place or set out, expose...” (Thayer, p. 200), (3) The usage of this word to mean something posted (in written form) in both secular Greek and in the LXX adds weight to the interpretation that this refers to a written document that Aquila and Priscilla provided to Apollos, (4) The translation of this word as “expounded” is permissible if one understands the meaning of the English word “expound,”¹⁹ and, (5) There is implicit evidence that Apollos possessed written copies of at least part of the New Testament. How could Apollos be said to have: “... powerfully confuted the Jews ... showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ” (Acts 18:28) without either possessing a copy of the New Testament Scriptures or having a miraculous gift? What Scriptures did he use: the Old Testament, the New Testament, or both?

In Modern Greek the spelling of the word “εκτιθημι” has been changed to “εκθετω.” Magazis gives the following definition of the modern Greek word “εκθετω”: “expose ... exhibit” (p. 314). Magazis defines the noun form of this word (εκθεση) as: “display ... exhibition ... exposure ... composition, essay ... report ... exposition.” (p. 314)

THE USAGE OF THE WORD “SAID” IN THE SCRIPTURES

It is a serious mistake to think that the words: “Said” and “Spoke” always refer to spoken communication. These words frequently refer to written communications (cf. Acts 1:16, 28:25, etc.).

In Hebrew, the word translated: “spake”²⁰ in Ex. 1:15, “said” in Ex. 1:16, and “saying” in Ex. 1:22 is certainly used to refer to a written decree in 2 Chron. 2:11, 21:12, 36:22, Ezra 1:1, Est. 9:14 and Jon. 3:7. There is no compelling reason to limit the words: “spake,” “said,” and “saying” to oral communication. This gives further credence to the interpretation that the word “*ektithēmi*” should be translated as: “post” or “posted.” (This removes one objection to my interpretation that the word “*ektithēmi*” should be translated “post” or “posted.”)

There is no reason to limit the word translated “commandment” διαταγμα (pronounced *diatagma*) to oral communications (Heb. 11:23). This word is used as a synonym for the word *ektithēmi* in Heb. 11:23. Moulton and Milligan write:

thought that the book of James was probably the first book written and that James the son of Zebedee may have been the author of it.

¹⁷ Cf. Fox, 2005, chapter 12.

¹⁸ Cf. Fox, Vol. II (2005), Appendix B for an extensive discussion of the copying and dissemination of the Scriptures.

¹⁹ This point was established in Appendix A by Melvin Elliott.

²⁰ All three words are from the same Hebrew word (Strong's # 559).

διαταγμα was in Imperial times the technical term for an ‘edict,’ ... of the edicts of Praefects, and numerous exx. ... The word is used of a ‘testamentary disposition’ ...” (p. 155)

In fact, it does not make sense for a king to give an edict (cf. several translations of this word in Heb. 11:23) that is purely oral. Oral commandments are subject to misinterpretation because of improper communication of the commandment. It is much more reasonable to view this as a written document that was posted or sent out to certain persons in the land of Egypt by Pharaoh. The word *diatagma* (translated “letter” in the ASV) is found in Ezra 7:11 in the LXX.

In fact, the usage of *diatagma* as: “... a ‘testamentary disposition’ ...” (Moulton and Milligan, p. 155) gives further evidence that *diatagma* is used of a written document. A testament or a will is rarely in spoken form (particularly in the first century when no recording equipment was available). (This removes another objection to my interpretation that the word “*ektithēmi*” should be translated “post” or “posted.”)

OTHER INFORMATION THAT MAY BE USEFUL IN INTERPRETATION OF THE MEANING OF εκτιθημι

The reader should read Chapter 12 and Appendix A for more information on the meaning of this word. It is interesting that Luke used the word καταγγεω (pronounced *katēcheō*) in Acts 18:25. This word is translated: “instructed” in most translations.²¹ Thayer defines this word:

κατ-ηγεω²² pronounced *katēcheō* “**1.** prop. to sound towards, sound down upon, resound ... **2.** to teach orally, to instruct ... **3.** to inform by word of mouth; pass. to be orally informed” (Thayer, p. 340)

This word is found in 7 verses: (Lk. 1:4, Acts 18:25, 21:21, 24, Rom. 2:18, 1 Cor. 14:19, and Gal. 6:6 [twice]). It is translated “instructed,” “informed,” “teach,” and “taught.” Note that Apollos was instructed: “... by word of mouth (*katēcheō*)” up to this time (Acts 18:25). It is clear (from the discussion [above]) that the instruction of Acts 18:26 was probably not by word of mouth, but was by a written communication (probably copies of some of the New Testament books).

Other Possibilities

In my second volume on the work of the Holy Spirit, I set forth the fact that there were miraculously guided scribes in the times of the apostles. (cf. Fox, 2005, Appendix B). If Aquila and Priscilla were miraculously guided scribes, it is possible that they made copies of the existing N. T. books (Matthew, Mark, Luke, etc) for Apollos. There would not be any violation of 1 Tim. 2:12 for Priscilla to make copies of the Scriptures for a man. In this scenario both Aquila and Priscilla could have done the same thing, without violating 1 Tim. 2:12 and other relevant Scripture.

It seems evident that Apollos had been baptized of John’s baptism prior to the cross. If this were true, he would become a Christian the moment that he believed that Jesus is the Christ (Acts 19:4). The baptism of John was discussed extensively in Fox (2003) Vol. I and Fox (2005) Vol. II.

ARE *didaskō* AND *ektithēmi* COGNATES?

Keith Moser²³ made the claim that *didaskō* and *ektithēmi* are cognates. The word: “Cognate” is defined:

²¹ ASV footnote: Gr. *taught by word of mouth*.

²² Strong’s number 2727.

Cognate ... adj [L *cognatus*, fr. *co* - + *gnatus*, *natus*, pp. of *nasci* to be born; akin to L *gignere* to beget – more in KIN] (ca. 1645) **1**: of the same or similar nature: generically alike **2**: related by blood; also: related on the mother's side **3 a**: related by descent from the same ancestral language **b** of a word or morpheme: related by derivation, borrowing, or descent **c** of a substantive: related to verb usu. by derivation and serving as its object to reinforce the meaning. (Merriam Webster)

It is evident that Keith Moser did not intend to use the second definition (above) for the word: “cognate.” He appeared to be arguing that the two Greek words (*didaskō* and *ektithēmi* or perhaps *didaskō* and *tithēmi*) are cognates. If this were his claim, he is most certainly wrong!

Robertson wrote: “... δι-δα-σκω (for δι-δαχ-σκω) ...” (p. 352) with regard to the verb: διδασκω (pronounced *didaskō*). Metzger has the word: “*didaskō*” being derived from the root: “δεκ (pronounced *dek*)” (pp. 53-54). Metzger has the word: “*dek*” meaning: “take.” Metzger has the word: “τιθημι” (pronounced *tithēmi*) being derived from the root: “θε” (pronounced *the*) which means: “put, set, place” (p. 58). When Van Voorst lists the cognates of *didaskō* he does not list *tithēmi* (p. 41). When Van Voorst lists the cognates of *tithēmi*, he does not list *didaskō* (pp. 37-38).

USING THE ENGLISH DEFINITION TO SUPPORT A DOCTRINE

It is unscholarly to support a doctrine exclusively on the English definition of a Bible word. An English word might not be an exact definition of the Greek, Hebrew, or Aramaic word. In fact, many words have more than one definition. We must not pick the definition that “fits our fancy,” but must allow the Bible to define the word (if it does). Under no circumstance are we allowed to employ a definition that would pose a contradiction between two or more passages of Scripture. I have heard sound gospel preachers repeatedly state that the context of the Scriptures must be the final determining factor in defining a biblical word. When one goes to a passage with a preconceived notion of the meaning of the passage and does not allow the context to shape his interpretation, he is taking a passage out of context. Remember: “A passage taken out of context becomes a pretext.”

One argument that is made by many preachers is:

Major Premise: All instances of the usage of A's are instances where the words mean *didaskō* type (authoritative type)²⁴ teaching.

Minor Premise: All instances of the usage of the English word “expound” are instances of the usage of A's.

Conclusion: All instances of the usage of the English word “expound” are instances where the word means *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching.

This conclusion was falsified by Melvin Elliott in Appendix A. We anxiously await the setting forth of a sound middle term (A) for this argument. Are those who claim that Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos able to supply a suitable middle term (A) for the following argument?

²³ Keith made this claim in the open forum of the Memphis School of Preaching lectureship (2008).

²⁴ I recognize that some of those who equate these two words do not accept my claim that *didaskō* is authoritative type teaching. It is possible that certain of those who equate the Greek words (*ektithēmi* [εκτιθημι]) and *didaskō* (διδασκω) will try to divert attention from their obligation to give a sound argument equating these words to quibbling about whether or not *didaskō* is authoritative type teaching. (Let them prove these words are equal in meaning.)

Major Premise: All instances of the usage of A's are instances where the words mean *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching.

Minor Premise: Some instances of the usage of the English word "expound" are instances of the usage of A's.

Conclusion: Some instances of the usage of the English word "expound" are instances where the word means *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching.

Let us assume (for the sake of argument) that they establish the conclusion of this argument (by supplying a suitable middle term - A), they still have not proven that either Aquila or Priscilla expounded in a *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching manner. Let me illustrate this last point by pointing out that I have heard Christians say: "The church preached the gospel in a gospel meeting last week." Did they mean that every member of the church preached? Did Luke intend to mean that Priscilla did everything that Aquila did? Could not Priscilla have served as a helper to her husband in teaching (*didaskō* type - authoritative type teaching)?

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is clear that the preponderance of the evidence supports this author's assertion that Apollos was either given a written document or written documents (probably either some or all of the existing New Testament books) in Acts 18:26. This is much like the words of Paul in 2 Thess. 2:15 where he wrote:

2 Thess. 2:15 So then, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye were taught, whether by word, or by epistle of ours.

It is clear (from this verse) that Paul taught (*didaskō*) both by word (oral – possibly "*katēcheō*") and by epistle (a written document). Note that *katēcheō* is limited to oral teaching and *didaskō* includes both oral and written teaching. The reader should remember that the writer of the document is the one who is engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching, not necessarily the one giving the document to others. It is possible for a person to both expound (*ektithēmi* - give a written document) and teach (*didaskō*) from the document.

However, it is not necessary for me to prove that the expounding, in Acts 18:26, was in the form of a written document for the following reasons: First, because those who claim that Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos have not proven their claim,²⁵ they have only made this assertion.²⁶ These men have made a pure naked assertion, with no evidence to support their claim. This is the logical fallacy of "begging the question." Anyone who makes a naked assertion and is unwilling to even attempt to prove the assertion is irrational. Second, because other explanations of this passage (without Priscilla engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos) are possible (cf. this present Volume). Third, even if (hypothetically) one were to prove that all expounding entails *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching,²⁷ it would not necessarily follow that the one doing the expounding was doing the *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching. This follows from the fact that the writers of the Scriptures could be doing the *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching (2 Thess. 2:15) when another person gave the Scriptures (expounded the matter) to the one being taught. Fourth, because of the logical implications of claiming that Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos (set forth in this present Volume). Note the following argument:

First Premise: If Priscilla were a faithful child of God and faithful children of God obey the Scriptures and the Scriptures forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type)

²⁵ The claim that all expounding (*ektithēmi* [εκτιθημι]) is *didaskō* (διδασκω) type teaching.

²⁶ Cf. Chap. 12 (particularly pp. 146-150).

²⁷ I deny this hypothetical claim (MRF).

teaching of a man, then Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos.

Second Premise: Priscilla was a faithful child of God and faithful children of God obey the Scriptures and the Scriptures forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man (1 Tim. 2:12).

Conclusion: Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos.

In order to affirm: “Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos” one must deny the consequent. If the consequent of the first premise (above) is denied the following must be²⁸ affirmed: “Either Priscilla was not a faithful child of God, or faithful children of God do not obey the Scriptures, or the Scriptures do not forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man. This brings us to the following argument:

First Premise: Either Priscilla was not a faithful child of God, or faithful children of God do not obey the Scriptures, or the Scriptures do not forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man.

Second Premise: Faithful children of God do obey the Scriptures. (Heb. 5:9, 2 Thess. 1:8, and 1 Pet. 4:17)

Conclusion: Either Priscilla was not a faithful child of God or the Scriptures do not forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man.

Those making their argument with regard to Priscilla are in a dilemma. Note the following dilemma (where I will use this conclusion as part of the argument):

First Disjunction: Either Priscilla was not a faithful child of God or Priscilla was a faithful child of God. (Principle of the excluded middle – cf. pp. 184-185)

First Premise: If Priscilla were not a faithful child of God, then Priscilla was not an apostolic approved example for Christian women to follow.

Second Premise: Priscilla is/was an apostolic approved example for Christian women to follow. (Those who use Priscilla as an example for Christian women to follow must affirm this premise.)

Conclusion: Priscilla was a faithful child of God.

This conclusion brings us back to the conclusion of our former argument. Note that the conclusion of this argument is linked with the conclusion of our former argument:

First Premise: Either Priscilla was not a faithful child of God or the Scriptures do not forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man.

Second Premise: Priscilla was a faithful child of God.

Conclusion: The Scriptures do not forbid women engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man.

Note how those making this argument with regard to Priscilla must be trying to emasculate 1 Tim. 2:12. It is apparent that those who are claiming that Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man must either be claiming that a woman may engage in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man in some manner (other than 1 Tim. 2:12 forbids) or they must be trying to emasculate 1 Tim. 2:12. How could those making the claim that Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man answer this argument?

1-They could prove that 1 Tim. 2:12 was limited to a certain place or location and that Priscilla was not in that place or location when she engaged in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos.

2-They could prove that 1 Tim. 2:12 was limited to a woman teaching a certain number of men and that a woman engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of one non-Christian man (with a Christian man being present) did not violate this prohibition.

²⁸ By transposition and DeMorgan’s Theorem (cf. Fox, 2003, Vol. I, Appendix A).

3-They could prove that 1 Tim. 2:12 was limited to a certain time (perhaps the first day of the week) and that a woman engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of a man at other times did not violate this prohibition.

4-They could prove that 1 Tim. 2:12 was limited to a certain class of men (perhaps to Christian men) and that a woman engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of all other classes of men (non-Christian men) did not violate this prohibition.²⁹

All four of these options (above) were addressed in this present Volume. There is a fifth option that one could take and still allow Priscilla to be teaching in the English sense, but not in the sense of the meaning of the Greek word *didaskō* (authoritative type teaching). This fifth option entails either:

5-Engaging in non-*didaskō* type (non-authoritative type) teaching by either acting as a helper to Aquila or by providing Apollos with information (a copy of parts of the New Testament).

This approach to the problem is simply approaching the problem as one was taught to write in secondary school. I was taught to frame the following words into questions: “who,” “what,” “when,” “where,” “why,” “which,” and “how” in order to thoroughly deal with a matter. The first option deals with the question of “where.” The second option deals with the question of “how many.” The third option deals with the question of “when.” The fourth option deals with the question of “who” or “which.” The fifth option deals with the questions of “how” or “what kind of.” It is obvious that the question of “how” or “what kind of” is what the Holy Spirit has in mind (the Holy Spirit is forbidding a woman engaging in *didaskō* type [authoritative type] teaching of a man) in 1 Tim. 2:12. I am confident that we have established (in this present Volume) that 1 Tim. 2:12 forbids women engaging in authoritative type teaching (*didaskō* type teaching) of a man (under any circumstance and at any place [in every place – 1 Tim. 2:8]). The Scriptures do not forbid a women engaging in non-authoritative type teaching (non-*didaskō* type teaching) of men (answering questions, discussing the Scriptures, asking questions, etc. [Women do have some special limitations in the assembly.]).

There are several possible explanations of Acts 18:26 that would not have Priscilla engaging in *didaskō* type (authoritative type) teaching of Apollos. These possible explanations were set forth in this present Volume.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William; Gingrich, Wilbur (1957). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. (BAG)

Fox, Marion R. (2003). *The work of the Holy Spirit, Vol. I*. Oklahoma City, OK: Five F Publishing Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2005). *The work of the Holy Spirit, Vol. II*. Oklahoma City, OK: Five F Publishing Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2006). *The role of women, Vol. I*. Oklahoma City, OK: Five F Publishing Co.

Fox, Marion R. (2006). *The role of women, Vol. II*. Oklahoma City, OK: Five F Publishing Co.

²⁹ They would still have a problem with allowing a Christian woman to engage in *didaskō* type teaching of a non-Christian man in the presence of a Christian man (Aquila).

Lust, Johan; Eynikel, Erik; Hauspie, Katrin. (2003). *Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint*. (Revised edition). Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Magazis, George A. (editor, 1995). *Pocket English Dictionary (English – Modern Greek, Modern Greek – English)*. Anixi, Attidis (Greece): Efstathiadis Group S. A.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 10th ed. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc. www.merriamwebster.com

Metzger, Bruce M. (1975). *Lexical aids for students of New Testament Greek*. Princeton, NJ: Theological Book Agency.

Moulton, James Hope; Milligan, George. (1976). *The vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.

Robertson, A. T. (1934). *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in light of historical research*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

Thayer, Joseph (1970). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.

Van Voorst, Robert E. (1990). *Building your New Testament Greek vocabulary*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.