

A REPLY TO WAYNE JACKSON

Written by: Marion R. Fox

Wayne Jackson wrote a response to my two volumes on the role of women (*Christian Courier*, Nov. 2008). In his response Wayne committed several logical and hermeneutical errors. Wayne also misrepresented what I teach (it is my desire that this misrepresentation is not intentional). However, how can Wayne read what I have written (so often and so clearly) and misrepresent what I have written without the misrepresentation being intentional? I will set forth evidence of this misrepresentation in this treatise.

In his first paragraph, Wayne wrote: “Once a proposition is formulated, zealots forage through Scripture collecting passages that conflict with their theory, mercilessly twisting them into submission.” Wayne is “begging the question” with this assertion. He has not proven that I am twisting the Scriptures, he has only asserted it.

As far as my being a zealot, I confess that I am zealous: (1) of good works (Tit. 2:14), (2) to be eaten up with zeal as my Lord (Jn. 2:17), (3) that Wayne would be infected with the zeal that I have to know the truth (cf. 2 Cor. 9:2), (4) to instruct (παιδεύω - by means of my writing) Wayne so that he might repent (cf. Rev. 3:19). Note that I tried to speak with Wayne on the telephone regarding these matters, but he did not want to speak with me, so I am forced to respond in writing by means of this treatise. There is nothing wrong with being a zealot, if one is zealous for what is good.

In paragraph two, Wayne makes the worn out argument that what I teach is: “(A) fairly new idea.” I answered this argument in Vol. II (pp. 30-32) and demonstrated that it contains a logical fallacy. In this paragraph he also misrepresents what I teach when he wrote: “It contends a woman may **never**, in **any** ‘didactical’ (from the Greek *didaskos*) way, instruct a man in biblical matters (Fox 2006, 140ff).” What I actually wrote is:

It has been established that *didaskō* type teaching in the New Testament is an authoritative type of teaching entailing a teacher – pupil relationship. Women are permitted to teach (*didaskō*) women and children. Women are never permitted to engage in *didaskō* type teaching of spiritual truths to men (adult human males). Women are never permitted to function as rabbis or teachers (masters) of men (in spiritual matters). This is the order or arrangement set forth by God from Eden onward. (Fox, Vol. II, 2006, p. 152)

The straw man that has been set up in many of the sixteen questions (above) is the implication that we do not believe a woman may teach a man in any manner. The question is not: “May a woman teach a man,” but: “How may a woman teach a man?” One of the problems is that we have one form of teaching of men that is forbidden (1 Tim. 2:12) and our English word “teach” is not the word that was employed by the apostle Paul (cf. Appendix C). Paul used the Greek word “*didaskō*” not the English word “teach.” All sound brethren agree that women may teach men, unsound brethren teach that she may teach men in ways that violate 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 and 1 Tim. 2:12.¹

¹ That is *didaskō* type teaching and/or teaching where the woman engages in speaking in the worship assembly.

One who is studying a matter must carefully look at both sides of the matter before deciding which one is right (Pro. 18:13, 17, etc.). Understanding both sides will enable the reader to recognize a “straw man” argument. A person may inadvertently set up a straw man argument because he does not understand the argument of his opponent, but often it is done because the one setting up the straw man is dishonest (he intends to misrepresent his opponent). One main difference between a false teacher and one who is honestly mistaken is the false teacher is inherently dishonest. (Fox, Vol. II, p. 29)

Wayne ignores my arguments on the definition of the Greek word: “*didaskō*.” I set forth evidence that the word “*didaskō*” is always (in the New Testament) an authoritative type of teaching. Wayne has simply ignored the arguments that I set forth in my two volumes.

Wayne wrote: “It contends a woman may **never**, in **any** ‘didactical’ (from the Greek *didaskos*) way, instruct a man in biblical matters (Fox 2006, 140ff).” (para. 2) I have taken several years of Greek (culminating in a senior level Greek course at Oklahoma Christian College) and have yet to find a Greek word *didaskos*. Wayne probably meant to write *didaskō*, but he was careless (just like he was careless in dealing with my books).

Wayne correctly wrote: “... that words may be employed variously in different **contexts**.” (para. 3) Certainly this is true, but the one who claims a word has different meanings is obligated to prove his assertion; otherwise he is simply “begging the question.” Where is Wayne’s proof that the Greek word *didaskō* has two different meanings: (1) authoritative type teaching (Mt. 4:23, Acts 5:25, 1 Tim. 2:12, etc.) and (2) non-authoritative type teaching (Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16)?

Wayne wrote: “Such reveals a failure to recognize that words may be employed variously in different **contexts**.” (para. 3) I assure the reader that Wayne knew or should have known that I recognize that: “... words may be employed variously in different contexts.” However, I have not seen any evidence to support Wayne’s claim that the word *didaskō* has a different meaning in Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16 than it has in 1 Tim. 2:12. I anxiously await some evidence from Wayne to support his unsubstantiated assertions. I only decide doctrinal matters upon the basis of sound arguments, not on the assertion of a man who is not miraculously guided by the Holy Spirit. I revealed that a word (including *didaskō*) must be defined by the context (Vol. I, pp. 2, 46, 97, 133, 157, 173, 180, Vol. II, pp. 11, 72, 103, 104, 105, 121, 169, 181, 182, 183, and 184). I reply to Wayne: “Wayne, it is not my failure to recognize this hermeneutical principle, but it is your failure to advance a sound argument to support your claim, that has caused me to teach that the Greek word *didaskō* is always authoritative type teaching (in the New Testament).” Wayne, I cannot find anyone else who has advanced a sound argument to support your claim that *didaskō* is sometimes used for non-authoritarian type teaching in the New Testament. Note what I wrote:

When dealing with the Scriptures we should always allow the Bible to establish the connotative meaning of the word (not our life experiences). Any Bible word must be defined by the context as well as by lexicons. For example, the word “mother” refers to a wicked woman (Ezek. 16:45), to a good woman (Mt. 1:18), to the covenant of the Lord (Gal. 4:26), etc. The word “teach” must not be defined exclusively by a lexicon,

but also by the context of the Scriptures. We recognize that it is wrong to give the word “mother” the same definition in every verse where it is found. We should also recognize that it might be wrong to give the word “teach” (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) the same definition in every passage where it is found. However, if one claims the word “teach” (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) has a different meaning, the burden of proof lies on him to prove that the meaning is different. The word “teach” might also be either literal or figurative (that would also affect its meaning). (Fox, Vol. II, p. 11)

Wayne is guilty of the logical fallacy of “equivocation” in the fourth paragraph (and in other parts of his article). He uses the English word “teach” as if it were an exact translation of the Greek word *didaskō* (Wayne switches back and forth with the word *didaskō* sometimes meaning authoritarian teaching and sometimes meaning non-authoritarian teaching). I made arguments, throughout Vols. I & II, proving that *didaskō* type teaching is an authoritative type teaching. I set forth another argument on this matter in Vol. II, Appendix C. The argument of Appendix C was set forth to prove that the word “teach” (*didaskō*) in 1 Tim. 2:12 is used of a woman being a teacher of man. Wayne is forced to use different meanings for the Greek word *didaskō* in order to sustain his interpretation of Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16. Is Wayne “... mercilessly twisting” these passages “... into submission?” (cf. para. 1) Where is his evidence that this word changes meaning? I admit that some words change meaning when the context changes, but where is the evidence that the Greek word *didaskō* changes meaning in Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16? Wayne has made the claim that it changes meaning, where is his evidence? In a debate the one who affirms something is obligated to prove his case, where is Wayne’s proof? My argument from Vol. II (Appendix C) is derived from Merriam Webster’s definition of the word “teach.” I encourage the reader to go to the Merriam Webster website: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/teach> and study the various definitions of the word “teach” to determine which one fits Paul’s usage of the word *didaskō*. (This is what I did in Vol. II, Appendix C.) With the title of his article, Wayne implies that I teach that a woman may never teach a man under any circumstance. Note his title: “May a Christian Woman *Ever* Teach a Man?” Even Wayne’s title is deceitful!

Wayne leads his reader to think that I do not allow a woman to engage in a conversation with a man regarding spiritual matters. This is totally false (cf. Vol. II, pp. 77 and 159)! In this he erects a “straw man.” Here is what I wrote:

Certainly women may engage in conversations with men about spiritual matters. The reader of this volume should remember that we are only saying that women are limited in their interaction with men in that they are not allowed to take the leadership role in any spiritual matter with men. In most conversations there is no leader and women do not violate any Scripture or scriptural principle when they engage in conversations about spiritual matters with men. In the event that a woman begins to become the teacher in a conversation, she violates 1 Tim. 2:12. How do we know when a woman has “crossed the line” from it being a mere conversation to her becoming the teacher of a man? We know it by the same evidence that we would have if a woman were to cross the same line in a Bible class by her comments and/or actions. This point is discussed more fully in Chapter Ten. (Fox, Vol. II, 2006, p. 77)

Wayne makes the false claim that I teach that: “A Christian woman is not permitted to ‘teach’ her unbelieving husband the gospel.” (para. 5) I set forth that the same regulations of the male-female role that apply between a woman and a man who is not her husband apply to her role with her husband (she may not teach him in an authoritative manner or exercise authority over him in the spiritual realm). (cf. Vol. I, pp. 59, 60, 68, and Vol. II, p. 98) Women are allowed to engage in discussions/conversations with men (including their husbands) in spiritual matters as long as they do not violate other Scriptures (cf. Fox, Vol. II, p. 77 [quoted above]). Allow me to demonstrate the inconsistency of Wayne with a hypothetical dialog between Wayne and me:

Marion: Wayne, would you allow a woman to preach a sermon from the pulpit on Sunday morning in the worship assembly in order “to ‘teach’ her unbelieving husband the gospel?”

Wayne: No, I most certainly would not!

Marion: Well, Wayne, you are claiming: “A Christian woman is not permitted to ‘teach’ her unbelieving husband the gospel.”

Wayne: Marion, you are speaking in half-truths and you should know better.

Marion: So are you when you wrote paragraph 5 of your article.

He makes the false claim that I teach that: “She even is forbidden to grade a correspondence course in which she writes ‘informational comment’ which ‘teaches’ an adult male.” (para. 5) The only time I use the word: “Comment” is in Vol. II (pp. 112-113) and this does not relate to women grading a man’s Bible correspondence course. I do not use the word: “informational” anywhere in either volume. By putting quotes around the words “informational comment” he leaves the impression that he is quoting me. I discussed the question of a woman grading a man’s Bible correspondence course in Vol. I (pp. 21, 22-23, 72, 76, and 81-82) and Vol. II (pp. 39-41 and 75). Why is Wayne making these false claims about what I teach, is he ignorant of what I teach or are these false claims intentional? Allow me to demonstrate the inconsistency of Wayne with another hypothetical dialog between Wayne and me:

Marion: Wayne, would you allow a woman to write a sermon to be delivered (word for word) by a man from the pulpit on Sunday morning in the worship assembly or to be taught to a mixed Bible class in order: “To correct the answers of a man in his Bible correspondence course?”

Wayne: No, I most certainly would not!

Marion: Well, Wayne, you are claiming with regard to a woman grading a man’s Bible correspondence course: “She even is forbidden to grade a correspondence course in which she writes ‘informational comment’ which ‘teaches’ an adult male.” (para. 5)”

Wayne: Marion, you are speaking in half-truths and you should know better.

Marion: So are you when you wrote paragraph 5 of your article.

Wayne needs to answer the questions: (1) “Is it ever possible to teach (*didaskō*) in writing?” and (2) “Is it ever possible to teach (*didaskō*) in an authoritative manner in writing?” The answer to the first question must be: “Yes” (2 Thess. 2:15). If Wayne answers the second question: “Yes,” he is trapped by his own objection. If Wayne answers: “No” to the second question, I ask him the following question: “Would it be in accordance with the Scriptures for your wife to: (1) Do all of the research for a sermon, (2) Write the full text of this sermon, and (3) Give this sermon for you to read (word-for-word) to the Sunday morning worship assembly?” If Wayne replies: “Yes,” he has a woman preacher, she is just not delivering the sermon. (She is doing everything except delivering the sermon.) If Wayne answers: “No” to the second question (above), I ask him: “Did the apostle Paul engage in authoritative type *didaskō* teaching in his writings (2 Thess. 2:15)?” Clearly, Paul wrote (taught) in an authoritative type manner when he taught *didaskō* through his writings. Consequently, some *didaskō* type teaching, by means of writing, is authoritative *didaskō* type teaching.

Wayne wrote:

The Greek term *didasko* is found ninety-seven times in the New Testament. In the King James Version it is rendered “teach” or “taught”, and is employed in several ways. Frequently it indicates a formal teacher-student relationship. At other times, however, with a more general import, *didasko* constitutes informal instruction, or simply a lesson conveyed. (para. 6)

Here, Wayne admits that it indicates a formal teacher-student relationship (in, at least, some instances [Wayne used the word “frequently.”]). This gives me one of my points. I anxiously await his proof that it is used for informal instruction (with both a passage to which I have not replied in Vols. I & II and with a sound argument). He claims that the word *didaskō* is used for a general lesson in 1 Cor. 11:14 and he seems to misunderstand the meaning of this word in Mt. 28:20 (cf. my volume on The Great Commission, 2007). Certainly nature, in a figurative sense, can act as a teacher of God’s people (and mankind in general); so 1 Cor. 11:14 poses no problem with my interpretation of the meaning of the word *didaskō*. (I will deal with 1 Cor. 11:14 in more detail in Vol. III).

The word “teach” (*didaskō*) is equated to the word “preach” (*kērussō*) in Mt. 28:20 and Mk. 16:15-16. Since the word “preach” is certainly authoritative type teaching and it is equated to the word “teach,” it follows that the teaching of Mt. 28:20 is authoritative type teaching (cf. Fox, Vol. II, pp. 12, 135, and 138). Note how Thayer defines the word *kērussō*: κηρυσσω “to be a herald; to officiate as herald; to proclaim after the manner of a herald; always with a suggestion of formality, gravity, and an authority which must be listened to and obeyed” (Thayer, p. 346)

Now Wayne needs to tell his readers why the word *didaskō*, in 1 Tim. 2:12, is authoritative type teaching. Is it authoritative type teaching: (1) Because of the Greek

grammar and syntax (as I set forth in my two volumes and as he set forth in para. 8), (2) Or because the word *didaskō* is always authoritative in the New Testament (as I set forth and he denies), (3) Or because of the first two reasons (which I affirm), or (4) Because of some other reason? I have argued that the first two reasons are true throughout my two volumes. I anxiously await a response from Wayne, will he reply? I do not have to have the second reason to sustain most of what I teach in my two volumes, I only need to establish the first (which Wayne also claims is true).

Wayne cannot logically argue from the Greek grammar/syntax because the Greek text has the same grammar/syntax in Mt. 4:23 and Acts 5:25 as it has in Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16. If he argues it is because of the present tense in 1 Tim. 2:12, he must give me my point in Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16. Wayne wrote:

In 1Tim. 2:12, the grammatical construction of Paul's prohibition clearly indicates that the term "teach" (*didasko*) in **this setting** is the **type** associated with exercising "authority". The woman is not to teach in a situation wherein she exerts "authority" as "teacher." (para. 8)

This is precisely what I teach, but one must recognize that there may be more than one reason to define the word *didaskō* as authoritative type teaching (c.f. the paragraph below where Wayne admits that there are other reasons [cf. his paragraph 7]).

Note the words (derived from *didaskō*) of Mt. 4:23 (διδασκων - [pronounced *didaskōn*] nom. sing. masc. pres. act. part. of διδασκω), Mt. 28:20 (διδασκοντες - [pronounced *didaskontes*] nom. plur. masc. pres. act. part. of διδασκω), Acts 5:25 (διδασκοντες - [pronounced *didaskontes*] nom. plur. masc. pres. act. part. of διδασκω), and Col. 3:16 (διδασκοντες - [pronounced *didaskontes*] nom. plur. masc. pres. act. part. of διδασκω). Note that all of these are present tense - active voice participles. Note my argument:

First Premise: If the Greek word *didaskō* being in the form of a present tense participle requires the word *didaskō* to be authoritative type teaching in Mt. 4:23 and Acts 5:25, then Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16 are authoritative type teaching.

Second Premise: The Greek word *didaskō* being in the form of a present tense participle requires the word *didaskō* to be authoritative type teaching in Mt. 4:23 and Acts 5:25. (I proved this in Vols. I & II.)

Conclusion: Mt. 28:20 and Col. 3:16 are authoritative type teaching.

Wayne is trapped by his own argument, unless he comes up with another reason to make Mt. 4:23 and Acts 5:25 authoritative type teaching. Note my argument from 1 Tim. 2:12:

First Premise: If the Greek word *didaskō* being in the present tense requires the word *didaskō* to be authoritative type teaching in 1 Tim. 2:12, then Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16 are authoritative type teaching.

Second Premise: The Greek word *didaskō* being in the present tense requires the word *didaskō* to be authoritative type teaching in 1 Tim. 2:12.

Conclusion: Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16 are authoritative type teaching.

Wayne is also trapped by his own argument, on 1 Tim. 2:12, because he has argued that the grammar makes 1 Tim. 2:12 to be authoritative teaching (para. 9 [quoted above]). I await his proof that the Greek word (*didaskō* - 1 Tim. 2:12) refers to authoritative type teaching, a proof that does not also prove my claims. Will he shoulder the burden of

proving his claims or will he ignore his obligations? Since I proved the second premise of this last hypothetical syllogism, I have proven the conclusion to be true.

Wayne makes a correct statement: “The **context**, combined with complementary information, prohibits a woman from arrogating herself to the formal role of ‘**the teacher**’ in an assembly where men are subordinated to the status of students (cf. 1 Cor. 14:24-35).” (para. 7) There is one thing that I must add to this statement; this prohibition is not limited to “the assembly” in 1 Tim. 2:12 (Wayne appears to agree with me on this point – cf. para. 8 [quoted above], but in his commentary [2007] he seems to limit all of 1 Timothy 2 to the assembly). If Wayne limits 1 Timothy 2 to the assembly, he is teaching a serious false doctrine. Wayne has now argued that there are three reasons for a woman not being in the role of “the teacher”: (1) the grammatical construction, (2) the context, and (3) complementary information. If I might be allowed to define the expression “complementary information;” I point out that these are the three lines of argumentation that I have used in my two volumes.

Wayne resorts to the fallacy of “appealing to an authority” in para. 9. Wayne wrote: “In my research, I consulted dozens of scholarly works pertaining to 1 Tim. 2:12. Not once did I discover a scholar, in the church or out, who contended that this text indicates a woman can never teach (*didasko*) a man.” I respond by quoting the apostle Paul: “But I permit not a woman to teach (*didaskō*), ... a man, ...” (1 Tim. 2:12) I just could not believe that Wayne wrote this quote; Wayne Jackson actually denied the plain text of what Paul wrote! Wayne Jackson’s version of 1 Tim. 2:12 reads: “But I permit not a woman to (*didaskō*) teach (except when she sings, expounds the way of God, when she fulfills The Great Commission, etc.), ... a man, ...” (*Wayne Jackson’s version of the Bible*). I respond to Wayne: “My authority is the apostle Paul and Wayne has admitted that *didaskō* refers to authoritative type teaching in 1 Tim. 2:12.” Wayne is obviously equivocating on the meaning of the word *didaskō* here. Wayne is caught up in his own equivocation and it caused him to deny the plain wording of 1 Tim. 2:12. Wayne is foraging through Scripture collecting a passage (1 Tim. 2:12) that conflicts with his theory, and mercilessly twisting it into submission (cf. para. 1). Wayne’s argument (quoted above) on scholars teaching on *didaskō*, contains the logical fallacy of “denying the antecedent.” Note Wayne’s invalid (and therefore unsound) argument:

First Premise: If a scholar, in or out of the church, contended that this text (1 Tim. 2:12) indicates a woman can never teach (*didaskō*) a man, then the doctrine that a woman may not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of a man is sound doctrine.

Second Premise: A scholar, in or out of the church, has not contended that this text (1 Tim. 2:12) indicates a woman can never teach (*didaskō*) a man.

Conclusion: The doctrine that a woman may not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of a man is not sound doctrine.

Anyone who has studied logic knows that this argument is invalid (it contains the fallacy of “denying the antecedent”) and since all invalid arguments are unsound, Wayne’s argument is unsound. Allow me to make a sound argument from this first premise:

First Premise: If a scholar, in or out of the church, contended that this text (1 Tim. 2:12) indicates a woman can never teach (*didaskō*) a man, then the doctrine that a woman may not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of a man is sound doctrine.

Second Premise: A scholar, in or out of the church, has contended that this text (1 Tim. 2:12) indicates a woman can never teach (*didaskō*) a man. (The scholar was the apostle Paul.)

Conclusion: The doctrine that a woman may not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of a man is sound doctrine.

Wayne then misrepresents what I teach when he wrote: “Is there any New Testament evidence that a woman, under proper circumstances, could instruct a man scripturally?” (para. 10) He is engaging in the logical fallacy of “poisoning the well” by misrepresenting what I teach (just as he did with the title that he gave to his article). I have set forth repeatedly (in both volumes) that a woman may, under proper circumstances, instruct a man scripturally. Wayne is also engaging in the fallacy of equivocation (using the word “teach” in two different manners). I warned of these men who are teaching error on the role of women committing the logical fallacy of equivocation (Vol. II, p. 33). Why would a man with Wayne’s experience in preaching, writing, and debating commit so many logical and/or hermeneutical errors?

Wayne gives Priscilla as evidence of his claim that the word *didaskō* is used of generic teaching (paragraphs 11-16). Note how he writes: “**they** took him unto them, and expounded ...” (para. 11) then how he subtly equates the word “expound” to the word “instruct” when he wrote: “**Both Priscilla and Aquila** took him aside and **instructed** him in the ‘way of God.’” (para. 12) In this Wayne is subtly equating the English word “instruct” to the Greek word *didaskō*. I admit that Aquila and Priscilla taught (in the English sense of the English words “teach” or “instruct”) Apollos, but where is the proof that they taught him in a *didaskō* type teaching manner (authoritative manner)? Luke does not use the word *didaskō* for what Aquila and Priscilla did (Acts 18:26). Wayne has not cited a single Greek authority who equates the Greek words *ektithēmi* (the word translated “expounded” in Acts 18:26) and *didaskō*. Why did he not quote a Greek authority to support his assertion, was it because he could not find one? I will have an extensive discussion of Priscilla and the Greek word *ektithēmi* in Vol. III. Even without evidence that *ektithēmi* and *didaskō* are equal, Wayne makes a “leap of faith” and goes beyond the evidence. The following logical argument establishes how Wayne engages in the logical fallacy of “begging the question.” Note my argument:

First Premise: If Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type teaching of Apollos and Priscilla did not sin, then *didaskō* type teaching is not always authoritative type teaching.

Second Premise: Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type teaching of Apollos and Priscilla did not sin. (This is Wayne’s argument – it begs the question.)

Conclusion: *didaskō* type teaching is not always authoritative type teaching.

Note how the second premise of Wayne’s argument “begs the question” (it assumes the point in question). Let us apply transposition to the first premise:

First Premise: If *didaskō* type teaching is always authoritative type teaching, then either Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of Apollos or Priscilla sinned.

Second Premise: *didaskō* type teaching is always authoritative type teaching (my affirmation [proven by numerous arguments in Vols. I & II]).

Conclusion: Either Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of Apollos or Priscilla sinned.

Let us place this conclusion into an alternative syllogism:

First Premise: Either Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching of Apollos or Priscilla sinned.

Second Premise: Priscilla did not sin.

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

It is axiomatic that nothing can be proven from Acts 18:26 with regard to *didaskō* type teaching. Wayne cannot escape this argument by saying that Priscilla sinned, because this incident would not be an apostolic approved example (if she sinned). All of his arguments on Acts 18:26 are “red herrings” (smoke screens).

In order: “To buttress his case, my friend introduces a quotation from J. W. McGarvey which asserts that Aquila and Priscilla ‘... took the powerful and zealous preacher to their own home, and taught him the truth on the subject (1892, 148)’ [para. 11] This position implies that Paul contradicted himself-in spite of McGarvey’s name associated with the idea. .. My correspondent is fearfully close to overtly affirming a female preaching ministry. McGarvey was wrong, and so are those who follow him in this respect.” (Jackson, [1994] pp. 467-468) The reader should note that I have meshed together two quotes from Wayne Jackson, one where he rejects an appeal to McGarvey (1994) and para. 11. (Wayne rejects McGarvey as an authority [when it suits him] and uses McGarvey as an authority [when it suits him].) I could neither find the quote of McGarvey on page 148, nor could I find it on page 232. The best I can determine is that Wayne Jackson either misquoted McGarvey or he cited the wrong page of McGarvey’s commentary. Wayne is either careless here or he is dishonest in misquoting McGarvey.

In para. 15 he attacks Appendix A of my Vol. I (written by Melvin Elliott). However, let us quote McGarvey (Wayne’s authority [above]):

His ignorance had reference to the points of distinction between John’s immersion and that of the apostles, which were chiefly these, that John did not promise the Holy Spirit to those who were immersed, and did not immerse into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Whatever confusion of thought upon kindred topics is necessarily involved in ignorance of these two things, Apollos must also have been subject to; but we are not authorized to extend his ignorance any further than this. (McGarvey, p. 232)

Wayne rejects McGarvey on this matter, but quotes (misquotes) him on another issue. How shameful is it when we begin to appeal to the traditions of men (an assertion [without a sound argument] of a man who lived after the age of miracles made [either orally or in writing]). Wayne actually denied the writings of the inspired Luke when he wrote: “... Luke disagrees, stating that Apollos’ teaching was less than accurate ...” (para. 16) However, Luke wrote: “This man had been instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught **accurately** the things concerning Jesus, knowing only the baptism of John:” (Acts 18:25 – ASV - Emphasis added by MRF).

Note the lexical definition of the Greek word translated **accurately**:

ακριβῶς [pronounced *akribōs*] “adv., *exactly, accurately, diligently*” [Thayer, p. 24] “adv. ... *accurately, carefully, well ... pay close attention*” [BAG, p. 32] “*Akribōs* (ακριβῶς) means accurately, exactly.” (Vine, p. 314)

I have a fairly extensive discussion of this word in Vol. I, p. 140.

In paragraph 18, Wayne makes a wild unproven assertion: “It implies the man had been taught the truth, but he stubbornly resisted. Who had taught him the gospel? Quite obviously his wife, ...” He cites as his proof Peter Davids (a denominational commentator) and Guy N. Woods (who does not make the wild claim that Wayne makes [“Who had taught him the gospel? Quite obviously his wife, ...”]). Brother Woods did not make the claim that the husband was taught by the wife in his commentary. Wayne will not accept what brother Woods taught on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, why does he cite him here? Even in the area of the role of women, Wayne disagrees with brother Woods (Wayne correctly applies 1 Cor. 14:33b-36 to the church today, but brother Woods did not). Is it possible that Wayne is dropping names here in an attempt to mislead the reader into thinking that brother Woods taught what Wayne teaches? Is Wayne using the traditions of men (what a man [Peter Davids] who lived after the age of miracles wrote or said) as his authority in spiritual matters? I dealt with the problem of those teaching error on the role of women using traditions to support their false doctrines (Vol. I, pp. 6-7, 13-15, 79, 149-150, Vol. II pp. 3, 30-31, etc.). Wayne asked his readers to accept his assertion in this matter without any evidence, how shameful! This is an excellent example of the logical fallacy of “begging the question.” Allow me to set forth Wayne’s argument in the form of an enthymeme (the major premise is elliptical):

Major Premise: All A are B.

Minor Premise: The claim that the wife had obviously taught her husband is a claim that Wayne Jackson has made without any proof.

Conclusion: The claim that the wife had obviously taught her husband is a claim that is true.

Allow me to show the reader how to interpret an enthymeme (an incomplete syllogism [a necessary inference]). First, all valid (properly constructed by the rules of logic) syllogisms contain three terms (the major term which is the predicate of the major premise [represented here by the letter “B”], the middle term which is the subject of the major premise [represented here by the letter “A”], and the minor term which is the subject of the minor premise). When we have the minor premise and the conclusion, we can reproduce the major premise (because the middle term and major term are in the remainder of the incomplete syllogism). The unstated (but implied) major premise that Wayne is using here is: “All claims that Wayne Jackson has made without any proof are claims that are true.” Anyone who would seriously make this claim must think he is miraculously guided by the Holy Spirit. Since Wayne has implicitly made this claim, we have evidence that he has implicitly joined Mac Deaver in his direct operation of the Holy Spirit error. I have a concise development of the enthymeme and logic in general in my book on the work of the Holy Spirit, Vol. I, Appendix A.

Frequently Wayne paraphrases what I wrote and his paraphrases misrepresent what I teach. In addition, Wayne simply ignores many of my arguments and seems to think that his readers will not read what I have written. In paragraph 19, Wayne, with a simple wave of the hand, ignores many separate arguments on the definition of the word *didaskō*. I developed a number of arguments throughout Vols. I & II, culminating in Vol. II (particularly Chapter Nine) on the definition of the word *didaskō*. I will be adding more arguments in Vol. III on the role of women.

Wayne's last attempt to answer my arguments is found in his last two paragraphs (20 and 21). In these paragraphs his only argument is that Prof. Melick (a denominational commentator) agrees with him (with Wayne). What kind of argument is this, is it not an appeal to the traditions of men? I will have a reply to him when he gets around to telling us what rules of Greek grammar/syntax make *didaskō* to be authoritative type teaching in Mt. 4:23, Acts 5:25, and 1 Tim. 2:12.

Let me make another point in reply to Wayne Jackson. If (for the sake of argument) we may assume that *didaskō* type teaching is always (in the New Testament) authoritative type teaching, then no woman is allowed to teach (in a *didaskō* type teaching manner) any man under any circumstance. This means that all of Wayne's arguments are moot.

Wayne has already given us the point that the Greek word *didaskō* is used of authoritative type teaching (paragraphs 6, 7, and 8). I repeatedly defined the expression *didaskō* type teaching (as authoritative type teaching) and Wayne seems to ignore my definition (cf. Vol. I, pp. v [footnote 2], 4 [footnote 8], 14 [footnote 13], 20, 22, 25, 27, 49 [footnote 40], 53 [footnote 43], 74, 111 [footnote 86], 129, 131 [footnote 120], 136, 145, 149 [footnote 146], 150 [footnote 151], Vol. II, pp. 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 47, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 69, 70, 76, 77, 96, 98, 99, 105, 118, 119, 120, 121, 126, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141, 152 [quoted above], 159, 167, 184, and in other instances). Let me summarize this matter: (1) Wayne Jackson defines the word *didaskō* as authoritative type teaching in 1 Tim. 2:12, (2) I use the same definition and stipulate many times (cf. above) that this is the definition I am using for *didaskō*, and (3) Wayne condemns me for doing this. I am truly amazed at his inconsistency! When I wrote my books, I thought this might be a problem (because I have been misrepresented by the Online Academy of Biblical Studies [OABS] director [Tom Bright] and some of their faculty), so I inserted the definition over and over (on at least 60 different pages [on some of these pages I defined it more than once]) in my two books. Even this repeating of a definition, that Wayne Jackson agrees with, did not stop his misrepresentation of me.

In this paragraph I will illustrate the irrational nature of Wayne's ignoring of my stipulative definition of the expression: "*didaskō* type teaching." I have been preparing notes for several years to write a book on the subject of baptism. I plan to discuss the various baptisms of the New Testament in chapter one (John's baptism, baptism in the Holy Spirit, baptism in fire, Great Commission baptism, etc.). I plan to stipulate (in Chapter Two) that I will be discussing The Great Commission baptism in the remainder of the book. I suppose that Wayne might obtain a copy of my book and find the word "baptism" in a later chapter and claim that I am advocating baptism in the Holy Spirit for remission of sins (ignoring my stipulative definition). This is what he has done with my repeated stipulation of *didaskō* type teaching as authoritative type teaching. How did Wayne miss the stipulating of *didaskō* type teaching as authoritative type teaching on 60 different pages? I do not believe that Wayne Jackson missed the more than 60 times that I stipulated that *didaskō* type teaching is authoritative type teaching in my two volumes. No, there is another problem here; and a discerning reader can discern that there must be

another problem and can probably discern that there is sin involved in Wayne's actions. All one needs to do it to look at the misleading nature of the title for Wayne's article.

My interpretation of these passages (particularly 1 Tim. 2:1-15 and 1 Cor. 11:2-16, and 14:33b-36) would have the following consequences: (1) Women would not be allowed to authoritatively teach the Bible to mixed groups, (2) Women would not be allowed to lead prayer in mixed groups, (3) Women would not be allowed to lead singing in mixed groups, (4) Women would not be allowed to officiate at the Lord's supper in mixed groups, (5) Women would not be allowed to officiate over the collection in mixed groups, (6) Women would not be allowed to ask questions in the assembly, but would be allowed to ask questions in a Bible class, (7) Women would not be allowed to read Scripture in the assembly, but would be allowed to read (not as the leader) in a Bible class, (8) Women would not be allowed to make comments in the assembly, but would be allowed to make comments in situations outside the assembly (in a Bible class, one-on-one, etc.), and (9) Women would be able to do all of 1 through 8 in groups containing women and children (as long as no men were present). Women would be allowed to have discussions with men regarding spiritual matters, but would not be allowed to "take charge of the discussion as the leader" in just the same way they may discuss spiritual matters in a Bible class (as long as they do not become the leader of the study).

Unless Wayne disagrees with one or more of these conclusions, why is he making such a fuss over my interpretation? Why is Wayne being divisive in this matter? If he thinks that one or more of these conclusions are fatal doctrinal errors, then he should set forth wherein he thinks I am teaching fatal error and debate this matter. In our brief telephone conversation (Dec. 2, 2008), Wayne said he was not interested in debating the matter. He is willing to engage in hit-and-run tactics, but will not stand and defend what he teaches.

My interpretation of these passages would apply to all women in their roles with all men (both Christian men and non-Christian men). The same regulations would apply to a woman's role with regard to her family members (father, husband, son, uncle, etc.) that apply to her relationship with other men.

With the instances wherein Wayne has made false charges about what I teach we must draw one of the following conclusions:

1-Either Wayne has ignorantly charged me with teaching things that I do not teach (in which case he is unrighteous because he made charges that he did not know were true). Wayne assured me that he had read both of my books and that he had "marked them up" when I had a brief discussion with him on the telephone (Dec. 2, 2008). I encourage the reader to go to the four articles that I wrote on righteousness in the One Heart Journal (2007 issues). Go to: <http://www.okcsbs.com/oneheart.html>

2-Or Wayne has deliberately falsely charged me with teaching things that I do not teach (in which case he is not only unrighteous, but he is guilty of the sin of lying [telling a deliberate falsehood]).

3-Or he has not falsely charged me with teaching anything. (Those who have my books can turn to the pages that I cited in the above article and judge for themselves whether or nor Wayne has falsely charged me with teaching things that I do not teach. In the final analysis it does not even matter what man thinks, God will judge in this matter.)

Let me add that the editor of *The Forest Hill News* (probably Barry M. Grider) and the elders: Anthony D. Callahan, Jim D. Crowe, Floyd M. Hayes, Harold D. Mangrum, and Leonard Watson are also unrighteous (if I have been falsely charged with teaching things I did not teach), because they have published these false charges. In addition, the editor of *The Informer*, Vol. 62 # 29, Nov. 30, 2008; edited by Ben Vick and the elders: Ben Vick and Bobby F Davis are also unrighteous (if I have been falsely charged with teaching things I did not teach), because they have published these false charges.

All of Wayne's article (beginning with his title) constitutes a red herring (smoke screen) that has the effect of diverting the brotherhood's attention away from the issues that have already split the Lord's church (in Georgia and elsewhere). There are four issues that need to be studied and debated to let the brotherhood decide for itself (based upon the Scriptures) where they will stand: (1) Certain men (Jim Bullington, Jeff Coalson, and others) were involved in splitting the Lord's church by teaching the false doctrine that a non-Christian man has no spiritual authority that a Christian woman might usurp, (2) Certain men (Jim Bullington, Jeff Coalson, Wayne Jackson, and others) have limited the instructions of 1 Tim. 2:8-15 to the assembly of the church, and (3) Others have limited the instructions of 1 Tim. 2:8-15 to the Christian man – Christian woman roles (claiming it does not apply to the Christian woman – non-Christian man roles), and (4) Certain men (Jim Bullington, Jeff Coalson, Tom Bright, Wayne Jackson, Ben Vick, and others) have claimed that women have the duty (from The Great Commission) to teach and preach to men (cf. my answer to this in my book: *The Great Commission*, 2007, M. Fox). These are the real issues that need to be discussed by our brotherhood. The doctrines taught by these certain men (Jim Bullington, Jeff Coalson, and others) have been endorsed by: Tom Bright, the OABS faculty (both former and present faculty), and certain other preachers from west Tennessee.

Since the Forest Hills church of Christ supports Wayne's article, they must agree with all of his irrational reasoning. Is this the kind of reasoning that is being taught at the Memphis School of Preaching (the Forest Hills church of Christ oversees the Memphis School of Preaching)? Where do the Memphis School of Preaching director and faculty stand on the four issues of the last paragraph (above)? Where do the elders of the Shelbyville Road church of Christ (Indianapolis, Indiana), Ben Vick and Bobby F. Davis stand on these four issues?

Let me close this reply to Wayne Jackson's article with an observation. If a man has a sound argument to support his doctrinal position, then he will set forth the sound argument (rather than set forth an unsound argument). This will occur unless: (1) He either does not know how to reason correctly or (2) He knows that he does not have a sound argument and is dishonest and is unwilling to change his doctrine. Since the Forest

Hills and Shelbyville Rd. churches of Christ have endorsed this article (by printing it), this applies equally to them and to the Memphis School of Preaching as well as to Wayne Jackson.

OTHER ERRORS TAUGHT BY WAYNE JACKSON

It is commonly known that Wayne teaches error on women wearing the veil, but I will deal with this error in: “*The Role of Women, Vol. III.*”

Wayne limits 1 Cor. 14:33-35 to the worship assembly (he is correct in this). However, Wayne incorrectly, limits 1 Tim. 2:1-15 to the worship assembly (Jackson, 2007). Since he limits 1 Tim. 2:8-12 to the worship assembly, he cannot forbid women engaging in authoritative type teaching of men and leading men in other spiritual activities (including leading prayer and leading singing) outside the worship assembly. With his unsound interpretation of 1Tim. 2:1-15, he has laid the groundwork for women teaching mixed Bible classes and preaching (outside the worship assembly). With his claim that women are amenable to The Great Commission (Mt. 28:20), he must also have women preaching the gospel to every creature (Mk. 16:15-16). This follows because Mk. 16:15-16 is a parallel passage to Mt. 28:18-20. Wayne has, with his unsound reasoning and unsound hermeneutics, laid the foundation for women preachers and women teachers of mixed Bible classes. I answered his unsound claims that women are amenable to The Great Commission in Fox (2007).

In another article in the Nov. 2008 issue of *Christian Courier* (p. 42), Wayne commits more errors. Wayne seems to be saying that the punctuation of Col. 3:16 was only challenged by the RSV in 1946. However, if the reader would refer to my Vol. II (pp. 118-139), he will see that the punctuation that I suggest has been suggested by others for over 180 years (other commentators and other translations). Wayne writes: “But ‘teaching’ and ‘admonishing’ are not verbs without objects; the teaching is executed by singing.” The words: “teaching” and “admonishing” are not verbs, but these words are participles. Since the singing is directed “to the Lord” (Col. 3:16), how is it that we teach the Lord anything (by our singing)? In this article, Wayne ignores several arguments that I made on Col. 3:16. Is this how a sound gospel preacher deals with doctrines that he considers to be error? A sound preacher does not attack a doctrine unless he can definitively prove it is untrue. Wayne has not even attempted to deal with many of my arguments and Wayne has steadfastly refused to even consider debating this issue. Has Wayne refused to deal with this matter because he cannot answer the opposing arguments? When I asked Wayne if he would be willing to debate the issue, he asked me if I debated everyone who challenged me to a debate. Whereupon, I replied: “No.” He said he did not debate everyone who challenged him. However, I do either debate or obtain a representative to represent my position, if I publicly write and or preach and call the name of a person. He has publicly called my name and he is acting like a coward by not defending (in a public debate) his false charges. Is he like the terrorists who “hit and run” but will not stand and fight? Only Wayne can answer for his reasons why he will not defend (in either a written or an oral debate) the positions he has taken, but it appears that it is nothing but fear on his part.

ADDITIONAL POINTS

I wrote the following:

When sound preachers say that teaching of men by woman is forbidden (1 Tim. 2:12), no person has the right to add the word “all” to their assertion. They do not have the right to say that sound preachers mean: “All teaching of men by women is forbidden.” Sound preachers are only saying: “Some teaching of men by women is forbidden (*didaskō* type teaching is forbidden).” (Vol. I, p. 20)

The reader should remember that I have repeatedly written that *didaskō* type teaching is an authoritative type of teaching (throughout Vols. I & II). Wayne makes the false implication that I teach that women may never teach a man (by the title of his article and by the final paragraph of his article). Wayne’s final paragraph reads: “This doctrine that a woman may never ‘teach’ a man is new, void of genuine evidence, and divisive.” Note how Wayne knowingly misrepresents me by using the generic English word “teach” rather than the Greek word *didaskō* (to teach in an authoritative manner). If I were to do this with his claim that 1 Tim. 2:12 prohibits teaching and said that Wayne prohibited generic (all kinds of) teaching, he would quickly claim that I was misrepresenting him. Wayne is guilty of the fallacy of “special pleading.”

Wayne also made more factual errors when he made a reference to pages that I wrote (Vol. I, pp. 136-152) and he attributed them to Melvin Elliott (para. 15). Actually, Melvin wrote pp. 153-172. This is another example of Wayne’s careless reading and careless research of the matter.

In para. 15, Wayne wrote: “In his book, *The Role of Women*, one brother incorporates thirty-six pages attempting to establish his theory that Priscilla was not involved in teaching gospel truth on this occasion.” The reader should note that Wayne has equivocated on the meaning of the word “teach.” It is not the act of a woman teaching (to use the generic English word “teach”), but it is *didaskō* type teaching that I oppose. In The chapter relating to Aquila, Priscilla, and Apollos; I defined *didaskō* type teaching on pp. 136, 140, 142, 145, 148, 149 (footnote 146), and 150 (footnote 151). How could Wayne miss these eight times that I defined the word *didaskō*? Obviously he did not miss these, Wayne purposely misrepresented me. I ask why he misrepresented me and what is Wayne’s motive for misrepresenting me? Wayne claimed that he had read both of my books; allow me to make an extensive quote from Vol. II (**the quote is in smaller print**):

DOES NOT THE FACT THAT AQUILA AND PRISCILLA EXPOUNDED THE WAY OF
GOD MORE ACCURATELY TO APOLLOS (ACTS 18:24-26) PROVE
THAT WOMEN MAY TEACH MEN?

The incident with Aquila and Priscilla in this passage has been used by many of those who are trying to introduce doctrinal error on the role of women. This question can be reduced to a simple conditional syllogism:

First Premise: If Priscilla taught (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos, then some expounding of Scripture (the way of God) is teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) of Scripture.

Second Premise: Priscilla taught (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos. (Assertion of those asking this question)

Conclusion: Some expounding of Scripture (the way of God) is teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) of Scripture.

This argument obviously does not consider the possibility that some expounding of Scripture is not teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*). This would follow unless they are assuming that all expounding is teaching (begging the question). The reader should ask himself if it is possible to expound something without engaging in the kind of teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) of 1 Tim. 2:12. If it is possible to expound something without teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*), how does the one arguing from the actions of Priscilla know she did not expound in a non-*didaskō* type of teaching manner? Note: the word *didaskō* is used for what Apollos did (Acts 18:25), but it is not used for what Aquila and Priscilla did (Acts 18:26).

Note the argument of this author:

First Premise: If Priscilla did not violate Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos, then Priscilla obeyed the principles of 1 Tim. 2:12.

Second Premise: Priscilla did not violate Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos.

Conclusion: Priscilla obeyed the principles of 1 Tim. 2:12.

From this conclusion we learn that once we know what 1 Tim. 2:12 teaches, we will know what Priscilla did not do. This incident neither set aside any instructions from the pen of the apostle Paul nor modified any instructions from the pen of the apostle Paul.

Note the following argument that demonstrates that this whole claim about Priscilla is unsound:

First Premise: If Priscilla obeyed the principles of 1 Tim. 2:12, then Priscilla did not teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Apollos. (This premise is axiomatic.)

Second Premise: Priscilla obeyed the principles of 1 Tim. 2:12.

Conclusion: Priscilla did not teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Apollos.

Obviously Priscilla did not teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Apollos and from this we see that this whole discussion about Priscilla is a smoke screen (a red herring). Note the following argument that proves it is a red herring:

First Premise: If Priscilla did not teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos, then any argument relating to Priscilla that is brought up to attempt to limit the meaning of the word teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) in 1 Tim. 2:12 is a red herring.

Second Premise: Priscilla did not teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos.

Conclusion: Any argument relating to Priscilla that is brought up to attempt to limit the meaning of the word teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) in 1 Tim. 2:12 is a red herring.

Again we ask “what is their purpose in bringing up Priscilla, if not to limit the meaning of the word *didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse* in 1 Tim. 2:12?” Those who try to limit the meaning of the word teach (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*), in 1 Tim. 2:12, by bringing up Priscilla are either guilty of “begging the question” or they are guilty of “introducing a red herring.”

Acts 18:24-26 does not relate to *didaskō* type teaching if *didaskō* type teaching is defined as public teaching and Priscilla engaged in *didaskō* type teaching. (CHART RW-26) The following arguments establish this assertion:

First Disjunction: Either *didaskō* type teaching is limited to public teaching or it is not limited to public teaching.

First Premise: If *didaskō* type teaching is not limited to public teaching, then women are forbidden to teach (*didaskō*) men publicly and privately.

Second Premise: *didaskō* type teaching is not limited to public teaching.

Conclusion: Women are forbidden to teach (*didaskō*) men publicly and privately. (This is truth.)

Second Disjunction: Either teaching two pupils is public teaching or teaching two pupils is not public teaching.

First Premise: If *didaskō* type teaching is limited to public teaching and teaching two pupils is not public teaching, then Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching in Acts 18:24-26.

Second Premise: *didaskō* type teaching is limited to public teaching and teaching two pupils is not public teaching. (This premise is asserted by certain brethren.)

Conclusion: Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching in Acts 18:24-26.

Note the following proof that the act of bringing up Acts 18:24-26 is a red herring.

First Premise: If Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching in Acts 18:24-26, then Acts 18:24-26 does not nullify or modify 1 Tim. 2:12.

Second Premise: Priscilla did not engage in *didaskō* type teaching in Acts 18:24-26.

Conclusion: Acts 18:24-26 does not nullify or modify 1 Tim. 2:12.

This argument is set forth in CHART RW-26.

There is another possibility with regard to Priscilla. It is highly probable that Paul laid his hands upon Priscilla and imparted a spiritual gift to her. It is also possible that the gift given to her was that of being a prophetess. Note the following argument:

First Premise: If Priscilla were a prophetess and passages dealing with prophets (and prophetesses) are no longer binding upon the church, then Priscilla does not serve as a pattern for us today.

Second Premise: Priscilla was a prophetess and passages dealing with prophets (and prophetesses) are no longer binding upon the church. (The first part of this conjunction is highly likely and the second part is affirmed by some who teach error on the role of women.)

Conclusion: Priscilla does not serve as a pattern for us today.

We ask: “Why would the apostle Paul leave Aquila and Priscilla without imparting gifts to them (particularly since there was no complete written New Testament at that time [only certain books of the New Testament existed at that time])?”

These certain men have implicitly charged Priscilla with violating Scripture, but they are wrong. Note the following argument:

First Premise: If Priscilla violated Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos, then women may teach men in a way that violated 1 Tim. 2:12.

Second Premise: Women may not teach men in a way that violated 1 Tim. 2:12. (This premise is axiomatic.)

Conclusion: Priscilla did not violate Scripture by expounding the way of God more accurately to Apollos.

Priscilla did not violate Scripture (including 1 Tim. 2:12) in Acts 18:24-26. Note the argument of certain brethren on Priscilla:

Major Premise: All instances of women expounding spiritual truths to men are instances of *didaskō* type teaching.

Minor Premise: Acts 18:24-26 is an instance of a woman expounding spiritual truths to a man.

Conclusion: Acts 18:24-26 is an instance of *didaskō* type teaching.

This major premise will be used in the following argument to demonstrate that it is untrue.

Major Premise: All instances of women expounding spiritual truths to men are instances of *didaskō* type teaching.

Minor Premise: No instances of women lawfully teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) men are instances of *didaskō* type teaching.

Conclusion: No instances of women lawfully teaching (*didaskō* - *authoritatively deliver a discourse*) men are instances of women expounding spiritual truths to men.

Note the following argument derived from this argument:

First Premise: Either the syllogism is invalid, the major premise is untrue, or the minor premise is untrue.

Second Premise: The syllogism is valid.

Third Premise: The minor premise is true (1 Tim. 2:12).

Conclusion: The major premise is not true.

Obviously Acts 18:24-26 does not prove their case. Obviously “some instances of women expounding spiritual truths to men are not instances of *didaskō* type teaching.” It is manifest that women are able to expound without engaging in *didaskō* type teaching. CHART RW-9 (cf. Chapter Twelve and Appendix A in Vol. I) (**Volume II, pp. 58-64**)

I do not see how an honest person can miss what I wrote here and elsewhere (cf. Vol. I, p. 129 etc.).

Wayne introduced an *Ad Hominem* argument (para. 19), but did not develop it and make any point where I was supposedly inconsistent. What is his point? The reader should note that his whole point hinges upon the question of how the Greek word *didaskō* is defined. If *didaskō* type teaching is always authoritative type teaching (in the New Testament), as I claim, then his 19th paragraph is moot. The reader should remember that most *ad hominem* arguments are fallacious.

OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT WAYNE HAS WRITTEN

Wayne seems to be making one argument that is sound throughout his treatise. Wayne seems to be arguing that some kind of teaching is forbidden in 1 Tim. 2:12 (I agree with this) and he argues (implicitly) that no two verses can contradict each other (I agree with this). He then reasons:

If *didaskō* type teaching is always authoritative type teaching (in the New Testament), then there is a contradiction between 1 Tim. 2:12 and three passages (Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16).

He (implicitly) applies transposition to this premise to obtain:

If there is no contradiction between 1 Tim. 2:12 and three passages (Mt. 28:20, 1 Cor. 11:14, and Col. 3:16), then *didaskō* type teaching is not always authoritative type teaching (in the New Testament).

What must Wayne be assuming in order to prove his first premise? Wayne is assuming that: (1) Women are under The Great Commission (Mt. 28:20), (2) That the figurative

teaching by nature cannot teach in an authoritative manner, and (3) That the punctuation of Col. 3:16 of the KJV and ASV is correct. I answered his claim that women are under the Great Commission in Fox (2007) and in earlier sections of this treatise. It is clear that the teaching of “nature” (1 Cor. 11:14) is authoritative because it is binding upon the church. This leaves us with one passage (Col. 3:16) and Wayne simply ignores my arguments in my two volumes (particularly Vol. II). We shall see if he ignores my arguments set for in this treatise. Of course, Wayne also makes the unproven and unproveable claim that the word *didaskō* is found in Acts 18:26. There is not one single Greek manuscript that has the Greek word *didaskō* in Acts 18:26. Wayne is engaging in mercilessly twisting this passage into submission (cf. para. 1). Allow me to quote one of my arguments: **(The quote is in smaller print.)**

There are two possible options for the four participles in Col. 3:16-17. First, there is the adverbial participle of means and second, the adverbial participle of result. “... the participle of means is often used in the present tense *after* a present imperative... Result participles are invariably present participles that follow the main verb; ...” (Wallace, p. 639) These are almost certainly participles of result. The result of having the word to dwell richly is that they will be teaching and admonishing one another and they will be singing (not to one another, but to the Lord). If one already knows something he does not need to be taught (Jer. 31:31-34). It is also axiomatic that one cannot teach what he does not know. Therefore, how can we be both teaching through our singing and learning at the same time (by the same words)? The singing was not “to one another,” but “unto the Lord² (Majority Text).” This problem can be removed by a change in the punctuation of this verse. (Fox, Vol. II, 2006, pp. 123-124)

Wayne quotes the English Standard Version (para. 13), but fails to note that it punctuates Col. 3:16-17 the way that I punctuate these verses:

Colossians 3:16-17 (ESV) Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, teaching and admonishing one another in all wisdom, singing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, with thankfulness in your hearts to God. 17 And whatever you do, in word or deed, do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.

Clearly, Wayne is selective in his quoting of his human authorities.

I encourage the reader of this treatise to go to my website and download the charts that I have in my two volumes: <http://members.cox.net/mrfox1/charts.pdf> , if he does not have copies of my books. Several of these charts succinctly set forth my arguments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

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

² The word “Lord” is supported by the Majority Text, C², D², Ψ*, several Vulgate MSS, the Old Latin MS (a), and several Boharic MSS.

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

Fox, Marion R. (2007). *The Great Commission*. Oklahoma City, OK: Five F. Pub. Co.

Jackson, Wayne. (2007). *Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus; Before I Die*. Stockton, CA: Christian Courier Pub.

Jackson, Wayne. (Nov. 2008). "May a Christian Woman *Ever* Teach a Man?" *Christian Courier*, Vol. 44, # 7, pp. 37 and 39. Wayne has a related article on p. 42. Wayne's article can be found at the following website:

http://www.foresthillcofc.org/nov_18_08.pdf At present it is not on the Christian Courier website: <http://www.christiancourier.com/articles> This article was also reproduced by the Shelbyville Road church of Christ in their bulletin: *The Informer*, Vol. 62 # 29, Nov. 30, 2008, Indianapolis, Indiana.

McGarvey, J. W. (n. d.) *A commentary of Acts of Apostles with a Revised Version of the Text*, 7th ed. Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate Co.

Vine, W. E. (n. d.) *A comprehensive dictionary of the original Greek words with their precise meanings for English readers*. McLean, VA: MacDonald Pub. Co.