

THE CASE OF AQUILLA AND PRISCILLA

(A review of an article by Wayne Jackson, *May a Christian Woman Ever Teach a Man?*)
MELVIN ELLIOTT

(A word of explanation before I begin this article: it is in reference *only* to a woman and *didaskō* teaching. We have made this plain in our writings. I'm not discussing whether she may teach her children, other women, ask a question, make a comment in a class situation with men present in which some information is given or grade a correspondence lesson from men and make corrections. I have defended all of these and will continue to do so and so do those of my acquaintance. The advocates, whose arguments require a woman to *didaskō* teach, will not be this honest. For example, the title of the article under review, "May a Christian Woman *Ever* Teach a Man?" What kind of "Teach" does he mean? Is it the general idea of the English teaching or the specific, *didaskō* teaching? You really can't absolutely know. In the first four paragraphs he implies at least, that in some unspecified circumstances that she may *didaskō* teach. Later he states woman is not to, "...[T]each in a situation wherein she exerts 'authority' as a teacher." Also, he implies that she may *didaskō* teach a man. This is typical of these men so I seriously question if they are being honest with their readers? A person has a motive for everything he does. What their motive is might not be known but to be consistent with their teachings, they would require that a woman authoritatively teach men and also preach and at least three that I know of have so stated.)

All truth harmonizes with itself so all true statements about the Bible will harmonize with all the Bible teaches on that subject. Therefore, if what one says about the Scripture contradicts with any Bible truth, it is a false statement. When the Bereans searched the scriptures and saw that Paul's preaching harmonized perfectly with the Old Testament, they knew he spoke the truth. The Bible states, "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man..." (I Tim. 2:12) The original word translated "teach" is *didaskō*. Now look at this statement, "A woman is required to engage in the teaching (*didaskō*) of spiritual matters on some occasions..." This statement is out of harmony with I Tim. 2:12 therefore, I know the statement is false. It is that simple if we have the humility to accept Scripture.

This writer lists, among other passages, Acts 18:24-28 for proof of his statement. There is no original word for teach, much less *didaskō* teach in Acts 18:26, so there is not the slightest indication that Priscilla did any *didaskō* **TEACHING** whatsoever. In verse 25 it is stated that Apollos did *didaskō* teach but an entirely different word is used in verse 26 in referring to Aquila and Priscilla. The word is expounded. Why did Luke change the terminology? Because they did **NOT** *didaskō* teach! It is that simple. To use this passage for proof is a total misfire. Further, to say a woman can *didaskō* teach a man is out harmony with Scripture, completely false and therefore, must be rejected as false teaching. This is sufficient to prove Acts 18 cannot be correctly used to support women in *didaskō* teaching. To indicate that she did is to say that Luke did not use the right word. That questions inspiration and to change what he said is to **PERVERT** inspiration. Therefore, to teach such is transgression of the law and that is **SIN!** I want to show the harmony of Scripture by showing that Apollos did not need to be taught in the Bible sense of a teacher-student relationship and so Luke used the right word and it was **NOT** *didaskō*.

It has been since the turn of the century and probably in 2004, I began to hear that some of our preachers were advocating that Christian women were to take a leading (authoritative role) in teaching men the gospel of Christ. Some of the scriptures they were misusing would demand a woman *didaskō* (take the authoritative role of the teacher student relationship) in teaching men and/or preaching to men. I also learned of a congregation that was split over this matter and heard that others were having problems. Although all of us through the years had taught on these things, our recent efforts in teaching and writing on this matter were in response to the false teaching on the role of women that was being advocated by a number of preachers in several states. On one occasion I was visiting in another state and mentioned this to the preacher and when I

returned home I had an e-mail challenging me to have a written discussion. I soon found out that he didn't know an argument from a mere assertion and would not accept plain Bible statements so he ceased replying to my Bible statements of facts.

I have found that these men, like other false and intellectually dishonest teachers, are following in the same steps. They are dishonest in their treatment of what we teach, deceitful in their handling the scriptures, will argue one way on one point and differently on another and accuse us of the very thing of which they are guilty. A case in point is an article by Wayne Jackson. This article is deceitfully titled, deceitfully written, contradicts itself and is dishonest in its representation of us and worst of all, **perverts scripture!** This article has been reprinted in *THE FOREST HILL NEWS*, of the Forest Hills Church of Christ, Memphis, TN home of the MEMPHIS SCHOOL OF PREACHING. According to their bulletin, Anthony D Callahan, Jim D. Crowe, Floyd M. Haynes, Harold D. Mangrum and Leonard Watson are their elders. Barry M. Grider is their minister. Also, Ben Vick Jr. and his fellow elder, Bobby Davis of the Shelbyville Road Church of Christ in Indianapolis, IN has reprinted the article in their bulletin *THE INFORMER*, Nov. 30, 2008 so it has been spread far and wide. Those who have and those who may reprint this article and send it out are no less guilty of its errors than the author. They have sinned and they need to get right with God. That requires nothing less than repentance, a public retraction of this article and an apology from them.

As others have and are answering this article, I will pay particular attention to those things that seem to involve articles I have written but I also need to discuss some things for a background to my remarks. In the eighth paragraph he states, "In I Tim. 2:12, the grammatical construction of Paul's prohibition clearly indicates that the term "teach" (*didaskō*) 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.'" (This is exactly where I stand and what I teach.) Yet, in the very next paragraph he contradicts this statement. "In my research, I consulted dozens of scholarly works pertaining to I 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 (*didaskō*) a man." Can you believe a gospel preacher(?) would make such a statement? This is exactly what false denominational preachers have been doing for years—**contradicting the Scripture by the words of men and following men instead of Scripture!** Since, according to Jackson's statement, these men did not say a woman may "never teach (*didaskō*) a man." he assumes that they were saying she could and wants you to accept that insinuation. Silence cannot authorize a woman to *didaskō*, yet, this is the implication of the statement. Doesn't he know (as well as those who reprinted this article) that silence can **forbid** but it can never **authorize**? I believe he knows this but he hopes to deceive those who may not be cognizant of this fact. Scholarly? I think not, deceitful, yes!

Paul taught that a woman was not to *didaskō* teach, i.e., in a master, teacher student circumstance "nor," an absolute negative, take for her self the authority given man, (*aner*, the male gender). (There can be no exception to an absolute negative, else it ceases to be a negative.) It is apparent to all that one can line up men both pro and con on about any proposition. So, what does he prove when he appeals to men? At best he only proves what a specific person(s) believes and nothing further. It only shows he can find men who will not teach in harmony with Paul's statement. To use them for this purpose shows he (Jackson and those who reprint this article) will not follow God's word but further error. Further, those who allege the text of I Timothy 2:12 does not indicate, "...[A] a woman can never teach (*didaskō*) a man." are not scholars for that is exactly what it teaches. I Timothy 2:12 states; "But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." The word "nor" in this text is from the Greek absolute negative, has the force of never and could correctly be translated **never**. Look in Hebrews 8:4; "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law:" The word for **not** is from the same word as **nor** in the Timothy passage. Was there a possibility Christ could be priest on earth, **never**? Also, I John 2:23; "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (*but*) *he that*

acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.” Again the original word **not** is the same as **nor** in the Timothy passage: is there ever a possibility, condition or circumstance for one who denies the Son to have the Father? **Never?**

The Greek word translated “nor” in Timothy is also translated **neither** in many places. In I Peter 2:22; “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth:” This is the absolute negative without the possibility of finding **any exception**. How similar to the Timothy passage. So it is clear to all who have an open mind to the Scripture that the Timothy passage is an absolute negative. There is never an exception to the absolute negative. Yet the purpose of the Jackson article under review is to show there are exceptions and under some circumstances a woman may *didaskō* teach the man. Scholarly? The very fact that some men seek to find an exception to Paul’s statement belies their alleged acceptance of Scripture and I can prove it with Scripture.

God through Paul said, “But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.” The word for teach is *didaskō*, a formal, authoritative master student relationship and God does not permit or allow an exception to it. Rather than humbly submitting to this, men search for an exception thinking it will prove those who stand with Paul to be, “[Z]ealots foraging through Scripture collecting passages that conflict with their theory, mercilessly twisting them unto submission.” The article is proof enough as to who is “mercilessly twisting” Scripture. These men do not object to, “mercilessly twisting” scripture as well as our position. For example, I have before me another article written to review my teaching and the author puts in quotes, “He says...” but I didn’t say such. In another place he puts in quotes, “hey, it is here. Start saying it IS come instead of it WILL come.” (All mistakes and emphasis are the authors) I did not say that so what does his putting it in quotes show about his integrity? I don’t know the man so can’t say whether he knows better than to write so poorly or not. However, in view of a number of things in his paper and in that he could not answer any of my arguments, (he didn’t answer any and if he could, why didn’t he do so) I suspect his putting such poor writing in quotes is to make me appear to be dull. However, since I did not say that, what does that make of him?

Others have also changed things I have said on this matter. Whether out of carelessness, ignorance or deliberate, it doesn’t speak well of them. Jackson in his article states, “In his book, *The Role of Women*, one brother incorporates thirty six pages attempting to establish the theory that Priscilla was not involved in teaching gospel truth on this occasion.” Jackson, is that *didaskō* teaching? These men continuously mix their terms to confuse) He goes on to say, “The major point is supposed to be that Apollos was provided no ‘new information’” (Elliott 2006, 136-152). He seems to be crediting the book to me and pages 136-152 to, “[O]ne brother...” However, Marion Fox wrote and published this book. Did he simply make a mistake in attributing the book to me instead of Marion in which case I would be the, “[O]ne brother...” but then Marion wrote pages 136-152. So I’m not sure whether he was referring to Marion or me? Marion did include in his book three articles written by me but the page numbers are different. I did use the words, “new information” but in this and the following paragraph, at least by implication, he changes the context of my statement so it doesn’t correctly represent my contention at all. (I will show what I said later) He also does this with other statements so it shows the author is more than careless in dealing with facts in his article. Scholarly; you decide.

Readers, you need to know that many of these men have been challenged to publicly discuss I Timothy 2:12 and so far all have refused to do so and I’m not expecting them to accept. Some wanting to divert attention from their error have wanted to discuss peripheral matters but will not discuss the core issue. One person, Ben Vick jr., was asked to **affirm**, “The New Testament affirms that a woman may, with God’s approval” teach (*didaskō*) an adult male in spiritual matters.” Then he was asked to **deny**, “The New testament affirms that the authority of man over woman includes the act of teaching (*didaskō*).” His reply, “In the first

proposition, our discussion would be limited to the meaning of the Greek word ‘*didaskō*.’” “I do not intend to be hemmed in on that word alone.” Paul used the word *didaskō* and it certainly hems one in. Believe it or not, he then states. “The second proposition, I could sign in the affirmative.” It follows, if he can affirm the second, consistency demands he deny the first. (The first proposition would not limit the discussion to the meaning of *didaskō*.)

Yet, in his bulletin Vol. 58, No. 43, August 21, 2005, Vick states. “To say that women are not obligated to the great commission, as I have heard stated, is an egregious error.” So, in effect he states, women are obligated to the great commission. The great commission obligated the apostles to, “Teaching them to observe all things...” Teaching is from *didaskō*. To the proposition, “The New testament affirms that the authority of man over woman includes the act of teaching (*didaskō*).” He replied he could sign in the affirmative. Yet, in this bulletin, he states, by implication, that a woman is obligated to the great commission but the great commission obligates one to *didaskō* of which Paul said, “But I suffer not a woman to teach, (*didaskō*) nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.” Yes, an, “[E]g egregious error” has been committed but **not** by us who abide in the doctrine taught by God.

Those of us who contend that in spiritual matters, a woman may not with God’s approval, *didaskō* man, i.e., teach in an authoritative, a master, teacher student relationship, nor take to herself the authority God gave man, are accused of teaching, “...[A] fairly new idea...” (Paragraph two, Jackson’s article) This is simply not so. It is absolutely true that near universally, our people have stood against women taking authoritative roles in teaching adult men. Suppose you could find an exception, exceptions do not break the rule. The use and defense of using women translators in the 1990’s was to my knowledge the first general breach in this prohibition among us and may be directly related to the use of women authoritative teachers. At least some who advocated the use of women translators are leading in defending the use of women taking the authoritative role of men.

Since the final words of the New Testament were written, there has been no new spiritual truth. Every true doctrine taught is at least as old as the New Testament and cannot be new or of recent origin. If some things are different than that which is taught in the Scripture, it is not correct. From a personal standpoint, I am now 79 years old and have attended the assembly of the saints from infancy until now. I have lived in 7 states and was usually acquainted with many congregations and preachers in those and other states and until recently, I have never heard taught nor seen practiced what some are advocating today. If I saw anything different, it was (among other things) a few who would not allow a woman to teach a children’s class. I knew elderly men and preachers when I was a teen-ager and they did not teach or practice what some are advocating so in that sense I go back well over 100 years. So, the only answer to the charge that what I stand for is a new doctrine is, *it is not so!* They made the charge; they are obligated to prove it.

What is the problem in this matter? Is it the inability to understand? **Absolutely not!** Some of the men teaching this new and erroneous doctrine have up to and beyond a four-year college degree. It isn’t inability but the problem is a rebellious heart against the truth and of the authority of the Scripture. They know they can’t successfully deny the truth of I Timothy 2:12 so they refuse to debate this passage. Since they are unwilling to submit to scripture, they seek to find an exception to Paul’s prohibition. Since there are no exceptions to an absolute negative command, they twist the scriptures in an attempt to make them appear to be and deceive by mixing the English teach with the Greek *didaskō* so you really can’t tell what they are saying. Jackson does this very thing in his section on “The Priscilla Case.” In addition, he appeals to men to sustain his deception and that within itself belies his submission to Scripture as well as those who carry his article in their bulletins.

Suppose they found an exception, what would it prove? Can these men be so deceived by their own pride and arrogance that they do not know what would be proven if they found such a case? It would prove they found a woman that *sinned!* Look at some parallel Bible cases. Remember, Moses forbade one to murder. In II Samuel 11:15, David had Uriah murdered and God sends Nathan to David. Nathan believed and upheld the law and to show David the truth of his sin he told a story of an unmerciful deed done by a rich man. David was so moved that he said the man should die. It was then that Nathan replied, "...Thou art the man." Had Nathan been minded like some modern deceived preachers, he would have twisted some scriptures in an attempt to find an exception to what Moses prohibited. However, Nathan was true to God and spoke God's word exactly as it was given to him. II Samuel 12:7-9; "Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul; And I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if *that had been* too little, I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things. Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the LORD, to do evil in his sight? thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and hast taken his wife *to be* thy wife, and hast slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon." So, what does this prove? *It proves David violated the law and sinned!*

Moses also said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." We have all ready shown where David did this. Does his action prove there is an exception to Moses? No! Again, it proved *David violated the law and sinned!* Suppose you find a case of a woman *didaskō* teaching a man, it would prove *only* the woman violated I Timothy 2:12 and *sinned!* Moses also said, "Thou shalt not steal." Now I find an actual case, old Achan who both coveted and stole. Will this prove an exception to Moses? *Absolutely not!* Turn to Joshua 7 and read the story for yourself and see if God thought this was an exception to Moses. The actions of Achan *did not* change God's law. Look in Joshua 7:25; "And Joshua said, Why hast thou troubled us? the LORD shall trouble thee this day. And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones." It doesn't matter what the scholars(?) may think and write but what God said. God said, "Thou shalt not steal." Achan stole and every preacher knows he violated Moses' law and *sinned*. These preachers believe and teach exactly what I teach about this, why not Timothy 2:12? God said in effect to women, *thou shalt not didaskō man!* Every person, *preachers included*, that sees the above can also see if a woman *didaskō* teaches man that *she sins* if he will deal logically, honestly and consistently with the case. Why change when it comes to women *didaskō* teaching men? Is it pride, arrogance, stubbornness? I may not know but whatever it is, it is not according to the Bible.

Jackson's article uses six paragraphs that he designates, "THE PRISCILLA CASE." In every paragraph there is error, erroneous implications, mistakes, and denial of some scriptures. In my articles published in THE ROLE OF WOMEN, Vol. I, Pages 153-172 by Marion Fox, I discuss the matter of Aquila and Priscilla and will not repeat it here. However, I will show how Jackson perverted the scripture and also what I said. In the first paragraph under this heading he states, "When this couple heard him, **they** took him unto them, and expounded (plural) unto him the way of God more accurately" (v. 26b). Yet, in the next paragraph he states, "The following facts are indisputable: (a) Apollos was lacking in necessary spiritual information. (b) **Both** Priscilla **and** Aquila took him aside and **instructed** him in 'the way of God.'" (EMP. his) Will someone tell me specifically what Apollos was lacking? In the first paragraph he correctly said, "expounded" but in the second he said "**instructed**." This is a deliberate change in what Luke said and it is misleading to his readers! The New Testament word *ektitheōmi* is not translated instructed and the Oxford English Dictionary (the final appeal for the usage of English words) doesn't use "**instructed**" in defining expounded. So why does Jackson and others insert "instructed" or "teach" in this place? It is the only way they can confuse and deceive their readers. When you read closely, you will see these men are using the word teach in different ways; whatever meaning is needed to suit their immediate point. However, they do not dare say Aquilla and Priscilla *didaskō* taught Apollos for the reasons stated above. Yet, until they do,

their use of this case is pointless and also contradictory with their coupling this case with Matthew 28:19-20 and Mark 16:15 where *didaskō* and *kerusso* are used.

Jackson further states and this is the complete paragraph, “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 major point is supposed to be that Apollos was provided no ‘new information’” (Elliott 2006, 136-152). There is so much misinformation, confusion misapplication and deception in this and the following paragraph that it doesn’t resemble the real situation. There is only one word that can be correctly used to describe it: it is deception. The intent to deceive is a lie. First, I cannot of certain determine whether he is referring to me, to Marion Fox or both. He said the purpose of these “36” pages was to establish his theory; that is “begging the question.” Marion wrote pages 136-152 but that is only 16 pages and not 36. My articles in this book covered pages 153-172, 19 pages. Neither is the major point of our articles what he states. I did use one time the words, “new information” but in my article defining the word expounded and not on pages 136-152. This paper answers none of our arguments but is little more than assertions based on his assumptions, the statements of uninspired men and the mutilation of what we did say.

In the following paragraph, he states, “Unfortunately for the writer, Luke disagrees, stating that Apollos’ teaching was less than accurate because he did not know that John’s baptism was obsolete (vv. 25-26). He needed ‘new information,’ namely that Jesus died, was resurrected, ascended, and a new regime was in place.” To imply that Apollos didn’t know and didn’t preach this *was to come* is pure deception. The oral teaching and writings of all of these men, at least by implication, would have you believe that Apollos did not know the truth concerning Jesus and his kingdom. To say that, “Luke disagrees” with our statements, is a *scripture denying* statement. Acts 18:25 states, “...[H]e spake and taught diligently...” The original word for “diligently” means accurately and exactly. So to state, “...Unfortunately for the writer, Luke disagrees...” in the words of Nathan, Jackson, “...Thou *art* the man.” Now who is guilty of, “...[M]ercilessly twisting them into submission.” These men are so desperate to support their assertions that they will make Luke, a Spirit empowered man, to contradict himself. To make any point, these men are all assuming that John, the greatest prophet, and Apollos had some doctrine peculiar to themselves and did not accurately show the truth of God concerning Jesus and his coming kingdom. This is *deception and not so!*

I will prove by scripture that Jesus and his disciples and later Paul preached exactly what John and Apollos taught. These men preached Jesus and all preached accurately all the truth of the coming Savior. In Matthew 3:1-2; “In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea, And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Now look in Matthew 4:17; “From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” In both cases, this statement is used to indicate the totality of John’s teaching. Now, since Jesus preached what John preached, did Jesus not know and preach the truth about his coming in his kingdom? Apollos preached the baptism of John, i.e., the teaching of John, therefore, if Apollos did not preach the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, it follows that neither John nor Jesus preached it. Further, consider Acts 26:22-23; “Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, *and* that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.

Did you hear what Paul said? He said that he preached, “...[N]one other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say *should come*...” (EMP. M.E.) Paul said John preached, “...[S]aying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.” What is the

difference? As Apollos preached the baptism of John, he taught the same thing that John the prophet, Jesus and Paul taught. John, a great prophet, knew Jesus was going to the cross and Apollos, a student of John and the prophets, also knew it. This effort to make Apollos to be ignorant of the truth, and as one preacher contended, a false teacher is simply *not so!* All the original twelve were disciples of John so my question: what doctrine did they have to change after Pentecost? That is all Apollos had to change.

Were these men taught “new doctrine” and if so in what sense was it new? “New is applied to that which has never existed before of which has only just come into being, possession, use, etc...” New information then is information that was unknown and/or possessed previously. It is false to say, “He needed ‘new information,’ namely that Jesus died, was resurrected, ascended, and a new regime was in place.” This is not the case because the knowledge of the death, burial, resurrection and ascension is as old as the prophets and Apollos knew these prophecies, Acts 18:24. So it was not “new information” to him that this **was to** happen and it was in this sense I used the phrase. In the very sentence that I used the phrase, I stated it in reference to expounded, that it meant, “[T]o reveal or lay bare a matter that was previously hidden to the subject before such was done and that it relates to the **significance** of the known facts or the **circumstances** of the case rather than the giving of any new information.” (Page 158) As I said in my article in The Role of Women, (Page 171), “[H]e simply hadn’t heard the same thing he taught was to come had in fact come to pass.” So I recognized that Apollos didn’t know this had occurred, so if that is all that Jackson means to convey by “new information,” why did he take issue with my statement? It is because to make their contention stand, they are forced to attempt to show Apollos was untaught in essential facts about Jesus and his kingdom. So they are the ones who twist the scriptures to deceive their readers in order to sustain their contention that Priscilla “**instructed**” Apollos. This just goes to show that the old serpent is still, “[M]ore subtle than any beast of the field...”

In conclusion, I have yet to see an article with more assumptions and accusations without any evidence to sustain them and pitting the words of un-empowered men against Spirit empowered men. They mix the English word teach with the Greek *didaskō* and twist what we say as well as the facts of stated in Scripture. These men are either ignorant of the true teaching of the Scripture or else knowingly and deliberately, they are using deception to pervert the scriptures. You be the judge. At the time of this writing, I have just read a reply to this article from a 24-year man that showed more scholarship than the author of it. These men have been repeatedly asked to debate the matter and so far they have all refused to debate a meaningful proposition. Will they prove themselves to be a poltroon? Time will soon tell. (I learned a new word and had to use it)

2731 President Lane, Kokomo, IN 46902-3067