

# The Meaning of Head in the Bible

by Wayne Grudem

---

*The word 'head' in the Bible means a person in authority, not a source or end point, and is used to describe the relationship between God and humanity, as well as the relationship between husbands and wives.*

**Duration:** 1:08:22

**Scripture:** Genesis 2:18, Exodus 18:21, Matthew 6:33, 1 Corinthians 11:3, 2 Corinthians 4:2, Ephesians 5:23, 1 Peter 3:7

**Topics:** "Headship"

---

## Description

In this sermon transcript, the speaker discusses the importance of citing references in a way that makes them difficult to locate. He emphasizes that evangelical scholarship should aim to follow the procedure used by Paul, who commended himself to every person's conscience by openly stating the truth. The speaker also mentions a system used by Chris, where the word 'A' is used to refer to a person in authority. The transcript includes references to a conference on building strong families and the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. The speaker concludes by mentioning a conversation with Stan Gundry, a senior vice president, who holds a different view but allows for the publication of opposing views in his work.

---

## Transcript

This message was given at the Building Strong Families Conference held in Dallas, Texas, March 20th through the 22nd of 2000. This conference was sponsored by the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood and Family Life Ministries. Following the message, there will be information on how to order additional materials on building a strong family.

Thank you. Let's pray. Lord, we give you thanks for your word.

What a great treasure it is. And we thank you for every word of your word. You have caused to be written exactly what you wanted.

And we believe that it is all God-breathed. And so when we look at this one word for head, kephele, Lord, we're looking at a word that you chose. To put in your word that we would understand it.

And we ask that we would understand it rightly. And that you would teach us not only content, but also throughout. That you would guard my heart and lips and the rest of our hearts and lips.

That our reactions to what others have said would be in accordance with your heart and your mind. Amen. I'm going to talk in this seminar about the meaning of the word head, specifically the Greek word kephale in the New Testament.

Some of you are aware that a number of years ago, about 25 years ago now, there was a new interpretation of passages such as Ephesians 5.23, where it says the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. And of 1 Corinthians 11.3, where Paul says, I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God. These verses created difficulty for an egalitarian view of marriage.

Because if the word head had been correctly understood, as it always had been understood, to mean one in authority, then the egalitarian argument fails. The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. The husband is in authority over the wife, as Christ is in authority over the church.

If the word head, or the phrase for person A to be the head of person B, if it meant in the first century to be one in a position of authority over person B, then we don't even need to have a conference. The argument is over. The debate is finished.

It says there's a unique authority that belongs to the husband. So it is absolutely essential to the egalitarian position to find another meaning for this word, or at least many egalitarians thought it was. And so what happened a number of years ago, particularly, well, in 1952, there was a little article published by a man named Bedale, B-E-D-A-L-E, in which he said, well, there are a couple of examples in Greek where the word kephal<sup>α</sup> means source.

It's applied to the source of a river, for instance, in Herodotus. And in fact, the large lexicon, the Little and Scott lexicon for classical Greek, did at one point mention this meaning, source, for kephal<sup>α</sup>. I'm going to ask, just as a point of information here, how many of you have had at least some Greek? Yeah, a great majority of you.

OK. And I'm going to ask also, is Duane? I don't have a marker board here or an easel. Is there a possibility to get a blank overhead? We'll do.

OK, that's enough. Thanks. Although Bedale in the 50s said, well, this doesn't diminish the idea of authority.

There is still authority with the head of Christ is God, or the husband is the head of the wife. There's still authority there, but there's some sense of derivation, too. It was just a novel idea that he proposed, and nobody made much of it.

Until more than 20 years later in the 1970s, then egalitarians began to promote the idea that had meant source apart from any idea of authority. Nobody in the history of the church before the mid-70s, as far as I know, had ever held that view, that head meant source without authority when applied to persons. But the evidence cited was the entry in the Little and Scott lexicon, where it talked about the head of the river and said the source of a river.

And then they were quoting something from Herodotus and something from poetry called Orphic Fragments. So I'll get to those in just a few minutes. But that was the sum of the argument, the Greek lexicon by Little and Scott and then the evidence from Little and Scott where they cited Herodotus, the historian, and the Orphic Fragments, two examples for this word head meaning source.

Now, what happened was egalitarians then began to run with that and say, well, now head means source in a lot of places. The husband is the head of the wife is an allusion to Adam and Eve, so that Adam was the source of Eve. And the head of Christ is God means that the father sent the son into the world.

He was the source of sending him into the world for the incarnation. So there was some appeal to that meaning in those verses, and it was then to destroy the idea of authority in those passages. That was the background to this.

As that went on, I one day was at Bethel College in Minnesota teaching, and George Knight came to lecture. And I said to him, George, you know, somebody really needs to do a study of this word head in the Bible. I think, George, that you should do that.

And he said, well, no, you should do it. I said, no, I don't want to do that. But anyway, the idea simmered, and eventually I decided to do some research on the meaning of this Greek word kephele, head.

And at that time I heard about a computer database called It had all the words that were ever written in ancient Greek in this database. It was put together at the University of California, Irvine, and they had about 50 or 60 million words of Greek text from 8th century B.C., Homer, the earliest Greek writer, on to about the 4th century A.D. So I wrote a letter to them and said, could I get a printout of all the instances of the Greek word kephele, head? And they said, well, you could, but it would be over 12,000 examples. And then they said, perhaps you would like our basic text package, which includes representatives from various points in history and most major authors, Plato, Aristotle, Homer, the New Testament, and many other examples.

And it's representative of the kinds of literature and the historical scope. So I said, OK, well, how many examples would that be? And they said, well, that would be just over 2000. So they sent me the printout and I went over to the library and started to work.

And I looked up every example of kephele in that list in all of those ancient Greek authors and to see how the word was used. And in the course of that, I read more stories about one soldier cutting off another soldier's head than I ever want to read in my whole life. Those ancient Greeks did a lot of fighting.

And the vast majority of the cases were just referring to the literal head of the body. But I found about 50 examples where kephele, head, referred to a person in authority. The Roman emperor was referred to as head.

A general of an army was called the head of the army. In the Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, the heads of the tribes of Israel were called heads and the word was kephele there. David was head of the Gentiles when he ruled over them.

And in the New Testament, of course, Christ is the head of the church. Early Christian literature, the bishops were the heads of the churches. And the husband is the head of the wife.

In all these examples, and there were about 50 of them, there were cases where the person who was said to be the head of another person or group was one in a position of authority. So I wrote that up and I said, I found no cases where head, when applied to persons, meant source. Well, what about those two examples that were in the Liddle and Scott lexicon? Those two examples.

And in Herodotus, the Greek historian, he talks about the sources of the Pyrrhus River. I'm not remembering correctly the name of the river, but the sources of a river. And it's plural.

And so it's plural, the source, and the Little and Scott lexicon, D-D-E-L-L, Scott, says in plural, source of a river, but in singular, mouth of a river. And what was happening in this case, as I looked at it, was *kephele* was simply being used in a fairly common sense to mean the top or the end point of something. So in plural, the sources of a river were the end points where it began, and in singular, the mouth was called the head as well.

This was not surprising, because in Greek literature, when you had a building with a column, the top of the column was called the head of a column. Why would they do that? Whatever gave them that idea? Hmm? Yeah, it's an analogy to a human being. Our head is at the top of our body.

Now you look at a column holding up a building, and the top point is called the head of the column. Right? Or, even in describing vegetables, the top of a vegetable, or in the Septuagint, the poles, remember the priests used poles to carry, and those end points of the poles, and so the meaning end point was commonly attested in Greek. And to say that the Greek word *kephele*, when applied to a river, could speak of the source of the river, or the mouth of the river, was not a surprise.

But it didn't really mean source or mouth, it just meant end point, and it was applied to that position by virtue of where it was in the location on the river. Moreover, the people who quoted this Little and Scott lexicon misused it in two ways. Because there were two separate categories in the definition of *kephele*.

One was applied to persons, and the other was applied to things. Well, this was in the things category. Not with regard to persons, when we have the husband as the head of the wife, that's persons.

Moreover, look what happens here. Little and Scott says in plural, head means source, but in singular, the mouth of a river. Now I ask you, what about Ephesians 5.23? If you're going to use this definition, let's use it in the right way.

The husband is the head of the wife, *kephele*. Is it plural or singular? Okay, so if you want to take the wrong definition from Little and Scott and apply it to that verse, you might as well apply it consistently and correctly and say the husband is the mouth of the wife. Makes no sense at all.

Okay, so that was a misapplication. But it was still there, and people continued to use it. So I wrote up this article and published it.

Survey of 2,336 examples. Said here are 50 examples, 49 or 50, where a person in authority is the head. No examples where a person is called the source of another person.

Oh, and I told you the Herodotus example. It's 4th century B.C. poetic literature about this Orphic religion that had something to do with worship of snakes and things like that. Orphic Fragments has this quotation where it says, Zeus is the *kephele*, Zeus is the middle, and Zeus from whom all things come.

Or in whom all things are perfected. In that case, it is applied to a person, a personal deity in Greek religion. But there again, I think it means beginning or first in a series.

It doesn't mean source. That is, Zeus was the first one of the gods. He's the middle and he's the one at the end.

Even in this case, it certainly doesn't mean source without authority. Because Zeus is the main god in Greek mythology. He's the top dog, the leading deity.

But I think here it means Zeus is the beginning or the first. And he's in the middle and he is the one through whom perfection comes. He's the beginning, middle, and end.

It doesn't really mean the one from whom other things come. The meaning first in a series, the beginning of a series, also fits here very well. And that's an established meaning for kephele.

So I found no examples where it meant source without authority. I wrote it up in an article, and then other people began to respond to that and interact with it. And at that point, after a few years, I gathered up all those responses and wrote a 70-page analysis of their responses and published that in the back of *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*.

Appendix 1, *The Meaning of Kephele*, had a response to recent studies. And the academic debate continued, but a number of people were saying, well, that article settled it. Now, what has happened since then? What has happened since then is that in some circles, there have been egalitarians, such as Craig Keener, who have said, yes, Grudem has shown that kephele can mean authority anyway.

But others have not. And what I'm going to focus on today is an article by Catherine Kroeger. K-R-O-E-G-E-R.

Catherine Kroeger, she is the founding president of Christians for Biblical Equality. And Catherine Kroeger is sort of my counterpart in that other organization. She's been the kind of driving force behind Christians for Biblical Equality.

She has a Ph.D. in classics from the University of Minnesota. So she knows Greek quite well. And Catherine Kroeger was chosen by InterVarsity Press to write the article on head for a reference book called *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*.

How many of you are familiar with that? *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. There's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*.

And there's a third one. And she has the article head in there. And in this, she writes the following.

And so I'm going to start with transparency one. This is headship in the Trinity after she discusses. She says, by the Byzantine era.

Can you see this in the back? Can you read this from the back? Hold up your hand if you can't read it. All right. I'm going to ask while I'm speaking if we could move this back about three feet.

And I'll just keep on talking. And we'll see if we can increase the focal length for it. So she says, by the Byzantine era.

That's into the Middle Ages, but not New Testament. Kefale had acquired the sense of chief or master. Although the English word head can mean that.

It was rarely true in Greek and New Testament times. No. Thank you.

And then she says, the contemporary desire. I'm right here to find in First Corinthians 11, 3, a basis for subordination of the son to the father as ancient roots in response to such subordinationism. And now she's using the word for a heresy subordinationism, which claims that the son is an inferior being, a lesser being than the father isn't fully God.

In response to such subordinationism, church fathers argued vehemently that for Paul, head had meant sword. Athanasius in Armin 26, 335 and Athema 26. Mingyin, PG 26, 740b.

Now, what is it? Athanasius is a church father. The Mingyin series, PG, is this hundreds of volumes of Greek text from the church fathers, many centuries of the church fathers, only in Greek, published in Paris in mid 1800s. And it takes a pretty large library to have a collection of that.

But that's what she's quoting from. Cyril of Alexandria. And it gives the reference of Basil, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and even Eusebius were quick to recognize the danger of an interpretation of First Corinthians 11, 3, which could place Christ in a subordinate position relative to the father.

And then she goes on and says, John Chrysostom declared that only a heretic would understand Paul's use of head to mean chief or authority over. Rather, one should understand the term as implying absolute oneness and primal source. This is a standard reference book from InterVarsity Press.

This article, therefore, will have wide influence. When I read it, I, of course, didn't know what those quotations said until I looked them up. But this sentence concerned me and I raised my eyebrows.

John Chrysostom declared that only a heretic would understand Paul's use of head to mean chief or authority over. The reason I wondered about that sentence was the phrase authority over is kind of a strange phrase. It didn't sound to me like a phrase that early church writers would use.

It sounded to me more like a modern phrase. In fact, it reminded me of an article I had written. And the article was titled, Does Heffalay Mean Source or Authority Over? A survey of two thousand three hundred thirty six examples.

And I wondered, I thought it is quite puzzling that the ancient church father, John Chrysostom, would have written an article saying that my view was wrong. Long before my time. So I thought, hmm, I really have to look at this.

So, again, she's quoting the series. Sixty one to fourteen and to sixteen. No.

It took some doing to track it down, but I'm going to put it up here in English translation. And I have it. I have all this stuff, the Greek text of all of it as well.

In fact, could I have that whole folder? That's what it looks like. And it was some work to track it down and to coordinate it with an English translation. But when I did, it came up with transparency to here.

And I'm going to keep coming back to have one nearby and transparency to then. Here it is. Chrysostom says, But the head of the woman is a man.

The head of price is God. Here, the heretics rush upon us with a certain declaration of inferiority. And so here, Chrysostom is talking about the heretics.

In the controversy of the fourth century, in that context, it was a Trinitarian controversy. And people were saying that only God the Father was fully God and the Son was a lesser being. He was created.

Great heavenly creatures, the Son and the Holy Spirit were created. And the Aryans, who denied the full deity of the Son, said that there was a time when the Son didn't exist. Their phrase was there was there was when he was not.

That is, there was a time when he was not. And he's the greatest creature, but he's still a creature. And they denied the full deity of Christ.

This heresy of Aryanism is what Chrysostom is talking about. And he's saying the head of price is God. The heretics rush upon us with a certain declaration of inferiority.

They're saying the Son is a lesser being than the Father. Which, out of these words, they contrive against the Son. But, says Chrysostom, they stumble against themselves.

For if the man be the head of the woman, and the head be of the same substance with the body, and the head of Christ is God, and that same substance is homoousios, which in the 19th Creed is one substance, the one being with the body. If the head be of the same substance with the body and the head of Christ is God, the Son is of the same substance with the Father. So he turns it around on them and says, this proves that the Son is fully divine.

Nay, they say, it's not his being of another substance which we intend to show from hence, but that he is under subjection. What then are we to say now? I've left out a few lines which I digress, but it does not affect the substance of the quotation here. And then he says, for what if the wife be under subjection to us? It is as a wife, as free, as equal in honor.

And the Son also, though he did become obedient to the Father, it was as God. As the obedience of the Son toward the Father is greater, so his liberty is greater. And so he is yielding obedience as free, yielding obedience.

For with us, indeed, the woman is reasonably subjected to the man. So, Chrysostom says, the Arians say, well, the Son is under subjection to the Father. And Chrysostom says, yes, but it's voluntary.

Just as a wife is free and equal in honor to us. So he says there's subordination, there's obedience from the Son to the Father. Now, where in that sentence, or that paragraph, does Chrysostom say, only a heretic would say that head means authority over.

You see, he says the Son obeys, but he's voluntarily, he voluntarily obeys. That implies that the Father is the one in authority over. He is assuming that head means one in authority.

Are you following me? Is that clear? He doesn't differ with that at all. He says, yes, the Son is in subjection, but it's voluntary. And so, similarly with a wife, reasonably subjected, no, to us, no.

So I found this, and I copied the Greek, and I copied the English text, and I wrote to Catherine Frager, and I said, Catherine, I can't find in this sentence that you quoted, I can't find where Chrysostom says head doesn't mean authority. Only a heretic would say that. He assumes that head doesn't mean authority here.

Do I have the right quotation? And she just sent me back the same quotation in Greek text and said, this is the one I'm quoting. All right. Well, I was in Chrysostom.

I thought, well, a couple of things. See, if Chrysostom had ever wanted to say that head didn't mean one in authority, here's the perfect opportunity. He could have said, head doesn't mean one in authority.

Only a heretic would understand Paul's use of head to mean one in authority. But he doesn't say that at all. He agrees that the Son is obedient to the Father, but says that the obedience is not servile like a slave, but free like that of a wife who is equal in honor.

I thought I should add one other comment. In a reference work intended for a general public, as well as an academic audience, it is courteous to cite references in a way that enables others to look them up and evaluate them. This statement from Chrysostom exists in English translation in the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers series, which is widely available.

You can buy it from CBD quite cheaply, and it's in all public libraries that are older libraries anyway. The citation could have been given as Chrysostom, homily 26 on 1 Corinthians, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Volume 1, Section 12, Page 150, or Series 1, Volume 12, Page 150, and it would have taken only a few minutes for any reader to locate in most any library. And then PG 61-214 could have been added for a Greek reference.

But the reference was only given as PG 61-214, a reference in Mingnis Patrologia Raica, which took a considerable amount of time to locate and coordinate with English translation, which has a different numbering system. I doubt that even 1% of the readers of the Dictionary of Paul in his letters could ever have found and understood this paragraph from Chrysostom, or could ever have discovered that the quotation, in fact, does not exist. And this reference was easy to locate compared with others in this article.

What is the reason for citing references in a way that makes them most difficult to locate? Evangelical scholarship at its best should aim for the procedure Paul used. Paul said, by the open statement of the truth, we would commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. While I was working in Chrysostom, I thought I would look at a few other examples of his word kephalae, which I didn't do for my earlier studies, to see if there might be any other instances where Chrysostom used the word kephalae to mean a person in authority over.

This would add to my 50 examples that I had earlier, and admittedly, it's fourth century A.D., but it's still quite relevant. He's interpreting the New Testament. And so now I'm going to do the next transparency, three to eleven, and just read these briefly to you.

And by this time, Trinity had the TLG database and I could search it and print it out. Consider, nevertheless, that it is homily 26 on 1st Corinthians. Consider that she is a woman, the weaker vessel, whereas you are a man.

For therefore were you ordained to be ruler and were assigned to her in place of a head that you may bear with the weakness of her that is set under you. Make then your rule glorious, and glorious it will be when the subject of it meets with no dishonor from you. You know, there's stuff here in Chrysostom you could preach on Sunday morning.

He's saying, you're the authority, but don't dishonor your wife. Care for her. Love her.

All right? But here, look, head is equated with ruler. Head and ruler. Okay, and the next is homily 5 on 1st and 2nd Thessalonians, page 397.

For how is it not absurd in other things to think yourself worthy of the preeminence and to occupy the place of the head, but in teaching to quit your station? He's saying, husband, you should be the teacher as well. In other things, you're the head. In teaching, you have a responsibility.

The ruler ought not to excel the ruled in honor so much as in virtue, for this is the duty of a ruler. You are the head of the woman. Let then the head regulate the rest of the body.

In the head are the power of directing, and the rest of the body is appointed for service, but the head is set to command. So let us rule the women. Let us surpass them, not by seeking greater honor from them, but by their being more benefited by us.

See, the connection of being head and being one in a position of rule. Right? We'll go on. Here's an homily on Ephesians.

In order that when you hear of the head, you may also not conceive of the notion of supremacy only, but also of consolidation, and that you may behold him not as supreme ruler only, but as head of a body. This is referring to Christ. You see the connection of Christ, who is the head, and has the rule, archaic, and he is the ruler, archon, and he is the head.

Okay? So let us reverence our head, a head to whom all things are put in subjection. Okay? Go on. Charlie's helping me here to manage these transparencies.

I appreciate it. In virtue. He's saying, Husbands, your wives are more virtuous than us.

They're more moral. They're more obedient to God. This is a shame.

He says, what a shame. We hold the place of the head, and are surpassed by the body. We are ordained to rule over them, not merely that we may rule, but we may rule in goodness also.

Does he think that... I mean, would he say, only a heretic would say head means one in authority? In authority over? The husband... Here's Ephesians homily as well. The husband occupies the place of the head, and the wife the place of the body. The husband is the head of the wife, and Christ is the head of the church.

He had already laid down beforehand for man and wife, assigning to each their proper place, to the one that of authority in forethought, the other that of submission. The head is one in authority. Wife, submit yourself to your husband.

Here again, still further on Ephesians. This is interesting. The wife is the second authority.

It's not head. It's arche there, which will be important later. The word arche can also mean beginning, or it can mean authority.

The wife is the second authority. Let not her demand equality, for she is under the head. Nor let him despise her as being in subjection, for she is the body.

And if the head despise the body, it will perish. She reverences him as being the head. Hence, God places the one in subjection, the other in authority, that there may be peace.

For where there is equal authority, there can never be peace. The ruling power must of necessity be one. Go on.

Head, head, head. Authority, authority, authority. Not heretic, heretic, heretic.

She is the body, not to dictate to the head, but to submit herself and obey. Down here, we talk about teachers. Them that sin, reprove in the sight of all, is that the rulers are in a sickly state.

For the head, if the head be not sound, how can the rest of the body maintain its vigor? This is teachers in the church. Here are the teachers in the church who are, he says, rulers. They are the head.

All right? Again, position of authority over the church. Well, now, I found one place in Christendom where a woman was called the head of another person. I'd never found this in all of the rest of Greek literature.

And here it is. But, you say, the whole tribe of slaves is intolerable if it meet with indulgence. True.

I know it myself. But then, as I was saying, correct them in some other way, not by the scourge only and by terror, but even by flattering them and by acts of kindness. If she is a believer, she is your sister.

Consider that you are her mistress and that she ministers unto you. If she be intemperate, cut off the occasions of drunkenness. Call your husband and admonish her, et cetera.

Even if she be drunkard or a realer or a gossip, et cetera, you have her for the partner of your life. Train and restrain her necessity is upon you. It is for this that you are the head.

Regulate her, therefore, do your own part. It's talking to women and anything to them. You are the head.

Head of whom? A slave or a servant woman in the household. You are the head. Therefore, train and he's even asking them to be to take care in that situation, that society.

But the significant point for us is the one place in which a woman is called the head. It's with respect to a servant girl or or a slave who is under her authority. So even in this case, the word head means one in authority over not.

OK. So that was that that is the instances of head in criticism. Now, what should we make of Prager's statement that John Chrysostom declared that only a heretic would understand Paul's use of head to mean chief or authority over it is simply false.

Not only did Chrysostom never say this, he also regularly used to mean one in authority over with regard to Christ's authority over the church, the father's authority over the son church leaders authority over the church and most frequently a husband's authority over his wife. But now, if I can go back to page one, what about Dr. Kroger's other references to patristic text, which she induces to support her claim that the church fathers argued vehemently that for Paul head had meant source and they were quick to recognize the danger of an interpretation of First Corinthians eleven three, which could place Christ in a subordinate position relative to the father. We can examine these now.

They are as follows. Athanasius, two quotations, Cyril of Alexandria to Basil one, Theodore of Massautia one and Eusebius two. The first thing to notice is that four of these eight citations are found in one paragraph on page seven forty nine of Lamp.

Lamp. I'm talking about lexicons here. Jeffrey Lamp has something called patristic Greek lexicon.

It's after the time of the New Testament, all the church fathers. And in fact, Professor Lamp was one of the two examiners on my doctoral dissertation at Cambridge and many years ago. But in this lexicon, these references, four of these are found in one paragraph in that lexicon, and that is here on page seven thirty thirteen.

This paragraph gives examples of Kefale as equivalent of archaic. Could we see transparency thirteen? Oh, here's the list of the examples. I'm sorry.

I'll come back to that in a minute. Now the next transparency. I'll keep these up here.

Here's Lamp's patristic Greek lexicon, page seven forty nine. And he's saying in Exodus, the first Corinthians eleven three, Kefale is used as equivalent of archaic. And here we have Athanasius, Cyril, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Cyril again.

And Athanasius, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Cyril again. Those four are right from this page in the lexicon. The exact reference.

But archaic is itself an ambiguous word. It sometimes means beginning. John one one and archaic.

In hollow in the beginning was the word Genesis one one and archaic in the beginning. God created the heavens and the earth. It can mean beginning or archaic is Mark one one, the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

I mean, just the first thing or it sometimes means ruler or authority as in some of those quotations from criticism. Remember, she is the second archaic second ruler. And so it sometimes means authority can mean beginning or authority to find examples of Kefale uses equivalent of archaic doesn't prove anything.

It doesn't prove that for the church fathers archaic Kefale meant source. Okay, now we look at these quotations and I'll just look at some of them. So take the next transparency.

Eusebius or a couple of her examples. This is a little bit smaller. You can't see it.

I'll just read it anyway. The great apostle teaches that the head of the sun himself is God, but the head of the church is the son. How is he saying on the one hand the head of the church made him to be head over all things for the church? Is it not therefore that he may be leader and head of the church, but of him the head is the father? But if there is one ruler and here archaic means ruler and head how could there be two gods? Is he not one alone? The one above neither does he claim any other cause of him.

He has acquired the familial unbegun as the father and he has given to the son his own divinity and life who through the son has placed all things in subjection. Now how does the father relate to the son? He sends him. He appoints him.

He commands. He teaches. He commits all things to him.

He glorifies him. He exalts him. He declares him king of all and has committed all judgment to him.

In other words, the head of Christ as God does not diminish the fact that there is one ruler, God the Father. That's not saying that Kephalé means source. That's establishing the sense of Kephalé as ruler.

We'll look at another one here. That was Eusebius. Here, Basil, the beloved is of the son of Unicorn.

This Basil, PG 30, 80, 23, this nowhere exists in English translation. And as with some of these other quotations, this was a lot of work because it was unfamiliar Greek to me. And I was translating along looking up strange words in the dictionary and I came to this, Unicorn.

And I thought, what is going on here? The beloved is of the son of Unicorn. I found out it's a mistranslation of Psalm 28 which translated Unicorn. I hadn't been understood by some to mean Unicorn.

But look at this. This is talking about Christ, God the Son. But a unicorn is a royal animal not made subject to man, his strength unconquerable, always living in desert places, trusting in his one horn.

Therefore, the unconquerable nature of the Lord is likened to a unicorn, both because of his rule, archaic, upon everything, and because he has his son, because he has one ruler, archaic of himself, the Father, for the head of Christ is God. So, I don't know if Dr. Cragar looked this up and translated it herself. It took me a long time.

But she listed a citation from Lamb's Lexicon. Is this one from Lamb? No, I'm sorry. This one may have been from another source that talked about Cephalae being equivalent to archaic.

But, the archaic here is ruler and head is ruler. All right, we'll go on. The head of Christ is God, meant the ruler.

Okay. Now, Dr. Cragar's citation of Lamb's Matristic Greek Lexicon, page 749, where she got some of her examples from, and I won't look at all of those now, is puzzling for another reason. Because, on that same page, page 749, this was meaning number four.

She fails to mention that the meaning source, which she claims was vehemently defended by the church fathers, is nowhere mentioned as a meaning for Cephalae in this standard lexicon for patristic Greek. If the meaning source was vehemently, as her word, defended by the church fathers, it's surprising that this editorial team of this definitive lexicon did not discover this fact as they worked to compile the lexicon from 1906 to 1961. Second, it's somewhat troubling to see that Cragar claims a non-existent quote from Chrysostom to deny the meaning, meaning chief or authority over for the patristic period, but does not mention the immediately prior definitions of Cephalae on the same page in Lampe's lexicon, from which she took several of her examples.

So look up the page here, page 749, metaphorical uses of Cephalae, here of things, and then a person, head of the house, chief, headman, religious superior, of bishops, the cephalai excecion, the heads of the churches, and cephalai ani, to be head, with genitive, to be head of, to take precedence of. And then we go on to Christ as head of the creation and head of the church. These definitions of persons, all five, include leadership and authority attaching to the term Cephalae.

They show that Cephalae meant chief and authority over, according to the standard lexicon for patristic Greek. In an article that depended so heavily on patristic evidences, these definitions should have been mentioned. It is also difficult to understand that she would claim that Chrysostom said only a heretic would use this meaning when the standard lexicon for patristic Greek lists this as their very first meaning in the section on Cephalae used as a metaphor, the very page from which she took the other examples.

Well, that's the patristic evidence. Now, I want to look at another section of her article, and if I could have page one. Oh, I have page one here again.

She not only talks about headship in the church father, and these references, none of them support that view. Many of them support the idea of head as authority. Then she also talks about the classical view of head as source.

The classical period in Greek is prior to the New Testament in which such authors as Plato and Aristotle. Here she says, by the time of Plato, adherents of Orphic religion were using Cephalae with Archaie, source, or beginning. Now, look at this list.

Say you're studying your study of the pastor. Current Orphic Fragments 2, Numbers 21, 8, 2, 1, 68, Plato, Legs 4, 7, 15, E, and Proclus, in Tim, 2, 95, Pseudo- Eristides, World, 7, Eusebius, Prep, F, 3, 9, Divinity, Papyrus, Column 13, Line 12, Siveus, Eccles, 123, Plutarch, etc. You have time before Sunday morning to check those out.

Looks pretty impressive, doesn't it? You say, ah, she's won the day. She shows that Cephalae means source in classical literature before the time of the New Testament. Well, let's look at the evidence.

Next transparency. And here is her, this is, these are the things that she's listed. These 14 references.

And so, um, I want to look at some of them. This looks impressive, but let's look at them. Current Orphic Fragments 2, that's the first one.

Um, I don't know if that's on the next transparency or not. Do you have transparency 16? No, I don't. Okay.

I'm going to take this with a piece of paper here. Okay. This reference says, Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom all things come, or are perfected.

That's the quotation we saw before. I think it means Zeus is the one in authority or the beginning. It's a little bit hard to tell, but it certainly does not require the sense of source.

And it certainly cannot mean source without authority, because Zeus is authority. All right, so we've seen that one. That's not new.

Next, Plato. Fourth century B.C. It does not have the word kephalae, it has the word archaic. God is the ruler of all.

So we just crossed that one out. It's not relevant because it doesn't even have our word in it. Proclus.

Fifth century A.D. Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom all things are perfected. I put this in red, though, because it's not classical. It's not prior to the New Testament.

It's fifth century A.D. And the reference is not in 295-48, but 313-21. It took quite some time to track it down. Fourth century B.C. Pseudo ericities world seven.

What is this? Pseudo ericities world seven. This is an incorrect reference. There's no work called world written by ericities or pseudo ericities.

However, the following quotation does appear in Aristotle on the cosmos or on the world section seven. Zeus the head, Zeus the center, Zeus from whom all becomes all that is. Perhaps Dr. Crager found a

reference to pseudo ericities world seven and understood ericities rather than Aristotle, but it's the same sentence.

Next, Eusebius, preparation for the gospel. This is not classical. It's third to fourth century A.D. Eusebius says, Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom comes all that is.

This is the same sentence again. Divini papyrus column 13 line 12. This is a mistaken reference and it turned out to be quite difficult to locate.

I actually had to write a friend who was PhD at Cambridge and had access to much better library resources than I did and he was able to track this down. It should be Divini, not Divini, Divini papyrus column 13 line 12 published in 1982 in a German periodical. It's from the fourth century B.C. It took several hours and three libraries to locate.

It says, Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom comes all that is. The repetition of the same sentence provides no additional evidence. Stobaeus, this quote, this is fifth century A.D. It's not classical.

I put it in red. It's after the New Testament. Stobaeus says, Zeus the head, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom comes all that is.

Same sentence. The next, Plutarch, first to second century A.D. The Plutarch sentence says, Zeus the beginning, Zeus the middle, Zeus from whom comes all that is. But this does not use the word kephalae.

It uses a different word, arche, and so it's not relevant for our investigation. It doesn't even have this word. Achilles Tatius, fragment from David Chapman.

requested help from David Chapman, a former student of mine as a PhD candidate at Cambridge. He wrote me back and said, I spent most of the day looking, but still could not find the Achilles Tatius reference. It doesn't remotely correspond to the enumeration in any of the critical texts I could get my hands on.

So I'll leave that as a question. Isaiah 9 in the Septuagint, the elder and the honored man of Israel is the head. Well, there it does use the word head.

But the elders wanted authority. This doesn't mean source. It actually disproves her case.

Second century AD Irenaeus the Gnostic demiurge is the Kephalian archaic. And in this case, the it's a little bit hard to say whether it means ruler or beginning, but it certainly does not require the meaning source. And then it's if even if archaic translated source, which is not likely, the phrase could still mean the ruler and source of his own being.

The text is ambiguous. Next, Tertullian, second to third century AD, not classical period. Here, this is not a Greek text at all.

Tertullian was writing in Latin. It isn't relevant, but it says the head of every man is Christ. The head here, he is put for authority.

Now, authority will accrue to none other than the author, so there Christ is seen as the authority, not proving her case. Philo, Esau is the genarchase as head of the living being. Here, archaic and genarchase can mean ruler of created beings.

I'm going to pass over that and not go into detail on how you can ask about it. And then finally, both years, ninth century AD, I didn't even look at it so far beyond the time of the New Testament. So, where does that leave us? Do any of the fourteen examples support the meaning source? Not really, because beginning and ruler, which are well-established meanings, account for all uses.

The actual classical references boil down to these in black, one, two, three, four. Four references to Cephalae, one doesn't have, so it's just number one, four, six, and ten are prior to the New Testament, and they three of them are quote about Zeus, and one proves that the elders of Israel are in authority. So that leaves us with only one sentence, and that sentence, Zeus, the head Zeus, the middle Zeus, from whom all things come, does not prove the sense source, and certainly not source without authority.

Now, recent developments. The conclusion is that none of those classical references support her claim. Now, how am I doing on time here? I want to stop and have questions, so I've got one more, two more recent things.

The article that I published in the back of Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood. I decided about three years ago that I would send it to the current editor of this earlier lexicon that I mentioned, the Little and Scott lexicon, and has anybody ever used this lexicon? A few of you know it. The only book that I know that's that big is the Unabridged Merriam-Webster Dictionary that sits on its own table in the library.

I mean, it's a mess. It's this thick and this high and this wide, and it's the standard lexicon for all of ancient Greek. It's been around since the early 1800s and it keeps on being published in new editions.

Well, I thought I would just send the article that I wrote on Kefalé to the editor of the Little and Scott lexicon. I didn't even know who he was. I just said to the editor, Little and Scott Lexicon, Oxford, England, and got back this letter.

So, this is the article that I wrote on Kefalé. It's the standard lexicon for all of It's this thick and this wide, and it's the standard lexicon for It's this thick and this and it's the standard lexicon for all of It's this thick wide, and it's the standard It's the standard It's this thick and it's wide. It's the standard source or source of life.

I think that the scholars who have done this have accountability for misleading Cindy Jacobs, who doesn't have the technical ability who understand this. Priscilla Papers, Fall 1999, after I read this paper at ETS with Catherine Krager in the room, they still published, Fall 1999, an article by Judy Brown, professor at Central Bible College, Springfield, Missouri, Assemblies of God, in Ephesians 5.23. The meaning of head in first century Greek, the evidence is overwhelming that the word meant source or supply, and the literature cited is only literature that supports that view. Questions? What was her response? I didn't know she was in the room.

The room had 200 people in it where I read the paper. She stood up and she said three things. She said, first, Chrysostom said that husbands should treat their wives in a kind and honoring way, and I said, I agree with that.

She said, second, that one quotation, I can't remember the author, I can't remember, one quotation from somebody after the New Testament that this author was quoting earlier sources and so should be counted as evidence of classical usage. That's a debatable point. And then the next year, she did do a presentation at the ETS meeting and she said she was going to interact and so I went, she gave me the, and I went to

it, but she said, um, the ninth century scholar Photius had a vast knowledge of classical authors, so that, that was a relevant quote.

I differ with that. Okay. She said then that in, uh, Orphic religion, uh, this Zeus, the head Zeus, the middle, it's used interchangeably with archaic and archaic mean source.

Well, I just differ with that because archaic means ruler many times. Um, the, uh, and, uh, it's, it's questionable whether, I mean, maybe archaic can sometimes mean source or beginning, but it doesn't mean beginning, but I'm not sure about source. So that's just repeating the same argument again.

She says in her own effort to condense the lengthy citations, it led to a scrambling of a couple of references, although the majority were accurate. So she said, and then she said, pre-system in the very disputed quotation that we started with, pre-system understands that head is employed as a metaphor and kephalae should be understood as applied in applied to the Trinity. It must imply a perfect oneness and primal cause and source in, and no new arguments, just repeating it.

And her last sentence is indubitably pre-system viewed one of the meanings of head to be source or origin and deemed it theologically important. So it just, it was a reaffirmation of things that she said at the beginning, but it was not any new argument or evidence. No, no.

And she actually, the one quotation I said I couldn't find, she, she said, she told me where she found it. I haven't looked that up yet. So there, I have to look that up.

I gave immediately after I read this two years ago, I gave it to one of the editors there at their display booth and I haven't heard anything from them since. I think I gave it to two of their editors. Okay.

Yeah. I don't know if everybody can hear the question. I'll just repeat for the sake of the tape.

At what point do you question someone's integrity and pushing an agenda in unwillingness to consider fairly the truth and commitment to truth? I just, I'm not going to get into that. I just want to lay out the facts here and say, and I did it with Catherine present. There was a public meeting and she's had a time to interact with me.

I went to her. Actually, when she read this other response, I went and sat in the back of the room waiting and there were only about 30 people there waiting for a chance to interact with her response. But the person sharing the meeting after she was finished with her paper immediately went on to other papers and didn't give any chance for interaction and I had other commitments and had to leave.

So I haven't been able to, in any public way, interact any further with this. But what I did want to do is just lay out the facts as they are here and let people evaluate them. Yeah, this is a good question to lay people who don't have the technical ability and look, translating that stuff like that unicorn passage from Babel, this is taking me hours to do, just to find it.

And I have a PhD in New Testament. So what do you say? Well, I haven't pursued this, but I suppose someone needs to go to InterVarsity Press and say, people trust you. You see what's going on here? And by giving them the article, I suppose I did that, but I haven't pursued it.

But we have a responsibility, at least to guarantee fundamental reliability of evidence, I think. Are there other publishers that we need to be concerned about? Well, it's interesting that the publishing world has

great influence in evangelicalism and it has kind of sorted out a little bit on this question. Let's see what is happening.

Although, you see, even publishers that are publishing egalitarian books have fundamental integrity. I think this is an aberration with InterVarsity Press. I just wish they would get it straightened out.

I mean, I don't think they normally are careless with evidence, but they let this one go through. I'm not sure. Yeah, that's maybe what I should say.

I mean, I'll give you another example. Stan Gundry is the senior vice president of Zondervan, and he's an egalitarian. We talk about it.

We send emails back and forth about it, humorous ones sometimes. But though he has one view, he publishes other views. And in all the work in editing my systematic theology book, 1262 pages, he didn't ask me to change one word and let me write whatever I wanted to write about male-female roles and things.

So, Zondervan, I've had wonderful dealings with them. Though, at that one editorial position, there's someone who differs with me, but is very careful with facts. So, I don't want to say that all egalitarians are this way, but the Priscilla papers troubles me because that's an official paper of GBE.

Let me see in the back. Well, OK. Oh, yeah.

She she was in the room where I read this letter from Little and Scott. I read the letter and put it on the transparency. I mean, she saw the same transparency you have.

Yeah, no, I mean, these are the same transparency that I used at that presentation. Yeah, sure. Yeah.

And we've published a quote from that in our journal for biblical manhood and womanhood. What was called CBMW. Yeah.

Well, I don't I can't tell people's motives. See, I can't get into that. But what I can say is there's a lot at stake, because if you give up the idea that head means source, then you're back to the husband is the person in authority over the wife.

And the ballgame is over. The ballgame is over. That's it.

That's OK. What's your question? Yeah. No, no, no, no other references.

TNT volume three, three sixty three, three seventy two has discussion of it and no meaning of source there. Nobody else except Little and Scott and now Little and Scott doesn't. The editor says it's wrong.

So no, no lexicon has it now. I should say that this paper. We've got half a minute left.

It's time to quit. Well, I can talk about paper anyway. We asked in the business center, 25 page paper, and you could have it for six dollars and twenty five cents, which seemed a little high.

Twenty five cents a page. So I think I'm going to ask counsel on biblical manhood and womanhood in our display booth. I'll see if by tomorrow we could have copies for two fifty or something in our booth.

Probably less than that. Probably two dollars. If you want a copy of this paper, just stop by the booth and you can get it.

And we are out of time. Thank you very much.

---

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/22/SID22268.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/wayne-grudem/the-meaning-of-head-in-the-bible/>

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**