



# Solomon on Sex

## *Dating and Relating*

### Small Group Work Sheet

February 5, 2012

#### Part 1 - Ice Breaker

- Have you given away *Solomon on Sex Invitation Cards*? To whom? How did it go?
  - Have you heard of anyone outside of the church talking about the series?
  - Have you heard of anyone checking out the [www.solomononsex.com](http://www.solomononsex.com) web site or visiting the church because of the series?
  - What is your plan to share Jesus with your community this week? Is this series helping you accomplish that?
1. This week, there is no specific homework. What homework from the last two weeks have you done? What homework do you plan to accomplish?

#### Part 2 - Sermon Review

2. This week, we talked about two qualities of poor manhood that young women should avoid in the men they date. They are laziness and a man who wants mothering. What other qualities of poor manhood should a young woman avoid?
3. This week, we talked about immodest, a quality of poor womanhood that young men should avoid in the girl they date. What other qualities of poor womanhood should young men avoid in the women they date?
4. We talked about the importance of understanding and fulfilling the biblical roles in a marriage. How has sin twisted the way a husband and wife play their marital roles?
5. Read Colossians 3:18-21. In what ways does sin taint the other family roles?
6. Read Galatians 3:28. This verse appears to teach egalitarianism. Read the verse in context. What kind of equality is it talking about?
7. According to Romans 5:19, it was the sin of Adam that resulted in the sinfulness of all mankind. When we read Genesis 3:1-7, it was Eve who was deceived by Satan and Eve who brought the forbidden fruit to her husband. If Eve is originally at fault, why is Adam held responsible?

## Part 3 - Digging Deeper - The Meaning of “Head” In The Bible

### *A Simple Question No Egalitarian Can Answer*<sup>1</sup>

#### Wayne Grudem

If you ever meet an egalitarian (an evangelical feminist) claiming that the word “head” in the Bible doesn’t mean “authority” but means “source,” you may wonder how to answer. Their purpose, of course, is to get rid of the idea of authority in the family in verses like, “The husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church” (Eph. 5:23). So they claim that the word “head” (the Greek word *kephalē*) meant “source” rather than “authority” in the ancient world. Sometimes they quote some ancient Greek texts which, they say, show Zeus to be the “source” of all things, or Esau to be the “source” of his clan, or which mention the “head” of a river. For a verse about husbands and wives, even this idea makes no sense (I am not the source of my wife!), but they will usually then suggest a more specific meaning like “source of encouragement.”

At this point in the discussion there is something that can be done. There is a simple question which they have never been able to answer. It is this:

You claim that the Greek word for “head” means “source without the idea of authority.” Will you please show me one example in all of ancient Greek where this word (*kephalē*) is used to refer to a person and means what you claim, namely, “non-authoritative source”?

I asked this of both Catherine Kroeger and Gilbert Bilezikian in public debate in Atlanta in 1986 and they gave me no example. I asked this question in an academic article published in *Trinity Journal* in 1990 and received no example. I asked this question in the book *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* in 1991 and received no example. That is because no example has ever been found.

The reason is simple: *In the Greek speaking world, to be the head of a group of people always meant to have authority over those people.* Notice the egalitarian examples: Zeus is the chief of the Greek gods! Esau was the leader of the clan descended from him. These examples don’t disprove the idea of authority; they confirm it.

The example of “head of a river” doesn’t prove “source without authority,” because (1) this usage is not referring to a person at all, and (2) the example is misquoted for Eph. 5:23, because there “head” is singular, and “head” in the singular is in fact used to refer to the *other* end of the river, the “mouth” while only in the plural is it used of the “source” of the river (see the *Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon*, p. 945), and (3) in both cases it just means “end point,” in the same way that it can refer to the “head of a column” or “head of a pole,” and these examples have nothing to do with the ideas of “source” or “authority.”

I once looked up over 2,300 examples of the word “head” (*kephalē*) in ancient Greek. In these texts the word *kephalē* is applied to many people in authority, but to none without governing authority:

- the king of Egypt is called “head” of the nation
- the general of an army is called the “head” of the army
- the Roman emperor is called the “head” of the people
- the god Zeus is called the “head” of all things
- David as king of Israel is called the “head” of the people
- the leaders of the tribes of Israel are called “heads” of the tribes
- the husband is the “head” of the wife
- Christ is the “head” of the church
- God the Father is the “head” of Christ

(For details, see my 35-page article available under reprints on page 15, or see pages 425–468 in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*).

No one in a non-leadership position is called “head”—ever. The egalitarian assertion that a person who is called the *kephalē* can be the “source without governing authority” is simply false.

Therefore I would encourage you, in discussing these matters with egalitarian friends, to ask this simple question: May I see an example to support your claim that there is no authority implied in the word “head” in the statement, “the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church”?

Can egalitarians find even one example out of millions of words of ancient Greek literature where a person is called “head” and it means “non-authoritative source”? If even one example could be found, then of course we could go on to discuss whether that meaning might be the one that best fits the context of Ephesians 5.

But if they cannot find one example of this meaning, then their proposed sense of the word in Ephesians 5:23 is a theory without one hard fact to support it. Of course, people can still believe in theories that have no facts to support them if they wish, but such belief can no longer be thought to be reasonable or academically responsible. And such unsupported theories should certainly not be used in debates, or written in commentaries and reference books, or thought to be true.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* Volume 1:3 (June 1996). Louisville, KY: Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.