Enemy of your neighbours, beloved of the immortal gods,
sit at your guard with your spear held within
and protect your head; and the head will keep the body safe.

The oracle's advice is clear: your enemies hate you but the gods love you; so arm yourselves and protect your head and you will be safe. *Head* here is literal — as long as one's head is safe, i.e., as long as one's brains are not splattered on the ground, one will continue to live. In hand-to-hand combat, each soldier protects *himself,* not his commanding officer! These two examples must therefore be rejected.

(3) In this example, *Timaeus* 44D, Plato (4th c. B.C.) is discussing how the gods formed the human body and how the soul is tied to it. The text reads:

Τὰς μὲν δὴ θείας περιόδους δύο οὔσας, τὸ παντὸς σχῆμα ἀπομιμησάμενοι περιφερὲς ὄν, εἰς σφαιροειδὲς σῶμα ἐνέδησαν, τοῦτο δ νῦν **κεφαλὴν** ἐπονομάζομεν, ὃ θειότατόν τέ ἐστιν καὶ τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν πάντων δεσποτοῦν· ᾧ καὶ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα παρέδοσαν ὑπηρεσίαν αὐτῷ συναθροίσαντες θεοί, κατανοήσαντες ὅτι πασῶν ὅσαι κινήσεις ἔσοιντο μετέχοι.[15]

Since there are two divine circles, [the gods], keeping the round form of each in mind, bound [them] to a spherical body, which we now call the *head,* which is the most divine part and which controls everything within us; to which [the head] the gods gave the entire body as a servant after they blended [them] together, since they understood that whatever movements there might be partake [thereof].

Plato refers to the head as "the most divine part" of the body which controls the body. There is no political, social, or military metaphor here; rather, Plato views the head as the preeminent part of the human body, "the most divine part," which controls the body's movements. Understanding this metaphor of Plato's will be significant for several examples to come.

(4-16) The next several examples come from the Septuagint (LXX). There are several problems associated with the LXX passages, which Grudem turns a blind eye to. The biggest problem is the fact that κεφαλή is seldom used as a translation of the Hebrew רֹאשׁ when the Hebrew word refers explicitly to *leaders.* The Mickelsens have pointed this out and they show that κεφαλή translates רֹאשׁ when it means "leader" only 8 out of 180 instances.[16] That is 4.4%, a rather slim percentage. If the "head = leader" metaphor is as common in Greek as it is in Hebrew, *why* did the translators of the LXX not use it? Grudem has failed to address this issue; rather, he dismisses the Mickelsens' claim in a footnote (p. 62, n. 17). Another problem with citing the LXX is its status as a translation. As a translation, the LXX is valuable as a *secondary* source, not as a

[15]I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Plato.
[16]"What does *kephalē* Mean in the New Testament?" 102ff.

primary one. All translations run the risk of being influenced by the original language. Furthermore, not all translations are as good as they could be, and not all translators are as competent as they could be. Grudem has failed to deal with these matters.

Let us now look at Grudem's examples from the LXX. All citations are taken from Rahlfs's edition. References to English versions will be added where there is a difference. Examples 4-6 all involve variant readings, a fact which Grudem concedes in a footnote:

(4) Judg 10:18:
... καὶ ἔσται εἰς **κεφαλὴν** πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Γαλααδ.
... and he shall be a head (= leader) for all the inhabitants of Gilead.

(5-6) Judg 11:8-9:
... καὶ ἔσῃ ἡμῖν εἰς **κεφαλήν**, πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Γαλααδ.
... ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἔσομαι εἰς **κεφαλήν**.
... and you shall be a head (= leader) for all the inhabitants of Gilead.
... I shall be your head (= leader).

In all three of these passages manuscript A reads κεφαλή, while B reads ἄρχων. The presence of the variants indicates either that a scribe felt the translation to be not quite literal enough (thus changing ἄρχων to κεφαλή), or that he felt the translation was too literal and did not convey the correct meaning (thus changing κεφαλή to ἄρχων). We have no way of knowing who changed what or why. These three examples are therefore dubious, due to the presence of the variant readings.

(7) Judg 11:11. Again there are two manuscript traditions, A and B, and both have added a gloss on the translation of רֹאשׁ as κεφαλή:

(A) ... καὶ κατέστησαν αὐτὸν ἐπ' αὐτῶν εἰς **κεφαλὴν** εἰς ἡγούμενον.
... and they set him over them as a head, as a leader.

(B) ... καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν ὁ λαὸς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς **κεφαλὴν** καὶ εἰς ἀρχηγόν.
... and the people set him over them as a head, as a ruler.

The presence of εἰς ἡγούμενον "as a leader" in A and εἰς ἀρχηγόν "as a ruler" in B is sufficient to clarify the metaphor. This example is also of questionable value.

(8) 2 Kingdoms (2 Sam) 22:44. Here the LXX provides a literal translation of the Hebrew. There are no textual variations and no glosses. κεφαλή refers to a leader:

καὶ ῥύσῃ με ἐκ μάχης λαῶν, φυλάξεις με εἰς **κεφαλὴν** ἐθνῶν· λαός, ὃν οὐκ ἔγνων, ἐδούλευσάν μοι . . .

and you will rescue me from the people's battle, you will keep me as a head of the nations; a people, whom I did not know, were my slaves...

(9) 3 Kingdoms (1 Kgs) 8:1. Again, there is a variation in the text. Rahlfs's text reads:

. . . τότε ἐξεκκλησίασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων πάντας τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους Ισραηλ ἐν Σιων τοῦ ἀνενεγκεῖν τὴν κιβωτὸν διαθήκης κυρίου ἐκ πόλεως Δαυιδ . . .

. . . at that time king Solomon convened all the elders of Israel at Zion in order to take the ark of the covenant out of the city of David...

The word κεφαλή does not even occur; rather it is found in a variation of Origen's: πάσας **κεφαλὰς** τῶν ῥάβδων ἐπηρμένους τῶν πατέρων υἱῶν Ισραηλ πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα Σαλωμων, "all the heads of the rods of the fathers of Israel were raised toward King Solomon." Origen's version does not even have anything to do with "leaders." The word "heads" is used of the tops of rods or staffs! This example must be rejected also.

(10) Ps 17:44 (18:43). This example is very similar to (8):

καὶ ῥύσῃ με ἐξ ἀντιλογιῶν λαῶν, καταστήσεις με εἰς **κεφαλὴν** ἐθνῶν· λαός, ὃν οὐκ ἔγνων, ἐδούλευσάν μοι . . .

And you will rescue me from the clamouring of the people, you will establish me as the head of the nations; a people, whom I did not know, were my slaves . . .

Here the metaphor of "leader" is apparent.

The next four examples (11-14) are from Isa 7:8-9. Again, a textual variation is involved. In Rahlfs's text of the LXX, κεφαλή occurs only three times (not four):

ἀλλ' ἡ **κεφαλὴ** Αραμ Δαμασκός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἑξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν ἐκλείψει ἡ βασιλεία Εφραιμ ἀπὸ λαοῦ, καὶ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** Εφραιμ Σομορων, καὶ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** Σομορων υἱὸς τοῦ Ρομελιου· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσητε, οὐδὲ μὴ συνῆτε.

But the head of Aram is Damascus, but within 65 years, the kingdom of Ephraim will erase from the people, and the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah; unless you believe, you will not understand.

Two of these examples, ἡ κεφαλὴ Αραμ Δαμασκός and ἡ κεφαλὴ Εφραιμ Σομορων, refer to capital cities, not to people. The other occurrence does involve a person, "the head of Samaria." The variation involves the phrase καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Δαμασκοῦ Ρασειμ,

"and the head of Damascus in Rezin," which was rejected by Rahlfs and relegated to the apparatus.

(15-16) Isa 9:13-14 (14-15). In this text, κεφαλή only occurs once, not twice as Grudem leads his readers to believe:

> καὶ ἀφεῖλεν κύριος ἀπὸ Ισραηλ **κεφαλὴν** καὶ οὐράν, μέγαν καὶ μικρὸν ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ, πρεσβύτην καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρόσωπα θαυμάζοντας (αὕτη ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ προφήτην διδάσκοντα ἄνομα (οὗτος ἡ οὐρά).
>
> And the Lord took away from Israel head and tail, the great and small in a single day, the elder and those who marvel at the people (this is the government) and the prophet who teaches lawlessness (this is the tail).

There are two significant points regarding this passage: (1) Isaiah is using a "head-tail" metaphor (hence the translation of κεφαλή), *not* an authority metaphor. (2) The second occurrence of the word "head," which is in the English translation but not in the LXX, is translated in the LXX by the word ἀρχή, probably meaning "government" here. This example must be rejected.

(17) T. Reuben 2.2. This passage also contains a variation in the MSS, between the singular and the plural. Furthermore, the entire passage is discussing the evils of sensory perception, the "spirits of deception," which are the "head(s)" (possibly "source") of rebellion.

> 1. Καὶ νῦν ἀκούσατέ μου, τέκνα, ἃ εἶδον περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων τῆς πλάνης ἐν τῇ μετανοίᾳ μου. 2. ἑπτὰ πνεύματα ἐδόθη κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ τοῦ Βελιὰρ καὶ αὐτά εἰσι **κεφαλή** (–αὶ) τῶν ἔργων τοῦ νεωτερισμοῦ. 3. καὶ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, τοῦ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς πᾶν ἔργον ἀνθρώπου. 4. πρῶτον πνεῦμα ζωῆς, μεθ' ἧς ἡ σύστασις κτίζεται· δεύτερον πνεῦμα ὁράσεως, μεθ' ἧς γίνεται ἐπιθυμία· 5. τρίτον πνεῦμα ἀκοῆς, μεθ' ἧς δίδοται διδασκαλία· τέταρτον πνεῦμα ὀσφρήσεως, μεθ' ἧς ἐστι γεῦσις δεδομένη εἰς συνολκὴν ἀέρος καὶ πνοῆς· 6. πέμπτον πνεῦμα λαλιᾶς, μεθ' ἧς γίνεται γνῶσις· 7. ἕκτον πνεῦμα γεύσεως, μεθ' ἧς γίνεται βρῶσις βρωτῶν καὶ ποτῶν, καὶ ἰσχὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς κτίζεται· ὅτι ἐν βρώμασίν ἐστιν ἡ ὑπόστασις τῆς ἰσχύος· 8. ἕβδομον πνεῦμα σπορᾶς καὶ συνουσίας, μεθ' ἧς συνεισέρχεται διὰ τῆς φιληδονίας ἡ ἁμαρτία· 9. διὰ τοῦτο ἔσχατόν ἐστι τῆς κτίσεως καὶ πρῶτον τῆς νεότητος, ὅτι ἀγνοίας πεπλήρωται καὶ αὕτη τὸν νεώτερον ὁδηγεῖ ὡς τυφλὸν ἐπὶ βόθρον καὶ ὡς κτῆνος ἐπὶ κρημνόν.[17]
>
> 1. And now, hear from me, children, what I saw regarding the seven spirits of deception in my repentance. 2. Seven spirits were given against mankind from Beliar, and these are the head(s) [source?] of

[17]*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. M. De Jonge; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978). The date of composition is unknown.

the works of rebellion. 3. Seven spirits were given to him against the creation, so that every deed of man might be among them. 4. First is the spirit of life, with which desire comes into being; 5. third is the spirit of hearing, with which instruction is given; fourth is the spirit of smell, with which is given the sense of smell for the inhalation of air and breath; 6. fifth is the spirit of speech, with which knowledge comes about; 7. sixth is the spirit of taste, with which there is the taste of food and drink, and the strength is devised in them; because the substance of strength is in the food; 8. seventh is the spirit of sowing and intercourse (sexual), with which sin enters through the means of the love of pleasure; 9. for this reason, it is the last of creation and the first of youth, because it is full of ignorance, and this leads the youth into a pit like a blind man, and to a precipice, like an animal.

There is nothing in this text which is remotely political, social, or military, and so the translation "leader" which Grudem advocates is not justified. In fact, the notion of "source" is much more appropriate to the context, the seven spirits being the "source" of rebellion. This example must be rejected.

(18) Philo (1st c. A.D.), *On Dreams* 2.207. Philo is discussing the interpretation of dreams, and is discussing here the Baker's dream in Genesis 40:

"ᾤμην" γάρ φησι "τρία κανὰ χονδριτῶν αἴρειν ἐπὶ τῆς **κεφαλῆς** μου." [Gen 40:16] **κεφαλὴν** μὲν τοίνυν ἀλληγοροῦντές φαμεν εἶναι ψυχῆς τὸν ἡγεμόνα νοῦν, ἐπικεῖσθαι δὲ τούτῳ πάντα· καὶ γὰρ ἐξεφώνησέ ποτε ἐπιτον(ὼς)· "ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐγένετο ταῦτα πάντα." [Gen 42:36][18]

For it says, "I thought I raised three baskets of groats onto my head." *Head* we say is here an allegorical use of the controlling mind and soul, and everything is laid upon this [the head]; for in fact, at one time, it cried out bitterly, "All these things have come upon me."

Philo is a Platonist and he is explaining his allegorical interpretation of the Genesis text. Philo's use of *head* as the control center of the mind is in accordance with Plato's doctrine in *Timaeus;* it is not a metaphor of "authority."

(19) Philo, *Moses* 2.30. In this passage, Philo is obviously using *head* as a metaphor of preeminence. This is fully in keeping with the use of κεφαλή as defined in LSJ:

συνόλως μὲν οὖν ἡ τῶν Πτολεμαίων οἰκία διαφερόντως παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας βασιλείας ἤκμασεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Πτολεμαίοις ὁ Φιλάδελφος — ὅσα γὰρ εἷς ἔδρασεν οὗτος ἐπαινετά, μόλις ἐκεῖνοι πάντες ἀθρόοι διεπράξαντο — γενόμενος καθάπερ ἐν ζῴῳ τὸ ἡγεμονεῦον **κεφαλὴ** τρόπον τινὰ τῶν βασιλέων.

[18]I have used the Loeb editions of Philo.

> On the whole, the house of the Ptolemies was entirely distinguished from the other kingdoms, and among the Ptolemies, Philadelphos — for whatever this one man did was praiseworthy, scarcely all the rest together accomplished as much — [Philadelphos] was the head of kings, in a manner of speaking, just like a head is to an animal.

Philo says that Philadelphos is the *head* of kings, not in the sense of ruling them, but as the *preeminent* king among the rest. Philadelphos is the *top* of the kings just as the head is the *top* of an animal's body. In English we would say that Philadelphos was *head and shoulders* above the rest of the kings. This example is therefore to be rejected.

(20) Philo, *Moses* 2.82. In this example, Philo is providing an allegorical interpretation of the construction and building materials of the temple. Regarding the pillars he says:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν αἰσθήσεως **κεφαλὴ** μὲν καὶ ἡγεμονικὸν ὁ νοῦς, ἐσχατιὰ δὲ καὶ ὡσανεὶ βάσις τὸ αἰσθητόν, εἴκασε δὴ τὸν μὲν νοῦν χρυσῷ, χαλκῷ δὲ τὸ αἰσθητόν.
>
> Now since the mind is the head and controller of the sense-perception within us, and [since] what is perceived by the senses is the extremity and, as it were, the base, he likened the mind to gold, and what is perceived by the senses to bronze.

Philo is again making use of Plato's metaphor of the soul. This is not a metaphor of "authority."

(21-22) Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 125 (not 1.25). In this text, Philo employs a simple head-tail metaphor. This is obvious in context, which Grudem does not cite:

> ταῦτα δ' ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ζῴῳ **κεφαλὴ** μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον, οὐρὰ δ' ὕστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐ μέρος συνεκπληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμόν, ἀλλὰ σόβησις τῶν ἐπιποτωμένων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον **κεφαλὴν** μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἔσεσθαί φησι τὸν σπουδαῖον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαόν, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν **κεφαλῇ** καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμασιν.
>
> Now these things are allegorical, being expressed in a manner of speaking: for just as the head is the first and best part of an animal, and the tail is the last and worst part, not the part which finished off the number of body-parts, but the part which shoos away insects; in the same manner, he says, the virtuous one, whether a man or a people, will be the head of the human race; and all the rest [of the people] are like the parts of the body, which take their life from the faculties in and above the head.

Philo explicitly says that the head (in the literal sense) is the "first and best." This again is reminiscent of Plato's doctrine in the *Timaeus* discussed above. Grudem rejects the notion of "source" for this passage, saying that "there is no sense in which the ordinary

people derive their being or existence from the leaders who are the 'head'" (p. 74, n. 25). In making this statement, Grudem has shown that he has failed to understand Philo, for Philo expressly says that the "rest" will "take their life from the head *like parts of a body.*" It is fairly clear that "head" here is the source of life, which Colson, in a footnote to the Loeb edition identifies as "spiritual life."

Whether or not "head" is taken to mean "source" in this passage, Philo's simile of the animal, and his statement that the head is "the first and best part" makes it clear that "preeminence" is Philo's point, not "authority." The "virtuous one" will be preeminent among the human race. These examples must be rejected.

(23) Plutarch, *Pelopidas* 2.1. Here, Plutarch is using the human body as a simile for the army. This is obvious in context, which Grudem again fails to provide:

> Εἰ γάρ, ὡς Ἰφικράτης διήρει, χερσὶ μὲν ἐοίκασιν οἱ ψιλοί, ποσὶ δὲ τὸ ἱππικόν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ φάλαγξ στέρνῳ καὶ θώρακι, **κεφαλῇ** δὲ ὁ στρατηγός, οὐχ αὑτοῦ δόξειεν ἂν ἀποκινδυνεύων παραμελεῖν καὶ θρασυνόμενος, ἀλλ' ἁπάντων, οἷς ἡ σωτηρία γίνεται δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὐναντίον.[19]
>
> For if, as Iphicrates tells the story, the light-armed troops are like the hands, and the cavalry is like the feet, and the phalanx is like the chest and shield, and the general is like the head, he who rashly runs risks would not seem to disregard himself, but everyone, in as much as safety, and its opposite [i.e., destruction], depends on him.

While it is true that the general controls the army like the head controls the body (cf. Plato again), it is also true that the general holds the topmost position within the army and is preeminent with respect to the army, just as the head is the topmost part of the body and is also preeminent with respect to the body. Plutarch does not call the general the "head of the army"; he is merely employing a simile. This example is ambiguous at best, and may thus be dispensed with.

(24-25) Plutarch, *Cicero* 14.6 (not 14.4). In this example, *head* is used by Cataline for a *leader* (himself), but there is more to this example than meets the eye:

> ὁ δὲ πολλοὺς οἰόμενος εἶναι τοὺς πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐφιεμένους ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ ἅμα τοῖς συνωμόταις ἐνδεικνύμενος, ἀπεκρίνατο τῷ Κικέρωνι μανικὴν ἀπόκρισιν· "Τί γάρ," ἔφη, "πράττω δεινόν, εἰ, δυεῖν σωμάτων ὄντων, τοῦ μὲν ἰσχνοῦ καὶ κατεφθινηκότος, ἔχοντος δὲ **κεφαλήν**, τοῦ δ' ἀκεφάλου μέν, ἰσχυροῦ δὲ καὶ μεγάλου, τούτῳ **κεφαλὴν** αὐτὸς ἐπιτίθημι;" τούτων εἷς τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἠνιγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, μᾶλλον ὁ Κικέρων ἔδεισε . . .

[19]I have used the Loeb editions of Plutarch.

> And [Cataline], thinking that there were many in the senate who were wanting a rebellion and at the same time showing himself off to the conspirators, gave Cicero a mad answer: "For," he said, "what terrible thing am I doing, if there are two bodies; one thin and wasted, but having a head, while the other is headless, but strong and large, and I set myself as a head on the latter?" Since [Cataline] was speaking this of the senate and the people, in the form of a riddle, Cicero was very afraid . . .

First of all, Cataline's answer was in the form of a "riddle," as Plutarch points out. Secondly, and more importantly, Cataline was speaking *in Latin*, not Greek. Ziegler points out two possible sources of Plutarch's, one of which is from Cicero himself (*Pro Murena* 51).[20] In this speech, Cicero says:

> Itaque postridie frequenti sentatu Catalinam excitavi atque eum de his rebus iussi, si quid vellet, quae ad me adlatae essent dicere. Atque ille, ut semper fuit apertissimus, non se purgavit sed indicavit atque induit. Tum enim dixit duo corpora esse rei publicae, unum debile infirmo **capite**, alterum firmum sine **capite**; huic, si ita de se meritum esset, **caput** se vivo non defuturum. Congemuit senatus frequens neque tamen satis severe pro rei indignitate decrevit; . . .[21]

> Then, on the next day, in the crowded senate, I called on Cataline and asked him about his concerns, to say whatever he wanted about what had been reported to me. And he, as he was always so frank, did not excuse it but accused and entangled himself. And then he said there were two bodies for the State, one powerless with a weak head, another strong without a head; for the latter, if there was any merit about it, the head would not fail, as long as he was alive. The crowded senate groaned, but nevertheless did not pass a decree of sufficient severity for the unworthy matter; . . .

It is entirely possible that Plutarch used this passage as source material for his life of Cicero, and it is equally possible that Plutarch translated the Latin rather literally for the sake of the "riddle." If this were so, then this use of *head* for "leader" is really a Latin metaphor, and not a Greek one. Recall that Latin *caput* is used as a metaphor for "leader" in Latin. These examples are therefore illegitimate.

(26) Plutarch, *Galba* 4.3. Again, Plutarch is using the body as a simile. He is not calling Galba "the head." The "body" is the province of Gaul:

> ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ λαμπρῶς τὸν πόλεμον ἐκφήνας ὁ Οὐίνδιξ ἔγραψε τῷ Γάλβᾳ παρακαλῶν ἀναδέξασθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ παρασχεῖν ἑαυτὸν ἰσχυρῷ σώματι ζητοῦντι **κεφαλήν**, ταῖς Γαλατίαις δέκα μυριάδας ἀνδρῶν ὡπλισμένων ἐχούσαις

[20]Konrat Ziegler, ed., *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* (vol. 1, fasc. 2; Leipzig: Teubner, 1959) 326.

[21]The Loeb Classical Library Edition.

ἄλλας τε πλείονας ὁπλίσαι δυναμέναις, προὔθηκε βουλὴν τοῖς φίλοις.

But when Vindex, who had openly declared war, wrote to Galba encouraging him to accept the imperial power and to make himself head to a strong body seeking one, [i.e.] to Gaul which had 100,000 heavily armed troops, and able to arm many more, [Galba] took counsel among his friends.

It should also be pointed out that Galba was a Roman, not a Greek, and that this passage, like the preceding, may have been influenced by Latin. Ziegler provides no known source material for this passage in Plutarch. This example is therefore dubious.

(27) Plutarch, *Agis* 2.3 (not *Agesilaus* 2.5). With this example, Plutarch is illustrating the folly of having the same man as both a leader and a follower. This example may at first seem valid, but Plutarch does not refer to the leader as a *head;* rather he invokes a fable to illustrate his point:

"Οὐ δύνασθε τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχειν καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ ἀκόλουθον." ἐπεὶ συμβαίνει γε καὶ οὕτως τὸ τοῦ δράκοντος, οὗ φησιν ὁ μῦθος τὴν οὐρὰν τῇ **κεφαλῇ** στασιάσασαν ἀξιοῦν ἡγεῖσθαι παρὰ μέρος καὶ μὴ διὰ παντὸς ἀκολουθεῖν ἐκείνῃ, λαβοῦσαν δὲ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτήν τε κακῶς ἀπαλλάττειν ἀνοίᾳ πορευομένην καὶ τὴν **κεφαλὴν** καταξαίνειν, τυφλοῖς καὶ κωφοῖς μέρεσιν ἀναγκαζομένην παρὰ φύσιν ἕπεσθαι.

"You cannot have the same man for both a leader and a follower." It thus turns out that the [fable of] the serpent [is appropriate], of which the tale is told that the tail rebelled against the head thinking to take the lead contrary to its part and not to always follow it [the head], and so, taking the lead, it navigated the body, proceeding in ignorance, and it tore the head to pieces by forcing the head to follow a blind and deaf part, contrary to nature.

Plutarch uses the word *head* in a literal sense, the head of the serpent. He does not use the word *head* as a metaphor for *leader,* but uses the fable as a metaphor or a parable. This example is therefore illegitimate.

(28) Plutarch, *Moralia* 629d-e (*Table Talk* 6.7, not 7.7). Plutarch is here writing about a particular kind of wine-making process, and is referring more to the common use of κεφαλή as a term of address, rather than to a political, military, or social metaphor for "leader."

μέγα δὲ τεκμήριον νὴ Δία φθορᾶς τὸ μὴ διαμένειν ἀλλ' ἐξίστασθαι καὶ μαραίνεσθαι, καθάπερ ἀπὸ ῥίζης κοπέντα τῆς τρυγός· οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ καὶ τρύγα τὸν οἶνον ἄντικρυς ἐκάλουν, ὥσπερ ψυχὴν καὶ **κεφαλὴν** τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰώθαμεν ἀπὸ τῶν κυριωτάτων ὑποκορίζεσθαι.

> Now a great proof of the destructiveness [of this process] is that [the wine] does not last, but it gets weak and fades, as if it were cut from the root, i.e. the lees; the ancients used to call the wine *lees*, just as we are accustomed to affectionately call an individual *soul* or *head* from his principal parts.

The use of κεφαλή as a salutation can be illustrated from the following passages (all cited from LSJ):

1. Τεῦκρε, φίλη **κεφαλή**, Τελαμώνιε, κοίρανε λαῶν, ... (Iliad 8.281)
   Teucrus son of Telamon, my dear friend, leader (κοίρανος) of the people, ...
2. Ἄπολλον, ὦ δία **κεφαλά**, ... (Euripides, *Rhesus* 226)
   Apollo, oh dear god, ...
3. ... ἢ οὐδὲν εἶπον, Φαῖδρε φίλη **κεφαλή**; (Plato, *Phaedrus* 264a)
   ... or did I say nothing, Phaedrus my dear friend?

(29) Plutarch, *Moralia* 647c (*Table Talk* 3.1). In this passage, Plutarch discusses the effects of wine *on the head*. "Head" here is literal, not metaphorical at all! Plutarch's reference to the head as the "controller" of the body is surely nothing but another reference to the Platonic doctrine.

> μάλιστα μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἄκρατος, ὅταν τῆς **κεφαλῆς** καθάψηται καὶ τομεύσῃ τὰ σώματα πρὸς τὰς τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἀρχάς, ἐπιταράσσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον· αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀνθῶν ἀπόρροιαι πρὸς τοῦτο θαυμασίως βοηθοῦσι καὶ ἀποτειχίζουσι τὴν **κεφαλὴν** ἀπὸ τῆς μέθης ὡς ἀκρόπολιν, ...
>
> For unmixed wine especially, when it assails the head and cuts the body off from the governor of the senses, distresses the individual; and the fragrances of flowers help against this in a wonderful way, and they fortify the head against drunkenness, like an acropolis, ...

(30) The Shepherd of Hermas, *Similtudes* 7.3. This is one instance where the "leader" metaphor is clear:

> λέγω αὐτῷ· Κύριε, εἰ ἐκεῖνοι τοιαῦτα εἰργάσαντο, ἵνα παραπικρανθῇ ὁ ἔνδοξος ἄγγελος, τί ἐγὼ ἐποίησα; Ἄλλως, φησίν, οὐ δύνανται ἐκεῖνοι θλιβῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ σὺ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** τοῦ οἴκου θλιβῇς· σοῦ γὰρ θλιβουμένου ἐξ ἀνάγκης κἀκεῖνοι θλιβήσονται, εὐσταθοῦντος δὲ σοῦ οὐδεμίαν δύνανται θλῖψιν ἔχειν.[22]
>
> I said to him, "Lord, if they have done such things to provoke the glorious angel, what have *I* done?" He said, "They cannot suffer in any other way, unless you, as the head of your household, suffer; for while you suffer under compulsion, they also shall suffer, and while you prosper, they cannot suffer at all."

[22] I have used the Loeb edition of the Shepherd.

We do not know who wrote the Shepherd. The author could have been a Greek, or he could have been a foreigner, perhaps a Palestinian. Palmer suggests that the author may have been a Roman,[23] but Koester argues that the author was Jewish.[24] If the author were a foreigner, it is entirely possible that this metaphor could have been calqued from his own native language. If this were the case, then this would be another example of an imported, not a native, metaphor. The situation is unknown. In any case, the metaphor is legitimate here.

(31-34) These examples from Aquila are all illegitimate for the simple reason that Aquila's Greek translation of the OT was so slavishly literal that it was incomprehensible to native Greeks! Aquila was not so much interested in producing a translation which would accurately convey the *meaning* of the Hebrew text in Greek; rather, he wanted to produce a "translation" which would provide an exact representation of the Hebrew sentence structure, roots and all, in the Greek language. Aquila "did not shrink from perpetrating the most appalling outrages to the whole essence of the Greek language."[25] Swete discusses Aquila and his translation, and provides several parallel passages of Aquila's rendering and that of the LXX for comparison. Swete notes, among other things, that Aquila's translation contains "frequent instances of absolutely literal rendering of the original" and "the same Hebrew words are scrupulously rendered by the same Greek."[26] These examples from Aquila must therefore be rejected since Aquila did not remain faithful to the *meaning* of the Greek language.

(35) Theodotion, *Judg* 10:18 (not 10:28). This verse was dealt with above (example 4). Citing one verse by Theodotion tells us nothing. With regard to Theodotion, the crucial question is how consistent is he in translating רֹאשׁ into Greek? Swete makes it clear that Theodotion was not as insanely literal as Aquila,[27] but it is not clear how literal or free Theodotion's translation was, and there is no information regarding his treatment of רֹאשׁ that I am aware of. Until more is known about Theodotion's translation(s) of רֹאשׁ, judgment must be suspended on this example.

(36) Libanius, *Oration* 20.3 (4th c. A.D.). This passage is in fact ambiguous. The text reads:

> ... καὶ πάλιν ἄλλους συνέχεαν μὲν τὰν τῷ κοινῷ βαλανείῳ νόμῳ διατεταγμένα, κινηθέντες δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὧν ἔδρασαν ἐπὶ

[23]L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (1954; reprint ed.; Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988) 197. See also Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987) 63-67.

[24]Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament. Volume two: History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 257-61.

[25]'History of the Septuagint Text,' in the Preface to the Septuagint (ed. Alfred Rahlfs) 58.

[26]H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914) 31-42 (39).

[27]Ibid., 42-49.

μείζω καὶ παρανομώτερα προσπίπτουσι μὲν οὕτω σφοδρῶς τῇ τοῦ ἄρχοντος κιγκλίδι καὶ ταῖς μετ' ἐκείνην θύραις, ὥστε δεῖσαι τοὺς ὑπηρέτας μὴ καὶ ῥήξαντες αὐτὰς ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν, οἷα τοιοῦτοι καιροὶ πεποιήκασι πολλαχοῦ, τοῦτο δὲ οὐ δυνηθέντες κατέχεαν μὲν τῶν ἑαυτῶν **κεφαλῶν** ὕβρεις, οὕτω γὰρ ἄμεινον εἰπεῖν, ἃς οὐδ' ἐν καπηλείῳ τῶν τις ἀγοραίων ἐφ' ἕτερον τῶν ἴσων.[28]

... and again they [rioters] threw others into disorder, as well as the ordinances for the public bath, and being spurred on by their actions to greater and more lawless deeds, they violently fell upon the magistrate's gate and the doors with it, with the result that the servants feared that those who broke them might kill him [the magistrate], which has happened frequently on other occasions, but unable to do this, they heaped insults on their own heads, for it is better to speak thus, which insults not even one of the lowlifes would throw at his peer in a tavern.

First of all, Libanius was writing in the fourth century, some 300 years after Paul. Second, he is employing a double entendre, as he himself makes clear with the words "it is better to speak thus" (euphemistically). Thus, κεφαλή is both literal (the people brought their insults upon themselves), and metaphorical (they insulted their rulers). Furthermore, the Loeb text calls attention to a note by the Scholiast which reads: κεφαλὰς ἐνταῦθα τοὺς βασιλεῖς αὐτοὺς λέγει, "*heads* here means the rulers themselves." Now if "leader" is a common metaphorical understanding of *head*, as Grudem claims, why does the Scholiast feel he must explain it? Unless of course the metaphor is so obscure that it needs explaining? This example is questionable.

(37) This is an epigram written by Gregory Nazianzus (4th c. A.D.), *Greek Anthology* 8.19:

Οὐχ ὁσίης ῥίζης μὲν ἐγὼ θάλος, εὐαγέος δέ
συζυγίης **κεφαλὴ** καὶ τεκέων τριάδος·
ποίμνης ἡγεμόνευσα ὁμόφρονος· ἔνθεν ἀπῆλθον
πλήρης καὶ χθονίων κούρανίων ἐτέων.[29]

I am the shoot of no holy root, but the head of a pious wife and three children;
I ruled an agreeable flock; I have departed hence full of earthly and heavenly years.

Grudem's citation of this epigram is dubious because Gregory, like Libanius, lived some 300 years after Paul, so there is no guarantee that he would have understood or used the word *head* in the same way Paul did. This example is questionable.

On pages 79f, Grudem asks the question: "We may wonder why the meaning 'ruler, authority over' was not common in earlier Greek

[28]I have used the Loeb edition of Libanius.
[29]I have used the Loeb edition of the *Greek Anthology*.

literature. . . ." He then points out that the adjective κεφάλαιος did have this meaning, and he refers to LSJ, who cite nine passages from seven authors ranging from the 5th century B.C. to the 4th century A.D. for κεφάλαιος meaning "leader." Grudem suggests that there was a semantic shift in late Greek whereby the meaning "leader" was carried over from the adjective to the noun. There are several problems with this line of reasoning. First, nouns and adjectives are not always used in the same ways.[30] Just because an adjective could mean "leader" does not mean that the noun can be used in the same way. In fact, all one has to do is study the entries in LSJ for κεφάλαιος and κεφαλή to see the differences. Second, Paul did not use the adjective, he used the noun. Third, I have demonstrated that the vast majority of Grudem's examples do not mean "leader" anyway. There *was* a semantic shift whereby κεφαλή took on the meaning "leader," at least in part, but that shift did not occur until the Byzantine or Medieval periods.[31]

Grudem also states that the meaning "leader" is common in Patristic writings, and he makes a passing reference to Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*.[32] However, if one looks at the entry in Lampe's lexicon, one will find that the vast majority of the citations quoted refer to Christ as the "head of the Church"! There is only one citation which is glossed "chief, headman," and Lampe does not quote it. He does list a few citations where κεφαλή refers to religious superiors or bishops. It appears that the use of *head* in Patristic Greek is a technical term referring primarily to Christ, and occasionally to members of the ecclesiastical order. Grudem's citation of Lampe is misleading.

Grudem has made known to me (personal communication) another article on κεφαλή by Joseph Fitzmyer, S. J., which was recently published.[33] Fitzmyer, whose work was done independently of Grudem, agrees with Grudem that κεφαλή denotes 'authority, leader,' and should be so understood in the New Testament. While Fitzmyer cites some of the same passages which Grudem has cited, he cites some additional passages not discussed by Grudem. Unlike Grudem, Fitzmyer quotes the Greek text for most of his examples, but he unfortunately does not quote enough context, and he does not always discuss each of his examples. I have looked at Fitzmyer's examples, to which I now turn.

Fitzmyer groups his data into two sections: biblical and non-biblical examples. Fitzmyer argues that since the Hebrew רֹאשׁ "leader" is in fact translated by κεφαλή in the LXX, at least a few times, such an understanding is proper in 1 Cor 11:3. I have already dealt with the problem of semantic borrowing in the LXX, and so I would like to proceed with an examination of Fitzmyer's examples.

---

[30]For example, the adjective λογικός is much more restricted in meaning and usage than is the related noun λόγος; see LSJ for details.

[31]See D. Dhimitrakou, Μέγας Δέξικον, referred to in part 1 above.

[32]Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.

[33]"Another Look at ΚΕΦΑΛΗ in I Corinthians 11:3," *NTS* 35 (1989) 503-11.

Fitzmyer's biblical examples (1) and (4) correspond to Grudem's (11-14) and (8) respectively. Fitzmyer's examples (2, 3, 5) are as follows:

(2) Jer 31:7 (LXX 38:7):

> Εὐφράνθητε καὶ χρεμετίσατε ἐπὶ **κεφαλὴν** ἐθνῶν, . . .
> Rejoice and shout over the head of the nations, . . .

Fitzmyer says that the "notion of supremacy or authority is surely present" in this passage (p. 508). I do not necessarily disagree.

(3) 1 Kgs 21:12 (LXX 20:12). I am puzzled by Fitzmyer's inclusion of this passage because, in context, the passage is about Jezebel's plot to murder Naboth. Jezebel instructed her henchmen to "Proclaim a fast and set Naboth at the *head* (רֹאשׁ; κεφαλή) of the people. Next, get two scoundrels to face him and accuse him of having cursed God and king. Then take him out and stone him to death" (vv. 9-10, New American Bible). And the deed was done (vv. 11-14). There is no indication of "authority" or "leader" in this passage at all. Naboth was a falsely accused man, not a leader of the community. Placing him at the *head* of the people is merely local, "in front of" (see Gesenius's *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, p. 911). This example is therefore false.

(5) Fitzmyer cites three passages, all of which have to do with a "head-tail" metaphor, which he acknowledges. The passages are Deut 28:13, 44 and Isa 9:13-14. The latter is cited by Grudem (see nos. 15-16 above). I should reiterate that the presence of the *head-tail* metaphor is not sufficient to establish these examples as *unambiguously* denoting "authority" or "leader." There is more here than simply calling one "the head of the clan." These examples are therefore dubious due to the presence of the additional metaphor.

Fitzmyer next turns to Philo and Josephus for a few non-biblical examples of "authority" for κεφαλή. He cites Philo's *Preliminary Studies* 61 as an example of the meaning "source." This example was discussed on page 92 above. Fitzmyer then quotes two passages which Grudem has cited (Grudem's 18 and 19). Fitzmyer also cites two other passages discussed by Grudem: one from Philo's *Moses*, and one from the *Shepherd of Hermas* (Grudem's nos. 20 and 30 respectively). The rest of Fitzmyer's examples have not been cited by Grudem. I shall discuss them at length.

(3) Philo, *The Special Laws* 184. Fitzmyer quotes only one line from this passage, and thus does Philo a great injustice. The entire passage is as follows:

> Πάλιν ἐάν τις, φησίν, ὀφθαλμῶν οἰκέτου ἢ θεραπαίνης ἐκκόψῃ, ἐλευθέρους ἀφιέτω. διὰ τί; ὥσπερ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἡγεμονίαν ἡ θύσις ἀνῆψε **κεφαλῇ** χαρισαμένη καὶ τόπον οἰκειότατον ὡς βασιλεῖ τὴν ἄκραν — ἄνω γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐπ' ἀρχὴν παραπέμψασα ἱδρύσατο καθάπερ ἀνδριάντι βάσιν ὑποθεῖσα τὴν ἀπ' αὐχένος ἄχρι ποδῶν ἅπασαν ἁρμονίαν —,

οὕτως καὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τὸ κράτος ἀνέδωκεν ὀφθαλμοῖς· ὑπεράνω γοῦν καὶ τούτοις ὡς ἄρχουσιν ἀπένειμεν οἴκησιν, βουληθεῖσα μὴ μόνον τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀλλὰ καὶ χωρίῳ περισημοτάτῳ καὶ περιφανεστάτῳ τούτους γεραῖραι.

Again he [Moses] says that if anyone knocks out the eye of a manservant or maidservant he must set him or her at liberty. Why is this? Just as nature conferred the sovereignty of the body on the head when she granted it also possession of the citadel as the most suitable position for its kingly rank, conducted it thither to take command and established it on high with the whole framework from neck to foot set below it, like the pedestal under the statue, so too she has given the lordship of the senses to the eyes. Thus to them too as rulers she has assigned a dwelling right above the others in her wish to give them amongst other privileges the most conspicuous and distinguished situation.[34]

There are several points in this passage which must be considered. *Leadership* is one, and *preeminence* is the other. While it is true that Philo says that the head has the "sovereignty of the body" (τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἡγεμονίαν), he also says that the eyes have "lordship of the senses" (τῶν αἰσθήσεων τὸ κράτος). This entire passage is metaphorical, and one metaphor must not be taken out of context at the expense of another. Furthermore, Philo likens the *head* to a citadel, and to the statue which rests upon a pedestal. Both citadels and statues are physically *above* the city and pedestal, just as the head is physically *above* the body. The reason Philo gives for this state of affairs has to do with "privileges" pertaining to "the most conspicuous and distinguished situation" (χωρίῳ περισημοτάτῳ καὶ περιφανεστάτῳ τούτους γεραῖραι). There is really much more to this passage than a simple "head = leader" metaphor.

(4) Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 114. Fitzmyer quotes this example in context, to which I add more. In the previous paragraph to this passage (113), Philo discusses the merits of a good statesman (πολιτικός) and householder (οἰκονόμος). And then he says:

ἐὰν μὲν οὖν εἷς ἀνὴρ τυγχάνῃ τοιοῦτος ὢν ἐν πόλει, τῆς πόλεως ὑπεράνω φανεῖται, ἐὰν δὲ πόλις, τῆς ἐν κύκλῳ χώρας, ἐὰν δὲ ἔθνος, ἐπιβήσεται πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν ὥσπερ **κεφαλὴ** σώματι τοῦ περιφαίνεσθαι χάριν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ εὐδοξίας μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς τῶν ὁρώντων ὠφελείας· αἱ γὰρ συνεχεῖς τῶν καλῶν παραδειγμάτων φαντασίαι παραπλησίας εἰκόνας ἐγχαράττουσι ταῖς μὴ πάνυ σκληραῖς καὶ ἀποκρότοις ψυχαῖς.

So then one such man in a city, if such be found, will be superior to the city, one such city to the country around, one such nation will stand above other nations, as the head above the body, to be conspicuous on every side, not for its own glory but rather for the benefit of the beholders. For to gaze continuously upon noble models im-

[34]The translation is Colson's, from the Loeb edition.

prints their likeness in souls which are not entirely hardened and stony.[35]

Philo again uses the word *head* as a simile to indicate *preeminence*. Philo is not calling the statesman or householder the *head* in the sense of "leader," he is rather using *head* as a metaphor to indicate preeminence. Just as the head is the most conspicuous part of the body, so the good statesman or householder is conspicuous among his peers. The notion of "leader" in this passage is explicit in the terms *statesman* and *householder*, but the metaphors Philo uses convey the sense of preeminence.

In a footnote on page 509, Fitzmyer cites two passages from *Moses*, 2.82 and 2.290. The former corresponds to Grudem's (20). In the latter, Philo is discussing how the story of the death of Moses is a wonderful conclusion to the Torah:

θαυμάσια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα· θαυμασιώτατον δὲ καὶ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὃ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ ζῴῳ **κεφαλὴ** τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐστίν. ἤδη γὰρ ἀναλαμβανόμενος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς βαλβῖδος ἑστώς, ἵνα τὸν εἰς οὐρανὸν δρόμον διιπτάμενος εὐθύνῃ, καταπνευσθεὶς καὶ ἐπιθειάσας ζῶν ἔτι τὰ ὡς ἐπὶ θανόντι ἑαυτῷ προφητεύει δεξιῶς, ὡς ἐτελεύτησε μήπω τελευτήσας, ὡς ἐτάφη μηδενὸς παρόντος, δηλονότι χερσὶν οὐ θνηταῖς ἀλλ' ἀθανάτοις δυνάμεσιν, κτλ.

This indeed was wonderful: but most wonderful of all is the conclusion of the Holy Scriptures, which stands to the whole law-book as the head to the living creature; for when he [Moses] was already being highly exalted and stood at the very barrier, ready at the signal to direct his upward flight to heaven, the divine spirit fell upon him and he prophesied with discernment while still alive the story of his own death; told ere the end how the end came, told how he was buried with none present, surely by no mortal hands but by immortal powers; etc.[36]

It should be apparent that Philo is not at all using *head* as a metaphor of "authority," rather he is referring to the story of Moses' death as the most preeminent part of the Torah, just like the head is the most preeminent part of an animal's body.

The last two examples Fitzmyer cites come from Josephus' *Jewish War:*

3.54: [Ἰουδαία] μερίζεται δ' εἰς ἕνδεκα κληρουχίας, ὧν ἄρχει μὲν βασίλειον τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα προανίσχουσα τῆς περιοίκου πάσης ὥσπερ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** σώματος·

[Judea] is divided into eleven districts, among which Jerusalem as the capital is supreme, dominating all the neighbourhood as the head towers above the body;

[35]The translation is Colson's, from the Loeb edition.
[36]The translation is Colson's, from the Loeb edition.

> 4.261: οἵ γε ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξώκειλαν ἀπονοίας, ὥστε μὴ μόνον ἐκ τῆς χώρας καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν πόλεων ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν **κεφαλὴν** ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους μετενεγκεῖν τὴν ληστρικὴν τόλμαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν.
>
> To such extremes of insanity have they [i.e. gentile criminals] run as not only to transfer their brigands' exploits from the country and outlying towns to this front and head of the whole nation, but actually from the city to the Temple.[37]

In 3.54, the metaphor is clearly one of preeminence, rather than one of "authority" or "leader," and Josephus is very clear in specifying the simile: "like the head of a body." In 4.261, Josephus is referring to Jerusalem as the "head of the whole nation." The notion of "leader" may be admitted here. There is no simile, and no additional metaphor. Josephus is simply referring to the city as the "head of the nation."

Fitzmyer also cites one example from Athanasius, who refers to some bishops as the "heads of such great churches" (*Apol. II contra Arianos* 89 [PG 25.409A]). However, it must be remembered that Athanasius lived in the 4th century, and so his use of κεφαλή will not necessarily reflect Paul's. Furthermore, this passage in Athanasius may be modelled on Christian jargon, or it may be a technical term. It is therefore an illegitimate example since it occurs some 300 years after Paul. One cannot define pauline words based on uses that may have arisen after Paul had died.

The bulk of Grudem's examples of κεφαλή meaning "authority over" or "leader" have proved to be non-examples. Of Grudem's 49 examples, the 12 of the NT are illegitimate as evidence on the grounds that one cannot logically assume what one intends to prove. This leaves 37 examples, only four of which are clear and unambiguous examples of κεφαλή meaning "leader" (examples 8, 10, 14, 30). Eleven examples are dubious, questionable, or ambiguous (4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 23, 26, 36, 37); twelve examples are false (1, 3, 9, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29); seven other examples are illegitimate (24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34); two examples do not exist (2 and 16);[38] and one example (35) cannot be decided. Of the four clear examples, three are from the LXX and one is from the Shepherd of Hermas, and it is very likely that all four of these are imported, not native, metaphors. Six of the questionable examples come from biblical sources, while all of the false examples have been from non-biblical writers.

Fitzmyer argues that, from his examples (and those of Grudem), "a Hellenistic Jewish writer such as Paul of Tarsus could well have intended that κεφαλή in 1 Cor 11:3 be understood as 'head' in the

---

[37]I have used the Loeb editions of Josephus; the translations are Thackeray's.

[38]Grudem explains (p.e.) that he had based his count on English translations rather than on the Greek text.

sense of authority or supremacy over someone else" (p. 510). This may be so; however, the question remains whether Paul's *native Greek* hearers would have understood such a usage. So far, there have been no *clear and unambiguous* examples of κεφαλή denoting "leader" in extra-Biblical literature, and this fact speaks against such an understanding by native Greeks.

Fitzmyer ends his article with the following statement: "The next edition of the *Greek-English Lexicon* of Liddell-Scott-Jones will have to provide a sub-category within the metaphorical uses of κεφαλή in the sense of 'leader, ruler'" (p. 511). Due to the paucity of verifiable, unambiguous examples, this statement is certainly too strong.

By way of concluding this paper, we may ask the following questions: Can κεφαλή denote "source"? The answer is *yes*, in Herodotus 4.91; *perhaps*, in the Orphic Fragment and elsewhere (in Artemidorus Daldianus, *T. Reuben* [no. 17], and in Philo [nos. 21-22]). Is the meaning "source" common? Hardly! It is quite rare. Does κεφαλή denote "authority over" or "leader"? No. The only clear and unambiguous examples of such a meaning stem from the Septuagint and The Shepherd of Hermas, and the metaphor may very well have been influenced from Hebrew in the Septuagint. The metaphor "leader" for *head* is alien to the Greek language until the Byzantine or Medieval period. In fact, the metaphor is quite restricted even in Modern Greek; one may speak of the *head* of a procession, the *head* of state, and, of course, Christ is the *head* of the Church. But one cannot speak of the *head* of a department, or the *head* of a household in Modern Greek.[39]

What then does Paul mean by his use of *head* in his letters? He does not mean "authority over," as the traditionalists assert, nor does he mean "source" as the egalitarians assert. I think he is merely employing a head-body metaphor, and that his point is *preeminence*. This is fully in keeping with the normal and "common" usage of the word. Both Plutarch and Philo use *head* in this way, and this usage is listed in Liddell-Scott-Jones (with other references). It might be objected that *preeminence* does not fit the context of 1 Corinthians 11. How can the husband be *preeminent* over his wife? In the context of the male-dominant culture of which Paul was a part, such a usage would not be inappropriate. Furthermore, it must never be forgotten that we are 20th century Americans looking back into the world of 1st century Rome whose lingua franca was Greek. It is presumptuous for us to think that we can understand every aspect of a world which existed two thousand years in the past. Just because *we* might have difficulty with a given metaphor does not mean that Paul would have had the same difficulty; it is after all *his* metaphor, not ours.

[39]I have asked two Greek friends of mine about this. Both told me that the word κεφαλή as a metaphor for "leader" would be understandable, but it "sounded funny" to them. See also the *Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek* (ed. J. T. Pring; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 149.