

Joshua the high priest as (so one might say) an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile. But this (as Dr. Dodd is very ready to agree) is far-fetched.

Is it conceivable, then, that the phrase 'under the fig tree' indicates something far more prosaic, namely, accurate knowledge of a person's whereabouts and movements? In the History of Susanna, when Daniel cross-examines the two wicked elders who are giving false evidence against Susanna, he asks each of them separately under what tree and in what part of the garden they had seen the alleged offence take place. They give contradictory answers: one says ὑπὸ σχίνου (R.V. 'a mastick tree'), the other ὑπὸ πρῖνου (R.V. 'a holm tree'); and so their lie is detected, and they are threatened with penalties described by verbs which are puns on the trees named. Supposing, then, that 'Under what tree?' was a stock question—a proverbial expression meaning 'Can you tell me all about it?'—the Johannine phrase might mean, quite simply, that Jesus knew all about Nathanael, as though he had watched his every movement, as the heart of Elisha watched Gehazi in 2 Kings v. 26.

In further support of this, Professor D. Daube has kindly referred me both to Mishnah *Sanhedrin* v. 2, where the importance of scrupulous examination of the evidence is stressed, and where [Johan] ben Zakkai is said to have once tested the evidence 'even to the inquiring about the stalks of the figs' (Danby's translation); and to a supplementary Tannaitic statement in Bab. *Sanhedrin* 41a, which shows that the witnesses had told Johan ben Zakkai that 'the accused killed the victim under a fig tree', and the Rabbi, not satisfied even with their agreement as to the kind of tree, went on to see whether they would agree as to the species of figs (or, according to a note in I. Epstein's English edition, Soncino Press, 1935, *Sanhedrin*.i. p. 266, the *condition* of the figs—whether ripe or unripe). Johan ben Zakkai lived in the first century A.D. Susanna is of uncertain date. C. F. D. MOULE

THE MEANING OF κεφαλή IN THE PAULINE EPISTLES

IN normal Greek usage, classical or contemporary, κεφαλή does not signify 'head' in the sense of ruler, or chieftain, of a community. If κεφαλή has this sense in the writings of St. Paul (it certainly has it nowhere else in the New Testament) we must suppose it to have been acquired as the result of LXX use of the word to translate שׂר.

It is usual to give it that sense in Col. i. 18, ii. 19, and Eph. i. 22, iv. 15; and to explain that in this image or analogue Christ is the 'head' of his 'body', the Church, because he is the ruler or director of it. Thus

Armitage Robinson on Eph. iv. 15 writes: 'It is natural to think of him as the body's head, for that is the seat of the brain which controls and unifies the organism'; and again: 'The head is regarded as the source of the harmony of the various parts, which is essential to a healthy development.' But this is to be guilty of serious anachronism: for this metaphor, which is 'natural' to us, would be unintelligible to St. Paul or his readers, who had no idea of the real function of the central nervous system. (It seems that Hippocrates was on the track of the function of the brain and Plato perhaps is following him in, for example, *Phaedo* 96B: but the influence of Aristotle prevented the following up of the clue for many centuries.) In St. Paul's day, according to popular psychology, both Greek and Hebrew, a man reasoned and purposed, not 'with his head', but 'in his heart' (כֹּל or καρδία—or diaphragm, φρήν).

Further, this meaning for κεφαλή involves a very forced interpretation of Col. ii. 19 and Eph. iv. 15 where Christ is spoken of as the 'source of' (ἐξ οὗ) the body's development and growth.

Now on any interpretation of these passages it seems clear that we shall have to invoke ראש as determining the sense of κεφαλή. But ראש itself has more than one meaning: it has, in fact, two main meanings, and the connexion between them is not obvious.

There is first the literal, anatomical, meaning which is presumably fundamental. Derived from this primary meaning we find the word used for the 'top' of anything, e.g. of a mountain, or the head of the corner. It is also used, on the principle of the part for the whole, to signify the person in reckoning, e.g. Jud. v. 30 (cf. 'a head', *per capita*, and the classical use of κεφαλή). Occasionally it is used for 'sum' or 'total', e.g. Num. i. 2 (cf. κεφάλαιον).

The other main meaning would seem to be that of 'first'. In relation to time this signifies 'beginning', e.g. of the night-watch (Jud. vii. 19): or, 'from the beginning' (Prov. viii. 23 'I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was': cf. Isa. xl. 21). The word is used also of the 'beginning' of things, e.g. of the dust of the earth (Prov. viii. 26). In Gen. ii. 16 the river of Eden is described as dividing and becoming four 'heads', i.e. the beginning, or starting-point, of four rivers.¹

It may be noted that in the feminine form of the noun (ראשה) this sense of 'beginning' or 'first' is dominant (ראשה never signifies head in the literal sense, and only occasionally 'chief', e.g. Amos vi. 1). It is used of the first step in a process, e.g. the beginning of sin;² of knowledge³; and, in effect, for the source of being, or origin, of the world.⁴

¹ See Dillman, and Driver, ad loc. Compare the 'head' of a road Ezek. xvi. 25, xxi. 18.

² Mic. i. 13.

³ Prov. i. 7.

⁴ Gen. i. 1.

שׂר quite frequently has the meaning 'chief among' or 'head over' men: but this would seem to be connected, not with the controlling influence of the head over the limbs, but with the idea of priority,¹ e.g. 1 Chron. v. 12, xxiii. 8, 11, &c. This perhaps best explains the phrase 'head of the family' (in 1 Chron. v. 12 LXX renders שׂר by *πρωτότοκος*). Unquestionably the idea of authority or leadership often attaches to שׂר: but then a chieftain's authority in social relationships is largely dependant upon his 'seniority', or 'priority', in the order of being. It is not irrelevant to note that in Jud. xi. 11 שׂר is distinguished from, while combined with, יָצַק (commander, or decider).

Turning to the LXX we find שׂר in its literal sense is rendered by *κεφαλή*: but where, as in the instances cited, it signifies 'first' or 'beginning of' the LXX has *ἀρχή*, which is also the normal rendering of ה'שׂר.

שׂר in the sense of 'chief' or 'ruler' is rendered sometimes by *κεφαλή*, e.g. Jud. xi. 11, 2 Sam. xxii. 44: sometimes by *ἀρχή*, e.g. Exod. vi. 25 ('heads of houses'), Mic. iii. 1 ('heads of Jacob and rulers of the house of Israel'): but most commonly by *ἀρχων* or *ἀρχηγός*. The evidence here suggests that *κεφαλή* and *ἀρχή* at least tended to become interchangeable as renderings of שׂר: and this suggestion is powerfully reinforced by the fact that שׂר in the phrase 'head and tail' which occurs in Isa. ix is rendered by *κεφαλὴν* in verse 14, but in the very next verse, explaining the phrase, by *ἀρχή*. In short, *κεφαλή* and *ἀρχή*, which in classical Greek have nothing in common, in biblical Greek have become closely associated by reason of their common connexion with שׂר.

It seems a fair inference that St. Paul, when using *κεφαλή* in any but its literal sense, would have in mind the enlarged and metaphorical uses of the term 'head' familiar to him from the Old Testament: and these, as we have seen, include the meaning of the 'beginning' of something. Consequently, in St. Paul's usage, *κεφαλή* may very well approximate in meaning to *ἀρχή*.²

If this virtual equation of *κεφαλή* with *ἀρχή* be conceded a new and illuminating interpretation of several Pauline passages becomes possible.

In Col. i. 18 *κεφαλή* in the sense of 'ruler' of the Church would be an irrelevant intrusion into the context, which is otherwise wholly concerned with Christ as *ἀρχή*, the 'beginning' and 'principle' alike in Creation and Redemption (cf. Rev. iii. 14, *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως*). In

¹ See B.D.B. *Lexicon*, 'chief . . . apparently combined with the idea of first in a series'.

² Schlier in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*, vol. iii, p. 677, remarks that, in gnostic usage, '*κεφαλή* comes very near to the idea of *ἀρχή*'.

Eph. i. 22, on the other hand, it is possible, in view of the context, that it is the 'over-lordship' of Christ which is stressed.

In Col. ii. 19 and Eph. iv. 15, where the 'body' is said to derive its growth and development from the 'head' (ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα . . . αὖξει), it is very difficult to make any sense at all so long as κεφαλή is regarded as 'over-lord'. But when it is realized that Christ is ἀρχή in relation to the Church, it is possible to see how Christians can be said to 'grow up into him' (αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτόν Eph. iv. 15), as the archetypal image of the Second Adam is progressively realized in them: and the passages then fall into line with other Pauline passages which refer to the remaking of Man in the μορφή of Christ who is himself the εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.¹ At the same time it remains possible to think of the σῶμα as the πληρῶμα or 'fulfilment' of the κεφαλή, as Armitage Robinson argues on Eph. i. 23. All this sounds, and indeed is, sufficiently 'Platonic': but Phil. iii. 4-21 in itself provides warning enough that St. Paul is not merely resolving Christ into a Platonic archetype. All his Christian experience starts from his encounter with the historical Jesus (see Acts ix. 5, 'I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest'). But there is no reason to suppose that he would be in the least unwilling to borrow from his commonplace book of Greek philosophy if he thought it would help to interpret the full significance of that Person, as he himself had come to realize it, to his Gentile converts.

Of course it seems hardly possible that St. Paul could use κεφαλή in the immediate context of σῶμα without any conscious reference at all to the anatomical image thereby evoked. It is suggested, rather, that there is something in the nature of a *double-entente* in his use of the word in these passages.

But the new light which this interpretation of κεφαλή throws on St. Paul's meaning is perhaps most striking in the case of an earlier passage, 1 Cor. xi. 3-12. Here, St. Paul, with the practical motive of impressing upon certain 'gifted' Christian ladies at Corinth the importance of observing conventional standards of modest behaviour, stresses the fact that Eve derives her being from Adam (γυνή ἐξ ἀνδρός: cf. Gen. ii. 18-22). And this seems to be what he means by the 'headship' of the male in verse 3 (κεφαλή δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ). That is to say, the male is κεφαλή in the sense of ἀρχή relatively to the female; and, in St. Paul's view, the female in consequence is 'subordinate' (cf. Eph. v. 23). But this principle of subordination which he finds in human relationships rests upon the order of creation, and includes the 'sonship' of the Christ himself. Thus, παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλή ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστίν, and κεφαλή

¹ See Col. i. 15 and 1 Cor. xv. 49, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Gal. iv. 19, Rom. viii. 29, Phil. iii. 21, Col. iii. 9, 10; cf. Gen. i. 26.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ Θεός. That is to say, while the word κεφαλή (and ἀρχή also, for that matter) unquestionably carries with it the idea of 'authority', such authority in social relationships derives from a relative priority (causal rather than merely temporal) in the order of being. St. Paul makes it plain, of course (verse 2, cf. Gal. iii. 28), that he is here speaking only of men and women in their respective sexual differentiation and function, not of their spiritual status or capacities.

Finally, when κεφαλή is seen as signifying not mere 'overlordship', but rather a certain relationship of one to the *being* of another, it is possible to do full justice to the great passage in Eph. v. 22-33 in which the Church is presented to us as the Bride of Christ. In the natural relationship of Adam to Eve we have an analogue of the spiritual relationship of Christ to the Church. The Church is the Eve of the Second Adam—'bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh'. So Christ is κεφαλή in relation to the Church, as Adam in relation to Eve. The allusion in 2 Cor. xi. 2 to the fall of Eve, in connexion with St. Paul's anxieties over the Church in Corinth whom he 'had betrothed as a chaste virgin to a single husband, namely Christ', shows that this was a line of thought familiar to his mind.

STEPHEN BEDALE

FIRMILIAN AND EUCHARISTIC CONSECRATION¹

In the year 256 St. Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, wrote a long letter to St. Cyprian on the subject of heretical baptism.² In the course of this letter he recounted how some twenty-two years previously a certain prophetess had greatly troubled the Cappadocian church and went on to say that she 'invocatione non contemptibili sanctificare se panem et eucharistiam facere simularet, et sacrificium Domino (non)³ sine sacramento solitae praedicationis offerret, baptizaret quoque multos usitata et legitima verba interrogationis usurpans, ut nihil discrepare ab ecclesiastica regula videretur'.

The practices of an heretical female are of no great interest in themselves, but it is otherwise with the opinions of a distinguished bishop of an important see. It will therefore be worth while to examine Firmilian's statements and try to discover whether they throw any light upon his liturgical ideas. As far as Baptism is concerned, his statement is clear

¹ A paper read at the First International Conference on Patristic Studies at Oxford, September 1951.

² Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxv. 10.

³ The word *non* is not in the manuscripts, but it seems to be generally agreed that the sense of the passage as a whole requires its insertion. Whatever the true reading may be, the main argument of this paper is unaffected, since Firmilian clearly regarded the *sacramentum solitae praedicationis* as important.