'Does *kephalē* ("head") Mean "Source" or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature?': A Rebuttal

Richard S. Cervin
Doctoral candidate for the degree in Linguistics
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

In this paper I shall discuss the meaning of one of the Greek words which is at the centre of the debate over women's roles in the Church: κεφαλή 'head'. This paper is a rebuttal and refutation of Wayne Grudem's article on the meaning of κεφαλή. Grudem's article has obviously had some influence because it is often appealed to by traditionalists in support of an interpretation of I Cor 11 that men have authority over women.

0. Introduction. Wayne Grudem, in his article 'Does *kephalē* ("head") Mean "Source" or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples',[1] claims to have analyzed 2,336 occurrences of the word in Greek literature in order to determine whether κεφαλή can in fact mean 'source' or whether it can in fact mean 'authority over'. His findings are directly relevant for our understanding of Paul's use of this word in the New Testament. Grudem concludes that 1) κεφαλή *never* means 'source', and 2) 'authority over' is a 'common and readily understood' meaning of the word, and that the latter meaning 'best suits the New Testament' (p. 80).

Is Grudem correct in his assessment of the meaning of κεφαλή? My answer is a resounding 'no'. Grudem's article is based on a host of false assumptions. I will expose Grudem's assumptions, and I will further demonstrate that the 49 passages which Grudem cites as evidence for 'authority over' do not mean what Grudem claims they mean, but that Grudem has in fact misrepresented the evidence. §1 of this paper will contain a summary and critique of Grudem's assumptions and methodology. In §2 I will discuss Grudem's treatment of the argument for the meaning of 'source'. In §3 I will discuss each of Grudem's examples at length, and I will demonstrate that most of the examples Grudem cites do not support his claim. I will accomplish this by doing what Grudem has failed to do -- by citing and discussing each passage *in context*. All translations of original texts are my own unless otherwise specified.

1. Methodology. There are several problems in the methodology of Grudem's argument. First of all, he invokes evidence from various lexica. Regarding the lexica involved, Grudem seems to take a rather disparaging view of Liddell-Scott-Jones' *Greek-English* Lexicon [2] (henceforth LSJ). He says: 'Liddell-Scott is the tool one would use when studying Plato or Arisotle, for example; but it is not the standard lexicon that scholars use for the study of the New Testament' (p. 62). Grudem has a great deal of praise for Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich [3] (henceforth BAG) as the 'standard' New Testament lexicon. In making these statements regarding LSJ and Bauer, Grudem has demonstrated that he does not really understand the significance of LSJ. Grudem wrongly claims that LSJ 'emphasizes Classical Greek' (ibid.). This is not so. LSJ is the *only* comprehensive Greek-English lexicon of *Ancient* Greek currently available. While LSJ was originally planned to cover only Classical Greek (Preface, p. 10f), it currently covers Homer and

---

[1] As an appendix in *The Role Relationship of Men and Women*, by George W. Knight III, revised 1985, Moody Press. All quotations from Grudem's article are taken from the appendix in this book.

[2] 9th edition, with Supplement, 1968, Oxford University Press.

[3] *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 1957, University of Chicago Press.

Christians for Biblical Equality
122 West Franklin Avenue Suite 218
Minneapolis, MN 55404-2451
Ph: 612-872-6898 Fax: 612-872-6891
Email: cbe@cbeinternational.org
Website: http://www.cbeinternational.org

other pre-Classical authors, the Classical period, the Hellenistic period, and the Graeco-Roman period, *including* the New Testament and the Septuagint (this amounts to a time span of roughly 1400 years, 800 BC to 600 AD). In order do deal expressly with the New Testament and the Septuagint, the contributors and editors of LSJ included a team of theologians, Milligan among them, (Preface, p. 9). The value of BAG lies more in their citations of the literature and their bibliography rather than in the definitions per se. I do not wish to undermine the value of BAG, but it is deficient in certain respects (e.g. it does not treat the idiomatic expressions of prepositions while LSJ does). Insofar as theologians use only BAG, they automatically restrict their understanding of the Greek language, which in turn seriously affects their exegesis.

Just as numerous New Testament lexica have been produced over the years, so also are there lexica for very many individual Greek authors. I have checked the following for any definition of 'authority over, leader' for κεφαλή: H. Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, 8 vols ([1831-65], revised by K. Hase, W. and L. Dindorf, Paris: A. Firmin Didot); F. W. Sturz, *Lexicon Xenophonteum*, 4 vols. (1801-4, Lipsiae); D. F. Ast, *Lexicon Platonicum sive vocum Platonicarum*, 3 vols. (1835-38, Lipsiae: Weidmann); E.-A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum*, 2 vols. (1843-7, Geneva); W. Dindorf, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (1870, Lipsiae: Teubner); F. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (2nd. ed. corrected by Hermann Genthe, 1872, Berlin); W. Dindorf, *Lexicon Aeschyleum* (1876, Lipsiae: Teubner); J. Rumpel, *Lexicon Theocriteum* (1879, Lipsiae: Teubner); R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (1924; new edition, 1963, University of Oklahoma Press); J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, 2nd ed. (1938, reprinted 1977 by Georg Olms Verlag); A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexicon*, 4 parts (1956-75, Berlin: Acadamie-Verlag); J. H. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (1980, Leiden: E. J. Brill); J. I. McDougall, *Lexicon in Diodorus Siculus*, 2 vols. (1983, Georg Olms Verlag). None of these have any such listing; in fact, the only lexicon I have found which defines κεφαλή as 'leader' is D. Dhimitrakou Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης, 9 vols. (1933-50, Athens, privately published) and he explicitly states that the meaning of 'leader' is medieval (vol. 5, p. 3880).

Apparently, the only other lexica to include such a definition are the New Testament lexica. Why is this so? The soil of Greek lexicography has been amply tilled and ploughed over the centuries, and if 'leader' is a *common* understanding of κεφαλή, as Grudem claims, then why is it apparently never so listed in *any* Greek lexicon outside the perview of the New Testament? I offer several possible reasons, not the least of which is *tradition* and a *male-dominant world-view*: The expertise of theologians is the New Testament, not Classical, or even Hellenistic, Greek per se. While it may be true that some theologians have had a grounding in Classical Greek (especially those of the 19th century), they spend their time pondering the New Testament, *not* Plato, Herodotus, or Plutarch. And it must never be forgotten that it was philologists like Moulton and Deissmann who exploded the myth that the language of the New Testament was 'special' or 'unique', rather than the colloquial Koiné. Another reason stems from Latin -- a very unlikely source. In the West, Latin has always been more popular than Greek, and until the last century, Latin was the lingua franca of the scholarly world. Now the Latin word for 'head', *caput*, does have the metaphorical meaning of 'leader' (see the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, p. 274f). Thus, for English speaking theologians at least, English, Hebrew, and Latin all share 'leader' as a common metaphor for *head*, a metaphor which is nonetheless alien to Ancient Greek. Thus, the forces of tradition, a male-dominant culture, the identical metaphor in three languages, and a less than familiar understanding of the Greek language *as a whole*, could, in my mind, very easily lend theologians to assume that the metaphor of 'leader' for *head* must be appropriate for Greek as well.

Grudem assumes that if 'leader' is a common metaphor for κεφαλή, then there should be several examples of such a usage in Greek authors of the Classical, Hellenistic, and Graeco-Roman periods. Grudem is correct in this assumption. He therefore set about to collect a sampling of the occurrences of the word in several Greek authors ranging from Homer (viii BC) to Libanius (iv AD), in order to see if and how often the metaphor of 'leader' is used by native Greeks. This is a proper methodological first step. Grudem says that he took a collection of about 2000 occurrences from the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG). The authors checked and the number of occurrences in each author are listed by Grudem on pp. 66-7 of his article. With respect to the authors listed by Grudem, he claims that '*all the extant writings* of an author were searched and *every instance* of *kephalē* was examined and tabulated with the exception of fragmentary texts and a few other minor works that were unavailable to me' (p. 65, emphasis mine). I myself have access to the TLG here at the University of Illinois, and I have checked several of the authors in Grudem's list as to the frequencies. If Grudem has in fact checked '*every* instance in *all* the extant writings', as he claims, then he has not been very thorough in his search, for I have found some rather different figures for the same authors in Grudem's list. Grudem claims that κεφαλή occurs 114 times in Herodotus, I found 121 occurrences. I also found 59 in Aristophanes (not 56); 90 in Plato (not 97); and 15 in Theocritus (not 1). If Grudem has indeed checked *every* instance, why are his figures different from mine? And how can we be certain that his figures for the rest of the authors in his list are accurate?[4]

Grudem further states that the Loeb editions were used by him 'where available; otherwise, standard texts *and translations were used*' (p. 65, emphasis mine). I find the last phrase of this sentence very disturbing. One *cannot* conduct a word-study of Greek (or *any* foreign language) by using translations! One *must* have the original text! Furthermore, how does one know which Loeb editions were available to Grudem and when he used translations? Nowhere does he identify which text he used for his examples.

Grudem notes in passing that his study did not turn up any examples of κεφαλή meaning 'source' (p. 68). It must be pointed out, however, that two of his examples (21-22) are cited by Payne [5] for 'source'. These examples will be dealt with later.

Against those who claim that κεφαλή may denote 'source', Grudem says that in order to demonstrate that κεφαλή may indeed mean 'source', the examples 'ought to be cases in which the meaning is *unambiguous* and not easily explained in terms of other known senses of *kephalē*. (*That is consistent with sound lexical research*)' (p. 70, emphasis mine). This is very true in principle, and is equally true of Grudem's study. Unfortunately for Grudem, two of his examples do not exist, and the vast majority of the rest are either ambiguous, false, or illegitimate on other grounds! This will become clear by examining Grudem's examples *in their context*.

2. On the meaning 'Source'. Grudem critiques the various arguments which have been put forth in recent years by those who advocate 'source' as the meaning of κεφαλή in the New Testament. Grudem condemns, and rightly so, the Mickelsens and

---

[4] Grudem tells me (personal communication) that the reason for the descrepancies is that there have been a number of corrections, additions, and deletions to the TLG databank since he received his printout in 1984. I do not know that this is a valid explanation however. One of the drawbacks to the TLG databank, and it is a serious one, is that variant readings are not taken into account. Furthermore, the TLG databank is based on standard Greek texts (Oxford, Teubner, Budé, Loeb, etc.), and the editors of the TLG have not, as far as I know, practiced textual criticism as they processed the texts. Moreover, Grudem should not have claimed to have analyzed '*every*' occurrence when in fact he has not.

[5] *Response* [to 'What does *kephalē* Mean in the New Testament?' by B. and A. Mickelsen], in *Women, Authority, and the Bible*, p. 124f.

some New Testament commentators (e.g. F. F. Bruce and C. K. Burkett, among others), who have claimed that the meaning of 'source' is 'common' for κεφαλή. Grudem points out that the alleged 'common meaning' of 'source' was propounded by Bedale in the 1950s, and Grudem proceeds to briefly criticize Bedale. I have not seen Bedale's article, so I will not comment on it, except to say that some of Grudem's criticisms appear valid.

Grudem points out that the actual attestation for the meaning of 'source' rests on two citations from the ancient literature: Herodotus 4.91 and the Orphic Fragment 21A. Grudem points out, again rightly, that two examples does not constitute 'common', especially when both examples are from the Classical and pre-Classical periods (respectively). However, it must be pointed out that, out of 2,336 occurrences, Grudem claims to have found 49 examples of *head* meaning 'leader'; that is 2.1%, a figure which hardly deserves the epithet 'common' by anyone's standards! Grudem further proceedes to dismiss the translation of 'source' for both of these passages, and in this he is wrong.

Grudem dismisses the Herodotus passage by quoting the several meanings cited in LSJ for κεφαλή denoting 'end, top, brim', etc. and concludes that when Herodotus speaks of the κεφαλαί of the river, he means 'the many "ends" of a river where tributaries begin to flow toward the main stream' (p. 58). He goes on to state: 'Those who cite Herodotus or the "head of a river" examples to show that *kephalē* could have meant "source" at the time of the New Testament have not been careful enough in their use of Herodotus or Liddell-Scott' (ibid.). These words are equally true of Grudem himself because he has failed to comprehend Herodotus. The entire passage, 4.89-91, is rather long to be cited in full, but I will cite enough to show that Grudem's explanation is wrong:

> Δαρεῖος δὲ ὡς διέβη τὸν Βόσπορον κατὰ τὴν σχεδίην, ἐπορεύετο διὰ τῆς Θρηίκης, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ Τεάρου ποταμοῦ τὰς πηγὰς ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο ἡμέρας τρεῖς. ὁ δὲ Τέαρος λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων εἶναι ποταμῶν ἄριστος τά τε ἄλλα ⟨τὰ⟩ ἐς ἄκεσιν φέροντα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἵπποισι ψώρην ἀκέσασθαι. εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ αἱ πηγαὶ δυῶν δέουσαι τεσσεράκοντα, ἐκ πέτρης τῆς αὐτῆς ρέουσαι· καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτέων εἰσὶ ψυχραί, αἱ δὲ θερμαί. (4.89.3-90.1).[6]
>
> Now when Darius had crossed the Bosporus on the pontoon bridge, he proceeded through Thrace and, arriving at the source (lit. 'springs') of the Tearus river, he camped (there) for three days. The Tearus is said by the locals to be the best river, in that it is curative in many respects, and it especially cures scurvey in both men and horses. There are 38 springs flowing out of the same rock, some cold and some hot.

In context, it is clear that Herodotus is discussing the 'souce' (πηγαί) of the Tearus river. There are 38 springs, some hot, some cold, which form the source of the river. Darius camped by these springs for three days, and was so impressed with the springs that he ordered a stele erected at the spot which read:

> Τεάρου ποταμοῦ **κεφαλαὶ** ὕδωρ ἄριστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον παρέχονται πάντων ποταμῶν. (4.91.2).
>
> The source (lit. 'heads') of the Tearus river, the best and most beautiful, supplies all rivers.

The context of this passage should make it abundantly clear that Herodotus is using κεφαλαί 'heads' as a synonym of πηγαί 'springs', referring to the source of the Tearus.

---

[6] I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Herodotus.

Regarding the Orphic Fragment, Grudem contends that 'source' is an inappropriate meaning for κεφαλή as an epithet of Zeus. There are two problems with this fragment, however. First, there is a variant text. Grudem notes the presence of the variation, but he downplays its significance. Secondly, and more importantly, this entire fragment is ambiguous. Following are the two fragments as found in Kern:[7]

Fragment 21:

Ζεὺς ἀρχή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τέτυκται.
Ζεὺς πυθμὴν γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος.

Zeus is the beginning, Zeus is the middle, and by Zeus everything is accomplished.
Zeus is the foundation both of earth and of sparkling heaven.

Fragment 21A:

Ζεὺς πρῶτος γένετο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀργικέραυνος·
Ζεὺς **κεφαλή**, Ζεὺς μέσσα· Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τελεῖται·
Ζεὺς πυθμὴν γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος·
Ζεὺς ἄρσην γένετο, Ζεὺς ἄμβροτος ἔπλετο νύμφη·
Ζεὺς πνοιὴ πάντων, Ζεὺς ἀκαμάτου πυρὸς ὁρμή.
Ζεὺς πόντου ῥίζα· Ζεὺς ἥλιος ἠδὲ σελήνη·
Ζεὺς βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς ἀρχὸς ἁπάντων ἀργικέραυνος·
πάντας γὰρ κρύψας αὖθις φάος ἐς πολυγηθὲς
ἐξ ἱερῆς κραδίης ἀνενέγκατο, μέρμερα ῥέζων.

Zeus is first, lightning-flashing Zeus is last;
Zeus is head, Zeus the middle, and by Zeus everything is accomplished;
Zeus is the foundation both of earth and of sparkling heaven;
Zeus is male, Zeus is the bride immortal;
Zeus is the breath of everything, Zeus is the rage of unresting fire;
Zeus is the root of the sea, Zeus is the sun and the moon;
Zeus is king, Zeus is the lightning-flashing leader of all;
for having covered everyone, he who does baneful things once again brings (them)
to delightful light out of his sacred heart.

Fragment 21A has κεφαλή whereas Fragment 21 has ἀρχή, which may mean 'source' or, as Grudem notes, 'beginning'. Grudem's understanding of 'beginning' for this fragment is quite valid. However, the understanding of 'source' is also quite valid, and can be supported in two ways: 1) The scholiast (cited by Kern), has this comment regarding Frag. 21: καὶ ἀρχὴ μὲν οὗτος ὡς ποιητικὸν αἴτιον, τελευτὴ δὲ ὡς τελικόν, μέσα δὲ ὡς ἐξ ἴσου πᾶσι παρών, κἂν πάντα διαφόρως αὐτοῦ μετέχηι. 'And he is the beginning, as the producing cause, and he is the final cause, and he is the middle, as being present in everything equally, and everything partakes of him in a variety of ways.' The idea of 'souce' is clear; Zeus is the source of everything, he is the first cause. 2) The understanding of 'source' can be found in the clause Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τελεῖται/τέτυκται. This clause is itself ambiguous, and may be taken in two ways: either ἐκ is in *tmesis* and goes with the verb, in which case the genitive Διὸς depends on πάντα and can be construed as a 'genitive of source' (Smyth §§1410-11[8]) thus: Διὸς πάντα ἐκτελεῖται/ἐκτέτυκται 'everything from Zeus has been accomplished' (The *hyperbaton* involved in this reading is

[7] Otto Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, 1922, Berlin: Weidemann, p. 91f.

[8] Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, revised by Gordon M. Messing, 1956, Harvard University Press.

not difficult as far as Greek poetry is concerned), or, ἐκ may be in *anastrophe* and thus goes with Διός, making Διός the agent of the passive (see Smyth §1755 for ἐκ with the passive): ἐκ Διὸς πάντα τελεῖται/τέτυκται 'everything is done by Zeus'. Either reading is possible. Grudem's assertion that 'source' is 'doubtful' in this passage (p. 60) is erroneous. Zeus as the 'head/beginning/source/origin/cause' are all plausible readings. This fragment contains a series of epithets of Zeus. Otherwise, there is really no context which can be appealed to in order to settle which meaning(s) were intended by the author, or if all of the possible meanings were intended. As an additional note to this fragment, it may very well be the case that the word 'head' is used as a sort of technical term within the Orphic Cult. If this were so, then this fragment would not be relevant for the New Testament at all. It would take a specialist in Orphic religion to determine if this word is a technical term or not.

As for other examples of κεφαλή 'source', Payne (*Response*, p. 124f) cites the following passages in support of the meaning 'source': two from Philo, and three from Artemidorus Daldianus. In *Preliminary Studies* 61, Philo writes of Esau:

> κεφαλὴ δὲ ὡς ζῴου πάντων τῶν λεχθέντων μερῶν ὁ γενάρχης ἐστὶν Ἠσαῦ, ὅς τοτε μὲν ποίημα, τοτὲ δὲ δρῦς ἑρμηνεύεται...(Loeb).
>
> Like the head of a living creature, Esau is the progenitor of all the clans mentioned so far; (his name) is sometimes interpreted as "product" and sometimes as "oak"...

Note however, that Philo does not call Esau the 'head' of his clans. Philo is using a simile, 'like the head of a living creature', to describe Esau. This simile (like many of the examples Grudem cites, which will be discussed later) has nothing to do with 'source' or 'authority'. It is simply a *head-body* metaphor which shows that Esau is the 'topmost' or 'preeminent' part of his clan, just like the head of an animal is the topmost or preeminent part of the animal's body.

Philo's *On Rewards and Punishments* 125 is cited by Payne as meaning 'source' while Grudem cites this same passage as an example of 'authority' (his examples 21-22). This passage will be dealt with later.

Payne also cites six occurrences of κεφαλή meaning 'source' from Artemidorus Daldianus (ii AD), whose *Onirocriticon* [9] is a collection of dreams and their interpretations. In Book I of his collection, Daldianus sets up a system for the interpretation of dreams whereby parts of the human body represent members of the household: the *head* represents the father; the *feet* represent the slaves; the *right hand* represents a male member while the *left hand* represents a female member; and so forth (*Onirocriticon* I.2). Daldianus uses this system throughout his book. Several of the passages cited by Payne do not warrant the interpretation of 'source', however. The passages cited by Payne (with more context than he gives), are as follows:

I.2. (in Pack's text: p. 7, l. 20 - p. 8, l. 1):

> καὶ πάλιν ἔδοξέ τις τετραχηλοκοπῆσθαι. συνέβη καὶ τούτου τὸν πατέρα ἀποθανεῖν, ὃς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς αἴτιος ἦν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** τοῦ παντὸς σώματος. οἷον [δέ] ἐστι καὶ τὸ τετυφλῶσθαι τέκνοις ὄλεθρον καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ ἰδόντι σημαῖνον καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τοιαῦτα εἴποι τις ἄν.

---

[9] *Artemidori Daldiani, Onirocriticon Libri V*, edited by Roger A. Pack, 1963, Lipsiae: Teubner.

And again, someone thought that he had been decapitated. It turned out that this man's father had died, who (the father) was the source both of life and light, just as the head is (the source) of the entire body. For example, to be blind is destructive for children, and not just for the one who sees a vision (lit. *sign*), but (who sees) many other things which one would speak of.

I.2. (in Pack's text: p. 9, ll. 6-11):

οἷον **κεφαλὴ** εἰς πατέρα, ποῦς εἰς δοῦλον, δεξιὰ χεὶρ εἰς πατέρα υἱὸν φίλον ἀδελφόν, ἀριστερὰ χεὶρ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ μητέρα καὶ φίλην καὶ θυγατέρα καὶ ἀδελφήν, αἰδοῖον εἰς γονεῖς καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ τέκνα, κνήμη εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ φίλην. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἕκαστον, ἵνα μὴ μακρολογῶμεν, οὕτω σκοπητέον.

For example, the head represents the father; the foot represents the slave; the right hand represents the father, son, male-friend, brother; the left hand represents the wife, mother, female-friend, daughter, and sister; the genitals represent the parents, wife and children; the shin represents a woman and female-friend. Thus, it must be inquired about each of the rest, so that we may not be long-winded.

I.35. (in Pack's text: p. 43, ll. 12-16):

Ἀφῃρῆσθαι δὲ δοκεῖν τῆς **κεφαλῆς** εἴτε καταδίκης εἴτε ὑπὸ λῃστῶν εἴτε ἐν μονομαχίᾳ εἴτε οἱῳδήποτε τρόπῳ (οὐ γὰρ διαφέρει) πονηρὸν τῷ γονεῖς ἔχοντι καὶ τῷ τέκνα· γονεῦσι μὲν γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ **κεφαλὴ** διὰ τὸ τοῦ ζῆν αἰτίαν εἶναι· τέκνοις δὲ διὰ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα.

And it seems that to deprive (one) of his head, either by legal judgement, or by thieves, or by single combat, or by any other means (for it makes no difference), is an evil deed as far as the one who has parents or children is concerned; for the head is likened to the parents since they are the cause of life; and to the children because of the face and image.

III.66. (in Pack's text: p. 234, ll. 16-28):

ἐν μὲν ⟨οὖν⟩ τῷ πρώτῳ βιβλίῳ ἔφην εἶναι τὴν **κεφαλὴν** πατέρα τοῦ ἰδόντος, ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ λέοντα εἶναι βασιλέα ἢ νόσον, καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ θανάτου τοῖς πενομένοις τὸ ἀποθανεῖν χρηστὸν εἶναι καὶ λυσιτελὲς ἐπέδειξα. ἐπειδὰν οὖν πένης ἀνὴρ πατέρα ἔχων πλούσιον ὄναρ ὑπὸ λέοντος τὴν **κεφαλὴν** ἀφῃρῆσθαι δόξῃ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν, εἰκός ἐστι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντα κληρονόμον αὐτὸν καταλείψειν, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἄλυπος ἂν γένοιτο καὶ εὔπορος, οὔτε φορτικὸν ἔτι ἔχων τὸν πατέρα οὔτε ὑπὸ τῆς πενίας θλιβόμενος· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ μὲν **κεφαλὴ** ὁ πατήρ, ἡ δὲ ἀφαίρεσις ἡ στέρησις τοῦ πατρός, ὁ δὲ λέων ἡ νόσος, ἣν νοσήσας ὁ πατὴρ ἀποθάνοι ἄν· ὁ δὲ θάνατος ἡ μεταβολὴ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸ διὰ τὸν **πλοῦτον ἀνενδεές.**

In the first book I said that the head was (represented) the father of the dreamer (lit. *the one who sees*), and in the second book that the lion was (represented) a king or a disease, and in the book about death I demonstrated that it is good and beneficial for the poor to die. Now whenever a poor man who has a wealthy father dreams that he is deprived of his head by a lion and dies, it is likely that when his father dies, he will leave (him) an inheritance, and in this manner he will be without grief and (will be) well-off, neither having his father as a burden, nor suffering by poverty; for the head is the father, and the deprivation (of the head) is the loss of the father; the lion is the disease which the father contracts and dies from; and the death (of the father) is the change of livelihood due to the wealthy man's abundance.

It should be apparent that Artemidorus Daldianus' use of *head* is directly related to his theory of dream interpretation. He uses *head* more as a representation of one's father than as a metaphor for 'source'. Furthermore, only two of these passages, I.2 (p. 7) and I.35, mention anything about the *head* being the 'source' or 'cause' of life.

3. Grudem's examples. Grudem has cited 49 examples of what he claims are occurrences of κεφαλή meaning 'authority over' or 'leader'. Let us examine each passage in detail to see if Grudem is correct. A few of the passages Grudem cites are incorrectly referenced, and shall be so noted.

First of all, 12 of these passages (nos. 38-49) are from the New Testament, and are therefore illegitimate as evidence since they are the disputed texts. In citing these N.T. passages, Grudem commits the logical fallacy of assuming what he sets out to prove. The whole purpose of Grudem's study is to determine whether or not κεφαλή can denote 'authority over' or 'leader' in Paul's Epistles. He cannot therefore cite Paul as supporting evidence. This brings his count down to 37. What then of the rest of his examples?

The first two come from Herodotus 7.148.3 (v BC),[10] and the second example is not even the word κεφαλή, it is κάρη! By failing to cite the Greek text of Herodotus, Grudem leads his readers to conclude that κεφαλή is used twice in this passage, a conclusion which is patently false.

In the context of this passage, the Argives, a Greek tribe, sent to the Delphic oracle for advice as to their best course of action in view of the pending invasion of Greece by Persia. Furthermore, the Argives had just lost 6000 soldiers in a battle with the Spartans. The oracle answers:

> ἐχθρὲ περικτιόνεσσι, φίλ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,
> εἵσω τὸν προβόλαιον ἔχων πεφυλαγμένος ἦσο
> καὶ **κεφαλὴν** πεφύλαξο· **κάρη** δὲ τὸ σῶμα σαώσει.[11]
>
> 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,[12] Plato (iv BC) 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 ὃ 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.

---

[10] Small case Roman numerals denote the century in which an author flourished.

[11] I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Herodotus.

[12] I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Plato.

> 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.

The next several examples (4-16) come from the Septuagint (LXX; iii BC). 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 *rosh* when the Hebrew word refers explicitly to *leaders*. The Mickelsens have pointed this out [13] and they show that κεφαλή is translated for *rosh* 'leader' only 8 out of 180 instances. 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 simply failed to address this issue; rather, he dismisses the Mickelsen's 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 *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' edition[14]. 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) Judges 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) Judges 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 'head' while B reads ἄρχων.'ruler'. 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.

---

[13] *Women, Authority, and the Bible*, pp. 102ff.

[14] *Septuaginta*, duo volumina in uno, edited by Alfred Rahlfs, 1979, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

(7) Judges 11:11. Again there are two manuscript traditions, A and B, and both have added a gloss on the translation of *rosh* 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) II Kings (II 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 do not know, were my slaves...

(9) III Kings (I Kings) 8:1. Again, there is a variation in the text. Rahlfs' 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 towards 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) Psalm 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 do not know, were my slaves...

Here the metaphor of 'leader' is apparent.

The next four examples (11-14) are from Isaiah 7:8-9. Again, a textual variation is involved. In Rahlfs' 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 is Rezin', which was rejected by Rahlfs and relegated to the apparatus.

(15-16) Isaiah 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 ἀρχή) 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) The Testament of Reuben, 2.2.[15] 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 **κεφαλὴ** (-**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.

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 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 the foundation is devised; second is the spirit of sight, 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

[15] *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, edited by M. de Jonge, 1978, Leiden: E. J. Brill. The date of composition is unknown.

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 'souce' of rebellion. This example must be rejected.

(18) Philo (i AD),[16] *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(ῶς)· "ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐγένετο ταῦτα πάντα." [Gen 42:36].

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 of the 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 centre 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.

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:

---

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

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, χλακῷ 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 finishes 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 a 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 part'. 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 the 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' (Loeb, p. 389).

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,[17] *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 διῄρει, 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.

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

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

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, 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 εἴς τε τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἰνιγμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, μᾶλλον ὁ Κικέρων ἔδεισε...
>
> 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[18] points out two possible sources of Plutarch's, one of them is from Cicero himself, *Pro Murena* 51.[19] 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;...
>
> 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 himself 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 himself, 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

---

[18] Konrat Ziegler, ed., *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, vol. I, Fasc. 2, p. 326, Lipsiae: Teubner.

[19] Cicero, vol. 10, p. 252, Loeb Classical Library, translated by C. MacDonald.

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 provinces 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 ἄλλας τε πλείονας ὁπλίσαι δυναμέναις, προὔθηκε βουλὴν τοῖς φίλοις.
>
> But when Vindex, who had openly declared war, wote 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 badly, 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* 692d-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 as 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 discuses 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.[20] 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 δύναται ἐκεῖνοι θληβῆναι, ἐὰν μὴ σὺ ἡ **κεφαλὴ** τοῦ οἴκου θλιβῇς· σοῦ γὰρ θλιβομένου ἐξ ἀνάγκης κἀκεῖνοι θλιβήσονται, εὐσταθοῦντος δὲ σοῦ οὐδεμίαν δύνανται θλῖψιν ἔχειν.

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.'

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[21] suggests that the author may have been a Roman, but Koester[22] argues that the author was Jewish. 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,

---

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

[21] L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, 1954, University of Oklahoma Press, reprinted 1988, p. 197. See also Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament*, 1987, Oxford University Press, pp. 63-7.

[22] Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament. Volume two: History and Literature of Early Christianity*, 1982, Fortress Press, pp. 257-61.

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 (which Grudem fails to explain) that Aquila's Greek translation of the Old Testament 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'.[23] Swete, in his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*,[24] (pp.31-42), 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.' (ibid., p. 39). These examples from Aquila must therefore be rejected since Aquila did not remain faithful to the *meaning* of the Greek language.

(35) Theodotion, *Judges* 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 *rosh* into Greek? Swete makes it clear that Theodotion was not as insanely literal as Aquila,[25] but it is not clear how literal or free Theodotion's translation was, and there is no information regarding his treatment of *rosh* that I am aware of. Until more is known about Theodotion's translation(s) of *rosh*, judgement must be suspended on this example.

(36) Libanius, *Oration* 20.3 (iv AD)[26]. This passage is in fact ambiguous, a fact which Grudem fails to note. The text reads:

> ...καὶ πάλιν ἄλλους συνέχεαν μὲν τὰν τῷ κοινῷ βαλανείῳ νόμῳ διατεταγμένα, κινηθέντες δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὧν ἔδρασαν ἐπὶ 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 ἄνειμον εἰπεῖν, ἃς οὐδ' ἐν καπηλείῳ τῶν τις ἀγοραίων ἐφ' ἕτερον τῶν ἴσων.
>
> ...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. Secondly, he is employing a double entendre, as he himself makes clear with the words 'it is better to speak thus' (i.e. euphemistically). Thus, κεφαλή is both literal (the people brought their insults upon themselves), and metaphorical (they insulted their rulers).

---

[23] 'History of the Septuagint Text', p. 58, in the Preface to the Septuagint, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs, one volume edition, 1979.

[24] 1914, Cambridge University Press; reprinted 1989 by Hendrickson Publbishers, Inc.

[25] Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, pp. 42-49.

[26] I have used the Loeb edition of Libanius.

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 (iv AD), *Greek Anthology* 8.19:[27]

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

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. Moreover, there is no explicit reference in the context of this epigram (what little context there is) for the meaning 'authority over.' 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 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 BC to the 4th century AD.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 of all, nouns and adjectives are not always used is the same ways.[28] Just because the 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. Secondly, Paul did not use the adjective, he used the noun. Thirdly, 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 (see D. Dhimitrakou, Μέγας Λέξικον referred to in §1 above).

Grudem also states that the meaning 'leader' is common in Patristic writings, and he makes a passing reference to Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (1961, Oxford University Press). 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.

---

[27] I have used the Loeb edition of the *Greek Anthology*.

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

3. Conclusion. 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 New Testament 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); 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.

I do not wish to cast aspersions on Grudem, but the quality of 'scholarship' which he exhibits in his article is so poor that I can only draw two conclusions: either he has deliberately misrepresented the facts, or that he is so blinded by his ideological position on women that he is incapable of seeing the facts as they are. I am inclined to the latter conclusion, and it seems to me that Grudem has come up with these examples simply because he *wants* them to mean 'authority over' or 'leader' so as to bolster his interpretation of Paul.

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, the Testament of 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 resticted 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.[29]

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 I Corinthians. 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 2000 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.

---

[29] 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*, J. T. Pring, 1982, Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 149.