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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 1 Cor 11 that men have authority over women.

0. Introduction. Wayne Grudem, in his article 'Does κεφαλή ("head") Mean "Source" or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples', 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 Aristotle, 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.
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 Xenophonteiun, 4 vols. (1801-4, Lipsiae); D. F. Ast, Lexicon Platonice sive vocum Platonicae, 3 vols. (1835-38, Lipsiae: Weidmann); E.-A. Bétant, Lexicon Thucydidæ, 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 Theocratæum (1879, Lipsiae: Teubner); R. J. Cullifhe, 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: Academie-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 κέφαλη as 'leader' is D. Dhimittrakou Μέγα Λεξικόν 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 κέφαλη, 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 Koine. 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 Payne5 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
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4 Grudem tells me (personal communication) that the reason for the discrepancies 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.

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 do 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 proceeds 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 κεφαλαι of the river, he means 'the many "ends" of a river where tributaries begin to flow toward the main stem' (p. 58). He goes on to state: "Those who cite Herodotus or the "head of a river" examples to show that kephale 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:

Δαρείως δὲ ὃς διέβη τὸν Βόσπορον κατὰ τὴν σχεδόν, ἔκορεύετο διὰ τῆς Ἐρυθίκης, ἀπλικόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ Τεάρου ποταμοῦ τὰς πηγὰς ἐπιστεφεδεύοντο ημέρας τρεῖς. ὁ δὲ Τεάρος λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν περιοχῶν εἶναιποταμῶν ἁμείρως τὰ τα ἀλλὰ (τα) ές ἄκεσιν φέροντα καὶ ὅ ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀνέφαλται ἔμεσοι νάρκης. ἐκαὶ ὅ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ πηγαὶ δυὸν δέονται τρεις ἐκτοσικόντα, ἐκ πέτρης τῆς αὐτῆς τὴν νέουςαν, καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτὰς ἐναι ἡπτὰς, 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 'source' (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 κεφαλαῖ υδάρ όριστόν 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:

Fragment 21:

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:

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 οὖσις ἄσπευτον αὐτὸν, τελευτή δὲ ἄσπευτον, μέσα δὲ ἄσπευτον πάντα πάντα παρὸν, κἀν πάντα διαφόρος αὐτοῦ μετέχει. '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 'source' 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 τελείται/τέτυκται. This clause is itself ambiguous, and may be taken in two ways: either εκ 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 §§1410-118) thus: Διὸς πάντα ἐκτελεῖται/ἐκτύκται 'everything from Zeus has been accomplished' (The hyperbaton involved in this reading is

not difficult as far as Greek poetry is concerned), or, ἐκ may be in anastrophe and thus goes with ἄρα, making ἄρα the agent of the passive (see Smyth §1755 for ἐκ with the passive): ἐκ ἄρα πάντα τελείωται τὰ ἔστιν '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 κεφαλὴ '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 ὣς ἥπερ τῶν πάντων τῶν ἐξ ἑξῆς μερῶν ὁ γενάρχης ἐστίν ὁ Ἰσαάκ, ὡς τοιε μὲν ποῖμα, τοτὲ δὲ δρός ἐριπυνεύεται...(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 κεφαλὴ meaning 'source' from Artemidorus Daldianus (ii AD), whose Oniocricon 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 (Oniocricon 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:


καὶ πάλιν ἔδοξε τις τετραχηλοκοπησθαι. συνέβη καὶ τούτω τὸν πατέρα ἄκοτανεν, ὡς καὶ τοῦ ζην καὶ τοῦ φατος αἰτος ἄν, ὅπερ καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ παντος σώματος. οἷον [δὲ] ἐστι καὶ τὸ τετυφλάθη τέκνοις διέθρον καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ ἰδόντι σημαίνον καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τουτά τι εἶποι τὸ δὲν.

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):

οἶνον κεφαλὴς εἰς πατέρα, ποὺς εἰς δοῦλον, δεξιὰ χεῖρ εἰς πατέρα ὑπὸ φίλων ἀδελφῶν, ἀκριστὰ χεῖρ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ μητέρα καὶ φίλων καὶ θυγατέρα καὶ ἀδελφήν, αἰδοῖον εἰς γονεῖς καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ τέκνα, κνήμη εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ φίλην. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἔκαστον, ἵνα μὴ μακρολογῶμεν, οὕτω σκοπηθῶμεν.

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):

Ἀφηρήσοι τις φοίνικας εἰς κατάδεικνυς εἰς ὑπὸ ληστῶν εἰς ἐν μυομαχίας εἰς ὑπὸ μεθοδικεῖς τρόπος (οὗ ἑκατοντάρχει) πονηρῶν τῷ γονεῖς ἐχοντες καὶ τῷ τέκνα. γονεῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ οὔτε δείκνυας κεφαλή διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἐν 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 (οἷον) τῷ πρῶτῳ βιβλίῳ ἔχειν εἶναι τὴν κεφαλὴν πατέρα τοῦ ἰδὼντος, ἐν δὲ τῷ δεύτερῳ λέωντα ἐχεῖν βασιλέα ἢ νόσον, καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ περὶ βασιλέως τοῖς περιφραγμοῖς τὸ ἀποφανένει χρήστων εἶναι καὶ λυσιτελεῖς ἐπέδειξα. ἔπειδὴ δὲν πένθος ἄνηρ πατέρα ἔχειν πλούσιον ὅπως ἔχων τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀφηρήσοι τῇ βοήθει καὶ ἀποφανένει, εἰκός ἐστὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἀποφανάντα κληρονόμον αὐτῶν καταλείπεις, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ζωῆς ἂν γένοιτο καὶ ἐνόποις, ὅτε φορτικὸν ἔτι ἔχων τὸν πατέρα ὑπὸ τῆς πεύκας συλλέινον· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ μὲν κεφαλὴ ὁ πατήρ, ἡ δὲ ἀφαίρεσις ἡ στέρησις τοῦ πατρόκλου, ὁ δὲ λέων ἡ νόσος, ἢ νοσήσως ὁ πατήρ ἀποθάνειν ἰδίᾳ· ὁ δὲ βάναυσος ἡ μεταβολὴ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸ διὰ τῶν πλούτων ἀνένδεες.

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 *κρήπι*. 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:

\[\text{ἐξθρεὶ περικτόνεσση, φιλ' ἀθανάτοις θεοῖς,}
\begin{align*}
&\text{εἰςω τὸν προβάλασαι ἔχουν περιφυλακόμενος ἵππο}
&\text{kai κεφαλῆν περιφύλαξο. κάρη δὲ τὸ σῶμα σαώσει.}\end{align*}\(^{11}\)

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:

\[\text{Tὰς μὲν δὴ θεῖας περίδος ἄφω σώσας, τὸ παντὸς σχῆμα ἀπομημασάμενον περιφερεῖς ὅν, εἰς σοφομοιδὲς σώμα ἐνθέσαν, τὸν δὲ τῶν κεφαλῆν ἐπονομάζομεν, δ’ θεοτάτον τί ἐστιν καὶ τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν πάντων δησποτῶν. ὦ καὶ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα παρέδοσαν ὑπὲρεσάν αὐτῷ συναποιούσας τοῖς, κατανοούσας τοῖς πατῶν ὡσαὶ κινήσεις ἐσοώτιος μετέχω.}\]

\(^{10}\) 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 κεφαλὴ 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 κεφαλὴ 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 Rahlf's edition14. 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 ἦσαν εἰς κεφαλὴν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Γαλαὰδ.
...and he shall be a head (= leader) for all the inhabitants of Gilead.

(5-6) Judges 11:8-9:
...καὶ ἦσαν ἡμῖν εἰς κεφαλὴν, πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Γαλαὰδ.
...ἔγειρεν ἡμῖν ἐκείνο εἰς κεφαλὴν.
...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 κεφαλὴ 'head' while B reads αρχὴν 'ruler'. The presence of the variants indicates either that a scribe felt the translation to be not quite literal enough (thus changing αρχὴν to κεφαλὴ), or that he felt the translation was too literal and did not convey the correct meaning (thus changing κεφαλὴ to αρχὴν). 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.
(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 ἀρχηγὸν.
...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 ἀρχηγὸν '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. *κεφαλὴ* refers to a leader:

καὶ υἱὸς με ἐκ μάχης λαῶν, φυλάξεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐθνῶν· λαὸς, ὅν οὐκ ἔγνων, ἐδούλευσον 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 ἔξεκκλισασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμὼν πάντας τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους Ἰσραήλ ἐν Σιων τοῦ ἀνενεκείν τὴν κυρίαν Δαυὶδ...

...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 *κεφαλὴ* does not even occur; rather it is found in a variation of Origen’s: πάσας κεφαλὰς τῶν βάρβαρων ἐπηρμένους τῶν πατέρων υἱῶν Ισραήλ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Σαλωμὼν, '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 υἱὸς με ἐκ ἀντιλογίων λαῶν, καταστήσεις με εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐθνῶν· λαὸς, ὅν οὐκ ἔγνων, ἐδούλευσόν 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, *κεφαλὴ* occurs only three times, not four.

ἀλλ' ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἀραμ Δαμασκός, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἔξηκοντα καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν ἐκλείψει ἡ βασιλεία Εφραίμ ἀπὸ λαοῦ, καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Εφραίμ Σομορῶν, καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ Σομορῶν υἱῶς τοῦ Ρωμελίου· καὶ ἔδω μὴ πιστεύσητε, οὐδὲ μὴ συνήτε.
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 Ἀραμ δαμασκῶς and ἡ κεφαλὴ Ἐφραὶμ Σομορῶν 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 δαμασκῶν ἡ ἀρχὴ 'and the head of Damascus is Rezin', which was rejected by Rahlfis and relegated to the apparatus.

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

καὶ ἀφεῖλεν κύριος ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ κεφαλὴν καὶ οὐράν, μέγαν καὶ μικρόν ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ, πρεσβύτην καὶ τοὺς τὰ πρόσωπα θαυμάζοντας (αὕτη ἡ ἀρχὴ) καὶ προφητεύτην διδάσκοντα ἄνωμα (αὕτος 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 were as beloved as 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 κεφαλὴ), 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 ἀκούσατε μου, τέκνα, ᾧ εἶδον περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ πνευμάτων τῆς πλάνης ἐν τῇ μετανοίᾳ μου. 2. ἐπὶ πνεύματα ἔδοθε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀπὸ τοῦ Βελιάρ καὶ αὐτὴ εἰσὶ κεφαλὴ (-αι) τῶν ἔργων τοῦ νεοτερισμοῦ. 3. καὶ ἐπὶ πνεύματα ἔδοθε ἀυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως, τοῦ ἐνα γινώσκειν πάν ἄνθρωπον. 4. πρῶτον πνεῦμα (κυρία, μεθ᾽ ἡς ἡ σύστασις κτίσεως, δυστερον πνεῦμα ὅρασις, μεθ᾽ ἡς γίνεται ἐπιθυμία. 5. τρῖτον πνεῦμα ἁγίωσις, μεθ᾽ ἡς διδάσκεται διδασκαλία· τέταρτον πνεῦμα ἀφρόσις, μεθ᾽ ἡς ἦτο γένεις δεδομένη ἐς συνοίκην ἄρος καὶ πνοής. 6. πέμπτον πνεῦμα λαλίας, μεθ᾽ ἡς γίνεται γνώσις. 7. ἐκτὸς πνεῦμα γεύσεως, μεθ᾽ ἡς γίνεται βρώσις βρώσιν καὶ ποτόν καὶ ἰσχύς ἐν αὐτῷ κτίσεως, ὅτι ἐν πρώτῃ ἐτίμην ἡ ὑπόστασις τῆς ἰσχύος. 8. ἐβδομον πνεῦμα σποράς καὶ συνοδείας, μεθ᾽ ἡς συνεισέρχεται διὰ τῆς φιλάδελφος ἡ ἀμαρτία. 9. διὰ τοῦτο ἅγιον ἄγαν ἐπὶ τῆς κτίσεως καὶ ἄμαρτον τῆς νεότητος, ὅτι ἄγνοιας πεπλήρωται καὶ αὕτη τὸν νεότερον ἄθησεν ὡς τυφλὸν ἐπὶ βοῶν καὶ ὡς κήθην ἐκ κρησμῶν.

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

---

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 (i AD). On Dreams 2.207. Philo is discussing the interpretation of dreams, and is discussing here the Baker's dream in Genesis 40:


For it says, 'I thought I raised three baskets of groats onto my head.' Head we say is here an allegorical 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 διαφερόντος παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας βασιλείας ἡμισεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Πτολεμαίοις ὁ Φιλάδελφος - ὅσοι γὰρ εἶς ἐδρασσέν ὅτι ηπαίετα, μόλις ἐκείνοι πάντες ἄθροι διεπράξαντο - γενόμενος καθήκερ ἐν ζεφο τῷ ἡγεμονεύον κεφαλὴ τρόπον τινά 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, ἐσχατὰ δὲ καὶ ὁσανεὶ βάσις τὸ αἰσθητῶν, εἴκασε δὴ τὸν μὲν νοῦν χρυσῷ, χλακῷ δὲ τὸ αἰσθητῶν.

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:

ταύτα δ' ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ζῷῳ κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον, οὐρά δ' ὑστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐδε μέρος συνεκκληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμὸν, ἀλλὰ σύντομον τῶν ἐπισκόπομένων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κεφαλῆς μὲν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γένους ἤσσεθαῖ τὰ σοφότατα ἐπί τόσον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαὸν, τοὺς δ' ἄλλους ἀπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχουμένα εἰς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ υπεράνω δυνάμειν.

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 shoo 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 γὰρ, ὡς Ἰππικάρτης διηρύη, χεριώς μὲν ἔοικοιν οἱ ψιλοὶ, ποσὶ δὲ τὸ ἱππικόν, αὐτῷ δὲ ἡ φάλαγξ στέρνεται καὶ θάφος, κεφαλῆς δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς, ὡς αὐτὸν δοξαίον ἄν ἀποκινδυνωμέναν παραμελεῖν καὶ θρασυνόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀπάνταν, ὡς η σταυρία γίνεται διὰ αὐτοῦ καὶ τούναντον.

For if, as Iphocrates 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 Catiline for a leader (himself), but there is more to this example than meets the eye:

ο δὲ πολλοίς οἰόμενοι εἶναι τοὺς πραγμάτων καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφειν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ ἐὰν τοὺς συνωμότας ἐνδεικνύοντος, ἀπεπείραντο τὴν Κικέρωνον μανικήν ἀπόκρισιν. "Τι γὰρ," ἐφε, "πράττω δεινών, εἰ, δυσὶ συμμάχοις ὑμῶν, τὸν μὲν ἱσχυόν καὶ καταφθεινόντος, ἐγγονοῦς δὲ κεφαλῆς, τὸ δὲ ἀκεφαλόν μὲν, ἱσχυρότερο δὲ καὶ μεγάλον, τὸν κεφαλῆν αὐτοῦ ἐπιτίθησιν." τούτων εἰς τῆν βουλήν καὶ τὸν ἱσχυόν ἑνεμένων ὑπ' ἄετος, μᾶλλον οἱ Κικέρων ἐδείσει.

And (Catiline), 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 (Catiline) was speaking this of the senate and the people, in the form of a riddle, Cicero was very afraid...

First of all, Catiline's answer was in the form of a 'riddle', as Plutarch points out. Secondly, and more importantly, Catiline was speaking in Latin, not Greek. Ziegler points out two possible sources of Plutarch's, one of them is from Cicero himself, Pro Murena 51. In this speech, Cicero says:

Itaque postridie frequenti sentatu Catalinam excitiavi atque eum de rebus iussi, siquid vellet, quae ad me adlatae essent dicere. Atque ille, ut semper fuit aperiissimus, non se purgavit sed indicavit atque inuit. 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 decravit;

Then, on the next day, in the crowded senate, I called on Catiline 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

---

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 Οὐίνδις ἔγραψε τῷ Γάλβῳ παρακαλόν ἀναδεξάσθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ παρασχεῖν λαοὺν ἵππουρόν σώματι ζητοῦντι κεφαλήν, ταύτως ἐκλέξας δέκα μυριάδες ἀνδρῶν ὀπλισμένον ἐχόσας ἄλλας τε πλείονας ὀπλίσαι δυναμέναις, προὔθηκε βούλην 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:

"Ου δύνασθε τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχειν καὶ ἀρχοντα καὶ ἀκόλουθον." ἐπει διαμαινέτε γε καὶ οὕτως τὸ τοῦ δράκοντος, οὐ φιλον ὁ μύθος τὴν ὑφήν τῇ κεφαλῇ στενάκασαν ἄξιον ἱεράθαι παρὰ μέρος καὶ μὴ διὰ παντὸς ἀκόλουθον ἐκείνη, λαβοῦσαν δὲ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐτὴν τε κακῶς ἐπιλατέειν ἀνοίξει πορευμένην καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καταξάνεειν, τυφλὸς καὶ καφως μέρεσιν ἀναγκαζομένην παρὰ φύσιν ἐπεσθαί.

'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 ἄλλα ἐξίστασθαι καὶ μαραίνεσθαι, καθάπερ ἀπὸ ἰδίους κοπέντα τῆς ῥυγος: οὐ δὲ παλαιοὶ καὶ τρόπος τὸν οἴνον ἄντικρυς ἐκαλοῦν, ἀντή πυκνή καὶ κεφαλὴ τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐνδώθηκεν ἀπὸ τῶν κυριστῶν 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 *kephalē* as a salutation can be illustrated from the following passages (all cited from LSJ):

1. *Τεῦκρε, φίλη κεφαλή, Τελαμώνιε, κοιρανε λαῶν...* (Iliad 8.281) Teucrus son of Telamon, my dear friend, leader (κοιρανος) of the people,...

2. "Ἀπόλλων, ὄ δία κεφαλά..." (Euripides, *Rhesus* 226) Apollo, oh dear god,...

3. ...ἡ οὐδὲν εἶπον. Φαίδρε φιλή 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.

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, *Similitudes* 7.3.\(^{20}\) This is one instance where the 'leader' metaphor is clear:

λέγω αὐτῷ. Ἐκείνη, εἰ ἐκείνη τοιαύτα εἰργάσαντο, ἦνα παραπληραθηκή ὁ ἐνδοξος ἄγγελος, τι ἐγένο ἐκπιστα: "Ἀλλας, φησίν, οὐ δύναται ἐκείνῃ θλίψην, ἄν μὴ σὺ ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος θλίψης: σοῦ γὰρ θλίψιμον εὑ τὸ ἀνάγκης κάκεινος θλίψησθαι, εὐταξιότερος δὲ σὸν οὐδέμιαν δύνανται θλίψιν 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.


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*, (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, 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). This passage is in fact ambiguous, a fact which Grudem fails to note. The text reads:

...καὶ πάλιν ἄλλους συνέξεαν μὲν τάν τῷ κοινῷ βαλανεῖα νόμῳ διατεταγμένα, κινηθέντες δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐν ἐνδυσασθεὶς ἐπὶ μείζω καὶ παρανομώτατα προσπέμποντας μὲν οὕτω σφοδρῶς τῇ τῷ ἀρχοντῷ κυριεύει καὶ ταῖς μὲτ' ἔκτινην θύρας, ἦσε δεῖσαι τοὺς υπηρέτας μὴ καὶ ἰδίαντις αὐτάς ἀποκείμεναι αὐτῶν, οἷα τοιούτου καθορι πεποίηκα τολμάσαντες, τόσο όσο εἰς δυνάμεις κατεύχαντες μὲν τάν ἐν οὕτως κεφαλῆς ὑβρεῖς, οὕτω μᾶρ ἤνειμον εἰςεῖν, ὡς οὖν ἐν καταλείψει τῶν τίς ἀγοράσαν ἐρ' ἔτερον τῶν ἱερῶν.

...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, κεφαλὴ is both literal (the people brought their insults upon themselves), and metaphorical (they insulted their rulers).

---

26 I have used the Loeb edition of Libanius.
Furthermore, the Loeb text calls attention to a note by the Scholiast which reads: κεφαλάς ἐν τούτοις βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν λέγεται '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

Οὖχ ὡσῆς ἁίσης μὲν ἐγὼ θάλας, εὐαγγέλος δὲ
σωζώμης κεφαλή καὶ τεκέων τριάδος·
ποιμνῆς ἡμέρονα ομόφρονος· ἐνθὲν ἄκηλθον
πλήρῃς καὶ χθονίων κούρασιν ἑτέοιν.

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 κεφαλάς 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 κεφαλάς 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 in the same way.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 κεφαλάς 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, Μέτωπος Λέξεων 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 Daldanianus, 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 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.

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.