

DOES **Κεφαλή** MEAN "SOURCE" OR  
"AUTHORITY OVER" IN GREEK LITERATURE? A REBUTTAL

RICHARD S. CERVIN  
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS

In this paper I shall discuss the meaning of one of the Greek words which is at the center of the debate over women's roles in the Church: κεφαλή "head." This paper is a rebuttal 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 Corinthians 11 that men have authority over women.

INTRODUCTION

In his article "Does *kephalē* ('head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples,"<sup>1</sup> Wayne Grudem claims to have analyzed 2,336 occurrences of the word in Greek literature in order to determine whether κεφαλή can mean "source" or "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 "no." Grudem's article includes some questionable assumptions. I will expose Grudem's assumptions, and I will further demonstrate that many of the 49 passages which Grudem cites as evidence for "authority over" do not mean what Grudem claims they mean, and that Grudem has misrepresented the evidence. The first part of this paper will contain a summary and critique of Grudem's assumptions and methodology. In Part Two I will discuss Grudem's treatment of the argument for the meaning of "source." in Part Three I will discuss each of Grudem's examples at length, and I will demonstrate that most of the examples Grudem cites do not

---

<sup>1</sup>As an appendix in *The Role Relationship of Men and Women*, by George W. Knight III (revised ed., Chicago: Moody, 1985). All quotations from Grudem's article are taken from the appendix in this book. The article also appeared in *TrinJ* 6 (1985) 38-59.

support his claim. All translations of original texts are my own unless otherwise specified.

### I. METHODOLOGY

There are several problems in the methodology of Grudem's argument. First, he invokes evidence from various lexica. Grudem seems to take a rather disparaging view of Liddell-Scott-Jones's *Greek-English Lexicon*<sup>2</sup> (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<sup>3</sup> (henceforth BAG) as the "standard" New Testament lexicon. In making these statements regarding LSJ and BAG, 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,<sup>4</sup> it currently covers Homer and 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 B.C. to A.D. 600). In order to deal expressly with the New Testament and the Septuagint, the contributors and editors of LSJ included a team of theologians, Milligan among them.<sup>5</sup> The value of BAG lies more in its citations of literature and its bibliography 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 NT 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.; revised by K. Hase, W. and L. Dindorf; Paris: A. Firmin Didot, 1831-1865); F. W. Sturz, *Lexicon Xenophonticum* (4 vols.; Leipzig; 1801-1804); D. F. Ast, *Lexicon Platonicum sive vocum Platoniarum* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1835-1838); E.-A. Bétant, *Lexicon Thucydideum* (2 vols.; Geneva, 1843-1847); W. Dindorf, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1870); F. Ellendt, *Lexicon Sophocleum* (2nd ed.; corrected by Hermann Genthe; Berlin, 1872); W. Dindorf, *Lexicon Aeschyleum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1876); J. Rum-

<sup>2</sup>9th edition, with Supplement (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968).

<sup>3</sup>A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

<sup>4</sup>Preface to LSJ, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

pel, *Lexicon Theocriteum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1879); R. J. Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (1924; new edition, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963); J. E. Powell, *A Lexicon to Herodotus* (2nd ed.; 1938; reprinted by Georg Olms Verlag, 1977); A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexicon* (4 parts; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1956-1975); J. H. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980); J. I. McDougall, *Lexicon in Diodorum Siculum* (2 vols.; Georg Olms Verlag, 1983). None of these has any such listing; in fact, the only lexicon I have found which defines κεφαλή as "leader" is D. Dhimitrakou, *Μέγα Λεξικόν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης* (9 vols.; Athens, privately published, 1933-1950), and he explicitly states that the meaning of "leader" is medieval (vol. 5, p. 3880). The seventh edition of Liddell and Scott also notes that κεφαλή denoting *chief* is Byzantine (seventh edition, revised and augmented throughout [New York: Harper and Bros., 1889] 801), but this reference was deleted from the ninth edition along with all other references to Byzantine Greek (see Preface to ninth ed., pp. 10-11).

Apparently, the only other lexica to include such a definition are the NT 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 purview of the NT? I offer several possible reasons, not the least of which is *tradition* and a *male-dominant world-view*. The expertise of theologians is the NT, 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 NT, *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 NT 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*. 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 lead 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 (8th c. B.C.) to Libanius (4th c. A.D.) 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. 66-67 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. 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; Grudem found 56 in Aristophanes — I found 59; Grudem found 97 in Plato — I found 90; Grudem found 1 in Theocritus — I found 15. The discrepancy may be due to our using different "editions" of the TLG database; but his assertion that he has checked every instance may be overstated.<sup>6</sup>

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 for "source."<sup>7</sup> 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 am-

---

<sup>6</sup>There have been a number of corrections, additions, and deletions to the TLG databank since Grudem received his printout in 1984. 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, etc.), and the editors of the TLG have not, as far as I know, practiced textual criticism as they processed the texts.

<sup>7</sup>Response to "What does *kephalē* Mean in the New Testament?" by B. and A. Mickelsen, in *Women, Authority, and the Bible* (ed. B. and A. Mickelson; Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1986) 124f.

biguous, false, or illegitimate on other grounds. This will become clear by examining Grudem's examples *in their context*.

## II. 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 NT. Grudem condemns, and rightly so, the Mickelsens and some NT 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 briefly to 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 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:

Δαρειός δὲ ὡς διέβη τὸν Βόσπορον κατὰ τὴν σχεδίην, ἐπορεύετο διὰ τῆς Θρηϊκῆς, ἀπικόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ Τεάρου ποταμοῦ τὰς πηγὰς ἐστρατοπεδεύσατο ἡμέρας τρεῖς, ὃ δὲ Τεάρος λέγεται ὑπὸ τῶν περιόικων εἶναι ποταμῶν ἀριστος τὰ τε ἄλλα (τὰ) ἐς ἄκρσιν φέροντα καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀνδράσι καὶ ἵπποισι ψώρην ἀκέσασθαι. εἰσὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ αἱ πηγαὶ δυῶν δέουσαι τεσσεράκοντα, ἐκ πέτρης τῆς αὐτῆς ῥέουσαι· καὶ αἱ μὲν αὐτέων εἰσὶ ψυχραὶ, αἱ δὲ θερμαί. (4.89.3-90.1)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup>I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Herodotus.

Now when Darius had crossed the Bosphorus 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 scurvy 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 began:

Τεάρου ποταμοῦ κεφαλαί ὕδωρ ἀριστόν τε καὶ κάλλιστον  
παρέχονται πάντων ποταμῶν. . . (4.91.2)

The source [lit. "heads"] of the Tearus river, provides the best and most beautiful water of all rivers. . .

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

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 variant, but he downplays its significance. Secondly, and more importantly, this entire fragment is ambiguous. Following are the two fragments as found in Kern:<sup>9</sup>

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 γένητο, Ζεὺς ὕστατος ἀργικέραυτος·  
Ζεὺς κεφαλή, Ζεὺς μέσσα· Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τελείται·  
Ζεὺς πυθμὴν γαίης τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος·  
Ζεὺς ἀρσὴν γένητο, Ζεὺς ἀμβροτος ἔπλετο νύμφη·  
Ζεὺς πνοιή πάντων, Ζεὺς ἀκαμάτου πυρός ὀρμή·  
Ζεὺς πόντου ρίζα· Ζεὺς ἥλιος ἠδὲ σελήνη·  
Ζεὺς βασιλεύς, Ζεὺς ἀρχὸς ἀπάντων ἀργικέραυτος·

<sup>9</sup>Otto Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1922) 91f.

πάντας γὰρ κρύψας αὐθις φάος ἐς πολυγηθῆς  
ἐξ ἱερῆς κραδίης ἀνενέγκατο, μέριμερα βέζων.

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 ἀρχή μὲν οὗτος ὡς ποιητικὸν αἴτιον, τελευτή δὲ ὡς τελικόν, μέσα δὲ ὡς ἐξ ἴσου πᾶσι παρών, κἄν πάντα διαφόρας αὐτοῦ μετέχη ("And he is the beginning, as the producing cause, and he is the end as 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. Ἐκ may be in *tnesis* and go with the verb, in which case the genitive Διὸς depends on πάντα and can be construed as a "genitive of source"<sup>10</sup> thus: Διὸς πάντα ἐκτελείται /ἐκτέτυκται "everything from Zeus has been accomplished" (the *hyperbaton* involved in this reading is not difficult as far as Greek poetry is concerned). Alternatively, ἐκ may be in *anastrophe* and thus go with Διός, making Διός the agent of the passive:<sup>11</sup> ἐκ Διὸς πάντα τελείται/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 NT at all. It would

<sup>10</sup>Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. Gordon M. Messing, Cambridge Press: Harvard University Press, 1956) ¶ 1410-11.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, ¶1755.

take a specialist in Orphic religion to determine if this word is a technical term or not.

As for other examples of κεφαλή meaning "source," Payne cites two passages from Philo, and three from Artemidorus Daldianus.<sup>12</sup> In *Preliminary Studies* 61, Philo writes of Esau:

κεφαλή δὲ ὡς ζῴου πάντων τῶν λεχθέντων μερῶν ὁ γεν-  
άρχης ἐστὶν Ἡσαῦ, ὃς τότε μὲν ποίημα, τότε δὲ δρυὶς ἐρμηνεύ-  
εται . . . (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 (2nd c. A.D.), whose *Onirocriticon*<sup>13</sup> is a collection of dreams and their interpretations. In Book 1 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* 1.2). 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:

1.2 (in Pack's text: p. 7, 1.20 - p. 8, 1.1):

καὶ πάλιν ἔδοξέ τις τετραχλοκοπήσθαι. συνέβη καὶ τούτου τὸν πατέρα ἀποθανεῖν, ὃς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς αἴτιος ἦν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ κεφαλή τοῦ παντὸς σώματος, οἷον [δέ] ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ τετυφλωσθαι τέκνοις δλεθρον καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ ἰδόντι ση-  
μαῖνον καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα ὅσα τοιαῦτα εἶποι τις ἄν.

<sup>12</sup>"Response," 124f.

<sup>13</sup>*Artemidori Daldiani, Onirocriticon Libri V* (ed. Roger A. Pack; Leipzig: Teubner, 1963).



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 of both 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.

1.2. (in Pack's text: p. 9, 2.6-11):

οἶον κεφαλή εἰς πατέρα, ποῦς εἰς δοῦλον, δεξιὰ χεῖρ εἰς πατέρα υἰὸν φίλον ἀδελφόν, ἀριστερὰ χεῖρ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ μητέρα καὶ φίλην καὶ θυγατέρα καὶ ἀδελφὴν, αἰδοῖον εἰς γονεῖς καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ τέκνα, κνήμη εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ φίλην. τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἕκαστον, ἵνα μὴ μακρολογώμεν, 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, each of the other matters must be considered, so that we may not be long-winded.

1.35 (in Pack's text: p. 43, 2.12-16):

Ἀφρηῆσθαι δὲ δοκεῖν τῆς κεφαλῆς εἴτε καταδίκης εἴτε ὑπὸ ληστῶν εἴτε ἐν μονομαχίᾳ εἴτε οἰωδήποτε τρόπῳ (οὐ γὰρ διαφέρει) πονηρὸν τῷ γονεῖς ἔχοντι καὶ τῷ τέκνῳ· γονεῦσι μὲν γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ κεφαλή 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 since they are the cause of life; and to the children because of the face and image.

3.66 (in Pack's text: p. 234, 2.16-28):

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 λυσιτελεῖς ἐπέδειξα. ἐπειδὴν οὖν πένης ἀνὴρ πατέρα ἔχων πλούσιον ὄναρ ὑπὸ λέοντος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀφρηῆσθαι δόξη καὶ ἀποθανεῖν, εἰκὸς ἔστι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντα κληρονόμον αὐτὸν κατακλείψειν, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἄλυπος ἀν γένοιτο καὶ εὖπορος, οὕτε φορτικὸν ἔτι ἔχων τὸν πατέρα οὕτε ὑπὸ τῆς πείνας θλιβόμενος ἔστι γὰρ ἡ μὲν κεφαλή ὁ πατήρ, ἡ δὲ ἀφαίρεσις ἡ στέρησις τοῦ πατρός, ὁ δὲ λέων ἡ νόσος, ἦν νοσήσας ὁ πατήρ ἀποθάνει ἀν· ὁ δὲ θάνατος ἡ μεταβολὴ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸ διὰ τὸν πλούτον ἀνευδεῖς.

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 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's 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, 1.2 and 1.35, mention anything about the *head* being the "source" or "cause" of life.

### III. 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 noted.

First of all, 12 of these passages (nos. 38-49) are from the NT, and are therefore illegitimate as evidence, since they are disputed texts. In citing these NT 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?

(1-2) The first two come from Herodotus 7.148.3 (5th c. B.C.) 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, send to the Delphic oracle for advice as to their best course of action in view of the pending invasion of Greece by Persia. The Argives had just lost 6,000 soldiers in battle with the Spartans. The oracle answers:

ἐχθρὲ περικτιόνεσσι, φίλ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι,  
εἴσω τὸν προβόλαιον ἔχων πεφυλαγμένος ἦσο  
καὶ κεφαλὴν πεφύλαξο· κάρη δὲ τὸ σῶμα σαώσει.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup>I have used the Oxford Classical Text of Herodotus.