

V. S. Zykov

The Image of God: “male and female” or “neither male nor female”?¹

This article is dedicated to the problem of the relationship between the two halves of Genesis 1:27 (“So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them”). The question of the relationship between the two halves of the verse is examined in light of various interpretations of the expressions “image of God”^{*1} and “male and female”^{*2} in texts from the Second Temple era, the New Testament and Rabbinic literature. Within this group of texts, a common line of usage for the two separate halves of the verses (Gen 1:27a, b (Gen 5:1b, 2a)) predominates, both in terms of quotation and in terms of interpretation. In the ancient texts listed, we can observe two basic trends vis-à-vis the expressions “image of God” and “male and female”. The first trend, dealing with the fulfillment of God’s words, “and let them have dominion <...> over all the earth”^{*3} and God’s command “be fruitful and multiply, fill the earth and subdue it”^{*4}, relates to man’s calling to be the ruler of the earth and to childbearing. The second trend is found in the context of striving for eternal life, appearing on the one hand in Philo’s understanding of the “heavenly man”, and on the other hand in Christian conceptions of Christ as the image of God^{*5} and of there being “neither male nor female”^{*6} in Christ and in the Church.

KEYWORDS: Image of God, Bible, man and woman, male and female, androgynous.

The Expression **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים** (“Image of God”)

For Biblical Studies in the XX and XXI century, there are two basic approaches² to interpreting the story about the creation of man in Gen 1:26–27, in light of the expression **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים** (“image of God”). In the first approach, views people as God’s representatives on earth, to whom has been given authority over the rest of creation. The se-

1. The Biblical quotes in this article, with the exception of specially noted cases, are translated from the Synodal Translation. The quotation from Galatians 3:28 in the title accords with the translations of V. A. Zhukovsky (VZh) and K. P. Pobedonostsev (KP).

2. Here, the analyses of different authors writing between 1935 and 1997 [Stendebach, 386–387, 392–393], also taking into consideration research published in 2011 [Schellenberg, 29–142].

cond approach looks at people as co-workers and dialog partners with God. Man is the only creature capable of answering God when in dialogue with Him [*Stendebach*, 392, 395].

In view of the interchangability of the nouns **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** in Gen 5:3 (“image” and “likeness”, *authorized version and NKJV*), some researchers believe that the two terms are synonyms³ [*Stendebach*, 394]⁴. According to this interpretation, the juxtaposition of the expressions **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** in Gen 1:26 is to strengthen the overall impression of man’s dignity in the words of the verse [*Preuss*, 259].

The expression **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים** (“image of God” — εἰκὼν θεοῦ, *LXX*) is used in the following Biblical texts: Gen 1:27 and 9:6. The form **בְּצַלְמוֹ** (“in His own image”) is used in Gen 1:27 along with the expression **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים**. The word **בְּצַלְמֵנוּ** from the expression **בְּצַלְמֵנוּ בְּדְמוּתֵנוּ** (“in Our image, according to Our likeness”) is used in direct speech in Gen 1:26. In addition, it is worth noting the unique usage in the Hebrew Bible of the expression **דְּמוּת אֱלֹהִים** in Gen 5:1: **בְּדְמוּת אֱלֹהִים** (“in the likeness of God”). Perhaps the Greek translation of this expression *κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ* (“in the image of God”; Gen 5:1, *LXX*) confirms the scholarly opinion stated above, which views **דְּמוּת** and **צֶלֶם** as synonyms. The form **בְּדְמוּתֵנוּ** (“according to our likeness”) is used only once in the Hebrew Bible, as part of the expression **בְּצַלְמֵנוּ בְּדְמוּתֵנוּ** (“in Our image, according to Our likeness”) in the context of direct speech, in Gen 1:26.

The relationship between the expressions **זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה** (“male and female”) and **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים** (“image of God”): the communicative and reproductive aspect

Here is a short summary of scholarly opinion on the juxtaposition of the expression “image of God” and the half-verse “male and female He created them”^{*1, 5}.

*1 Gen 1:27

- In no way is it possible to relate to the God of Israel the division into sexes which is characteristic of the created world [*von Rad* 1975, 146–147; *Stendebach*, 394]. The nature of God cannot be character-

3. **צֶלֶם** — “image” [*BDB*, 853]; **דְּמוּת** — “likeness”, “similitude” [*BDB*, 198].

4. Examples of the usage of **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** in Gen 1:26; 5:3, according to scholarly opinion, bear witness to the fact that semantically there is very little difference between the two terms. In order to clarify the exact meaning of the words **צֶלֶם** and

דְּמוּת in Gen 1:26, the broader context of Gen 1:28 is needed; Gen 1:28 provides a connection between the two terms and man’s authority over the world of living beings that God has created. [*Preuss*, 259].

5. For the texts of verses Gen 1:27 and 5:1–2 and a scheme for breaking them down into half verses, see tables 1 and 2 (p. 4, 5).

ized as male or female or as sexless. The metaphor related to sex in Gen 1:27 refers us to the mystery of God [*Bruggeman, 40*].

- Nowhere in the Bible are masculine and feminine principles described as part of the image of God. Although the expression *imago Dei* ⁶ is juxtaposed with the masculine and feminine principles in Gen 1:27, a full manifestation of the image of God (in man) is in no way dependent upon his being connected with the opposite sex. The image of God is made manifest in human interrelations and interpersonal relationship. [*Blomberg, 145; Wilson, Blomberg, 8–15*].

- On the basis of Gen 1:27b, various scholars note that neither man (as separate from woman) nor woman (as separate from man) is the image of God. On this interpretation, the image of God doesn't relate to a single person in isolation but to human community [*Bruggeman, 40–41*].

- According to Karl Barth, the “determining clarification” for Gen 1:27a, which is contained in Gen 1:27b, shows that the expression “image of God” is revealed in the interrelationships between “me” and “you” inside mankind, understood as a unity of men and women. Barth draws an analogy between the relationship between “Me” and “You” within the Godhead and the relationship between man and woman in the context of Gen 1:26–28 [*Barth, 195, 196; Davidson, 44–45*].

- According to the opinion of C. von Wolff, the opportunity for people to compliment each other in love, similar to the love of a married couple, is the most important condition for the fulfilment of man's calling to govern the world in relation to his being made in the image of God. This approach relies on the corresponding vision of mankind as created in the image of God ^{*1} and existing in two sexual forms — male and female ^{*2} [*Wolff, 162*].

- V.P. Hamilton notes the particular role of Gen 1:27b as a sort of bridge between 1:27a and the verses that follow, in that it specifies who it is that bears the image of God and prepares the way for the blessing of God that follows, to be fruitful and multiply in childbearing. Noting that both sexes participate in the image of God, Hamilton accentuates not the communicative but the reproductive component of the relationship between the male and female halves of mankind [*Hamilton, 139*].

- According to F. A. Bird, the words “male and female He created them” ^{*1} mean nothing either in relation to the word “image” (צֶלְמִם)

*1 Gen 1:27a

*2 Gen 1:27b

*1 Gen 1:27b

6. *Imago Dei* (Lat.) — “image of God”.

which relates man (אָדָם) ⁷ with God, or about God as a referent of the word “image” (צֶלֶם). Neither do they contain any indication of man’s (אָדָם) lordship over creation or the submission of the world to him. Bird believes that the words of Gen 1:27b describe a biological pairing and not a social partnership, i. e. male and female rather than husband and wife, and that they refer only to the blessing to be fruitful and multiply [Bird, 155] ⁸.

• According to the opinion of G. von Rad, the masculine 3rd person plural pronoun אֹתָם (Gen 1:27b, MT; “them”) is a purposeful contrast with the masculine 3rd person singular pronoun אֹתוֹ (Gen 1:27a, MT; “his”) and speaks against an interpretation which supposes that man was initially created as an androgynous human being ⁹. Looking at man in the context of Gen 1:26–28, von Rad believes that spiritualization should be avoided and that the spiritual and bodily should be held together as much as possible in our understanding, insofar as the whole man — an integrity of spiritual and bodily principles — was created in the image of God [von Rad 1972, 58, 60].

Here is a list of Bible verses where the words זָכָר וְיִקְבָּה are used in the ancient Hebrew text: Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19; 7:3, 9, 16. In the first two instances, the words זָכָר וְיִקְבָּה are used in relation to man in the context of his creation in the image (likeness) of God ¹⁰. In the other instances, the words זָכָר וְיִקְבָּה relate to male and female mating partners ¹¹ which Noah brought into the ark, as God commanded. But in all six instances, the expression זָכָר וְיִקְבָּה is translated as ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυς in the Septuagint ¹².

7. In this instance [Bird, 155], as in many other places in the article mentioned [Bird, 133–159], F. A. Bird uses the word “adam” as equivalent to the ancient Hebrew masculine noun אָדָם in a context which does not presuppose a distinction between masculine and feminine.

8. There is a well-known contention that the statement about the image of God is separated from language about childbearing for polemical reasons, directed “against a mythological understanding and orgasmic triumphalism surrounding divine sexual activity” [Davidson, 52].

9. See also the list of contemporary works containing arguments for and against the idea that man was originally androgynous: [Davidson, 629–630].

10. “Man and woman” — Gen 1:27; 5:2 (Synod., BK, RBO); Gen 5:2 (MBO); “male and female” — Gen 1:27 (MBO); “male and female mating partners” — Gen 1:27; 5:2 [Teaching, 58, 61].

11. “male and female” — Gen 6:19; 7:3, 9, 16 (Synod.); “male and female mating partners” — Gen 6:19; 7:3, 9, 16 (BK, RBO, MBO, [Teaching, 62–63]).

12. “man and woman” (Gen 1:27), “male and female” (Gen 5:2; 7:3), “male and female” (Gen 6:19; 7:3, 9, 16) (PYU).

The Problem of the relationship between the expressions זָלַם אֱלֹהִים (“image of God”), דְּמוּת אֱלֹהִים (“likeness of God”) and זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (“man and woman”) in the context of Gen 1:26–28 and 5:1–2

Let’s look at the various versions of the texts of Gen 1:27 and 5:1–2 that contain the expressions זָלַם אֱלֹהִים (“image of God”), דְּמוּת אֱלֹהִים (“likeness of God”) and זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (“man and woman”). They are shown in Table 1, below:

Table 1. The language and wording of Gen 1:27 and 5:1–2: זָלַם אֱלֹהִים, εἰκὼν θεοῦ; דְּמוּת אֱלֹהִים, εἰκὼν θεοῦ; זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה; ἄρσῆν καὶ θήλυ

Verse	MT	Synod. and its translation into English	NKJV	LXX	P1u
1	2	3	4	5	6
Gen 1:27	וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:	И сотворил Бог человека по образу Своему, по образу Божию сотворил его; мужчину и женщину сотворил их. And God created man in His own image; in the image of God he created him; man and woman he created them.	So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.	καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς	И сотворил Бог человека, по образу Божию сотворил его: мужчину и женщину сотворил их. And God created man; in the image of God he created him: man and woman he created them.
Gen 5:1	זֶה סֵפֶר הַתּוֹלְדוֹת אָדָם בְּיוֹם בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם בְּדְמוּת אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ:	Вот родословие Адама: когда Бог сотворил человека, по подобию Божию создал его, This is the genealogy of Adam: when God created man, in the likeness of God he created him,	This is the book of the genealogy of Adam. In the day that God created man, He made him in the likeness of God.	αὕτη ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων ἣ ἡμέρα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν	Вот книга происхождения (бытия) ¹³ людей, с того дня как сотворил Бог Адама, по образу Божию сотворил его... This is the book of the of people’s origin (genesis)[8], from

13. The vocabulary used in P. A. Jungerov’s translation has been partially changed in this fragment.

Table 1. Continued

1	2	3	4	5	6
					the day that God created Adam, in the likeness of God he created him...
Gen 5:2	זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאָם וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמֵם אָדָם כְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָם:	мужчину и женщину сотворил их, и благословил их, и нарек им имя: человек, в день сотворения их. Man and woman he created them, and blessed them, and named them “man”, on the day of their creation.	He created them male and female, and blessed them and called them Mankind in the day they were created.	ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἔποίησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν Ἀδὰμ ἢ ἡμέρα ἔποίησεν αὐτοῦς	Мужской пол и женский сотворил их, и благословил их, и нарек имя им ¹⁴ : Адам, когда сотворил их. Male and female he created them, and blessed them, and named them [9] “Adam”, when he created them.

In our opinion, it is fairly difficult to establish an interrelationship between the expressions זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה and דְּמוּת אֱלֹהִים, צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים directly from the context of the above biblical versions.

Therefore, let us look at the general context in which the above-mentioned words and expressions appear. The topical content of verses 26 and 27 of Genesis 1 might be represented as “God’s plan for man as the image and likeness of God, man therefore being called to govern the world^{*1}; God’s creation of man in God’s image^{*2}, and his creation of male and female / man and woman (Gen 1:27b)”. This is followed by the words

*1 Gen 1:26

*2 Gen 1:27a

Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth”^{*3}.

*3 Gen 1:28,
NKJV

The words זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (Gen 1:27b, MT; “man and woman”, “male and female”) from the passage above play a connecting role between the mention of man being created in the image of God^{*4} and the following blessing, as well as the words “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the

*4 Gen 1:27a

14. The text of P. A. Jungerov’s translation has been brought into line with the text of the Alexandrian Codex (LXX).

*1 Gen 1:28

*2 Gen 1:26

*3 Gen 1:28

*4 Gen 1:26b

*5 Gen 1:28

earth and subdue it...” *1 In order to fulfil his calling to be the governing principle of the world *2, and particularly in order to fill the world and subdue it and rule over the animals living on the earth *3, man should “be fruitful and multiply”, and it is with this, it would seem, that the words זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (Gen 1:27b, MT; “man and woman” / “male and female”) are directly related. In relation to man’s calling to govern the whole world that has been created by God, we should note the sequence of the verbs that appear in the plural form in Gen 1:26 and 28: the verb form *wayiqṭōl* which is from the root רָדָה *4, and imperatives from the roots פָּרָה, רָבָה, מָלֵא, כָּבַשׁ and רָדָה *5. The 3rd person plural masculine pronoun אֹתָם (“them”, Gen 1:27b), together with the nouns זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה, neatly fits into the sequence of plural verb forms in Gen 1:26 and 28.

In the context of Gen 1:26–28, presumably it is possible to affirm the existence of a connection between the words זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (Gen 1:27b, MT; “man and woman” / “male and female”) and God’s commandment פָּרּוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ (Gen 1:28, MT; “be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth...”, NKJV).

In order to compare verse fragments that refer to the creation of man in the image (or in the likeness) of God, let us look at Table 2, below:

Table 2. Gen 1:27; 5:1b–2a (MT, LXX)

Verse	NKJV	MT	MT	NKJV	Verse
Gen 1:27aα	So God created man in His own image;	וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ	בַּיּוֹם בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם	In the day that God created man,	Быт 5:1bα
Gen 1:27aβ	in the image of God He created him;	בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא אֹתוֹ	בְּדְמוּת אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ:	He made him in the likeness of God.	Быт 5:1bβ
Gen 1:27b	male and female He created them.	זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָא אֹתָם:	זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאָם	He created them male and female,	Быт 5:2a

*6 Gen 5:2a, MT

The juxtaposition of a series of phrases from Gen 1:27 and Gen 5:1 and 2, shows that the half verse at זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאָם *6 (“male and female He created them”, NKJV), is semantically equivalent to the half-verse at Gen 1:27b, MT, with an almost complete coincidence of vocabulary. In our opinion, the syntax of Genesis 5:1 and 2 indicates that the

half-verse at Gen 5:2a is not directly connected with the second half of the half-verse at Gen 5:1b (i. e. Gen 5:1bβ). Thus the question arises, to what degree can this supposition also be related to the semantics of the fragments at Gen 1:27b and Gen 1:27aβ, or Gen 1:27aα? In this case, of course, we would have to consider the above-mentioned presumption of a connective role for the words זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (Gen 1:27b, MT; “man and woman” / “male and female”) in the general context of Gen 1:26–28. And in our opinion, the words זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (Gen 1:27b, MT; “man and woman” / “male and female”) are much more closely tied to the verse at Gen 1:28, than to Gen 1:27aβ.

Next, let us pose a series of questions. Is there a basis upon which to assume that there is no semantic relationship between the text fragments at Gen 5:2a and Gen 5:1bβ, on the one hand, and those at Gen 1:27b and Gen 1:27aβ, or Gen 1:27aα, on the other? Is it possible to either confirm or refute the existence of a connection between the expressions צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים (Gen 1:27, MT; εἰκὼν θεοῦ, LXX) and זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (Gen 1:27, MT; ἄρσῆν καὶ θήλυ, LXX)¹⁵? For answers to the questions which have been posed, we should consider various interpretations of the expressions צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים (εἰκὼν θεοῦ) “image of God”, and זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (ἄρσῆν καὶ θήλυ) “man and woman” / “male and female”, as they are seen in texts from the Second Temple era, in the New Testament, and in Rabbinical sources from the II–VI centuries AD.

The interpretation of the expression “image of God” (εἰκὼν θεοῦ) in Sirach 17:3–4. The words זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (“man and woman” / “male and female”) in Qumran fragments from the Damascus Document Scroll (CD 4:21; 6Q15 (6QD)) and the Book of Jubilees (4Q216 (4QJub^a))

An example interpretation of the expression “image of God” (εἰκὼν θεοῦ) in light of the idea of people’s calling to govern the world can be seen in the Book of Wisdom of Yeshua ben Sira (also known simply as Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus)¹⁶. The fragment we are looking at (Sir 17:3–4)¹⁷ fits into the larger context of the 17th chapter, in which it is

15. In this case, we have in mind the vocabulary of the expressions from Gen 1:27 (MT, LXX): צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים (“in the image of God”); κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ (“in the likeness of God”); זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה (“man and woman” / “male and female”).

16. According to scholarly opinion, the author of the Book of Wisdom of Yeshua ben Sira was a Palestinian

Jew by the name of Yeshua Ben-Sira. It is supposed that the original Hebrew text of the book (Book of Ben-Sira) was completed by the author not later than 175 BC and the Greek translation became known some time after 117 BC [Di Lella, 932].

17. We note parallels to Sir 17:3–4 in Gen 1:26–28 and Ps 8:6–9, *Opif.* 88.

stated that God gave man authority over everything that He had created on earth, and gave him discernment and the insight that comes with reason, showed him good and evil, showed him the greatest of His words, gave him knowledge and the law of life, established an eternal covenant with him and showed him His councils *1, 18.

*1 Sir 17:2–10

Sir 17:1–4 (LXX)

κύριος ἔκτισεν ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπον καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτήν
 ἡμέρας ἀριθμοῦ καὶ καιρὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἐπ’
 αὐτῆς
 καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐνέδυσεν αὐτοὺς ἰσχὺν καὶ κατ’ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς
 ἔθηκεν τὸν φόβον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάσης σαρκὸς καὶ κατακυριεύειν θηρίων καὶ πε-
 τεινῶν

The Lord fashioned human beings from the earth, to consign them back to it.

He gave them so many days and so much time, he gave them authority over everything on earth.

He clothed them in strength, like himself, and made them in his own image.

He filled all living things with dread of human beings, making them masters over beasts and birds *2.

*2 Sir 17:1–4

Let us cite now the Qumran text 6Q15 (6QD) with the fragment of the Damascus Document.

6Q15 (6QD) 6QDamascus Document

Frag. 1

[...>] 2 הם נתפשים | בשמים בינות לקחת שתי נשים |
 3 [בחייהם ויסוד הבריאה זכר | ונקבה ברא אותם...]

[*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 2, 1154].

*3 = CD-A 4.20-21

Frag. 1 *3

2 [*Mic 2:6* «Assuredly they will preach» — are caught [twice in fornication: by taking two wives]

3 [in their lives, even though the principle of creation is *Gen 1:27* «male [and female he created them» ...] [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 2, 1155].

The general context of this fragment is related to an accusation directed at בני החייץ (bonej hakhayitz), “the builders of the wall”¹⁹, by which may be meant Pharisees or some other Jewish group who were

18. The text of Sir 17:1–10 is not included in the fragments of the original Hebrew text of the Book of Wisdom of Yeshua ben Sira that have been preserved [*The Book of Ben Sira*, 22–24].

19. 6Q15 (6QD) 6QDamascus Document [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 2, 1152]; (CD 4.20–21) [*Damascus Document*, 38].

not part of the Qumran community. Scholars believe that the accusation of bigamy in this fragment relates not only to polygomy proper, but to also to widowers who remarry. [*Instone-Brewer*, 81–82]²⁰.

In the text of the Damascus Document, based on the manuscript from the Cairene genizah²¹, after the phrase “...but the foundation of creation — (essence of the word): “male and female created he them”^{*1}, the words “And they who came into the Ark, “went into the ark two by two” directly follow^{*2} [*Damascus Document*, 38]. In the final instance, an incomplete quotation from Gen 7:9 is used, the continuation of which is וַיִּקְרָא וַיִּקְרָא (“male and female”; Gen 7:9, MT), upon which the connection between these two fragments of the Damascus Document (4.21 and 5.1) is founded. The link between the two fragments using words from Gen 7:9 and Gen 1:27 occurs in the context of condemning polygomy [*Instone-Brewer*, 176].

In summarizing the above, we note that the example from the Damascus fragment^{*3} which uses the words of Gen 1:27ב זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָא אֹתָם — “male and female He created them”, doesn’t present us with the opportunity of relating the words back to the theme of being created in the image of God. This Qumranian quotation of Gen 1:27b must be taken as referring to the original structured order of creation, as is made clear by the words יְסוּד הַבְּרִיאָה (yesod hab-beriah)²² “foundation of creation”^{*4} [*Instone-Brewer*, 176].

Now let us look at Qumran text 4Q216 (4QJub^a), which contains a fragment of the original text of the Book of Jubilees²³.

4Q216 (4QJub^a) [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 1, 462].

[ובין]ם הששי את כל חית[ת]... 2 עשה את האדם זכר ונק[ן]בה...
3 ובחיה ובכל הרמש ה[ר]ומש...

Col. VII (= Jub 2:13–14) 1 [On the] sixth [da]y [he made] all the anim[als] of the earth and all the cattle and everything that creeps over the earth. After all these] 2 he made man, male and fem[ale he made them], and gave them control over

20. Moreover, according to currently prevailing opinion, it is possible to interpret this text as an interdiction against marriage after divorce. On the other hand, there have been attempts to re-interpret the text in a way that would allow the possibility of divorce and re-marriage after the death of a spouse [*Instone-Brewer*, 82–83].

21. See: CD-A 4–5 [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 1, 556]. The Instone-Brewer edition of this manuscript is known as Geniza MS A [*Instone-Brewer*, 82, 176].

22. יְסוּד — “foundation”, “base” [BDB, 414];
בְּרִיאָה — “a creation” [BDB, 135].

23. According to this opinion, the author of Jubilees is probably from a priestly family in Palestine, belonging to a extremely pious strain of Judaism such as the Essene group [*Wintermute*, 45]. Scholars believe that the full Hebrew version of the book of Jubilees dates to 160–150 BC [*VanderKam*, 434–435]. It is believe that the original Hebrew text was translated into Greek, from which the translation into Ge’ez was prepared [*VanderKam*, 435]. The supposed date of fragment 4Q216 (4QJub^a) is between 125–100 BC. [*VanderKam*, 434].]

*1 CD 4.21

*2 CD 5.1

*3 6Q15 (6QD);
CD 4:21

*4 CD 4:21; 6Q15
(6QD)

everything there is on the earth and in the seas and over everything that flies] 3 over the animals and over all the creeping animals that [creep over the earth, and the cattle and over all the earth. Over all these he gave them control.] [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 1, 463].

Before is a statement of man's calling to govern the world that is analogous to tth in Sir 17:3–4. Here we note that the image of God is not mentioned. In all likelihood, neither is there any allusion here to the image of God in the words saying that man (הָאָדָם, *ha'adam*) is created male and female (זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה, *zakhar unekevah*)^{*1} [*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, v. 1, 462]. The words about “male and female” (זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה)^{*2}, just as with similar expressions from CD 4:21 (6Q15 (6QD)), may in our opinion without question be associated with Gen 1:27 and related to the original creation, in accordance with the words יְסוּד הַבְּרִיאָה (yesod hab-beriah) — “foundation of creation”^{*3}.

*1 4Q216
(4QJub^a)

*2 4Q216
(4QJub^a)

*3 CD 4:21; 6Q15
(6QD)

The image of the Lord is also mentioned at Jub 6:8:

From the hand of every man / from the hand of every (creature), / I will seek the blood of a man. / Whoever pours out the blood of a man, / by man his blood shall be poured out, / because in the image of the Lord he made Adam^{*4} [*Jub*, 66].

*4 Jub 6:8

Juxtaposing the last line of Gen 9:6, MT, we can establish that the expression “in the image of the Lord” from the text of Jubilees in Ethiopic (Ge'ez) has replaced the original formula, “in the image of God” (בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים), which is known to us from Gen 9:6, MT. Via a virtual retroversion²⁴ to the polysemantic Hebrew word אָדָם (*adam*), the name “Adam” which is used in the Ethiopic text of Jubilees can be represented as the word “man” in such a fashion as to sufficiently accord with the text of Gen 9:6, MT.

The expressions εἰκὼν θεοῦ (“image of God”) and ἄρσην καὶ θήλυ (“man and woman” / “male and female”) in Philo of Alexandria

Taking the words κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν — “in the image and likeness of God” as a point of departure^{*5}, as regards the creation of man Philo writes that we shouldn't understand the likeness mentioned

*5 *Opiif*. 69

24. A reconstruction of the word from the Hebrew text of Jubilees is envisaged as produced in the following way: the name from the Ethiopic text is translated back to the Greek (Ἀδάμ), and then from Greek back to Hebrew: אָדָם (*Adam*).

in terms of bodily traits: οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρωπόμορφος ὁ θεὸς οὔτε θεοειδὲς τὸ ἀνθρώπειον σῶμα — “for neither is God a being with the form of man, nor is the human body like the form of God” *¹ [*Philo*, 65–66] ²⁵. *¹ *Opif.* 69

The term “image” (εἰκόν) relat *Opif.* 71es to the human mind (νοῦς), thanks to which man is likened to God *² [*Philo*, 66; *Runia*, 222]. *Philo* notes that the addition of the words “and in the likeness” (καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν) to the expression “in the image” (κατ’ εἰκόνα) is brought about by the need to “to prove that it means an accurate impression, having a clear and evident resemblance in form” *³ [*Philo*, 66]. *² *Opif.* 69

In light of the concept of a “double” creation, supposing the creation of a heavenly and an earthly man ²⁶, *Philo* writes the following regarding the words ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν *⁴ — “let us create man in Our image and likeness” *⁵: *³ *Opif.* 71

πάνυ δὲ καλῶς τὸ γένος ἄνθρωπον εἰπὼν διέκρινε τὰ εἶδη φήσας ἄρρεν τε καὶ θῆλυ δεδημιουργῆσθαι μήπω τῶν ἐν μέρει μορφήν λαβόντων...
And very beautifully after he had called the whole race “man”, did he distinguish between the sexes, saying, that “they were created male and female”; although all the individuals of the race had not yet assumed their distinctive form... *⁶ *⁴ Gen 1:26, LXX
*⁵ Gen 1:26, PYu

And *Philo*’s words describing the creation of the heavenly man created in the image of God are well known:

ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα ἰδέα τις ἢ γένος ἢ σφραγίς, νοητός, ἀσώματος, οὔτ’ ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ, ἄφθαρτος φύσει
But man, made according to the image of God, was an idea, or a genus, or a seal, perceptible only by the intellect, incorporeal, neither male nor female, imperishable by nature *⁷. *⁶ *Opif.* 76

In the opinion of T. Tobin, *Philo*’s approach to interpreting the texts of Gen 1:27 and 2:7 *⁸ doesn’t allow for an interpretation of the words ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ *⁹ as an androgynous human being, and presupposes that heavenly man *¹⁰ was “neither male nor female” and that his *⁷ *Opif.* 134

25. *Philo* of Alexandria was born approximately 20–10 BC and died in the 40s AD [*Matusova*, 7].

26. The concept of a “double” creation explained the existence of two descriptions of the creation of man in Gen 1 and 2, beginning with a picture according to which two different “human beings” were created: the heavenly, relating to the world as understood by the mind, and the earthly, relating to that world which is perceived by the senses. According to one opinion, this

understanding and the above-mentioned, associated interpretive approaches to the texts of Gen 1:27 and 2:27 were adopted by *Philo* and stemmed from the previous Alexandrian exegetical tradition [*Tobin*, 108–109; *Runia*, 325]. In addition, it is worth noting the existence of an opinion which supposes that the allegorical commentary of *Philo* was forged within the general framework of the “Greek, Hellenistic approach to texts from the barbaric tradition” [*Matusova*, 36].

*⁸ *Opif.* 134–135*⁹ Gen 1:27, LXX*¹⁰ Gen 1:27

condition was a precursor to any sort of sexual differentiation [*Tobin, 108–109*]. D. Runia also argues against an understanding of original man in Philo as an androgynos²⁷. Philo's texts^{*1}, according to Runia, attest that despite the biblical words ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ (“male and female” / “man and woman”), sexual differentiation is not characteristic of man^{*2}, where he is at a pre-sexual stage [*Runia, 243*]²⁸.

*1 *Opif. 76*

*2 *Gen 1:27*

We have looked at the texts of Philo that contain the words “image of God” and a number of similar expressions (a list of the excerpts we have considered may be found in Table 3). In addition, we have studied excerpts of Philo's tractates which use the expressions κατ' εἰκόνα (“in the image”), κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν (“in our image”), κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν (“in our image and likeness”), and also the word εἰκὼν “image” (in its various forms) in contexts, presupposing the expression “image of God”. We have also examined excerpts from Philo containing the words ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ, ἄρσιν καὶ θήλυ (“male and female”), and various expressions which are similar in terms of vocabulary.

Table 3. A list of Philo's texts containing the expression εἰκὼν θεοῦ (“image of God”) etc.²⁹

Philo's Lexicon	Excerpts from Philo's tractates	English translation of Philo's lexicon
εἰκὼν θεοῦ	<i>Fug. 101; Her. 164, 231 (×2); Leg. 1.31 (×2), 1.43, 3.96; Opif. 25, 69, 134; Pot. 86; Plant. 19, 1.44; QG (Qge.) 2.62; Somn. 1.74 (×2); Spec. 1:81;</i>	image of God
εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ	<i>Leg. 2.4</i>	image of God
θεοῦ εἰκὼν	<i>Lin. 147; Somn. 1.239; Spec. 2:176</i>	image of God
εἰκὼν τοῦ ποιητοῦ	<i>Her. 56</i>	image of God
εἰκὼν τοῦ μόνου πλήρους θεοῦ	<i>Her. 187</i>	image of the one perfect God
εἰκὼν τοῦ ὄντος	<i>Spec. 1.81</i>	image of Him who Is
θεῖα εἰκὼν	<i>Her. 57; Lin. 62; Opif. 25; Spec. 3.207</i>	divine image
εἰκὼν θεῖα	<i>Mut. 223; Spec. 1.171</i>	divine image

27. We have in view here D. Runia's polemic vis-à-vis the ideas of E. Urbach [*Urbach, 177*] and other authors [*Runia, 243*].

28. In some of Philo's texts, various forms of the word ἀνδρόγυνος “androgynos” are used to mean a “woman-like” man, as well as a number of other mean-

ings: *Contempl. 60; Her. 274; Sacr. 100; Somn. 1.126; Spec. 1.325, 3.38, 40; Virt. 21*. Not one of these excerpts containing the word ἀνδρόγυνος is connected with the creation of man.

29. We note also the expression ἀειδής εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ — “His bodiless image” (*Lin. 147*).

As a result of our analysis of the excerpts from Philo, we can say the following: we have distinguished two texts in which the expression εἰκὼν θεοῦ (“image of God”) and the words ἄρσιν (ἄρσιν) (“male”), θῆλυ (θῆλυ) (“female”) from Gen 1:27, LXX are simultaneously used. In one case we have nearly a complete quotation of Gen 1:27, LXX in Philo’s tractate, *Who is the Heir of Divine Things* *^{1,30}. In the other *², we see the expressions κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ (“in the image of God”) and οὐτ’ ἄρσιν οὔτε θῆλυ (“not yet male or female”): the expressions are not linked by syntax, and “male” and “female” in equal degree relate to man as made in the image of God. Here is the excerpt from *Her. 164*.

*¹ *Her. 164**² *Opif. 134*

διεἶλεν ἰσότης καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα, δύο τιμήματα, ἄνισα μὲν ταῖς ῥώμασι, πρὸς ὃ δὲ ἔσπευσεν ἡ φύσις, τρίτου τινὸς ὁμοίου γένεσιν, ἰσαίτατα. “ἔποίησε” γὰρ φησὶν “ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν” οὐκέτ’ αὐτόν, ἀλλ’ “αὐτοὺς” ἐπιφέρει πληθυντικῶς, ἐφαρμοτῶν τὰ εἶδη τῷ γένει διαιρεθέντα, ὡς εἶπον, ἰσότητι *³.

*³ *Her. 164*

It is equality also that divided the human race into man and woman, making two divisions, unequal in strength, but most perfectly equal for the purpose which nature had principally in view, the generation of a third human being like themselves. For, says Moses, “God made man; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them”. He no longer says “him”, but “them” in the plural number, adapting the species to the genus, which have, as I have already said, been divided with perfect equality *^{4,31}.

*⁴ *Her. 164*

In our opinion, in the remainder of Philo’s texts which contain the expression εἰκὼν θεοῦ (“image of God” and similar expressions) it is usual that there should be no connection in terms of meaning between the expression “image of God” and the words ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ (“male and female”) (and other similar words) *³². Analogously, in the remainder of Philo’s texts which contain the words ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ (and other similar words), in our opinion it is usual that there should be no link in terms of meaning to the expression εἰκὼν θεοῦ (“image of God”) *³³.

30. See also: [*Philo and Holy Scripture*, 4].

31. This quote is written into the general context of Philo’s discussion of fairness, equality and the division of bodiea and things into two equal parts (*Her. 161–163*).

32. As an example, we might mention various of Philo’s texts which contain the expression εἰκὼν θεοῦ

(and similar expressions): *Opif. 25, 69; Leg. 1.31; 3.96; Plant. 19, 44; Her. 231; Somn. 1.74*.

33. Philo’s anthropological texts contain a number of different versions of the expression ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ (and other similar words). For examples, please see: *Opif. 76, 161; Leg. 2.13; Cher. 111; Sacr. 112; Agr. 139; Somn. 2.184; Abr. 101, 102*.

The expressions εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (“image of God”) and ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ (“male and female”) in the New Testament

Within the New Testament corpus itself, the expressions εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ and ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ never occur together within a single verse. Here are various examples of the two expressions appearing in isolation (Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4. The Expression ἄρσιν καὶ θῆλυ (“male and female”) in New Testament Texts

Verse	Greek New Testament [NTG]	Translation into English (NKJV)
Mt 19:4	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν • οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ κτίσας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς; [NTG, 60].	And He answered and said to them, “Have you not read that He who made them at the beginning ‘made them male and female?’
Mk 10:6	ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς • [NTG, 143].	But from the beginning of the creation, God ‘made them male and female.
Gal 3:28	οὐκ ἔστι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ • πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [NTG, 584].	There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Table 5. The Expression εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (“image of God”) in New Testament Texts

Verse	Greek New Testament [NTG]	Translation into English (NKJV)
1 Cor 11:7	Ἄνθρωπος μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων • ἡ γυνὴ δὲ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστίν [NTG, 539].	For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man.
2 Cor 4:4	ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀνύλασαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ [NTG, 560].	whose minds the god of this age has blinded, who do not believe, lest the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine on them.
Col 1:15	ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ... [NTG, 143].	He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.

Twice in the New Testament, Christ is called the image of God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ), at 2 Cor 4:4 and Col 1:15.

Christ took on human form and completed that, which the first Adam had not completed; therefore, being a divine and ideal human being, Christ has that image which Adam and other people were unable to reflect and depict [Beale, 408].

In 1 Cor 11:7, the expression εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ (“image and glory of God”) is used in relations to the Christian (man / male) in the general context of discussing that head of a Christian man who is praying or prophecying in the community gathering should remain uncovered.

In the context of affirming the unity of believers in Christ, independent of ethnicity, social-cultural background or sex, it is written that in the mystical union of believers with each other and Christ “there is neither male nor female”^{*1} (οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ)³⁴.

*1 Gal 3:28

In the pericopes on divorce in the Gospels of Mark (10:6) and Matthew (19:4) Genesis 1:27 is quoted (LXX) ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (“male and female He created them”).

If we juxtapose the excerpts from the Damascus Document and the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, we can see the following analogy: just as in CD 4:21 (6Q15 (6QD)) the quotation **זכר ונקבה ברא אותם**^{*2} — “male and female He created them” relates to the expression **יסוד היסוד** (yesod hab-beriah) — “the foundation of creation”^{*3} [In-*stone-Brewer*, 176–177], in the text of Mk 10:6, the quotation^{*4} ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (“male and female He created them”) relates to the expression ἀρχὴ κτίσεως — “the beginning of the creation”^{*5}. Likewise, in Mt 19:4, the quotation^{*6} ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (“male and female created He them”) relates to the expression ὁ κτίσας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς — “who made them at the beginning”^{*7}.

*2 Gen 1:27b

*3 CD 4:21

*4 Gen 1:27, LXX

*5 Mk 10:6

*6 Gen 1:27, LXX

*7 Mt 19:4

D. Daube believes that the concept of an androgynous person lies behind the pericope on divorce in Mark [Daube, 72–74], whereas for Matthew the androgynous Adam has been forgotten, rendering the quotation of “male and female He created them” nearly meaningless [Daube, 83].

However, though Matthew himself is presumably no longer influenced by the notion of an androgynous being, there is reason to believe that it played a part in that source from which he took the private reflections of Jesus and his disciples concerning marriage as such: “It is not good to marry, There be eunuchs for the kingdom’s sake” [Daube, 84].

34. In our opinion, other New Testament texts similar to Gal 3:28 in terms of semantics and general context include: Mt 5:28; 19:12; 22:30; 1 Cor 7:7–8.

At the same time, there is another perspective.

Although it seems safe to say that neither Matthew nor Mark plays on this concept of an original androgynous man... this reading of Genesis³⁵ passage they cite may have informed the understanding of some members of their original audiences [Keener, 464].

Moreover, with regard to the concept of the androgynous person, Keener notes that rabbis were significantly more interested in laws, regarding rare instances of hermaphroditism [Keener, 464].

The expressions צֶלְמֵם אֱלֹהִים (“image of God”), זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה (“male and female”) and the word אַנְדְּרוֹגִינּוֹס (“androgynous human” or, hereinafter, “androgynos”) in Rabbinic sources

In accordance with the understandings current for early Judaism, the words of Gen 9:6b on the creation of man in the image of God were understood as relating to the whole man in his entirety [Urbach, 176; Instone-Brewer, 216]³⁶.

Researchers note that the main discussion regarding the expression “image of God” in Rabbinic texts does not have to do with the problem of the relationship between Gen 1:26 and forward and 2:7 (as with Philo), but with the question of plural usage in God’s speech in Gen 1:26a [Kittel, 392–393].

The interconnection between the words about God’s creation of man “in Our image, according to Our likeness”^{*1} and God’s command to “be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth”^{*2} is reflected in the commentary of rabbi Jakov from Kfar-Khanina^{*3,37}. Moreover, it is assumed, that man’s authority over animals is contingent upon his behaving as a higher being, in accordance with being the image and likeness of God [Midrash Rabbah 1911, 9[a]; Midrash Rabbah 2012, 157].

There is a well-known interpretation according to which the image and likeness of God given to man at creation are considered to be of

*1 Gen 1:26

*2 Gen 1:28

*3 Bereshith Rabbah 8:12

35. In the Greek text of Mt 19:4 [NTG, 60] and Mk 10:6 [NTG, 143], Gen 1:27, LXX is quoted: ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (“male and female created He them”).

36. See the text of the story about Gilel the Elder from Vayikra Rabbah 34:3 [Urbach, 176].

37. According to scholarly opinion, Midrash Bereshith Rabbah is a collection of Rabbinic texts from different eras. The corpus was edited in Palestine in approximately the V century AD [Boyarin, 77]. In Schiffman’s opinion, the text of Bereshith Rabbah can be dated to 400-500 AD [Schiffman, 225].

the angelic world (and higher creatures), and unrelated to multiplication of species, which is considered an animal trait (for lower creatures) *¹ [*Midrash Rabbah* 1911, 9a; *Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 156].

*¹ Bereshith Rabbah 8:11

At the same time, according to a well-known Rabbinic tradition, support of God’s image on earth involves the propagation of the human race [*Urbach*, 176]. Here we might cite, in the context of our polemic, sayings from Bereshith Rabbah 17:2, in which the creation of man in the image of God is related to childbearing and marriage [*Midrash Rabbah* 1911, 18b; *Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 255–256].

An excerpt from Bereshith Rabbah 8:9 specifies that God and man are co-creators in the propagation of the human race, that God participates in every act in which a new person appears on earth, and even that God creates the new man from his father and mother. In this scenario, the image of God is passed on to posterity through the image of the first man, Adam *² and through the parents of the new person coming into the world [*Midrash Rabbah* 1911, 9a; *Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 154, 327; *Gudelite*, 35–36]. Here is the text of the Mishna, which connects childbearing and the words זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרֵאָם *³ on the creation of man as male and female:

*² Gen 5:3

*³ Gen 5:2a, MT

A person should not cease [to fulfil the commandment] “to be fruitful and multiply”, unless perhaps he already has children. Dom Shamaya says: two boys [שְׁנֵי זָכָרִים]. Dom Gilelja says: a boy and a girl [זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה], as it is said, “male and female created He them” [זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרֵאָם] *³⁸, *⁴ [*Yevhamoth*, 66–67] *³⁹.

*⁴ M. Yevhamothh 6:6

This example of usage of the text from *⁵ “male and female He created them” immediately after the quotation of “and God created man in His image” *⁶ is an excerpt from the Gemara from the Kethuboth tractate of the Babylonian Talmud *⁷, *⁴⁰. The general context of the excerpt is the pronouncement of six blessings during wedding festivities and presupposes the discussion of the creation of man within a Rabbinic framework.

*⁵ Gen 5:2a

*⁶ Gen 1:27aα

*⁷ Kethuboth 8a

Levi happened to come to the house of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi during the wedding celebration of Rabbi Shimon, his son, and recited five of these blessings. Rav Asi

38. Excerpts of the original text M. Yevhamoth 6:6 cit. ex: [*Yevhamoth*, 66–67].

39. The editing of this version of the Mishna, according to scholarly opinion, was completed around the year 200 AD [*Schiffman*, 180]. The name of the tractate called Yevhamoth, can be translated as “Levirite Marriages”, or “Brides”.

40. According to scholarly opinion, the editing of the Babylonian Talmud happened over the course of the VI c. AD [*Schiffman*, 224]. The name of the tractate called Kethuboth, can be translated as “Marriage Contracts”.

happened to come to the house of Rav Ashi during the wedding celebration of Mar, his son, and recited six of these blessings. Shall we say that their disagreement is about this: One Sage holds that it was one act of creation with which man was created, and the other sage holds that it was two acts of creation? No, everyone agrees that it was only one act of creation. However, one Sage holds: It is according to the initial thought that we proceed. And one Sage holds: It is according to the action that we proceed. That explanation is like the following. Rav Yehuda raises a contradiction. In one verse it is written: “And God created man in His own image” [ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו] (Genesis 1:27), indicating one act of creation, and in another verse it is written: “Male and female He created them” [זכר ונקבה בראם] (Genesis 5:2), indicating two acts. How can this apparent contradiction be resolved? Initially, the thought entered God’s mind to create two, but ultimately only one was actually created *¹ [*Ibn-Habib*, 155–156]⁴¹.

*¹ Kethuboth 8a

*² Kethuboth 8a

The opinion of Levi *² is that it is imperative to consider the act of creation of man and woman as a single act of creation, which accords, therefore, with a single blessing. The opinion of Rav Ami presupposes two separate acts of creation (of the man and the woman). According to this excerpt from the Gemara, God had the intention to create two people — a man and a woman, but God created one creature with two sexes, which were subsequently separated out into man and woman *³. When two blessings are pronounced, God’s intention to create two beings is in view, and when one blessing is pronounced, God’s creation of a single human creature, subsequently differentiated into man and woman, is in view. [*Ibn-Habib*, 155–156].

*³ Gen 2:21–24

According to the opinion which is usual for Rabbinic literature, the interpretation of the stories of the creation of man from the 1st, 2nd and 5th chapters of Genesis provides that one goal of marriage is the restoration of the image of God present in the aboriginal androgynos via the sexual act of the marriage partners *⁴ [*Boyarin*, 92, 97].

*⁴ Gen 1:27; 5:2

Rabbi Jeremiah ben Leazar said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, created the first man [אדם הראשון], He created him as an androgynos [אנדרונינוס] *⁴², for it is said, “Male and female created He them [זכר ונקבה בראם] {and called their name Adam [man]}” *⁵.

*⁵ Bereshith 5:2

41. Excerpts of the original text of Kethuboth 8a cit. ex: [*Kethuboth*, 8a].

42. This midrash presupposes that the first man (אדם הראשון (adam harashon)) appeared as an

androgynos (אנדרונינוס — from the Greek ἀνδρόγυνος) — a creature harmoniously bringing together the masculine and feminine principles and capable of self-reproduction [*Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 140–141].

Rabbi Samuel ben Nahman said: When the Lord created Adam He created him double-faced [דִּיפְרוֹסוֹפִין] (*diprosopon*)⁴³, then He split him and made him of two backs, one back on this side and one back on the other side *¹ [Midrash Rabbah 2012, 140–141]⁴⁴.

*¹ Bereshith Rabbah 8:1

Scholars believe that the myth about proto-human androgynos which was used by Plato in the Symposium (189e–193c) [Plato, 98–102] was known to Greek literature from the pre-Socratic times of the philosopher Empedocles [Lebedev, 437; MacDonald, 25]⁴⁵.

The reception of excerpts containing myths of the androgynous human within Rabbinic literature was contemporaneous with these myths’ judaization [Urbach, 177]. We don’t know whether the Amora used the platonic myth or some other version of the androgynos myth [Midrash Rabbah 2012, 140–142]⁴⁶. Researchers note, that subsequently, within the context of European culture, the mythologems concerning the two-sexed, two-faced person lost their mythological character [Urbach, 177]. The Amora, to some extent, present the figures of the androgynos (אֲנֲדְרוֹנִינִיּוֹס) and the diprosopon (דִּיפְרוֹסוֹפִין) as demythologized, reconsidered and devoid of that ideal and perfection which Greek mythology had lent them. The division of man into two in Bereshith Rabbah 8:1 is not a punishment for standing against the gods, and the words to the effect that the man who had been created was “sawed into two” halves, is not seen to contradict the words “and he took one of his ribs” [Urbach, 177; Midrash Rabbah 2012, 140–142]. One opinion holds that for the Jewish Hellenistic culture of Midrash Rabbah, this particular figure⁴⁷ is imbued with exactly the opposite meaning. Often this sort of reference to an image taken from the surrounding culture bears witness to a stand against that culture [Boyarin, 92].

The image of the androgynos subsequently split into two bodies was called to life by the hermeneutical task of resolving the contradictory stories in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 into a single narrative. [Bo-

43. דִּיפְרוֹסוֹפִין (*diprosopon*) — arameism from the Greek δύο πρόσωπα — “two faces” [Midrash Rabbah 2012, 141].

44. Excerpts of the original text of Bereshith Rabbah cit. ex: [Midrash Rabbah 1911, 8a; Midrash Rabbah 2012, 141].

45. It is generally known that the 3rd degree of the 4th (zoogonic) phase of the cosmogonic cycle of Empedocles was “bisexual creatures, unable to sexually reproduce” [Lebedev, 437]. See also: Elian (Aelianus).

O prirode zivotnikh [On the Nature of Animals] (XVI. 29) [Fragments, 384].

46. Given the possibility that Plato’s androgynos myth influenced the text of Bereshith Rabbah 8:1, scholars note that Jewish and Christian interpreters, apparently influenced by their religious convictions, left discussion of same-sex pairs present in Aristophanes speech in Plato’s *Symposium* to one side [Smagina, 104]. See: [Plato, 100–101].

47. The figure of the androgynos, in this case.

yarin, 92; *Daube*, 72]. The development of the plot can be seen in the interpretation in which Adam is understood as a man, from which the woman is subsequently created [*Boyarin*, 92].

Midrash Rabbah cites the following tradition with regard to the words זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרֵאִים*¹ — “male and female He created them”:

*¹ Gen 5:2a, MT

This is one of the things they altered for King Ptolemy: “Man with his orifices (*nekuvav*) He created them” [זָכָר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרֵאִים]^{48, *2} [*Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 155]⁴⁹.

*² Bereshith Rabbah 8:11

Before us is a tradition which states that in the text of the first translation of the Pentateuch into Greek, made at the command of King Ptolemy II of Philadelphia, changes were made in order to harmonize the two stories about the creation of man in the 1st and 2nd chapters of Genesis — so that the story about the simultaneous creation of man and woman would not contradict the story about the subsequent creation of woman from man. One opinion holds that the specification of the structure of the male body which is related in the above-quoted text of Bereshith Rabbah 8:11 was stipulated by the effort of the Torah translator to prevent the Greek text from being understood as if it referred to an androgynos⁵⁰. In other words, according to tradition recorded in Bereshith Rabbah 8:11, the Greek translation of the Torah spoke of God’s creation of a male human being, with all the characteristics of a male body [*Midrash Rabbah* 2012, 155–156]⁵¹. As such, in the above-mentioned text of Bereshith Rabbah 8:11, we can also note the characteristic play on words נִקְבָּה בְּרֵאִים (*nekuvav*, “his orifices”^{*3}) [*Avot de-r. Nathan*, 287].

*³ Gen 1:27; 5:2, MT

However, if we look at the text of the Septuagint as it has come down to us (in this case at the appropriate verses of the Alexandrian Codex), we don’t find the version of the translation related at Bereshith Rabbah 8:11 (see: Gen 1:27; 5:1–2, LXX; Table 1)⁵². Nevertheless, it isn’t entirely without possibility that some likeness of the Septuagint carrying the tradition of Bereshith Rabbah 8:11 could still be found in the muted echo of the image of the figure of the androgenos (ἀνδρόγυνος)

48. Excerpt of the original text of Bereshith Rabbah 8:11 Cit. ex: [*Midrash Rabbah* 1911, 9a].

49. See also: The Avot of Rabbi Nathan (2nd version), chapter 37 [*Avot de-r. Nathan*, 287]; Mekhilta. Weekly Torah Section “Bo”. Parashah 14. Exodus 12:40 [*Mekhilta*, 44]; tractate Soferim, ch. 1.

50. See also: [*Avot de-r. Nathan*, 287 (footnote. 245)].

51. D. Boyarin, citing Mishna Berakhot, refutes D. Daube’s proposed interpretation of נִקְבָּה בְּרֵאִים (*nekuvav*,

Bereshith Rabbah 8:11), as connected to the concept of an aboriginal androgynos [*Boyarin*, 76–77; *Daube*, 72–73].

52. The Septuagint uses the word ἀνδρόγυνος exactly one time, at Proverbs 18:8, LXX, to mean a woman-like man. The word ἀνδρογύναιος “womanlike” is also used once at Proverbs 19:15, and is a neologism [*Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 46].

which is supposedly concealed behind the words καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν Ἀδὰμ *¹ — “...and called them Adam”.

*¹ Gen 5:2, LXX

In addition, it is worth noting the significantly earlier (relative to the texts of Midrash Rabbah and the Babylonian Talmud) examples of the word אנדרוגינוס (androgynos) in Mishnah tractates Bikkurim (1:5), Hagigah (1:1), Niddah (3:5), Parah (12:10), Shabbat (19:3), and Yevhamoth (8:6). In the Halakhic context, these usages have the connotation of hermaphroditism [*Krauss, T. 2, 64–65*].

Conclusion

1. Use of the entire version of Gen 1:27 (Gen 5:1b–2a) was, it appears, not common practice in ancient texts. Two examples would be Philo’s *Who is the Heir of Divine Things* *² and the excerpt from the Gemara, tractate Ketuboth, in the Babylonian Talmud *³. In quoting Gen 1:27a and b, Philo accentuates the fact that God created not “him”, but “them” (that is, male and female), while Ketuboth 8a, in quoting Gen 1:27aα and Gen 5:2a, accentuates that in the end only a single creature (an androgynos), was created, though God’s original plan was the creation of two human creatures (male and female). The material considered shows that in *Her. 164* and Ketuboth 8a, the interpretation is subject only to Gen 1:27b and Gen 5:2a, while the words relating to the image of God from Gen 1:27a, are not used in the interpretation, in our opinion.

*² *Her. 164*

*³ Ketuboth 8a

2. In the ancient texts represented in this work, a general line of separate usage of the half-verses at Gen 1:27a,b (Gen 5:1b, 2a) predominates both in terms of quotation and in terms of interpretation.

*⁴ Sir 17:3–4, Bereshith Rabbah 8:12

3. In the texts we have reviewed, the expression “image of God” (צִלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים, εἰκὼν θεοῦ) is used in considerably varying ways: relating to man’s calling to govern the world *⁴, when alluding to childbearing *⁵, and also without a reference to childbearing in the context of Philo’s picture of the heavenly man *⁶ or in the context of man as a representative of the angelic world *⁷. In the New Testament, Christ is twice referred to as the image of God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ) *⁸. The godman Jesus Christ has the image, which neither Adam, nor other representatives of the human race were able to reflect [*Beale, 408*].

*⁵ Bereshith Rabbah 8:9; 17:2

*⁶ *Opif. 134*

*⁷ Bereshith Rabbah 8:11

*⁸ 2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15

*⁹ Jub 2:13–14 (4Q216 (4QJuba)); CD 4:21 (6Q15 (6QD)); Mk 10:6; Mt 19:4

4. In a number of cases זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה, ἄρσην καὶ θήλυς (“male and female”) serves as an allusion to the original reality of man’s creation in Gen 1:27 *⁹. For some of these texts *¹⁰ these words are related to the

*¹⁰ CD 4:21 (6Q15 (6QD)); Mk 10:6; Mt 19:4

*1 *Opif.* 134

prohibition against polygamy and divorce. The excerpt from Philo of Alexandria at *1 is an original case of exegesis of Gen 1:26–27 (relative to those texts which have come down to us from the Second Temple era), in the context of which heavenly man, created in the image of God (κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ), is described with the words “neither male nor female” (οὐτ’ ἄρρεν οὔτε θήλυ). In the context of Christian teaching and anthropology characteristic for the Apostle Paul, a well-known example using the words ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ (“male and female”) is found at Gal 3:28, in which it is affirmed that in the mystical union of the faithful with each other in Christ “there is neither male nor female” *2 (οὐκ ἔστι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ). On the basis of several rabbinic texts it is possible to establish a link between the expressions “male and female” (זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה) from Gen 5:2a (M. Yevhamoth 6:6) and the theme of childbearing. Use of the image of the androgynos (אַנְדְּרוֹגִינּוֹס) in the text of Bereshith Rabbah 8:1 is an example of demythologizing and rethinking of the figure (of the androgynos), which is taken on from Hellenic culture [*Urbach*, 177].

*2 Gal 3:28

5. The general contents of the two previous sections of this Conclusion can be summarized in the following way. We note that in the ancient texts we have considered, there are two general tendencies relating to the expressions “image of God” and “male and female”. The first tendency relates to the realities of our world and to the continuation of the use of the words of God “let them have dominion... over all the earth” *3 and the commandment of God “be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it” *4. Here the subject is governing the world *5 and childbearing *6. The second tendency is marked by a longing for and striving for eternal life. Here we have, on the one hand, the understanding of heavenly man as created in the image of God, for whom, according to Philo, there is “neither male nor female” *7. And on the other hand, we have the Christian understanding of Christ as the image of God found in 2 Cor 4:4 and Col 1:15, and Gal 3:28, which tells us that in Christ and in the Church “there is neither male nor female”.

*3 Gen 1:26

*4 Gen 1:28

*5 Sir 17:3–4;
Jub 2:13–14
(4Q216 (4QJub^b);
Bereshith Rabbah 8:12*6 M. Yevhamoth 6:6;
Bereshith Rabbah 8:9; 17:2*7 *Opif.* 134

6. In our opinion, none of the ancient textual examples of exegesis of Gen 1:27a,b (Gen 5:1b, 2a) that we have considered provide the occasion to identify an interconnection between the excerpts on the one hand of Gen 1:27b and Gen 1:27aβ, or Gen 1:27aα, and on the other, Gen 5:2a and Gen 5:1bβ. The ancient texts considered above can, in our opinion, given a certain degree of supposition, be used

as an argument against a clear semantic link between the expression **אֱלֹהִים צִלְמֵם** *¹ (εἰκὼν θεοῦ *²) and the words **זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה** *³ (ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ *⁴), and also the expressions **בְּדְמוּת אֱלֹהִים** *⁵ (εἰκὼν θεοῦ *⁶) and the words **זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה** *⁷ (ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ *⁸)⁵³.

Translation from Russian by Georgia J. Williams

*¹ Gen 1:27aβ, MT

*² Gen 1:27aβ, LXX

*³ Gen 1:27b, MT

*⁴ Gen 1:27b, LXX

*⁵ Gen 5:1bβ, MT

*⁶ Gen 5:1bβ, LXX

*⁷ Gen 5:2a, MT

*⁸ Gen 5:2a, LXX

Biblical Translations Used in this Text

- BK** Kulakov M. P., Kulakov M. M. (eds.) (2015). *The Bible : The Books of Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament in modern Russian translation*. Moscow : BBI (Sovremennaia bibleistika) (in Russian).
- KP** Pobedonostsev K. P. (transl.) (2000). *The New Testament*. Petersburg : Russian Bible Society (in Russian).
- LXX** *Septuaginta : Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs : duo volumina in uno*. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- MBO** *Genesis : Translation by the International Bible Society*. Moscow : BBI, 1998 (in Russian).
- NTG** *Novum Testamentum graece*. 28 Aufl., rev. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
- PYu** Yungerov P. A. (transl.) (2000). *Knigi Vetkhogo Zaveta : Uchitel'nye knigi [Books of the Old Testament : Educational books]*. Moscow : Izd-vo Moskovskoi patriarkhii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi tserkvi (In Russian).
- RBO** *The Bible : The Books of Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testament : Canonical : translation into Modern Russian*. Moscow : Russian Bible Society, 2011 (in Russian).
- Synod.** *Synodal translation of the Bible* (in Russian).
- VZh** Zhukovskii V. A. (transl.) (2008). *The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ*. St. Petersburg : Dmitry Bulanin (in Russian).

53. The vocabulary in the expressions from Gen 1:27 (MT, LXX): **אֱלֹהִים צִלְמֵם** (“in the image of God”), κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ (“in the image of God”), **זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה** (“male and female”), ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ (“male and female”); Gen 5:1bβ, Gen 5:2a (MT, LXX): **בְּדְמוּת אֱלֹהִים**

(“according to God’s likeness”); κατ’ εἰκόνα θεοῦ (“in the image of God”); **זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה** (“male and female”); ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ (“male and female”).

References

1. *Avot de-r. Nathan* = Pereferkovich N. (trans.) (2011). “Avot de-rabbi Nathan (vtoraia versiia)” [“Avot de-rabbi Nathan (second version)”], in *Talmudicheskie traktaty : Pirkei Avot. Avot de-rabbi Nathan (1–2)* [Talmudic tractates : Pirkei Avot. Avot de-rabbi Nathan (1–2)], Moscow : Mosty kul'tury ; Jerusalem : Gesharim, pp. 207–325 (Russian translation).
2. *Barth* = Barth K. (2004). *Church Dogmatics*, v. 3 : *The Doctrine of Creation*, pt. 1. London ; New York : T&T Clark International.
3. *BDB* = Brown F. et al. (ed.) (1999). *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon : With an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA : Hendrickson publishers.
4. *Beale* = Beale G. K. (ed.) (2015). “Colossians”, in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament : In 4 v., v. 4 : The Pauline Epistles*, Cherkasy : Kollokvium, pp. 393–434 (Russian translation).
5. *Bird* = Bird P. A. (1981). “‘Male and Female He Created Them’: Gen 1:27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation”. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 1981, v. 74, n. 2, pp. 129–159.
6. *Blomberg* = Blomberg C. (2010). “The Gospel of Matthew”, in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament : In 4 v., v. 1*, Cherkasy : Kollokvium, pp. 41–237 (Russian translation).
7. *Boyarin* = Boyarin D. (2012). *Israel after the Flesh : On Sex in Talmudic Culture*. Transl. Ia. Sinichkin. Moscow : Knizhniki (Russian translation).
8. *Bruggeman* = Bruggeman U. (2013). *Genesis*. Transl. L. Kolker, P. Valenchuk. Cherkasy : Kollokvium (Russian translation).
9. *Damascus Document* = Gazov-Ginzberg A. M., Elizarova M. M., Starkova K. B. (transl.) (2009). “Damasskii document” [“Damascus Document”], in *Teksty Kumrana. Vypusk vtoroi* [Qumran Texts. Second Edition], 2 ed., Saint Petersburg : Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, pp. 21–91 (Russian translation).
10. *Daube* = Daube D. (1956). *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. Peabody, MA : Hendrickson Publishers.
11. *Davidson* = Davidson R. (2015). *The Flame of Yahweh : Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Transl. G. G. Iastrebov. Moscow : Eksmo (Russian translation).
12. *Di Lella* = Di Lella A. A. (1992). “Wisdom of Ben-Sira”, in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* : In 6 v., v. 6, New York et al. : Doubleday, pp. 931–945.
13. *Fragments* = Rozhanskii I. D. (ed.) (1989). *Fragmenti rannikh grecheskikh filosofov* [Fragments of the early Greek philosophers], part 1 : *Ot epicheskikh teokosmogonii do vozniknoveniia atomistiki* [From epic theocosmogony to the emergence of atomistics]. Moscow : Nauka (in Russian).
14. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* = Lust J. et al. (comp.) (2003). *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

15. *Gudelite* = Gudelite K. (2003). “Dva opisaniia sotvoreniia cheloveka v Biblii i raznye ikh traktovki” [“Two Descriptions of the Creation of Man in the Bible and their Different Interpretations”], in *Materialy Desiatoi ezhegodnoi mezhdunarodnoi mezhdistsiplinarnoi konferentsii po iudaike* [Proceedings of the Tenth Annual International Interdisciplinary Conference on Judaica], ch. 2, Moscow : Sefer, pp. 33–38 (in Russian).
16. *Hamilton* = Hamilton V. P. (1990). *The book of Genesis : Chapters 1–17*. Grand Rapids, MI : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
17. *Ibn-Habib* = Jacob ibn Habib (2014). *Ein Iaakov (Istochnik Iakova)* [Ein Yaakov (Source of Yaakov) : In 6 v.], v. 4, Moscow : Knizhniki : Lekhaim (Russian translation).
18. *Instone-Brewer* = Instone-Brewer D. (2016). *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible*. Transl. A. Karpliuk. Cherkassy (Russian translation).
19. *Keener* = Keener C. S. (1999). *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI ; Cambridge, U. K. : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
20. *Kethuboth* = מסכת כהובות . תלמוד בבלי . (1865). Warszawa : Naklad i Druk S. Orgelbranda.
21. *Kittel* = Kittel G. (1974). “Εἰκών : E. The Divine Likeness in Judaism”, in *Theological dictionary of the New Testament* : In 10 v., v. 2, Grand Rapids, MI : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974, pp. 392–395.
22. *Krauss* = Krauss S. (1898–1899). *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* : In 2 v. Berlin : S. Calvary & Co.
23. *Lebedev* = Lebedev A. V. (2010). “Empedokl” [“Empedocles”], in *Novaia filosofskaia entsiklopediia* [New philosophical encyclopedi : In 4 v.], v. 4, Moscow : Mysl', pp. 437–438 (in Russian).
24. *MacDonald* = MacDonald D. R. (1987). *There is No Male and Female : The Fate of Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*. Philadelphia : Fortress Press.
25. *Matusova* = Matusova E. D. (2000). “Filon Aleksandriiskii — kommentator Vetkhogo Zaveta” [“Philo of Alexandria — commentator of the Old Testament”], in *Filon Aleksandriiskii. Tolkovaniia* [Vetkhogo Zaveta Philo of Alexandria. Interpretation of the Old Testament], Moscow : Greko-latinskii kabinet Iu. A. Shichalina, pp. 7–50 (in Russian).
26. *MT* = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1990). 4 ed., emend. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
27. *Mekhilta* = Pereferkovich N. (trans.) (2009). “Mekhil'ta: Midrash k knige Iskhod” [“Mekhilta: Midrash of the book of Exodus”], in *Talmud*, v. 7 : *Midrash (Mekhil'ta i Sifra)* [Midrash (Mekhilta and Sifra)], Moscow : Izdatel' L. Gorodetskii, pp. [1]–273 (Russian translation).
28. *Midrash Rabbah 1911* = מדרש רבה . בראשית רבה , שמות רבה , ויקרא . חלק א א
 = *Midrash Raba : Bereshit Raba, Shmot Raba, Vaikra Raba s kommentarijami* [Midrash Rabbah : Bereshith Rabbah, Shmot Rabbah,

- Vayikra Rabbah with commentaries], part 1. Warsaw : [Tipographia Levin-Epstein], 1911 (Russian translation).
29. *Midrash Rabbah 2012* = Sinichkin Ia., Chlenova A. (trans.) (2012). *Midrash raba (Velikij midrash)* [Midrash Rabbah : In 8 v.], v. 1 : *Bereshit raba* [Bereshith Rabbah]. Moscow : Knizhniki : Lekhaim (Russian translation).
 30. Philo = Vdovichenko A. V. (2000). “Filon Aleksandriiskii. O sotvorenii mira soglasno Moiseiu” [“Philo of Alexandria. On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses”], in *Idem. Tolkovaniia Vetkhogo Zaveta* [Idem. Interpretation of the Old Testament], Moscow : Greko-latinskii kabinet Iu. A. Shichalina, pp. 51–113 (in Russian).
 31. *Philo and Holy Scripture* = Ryle H. E. (notes) (1895). *Philo and Holy Scripture or The Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament*. London ; New York : MacMillian and Co.
 32. Plato = Apt S. K. (trans.) (1993). “Platon. Pir” [“Plato’s Symposium”], in *Platon. Sobranie sochinenii* [Idem. Collected Works : In 4 v.], v. 3, Moscow : Mysl’, pp. 81–134 (Russian translation).
 33. Preuss = Preuss H. D. (1978). “דָּמָאָה; דְּמוּת” *dāmāh; d’mūth*, in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, v. 3, Grand Rapids, MI : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 250–260.
 34. *Rad von 1972* = Rad G. von. (1972). *Genesis : A Commentary*. London : SCM Press Ltd.
 35. *Rad von 1975* = Rad G. von. (1975). *Old Testament Theology*, v. 1 : The theology of Israel’s historical traditions. London : SCM Press Ltd.
 36. Runia = Runia D. T. (2001). *Philo of Alexandria. On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses : Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden et al. : Brill.
 37. Schellenberg = Schellenberg A. (2011). *Der Mensch, das Bild Gottes? Zum Gedanken einer Sonderstellung des Menschen im Alten Testament und in weiteren Altorientalischen Quellen*. Zürich : Theologischer Verlag Zürich.
 38. Schiffman = Schiffman L. (2002). *From Text to Tradition : the History 2nd Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Moscow : Mosty kul’turny ; Jerusalem : Gesharim (Russian translation).
 39. Smagina = Smagina E. B. (2017). “Gendernyi aspekt v bibleiskoi ekzegeze i ego evoliutsiia v gnosticheskikh ucheniakh” [“Gender aspect in biblical exegesis and its evolution in gnostic teachings”], in *Etnokul’turnoe razvitie Blizhnego Vostoka v IV–I tysiacheletiiakh do n.e.* [Ethnocultural development of the Middle East in the IV–I millennium BC], Scientific conference materials (Moscow, October 26–27, 2017), Moscow : Institut vostokovedeniia RAN, pp. 100–108 (in Russian).
 40. Stendebach = Stendebach F. J. (2003). “שֵׁלֶם” *šelem*, in G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren (eds.). *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* : In 15 v.,

- v. 12, Grand Rapids, MI : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 386–396.
41. *Teachings* = Shifman Il'ia (trans.) (1993). *Uchenie : Piatiknizhie* [Teachings : Pentateuch]. Moscow : Respublika (in Russian).
42. *The Book of Ben Sira* = *The Book of Ben Sira : Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (1973). Jerusalem : The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book.
43. *The Dead Sea Scrolls* = Martinez F. G., Tigchelaar E. J. C. (eds.) (1997–1998). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* : In 2 v. Leiden [etc.] : E. J. Brill ; Grand Rapids, MI ; Cambridge, U. K. : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
44. *Tobin* = Tobin T. H. (1983). *The Creation of Man : Philo and the History of Interpretation*. Washington, DC : The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
45. *Urbach* = Urbach E. (2016). *The Sages of the Talmud*. Transl. E. Levina, M. Orlova. Moscow : Mosty kul'tury ; Jerusalem : Gesharim (Russian translation).
46. *VanderKam* = VanderKam J. C. (2000). “Jubilees, Book of”, in H. Schiffman, J. C. VanderKam (eds.). *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* : In 2 v., v. 1, Oxford et al. : Oxford University Press, pp. 434–438.
47. *Westermann* = Westermann C. (1984). *Genesis 1–11 : A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN : Ausburg Publishing House ; London : SPCK.
48. *Wilson, Blomberg* = Wilson R. W., Blomberg C. L. (1993). “The image of God in humanity: a biblical-psychological perspective”. *Themelios*, v. 18, n. 3, 1993, pp. 8–15.
49. *Wintermute* = Wintermute O. S. (transl.) (1985). “Jubilees (Second Century B. C.)”, in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* : In 2 v., v. 2, New York et al. : Doubleday, pp. 52–142.
50. *Wolff* = Wolff H. W. (1974). *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. London : SCM Press.
51. *Yevhamoth* = Levinov M. (2013). “Traktat Jevamot” [“Tractate Yevhamoth”], in *Mishna* [Mishana], v. 2 : *Razdel Nashim (ZHenshchiny)* [Nashim (Women)], Moscow : Knizhniki : Lekhaim, pp. 11–160 (Russian translation).

List of Abbreviations

M. Jevhamoth	Mishnah tractate Jevhamoth
Jub	The Book of Jubilees
BDB	The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon
CD (CD–A)	the Damascus Document
LXX	The Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
4Q216 (4Q Jub ^a)	The 1 st Scroll of Jubilees from Qumran Cave 4

6Q15 (6QD) 6QD Damascus Document A fragment of the Damascus
Document from Qumran Cave 6

Tractates of Philo of Alexandria

Abr.	De Abrahamo / On Abraham
Agr.	De agricultura / On Agriculture
Cher.	De Cherubim / On the
Contempl.	De vita contemplativa / On the Contemplative Life
Fug.	De fuga et inventione / On Flight and Finding
Her.	Quis rerum divinarum heres sit / Who is the Heir of Divine Things
Leg.	Legum allegoriae / The Allegories of the Laws
Lin.	De confusione linguarum / A Treatise on the Confusion of Languages
Mut.	De mutatione nominum / On the Changing of Names
Opif.	De opificio mundi / On the Creation of the World According to Moses
Plant.	De plantatione / De plantatione
Pot.	Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat / That the worse are inclined to prey upon the better
QG	Quaestiones in Genesim / Questions on the Book of Genesis
Sacr.	De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini / On the sacrifices of Abel and Cain
Somn.	De somniis / On dreams
Spec.	De specialibus legibus / On special laws
Virt.	De virtutibus / On virtue