

Male and Female in Galatians 3:28: A Short Biblical Theology of Unity

Daniel Wayne Roberts

Cameron Avenue Church of Christ, Colonial Heights, VA

Abstract: *Paul's use of the OT has been a subject of great interest within the field of biblical theology, with special interest on Pauline echoes and/or allusions. While direct quotations are often obvious, recognizing echoes and/or allusions requires more sophistication and nuance. Galatians 3:28 is a rare case of a direct quote going relatively unnoticed by scholarship, which is then followed by a one-word allusion to further solidify Paul's claims concerning unity. This study contends that in Gal 3:28 Paul quotes Gen 1:27 (ἄρσεν και θήλυ), though it appears without an introductory formula, and that this purposeful quotation of Gen 1:27 is meant to couple with an allusion to Gen 2:24 to articulate further Paul's theology of unity found in Christ. The subtlety that Paul employs underscores the variety of ways Paul utilizes the OT and how Paul's deliberate change of wording illuminates his theology.*

Key Words: *allusion, biblical theology, echo, female, Galatians 3:28, gender, male, Paul, unity*

The study of the NT's use of the OT is notoriously slippery, particularly when it comes to categorizing the various methods the NT authors employ.¹ Direct quotes are usually the easiest to identify in that there is

¹ Defining biblical theology itself can also be a daunting task—a wide spectrum separates more descriptive uses from prescriptive ones. Depending on one's position on this spectrum, there are numerous ways of identifying the disparate uses of the OT in the NT. James Barr says as much in the beginnings of his own work on biblical theology, though not speaking expressly of the NT use of the OT. He explains, “One of its weaknesses, however, has been the difficulty of defining exactly what it is. The very idea of ‘biblical theology’ seems to hang uncertainly in middle air, somewhere between actual exegesis and systematic theology.” James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 2. Edward Klink and Darian Lockett provide a helpful taxonomy of biblical theology in *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012). Works focused on the NT

substantial verbal agreement between the new text and the text being quoted, or there is the ever-helpful introductory formula (e.g., “it is written ...”).² However, on some occasions, though a text is being quoted, there is no introductory formula, and the text quoted may consist of only a word, or maybe a few words. For example, in 1 Pet 2:9 a string of such quotations is taken from Isa 43:20–21, Exod 19:5–6, Deut 4:20, 7:6, and 14:2 (as well as a possible allusion to Isa 9:2).³ Sometimes, these short quoted texts may also be intended to draw one's attention to the “rest of the story,” so to speak, and to borrow and reimagine it in a new context.⁴ These uses are the most difficult to identify because they require a greater degree of sophistication, both of author and reader. This study contends

use of the OT include G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), and the volume edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007). Many works practice “biblical theology” but do not necessarily focus on the NT use of the OT, at least not the NT as a whole. A few examples include G. K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, LNTS (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998); C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet Co., 1953); R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Vancouver: Regent College, 1998); Steve Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010).

² It should be noted that sometimes a formula does not “introduce” a quote but may follow it (e.g., Matt 24:14; Rom 2:24). At any rate, the formula is a signal that what is being said, or had been said, is purposefully being quoted as evidence of a claim.

³ Another example is Mark's account of Jesus's words concerning the “abomination of desolation.” In Matthew, Jesus specifically mentions Daniel. However, in Mark, the phrase “abomination of desolation” serves as a marker to the book of Daniel, though there is no specific reference outside of the phrase “let the reader understand” (see Mark 13:14 and Matt 24:15).

⁴ One such example may be Jesus's cry from the cross quoted from Psalm 22 in Matthew. Jesus's cry of abandonment is not isolated from the rest of Psalm 22 or even divorced from his own ministry and death. Just what Jesus is indicating through his cry is debated, but that he is purposefully drawing one's mind to Psalm 22 and the surrounding context of his own abandonment is obvious. Matthew helps in this regard as he records other happenings in the Passion narrative that also find resonance and reference within Psalm 22 (e.g., Matt 27:43/Ps 22:4, 8). For a more thorough examination of the various correlations between Psalm 22 and the Passion in Matthew, see Craig Blomberg, “Matthew,” in Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 97–100. See also Luke 13:19.

that Paul in Gal 3:27–28 quotes Gen 1:27, though the quote appears without an introductory formula, and that this purposeful quotation of Gen 1:27 is meant to couple with an allusion to Gen 2:24 to articulate further the unity found in Christ.⁵

Galatians 3:27–28 is a theologically significant passage, some of which Paul repeats as a liturgy of sorts in some of other epistles.⁶ The theological thrust of the passage is one of the pillars of his theology—that being “in Christ” dismantles worldly partitions. Galatians 3:28 provides a special quandary for the interpreter because of the addition of ἄρσεν και θήλυ (“male and female”), a phrase found nowhere else in Pauline literature and found only two other times in the whole of the NT (Matt 19:4; Mark 10:6). Several commentators have noted the similarity of Gal 3:28 to Gen 1:27, but these (to my knowledge) have not argued systematically whether or not Paul is quoting or alluding to Gen 1:27 and, if so, how that affects the way in which one should read the surrounding context of Gal 3:27–28 in relation to Gen 2:24.⁷

This study proposes to accomplish several goals. (1) This study will focus on the context of the phrase ἄρσεν και θήλυ in the Greek OT, noting the specific use of the phrase in Gen 1:27 and 5:2. The context of Gen 2:24 will also be considered because it is explicitly connected with 1:27 in two of the three occurrences of the phrase ἄρσεν και θήλυ in the NT (Matt 19:4–5; Mark 10:6–7) and likely has some important implications for Gal 3:28. (2) This study will also examine the way in which the phrase ἄρσεν και θήλυ is understood in Gen 1:27 as well as Gen 2:24 in the Second Temple/early Jewish period. This early Jewish literature does not consist of seminal discussions taken up by Jesus and the Christians. In other words, Jesus (and subsequently, Christianity) seems to be the first

⁵ Richard Hays’s study is especially significant for the study of Paul’s more subtle uses of the OT, what he calls echoes and allusions. This specific example, not discussed by Hays, arguably passes all seven of his tests for Pauline echoes. See Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 29–32.

⁶ Rom 10:12; 1 Cor 12:13; Eph 6:8; Col 3:11.

⁷ For example, see F. F. Bruce, *Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 189; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 157; James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNTC (London: A & C Black), 206–7, and Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 175. One exception may be Richard Hove, *Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1999), 66–69, who argues that Paul is likely deliberately quoting Gen 1:27, yet Hove still opts for translating the phrase “male nor female” in keeping with the first two couplets. One should also note that the UBS 4th and 5th revisions do not include a reference to Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28.

to tie Gen 1:27 and 2:24 together explicitly. (3) The way in which Jesus used these passages in conjunction with one another will also be reviewed in an attempt to make a case that Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are related in Christian thought with regard to the unity of marriage, which Paul compares to the unity of Christ and the church. (4) Paul’s use of Genesis 1–3 will be examined (both direct and indirect references) in an attempt to situate his theology within Jesus’s theology of Gen 1:27 and 2:24. Several similarities and differences will be pointed out in Galatians and other Pauline literature in order to demonstrate that Gal 3:28 fits within the wider context of Pauline theology and that his addition of the phrase ἄρσεν και θήλυ is purposeful and has significant theological value. Within this section, several motifs and themes found within Gal 3:28 will be traced as well as significant verbal and syntactical clues. (5) Galatians 3:27–28 will be expounded focusing on the Pauline themes and verbal cues that suggest Paul is explicitly and purposefully quoting Gen 1:27 and means to imply the latter part of Gen 2:24 through the use of the word εἰς/μίαν (Gal 3:28//Gen 2:24).

Implications

The modern debates concerning Gal 3:28 revolve not around the text itself, but about how the text is interpreted concerning the role of women in the church. Feminist readings have predominantly read in Gal 3:28 a gospel that completely erases all distinctions of race, gender, or social class in church leadership and ministry in particular.⁸ However, on the whole of Pauline exegesis, this interpretation cannot be supported because it presses one into taking Gal 3:28 as more fundamental than other texts or makes Paul ambivalent and confused.⁹ Keener warns against this sort of cultural reading, stating, “One of the greatest tragedies of history is when God’s holy Scripture, addressing one situation, is uncritically applied to another situation while ignoring the larger tenor of Scripture.”¹⁰ One must read Gal 3:28 within the overall matrix of Pauline theology, which accommodates gender distinctions as well as instructions to slaves and Jewish

⁸ See, e.g., Pauline Nigh Hogan, “No Longer Male and Female:” *Interpreting Galatians 3:28 in Early Christianity*, LNTS 380 (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 6–19. Hogan’s work traces the history of interpretation of this passage giving special attention to those like Stendahl, Meeks, MacDonald, and Firoenza.

⁹ See, e.g., W. M. Ramsay, *The Teachings of Paul in the Present Day* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913), 214–15, and Craig Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women’s Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 20–21.

¹⁰ Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 210.

cultic practices. Thus, though the Jews no longer had to practice certain food regulations or attend feasts, they had the freedom to do so. They did not have to give up their Jewish identity completely. Though Philemon was urged to treat Onesimus as “no longer a slave but a brother” (Phlm 16) slaves were still asked to serve their masters well, and masters were told how to treat their slaves (1 Cor 7:17–24;¹¹ Eph 6:5–9; Col 3:22–4:1). Gender roles, or gender distinction, are also discussed by Paul, even in his undisputed letters (e.g., 1 Cor 11:8–9; 14:34–35).¹² Thus, Gal 3:28 is not about gender equality *per se* but about the unity found in Christ. To be balanced, a certain liberty and an equality that otherwise had not been granted to women were offered in Christ (by his actions) as well as Paul and the early church (e.g., Acts 16:14–15; Rom 16:1).

One should note that in each of these cases in which Paul appeals to Genesis, he is attempting to strengthen the position he takes on these gender roles. For example, when explaining that a man ought not to have intercourse with a prostitute, he quotes Gen 2:24 to prove that whoever joins himself to a prostitute has become one with her (1 Cor 6:15–16).¹³ Interestingly enough, in this instance, he also makes a case about unity with the Lord, *ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμα ἐστίν* (“... the one who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit with him”), using the same verb used in 1 Cor 6:15 and the unquoted portion of Gen 2:24 as used in Matt 19:5.¹⁴ In other words, this is yet another case in which the oneness of marriage is both physical and/or sexual as well as spiritual in Paul’s thinking (Gen 2:24 is used as is the word “one”).

Because there are no instances of these connections in contemporary literature (or in early Jewish literature), Paul may have relied upon the Jesus tradition (or one of the early Gospels) for his theology. While the questions Paul and Jesus are answering are different, one cannot easily dismiss the fact that the phrase *ἄρσεν και θήλυ* appears in only these two places in the NT, both in close conjunction to the unity found in two becoming one. So, the two ethnicities of Jew and Gentile become one in Christ, just as the two classes of slaves and freemen. The “male and fe-

¹¹ It is worth noting, however, that in 1 Cor 7:17–24 the only situation in which release is encouraged is slavery (1 Cor 7:21).

¹² First Corinthians 14:34–35 is particularly problematic if taken out of its context or if “as in all the churches” is to be taken with the silence of women. See Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 70–88.

¹³ Proof, again, in an undisputed Pauline letter that he was familiar with and used Gen 2:24 in a way similar to the argument of this work.

¹⁴ The form of the verb used in Gen 2:24 in the LXX is *προσκολλάω*.

male” dichotomy is also erased through marriage/intercourse, and marriage creates a new “oneness” that otherwise is not achieved.¹⁵ So, in 1 Corinthians 7 Paul can understand that slaves remain slaves yet still be equal active participants in the body of Christ. The same is true of Jew/Gentile relationships, which is a prevalent issue in Galatians and throughout Pauline literature, a distinction that drove the premier battle of the early church.

Paul’s quotation of Gen 1:27 illuminates his theology. If, in some mysterious way (as in Ephesians), a man and woman can become one flesh,¹⁶ and so Christ and the church are also wed (2 Cor 11:2), then in a similar way, the distinctions of Jew and Gentile, slave and free, and male and female can be erased in Christ while still being Jewish, free, and male or female.¹⁷ Paul is quoting Gen 1:27 and in turn 2:24 in order to compare the unity that comes in Christ with the unity of marriage. As has been (and will be) demonstrated, Paul’s biblical theologies of marriage and unity in Christ are not isolated to Gal 3:28. However, Paul’s quotation of Gen 1:27 (2:24) solidifies the radical nature of his proposal to the Galatian Jews—Greeks can be one with Jews in Christ just as men and women can be one through marriage, and in this case, can be one in Christ. There may be further implications for modern society, gender roles in the church, and the ministries of women. However, this study is seeking primarily to demonstrate Paul’s subtle, deliberate quotation of Gen 1:27 to draw one’s mind to the unity found in Christ compared with the unity of man and woman in marriage by an allusion to, or echo of, Gen 2:24.

ἄρσεν και θήλυ in the OT

In order to demonstrate the way in which Paul uses the phrase *ἄρσεν και θήλυ* in Gal 3:28, a review of the phrase in the OT is necessary, focusing especially on the LXX because Paul seems to quote from the LXX.¹⁸ The phrase as Paul uses it appears only in Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19, 20;

¹⁵ Further illustrating this point is Paul’s argument in 1 Cor 7:1–7 regarding marriage and singleness. Marriage itself requires attention be given to one’s spouse, whereas the single person is wholly devoted to God. Cf. also 1 Cor 6:16–17.

¹⁶ See also 1 Cor 6:15–16 above.

¹⁷ See Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*, trans. Erasmus Middleton (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1979), 223–24, and Dunn, *Galatians*, 207–8.

¹⁸ Paul, although often quoting the LXX, feels free to modify slightly these texts. For example, in Romans 4, Paul quotes Gen 15:6 three times, not once

7:2, 3, 9, 16 (Exod 1:16, 22, and Lev 12:7 all have the same words in the passage but not the specific phraseology of Gal 3:28; see also 2 Macc 7:21).¹⁹ This cluster of uses in the first portion of Genesis demonstrates the primary significance of the phrase as that which conveys the elementary aspects of creation, procreation, and multiplication. Each instance in Genesis 6–7 refers to the male and female animals that entered the ark.²⁰ Exodus 1:16 and 1:22 refer to the male and female children being born to the Hebrews. The one example in Leviticus also refers to the sex of children born (12:7). The exact phrase Paul uses in reference to humanity is found in Gen 1:27 and 5:2. In the LXX, both of these verses contain the sentence ἄρσεν και θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.²¹ In Gen 1:27, the focus is humanity (τὸν ἄνθρωπον) made in the image and likeness of God, which

quoting it precisely the same way (Rom 4:3, 9, 22). Similarly, see Paul's quotation of Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19, wherein he quotes the LXX text verbatim aside from the final verb. See C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 186. Though beyond the scope of this study to exhaust fully, many works focus on the NT use of the OT, and more specifically Paul's use of the OT. These works include E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981); C. D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004); Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*; Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 88–116. Among these, Ellis's and Hays's works are premier works on the subject. As noted in earlier, sometimes identifying or categorizing references to the OT can prove problematic. The primary intent of this work is not to situate the use of Gen 1:27 and 2:24 among the already-constructed categories, but to determine whether Paul's use of these passages is purposeful, and what that purposeful use conveys. However, if pressed, I would classify Paul's use of Gen 1:27 as a quotation and his use of Gen 2:24 as an intertextual "echo."

¹⁹ ἄρσεν in the LXX: Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19–20; 7:2–3, 9, 16; 17:14, 23; 34:24; Exod 1:16–22; 2:2; 12:5; Lev 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:23; 6:22; 7:6; 12:2, 7; 15:33; 18:22; 20:13; 22:19; 27:3, 5–7; Num 1:2; 3:40; 31:17–18; Josh 17:2; Judg 21:11–12; Job 3:3; Isa 26:14; 66:7; Jer 20:15; 37:6; Mal 1:14; Tob. 6:12; Sir 36:21; 2 Macc 7:21; 4 Macc 15:30; Odes Sol. 5:14.

θήλυς in the LXX: Gen 1:27; 5:2; 6:19–20; 7:2–3, 9, 16; Exod 1:16, 22; Lev 3:1, 6; 4:28, 32; 5:6; 12:5, 7; 15:33; 27:4–7; Num 31:15; Judg 5:10; 1 Kgs 10:26; 2 Chr 9:25; Prov 30:31; Job 1:3, 14; 42:12; Amos 6:12; Jdt 9:10; 13:15; 16:5; 2 Macc 7:21.

²⁰ The only exception is Gen 7:16, which refers to the male and female of all flesh (ἀπο πάσης σαρκός), likely a reference to both animals and humanity.

²¹ The Hebrew reads זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרֵא אֱתָם.

some have understood to be an androgynous human.²² However, in Gen 5:2, rather than referring to them (the man and woman) as τὸν ἄνθρωπον ("man" or "mankind"), they are referred to by the name *Adam* (ἐπωνόμασεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν Ἀδάμ, "He named them man ..."). So, in the context of Genesis the phrase refers to the distinct sex of both humanity and animals.²³

The context of Gen 2:24 encompasses a more thorough explanation of the creation of woman. Adam ("mankind")²⁴ was alone (and presumably male), so a helper was sought among the animals (Gen 2:18–20).²⁵ A helper was not found from the animals, so God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him and he took a rib from his side. The flesh closed up, and woman (ἡψῆς; γυνή) was formed.²⁶ Adam proclaims about her, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh" (Gen 2:23), which is a Semitic phrase found throughout the OT denoting familial relationships

²² For example, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 195–200. See also Wayne A. Meeks, "Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13.3 (1974): 165–208. This discussion of androgyny is peripheral (at best) to the present inquiry. However, it should suffice to say that commentators seem to be in relative agreement that although the post-Pauline church may have understood the passage in this way, Paul himself likely did not mean to erase social distinction, race, or gender, but to speak to the oneness—unity—found in Christ in spite of these differences. Galatians 3:28 should not be interpreted in isolation from the rest of Pauline theology and church practice. See Dunn, *Galatians*, 206–7 and Fung, *Galatians*, 175.

²³ Cf. Gen 1:27, 5:2; 6:19, 20; 7:2, 3, 9, 16.

²⁴ It should be noted that the name and designation of humankind as "Adam" can refer to both the individual Adam as well as humankind. One study recounted every use of both אָדָם and אֱנוֹשׁ in the OT, concluding that Adam is best understood as "mankind" and not "male." However, the study itself is not altogether helpful as it pertains to our specific inquiry because Paul is not quoting the MT, but the LXX. In the LXX, ἄνθρωπος is used in place of אֱנוֹשׁ in Gen 2:24. However, in Gen 1:27, the LXX still uses the term ἄνθρωπος although the word in the MT is Adam. See Alison Grant, "'Adam and 'Ish: Man in the OT,'" *ABR* 25 (1977): 2–11. There is some overlap in the meaning of the words, but ἄνθρωπος encompasses, in some way, the meaning of them both. However, ἄρσεν captures well the idea of gender and is thus used instead of either word for "man/one" or "humankind." See BDAG, "ἄρσεν," 135.

²⁵ See Josephus's interpretation in *Ant. 1.1.33* and *1.2.35–6*. In Gen 1:27 he seems to think that what God created "male and female" were the animals. And that "Moses, after the seventh day was over, begins to speak philosophically" (*Ant. 1.2.34*).

²⁶ The creation of male then female will be significant later in one of Paul's arguments concerning gender roles (1 Tim 2:13).

(Gen 29:14; Jdg 9:2; 2 Sam 5:1; 19:12–13; 1 Chr 11:1; Job 2:5; 19:20). Then comes the editorial comment of the writer of Genesis: “For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh” (2:24).²⁷ In connection with this editorial comment, France writes, “In the Genesis context the ‘one flesh’ image derives from the creation of the woman out of the man’s side to be ‘bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh’ (Gen 2:21–23); in marriage that unity is restored.”²⁸ In other words, the marriage of Adam and Eve—two separate beings—restores the “one flesh” of humankind.

In the immediate context of Gen 2:24, there does not seem to be a purposeful reference to Gen 1:27. In fact, depending on the interpreter, 2:24 may simply represent another iteration of the account of the creation of mankind.²⁹ Genesis 1:27 is a bird’s eye view concerning the creation of man and woman and their distinct roles (thus the phrase *ἄρσεν και θήλυ*), while 2:24 is a commentary on the unity between the two that stands above even the relationship between father and mother.³⁰ As will be noted in the following sections, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus connects the two passages with regard to the unity of marriage. There are possibly other considerations for these original texts, but for the purpose of this study it is important to note (1) the clustering of usage early in Genesis, (2) the phrase *ἄρσεν και θήλυ* as demonstrative of creative activity, and (3) these two (male and female) are brought together (by God) into one

²⁷ See William Reyburn and Euan McG. Fry, *A Handbook on Genesis* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1997), 75, and Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 84–85. Certainly, some see this narrative as mythic—not referring to the specific persons of Adam and Eve. So, in their case, this excursion/editorial comment is a way for the author/editors of Genesis to justify and explain marriage. For example, see Georg Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. David Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968; originally published in German 1965), 85–95.

²⁸ R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 717.

²⁹ In fact, many Introductions discuss the Documentary Hypothesis and its various iterations citing Genesis 1 and 2 as examples of two separate documents/traditions edited and/or redacted as the Genesis account. For example, see Michael D. Coogan, *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 10–14, 21–29, and William Samford Lasor, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 6–13.

³⁰ Honoring one’s father and mother is a significant OT motif iterated many times. This comment in the creation account may have been added to strengthen and validate a man who must leave his own household to live with his wife (e.g., Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16).

flesh.³¹

Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 in Early Jewish Literature

These Genesis narratives are retold numerous times in early Jewish literature.³² Several works such as the Jubilees,³³ Life of Adam and Eve, and the Genesis Apocryphon retell the story of creation; however, the explicit meaning of Gen 1:27, 2:24, and 5:2 is not discussed in great detail. Philo expounds both passages, though his discussions are not immediately relevant to its use in the NT, or Gal 3:28 in particular. In one case, Philo allegorizes the text: mind (the man), father (God), mother (the “mother of all things”), and woman (external sensation/rose).³⁴ He also expounds the reasons that the man (not the woman) leaves his father and mother, which include fidelity, the man’s “master-like authority,” and the woman “being in the rank of a servant, is praised, for assenting to a life of communion” (*QG* 1.29). Concerning Gen 2:24 and the “one flesh” of the union of man and woman he states that the “flesh is very tangible and fully endowed with outward senses” (*QG* 1.29), which are pain and pleasure enjoyed by the man and woman. Watts notes that later Rabbinic tradition mentions both 1:27 and 2:24 in various forums and “often together.”³⁵ Most notable are the discussions of marriage and “procreation as a requirement thereof” (m. Yebam. 6:6; b. Mo’ed Qat. 8b; 23a; b. Yebam. 61b).³⁶ According to Watts, the Babylonian Talmud also uses these verses in conjunction, but after having reviewed the material he cites, there seems to be no explicit, purposeful connection between these

³¹ Watts also notes regarding Gen 2:24, “In other words, this is not merely descriptive, but rather, in the context of Torah, constitutes a divine decree.” Rikk Watts, “Mark,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 197.

³² Cf. 4 Macc 18:7 and the connection between “rib” and womanhood.

³³ See especially Jub. 3:7.

³⁴ Alleg. Interp. 2.49.

³⁵ Watts, “Mark,” 198.

³⁶ Watts, “Mark,” 198. In contrast to the predominant focus on marriage and procreation by the rabbis, Ben Witherington argues that Paul purposefully invokes Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28 in opposition to the idea that one *must* be married or married to a circumcised male to be considered part of the community. For Paul, the oneness found in Christ is not based on ethnic, social, or marital status. In other words, as Witherington understands it, Paul’s emphasis is not on gender distinction (male *or* female), but that marriage is not a requisite of covenant membership (male *and* female; cf. 1 Cor 7). See Ben Witherington III, “Rite and Rights for Women—Gal 3:28,” *NTS* 27.5 (1981): 599.

two verses and no substantial similarity with the argument Jesus made.³⁷ This reality should not be overstated, lest some details have been missed. At any rate, one would be hard-pressed to demonstrate that the Talmud or Mishnah predated Jesus's or Paul's own quotations of these passages for the purpose of defining marital and Christian unity.

The DSS contain two documents that mention Gen 2:24. CD 4:21 quotes this passage as an argument against polygamy. The writer of the Damascus Document explains, "[T]hey are caught in two traps: fornication, by taking two wives in their lifetime although the principle of creation is 'male and female He created them.'"³⁸ Also 4Q416 2 iii 21–iv.1 reiterates the teaching of the passages as a midrash. The wife is to be lived with (in contrast to living with father and mother) and that "He has made you rule over her, so [...] God did not give [her father] authority over her, He has separated her from her mother, and unto you [He has given authority.... He has made your wife] and you into one flesh." Thus, the argument of the community was that because the woman has left father and mother, this gives the man authority over her and that they share one flesh.³⁹

Later Gnostic tradition and apocryphal gospels understood these passages (possibly coupled with Gal 3:28) to erase sexual identity.⁴⁰ For example, Hippolytus says that the Naassenes believed in a bisexual being, "For ... Attis was castrated, that is, (cut off) from the earthly parts of the creation (here) below, and has gone over to the eternal substance above where, he says, there is neither female nor male (οὐκ ἔστιν θῆλυ οὔτε ἄρσεν),⁴¹ but a new creature, a new man, which is bisexual

³⁷ The texts to which he refers are Gen. Rab. 17:4; b. Ketub. 8a; Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 1:27; Gen. Rab. 8:1; b. Ber. 61a; b. 'Erub. 18a; Midr. Ps. 139:5; b. Mo'ed Qat. 7b; 8b; 18b; 23a; b. Git 43b; m. Yebam 6:6; b. Yebam 61b. See Watts, *Mark*, 198.

³⁸ The writer follows with Gen 7:2 (the animals entered the ark two by two) and the command to the king not to multiply wives (Deut 17:17), which follows with an explanation of why David was justified in his multiplying of wives. One might note that this quotation may go beyond polygamy and prohibit having more than one wife at all (even if one wife should die), which Paul mentions two times in the NT, except in regard to a woman's responsibility to her husband (Rom 7:2–3; 1 Cor 7:39). Notice that Jesus holds a similar position regarding divorce (Matt 5:32; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18).

³⁹ This may be an implicit argument of Paul in 1 Cor 7:36–39, though he does not cite Gen 2:24 as evidence.

⁴⁰ See Betz, *Galatians*, 195–96, especially n. 118–21.

⁴¹ This syntax and verbiage are what one would expect in Paul's tripartite formula in Gal 3:28.

(ἄρσενόθηλος).⁴² One can see from this text that some early Christians misread Paul and followed the syntax of the first two pairings (Jew/Greek, slave/free) which read οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλληνι, οὐκ ἐν δούλῳ οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος. However, as will be noted more fully below, the conjunction Paul uses between male (ἄρσεν) and female (θῆλυς) is not "nor" (οὐδέ) but "and" (καί).

In sum, early Jewish literature does not combine Gen 1:27 with 2:24 explicitly; thus, this connection is likely an early Christian link, following the theology of Jesus himself. For example, though the explicit verbal connection between being "male and female" and intercourse or marriage is absent prior to Christianity, several apocryphal gospels and Nag Hammadi literature seem to make this connection.⁴³ As is demonstrated below, Jesus does explicitly connect Gen 1:27 to 2:24 and both 1:27 (Gal 3:28) and 2:24 (Eph 5:31) are used elsewhere in the NT, which may have made up part of the sub-structure of NT theology concerning marriage/divorce and unity.⁴⁴ So, though Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are discussed in early Jewish literature, the explicit theological connection of these two passages seems to be one of Christian ingenuity.

Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 in the New Testament

Besides Gal 3:28, the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ is used only three times in the NT. These two quotations are found in the Gospel accounts of Jesus's discussion about divorce with the Pharisees (Matt 19:4; Mark 10:6).⁴⁵ It is the intention of this study to draw a connection between Jesus's use of Gen 1:27 in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 and a similar usage in Gal 3:28. This phrase (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) is encountered so few times, it is difficult to imagine Paul and the Gospel writers not referring to the same two passages, each followed by the idea of unity using a form of the word εἷς ("one"). As noted above, these phrases have not been connected prior to Matthew and Mark in early Jewish literature, so Paul may be using a

⁴² Hippolytus, *Ref. Her.* 5.2.15.

⁴³ Betz, *Galatians*, 195–96; Watts, "Mark," 198.

⁴⁴ See Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 30. Dodd's hypothesis is that unless otherwise noted, when the same texts are quoted, a common tradition is represented.

⁴⁵ It is worth noting that Luke, who shares considerable continuity with Matthew, does not incorporate this quotation or Jesus's teaching on divorce.

uniquely Christian hermeneutic.⁴⁶ What follows is a review of the Evangelists' and Paul's usage of the phrase.

Jesus in Matthew and Mark

The two instances of ἄρσεν και θήλυ in Matt 19:3 and Mark 10:4 are essentially the same though there are slight variations in the verbiage of the accounts. The Pharisees ask Jesus about the lawfulness of divorce (Matt 19:3; Mark 10:4)⁴⁷ in an attempt to test him.⁴⁸ Jesus answers by saying that “from the beginning” (ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, Mark 10:6; ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Matt 19:4) “God made them male and female” (ἄρσεν και θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς). Then Jesus connects Gen 1:27 with Gen 2:24, both of which are quoted in Matthew and Mark:⁴⁹ Ἔνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα και τὴν μητέρα και κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, και ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.⁵⁰ The quotation is identical to the LXX except for some slight, relatively insignificant derivations.⁵¹ Then, Jesus explains, ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία. ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωρίζετω (“so no longer are they two but one flesh; Therefore, whatever God has joined let not man separate”).

⁴⁶ Though there may be some difficulty with the dating and chronology of the Gospels and Galatians, one can justifiably assume that even if Galatians were written first, that Jesus's words attested by the tradition found in both Matthew and Mark provide the backdrop for this uniquely Christian hermeneutic. In either case, regardless of which came first, Paul and the Evangelists seem to be the only ones to employ Gen 1:27 and 2:24 in this way.

⁴⁷ In the Matthean account the Pharisees ask if a man can put away his wife for any reason (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν), whereas in Mark they simply ask the question, εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. Also, Mark seems to be stating their question as an indirect quotation, while Matthew has the statement recorded as a direct quotation.

⁴⁸ Both Matthew and Mark record the reason for the Pharisees' questioning of Jesus (πειράζοντες αὐτόν; Matt 19:3; Mark 10:2).

⁴⁹ A textual variant in Mark omits και κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ. Bruce Metzger and the committee for the UBS³ opt for the fuller reading: “In order to represent the very close balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to include the clause in the text (where it seems to be necessary for the sense, otherwise οἱ δύο in ver. 8 could be taken to refer to the father and the mother!), but to enclose it within square brackets.” Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the UBS Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), 104.

⁵⁰ “Because of this, man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.”

⁵¹ Matthew omits αὐτοῦ as well as the prefix προσ- and the word πρὸς before τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ.

In both Matthew and Mark, Jesus expects his audience to make an important connection in his argument. Jesus could have quoted Gen 2:24 if his point were only that man and woman come together in marriage and thus become one flesh. However, the first quotation of 1:27 “establishes the complementarity of male and female within God's created order, but does not itself directly address the issue of divorce or indeed marriage as such.”⁵² The connection to be made is that God made male and female with the intention to join them. France points out that Jesus is not concerned with a documentary hypothesis behind two different creation stories as in modern critical studies.⁵³ Rather, Jesus's focal point is his conclusion, “what God has joined, let no man separate” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). Notice also his words just prior that reiterate Gen 2:24, “so they are no longer two, but one flesh,” which is quite similar to Paul's “male and female” (two) made “one” in Christ Jesus. Jesus is not insinuating that God was only performing the first marriage, but that the joining of man and woman was God's intention “from the beginning” (Matt 19:4) by the creation of two sexes.⁵⁴ Similar to the use of the DSS, Jesus combats marriage/divorce or the multiplication of wives with Gen 1:27. However, the connection with Gen 2:24 seems to be original with Jesus.

⁵² France, *Matthew*, 716–17.

⁵³ France, *Matthew*, 717.

⁵⁴ Jesus here does not intend to suggest that God created an androgynous, sexless being that was later sexualized, or that the two becoming one somehow erases sexual identity. Rather, Jesus's point seems to be that Gen 1:27 speaks of macro-creation—that male and female were created in complement to one another. Then, with the addition of 2:24, he further explains that these two created beings became one. This complementarity can be seen in the use of the words “male and female” in regard to both animals and mankind. Other implications may include that because Eve was taken from the rib, Adam and Eve began as one flesh and returned to that state with marital unity. However, one must draw concrete conclusions based on the evidence of the passage and Jesus's usage, which is that two distinct beings are (re)joined by God—two become one flesh. See Betz, *Galatians*, 195–200, and Meeks, “Image of the Androgyne,” 165–208. See also Daniel Boyarin, “Paul and the Genealogy of Gender,” *Representation* 41 (1993): 1–33. Both Meeks's and Boyarin's works stand in opposition to what seems to be the plain sense of Paul's isolated use of “male and female” in Gal 3:28. Boyarin focuses on the “spiritual” element of Galatians in contrast to the “fleshly” element of 1 Corinthians. I am not sure this bifurcation is completely warranted. He often cites Meeks and Dennis MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominical Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*, HDR (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1987).

Paul

Although he does not always use direct quotations, Paul points to the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall regularly.⁵⁵ In 1 Tim 2:13–15, the Pauline tradition points to the Fall as evidence for the submission of wives, or better, that women should not “exercise authority” over men.⁵⁶ Paul concludes, “For it was Adam who was first created, *and* then Eve. And *it was* not Adam *who* was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression” (NASB, italics original). So, even though a specific text is not quoted, the story of Creation and the Fall are utilized to strengthen his argument for the creation story as the foundation of his thought on the roles of men and women in marriage and in the church.⁵⁷ One major facet of Paul’s Christology is also based on the Creation story and the Fall (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 47)—Adam and the death that reigned through his disobedience is juxtaposed with the life granted through Jesus and his resurrection. This usage has a typological element and is understood only through the lens of the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall. Another facet of Paul’s theology, though not quoted from Genesis explicitly, is the concept of “image” (εἰκόνας). Paul uses the word εἰκόνας nine times.⁵⁸ In 1 Cor 11:7, Paul explicitly references man (not humankind, but *a man/ἀνὴρ*) made in the image and glory of God.⁵⁹ In 1 Cor 15:48–49, however, the “image” humans bear is that of Adam (earthly), but that humanity shall also bear the image of the heavenly

⁵⁵ See Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 6:16–17; 11:8–9; 15:21–22; 45–51; 2 Cor 11:3; Eph 4:24; 5:31–32; Col 3:10; 1 Tim 2:13–15. Although the monograph does not contain any reference to Gal 3:28 as an explicit quote from Genesis, *Genesis in the New Testament* demonstrates the prolific use of Genesis in the NT with two chapters devoted wholly to Pauline and “pseudo-Pauline” epistles. See chapters 6 and 7 in Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2012), 99–129.

⁵⁶ An entire monograph was written with this passage in mind with contributors discussing various aspects of the passage from the Ephesian situation, the history of interpretation, to the meaning of the word αὐθεντεῖν. See Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church: An Interpretation and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016). In this study, Ephesians, Colossians, and 1 Timothy are considered Pauline documents. Whether Pauline or not, these passages demonstrate reliance on the Genesis account of the creation of man and woman as well as an early Christian quotation of Gen 2:24.

⁵⁷ Similarly, see 2 Cor 11:2–3.

⁵⁸ Rom 1:23; 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:29 (twice); 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10.

⁵⁹ The woman in this case is the glory of the man which keeps with Paul’s understanding of headship. Christ is the head of the man, and the man is the head of the woman (1 Cor 11:3; Eph 5:23).

(Christ). So again, Paul uses Adam and the Fall as an antithetical archetype to Christ and the resurrection. Pauline theology also acknowledges Christ as the One who bears God’s image (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10). None of these instances are direct quotations of the OT, but each refers to and provokes thoughts of the Genesis account of Creation and the Fall. In some cases, Paul slightly nuances the meaning of words in their original setting in order to further strengthen his claims about Christ and his work (e.g., Col 1:15).

As noted above, the text of Genesis 1–3 is used often in the letters of Paul. Specific passages (such as Gen 1:27 and 2:24) may make up part of what Dodd calls the “substructure of NT theology.”⁶⁰ Whether separate *testimonia* made up these writings or they simply became Christian proof-texts of sorts is, in this case, irrelevant. What is relevant is that Christians seem to have used clusters of texts as witnessed in the NT (e.g., Psalm 110). Dodd refers specifically to Messianic texts, but other facets of NT theology also have these clustered texts. Dodd writes, “Our first task will be to collect passages from the Old Testament which, being cited by two or more writers of the New Testament in *prima facie* independence of one another may fairly be presumed to have been current as *testimonia* before they wrote.”⁶¹ For example, Paul uses Gen 15:6 three times in Romans 4 and then again in Gal 3:6 in an attempt to draw a connection between faith and being reckoned as righteous. James uses this same text to reinforce a different argument (Jas 2:23). James may have been able to find a more suitable passage for his purpose, but he drew from this well-known Christian passage.⁶² If Paul is quoting, or even alluding to, Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28, then Gen 1:27 has a high probability of being a Christian *testimonia*. And if both Gen 1:27 and 2:24 are Christian *testimonia* taken from Jesus himself (2:24 is also used by Paul, Matthew, and Mark),⁶³ the likelihood of them both being used in Gal 3:28 are higher, even though they are not quoted in their entirety—the first (Gen 1:27) is quoted, the other is a natural allusion (Gen 2:24) based on Jesus’s teachings and the early church signaled by the word “one.”

Paul does something similar with regard to unity. What follows are

⁶⁰ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28–29.

⁶¹ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 28–29.

⁶² Many scholars have pointed out these two contrasting emphases of Gen 15:6. See, for example, D. A. Carson, “James,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 1004–5.

⁶³ Though technically two occurrences of this Christian *testimonia*, Matthew and Mark are likely not independent sources.

very similar passages that many believe are early baptismal creeds/formulas: Gal 3:27–28, 1 Cor 12:13, and Col 3:9–11.⁶⁴ Common themes found in these three formulas are baptism (1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:27) or baptismal language (Col 3:9–11), antithetical couplets, and unity. Though Paul in Col 3:9–11 does not mention baptism explicitly,⁶⁵ the language of “putting on” (ἐνδύω) Christ is used in Gal 3:27 in reference to baptism. There are also significant verbal similarities. In each case the couplets Jew/Greek and slave/free are mentioned (notice that in Col 3:9–11, “Greek” comes before “Jew”). Galatians is the only one among them that mentions “male and female” (this point will be discussed further below). Each example places emphasis on unity with either the word πάντες or εἷς/ἓν, or both.

Table 1.1⁶⁶

Galatians 3:27–28	1 Corinthians 12:13	Colossians 3:9–11
<p>οἱ ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε.</p> <p>Οὐκ ἔστι Ἰουδαίος οὐδὲ Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ· πάντες γὰρ</p>	<p>καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνας εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύματι</p>	<p>μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν,</p>

⁶⁴ Fung, *Galatians*, 175; Betz, *Galatians*, 188–89; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 154; A. Andrew Das, *Galatians*, Concordia Commentary (Saint Louis: Concordia, 2014), 379–83; and MacDonald, *There Is No Male and Female*. The statements are certainly similar, but there may be some problems with labeling them baptismal formulas. Part of the formula is used elsewhere (1 Cor 12:12–13; Col 3:11) and the male and female portion would have had to have been omitted from these other two instances or added in this one (which, admittedly, is not an altogether insurmountable problem). There is no more reason to place the male/female distinction in Galatians than in any other case. Paul has made no argument concerning gender roles. In this particular discussion he has only been concerned with the Jew/Gentile (Greek) relationship, and in the following passage, slavery and freedom as represented in the Old Law and Promise, allegorized through Sarah and Hagar. So, the phrase “male and female” probably serves some other function. I submit that the function is to direct the Galatians to Gen 1:27 and the implication of unity found in the last phrase *άντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*.

⁶⁵ Paul does mention baptism in Col 2:12.

⁶⁶ Shared words between the passages have been placed in bold type and underlined. Though each passage is similar, one can also detect originality.

<p>ὕμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.</p>	<p>ἐποτίσθημεν.</p>	<p>ὅπου οὐκ ἔστι Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομή καὶ ἀκροβυστία, Βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.</p>
-----------------------------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Ephesians 5:31–32 is another passage in which one can find Paul’s theology of unity coupled with a reference to Genesis, specifically Christ’s unity with the church—in this case Gen 2:24 is explicitly quoted. After quoting Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31, Paul writes, “This mystery is great; but I am speaking with reference to Christ and the church.” This passage carries particular significance in this study because one is dealing with each of the several important themes found in Gal 3:27–28 but without explicit reference to “male and female,” though marriage implies it. In Ephesians, Paul makes a case for unity (e.g., Eph 4:1–13) and transitions into the household, first focusing on the marital relationship. Paul compares this relationship to Christ and the church, then makes an appeal to Gen 2:24 for clarification. The clarification is not the mystery of marriage itself, but the mystery of unity found in the two becoming one, specifically the unity between Christ and the church.⁶⁷ So, both Gal 3:27–28 and Eph 5:31 deal with man and woman (though different words are used for man and woman), a subtle connection to baptism in Ephesians (or similar ritual ablution; cf. Eph 5:26), an appeal to the origin story of Genesis, and the concept of unity (both the unity of the husband and wife as well as the unity of Christ and the church; Eph 5:30). Admittedly, many of these connections in Ephesians are not proof within themselves, but when the evidence is taken in sum, one begins to see a Pauline trend. The direct quote of Gen 2:24 is also explicit evidence that Paul is not only familiar with the passage but that he uses the passage in connection with marital and spiritual (Christian) unity.⁶⁸

Although not the familiar “baptismal formula” mentioned above, Eph 4:24 has special significance as well. Like 2 Cor 5:17, Gal 3:27, and Col 3:9–11, the old self is put away and the new self (man) is put on. Paul writes, “... and put on the new self (ἄνθρωπος), which in *the likeness of God*

⁶⁷ See Andreas J. Köstenberger, “The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, ‘One Flesh,’” *TJ* 12 (1991): 79–94. For other options see John Muddiman, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, BNTC (New York: Hendrickson, 2001), 269–70, and Brooke Foss Westcott, *Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 86.

⁶⁸ Consider also 1 Cor 6:15–16.

has been created in righteousness and holiness of the truth” (NASB, italics original). Both Col 3:9–11 and Eph 4:24 refer to creation. In both cases the word *κρίζω* is used. In Colossians, the reference is to renewal—“to image of the One who created him” (Col 3:10). So, the creation of man is alluded to once again in a discussion of putting away one self for another self. Paul is redefining or appropriating creation language in light of Christ. In Genesis, humanity was made in the likeness of God, but because of Adam and sin, humanity becomes like Adam. However, through the re-creation found in Christ, the new self is made in his image (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:45–49).⁶⁹

Significant Phrases in Galatians 3:28

The phrase “Jew nor Greek” is a relatively common phrase in Pauline literature and as can be seen in Table 1.1 is used in all three of these “baptismal formulas” as well as in Rom 10:12.⁷⁰ The second of the three couplets is “slave nor free.” The language of slavery and freedom are so prolific in Pauline discourse that they cannot be adequately considered in this study.⁷¹ However, in the context of Galatians, this language is taken up in 4:1–5:1 and represents a major theme in the discourse and plays a significant role in Paul’s theology. Though at first glance this phrase may simply be a part of the common baptismal formula noted above or part of the freedom Paul preaches to those in Christ, in the case of Galatians, the phrase is likely more intentional. Of the three couplets mentioned, Paul discusses two of them in depth. The Jew/Gentile couplet is an obvious subject of contention in Galatians, but after 3:28 and the reference to the slave and free, Paul takes up a discussion about slaves, sons, Sarah, and Hagar. After only one verse (3:29), Paul highlights the dichotomy of a son and a slave (4:1–7) trying to demonstrate the superiority of the sonship granted through being an heir of Abraham (which comes through the promise realized in Christ) and not simply a servant. Then, he transitions to the verbal form used throughout the remainder of chapter 4 and not

⁶⁹ Paul again quotes from Genesis 1–3 although this is the only time this specific verse is explicitly quoted (Gen 2:7). See Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 609–11, and Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 436–41.

⁷⁰ See also Rom 2:9, 10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 1 Cor 1:24 wherein Gentiles and Greeks are essentially the same. See Dunn, *Galatians*, 205.

⁷¹ Cf. Rom 8:15, 21 (creation and slavery); 1 Cor 7:21–22; Gal 4:1–8, 25; 5:1; Philemon. For an investigation of the theme of slavery and sonship in Galatians, see Sam Tsang, *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul’s Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians*, SBLit 81 (New York: Peter Lang, 2005).

used again in Galatians (4:8, 9, 25).⁷² Paul then uses Sarah and Hagar as examples. Though Hagar is not called a *δοῦλος*, her children are called *δουλείαν*, and Sarah is described as being “free” (*ἐλευθέρας*). These women represent two covenants. Hagar is Sinai and the “now” Jerusalem. Sarah is the Jerusalem above and is “free.” In contrast, Sarah is the Jerusalem above and she is “free.” So, though the phrase “slave nor free” is probably part of a common formula, Paul expands the language, referring to more than only slaves and freemen. For Paul, unity comes because all are free, though their social status may not have changed. In other words, Paul has spiritualized⁷³ both slavery and freedom. “It was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of slavery” (Gal 5:1 NASB). If one follows that each of the three couplets are discussed in Galatians with the Jew/Gentile couplet being paramount, followed by the son/slave language, then the relationships of Hagar and Sarah to Abraham may correspond to the “male and female” couplet, only one of whom was a legitimate wife (Sarah) with a legitimate heir (Isaac).

The phrase “male and female” is found only here in Pauline literature.⁷⁴ The individual terms are used by Paul only in Rom 1:26–27 referring to the natural function of male and female. As noted above, the terms (phrase) are used in the LXX in a similar way. That Paul in Gal 3:28 uses such specific, uncommon vocabulary (uncommon to him and both words combined used only ten other times in the NT, two of which are a direct quote from Gen 1:27) seems to indicate that Paul is purposefully quoting Gen 1:27.⁷⁵ Unity that is found in Christ is also one of the dominant themes of the Pauline epistles. Paul labored among the churches trying to establish unity. Galatians 3:28 has garnered special attention in recent years because of the phrase “male and female” and the changing roles of

⁷² The noun is not used again either.

⁷³ Dunn uses the term “relativized.” Dunn, *Galatians*, 205.

⁷⁴ One should also note the use of *ἐνδύω* in both Gal 3:27 and Gen 3:21 (LXX). The baptized are “clothed” with Christ and God “clothed” Adam and Eve with garments made of skin, yet another common Pauline word also found in the story of Creation and the Fall (Rom 13:12, 14; 1 Cor 15:53–54; Gal 3:27; Eph 4:24; 6:11, 14; Col 3:10, 12; 1 Thess 5:8).

⁷⁵ Many commentators of Galatians draw a connection to a later Jewish prayer that thanks God for not being a Gentile, a slave, or a woman. Though the roots of this type of thinking probably date before Christianity (there was a similar prayer among the Greeks), Gal 3:28 does not necessitate knowledge of such a prayer. The status of women and slaves in antiquity is well known, so with or without knowledge of such a prayer, Paul’s words are still provocative and progressive. See Bruce, *Galatians*, 187.

women in church and society, but Paul's primary concern was racial unity between Jews and Gentiles as people of the promise, not ethnic erasure.⁷⁶ In fact, in Romans, Paul gives precedence to Jews on a number of occasions (1:16; 2:9, 10; 11:13–31) in order to prevent the Gentiles from becoming arrogant concerning their salvation as those grafted in.

Syntactical Considerations

Two syntactical issues hint at Paul's use of Gen 1:27 (and subsequently 2:24). First, the negative οὐκ ἔνι is coupled with οὐδέ in the first two couplets. However, in the final couplet the same negative statement (οὐκ ἔνι) is used except the conjunction is changed to καί. Although Paul does use οὐκ ἔνι with καί in Col 3:10 he uses the καί throughout. In 1 Cor 12:13 οὐκ ἔνι is not used at all. This change is quite likely deliberate, not a stylistic or grammatical issue, and yet is either passed over by most translations or purposely translated as “nor,” though BDAG does not list “nor” as a potential gloss for καί.⁷⁷

Another syntactical issue is Paul's phraseology in Gal 3:26 in contrast to Gal 3:28b. Galatians 3:26 reads Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ while 3:28 reads πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Longenecker draws attention to the difference: “The only somewhat new features of v 28b are the explicit use of εἷς (‘one’) and the more direct correlation of εἷς to ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, but they are new only in focus and directness, for both are inchoate in v. 26.”⁷⁸ Similarly Fung states, “The masculine gender of ‘one’ suggests that the meaning here is that all who are in Christ form a corporate unity.”⁷⁹ With the addition of “male and female,” the word εἷς signals the idea of these two becoming one flesh (Gen 2:24). This subtle change in wording and syntax hints that Paul is doing so deliberately.

⁷⁶ See James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 592–93. For a contrast see Witherington, “Rite and Rights for Women,” 593–604.

⁷⁷ See Hove, *Equality in Christ*, 66–69, 80–86, wherein he argues that though Paul is quoting Gal 1:27, that the intended meaning requires negation (“nor”). See also BDAG, “καί,” 494–96. Admittedly, nuances in language may permit such a translation. However, when the word has been changed deliberately in a triplet like this one, it seems wise to translate it woodenly to capture the intention of the author.

⁷⁸ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 158.

⁷⁹ Fung, *Galatians*, 176.

Conclusions

This study has sought to argue that Paul is quoting Gen 1:27 in Gal 3:28 and that by doing so he is drawing the Galatian audience into the Genesis account of creation. Through this quotation, Paul expects his audience to find a natural parallel with or allusion to Gen 2:24 and the oneness of the male and female through marriage. Though the allusion to Gen 2:24 may not be as convincing as the quotation of 1:27, there are several reasons to consider its plausibility. (1) Paul changes the wording from πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 3:26 to πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 3:28.⁸⁰ This change is significant because Paul spends no more time unpacking the implication of the couplet ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ, but he does spend the rest of chapter 4 describing freedom in Christ found in sonship (πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) and the problems with Judaizing. This shift in wording and syntax from other similar formulas signals Paul's connection to Gen 1:27 and 2:24. Admittedly, trying to make such a bold claim by the use of only one word (“one”) is tenuous. However, this one word taken in context of the only Pauline quotation of Gen 1:27 further strengthens the argument.

The congregations that Paul had visited probably already knew the basic tenets of his theology, or in some cases he expected them to make implicit connections to an already stated theology. For example, in Romans, Paul spends much of the first three chapters arguing that both Jews and Gentiles were all under sin, incorporating several OT quotations strung together to prove his thesis (Rom 3:10–18). But in Gal 3:22 Paul simply states, “But the Scripture has shut up everyone under sin, so that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe” (cf. Rom 11:32). Paul does not necessarily need to articulate fully his theology in Gal 3:28. What is more is that in Eph 5:31–32, Paul does quote Gen 2:24 explicitly and with regard to the oneness of man and woman and Christ and the church, demonstrating that Paul was not only familiar with Gen 2:24, but that he has used it in conjunction with both marital and spiritual unity.

(2) Paul uses similar phraseology referring to the Genesis account in other passages. As noted above, Paul explicitly quotes Gen 2:24 in Eph 5:31 in respect to the mystery of the unity of Christ and the church.⁸¹ (3) In two of the three so-called baptismal formulas a reference is made to creation, and in some cases “new man” language is also used. (4) The only

⁸⁰ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 158.

⁸¹ Köstenberger, “The Mystery of Christ and the Church,” 79–94.

other instance of the phrase ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ found in the NT is in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 (both referring to the same event and also quoting Gen 2:24). As Christians used clusters of texts for Christology, Gen 1:27 and 2:24 may also have been part of a cluster of texts used of marriage and, in turn, the unity found in Christ often compared to marriage (e.g., 2 Cor 11:2). There is certainly a natural draw to the teaching of Christ where these two texts (Gen 1:27; 2:24) are found back-to-back. In this case, the intertextuality, or “echo,” is threefold—from Genesis to Jesus, then finally, to Paul. Each of these factors plays an important role in the argument of this study and comprehensively they make a strong case that Paul was quoting Gen 1:27 and alluding to 2:24.