

## Beauty Tips from a Seminary Washout

### Chapter 2

#### The Fresh Fruit Diet

What's the healthiest diet to be on? What are we, as humans, designed for?

Keto. It's totally the "keto craze," right? Or are you wicked smart and think based on the title of the Chapter that it's clearly going to be "fresh fruit."

I think the question "what is good for us?" has always been a big point of contention. And I'm not just talking whether coconut oil is good or bad, or whether we should put butter in our coffee.

What was the first command given, in Scripture, from God, to humanity?

It was about food and eating, wasn't it? But probably not the one you're thinking of. Long before Genesis 2:16-17, was Genesis 1:29-30.

*"Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which as fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you; and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to every thing that moves on the earth which has life, I have given every green plant for food"; and it was so.*

There's always this same humorous reaction that people give me when I've tried to explain to them that—according to the Bible—mankind (nor, in fact, animalkind for that matter) was not originally created to eat meat, but rather, fresh fruit. There's this sort of disconcerting demeanor until I tell them to get out their books and look it up.

It's true.

**Meat** was not "given" by God as something to eat until after the flood; all the way in Genesis chapter 9 (v.3). And a *lot* of human years past in between then (see last chapter and the whole issue of the measurement of time).

Here's the thing that stands out to me about this—not that we should go back to eating raw fresh fruit only (because that may lead to some unwanted consequences...), but that—within the given "command" in verse 29—there is an unstated negative equivalency that I think we tend to look over. Which makes sense, because how often do you even hear that phrase, to let alone think about it and what it means. Basically, when we're dealing with numbers and their expression and interaction, variable  $x$  is equal to the negation of the negation of variable  $x$ .

$x = -(-x)$

or

$1 = -(-1)$

You may say, "who cares? Why not just say 1?", but it matters to mathematicians, because it opens up new ways of interacting with numbers.

In logic, this same concept can be known as a clumsy equivalency. "Diamonds are all made from carbon." "Carbon is what all diamonds are made from." When speaking, we know that these two statements are saying the same thing, so even though someone may say it one way and another person another way, the correctness of the statement is not dependent on which way you say it.

This continues when symbolizing statements, specifically conditionals. That is, a statement that fits the category: "If P, then Q."

Take the statement, "*If you live in Denver, Colorado, then you live in the United States of America.*"

The clumsy equivalency would then be "*If you do not live in the United States of America, then you do not live in Denver, Colorado.*" Both are true statements. So there's a...clumsy equivalency.

This is all part of a bigger philosophical concept called “The Raven Paradox,” but my point here is to show how it applies to the very first command given in Genesis 1:29.

If every seed bearing plant and every tree with fruit that has seed in it is good for food (to eat), then *every plant that isn't seed bearing and every tree that has fruit without seed is not good for food (to eat)*.

Now I know that may seem ridiculous to think about, because we know how plants work. But do you think Adam and Eve did? It was all new to them. They had no “knowledge”. The animals weren't even named yet, and you think the plants were? Think about it this way: how many years of human experience did we have to have to know what plants are poisonous or not, or that particular leaves taste good, other plant roots taste good, and so on?

How old were you when you learned that a tomato was a fruit? Or that there is no such thing as a “vegetable,” in terms of botany (the actual study of plants, the “experts”), but rather, it's a culinary term?

...Just found that one out?

The best way I've heard it put is that following that command in Genesis 1:29, Adam and Eve effectively became “fruit inspectors.” With everything being new to them, by not knowing, they needed to go around “inspecting” each plant and fruit to make sure it “yeilded seed”. They interacted with what was provided for them, inspecting each to see if it bore seed or didn't, intrinsically, maybe even indicatively following that first command.

See it was then that they had both a free will, and a *good* free will—for they only wanted to good, namely, seed bearing food, but were free to interact and choose the good. Yes, given in the command is also both a value *and* a moral judgment: that only seed bearing plants and fruits are good for food (given by God). But this same value and moral judgment was wired into them. They only *wanted* “the good,” because they trusted that judgment; and so they too looked, “inspected” and—in effect—*judged* which were seed bearing plants and fruit, and which weren't.

So the first was a command of allowance. This is what is “good” to eat. This command included an unstated negative equivalency. “If x contains property y, then it is good (for food).” Thus the unstated negative equivalency is that “if x does *not* contain property y, then it is *not* good (for food).” If the plant and/or fruit you're inspecting is a plant and/or fruit that yields seeds, then it is good (for food). If the plant and/or fruit you're inspecting is a plant and/or fruit that does not yield seeds, then it is not good (for food).

This is when the second “command” comes in; the one we're all far more familiar with.

In Genesis 2: 16-17, God says “*From any tree of the garden you may eat freely; but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die.*”

How do they know what death is? When was their first experience with death? It wasn't when they ate the fruit from the tree they were told not to. They didn't die then.

Death came later.

Well anyway, God gives a second command and it too has to do with food and eating. And they follow it. They're not told, as in the original command, that it is good. There is no “good” in this command. There isn't even a double negation. There is no “this action is bad.” They're simply told “do not do x.” So we have two commands about eating, specifically fruit. The first is that EVERY plant and fruit that

yields *seed* is *GOOD*. The second command begins by reaffirming part of the first command with “any tree”, that is, “any tree” that yields seed-bearing fruit you may eat freely. But then adds a limitation, except this specific tree, and its fruit.

Did the tree of the knowledge of good and evil have fruit that had yielded seeds?  
So then by the first command, wouldn't it be good to eat if it did?

What's the second command actually saying?

Well in the course of the narrative, the Serpent approaches and asks specifically this: if God had said the man and the woman can't eat from *ANY* tree of the garden. This line of questioning leads directly to their interaction, their fruit inspection job, their own judgments about which is good and which isn't to eat, given God's first and second command. See, the serpent wasn't questioning the prohibition of the one *tree*, but specifically the judgment of God *on* that tree. Making man's judgment seem greater than God's. That is, if Adam and Eve weren't to even go near it, it meant that they were to trust God's judgment that this tree's fruit had no seeds, it was not good (at least for them). They had to trust that judgment without making their own.

They had to trust without “inspecting” it for themselves.

The serpent dared them to “inspect” for themselves. See whether or not God was lying. And what was the fruit but “pleasing to the eye”? What else could this random description mean given the context except that—upon inspection, this fruit may have indeed seemed to have seeds?

And in the course of the narrative of the Fall in Genesis, Eve is always portrayed as making stuff up. *Stupid woman*. She was deceived because she was silly and ignorant and childish and naïve. She added commands to what God had originally instructed Adam. “This is what happens when you let a woman in charge...”

When in reality, Eve displays a coherent knowledge, and the text expresses her own personal relation to God. She makes a clear statement of their charge (the second command), and a declarative statement of what God said to them both: they are both to not eat, and not touch it (and that's actually an important point).

Adam was told that there was only **one** tree that had fruit that was not given by permission. However, in Genesis 2: 16-17, God did not say the location of the tree. So how did Eve know in her discussion with the Serpent in 3:3 that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was in the middle of the garden? That information would not have been needed since Adam was there when God created and named the trees, including the tree at the center of the garden. While these trees were created after Adam was placed in the garden, the woman was not there to see the creation of the trees. She was the one who needed to know where this special “off limits” tree was located.

And the woman, Eve, identifies that the location of the tree was given to her by the words of God. It is her testimony that “God has said.” See most arguments directed at Eve in support of the “stupid woman” theology is that she misspoke about the command, because she heard from Adam. So what is written in Genesis 2:16-17, does not match Genesis 3: 2-3, because of the woman. But if that were the case, why didn't she say in verse 3, “*the man told me that God said,*” instead directly saying “*God has said*”?

We say “*stupid woman*” because she seems to add to the command from 2:16-17, adding that not only can you not eat it, but you can't even *touch* it. But now that we've covered the first command from 1:29 and 30, think of what she's responding to the Serpent with in that understanding. To touch the fruit

meant to *inspect* it. Because any fruit that yields seed is good to eat, and then God essentially says “except that one. Trust me on this.” And they did. Maybe it's easy when there's no way of knowing that that fruit didn't not yield seeds. Because if it didn't yield seeds, then God wouldn't be seemingly contradicting Godself (through the two commands). But if that fruit of the tree at the center of the garden (the tree of the knowledge of good and evil) yielded seeds, then according to the first command God gave, it *would* be good to eat.

So Eve's addition of “don't touch it” actually makes sense. “All fruit that yields seed is good to eat, but I don't want you eating from this tree, nor inspecting it to see if it has seeds, just trust me and my judgment.”

Trust God and what God's judgment is.

Essentially, all the Serpent did was say “*see for yourself.*” Inspect what you were told not to inspect. There was no need for deception or lying.

*And Eve found the fruit good for food, and a delight to the eye... (Genesis 3:6)*

Well of course it would be. It had seeds.

And then “sin” entered the world.

Well, sin entered the world. But sin nature, or the ability to sin, that was always there. Whether you believe we were made perfect and then fell and became imperfect, or you believe that—based on what I conveyed in Chapter 1—we are still being made, either way, you can not do something without the capacity to do so. I can't taste anything if I don't have the capacity to do so. Which means since I taste, I was made able to do so. And Eve committed what would be known as “first sin”, but that means that had to have the capacity to do so in the first place, or they never would have sinned (much like, even if I never tasted anything a day in my life, and then one day did, I had to always have had the capacity to do so. If I never had the capacity to taste, I would never taste. If Adam and Eve never had the capacity to sin, they never would have.)

And what was that original, first sin? The general thought was disobedience. Disobeying God's command. And they did disobey God's command. God's *second* command, that is. They didn't disobey the first command, actually they followed it.

We tend to read and assume that the serpent stated that we would know—intimately (*yada*) good and evil, as distinct. And that is where the idea that “judgment” came into being. That we would know good *from* evil.

Yet there's no distinction or distinguishing between the two—Good and Evil. We tend to see it that through the fall, through the eating of the forbidden fruit, we'd be able to know good, and separately know evil, mutually exclusive. This isn't stated by the serpent nor by God later in Genesis 3 that the consequence of breaking God's command has imbued us with the ability to categorize good and evil separately, good from evil—**judgment**, BUT RATHER, we would “*yada*” (know *intimately*, based on experience, relationally) **BOTH GOOD AND EVIL**. Which we now do. And can judge what is good and what is evil. We have that capacity now.

So what was the first sin? It wasn't disobedience. And mankind's capacity judge didn't come about as a consequence of that original sin, for the Woman and Man judged fruit and plants all the time, the goodness of them.

The original sin was not trusting God.

Specifically, not trusting God's judgment.

Or rather, trusting and relying on our own judgment over and opposed to God's.

God made a judgment about the fruit from the tree at the center of the garden. The Man and Woman trusted their own judgment about it. And then became aware.

And they went from feeling no shame. To being ashamed.

And ever since, shame has been an issue. (and will be right to the end of the book, but we'll get into that when we cover some of the book of Revelation)

And ever since, not understanding, nor trusting God's judgment has been issue.

What if God's judgment is the cross?

What if God's judgment is love?

Do you trust it?