

# Genesis Chapter 3 – The Root of Mankind’s Problem

And an analysis of how to resolve it

Intellectual Property of [John Marsing](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com) - [www.MyHebrewBible.Com](http://www.MyHebrewBible.Com)

**Tags:** millennial-kingdom, conspiracy-theory-mindset, torah-law-form-1st-form, torah-law-form-2nd-form, divorce, feminism, legal-vs-torahful,

**Version:** ver 1.7 4/25/2018, 1.6 2/3/2016, ver 1.5 10/17/2015, ver 1.0 4/19/2010

## Table of Contents

Genesis First Hand Testimony (2:9, 16-17) and Hearsay Testimony (3:1-6).....	1
Genesis 3:7-23.....	4
Definitions.....	7
Conspiracy .....	7
Mindset .....	7
Opportunity cost.....	7
Genesis 3:12 - The Conspiracy Theory Mindset of Adam.....	8

## Genesis First Hand Testimony (2:9, 16-17) and Hearsay Testimony (3:1-6)

The first three verses of Genesis chapter 3 are a conversation between the serpent (in Hebrew it’s Nachosh) and Eve which in regarding a prior conversation between YHVH and Adam found eight verses back in Gen 2:16-17, therefore you need to go back and compare what was actually said (the source) with what the serpent and Eve believe was said (hearsay testimony). I will put what YHVH said in **red** and what was retold in Gen 3:1-3 by the woman in **purple** and by Nachosh in **brown**.

**Gen 2:9** And out of the ground made YHVH thy Elohim to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life *also* in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

**Gen 2:16-17** <sup>16</sup> And YHVH Elohim commanded the man, saying, **Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:** <sup>17</sup> **But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.**

**Gen 3:1-6** <sup>1</sup> Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which YHVH Elohim had made. And he said unto the woman, <sup>A</sup> **Yea, hath Elohim said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?** <sup>2</sup> And the woman said unto the serpent, **We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:** <sup>3</sup> **But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, Elohim hath said, “Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die”.** <sup>4</sup> And the serpent said unto the woman, **Ye shall not surely die:** <sup>5</sup> **For Elohim doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.** <sup>6</sup> And when the woman saw that the tree was *1*) good for food, and that *2*) it was pleasant to the eyes, and *3*) a tree to be

---

<sup>A</sup> Interesting that it was the *nachash* that started the conversation. He was the instigator of this whole thing.

desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

1. Eve never heard this from Elohim, only Adam did (see Gen 2:16-17), therefore Adam is either a bad "Torah" teacher and/or Eve is a poor "Torah" student.
2. In Gen 2:16-17 there was nothing about touching.
3. Eve added the restriction of "touching" to the tree that is in the midst of the garden.
4. the Nachosh in Gen 3:4 "You will not die" if you eat from the tree of life. My point is which tree was Nachosh referring to, Eve was making an assumption.
5. Uri says for Gen 2:9, that *also* is not there.
6. Uri says that Eve is talking about the wrong tree and the Nachosh lets her keep thinking this.
7. In Gen 3:6, Eve sought wisdom and reasoned that eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was good but did so using hearsay evidence. But how is wisdom defined in scripture, isn't it the Fear of YHVH? See Job 28:28, Psa 111:10, Pro 1:7, Pro 9:10, Pro 15:33, Isa 11:2 and Isa 33:6. The problem isn't necessarily the seeking of knowledge but the seeking of knowledge without first and foremost "the fear of YHVH". 1Co 1:22-23 says that the Greeks seeks knowledge, but the testimony of "Y'shua crucified" (and I would add the Fear of YHVH) is foolishness to them. Whether Eve was tricked into eating from the wrong tree or not is irrelevant, because in the end she did what YHVH told Adam not to do and therefore the prima facie evidence would indicate that she did not "Fear YHVH". As I understand the word fear, it's all about motivation i.e. fear is a great motivator and it would appear that Eve was not motivated by YHVH but rather her own reasoning and/or the Nachosh.
8. Also in Gen 3:6, it's noteworthy to see how she orders the reasons for her conclusion. I content that this ranking process is indicative of what's important to her.
  - a. **good for food:** A primeval sensual need to fill the belly (a physical thing) which overrides the higher spiritual needs. Was there not other food in the Garden which is good to eat (see Gen 2:9)? This reminds me of Israel in the desert complaining about what's on the menu, even though what's given is free from YHVH. This also is exactly what YHVH said i.e. defined what was food and what was not. Christian-dumb thinks Torah is too complicated and hard to follow even though it comes from YHVH and Y'shua. Are we to understand that following one law, which is all that was the Torah law form at that time, is too hard? Are we supposed to conclude that being Kosher as irrelevant even though that is the triggering event that has kept "Adam-kind" out from the presence of YHVH for 6,000 years?
  - b. **pleasant to the eyes:** Again relying on our senses of sight (as opposed to "shema-ing" to guide us through life. A fishing lure is made to be shiny in order to get the fishes attention so as to ensnare it. A beautiful painting is "pleasant to the eyes", but that doesn't mean you eat it. How wise is this?
  - c. **a tree to be desired to make one wise:** Last on Eve's list of reasons why disobeying YHVH is ok she finally gets around to something that could be argued is reasonable. Seeking out the knowledge and the wisdom of YHVH's creation isn't the problem rather it's disrespecting the Creator.
9. Nachosh is an unwanted 3<sup>rd</sup> party intervener.

- a. Contrast this with us being a Adam being 3<sup>rd</sup> party intervener between YHVH and Nachosh. Is Elohim surprised that Nachosh is wandering around in the garden? I say now because was he not cast down by YHVH from the heavens (see Isa 14:12)? I strongly suggest that you make a clear distinction between what's your business (your relationship with YHVH) and what's not your business (the relationship between YHVH and Nachosh). I'm not asking you to be ignorant of the fact that there is a Nachosh (along with his agents) in this world and that he has a "relationship" with YHVH. Do you want to go through life with your "glasses have empty" lenses on and be angry with your enemy (Nachos et. Al.) and thereby be indirectly angry with YHVH because after all there is a relationship there. Or do you want to go through life with your "glasses have full" lenses on and be happy (asher) and view Nachosh and his ilk as your "quality assurance" department whose job it is to make your product i.e. you a better person?

10. Law form's defined:

11. Torah defined:

- a. Was the second form of the Torah brought in when YHVH was merciful i.e. equitable towards Adam? Adam did die but it was a delayed death (which is the definition of mercy because YHVH must be just and stand by his word). Did YHVH do the same thing happen to Cain ... like father like son (the apple doesn't fall far from the tree (of the knowledge of good and evil?)).

12. Does Nachosh every lie in this conversation? I contend that legally "he" was right but not law fully. I define the difference between the two as xxx . The reason it's important to accept (or at least entertain the idea) that Nachosh did not lie is because if he did lie then Adam and Eve shouldn't have been kicked out of Eden i.e. divorced from El (more on that later). Here is my reasoning. If originally there was a covenant between YHVH and Adam then it is a binding contract. If Adam and Eve re-contracted with Nachosh and that re-contract was predicated on a lie then it would be an unenforceable contract, and if this were true then all YHVH had to do was to evidence the fraud and go back to his contract with Adam and Eve.

- a. ToDo: further define that contract (see bullet points 10 and 11)
- b. ToDo: investigate the possibility that even if Nachosh did lie, YHVH still divorced himself from Adam and Eve because you could argue that Adam excepted the lie by defiling himself with his word in Gen 3:12

13. zzzz:

## Genesis 3:7-23

Text	Commentary
<p>3:7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they <i>were</i> naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.</p>	<p>Word Study: naked <sup>Arom H6174</sup> An adjective meaning naked. It can allude to physical nakedness (Gen 2:25; 1Sa 19:24; Isa 20:2-4). It can also be <u>used figuratively to relate to one who has no possessions</u> (Job 1:21; Ecc 5:15 [14]). Moreover, Sheol is described as being naked before God, a statement of its openness and vulnerability to God and His power (Job 26:6).</p> <p>The fig tree leaves is the solution of man not YHVH, is this related to Y'shua cursing the fig tree. The fig tree is the Torah but they are doing so without the blood.</p>
<p>3:8 And they heard the voice of YHVH Elohim walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of YHVH Elohim amongst the trees of the garden.</p>	<p><u>Which tree?</u> Uri says this is saying that they are hiding behind the Tree of life.</p> <p><u>Cool of the day</u> should be "the breeze of the day". Ruach HaYom, I content this is prayer time because this is their appointed time to meet with YHVH and spiritually do the "Hebrew Halicha" i.e. Adam walked beside Elohim.</p> <p>"...hid themselves from the presence of YHVH Elohim..." is the panim i.e. face of YHVH. This indicates that prior to this Adam and Eve could see His presence but can't now because they are naked. Compare to this with Deu 34:10.</p> <p>The ruach part of the day for me is early in the morning when it's the coolest part of the day.</p>
<p>3:9 And YHVH Elohim called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where <i>art</i> thou?</p>	
<p>3:10 And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I <i>was</i> naked; and I hid myself.</p>	<p>Now they are "shema-ing" and fear YHVH, too bad they weren't wise (defined as the fear of YHVH) before.</p>
<p>3:11 And he said, Who told thee that thou <i>wast</i> naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?</p>	
<p>3:12 And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest <i>to be</i> with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.</p>	<p>Let the finger pointing begin. For more detail, see below "<u>Genesis 3:12 - The Conspiracy Theory Mindset of Adam</u>"</p> <p>JKM Question. When Adam sinned did he commit a civil offense, when he transgressed did he commit a criminal act? (at least this preaches good). My theory is that all judicial proceeding's (at least in USA Inc. courts) start off as civil, and it takes the act of the supposed defendant to make it</p>

	<p>criminal.</p> <p>Ahavta says that Adam replied (literal translation of v.12 Heb. v'ochel – future tense), “I ate and will eat again”! This seems to be an admission that he would likely do the same again in similar circumstances.</p>
3:13	<p>And YHVH Elohim said unto the woman, What <i>is</i> this <i>that</i> thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.</p> <p>More finger pointing</p>
3:14	<p>And YHVH Elohim said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou <i>art</i> cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life:</p> <p>YHVH begins the judgment and sentencing. The first use of curse <sup>H779 - arar</sup> and it is attributed to Nachosh. It's at this point that we associated the serpent/snake with Nachosh, but what was he like before the curse?</p> <p>My theory is that Nachosh was in fact Lucifer who was the “shining one” and an angel who was cast down from Heaven who personifies HaSatan. His motivation is to prove to Elohim that he made a mistake by making mankind his bride and not him. Nachosh is more than willing to play hardball by using legal tactics as opposed to “Torahful”/Lawful tactics to get his way.</p>
3:15	<p>And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.</p> <p>Seed is singular. The seed of the Woman (Gal 3:16) means that She will have a son who will have the seed.</p>
3:16	<p>Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire <i>shall be</i> to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.</p> <p>The Four Desires; desire H8669 tesh-oo-kaw  H8669 teshuqah; KJV Concordance: desire, 3: Gen_3:16, Gen_4:7, Son_7:10  H7783 shuq; KJV Concordance: overflow, 2 Joe_2:24, Joe_3:13, waterest, 1 Psa_65:9</p>
3:17	<p>And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened <sup>H8085 shema</sup> unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed <i>is</i> the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat <i>of</i> it all the days of thy life;</p> <p>"...Because thou hast hearkened <sup>H8085 shema'd</sup> unto the voice of thy wife..."</p> <p>Adam does not <del>man</del> Adam up. Adam failed because he is not a problem solver (the best way to solve a problem is to never allow it to exist from inception). Adam delegated what was his duties, responsibilities and obligations by projecting them onto his wife. The word for hearkened is shema and from shema is the word shem which is about power and authority as in "stop in the name of the law" or "stop in the shem of HaShem". The point being that Adam was given the power and authority to not only not listen to his wife, but to stop the interaction between her and Nachosh or the serpent (i.e. the sly accuser) from occurring in the first place.</p> <p>YHVH told Adam what the Torah law form was and Adam</p>

didn't do a good job of communicating this to Eve. In the conversation between Nachosh and Eve, Adam did not step in to "correct the record" of what the Torah law form really was. If you do not correct the record timely then it will stand. Isn't this why YHVH is forced to punish Adam?

3:18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

3:19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou *art*, and unto dust shalt thou return.

3:20 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.

YHVH delegated the right to name the animals was given to Adam and (I contend) made him part of the creation process (Gen 2:19) and therefore a very powerful thing. Part of Eve's punishment therefore was to be named by Adam. If there wasn't a hierarchical relationship that existed before (One could argue that there was because YHVH talked to Adam regarding the commandments of Torah not the woman (see Gen 2:16-17). A counter to this argument is that Woman (Hebrew it is Isha) was still in Adam (Gen 2:21-23) and as a corporate body they both were equally given the creative power to name

Compare this verse with Gen 2:23 "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man".

My notes indicate that it was not clear who named Isha Isha, was it YHVH or Adam? If it was Adam one could conjecture that he wasn't given the power and authority to name Isha, but only to name the animals and therefore this caused friction between Adam and Isha. Could this have been the causal agency for the Garden Exodus. Is Isha ticked with Adam and start's flirting around with this new shiny guy in town called Lucifer? If you don't know the answer to something that's very important shouldn't you, via prayer, involve YHVH your Elohim in the decision making process? Adam could have asked, "I understand you want me to name the animals and that delegating to me the right to name your creation is a most powerful thing that I should utmost respect honor an cherish, but this Isha is very different than the rest of the animals because it came from me whom you have deemed am very special."

todo: expand on feminism's view of this.

Thinking commercially, does it add confusion when you have two names in the commercially world most assuredly "John Smith" vs "JOHN SMITH". We had Isha and now he have added Eve. How powerful is you name in commercial redemption process? Do you willy nilly give up your name to a public official? Aren't you supposed to, respectfully, respond with "I accept your offer to grant and convey a security interest in my property, conditional upon a bona-fide claim. Do you have any original charging or accusatory instruments for my inspection?". If we are the ultimate banks in the country (because the US Fed govt. operates on the full faith and credit of the American

	people) then our name in the form of our signature and a blue ink pen (in this regard anyway) is the most powerful thing we have.
3:21	Unto Adam also and to his wife did YHVH Elohim make coats of skins, and clothed them.
3:22	And YHVH Elohim said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:
3:23	Therefore YHVH Elohim sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. Was not Adam not divorced from YHVH and therefore he was dead to YHVH?

## Definitions

### Conspiracy

18 U.S.C. 371 makes it a separate Federal crime or offense for anyone to conspire or agree with someone else to do something which, if actually carried out, would amount to another Federal crime or offense. So, under this law, a 'conspiracy' is an agreement or a kind of 'partnership' in criminal purposes in which each member becomes the agent or partner of every other member.

An agreement between two or more persons to engage jointly in an unlawful or criminal act, or an act that is innocent in itself but becomes unlawful when done by the combination of actors.

<http://www.lectlaw.com/def/c103.htm>

In the criminal law, a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more persons to break the law at some time in the future, and, in some cases, with at least one overt act in furtherance of that agreement.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conspiracy\\_\(crime\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conspiracy_(crime))

### Mindset

A way of thinking; an attitude or opinion, especially a habitual one. <http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/mindset>

### Opportunity cost

Opportunity cost is the next-best choice available to someone who has picked between several mutually exclusive choices.<sup>[1]</sup> It is a key concept in economics. It is a calculating factor used in mixed markets which favour social change in favour of purely individualistic economics. It has been described as expressing "the basic relationship between scarcity and choice."<sup>[2]</sup> The notion of opportunity cost plays a crucial part in ensuring that scarce resources are used efficiently.<sup>[3]</sup> ... The concept of an opportunity cost was first developed by John Stuart Mill.<sup>[4]</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opportunity\\_cost](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Opportunity_cost)

## Genesis 3:12 - The Conspiracy Theory Mindset of Adam

**Gen 3:12** And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.

For the record, I keep Shabbath at TYoAZ and consider it to be at a very high level when it comes to the understanding of scriptures. It would be tough for me to select my top five most important verses, but Gen 3:12 and my understanding / teaching of it would be among them. Of those few verses almost all of them would be “preaching to the TYoAZ choir” e.g. “if you love me keep my commandments (Joh 14:15)”. For many at TYoAZ though this verse (and, if you except it, my teaching that goes along with it) is the number one verse that is an impediment for their spiritual growth and therefore the number one verse that they could glean the most from.

With that bold statement let me explain.

To Do Finish my commentary with these bullet points

- Adam goes to war with YHVH instead of peace
- Understanding and practice
- It gets to the heart of the matter ... faith
- Adam personalizes his sin converting it into a transgression
- Critical thinking
- sin compared to transgression: It should not just be “original sin” but rather “original sin and transgression”
- They are no longer “covered” under the contract (Torah law form 1)
- Convert a civil offense into a criminal one.
- Interestingly, Adam replied (literal translation of v.12 Heb. v’ochel – future tense), “I ate and will eat again”! This seems to be an admission that he would likely do the same again in similar circumstances. (Source, Ahavta)
- In Adam’s foolish emotionally driven diatribe against YHVH, notice that he never mentions Nachosh as the cause of his problem. Why didn’t Adam act like a creditor to YHVH and respectfully answer YHVH’s question with a question? Examples...
  - “Why did you put this Nachosh character in the garden?”
  - “In all of my days in the garden, I never experienced the craftiness of one like Nachosh character, was I expected to overcome him?”
  - Assuming Nachosh lied, “Since you’re my Elohim (in charge of blessing me and protecting me) can’t you set aside this fraudulent contract I have with Nachosh if make a concerted effort to better shomer the garden (i.e. my covenant with you)?”