

Gn.3.5

TANAKH translation (Jew.Pub.Soc./85):

"you will be like divine beings who know [or "God, who knows"] good and bad."

4 years earlier, the same tr. in

THE TORAH: A Modern Commentary (Union of Am.Heb.Congregations). P.35, "Another translation: 'You will be like God in telling good from bad.'"

Since omniscience is a steady conviction in OT,
to know as God knows = to know everything.----

"God's truth pointing to my limit, the serpent's truth pointing to my limitlessness."--Dietrich Bonhoeffer, p.71 of CREATION AND FALL: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3 (1937 in German; SCM/59).

NRSV

"you will be like God ["or gods"], knowing good and evil."

On NRSV, this in THE HARPERCOLLINS STUDY BIBLE (HC/93), p.10: "*Knowing good and evil* can suggest "everything, all extremes," as well as knowledge of sex, morality, and moral distinctions; cf. 2Sam.14.17,20; 1K.3.9." So a great Jewish authority, J.H. Hertz, THE PENTATEUCH AND HAFTORAHS (Metzudah Pub.Co./41), vol.1, p10 (on vs.5): "having acquired omniscience, you will be in a position to repudiate His authority." good/evil is "a Heb. idiom for 'all things'--not moral sense, which was implicit in the imago: Adam could "distinguish between good and evil." On vs.22 (p.13), Hertz
verse 22 says man acquired "unlimited knowledge," tempting to "outstrip...obedience to Divine Law."

The God of the Garden is worried that with omniscience, humanity may acquire immortality--a Luciferan expansion of the 1.26-27 "image."

"The Drama" section of #3173 (which I gave you) spells out this Luciferian theme, which is the Bible's cosmic instance of OVERREACHING: of the two heavenly beings in this drama, one (Lucifer/Satan/etc.) has ascent in mind (& is thrown down), the other has descent (compassionate incarnation) in mind (&, after completing his mission, ascends). What determines their disparate destinies is the standing of their opposite projects in the mind of God (as in the case of the offerings of Cain & Abel).

This, the interpersonal, is one ancient grounding (including the biblical) of the ontological status of good/evil. The other is the inherent: good/evil are "kata/para physis," built into "natura" & accordingly reflexive-automatic-impersonal (as in the "diké" of the Greek tragedians in operation as "moira" [fate]).

Modernity trusts the predictability of the latter inheritance from the ancients, & thus developed empirical science.

Postmodernity rejects both ancient paradigms: good/evil have no ontological status. The fact that this rejects both the personal & the inherent should have the effect of drawing biblical religion & empirical science together, against a common enemy.

You had concluded for the above underlined: I hope this note provides useful support. ...Also above, you've probably noticed the Jewish use of "bad" (from "yetzer ra," a human tendency parallel with "y. tov" [to goodness]);* & the Christian translation's choice of "evil".

*The two Heb. wds. in Gn.3.5,22.

After writing this note in response to an author's request, it occurred to me that some Thinksheet readers might be interested.

