

Chapter 1 : Why did God put the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden?

The propositional knowledge that is the analysandum of the analysis of knowledge literature is paradigmatically expressed in English by sentences of the form "S knows that p", where "S" refers to the knowing subject, and "p" to the proposition that is known.

What was is this Tree? What could it do to Adam us? That is the subject of the present Chapter. We will examine the forbidden Tree, attempt to determine its nature, and see what effects these have on those who eat from it. After they had just been created, what was Eden like for them? What did they think about? We know that they were created in the image of God Gen 1: These are difficult questions. We have only a tiny bit of information in the Genesis account. The rest we must deduce. I bring it up here because there is one absolutely critical point that we must understand. From this one point we can gain much understanding about both Eden and the fall. Before the fall, all Adam and Eve knew was life. They did not know evil. And they did not know good as "good". It was only life. This very well may be one of the most significant ideas in the history of our race. It is a mistake to think that before the fall Adam and Eve only knew "good", and that after the fall they knew evil. In other words, this is wrong: Before the fall they neither knew good nor evil. They only knew life. They only knew it as being what it was. It was what it was. All he could say of himself was "I am what I am. In that he was a living, dynamic being, with the future of eternity open before him, he could therefore say "I will be what I will be. That is why he could declare that all he made was "very good". He knew the difference. He had nothing to compare this goodness to. It was therefore not relative to anything else, but absolute. All Adam knew was life. The fruit from the Tree of Life. His consciousness was single minded, unitive, monistic, free from all awareness of duality or separateness. He lived "as one with nature," to use a modern phrase. Try to imagine that from the moment you were born: Furthermore, no one else existed to tell you about a thing called "dark". Yes, you would know the light, obviously. But you would know it not as a relative thing, the opposite of another, but as an absolute unchanging permanence. You would have nothing to compare it to, no frame of reference. So it was with Adam and Eve. They knew good, but not as "good". I realize that I am repeating myself. Many of these concepts are so foreign to our normal way of thinking that I try different approaches or views in order to encompass the idea. From this central understanding, we can gather much about the state before the fall. What was the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? As we have seen, the CUG answers this question by saying that the Tree was simply an ordinary Tree which became important only when God chose it as the object of his obedience test. Why then was it called the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? As we have seen, this is a meaningless ascribed quality, if obedience serves no purpose other than itself. But what if, in fact, the Tree was intrinsically harmful? If God had a reason for commanding Adam to avoid it, what danger did the Tree represent? To echo an earlier example, what was wrong with the hairspray? This leads us to This is the toughest question of all. From this comes our understanding of sin, the fall, expulsion from paradise, the law, and establishing the plan of salvation. Biblical religion claims that the fall of man accounts for the root of all problems that have ever been encountered on this planet. Murder, rape, idolatry, theft, lying, child abuse, taxation, war. All pain and suffering have resulted from this Tree. These are all manifestations of evil. For this will mean that: And the purpose of the law was not to show us how disobedient we are. That is the question. The unitive perception of life as it is was, split into dual awareness of good and evil. Evil is the opposite of good. So all we need do is find out what good is, and its opposite will be evil. Everything, everywhere, is good! Remember crucial point 1? Well, here it is again. Everything in the entire universe, every single thing that existed, everything everywhere was good. An extension and expression of the nature and attributes of the transcendently glorious being that had created it. Whether under the earth, in the water, on the land, in the sky, all the stars, all the planets, all the galaxies, absolutely all of creation, all of the entire manifest universe was good! Everything that was, was good. Goodness was the only reality. We live in a world full of evil and suffering, so it is very hard for us to comprehend the pristine perfection of paradise. Pure goodness and beauty. Everywhere they looked, every thing they saw, touched and thought, radiated perfect goodness. So what is evil? Are you saying that evil is not? That is the exact truth. It is pathetically

irresponsible to deny the existence of evil. Follow me just a little more. Everything that God created was perfectly good. Since everything was good, nothing was evil. There was no object that Adam or Eve could point to that was bad. Knowledge of what is, knowledge of what is not. Everything they saw, touched, heard, everything that existed for them to experience and know was good. There was no thing, object, or created entity they could know that was evil. So here it is. In order to know evil, Adam and Eve had to have their eyes opened to what was not. Partaking of the fruit from the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Adam and Eve became aware both of what did and what did not exist. The Tree of the knowledge of good and evil contained the ability to make one see life from the perspective of what does not exist, in addition to what does. Evil is not a thing. No thing is evil. Every created thing was and is good. Evil is a knowledge, a way of thinking, an orientation, a way of looking at life. Good and evil are not ontological opposites; that is to say, they do not exist in the same manner. Evil is a projection onto the goodness, a denial of it. Evil is a mistaken perception of that reality. The Bible tells us so. All you have to do is read it. What was the first thing that happened after Adam and Eve ate from the Tree?

Chapter 2 : Introduction to Philosophy/The Branches of Philosophy - Wikibooks, open books for an open world

"While Adam and Eve had cognitive knowledge of good and evil before the Fall, they came to know evil in a new way after the Fall because they experienced it personally." Jason, I agree with your above statement %.

A woman does not think or reason like a man nor does she look at those in authority the same way due to her experiences and interactions with parents, culture, and her economic situation. The parental aspect is complex, leading into religious and moral issues along with physical, sexual, and mental abuse. These women came from different ethnic backgrounds and social classes in order to analyze a broader range of voices. Interview questions revolved around the topics of self-image, decision making, relationships, education and learning, personal changes and growth and what encouraged them to initiate changes. Stages of Intellectual Development

Silence A woman of silence is totally dependent on those in authority, not questioning or voicing an opinion Belenky et al. Expressing her personal thoughts is very difficult as she lives in the present and normally speaks of specific concrete behaviors. A woman of silence usually has experienced physical, mental, or sexual abuse and feels that she is to be seen and not heard. If she should voice her opinion or ask a question, punishment is the most likely result. A woman of silence views decisions as either right or wrong with no room for reasoning. Received Knowledge Belenky et al. As the receiver she will listen and pass knowledge on to others, shaping her thoughts to match those in authority. When asked about herself, the receiver of knowledge will reply with what other individuals have stated, unable to voice her feelings. Abuse is still prevalent in the life of a woman receiving knowledge. Subjective Knowledge About half of those participating in the project were at the subjective knowledge level Belenky et al. She recognizes that she does not have to agree with the authority but is still cautious about voicing opinions. Truth is experienced within oneself but not acted upon for fear of jeopardizing the associations one has with others at the same level. Procedural Knowledge Belenky et al. A woman in either area realizes that she has voice, is still cautious of others and their actions, however now she is not threatened and is more willing to listen to what is being said. A separatist will not project her feelings into a situation and is able to speak taking on the requested view. A connected knower empathizes with others and feels it is her responsibility to help them understand their situation so they might make the best decision. Constructed Knowledge A constructivist realizes that one must speak, listen, share ideas, explore, and question, analyzing who, why, and how Belenky et al. Speaking and listening does not remain within oneself but includes speaking and listening to others at the same time. She wants a better quality of life for herself and for others. Dualism is similar to a receiver of knowledge with the man identifying with those in authority whereas a woman is unable to do so Belenky et al. William Rapaport placed multiplicity and subjectivism at similar levels. He states that a man has his opinion but has difficulty expressing it to authorities; a woman feels powerless to express her opinion Belenky et al. Rapaport relates commitment and constructivism as similar with a man viewing knowledge as an ongoing unfolding activity whereas a woman brings her personal experiences and reflection into the integration of knowledge. Progression Between Stages Belenky et al. Rapaport however alludes to the progression as a journey that can be repeated where one might be at different levels at the same time with respect to different subjects. He goes on to state that both have a final position where a mature thinker seeks to fully understand an issue and is able to make up his or her mind. Both models agree that the progression to another level takes time and is not always easy but how one goes between the steps is also not always clear cut. Critique The progression from one level to another for a woman is like the bloom of a Morning Glory. A woman will become more confident with her feelings and voice but under certain conditions might step back, reassess, and then go forward once more like the blooming of the flower. It is not that she will retreat permanently but will use her reasoning skills and her concern for others to determine the best route to obtain the goal. A woman is not always as delicate as the flower but can persevere through many situations to become a pressed flower, firm in her thoughts and expectations. Discussion of families and education at the end of the book evokes controversy Belenky et al. It states that children are told to listen but not be heard. In some matters children are unable to make decisions and need to listen; this may also be called showing respect. Education is also referred to as the

road to life changes. Is it the educational experience or is it a time that the woman is growing emotionally and learning more about herself? This leads to the non-inclusion of the working woman in the study. Women that get decent jobs and go on to have productive lives were ignored; why did they decide not to go on to school, if they were abused in some way, or their perspectives with those in authority were not studied. The Belenky et al. Looking back on the lives of family and friends one begins to also question and analyze actions and moral or religious issues. Why do I do what I do?

Chapter 3 : Chapter 6: The Fall of Adam and Eve

The Difference Between Knowledge And Skills: Knowing Does Not Make You Skilled For many people, knowledge and skills are similar concepts used to describe competency. But for learning professionals they should be considered as two quite different yet related concepts.

Donate Why did God put the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden? God put the tree of knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden to give Adam and Eve a choice to obey Him or disobey Him. Adam and Eve were free to do anything they wanted, except eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. In order for Adam and Eve to truly be free, they had to have a choice. There was nothing essentially evil about the tree or the fruit of the tree. It is unlikely that the fruit, in and of itself, gave Adam and Eve any further knowledge. That is, the physical fruit may have contained some vitamin C and some beneficial fiber, but it was not spiritually nutritious. However, the act of disobedience was spiritually deleterious. For the first time, they knew what it was to be evil, to feel shame, and to want to hide from God. Their sin of disobeying God brought corruption into their lives and into the world. Eating the fruit, as an act of disobedience against God, was what gave Adam and Eve the knowledge of evil and the knowledge of their nakedness Genesis 3: God did not want Adam and Eve to sin. God knew ahead of time what the results of sin would be. God knew that Adam and Eve would sin and would thereby bring evil, suffering, and death into the world. Why, then, did God allow Satan to tempt Adam and Eve? God allowed Satan to tempt Adam and Eve to force them to make the choice. Adam and Eve chose, of their own free will, to disobey God and eat the forbidden fruit. The results—evil, sin, suffering, sickness, and death—have plagued the world ever since. May we echo the words of the Apostle Paul in Romans 7: Who will rescue me from this body of death? Thanks be to God—through Jesus Christ our Lord!

Chapter 4 : The Analysis of Knowledge (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

In Genesis where you have the Garden of Eden story and God's prohibition he says, "You can eat of any tree you want but you must not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die."

Original sin Catholic exegesis of Genesis 3 claims that the fall of man was a "primeval event, a deed that took place at the beginning of the history of man. These negated or diminished the gifts of God to Adam and Eve of original justice or sanctifying grace, integrity, immortality and infused knowledge. This first sin was "transmitted" by Adam and Eve to all of their descendants as original sin, causing humans to be "subject to ignorance, suffering and the dominion of death, and inclined to sin. Even children partake in the effects of the sin of Adam, but not in the responsibility of original sin, as sin is always a personal act. Eastern Orthodoxy rejects the idea that the guilt of original sin is passed down through generations. It bases its teaching in part on Ezekiel The Church teaches that, in addition to their conscience and tendency to do good, men and women are born with a tendency to sin due to the fallen condition of the world. Thus, according to St Paul in his epistle to the Romans, non-Christians can still act according to their conscience. Orthodoxy believes that, while everyone bears the consequences of the first sin that is, death , only Adam and Eve are guilty of that sin. The subordination exegesis is that the natural consequences of sin entering the human race, was prophesied by God when the phrase was made: This interpretation is reinforced by comments in the First Epistle to Timothy , where the author gives a rationale for directing that a woman NIV: I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man NIV: For Adam was formed first, then Eve. And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. They reason that "if the Apostle Paul was forgiven for what he did ignorantly in unbelief" including persecuting and murdering Christians, "and thereafter was given a ministry, why would the same forgiveness and ministry be denied women" for the sins of their foremother eons ago? Addressing that, the Kroegers conclude that Paul was referring to the promise of Genesis 3: Religion and agriculture Symbolic aspects of the fall of man are commonly taken to correlate with knowledge gained by experience in the wake of fateful decisions. In Ancient Mesopotamian religion , humanity was originally immortal and walked with the gods, but after the great flood the gods departed and humanity lost their divinity. The Demiurge banished Adam and Eve, because man was now a threat. Following this sin, their "nakedness appeared to them: However, God also gave them the assurance that "when there come unto you from Me a guidance, then whoso followeth My guidance, he will not go astray nor come to grief. Failure to do so actively leads to misery for the individual and for his family. This is also the moral of many of the stories of the Shahnameh , the key text of Persian mythology. Christian writers gladly appropriated terminology utilised to describe this Greek concept. In the novel Perelandra by C. Lewis , the theme of the fall is explored in the context of a new Garden of Eden with a new, green-skinned Adam and Eve on the planet Venus, and with the protagonist " the Cambridge scholar Dr. Ransom " transported there and given the mission of thwarting Satan and preventing a new fall. In the novel The Fall by Albert Camus , the theme of the fall is enunciated through the first-person account given in post-war Amsterdam, in a bar called "Mexico City. The dilemmas of modern Western conscience and the sacramental themes of baptism and grace are explored. Pullman believes that it is not worth being innocent if the price is ignorance. The novel Lord of the Flies explores the fall of man. The storyline depicts young innocent children who turn into savages when they are stranded on a desert island. Lord of the Flies was originally named Strangers from Within, also showing his views of human nature. The theme is also frequently depicted in historical European art. Lucas van Leyden , a Dutch engraver and painter during the Renaissance period, created several different woodcuts featuring Adam and Eve two were part of his Power of Women series.

Chapter 5 : J.I. Packer Quotes (Author of Knowing God)

Knowledge in itself is not wrong (see Luke), so what was so bad about man "knowing good and evil"? It is vital to know the context of God's statement. God had already told Adam not to eat from this tree.

July 21, at 1: A similar thing occurs in children. At some age, a child realizes they can choose to disobey a parent, i. The Law of Sin being what it is, children by nature choose, often and eventually, the latter. Then, at that moment, when such a choice is made, the knowledge of good and evil enters, and as it reads in Romans regarding the knowledge of sin through the law and that without the law, sin is not imputed; 3: So, to me, free will is death. The only life God offers is through a complete submission of the will to His. Not physically, of course, but the moment they became self-aware of their own freedom to choose between the two, and so ate, they died. Had they refused the serpent, they would have ostensibly chosen good, but the damage was already done. Self-conscious freedom of the will was established. Then, to rescue humanity from such a death, God sent Jesus to taste death for every man, pre-destinating His Son to suffer the same fate as we, so that, through His complete submission to the will of God, Jesus could effect our salvation. As to the morality vs. On the surface, this may appear to make them amoral, but I would argue that their morality, instituted by God, was merely dormant, awaiting a trigger. This is why God put the tree in the garden and gave them the freedom to choose. He knew they were going to need that moment of enlightenment in order for their dormant morality to kick-in. Regarding imago Dei, I think an understanding of the Hebrew concept of image is important here. Does it mean a similitude of God? Does it mean that Adam was to somehow be like God perhaps even God-like by virtue of being such an image? My understanding of tselem is that being the image of God made Adam His representative figure on earth, and nothing more. A representative in this case is merely someone who operates by proxy, not someone who takes after or is like to the one which they represent Compare this to the Greek word for image regarding Jesus being the image of the invisible God in Colossians 1: The word is eikon, and means a likeness or to have a resemblance, i. Semantically, it may appear to be only a slight difference, but doctrinally, the difference is quite significant. Now, regarding likeness Genesis 1: As the first son of God Luke 3: So, to each their own on whatever they feel is true.

Chapter 6 : What is the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil? | Free Online Bible Classes

In Christian theology, consuming the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil was the sin committed by Adam and Eve that led to the fall of man in Genesis. In Catholicism, Augustine of Hippo taught that the tree should be understood both symbolically and as a real tree - similarly to Jerusalem being both a real city and a figure of Heavenly Jerusalem.

However, God also created a tree that would give the eater the knowledge of good and evil - commanding Adam not to eat its fruit. Why would God create something that was banned and, specifically, why would it be a tree whose fruit offered knowledge of good and evil? Background Genesis 1 describes how God created the universe and life on earth. Genesis 2 provides the details of how human beings were created. Like most other creation accounts in the Bible, the one in Genesis 2 is brief. Here is what we know. God created Adam "from the dust of the ground" Genesis 2: Although God had created previous hominid species on earth, modern humans were the first to possess a spirit with which to communicate with and worship God. The Bible makes it clear that Adam was created outside the garden of Eden and placed in it when everything was ready Genesis 2: God had created many different kinds of fruit trees for Adam to eat. Of all the trees, Adam was commanded not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, in the middle of the garden Genesis 2: Sometime after Adam was placed in the garden, Eve was created Genesis 2: Why set Adam and Eve up to fail? Skeptics often complain that God set Adam and Eve up to fail. However, God had to give Adam and Eve a choice. Without free will to choose, Adam and Eve would have been mere puppets. True love always requires choice. God wanted Adam and Eve to choose to love and trust Him. The only way to give this choice would have been to command something that was not allowed. Since God had planted in the garden all the different trees from which we now get fruit, the test was not too difficult. Adam and Eve had plenty to eat and a large variety of fruits from which to choose, and could have chosen to believe God. They were only commanded not to eat from one tree out of the many. Why did God choose the knowledge of good and evil? Since everything else God planted in the garden was good, the natural choice of something to choose from would be knowledge of evil. God did not want Adam and Eve to experience evil or even know about it. However, Satan had already rebelled against God and then tempted Eve to join him in rebellion against God. Satan used the oldest ploy in his playbook of deceit - God is a cosmic killjoy who is trying to keep something good from you. The text suggests that Adam and Eve had enjoyed daily walks with God through the garden prior to their fall Genesis 3: The knowledge of evil brought fear and shame to Adam and Eve Genesis 3: This is somewhat speculative, but I believe that we believers will lose our knowledge of evil in heaven. Conclusion Skeptics claim that God set up Adam and Eve to fail by giving them a test that was either too difficult or deceptive. However, the Bible makes it clear that God gave Adam and Eve all they needed - with lots of different trees from which to eat fruit. It is clear that Eve knew she should not eat from the one tree in the middle of the garden that she was instructed to avoid. Instead of believing God and trusting Him, after all He had done for them, Eve chose to believe the lies of Satan in snake form, and believed that God was lying to her. She ate the forbidden fruit and convinced her husband to do the same, resulting in their loss of innocence and a broken relationship with God and each other. We still have the same choice as Adam and Eve. We can gain the knowledge of evil by directly participating in it or we can believe God and avoid the things He has said are bad for us.

Chapter 7 : Why was it wrong for Adam and Eve to know good and evil (Genesis)?

The TOK areas of knowledge are how we divide up and label the knowledge we possess. The TOK course identifies 8 different areas of knowledge, but although the nature of the knowledge within them undoubtedly varies, you should be aware that there is a great deal of overlapping both amongst themselves, and with the ways of knowing.

According to this analysis, justified, true belief is necessary and sufficient for knowledge. The Tripartite Analysis of Knowledge: S knows that p iff p is true; S believes that p; S is justified in believing that p. Much of the twentieth-century literature on the analysis of knowledge took the JTB analysis as its starting-point. It became something of a convenient fiction to suppose that this analysis was widely accepted throughout much of the history of philosophy. In fact, however, the JTB analysis was first articulated in the twentieth century by its attackers. Consequently, nobody knows that Hillary Clinton won the election. One can only know things that are true. Many people expected Clinton to win the election. Not all truths are established truths. If you flip a coin and never check how it landed, it may be true that it landed heads, even if nobody has any way to tell. Truth is a metaphysical, as opposed to epistemological, notion: Knowledge is a kind of relationship with the truth—“to know something is to have a certain kind of access to a fact. The general idea behind the belief condition is that you can only know what you believe. Failing to believe something precludes knowing it. Outright belief is stronger see, e. Suppose Walter comes home after work to find out that his house has burned down. Critics of the belief condition might argue that Walter knows that his house has burned down he sees that it has , but, as his words indicate, he does not believe it. A more serious counterexample has been suggested by Colin Radford Suppose Albert is quizzed on English history. One of the questions is: E Elizabeth died in Radford makes the following two claims about this example: Albert does not believe E. The fact that he answers most of the questions correctly indicates that he has actually learned, and never forgotten, such historical facts. Since he takes a and b to be true, Radford holds that belief is not necessary for knowledge. But either of a and b might be resisted. David Rose and Jonathan Schaffer take this route. The justification condition is the topic of the next section. Why not say that knowledge is true belief? The standard answer is that to identify knowledge with true belief would be implausible because a belief might be true even though it is formed improperly. Suppose that William flips a coin, and confidently believes—“on no particular basis—“that it will land tails. For William to know, his belief must in some epistemic sense be proper or appropriate: For example, if a lawyer employs sophistry to induce a jury into a belief that happens to be true, this belief is insufficiently well-grounded to constitute knowledge. Internalists about justification think that whether a belief is justified depends wholly on states in some sense internal to the subject. Conee and Feldman present an example of an internalist view. Given their not unsubstantial assumption that what evidence a subject has is an internal matter, evidentialism implies internalism. Propositional justification concerns whether a subject has sufficient reason to believe a given proposition; [9] doxastic justification concerns whether a given belief is held appropriately. The precise relation between propositional and doxastic justification is subject to controversy, but it is uncontroversial that the two notions can come apart. Suppose that Ingrid ignores a great deal of excellent evidence indicating that a given neighborhood is dangerous, but superstitiously comes to believe that the neighborhood is dangerous when she sees a black cat crossing the street. Since knowledge is a particularly successful kind of belief, doxastic justification is a stronger candidate for being closely related to knowledge; the JTB theory is typically thought to invoke doxastic justification but see Lowy This view is sometimes motivated by the thought that, when we consider whether someone knows that p, or wonder which of a group of people know that p, often, we are not at all interested in whether the relevant subjects have beliefs that are justified; we just want to know whether they have the true belief. For example, as Hawthorne One could allow that there is a lightweight sense of knowledge that requires only true belief; another option is to decline to accept the intuitive sentences as true at face value. In what follows, we will set aside the lightweight sense, if indeed there be one, and focus on the stronger one. Although most agree that each element of the tripartite theory is necessary for knowledge, they do not seem collectively to be sufficient. There seem to be cases of justified true belief that still fall short of knowledge. Here is one kind of

example: Imagine that we are seeking water on a hot day. We suddenly see water, or so we think. In fact, we are not seeing water but a mirage, but when we reach the spot, we are lucky and find water right there under a rock. Can we say that we had genuine knowledge of water? The answer seems to be negative, for we were just lucky. The 14th-century Italian philosopher Peter of Mantua presented a similar case: Let it be assumed that Plato is next to you and you know him to be running, but you mistakenly believe that he is Socrates, so that you firmly believe that Socrates is running. However, let it be so that Socrates is in fact running in Rome; however, you do not know this. Gettier presented two cases in which a true belief is inferred from a justified false belief. He observed that, intuitively, such beliefs cannot be knowledge; it is merely lucky that they are true. Since they appear to refute the JTB analysis, many epistemologists have undertaken to repair it: Above, we noted that one role of the justification is to rule out lucky guesses as cases of knowledge. A lesson of the Gettier problem is that it appears that even true beliefs that are justified can nevertheless be epistemically lucky in a way inconsistent with knowledge. Epistemologists who think that the JTB approach is basically on the right track must choose between two different strategies for solving the Gettier problem. The first is to strengthen the justification condition to rule out Gettier cases as cases of justified belief. No False Lemmas According to one suggestion, the following fourth condition would do the trick: There are examples of Gettier cases that need involve no inference; therefore, there are possible cases of justified true belief without knowledge, even though condition iv is met. Suppose, for example, that James, who is relaxing on a bench in a park, observes an apparent dog in a nearby field. So he believes There is a dog in the field. Suppose further that the putative dog is actually a robot dog so perfect that it could not be distinguished from an actual dog by vision alone. Given these assumptions, d is of course false. And since this belief is based on ordinary perceptual processes, most epistemologists will agree that it is justified. If so, then the JTB account, even if supplemented with iv, gives us the wrong result that James knows d. Suppose there is a county in the Midwest with the following peculiar feature. The landscape next to the road leading through that county is peppered with barn-facades: Observation from any other viewpoint would immediately reveal these structures to be fakes: Suppose Henry is driving along the road that leads through Barn County. Naturally, he will on numerous occasions form false beliefs in the presence of barns. Since Henry has no reason to suspect that he is the victim of organized deception, these beliefs are justified. Now suppose further that, on one of those occasions when he believes there is a barn over there, he happens to be looking at the one and only real barn in the county. This time, his belief is justified and true. Yet condition iv is met in this case. His belief is not the result of any inference from a falsehood. Once again, we see that iv does not succeed as a general solution to the Gettier problem. Sensitivity, to a first approximation, is this counterfactual relation: Given a Lewisian Lewis semantics for counterfactual conditionals, the sensitivity condition is equivalent to the requirement that, in the nearest possible worlds in which not-p, the subject does not believe that p. One motivation for including a sensitivity condition in an analysis of knowledge is that there seems to be an intuitive sense in which knowledge requires not merely being correct, but tracking the truth in other possible circumstances. This approach seems to be a plausible diagnosis of what goes wrong in at least some Gettier cases. For if there were no water there, you would have held the same belief on the same grounds—viz. However, it is doubtful that a sensitivity condition can account for the phenomenon of Gettier cases in general. It does so only in cases in which, had the proposition in question been false, it would have been believed anyway. But, as Saul Kripke Consider for instance the Barn County case mentioned above. Henry looks at a particular location where there happens to be a barn and believes there to be a barn there. The sensitivity condition rules out this belief as knowledge only if, were there no barn there, Henry would still have believed there was. But this counterfactual may be false, depending on how the Barn County case is set up. Relatedly, as Kripke has also indicated We assume Henry is unaware that colour signifies anything relevant. Since intuitively, the former belief looks to fall short of knowledge in just the same way as the latter, a sensitivity condition will only handle some of the intuitive problems deriving from Gettier cases. Most epistemologists today reject sensitivity requirements on knowledge. For example, George, who can see and use his hands perfectly well, knows that he has hands.

Chapter 8 : Eating the Fruit

The knowledge of evil brought fear and shame to Adam and Eve (Genesis). 4 So, the knowledge of good and evil was not a good thing, since it ruined their innocent relationship with God and each other.

I came across and read this book recently and there were some thoughts early on in the book that triggered my own desire to write this short study series about knowing the Holy One. Here are a couple of quotes that spoke to me: So what do you think? Is that a true quote? Do you think this quote still applies today? Has the Church solved this issue in the subsequent 60 years? It is my belief that A. W Tozer was spot on and would turn in his grave if he saw what passes as Christianity today. I simply want to explore some themes based around the nature and character of God, how he reveals Himself and how we get to know Him. In many ways these things should be Christianity But because of a lack of understanding among many that claim the name of Christ today, sometimes it is important to re-establish the foundations once again! Can finite man know the infinite God? Can you probe the limits of the Almighty? They are deeper than the depths of the grave--what can you know? Their measure is longer than the earth and wider than the sea. How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out! On the one hand, when considering the perfection of all His attributes and His limitless knowledge and power, we can only, humbly, say no. Zophar, in the book of Job asks that very question as stated above - Can you probe the limits of the Almighty? The fact is that as limited, fallen human beings we can only scratch the very surface. And yet here is the thing He wants His creation to know Him. Back in the garden of Eden He actually walked and fellowshiped with man Gen 3;8. So while the fullness of His power, wisdom and glory are beyond our comprehension, that which He has revealed to us, on a level that we can grasp and understood, is to be desired and apprehended by us - His creation. Here is an interesting verse that Jesus spoke to His own disciples shortly before going to the cross. So do you have that burning desire to know God more and more? Is that a priority in your life? While the distractions are many and varied, it is worth remembering that that is the very purpose for your creation. The primary and most essential responsibility of any human being is to know the One who made them. Look at what God said through His prophet Jeremiah about this: Wisdom, power and riches are all high up in the list of things to which mankind boast and takes pride in. But here is something that mankind can be proud of - that they have come to know and have a relationship with the Almighty. That is the desire that we need to have. That is what men and women of faith in ages past were commended for. Bible characters who have truly desired to know God Now this is going to be a very subjective list! Who truly desired to know this limitless God? Here are seven characters that came to my mind He is one that sought God, found Him, and was commended for it as one who pleased God! I like what we learn about Joshua from this one scripture alone: And he would return to the camp, but his servant Joshua the son of Nun, a young man, did not depart from the tabernacle. David often wrote of his desire to know God as expressed in his many Psalms. Psalm 63 is one such Psalm where he states: My soul thirsts for You, my flesh yearns for You, In a dry and weary land where there is no water. Because Your lovingkindness is better than life, My lips will praise You. Here also was a man who set himself to seek and know the Lord Dan 6: He was one that was able to hear and receive revelation from heaven. This is clearly seen in the gospels where John is often pictured next to Jesus, or leaning on his bosom John Paul was given great revelation concerning God and that only increased his desire to know more! I want to know Him and the power of His resurrection Would you place your name amongst this list of people that desire to know God better? They were giants in the history of faith and were equipped and enabled by God for the special calling that was upon their life. But anyone, and everyone, can have a heart for God and a desire to know Him better. He is no respecter of persons and is not far from any of us. What do the scriptures say about knowing God? And yes, it is that important! The fact is that knowing God is worth far more than gold or rubies for it holds value for both today and into the day of eternity. When we apply ourselves and have a heart to really want to know, the Bible promises that we will discover the knowledge of God. And with that comes the blessings of wisdom and understanding. Paul prayed for those in Colossae that they would be filled with the knowledge of God in all wisdom and understanding. Is that something you pray? You will see from the

Oswald Chambers quote the end of prayer is not things but God. Not what you can get from Him but what you can get of Him. You will see also that there is a practical outworking of this knowledge as well. The end of prayer is that I come to know God Himself. In other words, as we grow in our understanding and relationship with the Lord, so our experience of His grace and peace will be multiplied. Whatever measure of grace and peace you currently know is NOT all that there is! What do the scriptures say about NOT retaining the knowledge of God? It is also worth seeing what the Bible says about those that do not want to know God. Job struggled with the prosperity of the wicked who despised the knowledge of the Holy. He said that they did not desire the knowledge of God nor could they see any benefit from it. More than likely you will know many people that fit into this category. It is obviously an ancient problem! Here is what Job said: We do not even desire the knowledge of Your ways. Solomon, who knew a thing or two about wisdom, spoke of the present day consequences for those that rejected the knowledge of God: The Bible says they shall be satiated with their own devices. In other words, God will give them over to their own ways and thoughts to the point that it will become sickening to them. This is also expressed in the New Testament where the Apostle Paul spoke of the impact in this life for those that will not retain a knowledge of God: Conclusion So we have seen that we know Him to the degree that He has revealed Himself to us. We have also seen that God desires for us to know Him and has told us that it is more important that seeking for silver and gems. We have also looked briefly at different characters who had a heart that desired to know God more intimately. They desired to fellowship with Him and know the character, attributes and ways of God more clearly. How do we come to know Him? That is what we will look at in the next study. We will explore the revelation of God in the person of Christ and the important of revelation in knowing Him..

Chapter 9 : Fall of man - Wikipedia

Start studying TOK: Areas of Knowledge (AoK) and Ways of Knowing (Wok). Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools.

God prepared this earth as a home for His children. Adam and Eve were chosen to be the first people to live on the earth see Moses 1: They were to be the first parents. Use questions at the beginning of a section to start a discussion and send class members or family members to the text to find more information. Use questions at the end of a section to help class members or family members ponder and discuss the meaning of what they have read and apply it in their lives. He was chosen by our Heavenly Father to lead the righteous in the battle against Satan see Revelation Adam and Eve were foreordained to become our first parents. The Lord promised Adam great blessings: What can we learn from the examples of Adam and Eve? When Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden, they were not yet mortal. There was no death. They had physical life because their spirits were housed in physical bodies made from the dust of the earth see Moses 6: They had spiritual life because they were in the presence of God. They had not yet made a choice between good and evil. God commanded them to have children. God told them they could freely eat of every tree in the garden except one, the tree of knowledge of good and evil. He tempted her to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Eve yielded to the temptation and ate the fruit. When Adam learned what had happened, he chose to partake also. The changes that came upon Adam and Eve because they ate the fruit are called the Fall. Because Adam and Eve had eaten the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, the Lord sent them out of the Garden of Eden into the world. Their physical condition changed as a result of their eating the forbidden fruit. As God had promised, they became mortal. They and their children would experience sickness, pain, and physical death. Because of their transgression, Adam and Eve also suffered spiritual death. This meant they and their children could not walk and talk face to face with God. Adam and Eve and their children were separated from God both physically and spiritually. Some people believe Adam and Eve committed a serious sin when they ate of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. However, latter-day scriptures help us understand that their Fall was a necessary step in the plan of life and a great blessing to all of us. Because of the Fall, we are blessed with physical bodies, the right to choose between good and evil, and the opportunity to gain eternal life. None of these privileges would have been ours had Adam and Eve remained in the garden. The prophet Lehi explained: And all things which were created must have remained in the same state in which they were after they were created. Why do you think it is important to know about the Fall and how it influences us?