

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-03/msg00152.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 08 Mar 2007 22:08:17 +1300
-

On Thu, 08 Mar 2007 07:53:58 +0000, me@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Eric Stevens wrote:

It might be a rhetorical question but you are changing the subject. We started off with one person who may or may not want to learn to read peshet.

That's not true. The post that started this thread reads:

"Science is based on the idea that one scientist can replicate and confirm the work of another scientist. I publicly challenge Barbara Thiering or any of her followers to explain her "peshet method" so that a qualified scholar can apply it to the transfiguration passage in Mark Chapter 9 and independently come up with the "hidden peshet meaning" of Jesus stripping the Jewish High Priest naked and carrying out the atonement ritual in his place."

In the English language, the phrase "So that a qualified scholar" in the paragraph above means any qualified scholar, not one particular qualified scholar.

Could it be that you are confusing this thread with some other thread that started off with one person who may or may not want to learn to "read peshet" using Thiering's method?

The fact remains that **nobody** can test Thiering's "peshet method" to see whether they get the same results she does. Only Thiering can work the method, and she has not revealed enough of the details for anyone else to replicate her results. If she ever reveals that as-yet-secret information, **then** we shall see whether anyone wishes to learn her method.

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Ordinarily I would agree with you. However, before you broke the thread, we were discussing a particular opponent of Thiering who could not replicate her results (I forget his name, I don't follow this topic that closely).

My subsequent comment stems from an experience I had some years ago when I asked persons qualified to read a particular script, to test a hypothesis that a number of petroglyphs employed a precursor subset of the particular script. [I'm being coy here because I do not want to reopen old arguments.]

I COULD NOT GET THESE PEOPLE TO TEST THIS HYPOTHESIS for the simple reason that they could not bring themselves to even consider the possibility that it might just be correct. **THEY WOULD NOT DO IT.** The same thing applies to Thiering's pesher. A scholar sufficiently determined that Thiering is talking nonsense will never be able to either learn or apply Thiering's pesher technique. You have to realise that pesher is not just a simple substitution code and a determined failure to deduce the necessary connections will absolutely prevent a pesher reading.

You should be aware that when I wrote the above, I was not taking a stance of any kind about whether Thiering is correct in her pesher explanation. I am merely explaining the psychological mechanism which will prevent an unsympathetic scholar from replicating what she has done.

Eric Stevens

.