

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-03/msg00171.html>

- *From:* Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 09 Mar 2007 17:53:15 +1300
-

On Thu, 08 Mar 2007 21:30:35 +0000, Doug Weller
<dweller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 09 Mar 2007 08:56:27 +1300, in sci.archaeology, Eric Stevens
wrote:

On Thu, 08 Mar 2007 18:21:32 +0000, Doug Weller
<dweller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Thu, 08 Mar 2007 22:08:17 +1300, in sci.archaeology,
Eric Stevens
wrote:

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

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

want to
learn to read
pesher.

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 "pesher method" so that a qualified scholar can apply it the the transfiguration passage in Mark Chapter 9 and independently come up with the "hidden pesher 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 pesher" using Thiering's method?

The fact remains that *nobody* can test Thiering's "pesher method" to see whether they

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

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.

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.

Actually one person says he did. You disagree. And you can't
read
motivations. I didn't test it because it's not my field. Others
may have
felt it wasn't worth their time. And you are only talking about
a handful
of people.

That last is the point of my remark.

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

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.

Your statement only works if Thiering has laid out her methodology clearly for other people to test.

Its years since I read her books but I can recall that I had no trouble seeing what she was doing. What I lacked (and still lack) was the deep biblical knowledge to make or confirm the connections she had made.

Do you mean you could use her methodology if you had the knowledge? You seem to be unique in this.

I can see what she seems to be doing but I don't have the knowledge of the DSS to actually reach a conclusion that is what she actually doing.

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.

Re: Barbara Thiering Refuted!

Eric Stevens

Eric Stevens

Eric Stevens

.