

---

## Brev till THS Studentkår (som ej besvarats)

### Ärende till STHS studentrepresentant för nätkurser.

Hej!

Jag önskar att STHS, kanske i samband med studentkårens årsmöte, företräder studenternas och sanningens intresse med avseende på grundkursen i GT Exegetik. Det är min åsikt att kurslitteraturen "Understanding the Bible" av Stephen Harris avviker ifrån klassisk kristendom, samt att THS kursansvarig otillräckligt möter högskolans krav på vetenskaplighet och intellektuell integritet. Jag vill samtidigt understryka att mitt ärende, med bifogad information, ändå bör behandlas med personlig respekt för kursansvarige.

Kursansvarig inleder Närforum med följande ordalydelse: "*När det gäller kontakten med mig, vill jag att den uppehålls här i kursens forum och inte via vanlig epost. På så sätt blir all information genast tillgänglig för alla kursens deltagare.*" Det visar sig senare att denna avsikt möjligtvis var tunt förankrad.

Jag föreslår följande:

1) Kurslitteraturen Stephen Harris skall utebli och ersättas av annan litteratur, som bättre motsvarar vetenskapliga kriterier med balanserad tro.

Bifogar underlag.

Vänligen,

Torsten Nenzén

---

## Akademisk dialog med kursansvarig vid Teologiska Högskolan i Stockholm

**From:** Åke Viberg [ake.viberg@ths.se]  
**Sent:** den 18 mars 2004 13:12  
**To:** info@globalnet.de  
**Subject:** Re: ang inlägg  
Torsten,

Mitt förslag kvarstår. Lägg in ca 5 frågor så ska jag försöka svara på dem,

Vänligen, Åke Viberg

---

Åke Viberg, docent lektor, exegetisk teologi, Gamla testamentet  
tel 08-56435718 Teologiska Högskolan, Stockholm  
ake.viberg@ths.se <http://www.ths.se>

---

2004-03-18 kl. 10.58 skrev GLOCALNET.de:

### Åke Viberg.

Godmorgon, och tackar för din samarbetsvilliga respons. Som du kanske redan anar, värdesätter jag ärlighet, äkthet, öppenhet och sanning. Med osanningen kan jag aldrig kompromissa. Det innebär dock inte att erkända misstag ej kan kompromissas. Den relativistiska sanningen kan endast betraktas som relativt sann så länge som den inte är motbevisad. När meningsskillnader uppstår kring uppfattning om sanning, är den enda förutsättningen till förnuftets samförstånd eller respekterad meningsskillnad att argumentera för sin mening. Avsaknad av argumentation omöjliggör förnuftets samförstånd eller respekterad meningsskillnad. Förutsättningen för argumentation är givetvis att argumenten kommuniceras. En bruten kommunikation omöjliggör därför förutsättningen till respekt, eller till samförstånd.

I de mer intellektuella sammanhangen, vilket bl a högskolor och universitet utgör, måste, utifrån gemensamma definitioner, finnas enande kring argumentationen för fastställandet av teorier kring sanning respektive icke-sanning. Förutsättningen till kompromiss är enande kring argumentationens hållbarhet, även om argumenten i sig skiljer sig. Vi behöver alltså inte tro samma sak, men i ett höskolesammanhang måste du kunna argumentera för din tro. Om argumenten skulle utebli kan THS inte anses som en icke-konfessionell högskola.

Att hävda, som jag uppfattar att Harris gör, tvärsäkra svar angående Bibeltexternas uppkomst och tolkning med tunn, tveksam eller osann argumentation, visar inte på en vetenskaplig hållning utan på en stark tro. Om THS refuserar motargument, ifrågasättanden eller kritik, gör sig THS delaktig i Harris konfession. THS kan inte med trovärdighet behålla en status som icke-konfessionell akademisk institution, om THS diskriminerar mot oliktankande.

Jag uppmanar därför THS att allvarsamt rannsaka sin attityd till vetenskap och tro.

Jag förväntar inte att Ni, Åke Viberg, skall besvara samtliga frågor - jag framförde det

budskapet redan vid första e-postmeddelandet till Er (inklusive adressat: ths@ths.se för att markera den offentliga intentionen). Jag ser allvarligt på det inträffade och föreslår därför följande lösning, för att undvika en trist eskalerad konflikt:

- 1) Öppna klassens nätforum.
- 2) Publicera samtliga frågor.
- 3) Publicera samtliga dessa våra internet kommunikationer.
- 4) Jag utser någon eller ett par (högst tre) frågor till dig Åke.

Jag tror inte att varken du eller jag har någonting alls att förlora på den offentliga diskussionen. Tvärtom - endast genom den kan vi med intellektuell hederlighet närma oss sanningen, och varandra.

Vänligen,

Torsten

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Åke Viberg [mailto:ake.viberg@ths.se]

**Sent:** den 17 mars 2004 22:43

**To:** info@glocalnet.de

**Subject:** Re: ang inlägg

Torsten,

Låt oss göra en kompromiss. Välj ut fem frågor, ungefär i stil med vad andra studenter har valt att ställa i omfång, så ska jag försöka svara på dem. Men försök att hålla dig till ämnet som är för handen, och inte frågor där du ifrågasätter kurslitteraturens grundförutsättningar. De är i och för sig legitima frågor, något annat har jag aldrig påstått, men de är inte relevanta just i detta sammanhang, och det får du helt enkelt finna dig i. I en annan kurs så kan det bli mer relevant. Men jag erbjuder dig alltså att välja ut fem frågor, och då ska jag svara på dem efter bästa förmåga.

Vänligen, Åke Viberg

-----  
 Åke Viberg, docent lektor, exegetisk teologi, Gamla testamentet  
 tel 08-56435718 Teologiska Högskolan, Stockholm  
 ake.viberg@ths.se <http://www.ths.se>  
 -----

2004-03-17 kl. 21.35 skrev GLOCALNET.de:

**Åke Viberg.**

Hej!

Ni överraskar mig med, som jag uppfattar det, ett ganska typiskt slingrande liberateologiskt beteende. Jag fick nämligen intrycket av, under undervisningspasset, att Ni var någotsånär ortodox Bibeltroende. Jag hoppas att du instämmer i att den som inte riktigt förhåller sig samvetsgrant efter sanningen, frukar sanningen, samt att sanningen tål allt ifrågasättande och kritik.

Åke Viberg, när jag publicerar ett antal frågor offentligt via nätkursens forum, och du refuserar samtliga frågor, men istället responderar på mitt inlägg utanför forumet via ett enskilt e-post, och där meddelar att du inte vill besvara frågorna, sänder du till mig ett tydligt

budskap om att din ovilja till att besvara frågorna inte har samband med frågornas starka relevans till kursens litteratur, men att du ogillade frågornas indirekt förtydligande av Harris kamouflerade tro. När jag sedan publicerar mitt inlägg på nytt, inklusive ditt svar till mitt inlägg samt min respons till din tidigare refusering, väljer du att på nytt refusera samtliga frågor och stänga av forumet, möjligtvis med avsikt att hindra vidare exponering av frågorna och kommunikation .

Du säger att mitt inlägg inte uppfyller kriterierna för vad forumet är till för. (1) Vilka är dessa kriterier? (2) På vilket sätt anser du att jag inte uppfyller dessa kriterier?

- I) Du påstår att mina frågor inte rör svårigheter i läroboken.
- II) Du uttrycker att mina frågor rör saker i läroboken där jag inte har samma åsikt.
- III) Du säger att I) och II) inte är samma sak.

Hur menar du Åke Viberg? Får man inte ifrågasätta lärobokens påståenden? Vänligen förklara detta för mig - och till alla andra som inte heller förstår dig.

I sanningens namn, är det inte så att du egentligen fruktar att mina frågor är befogade och avslöjande?

Allt du eller THS meddelar i samband med det akademiska innehållet av mina frågor, och som inte är av privat eller intim natur, kommer jag att betrakta som ett offentligt innehåll. Det gäller naturligtvis ditt föregående e-post samt kommande - som behandlar det akademiska. Det är en vedertaget naturlig princip. Jag inväntar dina förklaringar, och dina svar.

Vänligen,

Torsten

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Åke Viberg [mailto:ake.viberg@ths.se]

**Sent:** den 17 mars 2004 20:21

**To:** torsten@helig.com

**Subject:** ang inlägg

Torsten,

Det finns vissa saker som man inte gör om man vill finnas med i ett forum som de vi har i våra nätkurser på THS. Om ditt inlägg tas bort beror det på att du inte uppfyller kriterierna på vad forumet är till för. Vi kan naturligtvis ha olika åsikter om detta, men det är ett forum i vår regi, och därför förbehåller vi oss rätten att sätta upp de kriterier som ska gälla för inlägggen. För det andra, och detta är betydligt allvarigare, så publicerade du på detta forum en kopia av ett privat mail från mig till dig. Det visar på ett mycket dåligt omdöme från din sida, och det kan betyda att vi inte kan räkna med att du kan hantera att vara med i ett sådant forum i fortsättningen.

Torsten, du kan mycket väl ha andra åsikter än både lärobok och annat, men det ger dig inte rätt att bete dig på detta sätt. Dina frågor rör inte svårigheter i läroboken, utan rör saker i läroboken där du inte har samma åsikt, vilket inte är samma sak. Hade du varit med på undervisningen och ställt någon av dina frågor där så hade vi kanske kunnat reda ut det hela på ett enklare sätt.

Åke Viberg

-----  
 Åke Viberg, docent lektor, exegetisk teologi, Gamla testamentet  
 tel 08-56435718 Teologiska Högskolan, Stockholm  
 ake.viberg@ths.se http://www.ths.se  
 -----

---

## 157 frågor angående kurslitteraturen ”Understanding the Bible” av Stephen Harris

1. Page 10 ...*many* readers find it difficult to discern any principle of organizational structure that binds the whole together. [how many?]
2. Page 14 ...it *appears* that many ancient scribes...also acted as editors and commentators... modifying the text... [to whom does it appear?]
3. Page 14 ...differences, scholars attempt to determine the text’s original wording [textual criticism] [what differences?]
4. Page 14 ...*indicates* that these documents underwent *extensive revision* after the exile... [which indications? Why extensive?]
5. Page 14 ...Dead Sea (an area *then* controlled by the state of Jordan but *now* is in the possession of Israel)... [vice verse?]
6. Page 15 *Many* of the almost 200 biblical scrolls...showed significant differences from the Masoretic text... [how many? Why significant?]
7. Page 28 *Only* by recognizing the multiplicity of viewpoints raised in Scripture will readers begin to appreciate its power to illuminate the many dimensions and varieties of religious experience. [why the only way? How many dimensions? If the viewpoints do conform, is it wrong appreciate this conformity?]
8. Page 29 ...cultural environment...a means of understanding them [text] more accurately. [what means of understanding the text is greater – spiritual or cultural?]
9. Page 30 [either-or formula, Scriptural inerrancy] This black-and-white fallacy, characteristic of some fundamentalists, is not supported by biblical writers, none of whom explicitly claim to be error-free. [why is belief in objective truth a fallacy? If Scripture is not the fundament of Christian belief, what is? Since the Scriptures itself claim to be without error, why then is Scripture regarded as errant?]
10. Page 30 *Most* scholars, whether Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, do not accept fundamentalism’s “all or nothing” approach, which tends to make enemies of faith and intellect. [Who is most? (most atheists, most liberal priests?), in fact, the opposite appears to be the truth; almost ALL Christian scholars adhere to the fundamentalist view – that Scripture is, in its original texts, inerrant as the words of God.]
11. Page 30 *Historians* ask such questions as: Is this event likely to have occurred in the way the author presents it? [How does probability relate to divine capability? Is human mind not a limitation to the scope of God’s greatness? Why should presumptuously a writer’s bias or personal agenda be forced onto the text?]
12. Page 31 It is probably significant that most miraculous events in the Hebrew Bible are assigned to Israel’s distant past... [What historical facts provide for such a probability? What theological indications suggest such significance?]

13. Page 31 Because the Gospel authors believed in Jesus divinity...*their presentation is* coloured by their faith. [Of course their presentation of Jesus is coloured by their faith – through historical personal experience. And Stephen Harris presentation is coloured by his lack of faith – through lack of experience and divine regeneration?]
14. Page 31 Although *many* people in antiquity uncritically accepted the existence of such [supernatural] entities, they are not part of the universe as modern science defines it and as most people now experience the world in their daily lives. [What utter nonsense! The Scriptures depict a continuum of Abraham's descendants' critical denial and rejection of divine authority. The physical, mathematical and medical sciences today indicate and strengthen creationist theories – acknowledging supernatural purpose and design – intelligent design, or designoid genetics. The social- and behavioural sciences have not succeeded in rejecting metaphysical solutions. Most liberal theologians do not experience the miraculous works of God today – because they do not believe – but many people are impacted by the supernatural in their daily lives all over the world, today.]
15. Page 31 Historians...judiciously distinguishing between recoverable historical fact and religious claims that exceed the reach of historical investigation. [Are not Scriptures itself a source of historical investigation and evidence? Are not Scriptures a part of the material realm?]
16. Page 32 source criticism [Is the Holy Spirit a source?]
17. Page 32 ...suggest to most scholars that it is a composite work... [Is popularity a valid argument? Again, who is most, who is not most, and what theories do the not-most present?]
18. Page 32 ...different names for God used by different authors to the repetitions, contradictions and other discrepancies that we find in the text. [Different names is a weak argument for supporting a theory of different authors. What are the other discrepancies?]
19. Page 32 ...so each Gospel writer presented Jesus' life from a distinctive theological perspective consistent with his individual comprehension of Jesus' nature and teachings. [What are the different theologies and how do they distinctively differ?]
20. Page 33 **Knowing**...incorporation of diverse sources... [No, we don't *know* this. These are constructed speculations by those who choose to believe in the attraction of diverse and contradictory sources. What source triggers delight in forcing a diverse-source-theory into the form of a conclusive presentation of unchallengeable fact? Where is the intellectual honesty in this claim?]
21. Page 35 ...paradox: the inherently baffling and contradictory quality of God's relationship to his human "image". [Where is the real paradox? What is inherently baffling? What are the contradictory qualities in God's attributes?]
22. Page 53 ...made scholars aware...that the Genesis authors had drawn an older Mesopotamian tradition in composing the biblical text. [Is this factual or hypothetical? What evidence? May it in fact be the reverse – that a true Biblical

- history was incorporated into a Mesopotamian myth? If similarities exist between Biblical Scripture and other mythical texts, are we inclined to suppose that Biblical texts are inspired by non-Biblical texts?]
23. Page 61 Because the statues were protected from public gaze by massive stone walls, the god's holiness was enhanced by elements of secrecy and mystery. [Harris appears to demonstrate his insensibility for reasonable or just comparisons. Harris senselessly suggests similarities between Egyptian idol worship and the Ark of the Covenant. (Kiss my ass Harris!)]
24. Page 63 Perhaps Egypt's most lasting contribution to biblical religion was the ritual practice of circumcision. [Clearly biased, Harris attributes the Greek historian Herodotus greater credibility and historical authority than Scripture itself.]
25. Page 65 ...adulterating Yahweh's cult... [Is cult an appropriate or a biased description of adherence to Yahweh's instructions?]
26. Page 77 ...traces of *polytheism* in the Hebrew Bible... Israelite religion was not monotheistic but *henotheistic*. ... [Are not the Mosaic laws acknowledging that other gods exist, but that Israel shall have no other gods (in this perspective Israelite religion has always been henotheistic)? Since God in the Hebrew Bible warns Israel of worshipping idols, how then is it possible to find traces of polytheism?]
27. Page 77 The Bible's complex portrait of God – to whom biblical authors assign an *astounding* variety of roles and functions – **is thus** a creative synthesis that draws on many different sources. [Harris blatantly claim that Scripture is the synthesis product of the human mind's creativeness and imagination. If Harris were intellectually honest, he would acknowledge that it is impossible to draw such finite conclusions "The Bible is thus...". Is not Harris merely marketing his unbelief through his lack of divine relationship, through an academic title and position?]
28. Page 77 The presence of these different names is *significant*, offering *important* insights into the historical evolution of Israel's ideas about the Deity and suggesting that the origin of Israel's God is as complex, and in some ways as mysterious, as the historical origins of Israel itself. [?? What is Harris trying to say? Why is God's origin perceived as complex? What is mysterious about the historical origins of Israel?]
29. Page 80 It is probably these subjugated divine beings whom Elohim addresses at creation when he proposes, "Let us make man in our own image..." [Is Harris professing heretics? Bible-believing scholars, in contrast to Harris, understand this verse (Gen.1:26) as God the Father communicates with God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, the triune God.]
30. Page 84 ...the diverse Near Eastern sources blended together in the biblical portrayal of God are reflected in the Deity's multifaceted character. The Hebrew Bible begins its composite portrait with a hymn to his creative might. [Harris obviously misunderstands the credibility of one pure divine source. What facts does Harris the Heretic have for assuming that God is multifaceted? How much more

- arrogance may a Biblical scholar delude his pupils with, than by characterizing Genesis 1 as a hymn?]
31. Page 84 ...the Biblical Deity possesses so lofty an ethical sense that... [Well, I guess this statement does excel Harris preceding statement in level of arrogance.]
  32. Page 85 Although the biblical God may have assumed some of the conflicting traits of older Near Eastern deities that contribute to his somewhat paradoxical character... [What are the conflicting traits? Why a paradoxical character?]
  33. Page 87 Other ancient war poetry, incorporated into the Book of Judges... [Poetry?]
  34. Page 94 Containing a diverse mixture of narrative, genealogy, poetry, law, etiology, folklore and myth, the first five books of the Tanak... [Folklore? Myth?]
  35. Page 94 ...process of composition, revision, and repeated editing by different writers and redactors (editors)... [How certain is Harris about different authors of the Tanak?]
  36. Page 94 Although some scholars have recently challenged this theory, a majority of scholars believe... [Is it not the opposite, that most scholar always have challenged the liberal theologian minority?]
  37. Page 94 Too complex in both origin and theological content to be reduced to a single viewpoint... [What are the complexities in origin and theology?]
  38. Page 94 Why do scholars think that the Pentateuch is a composite document, incorporating four discrete sources? [Yes, this is a formidable question. Why? Is it because they don't know God personally?]
  39. Page 95 In contrast to traditional views of Mosaic authorship, virtually all contemporary scholars are convinced that...the Pentateuch could not have been derived from Moses. ...not the work of a single author, but the product of multiple authors and editors... [Are there statistical estimates of the proportion of convinced Moses-rejectors?]
  40. Page 96 ...human beings, made male and female, made simultaneously... two distinct creation stories... [What are the two distinct creation stories?]
  41. Page 100 ...documentary hypothesis remains the standard model in Pentateuchal studies... [Standard hypothesis amongst whom? What is the antithesis? Are there sufficient arguments for the documentary theory? What purpose does this hypothesis serve?]
  42. Page 105 While recognizing the value of source criticism... [That's precisely my point; I apparently lack recognition of value in the documentary hypothesis. What value is there?]
  43. Page 108 Although editors divided the Torah...there is considerable overlap... [What are the overlaps?]
  44. Page 109 As in other surviving ancient Near Eastern literature... Like the different poets who contributed to the composition of Gilgamesh... [Why such comparisons?]



45. Page 110 Genesis features several etiological anecdotes, such as the folk tale in which Lot's wife... [Folk tale?]
46. Page 111 The Torah's...suggests not only its multiple sources but also its multiple purposes. [Multiple purposes?? And what may these multiple purposes be?]
47. Page 111 If we knew...this information...also aid in understanding its presumed intent and meaning. [Can God's intent and meaning possibly be a progressive revelation of salvation?]
48. Page 113 Opening with a priestly hymn to God's creative majesty and an etiological tale dramatizing humanity's alienation... [Hymn & tale? Is dramatizing implying exaggeration?]
49. Page 117 In the Yahwist's fable... [Fable?]
50. Page 118 Drawing upon Mesopotamian lore... [Is Genesis drawing upon, or is Mesopotamian lore drawing upon?]
51. Page 120 The Abrahamic Covenant, four different versions of which... [Different?]
52. Page 122 When alluding to Sodom's notoriety, later biblical authors do not mention sexual conduct, emphasizing instead the city's failure to help... [Most scholars, except a minority of liberal homosexual-admiring priests, know that later Biblical authors do specify the homosexual sin in regards to Sodom. Not emphasizing homosexual behaviour as a grave sin is merely unbiblical nonsense. (Judas brev 1:7, Rom.1:26-28, 1Kor.6:9-10, 3Mos.20:13)]
53. Page 124 A spiritual cousin of...Odysseus, Jacob... [Is this Blasphemy?]
54. Page 127 ...Joseph, like the hero of the Egyptian legend... [Why this comparison?]
55. Page 127 ...Joseph benefits from Yahweh's "kindness"... [Why quotation marks, and why kindness? Is Harris facetious?]
56. Page 127 Joseph...where he also practices the art of divination... [Is this Harris way of provocation and neglecting the spiritual gift of prophecy?]
57. Page 130 ...Yahweh at last "remembers"... [Why quotation marks, and why remember?]
58. Page 130 ...Israel...as the "people of God"... [No need for quotation marks!]
59. Page 132 ...heightening the miraculous event... [Is Harris, again, insinuating Biblical exaggeration?]
60. Page 133 Most scholars recognize that the Torah combines too many strands of tradition to permit an accurate recovery of the "historical Moses". The problem of Moses' historicity is compounded by the presence of **legend and folklore** embedded in *his* story. [How many is most? How many strands necessitate for too many? Is there any singular fact that presents a problem of Moses' historicity? What factual evidence prove a presence of legend and folklore in Scripture?]
61. Page 135 ...Yahweh, who resolves to "harden" Pharaoh's heart even before the king has an opportunity to make up his own mind, thus forcing him to "sin"... [Is this not yet another example of Harris' strife for perverting Yahweh's character? Is it

- not so, that God permits man to sin – not through revoking man’s free will of choice, but through degree removing God’s protection over man in helping that man should not choose to sin – and hence allows man this freedom of choice, with sin’s eternally lethal consequences?]
62. Page 143 The mystery of an unknownable Spirit who can create the universe... [Unknownable? Is not God’s Spirit, The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, Jesus’ Helper, personally knowable?]
63. Page 150 Interpolated into...is an old folktale that illustrates... [Folktale?]
64. Page 150 ...the editors of Numbers employ this incident **to** condemn intermarriage with Canaanite women... **To** demonstrate their God’s displeasure at mixed marriages, the editors... [Harris appears to know that 1) there were editors, and 2) the editors entertain their personal or political strategies. Are Harris’ assumptions factual?]
65. Page 151 Even after scribes and priestly editors extensively revised the text... [Extensively revised? This theory implies a certainty of an original and non-revised text. What is the editorially non-revised text?]
66. Page 152 Composed **to** meet Israel’s political and religious crises... [What facts provide for Harris’ strong faith in editorial intent?]
67. Page 152 ...the Deuteronomistic History (DH), the heavily edited narrative... [What is objectively heavy? What evidence of editing?]
68. Page 153 *Although* canonized as the Torah’s final book, Deuteronomy, in its literary history and origins, has little to do with the JE narratives that precede it. [Little to do with? On which arguments does Harris wishfully believe in support of Deuteronomy’s non-canonical status?]
69. Page 154 In general, it appears that the Judean editors of Deuteronomy wished to update and revise Israel’s ancient legal and sacrificial practices in the light of seventh-century... [In general – what does that mean? Appears – to whom and why? Wished – implying the editors were unsuccessful, and Harris & Co. cleverly revealed the editors’ Zionistic conspiracy? What evidence of revision?]
70. Page 155 Many scholars think that...**originated** orally as part of...in a greatly expanded version, eventually formed the **basis** of the Torah... [How many, or who? Originated? Basis? Greatly expanded – meaning creatively exaggerated? Rather than Harris’ consistent reliance on the popularity-conviction – what are the intellectually credible arguments for this theory?]
71. Page 157 Scholars believe that Deuteronomy **originated** as a legal code distinct from the Yahwist, Elohist and priestly sources that eventually were blended together to form the Pentateuch’s narrative framework. [Which scholars – and why? What arguments benefit the distinct-from and blended-together theory?]
72. Page 159 ...Israel first took possession of Canaan, the territory promised to Abraham’s descendants, and then lost it. [Lost – temporarily according to the conditions of blessings, or eternally and thereby attributing faithlessness to God’s character?]

73. Page 163 ...reflect the heavy hand of the Deuteronomistic authors, who appear to have shaped the narrative **to underscore** the moral causes of historical events. [Is Harris's Statement of Faith, here declaring faith in the manipulative intent of Deuteronomistic text, also suggesting that when the cause-effect relationships prove divine morality, the historical value of the text must have been manipulated by editors?]
74. Page 165 ...accounts of Jericho's fall that have been woven imperfectly into a single narrative. [I fail to recognize the factual background behind Harris' accusation of the text – can someone please archaeologically and textually guide me?]
75. Page 168 ...has led to increasing scepticism about Joshua's historical reliability. [Is it not exactly the reverse – that the overwhelming archaeological material discovered strengthen Joshua's historical reliability – and prove Harris as an heretic?]
76. Page 172 This composite narrative, a patchwork of folktales... [Is this factual and objective truth, or only a wishful theory on part of the liberal-theologian community?]
77. Page 174 ...biblical scholars believe that Yahwism probably evolved in a lengthy and complex process of syncretism... [It is likely that Harris adheres to these so called biblical scholars – but what evokes the probability to this belief? Is it faith in God's non-existence or mere categorical rejection of divine evidence?]
78. Page 178 Some critics regard Samson...as a mythological figure... [Ok – and how do the remaining critics regard Samson?]
79. Page 179 Incorporating several different sources... [Which different sources?]
80. Page 179 According to this theory, called minimalist because its advocates view the biblical story as having almost no historical value, David and his Israelite empire represent wishful thinking, a glamorous but mythological king and kingdom. [Are minimalists concerned that biblical historicity may inspire faith in the Hebrew texts as reliable, and therefore wishfully challenge all parts of Scripture that yet lacks sufficient historical conclusive evidence. Are there any so called "maximalists" (in logically reverting the nomenclature), and how would their belief be presented in a non-biased systematic theological comparison?]
81. Page 180 ...incorporating sources that were originally separate documents. [What are the arguments and evidence for this supposition about discreet stages of development, and of separate documents?]
82. Page 180 Although cast in the form of prophecy, Samuel's warning actually represents Deuteronomistic hindsight... [Actually, isn't this just one of Harris' summits of arrogance?]
83. Page 181 ...were composed **to** provide... [Is there any at all legitimate reason to singularly conclude strategic editing?]
84. Page 183 Although the Deuteronomistic scribes edited the books of Samuel... [Any evidence or logical arguments for this suggestion?]

85. Page 183 Many scholars believe that the portrait of Saul that we now find in 1 Samuel is highly biased, an unflattering revision...pro-Davidic editors later transformed...even after editing... [How many or who, and why? Is the opposite correct – that Harris is highly biased and an unflattering revisionist?]
86. Page 184 The biblical narrators **are** concerned less with historical accuracy than with theological significance. [Harris appears to be stating undisputed facts. Is it possible that Harris & Co. are concerned less with historical accuracy than with theological significance?]
87. Page 191 These sources were rigorously edited and reshaped **to** conform to the theological viewpoint of the Deuteronomistic historians... [Why rigorously? Any evidence of editing? Harris repeats his enlightened understanding of Scriptural intent and the strategic purpose.]
88. Page 194 Although DH judge Solomon primarily from a religious standpoint, the king's economic policies probably played a more important role... [Is there any credible argument for asserting this probability – other than a general discrediting of the reliability and divine authority of Scripture?]
89. Page 197 ...the book was revised to its present form to... [Harris declares knowledge of editorial intention of revision of the book of Kings. Revised from what, by who, when and where?]
90. Page 204 Despite the awkwardness of historical facts... [Awkward in what way?]
91. Page 205 The author of Psalm 44 contrasts ancestral tradition... [Does contrast imply contradiction?]
92. Page 206 Although the annihilation of the Davidic dynasty, never again restored to Judah's throne... [Is universal time and history over yet?]
93. Page 206 ...anonymous editors in Babylon – striving to understand their God's intentions – reworked ancient... [What argument supports this wishful thinking – of a reworked text?]
94. Page 210 ...the canonical prophetic books largely serve **to** reveal Yahweh's will **during** periods of social or political crises... [Harris reveals his interpretation of the prophetic books' intention, and the time period of its relevance. Is this the only interpretation?]
95. Page 214 ...scholars began to recognize that approximately a third of the Bible is written in **poetry**. [How is poetry defined here?]
96. Page 216 ...Third Isaiah **added their** eschatological **hopes** to the prophetic writings. [Harris claims additions to Isaiah, and that these poets merely present personal hopes. What facts provide evidence of Isaiah not being divine authority?]
97. Page 217 ...abruptly Zephania switches course and asserts that Yahweh has changed his mind...The prophet's abrupt change in attitude... [Is Harris alluding that Zephania is incoherent?]
98. Page 217 **Second** Isaiah...this **anonymous poet**... [Why does Harris present a theory of different authors as though it were a fact?]

99. Page 218 Zechariah...a later hand **added** chapters 9-12. [What evidence supports this as a fact?]
100. Page 218 **Third** Isaiah... [Why does Harris present a theory of different authors as though it were a fact?]
101. Page 218 Amos... was **added** by a Judean editor. [What evidence supports this as a fact?]
102. Page 222 Hosea... somewhat **random** collection of **poetic** declarations... [Random in what way? Why poetic?]
103. Page 223 ...the Book of Isaiah is the work of **at least three** prophets responding to three different crises...poetic oracles... [If any uncertainty of how many prophets, then why declare more than one?]
104. page 223 Israels prophets appeared largely **in response to** specific socio-political crises... [This is too ambiguous – is Harris asserting that the prophets responded by human initiative or by divine initiative?]
105. page 224 Although traditionally as the work of a single prophet, **scholars** [Which scholars?] **believe** [Unlike the remainder of Harris commentary, Harris for once is credible and honest here – admitting to a belief – without camouflaging his belief/disbelief beneath a superficial and erroneous mask of undisputable fact.] that the Book of Isaiah is an **anthology** of prophetic literature... **Most** [Who is most? Popularity is not an argument!] scholars divide the book into three parts... Most of Isaiah's **genuine** sayings, **embedded amid** later prophetic and editorial **additions**... [Suggesting non-genuine sayings within the canonized Hebrew Bible?]
106. page 225 As if to... editors... [Intention of questioning of intent? Editors?]
107. page 227 ...although this historical Jesus **did not** re-establish the Davidic monarchy...[...has not yet...]
108. page 229 **Expanded by later interpolations**, Micah's oracles are **edited** to include predictions... [Expanded? Later interpolations? Edited?]
109. page 229 Other scholars [Who?] suggest... were **added** by a later hand. ... an **editor** subsequently **inserted** references to Yahweh's unconditional promise **to** preserve the Davidic kingdom. [Which editor? Is it not arrogant to project a speculative editorial intent onto a text? Is this text not questioned as divinely authoritative only by a liberal theologian minority?]
110. page 230 Despite **scholar's suspicion** [What in the name of non-confessional scientific reasoning is "suspicion" supposed to mean?] that Micah's **original** [What is the original? What are the alterations?] message underwent **editorial modification**... [What modifications?]
111. page 233 ...considerably **revised** and **expanded** by later disciples and postexilic **editors**... [Is Jeremiah not authentic?]
112. page 233 In its **present form**, the Book of Jeremiah is a **bewildering collection of poetic** prophecies and prose narratives... [What is the original form and what are the differences? What is bewildering?]

113. page 234 This second scroll **may** form the nucleus of our present Book of Jeremiah... [May?]
114. Figure 6.5 ...reedited **and/or** produced much of the literature that now forms the Hebrew Bible. [If uncertain whether a text is produced or reedited, then what necessitates for a certainty in the present text's non-original status?]
115. Page 239 ...**readers** [a rather arrogant approach to the reader] are **sure** [speak for yourself Harris!] to find Ezekiel's metaphors bewildering. No other prophetic book...features such **hallucinatory** material. [Are hallucinations, divinations, prophecies, and retrospective hindsight synonymous terminologies to Harris?]
116. Page 243 ...the **anonymous** prophet known as "**Second** Isaiah"... [If the authorship is presumed anonymous, then what factual argument supports a declaration of several authors of Isaiah?]
117. Page 243 One of the Hebrew Bible's greatest **poets**, the **anonymous** prophet... [anonymous poet? Are poetry and prophecy synonymous?]
118. Page 243 ...Cyrus the Great, king of Persia... he declares that Cyrus is Yahweh's "anointed", his "Messiah". [Neither in chapter 45 or anywhere else does Isaiah declare Cyrus as the Messiah. Is this not merely a wishful liberal theology in attempting to bewilder readers regarding Isaiah's credibility?]
119. Figure 6.8 Cyrus Cylinder...completing the creation sequence begun in Genesis 1:1. [What's the point? What's the argument?]
120. Page 247 ...**increasingly obscure** oracles from a later prophet, known as second Zechariah. [Is obscurity of divine prophecy not an indication of insufficient revelation on part of the interpreter?]
121. Page 248 ...a **miscellaneous assemblage** of prophetic oracles drawn from the entire era of Israelite prophecy. [What are the arguments?]
122. Page 251 ...shortly before the time when traditional prophecy in Israel is **thought** to have ceased. [Who thinks this?]
123. Page 251 Jonah... Utilizing **folklore**... an unknown post-exilic author sets his **fictional** tale... [Folklore? Fictional? What is the basis of this preposterous accusation against God and His capabilities for the humanly unlikely?]
124. Page 255 ...theological histories reinterpreting Israel's past... [Liberal theologians reinterpreting Israel's history with a theological bias toward divine denial?]
125. Page 255 Title: "After the exile: A Reinterpretation of Judah's Religious Mission" [Or, perhaps a more appropriate title would be: "After the modernistic/post-modernistic divergence from objective/absolute divine truth: A Liberal Reinterpretation."]
126. Page 258 ...Esther, a volume that makes **no direct reference** to God... the Greek edition of Esther in the Septuagint **interpolates** a series of prayers... **to** demonstrate that the heroine was Torah observant... [No reference? Please provide some facts.]

127. Page 268 ...- but the wisdom movement ultimately **outlasted the prophetic line** and produced some of the greatest books in the Bible. The **origins** of the Israel wisdom tradition are unknown... [Did the prophetic line die? Is prophecy dead? Is God dead? Is the origin of universe also unknown?]
128. Page 269 Works like Ecclesiastes contain an **amalgam** of the sage's **personal** reflections...as well as **paradoxic** maxims... [Exemplify the paradoxes please.]
129. Page 269 ...and the **ambiguity** of its ethical "message". [ambiguity?]
130. Page 270 Proverbs... **drawn from diverse sources**... [Is this a fact, or just liberal speculation?]
131. Page 270 The biblical proverbs **typically** are based on observation and experience rather than on divine revelation... [I guess Harris's marvellous discernment here must contain great divine revelation for him to make this judgment.]
132. Page 270 ...a whole passage from the wisdom book of the Egyptian sage Amenemope has been **taken over** almost word for word in Proverbs. **Scholars now realize** ...that Israel's sages in some cases **borrowed** from older literary collections. [This is a great accusation of plagiarism. Which scholars is Harris referring to?]
133. Page 270 Like the Psalms, Proverbs grew from **many different sources** over a span of centuries. [What sources and what conclusive evidence?]
134. Figure 7.1 ...contains sage advice that was **later incorporated**... [Who incorporated/borrowed what from whom? What are the evidences of real origin?]
135. Page 275 Box 7.2 Evolution of the satan Concept  
 ...Hebrew Bible's portrayal of him as a **regular member** [ex-member!] of Yahweh's heavenly council. ... Despite the later popular **mythology** that transforms... the Tanak grants him **no independence of God**. [Harris & Co. must be blind not to recognize the Genesis depiction of satan as a snake, as well as Daniel's and John's Revelations of end-times. Declaring that satan is a regular member and without separation from God is outrageous heretics!] In the Tanak, "the satan" has an adversarial relationship with humanity, not with God, whose **servant he remain**. [To propose this heretic notion, Harris is not only blind, but he also remains a servant of satan.] In this view, the satan figure is essentially the "dark side" or psychological "shadow" of **Yahweh's ethically ambivalent character**. [Kiss my ass twice, Harris!] Yahweh is not only giver of life and pitiless executioner, he is also represented as tormentor and **deceiver**. [God created mankind into His own image – with freedom of choice of obedience – or disobedience and hence self-deception. God's grace and love, however, justly provides some protection against deception. As a perfectly righteous creator God retains the exclusive right to decide when, where, to whom, and in what manner he shall express his grace and love.] He functions as **God's obedient agent**, an adjunct of the **divine personality**. [The opposite, however, is true: satan is God's disobedient angel, with retained but limited divine giftings.] Page 276 ...new religious ideas gradually **infiltrated**

- Jewish thinking. (Zoroastrianism) [No, but liberal heretics gradually infiltrated Christian theology.]
136. page 280 ...redactors **inserted** a lengthy speech by Elihu... [Please provide evidence of redaction.]
137. page 283 Delighting in **paradox**, Koheleth denies the possibility of knowing anything for sure... [Is this not mere liberal theology projecting post-modern subjectivism onto Biblical text?]
138. page 285 The author's love of **paradox** is a characteristic of the book... Advising on to savour life and drink wine with a joyful heart, and ... better to frequent the house of mourning than the house of feasting. [Where's the real paradox? (= appreciative heart better than unappreciative heart, = insightfulness better than foolishness ?)] ...day of death is better than the day of birth, but he would rather be a "living dog" than a "dead lion". [Harris appears unable to recognize the coherent logic where's the paradox? (= bodily unrestricted relationship with God after bodily death is better than this life's limited divine relationship, = obedient and sacrificial life with God is better than the temporal illusion of worldly wealth and power without God ?)]
139. page 285 Later writers **added** a series of brief postscripts. [Where's the evidence?] ...A later editor...later redactor who appended...inserted elsewhere into Koheleth's text as well – could have been partly **responsible** for the eventual admission into the biblical canon... [Was canonization of Ecclesiastes a mistake?]
140. page 296 Although Ezra and Nehemiah **probably** formed a single book **originally**, the two histories present **conflicting** information... [What attributes to this probability? What is the conflicting information? Does not the proposal of a single book originally, conflict with the idea of two histories?]
141. page 300 ...postexilic scribes undertook the **necessary** task of **reinterpreting** the nation's past. [What necessitated for reinterpretation?]
142. page 305 ...the Book of Daniel translates this battle **to** preserve Israel's **legacy** into cosmic visions of End time... [Without supporting evidence, is it not arrogant to claim such intent behind the Book of Daniel?]
143. page 306 As the canonical Writings reflect **differing** theological responses... [What are these differing theologies?]
144. Box 8.1 Expressing a conviction that God will resurrect the faithful dead...- a view that enters the biblical record **only** with the Hellenistic Book of Daniel... [Contrary to Harris, this view recurs in the judeo-christian canon.]
145. page 317 Pseudonymity was a device that allowed apocalyptic writers, such as the author of Daniel, to review past history **as if it were prophecy**... to honour an ancient luminary... Some **New Testament writers**, with no thought of forgery, penned sermons or epistles in the name of apostles such as Peter or Paul. [Is Harris stating that Daniel is a fraudulent revisionist, or is Harris himself the fraudulent revisionist? Which canonized New Testament writers?]
146. page 317 **Thus**, both Daniel and Revelation were composed to encourage their respective audiences...rekindling hopes... ["Thus" indicates a concluding



- remark preceded by arguments. Where are the arguments supporting this liberal herecy?]
147. page 317 **While** differing significantly from both, apocalyptic literature **seems to draw from** a twofold **source**: Israel's prophetic and wisdom traditions. [While Harris appears to contradict himself, does it not seem that apocalyptic literature draws from divine and angelic revelation?]
148. page 318 The apocalyptic worldview **borrow**s much of its cosmology from Greek philosophical ideas... [Harris basic erroneous assumptions are as follows: (1) if similarities exist between non-canonical text and canonical text, the canonical text has borrowed from the non-canonical text. (2) when coherence between canonised texts cannot be disputed, one or both texts are fraudulent.]
149. page 318 ...adopt a rigidly sectarian attitude, **avoiding all association** with unbelievers. [This incorrect statement does, however, reveal something about the liberal theologians' mortal fears of disassociation from this world and particularly from self.]
150. page 318 "Limited Theology" [limited? Any theological stance is limiting, - you bonehead! Any belief, whatsoever, is, by nature and through definition, unavoidably a limiting factor.]
151. page 319 ...apocalyptists usually show little sympathy for differing viewpoints or compassion for non-believers. [What utter nonsense! Absolute truth cannot be corrupted by differing viewpoints, and can therefore never take emotional reaction or popularity into its consideration. Either one accepts and submits to truth, or one denies and opposes truth. What is the third alternative?]
152. page 319 As a result of the **author's mindset**, the apocalyptic picture of God is ethically limited. [In other words, Harris denies the divine authority of the canonized apocalyptic writing?]
153. page 319 Violent God...apocalyptists **imagine** this transference of power by picturing God as a destroyer... [Violent destroyer is not synonymous with righteous and tolerant.]
154. page 320 Written **to** encourage Jewish Torah loyalties during the persecution of Antiochus IV, the Book of Daniel **reviews past history as though it were prophecy**... [Is this a fact or is it simply an expression of strong faith in revision?]
155. figure 8.5 "little horn"...**was** the Seleucid ruler of Hellenistic Syria... [Why does Harris profess only this interpretation of Daniel's divine vision, and not the other more credible prophetic eschatological interpretations?]
156. page 323 **Most** experts agree, however, that Daniel's visions **were intended** primarily for the author's fellow Jews **during** the terrible days of Antiochus IV's attempt to... [Who is most? Most liberal theologians?]
157. page 327 It is, however, **only one book among a large body of similar** apocalyptic writings... [Why is it that Harris in some cases exaggerate differences while in other cases emphasise similarities?]

## Teologiska Högskolans Debattforum (relevanta delar)

Teologiska Högskolan, Stockholm

### THS Nätkurser

[THS Nätkurser](#)

## Allmänna frågor

Här kan ni ställa frågor av mer allmän natur, t ex vad gäller litteraturen, bokens innehåll och frågor, praktiska frågor kring tillfällena på THS, etc. Då och då läser Åke Viberg inläggen, och svarar.

[Gå till sista inlägget](#)

[Kurshemsida](#)

[Forum](#)

[Logga ut](#)

Inloggade just nu: 1 st

Av: Åke Viberg

Tid: 2004-01-27 13:38:08

När det gäller kontakten med mig, vill jag att den uppehålls här i kursens forum och inte via vanlig epost. På så sätt blir all information genast tillgänglig för alla kursens deltagare.

Jag läser regelbundet kursens rubriker, och dröjer det någon dag så ha tålamod så läser jag så snart jag kan.

När jag har gjort en rubrik passiv, dvs du kan inte längre göra något inlägg, så beror på det att vi inte kan föra diskussion kring alla frågor i kursen samtidigt. Du kan läsa vad som lagts ut av mig och de frågor och svar som kommit till, men när rubriken är passiv kan inte någon göra något ytterligare inlägg.

Av: Åke Viberg

Tid: 2004-01-29 21:10:29

Hej,

När det gäller kursplan, så gäller länken "kursinfo" på kurshemsidan som kursplan, eller kursbeskrivning.

Dokumentet "Textläsning" innehåller de bibeltexter som du ska vara väl förtrogen med. Sedan går läroboken igenom hela bibelböckerna, men det innebär inte att du måste vara väl förtrogen med alla texter i Gamla testamentet.

Att det står "GT 1" betyder helt enkelt GT grundkurs, inget annat.

På kurshemsidan, under länken "Kursmaterial" finns en länk till ett dokument som heter "Anvisningar för inläsning av Harris ...". Här beskriver jag hur du ska läsa in läroboken, hur du ska hantera bokens instuderingsfrågor och vad bokens olika kapitel handlar om. Där säger

instuderingsfrågor, och vad bokens olika kapitel handlar om. Där säger jag också vilka kapitel som du ska läsa mer extensivt. Där finns också anvisningar kring kursens examination.

Åke Viberg

Av: Torsten Nenzén

Tid: 2004-03-18 21:20:24

Tyvärr valde THS att refusera mina 93 frågor angående Stephen Harris kurslitteratur "understanding the Bible". Åke Viberg har undvikit att förklara varför mina frågor refuserades. Därmed begränsas den öppna och offentliga akademisk dialogen. THS kan genom detta uppfattas som intolerant mot oliktankande. Det är tråkigt. Men glädjande har THS nu beslutat att tilldela mig utrymme för högst fem frågor. Jag begränsar mina 93 frågor därför till cirka fem frågor i detta forum. De elever som önskar kännedom om de resterande frågorna är varmt välkommen att kontakta mig på [info@globalnet.de](mailto:info@globalnet.de).

Vänliga hälsningar,

Torsten

1. Page 30 This black-and-white fallacy, characteristic of some fundamentalists, is not supported by biblical writers, none of whom explicitly claim to be error-free... Most scholars, whether Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, do not accept fundamentalism's "all or nothing" approach, which tends to make enemies of faith and intellect... Historians ask such questions as: Is this event likely to have occurred in the way the author presents it?... [either-or formula, Scriptural inerrancy] This black-and-white fallacy, characteristic of some fundamentalists, is not supported by biblical writers, none of whom explicitly claim to be error-free.

[Why is belief in objective truth a fallacy? If Scripture is not the fundament of Christian belief, what is? Since the Scriptures itself claim to be without error, why then is Scripture regarded as errant? Who is most? (most atheists, most liberal priests?) How does probability relate to divine capability? Is human mind not a limitation to the scope of God's greatness? Why should presumptuously a writer's bias or personal agenda be forced onto the text?]

2. Page 85 Although the biblical God may have assumed some of the conflicting traits of older Near Eastern deities that contribute to his somewhat paradoxical character...

[What are the conflicting traits? Why a paradoxical character?]

3. Page 94 Why do scholars think that the Pentateuch is a composite document, incorporating four discrete sources?

4. Page 122 When alluding to Sodom's notoriety, later biblical authors do

4. Page 122 When alluding to Sodom's notoriety, later biblical authors do not mention sexual conduct, emphasizing instead the city's failure to help...

[Which biblical author emphasizes Sodom's failure to help, rather than Sodom's sexual immorality through homosexual sin? Most scholars, except a minority of liberal homosexual-admiring priests, know that later Biblical authors do specify the homosexual sin in regards to Sodom. Not emphasizing homosexual behaviour as a grave sin is merely unbiblical nonsense. Does not God in the canonized book of Jude verse 7 declare, "In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire." (Rom.1:26-28, 1Kor.6:9-10, 3Mos.20:13)]

5. Page 133 Most scholars recognize that the Torah combines too many strands of tradition to permit an accurate recovery of the "historical Moses". The problem of Moses' historicity is compounded by the presence of legend and folklore embedded in his story.

[How many is most? How many strands necessitate for too many? What are the 'strands of tradition'? Is there any singular fact that presents a problem of Moses' historicity? What factual evidence prove a presence of legend and folklore in Scripture?]

6. Page 153 Although canonized as the Torah's final book, Deuteronomy, in its literary history and origins, has little to do with the JE narratives that precede it.

[On which arguments does Harris believe in support of Deuteronomy's non-canonical status, and in which way has Deuteronomy little to do with the entire Torah?]

Av: Åke Viberg

Tid: 2004-03-21 23:29:01

Svar till Torstens frågor,

1. Du måste förstå att Harris inte argumenterar utifrån ett konfessionellt perspektiv, utifrån ett som han delar med de flesta forskare i ämnet, åtminstone så länge de inte argumenterar utifrån ett konfessionellt perspektiv. Ämnet gör sig bäst när vi studerar så induktivt vi kan, för att undvika cirkelresonemang, där vi bara finner vad vi utgår ifrån.

2. Att Jahve i GT bär drag av både El och Baal i den nordvästsemitiska kulturfären är ett konstaterbart faktum, men huruvida detta ska ses som ett paradoxalt faktum kan man naturligtvis diskutera, jag skulle inte välja ett sådant uttryck. Men i litteraturen kring ämnet är detta en gängse uppfattning.

3. Harris går rätt så ingående igenom de argument som bibelläsare fört

3. Harris går rätt så ingående igenom de argument som bibelläsare fört fram sedan slutet av 1700-talet för att den text vi har skulle gå tillbaks på äldre, separata traditioner. Text varierande Gudsnamn, berättelser som upprepas, varierande stil som stämmer överens med andra kriterier, etc. Harris ställningstagande är det vedertagna inom forskningen sedan ett antal decennier, men det har luckrats upp på senare tid till att bli alltmer en av flera hypoteser.

4. Om du hade fortsatt att citera Harris, så hade alla kunnat läsa att Harris refererar till en passage i Hesekiel. Med "later biblical authors" är det vad Harris syftar på, han menar inte alla, utan förtydligar själv vad han menar. Att Judas sedan gör sin tolkning har bärighet som en tolkning och inget annat, utifrån Harris icke-konfessionella perspektiv. Det är dessutom en mycket rimlig tolkning av berättelsen, att det är fråga om zenofobi.

5. I en grundkurs finns det ingen möjlighet att föra en detaljdiskussion kring historiska frågor av detta slag. I ljuset av att Harris accepterar den syn på Pentateuchens tillkomst som är legio inom forskningen och har så varit under mycket lång tid, så är det inte så konstigt att han dra samma slutsats som de flesta andra forskare dragit, nämligen att det inte är oproblemiskt att se en historisk grund för Moses. Här finns det naturligtvis andra forskare som har en annan åsikt, men de är en minoritet. Vad gäller legend och folkloristik, så är det genre-beteckningar, och har i sig inget med historiskt underlag att göra. Men genre-bestämningen gör det svårt att använda materialet för en historisk bedömning. För att bedömma en sådan här fråga är jag rädd att det kräver djupare studier.

6. Det är en konsensus inom forskningen sedan ett antal årtionden att Deuteronomium kommit till i form av en programskrift för den deuteronomistiska teologi-kretsen, som sedan format Josua-2 Kon. Språk, stil och teologi är utmärkande för Deut liksom för historieverket, mycket, mycket tydligt. Den hypotes som förespråkats av flertalet forskare innebär att Deut först var en inledning till detta historieverk, för att först senare bli sammankopplad till Gen-Num som en form av brygga mellan vad Harris kallar JE och de historiska böckerna. Harris beskriver detta mycket klart på sid 157-8.

Åke Viberg

Av: Torsten

Tid: 2004-03-26 10:09:55

De föregående 93 frågorna/kommentarerna (som refuserades av Åke Viberg) sträckte sig fram till och med sida 210 i kurslitteraturen av Stephen Harris "Understanding the Bible". Enligt mitt första inlägg lovade jag att inkomma med resterande frågor vid ett senare tillfälle. Här kommer nu dessa resterande frågor/kommentarer 94 till 157. De elever som önskar frågorna tillskickade per e-post är naturligtvis välkommen att meddela mig på [info@glocalnet.de](mailto:info@glocalnet.de).

Vänligen

Vänligen,

Torsten

....

Av: Katarina In de Betou

Tid: 2004-03-26 13:43:39

Hej Torsten!

Har du tänkt på hur denna sida skulle se ut om alla hade såhär långa inlägg hela tiden? Nätkurs är annurlunda än att läsa på institutionen, det får vi som valt det acceptera. Jag har också frågor och kommentarer, men jag får begränsa det, eller hur? Mvh, Katarina

Av: Torsten

Tid: 2004-03-26 14:28:15

Hej Katarina!

Jag uppmuntrar dig varmt att frimodigt framföra samtliga dina frågor och kommentarer. Genom dina frågor och kommentarer kan alla elever (och "most scholars") lära oss något. En teologiskt ensidig framställning som Harris som saknar fotnoter och referenshängivelser förtjänar all dissekerande kritik. Ifall ingen annan vill läsa dina frågor garanterar jag att åtminstone jag vill läsa dem.

Vänligen, Torsten.

Av: Johan Bergkwist

Tid: 2004-03-26 16:29:10

Till JHWs tjänare Torsten:

Du har inga frågor, du har åsikter. Dessa åsikter tar alldeles för stor plats här, och du fick ett utmärkt svar av Åke enligt min mening. Det innebär inte att åsikterna är ointressanta, tvärtom, jag föreslår att du lägger upp dem på din hemsida, och placerar en länk i detta forum.

Ovanstående skrivet i huvudsak med tanke på nästa kurs. Jag förmodar att du kommer vara minst lika långrandig i din kritik mot Harris del 2.

- Johan Bergkwist

Av: Katarina In de Betou

Tid: 2004-03-26 18:19:58

Hej Åke! Kommer det att ske en utvärdering av denna kurs? För mig, som tidigare ej studerat så mycket på högskolenivå (och aldrig via nätet) tog det halva kurstiden att bara lägga upp mina studier. Jag kommer att börja på det ordinarie programmet till hösten och hoppas att jag klarar dessa två kurser denna termin. Om inte annat så har jag i allafall lärt mig hur jag ska planera mina studier lite bättre till nästa kurs (NT). Mvh, Katarina

Av: Åke Viberg

Tid: 2004-03-27 01:25:15

Till Katarina,

Visst ska vi ha en utvärdering inte minst eftersom det är vårt första

Visst ska vi ha en utvärdering, inte minst eftersom det är vårt första trevande försök att genomföra en nätkurs. Jag kommer att skicka ut en sådan via epost, så att ni kan svara på den och skicka tillbaka den via epost, så att alla, även de som inte tentar denna första gång, kan skriva en utvärdering. Redan i nästa kurs som behandlar NT så kommer upplägget att vara annorlunda. Förhoppningsvis så lär vi oss mycket på dessa två kurser i vår, så att när hösten börjar så har vi nått fram till en bra form. När det gäller din kommentar om att lägga upp studierna, så är det naturligtvis svårt, och det är inte lätt att komma runt de svårigheter som det innebär att börja högskolestudier. De studenter som finns hos oss i det ordinarie programmet får inte något annorlunda mer än betydligt mer och obligatorisk undervisning. Men det är nog det informella i form av gemenskapen, utbytet studenter emellan som gör det lättare för dem. Men också här ska vi naturligtvis kunna bli bättre redan i nästa kurs, och definitivt i höst.

Åke Viberg

[Gå till första inlägget](#)

**Denna debatt är inte längre aktiv!**

Läs mera om teologiska Högskolans nätkurser [>>](#)

Teologiska Högskolan, Stockholm

Adress Åkeshovsvägen 29 , 168 39 Bromma  
Telefon 08-564 357 00  
Fax 08-564 357 06  
E-post [ths@ths.se](mailto:ths@ths.se)  
Uppdaterad 2003-12-17