

"I think we have to be very careful in looking at the Bible only as a work of literature. It is also Holy Scripture and I think that makes it a different sort of book than the great works of literature; [It is] so embedded in us that we can't overstate the significance of it." (Maira Goff, British Library)

Well, the [third in the series, 'The Real Garden of Eden', was aired this week \(29 March 2011\)](#)). And what a complete shambles it was! If I worked with the writer/presenter, Dr Francesca Stavrakopoulou, I would be highly embarrassed by her series, which was nothing but hype and smoke and mirrors. Indeed, though I totally disagree with her, I also feel deeply embarrassed for her, as both a person and as an academic.

Many academics want to present their work to the public, but know they must use a non-academic approach. That is fine... but not when the approach is so sloppy as to be garbled.

Her atheism has guided her academic work. It is untrue to say that she became atheist as a result of her studies. That is just atheistic rationalization. Francesca Stavrakopoulou is well qualified, but this is used by the BBC to justify using her services. As Maira Goff says, you cannot treat the Bible like another piece of literature. This escapes Francesca Stavrakopoulou completely, *because* she is an atheist.

Another point is that the BBC, when a complaint was sent, relied on the woman's academic qualifications, even though an atheist cannot possibly understand scripture because of its divine source. Neither the BBC nor Francesca Stavrakopoulou see it that way – for them Christianity is just a fairy story. It suits them both to present deceptive programmes that fit their unbelieving attitudes. It is an exercise in social engineering – something the BBC is very good at.

As I keep saying, I have no problem at all with a rationally-presented argument, but Francesca Stavrakopoulou does not do this. She deliberately confuses the average viewer, who invariably accepts what an 'expert' says without question.

I say this is deliberate because I can be very certain that if she presented her series as an

BBC2, 'The Bible's Buried Secrets', Part Three, 'The Real Garden of Eden': More Nonsense.

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

hypothesis to a real academic circle, they would kick it out of the field! Her approach is shocking in the extreme, because it uses tit-bits to engage the audience rather than accurately portrayed academic research, with its logical steps explained. She does not use logical steps, and deliberately mingles "I think" with definite statements and use of other unbelieving academics.

Throughout, she says things that fully undermine scripture, but without reason. The aim is very clear – disparage Christianity and the Bible. No doubt she thinks she is being very clever, but all I see is an atheist without a clue. And, if you watched the series, did you notice that when she quoted from Islam, she did not make one disparaging remark or sly sarcastic comment? That is because Christians are currently an easy target, already demonized by government and homosexual alike. She simply climbed on to this bandwagon, cynically abusing her position.

Another feature of her talks was her feminism. Feminism ridiculously finds anti-female references in the faintest of things! And, in the context of her series it has nothing to do with the programme content! But, that is what irrational feminism does.

The BBC also implied that her series was about new material. This has proved to be a complete lie. All she did was present the views of other academics, and all THEY did was present views based on the century-or-two-old views of Higher Criticism! That is why I firmly believe the series was an excuse for the BBC to hammer Christianity.

Yes, the BBC did present certain other programmes, which, *it thinks*, more than properly cover genuine Christianity. Only the two on the 1611 AV were genuine. As for the Christmas offering so liked by many Christians, The Nativity, I only bothered with one episode, because it was inaccurate!

So, my overall accusation is that Francesca Stavrakopoulou presented an anti-Christian, anti-God, anti-scripture, anti-semitic, pro-Muslim stance. The series was loaded with many repeated statements, that deride Christianity. I could tolerate that, if what she said was put over properly – but it was not. It was the most sloppy set of programmes I have seen for a long time. And, for a Hebrew scholar, her presentation of certain Hebrew words was also sloppy... no, deliberately misleading. And her attempt to destroy the basis of present-day Israel from its claim to their land was just a political statement that helped Palestinian terrorism; it was, then, outrageous.

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

I have read her kind of argument in old articles and books. This is why I am convinced her work and that of the BBC is designed to bring down Christianity by saying (not even suggesting!) that the Bible cannot be relied upon. That is only her opinion – ***it is not fact***. And the BBC might well have had a comedian as a presenter, because she is trained as an historian, but what did she use as 'proofs'? A totally different discipline – archaeology! That is like an anthropologist pretending to know about biology...just like David Attenborough.

I sighed as I watched the third programme, because I knew what would come, and I did not really wish to watch rubbish! But I did, for the sake of all who think 'experts' are always right. Francesca Stavrakopoulou was NOT right, and her academic qualifications were of no use to her whatever, as she trotted-out very silly arguments, time and again, under the guise of proved facts. Even the smallest details were out of sync with reality!

For example (though this is more to do with the graphics department than with her), the image of Eve with moles on her face! God would not have created a person with skin blemishes! But, of course, as the series decried Christianity and makes out the Bible to be just mythical, it is okay to make such a basic error.

Then, proving her inability to understand scripture, she said "Temptation destroyed everything". No, sin did that, not temptation. Perhaps she should read the New Testament to see what the difference is. Another weird statement was that the 'story' of Eden was central to Christian faith (which is true) and that it was used for "justifying the need for a Saviour". This is another very basic error on Francesca Stavrakopoulou' part! We did not invent sin to justify having a Saviour – a Saviour was needed (and the provision put in place in eternity) because mankind had sinned. Francesca Stavrakopoulou had a most odd way of putting it! The aim was to imply that man made up a need to satisfy a supposedly mythical Eden experience.

To emphasise her view that sin is a myth, Francesca Stavrakopoulou said that the idea of original sin "has had a devastating grip on the western imagination". Now, that is blatant! She is saying that the 'myth' we 'invented' has had a bad effect on western society! In reality, it is rejection of the idea of sin that has ruined society! If more people were 'in the grip' of the reality of sin, society as a whole would be far better off.

We see the effects of removing this reality in fast-increasing promiscuity, abortions, violence, and so on. We also see it in people like Francesca Stavrakopoulou, whose sin against God will be brought to her attention when she dies. She will no doubt smile at that... but she knows, and

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

I know, that in her darkest hours, and when she is awake at night, her doubts come flooding in. It will certainly hit her on her death-bed. This happens to every atheist, whose lives are miserable, though they outwardly claim otherwise.

Throughout, Francesca Stavrakopoulou scoffs at the idea that "human nature is fundamentally bad". Of course she scoffs – she is an atheist! And a feminist. Both want the end of the idea of inherent sin, so she ridicules the Christian teaching on it. Those who are not familiar with how words are presented will probably say "I didn't think she ridiculed anyone". But, she definitely did ridicule Christians, their faith, and the Bible, but cleverly (well, that is what *she* thought anyway), by relying on the general ignorance of viewers.

In all three programmes Francesca Stavrakopoulou made allusion to 'clues' that are 'hidden' in the Bible. The obvious reason for saying that? She wanted to give the idea that only she had the ability and qualifications to dig the secrets out. And that is why we all ought to listen to her and think the same way. The trouble is, many of us know better than she does!

Her notion, that there are 'hidden' clues, is nothing to do with what the Bible actually says, but with the way she strung together disparate, unconnected things as if they were all one fact. That is NOT academic reasoning – it is just plain, old quackery.

In another part, she contrasted 'fundamentalists' (those who believe every word of the Bible) with 'truth'. In other words, those who believe the Bible as it is written are liars and do not know the truth. But, she, AN ATHEIST, knows the truth! See the logic? No? That's because there is none.

It is a very old academic trick – just keep telling lies and fabrications but accuse the 'others' of lying and deception! It is a smokescreen to take the heat off your own inadequacies. Hitler once said (paraphrased) – if you must tell lies, make them big ones! This is because the bigger the lie the more likely it is that the hearer will believe it. But, Francesca Stavrakopoulou does not take into account people like me, who check every claim!

As well as contrasting Bible-believers and 'truth', Francesca Stavrakopoulou says "The REAL story is too important to ignore". This is another way of saying she is right and Christians are wrong... the 'real' story is whatever manure she cares to throw over the viewer. Well, I have

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

listened to her arguments, but they are not real arguments; they are just the ramblings of an atheist with a very poor academic output on TV.

When talking about Catholics (who she confuses with Christians) she says "To doubt the veracity of Eden is to doubt God Himself". This is true. She went on to 'prove' the Eden 'story' to be untrue. Or, rather, she THOUGHT she had proved it. (Note also she used the word 'story' throughout' rather than 'account', because most viewers would take this to mean a 'story' is untrue). All she did was give out a string of unrelated items as though they were connected, which they were not.

Francesca Stavrakopoulou then sows more seeds of doubt by saying that not all Christians see the Eden account as fact, but as allegorical. For myself, I do not accept these people as fellow Christians at all – their unbelief proves their inability to think as believers anyway. Thus, like atheists, and Francesca Stavrakopoulou herself, they have no credibility.

One could see the glint of coming victory in her eyes and half-smile (yes, they were there) as she pointed out several times that if the Eden 'story' was found to be wrong, it would have a devastating effect on Christian faith – which, of course, is her aim. She was building up to her main thesis: that Eden was not part of Old Testament truth, but was added much, much later. This, for her, was the main point. That it could be easily thrown out with the trash did not occur to her.

Francesca Stavrakopoulou claims that "some themes" were "read-into" the Bible. That made me smile – *she* 'reads-into' the Bible anything she likes, all the time! And so she dismisses the serpent as Satan, and the fact of sin.

According to Francesca Stavrakopoulou the serpent is not the devil! Revelation 12:9 and 20:2 say otherwise! "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan..." That Francesca Stavrakopoulou should completely ignore that reference is astounding and very bad scholarship. But, on the other hand, as an atheist, she does not have a clue about genuine interpretation, or even about accurate academic research.

So, for her to say "all these things are alien to the book of Genesis" is absolute nonsense. She can only get away with it because the BBC is a law to itself – it is not even governed by Ofcom!

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

How convenient... it allows the BBC to get away with anything it wishes to say.

She went on quite a bit about the supposed 'apple' eaten by Eve and Adam. So what? In my normal Bible study on Genesis I conclude and teach that 'apple' might be traditionally referred to, but it is not found in the Hebrew text. Her concentration on 'apple', then, is another smokescreen. It is a non-argument.

Most genuine Bible teachers KNOW the fruit was not (necessarily) an apple. But, Francesca Stavrakopoulou was trying to make a mountain out of a mole-hill. Even if people think it WAS an apple, it would not make any difference to the text. Laughably, she makes much of the word 'apple' and points out that it was, rather, 'fruit'. Yet, she abandons all true interpretation when she misuses or badly leaves out vital information when referring to Hebrew words she claims to be expert in!

Then, out of the blue – along comes one of her favourite axes, which she constantly grinds at every opportunity – even when it is not relevant to the argument. That is – feminism! Feminists tend to argue over everything and make up arguments on very flimsy evidence. And so Francesca Stavrakopoulou launched into saying that women are viewed badly throughout the world because everyone blames Eve for the fall of mankind.

Eh? I do not think that. Nor does anyone else I know, including pastors and theologians! If she likes to fool about with feminism then that is her choice – but leave it out of real debates. Feminism is just a sad, and sometimes pathetic, ruse.

She even went on to say that there are many "hang-ups about sex" because of the Eve account! Again – eh? The only hang-ups are with Francesca Stavrakopoulou and her feminism. Feminism is an imbalance of thought and mind, based on... what? Nothing. If any man has a poor view of women, it is his own fault, and nothing to do with Eve. Indeed, most men have no idea what the account of Eve says, anyway. It is just another fallacy perpetrated by feminists to support their own myths.

Francesca Stavrakopoulou continually undermines scripture, but not with facts or proof – she does it by placing doubt, with phrases like "I think its real meaning is lost". Even her much-repeated "I think" is only a front, because she later categorically claims the Bible is wrong

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

and she is right. Just as *she* repeats "I think", so must I repeat, because it is true, that for an academic she is poorly presented, using unproved arguments. Again, I must point to her atheism. An atheist who claims to be a Bible scholar is like a dead body claiming to be alive.

Throughout the series she bases her assumptions on archaeology, which, by definition, must make many conceptual leaps, because archaeological digs only provide very limited finds. But, though the Bible is already written and filled with detail, it is just dismissed. Again, this is the huge flaw of atheism. If I want to know about fish I go to a book about fish, not to a railway enthusiast meeting! It is the height of arrogance to dismiss meanings and truth written in the Bible.

So, our intrepid back-seat driver, Francesca Stavrakopoulou, says "I disagree". So? That I do not mind – but I DO mind when she puts out her inane hypotheses as proven fact.

After this Francesca Stavrakopoulou comes to her main idea: "the real garden (of Eden)... was constructed by humans by hand, much later". What? She bases this not on what the Bible says, but on an obscure temple in the desert that has no connection whatever to her argument. Her Higher Critical methods are easily detected in everything she says, especially when she confidently claims that Genesis was written in the first century BC!

This little gem is rooted in the atheistic Higher Critical method of literary criticism which basically says that Genesis "could not have been written" so long ago, because of language used, etc. This is fallacious and has long been debunked. So, when the BBC tells us Francesca Stavrakopoulou's work is 'new', well, they are either lying, or they are duped... or just playing the atheist game.

The main thrust of Francesca Stavrakopoulou's argument is that the Garden of Eden did not exist as per Bible, but was a garden built within a temple by a king. This pure conjecture is not a valid academic argument, because there are so many alternative arguments and so many denials. Francesca Stavrakopoulou says that the rivers mentioned in scripture bounding the Garden, though actual rivers, were 'really' irrigation canals built by gardeners of a king. It was a feast of gobbledygook to listen to her in full flight, like a phoenix without wings!

She said that Eden as a place where "nature runs free" is a myth. Why? Because archaeology

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

shows palace architecture and man-made structures. So, Eden could not have been a beautiful garden created by God. The unconnectedness of all this is amazing, but Francesca Stavrakopoulou fearlessly strides forward with no regard for academic excellence. I am the first to admit that trying to reduce an academic argument down to easy-watching is very hard... but the simplified version MUST always use logic and proper argument. Francesca Stavrakopoulou is incapable of doing this.

Her kind of arguments can only survive in its own context – she, and others like her, are big fish in a very small pond, a stagnating pond that is far removed from the mighty ocean of truth.

The existence of temples, their ruins, and temple carvings, are not relevant to the case, because the Garden is described in scripture as a... garden where “nature runs free”. Scripture is its own proof. Temple gardens are – temple gardens. They have no connection to the Eden account, because there were no buildings and only one couple – Adam and Eve. Again, to say Adam and Eve were not the first couple, etc., is just irrelevant and unprovable.

Always, for Francesca Stavrakopoulou, the Bible is just a book of myths, and she continually denigrates it and those who believe it. As the Bible says – she is a fool (Psalm 14:1). She insists that the only representation of the Garden of Eden is in the Alhambra palace in Spain. That is good going, seeing as creation took place a few millennia before it was built and no-one knows what it looked like.

However, Francesca Stavrakopoulou gladly accepts the Muslim view of Eden: as Heaven itself, not as a physical place in the world. She accepts that without any critical comments at all... clever girl – she does not want to be beheaded! All the time, like a good gnostic, she claims to know what is supposedly ‘hidden’ in the Bible. Again, what a clever girl to know all that, when no-one else can see it. She said that the ‘real’ detail in scripture cannot be seen by others today, and insists Eden was a place built much later (according to the debunked Higher Critical analysis made about a century or more ago).

With obvious delight she then pounces on another supposed ‘hidden’ part of the Genesis account – the cherubim. Aha! Most Christians think of them as little plump babies floating in the air, she said! It is true, sadly. But, many of us teach them to be fearsome angels used by God to guard the opening to the garden (and elsewhere). They are fearsome because they will do battle to guard what God wants guarded. The cherubim, keruwb, guarded Eden, and are either side of God’s throne, they act as bearers of the throne of God, like a chariot, and flanked the

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

Ark in the temple.

They are visually portrayed as a combination of man, ox, lion and eagle; they are shown in this way to represent power and wisdom. Because figures of cherubim are also found on certain non-Hebrew ruins, Francesca Stavrakopoulou thinks they are the same thing! What an error! In particular she points to cherubim shown on Assyrian ruins, and presumes therefore that the Bible takes its representation from these! Francesca Stavrakopoulou does not even consider that pagan and heathen depictions are borrowed from scripture and from real-time events and situations!

Her assumption that she could exactly pin-point where Eden was, by reading the Bible, is naïve to the point of being simplistic. She refers to places in the desert – but there is no evidence of desert until after the great Flood! Also, a most basic fact does not come into her head: that the Flood completely altered the earth, and so any rivers would have been remade, probably running somewhere other than as found in scripture! So, to follow pre-Flood directions in a post-Flood world is rather silly.

Francesca Stavrakopoulou makes the assertion that Adam was actually a king in a palace. She even argues against a Rabbi who made the correct definitions, such is her arrogance. To 'prove' her case she goes not to scripture, but to Assyrian ruins!! She claims that these ruins, which were, when new, constructed millennia after the creation, can tell us what Genesis means. The claims of Francesca Stavrakopoulou are so astoundingly childish, I find it disturbing to have to refute them. I am embarrassed for her! Her qualifications are denied by her ridiculous claims, all of which are 'old hat' and only believed by – atheists.

So, for Francesca Stavrakopoulou, the Assyrian and other ruins link directly to the Genesis account. No logical steps of argument – believe it because Francesca Stavrakopoulou says so! Thus, she says that Adam symbolised the link between heaven and earth. Where does that come from? For a 'Bible scholar' she does not use the Bible much. And when she does, she misinterprets it. Adam, she added, was a "gardener to the gods" (A bit later, when talking to the rabbi, she amended this to "gardener to God"). That is, he had "privileged access to the garden of the gods". None of this is found in scripture.

Though her rabbinical friend denies such a title or role, Francesca Stavrakopoulou says "Adam fulfils the role of a king". Frankly, we could make a case for Adam being *like* a king, but only because he was given complete control over the whole earth. But, he was not made a king by

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

God, so the epithet cannot properly be used.

He was not a gardener as such, but he did tend to the Eden garden. As there were no problems or weeds, this was more like observing it.

We get the picture so repeatedly (*ad nauseum*) given by Francesca Stavrakopoulou: Eden was 'actually' a garden built within a king's temple, and the king was regarded as a 'god'. There you have it: the Bible says one thing but this 'scholar' says something completely different, based on non-Biblical sources. Sounds like a recipe for a flat soufflé.

Francesca Stavrakopoulou again talked to folks who think as she does, so that anyone she interviews will either be made to be her local moron, or her worldwide friend. So, she talked to Prof. Nicolas Wyatt. What Francesca Stavrakopoulou did NOT tell us is that Prof Wyatt's abiding interest in in "Ugaritic literature for understanding the background to the Hebrew Bible". Well, what a surprise – he believes just as she does, and uses the same dubious sources, instead of looking at scripture itself! (The Ugaritic finds were looked at in programme two; see my comments).

The Professor shows his biblical disbelief by saying that the Bible "cannot be treated seriously in isolation from surrounding cultural crosscurrents." That is, the Bible cannot be trusted unless it is verified by pagan sources. Now is that not a coincidence? He also believes that Israel was "rooted" heavily in the surrounding Canaanite culture. In this man's work we see the work of Francesca Stavrakopoulou. That is, her work on the series is not unique to her, but is borrowed from others. So much for her choosing an independent scholar, and the BBC for choosing Francesca Stavrakopoulou for her fresh insights!

Reference is then made to Ezekiel 28 and the king of Tyre. Here I must warn that many Christians have been taken in by the argument that this refers figuratively to the Garden of Eden, but it is wrong (see my article on this subject). The chapter is wholly about the then king of Tyre, who was rebuked for his behaviour.

As I show in my article, when the account is examined carefully, it has nothing to do with Genesis. Yet, people like Francesca Stavrakopoulou and Prof Wyatt claim that Tyre is where the Garden of Eden was. But, if their interpretation is wrong, then so is the site of the Garden!

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

And their interpretation IS wrong. (This is changed later, to Jerusalem).

She goes on to say that the “mountain of God” in Ezekiel was mount Zion. “Eden was in the city of Jerusalem”. This is founded not just on the work of Higher Critics, but on the fables devised by charismatics, such as Unger, and heretics like Pember. Also, the phrase “mountain of God” is not necessarily an allusion to the temple of God in Jerusalem. (See Article A-385 for more textual details).

In total, Francesca Stavrakopoulou's arguments are confused and an attempt to tie-together things that are not connected at all, just to justify her sub-hypothesis. But, when it is taken apart and analysed, it has no merit whatever. She is a story-teller, not a good academic.

She also keeps confusing Catholics and Christians, again proving her knowledge to be deficient. She even shows us the “burial place of Adam” (Catholic, of course) in Jerusalem! Now that is a great proof, especially as wherever he was buried was completely destroyed by the great Flood (which, no doubt, she does not believe in)!

Francesca Stavrakopoulou has made her own world and own Bible, and they have no foundation other than her own mind and the faulty minds of other atheists. Thus, she says Adam's disobedience was “the first sin”. No, it was not. The first sin was by Satan. The second sin was by Eve, Adam's sin was the third.

Really, we could break down those sins into many more... pride, deception, lies, and so on. So, it is possible that Adam's sin was the 27th! (If you see what I mean). But, for normal purposes, we can say his sin was the third. (And, of course, Francesca Stavrakopoulou does not know the difference between temptation and sin).

Francesca Stavrakopoulou again interviewed her fellow atheist, Herbert Niehr (see second article), who pompously said “Jerusalem was the place of creation”. He bases this on the time of the Babylonian taking of the city and the exile. From this came the assertion that ‘original sin’ was not by the people but by a king. Really, the tenuous nature of these arguments makes them worthless; they are like making real-world policies based on comic books.

BBC2, 'The Bible's Buried Secrets', Part Three, 'The Real Garden of Eden': More Nonsense.

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

The idea is that the king's ego led to the fall of Jerusalem and the exile. This was the 'break with God'... NOT the sin of Adam and Eve, even though that is what the Bible says. The fault lay with the errant king, and not with all of mankind. Therefore, original sin, the sin we are all born with, does not exist. Another very convenient thing to believe... if you are an atheist!

It seems to me that Francesca Stavrakopoulou is an atheist like all other atheists – they argue so strongly against scripture because it hides their misery, fear and guilt. They shout there is no God, knowing that He DOES exist. It is the very reason they shout so loudly.

"The rest of us are off the hook" if only one king is responsible for sin. Also, the serpent and Eve have had a 'bad press' for millennia: the snake was not a villain and was certainly not Satan (see Revelation text above). A quick mention was made of the rod of Moses changed into a snake that did good! But, this has no link whatever to the snake in Eden!

I just cannot comprehend why Francesca Stavrakopoulou should make such a fool of herself in public, knowing that a huge number of real scholars can easily debunk what she says. But, of course, she lives and eats amongst buddies who are also atheists, so they enjoy their little huddles and automatically accept anything that appears to be against scriptural truth... like politicians, they just ignore it and carry on regardless.

'When the Temple was taken and destroyed by the Babylonian army, it was the end of snake worship in the temple' (uh?). Then, when Genesis was written later, in the 1st century BC (uh?), the authorities wanted to destroy snake worship and so invented the story about the serpent in the Garden of Eden. Simple, eh? Forget mere truth and details and just accept the myth put out by atheists.

In another interview, Francesca Stavrakopoulou talked to Prof. Judith Hadley, and both agreed that people think "it was all Eve's fault" and that because of this "all of womankind" was condemned. These feminists must live on a different planet. Mistreatment of women is more likely amongst Muslims than amongst Christians! Even so, it is not so widespread as they make out.

Here is another point of interest, seeing as how Francesca Stavrakopoulou is put forward as the one with new information on the Bible... Francesca Stavrakopoulou based her ideas on the cult

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

of Asherah on this professor's work. Did Francesca Stavrakopoulou do ANYTHING original for the series? Yes, her jeans were bought privately by her own money (I think).

It is Hadley who put forward the idea that recent archaeological finds led her to re-evaluate the place and history of Israel. It is she who suggested that God had a 'wife'. It is she who decided that figurines found at Ugarit were of Asherah... even though other experts say they are not, but are evidence of Egyptian gods. And so on.

Hadley said Eve was not the first woman (she must have secret knowledge), so could not be blamed for the first sin. But, "women have inherited the sin of Eve". This is another blatant feminist idea not upheld in any Christian or church I know of. Yes, Eve succumbed to the temptation put to her by Satan (the serpent), and yes, she then tempted Adam, who also sinned. But, that is now 'academic' for we all are conceived in sin. I for one do not blame every woman on earth for this fact! Both women, though, say there is no such thing as sin. Well, they would.

The final theme is that the fall of Adam and Eve is "not about the fall of humanity". Again, this is against what scripture says. Of course, this is ignored in favour of non-Biblical sources. Prof Wyatt is able to say "Eden seems to be a cypher for a real place", which, for him and Francesca Stavrakopoulou, is the Temple at Jerusalem.

No – the 'real place' was the Garden of Eden referred to in Genesis, which was closed to Adam and Eve after their sin, and later lost its location and existence anyway when God brought the great Flood on the whole world. (Higher Critics claimed there were no written records at so early a time. This is nonsense. Moses wrote things down, so did Joseph, etc).

Perhaps the most useful thing we can say about Francesca Stavrakopoulou and the BBC series, is that it prompts us all to be vigilant against such blatant lies and un-academic nonsense, and we should prove to them they are liars or just bad academics. Francesca Stavrakopoulou is only one of many atheists, who think it is their business to decry the word of God.

In my three articles on the series I have shown that Francesca Stavrakopoulou and others are just ignorant folks with an agenda, which is the destruction of Christianity, through the scorning

BBC2, 'The Bible's Buried Secrets', Part Three, 'The Real Garden of Eden': More Nonsense.

Written by K B Napier
Friday, 01 April 2011 21:17

of the Bible, and they covertly try to undermine Israel and its claim to the land they live in. And, though a 'Bible scholar', Francesca Stavrakopoulou has no idea at all about what the Bible says. I have also shown that certain words and texts she relies on are grossly misinterpreted. Now, it is up to each Christian to advise people who viewed the series, so that such blatant buffoonery does not take root.

© 31 March 2011

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}