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Foreword

The evaluation of research and doctoral training is being carried out in the years 2010–2012 and will end in 2012. The steering group appointed by the Rector in January 2010 set the conditions for participating in the evaluation and prepared the Terms of Reference to present the evaluation procedure and criteria. The publications and other scientific activities included in the evaluation covered the years 2005–2010.

The participating unit in the evaluation was defined as a Researcher Community (RC). To obtain a critical mass with university-level impact, the number of members was set to range from 20 to 120. The RCs were required to contain researchers in all stages of their research career, from doctoral students to principal investigators (PIs). All in all, 136 Researcher Communities participated in this voluntary evaluation, 5857 persons in total, of whom 1131 were principal investigators. PIs were allowed to participate in two communities in certain cases, and 72 of them used this opportunity and participated in two RCs.

This evaluation enabled researchers to define RCs from the “bottom up” and across disciplines. The aim of the evaluation was not to assess individual performance but a community with shared aims and researcher-training activities. The RCs were able to choose among five different categories that characterised the status and main aims of their research. The steering group considered the process of applying to participate in the evaluation to be important, which lead to the establishment of these categories. In addition, providing a service for the RCs to enable them to benchmark their research at the global level was a main goal of the evaluation.

The data for the evaluation consisted of the RCs’ answers to evaluation questions on supplied e-forms and a compilation extracted from the TUHAT – Research Information System (RIS) on 12 April 2011. The compilation covered scientific and other publications as well as certain areas of scientific activities. During the process, the RCs were asked to check the list of publications and other scientific activities and make corrections if needed. These TUHAT compilations are public and available on the evaluation project sites of each RC in the TUHAT-RIS.

In addition to the e-form and TUHAT compilation, University of Leiden (CWTS) carried out bibliometric analyses from the articles included in the Web of Science (WoS). This was done on University and RC levels. In cases where the publication forums of the RC were clearly not represented by the WoS data, the Library of the University of Helsinki conducted a separate analysis of the publications. This was done for 66 RCs representing the humanities and social sciences.

The evaluation office also carried out an enquiry targeted to the supervisors and PhD candidates about the organisation of doctoral studies at the University of Helsinki. This and other documents describing the University and the Finnish higher education system were provided to the panellists.

The panel feedback for each RC is unique and presented as an entity. The first collective evaluation reports available for the whole panel were prepared in July–August 2011. The reports were accessible to all panel members via the electronic evaluation platform in August. Scoring from 1 to 5 was used to complement written feedback in association with evaluation questions 1–4 (scientific focus and quality, doctoral training, societal impact, cooperation) and in addition to the category evaluating the fitness for participation in the evaluation. Panellists used the international level as a point of comparison in the evaluation. Scoring was not expected to go along with a preset deviation.

Each of the draft reports were discussed and dealt with by the panel in meetings in Helsinki (from 11 September to 13 September or from 18 September to 20 September 2011). In these meetings the panels also examined the deviations among the scores and finalised the draft reports together.

The current RC-specific report deals shortly with the background of the evaluation and the terms of participation. The main evaluation feedback is provided in the evaluation report, organised according to the evaluation questions. The original material provided by the RCs for the panellists has been attached to these documents.
On behalf of the evaluation steering group and office, I sincerely wish to thank you warmly for your participation in this evaluation. The effort you made in submitting the data to TUHAT-RIS is gratefully acknowledged by the University. We wish that you find this panel feedback useful in many ways. The bibliometric profiles may open a new view on your publication forums and provide a perspective for discussion on your choice of forums. We especially hope that this evaluation report will help you in setting the future goals of your research.

Johanna Björkroth
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

The participants in the evaluation of research and doctoral training were Researcher Communities (hereafter referred to as the RC). The RC refers to the group of researchers who registered together in the evaluation of their research and doctoral training. Preconditions in forming RCs were stated in the Guidelines for the Participating Researcher Communities. The RCs defined themselves whether their compositions should be considered well-established or new.

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

The present evaluation recognizes and justifies the diversity of research practices and publication traditions. Traditional Research Assessment Exercises do not necessarily value high quality research with low volumes or research distinct from mainstream research. It is challenging to expose the diversity of research to fair comparison. To understand the essence of different research practices and to do justice to their diversity was one of the main challenges of the present evaluation method. Understanding the divergent starting points of the RCs demanded sensitivity from the evaluators.

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University’s strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University’s policy.  
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University’s research potential.
- to exploit the University’s TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

The evaluation can be considered as an enhancement-led evaluation. Instead of ranking, the main aim is to provide useful information for the enhancement of research and doctoral training of the participating RCs. The comparison should take into account each field of science and acknowledge their special character.

---

3 The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

4 Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized. The evaluation approach has been designed to recognize better the significance and specific nature of researcher communities and research areas in the multidisciplinary top-level university. Furthermore, one of the aims of the evaluation is to bring to light those evaluation aspects that differ from the prevalent ones. Thus the views of various fields of research can be described and research arising from various starting points understood better. The doctoral training is integrated into the evaluation as a natural component related to research. Operational processes of doctoral training are being examined in the evaluation.

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT\(^5\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^6\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**

Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:

1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

The University invited 10 renowned scientists to act as chairs or vice-chairs of the five panels based on the suggestions of faculties and independent institutes. Besides leading the work of the panel, an additional role of the chairs was to discuss with other panel chairs in order to adopt a broadly similar approach. The panel chairs and vice-chairs had a pre-meeting on 27 May 2011 in Amsterdam.

The panel compositions were nominated by the Rector of the University 27 April 2011. The participating RCs suggested the panel members. The total number of panel members was 50. The reason for a smaller number of panellists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

- On 11–13 September 2011: (1) biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences, (2) medicine, biomedicine and health sciences and (3) natural sciences.
- On 18–20 September 2011: (4) humanities and (5) social sciences.

---

\(^5\) TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

\(^6\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

The main material in the evaluation was the RCs’ self-evaluations that were qualitative in character and allowed the RCs to choose what was important to mention or emphasise and what was left unmentioned.

The present evaluation is exceptional at least in the Finnish context because it is based on both the evaluation documentation (self-evaluation questions, publications and other scientific activities) and the bibliometric reports. All documents were delivered to the panellists for examination.

Traditional bibliometrics can be reasonably done mainly in medicine, biosciences and natural sciences when using the Web of Science database, for example. Bibliometrics, provided by CWTS/The Centre for Science and Technology Studies, University of Leiden, cover only the publications that include WoS identification in the TUHAT-RIS.

Traditional bibliometrics are seldom relevant in humanities and social sciences because the international comparable databases do not store every type of high quality research publications, such as books and monographs and scientific journals in other languages than English. The Helsinki University Library has done analysis to the RCs, if their publications were not well represented in the Web of Science databases (RCs should have at least 50 publications and internal coverage of publications more than 40%) – it meant 58 RCs. The bibliometric material for the evaluation panels was available in June 2011. The RC-specific bibliometric reports are attached at the end of each report.

The panels were provided with the evaluation material and all other necessary background information, such as the basic information about the University of Helsinki and the Finnish higher education system.

Evaluation material

1. Registration documents of the RCs for the background information
2. Self evaluation material – answers to the evaluation questions
3. Publications and other scientific activities based on the TUHAT RIS:
   3.1. statistics of publications
   3.2. list of publications
   3.3. statistics of other scientific activities
   3.4. list of other scientific activities
4. Bibliometrics and comparable analyses:
   4.1. Analyses of publications based on the verification of TUHAT-RIS publications with the Web of Science publications (CWTS/University of Leiden)
   4.2. Publication statistics analysed by the Helsinki University Library - mainly for humanities and social sciences
5. University level survey on doctoral training (August 2011)
6. University level analysis on publications 2005–2010 (August 2011) provided by CWTS/University of Leiden

Background material

University of Helsinki
- Basic information about the University of the Helsinki
- The structure of doctoral training at the University of Helsinki
- Previous evaluations of research at the University of Helsinki – links to the reports: 1998 and 2005

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes
- Finnish University system
- Evaluation of the Finnish National Innovation System
- The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland. Publication of the Academy of Finland 9/09.

The evaluation panels were provided also with other relevant material on request before the meetings in Helsinki.
1.6 Evaluation questions and material

The participating RCs answered the following evaluation questions which are presented according to the evaluation form. In addition, TUHAT RIS was used to provide the additional material as explained. For giving the feedback to the RCs, the panellists received the evaluation feedback form constructed in line with the evaluation questions:

1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research
   - Description of
     - the RC’s research focus.
     - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
     - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

   Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
   - Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
   - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
   A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

   Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training
   - Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
   - Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

   The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness
   - Strengths
   - Areas of development
   - Other remarks
   - Recommendations

   Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- **Description of**
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
  - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

5. Operational conditions

- **Description of**
  - the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
  - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

- **Description of**
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC’s research focus
  - strengthening of the RC’s know-how
  - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

7. External competitive funding of the RC

- **The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:**
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- **On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:**
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation , EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

8. The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- **RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.**
  
  A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

10. Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material
Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

11. How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research?
Comments if applicable

12. RC-specific main recommendations based on the previous questions 1-11

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:

- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

Evaluation according to the criteria was to be made with thorough consideration of the entire evaluation material of the RC in question. Finally, in questions 1-4 and 9, the panellists were expected to classify their written feedback into one of the provided levels (the levels included respective descriptions, ‘criteria’). Some panels used decimals in marks. The descriptive level was interpreted according to the integers and not rounding up the decimals by the editors.

Description of criteria levels

Question 1 – FOCUS AND QUALITY OF THE RC’S RESEARCH

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of “international attention” or “international impact” etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by “international comparability”.

10
Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.

Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.

Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.

Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.

Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**

**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**

**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

**Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)**

**Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)**

Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the
documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of
doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the
documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and
quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in
alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient
quality.

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

**Participation category – fitness for the category chosen**

The choice and justification for the chosen category below should be reflected in the RC’s responses to the
evaluation questions 1–8.

1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.
2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present
   composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.
3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special
   features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation. The research is
   of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used
   research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the
   research.
4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening. A new opening can
   be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social,
   national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its
   present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce
   convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact. The
   participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research.
   The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate,
   or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having
   societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

**An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5)**

The RC’s representation and argumentation for the chosen category were convincing. The RC recognized
its real capacity and apparent outcomes in a wider context to the research communities. The specific
character of the RC was well-recognized and well stated in the responses. The RC fitted optimally for the
category.

- Outstanding (5)
- Excellent (4)
- Very good (3)
- Good (2)
- Sufficient (1)

The above-mentioned definition of outstanding was only an example in order to assist the panellists in
the positioning of the classification. There was no exact definition for the category fitness.

---

7 The panels discussed the category fitness and made the final conclusions of the interpretation of it.
1.8 Timetable of the evaluation

The main timetable of the evaluation:

1. Registration November 2010
3. External peer review May–September 2011
4. Published reports March–April 2012
   - University level public report
   - RC specific reports

The entire evaluation was implemented during the university’s strategy period 2010–2012. The preliminary results were available for the planning of the following strategy period in late autumn 2011. The evaluation reports will be published in March/April 2012. More detailed time schedule is published in the University report.

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panellists evaluated all the RC-specific material before the meetings in Helsinki and mailed the draft reports to the evaluation office. The latest interim versions were on-line available to all the panellists on the Wiki-sites. In September 2011, in Helsinki the panels discussed the material, revised the first draft reports and decided the final numeric evaluation. After the meetings in Helsinki, the panels continued working and finalised the reports before the end of November 2011. The final RC-specific reports are the consensus of the entire panel.

The evaluation reports were written by the panels independently. During the editing process, the evaluation office requested some clarifications from the panels when necessary. The tone and style in the reports were not harmonized in the editing process. All the reports follow the original texts written by the panels as far as it was possible.

The original evaluation material of the RCs, provided for the panellists is attached at the end of the report. It is essential to notice that the exported lists of publications and other scientific activities depend how the data was stored in the TUHAT-RIS by the RCs.
2 Evaluation feedback

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

- Description of
  - the RC’s research focus
  - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
  - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

Strengths

The self-evaluation ably delineates two areas where this RC has been strongly innovative, also internationally:

- a focus on ‘forgotten’ forms of early Christian religion (Gnosticism, Jewish Christianity),
- a focus on how to connect social-science and social-history approaches to early Christianity with the cognitive science of religion.

There is no doubt that this RC belongs at the top level internationally in these two respects. Nothing really comparable may be found in the other Nordic countries and the members of the RC make a strong mark internationally beyond the Nordic countries (e.g. in Germany and the US). There is a potential here, which has already been partly actualized, for striking breakthroughs in the traditional type of scholarship on early Christianity (and Judaism).

It should also be noted that it is an advantage (as the self-evaluation itself notes) that the RC is able to maintain a broad scope in its research, which of course also includes what is best in the more traditional approaches within the field.

In addition, one notes that this RC publishes very impressively internationally at the best publishing houses etc.

Areas of development

It is very difficult to see how all of this could be made much better. The only concern, of which the self-evaluation is itself acutely aware, is how to be able to maintain and develop the “staff” that is already so well engaged in this research.

Numeric evaluation: 4.5 (Excellent)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools-doctoral programmes
  - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
- Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management
Strengths
The strengths of the doctoral training are those that are found in many disciplines within the humanities at the University of Helsinki, only here one notes an extremely lucid and convincing account of its many different facets (Stage 2 pp. 4-6). Particularly noteworthy is the extent to which the doctoral students are from the start involved with international cooperation of various sorts, by themselves going abroad in various functions and by having their work scrutinized by international top experts who come to Helsinki.

Areas of development
The self-evaluation rightly notes two problems that may or may not be solved:

- the difficulty of securing long-term funding for PhD students (instead of just one year, as often happens for students who get private funding)
- the difficulty of finding employment for PhD students who have finished their studies.

In both respects, however, it should be noted that the PhD students of this particular RC are in fact doing quite well, both in securing longer-term funding as part of research projects that the RC has been very good at getting and also in terms of post-PhD employment.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

- Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
- Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Strengths
The self-evaluation ably describes the various categories of its societal impact. In addition to an impressive list of Finnish publications, including translations of ancient sources, the RC also spearheaded the field of internet publications and may boast of numerous appearances in the media.

All in all, this RC is extremely active also in making a societal impact.

Areas of development
The RC itself notes that it does not plan any change in its approach in this area. And one can understand why.

Numeric evaluation: 4.5 (Excellent)

2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- Description of
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

Strengths
The RC is extremely strong on this point. They have an international visibility that few could boast, for instance, at the American Society of Biblical Literature, where they are chairing research sections etc., but
also in the European Association of Biblical Studies and a number of important Nordic networks funded by the Nordic Council.

Also, the international mobility of the PIs and postdocs is very impressive, indeed.

**Areas of development**
The self-evaluation rightly mentions that all this activity places a strain on the amount of time that PIs and postdocs have for their own research. Thus it is a priority of the RC to attempt to get as much funding as possible for research posts, in order to be able to continue having something to present in all the internal contexts in which the RC is involved.

**Numeric evaluation: 4.5 (Excellent)**

### 2.5 Operational conditions

- **Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).**
- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management**

**Strengths**
The RC appears to be well served in general both by the University of Helsinki and the Faculty of Theology.

**Areas of development**
However, the self-evaluation also lists the following problems, which appear to be quite genuine:

- tenured teachers are relatively few, which means that they have quite heavy teaching loads (in addition to being expected to do all that makes this RC stand out),
- the PIs also have heavy administrative tasks,
- no system of sabbaticals is in place,
- in general it is a severe drawback for a number of highly qualified senior scholars that there are so few permanent teaching and research positions.

### 2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

- **Description of**
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC’s research focus
    - strengthening of the RC’s know-how

- **Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes**

**ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management**

**Strengths**
The main strength of this RC with respect to leadership and management is ... that it quite obviously works!
Areas of development

However, this is the one area where one might well suggest the need for some improvement. The self-evaluation ably describes (Stage 2 pp. 9-10) the benefits of not having any administrative structure or, as they call it, having “a ‘light’ version of leadership” which works well “democratically” (p. 10). Indeed, the self-evaluation turns this into one its strengths when it claims that “[i]novations cannot be dictated from above but they require academic freedom” (p. 10).

That is of course both true and important. It does seem, however, that one might consider taking some steps towards creating an only slightly more formal leadership structure, just as other UH RCs have that have the status of a Centre of Excellence. In fact, the present self-evaluation itself points to this possibility when it mentions that if one were to obtain a budget of one’s own one would also have to create a board consisting of the PIs + doctoral students representing the various subteams (p. 10). That seems exactly right, and it might be possible to create this even before one obtains a budget of one’s own.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

• The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  • the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  • the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
• On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness and future significance

Strengths
The RC has been able to attract a considerable amount of funding.

Areas of development
One notes, however, that no EU or ERC funding has been obtained. This would be an obvious strategic goal, considering the overall quality of this RC.

2.8 The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

• RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.
ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

Strengths
The self-evaluation gives an excellent account of its strategic goals, which cannot be improved here (Stage 2 pp. 11-12).
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category.
Category 1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.

The fitness of this RC for category 1 is quite obvious. When the self-evaluation describes its own RC as “an internationally recognized, academically strong and innovative research team” (Stage 2 p. 12), one can only concur.

Numeric evaluation: 4.5 (Excellent)

2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

This is stated so excellently on Stage 2 p. 13 that there is no need to repeat it here. The procedure does show that in spite of not having any real formal leadership structure, the management works!

2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

Focus area 8: Language and culture

This RC in fact belongs so squarely under the UH key focus area of ‘The thinking and learning human being’ (not least due to its innovative engagement with the cognitive science of religion) – that one would hope that it could be mentioned in the future along with other Centres of Excellence already mentioned there.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

See under item 6 on the leadership structure.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

The main conclusion must be that this is a top level RC that deserves all the support in the future that the University of Helsinki is able to provide.

2.14 Preliminary findings in the Panel-specific feedback

The main issues here are those listed under item 5:
- tenured teachers are relatively few, which means that they have quite heavy teaching loads (in addition to being expected to do all that makes this RC stand out),
- the Pls also have heavy administrative tasks,
- no system of sabbaticals is in place,
- in general it is a severe drawback for a number of highly qualified senior scholars that there are so few permanent teaching and research positions.
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NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
The Formation of Christianity: Historical, Social and Cognitive Perspectives (FC)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Ismo Dunderberg, Faculty of Theology

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

- Material submitted by the RC at stages 1 and 2 of the evaluation
  - STAGE 1 material: RC’s registration form (incl. list of RC participants in an excel table)
  - STAGE 2 material: RC’s answers to evaluation questions
- TUHAT compilations of the RC members’ other scientific activities 1.1.2005-31.12.2010

NB! Since Web of Science (WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)
**INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI**

**RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)**

### 1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dunderberg, Ismo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ismo.dunderberg@helsinki.fi">ismo.dunderberg@helsinki.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>+358-9-19124341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street address</td>
<td>Aleksanterinkatu 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

**Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters):** The Formation of Christianity: Historical, Social and Cognitive Perspectives

**Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters):** FC

**Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

The researcher community brings together internationally acknowledged experts in Christian origins and cutting-edge cognitive science of religion. The Faculty of Theology at the University of Helsinki hosts one of the world's largest research units of formative Christianity. Its research is not confined to the texts included in the New Testament. The unit also features a strong research tradition in the study of "forgotten" forms of the early Christian religion, especially "Gnostic" and Jewish Christian groups. In these fields, there are well-established forms of cooperation between individual scholars, including common research projects, shared publications, and joint supervision of doctoral students. In addition, all doctoral students working on Christian origins come together in the New Testament doctoral seminar.

At the same time, scholars of comparative religion in the researcher community have been developing new theoretical insights into religion based on the cognitive sciences. In the period under review (2005-10), there has been active cooperation between them and the scholars of Christian origins in the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. They have arranged in the Collegium joint workshops with world-class participants, and they have published joint publications, in which new approaches to early Christianity, informed by the cognitive science of religion and social-scientific approaches, are explored and critically discussed.

The co-operation has introduced a new approach in religious studies to early Christian studies: scholars on early Christianity, trained to work with social-science and social-history approaches, have integrated these perspectives with the cognitive one, and developed them together with cognitive scientists of religion toward a new socio-cognitive approach to early Christian religion.
**INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI**

**RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)**

### 3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

**Main scientific field of the RC's research:** humanities

**RC's scientific subfield 1:** Theology

**RC's scientific subfield 2:** Religion

**RC's scientific subfield 3:** --Select--

**RC's scientific subfield 4:** --Select--

**Other, if not in the list:**

### 4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

**Participation category:** 1. Research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field

**Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

1) The research conducted in New Testament and early Christian studies in the Faculty of Theology has been awarded the highest score (7) already in two previous research assessments.

2) The research in this field is of strategic importance in the faculty: Biblical studies, including Gnostic and Jewish Christian studies, are mentioned first in the faculty's listing of the areas of research emphasis where scholarship is already at the international top level.

3) This field of study was part of the group comprising one of the Centres of Excellence at the university (2000-2005, 2006; the group was led by Professor Heikki Räisänen, who himself is one of the best known scholars in New Testament and early Christian studies worldwide). After this period, a number of new research projects have been launched (funded by the Academy of Finland and the University of Helsinki), all producing international publications with best academic presses, which employ peer review as part of their publishing policy (e.g., Brill, Columbia University Press, Oxford University Press).

4) The researcher community has introduced pioneering applications of cognitive science to early Christian studies, and also actively sought to develop this approach on the basis of the specific materials examined.

5) The cooperative partner Ilkka Pyysiäinen is an internationally renowned scholar of religion and among the main developers of the cognitive science of religion. Under his lead, Helsinki has become one of the centers for the cognitive study of religion in the world.

6) The Finnish research of Gnostic and Jewish Christian groups has gained increasing visibility and credence among international scholarly audiences. One sign of this is that the Finnish senior scholars working in this field are constantly invited to write on these themes (commentaries, international handbooks, encyclopedias etc.), and to read papers on these topics in international congresses.

### 5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

**Public description of the RC's research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):**

The researcher environment explores early Christian intellectual and social milieu from several perspectives on the one hand, and refines methods in dialogue with recent developments in the cognitive study of religion on the other.
One of the most important studies published in the review period is Heikki Räisänen's *The Rise of Christian Beliefs*. This broad synthesis is a non-confessional and non-prescriptive take on early Christian ideologies, in which the non-canonical early Christian texts are taken as seriously as those in the New Testament.

Other significant publications include *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'* (ed. Petri Luomanen & Antti Marjanen); studies on "gnostic" groups and ideas (e.g., *Was There a Gnostic Religion*, ed. Antti Marjanen; *Beyond Gnosticism* by Ismo Dunderberg) and on New Testament gospels (e.g., *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness* by Raimo Hakola; *Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus* by Outi Lehtipuu).


In addition, Uro and Luomanen have organized workshops where leading international specialists of early Christianity and of religious studies have come together to explore the prospects embedded in the new approach. Luomanen, Uro and Czachesz have also been the driving forces in establishing the "Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity: A Nordic Network," which started its work in the fall 2010.

The PIs are very active in doctoral training. In addition to individual supervision, most doctoral students have their works discussed in smaller project meetings, doctoral seminars, and many of them also in the Finnish Doctoral School in Theology. Most doctoral students working in the projects are employed (with full salary) for the most part of their doctoral studies.

**Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):** The unique combination of world-class research in both early Christian history and socio-cognitive approaches has already attracted new international scholars (e.g., Czachesz) to the university, and is bound to attract international doctoral students as well, which is what the university needs in the future.

The ongoing research cooperation between scholars of comparative religion and Christian origins provides doctoral students with a wider perspective in the formation of religious traditions in general and early Christianity in particular.

It is of strategic importance to the faculty and the university that the PIs of the researcher community have been active in establishing international networks for master’s and PhD training. For example, Marjanen is the Finnish coordinator of the Nordic Master programme Religious Roots of Europe, which attracts students from all over the world. Many PIs in the researcher community are involved in this programme, and the plan is to establish a similar Nordic doctoral programme in the future.

The researcher community also hosts the new Nordic network Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Christianity and Early Judaism (with Luomanen as coordinator, and Uro & Czachesz in the steering group).
The group brings together ca. 70 Nordic doctoral students, post-docs and supervisors of doctoral studies in order to enhance the application of socio-cognitive perspectives in the study of early Christianity (and early Judaism). Participation in the group adds to the quality of dissertations and works by senior scholars alike.

Finally, the research community is one demonstration of the strategic value of the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, because it is here that much of the interdisciplinary cooperation described in this proposal was established, and the Collegium has provided the resources needed to launch more serious forms of cooperation.

Keywords: New Testament, early Christianity, Christian origins, socio-cognitive approach, cognitive study of religion, Gnosticism, Jewish Christianity

6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

The doctoral training is ambitious and is offered in several forms: personal supervision, project meetings, doctoral seminars and the annual meetings of the Doctoral School in Theology. The doctoral trainees have opportunities to gain professional experience by teaching courses, and they are strongly encouraged to visit other universities and to present papers in international congresses.

The cooperation between biblical scholars and scholars of comparative religion has offered new, innovative platforms where both senior scholars and doctoral students are updated as regards the most recent developments in respective disciplines.

The quality of the dissertations supervised by the PIs in the period is high: many of them are published in the leading academic series (e.g., Hakola, Lehtipuu, Rasimus). Many former doctoral students have been able to secure funding for their post-doc and research projects (e.g., Hakola, Lehtipuu, Rasimus, Visala).

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): 1) A panel comprising of specialists in theology and religious studies is the best alternative for assessing a RC like the one described above.

2) Important: Theology and religious studies belong to the fields where the so-called “bibliometrics”, which are planned to be employed in the research assessment, yield misleading results. The main format in these fields is still monograph-length study. Accordingly, the evaluation should take into account not only how
often articles (written in English!) are cited in other articles (written in English!) but also how many references there are to the books published by the members of the research community in other academic studies, both articles and books. Only such a system would fully show the scholarly impact which might remain hidden in the mechanic use of bibliometrical data.

In addition, it should be acknowledged that many academic presses exercise no less stricter anonymous peer review for monographs than for academic journals.

3) As described above, the RC’s publishing strategy is highly academic, ambitious, and international: the members have published and continue to publish their works with the best academic presses (Brill, Columbia University Press, Oxford University Press etc.). A selection and brief descriptions of the main publications have been offered above at #5. New monographs on cognitive study of early Christian rituals (e.g., by Uro for Oxford UP), on Jewish Christianity (by Luomanen for Brill), and on Gnosticism (Antti Marjanen’s commentary on the Secret Book of John for the Hermeneia series) are already under contract and will appear in due time. New projects are negotiated (e.g., Dunderberg with Harvard UP on a book on Johannine literature).

4) As said above, many dissertations by the doctoral candidates have been published with leading international academic presses in the field.
# LIST OF RC MEMBERS

**NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:** FC  
**RC-LEADER** I. Dunderberg  
**CATEGORY** 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dunderberg</td>
<td>Ismo x</td>
<td>Professor (IV)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marjanen</td>
<td>Antti x</td>
<td>Professor (IV)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Räisänen</td>
<td>Heikki x</td>
<td>Professor (IV), senior researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pyysälänen</td>
<td>Ilkka x</td>
<td>Univ Lecturer (III), senior researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uro</td>
<td>Risto x</td>
<td>Univ Lecturer (III), senior researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Luomanen</td>
<td>Petri x</td>
<td>Senior researcher (II), professor (IV)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Czachesz</td>
<td>Istvan</td>
<td>Senior researcher (II)</td>
<td>Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hakola</td>
<td>Raimo x</td>
<td>Senior researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lehtipuu</td>
<td>Outi x</td>
<td>post-doctoral researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Huttunen</td>
<td>Niko</td>
<td>Senior researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Myllykoski</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td>senior researcher (II), librarian</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rasimus</td>
<td>Tuomas</td>
<td>post-doctoral researcher (II)</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOCTORAL STUDENTS IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY**

| 13         | Asikainen  | Susanna                      | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 14         | Auvinen    | Risto                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 15         | Heimola    | Mikko                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 16         | Heimola    | Minna                        | doc stud (I), ThD 2010                    | Faculty of Theology |
| 17         | Hynninen   | Mika                         | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 18         | Järnefelt  | Elisa                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Arts |
| 19         | Liljestrom | Kenneth                      | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 20         | Mustakallio| Antti                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 21         | Niemelä    | Jussi                        | doc stud (I), PhD 2007                    | Faculty of Arts |
| 22         | Nikander   | Perttu                       | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 23         | Närhi      | Jani                         | doc stud (I), PhD 2009                    | Faculty of Arts |
| 24         | Paananen   | Timo                         | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 25         | Pehkonen   | Nina                         | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 26         | Pihlava    | Kaisamaria                   | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 27         | Pohjanheimo| Outi                         | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Arts |
| 28         | Rikala     | Mia                          | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Arts |
| 29         | Salaranta  | Pia                          | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 30         | Siitonen   | Kirsi                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 31         | Tervahauta | Ulla                         | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
| 32         | Vähäkangas | Päivi                        | doctoral student (I)                      | Faculty of Theology |
Name of the RC’s responsible person: Dunderberg, Ismo

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: ismo.dunderberg@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: The Formation of Christianity: Historical, Social and Cognitive Perspectives, FC

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 8. Kieli ja kulttuuri – Language and culture

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area:

1 Focus
The researcher community’s (RC) work is focused on explaining early Christian religion from two main perspectives. On the one hand, the RC explores through careful textual analysis and historical interpretation of source texts a broad array of early Christian beliefs, groups, and practices. One the other hand, the RC develops new innovations in the study of early Christian religion that are based upon social science approaches and the cognitive science of religion. The RC has also established new scholarly networks based upon international and interdisciplinary cooperation.

The RC’s broad scope can be illustrated with the topics of its sub-projects that, in 2005-10, have received external funding: Enemies in the Making: Otherness and the Formation of Early Christian Identity (leader: Hakola, 2010-13); Explaining Early Jewish and Christian Movements: Ritual, Memory and Identity (Luomanen, 2007-10); Gender, Social Roles and Occupations in Early Christianity (Marjanen, 2009-12); Gnosticism and the Formation of Christianity (Dunderberg, 2007-11); Myth and Social Reality in Gnostic Writings (Marjanen, 1999-2006); Supernatural Agents (Pyysiäinen 2005–10).

2 Key Questions and Results
1) The RC places emphasis on studying different strands of early Christian literature inside and outside the New Testament in the spirit of fair play. This viewpoint neither presupposes nor develops an internal faith perspective on the materials discussed but seeks to approach all evidence on equal footing. The RC defines its task as a cultural (descriptive and explanatory) one, rather than a normative (prescriptive) one. This approach not only forms the heart of Heikki Räisänen’s new synthesis of early Christian thought (Räisänen 2010), but it also characterizes all scholarship conducted in the RC.

The most prominent sign of the fair-play approach is the group’s work on “forgotten” forms of early Christianity, including Gnosticism, Jewish Christianity, and apocryphal gospels. The RC’s scholars of this field seek to lay bare and avoid the pitfalls embedded in the traditional orthodoxy-vs.-heresy discourse, which stubbornly vitiated scholarly assessments of early Christian groups. The group’s work has led to a reclassification of earliest Gnostic groups (Rasimus 2009) and of Jewish Christian gospels (Luomanen), and to a new assessment of the school of Valentinus (Dunderberg 2008). A Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heresics’ (ed. Marjanen & Luomanen, 2005) has become an important resource for scholars and students.
The RC’s broad scope to early Christian religion is continued in new projects; for example, the evaluators of Hakola’s project regarded as one of its strengths that “it ignores conventional disciplinary boundaries between New Testament studies and patristics, also integrating the important and difficult Nag Hammadi material into the wider picture.”

2) The new approach to early Christian religion developed in the RC is partly based upon the cognitive science of religion. This approach has been jointly developed by Ilkka Pyysiäinen, who is one of the leading theorists in the cognitive science of religion, his doctoral students, and scholars of early Christianity (Czachesz, Luomanen and Uro).

Building on findings from social-scientific studies and cognitive research, RC members are developing a socio-cognitive approach which aims at integrating cognitive and social properties in explaining the emergence of early Christianity. This work has focused on social networks (e.g., how “weak links” explain the formation of early Christian groups); social identities; memory studies (cognitive studies shed new light on orality and scribality); and ritual and magic.

Some examples of the results: Uro employs the ritual competence theory to explain how ritual innovations contributed to the rise of the Jesus movement; Czachesz uses psychological research on “everyday magic” to illuminate the magical practices in the early Christian world. Hakola uses social identity approach to explain diversity and similarity among Second Temple Jewish groups; the role of the Pharisees in the New Testament; and the parallel development of Judaism and Christianity in the first centuries CE. The approach helps understand how early Jewish and Christian writers are sometimes unbiased or even favorable towards their opponents but disparage them in some other contexts. Lehtipuu applies sociological theories of deviance and marginalization in her study of how different interpretations of in resurrection were used to construct Christian identities.

The RC has produced two important books on the socio-cognitive approach to early Christian religion (Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism, ed. Luomanen, Pyysiäinen and Uro, 2007; Mind, Morality and Magic, ed. Czachesz and Uro, forthcoming in 2011). RC members have also arranged a number of workshops on this approach; the workshops have also been attended by other RC members working with more traditional methods.

3. Quality

The following indicators can be mentioned:

1) The RC publishes with leading academic publishing houses, e.g., Columbia University Press, Eisenbrauns, Fortress (USA); Oxford University Press, T & T Clark (UK); E. J. Brill (Netherlands). Most of these publishers use anonymous referees to guarantee the academic quality of their books.

2) Laudatory reviews in academic journals, e.g.:

- Dunderberg (2008): “a solid, informative and persuasive contribution” (W. Arnal); “the overall thesis and approach . . . represent an exciting and promising new direction in the study of Valentinian Christianity” (D. Brakke); “a brilliant book” (B. Dehandschutter); “a timely and original study” (B. Dunning); “a book every student of ancient gnosticism should read” (M. Meyer).

- Hakola (2005): “an excellent study adding significantly to our knowledge of the first-century religious world and the place of John’s Gospel in this world” (M. L. Coloe).
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- Luomanen & Marjanen (ed., 2005): “the standard is high” (S. G. Hall); “Alle Beiträge stehen auf erkennbar hohem Niveau” (T. Nicklas); “à la fois une introduction . . . et une contribution originale” (J. Brankaer)
- Luomanen, Pyysiäinen & Uro (ed., 2007): “the volume is so rich in fruitful linkages that several doctoral theses might grow out of the work begun here” (C. Shantz)
- Räisänen (2010): “a magisterial survey of the development and diversity of early Christian beliefs” (J. Dunn).
- Rasimus (2009): “a first-rate piece of scholarship” (P. Foster)

4. Significance
The RC has strengthened an inclusive approach to early Christian religion where various groups are studied on their own terms. This approach has resulted in novel assessments of the intellectual and social contexts of these groups, of their mutual relationships, and of the diverse ways Christian identities were constructed.

Approaches derived from the cognitive science of religion, and the socio-cognitive approach developed in the RC, have introduced new perspectives and analytic categories to different aspects of early Christian religion.

The RC also contributes to the development of the cognitive science of religion. It has thus far been theoretically and experimentally oriented. Some historical applications already exist but the members of the RC develop this line of inquiry so that the cognitive science of religion would not become overly theoretical.

• Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.

The RC seeks to improve its high quality by creating new contexts where the group’s members can assess the strengths and challenges of the cognitive approach as regards their own research. There will be a series of meetings where the cognitive scientists of religion and scholars of early Christianity come regularly together; the first meeting will be held in Helsinki in March 2011; its topic will be cognitive approaches to Christianity and morality. The speakers include a number of people from the RC, and from other theological and humanistic disciplines.

Since the RC seeks to excel in a number of fields, its intention is not to force all research conducted in it under one unified methodology. It is more important that the scholars working in the RC are well updated as regards each other’s work and thus together form a sufficiently multifaceted perspective on their exploration of early Christian religion. The RC also seeks to make room for new openings, such as the archeological excavations at Horvat Kur, Israel (a new joint project with the Universities of Leiden and Bern).
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2 PRACTISES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC’s principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

1. Recruitment

In the Faculty of Theology, all doctoral students are subjected to a careful selection process. Candidates must hold a Master level university degree. Special emphasis in the recruitment is paid to the academic quality of the Master’s thesis. The applicants must submit a thorough research proposal and a study plan which are first evaluated by professors in the candidate’s respective field, and then by the Research Committee of the Faculty.

While there have been only a few international doctoral students in Finland, the strong research tradition in the RC gradually begins to attract foreign students of this field as well. The RC welcomes foreign candidates and seeks to provide them with the information they need concerning studies in Finland. The faculty has a secretary of international affairs who assists the RC members in this task and also has the expertise in checking the quality of exams granted in other universities.

2. Supervision and doctoral training

The faculty appoints two supervisors to each doctoral student, and encourages students and supervisors to sign a written agreement on supervision, where responsibilities are detailed.

In addition to individual supervision, the doctoral candidates in the RC are supported in a number of other ways:

1) The doctoral students meet regularly in doctoral colloquiums, where they present parts of their dissertation for discussion. In these seminars, there is an outspoken emphasis on techniques of constructive feedback.

2) Many doctoral students in the RC are working (with full salary!) in research projects, which arrange regular meetings (usually once a month). In the project meetings, the students receive feedback not only from their supervisors but also from other senior scholars specialized in their topics. Some projects have also international advisory partners, who visit the project meetings (e.g., J. Kloppenborg and C. Osiek in Marjanen’s project).

3) Most doctoral students in the RC are members, and participate in the meetings, of the Finnish Graduate School of Theology, from which they can also obtain travel grants.

4) The doctoral students teach: not only are they provided with opportunities to do this but they are supposed to reserve 5% of their total working hours to this task. Most students supervise introductory exercises for freshmen, give tuition in Greek, etc, but they can also work as assistant teachers of professors in mass lectures.

5) The doctoral students are encouraged to read papers in international congresses. Some of the students have also visited other universities for longer periods (Laval, Quebec; Heidelberg; Tübingen).

6) The nordic research networks (see below) are focused on doctoral training. The doctoral students in the RC have especially benefited from annual text seminars arranged by the Nordic Nag Hammadi and Gnosticism Network (2004-08), and from excursions to Syria and Rome, arranged by the Nordic Network on the Study of Early Christianity in its Greco-Roman Context, and to Rome, arranged by the Nordic
Network for the Study of Religious Roots of Europe: Dynamics in the Formation and Transformation of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Most of workshops organized by the Socio-Cognitive Network also function as seminars for PhD students. Starting from 2011, the doctoral students will also have the opportunity to participate in archaeological excavations at Horvat Kur.

3. Quality assurance

In addition to the careful selection of doctoral students, the most important form of quality assurance is that doctoral dissertations are evaluated in two phases: first, the work is submitted to pre-review by external readers, and second, if the work is accepted, it will be discussed in a public disputation with an external reader. The external readers are regularly invited from other universities and belong to the leading international experts in their respective fields. The candidate’s supervisor is consulted in the evaluation process but the supervisor is not entitled to participate in grading the work. The grade is ultimately decided by the faculty meeting at the recommendation of a dissertation grading committee; the candidate has the right to issue a complaint before the meeting in case he or she finds the grading to be unfair.

In Finland, dissertations must be published before the public defense. However, the doctoral students in the RC can, and are advised to, choose a form of publication (e.g., electronic format) that does not prevent later publication of their works in international series. This is also part of quality assurance since the publishers of these series use anonymous referees as part of their acceptance process. Many dissertations completed by RC members (now post-docs and PIs) were published in this way under the period under review (Hakola, Huttunen, Lehtipuu, Rasimus).

Whenever the PIs of the RC cooperate with other scholars representing other universities to establish research projects which involve doctoral students, they also seek to arrange cooperation in the supervision of the doctoral students. For example, Hakola works together with Professor Jürgen Zangenberg (Leiden) in a new archaeological project at Horvar Kur (Israel); it is natural that doctoral theses written in connection with this project will be jointly supervised by both parties. There is already Nordic cooperation in supervision (e.g., Dunderberg is the co-supervisor of one doctoral student in Aarhus, and Marjanen supervises one doctoral student in Copenhagen), but there are also plans to launch a new Nordic doctoral program, based upon the already existing Nordic master program Religious Roots of Europe. Like the master program, the planned doctoral program would be focused on Judaism, early Christianity, and Islam. The partners in the program are the universities of Aarhus, Bergen, Copenhagen, Helsinki, Lund, and Oslo; Marjanen is the Finnish coordinator in the program.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.**

The strengths have already been described above: careful recruitment; qualified supervisors; international and national networks, etc. The RC’s spirit of academic ambition encourages the students to write for international audiences.

The doctoral students regard as the most important challenge the difficulty to secure long-term funding for their research. Scholarships granted by private funds are usually only for one year. The things are somewhat better for those working in research projects, in which funding is allocated to the same persons for 3–4 years.

Another concern is the students’ employment after the doctor’s degree. Permanent academic teaching positions and other expert positions, where a doctor’s degree is required, are few in Finland, and other employers are hesitant to recruit people with doctoral degrees.
The RC’s strong research orientation has contributed to the fact that people educated in it have been relatively successful in their academic careers; they have received post-doc positions and even obtained funding for new research projects of their own.

1) Publications:
   a) A number of PIs, especially Räisänen, Pyysiäinen and Myllykoski, are well-known academic persons in Finland, who are active writers of popular books in Finnish. In 2005-10 appeared Räisänen’s book on biblical interpretation; Pyysiäinen’s two books (one on sin, another on conceptions of God); and a history of antisemitism by Myllykoski (written jointly with S. Lundgren). Hakola is the co-author of the award-winning Kristinusken ja juutalaisuuden juuret (Roots of Christianity and Judaism), based upon the most recent stand of archaeological evidence.
   b) Translations of early Christian texts: Dunderberg and Marjanen published a Finnish introduction to and translation of the Gospel of Judas only six months after its publication in 2006; their collection of translations of Nag Hammadi and other Gnostic texts was reprinted twice in 2005. Myllykoski (with a contribution by Lehtipuu) published the first Finnish translation of Justin’s works, together with an extensive commentary.
   c) Internet publications: Uro was the first chair of the editorial board for the new website www.teologia.fi, by which the three faculties of theology in Finland make their research known to broader audiences. The RC has also been active in creating and updating two websites on early Christian themes.
   e) There will be new popular books disseminating knowledge of the RC’s work (e.g., the Finnish version of Räisänen 2010 and Lehtipuu’s book on mothers in the Bible are scheduled to appear in 2011; Marjanen and Dunderberg have relaunched the translation project in 2011).

2) Public visibility in mass media: RC members are often invited to TV and radio shows to talk about topics related to their research. Specifically, themes related to non-canonical gospels attracted more than usual attention, first because of the claims made in Dan Brown’s Da Vinci Code, and then because of the Gospel of Judas. As soon as the latter was published, Dunderberg, Marjanen, Rasimus and Uro wrote press releases and newspaper articles, and were interviewed in mass media, including the national TV news. The Finnish audience thus immediately received the best available information concerning this debated text (without sensationalism characteristic of the text’s publication in U.S.A.). Raimo Hakola was part of the team who found an ancient synagogue at Horvat Kur in the summer 2010; the new discovery found a great visibility in Finnish media.

3) Other societal impact: RC members are frequently invited to give talks related to their research topics in a variety of contexts, from radio lectures to presentations in congregations and in smaller study
groups of different persuasions (ranging from the Catholic study centre in Helsinki to The Finnish Gnostic society and freethinkers’ study group).

- **Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.**

  The RC is basically content with its expert role in society. Given its clearly academic profile, the RC has not thus far made its goal to try to change the ways the things are in society at large. This is not to say that its work would lack societal relevance. A critical analysis of how early Christian groups built identities as opposed to their (often misleading) constructs of the opposed groups should make implicit present-day strategies of making enemies visible and subject to critical review. In this way, the RC’s work could increase tolerance in society. (Yet, it seems that the religious groups most in need of a critical self-analysis are usually also the most reluctant to submit themselves to, and learn from, it.) The socio-cognitive work done in the RC has also potential for an analysis and understanding encounters and conflicts between different religious traditions creating challenges to present-day European societies.

### 4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- **Description of the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.**

  1) Cooperation with research groups of the Society of Biblical Literature:
  - Jewish Christianity Consultation (Luomanen and Mlylykoski: steering committee)
  - Jewish Christianity / Christian Judaism section (Luomanen: co-chair, Mlylykoski: steering committee)
  - Nag Hammadi and Gnosticism section (Dunderberg, Marjanen: steering committee)
  - Ritual in the Biblical World Consultation and Section (Uro: steering committee)
  - Mind, Society, and Tradition (Czachesz and Uro: co-chairs).

  2) European Association of Biblical Studies: Lehtipuu is the secretary, and the chair of the group "Early Christianity between Hellenism and Judaism"; Hakola is the chair of the group "Others and the Construction of the early Christian Identities".

  3) Cooperation with Nordic networks funded by NordForsk:
  - Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity (2010-13): Luomanen is the leader, Uro is in the steering committee; Czachesz, Hakola and Uro are project directors.
  - Nordic Nag Hammadi and Gnosticism Network (2005-8) arranged four summer seminars, which were visited by international specialists and by doctoral students also from other universities (Harvard, McGill, Princeton, HU in Berlin). The network continues its work (two seminars organized by Rasimus in Quebec, 2009-10, and one to be held at Yale, 2011).
  - Nordic Network on the Study of Early Christianity in its Greco-Roman Context (2005-9: 13 research seminars and special courses for doctoral students, e.g., in Athens; Ephesus; Rome; Syria).
3) Other networks: a) Luomanen and Uro belong to the international Context Group, committed to the application of the social sciences in biblical interpretation. b) Luomanen has done research cooperation with a social-science project Trends and Tensions in Intellectual Integration.

4) Researcher mobility

a) PI’s visits abroad: Dunderberg (Oxford, 12 months in 2007-8); Marjanen (Yale, 2 months in 2006); Pyysiäinen (Oxford, 3 months in 2007). Rasimus lives in Quebec and conducts his research in close contact with a team of Gnostic scholars at the University of Laval. Lehtipuu stayed in Hamburg for the most part of her first post-doc term. Lehtipuu and Marjanen have spent several months respectively at the Centre for Advanced Study of the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters in Oslo (contributing to Professor Turid Karlsen Seim’s research project).

b) The RC attracts international scholars to Helsinki (e.g., Czachesz is from Hungary and has his PhD from Groningen and Habilitation in Heidelberg).

c) A number of doctoral students in the RC have visited other universities for longer periods of time (from a couple of months to one year): Boston University (Järnefelt); Heidelberg (Pehkonen); Laval University, Quebec (Vähäkangas); Tübingen (Liljeström). The Nordic cooperation has also made possible for doctoral students to make shorter visits to other Nordic universities (e.g., Heimola’s visits to Bergen). In addition, doctoral students from other universities (e.g., Copenhagen, Laval, Bern) have begun to visit the RC.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

The RC’s efforts in research collaboration are high, and they have made Helsinki one of the driving forces in the field. The networks put pressure on individual scholars, in good and bad. The networks promote research by setting fixed dates for scholars’ papers and by bringing specialists with different sets of expertise together. However, the sheer number of academically engaging networks and new duties created by them (such as added responsibilities in supervision) also pose a great challenge; the scholars involved in the networks should also have enough time for their own research to be able to make significant contributions in the networks.

Another challenge is that the Nordic funding can be used to create networks and cover their costs, but not for full-time research posts, which would be urgently needed. In the future, the RC must be active also in applying EU-based funding, which can be used for research posts as well.

5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).

The University of Helsinki belongs to the League of European Research Universities (LERU), and is explicit in its aim to be one of the leading research universities in the world. The university is to be commended for setting this goal to all the fields covered by it.

The Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, financed by the university, has proved to be an essential resource for the emergence of the present RC (both in form of research posts and as a seminar location); this is where the cooperation between Pyysiäinen, Luomanen and Uro started.
The university also supports young scholars by offering funding for small research groups (e.g., Dunderberg has received 2 x 4 years funding for doctoral students in his project, and Hakola a research grant of EUR120000) and for post-doc scholars (e.g., Lehtipuu’s post-doc term of three years).

The research projects funded by the Academy of Finland are a vital part of the research infrastructure. As has been mentioned above, the RC has been successful in gaining project funding from the Academy of Finland, which shows that there are no misgivings about the value of the academic study of religion. The projects give doctoral students and post-docs good chances to commit themselves to research (yet for a limited period of time, see above).

As far as research is concerned, the situation is more challenging for those with teaching posts. This is especially so in the RC because the student-teacher ratio in the Faculty of Theology is the highest of all the faculties at the University of Helsinki. The RC members working as university lecturers (Uro, Pyysäläinen) have heavy teaching loads, whereas the professors in the RC (Dunderberg, Marjanen) are heavily occupied with administrative duties (e.g., as members of search and dissertation committees). It is deplorable that there is no system of regular sabbatical leaves at the university, which would make a full concentration on one’s own research possible from time to time.

The academic libraries in Helsinki are relatively well equipped for research purposes. Though they do not have resources to systematically order all books published in the field (like the libraries in Oxford or Tübingen), the RC members can usually have the books they need ordered either to the faculty library or to the National library.

• RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

For strengths see above. The greatest challenge is also here the small amount of permanent teaching and research positions in the field. In spite of their very strong academic credits, including leadership of projects, Hakola and Luomanen still have no permanent posts in the faculty; even Marjanen’s professorship is a non-permanent one.

The Faculty of Theology has recently taken this problem seriously under consideration, and it seeks ways to recruit the most prominent senior scholars more permanently, though the budget does not give great opportunities for this effort.

The RC cannot launch the sabbatical system in the university but it has offered senior scholars some opportunities for brief research breaks (with external funding). One course of action to be taken in the future may be that research funding will be used not only to recruit full-time doctoral and post-doc scholars but also to decrease the teaching load of PIs by financing adjunct staff to teach their courses.
distribution of management-related responsibilities usually takes place in informal discussions among the RC members.

The Nordic networks funded by NordForsk and the research projects funded by the Academy of Finland have their own leadership structures. The Nordic networks must appoint a leader and a steering committee with representatives of all parties. This group makes the decisions concerning the program and the use of funding; the funding is administered through the leader’s university. The research projects of the Academy of Finland are led by the applicant, who is responsible for recruitment and budget issues and for the project’s academic results. Since the projects are based in host departments, the projects need the faculty’s approval already in the application process (yet there have thus far been no cases in which the approval would have been denied).

The PIs work closely together with other researchers of the RC both in project meetings and as supervisors of their doctoral theses. Many PIs participate in more than one project (e.g., Uro attends the meetings of Marjanen’s and Luomanen’s projects; Marjanen attends Dunderberg’s project in addition to his own one; Dunderberg regularly meets all doctoral students of early Christianity in the New Testament Doctoral seminar, and advises them in planning the course of their studies). The workshops arranged in the RC have been of vital importance for strengthening the RC’s focus and especially for making the new insights of the cognitive science of religion known also to those members in the RC working with more traditional methods.

The results show that the RC’s “light” version of leadership has been a good practice academically: scholars cannot be forced into cooperation but they must find points where their research interests coincide, and then they must democratically agree how to establish new projects and what funding should be applied.

The Faculty of Theology has recently made a list of its key research fields; both early Christian studies and cognitive studies are included, which means that these fields can be preferred in future decisions concerning new posts and research funding.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

The RC’s structure is based on a democratic cooperation of equal partners, and this has functioned quite well thus far. Although research projects are led by a number of people, they form a surprisingly coherent whole thematically. Innovations cannot be dictated from above but they require academic freedom.

If the RC would have a budget of its own (e.g., research funding allocated to the entire group), then it would need a tighter administrative structure. The ideal form in that case would be a board consisting of PIs (especially project leaders) and doctoral students representing various research subteams in the RC.

The faculty has been supportive of the RC; one point to be considered in the future is how the faculty could more effectively support the research activity of the PIs working as teachers. Options include both earmarked research grants (for travels, books, and leaves of absence) and diminished teaching load for those who are most active in research internationally.
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7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 3350000

- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010:

- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010:

- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010:

- International and national foundations - names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: NordForsk; Suomen Kulttuurirahasto
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 300000

- Other international funding - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations:
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations:
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:

8 RC’S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.
  The RC’s most important goals for 2011-13 are the following:
  1) to secure that the research carried out within the RC can continue in all the areas where the RC has proved to be a driving force in early Christian studies;
  2) to continue to develop new innovations in the study of early Christian religion that are based upon socio-cognitive approaches to the study of religion;
  3) to widen the international cooperation on developing cognitive and socio-cognitive approaches in the study of biblical religions;
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4) to recruit more international doctoral students and post-doc scholars to the RC;
5) to establish, in collaboration with six Nordic universities involved in the Nordic master program Religious Roots of Europe, a joint doctoral program in this particular field.

A number of initiatives to support these goals in 2011-13 have already been taken.

1) Chachesz and Uro have submitted a proposal for a program unit "Mind, Society, and Religion in the Biblical World" to the program committee of the Society of Biblical Literature.

2) Luomanen has envisaged a plan for the future meetings of the Nordic network Socio-Cognitive perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity. In March 2011, the network will arrange a workshop Morality: The Role of Religion and Religious Communities at Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. The seminar seeks to cast light on these questions through interdisciplinary cooperation which brings together scholars from religious studies, theology, cognitive science, social psychology, sociology of religion, religious education, early Jewish and Christian studies, philosophy, systematic theology, and Biblical studies.

3) The project led by Hakola has set up a new research group "Enemies in the Making: 'Others' and the Construction of Early Christian Identity" at the European Association of Biblical Studies. This research group serves as a platform to present and discuss common themes running through various projects of the RC. The group also enhances the internal collaboration in the RC: In the 2011 meeting in Thessaloniki, doctoral students and senior scholars from both Hakola’s and Dunderberg’s projects will present their papers together with other international presenters.

4) A group of scholars and students, headed by Hakola, has already taken part in the archeological excavations at Horvat Kur, Israel, in the summer 2010. The excavations are led by prof. Jürgen Zangenberg (Leiden) and conducted jointly with Universities of Helsinki, Leiden and Bern. The excavation team consists of established experts in different required fields (e.g. Mediterranean and classical archaeology, zooarchaeology, archaeological survey, pottery, artifact conservation). This cooperation creates a possibility for active, interdisciplinary networking also outside summer excavation seasons. There have been preliminary plans to arrange the supervision of the future dissertations incorporating archaeological insights into the study of early Christianity jointly between the universities of Helsinki and Leiden.

The RC seeks to develop new ways to enhance the mutual cooperation of doctoral students working in different research groups. For example, Pyysiäinen’s doctoral students have been in contact with PIs specialized in early Christian groups, but there has not yet been a common doctoral seminar where the students from both fields could come to share knowledge and be informed of each other’s research.

Since the RC forms an internationally recognized, academically strong and innovative research team, committed to developing new perspectives on the study of early Christian religion, the team plans to prepare an application for being elected one of the Centres of Excellence, funded by the university, the Academy of Finland and the Ministry of Education and Culture; the next search will be in 2012. (There was Centre of Excellence in Biblical Studies, led by Räisänen in 1995-2006: New Testament and early Christian studies were an essential part in this team).
The coordinator (Dunderberg) gathered a group of PIs to compile materials required in the stage 2 of the evaluation. These PIs were chosen in order that all aspects of the research conducted in the RC were represented (Dunderberg, Luomanen, Marjanen, Pyysiäinen, Uro). The description of the RC’s work was jointly produced by this group; drafts were also circulated for comments among two other PIs (Hakola, Räisänen).

The planning group felt it necessary to ask the opinions of the doctoral students and post-docs concerning the practices of doctoral training. A smaller group, led by Hakola, was formed to comment on the initial description of the doctoral training. The members represented different groups in the RC (post-docs, one doctoral student from each project, two doctoral students outside the projects, one from the Faculty of Theology and another from the Faculty of Arts). The comments and concerns expressed by this group are now integrated into the relevant passages of the report.
**FC/Dunderberg**
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**RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010**

1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi, Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi, Heikki Räisänen, Heikki.Raisanen@helsinki.fi, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, ilkka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi, Riito Unto, Riito.Unto@helsinki.fi, Petri Luomanen, Petri.Luomanen@helsinki.fi, Isivan Cochrane, isivan.cochrane@helsinki.fi, Ramo Tapani Heloisa, Ramo.Heloisa@helsinki.fi, Outi Lehtipuu, Outi.Lehtipuu@helsinki.fi, Niko Huttunen, Niko.Huttunen@helsinki.fi, Matti Myllykoski, Matti.Myllykoski@helsinki.fi, Tuomas Raesmaa, Tuomas.Raesmaa@helsinki.fi, Susanna Aaltonen, suusanna.aaltonen@helsinki.fi, Riito Aurinen, mika.niemi@helsinki.fi, Mikko Herlin, Mikko.Herlin@helsinki.fi, Minna Heikkinen, minna.heikkinen@helsinki.fi, Mika Koutman, mika.koutman@helsinki.fi, Elisa Järnefelt, elisa.jarnefelt@helsinki.fi, Kenneth Liljestrom, kenneth.liljestrom@helsinki.fi, Antti Mustakallio, Antti.Mustakallio@helsinki.fi, Jani Närhi, Timo Paananen, Nina Pehkonen, Nina.pehkonen@helsinki.fi, Outi Pohjanheimo, outi.pohjanheimo@helsinki.fi, Mia Riska, Mia.Riska@helsinki.fi, Paula Sakaranta, Paula Sakaranta, Paula.Sakaranta@helsinki.fi, Outi Pohjanheimo, Outi.Pohjanheimo@helsinki.fi, Päivi Vähäkangas, paivi.vahakangas@helsinki.fi, Päivi.Vahakangas@helsinki.fi

### Publication year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Article in professional conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


2006


2007


Czachesz, I 2007, 'James the Just in History and Tradition: perspectives of past and present scholarship (Part 1)', Currents in biblical research, vol 5, no. 1, pp. 73-122.
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2008

2009

2010

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005
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FC/Dunderberg


2006


2007


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

FC/Dunderberg


2008


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

FC/Dunderberg


2009
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FC/Dunderberg


2010


A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2007

Dunderberg, I 2007, Body Metaphors in 1 Corinthians and in the Interpretation of Knowledge (NHC XI.),

2009

Dunderberg, I 2009, Judas’ Anger and the Perfect Human.

2010


B1 Unrefered journal article

2005


2006


Myllykoski, M 2006, 'Vitaminteho ja viisaus, yhteiskunta ja uskonto', Teologinen Aikakauskirja.


2007


2009
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Myllykoski, M 2009, 'Kirja-arvostelu', Teologinen Aikakauskirja, vol 114, no. 6, pp. 634-635.


2010


Räsänen, H 2010, 'How Christianity and Islam Challenge Each Other', The Fourth R.


B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)

2005


2006


2007
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2008

2009

B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2010
Vähäkangas, P 2010, Platonic, Sethian and Valentinian Views of the Tripartition of the Human Soul.

C1 Published scientific monograph

2005
Hakola, R 2005, Identity matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, no. 118, Brill, Leiden.
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Huttunen, N 2009, Paul and Epictetus on law: a comparison, Early Christianity in context, no. 405, T & T Clark, London.


C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal


2007


2008


2009


2010

Ksenofon: *Talouden taito*, translated by Ulla Tervahauta, Gaudeamus, Helsinki.


2009

Ksenofon: *Taistuden taisto*, translated by Ulla Tervahauta, Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

2010


**D1 Article in professional journal**


**D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material**

2007


2009


Luomanen, P 2009, 'Kritiiksen raamatuntutkimuksen historia - Lyhyesti', in P Luomanen, J Jokiranta, K Latvus, A Marjanen, H Von Weissenberg (eds), EMO. Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö., Department of Biblical Studies, UH.

Luomanen, P 2009, 'Kirjallisuuskritiikki menetelmänä', in P Luomanen, J Jokiranta, K Latvus, A Marjanen, H Von Weissenberg (eds), EMO. Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö., Department of Biblical Studies, UH.

Marjanen, A 2009, 'Uuden testamentin sosiaalitieteellinen tutkimus', in P Luomanen ym. (ed.), EMO: Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö, Department of Biblical Studies, UH.

Marjanen, A 2009, 'Feministinen raamatuntutkimus', in P Luomanen ym. (ed.), EMO: Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö, Department of Biblical Studies, UH.

Marjanen, A 2009, 'Varhaiskristillinen kirjallisuus', in EMO: Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö, Department of Biblical Studies, UH.


D3 Article in professional conference proceedings

2010


D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2005


2006


2008


2009


Luomanen, P, Jokiranta, J, Latvus, K, Marjanen, A, Weissenberg von, HM (eds) 2009, EMO: Eksegetiikan menetelmien oppimisympäristö, Department of Biblical Studies, UH.

2010
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E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005


2006


Rikala, M 2006, 'Pääkirjoitus', Kirjuri, vol 2, pp. 4-5.


2007


2008
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FC/Dunderberg


2009

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2008

2009

E2 Popular monograph

2005

2006
Räsänen, H 2006, Rosolinen Raamattu, WSOY, Helsinki.

2007
Mustakallio, A 2007, Paavalli, Kristinuskon vaikutajat, WSOY.
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FC/Dunderberg

1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi, Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi, Heikki Räisänen, Heikki.Raisanen@helsinki.fi, Esko Pyysäläinen, Ehsa.pyysalainen@helsinki.fi, Risto Uno, Risto.Uno@helsinki.fi, Petri Luomanen, Petri.Luomanen@helsinki.fi, Isvan Coazzine, Isvan.coazzine@helsinki.fi, Ramo Tapani Hekola, Ramo.Hekola@helsinki.fi, Ouli Lehtipus, Ouli-Lehtipus@helsinki.fi, Niilo Huttunen, Niilo.Huttunen@helsinki.fi, Matti Myllykoski, Matti.Myllykoski@helsinki.fi, Tuomas Raissila, Tuomas.Raissila@helsinki.fi, Susanna Askonen, susanna.askonen@helsinki.fi, Riitta Auvinen, riitta.auvinen@helsinki.fi, Mikko Hauri, Mikko.Hauri@helsinki.fi, Minna Hautala, minna.hautala@helsinki.fi, Mika Knäcke, Mika.knaacke@helsinki.fi, Eeva Järvelä, eeva.jarvela@helsinki.fi, Kenneth Liljestrom, Kenneth.Liljestrom@helsinki.fi, Antti Mustakallio, Antti.Mustakallio@helsinki.fi, Jussi Niskelä, Perttu Nikander, Perttu.Nikander@helsinki.fi, Pertti Nikander, Pertti.Nikander@helsinki.fi, Jari Niinistö, Timo Paananen, Nina Petikonen, Nina.petikonen@helsinki.fi, Outi Pohjanheimo, Outi.Pohjanheimo@helsinki.fi, Mia Rikala, Mia.Rikala@helsinki.fi, Pia Saloranen, Pia.Saloranen@helsinki.fi, Olli Siltanen, Olli.Siltanen@helsinki.fi, Ville Tervahauta, Pasi Vahakangas, pasi.vahakangas@helsinki.fi, Pasi.Vahakangas@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public/Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi
Dissertation Supervision: Risto Auvinen, Ismo Dunderberg, 2004 → ..., Finland
Dissertation co-supervision: Päivi Vähäkangas, Ismo Dunderberg, 2004 → ..., Finland
Dissertation Supervision: Ioannis Giantsakidis, Ismo Dunderberg, 2007 → ..., Finland
Dissertation co-supervision (Aarhus): Erin Wright, Ismo Dunderberg, 2010 → ..., Denmark
Dissertation co-supervision: Timo Paananen, Ismo Dunderberg, 2010 → ..., Finland
Dissertation supervision: Pia Salaranta, Ismo Dunderberg, 2010 → ..., Finland

Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi
Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor, Antti Marjanen, 1999 → ...
Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor, Antti Marjanen, 2008 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaaja, Antti Marjanen, 2008 → ...
Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaaja, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ...
Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor, Antti Marjanen, 2011 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaaja, Antti Marjanen, 2011 → ...

Ilkka Pyysiäinen, ilkka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi
Supervised doctoral thesis in progress, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, 2004 → 2011, Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, 2005 → ..., Finland
Supervisor of doctoral thesis, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, 2006 → ..., Finland

Prizes and awards

Ilkka Pyysiäinen, ilkka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi
Member, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, 16.04.2007 → ..., Finland

Editor of research journal

Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi
Teologinen aikakauskirja, Ismo Dunderberg, 2002 → ...
Teologinen aikakauskirja, Ismo Dunderberg, 2005 → ..., Finland

Istvan Czachesz, istvan.czachesz@helsinki.fi
Board member, Biblical Interpretation, Istvan Czachesz, 2010 → ...

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Istvan Czachesz, istvan.czachesz@helsinki.fi
Co-editor of the Kompendium der frühchristlichen Wundererzählungen (Early Christian Miracle Stories: A Commentary), Istvan Czachesz, 2009 → ...
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Peer review of manuscripts
Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi
peer review of manuscript (YUP), Ismo Dunderberg, 03.2011, United States
Iikka Pyysiäinen, iikka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi
Ad Hoc Referee, Iikka Pyysiäinen, 1995 → ...
Petri Luomanen, Petri.Luomanen@helsinki.fi
Peer reviewer for Finnish Journal of Theology, Petri Luomanen, 2005 → ...

Editor of series
István Czachesz, istvan.czachesz@helsinki.fi
Co-editor of the series "Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha", István Czachesz, 2009 → ...

Editor of special theme number
Iikka Pyysiäinen, iikka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi
Guest Editor, Iikka Pyysiäinen, 2008 → ..., United Kingdom

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi
Search committee: Book History, Ismo Dunderberg, 2010 → 2011, Finland
Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi
Kirjahistorian professuurin täytön valmisteluryhmän jäsenyys, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ...
Kirkkohistorian professuurin täytön valmisteluryhmän jäsen, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Membership or other role in review committee
Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi
Chair of a Dissertation Grading Committee, Petri Luomanen, 29.04.2011

Membership or other role in research network
Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi
Member of the Programme Committee of the Research Network for RRE, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ...
Risto Uro, Risto.Uro@helsinki.fi
Suomen eksegettisen seuran hallitus, Risto Uro, 01.01.1992 → 28.02.2012
Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity: A Nordic Network, Risto Uro, 01.09.2010 → 31.12.2013, Finland

Petri Luomanen, Petri.Luomanen@helsinki.fi
Member of Finnish Exegetical Society, Petri Luomanen, 1986 → ...
Member of Society of Biblical Literature, Petri Luomanen, 1993 → ...
Member of the Context Group, Petri Luomanen, 2004 → ...
Alumnus of Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies (HCAS), Petri Luomanen, 2005 → ...
Member of NordForsk Network: The Religious Roots of Europe: Dynamics in the Formation and Transformation of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, Petri Luomanen, 2009 → 2012
Chair of NordForsk Network: Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity, Petri Luomanen, 2010 → 2013
Member of LERU (League of European Research Universities) project: Love and Forms of Empathy, Petri Luomanen, 2010 → ...

István Czachesz, istvan.czachesz@helsinki.fi
Organizer and director of the Centre for Religion & Cognition, István Czachesz, 2005 → ...
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Co-chair of the “Mind, Society and Tradition” international program unit of the Society of Biblical Literature, Istvan Czachesz, 2006 → ...

Steering committee member of the Nordic Network “Socio-Cognitive Perspectives on Early Judaism and Early Christianity”, Istvan Czachesz, 2010 → ...

Perttu Nikander, Perttu.Nikander@helsinki.fi, perttu.nikander@helsinki.fi

Publishing secretary, Perttu Nikander, 2010 → ..., Finland

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board

Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi

Member of the Steering Committee, Antti Marjanen, 20.11.2010 → ..., United States

Puheenjohtaja, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ..., Finland

Risto Uro, Risto.Uro@helsinki.fi

Chair of the Research Group “Early Christianity between Hellenism and Judaism”, Oulti Lehtipuu, 2010 → ...

Committee Member (Secretary), Oulti Lehtipuu, 2010 → ...

Teologinen toimikunta, Oulti Lehtipuu, 2010 → ...

Mikko Heimola, Mikko.Heimola@helsinki.fi

Teologisen tiedekunnan tutkimustoimikunnan jäsen, Mikko Heimola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Oulti Pohjanheimo, Oulti.Pohjanheimo@helsinki.fi

Osallistuminen hallituksen toimintaan, Oulti Pohjanheimo, 01.02.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ulla Tervahauta

Suomen eksegetisissä seurassa hallitus, Ulla Tervahauta, 2008 → ...

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Istvan Czachesz, istvan czachesz@helsinki.fi

Publications Officer of the International Association for the Cognitive Science of Religion, Istvan Czachesz, 2006 → ...

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Ismo Dunderberg, Ismo.Dunderberg@helsinki.fi

Suomen eksegetisissä seurassa, Ismo Dunderberg, 2005 → ..., Sweden

Participation in interview for written media

Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi

Haastattelu/Kotimaa, Antti Marjanen, 18.05.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kymen seurakunta, Karhu (esitelmä), Antti Marjanen, 01.11.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomen egyptologinen seura: esitelmä, Antti Marjanen, 27.11.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Fördrag, Religionspedagogiska dagar i Jakobstad, Antti Marjanen, 22.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Föredrag i Hyvinge, Antti Marjanen, 13.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu (Kirkko ja kaupunki 42, 9.11.2005), Antti Marjanen, 09.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmä (Kuopio, Ortodoksisen uskonnon opettajien koulutuslaisuus), Antti Marjanen, 24.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmä (Suomen Egyptologinen Seura, Helsinki), Antti Marjanen, 28.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmä (TJS-opintokeskus, Rikhardinkadun kirjasto), Antti Marjanen, 12.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmä (Yliopistokeskuksen seurakunta), Antti Marjanen, 02.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu (Huvudstadsbladet), Antti Marjanen, 02.04.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu (Lta-Sanomat Plussa), Antti Marjanen, 26.08.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu (Krisstitty 10/2006), Antti Marjanen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu (Kykpressien), Antti Marjanen, 28.09.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmä Korson srk:n luentosarjassa, Antti Marjanen, 24.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
National Geographic News (Nationalgeographic.com/News), Antti Marjanen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu, Antti Marjanen, 2010 → ...

Heikki Räisänen, Heikki.Raisanen@helsinki.fi

Studia generalia, Helsingin yliopisto, Heikki Räisänen, 03.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Haastattelu, Etelä-Suomen samanomat, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Haastattelu, Suomen akatemian kotisivut & tiedotuslehti, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Lehithaastattelu (STT:n kautta), Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Seminari kymmenestä käsikyyristä, Heurela & Vantaan seurakunnat, Heikki Räisänen, 09.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Syntymäpäivähaastattelu, Etelä-Suomen samanomat ym. (STT), Heikki Räisänen, 10.12.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Vantaan rovastikunnan diakoniatyöntekijöiden koulutuspäivityö, Heikki Räisänen, 11.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States
Euroopan tiedotevannan kokous, Suomen Akatemia, Heikki Räisänen, 13.08.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu, Savon Sanomat ja 3 muuta lehteä, Heikki Räisänen, 27.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehithaastattelu, useissa lehdissä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Bibliodraamatyöpaja, Helsingin seurakuntayhtymä, Heikki Räisänen, 06.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Norway
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Helsingin yliopiston esitelmäraja, Heikki Räisänen, 08.10.2003 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Wrightin sukuseuran kokous, 10-vuositjuhlaesitelmä, Heikki Räisänen, 02.08.2003 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Artikkelit "Da Vinci -koodista" Suomen Tietotoimistolle, julkaistu useissa maakuntalehdissä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Artikkelit Gibsonin elokuvasta Suomen Tietotoimistolle, julkaistu useissa maakuntalehdissä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Artikkelit Kirkko ja Kaupunki -lehdessä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Papiston synodaliikkokouus, Kuopio, Heikki Räisänen, 05.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Herättäjäyhdistyksen talviselviri, Lahti, Heikki Räisänen, 12.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Bibliodraamatyömaa, Helsingin seurakuntatyömaan Armo -seminari, Heikki Räisänen, 09.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Erkki Niinivaara-seura, Heikki Räisänen, 01.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Meesokoulu, Helsingin seurakuntatyömaa, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2005 → 26.10.2006, Finland
Haastattelu Karjalainen lehdessä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu Kirkko ja Kaupunki-lehdessä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu Kotimaa-lehdessä, Heikki Räisänen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin kirjamessut, Heikki Räisänen, 29.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Jäähyväisluento Helsingin yliopistossa, Heikki Räisänen, 10.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tietokirjaklubi, Rikhardinkadun kirjasto, Helsinki, Heikki Räisänen, 08.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Turun kirjamessut, Heikki Räisänen, 01.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ilkka Pyysäinen , ilkka.pyysiainen@helsinki.fi
"Turvallinen Suomi 2025?" Finnsecurity r.y:n ajankohtaisseminaari, Ilkka Pyysäinen, 18.10.2001 → 31.12.2011, United States

Risto Uro , Risto.Uro@helsinki.fi
Helsingin yliopiston verkkokoulutehtävät ja tutkimus, Risto Uro, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kotimaa, Risto Uro, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin yliopiston verkkolehdistö: kuukauden tutkija, Risto Uro, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Netherlands
Kirkon koulutuskeskus, Risto Uro, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Netherlands
Lapsen maailma, Risto Uro, 01.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Raimo Tapani Hakola , raimo.hakola@helsinki.fi
Kirkon koulutuskeskuksen järjestämä raamattuteologinen kursi; Kirkon koulutuskeskus, Järvenpää, Raimo Tapani Hakola, 05.04.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirkon koulutuskeskuksen järjestämä raamattuteologian kursi, Raimo Tapani Hakola, 08.04.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmiä Jämsän työväenopiston järjestämällä Satavuotias Jämsän yhteiskoulu -juhlatuotosarjalla, Raimo Tapani Hakola, 06.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estelmiä Suomen Piisplaseuran järjestämässä raamattusuunnitakoulutuspävissä, Raimo Tapani Hakola, 06.02.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Outi Lehtipuu , outi.lehtipuu@helsinki.fi
Helsingin Kirjamessut, Outi Lehtipuu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Norway
Helsingin hiippakunnan kirkkoherrojen kokous, Outi Lehtipuu, 14.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Suomen evankelis-luterilaisen kirkon nuoriso- ja lapsityön neuvottelupäivät, Outi Lehtipuu, 10.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden
Lapuan hiippakunnan naasteologien seminaari (20 vuotta pappisviran avaamisesta naisille), Outi Lehtipuu, 06.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States

Matti Myllykoski , matti.myllykoski@helsinki.fi
KESPEDin vuosijuhla, Matti Myllykoski, 07.09.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1:n uutiset, Matti Myllykoski, 22.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1:n uutiset, Matti Myllykoski, 22.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yokota, Matti Myllykoski, 01.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Erkki Niinivaara seura, Niko Huttunen, 05.12.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Matti Myllykoski , matti.myllykoski@helsinki.fi
KESPEDI:n vuosijuhla, Matti Myllykoski, 07.09.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1:n uutiset, Matti Myllykoski, 22.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yokota, Matti Myllykoski, 01.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tuomas Rasimus , tuomas.rasimus@helsinki.fi
Yleiskaumo, Tuomas Rasimus, 25.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, United States

Participation in radio programme

Antti Marjanen , antti.marjanen@helsinki.fi
Radio-haastattelu (YleQ: Markku Heikkinen), Antti Marjanen, 24.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Radiohaastattelu (BBC), Antti Marjanen, 13.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radiohaastattelu (Hannu Reima/YLE1), Antti Marjanen, 05.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radiohaastattelu (Tuuikka Rantanen/Radio Del), Antti Marjanen, 29.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radiohaastattelu (YLE1/Jarko Tirkkonen), Antti Marjanen, 15.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio-ohjelma (Yle Radio 1), Antti Marjanen, 23.07.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Radio Vega, program Kvanttoper, Antti Marjanen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Risto Uro, Risto.Uro@helsinki.fi
Radio, Risto Uro, 06.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Netherlands

Outi Lehtipuu, Outi.Lehtipuu@helsinki.fi
YLE Radio Keskisuomi, Outi Lehtipuu, 16.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Participation in TV programme

Antti Marjanen, Antti.Marjanen@helsinki.fi
TV-haastattelu (Ajankohtainen kakkonen), Antti Marjanen, 24.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Appendix B.b.

Maria Forsman, Chief Information Specialist, DSocSc
Helsinki University Library 7.7.2011

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

Background: The bibliometric analyses – especially citation analyses – have raised a lot of discussion and critics among researchers in social sciences and humanities. Researchers view that bibliometric analyses are often unfair to these fields of sciences because they do not give a good enough picture of the publishing. Citation databases – Web of Science and Scopus – cover only weakly the main publications in these fields. Also, in humanities and social sciences monograph is still the main form of publishing, and it does not include in these article databases.

At the University of Helsinki, the above mentioned concerns have been taken into account in the evaluation. The Evaluation Office has ordered analyses from the Helsinki University Library (HULib) for the participating researcher communities that are weakly represented in Web of Science. The database for the HULib analyses is TUHAT (https://tuhat.halvi.helsinki.fi/portal/en/) including all the publications that the researchers have considered important.

Based on this data, information specialists at HULib have carried out the following analyses:

1) Number of authors/publication/year as a table; a pie of authors/publication in the period 2005-2010;
2) Language of publication/year; a pie of language of publication in the period 2005-2010;
3) Articles/journal/year; journals have been compared by ISSN with the Norwegian, Australian and ERIH (2007-2008) journal ranking lists; number of articles in ranked journals;
4) Publisher/monograph type (according to TUHAT database); monographs have been compared with the Norwegian publisher ranking list. According to this, it has been counted how many monographs are published by a leading scientific publisher (2) or a scientific publisher (1).
5) Conference publications (from TUHAT database) especially in computer sciences; compared with the Australian conference ranking list.

Where relevant, some additional analyses and notes concerning the publication culture of a scientific field have been added. Overall, these analyses complement the other evaluation material and lists of the publications of the participating researcher communities.

If the publications of the RCs were less than 50 or/and the internal coverage less than 40 percentage, the WoS analyses were considered not reliable. These RCs were 58 altogether.

In addition, both Leiden and Library analyses were done to the RCs if WoS analyses covered less than 40 per cent of the peer review (A+C) publications of the RC. These RCs were 8 altogether.

The appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Analysis of publications by Helsinki University Library – 66 RCs altogether

**Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences**
- Luukkanen, Olavi – VITRI
- Valsta, Lauri – SUVALUE

**Natural Sciences**
- Abrahamsson, Pekka – SOFTSYS
- Kangasharju, Jussi – NODES
- Ukkonen, Esko – ALKO
- Väänänen, Jouko – HLG

**Humanities**
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
- Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
- Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
- Havu, Eva – CoCoLaC
- Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
- Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
- Henriksson, Markku – CITA
- Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
- Kaja, Mika – AMNE
- Klippi, Anu – Interaction
- Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
- Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
- Lauha, Aila – CECH
- Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
- Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
- Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
- Mauranen, Anna – LFP
- Meinander, Henrik – HIST
- Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
- Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
- Pulkkinen, Tuija – Gender Studies
- Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
- Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
- Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
- Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
- Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
- Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
- Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

**Social Sciences**
- Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
- Engeström, Jyrö – CRADLE
- Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
- Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
- Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
- Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
- Helén, Ilpo – STS
- Hukkanen, Janne – GENU
- Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
- Kaartinne, Timo – SCA
- Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
- Kivinen, Markku – FCREEES
- Koponen, Juhan – DEVERELE
- Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
- Kultti, Klaus – EAT
- Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
- Lanne, Markku – TSEM
- Lavonen, Jari – RCMER
- Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
- Lindblom-Yläne, Sari – EdPsychHE
- Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
- Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
- Nyman, Göte – METEOIR
- Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
- Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
- Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
- Roos, J P – HELPS
- Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
- Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
- Sumelius, John – AG ECON
- Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTS
- Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.

### Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language of publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>da_DK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de_DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr_FR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nl_NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of au in publications 2005-2010

- 84.7%
- 10.4%
- 4.2%
- 0.5%
- 0.3%
Language of publications 2005-2010

- FI 50.6%
- EN 46.0%
- SE 0.5%
- NL 0.3%
- FR 0.3%
- DK 0.5%
- Other 0.3%
- DE 1.6%
- Other languages 0.3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varti - ihmisen, uskonto, yhteiskunta.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII - ihmistilu nuorisotyöpäällä</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirjuri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Samomat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Biblical Literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fourth R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theotessa tapahtus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currents in biblical research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistoriallisena Seuran Vuosikirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ourkheimian Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno Domini : diakoniatieteen vuosikirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of beliefs and values : studies in religion and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cognition and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Taakarilehti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousvinderskabeligt Tidsskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations in Religion and Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeptical inquirer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welt und Umwelt der Bibel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studia Celtica Fenissa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method &amp; Theory in the Study of Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gereformeerd Theolcgisch Tijdschrift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue (Los Angeles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin for the Study of Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia : kristillinen opiskelulehti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakoniatutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedo-Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for the Study of Consciousness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polititka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kultturitutkimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological Quarterly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilae Christianae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arxitekten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annali di Storia dell’Essegest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval Théologique et Philosophique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihetyöstetietinen aikakauskirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal Ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

Norway ranking
Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

Australian ranking
A*
Typically an A* journal would be one of the best in its field or subfield in which to publish and would typically cover the entire field/subfield. Virtually all papers they publish will be of a very high quality. These are journals where most of the work is important (it will really shape the field) and where researchers boast about getting accepted. Acceptance rates would typically be low and the editorial board would be dominated by field leaders, including many from top institutions.

A
The majority of papers in a Tier A journal will be of very high quality. Publishing in an A journal would enhance the author’s standing, showing they have real engagement with the global research community and that they have something to say about problems of some significance. Typical signs of an A journal are lowish acceptance rates and an editorial board which includes a reasonable fraction of well known researchers from top institutions.

B
Tier B covers journals with a solid, though not outstanding, reputation. Generally, in a Tier B journal, one would expect only a few papers of very high quality. They are often important outlets for the work of PhD students and early career researchers. Typical examples would be regional journals with high acceptance rates, and editorial boards that have few leading researchers from top international institutions.

C
Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

ERIH ranking 2007-2008
Purpose of The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) is to develop and to maintain an impact assessment tool for European research journals. Journal classification processes are conducted by discipline-specific expert panels. In the ERIH 2007 Initial List there are three categories:

A = international publications, both European and non-European, with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world.

B = international publications, both European and non-European, with significant visibility and influence in the various research domains in different countries.

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartija : ihmisen, uskonon, yhteiskunta.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral and Brain Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currents in biblical research</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederlandse theologische tijdschrift</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistorialliset Seurueen Vuoskirja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung : Monatsschrift für das gesamte Gebiet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der Theologie und Religionswissenschaft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annali di Storia dell'Ecclesi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropological Quarterly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antike Welt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations In Religion and Theology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonian tutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of beliefs and values : studies in religion and education.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Cognition and Culture</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Religion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanova</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulttuuritutkimus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval Théologique et Philosophique</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method &amp; Theory in the Study of Religion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religionsvidenskabeligt Tidsskrift</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies Review</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in religion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistorialliset Seurueen Vuoskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welt und Umwelt der Bibel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigiliae Christianae</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norway Journal articles

**Level 2**

Journal articles: 14

**Level 1**

Journal articles: 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1 Published scientific monograph</th>
<th>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceedings or special issue of journal</th>
<th>C5 Textbook or professional handbook or guidebook or</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Biblical Studies, UH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerdmans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn Lectura</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Exegetical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortress Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudemus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipapia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton de Gruyter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen Kirjallisuuden Seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen eksegeettinen seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T &amp; T Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopistopaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>