

# Re: India archaeological measurments [was: Re: temple/pyramid plans]

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-12/msg00967.html>

---

- *From:* Kendall K. Down <[webmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:webmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 28 Dec 2006 19:19:09 GMT
- 

In message <1167330051.883425.157300@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
"Chris" <[chrisg777@xxxxxxxx](mailto:chrisg777@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Thanks, I was posting from Google Groups and was not aware I was "top-posting". I just hit reply at the bottom and assumed it was the right button. Hopefully this reply appears in the right spot...?

No, but if you're willing to learn, we're more than willing to teach.

Top posting is when your reply comes above the post to which you are replying. The usual reason for condemning top posting goes like this:

=====

Because people will think you are a jerk if you top post.

Why should I care?

Because it breaks the natural order in which people read and think.

Why is top posting wrong?

=====

I think you can see that if the answer came \*below\* the question, it would make much more sense and a reader who had not been following the exchanges would be able to understand them much more easily.

Does anyone have an interest in sites in India?

Speaking for myself, no.

As to the raison d'etre for all this: I am doing a cross-cultural study on mytho-geographical centers. I doubt that there is one such mytho-cultural center to India so I thought I would be able to

Re: India archaeological measurments [was: Re: temple/pyramid plans]

generalize by studying many such sites. In doing so, I was drawn to the similar axial plans between India, Egypt and the Judeo-Christian tradition.

You mean, they all have a front door at one end and a shrine at the other?  
Gee! Now that really is significant. How come no one else has noticed it