

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-12/msg00986.html>

- *From:* <joerevskelton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Dec 2006 20:55:51 -0600
-

"Chris" <chrisg777@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1167330051.883425.157300@xx>

Hi Tom,

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...?

"Top-posting" refers to responses appearing at the top of a post: before the material being responded to, as yours still does.

After clicking on the "Reply" button, re-read what you wish to reply to; then click at the end of what you are replying to to move your cursor to that point, and hit [enter] a couple of times before you begin to type.

That will place your reply below what you are replying to, and separate it a bit from what you are replying to. That just makes it a little easier to read and follow..

Does anyone have an interest in sites in India? They don't have to be sacred. But I am genuinely interested in understanding more about the sizes and units of measurements that were prominent in India. Stella Kamrisch does not go into that level of detail. And while the two resources I referenced have excellent plans for many important sites, they do not go into the level of detail I am curious about.

Does anyone on this list have an interest in finding out more information about the relative sizes of important cultural sites in India? I have tried searching JStor but have yet to really turn up anything helpful. I'll keep digging, however.

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

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 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. There is a wealth of information on the sizes of the latter two but I am not so sure on the former.

Hopefully, this helps you understand why I am posting; limits the topic; is not inappropriately top-posted; and sufficiently restates my original query so that the author's-name-that-cannot be-mentioned is removed.

-Chris

On Dec 28, 9:40 am, "Tom McDonald" <kilt...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

Kendall K. Down wrote:

In message

<1167264776.401209.304...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

"Tom McDonald" <kilt...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

[Rude, ignorant top-posting corrected]

Good for you, Tom. I just ignore top posters after one warning. I felt a little guilty about jumping on Chris so hard. I assumed (and

you know what that gets you) that Chris was relatively experienced on Usenet. One of the advantages of Google Groups is that it makes it easy to check a person's posting history. Turns out Chris had only posted four or so times to a computer group ere he set foot in s.a. So the default position for me to have taken, knowing that, was that he needed education, not being fallen upon from a great height.

I think Chris may have assumed that s.a. was a place where a simple question would get a simple answer. Of course, that does happen. However, as your post intimated, folks who have significant knowledge in a field can often see potential problems underlying apparently simple questions. And they may take the time to suggest that the questioner go beyond the simple question to what might be an underlying trap. You and David did that; Chris apparently objected so strongly to your tone that he missed the message.

I hope Chris thinks this over and applies it to future forays into Usenet.

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

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