

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006-12/msg00997.html>

- *From:* "Chris" <chrisg777@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 30 Dec 2006 16:02:49 -0800
-

<boatloads snipped>

Tom wrote:

I'm still not certain what you mean by those two new-to-me terms. Could you define them more closely for me?

Doug wrote:

Mytho-geographical seems to be a word used to both bodies of knowledge, praxis, and a way of mapping. And places. I don't see any requirement for a center though. Or any reason to think that any such concept today relates to what people were thinking 2 thousand years ago.

http://www.johndavies.org/articles/article_04_07_06.html

I don't think that link is helpful at all. It seems more like an advert than anything else. For a better start, try these two:

http://www.gravesnet.com/drop/Archaeological_Landscapes_And_Textual_Images.pdf
http://www.gravesnet.com/drop/SacredLandscapes_And_The_Phenomenon_Of_Light.pdf

The best field to look to for further info on this topic is Cultural Geography.

Mytho-geography is short for "mythic geography" and combines the two words in one: the physical and imagined communities of meaning. In essence, a place is never really devoid of our impressions, meanings, associations or <ahem> myths. I am sure you can see a mythic landscape in varying degree in your town (flags, churches, parade squares, heritage sites, etc.); and for Amerindians the "sacred landscape" is just a highly focused version of this. A cultural landscape could be construed in a non-religious way but, personally, I tend not to do so (because I see politics as so much myth). That is why I use "mytho-geography" as an umbrella term for all these things.

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

On the other hand, a mytho-geographic *center* is a highly-charged place within the general (mythically charged) landscape. I already gave one example: Saint Peter's tomb/altar is to Vatican City what a mytho-geographic center is to sacred/mythic landscape. Clear?

As to Doug's point, I don't see the relevance in limiting myself to what I *think* such peoples thought; I am doing a cross-cultural study and I would just spin wheels in the mud if I didn't apply some of my own criteria. Elsewise, how could sociology ever progress? Can a sociological principle apply if the individual his or herself is unaware of the larger sociological pattern at work? I think not.

So I shall continue on this route.

By the way, I am making a little headway into the dimensions of Indian architecture/sites. But am mostly waiting till I get back to work when I can follow-up on the research leads. I work at a university here in Canada (staff, not faculty) and am in book-heaven.

-Chris

.