

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-07/msg00763.html>

- *From:* Carl <pchristainsen@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 19 Jul 2007 15:00:15 -0700
-

On Jul 19, 1:52 pm, Doug Weller <dwel...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Thu, 19 Jul 2007 01:50:36 +0200, in sci.archaeology, Peter Alaca wrote:

Carl <pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx > wrote:

On Jul 16, 3:43 pm, Lisbeth Andersson
<lis...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Carl <pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote
innews:1184503210.237340.132020@xx:

On Jul 14, 6:53 pm, Lisbeth
Andersson
<lis...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Carl
<pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
innews:1184452212.165686.183410@xx

...
The article
about early
iron
production
was
interesting,
wikipedia
was, well
wikipedia –
a war that
may have
happened in

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

any of
several
millenia!, if
it happened
at all, the
hindunet
articles
gave
"access
denied" and
the others –
interesting,
although I
don't really
see what
relevance
they have to
this
thread.

Dr. Rao has a huge
reputation in archaeology. I
gave the quote
from his paper to date
Kurukshetra War to
1700–1900 BC.

I am upset that the site now
gives "access denied".
However,
Webcrawler
would allow the diligent
researcher to get at that
2002
conference where
Dr. Rao gave his paper.

BTW, Indians, as opposed
to Americans, would care
about the
Kurukshetra War.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

Well, you weren't around a while back for the discussion about early wars and how to recognize them in the archeological material. I know that several people here would be very interested if anybody could make a convincing case for that war to actually have happened and get a reliable identification of the time and place.

My ethnical traditions (at least one of them) contains enough fictional battles, non-existing people and historical persons who did not do the things they were credited with doing, so I have a tendency to regard all old traditions as possibly fictional unless there is some corroborating evidence to support them. And don't get me started on my personal geneology and family traditions. :-) If a story seems to have been invented to serve as a background for a discussion of religious philosophy, then I'll definitely keep the possibility open that it was indeed invented.

My background in Yoga since college explains where I am coming from.

You are trying to reach Nirvana? Or do you want to have a really flat stomach?

I'm sorry, I must have missed the post where you explained what form (s) of yoga you practice/study, and what connection there is between that and archaeology.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

The Osborn link gives date
for Kurukshetra War, based
on
archaeology, of 2800 BC.

Sci.archers are clearly not
equipped, by temperament
or
background, to get into
explaining the discrepancy.
Yet, I care because I am
studying
the Gita.

Yes, most "sci.archers" do not regard
religious literature as
archaeology.

I already clued sci.arch what
explains the discrepancy in
this
thread.

"the Mahabharata does not have correct
historicity"? Duh!
So, who do you think is correct? Osborn?
Rao? None of the above? Why?

I used Kurukshetra War as a
lead-in to tracing vedic
culture to
earliest
archaeological sites
(Frawley's New Model –
Mehrgarh etc.). In
the process
the vedas got thrown into
the mix.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

Since the Bhagavadgita is younger than the Vedas, you have your work cut out for you. Your link had iron production starting after 1900 BCE and the Rigveda mentions iron items. Also in the Gita the religious center has moved to the Ganges area.

I would love for some sci.archer to start talking about Mehrgarh or Dr. Rao because that would be solid archaeology for sci.arch.

I did google Frawley and Hancock and found:<http://www.grahamhancock.com/underworld/review2.php>

It gave me a feeling of deja-vu. I could have sworn I have read exactly the same text about Egypt and the pyramids.

Wrong move on your part; please stick with Hancock's book;

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TsofKUDXds4>

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

get it

and study
in close detail; I already
posted a list of
archaeological sites
from his book
relevant for the
Frawley/Hancock thesis; if
sci.archers would get
with the program, I would
be obliged.

This is not a classroom, and the only reason
I'll read any book is if
I think it might be interesting. So far I have
no reason to to
believe
that Hancock's book(s) qualify. Convince me
– surely Hancock have
some
interesting passages that have
archaeologically dated structures from
7000 BC that matches the stars, some
religious structures in Mehrgarh
that ties in with the Vedas – water basins
perhaps. Or a bunch of
dead
horses, who were killed by arrows when
they pulled the chariots in
the
war. (No, the last one is not Hancock's
period, is it?) Well you are
the one who have read the book, there must
be something in it that is
really interesting. If you start discussing it
I'm sure there are
some
people who will realize what a fascinating
subject it is.

Ask
me

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

further
questions
as
necessary.

Well, since
I haven't got
Hancocks
book
around and
it will take
some time
to get it, if I
decide to
get it on
interlibrary
loan
– is his
argument
for an older
date, that
the temples
are
aligned with
the stars in
Orion? Or
does he
have any
other
arguments?

Don't throw it onto me,
please. I wish you or some
interested
sci.archer to do a careful job
of homework.

At the moment, the interested "sci.archer"
seems to be you. When can
we have your book report? I don't know
enough of the subject to
grade
web-pages for accuracy, and I'm not taking
Hancock's word for
anything.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

How long
do you
think it took
from the
Vedas were
composed
until
they were
written
down?

5000 years plus or minus (at
least the oldest parts). This
is
a question not easily
resolved; highly
controversial; not
entirely appropriate for
sci.arch, yet Hancock and
Frawley push
it for all it is worth.

When do you think they were written down?
Remember there is still
that
pesky iron to explain.

And what
parts of the
Rigveda are
supposed to
be
historical?

Tilak had a few ideas
referenced in Hancock's
book; please get
the book ASAP.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

Would that be this

Tilak:<http://www.ncte-in.org/pub/tilak/4.9.htm?>

No, surely not.

When I've finished my current projects,
probably in September, I
might
check what the library has available on
archaeology in the area. Does
anybody else have any reading suggestions?

Lisbeth.

The day I don't learn anything new is the day
I die.

*What we know is not nearly as interesting
as *how we know it.

Please check my reply to Peter, where he replied to you.

Tom McDonald and I are starting to have a real conversation
about
Mehrgarh.

Peter may stop pestering me once he sees Tom is actually
interested in
the archaeology at least.

Re: Rao, Osborn, and Frawley

Tom is interested in the archaeology
not in what you have to say.

Do get involved if and when you can. I expect the Mehrgarh
and Indus
Valley
Civilization discussion to continue for some time, with more
sci.archers joining in.

Tom is having a monologue so far as I can see. Carl hasn't read any of
the archaeology it appears.

Doug

--

Doug Weller --

A Director and Moderator of The Hall of Ma'at <http://www.hallofmaat.com>

Doug's Archaeology Site: <http://www.ramtops.co.uk>

Amun - co-owner/co-moderator <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Amun/> - Hide quoted text -

- Show quoted text -

You are apparently not following the flow of conversation.

To be charitable, perhaps there is some delay for you to read my posts.

.