

Martin Malata

1st lesson topic:

Archaeology and its view on the past.

When looking back to the past, we must be very careful not to fall into "colonial state of mind", which can happen, if we do interpret the past by our knowledge or our experience. I think a good view to illustrate how quickly can nowadays a view of society change, is to look at the trailer of original movie The Clash of Titans and on the trailer of its forthcoming remake, both are supposedly freely watchable on YouTube. In the first trailer, we can see the struggle for epicness, making it "the big movie", with idealised moral story, sympathetic characters and emphasis brought on "classical portrayal" of antiquity, mainly haircuts, clothes and manners.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xVcT5YWBzq8>

The other trailer, and, supposedly, other movie, concentrates, on bombasticity. It tries to sell itself, not the story. We can see a lot of action. There is much less emphasis on the main plot, which is not abstracted. On the other hand, we can see a glimpse of all the action scenes. There is also major difference in the portrayal. Main protagonists are wearing heavier, military clothes and are having very short, contemporary haircuts. The manner, in which they represent themselves, is not that important.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q6CJenNMs4&NR=1>

To conclude, the same can be implied in archeology. Now we are in phase when we actually think, that we do understand why and how people in the past did the things they did. There is a threat of seeing them to behave just like we would do. However, they were people with different traditions and states of mind. Conservative pull of tradition, which is dominant in rural society, slows down actual philosophical thinking of people ("what would they just say" complex), so it could be very different from our state of mind.

2nd lesson topic:

OT Map shows us not only the perception of world, but filled with actual names also shows the perception of the peoples between themselves. Namely, in reference to the biblical names of three sons of Noah:

Shem refers to semithic peoples of Near East. Actual word shem means the name (so to speak; Shem which brings Golem to life and controls it meant that you must have known his "true name"), which can be interpreted that semitic peoples

were well-known to old Israelites, so they knew their names (shmot). Ham (or kham) refers to the peoples of Africa. Surprisingly, this word in Hebrew means warm or hot. So, these are folks living in countries, where it is very hot. It shows us, that if they did not know their names, Israelites actually had an idea about where and possibly how these folks are living. Last are the sons of Japeth, whose name, translated is something like "the other guy", showing us, that Israelites had quite little knowledge about european and caucasian peoples of their time. Interestingly, in some cultures or religions, knowing the true name is very important mean to control someone (see the case of Golem). It is probable, that because Israelites were themselves sons of Shem, they thought to have had their name actually given to them by the God, although it is only an idea and I have no evidence so far to support it.

In his contribution M. Malata focuses on interpretation of the past as an ongoing process that never leads to final results, but is a mirror of the topics and biases that rule public discussion at a certain point of time. - His comparison is most useful and highlighting: In the case of 'trivial myths' (film) it is plain to see that interpretations of the past/distant are ultimately society-derived and serve an essential projective function, taking the own existence as a reference point ('anthropocentrism').

In the second part M. Malata treats the ethnonyms incorporated in the Ptolemaic OT-chart (s. lecture ppt #2/slide 3). In M. Malata's opinion the names used also signify relations (proximity/distance) between the ancient folk.

Indeed, in traditional context the name of individuals, holy objects and certain rites are often kept secret (the name being considered as a means for identification, use, seizure). [→ Golem example]

With some justification we can see 'hot', 'the other(s)' as sort of an exterior description (indicating some distance to the subject that is being described), whereas 'the name' is intimately related to the self-understanding of individuals and groups.

Both examples (Clash of the Titans/OT) are a good proof of independent thinking and of a deep understanding of the topics of our lecture.