

The Archaeology of Consciousness

PAUL DEVEREUX

*International Consciousness Research Laboratories, 4 Crossway Road
Hudson View Park, Beacon, NY 12508, U. S. A.
Email: devereux@aol.com*

Abstract — It is suggested that ancient sacred places provide the opportunity for consciousness study — if we know how to approach them. The emergence of a new discipline, "cognitive archaeology," is noted, in which archaeologists are learning to overcome intrinsic Western assumptions in the study of ancient sites and landscapes. The nature of place is then considered: it is argued that place can be expressive and evoke and organize memories, images, feelings and imagination. The curious notion of "sacred place" is next addressed. The concept of treating prehistory as being analogous to the unconscious mind is presented. Sacred places, it is suggested, may be those which yield greater information than secular ones; locations where information is received more effectively by the unconscious mind. It is argued that we can never fully understand an ancient sacred site by use of modern rationalism alone. Plato's distinction of two kinds of space, *chora* and *topos*, is considered, and the accessing of *chora* by "dreaming with our eyes open." A detailed description of such a process is offered, and unfamiliar ways of approaching ancient monuments described.

Keywords: consciousness — archaeology — prehistory

Introduction

For me, the lost knowledge and wisdom of the ancient world does not relate to how the ancient people built certain monuments, whether or not they could levitate stones, had help from ancient astronauts or whatever other notions might occupy our 20th-century minds. Rather, I feel what was known in some societies in the remote past *was an intimate knowledge of the mind, of consciousness*. These archaic peoples knew how to navigate mental space, and had a deep working knowledge of altered mind states. Vestiges of such ancient wisdom still linger in some traditional tribal societies today, but they are rapidly becoming extinguished. We need to catch that wisdom before it finally evaporates, for while our modern culture is learning much about the workings of the brain, its knowledge of the mind is still fairly primitive.

Our culture is a *monophasic* one, that is, one locked into a single culturally-acceptable state of consciousness and a single worldview which it insists is reality. Other ways of seeing the world, of relating to it, are being eliminated remorselessly from our view. In a broad cultural sense, we are losing the "news of difference," to use Gregory Bateson's phrase. I argue that we need to find

again a mythic or imaginal dimension to add to our modern perceptions of the world.

Western problems with relating to the environment, which at heart means relating to place, lay with changes of perception that occurred in ancient Greece, on the one hand, and with the cultural worldview reinforced by our twentieth-century psychology, on the other. Both these elements are well captured in a true story concerning Sigmund Freud, the father of modern psychology, when he visited the Acropolis in Athens in 1906. When he had the blinding white and blue experience that the ruined temples and rich Athenian sky create on this sacred hilltop, he just could not believe it — he really could not. Over three decades afterwards he wrote that what he had felt there and then he had "never understood" and that it had kept recurring to his mind. Standing there surrounded by the remains of the classically beautiful Parthenon and other temples of antiquity, he had felt a curious *alienation*. Somehow, he was not sure if he was present in a real place. He eventually tracked down this odd feeling of estrangement to his schooldays, when he had first learnt of the Acropolis. He realized that as a schoolboy he had never believed that he would ever visit this famous place, and a dissonance had been set up between his boyhood visualizations about the place and the actuality of his being there. He realized that "the original factor must have been a sense of some feeling of the unbelievable and the unreal in the situation at the moment. The situation included myself, the Acropolis and my perception of it." In other words, Freud literally experienced a feeling of *dis-location*.

The Nature of Place

This anecdote brings us to the deceptively simple question of "What is a place?" In the growing monophasic mind state of our culture and times, we are encouraged to virtually dismiss, or at least downgrade, ideas concerning the power of place. We are generally unconscious of place at any level other than the superficial one of it being a co-ordinate, an address. This mental habit can be traced back to ancient Greece, as I have already indicated, where a crucial switch in the history of the Western intellect took place. The ancient Greeks had words for two senses of place — *chora* and *topos*. *Chora* is the older of the two terms, and was a holistic reference to place: place as expressively potent, place as experience, place as a trigger to memory, imagination and mythic presence. *Topos*, on the other hand, signified place in much the way we think of it nowadays — simple location, and the objective, physical features of a locale. Topography. Aristotle took this sense of place, and abstracted it further into the pure concept of position. Ultimately, even sacred places became *topoi*, shorn of their mythic dimension, shorn of *chora*.

In his *Timaeus*, Plato, on the cusp of the old mythic worldview and the new rationalist, intellectual order, struggled to define the process of becoming aware of *chora*, of primeval space. He claimed that *chora* could not be apprehended by the senses alone, but required in addition a kind of "bastard reason-

ing"; it could only be known "in a kind of dream," (Lee, 1965) a phrase Eugene Walter interprets as "dreaming with our eyes open" (Walter, 1988). This is not metaphor, it is technique, that Plato was referring to. What he was saying about a special kind of dreaming, was in effect, that we need to place a mythic filter onto our perception if we are to experience *chora*, the imaginal qualities, of a place. (The visionary poet William Blake expressed this ability well when he stated that "double the vision" was always with him, so that a thistle across his way could also appear to him as "an old man grey.")

So, in short, *chora* relates to an engaged, mythic or imaginal sense of place rather than a physical, utilitarian and mundane one. Our present disengagement from a soulful sense of place is leading us to the danger of no longer standing on meaningful ground.

Meaningful Ground

This danger has been interestingly considered by Edmund Bunske of the University of Delaware. He feels that modern Westerners, especially in the United States, are beginning to display the symptoms of exile. He says: "Where people work and how they live is increasingly being organized according to world market criteria... Global market forces... together with a global communications and information industry, and postmodern cultural styles and forms, are squeezing out local culture, history, society, and nature.... Places are either losing their identity, or entirely "new" places are being created without a distinct identity...." Bunkse refers to a "a corporate footprint" in which shopping malls, office and hi-tech complexes, warehouses, hotels, and the like are *packaged* onto the landscape, and states that "people's internal lives may be becoming as discontinuous with their environment as it is for classic exiles." (Bunkse, 1994)

Cognitive Archaeology

This estrangement from place is also projected back in time by our scholars, when they study ancient sites and landscapes. A new branch of archaeology called "cognitive archaeology" has come into being to try to check this process. One young cognitive archaeologist, Julian Thomas, has written:

Landscape is not a universal concept, applied in the same way by all people at all times... the modern West has developed a particular and distinctive way of looking, which is deployed against place as it is deployed against other phenomena. (Thomas, 1993)

He goes on to explain that we have developed a particular way of seeing — the *gaze* has become the dominant mode of perception within our civilization. Thomas draws on the work of Susan Ford to suggest that we moderners characteristically look at landscape through the medium of the *male gaze*. Thomas

warns that archaeology may be guilty of studying ancient landscapes in just such a manner, and this leads to typical Western approaches to studying landscapes involving distribution maps, air photos, satellite imagery, and so on, which all imply a considerable distance between subject and object. Thomas points out that modern archaeology often presents a picture of past landscapes which their inhabitants would not recognize.

Another cognitive archaeologist, Christopher Tilley, attacks what has been the tendency of modern geography and archaeology to falsely assume that there is no difference in our understanding of the environment and the nature of space from that had by prehistoric peoples. Tilley stresses that earlier and non-Western peoples tend to experience the space around them as a medium rather than as simply a "container" (Tilley, 1994).

Our present cultural worldview is increasingly seeing the land in terms of economic and social utility. Imaginative, expressive qualities of place are remorselessly marginalized. This worldview can actually be seen growing throughout history in the development of maps, with the mythic content in early cartographic essays gradually being shunted to the margins, ("Here be Dragons"), until now we are left with our clinically exact maps, technical masterpieces certainly, but bereft of expressive, mythic quality. Topography has replaced chorography. With modern technological power, our emerging monoculture is enforcing its socio-economic worldview with gathering speed and effectiveness. Wherever the Western mind goes, it marginalizes local, indigenous and often very different worldviews and systems of knowledge. Soon all news of difference will be gone; we will be living in Marshall McLuhan's long-prophesized "global village," and it will be built in our monophasic cultural image.

The world will have fallen silent around us.

The World As Information

Fortunately there are some items of good news! One is that none of us really perceives places in the neutral manner good Westerners are supposed to do. Deep down, we are aware that we actually cannot think of a place without the elements of memory, imagination and feeling becoming part of the internal picture of it, which we construct. A second item of good news, even though it may not seem like it at first, is that we never actually see the world. At least, not as it is. Whatever the world is, we will never know — physicists tell us that it is an "n-dimensional energy soup." The data that stream into the brain through our sensory mediators are constantly changing and developing, so that countless models are always being made by the brain-mind. All that we can ever be aware of are these mental models; they are the only world we are ever in contact with. We draw these models out of the infinite possibilities that the "n-dimensional energy soup" we are part of contains. Even what seems to be stable three-dimensional space is, like time, a construction of our brain-minds, used to organize the data. Following this logic, we can therefore say that our

idea of a place, of the environment, of the world, is but an *informational model* which is dependent on the way our brain-minds work, and how the processing of that information is affected by the culture we are immersed in. The worldview of, say, Western science, is no more and no less than a particular cognitive model, differing from that of a tribal, shamanistic worldview, for example, but not necessarily superior to it: the same world, but a different reading of it. (Nor is this simply poetic or metaphorical. It is how it really is. For instance, a German cultural anthropologist, Christian Ratsch, told me of incidents he experienced when he lived for some time with the Lacandon Indians of the south Mexican rain forest. He spoke their language and took part in their village life. As the months went by, he began to see things that his Western sensibility and worldview struggled to redefine as non-existent. So he saw trees, and even shot birds, that his deep-rooted Western self would cause to disappear. He eventually joined in the Lacandon ritual life, and was trained in the use of complex spells for healing and other purposes. One of these saved him from an injury so severe that his Western common sense told him he was going to die, yet the spell apparently caused instant healing.)

The "good news" in all this is that any informational model of the world *can be changed*. It takes an effort, but it can be done. So, if we want to modify our cultural way of seeing the world, if we want to add a mythic element to our Western perception, which would result in an alteration of our relationship with the world, then we have to expose ourselves to different worldviews and ways of perceiving.

Sacred Places

There are various ways of attempting to do this, and I feel the visiting of pre- or proto-historic sacred places is an often overlooked opportunity. The visiting of sacred monuments in my view need not be simply tourism, or archaeology, or worship, but above all it can become a form of *consciousness study*. There are distinct reasons for this. For a start, place is not passive, if we take the meaning of place in the terms of the old Greek *chora*. A place can interact with our consciousness in a dynamic way. It contains its own memory of events and its own mythic nature, its *genius loci* or spirit of place, that may not be visible but can be apprehended by the human — and animal — interloper, especially in the appropriate mental state. (The bringing of information into the focus of conscious awareness is a state-specific activity.) On a less dramatic (or contentious) level, the forms, textures, smells, sounds or light of a particular place can trigger associations within us that another place would not. It can bring things to the fore, into awareness, that were until then existing in the unconscious mind. Places can therefore illuminate us, and can provoke mythic imagining within us.

These considerations about place and cognition in general have particular relevance with regard to sacred places. For various reasons, people through the ages have separated out certain places as being different, sanctified — in some

way specially powerful. Sacred places take many forms, and I will not waste time here by describing them. Suffice it to say that whether a sacred site is a natural feature that is simply recognized as being a powerful spot, or whether it is a constructed monument, a temple, for instance, it has until modern times been the *place* that matters. Why? German theologian Rudolf Otto explored this matter in his *The Idea of the Holy*. He considered feelings of eeriness or awe to be the "earliest manifestation" of the holy. (Otto, 1924) This mental effect can pass away, but sometimes, he noted, it can be articulated through, or by reference to a place. A place recognized as sacred possessed what Otto called a *numen loci*. We are therefore looking at a sacred place being a focus of *numinosity* (Jung's noun coined from Otto's adjective, "numinous") — it is a place which provokes a feeling of awe, eeriness, or, in mythical terms, which is haunted by a localized spirit. Similarly, Eliade considered a sacred place to be that where a breakthrough between the material and spiritual worlds could occur, a manifestation of the supernatural he called a *hierophany*. Hindus call sacred places *Tirthas*, meaning a ford or crossing, and all traditional peoples recognize the power of certain locations to encourage a person's mind or spirit to cross into the other-worlds.

I have come to view the visiting of ancient sacred places as a form of consciousness study because I have spent half of my adult life exploring, studying, or simply being at ancient sacred sites around the world, and I have a working conceptual framework that I use. I think of prehistory as analogous to the unconscious mind, and the sacred sites as being like fragments of dreams we struggle to remember. (It is therefore apt that the word "monument" derives from the Latin *monumentum*, which has the meaning "anything that recalls the mind.")

This could, in fact, be more than just an analogy. The nature of "prehistory" is qualitatively different to the condition we call "history." History is recorded, documented, linear time. We all too readily think of prehistory as a kind of illiterate history, but the difference is more fundamental than this. To chronicle, document, write, record requires a particular type of mentation, a certain kind of consciousness, as compared with a people who do not write, who do not chronicle and record in that way. "Prehistory" and "history" are really labels for different overall states of mind. They are not connected with chronological absolutes, for prehistory ends at different times in different parts of the world. History floats on the ocean of prehistory in the way the waking, conscious self or ego floats on the deeps of the unconscious mind. The two are mirror images of one another. Proto-history we could liken to those transitional waking moments in which the mythic dissolves away leaving the bleached bones and gaunt stones of the mundane — the stuff of archaeology.

In attempting to understand the long, silent change of worldview that has occurred from the unchronicled cyclic archaic past to the present, documented linear time we have to recognize that the ego, the sense of the self, has changed into that type of consciousness which produced and now inhabits "history." In

prehistory, the mind experienced time as slow, cyclical and seasonal, and the ego was soft-edged and merged with the physical world in a dreamy way. Now we watch the clock and count the seconds and our ego-sense is hardened, its boundaries are clear-cut; self and others are clearly demarcated. This has its expression on the land. Land becomes property. We have physical boundaries defining and containing our property, and they are recorded in legal documents.

The idea of enclosed land inevitably emerged from the settling of human beings and the beginning of agriculture. This simply became more defined, more exact, more entrenched "as time went on" (a phrase that is itself an expression of the historical mindset). Prior to such settlement, people moved through the land, hunting and gathering. Land was not seen in blocks, in defined areas, any more than it is today by the tribal Aborigine. The ego, the sense of self, was like-wise soft-edged, diffuse.

This brings us to what I would suggest is a critical principle: *state of consciousness and the view of the land, of the world, always relate to one another*. Further, I would suggest that we can gather more information from an ancient sacred site or landscape *by apprehending it in changed frames of consciousness*. When we visit a sacred site built or used in the prehistoric past, we are dealing with a place that comes from a different space of the mind, the archaic *chora* of the Greeks. We cannot apprehend its full essence by modern, Western analytical thinking, because it emerges into our rational worldview in just the way the fragments of a dream survive into waking consciousness. But if a place can organize our perceptions, feelings, memories and imaginings, if it is meaningful and expressive space, it may be able to speak to those dark areas of the mind beyond the bounds of the modern conscious self.

At a sacred site it is perhaps the case that information can pass between the place and our unconscious mind, without our ego-self being aware of the transaction.

If we can "dream with our eyes open" it might be that we can include a greater range of information in our cognized model of the monument or sacred locale. A monument, after all, is for recalling the mind. Such sanctified places can possess physical properties that "draw the believer into a meditative mood or even an altered state of consciousness," Eugene Walter has written (Walter, 1988). Psychologist Julian Jaynes says much the same thing, referring to the hallucinogenic properties of certain places (Jaynes, 1976).

How to apprehend place is possibly the greatest single lesson we have to learn from the archaic mindset or worldview. The environment we apprehend is a mental or cognitive construction, an informational model built within the recesses of our brain-minds. Sacred space is therefore a division of that cognitive construction. If we find ourselves engaged by sacred places, and have our consciousness provoked by them, it may be because we receive *more information* from them. The very fact that there are, and have always been sacred

places, demonstrates their psychological importance to us. They may be where we get a greater glimpse of reality.

“Monumenteeing”

So, we need to give our unconscious mind full rein when we visit sacred sites or monuments. I call this “monumenteeing” for want of a better term. This process is rendered more effective if we prepare and develop our imaginative faculties before we go to a monument, and if we deliberately seek out ways of understanding them that force us to use more of our intuitive and mythic capacity. Viewed in analytical terms, a standing stone or a pyramid can, after all, be measured, weighed, located topographically, and examined for means of construction. But while such work is important and even essential, it does not take us out of ourselves, it involves cognitive processes that are still central to the modern mind and worldview.

How does one go about “monumenteeing”? Here is the process as I suggest it (Devereux, 1996). Decide first of all where you are going to go to visit an ancient, sacred place. Take a special trip or make it part of your vacation plan. You could visit one of the great prehistoric megalithic sites of Europe, say Newgrange in Ireland (or, much better, the chambered cairns on the Loughcrew Hills thirty miles away), Stonehenge in England (or, again much better, the Avebury complex twenty miles to the north), the great rows of standing stones, dolmens or chambered mounds around Carnac-Ville in Brittany, or the mighty dolmens of Spain. You could visit instead one of the great Gothic cathedrals of Europe: any of them will do the trick, but it is difficult to better the mighty Chartres Cathedral in France for sheer power of place. Or you might visit the evocative, dreamy temples of Greece or Egypt, or the ancient marvels of Rome. Then again, there is a remarkable range of ancient, sacred places in the Americas to choose from: the mysterious, two-thousand-year-old Serpent Mound of Ohio; the medicine wheels in the Rockies of Canada and the USA; the Cahokia mounds in Illinois; Chaco Canyon in New Mexico, or the many other extraordinary prehistoric Native American ruins and rock art of the Southwest. And so on and on — there is the whole world to choose from. Whatever your choice, for the purposes of this particular activity it needs to be sufficiently well known to have something written about it, and for its photograph to be reasonably accessible to you in books or brochures *before* you visit it for the first time. When you have chosen the site, and assembled data and picture, you are ready to begin.

First, just *say the name* of the sacred place out loud a few times. As Lage Wahlström has pointed out: “Hearing the name of a place often gives rise to certain associations.” Note any connotations that may arise. Then, after reading up on the place, study its photograph. How do you imagine the place to be from its picture and the descriptions you have read? Visualize your preconceptions strongly.

The next stage is to physically visit the site, the temple, the monument. Take

a camera with you. Encounter the site with as few other people round as possible. Choose your moment. In that first encounter, try to catch the *difference* you sense between the place as you experience it and the place as you imagined it before you came. Play with that difference, both at the monument and afterwards. Try to identify what it is that is different. Is it the size of the monument? The area it encloses? The extent and nature of the surroundings? (I recall visiting the mystery temple of Eleusis, and being shocked to discover that there were cement factories and housing hemming it in on all sides. Yet the site itself maintained its own sense. In fact, the unfortunate surroundings actually amplified the power of the place.) Do not tell yourself the difference, try to make yourself feel it. Remember that feeling.

As you move about the site, use not only your eyes but other senses and sensibilities as well. Are there any legends associated with this place? If there are, run them through your mind as you "take in" the site. How does your body feel; how does it relate to the space the site creates? How do you feel on an emotional level? A little fearful? Somehow enhanced and liberated? Awestruck? Disappointed? Do not analyze these feelings, simply be conscious of them. How does the site smell? There may not be a particular smell that you are readily conscious of, but sometimes there is. I recall visiting Delphi for the first time on the sunny morning after a torrential rainstorm. Walking up the Sacred Way, the smell of flowers, of freshened earth, and above all the scent of cypress trees, was noticeably strong. Now, whenever I smell the scent of cypress, I am instantly transported to Delphi; a sunlit picture of that powerfully expressive place is flashed into my mind.

Smell is, of course, strongly linked to memory. It is a direct sense, in that it does not "cross over" in the way that, for example, the information impinging on the right eye is "read" in the left brain. Smell connects to the limbic system, and can evoke emotion and memory in powerful ways. (And smell can be at work on you without your being aware: it takes only eight molecules of substance to trigger an impulse in a nerve ending in the olfactory lobe, but it takes forty triggered nerve endings for you to consciously smell anything.) So if you have the opportunity, visit your selected site either prior to or just after a storm, when the smell rising from the soil is most noticeable, or during low pressure when there is more moisture in the atmosphere and scents carry more readily. In the evening, too, ambient scents tend to be stronger. Perhaps it is the earth at the site that gives off a recognizable odor, or local plants, bushes or trees. But if you can not detect a "site scent," come prepared so that you can "cheat" by taking a lump of incense, a sprig of herb or an essential oil with you — any scent with which you have no prior personal associations, and which you feel is appropriate to the site. (So, for instance, I might take cypress to Delphi, frankincense or myrrh to an Egyptian temple, sage or copal to a Native American place of power.) As you walk around the site, quietly sniff the scent you have selected. Touch the place, too, where it is permissible to do so. Take many photographs, from many angles, distant and close up, the

surroundings viewed from the site, and perhaps a series of pictures to produce a panorama of overlapping shots. If you have even rudimentary drawing ability, take a sketch pad along too: there is nothing like drawing a place or an object to make you see it. And spend some time just sitting or being at the place, not doing anything or thinking or concentrating on anything in particular. Before you leave, scan the surroundings so as to visually and haptically note how the site relates to its broader environment. If it is permissible and non-harmful to do so, go into the vicinity of the site (not the site itself) and take a blade of grass, or a leaf off a weed or plant, a pebble or a small handful of soil or sand (but take nothing if it would cause noticeable material damage to the site or its surroundings, and never take any archaeological fragment from an ancient place).

Later, when you are back home, and back in your routine lifeway, put the photographs you took of the site, the associated scent of the place, and a tactile reminder (should you have been able to bring one back), and put them together in a box. On one or two nights every week, go through this material, looking, touching, smelling, remembering, immediately before going to sleep. If a scent is involved, then see that it is sprinkled on your bedclothes or in the air of the bedroom. Repeat this (perhaps for several weeks) until you recall having a dream about the place. However brief and inconsequential it might seem, make a written note of it and add that to your box of the site's memorabilia. Keep at this until your dreams about the place become more frequent and, perhaps, more complex. Note the imagery and associations that creep into your site dreams. Continue with all this until you get to a point where no fresh development in your dreamlife regarding the place seems to be happening. Hopefully, by means of this process, which may take some months, you will develop a mythic relationship with the site you visited. Ponder the story that your unconscious mind tells you about the place (and, inevitably about yourself through the medium of the place). In this way you stand a chance of recovering some of the interaction that went on unconsciously between you and the site; the primal, information superhighway that by-passed your conscious mind.

Give yourself the freedom to slip out of the monophasic straitjacket of your culture to explore the mythic dimensions of your mind, and your perceptions. Do not decry or denigrate the activity — just do it. (And it's best not to tell friends what weirdness you are up to!) Slip out of your time to engage with a prehistoric place in its time.

A New Archaeology

Even if we choose not to engage in such a regimen, we can still approach places in ways that will challenge our expectations. By using senses other than just sight, upon which we are dependent in our culture. Hearing, for example.

We are beginning to discover the acoustical resonances of Neolithic chambered mounds, for instance, and find their frequencies to center on those of the male vocal range. (Jahn *et. al.*, 1996; Devereux & Jahn, 1996) Certain places

such as ancient Greek theaters, Mayan pyramids and ball courts, and east Mediterranean oracle sites have strange acoustic properties that might actually affect the consciousness of people at them. In our heavily dominant visual culture, we forget that there are peoples in the world, especially rain forest peoples with their close-spaced environments, whose primary sense is hearing, whose secondary sense is smell, with vision only third. In the forests of Papua New Guinea, for example, there are people who listen to mountains, who incorporate the sounds of waterfalls into the phonetics of their poetic language, who identify birds by their songs and not by their plumage, and who can hear the voices of the ancestors emerge from the "soft, green, scented gloom" that surrounds them. (Gell, 1995)

Again, we could look at how sacred places were used for dreaming by former peoples. A sacred waterfall, that is, one haunted by a spirit, might be used by a South American Shuar Indian as a site for a vision quest, or by a Celtic seer, wrapped in animal skins, as a place of entry to the underworld where prophetic dreams could be had. And we can understand this perhaps, again considering the acoustic properties, for we all know how the roar of water can conjure the semblance of voices in our ears, voices that sound like the spirits of the place calling to us, or like the voices of our own dead friends or relatives — perhaps spirits we brought with us. In ancient Greece, and Ptolemaic Egypt, people would go to special dreaming temples to be healed. Today, the Dragon Project Trust in England, with Stanley Krippner at the Saybrook Institute in San Francisco, is undertaking a program involving a scientific study of dreaming at selected ancient sacred places.

By learning how to enter such a dreaming or mythic state of awareness at ancient places, Plato's "dreaming with our eyes open," one can find out factual information from a site that is invisible to analytical awareness.

For example, I was fortunate enough to solve much of the mystery of Silbury Hill in the Avebury complex in southern England. I actually learned how to lock into a state of consciousness in which I could treat this enigmatic artificial hill, the largest such structure in all Neolithic Europe, as a sentient being, even resulting in auditory hallucinations. (Devereux, 1992) This led to the discovery of the monument's purpose and nature, which archaeologists had assumed could never be known. In a real sense, the site had its own memory, and it was possible to access that information in the appropriate state of mind. That information is now in the mainstream archaeological literature. (Devereux, 1991) We are also just learning that the ancients had the ability to see mythological presence in the very outlines of the land — as one dramatic example of this, giant heads and figures formed by artfully enhanced natural simulacra in remote pre-dynastic times are being rediscovered by Egyptologists in eroded rocks and cliff-faces behind temple sites in Egypt. In our monophasic cultural mode of consciousness we say we are "awake" (as if that were some absolute state instead of simply a particular mode of consciousness), and we have distinct boundaries between what we think of as ourselves and the outside world.

Other peoples have had a more dreamy, and thus more mythical relationship with their environment. We are only now coming to fully realize that even ancient dreams have left their monuments behind.

And we are beginning to understand that previously unexplained features such as the mysterious straight lines on desert areas such as the Nazca pampa, Peru, are maps of the mind — the geography of trance. (Devereux, 1993)

An archaeology that uses more senses and different modes of cognition will become a new, and superior archaeology. It will yield a wider spectrum of information about the past and ancient places. In so doing, it will uncover a more precise account of the heritage of the human mind. We may have to go back to find out just who we are. This new cognitive archaeology has as much to contribute to the new, burgeoning wave of consciousness research as neuroscience or any other aspect of the cognitive sciences. More importantly, it offers us new tools with which to help us explore our minds. Those tools look like Delphi, Avebury, Hatshepsut's temple and other sacred places. By exploring the sacred spaces of prehistory, we can reach into undiscovered realms of the mind.

References

- Bunkse, Edmunds V. (1994). The emerging postindustrial landscape as exile and its possible consequences for sense of place. In *The Spirit and Power of Place*. Ed. Rana P. B. Singh, National Geographic Society of India: Varanasi.
- Devereux, Paul (1991). Three-dimensional aspects of apparent relationships between selected natural and artificial features within the topography of the Avebury Complex. *Antiquity*, 65, 249.
- Devereux, Paul (1992). *Symbolic Landscapes*. Glastonbury: Gothic Image.
- Devereux, Paul (1993). Acculturated topographical effects of shamanic trance consciousness in archaic and medieval sacred landscapes. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 7, 1.
- Devereux, Paul (1996). *Re-Visioning the Earth*. New York: Fireside Original/Simon & Schuster.
- Devereux, Paul & Jahn, Robert G. (1996). Preliminary investigations and cognitive considerations of the acoustical resonances of selected archaeological sites. *Antiquity*, 70, 269.
- Gell, Alfred (1995). The language of the forest: Landscape and phonological iconism in Umeda. *The Anthropology of Landscape*. Eds. Eric Hirsch & Michael O'Hanlon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jahn, Robert G., Devereux, Paul and Ibison, Michael (1996). Acoustical resonances of assorted ancient structures. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 99, 2.
- Jaynes, Julian (1976). *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Lee, Desmond, translation. (1965, 1967). *Plato: Timaeus and Critias*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Otto, Rudolf (1924). *The Idea of the Holy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tilley, Christopher (1994). *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. Berg, Oxford and Providence.
- Thomas, Julian (1993). The politics of vision and the archaeologies of landscape. In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Ed. Barbara Bender. Berg, Oxford and Providence.
- Walter, E.V. (1988). *Placeways*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

[Expanded from a paper delivered at the "Return to the Source" conference, University of Delaware, 1996.]