

Cigán, Michal

## Methodology

In: Cigán, Michal. *Priest-king of the warriors and witch-queen of the others : cargo cult and witch hunt in Indo-European myth and reality*. First published Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2019, pp. 33-34

ISBN 978-80-210-9341-6; ISBN 978-80-210-9342-3 (online : pdf)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/141685>

Access Date: 28. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

## 4 METHODOLOGY

For the discipline of IECM suggestions proposed by W. E. Paden (1988) seem to be methodologically useful. In comparative cross-cultural studies, he recommended applying the dialectics of *local meaning* (meaning-for-insider) and *generalizing meaning* (meaning-for-comparativist) of the analyzed phenomenon. O. Sládek, evaluating Paden's concept (2002), suggests the term *intracultural* for the first and *intercultural* for the latter. According to Paden, comparative work should start with observation and interpretation of analyzed phenomenon within its local context. Only secondarily can it be compared with locally observed and interpreted phenomena of other cultural traditions in order to propose its generalizing comparative interpretation.

As noted above, one can question the competence of the anthropologist to enter the mind of the informant in order to interpret the way he or she, as an insider, truly perceives his own culture. However, Paden's methodology, when creatively upgraded and deprived of so unrealistic an expectation, can form a solid methodological ground for IECM. The discipline is intercultural by its nature; compared are myths of different periods and locations. In fact, there is nothing like "IE culture".

At first, there is the need to analyze and interpret every mythological text of the chosen comparative set intraculturally, within the specific conditions of its time and place. If the texts are proven to be interpretatively compatible, i.e. they really seem to speak more or less the same, they can be compared mutually, interculturaly. This two-step examination is required especially in the cases of subtle comparative situations, when a comparative set consists only of a few texts. On the contrary, its necessity declines when the rich portfolio of texts is available.

## Theoretical Background

The philological work with original text and its further interpretation reflecting three types of context (situation, sujet and tradition) and two analytical axes (contextual /macro-, mezzo-, micro-/ and ontological /history, genetics/) forms the core of intracultural phase of comparison.

The point of second, intercultural comparative step is to abstract and interpolate PIE textual muster out of comparative set of texts and suggest its interpretation related to its reconstructed (P)IE context. In this phase there is also a place for etymological analysis.