Does the Superstition Tablets contain a form of a triptych?

The focus of this essay is an exploration of the possibility that a portion of the Superstition Tablets which - using the Robinson/Reyes theory of the Superstition Tablets - could be a modified form of a “triptych”. What is a “triptych”? Using the Wikipedia definition:

A triptych (/ˈtriptɪk/ TRIP-tik; from a Greek adjective meaning "three-fold"), from tri, i.e., "three" and ptyso, i.e., "to fold" or ptyx, i.e., "fold")[1][2] is a work of art (usually a panel painting) that is divided into three sections, or three carved panels that are hinged together and can be folded shut or displayed open. It is therefore a type of polyptych, the term for all multi-panel works. The middle panel is typically the largest and it is flanked by two smaller related works, although there are triptychs of equal-sized panels.

The triptych form arises from early Christian art, and was a popular standard format for altar paintings from the Middle Ages (RAR note: Middle Ages, or Medieval period, lasted from the 5th to the 15th century) onwards. Its geographical range was from the eastern Byzantine churches to the Celtic churches in the west. Renaissance painters such as Hans Memling and Hieronymus Bosch used the form. Sculptors also used it.

An example of a triptych from the Columbia University web site is:

Guennol Triptych 12th century
While not going into any interpretation of the work - which is beyond my capability, it should be noted that the side panels have a strong relationship to the concept expressed in the center panel. The center panel concerns the Passion of Christ and the side panels portray two trumpet-blowing angels, awaking the dead to the Last Judgment.

A modern example of a triptych which highlights the strong relationship between the “action” in the center panel and the side panels free of religious allegorical symbolism is shown below. However, this example appears not to include all the concepts of a triptych (e.g. the panels do not appear to be hinged):

In this example, taken from the web site kpruett10.blogspot.com, one can clearly see how the two side panels are related to the center panel.
So what does this have to do with the Superstition Tablets?

In previous discussions on the Robinson/Reyes theory of the Superstition Tablets, two stone faces (THREE & CAVITY), while, according to the theory, represent three distinct but related geographical areas, has always been portrayed - logically - with the two stone faces fitted together as shown in the following figure:

However, while taking into consideration the fixed nature of the stones as compared to a typical hinged triptych, it is possible to postulate that the author(s) of the tablets created this section of the tablets with the triptych art form in mind. Such speculations are important if one is attempting to understand the mind set of the author or authors of the tablets. Questions like: “What intellectual traditions was the author familiar with?” or “What areas of knowledge did he possess?” or “What language is used to communicate an idea?”, are important considerations in this regards and are necessary if one tries to create a portrait of the author. In the final question in the above sentence, the term “language” is used in the sense of a device(s) used to translate an “idea” into a form in which it can be communicated from point A to point B (A and B could be individuals communicating or perhaps a method for the preservation and transfer of knowledge from one time period to another).
So, if the stone faces were created with the concept of a triptych in mind, what would it look like as three panels? Below is my attempt to create such a triptych:

![Triptych Diagram](image)

Stone faces as a triptych

In this case, the center panel focuses on a continuous geological area leading from the bottom into the CAVITY stone and the two side panels are connected to the central panel - at a minimum - by the Gila river and most probably by other considerations known by the author. The panel on the left is the geographical area of the Casa Grande Ruins and the right panel is the geographical area near Grayback Mountain. With this arrangement, the central panel has one constant scale factor which is much larger than the two side panels. According to the Robinson/Reyes theory, the distance between two dots on the doted line on the central panel is one Spanish league or 2.6 miles so that line would be 36 miles long (the distance between the Salt and Gila rivers - as the crow flies - is about 38-40 miles). However, in the Casa Grande Ruins panel, the area represents only about one mile in the east-west direction and the “mountain” alignment symbol represents the view to the north with no distance expressed except by knowing the distance to the objects represented. The Casa Grande Ruin, according to Padre Font’s 1775 report, is 420 feet in the north-south direction and 260 feet in the east-west direction so the symbol is drawn larger than the scale factor of the scene which is a consistent technique used by the author of the tablets when designating an object of importance (note similar examples in the central panel). The right panel similarly represents a smaller area near Grayback Mountain. According to my measurements the Grayback Mountain symbol represents about 1.2 miles in the east-west direction and the top of the F symbol is in the range of 2 miles from the Gila River.

Using the concept of separate isolated panels for the Casa Grande area which is approximately 21 miles west of South Butte in the central panel and the Grayback Mountain panel where Grayback Mountain is about 6 miles east of South Butte would facilitate using different scale factors for the two areas and perhaps indicate that the two areas have a connected but unique purpose or function related to the central panel - a philosophy associated with triptych art.
While such suggestions and postulates may or may not be correct or verifiable, it seems to me that such exercises are an important part of any evaluation process of a historical nature where dynamics of action cannot always be traced to causal effects.
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