

## Re: Meteoric and Cometary impacts in historical times – Observations in History

**Source:** <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004–11/0134.html>

---

**From:** Eric Stevens (*eric.stevens\_at\_sum.co.nz*)

**Date:** 11/01/04

Date: Tue, 02 Nov 2004 09:47:34 +1300

On Mon, 01 Nov 2004 10:25:17 GMT, Joe Jefferson  
<jjstrshp@mindspring.com> wrote:

>

>*Eric Stevens wrote:*

>>

>> *On Sun, 31 Oct 2004 23:01:57 GMT, Joe Jefferson*

>> *<jjstrshp@mindspring.com> wrote:*

>>

>> *>Eric Stevens wrote:*

>> >>

>> >> *On Wed, 27 Oct 2004 00:04:41 GMT, Joe Jefferson*

>> >> *<jjstrshp@mindspring.com> wrote:*

>> >>

>> >> >

>> >> *>None of this in any way contradicts what I said; that multiple*

>> >> *>Tunguska–size impacts, all visible from a single location and occurring*

>> >> *>within a human lifetime, probably has not occurred since the earliest*

>> >> *>days of the solar system.*

>> >>

>> >> *That's a conclusion which might be drawn from the experience of the*

>> >> *last few centuries. However, it is contradicted by the cratering*

>> >> *record and astronomical research.*

>> >

>> *>Ah but it isn't. The cratering record and astronomical research both*

>> *>\*strongly\* support my contention.*

>>

>> *I don't intend to turn this into an argument about the current state*

>> *of astronomical knowledge. I can only recommend you read some of the*

>> *more recently published works on the subject.*

>

>*You've got to be kidding. The material that I've read, and linked to, is*

>*more recent than the stuff you've posted.*

In this case, I recommend you don't rely only on what you find behind  
a URL.

>  
>> >> >> >> <snip of Hesiod quote>  
>> >> >> >  
>> >> >> >Very poetic, but how does this compare to the total body of Greek  
>> >> >> >religious texts from that era?  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >> Possibly in much the same way that an eyewitness account of 9/11  
>> >> >> compares to the total body of US religious texts.  
>> >> >>  
>> >> >You know better than to say something like that. Hesiod never claims his  
>> >> >\_Theogony\_ is an eyewitness account of *\*anything\**. It is a religious  
>> >> >work from beginning to end, which Hesiod himself attributes to divine  
>> >> >inspiration.  
>> >>  
>> >> It's a religious work in that it is talking about battles between the  
>> >> gods. Real physical 'gods' which could be seen.  
>> >>  
>> >But which were *\*not\** seen by him, or by any human being he'd ever met.  
>> >Hesiod explicitly credits his story to divine inspiration.  
>>  
>> See <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/OMACL/Hesiod/theogony.html>  
>  
>Thanks, but I don't need an online reference for Hesiod. I've got him on  
>my bookshelf (the Athanassakis translation). However, if I were going to  
>radically challenge the mainstream interpretation of his works I  
>wouldn't use anybody's translation; I would base my arguments on the  
>Greek text.

I have two problems with that. I don't know ancient Greek. Neither does my keyboard use it. :-)

But seriously, I agree with you. However, I don't think the argument hangs on details of translation so much as the interpretation of the underlying allegory.

>  
>> "(ll. 139–146) And again, she bare the Cyclopes, overbearing in  
>> spirit, Brontes, and Steropes and stubborn–hearted Arges (6), who  
>> gave Zeus the thunder and made the thunderbolt: in all else they  
>> were like the gods, but one eye only was set in the midst of  
>> their fore–heads. And they were surnamed Cyclopes (Orb–eyed)  
>> because one orbed eye was set in their foreheads. Strength and  
>> might and craft were in their works.  
>>  
>> (ll. 147–163) And again, three other sons were born of Earth and  
>> Heaven, great and doughty beyond telling, Cottus and Briareos and  
>> Gyes, presumptuous children. From their shoulders sprang an  
>> hundred arms, not to be approached, and each had fifty heads upon  
>> his shoulders on their strong limbs, and irresistible was the  
>> stubborn strength that was in their great forms. For of all the  
>> children that were born of Earth and Heaven, these were the most  
>> terrible, and they were hated by their own father from the first.

>>

>> *And he used to hide them all away in a secret place of Earth so  
>> soon as each was born, and would not suffer them to come up into  
>> the light: and Heaven rejoiced in his evil doing. But vast Earth  
>> groaned within, being straitened, and she made the element of  
>> grey flint and shaped a great sickle, and told her plan to her  
>> dear sons. And she spoke, cheering them, while she was vexed in  
>> her dear heart:"*

>>

>> *If you have read 'The Cosmic Serpent' you would be aware of Clube and  
>> Napiers cometary interpretation of all of this.*

>>

>> *Consider the Cyclopes – 'one orbed eye was set in their foreheads'.*

>

>*Giant one-eyed people. Yeah, that sounds \*so\* much like a meteor.*

Comet.

>

>> *Then ' From their shoulders sprang an hundred arms, not to be  
>> approached, and each had fifty heads upon his shoulders on their  
>> strong limbs'.*

>

>*The hecatonchieres. I don't think it would be possible to take enough  
>drugs to make a meteor impact look like that.*

Comet.

>

>> *And then, but not so immediately obvious, 'shaped a great sickle'.*

>

>*of grey flint.*

>

>> *The interesting thing is that as Clube and Napier point out, in one  
>> form or another all these things (and many others) may be found in the  
>> theology of many widespread religions of that time.*

>

>*Yes, that "one form or another" is crucial. It allows you to twist and  
>reinterpret as much as you want to try and make the facts fit your theory.*

On 28/10/2004 you wrote of Clube and Napier "The "problem" they try to solve in the book, is what replenishes the material from which comets are formed. They have a mechanism to explain this that tries to suggest we are in an unusually quiet period of impactors as the reservoir is somewhat depleted" ... which suggested you had read the book. I now don't believe you have. All I can do is suggest that you do actually read it as, with its references and citations, it answers you criticism.

>

>> *This is not*

>> *'divine inspiration'. It is a widespread retelling of events almost  
>> beyond comprehension to the people of that time.*

>

>And as evidence for this remarkable claim you offer... nothing at all.

>

>> >> *Exactly what were the*

>> >> *gods? Why is there so much in common between the earliest descriptions*

>> >> *of the gods of Scandinavia, Greece, Israel, Egypt, Mesopotamia, India*

>> >> *and possibly even China? Is it possible that they share a common*

>> >> *inspiration and if so, what was the inspiration?*

>> >

>> >*Is it \*possible\* that they share a common inspiration? Of course it's*

>> >*possible. But possible is a very long way from likely, and you have to*

>> >*get at least as far as likely before you know enough about the*

>> >*commonalities to even make a start at trying to identify the source.*

>>

>> *You haven't read the book, have you? Nor have you read anything else*

>> *on the subject. I'm not trying to be derogatory but I suggest you do*

>> *read some of the publications I've listed. It may help modify your*

>> *views.*

>

>*Eric, every post you make is making me \*less\* inclined to read that*

>*book. So far you haven't managed to come up with anything that rises*

>*above the level of Erich von Daniken.*

Try looking at some of the following links. I've selected them both for their shortness and leading to a site which sets out their field of interest. Most of the URLs are from the Cambridge Conference site at <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/cambproc.htm> .

Mike Ballie <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/baillie.htm>

Mark Bailey <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/bailey.htm>

Victor Clube <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/clube.htm>

John S. Lewis <http://www.lpl.arizona.edu/faculty/lewis2.html>

Bruce Masse <http://atlas-conferences.com/cgi-bin/abstract/caiq-36>

Bill Napier <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/napier.htm>

Duncan Steel [http://www.edge.org/3rd\\_culture/bios/steel.html](http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/bios/steel.html) (see also <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/steel2.htm> )

Gerrit Verschuur <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/abstract/verschur.htm>

>

>> >> >*If you want to argue that it was influenced by something*

>> >> >*Hesiod experienced, then go ahead and make that argument, but don't*

>> >> >*waste bandwidth with silly comparisons to eyewitness accounts of modern events.*

>> >>

>> >> >*Why not? It is likely that Hesiod either saw some of these events or*

>> >> >*relied on eyewitness accounts.*

>> >

>> > *Given that there's no evidence that those events ever actually happened,*

>>

>> *But in the orbit of comet Encke, there is definitely evidence that*

>> *they could have happened.*

>

> *Could have, you say. But not that they actually \*did\* happen.*

<http://www.innerx.net/personal/tsmith/encke.html>

"the Earth passes through each dense part of this belt of debris every 3000 years".

It is inconceivable that the earth could have passed through these streams without being subject to multiple impact.

>

>> *Further, there is an enormous amount of*

>> *apocryphal writing which suddenly becomes intelligible if one views it*

>> *in that light.*

>

> *If also becomes intelligible if one views it in the light of*

> *psychoactive drug use, or depth psychology, or dream interpretation, or*

> *any of a hundred other modern frameworks.*

You forgot shamanism.

The astronomical evidence is that these events have happened. While all these other explanations have been offered up in the past they fail to explain the very widely spread common aspects of what up till now has been regarded as 'mythology'. The only reason an astronomical explanation has never previously been offered is that we are only now beginning to properly understand the phenomenon.

>

>> > *I'd say it's extremely unlikely that he actually witnessed them.*

>> > *Particularly when Hesiod himself never claims to have seen them. If*

>> > *you're going to take Hesiod's descriptions of events seriously, why do*

>> > *you not do the same with his account of how he got the information?*

>>

>> *I am allowing him some poetic license. :-)*

>

> *So basically, you reinterpret what he says in order to fit your theory,*

> *then hold up that "fit" as evidence for your theory.*

No. The basic theory stands without Hesiod. What I'm proposing (and its not even my proposal) is that Hesiod's Theogony was inspired by real events experienced by real people. Not having the faintest idea of what really was happening, the ancient greeks expressed it in terms of gods in the sky (as did the Egyptians, Mesopotamians, Jews, Indians, Norse etc).

>

>> >

>> >> *There*

>>> *is far too much material to enable the subject to be properly covered*  
>>> *in a mere news group article. However, Clube and Napier have*  
>>> *identified the many points common to such a wide range of accounts.*  
>>>  
>>> *That's very nice, but I thought you said that Clube and Napier were*  
>>> *astronomers. That's hardly the specialty I'd go to for a detailed*  
>>> *understanding of classical literature.*  
>>>  
>>> *It might be if you are looking for an astronomical interpretation.*  
>>>  
>>> *Not even then. In fact, especially not then, because I wouldn't be*  
>>> *looking for a particular interpretation at all. It's been my experience*  
>>> *that if you approach a work with that mindset you can always find some*  
>>> *way to read your interpretation into the text.*

Their approach stemmed from the fact that once the data came in they started to realise the implications for human history and looked for evidence in the historical record.

>>>> *I*  
>>>> *can't give you a detailed survey of the territory but I can tell you*  
>>>> *where to find maps. The two best map guides I know are the Clube and*  
>>>> *Napier work, and the proceedings of the 1997 Cambridge conference*  
>>>> *described at <http://www.knowledge.co.uk/sis/cambproc.htm>*  
>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *\* A more accurate translation may just be 'bolt'.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Based on what, exactly?*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *Some translations leave out the 'thunder' bit and just stick with*  
>>>>>>> *'bolt'. I understand that 'bolt' is a more accurate translation of the*  
>>>>>>> *older writings. I can't give you a reference off the cuff but I have*  
>>>>>>> *several times noticed that while one transtaion will say 'thunder*  
>>>>>>> *bolt' an other will merely say 'bolt'. Mind you, the ancient authors*  
>>>>>>> *could have been justified to use the term 'thunder' to describe the*  
>>>>>>> *sound of*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *IOW, you don't know what the original Greek term actually means, you're*  
>>>>>>> *just making a guess based on the way some (unnamed) translators have*  
>>>>>>> *handled a religious poem.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *In many case, the translators don't seem to know what the term*  
>>>>>>> *actually means either. Otherwise there would not be the differences in*  
>>>>>>> *translation.*  
>>>>>>>  
>>>>>>> *That doesn't follow. Translators have to balance the formally correct*  
>>>>>>> *translation with an artistically correct rendering in the new language.*  
>>>>>>> *Some translations are so technically accurate that they're unreadable.*  
>>>>>>> *Others are paraphrases. Most fall somewhere in between. And if you're*  
>>>>>>> *going to challenge any accepted translation without having a very*  
>>>>>>> *thorough understanding of the language in question, don't be surprised*

>> > *if you're dismissed as a kook.*

>>

>> *I'm not challenging any particular translation. I'm pointing out the*

>> *apparent substitution of 'lightning bolt' for 'bolt' or even 'thunder*

>> *bolt'.*

>

> *Okay, you've pointed it out. But you haven't established that it means*

> *anything. Or that you even bothered to ask one of those translators*

> *whether or not it means anything.*

It may be more evidence that more recent translators have not understood exactly what it was that ancient authors were writing about. That's not surprising as we have no comparable recent experience and the knowledge of what has happened in the past is only now beginning to permeate through academic circles.

>

>> >> >> > *(And I think we are entitled to doubt that anybody has ever*

>> >> >> > *seen all the trees around them in a forest literally "flash into flame*

>> >> >> > *at the same instant" and survive to tell us about it.)*

>> >> >>

>> >> >> *I've spent quite a few years in the forest industry and do know*

>> >> >> *something of forest fires. In the right conditions fires advance in*

>> >> >> *leaps and bounds and large areas of tinder dry forest can burst into*

>> >> >> *flame more or less simultaneously. I agree few unprotected people*

>> >> >> *caught in this can survive but it is more common for the observer hear*

>> >> >> *this as the fire moves towards or around them*

>> >> >

>> >> > *Just out of curiosity, what percentage of forest fires that you've*

>> >> > *experience have been associated with meteor impacts? What percentage*

>> >> > *have been started by lightning?*

>> >>

>> >> *None by meteors. None by lightning. One from machinery. Five by arson.*

>> >> *One by a runaway cooking fire (illegal).*

>> >

>> > *None by lightning? That's interesting. I live in Southern California*

>> > *where wildfires are common, and here lightning is the number one*

>> > *non-human cause.*

>>

>> *You asked about my personal experience. Nobody needs an investigator*

>> *if the fire has been started by lightning.*

>

> *True enough. I didn't realize you were an investigator. I thought you'd*

> *been out there actually fighting the fires.*

Forensic engineer. I investigate fires among other things. I also have direct experience of forest fires from the days of yore when I worked in the timber industry but I have no idea of what started them.

Eric Stevens