Re: Scientist Says Concrete Was Used in Pyramids

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2006−12/msg00626.html

- *From*: Eric Stevens <eric.stevens@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sat, 16 Dec 2006 11:49:17 +1300

On Fri, 15 Dec 2006 16:14:27 +0100, firstname@xxxxxxxxxxxx (Florian)
wrote:

> David Johnson <trolleyfan_nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
>
> > Have you in fact _not_ been reading what others have been posting? Or
> > are you just so wedded to this idea, that you refuse to let it sink
> > through?
>
> Your comment was vague. I need accurate arguments to reply.
>
> > So, why:
>
> See, it worked :−)
>
> > 1) Probably 95% of the (physcial) effort involved in building the
> > pyramid is moving the material around. Two−and−a−half ton blocks or
> > two−and−a−half tons of "concrete" mix, it doesn't matter − it takes the
> > same effort. Unfortunately for "concrete", you not only have to move the
> > "mix", but the water to mix it as well − around 15−20% of freshly mixed
> > concrete is water. That means for every two−and−a−half tons of mix you
> > now have to _also_ move half a ton of water.
> >
> > Or, IOW, you've just increased the amount of material needed to be moved
> > by 20% or so. When that's all being moved by man−power without so much
> > as a wheelbarrow, this is _so_ less than good.
>
> The reconstituted limestone is a wet premix which does not contain as

much water as today's concrete => the overweight is negligible,
especially when you consider that a fraction of the pyramid was made of
casted blocks. Moreover, advantages of casting blocks largely balance
the reconstituted limestone "overweight". See below.