

## Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-02/msg00390.html>

---

- *From:* Doug Weller <[dweller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dweller@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 13 Feb 2008 18:10:36 +0000
- 

On Wed, 13 Feb 2008 05:46:12 -0800 (PST), in sci.archaeology, J.LyonLayden wrote:

On Feb 13, 4:38 am, Doug Weller <[dwel...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:dwel...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Tue, 12 Feb 2008 16:50:33 -0800 (PST), in sci.archaeology, J.LyonLayden wrote:

snip

I believe you. I know Kris and I knew that if she looked at the article again she would update it. So, yes, I wrote to her explaining that her post was being used to support the idea of giants (right?).

How fair. You have her email and can frame the "reasons" for your insistance any way you like, whereas I do not have the opportunity to present my case. She probably doesn't really care one way or the other. After all, it's POSSIBLE that cro-magnon wasn't as tall as it looks like he was from the evidence before 26,000 BC. It is CONCEIVABLE that all those tall skeletons we found were not the norm and due to lack of enough bones we cannot safely make the assertion

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

that they were any taller than we are now...

I have her email not just because it's on About.com but because we are in touch fairly regularly.

I sent her an url to the thread as I know context is important and I didn't want her to only see a bit of it that I chose.

I asked her where she got the 6'4" figure pointing out that the ones I found were different.

And in particular, I said I wasn't happy about her having an article with the title saying we don't use the word Cro Magnon anymore and then she continues to use it in the article to describe anatomically modern humans.

I tried very hard to be fair. If I wasn't trying to be fair I wouldn't have sent her the url to the thread.

But c'mon Doug you know it is most probable that cro-magnon was taller and more robust than us. You also know that we are taller and more robust than we have been in perhaps 1000 years due to modern medicine finally compensating for the malnutrition resultant of agriculture and civilization.

Certainly you acknowledge some difference in stature between the first malnourished agriculturalists and the last of the robust huntergatherers, long before the hunter gatherers were pushed into the less fertile lands and hence suffered from malnutrition as well?

Is that what this argument is about? Since I agree than why are we arguing?

Because it is perfectly conceivable that a population of cro-magnon could have averaged well over 6 feet, and you are taking away my support for that idea!!

As far as I'm concerned, a 6'4 wild man with a stronger build than any wrestler alive today who laughs when I hit him in the skull with a club because his skull is so thick is a GIANT, especially if I am 5'4 and used to farming and not fighting.

I have friggin stories to write that depend on this information. I

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

need quotes from scientist, not research papers that my readers can't understand!!

Ah, I see the problem. Let me think.

It really isn't a conspiracy. I was unhappy with the way she had a title that said Why we don't call them Cro-Magnon any more and yet continued to refer to Cro-Magnon, and pointed out that she needed to check on more current information about height.

Which she proolly didn't do and instead took your "It takes a Village" policing for granted and did the ol' delete/copy/paste. She certainly didn't go out and remeasure specimens in a days time.

Now you are being unfair to her without any evidence. What did she copy and paste from?

In a 2nd post (and last before her revised article) I sent her this:

"

Early investigators were impressed by the stature of Cro-Magnon man, as some reconstructions suggest that the Old Man of Cro-Magnon may have been as much as 190 centimetres (six feet three inches) tall. A restudy, however, suggests that the stature of the original Cro-Magnon remains varied from 166 to 171 centimetres (five feet five inches to five feet seven inches). The stature of several skeletons from the Grimaldi Caves (in Italy, near the French frontier), which show clear affinities to those of Cro-Magnon, was noticeably greater, with an average height of 177 centimetres. It is thus reasonable to conclude that, on the whole, the Cro-Magnon peoples were relatively tall.

So what the scientist who gave the measurement of 190 couldn't read a measuring tape when they stretched it across a femur?

If they were relatively tall, then at least some specimens must be taller than 171 centimeters, or they wouldn't be tall at all! They'd be average height!

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

If all you have is a femur, or a skull, etc -- not unusual at all -- you have to make assumptions. Note please that we are talking about fossils from a limited area (in relation to your people roaming the world).

When it is possible and logical to believe that modern humans reach 7 foot in height, it is impossible and illogical to believe that cro-magnon never ever no never got taller than 171 centimeters.

Agreed.

\

<http://clanrossi.com/Cromagnon.htm>  
which is from the Britannica.

No references though, but the author was Henri J. Delporte Préhistorien french born in Tourcoing in 1920 and died in Lesigneux (Loire) in 2002. Instituteur à dix-neuf ans, Henri Delporte devient professeur d'histoire et géographie à Arras, puis à Montbrison. Instituteur nineteen years, Henri Delporte became a professor of history and geography at Arras, then in Montbrison. Devoir expliquer marquera toutes ses activités. Duty will explain all its activities. Sur ses différents chantiers de fouilles, il recrute couramment trente ou quarante participants. On its various excavation, it recruits commonly thirty or forty participants. Il les forme patiemment, sévèrement parfois. Lorsqu'il devient directeur du musée des Antiquités nationales de Saint-Germain-en-Laye en 1966, il modifie profondément les rapports entre le musée et la recherche.(...) He patiently form, severely parfois. Lorsqu he became director of the National Museum of Antiquities in Saint-Germain-en-Laye in 1966, it profoundly changed the relationship between the museum and research ."

OK? Still tall, right?

In her article, she writes this:

"The physical characteristics of Early Modern Human are quite similar to modern humans, although perhaps a bit more robust, particularly seen in femora--the leg bones. The differences, which are slight, have been attributed to the shift away from long distance hunting strategies to sedentism and agriculture.

Ridiculous. Why don't modern hunter gatherers have robust bones?  
I have seen a study that says that aborigines have the thickest skulls

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

of modern humans, but that most likely has more to do with their isolation than with their life style.

You need to find out why they said that before saying it is ridiculous.

A recent study by Trent Holliday comparing early and late Upper Paleolithic skeletal materials provided an average male height of 170 centimeters (early) and 168 centimeters (late), and average female height of 157.6 cm (early) and 158.4 (late). However, Formicola and Giannecchini's data revealed that "EUP males are much taller (176.2 cm) and LUP shorter (165.6 cm), with an average difference of 10.6 cm. Similarly EUP females (162.9 cm) largely exceed LUP females (153.5 cm)."

I think the jury is still out. "

Which is not what I sent her.

Note the 'much taller'. Why do you have a problem with that?

Well I don't. But I also want quotes about the really tall ones. An average means there were some taller and some shorter than 176.2. And I think 176.2 is prolly a conservative estimate, basing it on proposed height/limb ratios that may or may not be entirely correct.

Well, that could go either way, but you are getting the point. But if you want something specific, you may be asking too much of the limited material to work with.

Sorry if you weren't clear, that's why it says 'updated' in the subject line, the article was updated.

As you have probably guessed, it is rare to find a complete skeleton and over time, for a species in a given time period, you will find different figures for something like height which has to be estimated from the

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

material that is available.

So now you want the estimate to be over a WHOPPING  
40,000 years  
instead of even the first 10,000 so that no one will be able to  
use  
the word giant anymore and you'll be finally, utterly  
vindicated for  
your suppositions.

Ridiculous. And even with those estimates, look at what Kris has written  
— early taller than later.

I think the idea of giants comes from a  
variety of sources, some being  
confusing fossils such as leg bones of other  
mammals with human fossils,  
some being the fact that there are 'sports',  
extremely tall people, etc,  
plus an explanation for giant ruins, etc.

That's what YOU think. Could we please be allowed to think  
as well  
without having the information sifted to us through a grate so  
that we  
won't get any ideas of our own?

A variety of sources. Are you really claiming only one source, which is  
what you seem to be doing. Because one of my 'sources' above is tall  
people. I still think that another origin of the idea of giants is as an  
explanation of who did things like raised the stones for Stonehenge,  
dolmens all over, etc. Evidently a large stone in Scandinavia was called  
the 'throw of the giant's. But yes, tall people are undoubtedly a source.

But Nephilim? Nah, they aren't  
any more real than those giants with double  
rows of teeth.

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

How do you have any idea? You don't even know what a nephelim IS, or what the word meant to those ancient people.

No, but I don't think that something written down about 2500 years ago can be used as 'real'.

Well since a lot of it has been shown to be correct with mentioned civilizations of the time, can't we refrain from throwing it out prematurely for the off-chance that it might provide a hint or clue?

Oh, no need to throw it out, just a need not to make it a key building block of an edifice.

Now I don't know how keen I am on oral legends lasting 10000 years, but still, how about this scenario:

Sure you don't think the earliest scroll found is the earliest scroll written, with all the prime real estate being swallowed up from 10,000 to 6,000

No idea where scrolls come into this.

Your Natufians, averaging around 5'5", run into a group of people averaging around 5'10" with of course some quite a bit taller -- over 6'6" for a couple perhaps, who knows? Hell, Robert Pershing Wadlow never ever stopped growing and when he died at 22 he was less than an inch to being 9 feet tall. He was called the Alton Giant and for good reason. But that was a medical problem. It could have happened in the past and you'd not only have had people who had seen such a person but for a while the whole skeleton.

There's a guy 8' 6" in the Ukraine, again a medical problem.

Anyway, back to the Natufians. They run into these taller people and the story lives on. Different labels are put on the people and they are fitted into different tales at different times. And they, maybe, are the source of the 'Nephilim'. But they weren't taller than people are today

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated  
in a number of Western countries.

No but they are as tall as the tallest and much bigger and stronger.

Who 'they'? If they met the Natufians, they aren't Cro Magnon.

But hold on -- look what I've done. And you've done.

The Nephilim giants?

Hm, let's look at the Bible.

I've got the New English Bible. Genesis Chapter 6. Oops, no giants.

'They were the heroes of old, men of renown'. But no comments on their height.

From the web English Standard version:

"6:1 When man began to multiply on the face of the land and daughters were born to them, 2 the sons of God saw that the daughters of man were attractive. And they took as their wives any they chose. 3 Then the Lord said, "My Spirit shall not abide in [1] man forever, for he is flesh: his days shall be 120 years." 4 The Nephilim [2] were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of man and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men who were of old, the men of renown."

No giants there either although some Bible version do have them.

Yes old Bibles interpreted nephelim as "giant" but from what i understand not all Nephelim were giants, just some families of them.

In the Bible? I think that is later tales.

Don't despaire:

Numbers:

But Caleb quieted the people before Moses and said, "Let us go up at once and occupy it, for we are well able to overcome it." 31 Then the men who had gone up with him said, "We are not able to go up against the people, for they are stronger than we are." 32 So they brought to the people of Israel a bad report of the land that they had spied out, saying, "The land, through which we have gone to spy it out, is a land that devours its inhabitants, and all the people that we saw in it are of great height. 33

Re: Kris Hirst's page on Why Don't We Call Them Cro-Magnon Anymore? updated

And there we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak, who come from the Nephilim), and ...

read more >>

---

Doug Weller ---

A Director and Moderator of The Hall of Ma'at <http://www.hallofmaat.com>

Doug's Archaeology Site: <http://www.ramtops.co.uk>

Amun - co-owner/co-moderator <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Amun/>

.