

Angel Briseno

Sumayyah Jewell

Brian Ochoa

Adam Zachcarzuk

Giants in the world

Our debate focuses on the relationship between giants in myth/folklore and in archaeology. One side will be arguing that giants are real in mythology and archaeology while the other side will argue against it. Each side will present their views and points with the support of different sources to defend their positions.

Perspective one: There is no argument that giants exist in mythology, folklore, and religions, each one with a cultural background of their own, but existing human or human like giants in the past is all very much a confusion of religious and cultural perspectives. What humans might have perceived as superhuman/supernatural/godlike giant humans, were most likely human beings who suffered from a benign tumor to the pituitary gland that causing excess growth hormones to be released. Another point of view is that humans who held positions of power in the society were exaggerated to the point of being giants. With presented evidence such as tools and fossils for the existence of giants, many of such evidence can have its legitimacy questioned.

Perspective two: Giants were real being that cohabitated in the same places as normal sized humans. Although there is a lack of hard remains lefts from the archaeological record we still hold a position that giants influenced culture some parts of ancient life. Based on archaeological evidence along with ancient historical texts there are a basis of truth behind myth of giants.

Tool Fakes

There was also a mass grave of giants reported to have been found in Southeastern Turkey in the 1950's whose leg bones were measured at nearly four feet tall from hip joint to knee. It is interesting to note that while many of these findings claim to be documented, it is difficult to find anything concrete. It certainly isn't helped by deliberate hoaxes such as the giant skeleton that was said to have been uncovered in the Arabian desert. Reported as fact, even sometimes to this day, it was actually a contest entry for a convincing photograph of an archaeological find.

Gigantism

Gigantism is a condition characterized by excessive growth and height significantly above average. In humans, this condition is caused by over-production of growth hormone in childhood before the long bone epiphyses (growth plates) close, resulting in individuals between 7 feet and 9 feet in height. The term is typically applied to those whose height is not just in the upper 1 per cent of the population but several standard deviations above mean for persons of the same sex, age, and ethnic

ancestry. Gigantism is usually caused by a tumor on the pituitary gland of the brain, although in some cases the condition can be passed on genetically through a mutated gene

Giant Tool making Australia

In old Pleistocene river gravels near Bathurst, N.S.W. huge stone artifacts-clubs, pounders, adzes, chisels, knives and hand-axes-all of tremendous weight, lie scattered over a wide area. A fossicker searching the Winburndale River north of Bathurst discovered a large quartzitized fossil human molar tooth, far too big for any normal modern human. A similar molar of chert fossilization was also recovered from ancient deposits near Dubbo, N.S.W. Prospectors working in the Bathurst district over 40 years ago frequently reported coming across large human footprints in shoals of red jasper. Some of these have been rediscovered over the years and give every appearance of being of great antiquity. The point raised by these discoveries is that there once existed on the Australian continent giant tool-making hominids who preceded the aborigines (Austroloids) by many thousands of years. For, it is certain that the aborigines were never the first inhabitants of this continent. Even they admit in their ancient folklore that this land was inhabited by many races of man, as well as giants, long before them.

Aborigines of Australian continent

Every form of life that has existed upon this earth has gone through it's 'giant' period. There have been giant plants, giant insects, giant reptiles, birds and fish. Why not also giant humans? From the excavations of Professor J. Mulvaney in south-western New South Wales it is now established that aboriginal man inhabited Australia at least 40,000 years ago. It is now also accepted that the aborigines co-existed with many now long extinct marsupial species in a lush, tropical environment at a time when the northern part of our continent was connected to mainland Asia by a land- bridge, of which the islands of South-East Asia are but a surviving remnant. This bridge was submerged toward the end of the last great ice-age, perhaps 20,000 years ago when the melting ice throughout the world raised the ocean levels a further 300 feet or more, inundating large tracts of low-lying land. Thus the aborigines were isolated on the Australian continent.

Pre Aboriginal Races

Just how long ago our earliest inhabitants appeared is still very much a mystery. Australian archaeology is still in its infancy and it may be many years before we know the full story of the earliest people to inhabit this continent. As an open minded field archaeologist I have never been able to accept the 'traditional' view that our only first inhabitants were the aborigines. Spurred on by this belief, many years ago I began extensive field investigations and excavations in the hope of unearthing supporting evidence for my theory. My first thought was that if races of man had indeed occupied this continent before the appearance of the aborigines, evidence for their prior existence would have to be found from areas which would have supported life during the period prior to the know appearance of the aborigines.

Rex Gilroy test digs

A test dig was soon begun on the east bank deposits, unearthing a large chopper, a chisel and hand axe, displaying a basic similarity to those once used by Wadjak Man of Java. I soon established a second dig on the opposite (west) bank, and found implements displaying considerably more modern innovations in their knapping technique. No normal human hand could have held these implements with ease, most of them weighed anything from 8 to 10 lbs. Geological evidence indicated the former river level to be 100 ft. above this site, at the gorge, where I found more extensive deposits of large stone tools. All artifacts at these sites were of jasper (the hardest rock of this region) as well as silicate and chert.

Bathurst Stone Club



Half a mile away I found among other tools a great club weighing 21 lbs. Displaying a handle chipped out to form a gripping surface and thumb rest for a mighty hand larger than any living man's. By now I had not the slightest doubt that a race of giant hominids once occupied the Australian continent. Pondering these finds I asked myself if these sites represented three tool-type developmental phases in the history of the race of giant men, or did they represent three distinct races of giants? Over following months I numbered other sites, and at one of these, site 5, I recovered a huge hand-axe, 25 lbs. in

weight, which makes it the heaviest stone artifact yet found at Bathurst. My analysis of these digs can be summarized as follows.

The lower Level

"The Lower Phase": The site 2 artifacts had been considered to be the oldest culture site of the 'Bathurst Giants'. The site was given a date of 60,000 years, that is, until I discovered sites 4 and 6, both of which possessed identical stratified layers which could be accurately dated back 240,000 years. Not only have these findings indicated that the giants of the "Lower Phase" occupied the Bathurst district for a remarkable 180,000 years, but that sites 4 and 6 have provided the oldest stone-age artifacts so far discovered across the Australian continent.

The above findings provide evidence to prove the existence at Bathurst of three distinct races of tool-making giants, each of which introduced a new style of stone artifact manufacture. But just how tall were the Bathurst Giants? Many of the huge artifacts recovered from the Bathurst occupation sites weigh anything from 8, 10, 15, to 21 and 25 lbs., implements which only men of tremendous proportions could possibly have made and used. Estimates for the actual size of these men range from 10 to 12 ft. tall and over, weighing anything from 500 to 600 pounds or more. There were, however, even taller giants. From fossiliferous deposits north of bed 3 site 1, I excavated from a depth of 6 ft.

below the surface a fossil lower back molar tooth measuring 67 mm. in length by 50 mm. times 42 mm. across the crown.

From a reconstruction of the probable size of the original jaw from which this molar tooth came we arrive at a complete jaw of approximately 42 cms. in length, 36 cms. wide and with a depth of about 90 cm. The Cranium must therefore have been 60 cm. in length across the dome, by 21 cm. depth. Thus, the complete skull must have been 110cm. depth, about 36cm. wide and 60 cm. in length. Of course I wish my readers to regard these measurements as nothing more than suppositions. But, if my measurements are approximately correct, the enormous beast to whom this hypothetical skull belongs to would have been at least 25 ft. tall, weighing well over 1,000 lbs!

From Forrgetten Ages published by Dr J. R. Jochmans

Other Giant remains, from historic rather than prehistoric times, have been brought to light on practically every continent.

Against Pituitary Mutation

In 1969, construction workers excavating a site for a factory near Terracina, sixty miles from Rome, bulldozed into a pit containing a row of fifty tiled coffins. Each coffin contained a skeleton, all of which were between 6 and a half and 8 feet tall. State archaeologist Dr. Luigi Cavallucci, who analyzed the find, noted that the bones were remarkably well preserved, and all the specimens had been males, and in their forties when they died. The conservative suggestion that was that this had been A group of special Roman legionaries, chosen for their height. But there were a number of problems with this theory: First, the skeletons were not abnormally tall, due to pituitary overgrowth; rather, the bones were well proportioned and healthy--meaning they belonged to a truly giant race, and not of short Roman stock. Second, no Latin inscriptions were found with the remains to date them to the Roman period. In fact, no inscriptions were dug up whatsoever, leaving the age of the remains very much in question. And third, as researcher John T. Battle noted: "Roman soldiers were buried with their uniforms, armor, and weapons. Their military trappings were placed beside them in their coffins. But there was nothing in these coffins except the bones."

Fossil Finds And Remains

In neighboring Nevada, a number of giant remains have been discovered in and around Lovelock Cave near Lovelock, eighty miles northeast of Reno. In 1911 a guano mining operation began unearthing large bones and mummies of several individuals who had once stood between 6 and 1/2 and 9 feet in height. John T. Reid, one of the mining engineers and also an amateur archaeologist, attempted to get professors from the University of California to see the strange remains. Finally one did arrive, accompanied by another "authority" from New York. The two gathered potsherds and basketry, and later published an article on these--but they would not have a thing to do with the "nonconformist" giant bones. In 1931 more skeletons--this time 8 feet and 10 feet long--were brought to light from the Humboldt lake bed near the Lovelock Cave. These had been bandaged in a gum, covered cloth, like

Egyptian mummies. And in 1939, still another specimen, this one 7 feet 7 inches, was discovered on the Friedman Ranch near Lovelock itself.

Tragically, while various findings were all well-documented, the bones themselves were either eventually thrown away or in one case, a collection was destroyed by fire. Today, only a handful of the bones are kept by a private museum in Winnemucca.

Giants in cross cultures (native americans)

Why have so many giant remains been found in Wisconsin? It is noteworthy that the Sioux Indians have legends which claim that ages ago their forefathers slaughtered a race of giants in a battle in Minnesota. In fact many Indian legends throughout America recount how, before their people inhabited this land, a race of giants lived here, whom the Indians overwhelmed and wiped out in a war of genocide. Surprisingly, the Indian stories find confirmation in Greek, Hindu, Chinese and Incan literature.

Ancient text(Greek)

The most detailed account of the American giants and their migrations comes to us from the Greek Theopompus of Chios, a student of Plato. The Roman chronicler Aelian, in his *Varia Historia* (c. A.D. 200) preserved portions of Theopompus' lost work *Maropidae*, written in 320 B.C. In this work, the Greek recorded a conversation between King Midas of Phrygia and the satyr Silenos. Theopompus--through Silenos--repeated Plato's accurate observation in the *Timaeus* and *Critias* that on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean from Europe is another land mass which he called the "outer continent." Silenos then proceeded to describe the inhabitants and nations of this distant western country: "The people are twice as tall as those common to our climate (Europe), As a race they are called Merops, and occupy that portion of the continent called Anostos ("no return"), its shores often covered by mist, and where the two rivers run nearby, the River of Pleasure and that of Grief, The Merops giants have several large towns governed according to their own customs. Among these are two which in no way resemble each other. The first is Eusebius (the peaceful). The earth is so productive of its fruits that its peoples need neither plows nor oxen--it is unnecessary to sow or till the soil. The Eusebian giants die happily and smiling. The second metropolis is Machimos (the warlike), and here the inhabitants-- numbering no less than two million--are very belligerent. They are always armed, always fighting, and work unceasingly to conquer, expanding their frontiers, thanks to which they command over several neighboring nations. Once, the Machimos giants desired to invade our islands (Europe), and gathered together from among themselves and the other nations of the outer continent they dominated a great host of ten million strong. They crossed the ocean, arriving on the shores of the land of the Hyperboreans (Britain). But upon learning that the Hyperboreans were the happiest of our nations, but which to their eyes was displeasing, the giants continued no further in their invasions."

One last interesting point to take note of is that Theopompus divided the giants of America into two major groups¹ the "peaceful" and "warlike." Archaeologists examining the earthworks of the Mound Builders divide the structures into two general areas-- north and south--each possessing their own particular architectural and artistic traits. Those mounds found among the southern states are characterized by temple platforms, truncated pyramids, etc. usually located in flat places, with no

surrounding walls or other concerns for defense whatsoever. The northern Mound Builders were for the most part of a different nature: their earthworks were predominantly fortress enclosures, usually constructed on river terraces, where the summits provided good strongholds. In practically every example of these elaborate defense structures, there is displayed great engineering skill and military knowledge. The northern Mound Builders thus seem: to have been preoccupied with fighting arid war-- while their southern neighbors had no such preoccupation. Is it only coincidence that these are the very same characteristics of Theopompus' American giants?

Giant Skelton Finds

- In his book, *The Natural and Aboriginal History of Tennessee*, author John Haywood describes "very large" bones in stone graves found in Williamson County, Tennessee, in 1821. In White County, Tennessee, an "ancient fortification" contained skeletons of gigantic stature averaging at least 7 feet in length.
- Giant skeletons were found in the mid-1800s near Rutland and Rodman, New York. J.N. DeHart, M.D. found vertebrae "larger than those of the present type" in Wisconsin mounds in 1876. W.H.R. Lykins uncovered skull bones "of great size and thickness" in mounds of Kansas City area in 1877.
- George W. Hill, M.D., dug out a skeleton "of unusual size" in a mound of Ashland County, Ohio. In 1879, a nine-foot, eight-inch skeleton was excavated from a mound near Brewersville, Indiana (*Indianapolis News*, Nov 10, 1975)
- A six foot, six inch skeleton was found in a Utah mound. This was at least a foot taller than the average Indian height in the area, and these natives- what few there were of them -were not mound builders.
- "A skeleton which is reported to have been of enormous dimensions" was found in a clay coffin, with a sandstone slab containing hieroglyphics, during mound explorations by a Dr everhart near Zanesville, Ohio. (*American Antiquarian*, v3, 1880, pg61)
- Ten skeletons "of both sexes and of gigantic size" were taken from a mound at Warren, Minnesota, 1883. (*St. Paul Pioneer Press*, May 23, 1883)
- A skeleton 7 feet 6 inches long was found in a massive stone structure that was likened to a temple chamber within a mound in Kanawha County, West Virginia, in 1884. (*American Antiquarian*, v6, 1884 133f. Cyrus Thomas, *Report on Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology*, 12th Annual Report, Smithsonian Bureau of Ethnology, 1890- 91)
- A large mound near Gasterville, Pennsylvania, contained a vault in which was found a skeleton measuring 7 feet 2 inches. Inscriptions were carved on the vault. (*American Antiquarian*, v7, 1885, 52f) [click here for full article](#)
- In 1885, miners discovered the mummified remains of woman measuring 6 feet 8 inches tall holding an infant. The mummies were found in a cave behind a wall of rock in the Yosemite Valley. [click here for full article](#)

· In Minnesota, 1888, were discovered remains of seven skeletons 7 to 8 feet tall. (St. Paul Pioneer Press, June 29, 1888)

· A mound near Toledo, Ohio, held 20 skeletons, seated and facing east with jaws and teeth "twice as large as those of present day people," and besides each was a large bowl with "curiously wrought hieroglyphic figures." (Chicago Record, Oct. 24, 1895; cited by Ron G. Dobbins, NEARA Journal, v13, fall 1978)

- The skeleton of a huge man was uncovered at the Beckley farm, Lake Koronis, Minnesota; while at Moose Island and Pine City, bones of other giants came to light. (St. Paul Globe, Aug. 12, 1896)

- · In 1911, several red-haired mummies ranging from 6 and a half feet to 8 feet tall were discovered in a cave in Lovelock, Nevada. [click here for the full article](#)

- · In February and June of 1931, large skeletons were found in the Humboldt lake bed near Lovelock, Nevada. The first of these two skeletons found measured 8 1/2 feet tall and appeared to have been wrapped in a gum-covered fabric similar to the Egyptian manner. The second skeleton was almost 10 feet long.(Review - Miner, June 19, 1931)

- · A 7 foot 7 inch skeleton was reported to have been found on the Friedman ranch, near Lovelock, Nevada, in 1939.(Review - Miner, Sept. 29, 1939)

- · In 1965, a skeleton measuring 8 feet 9 inches was found buried under a rock ledge along the Holly Creek in east-central Kentucky. [click here for the full article](#)

Hoaxes

People are taken in by hoaxes and fakes for many reasons. Successful bogus artifacts often match expectations or preconceived ideas of antiquities. Spectacular fakes have worked because those who buy them are blinded by their own pride of ownership--and the higher the price tag, the harder it is to make an embarrassing admission that it's a fake.

Archaeological Institute of America

-Brittany Jackson and Mark Rose

Jackson is a Student of Archaeology at the University of Chicago and Rose is an AIA Online Editorial Editor.

Ken Feder, author of *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries* (2001), says, "The most obvious explanation is that the Cardiff Giant confirmed biblical stories of giants. Then there were folks who probably knew better, the smart businessmen in Syracuse--they saw that people were coming in to see the giant, using hotel space and buying food." Another possibility, he says, is that it is like reading the National Enquirer today.

People didn't really believe it, but were willing to pay 50c to see the Cardiff Giant because they thought it was interesting. Feder's own experience at the Farmer's Museum is also enlightening, if discouraging. "They have the giant in a tent with a sign outside saying 'World's Greatest Hoax' along with displays inside explaining it. A couple came in and walked around the giant. As they left the wife turned to her husband and said, 'So is that real?' And the husband shrugged and said, 'I guess so.'"

Nephilim (Bible)

John M. Steadman published an article for John Hopkins University outlining the various interpretations of the Bible's Nephilim, or fallen giants.

In the second place, a conventional etymology of the word Nephilim (Genesis 6: 4) from a root meaning falling or assailing made the comparison of the defeated angels to giants particularly appropriate. Thus Jerome, commenting on this text (" Gigantes autem erant super terram in diebus illis"), explained Annaphiilim in terms of falling and violence. The Midrash Rabbah also derived the Hebrew word for giants from a root signifying falling: Nefilim denotes that they hurled (hippilu) the world down, themselves fell (nafli) from the world, and filled the world with abortions (ne/hlim) through their immorality.⁷ Drusius, on the other hand, rejected Jerome's suggestion that Nephilim meant caderntes and derived it instead from irruendo (assailing) Calvin traced the word Nephilim to a Hebrew verb meaning to fall, but observed that grammarians disagreed as to its meaning: These explanations of Nephilim in terms of violence and attack, hurling and falling, made the epithet " Giant" especially suitable for the rebel angels, whom Milton had described as attacking with " devilish Enginry " (VI, 553), hurling hills " with jaculation dire" (VI, 665), and falling from Heaven (VI, 871). This term had, moreover, become closely associated with Satan's fallen legions. Thus Ryle observes that " among Patristic commentators, the word [Nephilim] was connected with 'the fallen angels.'" Friedlander has noted a similar interpretation in rabbinical tradition: These "fallen angels" were called Nephilim (the fallen ones). "Giants" is the usual rendering of this term. In this dual interpretation of Nephilim to mean both giants and fallen angels Milton could have found a suggestion for his phrase " the Giant Angels." The propriety of this comparison was further enhanced by Eusebius' conception of this text as the origin of the classical legends of the Titans and giants.

Matthew J. Goff writes an article for the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in it he explains a view that we see many culture revert to. The view holds that giants tend to represent behavior that God or the culture's societal rules would be frown upon.

Ben Sira 16:7 also reflects the influence of early Jewish traditions regarding the *gibborim* of Genesis 6. This explains why the chieftains struggle against God by using their strength. The verse presumably does not allude exclusively to the trope that the Canaanites as a whole were wicked, since this theme is invoked in v. 9. It is not a major motif in the Bible that Canaanite chieftains rebelled against God with their strength. The mighty *nēpilim* of Numbers 13, though large and intimidating, are never described as physically opposing God or even Israel. In Genesis 6 itself, neither the *nēpilim* nor the *gibborim* struggle against God. But in the rich early Jewish traditions about these creatures, most fully expressed in the Enochic Book of the Watchers and the Qumran Book of Giants, they use their strength

to commit heinous acts on the earth, such as murder and cannibalism.³³ The giants do not rebel against God in the sense of a military uprising against him, as one finds with the titanomachy or gigantomachy of Greek mythology.³⁴ Through their actions, however, they oppose God's dominion on earth. God clearly understood this as a challenge to his sovereignty and he punished them (*1 En.* 10:9; 15:8–12). The claim in *Sir* 16:7 that Canaanite rulers used their strength to rebel against God adapts the idea that the antediluvian giants were wicked and committed iniquitous deeds that merited recompense. The statement in the verse that God did not forgive the chieftains may evoke the trope that the watchers unsuccessfully sought through Enoch a petition of forgiveness not only for themselves but for their sons the giants as well, as Argall has suggested.