

Niqnaq

son of Naqniq

- [Home](#)

does our sun revolve around sirius? you tell me

The diameter of the Earth is one-millionth that of the Solar System; but the diameter of the Solar System is only perhaps one forty millionth that of the Milky Way. When in our own system we find such relationships, it is not between sun and planets, but between sun and satellites of planets. That is to say, by analogy of scale and mass, we should expect the Solar System to be revolving about some greater entity, which in its turn was revolving about the centre of the Milky Way; just as the Moon revolves about the Earth, which in turn revolves about the Sun. What and where is this 'sun' of our Sun? Several attempts have been made to discern a 'local' system within the Milky Way, particularly by Charlier who in 1916 seemed to have established such a group 2000 light-years across and with its centre several hundred light-years away in the direction of Argo. If we study our immediate surroundings in the galaxy, we find an interesting gradation of stars, two of which are suggestive from this point of view.

For the most brilliant object in the heavens, after those within the Solar System itself, is of course the double star Sirius. This consists of an immense radiant sun, 26 times more brilliant than our own, which circles in a fifty year period with a white dwarf as big as Jupiter and 5,000 times denser than lead. The mass of the light star being two and a half times that of our Sun, and that of the dark one equivalent to it, the influence upon the solar system of this starry pair, which lie at less than nine light-years remove, must certainly far exceed that of any other extra-solar body that we can think of. By physical distance as by radiance and mass a Sirian system would seem in some way to fill the excessive gap between the cosmoses of the Solar System and the Milky Way. Indeed, the distance from the Sun to Sirius, one million times the distance from the earth to the Sun, falls naturally into the scale of cosmic relationships mentioned, and provided nineteenth century astronomy with an excellent unit of celestial measurement, the siriometer, now unfortunately abandoned.

No astronomical data contradict the possibility that the Solar System circles about Sirius, in the course of the latter's circuit of the Milky Way, as Kant believed. For such a circling would only noticeably alter the position in the heavens of Sirius itself and of two or three other near stars, and in a periodicity of some hundreds of thousands of years this could easily pass unnoticed. In fact, we have definite evidence to show that such is the case. As the ancient Egyptians observed, the apparent motion of Sirius, measured by its rising with the sun, is a little less than that of the apparent motion of all the other stars, which is recognised in the precession of the equinoxes. Whereas the general star mass rises twenty minutes later on a given day each year, Sirius rises only eleven minutes later. This corresponds to the difference in apparent motion between points outside a circle and the centre of the circle itself, when observed from a moving point on its circumference, just as, in a landscape seen from a moving car, far and near objects seem to run past each other.

From such an observation we have good reason to believe that our Sun does circle about Sirius. And if we suppose the generally accepted figure of 20 km/s for the sun's motion through space to be correct, then this circling would require 800,000 years. In other words, our Sun would make some 250 revolutions about its greater sun for every

full circuit of the Milky Way. Another very striking fact appears to confirm the idea of a local star system with Sirius as centre. If we take the great familiar stars within say forty light-years of the Sun, Sirius, Procyon, Altair, Fomalhaut, Pollux, Vega and so on, we find that all but two lie within 15° of the same plane. There is only one likely explanation of this: that all the near stars revolve about a common centre, and that this section is the ecliptic upon which all their orbits lie. Supposing Sirius to be the sun of these suns, then our Sun, curiously enough, appears to occupy a similar place in that system to that occupied by the earth in the solar one. And if this is so, then the Sirian system may be regarded as almost exactly a million times greater in diameter than the solar system, as the latter is a million times greater in diameter than the earth, and the earth a million times greater in diameter than an ordinary house.

- from Rodney Collin's "Theory of Celestial Influence" (1954) Incidentally, all these Gurdjieff people are the most fantastic spiritual materialists. This, from the same book, is typical:

We find that in studying light we are in fact very close to the nature of that 'Amor che muove il Sol e l'altri stelli', of which Dante spoke. One of the most striking qualities of this light is that it is undiminishable and eternal. No fraction of the light of a single candle is lost even when it reaches the outskirts of the solar system: it is only diffused around that prodigious circumference. Moreover, this process of diffusion of light without loss goes on indefinitely. As we know from observation of the most distant galaxies, it is still going on five hundred million years after its first emission. All the light which was then radiated by such galaxies still exists, though now at this immense remove. If light can diffuse and endure undiminished for half-a-billion years, it can surely do so for ever. This means that all light, from a candle or from a super-sun, sooner or later fills the entire universe. Light is undiminishable, eternal and omnipresent. In every religion that existed these qualities have been recognized as divine. So that we are forced to the conclusion that light — actual sensible light — is indeed the direct vehicle of divinity: it is the consciousness of God.

It is clear that all life on Earth is, as it were, a condensation of electronic or solar radiation. At the same time the creation of such life does not imply a loss of the electronic nature of matter, but its temporary locking into forms of varying shape and of greater or less density. Within these forms, the electrons, with their affinity for the Sun, still exist, and in fact, all these forms are made of such electrons. Further, when these forms 'die', as we say, it merely means that the magnetic field creating a certain individual shape is broken, the heavier or earthly elements composing it fall away, and the original hydrogen atoms are released. Most probably these hydrogen atoms again break up into electrons, and in this state resume their free passage throughout the Solar System which was temporarily interrupted by their incorporation into bodies. That is to say, the energy incorporated into physical bodies, when the latter die, becomes light again. If we remember the conclusion we just came to about the nature of light, we can even say that, physical bodies disintegrating, their matter returns to the divine state. Only the proof of this thesis is hampered by the fact that normally we can only conceive of consciousness attached to physical bodies, or to matter in cellular state. And it could only be established satisfactorily by the actual carrying over of consciousness into matter in electronic state.

This entry was posted on Monday, August 3rd, 2009 at 6:13 am and is filed under Uncategorized. You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed. You can skip to the end and leave a response. Pinging is currently not allowed.

Post navigation

[« Previous Post](#) [Next Post »](#)

15 Responses to *does our sun revolve around sirius? you tell me*

1. *moonkoon* says:

[August 3, 2009 at 12:08 pm](#)

What a coincidence.

Last week I happened to wake up just around dawn and glanced out the window, there was a big blue star. I closed my eyes, intending to resume my slumber when something went clang. I thought, "Surely it's not that big!" I opened my eyes again and was shocked to see that it was still inordinately large. With that I lapsed back into sleep.

I haven't spotted it since (overcast/didn't wake up/forgot 😊).

I've been reading about Sirius a bit lately, mainly looking for clues about the Levantine El, Baal, Mot trilogy. I figure that the Syriac/Aramaic tradition take their name from Sirius. It is said to have been red in those days.

It's responsible for the "dog days" say the Romans.

The question which can't be answered definitively at present is, is Sirius the sun of the sun or is the sun a moon of Sirius or are they both swishing around something else? 😊

2. *moonkoon* says:

[August 3, 2009 at 3:12 pm](#)

Interesting thing about red and blue. Conventional wisdom has that red shift means receding, blue shift means approaching. Of course this does not take into account changes in star burning processes themselves, white dwarfs, red giants etc.

It was initially adduced that Sirius was approaching our good selves, but later observations have found it to be receding, perhaps we caught it either side of the cusp.

"In 1868, Sirius became the first star to have its velocity measured. Sir William Huggins examined the spectrum of this star and observed a noticeable red shift. He concluded that Sirius was receding from the Solar System at about 40 km/s. Compared to the modern value of -7.6 km/s, this both an overestimate and has the wrong sign; the minus means it is approaching our Sun. " -wiki

With regard to relative motion, Dayton Miller's experiments and later work seem to reveal a southerly motion relative to the "ether", (I know, I know, but what about vacuum energy density, plasma, dark energy, or for that matter, dark matter. Some or all of that constitutes a reasonable facsimile of an ether).

This suggests that the ether itself is somehow incorporated into this induced orbital/rotational motion, and that there is a separate (galactic) drift relative to the ether

All we can say at present is that the Earth is moving relative to the ether with a speed of about 400km/s possibly along a line joining the constellations of Draco in the northern hemisphere and Dorado in the southern hemisphere. "

<http://www.worldnpa.org/php2/index.php?tab0=Experiments&tab1=Display&id=11>

The ether drift is said to be to the North, or conversely we are heading South relative to the plane of the ecliptic.

The whole gravity thing is rapidly turning into a shambles, it's coming apart at the seams what with dark matter requirements and the like needed to make it work galactically.

I like the idea of some type of gyre inducing field as the driver of our rotations and orbits.

I think we could be looking at a stirring action rather than rotations about a centre, for as Yeats says "the centre cannot hold...". 😊

Maybe the stirring is some sort of induction, a bit like those magnetic stirrers you see in laboratories

P.S. Some may object that Sirius being the sun of the sun or the sun being the moon of Sirius amounts to the same thing but that doesn't take into account different points of view, or should I say frame of reference. 😊 .

You may think this all a bit far-fetched, but what else can you expect from someone with a name like moonkoon. 😊

P.P.S. One of the footnotes on the wiki entry for Sirius states,

“In Arabic it is known as الشعري (transliteration: ‘al-ši‘rā’ or ‘al-shira’; English: the leader), from which the alternate name ‘Aschere’ derives.

Aschere is very close to Asherah, the “Queen of Heaven”.



3. *niqnaq* says:

[August 3, 2009 at 3:50 pm](#)

What an amazing fund of obscure knowledge you are sometimes.

Alternately approaching and receding makes sense, since orbits are generally elliptical rather than circular. With an orbital period of 800,000 years, though, the chances of catching it on both sides of the cusp in 100 years are minimal.

One great loony who also preaches the judeocentric (to put it mildly) ‘white gold’ theory turned up when I googled “does the earth orbit sirius?”:

<http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro/2008-03/msg00049.html>

But the second part of my comment is more important: what I call ‘spiritual materialism’ — the abysmally stupid idea that God is a substance (i.e., light). This is my second big realisation about the Gurdjieffians generally. The first was that they are all actually Christians. Now I see why they are so mystical about ‘the great cathedrals’ — they think that ‘God’ is actually trapped in them, in the admittedly wonderful form of their interior light. Perhaps this mystical overvaluation of light, which like the theory of fallen angels is derived from intertestamental Judaism, is the cause of the superstitious Christian theory about ‘Lucifer, Son of the Morning’.

4. *lobro* says:

[November 16, 2009 at 8:25 pm](#)

hm, like saying that penis is a fallen angel who occasionally rises to torment the boss and must be repressed and covered up in shame most of the time, no?



5. *niqnaq* says:

[November 16, 2009 at 8:37 pm](#)

actually, you are quite right, lobro, as I'm sure you knew, from some disreputable source: this is the argument of those gnostics who hold that the Sun itself is the fallen angel (666). Jung certainly knew this: it was Jung who invented the term “solar-phallic” — not Crowley. But Crowley invented a nice glyph for it: