123. Egyptian Cutting-Out Tools.

Author(s): W. M. Flinders Petrie

Source: *Man*, Vol. 1 (1901), pp. 147-149

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2839303>

Accessed: 17/01/2015 08:13

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Man*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

which occurred independently to the present writer. In the Harranian Calendar, published by Chwolsohn, occurs the name Taus, which Chwolsohn himself identified with Tammuz, and Professor Sayce has more recently connected with Theias or Thoas, who is in various places the Lemnian husband of Myrina, the king of Tauric Khersonese, the king of Assyria, the father of Adonis and Myrrha or Smyrna (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1887, p. 235). It is true that the Arabic letters which form the three names Taus, Taus, Tammuz, differ more than the ordinary English transliterations suggest (تموز, تاوز, طاوس), but this is not really a formidable objection to their identity. Tammuz becomes Taus by an omission of *m*, which is not uncommon in Kurdish names (see Lidzbarski) and which was well established, if Professor Sayce is right, in the classical period. Then Taus is identified with Taus (peacock) by a piece of vulgar etymology. The survival of the name of so important a god as Tammuz is intrinsically likely enough, and it is probable that more than the name has survived; the red anemones which, according to the Badgers, played a great part in the April celebrations, deserve more notice than they have had. And, again, the peacock element may have some more material foundation than the mere verbal assonance; as Sir George Birdwood writes (*Athenæum*, 30th September 1899), "the Melek Taus may indeed be an actual relic of Babylonian or Assyrian art."

More interesting to anthropologists than these speculations about origins will be, perhaps, the recurrence of the same figure among the Tachtadji in Lykia, a phenomenon to which writers on the Yezidi do not refer. Among the Tachtadji, however, the Melek Taus, so far, at least, as the reports of Von Luschan and Bent carry us, has no bronze embodiment; the natural peacock with them is regarded as the incarnation of evil. The Tachtadji speak Turkish only, the Yezidi Kurdish and a little Arabic. They live very far apart. To what, then, are we to attribute this common element? Two possibilities seem to be open to us. It might conceivably be an independent survival in each case of the Tammuz-Thoas worship which once extended over the whole area. Or there may in more recent times have been some connection between the two peoples, which has now been lost or else has completely eluded the observation of travellers.

Two religious developments seem to be universal over the whole Islamic area, the worship of Saints (Welis, Dedes, Marabouts), and the existence of Orders or Fraternities; both are common to the heretics as well as the true believers, but the former try, ineffectually indeed, to shelter themselves under the prestige of an orthodox Saint, in the case of the Yezidi, for example, Sheikh Adi (see Siouffi, *Journal Asiatique*, 1885, p. 78). I have shown how closely parallel this is with the pre-Christian worship of heroes (*J. A. I.*, 1900), and need not say more about it here. The religious Orders belong to another phase. The worship of heroes is something essentially local, and belongs to the family; the Fraternity is something which is in itself open to all, and knows no limits of race or place. One of the great Muslim Orders will include Negroes Arabs, Berbers, Turks, and Persians; difference of language is no bar. In the Pagan world they correspond to the thiasoi or brotherhoods of Orphic or Pythagorean initiates. It is, perhaps, on the lines of one of these Fraternities that subsequent research will prove that the common elements of Yezidi and Tachtadji may be explained.

J. W. CROWFOOT.

Egypt.

Egyptian Cutting-out Tools. By W. M. Flinders Petrie, Edwards' Professor of Egyptology at University College.

Petrie.

123

The use of special tools for cutting out textile fabrics has not yet been recognised in Egypt, nor perhaps elsewhere. When we notice the very elaborately made clothing of the Eighteenth Dynasty and later, and when we handle the exquisitely fine linen,

it is obvious that there must have been some efficient means of cutting out such materials. So far as we know shears or scissors are of Italic origin, and were quite unknown in the East until Roman times ; therefore some form of knife must have been used as we now use scissors.

A peculiar class of knife, marked here 9 to 13, has long been known in museums ; it is common, and appears to have been a personal tool and not a trade tool, as it is

[. . 1st Dynasty . .] [. 12th Dynasty] [. . 13th-14th . .] [. . . . 18th-19th Dynasties]

EGYPTIAN CUTTING-OUT TOOLS. SCALE, 1 : 4.

found singly in graves along with the tweezers, the mirror, and other personal objects. The cutting edges are at A-A (called here the main edge) and B-B (called here the butt edge) ; the remainder of the outline is smooth and rounded, suitable for holding in the hand.

As to the use of it we may set aside leather cutting, as the tool for that is often shown on the monuments, and was a short axe-like blade set in a rounded block of wood ; the thinness of some of these knives, moreover, is quite unsuited for so tough a material as leather. The form is, however, admirably adapted for cutting textiles ; the slant of the main edge enables the hand to grasp the stem clear of the cutting board. The narrow ends of the main edge, especially in 11 and 13, enable the user to see clearly the position of the cut.

The butt edge is a further evidence of its use ; for in thus slicing textiles, tough threads, or some not well cut, would drag, especially in narrow gores ; in such case a rocking cut with the butt edge would be required to chop through them.

If we once recognise the use of these tools we may see other examples of the cutting-out tool in earlier times.

No. 1 is a copper tool with a main edge on each side at the top ; while all the rest of the length and the butt was smoothed for holding. This belonged to a domestic of King Zer, of the First Dynasty, about 4700 B.C.

No. 2 is a similar knife of copper ; bought in Egypt, locality unknown. Both 1 and 2 are clearly not for ordinary cutting, as of meat, but are suited for outline cutting on a board.

No. 3 is the usual type of copper knife of the Twelfth Dynasty, here given to show how the cutting-out knives 4 and 5 have been specialised by only forming the

edge where it can cut on a board while held in the hand. None of these have butt edges, but were set in wooden handles.

Nos. 6 and 7. The butt edge, for chopping through threads, comes into use at this point, and the main cutting edge is more curved and thrown back.

Nos. 8 and 9. The width of the blade seems to have been felt to be a disadvantage in seeing the end of the cut; so the main edge was brought forward and ended below in a point or hook in advance of the handle. This type begins probably in the Thirteenth or Fourteenth Dynasty.

Nos. 10, 11, and 12. The type is very common in the Eighteenth Dynasty. The butt edge was widened more and more.

No. 13. Lastly, in the Nineteenth Dynasty the butt edge projects in two points at the sides. After this date the form seems to have passed out of use. What cutting-out tool was used between 1100 and 300 B.C. we do not yet know.

This whole class of outline cutters for use on a board should be worked out in other countries for comparison. Perhaps some anthropologist will follow this new type elsewhere.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

Totemism.

Haddon.

Totemism: Notes on Two Letters published in the "Times" of September 3rd and 7th, 1901. By A. C. Haddon, ScD., F.R.S.

124

Under the titles of *A New Record of Totemism*, describing what he believes to be an important discovery of worked flints, and *The Early Man and His Stones*, the Hon. Auberon Herbert has written letters to the *Times* of September 3rd and 7th respectively, which are as sensational as they are long. It is well recognised that those who may be termed outsiders often make fruitful suggestions or even important discoveries which have been overlooked by the professional teachers or investigators of a particular branch of science. Scientific men heartily recognise the labours of amateurs when they are carried out in the true scientific spirit, and all our museums have been enriched by collections amassed by enthusiasts from the mere "collector" to the erudite expert. Mr. Herbert will doubtless have more than one opportunity of presenting his evidence before anthropological or antiquarian experts, and he may rest assured that it will receive due consideration. The lesson of the first discovery of stone implements has not been forgotten.

Mr. Herbert claims that certain gravel beds in the valley of the Avon in South Hampshire extending over a tract of country for some 20 miles in length and of considerable breadth and from three to seven feet in depth practically consist of "stones handled" and worked by the earlier races; and, one may add, representing the strongest and "deepest feelings of their life . . . The gravel beds may be called, without exaggeration, a mass of worked stones . . . What are these stones? Certain well-marked types are constantly repeated, and I do not think that one can resist the belief that the greater number of the stones are representations of the totems of the tribes. They seem to be a new volume of *Totemism* suddenly placed in our hands. Many of the stones may be holy stones, amulets, or stones consecrated. Some may have been cut for purposes of decoration. There is also an interesting class of stones which, if I am right, were cup stones used as sacrifices. But I think all these other classes are subsidiary to the totem class—that is, to the stones which represent some animal or object which existed as the totem and had a sacred character. To make matters more clear I will presently return to the subject of the totem, for unless one understands something of the totem, one cannot understand the stones."

A description is then given of a number of forms which appear to the writer of the letter to resemble suns, moons, pyramids, snakes, fish, seals, teeth, tusks, mountains, peaks, mountain ranges, flames, animals, parts of the body, and so forth. "There are