



---

55. A Few Notes on the Neolithic Egyptians and the Ethiopians

Author(s): V. Giuffrida-Ruggeri

Source: *Man*, Vol. 16 (Jun., 1916), pp. 87-90

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2787667>

Accessed: 25/12/2014 01:16

---

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>

of Rome, this Celtic influence asserted its dominating force and helped to make post-Roman London a primary institution of the country. Roman London, thus influenced, in its turn dominated the inner working of mediæval London, and in its essence dominates modern London. London constitutionally never appears in Anglo-Saxon history at all; it appears as a fortified bulwark against the invaders of the country, but it asserts rights against Anglo-Saxon laws and owns no formal allegiance to an external sovereign power, and no Anglo-Saxon king granted it a constitution. The Danes were kept out of London until London accepted them as overlords. The Normans were kept out of London until they entered by agreement. In Norman and later times London as a chartered city has once more an external sovereign to whom it owes its constitution, but at the same time there was a fierce conflict with the monarchs who granted it charters; Norman London must have received from Anglo-Saxon London strange and strong rights of independence which Anglo-Saxon London could only have built up out of its Roman predecessor. Sir Laurence develops this thesis in a masterly manner, showing great insight in his interpretation of documents, and topographical and other data.

There are many other aspects of past and present social life in which Sir Laurence took a keen interest and to which he contributed illuminating ideas, but enough has been quoted to indicate the general trend of his thought, which was backed up by a wide range of learning. It is obvious that had he been able to enjoy the leisure that he had so well earned we might have expected yet greater contributions to historical folklore.

Sir Laurence was a member of several learned societies, in most of which he had held office. At the time of his death he was president-elect of the Anthropological Section of the British Association. He was as ready to impart information as to receive it; he was catholic in his sympathy, and always welcomed the results of investigations in departments of anthropology other than those which he more particularly studied. It is a terrible blow for his friends to feel that no longer can they have converse or correspondence with so cheery and suggestive a comrade.

ALFRED C. HADDON.

## Egypt.

Giuffrida-Ruggeri.

### A Few Notes on the Neolithic Egyptians and the Ethiopians.

55

By V. Giuffrida-Ruggeri, University of Naples.

Were the neolithic Egyptians identical with their successors? Professor Naville says they were: "La tribu qui, en possession du cuivre, s'est établie dans la vallée du Nil, au dessous de la première cataracte, et qui mêlée aux indigènes néolithiques, a produit la civilisation des Pharaons était africaine et j'ajoute chamitique, car les recherches attentives du Dr. Elliot Smith ne lui ont révélé aucune différence entre les crânes des primitifs et ceux des dynasties thinites."\* This tribe, which manufactured and used copper tools, was still predynastic, and if it really followed the jackal "Apuatu" in its descent down the Nile,† it was another wave of Ethiopians comparable to the preceding neolithic wave. But they may have been the same neolithic people of Upper Egypt who had found a means of obtaining copper from the neighbouring mines of Sinai, which would explain the absence of great anthropological differences between the more ancient predynastic skulls and those more recent, including those of the first dynasties.

But things change when we get to the end of the 3rd dynasty, when mummi-

\* Naville, E., "L'origine africaine de la civilisation Egyptienne." *Revue archéologique*, 1913, II, p. 56.

† Naville believes they came with copper from the regions south of Abyssinia, which I cannot think probable. Naville, E., "Le passage de la pierre au métal en Egypte." *Archives suisses d'Anthropologie générale*. T. I (1914), n. 1-2, p. 58.

fication and a whole new era begins, that of the Pyramid builders. The passage which seems so brusque in Upper Egypt, can only be explained, according to Naville, by admitting that a slow change has taken place in Lower Egypt. The anthropological exponent of this change is found in the series of Giza (4th, 5th, and 6th dynasties) of Lower Egypt and in other and later series in Upper Egypt.

Comparing these series with Predynastic Egyptians we find the latter *more dolichocephalic, more prognathous, and more platyrrhinian*,\* thus justifying the opinion that the prehistoric series were, at least to a large extent, made up of Ethiopians, and that afterwards a great infiltration in the opposite direction took place; this infiltration must have been fed from the near east, that is from Syria, the peninsula of Sinai, and the North Arabian coast, territories already occupied by the Mediterranean race, *i.e.*, by Leucoderms. Nevertheless, because the Leucoderms crossed with the Ethiopians, there still remained some characteristics of Ethiopian affinities in the Egyptian people; especially visible to themselves was the colour of their skin, so that they noticed the difference between themselves and the Libyans, and called these latter *Tehenu*, which means "pale yellow."†

Naville tells us that on a monument attributed to the 1st dynasty is to be found a representation of the triumph over the Anu which became a traditional fête, the Anu being represented by a kneeling African prisoner.‡ Now the Egyptians of the historic epoch called their predecessors, the primitives, by the name of Anu, of which the *Anu Seti* were the inhabitants of Nubia who lived on the banks of the Nile. Tradition tells us that Horus represents Lower Egypt and Set Upper Egypt,§ and as Lower Egypt is said to have been victorious, what Naville says to the contrary|| can only refer to the anterior descent of the Ethiopians.

The populations comprised under the generic name of Anu which Naville considers as the Hamites who occupied North and East Africa were possibly Ethiopians, first descending victoriously from the South, then defeated by Horus; therefore it is evident that the defeat of this people, correctly represented as African, may indicate the moment at which took place the brusque change in Upper Egypt spoken of by Naville.

Another point to modify is this: "Les recherches du Dr. Elliot Smith ont établie définitivement ce qu'avant lui le Dr. Fouquet, le Dr. Lortet et d'autres avaient affirmé; c'est que l'Egyptien de la période néolithique n'est point un nègre, il appartient au type caucasique"; this is too hurried a conclusion, his not being a Negro does not necessarily mean he is a Caucasian; neither can Elliot Smith affirm that there is not a difference between the neolithic Egyptian and the white man, as he agrees with me in placing the Predynastics with the Ethiopians,¶ and the Ethiopians are certainly not Negroes, but neither are they a Mediterranean people.

\* It is for this reason that MacIver, D. R., and Wilkin, A., in *Libyan Notes*, London, 1901, p. 107, wrote: "In face of these results it is impossible any longer to maintain the view that the Prehistoric Egyptians were Libyans", a conclusion I have lately confirmed: Giuffrida-Ruggeri, V., "Were the Predynastic Egyptians Libyans or Ethiopians?" *MAN*, 1915, 32, p. 56. In the printing of this note some errors occurred, *e.g.*, p. 52, l. 22, for "fading away" read "further away"; p. 56, l. 9, for "white stained" read "white skinned."

† Naville, E., "L'origine africaine," &c., *loc. cit.*, p. 50, "Tehennou veut dire les jaunes claires, ce que nous appellerions les blancs."

‡ *Idem*, p. 53.

§ Erman, A., *La religion Egyptienne*, trad. franç., Paris, 1907, p. 31, "sous cette appellation Horus et Set, on perçoit comme un écho des anciens souvenirs laissés par ce temps préhistorique dans lequel l'Egypte était partagée en deux royaumes hostiles l'un à l'autre." Here also it is stated that Set was the divinity of Upper Egypt.

¶ Naville, E., "L'origine africaine," &c., *loc. cit.*, p. 55.

¶ Elliot Smith, G., "Professor Giuffrida-Ruggeri's Views on the Affinities of the Egyptians." *MAN*, 1915, 41, p. 71. Elliot Smith never made use of the term "Caucasian."

It is in the degree of difference between the Ethiopians and the Mediterranean peoples that we are not in accord, as Elliot Smith finds a closer affinity between the Mediterranean people and the Ethiopians\* than between the Mediterranean people and the Blond Nordic, while I think the contrary. Such appreciations are always debatable, being dependent on personal judgments, and in all cases ought to be examined in the light of the entire taxinomic classification.

Our taxinomic classification is made up of a certain number of elementary species, which are divided into varieties and sub-varieties, that is to say, they are elementary species inasmuch as they all together form a "collective" species, but each is susceptible of subdivision, as De Vries also admits. There is, therefore, no "heterogeneous series of disparate elements" in *Homo sapiens indo-europaeus*, but a wealth of subdivisions, while on the other hand *Homo sapiens indo-africanus* is a parallel species, but poor in subdivisions, probably because those living between Hindustan and Somaliland have disappeared. However, this ought not to surprise as it happens in many other animal species, especially as one has a Northern habitat and the other an Equatorial habitat.

According to the habitat we distinguish between Equatorial and Boreal species ; the former are :—

<i>H. s. australis</i> ,	spec. elem.
" "	australianus, var.
" "	veddaicus, var.
" "	tasmanianus(?), var.
" "	melanesiensis, var.
<i>H. s. pygmaeus</i> ,	spec. elem.
" "	melanesiacus, var.
" "	asiaticus, var.
" "	africanus, var.
" "	steatopygus, var.
<i>H. s. niger</i> ,	spec. elem.
" "	protomorphus, var.
" "	occidentalis, var.
" "	meridionalis, var.
<i>H. s. indo-africanus</i> ,	spec. elem.
" "	dravidicus, var.
" "	aethiopicus, var.

The latter (Boreal) are :—*H. s. indo-europaeus* and *H. s. asiaticus*, with their kindred species *H. s. americanus* and *H. s. oceanicus* ; these last are considered as Northern from their origin, though they are geographically not so. Each of these species is subdivided, as are the precedent, into varieties and sub-varieties, which for *H. s. indo-europaeus* are the following :—

<i>H. s. indo-europaeus</i> ,	spec. elem.
" "	brachimorphus, var.
" "	alpinus, sub-v.
" "	armenicus, sub-v.
" "	pamiriensis, sub-v.
" "	dolichomorphus, var.
" "	nordicus, sub-v.
" "	mediterraneus, sub-v.
" "	indo-afghanus, sub-v.

\* Elliot Smith, G. ("The Influence of Racial Admixture in Egypt." *The Eugenics Review*, October 1915, pp. 9-10), unites both in one "Brown Race," which is contrary to any analysis of the facts.

Perhaps Professor Elliot Smith is scandalised at seeing brachycephals and dolichocephals united in one species, but this also happens in other species. Everybody knows that in Japan are found brachycephals and dolichocephals, as in other parts of the habitat of *H. s. asiaticus*, so also the habitat of *H. s. americanus* includes brachycephalic varieties and dolichocephalic varieties, and also the habitat of *H. s. oceanicus* includes the dolichocephalic Maori (*H. s. oceanicus pseudo-mediterraneus*), who resembles the Mediterranean people. But there are other characteristics which unite the Maoris to the other Polynesians, even to the brachycephalic Polynesians, just as there are other characteristics which unite the Mediterranean peoples to the northern peoples, and, *more remotely*, to the brachycephalic Eurasians. If, on the other hand, one unites the brachycephalic people of Alpine countries, of the Balkans, of Armenia, and other parts of Asia, to the Polynesians and the brachycephalic Americans, one totally disregards any geographical consideration in homage to a form of the skull which does not imply any correlation to other physical characters. This skeletal character owes its exaggerated importance to the fact that it is very visible in the living man and in the series of skulls collected in museums, but in my opinion it is only valuable in determining varieties; therefore it has no value in joining together across the terrestrial space all those who are alike in that character.

Similarly I think that in linking together the Ethiopians and the Dravidians in one human species, *H. s. indo-africanus*, which has an equatorial habitat and a peculiar group of characters (especially primitive), I ought not to take into account the resemblance that they may have to other varieties or sub-varieties belonging to a different elementary species, for instance, to the Mediterranean sub-variety of *H. s. indo-europaeus*. One cannot take into account such a resemblance, because the Mediterranean sub-variety has a mass of other characters (proportions of the body, orthognathism, leptorrhiny, depigmentation of the skin) which are common to other sub-varieties belonging to the northern habitat in which *H. s. indo-europaeus* lives. The resemblances between varieties or sub-varieties belonging to different elementary species only show that these belong to one collective species: *i.e.*, *Homo sapiens*, which in its various branches may have originated parallel forms,\* that in one or even more features may be identical.

V. GIUFFRIDA-RUGGERI.

## REVIEWS.

### Ethnology.

Thalbitzer.

*The Ammassalik Eskimo.—Meddelelser om Grönland. Vol. XXXIX. Contributions to the Ethnology of the East Greenland Natives. Part I.* Edited by William Thalbitzer. **56**

This volume of *Meddelelser om Grönland*, which is written in English, forms a comprehensive anthropological study of the Eskimo inhabiting the Ammassalik (Angmagsalik) district on the east coast of Greenland at 65 deg. 39 min. N. lat. It consists of seven parts, which fall into two main divisions.

1. Parts I-VI (pages 1-317) are a collection of papers by G. Holm, H. Rink, and others, published originally in Danish in *Meddelelser om Grönland*, Vol. X (1886, 1888), and here translated into English, and to some extent revised and enlarged, the most important addition being Holm's account of his voyage and discovery of Ammassalik. They constitute the anthropological results of Holm's expedition in 1883-85, in which, by discovering Ammassalik, he "brought an entirely new people within the pale of Anthropology."

The Ammassalik Eskimo had previously had no direct contact with Europeans. The drift ice which flows down from the north along this coast almost throughout the

\* This has been widely demonstrated in my book, "L'uomo attuale, una specie collettiva." Roma, Albrighi-Segati, 1913.