

# The Smoking Gun

Justin T. Bogner

Petrie's Drill Cores and the Physics of the Impossible

December 2025

## Abstract

In 1883, Sir William Matthew Flinders Petrie examined ancient Egyptian drill cores and recorded observations that remain unexplained 140 years later. The spiral grooves showed feed rates 500 times faster than modern diamond drilling. More confounding still, the grooves cut deeper through harder quartz than through softer feldspar—the inverse of what any conventional abrasive process produces. This paper examines the Petrie cores as evidence for ultrasonic drilling technology, demonstrating that piezoelectric resonance in quartz provides the only known mechanism consistent with the observed signatures. The cores exist. The measurements are verifiable. The physics is published. What remains is the willingness to follow the evidence.

## Contents

---

<b>1 The Most Important Artifacts You've Never Heard Of</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 The Measurements That Don't Make Sense</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3 The Paradox Within the Paradox</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4 The Only Mechanism That Fits</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5 The Three Signatures</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>6 What the Cores Are Telling Us</b>	<b>5</b>

---

CONTENTS

2

**7 The Experiment That Would Settle It 6**

**8 The Cores as Invitation 7**

## 1 The Most Important Artifacts You've Never Heard Of

---

The Petrie Museum at University College London houses artifacts that should revolutionize our understanding of ancient technology. They sit in quiet obscurity, examined occasionally by curious researchers but never explained satisfactorily by mainstream Egyptology.

They are drill cores—cylindrical remnants extracted from granite by ancient Egyptian tools during the creation of hollow vessels, sarcophagi, and architectural elements. They look unremarkable: dark gray stone cylinders a few inches long, the discarded byproducts of routine construction work performed millennia ago.

Their significance lies not in what they are but in what they reveal about how they were made.

Sir William Matthew Flinders Petrie was the founding figure of systematic Egyptology, the man who transformed treasure-hunting into archaeology through meticulous measurement and documentation. When he examined these cores in 1883, he brought the precision of a trained engineer to bear on what he saw.

What he saw astonished him.

## 2 The Measurements That Don't Make Sense

---

Petrie documented his observations in *The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh*, published in 1883 and still available in digitized form from the Giza Archives at Harvard. His language is careful, his measurements precise, his conclusions understated. But the implications are extraordinary.

On the spiral grooves visible on the core surfaces, Petrie wrote: “The spiral of the cut sinks .100 inch in the circumference of 6 inches, or 1 in 60, a rate of ploughing out of the quartz and feldspar which is astonishing.”

Let us unpack what this means.

A drill core shows the marks left by the cutting edge of the tubular drill that created it. As the drill rotates and advances into the stone, it leaves a helical groove—a spiral track that records the relationship between rotational speed and penetration rate. The “feed rate” is the depth of penetration per revolution.

Petrie measured a feed rate of 0.100 inches per revolution. The drill advanced one-tenth of an inch with each complete rotation.

Is this remarkable? To answer that question, we need modern comparison data.

In the 1980s, Christopher Dunn—an engineer with decades of experience in precision manufacturing—consulted with Donald Rahn of Rahn Granite Surface Plate Company, one of the premier granite fabricators in the United States. Rahn provided data on contemporary drilling performance: using diamond-tipped bits rotating at 900 RPM, modern drills penetrate granite at approximately 1 inch per 5 minutes.

That translates to 0.0002 inches per revolution.

The ancient Egyptian feed rate was 500 times faster than modern diamond drilling.

This number deserves emphasis. We are not talking about a modest improvement that might be attributed to experimental error or measurement uncertainty. We are talking about a performance difference of two and a half orders of magnitude. Ancient technology outperforming modern diamond-tipped drills by a factor of 500.

How?

### 3 The Paradox Within the Paradox

The feed rate alone would be extraordinary enough. But Petrie noted something even more confounding—an observation that Christopher Dunn would later recognize as the critical clue.

The spiral grooves did not cut uniformly through the granite. They cut deeper through some mineral components than others. Specifically, they cut deeper through the quartz crystals than through the feldspar matrix surrounding them.

Dunn's formulation is precise: "The spiral groove cut deeper through the quartz than through the softer feldspar. In conventional machining the reverse would be the case."

This statement sounds technical, but its implications are profound. In any abrasive cutting process—grinding wheels, sandpaper, diamond saw blades, rotary drills with loose abrasive—harder materials resist cutting and softer materials yield. This is fundamental physics. Hardness is literally defined as resistance to abrasion.

Quartz registers 7 on the Mohs hardness scale. Feldspar registers 6. In any conventional drilling process, feldspar should cut faster than quartz. Period.

The ancient drill cores show the opposite relationship.

This is not a subtle effect that might be attributed to grain orientation or local variations in material properties. It is a systematic reversal of the expected relationship between hardness and cutting rate. It is, in Dunn's words, "physically backwards."

No known conventional technology produces this signature.

Not copper tubes with sand abrasive—the standard archaeological explanation for Egyptian drilling. Sand is predominantly quartz, and quartz sand cuts through softer feldspar faster than through harder quartz in any experimental replication.

Not bronze tools, not stone tools, not iron tools (which did not exist in dynastic Egypt), not even modern diamond drilling.

Something else was happening in those ancient workshops. Something we do not understand.

## 4 The Only Mechanism That Fits

In 2023, Saksala and colleagues at Tampere University in Finland published research that illuminates the Petrie paradox from an unexpected direction.

The paper, appearing in *Rock Mechanics and Rock Engineering*, examined what happens when you subject granite to high-frequency alternating current. The title is technical: “Weakening of Compressive Strength of Granite by Piezoelectric Actuation of Quartz Using High-Frequency and High-Voltage Alternating Current.”

The key word is “piezoelectric.”

Quartz is one of nature’s piezoelectric materials. Apply mechanical stress, and quartz generates electrical charge. Apply electrical field, and quartz deforms mechanically. This is why quartz crystals keep time in watches—feed them an oscillating electrical signal and they vibrate at precise frequencies.

The principle works with mechanical input as well. Vibrate quartz at its resonant frequency and it oscillates sympathetically, the vibration amplifying through constructive interference.

What Saksala’s team discovered is that this effect occurs within granite itself. The quartz crystals embedded in the rock’s matrix respond to high-frequency excitation, not as isolated grains but as a distributed resonant system. At the natural frequency of the sample—274.4 kHz in their experiments—the rock’s compressive strength decreased by 10%.

The quartz within granite can be excited to weaken the stone.

Now consider what this means for drilling. If an ancient drill was vibrating at ultrasonic frequencies—frequencies that excited sympathetic resonance in the quartz crystals—those crystals would not be passive material waiting to be abraded. They would be actively participating in their own destruction, shaking themselves apart at the molecular

level while the inert feldspar surrounding them remained unaffected.

The harder quartz would become *easier* to remove than the softer feldspar.

This is precisely—exactly—the signature Petrie documented. The reversed hardness relationship that no conventional technology explains becomes not merely explicable but predicted under an ultrasonic model.

We have, in the Petrie cores, physical evidence of a technological process whose signature matches piezoelectric resonance drilling and matches nothing else.

## 5 The Three Signatures

Dunn, in his analysis of the Petrie cores, identified three distinct characteristics that any successful explanatory model must address.

First, the feed rate: 500 times faster than modern diamond drilling. This alone suggests energy input beyond what muscle-powered tools can achieve. Ultrasonic vibration dramatically increases material removal rates in modern machining—rotary ultrasonic drilling achieves 4 to 10 times conventional speeds. With resonant amplification and piezoelectric weakening, even higher rates become conceivable.

Second, the taper: both the hole and the extracted core show consistent taper, with the hole widening and the core narrowing as depth increases. This indicates a specific drilling geometry that was precisely controlled throughout the operation. Under ultrasonic conditions, tool wear follows predictable patterns. The taper is consistent with a soft tool (copper or bronze) wearing faster at its outer edge where abrasive contact is sustained.

Third, the reversed hardness relationship: quartz cutting faster than feldspar. This is the signature for which only piezoelectric resonance provides a mechanism. No alternative has been proposed that addresses this observation.

Together, these three characteristics constitute a fingerprint. The question is not whether the cores display these features—they do, and the evidence is available for any researcher to examine. The question is whether we are willing to follow the evidence where it leads.

## 6 What the Cores Are Telling Us

The Petrie cores are not anomalies to be explained away. They are data points—physical evidence of a technological process we do not understand.

The archaeological consensus holds that ancient Egyptians drilled granite using copper tubes and sand abrasive, the sand providing the cutting action while the copper tube guided the operation. This explanation accounts for the presence of copper residues found at some sites. It does not account for the feed rates. It does not account for the taper geometry. It absolutely does not account for the reversed hardness relationship.

When evidence contradicts a model, science requires updating the model. The Petrie cores have contradicted the copper-and-sand model for 140 years. No update has been forthcoming.

This is not a call to mysticism or ancient astronaut theory. It is a call to take the evidence seriously. The cores exist. The measurements are reproducible. The signatures point toward a specific technology—ultrasonic, piezoelectrically-assisted drilling—for which we have modern physics and experimental validation.

If ancient Egyptians used ultrasonic drilling, they did not need to understand the physics any more than ancient metallurgists needed to understand crystallography. Empirical discovery precedes theoretical explanation. Someone, at some point, noticed that vibrating a drill produced better results. The technique spread. It was refined. Its theoretical basis remained unknown, but its practical effectiveness was undeniable.

This is how technology usually develops. We do not begin with equations and derive techniques. We begin with what works and explain it later—often much later.

## 7 The Experiment That Would Settle It

The beautiful thing about scientific hypotheses is that they can be tested.

The ultrasonic drilling hypothesis makes a specific, falsifiable prediction: if you mount a copper tube on an ultrasonic transducer, add quartz sand abrasive, and drill granite, the quartz crystals should cut faster than the feldspar matrix.

This experiment is straightforward. Any engineering laboratory with ultrasonic machining equipment could perform it. The materials are common. The measurements are routine. The result would be decisive.

If quartz cuts faster than feldspar under ultrasonic conditions, the hypothesis gains powerful support. If it does not, the hypothesis is falsified and we return to the drawing board.

This is what science looks like. Not endless debate about what ancient people could or could not have done, but concrete experiments that generate unambiguous data. The Petrie cores have been debated for over a century. A few hours in a machine shop could

resolve the argument.

Until someone performs this experiment, the cores remain evidence of something we do not understand. After the experiment, we will know whether ultrasonic drilling reproduces their signatures—or whether some other mechanism, yet to be identified, is required.

Either outcome advances knowledge. That is the point.

## 8 The Cores as Invitation

---

Stand in the Petrie Museum and look at Core 7, the most famous specimen. It is a simple thing—a cylinder of gray granite, about the size of a large carrot, bearing spiral grooves from an ancient drilling operation.

It does not look revolutionary. Most visitors pass it without a second glance.

But those grooves encode information. They record the relationship between tool rotation and penetration rate. They preserve the differential cutting behavior across mineral phases. They document feed rates that modern engineers cannot approach with conventional technology.

The core is a message from the past, a data transmission across millennia. The message is: we knew something you have forgotten.

Perhaps that knowledge was ultrasonic drilling. Perhaps it was something else, something we have not yet imagined. The cores cannot tell us what the ancient technology was. They can only tell us what it did.

What it did was impossible by our current understanding.

That is not a reason to dismiss the evidence. It is a reason to expand our understanding.

---

*The cores exist. The measurements are on record. The physics is published. What remains is the willingness to look.*