The use of marine shells as cultural markers in the late Paleolithic and Neolithic of the Southern Levant is the subject of the paper by Daniella E. Bar-Yosef. The changing utilization of shell species through time and the increase in long-distance trade is carefully documented in this paper.

Nigel Goring-Morris investigates sociocultural aspects of shell use during the terminal Pleistocene in the southern Levant. Early hunters and gatherers utilized distinct assemblages of shells which correlate nicely with stone-tool assemblages. During the later portion of the period under study, with the advent of more complex sedentary peoples, shell use dramatically increases.

Stuart Fiedel provides a most-interesting discussion of the use of ornaments in hunter-gatherer burials in his cross-cultural study. He points out that many archaeologists would view the use of shell ornaments as evidence of ranked societies, particularly when they accompanied subadult burials, but through careful analysis, Fiedel demonstrates that many egalitarian societies provide rich burial accompaniments for children. Richly furnished child burials need not imply ascribed status, and this is an important lesson.

Finally, Paul Williams discusses the history of Grand-River-Iroquois wampum belts. Many of these belts were sold by individual Iroquois at the beginning of the 20th century to large museums in the eastern United States. Since that time, other Iroquois have attempted to have the belts, viewed as tribal property, returned. This paper ends with an appended note that the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, has returned eleven belts to the Iroquois people, and that the Royal Ontario Museum is considering returning wampum in its possession. The story of the return of these belts is told in an article by William Fenton in the journal, *Ethnohistory* (1989, No. 4).

I found this to be an excellent volume, certainly a must for anyone interested in the use of shell beads in archaeological analysis. The papers are well-edited and the illustrations are first quality. The subject matter is quite broad, and there is clearly something for everyone. This volume is a fitting tribute to the late Lynn Ceci, the prime mover for this conference. It comes highly recommended.

Marvin T. Smith
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
BMSB 8
University of South Alabama
Mobile, Alabama 33688

The Ubiquitous Trade Bead.

Anita Engle. *Readings in Glass History* No. 22, Phoenix Publications, Jerusalem, Israel, 1990. 100 pp., 26 figs., 5 color plates. $20.00 (paper).

Anita Engle is the doyenne of glass historians in the Middle East. For nearly 20 years her series of *Readings in Glass History* has provided information on the history of this material often not available elsewhere. Her work is always interesting, frequently stimulating, and sometimes ground-breaking. Although often difficult to locate and rarely cited by other writers, much of her work is worth seeking out.

In this volume, however, she has perhaps bitten off more than she could chew. It appears to belong to some sort of time warp in which bead studies have not advanced much beyond what they were in the late 1960s. Most of the bead sources on which she relies are either of that period or secondary references which rely heavily on older published findings. As a result, this volume fails to advance bead studies.

In the introduction, Engle outlines what she perceives as the problems with bead research. On p. 5 she says: "As archaeologists have long known, bead finds are inadequately recorded, if at all, they are undateable, even when found in stratified circumstances, and, with one notable exception, they are hopelessly unprovenanceable."

Perhaps such a statement could have been written with confidence a few decades ago, but with the increased interest in bead studies around the world and a dozen or more years of intensive work by many people, it is no longer tenable. Many beads found in a

number of stratified sites have now been fairly closely dated, dates which are increasingly being cross checked and made more accurate. Nor are beads "hopelessly unprovenanceable," as the origins for a great many of them are being verified.

Given this critique of bead research, one might expect some breakthrough from Engle, but all we are offered are "beads picked up from the sand dunes covering the ruins of ancient and medieval Caesarea... collected by two different families settled in the area, during the course of several years in which their main search was for ancient coins." To this unscientifically based assemblage are applied parallels derived almost entirely from long-outdated sources and more recent secondary sources. The parallels are not drawn from personal examination of beads but from texts and photographs, even in one case a fuzzy photocopy (p. 58).

Engle's lack of research into current bead studies seriously weakens her work. On pages 12-15, she echoes the old argument that glass beads made in Asia were made of glass imported as scrap from the West, while comparisons of their major ingredients show that this was not the case (Francis 1988-9:3-9). She remains confused about the origin and significance of chevron beads (pp. 18, 87), which have received much attention (for a summary, *see* Francis 1988: 25). Her discussion of drawn opaque red Indo-Pacific beads (pp. 20-22) relies on sources a quarter of a century old, and takes in nothing of the work that has been done on them for the last decade. She persists in calling them *mutisalah*, an inappropriate term, and even refers to "mutisalah glass" to mean opaque "Indian" red glass.

Not having acquainted herself with recent work in bead research, Engle relies heavily on old or secondary works. One of the latter is Deagan's (1987) excellent book which, however, discusses beads that have little or no relationship to those that Engle has. The other is Dubin's (1987) work, entirely secondary and marred by flaws that Engle repeats or compounds. For example, Engle (p. 85) mentions a turquoise-colored bead which Dubin (1987: chart no. 633) says is a ceramic "Donkey bead" made in India, whereas it is neither -- it is faience made in Qom, Iran. Engle then (p. 86) compares a "St. Eustace" bead with green beads that she has seen. The name of the island, in the Netherlands Antilles, is St. Eustatius (both Dubin and Engle misspell it). These beads are blue, not green. Moreover, if Engle's green beads are pentagonal they would not be mimicking emerald crystals, as she suggested, as the latter are hexagonal.

A lack of understanding of how glass is made into beads also leads Engle astray on several occasions. The top caption for Pl. 25 (p. 88) begins by describing two beads as "wound," and then suggests that they were made by the *Margariteri* of Venice, quoting Nesbitt (1879!) on how drawn beads are finished by being packed in a mixture of lime and charcoal and being fired. She concludes that the "lime-like substance" in one of the beads is a result of this operation. However, if the beads are wound, it is more likely a separator put on the mandrel by the beadmaker. If the beads are drawn, the material might well be dirt.

The same confusion is found in the caption of the lower plate on p. 98. The red beads being discussed are of a different finish in part because they are different beads: the strand is composed of drawn Indo-Pacific beads, while the two on the other strand are wound.

On p. 58 Engle notes that "a special type of large glass bead" found on early Spanish-colonial sites in North America (i.e., Neuva Cadiz beads; *see* pp. 54-8) is "the same type of large square-sectioned bead... produced in quantity by the Hebron glassmakers today." This astonishing statement compares multi-layered drawn beads to simple wound beads with no more similarity than the fact that they are both glass and have square sections. It fits in with her overall thesis, but bears no relationship to reality.

The same sort of undiscriminating analysis of beads is made throughout much of the work. Thus, the striped bead found by Lamb at Pengkalan Bujang is related to striped beads from Caesarea (pp. 9-12), as though striped glass beads were so excessively scarce that all had to have been made by the same process in the same place. On the same basis, black round beads from Caesarea are compared to those found in North American sites (pp. 84-5). Her discussion of mosaic beads (pp. 15-7) is hopelessly entangled in misconceptions. Those found at Pengkalan Bujang are Early Islamic, as probably are the ones from Caesarea. She cites van der Sleen (1973) discussing mosaic beads, but he was describing two types: one the so-called "Java bead," the other with heavy lead and barium contents,

which must be Chinese. Engle's discussion of cornerless cubes (pp. 17-8) is sketchy, and her parallel to specimens on "A necklace of Amsterdam beads from West Africa" (first published by Read in 1905) which appears as the frontispiece of the 1973 edition of van der Sleen is meaningless, since those on the necklace are not cornerless cubes but twisted squares.

Moreover, by being unacquainted with beads, Engle tends to believe that various types are rare. Opaque red glass is referred to this way on p. 22, while, in fact, it has been a common glass for beads for millennia. In the caption of plate 26 (p. 96), she refers to a carnelian cornerless cube as being "unusual," while they are actually quite common. In the same caption she cannot differentiate chalk from bone or whatever else certain beads were made from.

The author devotes considerable space (pp. 72-83) to the so-called "man in the moon" bead: round blue tabulars with the design of a half-moon with a face and stars on one side, and stars and what might be a comet on the other (some have what is thought to be an anchor in place of the moon face). These are known from a few North American sites. They have also been found in sites along the eastern Mediterranean, a fact which she does not mention. Apparently none were found at Caesarea, so why they are discussed is unclear. They must be what she sees as the "one notable exception" to all of those "hopelessly unprovenanceable" beads out there.

Engle's argument is that the "Half-Moon," which was a nickname for Amersterdam due to the arrangement of the canals (Henry Hudson's ship was named *The Half Moon*), was a common watermark on paper which, she argues, had a Dutch connection. Therefore, she believes that the beads were made in Holland. The point of all this is that in the preceding even-longer section (pp. 59-71) she states her case for the beadmakers of Holland having largely been new Christians, forcibly converted from Judaism in Spain and Portugal.

Much of Engle's corpus is devoted to the theme of how important Jews or converted Jews have been to the history of glass. The case she makes for this is often very interesting, but also sometimes convoluted. In the present work, many assumptions are made about the identification of people and their origins and, to accept it all, the reader must undergo a considerable suspension of skepticism.

This aside, to return to the "man in the moon" bead, Engle's idea is intriguing but not absolutely convincing. For one thing, the occurrence of this bead in North America postdates most Dutch trade in the regions in which it is found and perhaps even Dutch beadmaking, though the beads could have been in circulation for some time. The watermarks themselves do not date later than 1600, leaving a gap of a century or more between them and the beads. There are also no parallels among the beads found or excavated in Holland (K. Karklins 1990: pers. comm.)

Engle further weakens her argument by advancing ideas that are allowed to float in the air. For example: "My own theory is that [this motif represents] some significant event in the struggle for religious freedom on the part of this widespread movement of artisans, of varying crafts and differing beliefs, but all united in one goal." This non sequitur is never elaborated upon. We are told that the figure usually called an "anchor" on the beads is the man in the moon with an exaggerated nose and a cross at the tip, and that a watermark depicts this clearly but, although 27 watermarks are reproduced in her book, this one is omitted. We are also told that the "comet" is a "mini-dragon," again without substantiation; several of the watermarks appear to show a comet, while the dragons seem to belong to a different class of designs.

Despite these problems, Engle has advanced an interesting idea which could, theoretically, be tested in the future. This is a contribution, but does not live up to the billing of the book.

For the first time in her series, Engle publishes color photographs which are welcome and generally of good standard (the same cannot be said of all the black and white photos). Several of the illustrations, however, have been misplaced, printed upside down, and so on. The tip-in on p. 96 to explain how to view the color plates on p. 97 is very ambiguous as to what the reader is supposed to do. The plate of the necklaces on that page has either been cropped to remove the cornerless cube mentioned in the caption or there was no cornerless cube in the strand to begin with.

The form of citations and references are not up to international academic standards. Often entire volumes of her *Readings* series are cited, leaving the poor interested reader with no choice but to plow

through the entire volume to see what is being discussed. The bibliography cites neither publisher nor page numbers, an irritant to researchers.

In short, though the book is readable and sometimes interesting, it does not advance the field of bead research in any way, save the hypothesis about the origin of the "man in the moon" bead. This is a real shame. Engle is positioned to have made some real contributions to the field. A thorough study of the important beadmaking center of Hebron (*see* Francis, this volume) would have been welcomed. Had she done her homework in regards to the beads found at Caesarea which she asserts are from the Islamic period by comparing them to excavated examples in local museums and the literature, she could have advanced our understanding of that important beadmaking period. However, despite the announced theme of this volume, its real focus seems to be elsewhere.

REFERENCES CITED

Deagan, Kathleen
1987 *Artifacts of the Spanish Colonies of Florida and the Caribbean, 1500-1800. Vol. I: Ceramics, Glassware, and Beads. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.*

Dubin, Lois S.
1987 *The History of Beads from 30,000 B.C. to the Present.* Harry N. Abrams, New York.

Francis, Peter, Jr.
1988 The Glass Trade Beads of Europe: Their Manufacture, Their History, and Their Identification. *World of Beads Monograph Series* 8.
1988-9 Glass Beads in Asia. Part I. Introduction. *Asian Perspectives* 28: 1–21.

Nesbitt, Alexander
1879 *Glass.* Scribner and Welford, New York.

Sleen, W.G.N. van der
1973 *A Handbook on Beads.* Liberty Cap Books, York, Pennsylvania.

Peter Francis, Jr.
Center for Bead Research
4 Essex Street
Lake Placid, N. Y. 12946

The Glass Trade Beads of Europe: Their Manufacture, Their History, and Their Identification.

Peter Francis, Jr. *The World of Beads Monograph Series* 8, 1988. Lapis Route Books, Center for Bead Research, Lake Placid, New York. 69 pp., 1 map, 9 B&W figs., 1 color plate, index. $11.00 (paper).

Based on Francis' earlier works, "The Story of Venetian Beads" and "The Czech Bead Story," this is a much-updated study reflecting many years of painstaking research involving extensive travel to see museum and private collections, archival resources and modern bead manufacturing throughout the world. Those who have followed Peter Francis' peregrinations, as wonderfully detailed in issue after issue of *The Bead Journal* and its successor, *Ornament*, will, on the whole, be very pleased with the sequel. There are then, a few bones to pick as might be expected for a work of such scope. Taken as a whole, this is a fine complement to the pioneering study in this general field by Kenneth Kidd.

Francis' latest major study is made up of five sections, each of which I shall treat in turn. In Section One, after succinctly summarizing the major European processes for making beads (viz: furnace wound, drawn, and lamp wound) and making brief reference to other processes, notably for making "china" or "porcelain" (elsewhere called "tile") beads, Francis focuses on some major problems associated with identifying beads as to their countries of origin and dates of manufacture. The reader will be certain to agree that the author's caveats on these matters are not to be taken lightly. They include: 1) historical references to beadmaking operations or the bead trade; 2) bead sample cards; and 3) archaeological evidence.

Section Two: "The Medieval Background to Modern European Trade Beads" is but two pages in length due to the paucity of available information.

Section Three: "Venice: The Mother of Modern Beads" has 1) an introduction followed by a discussion of 2) "The Growth of Beadmaking at Venice," in turn succeeded by 3) "Growth of the Industry," 4) "Beadmaking History: The Early Centuries," 5) "The Nineteenth Century," 6) "The Twentieth Century," and concludes with 7) "The Identification of Venetian