

types of ornaments (beads, pendants, and amulets) and the sites at which they have been found. In this section she also tries to link the emergence of specific types of amulets to changing social, political, and religious systems. While the discussion is somewhat disconnected and is not fully supported with references, it does raise some important issues that need to be pursued through future research. Perhaps the most important themes relate to internal trade and exchange networks and linkages to external regions.

Jonathan Mark Kenoyer  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Wisconsin,  
Madison  
1180 Observatory Drive  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

*South East African Beadwork, 1850-1910: From Adornment to Artefact to Art.*

**Michael Stevenson and Michael Graham-Stewart (eds.).** Fernwood Press, Vlaeberg, South Africa. 2000. 192 pp., index. South African rands 295.00 (about \$32.00 + postage)(hard cover).

In this book, the beadwork and many of the archive illustrations are from the collections of the editors. Sandra Klopper, of the University of Cape Town, has contributed an Introductory Essay. This has the subheadings: Early Collectors; Beads vs. Indigenous Materials; The Changing Fortunes of Beads; Fashion vs. The Symbolic Use of Colour; Looking for Meaning in Style: Ethnicity vs. Regionalism; The Creative Role of Women; The Role of Beadwork in the Articulation of Male and Female Power and Influence; and Revisiting the Past: Proud Owners of Beadwork in the Late 20th Century.

Most of the pieces are without documentation and are identified by analogy with other published material, though some do have the collector's documentation, such as those acquired by Alfred John Gregory who was in the Cape Colony between 1891 and 1914, some of that time as Medical Officer of Health. Most of his pieces are attributed to the Mfengu, otherwise known as the Fingo. This leads me to raise the matter of the two maps in the volume which have

been taken from *An Atlas of African History* by J.D. Fage. "Fingoland" is shown on the first map, along with a few other tribal areas, but there is no indication on either map of where the Drakensberg range is, even though a number of the beadwork pieces are attributed to this area. It really would have been better to use maps with far less detail (much of it irrelevant to this book), but showing the tribes and areas referred to in the text, and using, for example, Mfengu rather than Fingoland.

The endnotes appear to be designed to incorporate a bibliography so, while authors and titles are indeed given, it does mean that the reader may have to search backwards through the notes to find the relevant title. A properly arranged bibliography is a surprising omission. The index is comprehensive and well laid out.

The pictures of the actual beadwork are of excellent quality and presented in a straightforward manner, whether in total view or in detail—prime requisites for studying beadwork appearance and technique. They are grouped by area, tribal attribution, and object type. Sandra Klopper's Introductory Essay, accompanied by archival illustrative material, some of it from Michael Graham-Stewart's collection, provides a logically arranged and clear background to the whole subject of South African beadwork. As a visual presentation of an insufficiently known assemblage of African beadwork, this volume will be useful as a tool for further research.

Margret Carey  
2 Frank Dixon Way  
London SE21 7BB  
United Kingdom

*Ancient Glass in the Israel Museum: Beads and Other Small Objects.*

**Maud Spaer, with contributions by Dan Barag, Tallay Ornan, and Tamar Neuhaus.** The Israel Museum, P.O. Box 71117, Jerusalem 91710, Israel. 2001. 384 pp., 51 color plates, 101 b&w figs., notes, indexes. \$93.00 + \$24.00 shipping (paper cover).

This is a wonderful book. It is beautifully laid out, well written, and profusely illustrated. It is also well made and a joy to read (and reread); a large (it weighs 2 kg or 4+ pounds) soft-cover book that does not fall apart when you open it.

The work is a catalogue of 647 small glass objects in the holdings of the Israel Museum, most of them beads or related items. As Spaer points out in her introduction, beads have received far less attention than large glass items, but this is a grave mistake as beads were among the first glass objects made and beadmaking was often at the forefront of glass technologies.

The first chapter covers both the history of glassmaking and the making and working of glass. The remaining chapters discuss the glass objects themselves: beads, pendants, bracelets and other jewelry, seals and cameos, game pieces and tokens, inlays and amulets, implements (spindle whorls, pins, and rods), and pre-manufactured elements (inlays, mosaic pieces, and what might be ingots). A glossary, a few notes, indices, references, plates, and maps follow the main text. Most chapters will interest bead researchers. I know that I am often asked by default to catalogue objects that are not beads or pendants at various sites, including spindle whorls and bangles (bracelets).

There are several nice touches in the book. It is illustrated throughout, not just in the plates section at the back. Particularly helpful are photos showing beadmaking processes in the section dealing with them. There is also a small bonus of a discussion on Hebron (pp. 146-147). I cannot say whether beads nos. 274-279 were made there, but the collection has none of the monochrome (and crumb) beads so well known in the African trade (at least some African traders know these beads came from Hebron). Perhaps different beads were made for different markets.

The major weakness of the book is not the fault of the author. It is that the book catalogues a museum's holdings, all of which appear to have been donated by collectors and, therefore, carry little information regarding where they were found and on what date. Most museum catalogues have the same weakness. Spaer tries her best to cite parallels, some of which have known proveniences, but dating and sourcing of many items remain problematical. Several beads are

also denoted as being from the "Islamic period" or something similar. Problem is, much of the world, including many places where these beads were found, is still in the Islamic period, now in its 15th century. Still, the book is a necessity for anyone interested in the glass beads of the Middle East. No work is perfect, of course, so the balance of this review will be to critique or correct some parts of it. The problem areas do not detract from the value of the book.

The history in chapter one is well done and informative. Perhaps it should have been pointed out, however, that it is not a general history of glass, but a history of glass around the Mediterranean and, to a lesser extent, Europe. China rates only a single sentence and India, Southeast Asia, and some parts of Europe are completely ignored. Of course, the history serves as an introduction to the catalogue, but then one wonders why China was even mentioned or why the Indian *lada* drawing technique is included in the glossary.

The glassmaking discussion in the same chapter is a little sparse. On page 35, only soda is mentioned as an alkali and it is said, "lime was added to stabilize the glass...." Most of the objects Spaer is dealing with may be soda glass, but no analyses are offered, so that is not certain. It is also likely that ancient glassmakers did not add lime and that it was included accidentally with other ingredients. She mentions these things in the glossary entry on glass, but it is curious that it is not in the text.

The beads are divided according to their decoration. Manufacturing processes would have been a better choice. Relying on decoration places Fustat Fused-Rod beads (they should not be called "Fustat beads" because several types of beads were made at Fustat) in the eye-bead section when they have eyes (no. 128) and in the "trailed line" section when they do not (nos. 181-182). "Trailed lines" is an unfortunate choice because "trailing" refers to adding lines to the body of the bead, while many of these beads have lines that are part of the glass and were not trailed onto the surface. I also think that at least the perforated "amulets" would have been better grouped with the beads or pendants, many of which are also amulets, and not with the inlays.

My major disagreement is over the names Spaer gives to some beadmaking processes. She divides the

hot-working techniques into "rod-forming" and "air-forming." "Rod-forming" is used throughout the book, but as it encompasses winding, joining (fusing), molding, folding, and piercing, it is not always clear what process is being discussed, though it is usually denotes winding. I do not think it is logical to say that air *forms* a drawn bead. Moreover, drawn segmented beads (such as gold-glass beads) would have to fall into both groups, since they began as drawn tubes which were then put on rods or wires to be rolled over molds to segment them.

The term "segmented" is not as confusing as Spaer has it (p. 132). A drawn segmented bead is so-called because the beads were made in a series, each bead being a segment of the tube. They are still called segmented beads whether they are cut into individual beads or left as a sequence of segments. Gold-glass beads are a subset of segmented beads. Perhaps her confusion comes because in this collection segmented beads are apparently represented only by gold-glass beads. In every Middle Eastern assemblage I have catalogued, including the Hellenistic-Roman Red Sea port of Berenike, Egypt, plain segmented beads are always quite common.

Another term with which I have problems is "gob-winding." This is taking a gather of molten glass on a punty or pontil and letting it drip onto a mandrel to form a bead. She claims (p. 45) that this was the most common way to wind glass beads. How she can determine that I cannot say. Most ancient wound beads, in my experience, are furnace-wound (directly in the furnace), as attested by black perforation deposits. The descendants of the beadmakers of Tyre (Hebron, Turkey, and Cairo), as well as traditional beadmakers in India, furnace-wind their beads. On the other hand, at Herat, Afghanistan, a distant offshoot of the Damascus industry, the glass is removed from the furnace and dripped onto a rotating mandrel. If we could identify "gob-wound" beads (and find a more attractive term for them), this might help us distinguish ancient beadmaking traditions and sites.

The section on Venetian beads (pp. 140-145) strikes me as somewhat odd. The history is presented as though she had discovered all these facts herself, referencing others only rarely. There is then a short section discussing research on Venetian beads. It would have been more consistent to cite the literature as she discussed the history, as she did for all the other

sections of the book. Spaer and I have discussed the three combed suboblates (no. 266) she grouped with Venetian beads. She told me that she had no definite information on them. I think they are not Venetian, as they are never found in Africa or the Americas, but have no guess as to their origin.

Now some remarks about individual beads. Bead no. 6 is paralleled with a bead found at Nuzi (both are wound segmented beads but they differ in shape). Rather, this bead looks like the wound, segmented, annular beads found in some numbers at Berenike, and one found in a Meroitic tomb in Nubia. Those at Berenike are mostly from the 4th and 5th centuries; the Meroitic kingdom ended at the beginning of the 4th century.

Beads 45 and 46 are small bicones that Spaer says were "obviously drawn." From the description, they appear to be the same beads that are quite common at Berenike. During my first season there (when I was too ill to look at them closely), I thought they were "obviously wound." Indeed, they are neither. They were made from a plaque of glass that was pierced, folded up the mandrel, and marvered or paddled into cones at either end. This complex technique became evident when I closely examined each one of these beads under a microscope at Berenike.

While some date beads (no. 160) were made by single-strip folding, and all of those in the museum's collection might be, most at Berenike were pierced and folded up the mandrel. Spaer correctly says that the better cornerless-cube beads (nos. 48-49) were made by lapidary techniques, but I have never seen one made in a mold. Most were wound and paddled into shape. Every head pendant (Pl. 25) I have examined was core-formed, not "rod-formed," unless you count the rod that held the clay core.

The glossary is useful, but several entries could use some correction. "Caged" is apparently a misprint for "cased." To the best of my knowledge, only one article ever referred to the spotted Venetian beads as *Alta Verapaz*; I do not think anyone else has ever used the term. Aventurine is a type of glass, not a bead. It can be made into a bead or be used to decorate beads. If a bar is a mosaic cane, it should be called that. Cane-winding is what has been called lamp-winding for a very long time; I see no reason to change it, especially as it contrasts with furnace-winding, etc.

No mention is made in the entry on "chevron bead" that the layers are corrugated, giving the bead its name; this is discussed in the text. Glass is not homogeneous; it is heterogeneous. It is also not a substance but a state of matter. Siliceous does not only refer to glass, faience, and similar artificial products, but also to stones containing silica.

Finally, I wish to discuss the beads that Spaer calls "mirror beads" (nos. 184-187) and the associated "rayed bead" (no. 189). She notes that I have used the term "torus folded" for these beads (Francis 1989:29), but says it is not clear which bead I was discussing. I thought the drawing in Fig. 2c would have made that clear, but that is beside the point. As far as I can tell, the first person to discuss these beads at any length was Chittick (1974:466-468). He replicated these beads with plasticine, but I have never quite been able to follow his method, which involves trailing a decoration, manipulating the bead, and using a mold.

Spaer also cites this work, but only notes Fig. 181e as a parallel to her "mirror beads." In this, she may be right. As I look at Chittick's drawing, the other eight beads do look different, while this one seems to be a "mirror bead." Spaer then cites a work by L'vov and reproduces a drawing from that work in which these beads (as well as some flat pendants) were made by piercing, folding, and manipulating a disc with concentric circular designs. I have not seen L'vov's paper, but am satisfied that this technique is workable, as it was presented by beadmaker Tom Holland at Bead Expo 2002. Holland worked with Jeff Mitchem trying to replicate beads Mitchem had recently uncovered in Jordan.

Spaer relates these beads to the one she calls a "rayed bead." The notes on the "rayed bead" (p. 116; insertion mine), however, read: "Zigzag of eight protruding ribs around small basic [*i.e.* base] bead of conical shape.... The ribs form the main body of the bead. Chipped." The chipped portion presumably helped her reach the conclusions about how the bead was constructed. This, then, is a torus-folded bead, made by manipulating a torus (a thick ring) up and down the sides of a bead used as a base. It is totally unlike the method proposed by L'vov and Holland for making "mirror beads."

My initial assumption that "mirror beads" and torus-folded beads were made in the same way appears

to be in error. Looking into the perforation of a "mirror" bead in the Center's collection, lines matching those on the surface are visible. Similar lines cannot be seen in the perforation of a torus-folded bead. We are dealing with two types of beads here (and possibly a third type that forms the bulk of Chittick's beads from Kilwa). That makes life more interesting, if more complicated.

In sum, Spaer's work is invaluable. I know I shall be consulting it often as I deal with material from roughly the same part of the world. There are a few flaws, but that happens with every publication. The use of what I consider odd or inappropriate terms may be a result of linguistic dissonance or cultural discrepancy (for example, I have never seen a bibliography set up the way this one is, but this may be standard practice elsewhere). The book is a major contribution to bead research.

## REFERENCES CITED

### Chittick, Neville

1974 Kilwa: An Islamic Trading City on the East African Coast. Volume II. *BIEA Memoir 5*. The British Institute in East Africa, Nairobi.

### Francis, Peter, Jr.

1989 Beads of the Early Islamic Period. *Beads: Journal of the Society of Bead Researchers* 1: 21-39.

Peter Francis, Jr.  
Center for Bead Research  
4 Essex Street  
Lake Placid, New York 12946

### *Asia's Maritime Bead Trade: 300 B.C. to the Present.*

Peter Francis, Jr. University of Hawai'i Press,  
2840 Kolowalu Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i  
96822. 2002. i-xi + 308 pp., 48 color figs., 89  
b&w figs., notes, index. \$52.00 (hard cover).

This reviewer, along with the entire bead community, remains greatly saddened by the premature death of Peter Francis, Jr., the author of *Asia's Maritime Bead Trade*. At it's best, a book review becomes part of a conversation between the reviewer and the book's author, and in this case, the