

size and extent of bead assemblages held in dealer's stocks and private collections, all gleefully represented as having been "excavated" from Jenné, Timbuktu, or wherever.

Society members should make it a priority to educate themselves and others about this terrible situation. While there is some demand within West Africa itself, the real money and the real incentive come from outside. The halting of demand from the rich nations for these antiquities would go far in slowing the looting Insoll describes.

Re: A Query Concerning a Mayan Practice (*Bead Forum* 1:8)

And now to answer one of my own questions. In the very first issue of *The Bead Forum* (1:8), I asked for references to a practice described in a popular journal of the Maya tying a bead to the hair of babies to dangle between their eyes to make them cross-eyed. Peter Pratt (*Bead Forum* 2:8) sent quotations from Coe and Morely. Coe (1966:144) said the parents hung small beads on the noses of the children (not easily envisioned), and Morely (1956:163) said they used little balls of resin dangling from the ends of the children's hair. Now there were three different accounts and no original source.

I now believe I have found one. Fray Diego Landa was one of a handful of Spanish clerics generally empathetic to the native peoples of the Americas. His mission was in the Yucatan where Maya culture still furnished. His *Relacion de las Cosas de Yucatán* is a work of sympathetic, careful observation on all aspects of post-classic Maya culture. He wrote: "It was held as a grace to be cross-eyed, and this was artificially brought about by the mothers, who in infancy suspended a small plaster from the hair down between the eyebrows and reaching the eyes; this constantly binding, they finally became cross-eyed" (Gates 1978:33). I also consulted a Spanish edition and the word in question is *pegotillo*, the diminutive of *pegote* which is sticking-plaster.

Sadly, no beads were involved and, even more sadly, they were not attached to the nose; Morely clearly had a better idea of the practice. Maybe this information only pleases me, but I *have* been wondering about it for a dozen years.

References Cited

Codex Borgia

- 1976 *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Cod. Borg. Messicano 1)* (commentary by Karl A. Nowtony). Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz.

Codex Vaticanus 3738

- 1979 *Codices Selecti LXV*. Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz.

Códice Rios

- 1900 *Il manoscritto messicano vaticano 3738, detto il Codice Rios*. Stabilimento Danesi.

Francis, Peter, Jr.

- 1987 The Endangered Bead. *Ornament* 11(1):64-73.
1988 The Glass Trade Beads of Europe: Their Manufacture, Their History, and Their Identification. *The World of Beads Monograph Series* 8, Lapis Route, Lake Placid.
1989 The Manufacture of Beads from Shell. In "Proceedings of the 1986 Shell Bead Conference," edited by Charles F. Hayes III. *Rochester Museum and Science Center, Research Records* 20:25-35.

Gates, William (tsl.)

- 1978 *Yucatan Before and After the Conquest*. Dover, New York.

Safer, Jane F. and Frances M. Gill

- 1982 *Spirals from the Sea: An Anthropological Look at Shells*. Clarkson N. Potter, New York.

25. SOME NOTES ON ARTICLES IN *BEADS*, by Peter Francis, Jr. (1996, 28:10-12)

First of all, congratulations to Karlis Karklins for continuing to make *Beads* the single best source of information on international bead research. The following are additions to two of my own articles in that journal concerning beads in the Middle East and one which Karlis reprinted for our benefit.

"Beads of the Early Islamic Period," *Beads* 1

The mystery of the bead wasters pictured in Plate IIA and discussed as part of the Fouqi Collection on pp. 29-30 is now solved. In the storerooms of the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam is material known to have been found at Fustat. It is very like the wasters discussed in my paper, but even more convincing of an Early Islamic date because of its provenience and because several unfinished beads are among the finds. The specimens are mosaic beads formed without a core in the manner typical of the Early Islamic period. I now have no doubt that this is what they are.

“Beadmaking in Islam: The African Trade and the Rise of Hebron,” *Beads* 2

The glass beads which I identified as having come from Hebron, following the lead of Arkell (pp. 23-26, Plate VD), have been further confirmed by their presence in the W.G.N. van der Sleen collection of the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam. The collection includes beads of this type and are marked “Palestine.” That would be Hebron (which is now again Palestinian). Double “thanks” to Geralda Jurriaans-Helle.

“On the Date of the Copper Age in the United States,” *Beads* 4

This is a reprint of a paper published in 1862 by A. Morlot, who concluded—on the basis of chevron beads—that the Phoenicians had come to the New World a couple of millennia before Columbus. He quotes material from the pioneer American anthropologist, Henry Schoolcraft, in defense of this hypothesis. Karklins kindly reproduced the relevant material, but there is more to the story.

In the “Editor’s Introduction,” Karklins (1992:39) writes:

Of course, not everyone shared his [Morlot’s] views. In fact, Henry Schoolcraft (1853:103-104), who published descriptions and color illustrations of the Canadian [chevron] beads referred to by Morlot, logically concluded that they dated to the period between the arrival of the French (1608) and the date of the beads’ discovery (1837).

This is both right and wrong. Schoolcraft did reach such a conclusion, but not in the passage quoted by Karklins (Schoolcraft 1853:104) and the one referred to by Morlot. This reads:

The colored enamel beads are a curious article. No manufacture of this kind is now known. They are believed to be of European origin, and agree completely with the beads found in 1817, in antique Indian graves, at Hamburg, Erie Co., N.Y. (Karklins 1992:43).

In this passage and in Part I of *Information*, Schoolcraft does not discuss the age of the beads, only their origin. Morlot happily quotes Schoolcraft. After all, the beads have been found in another (presumably) ancient cemetery and Schoolcraft did not know that chevron beads were still being made, even though to call the Phoenicians “Europeans” is a little farfetched, despite their colonies in Spain. However, Schoolcraft did firmly rule out the chevrons found at Beverly, Ontario, and all other glass beads found in North America as

being ancient (Phoenician or otherwise) in Part V (p. 110) of *Information* in which he wrote:

It is important to distinguish between the antiquarian vestiges of the early French, and of the Indian occupancy. Many of the articles of each period have been confounded, because they have been found in the same locations, and some of them in the same graves or sepulchral. This is the case with all articles of glass-beads, enamel and porcelain, transparent or opaque [sic], and all substances requiring vitrification (Vide. Vol. I, Plate 25, Figs. 7 to 13). [Emphasis mine. There is a misprint here; it is not Pl. 25 but 24, beads 7-11, magnified in Figs. 12 and 13. These are the aforementioned chevrons from Beverly.]

So, Morlot made a big thing of the Phoenicians coming to America and threw much sand in many people’s eyes for a long time, even though Schoolcraft had ruled out such a hypothesis as early as 1846 (Francis 1985). But, would he have done so had he read the passage in Part V? Did he never see it? Did he read it and suppress it, or was he just a lazy scholar? Did he just not see the right volume or did he not look far enough? Was he too enthused about his grand idea or was it all an accident? Is there a lesson here?

References Cited

Francis, Peter, Jr.

1985 Bead Report XIV: A Collection of “Phoenician” Beads. *Ornament* 8(4):42-45.

Schoolcraft, Henry R.

1853 *Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States*. Parts 1 and 5. Lippincott, Grambo and Co., Philadelphia (Published in 6 parts between 1851 and 1857).

26. SOME NOTES ON THE WORDS FOR BEAD, by Peter Francis, Jr. (1997, 30:11-13)

***Nazhim* in Arabic**

Around 1350, Ibn Battuta wrote about his travels in West Africa. In the French translation by Defrémery and Sanguinetti (1922:394), his words about what to take to trade in the area were translated as: *des ornements ou colifichets de verre, que l’on appelle nazhim, ou rangée* (“ornaments or baubles of glass, which are called *nazhim*, or *rangée*”).

I have cited this passage on several occasions, including in *The Bead Forum* (Francis 1992:9). In the *Forum* article,