

REFERENCES CITED

Beardsley, Richard K.

- 1954 Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology. *University of California, Archaeological Survey Reports* 24, 25.

Bennyhoff, James A. and Robert F. Heizer

- 1958 Cross-Dating Great Basin Sites by Californian Shell Beads. *University of California, Berkeley, Archaeological Survey Reports* 42:60-92.

Gifford, Edward W.

- 1947 Californian Shell Artifacts. *University of California, Anthropological Records* 9(1):1-132.

Hartzell, Leslie L.

- in press Archaeological Evidence for Stages of Manufacture of *Olivella* Shell Beads in California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*.

Lillard, Jeremiah B., R.F. Heizer, and F. Fenenga

- 1939 An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California. Sacramento Junior College, Department of Anthropology, *Bulletin* 2.

Leslie L. Hartzell
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Davis, CA 95616

Glass Trade Beads in the Northeast, and Including Aboriginal Bead Industries.

Gary L. Fogelman. *The Pennsylvania Artifact Series, Booklet No. 70*, Fogelman Publishing Company, Turbotville, Pennsylvania, 1991. i-iv + 44 pp., 29 figs., folded-in color poster. \$15.00 (paper).

In 1937, Gerald B. Fenstermaker published an article in *The Pennsylvania Archaeologist*, the newly established Bulletin of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology, entitled "Indian Glass Trade Beads." The purpose of this article was to describe the distinctive styles of glass beads found in Lancaster County and to correlate them with the known historic periods, beadmakers and traders. Included in the article was a chart depicting the "Evolution of Indian

Beads," as well as drawings of several reconstructed necklaces (Fenstermaker 1937:73-5). While the scholarship on glass beads and their role in the culture of Native Americans has advanced considerably since Fenstermaker's day, the popularity of this approach remains undiminished. Gary Fogelman's glossy booklet is the most recent addition to this literature.

The author's goals are ambitious. In a brief "Intent" section, he outlines four basic purposes for this booklet and its accompanying poster: 1) to familiarize the reader with a complex topic (glass trade beads); 2) to provide a "glimpse" of native beadmaking; 3) to look at how trade goods were assimilated into native culture; and 4) to put both glass trade beads and native-made beads into "a chronological perspective." These are daunting challenges for any bead researcher. Not surprisingly, the results of Fogelman's effort are mixed.

Fogelman divides his text into ten parts. Each ostensibly covers a particular subtopic. Some of these subsections are quite useful; other are, frankly, awful. Let's start with the good news. Fogelman is on firmest ground when discussing glass beads. Part III provides a review of previous classification systems and problems in bead research. Part IV summarizes manufacturing techniques, while Part V discusses bead terminology and includes an interesting compilation of the slang terms used in bead description. Part VI is a reprint of the classification system for glass beads developed by Kenneth and Martha Ann Kidd. Originally published by Parks Canada in 1970, the Kidd system, as amended by Karlis Karklins (1985), has become the standard for describing glass beads in northeastern North America. By making this information more broadly available, Fogelman has performed a valuable service to both collectors and scholars — helping us to speak the same descriptive language. Unfortunately, the Kidds' color plates were not reprinted along with the descriptions.

On the not-so-good side, there are several weak sections. Part I is an ill-fated effort to discuss native beads pre and post European contact. This is a large and complex topic, and Fogelman's choppy, shallow

account of native bead "industries" is just not adequate to the task. Part II, *An Overview on Glass Beads in the Northeast*, and Part VII, *Glass Beads Throughout the Northeast*, are largely redundant and, though more substantial, suffer from the same superficial, discursive style that plagues Part I. Superficial is the kindest word for Part VIII, *Native Use of Glass Beads*.

What differentiates this booklet from other surveys of glass beads is the large (30 x 20 in.) folded-in color poster. Like the booklet, this is an ambitious attempt, one with definite strengths and weaknesses. Essentially, the poster duplicates the information contained in the booklet but with an emphasis on visual rather than textual presentation. Nonetheless, there is a great deal of repetition. Part IX of the booklet is a discussion of the beads used on the poster and includes yet another statement of intent, chronological trends, and most commonly occurring types, all of which is then reprinted on the poster itself. Apparently, this was done so that the poster could be sold on its own, without the accompanying booklet. When used together, however, the impression is of too little information repeated too many times.

The poster's strong point is showing what these beads, both European and native, really look like. In general, the quality of illustration is good. Both a 2-inch and a 5-cm ruler are included for scale. While these suggest that the reproduction was 1 to 1, several beads seem to me to be somewhat larger than actual size. The clarity is pretty good and the printed color values are well matched to those of the beads themselves. The poster gives one an excellent sense of the beads used in northeastern North America from the 16th through the 18th century. Only seeing actual specimens would be better.

Unfortunately, the poster, like the text, is marred by problems. There are some mistakes. The examples labelled as "whelk shell" and "elk molar" are neither, while the bead identified as drawn variety IIbb3 in the 1600 time-range section is actually a wound specimen (WIIb) of 19th-century vintage. Many of the chronological placements also seem wrong to me. For example, "Roman" beads (IIj series) as well as the wound "raspberry" beads (WIIId series) are, to my knowledge, early 18th-century styles, not mid-17th century. On the other hand, long drawn beads of multi-layered construction, both with (IIIb-IIIbb') and without (IIIa) stripes, are more

typical of the mid-17th century than where the poster places them early in the 18th century. There are also many specific chronological assignments that seem questionable. It is unlikely, for example, that beads made from European "Kaolin [sic] pipe stems" date from the late 16th century. Given the effort and cost that undoubtedly went into this poster, it does seem that more care might have been taken to get things right. It is not a good sign when illustrated specimens are followed by the disclaimer "Doesn't belong here."

For all its advantages, the poster approach also has inherent liabilities. Beads are good time markers, but by pigeon holing them into specific time slots, one loses any sense of which varieties were ephemeral and which continued over a long period of time. The poster approach tends to gloss over such distinctions. Another, more serious, distortion is the impression that the chronological distribution of beads illustrated on the poster is spatially valid as well. This is clearly not the case. The bead assemblage that occurs on early 17th-century Iroquois sites in New York state is not the same as that found on Huron sites in Ontario or Algonkian sites in coastal New England. Different native groups received different beads from different European sources at the same time. The poster simply mashes all of them together.

Clearly, this is a publication aimed at collectors rather than scholars. That's fine. It is essential that good information on beads, or any other artifact type, not be locked away in obscure professional publications. In this sense, Fogelman's work provides a needed and useful contribution to the literature on beads. Nonetheless, substantial problems undercut this effort. There are some surprising omissions in the References, even for a popular publication. These include Karklins and Sprague (1980, 1987), as well as other studies that discuss and illustrate (in color) glass beads. Stone (1974) and Deagan (1987) are two examples. Omissions are bound to happen, but they are less forgivable when the author aspires to be "comprehensive, accurate, [and] up to date" (p. ii). The other great annoyance about this booklet is its carelessness. The writing is too chatty and familiar. The illustrations, aside from the poster, are little more than cartoons, and the whole production has a slapdash quality to it. This is not a matter of amateur versus professional work; it is a question of doing the work well.

In sum, this booklet attempts a great deal, but succeeds only occasionally in achieving it. A little time and a lot more attention to detail would have made this useful publication a much more valuable one.

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, D.C.

Fenstermaker, Gerald

- 1937 Indian Glass Trade Beads. *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 6(4):72-75.

Karklins, Karlis

- 1985 Guide to the Description and Classification of Glass Beads. In *Glass Beads*, 2nd ed., pp. 85-118. Parks Canada, Studies in Archaeology, Architecture and History, Ottawa.

Karklins, Karlis and Roderick Sprague

- 1980 *A Bibliography of Glass Trade Beads in North America.* South Fork Press, Moscow, Idaho.
1987 *A Bibliography of Glass Trade Beads in North America - First Supplement.* Promontory Press, Ottawa, Ontario.

Kidd, Kenneth E. and Martha Ann

- 1970 A Classification System for Glass Beads for the Use of Field Archaeologists. *Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History* 1:45-89.

Stone, Lyle M.

- 1974 Fort Michilimackinac 1715-1781: An Archaeological Perspective on the Revolutionary Frontier. *Publications of the Museum, Michigan State University, Anthropological Series* 2.

James W. Bradley
R.S. Peabody Museum of
Archaeology
Phillips Academy
Andover, MA 01810

Beads from the West African Trade Series.

- Volume V, "Russian Blues, Faceted and Fancy Beads from the West African Trade," 1989. 10 pp. of text, 34 pp. of color plates. \$15.00 (paper).
Volume VI, "Millefiori Beads from the West African Trade," 1991. 20 pp. of text, 68 pp. of color plates. \$25.00 (paper).

John Picard and Ruth Picard. Picard African Imports, 9310 Los Prados, Carmel, California 93923.

These are the two latest volumes in the spectacular series on *Beads from the West African Trade* by the Picards. They are the largest volumes to date and the most informative. There is little question that they present the best color photography in the bead field, showing beads singly or in strands in full size and often enlarged.

Those who have been following this series can only be pleased that it gets better all the time. More information is presented, more details on the beads given, and guest authors (Elizabeth Harris for Volume V, and Jamey Allen for Volume VI) are being invited to provide historical or technical details about the beads.

As impressive as these works are, however, there are a few points which this reviewer believes would make them even more valuable as research tools without sacrificing any of their sumptuous format. In these remarks it is necessary to consider four separate works: the work in the two volumes by the Picards, and the essays by Harris and Allen.

The first point is that there is a responsibility inherent in publishing the names of beads which inevitably become part of the nomenclature. Where there is no historical justification for a name and where it can be misleading, it should be avoided. Though the weak foundations of these names were noted in the text, it would be best to expunge "French Ambassador Bead" and "Lewis and Clark Bead," for example.