

Lobdell, John E. 1981. *The Putuligayuk River Delta Overlook Site: Fragile Traces of Ancient Man at Prudhoe Bay, Beaufort Sea, Alaska. Environmental Conservation Department, ARCO Alaska, Inc.: Anchorage.*

McGhee, Robert 1976. Parsimony isn't everything: an alternative view of Eskaleutian linguistics and prehistory. *Canadian Archaeological Association Bulletin* 8:60-81.

Workman, William B. 1980. Continuity and Change in the Prehistoric Record from Southern Alaska. In Y. Kotani and W. Workman, eds., "Alaska Native Culture and History," *Senri Ethnological Studies* 4. National Museum of Ethnology: Senri, Osaka. pp. 49-101.

Larsen, Helge. 1950. Archaeological Investigations in Southwestern Alaska. *American Antiquity* 15:177-186.

De Laguna, Frederica. 1934. *The Archaeology of Cook Inlet, Alaska.* The University Museum, Philadelphia.

De Laguna, Frederica. 1956. Chugach Prehistory. *University of Washington Publications in Anthropology*, Vol. 13. University of Washington Press.

Lobdell, John E. 1981. *The Putuligayuk River Delta Overlook Site: Fragile Traces of Ancient Man at Prudhoe Bay, Beaufort Sea, Alaska. Environmental Conservation Department, ARCO Alaska, Inc.: Anchorage.*

McGhee, Robert. 1976. Parsimony isn't everything: an alternative view of Eskaleutian linguistics and prehistory. *Canadian Archaeological Association Bulletin* 8:60-81.

Workman, William B. 1980. Continuity and Change in the Prehistoric Record from Southern Alaska. In Y. Kotani and W. Workman, eds., "Alaska Native Culture and History," *Senri Ethnological Studies* 4. National Museum of Ethnology: Senri, Osaka. pp. 49-101.

Glass Beads. Karlis Karklins. History and Archaeology 59, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Ottawa, 1982. 117pp., 21 b & w illustrations, 4 tables. \$7.25

While I should be the last person to be critical of misleading titles, the collective title of Karlis Karklins' latest effort conveys an expectation of a more encompassing coverage of glass bead research. Instead, it is a compilation of three essentially unrelated studies: two descriptive efforts dealing with 19th century collections from the Museum of Mankind (London, England) and a manual for classifying glass beads. Too short to be published separately in the Parks Canada *History and Archaeology* series, it appears to have been an editorial decision to combine these 1979 and 1980 articles in one volume under its unintentionally deceptive title.

The first article is entitled "The Levin Catalogue of Mid-19th Century Beads." Using an expanded version of Kidd and Kidd's (1970) glass bead typology, Karklins presents an exceptionally detailed typological and metrical quantification of the sample of 604 glass and 17 stone beads that Moses Levin, a London, England, bead merchant used in the African trade. Based on accession dates and other criteria, Karklins has assigned a date of between 1851 and 1869 to the collection. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that the beads were not collected prior to 1851. This should be taken into consideration especially when Karklins mentions that the Levin catalogue possesses bead types recovered from

North American contexts, and as such the catalogue can be used as a comparative, "temporally firm" collection. The dates determined by Karklins for the catalogue unlikely, however, provide the complete temporal span for the bead varieties represented, and consequently, the presence of these beads on archaeological sites in both the New and Old Worlds should not exclusively indicate dates of between 1851 and 1869. Some temporal information on the beads from more securely dated assemblages would have proved useful.

An interesting feature of the black-and-white photographs of the beads in the Levin catalogue are the original captions on the 1863 sheets. If it was Levin who assembled the sheets, very important information concerning value equivalencies in trade could be discerned. Each of the 1863 sheets have beads that were apparently traded for particular African commodities (ivory, palm oil, slaves, and gold). While Karklins does not deal with this here, such approaches to trade inventories would be a profitable avenue of research.

The second article, "A Sample Book of 19th Century Venetian Beads," follows the same format. Originally assigned a date of 1704, Karklins believes the collection more likely dates to the latter half of the 19th century. As far as origin of manufacture is concerned, he is confident that typologically they are indeed Venetian. As Karklins states, Van der Sleen believed that Dutch and Venetian glass beads could be chemically distinguished, and presumably this is why Karklins undertook a chemical element analysis of two specimens. For the reader not well versed in chemistry, the significance, if any, of the element breakdown in Table 2 should have been made clear by additional explanation.

Essentially, this collection possesses many of the deficiencies (if not more) of archaeologically recovered samples. Provenience and date are conjectural, so the collection itself would be of little comparative use for archaeological analyses.

The third article, "Guide to the Description and Classification of Glass Beads," is a welcome update of Kidd and Kidd's widely accepted and implemented 1970 typology which classifies beads on a manufacturing technique-class-type-variety system (eg. W-I-a-3). Karklins expands upon their typology for drawn and wound beads; but the major contribution is the incorporation into their system of beads manufactured by wound-on-drawn (WD), mould-pressed (MP), blown (B), and moulded (M) techniques. A combination of Karklins' clarification of Kidd and Kidd's original classes, with the addition of new types and manufacturing techniques, and Kidd and Kidd's existing varieties should result in a more universal acceptance of this glass bead classification system, a system which was originally developed from glass beads recovered primarily from 16th and 17th century sites in northeastern North America. Karklins' expansion significantly enhances this system, making it more applicable to 18th, 19th, and 20th century studies.

However, due to the nature of glass beads there will always be a variety/type class that does not fit, and the procedure for adding a new example, if in fact it is a previously unrecorded specimen, will always be a problem. Walter Kenyon's Grimsby report brings this point home quite strongly. He had identified what he considered to be 43 new varieties of glass beads to the early 17th century inventory

of southern Ontario (Kenyon 1982:237). Now, how many of these new varieties are actually "new" is one problem, but another more pressing one is, what would be the practical means to incorporate these new variants into Kidd and Kidd's system? Karklins appeals that new varieties be reported to him using the Parks Canada Object Catalogue. This is admirable, and if possible would, with periodic published updates, solve many of the classificatory headaches that are developing with increased excavation of sites with European assemblages.

Karklins' method of determining colour is basic in its common sense (especially wetting the bead to its natural colour, and using underlighting for translucent and transparent varieties) (Fitzgerald 1982, Kenyon and Kenyon 1982); however, when re-examining collections it is obvious that numerous researchers, unfortunately, rely simply on the colour presented to them in natural light. This, in combination with Karklins' detailed bead attribute list, and the presentation of Munsell colour equivalents to Kidd and Kidd's colours, should make the identification of bead varieties more objective (accurate), especially as they concern the annoying monochrome blue varieties (IIa31 to IIa57). As a rule, however, the bead varieties in Kidd and Kidd's typology are quite distinct and unmistakable.

Although I do not wish to put a damper on my general enthusiasm for this article, there is one shortcoming. While he adds four new manufacturing types to the system (WD, MP, B, and M), as well as other types of drawn (eg. Io, IIf, IIb', IVnn', etc.) and wound (WIe, WIH, WIIf, etc.) beads, he does not attempt to define new colour varieties. This is a particular drawback for people who would like to implement the system for the four new manufacturing branches he included. Perhaps this will follow.

In the "Historic Archaeological Interpretation" section of the last article Karklins states that as of 1980 no regional chronology of glass beads for Ontario had been formulated; however, "... Ontario [may] benefit from the proximity of New York and the Great Lakes," and in particular the chronologies developed by Pratt (1961) and Wray (1973). However, in 1969, Ian Kenyon produced a detailed typology and chronology of glass beads primarily from ca. 1580-1651 Neutral Iroquoian sites of southern Ontario. In addition, Kenyon implemented, for comparative purposes, Huron, Petun, and Iroquois samples in order to evaluate the chronologies of Wray and Schoff (1953) and Pratt (1961). More recently, Fitzgerald (1982, 1983) and Kenyon and Kenyon (1982) have further developed the late 16th/early 17th century Ontario glass bead sequence implementing historical and economic temporal parameters for assigning dates to distinct bead periods. These developments suggest Wray and Schoff's temporal determinations of the essentially guess-dated pre-ca. 1687 portion of the Seneca sequence were not as precise as they should have been. Wray and Schoff's dates, unfortunately, have become entrenched in northeastern United States archaeological literature, having been used uncritically by New York and Pennsylvania archaeologists since the 1950's. Ontario may be the beneficiary of several things from New York state, but glass bead chronologies are certainly not one of them.

Furthermore, geographical proximity should not necessarily result in archaeo-

logical similarity between groups as Karklins intimated it might. As Ian Kenyon (1969) initially suggested, Dutch and French spheres of influence in early 17th century northeastern North America should possess characteristic bead assemblages. Bead assemblages among the predominantly French-supplied Huron and Dutch-supplied Iroquois were notably different (Kenyon and Kenyon 1982), with Neutral assemblages exhibiting an admixture of the two (Kenyon and Fox 1982); not unexpectedly as the Neutral were being supplied by both French- and Dutch-supplied native groups. This tangent was necessary to illustrate the care which must be taken for the inter-regional use of foreign artifacts. The simple use of archaeological recoveries for cultural reconstruction without supporting historical substantiation, when possible, could in some circumstances lead to erroneous results.

Overall, the value of the first two articles in *Glass Beads* are of questionable archaeological and historical significance. If they were simply published to document collections, that would be fine; however, the chronological problems associated with the collections lessen their comparative value. The classificatory article is the strongest contribution and has the potential, if expanded by detailing new varieties, to complement and possibly supercede in utility Kidd and Kidd's initial attempt. Sight unseen, the title of this volume alone is tempting; however, close inspection of the nature of the articles, with the possible exception of the last one, would result in disappointment for the majority of glass bead researchers.

William R. Fitzgerald,
McGill University

References

- Fitzgerald, W.R. 1982. A Refinement of Historic Neutral Chronologies: Evidence from Shaver Hill, Christianson, and Dwyer. *Ontario Archaeology* 38:31-46.
- Fitzgerald, W.R. 1983. Further Comments on the Neutral Glass Bead Sequence. *Archaeological Notes* 83(1):17-25.
- Kenyon, I. 1969. Glass Beads: A Technique for Dating Historic Neutral Sites. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kenyon, I. and W.A. Fox 1982. The Grimsby Cemetery—A Second Look. *KEWA* 82(9):3-16.
- Kenyon, I. and T. Kenyon 1982. Comments on 17th Century Glass Trade Beads from Ontario. Paper presented at the Glass Trade Bead Conference, Rochester, New York.
- Kenyon, W.A. 1982. *The Grimsby Site: A Historic Neutral Cemetery*. Archaeological Monograph, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.
- Kidd, K.E. and M.A. Kidd 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.
- Pratt, P.P. 1961. *Oneida Glass Trade Bead Sequence, 1585-1745*. Onondaga Printing Company, Syracuse, New York.
- Wray, C.F. 1973. *Manual for Seneca Archaeology*. Cultures Primitive, Inc., Honeoye Falls, New York.