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Abstract

Descriptions and discussions of a selection of artifacts from the Harbor College Milo Moore Collection (HCMMC) serve to broadcast an accumulation of privately collected relics never previously acknowledged through scientific publication. The great majority of those HCMMC specimens relate to Gabrielino who were once settled at or near Palos Verdes Peninsula. Selection of the objects to be illustrated herein gave consideration to: (1) which artifacts might best serve to promote the profile of the HCMMC; (2) the potential of an object to impart some tidbit of information deemed not generally familiar to readers: and (3) anticipated aesthetic and/or intellectual enjoyment for readers.

Introduction

Milo Stuart Moore

In Thomas Tower I’s manuscript, “Stone Age Peoples of Malaga Cove, Prehistoric and Historic” (1942), a document with important Malaga Cove site (CA-LAN-138) content (see e.g., Koerper and Cramer 2014; Koerper, Hunter, and Snyder 2014; Koerper, Hunter, Snyder, and Cramer 2014; Koerper and Peterson 2014; and Koerper et al. 2016), the relic collector acknowledged the profound influence of Milo Stuart Moore (Figure 1), guiding Tower toward science generally, but specifically toward Native American prehistory and ethnology. Chemistry teacher Moore headed up the science department at John H. Francis Polytechnic High School, Los Angeles, where Tower oversaw the maintenance department. Moore had developed his own passion for Native American culture from family members who had encouraged the future educator’s childhood searches to retrieve artifacts from the farm fields surrounding his family’s Ohio home.1

From the period of his youthful searches and up to ca. 1955, Moore amassed an assortment of relics through surface pick-up, trade, purchase, and gifting. At about the half century point into his hobby, Moore cataloged the breadth of his collection (Moore ca. 1935); those listings have proved most useful to the purposes of this article.2

Moore’s Donation

In 1961 the then long-retired teacher donated many of his coastal southern California specimens to Los Angeles Harbor College (LAHC), the stated purpose being to stimulate interest in anthropology (Torrance Herald, 8 June 1961). This legacy gift is now formally named the Harbor College Milo Moore Collection (HCMMC). Certain of these HCMMC artifacts went on display about a half year later, two years before Moore passed away at age 89 (Los Angeles Times, 8 August 1963).

In late 1992 or early 1993 nearly all LAHC’s supposed LAN-138 artifacts were loaned to what is now called the Rancho de los Palos Verdes Historical Society and Museum (RPVHSM) for display at the Malaga Cove School, Palos Verdes Estates. The transfer occurred via the agency of Dr. James Heinselman, then president of LAHC (M. Roderman to J. Heinselman, letter, 19 January 1993, RPVHSM papers).
These objects presently reside with a noncommercial storage facility.

1988 Listings

In the 1980s professional archaeologist Daniel Foster was alerted by his brother John, also a trained archaeologist, to the presence of Malaga Cove artifacts at LAHC. Malaga Cove material held special interest for the brothers who grew up in the Palos Verdes area, and both wondered whether this might be the “elusive John Kohler collection.”

In 1988 Foster looked over the LAHC holdings which turned out to be a selection of materials aggregated by Moore; a few of those items once belonged to Kohler and were subsequently acquired by Moore. We located no record of Kohler ever loaning or gifting anything to the college.

Foster examined the collection and certain documentation kept by the community college’s anthropology department. He saw that most of the formerly Moore-owned holdings, whether individual specimens or aggregates of specimens, carried alphanumeric coding that referred to the collection (M=Moore), followed by another letter to indicate provenance (A=Malaga Cove; B=other mainland Los Angeles County sites; C=Channel Islands other than San Nicolas Island; and D=San Nicolas Island). Application of the alphanumeric labels directly onto certain items was done by someone operating off donor records, possibly Professor Claude Aklamakpe, one-time department chair. Some specimens lay in “box-trays” with the alphanumeric designation written on a card placed beneath the container. Owing to carelessness, but carelessness not clearly understood, instances arose where cards became separated from specimens. Foster despaired that some locational information was hopelessly lost; he surmised that about 400 projectile points would probably remain without provenance.

Foster’s document (1988) listed 85 sequential entries, all purportedly relating to the Malaga Cove site, 82 of which were followed by information specific to either a single artifact or to a grouping of artifacts. Codes M A-1 through M A-10, M A-12 through M A-14, M A-16 through M A-20, M A-22 through M A-53, and M A-55 through M A-86 account for these 82; there was no “M A-11” on the list. Accession codes M A-15, M A-21, and M A-54 were each followed by “None.” Specimen M A-9 in the listing was followed only by a question mark.

While the majority of listings call out a single artifact, 20 entries relate to two or more artifacts; for instance, the M A-86 entry reads “cowrie shell beads.” Measurements attended 30 entries.
Objectives

The primary purpose of our article is to formally alert both professional and avocational southern California archaeologists to the existence of a privately amassed aggregate of Native artifacts which was not previously acknowledged in the regional published literature and which is presently split between two locations. This purpose is served by offering some limited familiarity with the content of the HCMMC through attention directed to selected specimens. Three considerations were uppermost when choosing those artifacts to be described and illustrated: (1) whether an item might effectively help broadcast the collection as a scientifically productive resource and/or an educational resource to reach beyond persons already committed to archaeology, collaterally serving an advocacy for the collection’s eventual curation within a museum or interpretive center that could accommodate the needs of scholars, teachers, and the larger viewing public; (2) whether an artifact might be a vehicle to impart information not generally familiar to avocationalists or in some cases not even to professionals; (3) whether an object or group of objects might provide readers with some amount of aesthetic and/or intellectual enjoyment. Taking measure of the HCMMC followed from study of Foster’s (1988) document and perusal of Moore’s (ca. 1935) listings coupled with careful examination of collection materials made available to us both at LAHC and the RPVHSM’s previous storage rooms at a commercial facility in Torrance.

In the first three sections to follow, those HCMMC artifacts chosen for description and illustration are presented under the headings: “A Selection of Specimens Presently Curated with the LAHC Anthropology Department,” “A Selection of Specimens Presently Held in RPVHSM Storage,” and “A Malaga Cove Effigy Now Missing from the HCMMC.”

The LAHC curated objects include: a Malaga Cove site incised tablet; two unusual doughnut stones and a smoking pipe, the three from San Nicolas Island; other Channel Island specimens (San Miguel Island beads collected by Stephen Bowers [ca. 1879], a fish gorge, and a possible lozenge stone); and specimens of uncertain provenance (white glass trade beads, a nose ornament, a multi-chambered whistle, a pinniped baculum tool, a possible bone hair ornament, and a possible bone gaming piece). The specimens selected that are now in the new noncommercial RPVHSM storage facility include: a ritually broken, or “killed metate,” a broken mortar that was possibly repurposed into a bowl, a ceremonial “pestle,” a probable dorsal fin effigy, a biconically drilled slate disk, a possible bead anvil, another pinniped baculum tool, an abalone fishhook blank, abalone disk ornaments, a broken steatite pendant, and an unfinished steatite smoking pipe. The Malaga Cove artifact (M A-9) now missing from the Moore Collection appears from photographs to be a sandstone effigy, perhaps representing a cetacean.

Following the three sections just noted above, several additional discussions are offered prior to our article’s last section, a brief summary. Those additional discussions bear on the following: a small number of artifacts owned by Moore that had once been possessed by two California “pioneer archaeologists” — Horatio Rust and the Reverend Stephen Bowers; mortars and pestles once among Moore’s holdings; an unusual, very large double-grooved shaft straightener misattributed to Malaga Cove; and two coastal southern California artifacts each with probable shaft straightener function but of two different unusual morphologies, neither kind ever having appeared in published archaeological discussions.

This article’s last section apprises readers that copies of updated catalogs of the HCMMC are available. They now reside with the RPVHSM, with the Harbor College Anthropology Department, and with the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton.
A Selection of Specimens Curated by the LAHC Anthropology Department

A Malaga Cove Incised Tablet

A fragment of an incised siltstone tablet (Figures 2 and 3) lacks an accession code printed on any surface. Only one “incised stone” is noted among Foster’s listings, and it is designated M A-78. Foster’s photographic illustration is labeled “incised siltstone slab w/ asphaltum.” Unfortunately, the M A-78 designation appears on each of five pieces of a grouping of non-artifact stones. To further complicate matters, the same M A-78 designation is penned onto a rodent gnawed piece of siltstone.

The object weighs 144 g, and its maximum dimension is 13.9 cm. Maximum thickness measures 1.5 cm. The unbroken edges exhibit purposeful rounding.

Some care was taken to render the geometric panel adorning the one incised face. The generous coating of asphaltum is difficult to explain. It is so thick in places as to suggest that once the tablet became broken it was perhaps put to use as an asphaltum caulking tool.

Interestingly, Foster’s photograph of two small siltstone or sandstone slabs on the same page showing specimen M A-78 (1988) have similarly placed asphaltum. These were not available for the authors’ scrutiny. Foster wrote this description for M A-85 in his catalog: “rocks used for paint frags.” In the catalog, M A-61 refers to “caulkker used for putting asphalt between boards in Chumash plank boats.” Since neither the M A-85 entry nor the M A-61 entry mention incised surfaces, the M A-78 entry probably refers to the object of Figures 2 and 3.

Incised tablets have provided much dialog regarding their purposes and their symbolic communications. The reader is referred to Koerper, Hunter, Snyder, and Cramer (2014).

A San Nicolas Island Asphaltum Repaired Doughnut Stone

The mostly complete doughnut stone (M D-1) (Figure 4) is particularly unusual for the fact that it had broken into four or more pieces and that the three largest were reunited using asphaltum. It was fashioned from what appears to be densely consolidated sandstone. Maximum diameter is 12.1 cm, and height measures 8.8 cm. It weighs 1,486 g (3.3 lbs).

Moore (ca. 1935) supposed that these kinds of artifacts were attached to the “heads of digging sticks.” His document lists a “broken and mended … with asphaltum” specimen that was “very large, about 3 lbs.” It was found “about 1895” in Los Angeles County. Did Moore place San Nicolas Island within the orbit of the county? Perhaps what Moore called (ca. 1935) Ring Stone No. 2 is Specimen M D-1.

An Oddly Configured San Nicolas Island Doughnut Stone

The San Nicolas Island sandstone doughnut stone seen in Figure 5 is another doughnut specimen, but unusual for its configuration. The bidirectionally manufactured perforation is distinctively ovoid, not round. The effort to perforate the doughnut would have involved to-and-fro motion, rather than rotational motion, of some sort of abrading implement, one not rounded in cross section but rather, say, lenticular or elliptical. In plan view the artifact is slightly, yet noticeably, asymmetric. Specimen M D-7 has a maximum diameter of 8.0 cm, just two-thirds that of Specimen M D-1, a minimum diameter is 7.4 cm, and a height of only 2.9 cm. One might reasonably speculate that at only 253 g this is a toy digging stick weight.

A San Nicolas Island Smoking Pipe

The serpentine smoking pipe illustrated in Figure 6, Specimen M D-28, was found by Stephen Bowers
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(see Benson 1997) on San Nicolas Island (Moore ca. 1935). The label on the artifact that reads San Nicolas Island is in the hand of Moore. The fact that the accession number is 28 probably indicates that there were additional San Nicolas Island items that Moore left with LAHC, but if so, where are they?

The pipe measures 12.9 cm in length and has a diameter of 2.7 cm. Its surfaces were smoothed to a palpable polish. Rotational scars are evident when looking down the distal end barrel, but no tobacco residue remains. No mastic appears at the proximal end, that is, on the flange, where possibly a bird bone or reed mouthpiece had have been inserted.

**San Miguel Island Beads Collected by the Reverend Stephen Bowers**

A varied assortment of bead types strung together by Moore (Figure 7) is attributed to San Miguel Island and reflects the collecting activities of Stephen Bowers. The round label placing Bowers on the island in 1879 is in Moore’s hand (Figure 8). It is
Figure 4. Specimen M D-1. Asphaltum repaired donut stone from San Nicolas Island.

Figure 5. Donut stone from San Nicolas Island. Specimen M D-7

Figure 6. San Nicolas Island smoking pipe. Specimen M D-28.

Figure 7. Beads from San Miguel Island.

Figure 8. Identification tag seen in Figure 7 reveals the collector as “pioneer archaeologist” Steven Bowers.
certain that the reverend was on San Miguel in 1877 (Benson 1997:Chpt. 5, 165, 166, 213-215), but the authors failed to locate any reference to an 1879 visit. The source of Moore’s information is unknown, and it is unclear whether the year designation was in error or whether an 1879 exploration has gone undocumented.

**A Channel Island Bone Fishing Gorge**

The bone object seen in Figure 9 is probably a fishing gorge, less likely a part of a compound fish hook, and because of its ubiquitous asphaltum coating, the piece is unlikely to have been an ornamental nose rod that would have pierced and been held by the septum (see Hudson and Blackburn 1982:178, Figures 42.2-10, 42.2-11, and 42.2-12; also Hudson and Blackburn 1985:241–242). Its accession code, M C-16, flags it as not from San Nicolas Island but rather from an unspecified island. The sharply bi-pointed specimen is 5.9 cm long, and its maximum diameter is only 6 mm. It weighs just 2 g.

**A Channel Island, Grooved, Lozenge-Shaped Artifact**

Specimen M C-53 (Figure 10) appears to belong to the genre of lozenge stones (see Sutton and Koerper 2009:12–17; Koerper and Desautels-Wiley 2010). Fashioned of basalt, it is ovoid/lenticular in cross section, not round. Lozenge stones are dated to the Middle Holocene. Moore obtained it from a Mrs. Goodwin. The object’s accession code indicates that it was not found on San Nicolas Island but rather on some other island. Moore penned “L.A. Co.” after the previous owner’s name, but does that mean she lived in mainland Los Angeles County or on Catalina Island which belongs to the county? Does it mean that the artifact was found on Catalina?

The specimen measures 9.7 cm in length. Maximum width is 3.8 cm. The length-width ratio of 2.55 is near the middle of the 1.6 to 3.3 range for lozenge stones. It weighs 137 g.

Deep, wide grooves adorn both faces of the artifact and connect with one another at both ends. It is suggested that lozenge morphology projects pudendum imagery (Koerper, Reitz, et al. 2006:125; Koerper, Macko and Couch 2006:171, Figure 5e; Koerper 2007:94), and thus the genre was possibly embedded in fertility/fecundity belief and ritual. Somewhat telling with regard to the hypothesis of vulvar symbolism is that some lozenge-shaped objects exhibit a longitudinally running design element on usually one convex face, rarely on both convex faces, to seemingly evoke the vaginal cleft. This may be a thin line of asphaltum, but sometimes there is a broader swath of the adhesive, perhaps to lay in shell beads. Closely spaced parallel incised lines might establish the imagery (Koerper, Reitz, et al. 2006:125). The lozenge featured here seems to offer a more dramatic attempt to evoke the imagery.

**Glass “Trade” Beads (Uncertain Provenance)**

Of the herein discussed LAHC-held Moore artifacts of uncertain provenance, the only non-bone specimens are the many dozens of white-on-white, opaque-on-opaque, drawn, hot tumbled, glass “trade” beads that the authors encountered in a single container (Figure 11). It is unknown whether the beads had been
beads being exchanged, and within the indigenous population there surely would have occurred both trading and gifting of glass beads. On another terminological note, Woodward (1965:4–5) cautioned that opaque glass beads have often been incorrectly labeled opaque “porcelain” beads.

The Moore glass beads generally range from around 4 mm to 11 or 12 mm. Careful observation reveals that the beads’ centers are comparatively dull and possess air bubbles, but in contrast the exterior sides unearthed all together. More probable than not is that they were found on one or more of the islands rather than the mainland. Most likely they had passed through Russian hands, either directly to island folk or indirectly via Alaskan otter hunters in the employ of Russians.

Most glass “trade” beads arriving directly from a European source were gifted to Native people rather than offered in trade (see e.g., Woodward 1965:1–4). One might suppose some actual trafficking of goods and/or services between Aleuts and the locals that involved
are without such bubbles, are palpably smoother, and appear shinier. Clearly, the interior glass is of lower quality and lower cost than the exterior glass. The beads’ manufacture was accomplished employing drawn-bead technology (see e.g., Murray 1964; Kidd and Kidd 1970; Karklins 1981; Sprague 1985:87–92).

At some point in the manufacturing steps, a tube of the glass was laid on wooden slats to cool down, but if the glass was too hot, it might flatten to some degree, becoming imperfectly cylindrical. A close look at Figure 11 reveals that some of the ornaments are a bit compromised, less than round in cross section. After the tubes were divided into smaller tubes which were then worked into bead-sized pieces, the unfinished products were placed into ash-filled drums that rotated over a fire, thus causing rough edges to become rounded off (see e.g., Orchard 1929:85).

Asphaltum is conspicuous on many of the HCMMC beads. Similar white-on-white, opaque-on-opaque glass “trade” beads adorning northern California Native manufactures that are pictured in Hudson and Bates (2015:92, 150, Figure 7.27, 153, Figure 7.29[top]; 171, Figure 8.10, 175 Figure 8.19, 176, Figure 8.20) give no evidence of any such black mastic. These items are ethnographic specimens collected by Russians and other Europeans, long ago curated by institutions in Russia and western Europe or presently sequestered in private collections; they include such things as headbands sewn on tump lines for carrying nets, body ornamentation, and basketry. Consider, however, that these cultural treasures were procured well away from coastal southern California, a region awash in nature’s black glue. We suppose it likely that the HCMMC beads had been appended to the kinds of items noted just above. None of these beads are so coated with tar as to indicate they were pasted onto, say, a bowl. If these beads had all adhered to a single item, it would likely have been something with an extended surface area, perhaps a dress, blanket, or huge basket.

Ultimately, we can expect that agents for the Russian-American Company would have obtained the majority of their gifting beads through commercial links to the east, ultimately to the major glass manufacturing centers (Venice [Murano Island], Bohemia, France, and the Netherlands). However, when the Russians were in short supply, they acquired glass beads from Hudson’s Bay Company agents operating in the Pacific Northwest (see Ross 1974).

**Probable Nose Rod (Unknown Provenance)**

The bipointed bone artifact seen in Figure 12 is ca. 7.4 cm long. Since it lacks any mastic, it is more likely an ornamental nose rod rather than a component of fishing technology.

**A Multi-Chambered Whistle (Unknown Provenance)**

The remains of a rare multi-chambered whistle are seen in Figures 13 and 14. The six items were all in a single container. Each of the six chambers is asphaltum plugged, and they all exhibit some amount of surface smoothing and polishing. The three heavier tubes were fashioned of limb bones almost certainly assignable to deer (*Odocoileus*), while the other three tubes are portions of mid-sized mammal limb bones. The largest at 21 g (Figure 14a) is 6.6 cm long and has a maximum diameter of 2.5 cm. The intact end shows a beveled edge. The opposite end is broken so as to quickly reveal the tar, but the plug is also obvious when looking into the unbroken end.

The 15 g tube (Figure 14b) is 7.2 cm long with a maximum diameter of 1.9 cm. Its beveled end is where a plug can be located. Looking down the broken end, it is apparent that for most of its length this specimen is hollow.

The tube of Figure 14c weighs 18 g. It is 7.7 cm long, and its maximum diameter is 2.0 cm. The intact
end was straight cut and subsequently very slightly rounded along the outer edge. Asphaltum stops up that end. The breakage allows clear recognition that the chamber was mostly hollow.

The 9 g tube pictured in Figure 14d extends 8.1 cm. Maximum diameter measures 1.6 cm. Asphaltum fills the uncompromised end whose edges are slightly rounded, and the broken end allows one to see that the chamber is hollow through the great majority of its length.

An 8 g, 7.8 cm-long tube with a 1.3 maximum diameter (Figure 14c), also tar plugged and edge-rounded at its intact end, is mostly hollow. Near the broken area, on one side of the piece, there are shallow incisions with some small amount of mastic present, perhaps a hint that something had been wrapped onto the tube.

The smallest of the six tubes (Figure 14f) weighs 5 g; it is 4.8 cm long with a maximum diameter of 1.4 cm. Its unbroken end was filled with tar after the edges had been smoothed. The broken end provides evidence of it being largely hollow.

When the authors first became acquainted with the tubes at LAHC, they considered that the six might represent a cache of individual wind instruments, either “single-holed whistles” or “simple whistles,” each to be played independently of any other. Subsequently, two other hypotheses were considered. Perhaps all had been lashed together to form either a “multi-chambered whistle” or to make up a panpipe (aka, syrinx). The four kinds of wind instruments need some explanation.

Most familiar to archaeologists are what Gifford (1940:181) termed “single-holed whistles.” Such devices are singular tubular chambers with a side vent. A player blows directly into the tube, not across the mouthpiece. The vent is a slit or roundish opening which provides what is termed an “edge.” When blown air strikes the edge, the air goes into a swirling motion, first compressed and then almost simultaneously expanded, and is forcefully expelled through the vent, causing a shrill, clear musical note. Normally, at or near the far end of most single-holed whistles, a closed-off aperture prevents escape of any wind.

By contrast, a “simple whistle” is one whose single resonance chamber lacks a side hole, or vent. During play, the only open aperture is the mouth hole. Simple whistles are often tubular, but there are exceptions, such as a type regionally familiar—the Polinices shell whistle. Opposite the mouth hole, certain simple whistles have a hole that is closed with a finger or thumb when the instrument is in use. They might also be plugged, say, with asphaltum or pitch. Some chambers would need no plugging since a natural closure does the job, as when an articular end of a bone remains intact.
Figure 14. Views of each tube seen in Figure 13. Note asphaltum plugs.
The edge of a simple whistle is at the mouth hole, an ingress and egress opening; obviously, the player must blow obliquely across, but not straight down into this aperture. With tubular simple whistles, the tube, if it is a bone, is cut straight at what becomes the proximal end. The rim is worked to produce a somewhat sharp edge.

Played as a musical instrument rather than as, say, a warning device or a dog call, the simple whistle might have rhythmic purpose, but not harmonic or melodic. That is, perhaps its major use was to produce a uniform, patterned recurrence of a beat, a desideratum for much dance behavior.

As a point of interest, the human-made holes in *Polinices reclusianus* shells were possibly intended initially to break the suction holding tight a snail that had retreated into its calcareous shelter. Following the drilling or puncturing, the reluctant gastropod was more easily sucked out of its shell for eventual consumption (see Patel 2016:26). If this thought is correct, the whistle would have been a secondary outcome of perforating the shell in proximity to the apex.

Again, are we dealing with a discovery of a cache of individual whistles sequestered perhaps side-by-side within a bag, an animal skin, or a basketry wrapping, or had the tubes been lashed together forming a single instrument? The surface asphaltum noted for the first described tube (see Figures 13 and 14a) and the asphaltum partially filling shallow incisions on the tube of Figure 14e strongly hint that the six resonance chambers had once been held together. Following the observation that all have a broken end, in each case away from the intact ends where one can easily see an asphaltum plug. It seems likely that an excavation tool, probably a shovel, forcefully engaged conjoined tubes all at the same time. The regional archaeological record identifies but few “multi-chambered whistles,” or what Roberta Greenwood referred to as “multiple whistles” (1978:522, Figure 3). When it is the case of only two chambers joined to one another, the now accepted term is “double whistle.” Waterman (1908: Plate II) used the term “chimed whistles.” There is quite a size range for this category of instrument (see Abbott 1879:237, Figure 120, 238; Jones 1956:232, 264, Plate 115e; Wallace 1978:645, Figure 5; Breschini and Haversat 2000:77–79, 81; Hudson and Bates 2015:61–62).

Greenwood’s (1972:37, Figure 18h, 1978:522, Figure 3) multi-chambered example from CA-SLO-2 (Diablo Canyon, Ohlone territory) is five-chambered, with one component noticeably larger than the other four which are not graduated. David Banks Rogers’ Plate 74 (1929) shows three multi-chambered whistles, one with three tubes and two with four tubes (see also Orr 1956:18; Landberg 1965:100). Each might be characterized as having a “succession of graduated tubes,” to borrow Wallace’s (1978:645) wording.

The compromised conditions of the several Moore collection tubes preclude determination of whether the arrangement of these components was graduated. Also problematic is whether the tubes were “closed,” that is, without vent holes. Lacking holes, the instrument would have been a true panpipe (aka syrinx), but with holes, a multi-chambered whistle. To be precise, a panpipe consists of hollow pipes (closed tubes) of graduated length; blowing across the pipes’ upper ends produces a variety of tones.

Unfortunately, all breakage to the Moore Collection wind instrument occurred either near or below where a side vent would have been present on a multi-chambered whistle, but where holes are entirely lacking on a panpipe. Past inattention to terminological precision in discussions of both double-whistles and multi-chambered whistles has sometimes left the impression that panpipes are documented for coastal southern California Native culture. Waterman (1908) used “syrinx” in a discussion of double whistles, writing that a notable advance over the
single-holed whistle is that instrument composed of two “chiming elements,” and such joining of parts “when carried to its logical conclusion results in the well-known ‘syrinx’ type of instrument.” Hudson and Blackburn (1986:350) wrote that “two or more whistles of different pitch were often bound together to form a kind of panpipe.” One of the three multi-chambered whistles shown in D. B. Rogers (1929: Plate 74) was discovered at the Chumash village of Ajuahuilashmu, Barbareño territory, associated with a shaman burial (Rogers 1929: Plate 22, 231). Rogers noted “the marks of the thread that had once lashed [the four whistles] together being still visible” (1929:416). He announced that the grave offering was a “true” pan pipe and supposed his find to be the first ever documentation of that kind of musical instrument in North American Indian culture. He wrote:

Our Canaliño had been in possession of … the precursor of the pipe organ…. Similar instruments are known to occur in two isolated and widely separated [Western Hemisphere] regions, namely a small cluster of South Sea Islands and a small area in the interior of South America. Aside from these two instances, I think we must turn to the myths and sculptures of ancient Greece for our knowledge of this instrument [Rogers 1929:416].

At one time Greenwood (1972:36) referred to the multi-chambered whistle from CA-SLO-2 as a panpipe. Breschini and Haversat’s (2000:81) figure caption for a Yuki double whistle made reference to “the ‘pan pipe’ style of paired whistles.”

Given the numerous references to multi-chambered whistles for coastal southern California and given that no true Native panpipe is documented for the region, it becomes a near certainty that the Moore Collection musical device was a multi-chambered whistle. The six-chamber specimen possibly offered a rhythmic component for dance. Harmonious notes were possible. It is unrecorded whether melodic tunes were played on these kinds of instruments.

A Baculum Tool (Uncertain Provenance)

The literature of Native California has occasionally illustrated modified baculums, or penis bones, employed as awls or for knapping conchoidal stone (e.g., Heye 1921:Figure 11a, b, also Plate 51 [with asphaltum handle]; Gifford 1940:202[A3], 208[C6], also 161, 169; Jones 1956:269, Plate 120c; Hudson and Blackburn 1987:44, Figure 393-3). Baculum pressure flakers exhibit significant rounding nearly always by design at their distal ends and polish through use. A pointed distal end signals probable awl function. A baculum flint knapper is left unshaped at its proximal end. The curvatures of certain marine mammal baculums and of deer antlers lend themselves to the level of control necessary for precision detachment, particularly of secondary flakes.

A baculum knapper (Figures 15 and 16) was among the Moore materials presently with the LAHC Anthropology Department. It weighs 25 g and is 14.8 cm long. Maximum width is at the handle end (1.6 cm). Maximum thickness (transverse to maximum width) is 1.4 cm. There is bidirectional wear at the rounded business end of the artifact where one sees some interesting wear, a small groove (Figure 16).

The tool was probably crafted from the penis bone of an otariid, or eared seal, rather than any phocid (earless seals, aka hairless seals) (Koerper and Evans 2011:105–109; see also Burt 1960:16, Plate 1i). The best candidate is a California sea lion (Zalophus californianus) followed by a Steller sea lion (Eumetopias jubatus). That is, of the eared seals, we favor the sea lions over the fur seals.

On a final note, over 11 decades ago, Horatio Rust photographed a display of bone artifacts (Figure 17).
(Huntington Library, phot CL7, image 63), most likely from his personal collection. Sitting below the row of nine awls are ten modified baculums, all but one likely purposed to working conchoidal stone. In the bottom tier the sixth specimen from the left is relatively straight and pointed at the distal end, and perhaps it is a basketry awl or leather perforator.

**An Unusual Crafted Bone (Uncertain Provenance)**

The 16 g bone object shown in Figure 18 was shaped to a 13.5 cm length and 1.2 cm maximum diameter. The rounded end is only roughly shaped, with no evidence of having been ground with an abrasive material. There are six tooth sockets ranging from 1.1 cm to 1.6 cm in length and from roughly 3 to 5 mm in depth. Photographs of the object were shown to several persons. A vertebrate paleontologist who requested anonymity wondered whether it might be from a dolphin snout. Dr. Judith Porcasi (personal communication 2016) stated that species identification was “definitely a mystery” but offered a “guess”—from the dentary of a dolphin mandible.

Could it have been a hair pin, a clothing pin, or a head scraper? It is absent any signature of what could reasonably be construed as use wear. It lacks asphaltum or colorant.

**Phalange (Provenance Uncertain)**

An adult, right-side forelimb phalange of a fur seal (arctocephalinae) (Judith Porcasi, personal communication 2016), perhaps with light use wear, is shown in Figure 19. If there is in fact cultural wear, it may have resulted from the object’s employment as, say, a gambling die, hand pawn piece, game counter, divination piece, or talisman (see Hudson and Blackburn 1986:139–140, 397–417). The specimen weighs 9 g. It is 7.2 cm long, and maximum thickness is 1.1 cm.

**A Selection of Malaga Cove Specimens Now Held in RPVHSM Storage**

**A “Killed” Metate (Specimen M A-17)**

Specimen M A-17 (Figure 20) is a classic example of a “killed” metate, a near perfect illustration to reflect a long-ago ritual in which the milling slab’s central basin was hammered out and the remaining mass split into four chunks. These four disengaged pieces can almost be refitted; setting them close together would make for an instructive museum display.

Holding the four pieces together allows measurements of original length (36 cm) and original width (26 cm). The milling equipment as shown weighs 5,235 g.
Figure 17. Bone tool display photographed by Horatio Rust. All bottom row specimens are modified baculums. Courtesy Huntington Library (phot CL7, image 63).

Figure 18. A modified bone of undetermined function and unknown provenance.

Figure 19. Fur seal phalange possibly used as a game piece or a divination piece.

An Unusual “Bowl” (Specimen M A-2)

Specimen M A-2 (Figure 21) was collected in 1927 (Moore ca. 1935) at the beach below the Malaga Cove site. He described it as a mortar “broken and rounded off and used again,” a most interesting example of renovation rather than repair. There are splotches of asphaltum on the artifact, but they are merely incidental, not evidence of any effort to glue sherds back into place. Significantly reduced from its original size, the maximum dimension of this hard, dense sandstone artifact is a mere 19.2 cm. It weighs 3,905 g.

Clearly, specimen M A-2 started out as a mortar, but we wonder whether it served a milling function after the broken edges became rounded. Perhaps it was repurposed to a storage bowl function.
A Large Pestle (Specimen M A-40)

The bluish schist, 2,935 g object shown in Figures 22 and 23 is of uncertain purpose. It is not a seed pounding pestle. Both ends lack the kind of use wear associated with milling foodstuffs. Also, its extreme length is most unusual for processing acorns, rodents, etc.

Daniel Foster speculated that it might have played a ceremonial role. It is not overtly phallic like some pestles, spikes, etc., but then such imagery may have been intended but in understated style.

Length is 58.6 cm. Maximum width is 7.5 cm. It is not round in cross section, and toward the smaller extremity some of the mass has disengaged.

A Possible Dorsal Fin Effigy (Specimen M A-60)

Specimen M A-60 (Figure 24) was shaped out of a very fine sandstone that almost qualifies as a siltstone, a fragile material that belies Foster’s (1988) interpretation of the artifact as a “digging stone.” It exhibits no use wear that would accrue from rigorous employments, particularly at the pointed end.

It is uncertain whether the 1,275 g, 25 cm long, 10 cm wide object first entered human hands in its present configuration or whether any surface was subsequently modified. The form of the pointed end draws out first suspicion for some part having undergone purposeful shaping.

If the morphology was largely or solely the outcome of natural forces, did the finder perceive some amount
of resemblance to a particular animal’s dorsal fin or dorsal fins generally, thus precipitating its transport to a camp or village? Recent *PCAS Quarterly* articles (Koerper and Desautels-Wiley 2012; Koerper 2012; Koerper et al. 2014:66–67) discuss a number of lithic objects palpably bearing resemblance to dorsal fins, their referents presumably cetaceans in most if not all cases. They exhibit a range of shapes; some are incised. Specimen M A-60 may represent an orca dorsal fin, assignable to the portable cosmos of south central coastal California.

**A Perforated Slate Disk (Specimen M A-63)**

The dark gray slate disk seen in Figure 25 was found by Moore at the “burial dune” in Palos Verdes in 1933. This artifact has the most recent date entered in Moore’s (ca. 1935) document. The chemistry teacher considered three possible functions—spindle whorl, pendant, and ornament.

The artifact was manufactured by chipping, grinding, and biconical drilling. It weighs 36 g. Not perfectly round, its maximum diameter is 6.2 cm. Maximum thickness is nearly 7 mm.

Similar objects have been labeled “spindle whorls” for their morphological resemblances to whorls attaching to spindles found in and well beyond coastal southern California. This Malaga Cove specimen was almost certainly not employed to form and twist yarn or cordage in hand-spinning. J. P. Harrington’s (1942:25) Salinan, Chumash, Kitanemuk, Fernandeño, and Gabriélin denied that spindle whorls were used to make cordage. Cordage was made by rolling action against one’s thigh.

Regionally, such perforated disks are rarely considered as possible toys (e.g., tops, “buzzes” [a whirling toy]).
fly wheels for drill shafts, and ornaments (see Koerper 1998:260–263). It is a reasonable hypothesis that at least some of the perforated disks were accoutrements to game strings used to hold fast dispatched quarry for transport back to one’s camp or village. The senior author with his Cypress College field students engaged in experimental archaeology demonstrating that disks strung on cordage “provide a surface against which string can be hitched around itself and drawn taut, eliminating the need to hold objects in place using knots” (Koerper 1998:265; 1999). The disks can move freely along the string, and so quick adjustments are possible to accommodate the addition of subsequently dispatched prey.

**A Possible Bead Anvil (Specimen M A-64)**

Daniel Foster’s (1988) manuscript listed specimen M A-64 (Figure 26) as a “started stone disk,” meaning that the waterworn, flat, round pebble was intended to become a perforated disk, but for some reason drilling at the center of one face was not completed. Moore (ca. 1935) recognized that the small depression was manmade and supposed the object was an unfinished spindle whorl or pendant. When the object was on display at Malaga Cove School, it was identified as a “bead anvil.” Perhaps the shallow depression was intended to hold fast a bead blank in the course of drilling its hole. However, it seems small for the drilling stage of bead manufacture, and the presence of just a single depression is curious. The two bead anvils illustrated by Hudson and Blackburn (1987:128–130) and anvils discussed elsewhere (Schumacher 1877:41, Plate 22a; Irwin 1975:16, Figure 2) have multiple holes.

The artifact weighs 46 g. Its maximum diameter is 5.4 cm. Maximum thickness is 1.0 cm. Moore (ca. 1935) found this object in 1930 not quite at the Malaga Cove site, but rather just a short distance north at the location of the Hollywood Riviera bathhouse.

**Another Baculum Knapper (Specimen M A-70)**

A second worked baculum, probably that of a California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*), is illustrated in Figures 27 and 28 (see Koerper and Evans 2011:105–109; see also Burt 1960:16, Plate 1c). The terminus of the distal end is quite rounded, far from pointy, with high polish and some small amount of pitting. This item is probably a flint knapping tool and not some type of awl. A small patch of asphaltum occupies one side of the artifact. The 16 g artifact is 11.2 cm long. Its maximum width (1.6 cm) lies near the proximal end.

**An Abalone Fishhook Blank (Specimen M A-74)**

“M A-74” refers to various small abalone objects stored in a box labeled “Clifton Dec. 31, 1921.” We wondered whether Clifton was a location or whether perhaps it was a person who originally collected the fishhooks, fishhook blanks, and roughed-out pieces of shell with round drill holes which may be hook or ornament blanks. There is a Clifton, Arizona, where one of Moore’s two double-grooved shaft straighteners had been procured (see discussion of M A-55 below),
but Clifton, Arizona, is not a go-to-place for encountering abalone fishhooks. One of us (GH) subsequently discovered that “Clifton by the Sea” is a location between Redondo and Hollywood Riviera, not far from Malaga Cove, almost certainly the provenance for the contents of the box.

The container’s standout object for museum display value is an 11 g blank in the production of a single-piece fishhook (Figure 29). Its length is 4.3 cm, and width is 3.4 cm. Maximum thickness is 4.5 mm.

Ivan Strudwick’s classic article on single-piece circular fishhooks contains a section on production stages (1985:35–36). The specimen discussed here is at Stage 2 in a five-stage manufacturing sequence. It is no longer a coarse-edged, teardrop-shaped blank (Stage 1); at this initial stage, the rough blank may or may not be holed. The edges of this Stage 2 specimen have been smoothed, and most of the shell cortex has been removed. The nacreous layer on the ventral, or interior, of the shell is untouched. The edges of the hole are somewhat rough, because they had not yet undergone enlargement using a groundstone or sandstone drill/reamer. One side of this Stage 2 blank’s apex has not been abraded away, a step in producing the shank, however, it may have been started on the left side where some breakage occurs. Speculatively, this breakage may have occasioned abandonment of the manufacturing effort, thus gifting local prehistory with a notable example of a Stage 2, single-piece, abalone fishhook.

**Two Abalone Disk Ornaments**

Two abalone disk ornaments are subsumed under “M A-75.” Both appear to be assignable to *Haliotis cracherodii*, or black abalone. The more complete specimen (Figure 30) weighs 31 g, and its maximum diameter is 7.8 cm. The circumferential edge is slightly uneven; in other words, it was not smoothed using some sort of fine abrading tool, such as one of sandstone or sharkskin. Neither the slightly concave, pearly side nor the slightly convex cortex face were subjected to removal of material. The central round perforation appears punched or roughly drilled, certainly not produced with a drill made of fine grained,
abrasive stone. A narrow ring of asphaltum encircles the external hole opening, and the lustrous face was coated with dark mastic, most probably asphaltum. There is no evidence indicating what may have been glued on.

The more compromised abalone ornament weighs 21 g and has a maximum diameter of 7.4 cm. Its edges are likewise a bit rough, but the central perforation has a more finished look. Neither of its faces had been abraded, but the slightly concave pearly side appears to have received an application of colorant, likely ochre.

**A Steatite Pendant (Specimen M A-82)**

Specimen M A-82 (Figure 31) is a pendant. The 50 g steatite object has a biconically drilled perforation at its apex. It is 6.6 cm long, 5.6 cm wide, 1.1 cm thick, and is heavily damaged, particularly at its bottom end, where much of the stone has broken away. Moore (ca. 1935) recalled having found the artifact “about 1932” at the “burial site” at Palos Verdes, and he made note of the shallow lines engraved on one surface.

Weighing but 21 g, the damaged pipe tapers quickly to the small end where there is no opening, the place where a hollow mouthpiece made of bird bone or reed would have undoubtedly been inserted. Had the manufacturing effort ended successfully, this Malaga Cove specimen would be one of the smallest pipes documented for Native coastal southern California. It measures only 3.9 cm in length, with a maximum diameter of 2.3 cm. Hudson and Blackburn (1986:118–129) present an excellent discussion of smoking pipes.
A Missing Malaga Cove Effigy

Specimen M A-9

In Daniel Foster’s listings (1988) of Malaga Cove artifacts, an accession code, M A-9, was followed merely by a question mark (?). By a process of elimination, we determined that the alphanumeric must refer to an artifact shown in two of Foster’s photographs (see Figure 33). One of those images bore the following handwritten notation: “unusual groundstone artifact.” The other photo showed the artifact bore an accession code, but it was too small to read.

We were unable to locate that object which looks like a sandstone effigy, perhaps representing a cetacean. We were able to use other images of known dimensions photographed by Foster against the same background to reasonably estimate the artifact’s length at between about 22.5 and 24.5 cm.

Additional Discussions

Two Familiar Names

The names of two California “pioneer archaeologists” appear in Moore’s (ca. 1935) document. Horatio Rust collected a maul that Moore acquired thirdhand, and a number of specimens originated with Stephen Bowers, whom Moore never met (Bowers died in 1907; Rust passed the previous year).

In addition to those Bowers-owned artifacts previously noted, there were at least seven plummets and several possible “drills,” any one of which Moore thought might actually be a plummet; each “drill” was of “gritty sandstone,” suggesting that the term “sandstone reamer” might be apropos. Other categories of once owned Bowers items included: pestle; comal; knife; spear point; and doughnut stone. It is presumed that some Channel Islands awls, arrowheads, “charmstones,” rubbing stones, and mortars in Moore’s listings were originally collected by Bowers but without attribution to him.

Pestles and Mortars

For sheer numbers, pestles and mortars are conspicuous in Moore’s catalog. Of the 86 pestles recorded, all but 15 connect to Los Angeles County. Thirty were reportedly retrieved from the Palos Verdes area, perhaps the majority of those from or close to the Malaga Cove site. Which ones ended up in the HCMMC is an unanswered question. Of the 31 mortars in Moore’s listings, a dozen were from mainland Los Angeles County, eight were from San Nicolas Island, and two were found on Catalina Island.
The fact that Moore had acquired so many mortars and pestles, a significant proportion of them originating well beyond southern mainland Los Angeles County, suggests he was at least somewhat partial toward milling equipment and was willing to engage in trade or purchase to acquire them and not just to personally discover them. We wondered whether he sought them for outdoor displays set among garden plants and/or ringing, say, some part of the footprint of a dwelling or outbuilding such as a backyard hothouse, display behavior not unlike that of many other collectors (see e.g., Militello 2009:25, Figure 8, 26, Figure 9; Koerper 2014; Koerper et al. 2014:26, Figure 6, 27, Figures 7 and 8; Koerper 2015; Koerper and Cramer 2016).

**A Cautionary Tale: Specimen M A-55**

When studying older artifact collections, particularly those privately amassed, researchers should be alert to possible errors of provenance assignment. In this essay’s introduction, readers were apprised of locational information lost when HCMMC donor cards became separated from their artifacts. A case in point, but of unexplained cause, involves an erroneous alphanumeric designation (M A-55) inked onto a double-grooved shaft straightener (Figure 34).

The authors’ first awareness of the M A-55 piece was via Foster’s (1988) descriptive information and illustrations regarding an object whose design and attention to finish recalled nothing quite similar in the literature of south central coastal southern California. The underside of the specimen was conspicuously flat and extremely slick, conditions that argued against any seed grinding function.

Specimen M A-55 was eventually located among the RPVHSM holdings. Its dimensions (13.0 cm x 9.5 cm x 5.4 cm), weight (930 g), pleasing symmetry, and unusual material (dark greenish, dense, and serpentine-like [where polished]) added up to a definite attention-getter, yet stylistically an aberrant fit to Gabrielino culture. It turns out that the specimen actually originated in Arizona, this according to an entry in the Moore document (ca. 1935).

On lined paper Moore (ca. 1935) had drawn the object along with a second, smaller double-grooved example. Notation placed just below the larger specimen included, “Arizona, Pueblo Viejo dist[ric]t?” Information underneath the other, also penned in Moore’s hand, reads, “Pueblo Viejo Dist Clifton Ariz.”

**Two Steatite, Single-Grooved Objects**

The ledger page just cited pictures four additional artifacts, one of which (Figure 35) Moore identified as an arrow shaft straightener. Its whereabouts are not known. Rendered to the same scale as the M A-55 drawing, it is possible to reasonably estimate the length of this steatite tool from Santa Catalina Island, ca. 15.1 cm. The dorsal view shows a cup-like depression, which Moore supposed might have held hot coals, and the ventral view exhibits a single groove. The round handle was described as having about a “1.5 in” diameter where it joins the cup. This shape is reminiscent of certain asphaltum crucibles (see especially Hudson and Blackburn 1987:170,
However, no asphaltum residue appears that might call out a crucible function. If, as we suppose, Milo Moore was hypothesizing that the artifact combining a cup-like form and a groove was purposed to solely straighten shafts, then he may be due credit for recognizing a distinct subtype. Would “cup-and-groove arrow shaft straightener” be an appropriate taxon? Similar objects with a single groove opposite a cup-shaped device, but without a handle, have been published (Koerper et al. 2008:Figure 3c, 60, Figure 5, 60; Koerper et al. 2010:84–85, Figure 2; see also Abbott (1879:200–201).

A different ledger page bore the drawing of a soapstone artifact (Figure 36) found in 1924 by Moore when crossing a slope below an “Indian Village Site” in the Palos Verdes area, likely near LAN-138. This item was not located with the HCMMC artifacts.

Moore’s drawing caption calls attention to two holes drilled from opposite ends into the middle of what he thought was possibly a “shaman’s [sucking] tube” or perhaps an unfinished smoking pipe—“unfinished” since the two chambers did not intersect with one another. He pointed out that an “arrow straightener groove” sat midway atop the object. It is reasonable to propose that a failed effort to finish what was to be a tubular artifact provided the opportunity for someone, not necessarily the original craftsman, to repurpose the object to a straightener function.

The serpentine San Nicolas Island smoking pipe (M D-28) found by Stephen Bowers and shown in Figure 6 is sketched on this same ledger page. Since the scale is a near match to that of the previously discussed ledger page (ca. 64 percent actual size), it is reasonable to extrapolate an estimated length for the unfinished specimen, ca. 7.7 cm.

Figure 35. An unusual grooved steatite object sketched in Moore (ca. 1935).

Figure 36. An unfinished, steatite smoking pipe or shaman’s tube repurposed to a shaft straightener function. Sketched by Milo Moore (ca. 1935).
Brief Summary

Specimens discussed and illustrated in this article are not a representative sample of Milo Stuart Moore’s donation to Harbor College. Rather, the featured artifacts were judiciously selected to maximize interest in an archaeological resource not previously shared through publication and to collaterally draw regional prehistorians to the HCMCC to examine particularly those materials from what was once embraced as the type site for the southern California coast, LAN-138 (see Wallace 1955; see also Koerper and Peterson 2014).

Research for this essay had not been intended to provide an updated catalog of those objects now presently divided between the community college and a RPVHSM noncommercial storage facility, however our documentations eventually precipitated an updated catalog, copies of which are available at the Los Angeles Harbor College Anthropology Department, the RPVHSM, and the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton. Accompanying the catalog are copies of this article, Foster’s (1988) document, the Milo Moore (ca. 1935) listings, and an extensive photographic record.

Certain of the profiled artifacts draw attention to points of interest/information, any one of which might be unfamiliar to most avocationalists, but also either unknown, largely overlooked, or forgotten by many professionals. For instance, does the reader recall any printed discussions of flint knapping that reference pinniped baculums? Also, this essay offers a corrective to the misapplication of “panpipe” for two kinds of musical instruments that are best labeled “double-whistle” and “multi-chambered whistle.” Further, on the subject of whistles, the authors suggest that the first purpose of someone punching a hole near the apex of a Polinices reclusianus shell may not have been to manufacture an instrument, but rather to facilitate extraction of a gastropod’s meat.

A lozenge-shaped artifact (Figure 10), deeply grooved longitudinally on both faces, is deemed an especially good fit to the hypothesis that the designs of lozenge stones were intended to convey thematics of or related to fertility-fecundity. Another point of information is this: certain so-called “trade beads” (better labeled “gift” beads), repeatedly misidentified as porcelain beads, are actually made of glass.

The morphology of the object shown in Figure 24 evokes the look of an orca dorsal fin, thus feeding an advocacy for the inclusion of a recently proposed taxon (dorsal fin effigy) within the regional portable cosmos (Koerper 2012; Koerper and Desautels-Wiley 2012; Koerper et al. 2014:66–67). Consider also the reminder that some biconically, center-drilled, thin stone disks (Figure 25) functioned not as spindle whorls, fly wheels, or ornaments, but rather as functional accoutrements to game strings (see Koerper 1998).

This present Quarterly contribution and the updated catalog expand the database for LAN-138, the Malaga Cove site. There are additional unheralded collections that the authors are currently examining and documenting in order to help characterize the far southern Santa Monica Bay-Palos Verdes Peninsula region.

Endnotes

1. In 1884, eleven-year-old Milo Moore found his first Indian relic, half of an “Ontario banded slate gorget,” that was lying in his grandmother’s field in Coitsville, Ohio. He recorded (Moore ca. 1935) the artifact as “ground off lopsided on one side, from being used by my father as a whetstone.” This anecdote reflects that many early-day collectors of Native American artifacts very much preferred objects in excellent condition and might eschew or further compromise imperfect (e.g., broken) specimens. Further, there was the tendency to collect the more diagnostic and exciting artifacts, projectile points excepted.
2. A copy of the ca. 1935 catalog manuscript was shared with the authors by the Moore family, particularly through the efforts of Mrs. Valgerda Schoenmann, Milo’s granddaughter. Several observations gleaned from the document that readers might find interesting are that by the 1930s Milo Moore’s collection contained Native objects from at least 21 states (Alaska, Arizona, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming). The West Indies are represented (Puerto Rico, St. Vincent Island, and Trinidad) as is Argentina. Specimens were received from over a dozen California counties. At least three islands (Santa Catalina, Santa Rosa, and San Nicolas) were sources of specimens.

Moore (ca. 1935) identified some of the earlier collections that once contained artifacts that he later purchased or acquired through swapping. A number of his specimens were found by the Reverend Stephen Bowers (see Benson 1997), but Moore came by those artifacts indirectly. He also owned a large maul that was once in the possession of Horatio Rust (see e.g., Militello), sold to Moore by one Charles Carson.

3. The Kohler Collection dates at least as far back as the 1910s. At one time Kohler’s artifacts were on display at the Malaga Cove School, Palos Verdes Estates, supervised by the collector. Subsequently, the collection resided at the Malaga Cove Library. Eventually the Palos Verdes Homes Association donated the Kohler artifacts to the Rancho de los Palos Verdes Historical Society and Museum which presently keeps the objects at a noncommercial storage facility. The authors are preparing a catalog of these Kohler artifacts.
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