

## CHARMSTONES: A SUMMARY OF THE ETHNOGRAPHIC RECORD

John Sharp  
Sonoma State University  
1801 East Cotati Avenue  
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

### ABSTRACT

Charmstones are an artifact type which has intrigued California archaeologists from the earliest excavations in the late 1800s right up to the present. These artifacts have appeared in a variety of contexts in archaeological deposits spanning hundreds of miles and thousands of years. Although charmstones have played a minor role in building regional temporal chronologies, their function in prehistoric California has often been ignored or treated speculatively by archaeologists. This paper has two goals: (1) to provide a synthesis of the disparate and far-flung ethnographic accounts regarding charmstone function and use, and (2) to serve as a reference on this subject for archaeologists seeking to use ethnographic analogy as an explanatory or interpretive tool.

### INTRODUCTION

Before beginning any discussion of charmstones, it is necessary to provide the basic physical criteria used in this study to label an artifact as a "charmstone." After reviewing a variety of California archaeological literature, it became apparent that there is a general consensus as to what constitutes a charmstone. The basic criteria are as follows: (1) made of stone; (2) entirely shaped by manufacturing processes (i.e., grinding, pecking, or polishing); (3) cylindrical or elongate in form (rather than tabular or discoidal); (4) generally between 7 and 20 cm. in length; and (5) either perforated or non-perforated. While these criteria are neither all-inclusive nor extremely precise, they provide the simple definition necessary for further discussion.

Charmstones have been found in archaeological sites throughout much of California. Geographically, charmstones are most common in the Central Valley, the Delta, and the San Francisco Bay area, but they have also been found in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada, on the coastlines of northern and central California, and in the North Coast Ranges and South Coast Ranges (Moratto 1984; Elsasser and Rhode

1996). Charmstones have been found in a variety of archaeological contexts: as isolated artifacts (Blake 1872); in groups or caches (Latta 1949; Sutton 1996); at possible charmstone manufacturing sites (Elsasser 1955); as unassociated artifacts in larger middens; and as burial associations. Because of their association with burials, charmstones have played a minor role in building regional temporal chronologies (e.g., Beardsley 1954). Readers seeking an archaeological overview of California charmstones are referred to Elsasser and Rhode (1996).

The question of what charmstones were used for is an old one in California archaeology. California charmstones began to appear in natural history literature in the late 1800s (Foster 1868; Blake 1872; Abbott 1879), as California was first being heavily settled and developed by Euroamerican settlers. The earliest of these accounts refer to charmstones as "plumbets" because of their physical resemblance to plumb-bobs. These early accounts of charmstones were written by the antiquarian artifact collectors of the day, and tended to be sensationalistic and highly speculative by today's standards, proposing an amazingly wide range of possible uses for these mysterious artifacts. The most common

explanation was that they were used as fishing sinkers (Blake 1872; Abbott 1879; Rau 1884). The term "charmstone" first appeared in an article published by Lorenzo Yates in 1889. Yates' article is important not only for coining the term "charmstone," but because the label Yates chose for these artifacts was derived directly from Native American informants' testimony that these artifacts were in fact used as charms rather than as utilitarian tools.

The antiquarian fascination with charmstones was renewed in the early decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as a new breed of anthropologically-trained archaeologists turned their attention to interpreting native California's material culture. Many of the antiquarian hypotheses, and especially the fishing sinker idea, resurfaced in the work of Heye (1921, 1926), Gifford and Schenck (1926), and Schenck and Dawson (1929). Discussions of charmstone function during this period were generally less speculative, however, and typically focused on the question of ceremonial versus utilitarian use. In terms of charmstones, archaeologists of this period made disappointingly little use of a growing body of ethnographic data generated by Alfred Kroeber and his students at the University of California beginning in the early 1920s. Unfortunately, the early dichotomy between archaeology and ethnography on the question of charmstone function has continued to the present day. For the most part archaeologists have been content to re-work the speculations of earlier archaeologists in the absence of ethnographic data (but see Sutton 1996:52). There has been no systematic study of the ethnographic data on this subject, and archaeological discussions of charmstone function have generally remained within the well-worn rut of ceremonial versus utilitarian function (see Moratto 1984).

In reviewing ethnographic information on charmstone use in native California, it became apparent that ethnographic accounts of charmstone use provide a relatively clear and consistent definition of charmstone function. Although there were regional and even intra-regional variations in function, Native American informants over large geographic areas in California have given amazingly similar information

on this subject to ethnographers for almost a century. It is argued that this is the logical starting point for a more effective interpretation of these artifacts. The purpose of this study is therefore to summarize this information.

## METHODS

A wide range of historical and ethnographic materials were consulted during the course of this study, and three basic criteria were used to determine which ethnographic accounts to include in this paper. First, the term "ethnographic" will refer here to information directly witnessed by the ethnographer or provided directly by a Native American informant. Second, only ethnographic accounts from aboriginal groups native to California were included. Similar artifacts appear elsewhere in North America (Hodge 1910; Moorehead 1900; Pennypacker 1938; Rau 1884; Reiger 1990), but an in-depth look at the ethnography of these areas is well beyond the scope of this paper. Finally, each account had to provide a clear description or illustration of the "charmstone" under discussion. This was designed to eliminate potentially confusing references to other types of natural or artifactual stones (such as quartz crystals) commonly referred to as "charmstones," "luckstones," or simply "charms" (e.g., Levi 1978, Loeb 1926, Sapir and Spier 1943). Simple descriptions such as "plummet-shaped," "pear-shaped," or "perforated and oblong" were acceptable in the context of other descriptive information.

These criteria resulted in the identification of 16 sources of information regarding charmstone use among approximately 17 linguistic groups (Table 1). Stylistically, these sources can be divided into five major categories: antiquarian ethnography, Kroeberian ethnography, Culture Element Distributions (CEDs), oral narratives (i.e., myths), and modern ethnography. These materials vary wildly in theoretical outlook, content, and thoroughness, making comparison difficult. To overcome this difficulty each account was reduced to its basic content and plotted in table form (Tables 1-3). This simplistic approach is useful for conveying uneven information in a coherent manner, but is not advocated as a

substitute for the primary sources. In building Tables 1-3, sources which discussed charmstone use among more than one linguistic group (e.g., Gifford and Kroeber 1937) were broken down by language family. No information was intentionally omitted, although similar information with slight differences (for example, "...hung near salmon net" and "...hung near fishing stream") were often subsumed in one category. Negative information (for example, a statement that charmstones were *not* manufactured) has also been tabulated, as this information proved to be important in defining certain attributes. The resulting tables present a surprisingly wide range of functions, modes of use, and associated qualities.

## RESULTS

### Function

On the key question of function (Table 1), the ethnographic data overwhelmingly support the "ceremonial" or symbolic explanation long ago advocated by Kroeber (1925:936) and other ethnographers, but generally treated with suspicion by archaeologists. Although the sources attributed a surprisingly wide range of supernatural powers to charmstones, the overriding theme was their ability to influence the outcome of natural phenomena such as fish runs, animal behavior, drought, and sickness. A subtheme emerged, especially in northern California, indicating that they were also used to control social phenomena such as love, gambling, and war.

The most commonly reported charmstone function was their use as hunting and fishing charms. While these themes were repeated throughout different regions of the state, the actual physical use as hunting charms varied considerably: they might be, "tied over openings in [a] deer fence" (Gifford and Kroeber 1937:186); hung at good hunting places; or, "put into the stuffed deerhead decoy, for luck" (Kroeber 1930:391). Use as fishing charms was similar--they were generally hung on a pole near a fish net or weir or on a tree next to the stream. A Wappo informant told Yates that they were believed to, "travel in the night through the water to drive the fish up the creeks to favorite fishing places, or

through the air to drive the land game up towards certain peaks and favorite hunting grounds" (1889:304).

Another commonly reported function (in northern California) was in curing sickness. Informants from three different Pomo groups linked charmstones to curing doctors, "who might have one in outfit and touch [the] patient with it to cure illness" (Gifford and Kroeber 1937:185).

Among the groups of southern California, charmstones are most strongly associated with rainmaking ceremonies, a function absent from northern California ethnographic accounts. This theme is illustrated in a Yokuts informant's account of a rain-doctor's attempt to bring rain: "He put a little water on the unuk [charmstone] before he sang to make it rain. If he dipped it in the water and then sang and danced, he could bring a flood" (Latta 1949:204). Similar ethnographic evidence appears in other accounts of the Yokuts and neighboring Chumash (Henshaw 1885; Driver 1939), while a Chumash oral narrative clearly links charmstones to thunder and lightning (Blackburn 1975). It is interesting to note that Latta's account also strongly ties charmstones to fishing success. Anecdotal evidence from the early settlers that Latta interviewed suggests that the purpose of the Yokuts rainmaking ceremonies was in fact to, "bring water into streams during drought, and to induce the large trout of Tulare Lake to migrate up the various branches of the lower Kaweah River" (1949:201).

Various other "supernatural" abilities have also been attributed to charmstones: controlling wild fires, bringing fresh air into a house, and bringing luck in love, gambling and war. Unfortunately, however, these themes are not recurring in the literature, and are treated with suspicion by this author. They do, however, suggest the influences of enculturation and/or the dynamic nature of an artifact's role within a given culture.

Finally, four utilitarian functions are also mentioned, but follow a similar pattern--none of them are mentioned in more than one account. Three of these functions (fire drill, skin-processing tool, and weaving tool) appear in a single account of the Sierra Miwok (Barrett and Gifford 1933). The

authors themselves question the veracity of the informant's information, stating, "We suspect that these attributed uses were only guesses on the part of the informant" (p.213). It is important to mention that one ethnographic account does clearly state that charmstones were used as net sinkers (Gifford and Kroeber 1937:217). Puzzlingly, however, this account also says that charmstones were found, rather than manufactured, and that they were feared--both of which are traits of "charm" objects. It is possible that they were used in this case as net-weights that had the added value of bringing good fortune

### Use and Storage

The reported modes of physical use of charmstones (Table 2) roughly parallels the information regarding function. As mentioned above, charmstones were commonly hung near fishing or hunting areas, often above the fish net or deer net. They might also be worn on a cord around the neck by a hunter (Collier and Thalman 1991:134) or a shaman (McKern 1922:254). Again, the pattern for southern California was quite different. Their use as charms for bringing rain took place in a ceremonial setting, where they might be sprinkled with seed or other offerings, ritually dipped in water, or sung over by a rain doctor.

Reported modes of storage included burying charmstones underground, storing them (by shaman) with shaman's gear, keeping them in or near deer-head hunting decoys, and keeping them inside family dwellings.

It is interesting to note that the ethnographic information concerning the actual physical use and storage of charmstones appeared less coherent than that for function. There are three possible explanations for this lack of coherence: (1) the ethnographic data simply reflect the loss of traditional knowledge; (2) traditional practices of charmstone use and storage varied significantly from group to group prior to contact; and (3) the information regarding use and storage practices was under-reported, and the small sample size did not allow clear patterns to emerge. While this diversity may help archaeologists explain their findings on a case-by-case basis (indeed, an account can be found to explain the presence of

charmstones in almost any archaeological context), it offers nothing but confusion to those hoping to use ethnographic literature to actually guide their research.

### Charmstones and Social Roles

Perhaps the most useful pattern this study identified was the clear association between charmstones and shamanism (Table 3). Ethnographic accounts throughout California emphasized the supernatural nature of charmstones--and the need for a religious specialist to properly harness their power. Differences seemed to exist between southern and northern California, however.

Accounts from northern California commonly portrayed charmstones as dangerous items that might harm the wrong people: "They were powerful and most people wouldn't touch them" (Kroeber 1930:391); "Not brought into house because bad for children" (Gifford and Kroeber 1937:217); and, "Paralysis resulted from touching charmstone" (Gifford and Kroeber 1937:185). The use of charmstones by shamans as part of a curing ritual has already been mentioned, but a careful reading of the ethnography reveals that shamans were in some cases also involved in using charmstones for success in hunting and fishing. "Plummet-shaped charmstones [were] tied with grapevine over openings in deer fence by singing shamans" (Northern Pomo; Gifford and Kroeber 1937:186); "...but a shaman or wizard would keep [the charmstone] and hang it by a string from a pole set by his salmon net or weir..." (Patwin; Kroeber 1930:287). The ethnography does not portray charmstone use as exclusively within the realm of shamanism, however. A few accounts (e.g., Loeb 1926; Gifford and Kroeber 1937; Collier and Thalman 1991) clearly state that they were used individually by hunters or fishermen without the help of a shaman.

Accounts from southern California (i.e. Chumash and Yokuts) also clearly tied charmstones to shamanism, but in a different way. First, there is no mention of charmstones being "dangerous" in the wrong hands. Latta's informant, for example, tells of would-be rain doctors trying to use charmstones in ceremonies designed to bring rain:

Lots of Indian Doctors tried to learn this song. They wanted to be *Tripne* [supernatural] Rain Doctors. They tried to sing it, but never learned it right. I heard them sing lots of times, but I never sang my song for them. They were only *Ahntru*. They wanted to be *Tripne* (Latta 1949, 205).

Latta's account makes no mention of sickness or other ill effects stemming from the "misuse" of charmstones, nor do any of the accounts from southern California.

Second, accounts of charmstone use from southern California tend to portray charmstones as something used in the context of public ceremony, rather than on an individual basis. Henshaw provides one of the more colorful accounts:

The twelve sorcery stones were arranged in a circle close together. In the center was placed the *Tu-caut* [a special quartzite pebble]; chia (the generic name for seed meal), together with down from the breast of the white goose, was then spread over the stones. Red ochre was then sprinkled over the whole. A dance was held around the pile, while three old men sang, keeping time with rattles. This or similar ceremonies was observed for curing the sick, bringing rain, putting out fires in the mountains, calling fish up the streams, when war was to be made, etc., etc. (Henshaw 1885:110).

Yates' and Latta's accounts (Chumash, 1889; Yokuts, 1949) differ somewhat in detail, but also describe charmstones being used in the context of public ceremony.

#### Reported Origin and Supernatural Properties

Several other reported attributes reinforced the symbolic nature of charmstones and their apparent association with shamanism (Table 3). First, several informants asserted that the charmstones were found as is, and were not manufactured. While it is somewhat unclear how these statements should be interpreted, a Patwin account puts the question of origin squarely in the

realm of symbolism and mythology: "Such a stone was said to be a thunderbolt and was usually found, according to the owner, buried in the ground at the foot of a tree that had been struck by lightning" (McKern 1922:254). This concept of a non-human origin is common among "magical" or "charm" objects. Gifford and Kroeber, for example, also report the obsidian spear blades in a shaman's kit as being "found, not made by him" (Northern Pomo; 1937:199). The association with lightning, which was found in two other charmstone accounts (Kroeber 1930; Blackburn 1975), is also common among "charm" items. Loeb tells us, for example, that "gambling charms were sometimes taken by the Eastern Pomo from trees which had been struck by lightning" (1926:216).

Another attribute which was repeated in several accounts was the charmstones' ability to move by themselves. Yates' account, previously mentioned, tells of charmstones herding deer and fish; other accounts tell of charmstones running away from or returning to their owners. Self-locomoting objects are in fact common throughout California ethnography, and are generally considered "magical" in nature, such as quartz crystals or large obsidian blades (e.g., Levi 1978:47; Collier and Thalman 1991:368).

## CONCLUSIONS

The question of charmstone function in native California is in fact clearly addressed by the ethnographic literature. Although the data are neither entirely complete nor entirely consistent, they do provide a recognizable picture of the role charmstones played in the cultures of prehistoric California. In northern California charmstones were most frequently used to bring good fortune in fishing and hunting, and in curing the sick. In southern California they appear to have been used primarily in bringing rain, which may have been related to fishing success, a second reported charmstone function in that area. Throughout California, charmstones were used primarily by religious specialists, whether singing, curing, or rain doctors. The charmstones' role in native cultures as "charm" or "magical" objects is further witnessed by several commonly reported

attributes: their non-human origin, ability to cause sickness, powers of self-locomotion, and association with thunder.

significant, narrative nonetheless provides little "practical" knowledge, as story takes place on a mythical level. Both stories associate charmstones with thunder and lightning.

## NOTES

I thank Sonoma State instructors Thomas Rosin and Greg White, my 1994 proseminar classmates, and my wife Cassandra for comments which have improved this paper. Dr. Rosin's assistance and instruction have served me well throughout my graduate career. I must also thank Pete Rhode for compiling his "Charmstone Compendium," a collection of different charmstone references which sparked my interest in the subject and served as a good starting point for this study.

## ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Ethnographic Sources Used in This Study

Aginsky, B. W.

1943 *Culture Element Distributions: XXIV Central Sierra*. University of California Anthropological Records 8(4).

Sketchy checklist associates charmstones with curing and weather doctors among the Yokuts, Mono, and Miwok; no explanatory notes provided.

Barrett, Samuel A. and E. W. Gifford

1933 *Miwok Material Culture*. Yosemite National Park, California: Yosemite Natural History Association.

Brief ethnographic account is very unusual: informant lists three different utilitarian functions for three different styles of charmstones. Barrett's comment bears repeating: "We suspect that these attributed uses were only guesses on the part of the informant."

Blackburn, Thomas C. (ed.)

1975 *The Rejected Suitor* (No. 76). In: *December's Child: A Book of Chumash Oral Narratives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

The only oral narrative I am aware of which is clearly about charmstones (#39, "Coyote and the Sopo," is also probably about charmstones, but fails to provide clear description); rescued from John P. Harrington's notes. Entertaining and

Collier, Mary E. T. and Sylvia Barker Thalman (eds.)

1991 *Interviews with Tom Smith and Maria Copa: Isabel Kelly's Ethnographic Notes on the Coast Miwok Indians of Marin and Southern Sonoma Counties, California*. San Rafael, California: Miwok Archaeological Preserve of Marin.

Valuable write-up of Isabel Kelly's original field notes from 1931 and 1932 contains detailed primary information about charmstones. Reported functions and attributes are generally consistent with other ethnographic information from this area.

Most interesting is Tom Smith's assertion that charmstones were manufactured as a source of income (contradicting fellow informant Maria Copa). This unambiguous reference to charmstone manufacture is unique, and generally contradictory to other ethnographic accounts.

Driver, Harold E.

1939 *Culture Element Distributions: VI Southern Sierra Nevada*. University of California Anthropological Records 1.

Sketchy CED checklist indicates that charmstones were used by the Yokuts for causing "whirlwinds" and making rain; no explanatory notes provided.

Gayton, Anna H.

1948 *Yokuts and Western Mono Ethnography I: Tulare Lake, Southern Valley, and Central Foothill Yokuts*. University of California Anthropological Records 10(1).

Ethnographic account from the Southern Valley Yokuts ties charmstones to rainmaking.

Gifford, E.W. and Alfred L. Kroeber

1937 *Culture Element Distributions: IV Pomo*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 37(4).

The CEDs at their best: notes list detailed ethnographic data regarding function, use, attributes, and origins of charmstones. Use as hunting and curing charms is consistent among the several groups discussed -- Pomo, Patwin, Nomlaki, and Lake Miwok. Brief mention of use as fishing sinkers among the River Patwin is puzzling, as it is the *only* ethnographic account in California of charmstones being used for this purpose.

Harrington, John P.

1912-1922 Unpublished manuscript materials, on file at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Notes on Chumash shamanism mention charmstones as shamanic gear. A published summary of these notes can be found in: Applegate, Richard B., 1975, *The Datura Cult Among the Chumash*. *Journal of California Anthropology* 2(1):7-17.

Henshaw, Henry W.

1885 The Aboriginal Relics Called "Sinkers" or "Plummets." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1(2):105-114.

The first article to question proposed utilitarian functions and use ethnographic data to suggest a ceremonial function; clear arguments and detailed ethnographic data make this an essential.

Kroeber, Alfred L.

1925 *Handbook of the Indians of California*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 78.

Accounts of charmstone use among the Chumash, Wintun, and Yokuts are somewhat sketchy, but clearly portray charmstones as hunting, fishing, and rainmaking charms. Far more worthwhile is Kroeber's insightful commentary on the subject of charmstones as a whole, in which special attention is given to debunking the "tenacious" myth of use as fishing sinkers.

1930 *The Patwin and Their Neighbors*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 29.

Brief mentions of charmstone use among the Patwin and Valley Maidu. Reports functions to be (respectively) fishing and hunting charms.

Latta, Frank F.

1949 *Handbook of Yokuts Indians*. Oildale, California: Bear State Books.

Amateur ethnographer Latta has gathered detailed ethnographic data from San Joaquin settlers and elderly Yokuts. Use of charmstones as fishing and rainmaking charms is central to Latta's account, which provides a short song associated with charmstone use, as well as interesting archaeological information.

Loeb, Edwin M.

1926 Pomo Folkways. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 19.

Brief account of charmstone use among the Pomo (which group is unclear -- possibly Eastern); reports function as deer-hunting charm. Account is unusual in hinting at charmstone manufacture (versus curation), and in mentioning that they might be sold.

McKern, W. C.

1922 Functional Families of the Patwin. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 13(7).

Excellent discussion of shamanism makes brief mention of charmstones as shamanic gear. Also reports charmstone attributes such as self-locomotion and association with thunder and lightning, which are consistent with other accounts.

Peri, David W.

1985 An Ethnographic Survey of the Cloverdale (Makahmo) Pomo. MS on file at the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District.

Recent ethnographic account of charmstone function(s) among the Southern Pomo. Account confirms functions commonly reported elsewhere (i.e. hunting, fishing, and curing), but is unique in reporting additional uses as gambling and love charms.

Yates, Lorenzo G.

1889 Charm Stones: Notes on the So-Called "Plummets" or "Sinkers." In: Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1886; Part I, pp. 296-305. Washington: Government Printing Office. The article that coined the term "charm stone." Yates also questions proposed utilitarian functions and presents ethnographic data corroborating Henshaw's earlier account. Yates' detailed accounts of ceremonial use among the Chumash and Napa (Wappo?) make this article an essential. Excellent illustrations.

1890 Charm Stones: Notes on the So-Called "Plummets" or "Sinkers." *Bulletin of the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History* 1(2):13-28.

A reprint of Yates' important 1889 article; contains slightly more detailed accounts of previous ethnographic information as well as additional illustrations.

## OTHER SOURCES CITED

- Abbott, C.C.  
1879 Miscellaneous Objects Made of Stone. In: Report Upon United States Geographical Surveys West of the One Hundredth Meridian VII:190-217. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Beardsley, R. K.  
1954 *Temporal and Areal Relationships in Central California Archaeology*. Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Survey Reports No. 24.
- Blake, James  
1872 On Some Recently Discovered Aboriginal Implements. Paper presented at the May 6, 1872 Regular Meeting of the California Academy of Sciences. Published in: *Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences* 4 (1873):221-222.
- Elsasser, Albert B.  
1955 A Charmstone Site in Sonoma County, California. Berkeley: *University of California Archaeological Survey Reports* No. 28.
- Elsasser, Albert B. and Peter T. Rhode  
1996 Further Notes on California Charmstones. *Coyote Press Archives of California Prehistory*, Number 38. Salinas, California: Coyote Press.
- Foster, J. W.  
1868 Notice of a Stone Implement Found Near Woodbridge. Paper presented at the March 16, 1868 Regular Meeting of the California Academy of Sciences. Published in: *Proceedings the California Academy of Sciences* 4 (1873):18-19.
- Gifford, E.W. and W. E. Schenck  
1926 *Archaeology of the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 23.
- Heye, George C.  
1921 Certain Artifacts from San Miguel Island, California. Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, *Indian Notes and Monographs* 7(4).  
1926 Stone Objects from San Joaquin Valley, California. Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, *Indian Notes* 3:107-111.
- Hodge, Frederick W.  
1910 Plummets. In: *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico* (Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30, Part 2), F. W. Hodge, ed., pp. 267-268. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Levi, Jerome M.  
1978 Wii'ipay: The Living Rocks -- Ethnographic Notes on Crystal Magic Among Some California Yumans. *Journal of California Anthropology* 5(1):42-52.
- Moorehead, Warren K.  
1900 *Prehistoric Implements*. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co.
- Moratto, Michael J.  
1984 *California Archaeology*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Pennypacker, S.W.  
1938 The Problem of the "Plummet-Stone." *American Antiquity* 2:142-146.
- Rau, Charles  
1884 Prehistoric Fishing in Europe and North America. *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, No. 509.
- Reiger, John F.  
1990 "Plummets" - An Analysis of a Mysterious Florida Artifact. *Florida Anthropologist* 43(4):227-239.
- Sapir, Edward, and Leslie Spier  
1943 Notes on the Culture of the Yana. *University of California Anthropological Records* 3(3).
- Schenck, W. Egbert and E. J. Dawson  
1929 *Archaeology of the Northern San Joaquin Valley*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 25(4).
- Sutton, Mark Q.  
1996 A Charmstone Cache from the Southern San Joaquin Valley. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly* 32(4):41-54.

Table 1. Reported functions of charmstones. Key: X = positive statement (e.g., used by shaman); O = negative statement (e.g., not used by shaman); blank boxes = no information collected.

Linguistic Group	Charmstones: reported functions											Source				
	Ceremonial, symbolic, or magical										Utilitarian					
	Fishing charm	Hunting charm	Rainmaking charm	Bringing whirlwind (and rain?)	Bringing fresh air into house	Controlling wildfires	Multi-purpose charm (shaman)	Curing sickness	Gambling charm	Fortune telling	Love charm		War charm	Fishing anchor	Fire drill	Tool for skin-processing
Pomo (Southern)	X	X					X	X		X						Perr 1985
Pomo (Northern)	X	X					X									Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Central)																Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southern)		X														Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern)		X					X									Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southeastern)							X									Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southwestern)																Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern?)		X														Loeb 1926
Wappo	X	X									X					Yates 1889
Patwin (River)												X				Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Patwin	X															Kroeber 1930
Patwin																McKern 1922
Nomlaki																Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Maidu (Valley)		X														Kroeber 1930
Miwok (Lake)		X														Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Miwok (Coast)	X	X		X												Collier 1991
Miwok (Sierra)												X	X	X		Barrett and Gifford 1933
Miwok (Sierra)																Aginsky 1943
Mono (Central Sierra)			X													Aginsky 1943
Yokuts	X	X	X			X										Latta 1949
Yokuts (Southern)			X	X												Gayton 1948
Yokuts (Southern)			X	X												Driver 1939
Yokuts			X													Kroeber 1925
Yokuts (Central Sierra)				X												Aginsky 1943
Chumash/Yokuts																Blackburn 1975
Chumash											X					Yates 1889
Chumash	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	O					Henshaw 1885
Chumash																Harrington 1912-1922

Table 2. Reported modes of use and storage. Key: X = positive statement (e.g., used by shaman); O = negative statement (e.g., not used by shaman); blank boxes = no information collected.

Linguistic Group	Charmstones: use and storage											Source					
	How used										Storage						
	Hung near fishing area or net	Hung near deer net	Left on mountain peaks	Worn on a cord	Hung on canoe	Dipped in water	As part of net	As idol to be paid respect	As part of ceremony	Sprinkled w/ seed, offerings	Burned at shaman's death	Disposal in body of water	Underground (buried)	In shaman's bag	In deer-head decoy	In dwelling	
Pomo (Southern)				X													Peri 1985
Pomo (Northern)		X															Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Central)																	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southern)																	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern)		X												X			Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southeastern)										X							Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southwestern)																	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern?)															X		Loeb 1926
Wappo	X	X	X											X			Yates 1889
Patwin (River)																	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Patwin	X																Kroeber 1930
Patwin				X													McKern 1922
Nomlaki																	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Maidu (Valley)															X		Kroeber 1930
Miwok (Lake)																O	Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Miwok (Coast)				X									X		X		Collier 1991
Miwok (Sierra)																	Barrett and Gifford 1933
Miwok (Sierra)																	Aginsky 1943
Mono (Central Sierra)																	Aginsky 1943
Yokuts	X					X	X		X	X	X	X					Latta 1949
Yokuts (Southern)						X											Gayton 1948
Yokuts (Southern)																	Driver 1939
Yokuts						X											Kroeber 1925
Yokuts (Central Sierra)																	Aginsky 1943
Chumash/Yokuts																	Blackburn 1975
Chumash	X		X					X	X								Yates 1889
Chumash						X	X		X	X							Henshaw 1885
Chumash																	Harrington 1912-1922

Table 3. Reported users, origin, and supernatural attributes of charmstones. Key: X = positive statement (e.g., used by shaman); O = negative statement (e.g., not used by shaman); blank boxes = no information collected.

Charmstones: personnel, origin, and supernatural attributes															
Linguistic Group	Used by...			Origin			Supernatural attributes				Source				
	Singing, curing, or rain doctor	Hunter, fisherman, or warrior	Others	Found as is	Manufactured	Inherited	Sold	Self-locomotion	Associated w/ thunder	Lucky to find		Unlucky to find	Dangerous-can cause sickness	Upon finding, must be sung to, tapped w/ stick	Tobacco ingestion and/or fasting before use
Pomo (Southern)	X			X				X		X			X		Peri 1985
Pomo (Northern)	X		X	X	O										Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Central)	X										X	X	X		Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southern)															Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern)	X	O	O									X	X		Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southeastern)	X					X									Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Southwestern)										X					Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Pomo (Eastern?)		X			X	X	X								Loeb 1926
Wappo				X				X				X	X		Yates 1889
Patwin (River)				X	O					X					Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Patwin	X		O	X					X			X			Kroeber 1930
Patwin				X	O	X		X	X						McKern 1922
Nomlaki				X	O					X					Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Maidu (Valley)			O									X			Kroeber 1930
Miwok (Lake)	O	X	O	X				X				X	X		Gifford and Kroeber 1937
Miwok (Coast)		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			Collier 1991
Miwok (Sierra)															Barrett and Gifford 1933
Miwok (Sierra)	X														Agnasky 1943
Mono (Central Sierra)	X														Agnasky 1943
Yokuts	X														Latta 1949
Yokuts (Southern)	X		X						X						Gayton 1948
Yokuts (Southern)															Driver 1939
Yokuts	X					X									Kroeber 1925
Yokuts (Central Sierra)	X														Agnasky 1943
Chumash/Yokuts									X						Blackburn 1975
Chumash	X	X						X	X					X	Yates 1889
Chumash	X														Henshaw 1885
Chumash														X	Harrington 1912-1922