

"In this particular case your own definitions, it seems to me, are possibly more appropriate than the suggested alternates.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) ROSS MONTGOMERY." (Architect,
3828 Amesbury Road,
Los Angeles, California)

TREE-RING CHRONOLOGY IN THE SOUTHEAST

I have recently learned that back in 1914, or about that time, there was a lawsuit in Louisiana to get title to the oil rights under Caddo Lake near Shreveport. The geologist employed by the group which claimed title under the assumption that Caddo Lake is a lake, and not a navigable stream under federal jurisdiction, won their suit by establishing the age of the lake as being around 3,000 years. This age, I am told, they established through a study of tree rings of logs taken from the bed of the lake and from ancient log jams on the nearby Red River.

If it is true that these geologists worked up a tree ring calendar for northern Louisiana, reaching back 3,000 years, it should be of great interest to archaeologists. I am unable as yet to learn the title of the suit, but the United States Government and numerous oil companies were parties to it, and it was a very large suit for its time.

In this connection, geologically, Caddo Lake should afford a tree ring calendar reaching back to the beginning of the lake proper, for even now it is so studded with dead trees killed by impounded water that most people think it to be an artificial and not a natural lake. While I personally disagree with the theory that a log jam on Red River was a primary cause for the damming of this lake, and credit its origin to earthquakes which caused the jam, since there is evidence of recent faulting, the logs in this old lake bed and nearby river jams should reach back several hundred, if not thousands of years.

FRANK BRYAN
Seaboard Oil Corporation
Dallas, Texas

CHACO CANYON MASONRY

In order that certain errors in the Florence Hawley article on *The Family Tree of Chaco Canyon Masonry* (AMERICAN ANTIQUITY, Vol. 3, No. 3, January, 1938, pp. 247-255), may not become too strongly fixed in the minds of students of Southwestern archaeology, it is advisable to call attention to them at this time. In the diagram on page 250, No. 1 in the chart, the slab masonry is listed as Basket Maker III with the date 777 plus or minus, and on page 254 the discussion refers to Judd's pit house with the 777 plus or minus date as being Bas-

ket Maker III. The date was that obtained by Douglass, and in his table,²⁶ to which the author referred in her article, there was nothing to indicate that the pit house in question was Judd's No. 2. The latter was not Basket Maker III but fully developed Pueblo I. Judd's report on this house and the published pictures of the pottery and other objects found in the structure clearly indicate that it belongs to the Pueblo I period.²⁷ It is important that the 777 date be recognized as definite Pueblo I and not Basket Maker III, because there has been a tendency to regard Basket Maker III in the Chaco as of later date than is warranted by the evidence, and as a consequence certain comparisons made in some reports have been misleading. The problem of the interplay of influences and reciprocal diffusions is sufficiently difficult to solve without the added complication of incorrect correlation between dates and cultural horizons.

Another correction concerns the second form of masonry, Slab Base Rubble, No. 2 in the chart, page 250, which is listed as Pueblo I, 850–900 A.D. The type also occurred in Basket Maker III in the village, near the eastern end of the canyon, excavated by the writer in the summer of 1927.²⁸ These examples demonstrate that the type originated in Basket Maker III, although the culmination may well have been in Pueblo I. The sequence given in the Hawley article is probably correct, but both types belong in both Basket Maker III and Pueblo I, and the Slab Base Rubble certainly antedates 777 A.D.

FRANK H. H. ROBERTS, JR.
Bureau of American Ethnology
Washington, D. C.

(EDITORIAL NOTE: Mr. Gordon C. Baldwin, in a letter received immediately subsequent to that of Roberts, has pointed out these same "errors" in the Hawley article. Due to the similar subject matter and treatment characterizing these two criticisms, and in consideration of the limited space in the journal, it was thought best to publish only the one first submitted.)

INACCURATE REFERENCES

In the interest of accuracy I wish to point out some errors in the last October issue of *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY*. I am mostly objecting to these errors as instances of an unhistorical manner of writing that goes poorly with the work of archaeologists.

The second article of the *Symposium on Certain Problems in Culture Origin*, written by Vladimir J. Fewkes, lists two books by J. D. Hunter: *Manners and*

²⁶ Douglass, A. E., *Dating Pueblo Bonito and Other Ruins of the Southwest*, National Geographic Society, contributed technical papers, Pueblo Bonito Series, No. 1, Washington, 1935, p. 51 (Pit House in Wash).

²⁷ Judd, N. M., *Two Chaco Canyon Pit Houses*, Smithsonian Report for 1922, Washington, 1924, pp. 399–413.

²⁸ Roberts, F. H. H., Jr., *Shabik'eshchee Village*, Bull. 92, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, 1929, pp. 15, 31; pls. 2a, 5a.