

CORRESPONDENCE

ARCHITECTURAL NOMENCLATURE

Publication of the article on Chaco Canyon masonry types in the January, 1938, issue of *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY*, prompted the following letter of comments on nomenclature from the standpoint of a prominent architect who has specialized in western Mission architecture. Although I cannot agree with all of the suggestions, I believe that they merit serious consideration by archaeologists dealing with architectural material.

FLORENCE HAWLEY
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago

“Dear Dr. Hawley:

“I think your suggested terminology for Chaco masonry types as described in the current issue of *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY* is a step in the right direction. Perhaps the data as presented leaves no room for further classifiable postulation. It is clear, precise, without parochial inference. Abstracting from the merits of your definitions though, some of them are predicated upon negative descriptive matter, which in the builder’s art, is considered taboo. Therefore, forgetting archaeology for the moment, here is how these masonry types would be described, using the builder’s language:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Crude Rubble without Core. | 1. Crude rubble. |
| 2. Fine Unbanded with Core. | 2. Fine random stone veneered rubble. |
| 3. Spalled Blocks with Core. | 3. Spalled random stone veneered rubble. |
| 4. Inferior Wide Banded with Core. | 4. Inferior wide banded stone veneered rubble. |
| 5. Fine Wide Banded with Core. | 5. Fine wide banded stone veneered rubble. |
| 6. Unfaced Slab. | 6. Random natural stone slab masonry. |
| 7. Small Spalled Blocks without Core. | 7. Small spalled stone masonry. |
| 8. Slab Base Rubble. | 8. Rubble with exposed stone slab foundation. |
| 9. Slab lined Pit House. | 9. Stone slab lined pit house. |

“I don’t think it necessary however, to conform to architectural nomenclature in archaeology, although at times one runs across terms so utterly ambiguous that even an architect or engineer is at a loss to know what is meant. Sometimes the graphical architectural data as published is even worse.

"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-