

ket Maker III. The date was that obtained by Douglass, and in his table,<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> 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*

<sup>26</sup> 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).

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

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

*Customs of Several Indian Tribes and Memoirs of a Captivity among the Indians of North America*, printed in 1823 and 1824, respectively, in Philadelphia. I can trace no edition for 1824 in this country. There were, however, in London three editions of *Manners . . .* bearing the title: *Memoirs of a Captivity. . .* I repeat, the London editions were the same as the original American one, with the addition of some material purporting to vouch for the veracity of the author, and a title calculated to make the book more popular in England.

Source material should be examined personally and critically evaluated. Citing a small bit here and there is as apt to be dangerous or useless as taking a drug in defiance of instructions to "shake well before using." I will not go into the authenticity of Hunter's material, but if you do not question it after reading the entire book, I would suggest that you read its contemporary review by Lewis Cass.<sup>29</sup>

In this case, if Fewkes had read the work he was citing he would not have even intimated that the molding of vessels over wood blocks was practiced by the Kickapoo. On page 221 of the 1823 Philadelphia edition, Hunter qualified his account thus: "What remains to be said of the Indians, relates more particularly to the Osages, although it will apply with almost as much propriety to the Kansas, Mahas, and Ottowas [sic. Otos]." Possibly also he would not have given Hunter as the authority for his statement that such molding was also done "over a basket (?) or perhaps a contraption made of twigs especially for the purpose," for the words of Hunter were as follows:

"Another method practised by them, is, to coat the inner surface of baskets made of rushes or willows, with clay, to any required thickness, and when dry, to burn them as above described." (*Manners and Customs of Several Indian Tribes* (Philadelphia, J. Maxwell, 1823, p. 297).)

VERNON KINIETZ

Research Associate in Ethno-history  
University of Michigan

#### THE PURCHASE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL

The recent publication of an article advising travelers in the out-of-doors to keep their eyes open for archaeological specimens and natural history specimens which might be sold to museums or collectors as a means of increasing income makes it not untimely for us to state our position in regard to the purchase of archaeological material.

Collecting artifacts with no regard for their situation and association is analogous to tearing pages out of books. Unscrupulous collectors with an eye for monetary gains have been guilty of the worst types of vandalism. It goes without saying that most archaeologists are not as interested in artifacts that have been robbed of their setting as they are in artifacts that have been preserved along with all the associated information. To suggest at this time that a

<sup>29</sup> North Amer. Rev., 22: 94-107, Jan., 1826.