

The readership of the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* should take note of two (2) new e-mail addresses for the BHA as noted above. Because of server problems in the past, the BHA has changed its server for e-mail and has added a second address for the transmission of longer materials to the BHA's editorial office. For e-mail correspondence with the Editor of the BHA, please use the address: documents@primary.net. For contributions to BHA issues or for the transmission of longer materials to the Editor, please use the address: docres@primary.net. The BHA's editorial office can read most transmissions that are sent as "attached files" but there might be some instances where the files cannot be accessed and the contributor may be asked forward materials by snail mail.

We are currently thinking about creating a World Wide Web page for the BHA and would welcome any ideas or comments that the readership might have.

We have also added a section to issues of the BHA for listing the deaths of colleagues.

We would appreciate knowing of the same by forwarding to the editorial office the name of the deceased, date of death, and the obituary source (if any) where a "death notice" or obituary may be found.

II. Discourse on the History of Archaeology

Southwestern (U.S.A.) Archaeological Tree-Ring Dating: 1930-1942

by

Stephen E. Nash, Ph.D.
Laboratory of Tree-Ring Research
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Dendrochronology, the science of assigning precise and accurate calendar dates to annual growth rings in trees (Stokes and Smiley 1968), was the first independent dating technique available to prehistorians. Archaeological tree-ring dating came of age at a time when North American archaeologists concerned themselves primarily with time/space systematics (Willey and Sabloff 1980) and yet had no absolute and independent dating techniques available to guide their analyses. Histories of archaeology typically have not considered the development of archaeological tree-ring dating in detail. Willey and Sabloff (1980:112) devote one paragraph to the development of Southwestern archaeological tree-ring dating, as does Steibing (1993:261). Trigger (1989:305) considers dendrochronology (in the sense of the Douglass method) only in light of radiocarbon dating. Textbooks and regional histories of archaeology do a little better in their treatment of dendrochronology, though discussions typically focus on the interpretation of tree-ring dates and not on the developmental history of the technique itself (e.g. Cordell 1984:88-90; Fagan 1991:129-133; Lyon 1996:46; Michels 1973:116; Thomas 1979:190-194). Scott (1966:9) argues that 'the story of the discovery of archaeological tree-ring dating by A E. Douglass and others has been told and retold and is now familiar to scientists and laymen alike.' I beg to differ.

A recently completed doctoral dissertation (Nash 1997a) presents a controlled analysis and comparison of tree-ring sample collection records, archived correspondence, unpublished research documents, and the published literature relevant to the growth and development of North American archaeological tree-ring