CORRIGENDUM

A number of errors occurred in "Climatic Response of Densitometric Properties in Semiarid Site Tree Rings" by Malcolm K. Cleaveland (*Tree-Ring Bulletin*, Volume 46, pp. 13-29). The most serious of these was the omission of half of each of Figures 3, 4, and 5, making relations between text and figures impossible. The Editor sincerely regrets these omissions and offers Dr. Cleaveland his apologies.

ERRATA;

page 13, line 8 -	"anlyzed" and "definest" should read "analyzed" and "defines", respectively.
page 13, line 11-	"response" should read "Response".
page 20, line 5 - paragraph 2	"(46.$^{a\circ}$ F)" should read "(46.3° F)".

Figures 3, 4, and 5 are reprinted in their intended form with the original captions.



Figure 3. Douglas-fir response functions averaged from three collection sites (Spruce Canyon, Pueblito Canyon, Crystal). Separate Pueblito Canyon response functions were computed with north and south regional climatic data. Shaded months and prior growth or density lags are mean weights significantly different from zero at P <.95 level. The signs accompanying the months indicate in how many of the individual response functions the weights are significant or close to significant.



Figure 3, continued.



Figure 4. Ponderosa pine response functions averaged from two collection sites (Ditch Canyon, Crystal). Separate Ditch Canyon response functions were computed with north and south regional climatic data. Interpretation is the same as in Figure 3.



Figure 4, continued.



Figure 5. Pinyon response functions from Pueblito Canyon. Separate response functions were computed with north and south regional climatic data, then averaged. Interpretation is the same as in Figure 3.



Figure 5, continued.