

ments in his original article, he has shifted ground (between his original statements and his replies) to substantiate his original positions.

The theoretical argument can be handled quickly. Nowhere do I claim that external accommodation leads only to continuity. In a culture contact context, accommodation is fine evidence that change is threatening or already exists. Obviously accommodation means change but change following a pattern that has some survival value. Accommodation is functional in the sense that it softens the blows and abruptness of change. It thus allows for the pull and tug of the two systems in contact without completely destroying the cohesiveness and equilibrium of the subordinate system. If this means that accommodation leads to continuity, so be it. Few culture change experiences in my recollection have followed the all or none formula that I somehow read in Weingrod's "theoretical" arguments.

MILTON JACOBS  
*The American University*  
*Field Office-Panama*

#### REFERENCES CITED

JACOBS, MILTON

- 1964 Some comments on Weingrod's article on reciprocal change. *American Anthropologist* 66:124-127.

WEINGROD, ALEX

- 1962 Reciprocal change: A case study of a Moroccan immigrant village in Israel. *American Anthropologist* 64:115-131.  
 1964 On interpreting change: A reply to Milton Jacobs. *American Anthropologist* 66:633-637.

#### CROW TERMINOLOGICAL SCALES: CORRECTIONS

There are a number of errors in the Crow scales which were recently published in this journal (Buchler 1964:768, 770). Professor Eggan (1964) has pointed out that the documentary evidence from Edwards (Eggan 1937) would make the *minus* in Table I, variables two and three, and in Table II, variables eight and nine, *plus* for Choctaw. I gave historical breakdown products from Morgan and Swanton (FZDD $\neq$ FZ and FZDS $\neq$ F). Further, Tlingit should be coded *plus* for variable four and *minus* for variable five; with the same rank order of equations. The corrected coefficient of reproducibility for Scale I is therefore 1.00.

For Scale II, the following scale types are in error:

##### *Incorrect scale types*

1. Siriono	7
2. Kaska	7
3. Haida	7
7. Tlingit	11
8. Natchez	11

##### *Corrected scale types*

1. Kaska	6
2. Haida	6
3. Siriono	7
7. Tlingit	10
8. Natchez	10

The listed order of variables is accurate. The corrected coefficient of reproducibility for Scale II is 0.965.

I. R. BUCHLER  
Boston University

#### REFERENCES CITED

BUCHLER, I. R.

- 1964 Measuring the development of kinship terminologies: scalogram and transformational accounts of Crow-type systems. *American Anthropologist* 66:765-788.

EGGAN, F.

- 1937 Historical changes in the Choctaw kinship system. *American Anthropologist* 39: 34-52.  
1964 Personal communication.