



## APPENDIX A: SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN THE ARCHIVES

GIVEN THE LONG ODYSSEY of Shternberg's manuscript, as well as the influence of outside editors on the text since Shternberg and Boas' original agreement, excerpts from the more salient correspondence are included here.<sup>1</sup>

### 1904

**JANUARY 25.** Boas writes to Russian academician V. V. Radlov, saying he is pleased with the work of Bogoraz and Iokhel'son and hopes to meet Shternberg soon [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 1].

### 1905

**MARCH 2.** Boas writes to Shternberg, inviting him to New York for 3 months in the summer to work on the AMNH's Amur collection together with Berthold Laufer [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 2].

**MAY 7.** Shternberg writes his wife, Sarra Ratner-Shternberg, on AMNH letterhead. In his letters over the next 3 months he writes that he has visited her relatives in New York and has had intense meetings with local Jewish activists. He makes an agreement with Boas to submit a volume on "Gilyaks and Their Neighbours" for the Jesup publication series [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 64, l. 80–105].

### 1906

**AUGUST 11.** Shternberg writes to Boas, explaining that 1905 was a difficult year for him because of anti-Jewish incidents in Russia. He pledges to send Boas the manuscript by August of 1907 [APS].

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence from the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia [APS] is found in the Boas Collection (B/B61) organized alphabetically by name. Correspondence from the American Museum of Natural History [AMNH] is found in the Boas and Shternberg archives in the Department of Anthropology. Correspondence from the Russian Academy of Sciences Archive in St. Petersburg [AAN] is indicated according to Russian file codings, *fond*, *opis'*, *delo*, and *list*. All correspondence was in English unless otherwise indicated; letters between Lev Shternberg and Sarra Ratner-Shternberg were in Russian; most letters between Boas and Ratner-Shternberg were in German. All emphases are original. The original spellings of names such as Bogoraz, Sternberg, Jochelson, Averkijewa, and Winnikow have been retained when directly quoted. I am grateful to Alexandra Volin for translations of correspondence from the German.

**1907**

- FEBRUARY 15.** Boas writes to Shternberg that he hopes to print Shternberg's text by the end of the year [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 21].
- MARCH 16.** Shternberg writes to Boas, "On the political horizon, we are now expecting a new hurricane of massacres" [APS].
- AUGUST 9.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, "I have written once or twice to Mr. Sternberg, but without receiving any reply. I am exceedingly anxious . . ." [APS].
- AUGUST 16.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, observing that illustrations have been made for Shternberg's book; Boas hopes to receive the Shternberg manuscript by the end of the year [APS].
- AUGUST 28.** Shternberg writes to Boas, having heard of Boas' impatience through Bogoraz. States that he has responded to each of Boas' letters but has not heard from Boas in 5 months. Notes that he had written earlier to Boas about the necessity of paying for illustrations he commissioned in Vienna [not found—B. G.]. Financial difficulty had obliged him to undertake other "literary work" for money; for the same reason he had not been able to travel to Vienna or Berlin as he had hoped. He was planning to write further on Gilyak marriage and social organization [APS].
- SEPTEMBER 27.** Boas writes to Shternberg, suggesting that Boas have the manuscript translated into English in New York [APS].

**1908**

- JULY 17.** Shternberg writes to Boas, pledging three chapters pending revisions [APS].
- SEPTEMBER 19.** Shternberg writes to Boas, apologizing for delays. Sends him one chapter [APS].
- OCTOBER 2.** Boas writes Shternberg, requesting a bill for the illustrations for the manuscript, as they agreed upon in Vienna. Shternberg's files include a handwritten invoice reading, "By order of Dr. Sternberg, I have made 62 drawings for the volume, 'The Gilyak and their Neighbours . . .'" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 25].
- OCTOBER 21.** Shternberg writes to Boas that he has been suffering from cholera and that his physician has sent him to Finland to recover [APS].

**1909**

- APRIL 7.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, sorry to hear of Shternberg's long illness of that year [APS].
- MAY 5.** Boas writes to Bogoraz explaining how AMNH funding obliges Boas to condense materials at his own discretion; this applies to Shternberg's forthcoming manuscript [APS].
- OCTOBER 16.** Boas writes to Shternberg, "I received your letter a few days ago, and today your ms. . . . came into my hands. I am sorry to learn that you have been ill again during the summer, but I trust that your recovery is complete, and that it

will be permanent . . . I shall have the material that you have sent me translated at once, and then I shall have the translation copied and sent to you for revision" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 28].

### 1911

**SEPTEMBER 19.** Shternberg writes Boas apologizing for delays. "I am working now hard and in a month I send you the continuation and perhaps the end of the first part (family and gens). That part is one of the most serious for the Jesup Expedition. It would be of no interest to you to speak about my difficulties . . ." [APS].

### 1912

**FEBRUARY 16.** Shternberg sends Boas "the continuation of the manuscript containing the last chapters on the construction of Gilyak marriage. That part was for me the most difficult one, because it need a great deal of preparatory and compensatory work and—last not least—very much of considerations and over and over changing. The concluding chapter of the manuscript treats on one side the connections of the Gilyak system with cousin marriage and classificatory system in general, and on the other side—the connections with forms of marriage and all other peoples of the Pacific coast of N. Asia and partly North America. The next chapters will treat the everyday life details and rites of marriage and the organization of the gens and social relations" [APS].

**APRIL 4.** Alexander Goldenweiser writes to Boas, informing him that he received "the Shternberg manuscript . . . a 19,250 word chapter [on] . . . a genetic interpretation of the classificatory system of relationship among the Gilyak" [chs. 3 and 9 of this edition fit this description—B. G.]. He later sends the translation to Boas on October 14, 1912, and is remunerated for that one chapter in a letter from Boas on November 8, 1912 [APS].

**OCTOBER 22.** Boas writes to Shternberg, "We need for your paper which I am about to send to the printer an explanation of the alphabet. You will greatly oblige me by sending me a list of all the terms of relationship in English transcription, that is to say, the way you want to have them printed in English. I am very much afraid that there is a great deal of confusion between 'n' and 'p' and 't/m,' 'p/r' etc. Please do this if possible by return mail" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 35].

**OCTOBER 26.** Boas writes to Shternberg, "I was about to send your manuscript to the printer, but before doing so I have to ask a few questions, which [I ask you to] please answer at the earliest moment. I find the description of the study of the system of relationship very hard reading, and I have tried to make the matter clearer to me by introducing a few English terms which, as it seems to my mind, are really the equivalents of the Gilyak terms, but I want to know whether I am right. These terms are:

- Gens woman
- Gens woman's husbands
- Gens man
- Gens man's wives
- Gens men

In trying to lay out the system it troubles me whether the woman has not a term for her brother's prospective wife before their marriage, or whether they are always called *tuvn* even before marriage. Also does a man use the same term for the wife's brother and the wife's brother's daughter? You might expect, according to the parallelism with the terminology used by a woman, that there might be a separate term for the male of this group, although this is not necessary on account of the different treatment of the male and female lines. Then I am not clear on how a woman calls her prospective husband's brother's daughter. I mean, of course, the whole class of men of her gens we call *nern*. Furthermore, how does a man call his sister's prospective husband's brother's sons? I believe the whole system is set forth correctly in the enclosed diagram [not found—B. G.], but I beg to ask you kindly to look it over and correct it, and, if there is any way of filling the gaps to which I referred, to fill them in. The point that needs clearing up particularly is the nomenclature of the prospective degrees of affinity before marriage . . . also, confusion about the alphabet! is husband *ny* or *pu*?” [APS].

**NOVEMBER 7.** Shternberg cables Boas, “As for your notice that you are about to send my manuscript to the printer I would prefer you send the translation first to me that I might make all supplements, corrections and changes needed *before printing*, because in the proofs it will give me more trouble and will be exceedingly expensive. I hope you will comply with my request which is considered by me very important. In the manuscript I will correct all native terms distinctly and in the next days I send you the explanation of the Alphabet and also the list of the terms of relationship in english transcription” [APS].

**DECEMBER 1.<sup>2</sup>** Shternberg writes to Boas, “Now to your questions.

- 1) You propose to introduce the terms gensman, genswoman, etc. I am satisfied, but in some cases it were perhaps nicer to use terms—gensbrother, genssister, gensfather and so on. And moreover do you not think that for the english reader the term *clan* would not be more suitable?”
- 2) You ask:
  - a) How do I (male) call my *sister's* prospective husband's brother? Answer: *imgi, navx*.
  - b) [writing crossed out—B. G.]
  - c) Does a *man* use the same terms for the wife's father's son and the wife's brother's daughter? Of course not: for the former he uses the term—*navx, axmalk*; for the latter *yox*.
  - d) How [does] a woman call her prospective husband's brother's daughter? Answer: *ogla*.
  - e) How does a man call his sister's prospective husband's brother's [word on corner torn from original—B. G.]? Answer: *imgi*.

<sup>2</sup> While this letter is dated only “1 December” (the corner having been lost from the original), it responds to Boas' request of October 12, 1912 for clarification on key terms.

You ask: Whether the woman has *no term for her brother's prospective wife* before their marriage, or they are always called *tuvn* even before marriage? From the latter part of your question, I see that the typewriter made a mistake in the copy: you wanted it seemed, to know how the woman calls her *husband's brother's* prospective wife? My answer: if under the term *prospective* wife you mean the woman, which is orthodoxally from her birth the wife of a man and is called by him from childhood *anġej*, and there can be no other meaning of the term—then the women concerned are always called *tuvn* before marriage, simply because they are really genswomen of the same generation—gens sisters.

But if in your question (in the first part) is not [a] mistake, i.e. if you want to know how a woman calls *her brother's* prospective wife, then is the answer, *navx*.

As for your diagram I give it separately enclosed [not found—B. G]. I have filled up the gaps. If you find it necessary to give the diagram in the paper, do you not find necessary to make it larger, for instance to give the terms also in the second ascending line especially in the divisions of one's own gens?

I enclose here also the alphabet, but I have changed a little for to adapt it nearer to the English transcription. Then the translation used in my paper till now must be a little changed, for instead of *umk—imk*, instead *utk—itk*, instead *aṅġej—*  
*aṅġej*, etc. . . .

A few words more about the diagram. Filling the gaps, I have taken as granted that the terms of gensman and genswoman are used in the [sense of] gensman etc. of the speaking person, but the terms can be understood also in the meaning—gensman or genswoman of the person addressed to. I have answered in the first sense. Is that what you did want?" [AMNH].

**DECEMBER 17.** Boas writes Shternberg, "Many thanks for your letter . . . with the enclosed tables. Since that time I have sent the ms. and I shall not do anything in the matter until I get it back from you, which I hope will be soon. I do wish to insert a table in the ms. which I think makes the whole intricate relationship ever so much clearer" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 41].

**DECEMBER 26.** Shternberg writes Boas to say he has received a copy of the English translation and will examine it [APS].

### 1913

**JUNE 23.** Shternberg writes Boas, "I have corrected the greater part of the translation and inserted a great deal of new interesting [material] . . . now I am finishing the work . . . It seems that the translation has not been made by one person and one part of the text need much work and trouble in correcting, being myself so pitiful an Englishman . . . [In] September you receive the continuation and the end of the part concerning social organization" [APS].

**NOVEMBER 18.** Boas writes to Shternberg, "A few days ago I received the package containing your ms. . . . There is a little difficulty concerning the table of contents, because I do not know exactly what your further plans are . . ." [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 56].

**1914**

**MAY 26.** Shternberg writes to Boas, apologizing for delays [APS].

**1917**

**FEBRUARY 28.** Shternberg writes to Boas that he is sending further material [APS].

**1922**

**MAY 17.** Boas writes Shternberg that he can propose \$300 for "some subject on the Amur River tribes" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 66].

**JULY 19.** Boas writes to Shternberg, offering to send food packages to Petrograd since money was not being transferred safely [AAN f. 282, o. 1, d. 203, l. 19].

**1924**

**MAY 1.** Boas writes to Shternberg, "There has been such a delay in publishing your G. material that I do not know just what to do. I should like to know particularly whether the ms. which I have may be printed as it stands or whether you want to revise it" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 72].

**OCTOBER 24.** Boas writes to Shternberg recalling their meeting in the Hague in 1924. Boas reminds Shternberg that he has agreed to send chapters on Gilyak social organization and history in return for the \$300 sent in 1922. Boas acknowledges that Shternberg has also proposed further chapters on Gilyak mythology and folklore, religion and material culture. In return, Boas agrees to pay him \$2000 over 1925 and 1926" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 73].

**NOVEMBER 18.** Bogoraz writes to Boas, explaining that his brother, a doctor in Paris, examined Shternberg and recommended a stomach operation [APS].

**DECEMBER 24.** Shternberg writes to Boas, "I am sorry I have not received till now the manuscript. I am working now on the continuation of the social culture. It will not be a small task. The translation will be made here" [APS].

**1926**

**AUGUST 14.** Boas writes to Shternberg, saying that he still awaits a response to their "Hague agreement" [AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 29, l. 79].

**NOVEMBER 13.** Shternberg writes to Boas, expressing that he has felt "all the time remorse for breaking my promise. I am happy to be able now to not only send the Museum my work, but also to pay my debt in cash what I hope to make from Japan or after my return" [APS].

**1927**

**FEBRUARY 27.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, "I believe you know how embarrassing it is to me that [the Shternberg manuscript] is still hanging" [AAN f. 250, o. 4, d. 25, l. 29].

**AUGUST 14.** Shternberg dies at his dacha in Dudergof, outside of Leningrad.

**NOVEMBER 4.** Sarra Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas [in German], "In the unpublished papers of my deceased husband, Professor Leo Sternberg, is a manuscript "Family and Clan of the Gilyaks," which he checked over 2–3 days before becoming ill in order to send it to you as a supplement to the part of his work on the Gilyaks that is in your hands. Be so friendly as to tell me whether I should send you this paper. In case it is not printed, be so good as to send me the part that you have" [APS].

**NOVEMBER 19.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, gladly accepting her proposal. "It will always be a matter of the greatest regret that it was not possible for [your husband] to write out the most important information that he had relating to the tribes of the Amur River" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 1].

### 1928

**JANUARY 26.** Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas, "Excuse me for not yet sending you the manuscript about the Gilyaks: your letter arrived just at the time of a fresh blow of fate that struck our family (misfortunes never come singly)—suddenly the brother of my deceased husband died . . . Since I do not know for certain whether my deceased husband proofread all of the Gilyak words, I have resolved to ask for the help of the following people: Gilyak language specialists at the Ethnographic Department of the University; and eight Gilyak students who studied with Professor Sternberg last year to work out a phonetic Gilyak alphabet. These Gilyaks, as well as representatives of other primitive peoples of Siberia and North and East Asia, are studying at the Northern Sector of the Oriental Institute in Leningrad, which Prof. Bogoraz and Sternberg founded in the year 1926. Unfortunately these Gilyaks are very busy and I can ask for their help only very infrequently. It is unlikely I will be able to send you the manuscript before two weeks from now" [APS].

**APRIL 2.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, "I do not need to tell you how glad I am to have [the ms.]. I hope it may be possible to publish it soon. Of course it will be necessary to have it translated into English" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 5].

### 1929

**SEPTEMBER 27.** Bogoraz writes to Boas from Leningrad; introduces and recommends Julia Averkieva for a research stay with Boas in the United States [APS]. Averkieva arrives in New York in October 1930, and later travels with Boas for 6 months to the northwestern coast of British Columbia, beginning in October 1931. During this period she works with Boas on the Shternberg manuscript.

### 1930

**SEPTEMBER 2.** Erukhim Kreinovich writes to Ratner-Shternberg, noting that he has been at work on the Shternberg Gilyak materials. He asserts that Shternberg's original Gilyak informants were from the Amur and western Sakhalin; Kreinovich would like to add examples of the eastern Sakhalin dialect [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 27].

**JUNE 6.** The typesetter in Khabarovsk preparing the printing of Shternberg, *Giliaki*, writes to Ratner-Shternberg, explaining that there is confusion over how to proceed with Gilyak transcription in the text. He asks whether she would like it all in Cyrillic, or all in Latin, with diacritics or without. In the end, both Cyrillic and Latin letters are used, without diacritics, often within the same word [AAN f. 282, o. 1, d. 117, l. 7].

**DECEMBER 29.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, apologizing for AMNH-related delays in publishing the manuscript [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 17].

### 1931

**AUGUST 8.** Julia Averkieva writes Boas from Leningrad, asking whether Boas had a chance to see the English translation she prepared. Reports that Ratner-Shternberg is concerned that there may have been mistakes in the AMNH's Russian typescript [APS].

**SEPTEMBER 4.** Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas, "Almost four years ago I sent you the manuscript of my deceased husband, L. Sternberg, 'The Social Organization of the Gilyaks,' yet up to now I have received no final answer about [its] fate . . ." [APS].

**SEPTEMBER 8.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, "Your lines of September 4th have just reached me. The long delay in the publication of the MS of your honored husband is as disagreeable to me as to you, but I have not been able to remedy it. Julia Averkieva doubtless told you that we worked on it last year. Now a volume of the Jesup Expedition about physical anthropology has just been finished and the Gilyak MS is the next one at hand, so that I hope to receive the permission to send it to the printer in the coming winter" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 8, l. 20].

**NOVEMBER 14.** Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas, "I request that you kindly send a copy of the English translation carried out by Mrs. Averkieva (you probably possess such a copy), for the entering of a few important corrections in accordance with the more exact Russian original that has been found, and also for the purpose of verifying the exactitude of Mrs. Averkieva's reproduction of the Russian original. The corrections will be carried out by [her] under the direction of Mr. Winnikow [Isaak N. Vinnikov], a student of Sternberg's in the area of social organization. The proofreading will be carried out quickly, and immediately after its conclusion I will send the paper back to you. This will also eliminate the necessity of sending over proof sheets. In case you do not possess a copy of the translation, perhaps you would risk sending the original of Mrs. Averkieva's translation over here . . ." [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 8, l. 19–19ob].

### 1932

**JANUARY 20.** Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas, "I have learned secondhand that you are willing to fulfill my request—to send me the manuscript of L. Sternberg's 'The Social Organization of the Gilyaks.' I request that you kindly be careful to send it *to my address and not to Mrs. Averkijewa's*\* (\*in order to compare it with the new-found original and to check the accuracy of the translation)" [APS].

**FEBRUARY 8.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, "I am going to send Prof. Sternberg's manuscript to you. We are still engaged in revising the English" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 25].

**JUNE 2.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, "Sternberg's work is finally being completed now and I am going to take it along and send it to Mrs. Sternberg in parts" [AAN f. 250, o. 4, d. 25, l. 67].

**AUGUST 25.** Boas writes to Bogoraz, inquiring whether Ratner-Shternberg received the materials he sent. Boas explains that Sarra Ratner-Shternberg wanted to make her own additions from notes she had found [AAN f. 250, o. 4, d. 25, l. 69].

### 1933

Ratner-Shternberg publishes the Russian equivalent of the *Social Organization* manuscript in two editions, one in Khabarovsk, the other in Leningrad (Shternberg, *Giliaki* and *Sem'ia*).

**FEBRUARY 10.** Ratner-Shternberg writes to Boas, "Since over three months have already gone by since you sent off the manuscript 'The Social Organization of the Gilyak' and it has not arrived (except 4 chapters), I have resolved not to wait any longer . . . and to send the English manuscript back to you.

The manuscript has been completed in accordance with the copy here in a few places, which seemed especially important to me, especially the Introduction.

As far as the chapter on the Gens is concerned, which Mrs. Averkijewa translated [ch. 14 of this edition—B. G.], the Russian copy of this part is an exact copy of the one she translated. Unfortunately I have had a great deal to do with it, as Mrs. Averkijewa's translation was not sufficiently attentive and conscientious. She has left out much that was difficult for her to translate, and has misunderstood some things, e.g. she has translated 'Endosmos' and 'Exosmus' without further explanation as 'Endogamy' and 'Exogamy'!!!, etc. Unfortunately she has refused to correct the translations herself, as she seems to be 'very busy.'

I will send you the manuscript in the next few days. I would be greatly thankful and obliged to you if you would inform me of the manuscript's arrival by return mail.

In the hope that the work will finally be published, for which I express my most heartfelt thanks in advance, I remain with great respect . . ." [APS].

**FEBRUARY 21.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, "I am very much troubled to learn that you did not receive all the material. You will remember that we sent part of the English translation by mail a year ago, and another part was delivered by von den Steinem last summer. Then you asked for the Russian ms. I sent this by mail November 5, 1932 . . . . The English translation contained 332 typewritten pages, in all 17 chs. I only hope the whole material may turn up so we can go ahead with it" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 23].

**MARCH 17.** Boas writes to Ratner-Shternberg, "I was glad to receive the manuscript which you returned to me and I will try to get the printing started as soon as possible" [AAN f. 282, o. 5, d. 68, l. 22].

**1935**

**MARCH 27.** Ratner-Shternberg convenes a meeting in Leningrad of the committee overseeing Shternberg's posthumous works. Members are I. I. Meschannikov, Bogoraz, A. A. Busygin, Isaak N. Vinnikov, E. G. Kagorov, I. G. Karger, Sarra Ratner-Shternberg, and Ian P. Koshkin. On the reverse side of the memo, Sarra Ratner-Shternberg penned, "August 1936: V. G. Bogoraz—to be excluded by reason of his death; Busygin, Karger and Koshkin, by their political motives; and Vinnikov, one of Shternberg's most loyal students, by his refusal to participate in the editorial collective for personal reasons" [AAN f. 282, o. 1, d. 117, l. 2]. There is no mention of Erukhim Kreinovich, although he is listed as having edited the Gilyak language inserts of both Shternberg *Giliaki* and *Sem'ia*. Beginning in 1937, he spent 18 years in Siberian exile for unspecified anti-Soviet activities [Kreinovich Archive, SOKM]. Koshkin, who was the most active of Ratner-Shternberg's deputies, writing the prefaces for Shternberg, *Giliaki*, *Semi'a*, and 1936, disappeared after his arrest in 1937. Karger, who also studied the Gilyak language, may have assisted in editing. Vinnikov's contribution can be asserted more directly: portions of the Shternberg, *Sem'ia* draft typescript in the AAN include a note from Sarra Ratner-Shternberg stating, "Corrections in the male handwriting are the corrections of I. Vinnikov" [f. 282, o. 1, d. 2, l. 40].

**1936**

Ratner-Shternberg's editorial collective publishes its final posthumous volume, *Per-vobytnaia religiia v svete etnografii* [Primitive Religion in Light of Ethnography], in Leningrad (Shternberg, 1936). She later dies during the siege of Leningrad in 1942.

**1950**

**OCTOBER 13.** AMNH loans its library copy of the manuscript to Alfred Kroeber for his opinion on its publication [AMNH].

**1951**

**APRIL 6.** Harry Shapiro writes to Demitri Shimkin, proposing that Shimkin consider editing the manuscript. Shapiro observes that while "there are sections of the ms. that deal with rather outmoded points of theory, the essential observations are worthwhile . . ." [AMNH].

**APRIL 20.** Demitri Shimkin writes to Harry Shapiro, recommending a modified version of the Shternberg manuscript that would "synthesize [von] Schrenck and Sternberg, . . . Soviet and Japanese ethnographers . . . [to give a fuller portrait of] Gilyak and their neighbors." He proposes to complete it in a year's time during his time at the Harvard Russian Research Center, together with Clyde Kluckhohn [AMNH].

**APRIL 26.** Harry Shapiro writes to Demitri Shimkin, acknowledging Shimkin's idea of a new monograph on Gilyaks co-written with Clyde Kluckhohn, but encourages Shimkin not to give up publishing the Shternberg manuscript wholly [AMNH].

**MAY 1.** Harry Shapiro writes to Demitri Shimkin, asking that two new chapters be added to the Shternberg manuscript, the first on "Shternberg as an anthropologist, particularly in regard to the development of the discipline in Russia; and also with the Gilyak problem [raised] in his work, Boas' and others, both in regard to the putative connections with American Indians and to the peculiarities of social organization which have made the Gilyak such a favorite topic for students of social structure . . . . The second chapter, which would be considerably more lengthy, possibly seventy or eighty pages long, would be a succinct treatment of those aspects of Gilyak culture, such as the use of the environment and relations with neighboring peoples, including the Chinese, that have been neglected by Sternberg" [AMNH].

**OCTOBER 11.** Demitri Shimkin writes to Harry Shapiro that he was working on comparing Gilyak to Tungus, Yakut, and Oiro-Turkic kin systems [AMNH].

**OCTOBER 12.** Demitri Shimkin writes to Harry Shapiro proposing, "First, a rather long introduction outlining the geographical position of the Gilyak, their economy and certain other cultural areas with which Shternberg did not deal. Then would come the main body of the text which would be essentially a reordering of Shternberg's materials both in the ms. you sent me and in some of his other publications in a form somewhat more usable than exists at present. To these basic materials I would propose to add clearly separate paragraphs of discussion in terms of later additions to the problem. All the work would then revolve around the problem of social organization and religion with which Sternberg concerned himself largely, but it would be a somewhat more rounded presentation than could be gained by simply compiling his data" [AMNH].

### 1952

**MARCH 3.** Demitri Shimkin writes to Harry Shapiro, noting that he is working on the manuscript together with his assistant, Lawrence Krader, and that they plan to focus on the question of Altaic languages.

### 1954

**JANUARY 4.** Demitri Shimkin writes to Harry Shapiro, regretting that because he wanted to spend more time incorporating Russian and Japanese literature to the project, and felt it would be too much work, he is declining further work on the project. He returns the manuscript, noting that "little more than basic spade work was accomplished" [AMNH].

### 1956

**APRIL 7.** Thomas Hazard writes to Harry Shapiro to say that he has compared the manuscript to Shternberg, *Giliaki*, and finds it substantively different. He is concerned that it will be difficult to get copies of the relevant Soviet publications for editing work [AMNH].

**1958**

**JANUARY 28.** Rodney Needham writes to Harry Shapiro, saying that he learned of the manuscript when he was working in the AMNH in 1957 and would be interested in working on it given its importance in Lévi-Strauss, 1969 (1949) [AMNH].

**FEBRUARY 10.** Rodney Needham writes to Harry Shapiro that he could oversee the editing if it was done by Mrs. Mary Holdworth, of Russian origin, working at the Institute for Commonwealth Studies in Oxford [AMNH].

**1959**

**NOVEMBER 12.** Rodney Needham writes to Harry Shapiro that he would like to write a theoretical introduction for the project, and that Lévi-Strauss might be willing to write a preface [AMNH].

**DECEMBER 1.** Thomas Hazard writes to Harry Shapiro, regretting that his "personal life has upended work on the ms." He notes that he has received three parts, "One complete Russian text, one incomplete Russian text, and third, the translation into English by Roman Jakobson" [AMNH].<sup>3</sup>

**DECEMBER 29.** Harry Shapiro writes to Thomas Hazard, asking for the manuscript back so that he can send it to Rodney Needham [AMNH].

**DECEMBER 29.** Harry Shapiro writes to Rodney Needham, venturing that the translation was made by Roman Jakobson at the request of Boas, asks him to make sure it is verified [AMNH].

**1960**

**MAY 8.** Rodney Needham writes to Colin Turnbull, noting that he had agreed to edit the Shternberg manuscript, but that he had his own book to work on, plus a Borneo project. "Now, if ever Shapiro starts biting his finger-nails, tapping his foot, and wondering what the hell is happening to that Gilyak job, would you please give him some inkling of [how busy I was]? I don't want to write to him myself because I don't want to begin making excuses . . . . Assure him that Needham is the sort of man (anal complex, etc.) who when he says he will do a thing does it" [AMNH].

**1962**

**JULY 5.** Rodney Needham writes to Harry Shapiro, apologizing for delays, but observes, "I think the book is important, and that it is outstandingly valuable in the comparative study of prescriptive alliance in particular" [AMNH].

**JULY 11.** Harry Shapiro writes to Rodney Needham that the manuscript has been "bumped off repeatedly . . . ," adding, "Please hang on to it."

**1969**

**MARCH 18.** Memo in AMNH files reads, "Sternberg ms. received from Needham."

<sup>3</sup> An October 1, 1941 letter from Clark Wissler to Boas regretted that there was no money to support Jakobson to work on the Jesup materials. AMNH memos indicate only that Jakobson reviewed the manuscript's contents [AMNH].