

Sergei KAN

Dartmouth College
Hanover, N.H.

LEV SHTERNBERG (1861-1927): Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist, Anthropologist

INTRODUCTION. If one were to give a brief answer to the central question of whether Russian anthropology was a “Jewish” science, the answer would be a definite “no.”¹ Unlike American or French anthropology where Jews played a major role in shaping their discipline’s theoretical orientation and topical foci, Russian (and even Soviet) anthropology counted relatively few Jews in its ranks and especially among its intellectual and institutional leaders.

The one exception to this generalization was Lev Shternberg (1861-1927), whose position as the senior curator (i.e., second in command) of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (MAE) (Russia’s only museum of general anthropology) from 1901 to 1927, the last anthropology editor of the main Russian encyclopedia (*Brockhaus and Efron*) and a highly respected ethnographer as well as an erudite ethnologist more interested in theoretical issues than most of his Russian colleagues, made him a major figure in the late imperial Russian cultural anthropology (generally referred to as “ethnography” in Russia). Moreover, after the Bolshevik coup, Shternberg (with the help of another Jewish ethnographer, Vladimir Bogoraz) became the founder of the Leningrad school of anthropology and was responsible for training many members of the first generation of Russian cultural anthropologists and anthropological linguists.

 LIKE most of the other pre-revolutionary Jewish ethnographers, Shternberg entered this discipline by accident. Like them he had been arrested in the 1880s for Populist (*Narodnik*) activities and exiled to the empire’s eastern periphery. In his case, it was the Sakhalin Island where he became interested in the local indigenous peoples (particularly the Gilyak or Nivkh) and collected a great deal of data on their social organization, religion, folklore, and language. Unlike their Western socialist counterparts, the Narodniks believed that a country, like Russia, where the peasants still greatly outnumbered the proletariat, did not have to experience the horrors of industrial capitalism. In fact, they viewed the Russian peasant commune as a quasi-socialist institution, which had to be protected and cultivated, so as to become the foundation of the future egalitarian society of small-scale cooperating farmers. This fascination with and affection for the peasant commune and “the people” (*narod*) in general was largely responsible for the Populist exiles’ interest in studying the social institutions of the local population, whether they were Russian settlers’ communities or more often indigenous

peoples’ clans and other kinship groups. Combined with this interest was their sympathy for the oppressed minorities who, like themselves, were the victims of tsarism. This sentiment was particularly strong among the Jews and the Poles, who were the two main non-Russian ethnic groups within the exile community and who constituted a fairly high percentage of Siberian ethnographers.

Besides being the only Russian Jewish ethnographer fortunate enough to have a full-time job in his field, Shternberg was also unique among them because of his consistent and very strong identification with fellow-Jews and active involvement in various political, charitable, scholarly, educational, and other Jewish causes. Although most of his scholarly writing and teaching did not directly address Jewish issues, my examination of his Nivkh ethnography, his essays on general ethnological issues, and his lectures delivered at the Leningrad University in the 1920s indicates that his philosemitism and his ideas about Judaism, Jewish history, and Jewish national identity and character had a rather significant impact on his views about culture and sociocultural evolution and more specifically religion and ethnicity.

Drawing on my analysis of Shternberg's various writings on Jewish topics, which include three published lectures delivered at the Jewish Historical and Ethnographic Society (Shternberg 1912, 1924, 1928), numerous articles in the Russian-language Jewish press (especially *Novyi voskhod* [1910-1915] and *Evreiskaia Nedelia* [1915-1918]), literary sketches, political manifestoes (Shternberg 1907) and personal correspondence (The St. Petersburg Branch of the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Shternberg Fund), I challenge the existing view on Shternberg as being the last major Russian representative of the classic nineteenth-century evolutionism who never seriously wavered from the ideas of Spencer, Tylor and Morgan which he (like most other Russian Populists and liberals of the 1860s-1880s) had embraced in his younger days (Tokarev 1966, Gagen-Torn 1975, Solovei 1998, Grant 1999). My own research (still in progress) demonstrates that Shternberg's *Weltanschauung*, while heavily influenced by evolutionism, also incorporated and tried to reconcile his Populist socialism and his ideas about the uniqueness of Jews and Judaism (Kan 2000, 2001a, 2001b). Moreover, I believe that the fact that Shternberg was not only a non-Russian but a member and an advocate of an ethnic group, which suffered from some of the worst forms of prejudice and discrimination in tsarist Russia, influenced his vision of the scope and the goals of *the anthropology of Russia* (as opposed to "Russian anthropology") and made him very sensitive to any manifestations of nationalism within it. Hence, while one cannot say that the late imperial Russian and early Soviet anthropology was a "Jewish science" (as Boasian American anthropology was, according to Matti Bunzl [2002]), I am suggesting that one of its leading voices was, in fact, very much a Jewish one. The goal of this paper is to offer a few major examples to support this suggestion.

Anthropology in Russia the 1890s-1910s and the Place of Jews in It — Marginal Scholars within a Marginal Discipline

It is important to keep in mind that, in the pre-1917 Russian academy, anthropology (and especially "ethnography") was quite marginal. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Russian "ethnography" had developed no basic organizational structure and had not been institutionalized. Thus ethnographic research was conducted mainly by independent scientific societies (many of their members being amateurs) and museums who tended to

be rather isolated from each other (especially the St. Petersburg vs. the Moscow and other provincial ones) and often lacked the funds needed to carry out large-scale field research and dissemination of their findings. Only the Russian Academy of Sciences (located in St. Petersburg) enjoyed a good deal of autonomy to undertake serious independent anthropological studies; however, with the exception of the MAE, there was no separate unit within it devoted specifically to ethnographic and ethnological research. And even that museum lacked adequate funding and staff. Its rival — the Ethnographic Department of the Russian Museum (opened in 1902) did engage in ethnographic research and publishing, but on an even more modest scale (see below). It appears that the absence of overseas colonies and the perceived political and economic insignificance of most of the smaller ethnic groups inhabiting the empire resulted in a lack of government support for ethnographic expeditions. Some private funding for this kind of research did exist but it was no match to the support enjoyed by American and even Western European field ethnographers (Solovei 1998: 28-36).

To make matters worse, with the exception of the Moscow University, where courses on the subject were part of the curriculum of the geography *kafedra*, which was part of the natural sciences division of the physics-mathematics faculty, very little instruction in cultural anthropology was offered in tsarist Russia. The social status and the practical use of this discipline remained uncertain, while the reputation of many of its practitioners was tainted by their revolutionary past and leftist or liberal views (ibid.: 112-113). Consequently, most Russian anthropologists were either trained in some other discipline (such as linguistics or Oriental studies) or self-taught, while a handful received professional training in physical anthropology, archaeology, and to a lesser extent ethnology in Western Europe.

While since the late 1880s-early 1890s Russia did have two major and several minor journals, which published articles and book reviews in ethnology, very few works dealing with general and theoretical issues appeared in them. On the whole, the late imperial Russian ethnology was either descriptive or remained heavily influenced by classical evolutionism (even after this theory had already come under heavy fire in the Western scholarly community). Although there were several independent-minded erudite ethnologists in Russia, who criticized evolutionism and searched for new paradigms, they lacked the kind of clout one would need to influence other scholars in their field (Artiomova 1991). Moreover, given the backward nature of Russia's political

and socioeconomic system, evolutionism (especially in its modified Populist or Marxist versions), with its emphasis on social and intellectual progress, continued to play a progressive role in Russian intellectual life (see Vucinich 1976), after it had lost its appeal to most liberal Western intellectuals, with the exception of the socialists (see Pittinger 1993; Weikart 1999; Stocking 1995). As Shternberg put it in one of his earliest *Brockhaus and Efron* encyclopedia entries, “By aiding progress and eliminating obstacles in its path, the science of culture is mainly a science of reform” (1901: 487).

Anthropologists (and especially “ethnographers”) were not the only marginal group within the Russian academy — so were the Jews. Having escaped in significant numbers from the Pale of Settlement and begun studying at the Russian universities only in the 1870s-1880s and being prohibited from teaching at these institutions, unless they would convert to Christianity, the Jews were severely underrepresented among Russia’s scholars (Nathans 2002). Thus, despite his prominent position at the MAE (and his honorific title of “state councilor” [*statskii sovetnik*] granted by the government for good service), Shternberg was not allowed to teach at any of St. Petersburg’s institutions of higher learning until just before the February 1917 revolution. The only way he managed to share his ideas with students was to conduct informal lectures in the hallways of his museum or tutor them in the course of one-on-one conversations.

Shternberg’s View on the Scope of Anthropology in Russia

Because of the multiethnic nature of the Russian empire as well as the fact that the Russians proper (also known as the “Great Russians”) constituted the dominant and the most numerous ethnic group in the country, there existed two major views on what the main focus of the country’s ethnographic research ought to be. These two positions, first articulated in the mid-1840s, boiled down to the question of whether Russian ethnographers’ primary goal was the study the culture of the *Russian* people (especially peasants) or whether they were supposed to collect data on *all* of the empire’s ethnic groups and even the other peoples of the world. Using German terminology, one could characterize the former approach as “Volkskunde” and the latter as “Völkerkunde” (cf. Knight 1998: 117). The clash between these two positions echoed a larger debate between the so-called “Slavophile” and “Westernizers”, which also began in the 1840s-1850s and persisted in various guises until 1917.

The Slavophile (*slavianofily*) (Russian nationalist) ethnographers (Nadezhdin, Lamanskii, Smirnov and, to a lesser extent, Anuchin) argued that the gathering and dissemination of data on the Russian culture would not help scholars establish what was genuinely “Russian” in it and what had been borrowed from other peoples, but would also help strengthen the Russian national consciousness. The “Westernizers” (*zapadniki*) on other hand, saw Russian ethnography as being part of an international scholarly discipline, which had the same goals as British or German ethnography. In fact, some of the members of the latter camp saw the study of the Russian empire’s smaller ethnic groups (whom they expected to eventually die out or become assimilated by the Russians) as being more urgent and more important for the general science of culture than the study of the Russian proper. Not surprisingly, this position was first articulated by Karl von Baer, a prominent natural scientist of Baltic German descent and a cofounder of the Russian Geographical Society, while his opponent, Nikolai Nadezhdin, a literary figure as well as an ethnographer and geographer, came from a peasant Russian family (Knight 1998). Of course, not every ethnic Russian ethnographer was a Slavophile, just as not every non-Russian one was a Westernizer. In fact, despite some of the Slavophile ethnographers’, folklorists’ and linguists’ complaints about their fields being dominated by German scholars (especially in St. Petersburg), some of these Russian scholars of German extraction were ardent Russian patriots and even nationalists. Nonetheless, a non-Russian scholar was more likely to identify with the interests of the state and be interested in the country’s entire population than only in the “Great Russians” and other Slavs.

When it comes to the Populists, one might expect them to lean towards a Slavophile position. In fact some of the ethnic Russians among them undertook sociological and ethnographic studies of the Russian peasant social organization, folklore, and material culture. However, since most of the Populists, who became ethnographers, were exiled to those isolated parts of Siberia and the Far East where the local population tended to be non-Russian, much of their ethnographic research focused on the indigenous peoples. Moreover, as socialists, most Populists, and especially those of the non-Russian origin, tended not to be Russian nationalists.

The latter position was particularly difficult for a Jewish scholar, like Shternberg, to take. Moreover, because of his strong evolutionist views, he believed that ethnography (ethnology) was a general study of culture with the same goals, regardless of whether

one engaged in it in St. Petersburg or Berlin. As he wrote in a 1904 encyclopedia, “such terms as ‘Russian ethnography’ are totally incorrect... There is only one ethnography” (181). Like most other Populists, Shternberg was a humanist and an internationalist who found support for his political views in the evolutionist anthropology with its emphasis on the psychic unity of humankind. For him, one of the lessons of this kind of anthropology was that, while some races and people had advanced further than others up the evolutionary ladder, all of them were basically equal to each other, as far as their intellectual potential was concerned, and all of them were worthy of the scholars’ attention. An anthropology that focused exclusively or even predominantly on a single people was, in his view, parochial and conservative.

The most dramatic manifestation of the clash between these two traditions within Russian anthropology, which involved Shternberg directly, was a debate among some of Russia’s leading scholars, which took place in the early 1900s, about the goals of the proposed Ethnographic Department of a recently established Russian Museum (named after the emperor Alexander III, the deceased father of the reigning monarch). While Shternberg, who was neither a university professor nor a member of the Academy of Sciences, was not invited to participate in these deliberations, his own ideas had definitely influenced those expressed by the academician Wilhelm (Vasilii) Radlov, the MAE’s director. Shternberg subsequently elaborated them in several of his published essays on the MAE (Shternberg et. al. 1907; Shternberg 1911) and various unpublished papers.

When Radlov took over the museum in 1894, it had been in existence since the time of Peter the Great when it functioned as a “Cabinet of Curiosities” and was called the *Kunstkamera*. By the 1830s it had become the city’s first ethnographic museum that featured artifacts from all over the world. In 1879 the Academy renamed it “Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography Predominantly Russia” and appointed one of its members, Leopold Schrenk (a natural scientist who also engaged in ethnographic research in the Russian Far East), as its first director (see Staniukovich 1964 and Kan 1999 for more details).

Despite Schrenk’s efforts, the museum’s collections were not systematically catalogued or displayed. Radlov, a specialist in Turkic linguistics, folklore and archaeology, found this situation unacceptable and devoted an entire decade to a complete reorganization of the museum. In this project, he followed his own vision of a modern-day anthro-

pological museum which drew on a combination of evolutionist and cultural/historical particularist ideas fully shared by Shternberg (see Shternberg et. al. 1907, Shternberg 1909; Kan 1999). As Radlov complained in his memorandum to the Academy written at the beginning of his tenure as the MAE director, “given the present [small] space and budget as well as a great need for curators and ethnographers... the Museum cannot fulfill its function of *providing a more or less comprehensive picture of a gradual development of humankind and the diverse cultural state of the various tribes [of the world]*” (cited in Staniukovich 1964: 78; italics mine). By 1903 the MAE’s reorganization had been completed and its exhibits were opened to the public. One of the changes introduced by Radlov and Shternberg that year was to drop the words “Predominantly of Russia” from the museum’s name. Besides being a better reflection of the nature of the MAE’s diverse collection, it was also an attempt to distinguish it from the newly established Ethnographic Department of the Russian Museum.

While the Russian museum itself was supposed to showcase the Russian fine arts, its Ethnographic Department had been envisioned as a typical *Volkskunde* Museum whose primary goal was to collect the artifacts of material culture and art of the common peoples of Russia (and especially peasants). After an intense debate about the preferred focus of this Department’s collecting activities, a compromise decision had been reached, which leaned towards the proposals made by the more nationalist and Slavophile participants. In the words of Nikolai Mogilianskii (1911: 476), one of the new museum’s ethnographic curators, the first priority of its collecting activities was to be the peoples living within the borders of Russia, the second one – the inhabitants of the countries neighboring on Russia, which were under Russia’s “political, economic, and moral influence,” and finally – “Slavic peoples regardless of where they dwelled. Within the first category, the Slavic peoples and especially the “Great Russians” were the collectors’ primary concern. This Russia-centered approach to museum collecting was expressed in even stronger terms by Ivan Smirnov, a professor of history at Kazan University who specialized in the ethnography of the Finnic peoples of the Volga region and combined evolutionist and Russian nationalist views (see Geraci 2001, chs. 5-6). In 1901 presentation to the Academy of Sciences on the subject of the proposed Ethnography Department of the Russian Museum, he made the following statement:

‘The Russian Ethnographic museum is being born at the moment when Russia’s spiritual isolation

is beginning to end, when the Russian people are being recognized as an increasingly important factor of the cultural history of humanity... This museum must become cheval de bataille of Russian ethnography, and along with the other cultural undertakings of the Russian people, must serve one great goal – the establishment of the universal significance of Russian culture (Smirnov 1901: 227).

Smirnov also proposed that the museum displays should highlight the “white races” of Russians: from the Great Russians and other Slavic peoples to the Poles and the German rural colonists (ibid.: 229).

Such approach was totally unacceptable to Shternberg and Radlov, whose 1903 memo articulated a very different position by drawing a sharp distinction between general academic/scientific museum (like their own MAE) and a “territorial” or “national” one (like the one affiliated with the new Russian Museum). In their words,

The goal of an Academic Museum is to build an exhibition illustrating the evolution of human culture from the prehistoric period to the highest cultures of the modern day, using ethnographic materials from the various tribes and peoples. Since all of the needed materials could not be found in the culture of a single people or even a group of peoples, no matter how numerous it might be... a museum of scientific ethnography (which is what an academic museum must become) is obligated to embrace the entire world. Only by using materials from the peoples of the entire world, such a museum would be able to demonstrate all of the stages of the development of human society. If that were done, its exhibits would be able to give the viewer a fairly complete idea of the development of culture and a true demonstration of the psychic unity of mankind and the uniformity of the laws of its development.

An academic museum must judge the objects it collects exclusively from the point of view of their relative importance for a scientific construction of the picture of the evolution of culture; as a result, some numerically small people, which might have a special importance from an ethnographic point of view could be represented in this museum in a much more detailed manner than the more advanced peoples who have a less importance for ethnography.

In a territorial museum the degree of attention devoted to a particular people should be proportionate to its population size, historical role in the life of the country, the degree of development of its culture, etc. (Archive of the AN, f. 1, op. 1a, 1903, no. 150, OS, no. 161, quoted in Staniukovich 1964: 87-88).

Whether it was accidental or not, the fact that the MAE did not do much collecting among the

Slavic peoples of the empire and that its staff included several Jews and was headed by a German did not remain unnoticed by Russian nationalists. Thus when in 1910-1911 a Russian ethnographer, Zhuravskii, who had been collecting for the MAE in northern Russia since the mid-1900s, discovered that Radlov and Shternberg sold part of his collection to foreign museums through a foreign-born Jewish merchant in order to purchase artifacts from them on the peoples not represented in the MAE's collection (a standard procedure at the time), he wrote angry letters to the Grand Duke, Konstantin Romanov, the titular head of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as to an influential right-wing newspaper. In them, he questioned Shternberg's patriotism, repeatedly referred to him by his Jewish name, “Khaim” (which Shternberg stopped using a long time ago), and made other chauvinistic and veiled anti-Semitic remarks (Archive of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Zhuravskii file). Zhuravskii's accusations were strongly supported by several staff members from the Ethnographic Division of the Russian Museum who seem to have been motivated as much by personal animosity towards Shternberg as by anti-Semitism or Russian nationalism. Thanks to the efforts, a special court of arbitration, consisting of members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, examined the entire affair and found the MAE leadership largely not guilty of the charges leveled against them. No wonder that in his March 12, 1911 letter to Boas, Shternberg referred to this entire incident as his “Dreifus affair” (American Philosophical Society, Boas Correspondence). Of course, one ought to keep in mind that this was an era when right-wing Russian nationalism and anti-Semitism were at their peak and when a Jew, Mendel Beilis, was on trial in Kiev for an alleged ritual murder of a Russian boy. It is also worth noting that when a colleague of Shternberg's, Polish-born ethnographer, Edward Pekarskii, asked the Ethnographic Division of the Russian Geographic Society to issue a public scholarly rebuttal of these charges, the majority of the members refused to get involved in what they called a “political affair” (see the Minutes of the December 16, 1911 meeting of the Ethnographic Division of the Russian Geographic Society published in *Zhivaia Starina* 1911, vol. XX, book 1: XLVIII-XLIX).

Shternberg's Ideology of Ethical Judaism as Reflected in His Views on Evolution, Culture, Ethnic Identity, and Religion

While much of Shternberg's writing on the evolution of social organization and religion bears

a strong stamp of Morgan's and Tylor's evolutionism, he was never a dogmatic evolutionist. In fact, he admitted that stagnation and regress did often occur in the process of universal sociocultural evolution and that borrowing and diffusion were quite common as well.

It is my opinion that his interpretation of the course of Jewish history (itself colored by his Populist socialism), from the ancient Biblical times to the present, was one of the main sources of this modified evolutionism. Although I cannot discuss the former in any detail, I should point out that from his boyhood days as a Jewish religious school (*heder*) student, Shternberg had always maintained a strong admiration for the Judaism of the Biblical Prophets, with their message of social justice, compassion for one's fellow human beings, and messianic optimism. In his view, this message along with an ethical, moral and highly rational monotheism (which emphasized belief and downplayed ritual) was the Jews' greatest contribution to world culture. In fact, he argued repeatedly that the best ideas of Christianity and Western civilization in general (such as the ideas of the French Revolution and subsequent socialism) were those that had been inspired by Judaism. This ideology (which Shternberg shared with a number of other liberal and leftist Jewish intellectuals of his circle) was clearly aimed at reconciling his affection for Jews and Judaism with his democratic socialism and late nineteenth century liberal Western rationalism. In Shternberg's view, these great ideas of ancient Judaism had been "obscured" by the subsequent developments in Jewish culture and religious practice, which he blamed on the harsh realities of Jewish life in the Diaspora and the influence of the neighboring peoples.

Like the great Russian Jewish historian, Semeon Dubnow, and his other contemporaries among the liberal and leftist European Jewish intellectuals, Shternberg was also very interested in the question of the reasons for a "miraculous" survival of the Jewish people. In his view, the Jews were definitely an unusual ("chosen") people – a people without a state, a common territory or even a single national language. What had kept them alive as a people, according to Shternberg, was a unique religion, a strong spirit of community and mutual help, a particular kind of national character and, to a certain extent, a high level of endogamy practiced by them. As he argued in his articles written for the Russian Jewish press, the future survival of the Jews as a people in an era of secularization and other forms of dramatic sociocultural change could only be insured by their preservation of the best ancient ideas and values as well as their knowledge of and appreciation for their own "tragic yet noble" history.

This view of the Jewish historical experience (i.e., the importance of preserving and cultivating

certain "eternal" religious and cultural values) not only undermined or at least tempered Shternberg's evolutionism but also influenced his view on what constituted a people (*narod*), which he expressed in his 1920s lecture courses in ethnology. According to him, a people share "a set of common experiences and emotions creating a set of very powerful memories, feelings, which unite... [them] into a single unit that is not only psychological but historical one as well" ("Introduction to Ethnography": 26). This definition of a common historical/national consciousness is much closer to Boas' than Tylor's definition of culture.

While Shternberg's views on the unique history of the Jewish and Judaism seem to have helped him overcome the limitations of a classic evolutionist understanding of culture, they also impeded his appreciation for the importance of *ritual* in religious life. Thus, although his ethnographic writing on the Nivkh and their neighbors does contain fairly detailed descriptions of various religious practices (including an elaborate "bear festival", the central ritual of their culture), he does not have much to say about these rituals' religious, as opposed to social, meanings and functions. In fact, his enthusiasm about monotheism (which he called "humanity's greatest philosophical invention") prevented him from achieving the kind of unbiased and deep understanding (*Verstehen*) of non-Western ("pagan") religions, which he himself advocated in his writing about ethnographic fieldwork.

Finally Shternberg's dedication to prophetic Judaism made him rather ambivalent about the future of religion. On the one hand, like other classical evolutionists and many of his anti-evolutionist contemporaries in the West, he asserted that in the early twentieth century religion was clearly losing ground to science (even among the Jews). On the other hand, he was not ready to write religion off – predicting that there could still be a religious revival in Western societies and suggesting that the best aspects of the moral and ethical monotheism of the ancient Israelites could and should become the core of a new ideology of social justice and universal brotherhood that he had spent his entire life fighting for. In addition, he maintained that the old Jewish holy days, especially those, like Passover and Purim, which had a major historical and moral significance, should not be abandoned but only modernized to serve as powerful symbols that would unite the liberated Jewish people of the future. These ideas, which brought together Shternberg's version of modern liberal Judaism and his Populist socialism were much more reminiscent of Durkheim and Mauss – two other great "Jewish anthropologists" (and socialists) – than of Shternberg's own anthropological heroes – Tylor and Morgan (cf. Strenski 1997; Pickering 1998).

References

- Artiomova, O. Iu. 1991.** Zabytye stranitsy otechestvennoi nauki: A. N. Maksimov i ego issledovaniia po istoricheskoi etnografii [Forgotten Pages from the History of Russian Science: A. N. Maksimov and His Research in Historical Ethnology]. *Sovetskaia Etnografiia* 4:45-64.
- Bunzl, Matti 2002.** Franz Boas' Judaism reconsidered. Unpublished paper presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.
- Gagen-Torn, Nina I. 1975.** *Lev Iakovlevich Shternberg*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Geraci, Robert P. 2001.** *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Grant, Bruce 1999.** Foreword. Pp. XXIII-LVI In *The Social Organization of the Gilyak*. By Lev Shternberg. Ed. with a Foreword and Afterword by Bruce Grant. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, no. 82.
- Kan, Sergei. 1999.** Historical Particularism and Evolutionism at the St. Petersburg Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography. Paper presented at the 1999 Meeting of the American Society for Ethnohistory, Ledyard, Connecticut.
- Kan, Sergei. 2000.** The Mystery of the Missing Monograph: or Why Shternberg's *The Social Organization of the Gilyak* Never Appeared Among the Jesup Expedition Publications. *European Review of Native American Studies* 14(2):19-38.
- Kan, Sergei. 2001a.** The "Russian Bastian" and Boas: or Why Shternberg's "The Social Organization of the Gilyak" Never Appeared Among the Jesup Expedition Publications. Pp. 217-248 In *Gateways: Exploring the Legacy of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, 1897-1902*. William K. Fitzhugh and Igor Krupnik, eds. Contributions to Circumpolar Anthropology 1. Arctic Studies Center, Smithsonian Institution.
- Kan, Sergei 2001b.** "Boas and European Anthropologists: Science, Politics, and Personal Ties." Unpublished paper presented in at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, DC.
- Knight, Nathaniel 1998.** Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845-1855. Pp. 108-141 In *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nathans, Benjamin 2002.** *Beyond the Pale: the Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mogilianskii, Nikolai 1911.** Etnograficheskii Otdel Russkogo Muzeia Imperatora Aleksandra III [The Ethnographic Department of the Russian Museum of the Emperor Alexander III]. *Zhivaia Starina* XX (1): 473-498.
- Pickering, W. S. F. 1998.** Mauss' Jewish background. Pp. 43-60 In *Marcel Mauss: a Centenary Tribute*, ed. by Wendy James and N. J. Allen. New York: Berghan Books.
- Pittinger, Mark 1993.** *American Socialists and Evolutionary Thought, 1870-1920*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1901.** Teilor [E.B. Tylor]. *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedia*, vol. 64: 485-7.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1904.** Etnografiia [Ethnography]. *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedia*, vol. ? :180-190.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1907.** Zadachi russkogo evreistva [The Goal of Russian Jewry]. *Pervyi uchreditel'nyi s'ezd Evreiskoi Narodnoi Gruppy* [The First Congress of the Jewish People's Group], pp. 11-32. St. Petersburg.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1909.** Iz Zhizni i Deiatel'nosti Vasilii Vasil'evicha Radlova [On the Life and Career of Vasilii V. Radlov]. *Zhivaia Starina*, vol. XVIII, vyp. II-III: I-XXV.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1911.** *Muzei Antropologii i Etnografii imeni Petra Velikogo* [Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography]. *Zhivaia Starina* XX (1): 453-472.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1912.** Noveishie Raboty po Antropologii Evreev [The Most Recent Works on the Physical Anthropology of the Jews]. *Evreiskaia Starina* V:302-329.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1924.** Problema Evreiskoi Natsional'noi Psikhologii [Jewish National Psychology]. *Evreiskaia Starina* XI:5-44.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. 1928.** Problema Evreiskoi Etnografii [Issues in Jewish Ethnography]. *Evreiskaia Starina* XII:11-16.
- Shternberg, Lev et. al. 1907.** *Muzei Antropologii i Etnografii...* [Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography...]. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Smirnov, Ivan 1901.** Neskol'ko slov po voprosu ob organizatsii etnograficheskogo otdela Russkogo Muzeia Imperatora Aleksandra III [Remarks on the Question of the Organization of the Ethnographic Department of the Russian Museum of the Emperor Alexander III]. *Izvestiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk*, vol. XV, no. 2, pp. 225-237.
- Solovei, T. D. 1998.** Ot "burzhuaznoi" etnologii k "sovetskoi" etnografii [From the "Bourgeois" Ethnology to "Soviet" Ethnography]. Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Staniukovich, T. V. 1964.** *Muzei Antropologii i Etnografii imeni Petra Velikogo* [Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Strenski, Ivan 1997.** *Durkheim and the Jews of France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tokarev, Sergei A. 1966.** *Istoriia russkoi etnografii* [The History of Russian Ethnography]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vucinich, Alexander 1976.** *Social Thought in Tsarist Russia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vucinich, Alexander 1988.** *Darwin in Russian Thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weikart, Richard 1999.** *Socialist Darwinism: Evolution in German Socialist Thought from Marx to Bernstein*. San Francisco: International Scholars Publication.

Notes

- ¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at in the session "Anthropology: A Jewish Science?" of the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in New Orleans on November 22, 2002.
- ² Not being allowed to teach at the university level was only one of several forms of humiliating discrimination experienced by Shternberg during his sojourn in the capital. During his first few years there, he had to renew his residency permit every few months or face expulsion. Even after he had been granted permanent residency, he still faced various bureaucratic obstacles whenever he tried to rent a summer cottage outside the city in a popular resort area where Jews faced special restric-

tions because it was part of Finland (which had a special status within the Russian empire).

- ³ No wonder that Shternberg's gravestone, located in St. Petersburg's Jewish cemetery, is capped by a round representation of the Earth bearing an inscription "All Humankind Is One!" ("Vsiio helovechestvo edino!").
- ⁴ Shternberg's prison diaries contain numerous references to the prophets and even a long poem entitled *Jeremiah*.
- ⁵ In fact, there are some clear echoes of the ideas of Yehuda Leib Gordon (1830-1892), a prominent early Russian Jewish "enlightener" (*maskil, prosvititel'*) and of German Reform Judaism in his ideas, although topic requires a much more thorough exploration.

Сергей Кан

Л. Я. Штернберг (1861-1927) – российский социалист, еврейский активист, этнолог

Подвергаясь жестокой дискриминации, евреи дореволюционной России занимали маргинальное положение в науке и в том числе в этнографии. Тем не менее, к началу 1900-х гг. труды нескольких этнографов-евреев (Богораза, Йохельсона и др.) получили высокое признание в России и за рубежом. Как и они, Лев Штернберг в молодости покинул традиционный еврейский уклад и стал революционным народником. Однако, в отличие от многих других революционеров-евреев, он сохранил любовь и глубокое уважение к еврейскому народу и его культуре. Более того, на социалистические взгляды Штернберга явно повлияло то, что он называл "этико-моральным иудаизмом библейских пророков". Находясь в ссылке на Сахалине, Штернберг стал одним из ведущих специалистов по изучению культуры коренных жителей Дальнего Востока. На его понимание и интерпретацию этой культуры сильно повлиял классический эволюционизм, модифицированный народническими взглядами, а позднее и идеями Ф. Боаса. В 1900-х - 1910-х гг. Штернберг был одним из ведущих этнографов России: он занимал должность старшего этнографа Музея антропологии и этнографии в Петербурге, редактировал статьи по этнографии в энциклопедии Брокгауза и Эфрона, выступал на многих научных собраниях, (полулегально) преподавал и регулярно печатался. В этот же период он принимал активное участие в политической и научной деятельности либеральной еврейской интеллигенции, выступавшей за связь борьбы за равноправие и культурно-национальную автономию евреев с общей борьбой за свободу и демократию в России. Во взглядах Штернберга на культуру и судьбу евреев интернационализм сочетался с еврейским патриотизмом. Сомневаясь в успехе сионизма, он считал, что большинство российских евреев должны оставаться в России и там бороться за свои права. Многие работы Штернберга по этнографии и некоторые важные эпизоды его жизни и научной карьеры показывают, что еврейские чувства и взгляды на свой собственный народ влияли на его научные идеи - они смягчали его эволюционизм, заставляли противостоять националистическим тенденциям в российской этнографии и вдохновляли его на то, чтобы в каждой культуре искать те ценности и социальные институты, которые важно было сохранить.

(Сергей Кан)

