

THE ESKIMO LANGUAGE WORK OF ALEKSANDR FORSHTEIN

Michael E. Krauss

Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK 99775, ffmek@uaf.edu

Abstract: The paper focuses on another aspect of the legacy of the late Russian Eskimologist Aleksandr Forshtein (1904-1968), namely his linguistic materials and his publications in Eskimo languages and early Russian/Soviet school programs in Siberian Yupik. During the 1930s, the Russians launched an impressive program in developing writing systems, education, and publication in several Native Siberian languages. Forshtein and his mentor, Waldemar Bogoraz, took active part in those efforts on behalf of Siberian Yupik. The paper reviews Forshtein's (and Bogoraz's) various contributions to Siberian Yupik language work and language documentation. As it turned out, Forshtein's, as well as Bogoraz's approach had many flaws; several colleagues of Forshtein achieved better results and produced alternative writing systems for Siberian Yupik language. This review of the early Russian language work on Siberian Yupik is given against the backdrop of many colorful personalities involved and of the general conditions of Russian Siberian linguistics during the 1920s and the 1930s.

Keywords: A.S. Forshtein, V.G. Bogoraz, K.S. Sergeeva, E. P. Orlova, Yuit

This paper that evaluates the Eskimo language work of Aleksandr Semenovich Forshtein (1904-1968) must begin with a painfully conflicted apology. In the early 1980's I was invited by Isabelle Kreindler of Haifa University to contribute a paper to a collection on Soviet linguists executed or interned by Stalinist repression in the former USSR during the years 1930-1953 (Kreindler 1985). Unfortunately, I felt compelled then to decline that invitation, however much I wished to write especially on Forshtein's tragedy. That reluctant refusal was because I so deeply appreciated my contacts with Igor Krupnik and his colleagues Mikhail Chlenov, Nikolai Vakhtin, Evgenii Golovko, of the new generation of Eskimo scholars in the Soviet Union. They were my trusted partners ("co-conspirators") in a joint effort to restore Russian-American relations across the Cold War divide in the North Pacific/Bering Strait region, at both the academic and indigenous community levels. Also, at the same time my personal political status at that phase of Cold War tension was questionable in the former USSR (e.g. the KGB had been reportedly warning Eskimos in Chukotka that Krauss was a CIA operative). I thus had not only to fear for the continuation of my contacts, but also even for the welfare of those involved. Such was the insidiousness of that system, which

forced me to compromise a freedom taken for granted on this side.

Furthermore, I feel the need to warn the reader to bear with me that in the recent process of research for the present paper, I was repeatedly faced with new discoveries and realizations about Forshtein's work, especially in his relations with his mentor Vladimir Bogoraz scientifically and personally. Understanding of that relationship and of Bogoraz's overall role in the Soviet Eskimo language work in the 1930s thus became an important component to this paper.

Discovery of Soviet Eskimo Language Work and Forshtein, 1969-1974

I first came upon the name of A. S. Forshtein in 1969-70, which I was spending on sabbatical at MIT, with fine libraries there and at Harvard. I had been assigned by Dell Hymes the task of writing chapters on Na-Dene (Athabaskan-Eyak-Tlingit-Haida) and Eskimo-Aleut languages, *Current Trends in Linguistics* (see Krauss 1973). For the Eskimo-Aleut, which I was making largely bibliographical, for work

both on and also in those languages, I made a special effort to include all of the Soviet linguistic or language works on “Asiatic Eskimo,” actually four languages. I detail these, as Forshtein himself had evidently had contact with all four:

1. Chaplinski Yupik—the Chukotka side of Central Siberian Yupik (CSY) virtually identical with that on St. Lawrence Island, Alaska; Chaplinski remains the “official” Soviet Eskimo language and therefore the only standard for all Russian Eskimo language publications, including schoolbooks;

2. Naukanski Yupik—formerly on East Cape at Bering Strait, Russia only, proudly independent, unhappily forced to make do with the Chaplinski schoolbooks;

3. Sireniskii—a separate sub-branch of Eskimo, coordinate with the Yupik branch; it is now entirely extinct, and in Forshtein’s time it was already ceding to Chaplinski, with schoolchildren beginning to become monolingual in Chaplinski;

4. Big Diomedede Inupiaq—now extinct as such, but still spoken by elders on Little Diomedede Island, Alaska.

The MIT and Harvard libraries had collections as fine as then existed for such bibliographical purposes, though they of course did not have the schoolbooks themselves. From especially the annual *Ezhegodnik Knigi SSSR*, the annual bibliography of all books printed in the USSR in any language, I was able to come up with a listing of over 80 Soviet Eskimo (Chaplinski Yupik) schoolbooks printed 1932-1969. This was a startling revelation of sorts, of a very creditable production for an indigenous community of roughly 1300, especially as compared with Alaska’s wretched record.

My Eskimo bibliographic chapter was published in 1973 (Krauss 1973), and during the early 1970s, I managed to get copies of virtually this entire literature for the Alaska Native Language Center (ANLC) at the University of Alaska at Fairbanks, most of all through the International Book Exchange of the Lenin Library in Moscow (presently the Russian National Library). Those came in the form of microfilms, which we then printed out and bound as reconstituted books. We then presented complete sets of these to the St. Lawrence Island village schools at Gambell and Savoonga, as a part of the newly established Yupik language program that the recently established ANLC was helping to implement; this did include, of course, new materials in a new American Roman orthography developed for the Island

Yupik language. The collection of the Yupik Eskimo books or facsimiles thereof sent in 1974 to the Island was accompanied by a detailed report I had written for the Islanders, to describe and explain each vein and item of that literature (Krauss 1974). At the same time, Soviet propaganda, much of it by Chukchi journalist Iurii Rytkeu, converted this to a story that the St. Lawrence Islanders, having nothing else to read in their own language, were gratefully learning to read thanks to the Soviet material.

Little did I realize at that time that, ironically, no such collection of that Soviet Eskimo literature existed in Chukotka itself, which the Yupiks could see or perhaps had ever seen the likes of, certainly at least since 1958. That year, the two largest Yupik villages on the Russian side, Naukan and Chaplino, were both closed by the authorities and the people were removed from their ancestral homes, lest any contact with their American relatives remain possible, and to “facilitate their merging” with the Chukchis and local Russians. The children were taken from their parents, put into village boarding-schools, the only language of which was Russian, and the Eskimo-language books were burned (Georgii Menovshchikov, personal communication, 1976).¹

**Orlova, Forshtein, Sergeeva,
and
1932-1936 Eskimo Schoolbooks**

We now return to Forshtein and focus on the early period of that remarkable Soviet accomplishment in establishing a school literature in Chaplinski Yupik 1932-1936. Those years were the period of Soviet Northern minorities’ literature in the so-called “Alfavit Narodov Severa,” (Alphabet for the Peoples of the North), a Latin-based alphabet motivated by Komintern ideals or ambitions, for Communism worldwide, not just USSR. The first Soviet Eskimo book was the 1932 primer *Xwan̄kuta Ihaput*, i.e. in the American orthography *Whangkuta Igaput*, “Our Book.” It was composed on the Soviet model (and/or translated therefrom) by the “brigade” (team) of Yupik students Bychkov and Leita at the Khabarovsk Technical School, under the supervisory editorship of Elizaveta Porfir’evna Orlova (1899-1976). Orlova was a Russian ethnographer and educator, and a fellow student of Forshtein. She was a champion of truly minority languages, like Itel’men and Aleut, as well as Yupik, whom I managed to meet in Leningrad in 1976 shortly before her death. The 1000-copy printing of the Orlova primer never reached its destination—lost in shipment, apparently. A single copy reached Provideniia in

¹The ANLC effort did little for the viability of the St. Lawrence Island language in the long run, as no real investment in the program was forthcoming from the Bering Strait School District. By now the Island Yupik children are mostly speaking English; the common language between the Russian side and the Islanders is also becoming English. Now, a movement is beginning on the island, at least in some circles, to take significantly more responsibility and control of the status of the Yupik language in the school, so that real community initiative and commitment may eventually grow enough to keep the language alive.

Chukotka, where three copies were made of it on tracing-paper, for further such copying in the nearby Yupik villages in 1933-34 (Sergeeva 1935; Menovshchikov 1967; 1979:61-68; Budnikova 1990). We learn from Budnikova (1990) that the primer was very successful and popular, such that it also inspired, starting in spring 1934, the local production of a Yupik-language wall-newspaper (poster), which created quite a sensation.

We have no record of any further Soviet Eskimo books published in 1932-1934. The main contemporary bibliographical source, the *Ezhegodnik Knigi SSSR*, is incomplete for that period, except, fortunately, for 1935. However, it is usefully supplemented, quite thoroughly, for any Eskimo books printed 1931-1934, including those planned for 1934 and 1935. These were two Northern nationalities book-directories for the years 1931-1933 (*Ukazatel' 1934*) and 1931-1934 (*Ukazatel' 1935*), published by the Institute for the Peoples of the North, which Bogoraz headed and where Forshtein worked 1933-1936.

Vladimir Germanovich Bogoraz (1865-1936, known in the West as Waldemar Bogoraz) was the leading Soviet authority on Northern minority languages in Russia. Starting as a political exile, he had much studied Chukchi, and in 1901 also some Yupik, mainly Chaplinski, on the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, organized by Franz Boas for the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Bogoraz tried to write up an Eskimo grammar in Russian and also in English in New York, where he stayed upon his return from the expedition 1903-1904. He also worked on his 1901 Eskimo grammar some more in 1918, but he never got that grammar in shape to publish during his lifetime (except for a shortened Russian version in 1934). One can imagine that Bogoraz was happy to have his protege Forshtein in Chukotka in 1927-1933 (see Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*).

Forshtein's own Chaplinski grammatical sketch was reportedly written by 1930, which raises the question of the degree to which Bogoraz might have used Forshtein's work for his own. Bogoraz does indeed acknowledge a contribution by Forshtein in a footnote to the shortened grammatical sketch of Chaplinski he himself published soon after (Bogoraz 1934). That may be the first time Forshtein's name appears in print, aside from his student travel report of 1927 (Reshetov 2002). The degree to which that 1934 Chaplinski grammatical sketch is really Bogoraz's and not to some extent Forshtein's will be taken up below.

For late 1934 we have an unpublished evaluation by Forshtein (See subsection "Forshtein and Bogoraz Attack Orlova," this paper), no doubt volunteered by Forshtein and so assigned to him by Bogoraz, severely criticizing the Orlova team's work in the Yupik primer of 1932. One factor may be that the 1932 primer clearly was written in what may be called the "Avatmii" (Avan) dialect of Chaplinski, which has a few noticeable phonological differences from Chaplinski and which would show in spelling.² For such traits the Orlova primer could easily be stigmatized. That primer is thus in fact the only instance of the distinctive Avatmii dialect in print, of any kind, to the present. We also have Bogoraz's letter of January 1935 (See subsection "Forshtein and Bogoraz Attack Orlova," this paper), adding to Forshtein's critique also Bogoraz's strong support of his own protege's vastly superior skills.

We have good evidence to support such a claim from the *Ukazatel'* for 1931-33 (1934:20, plan for 1934) that Orlova was also to produce a Yupik reader for Class 1 (*Kniga dlia chteniia 1 god obucheniia*) and an arithmetic textbook, also for Class 1 (*Uchebnik arifmetiki 1 god obucheniia*), each to be printed in 1000 copies. For these, according to the *Ukazatel'* for 1931-34 (1935: 28, plan for 1935) Forshtein was to write back-translations into Russian, 500 copies of each to be printed. No such reader or arithmetic text evidently ever appeared in print with Orlova's name attached.

Meanwhile, Katerina Semenovna Sergeeva (1899-1975) had in 1933 become teacher at the Ureliki Yupik school (near Provideniia) in Chukotka. There she began working with a gifted young woman from Sireniki, Wye (Weyi), then 16, and a teenage boy, Atata, then 13, also of Sireniki. Wye (1917-1997) ended up being the last speaker of her native Sirenikski language, and Atata (1920-1946), ended up being a KGB operative, assigned to travel to St. Lawrence Island (Igor Krupnik, personal communication, 2005). They were the same Yupik students at the Ureliki school, who had begun in 1934 the wall-newspaper mentioned above. They had also become involved by 1935 in a new Eskimo language "brigade," systematically writing down Yupik folklore in Chaplinski, Sirenikski, and Avatmii, as well as using the written language in local business meetings, a practice which soon stopped (Budnikova 1990). These materials were never published; but they or some of them may be preserved in Sergeeva's personal file at the Magadan Regional Museum (cf. Budnikova 1989). The Sergeeva Yupik team was also somehow proofreading the Yupik textbooks that were to be published in Leningrad in 1935 in the new Latin orthography, now under the names of Sergeeva, who had returned to Leningrad by 1935, and Forshtein. So it is

²e.g., *saxsin* for *saqsin*, i.e., Alaskan spelling *saaghsin* for *saaqsin* 'what are you doing?'

in any case quite clear that Orlova's contribution was eliminated, her reader and arithmetic manual were rejected, with her role now taken over by Sergeeva and Forshtein.

The Latin alphabet Yupik schoolbook work done by Forshtein and Sergeeva, mostly headed under the latter's name, was all published in 1935-1936, before the conversion to Cyrillic orthography, implemented according to general intensifying Stalinist policy (see below, and Krauss 1973a; 1974; 1975). That 1935-1936 literature may have been in "better" Yupik, or was at least in a more prestigious dialect. In any case, however, the new Latin orthography itself was definitely not for the better (see below and Krauss 1975:59-61).

Stalinist Terror and Forshtein's Arrest, 1937

The period 1932-1936 of the Soviet "Latin" Yupik alphabets (1932 and 1935-1936) was one of relative political "liberalism." During that period Forshtein enjoyed in 1936 a goodly stay abroad in Copenhagen (see Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*), and an Eskimo schoolbook could be published in Russia in an international alphabet, of all things, on the history of aviation, teaching Eskimo children in Chukotka facing Alaska, that the first airplane that flew was invented by the American Wright brothers (see Appendix 1, A12).

Such "liberty" was to change radically with the onset of the Stalinist terror of 1937. A merely trivial symptom was the abolition of the Alphabet of the Peoples of the North, including that for Yupik, along with those for other new nationality literatures in the USSR. All of these were ordered to be converted to new alphabets designed on a Cyrillic base. In the case of the Soviet Yupik, this transition was presided over by Sergeeva herself, who continued through 1939. Sergeeva was then in turn replaced by two other Russian linguists and former village schoolteachers, Georgii Alekseevich Menovshchikov (1911-1991) and Ekaterina Sergeevna Rubtsova (1888-1971). Anyone who wished to persist with the old "Latin" orthography became an "enemy of the people" (Budnikova 1990).

The 1936-1937 changes were especially tragic for Forshtein. His mentor Bogoraz died May 10, 1936, apparently of natural causes, but unexpectedly. Forshtein learned of this during his stay in Copenhagen, April through

end of July 1936. Though Bogoraz himself would hardly have been in any position to protect Forshtein, news of Bogoraz's death might further have alarmed Forshtein and motivated him to write to Boas in New York. His letter is dated June 30, 1936, introducing himself, saying that he had valuable materials on Asiatic Eskimo, several dialects of which it would become impossible to do further research on within ten years. Forshtein would be especially able to work up dictionaries for two dialects, albeit with "blank spots." These were presumably Chaplinski and most probably also Sirenikski.³ Forshtein hoped that Boas could invite him to New York to work a year or so under his guidance. Forshtein adds that it would be "of great importance" to receive Boas's response by his scheduled departure date, 25 July. Sadly, it turned out that Boas was away on vacation, and sent his reply (negative, there was no money, and Boas was retired) only on August 29, 1936 to Copenhagen, whence it was forwarded to Forshtein by then back in USSR. This evidence of Forshtein's attempt to abuse his leave from the Soviet Union, absconding with his valuable papers, could easily have been an additional factor in his arrest in May 1937 (see Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*).

Forshtein's Eskimo Language Works

The Appendix constitutes a full listing of all Forshtein's known publications, planned publications, and unpublished scientific papers that have been located, all on Chaplinski or Sirenikski Eskimo.⁴ These fall into the following categories: A. published Chaplinski schoolbooks for which Forshtein is shown as author, translator, editor or otherwise contributor (12 items); B. Chaplinski schoolbooks which are listed as "planned" (or "in print"), for which Forshtein is listed as author or translator, or probably was intended as such, which may or may not have been written, but never were published (6 items); and C. unpublished manuscript and/or typescript materials written or partly written by Forshtein, found in the Bogoraz personal file at the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (4 items). Unpublished papers listed by Forshtein in his 1934 memorandum preserved at the Academy of Sciences Archives and referred to by Krupnik and Mikhailova (*this issue*) are not repeated here.

[The Appendix was originally written as part of the article text, starting at this point. Much more than a mere listing of Forshtein's Eskimo language work, it includes commentary to each entry, often relevant to the article text, so might also be read at this point].

³Most varieties of Asiatic Eskimo were at that time actually not losing their viability, all children speaking them, with many or most still monolingual. The exception was Sirenikski, which was at that time indeed ceding to Chaplinski (Krupnik 1991). It seems clear that Forshtein must indeed have had some contact with all four varieties of Asiatic Eskimo, but the preponderance of his time and contact must have been with Chaplinski and Sirenikski. His publication was of course all Chaplinski, and the only set of linguistic field notes we have from him is Sirenikski, plus possibly some Chaplinski. Forshtein's exaggeration of the declining state of the Eskimo 'dialects' in Russia is understandable in the framework of the time and especially of his personal situation (see his letter to Boas of June 30, 1936 in Krupnik 1998:213-214).

⁴Not counting his published student travel report of 1927, or reported Chukchi grammar with Stebnitskii, also 1927.

Excursus:

Evaluation of Bogoraz's Eskimo Transcription

In order to come to some evaluation of the linguistic quality of Forshtein's original fieldwork, with as little documentary evidence we have of it (see C2 in the Appendix), we must first go into the phonology of the language(s), and the linguist's ability to recognize the essential sound distinctions on which the structure of the language is based.

All Eskimo-Aleut languages make fundamental distinctions in two ways which differ from European languages generally, including Russian. First, they all make a systematic contrast between velar and uvular (=front velar and back velar) consonants, and, second, they have a system of only four (or three) vowels, where a systematic contrast between single and double (=long) vowels is crucial. Failure to observe the velar/uvular contrast is almost as serious as would be a failure to observe Russian palatalization ("hard" vs. "soft" consonants), and failure to observe vowel length would be even more serious than to ignore Russian word-accent.⁵ If insight into these structures is lacking, the result is not merely a heavy "foreign accent," but is also failure to observe fundamental grammatical structures, which depend on those sound distinctions.

To evaluate Forshtein's performance in this regard, we must first evaluate that of his mentor Bogoraz, who (alone) prepared Forshtein for the fieldwork, directly and/or through his published (and perhaps also unpublished) work. We have no record that any Eskimo speakers were available in Leningrad in 1926-27, i.e., Forshtein had no access to any other recent source of information on Eskimo, except of course foreign Eskimo, especially Greenlandic, such as that by Kleinschmidt and Thalbitzer, which Bogoraz certainly knew and cited.

The velar/uvular consonant distinction or contrast forms a 2x3=6 system, the 3 being the systematic 3-way contrast in all Eskimo-Aleut between 1) stops (plain, neither aspirated nor voiced), i.e. k/k' ; 2) voiced fricatives, i.e. g/g' ; and 3) voiceless fricatives, i.e. x/x' , to use here the Latin equivalents for the Cyrillic letters which the Soviet Eskimo literature ended up using by 1946, when that finally started fully to reflect an adequate level of observing the contrast (see Fig. 8).

Bogoraz began his most relevant fieldwork lengthily with Chukchi, which has a clear velar/uvular k/k' (= k/q)

contrast, and which Bogoraz definitely observed (though shakily, with frequent errors) at least by 1901, when he also did his first and only Yupik Eskimo fieldwork (Fig. 1). Chukchi, it should also be noted, has that contrast only for the stops k/q , not for the fricatives. Where Eskimo has four contrasting fricatives, g/g' and x/x' , paralleling k/q , Chukchi has only one, g (which has a predictable variant which sounds more like x).

In his Eskimo transcriptions of 1901, Bogoraz does manage to distinguish Eskimo k and q somewhat, but rather more shakily than he did in Chukchi, writing q (his long-tailed k) correctly about 20% of the time, but k 80%, as though it were the non-uvular k , which he correctly writes k about 99% of the time, rarely q , 1%, the reverse mistake. However, for the two Eskimo voiced fricatives, g and g' , Bogoraz makes a rather clear distinction, somewhat more clearly or accurately than he does for k and q , and obviously for a different reason, this time for the uvular. For the uvular Bogoraz quite regularly writes a symbol resembling lowercase Latin h , with both more or less of a downward extension, and a bar to the right from the top. From his first Eskimo text publication in 1909 on, however, he has representing that symbol in print a Latin r instead, usually with a dot underneath, clearly demonstrating that he recognizes that sound as the very widespread highly fashionable European uvular version of the trilled r , made at the back of the tongue instead of front. That r was and is prevalent for example in "good" French, much German, definitely Yiddish, and also in much Russian of the time in urban intellectual circles, including very probably Bogoraz and Forshtein themselves. It is still quite widespread in Russian, though hardly recognized these days except as a common "speech defect." It also explains such Russian spellings as *Sirenik-* for the village name *Sighinek*, where in Russian the r is now of course usually the tongue-tip trill.

For the non-uvular Eskimo g , Bogoraz often also wrote the same symbol (printed as dotted r), mistakenly, but only about 40% of the time. He in fact wrote something else about 60% of the time for it, as that g so often failed to meet his auditory expectations for r . He heard it with difficulty, often as nothing, zero, e.g. writing *ugu* as *uu*, or writing it as *w* after *u* before something else, e.g. *uwa* likewise as *y* after *i*, i.e. as nearly zero, and occasionally in certain positions he wrote h (later g) for it. In other words, though he had little or no idea of Yupik g as such, somewhat more often than not he did in a sense distinguish, however accidentally, g from g' , thanks to his Yiddish-Russian uvular r . (In fact, Bogoraz also

⁵Bogoraz and Forshtein did indeed fail to recognize Eskimo vowel length as such, though they did sometimes mark it as accent (along with accent without length). Russian Eskimo linguistics only began to recognize vowel length in the 1940s, mainly through the work of Rubtsova, but long vowels have never been recognized in schoolbook orthographies. This issue is covered at length in Krauss 1975.

Consonant Transcription Conventions Employed in Siberian Yupik Linguistics.
(Figures 1 through 8 and "St. Lawrence Island.")

1. Bogoraz 1901	2. Bogoraz 1909-34	3. Forshtein 1929	4. Orlova 1932	5. Forshtein - Sergeeva 1935-6																														
<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k k*</td></tr><tr><td>∅ h h*</td><td>h*</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x</td></tr></table>	k	k k*	∅ h h*	h*	x	x	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k</td></tr><tr><td>∅ g r*</td><td>r*</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x</td></tr></table>	k	k	∅ g r*	r*	x	x	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k</td></tr><tr><td>g*</td><td>r*</td></tr><tr><td>h*</td><td>h*</td></tr></table>	k	k	g*	r*	h*	h*	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>q</td></tr><tr><td>h</td><td>g</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x</td></tr></table>	k	q	h	g	x	x	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>q</td></tr><tr><td>g</td><td>r</td></tr><tr><td>h</td><td>h</td></tr></table>	k	q	g	r	h	h
k	k k*																																	
∅ h h*	h*																																	
x	x																																	
k	k																																	
∅ g r*	r*																																	
x	x																																	
k	k																																	
g*	r*																																	
h*	h*																																	
k	q																																	
h	g																																	
x	x																																	
k	q																																	
g	r																																	
h	h																																	
6. Sergeeva 1937	7. Sergeeva - Rubtsova 1938-41	8. Rubtsova - Menovshchikov 1946-	St. Lawrence Island																															
<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k'</td></tr><tr><td>g</td><td>r'</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x</td></tr></table>	k	k'	g	r'	x	x	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k'</td></tr><tr><td>g</td><td>g'</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x</td></tr></table>	k	k'	g	g'	x	x	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>k'</td></tr><tr><td>g</td><td>g'</td></tr><tr><td>x</td><td>x'</td></tr></table>	k	k'	g	g'	x	x'	<table border="1"><tr><td>k</td><td>q</td></tr><tr><td>g</td><td>gh</td></tr><tr><td>g(g)</td><td>gh(h)</td></tr></table>	k	q	g	gh	g(g)	gh(h)							
k	k'																																	
g	r'																																	
x	x																																	
k	k'																																	
g	g'																																	
x	x																																	
k	k'																																	
g	g'																																	
x	x'																																	
k	q																																	
g	gh																																	
g(g)	gh(h)																																	

Notes

1.-3. * symbols modified as described in text; ∅ = zero, y, w
6.-8. Latin equivalents here shown for Cyrillic symbols.

seemed to distinguish that *r* from the tongue-tip retroflex *r* that also occurs as such in all Asiatic Eskimo; that he also wrote *r*, of course, but without the dot underneath.)

For the voiceless Yupik fricatives *x* and *x'*, Bogoraz always wrote only *x*, having no inkling of a difference (though Russian has an *x* more like Eskimo *x*, and Yiddish one more like Eskimo *x'*). This failure is in fact quite expectable, given the above. The Yupik *k* and *q*, though much shakier still than that in Chukchi, he knew or sensed he had to deal with, from Chukchi. The *g/g'* contrast he heard a bit more clearly, but that sensibility came only because of his native Russian dialect and/or Yiddish. With those sensitivities coming from two different altogether unrelated directions, Bogoraz presumably sensed no connection between the two highly parallel contrasts, i.e. the same single contrast distinguishing both pairs, which of course applies equally to the third pair, *x/x'*. This last structural point is particularly unfortunate, because in fact there are in Yupik grammar extremely frequent parallel alternations between *g* and *x*, as well as *k*, and likewise of course between *g'* and *x'*, as well as *q*. It is not clear when Bogoraz first read Kleinschmidt (1851) or Thalbitzer, Bogoraz's contemporary in Copenhagen, both of which

Bogoraz often cites at least in his later publications, as they make that picture quite clear for Greenlandic. Without that picture, one not only fails to create an appropriate writing system, one also misses a lot of points in Eskimo grammar.

Fig. 1 illustrates Bogoraz's 1901 performance. For the *k/q* contrast I write a light dotted vertical separation line, for the *g/g'* a heavier dashed one, and for the *x/x'* no line. The shades of gray represent degree of failure to distinguish the two consonant series.

In his subsequent publications (Bogoraz 1909, 1913, 1934, and his 1918 manuscript published posthumously in 1949) however, some of which cite Kleinschmidt and Thalbitzer, Bogoraz continues with only *x* for *x/x'*, and something similar to his 1901 treatment for *g/g'*. For *k/q*, however, for some reason very difficult to fathom, he gives up nearly all his *q*'s, writing only *k* instead, with few exceptions (in the texts most notably Raven's caw, "qoq!" –see Fig. 2). One can only guess whether this is because of indifference, or of frustration with his 1901 transcription that he understood was faulty, but had no good chance to correct himself. Therefore, perhaps for both reasons, he

ended up “simplifying” his transcription by changing his *q*’s to *k*. As we shall see, for his grammar he then found himself painfully forced to backtrack a bit.

Bogoraz’s first published two-dimensional table of consonants is 1909, showing that there is some kind of system, but he fails to arrange symbols *g h q r x k* with any insight, or much correspondence to his actual usage. His 1918 (1949:45) table is much better, where he in fact shows a *k:q::g:r* proportion, but then has *x* and *h* both under *k*, with nothing corresponding under *q*; likewise his 1934 table, but there also missing *r*, and both later tables correspond only partly to his actual usage. As Bogoraz’s data and texts are all from 1901, this belated partial recognition of the system and the contrasts as such cannot be applied to the data, essentially lacking the necessary information. As a result, in the texts published in 1949 with the 1918 grammar, *q* as such is extremely rare, as noted, virtually always written *k*, and in the vocabulary no words begin with a *q*, only *k*, although many are (latterly there) provided with a *-q* as the inflectional singular ending.

This last inconsistency points to a rather painful brief spot in his 1918 grammar (1949:50-51), where Bogoraz faces up to the fact that Chaplinski has a dual number in its fundamental grammar, and that that dual is represented by a *-k* ending, which contrasts with the *-q* for the singular. He thus has correctly (i.e. corrected) *angyaq* ‘boat’ (singular), *angyak* (dual), *angyat* (plural). ‘Woman,’ however, he has *arnak* [*q*], *arnik* [*arnak*], *arnat*, respectively. Here, instead of simple respelling as in *angyaq*, he guesses the singular ends with a *-k* which is “pronounced” (? , added in brackets) as a *-q*, and decides there must be a different vowel in the dual but, then in brackets thinks the better of it. For ‘man’ he has *yuk*, *yuuk*, *yuit*,⁶ which are in fact *yuuk*, *yugek*, *yuget*, respectively, in American Yupik spelling, with a lengthened vowel in the monosyllabic singular, automatic alternation of *-k* with *-g-* (mentioned above, but here unrecognized altogether), which is automatic when adding the usual suffixes *-ek* and *-et* for the dual and plural. In an important sense even more seriously, for ‘arm’ he has *talik* in the singular, *talitik* for the dual, *talit* plural; the correct forms are of course *talliq*, *tallik*, *tallit* in American spelling. Bogoraz’s dual here is instead the possessed *tallikek* ‘his two arms,’ a different paradigm. Here a consequence is that Bogoraz’s limitations undermine the control he needs of the data to prevent slipping into a different paradigm, a very serious pitfall in constructing a grammar.

This problem then leads Bogoraz on to say of the dual, which in fact pervades all Yupik inflection in both nouns and

verbs (and those of all Eskimo except Greenlandic Inuit and Sirenikski)—that the dual is “quite rare” in Asiatic Eskimo, which, moreover, “has gone even farther than the Greenlandic in giving up the dual.” Bogoraz’s whole section on the verbal endings, the largest part of the paper, then ignores the dual. This resulting distortion is a major example of the consequences of failing to hear the sounds adequately.

Here, however, it becomes extremely important to add a point made by Nikolai Vakhtin, our colleague in Eskimo linguistics, with whom I fully agree. According to Vakhtin, my evaluation of Bogoraz’s contribution to Eskimo linguistics is highly one-sided and is preoccupied with its weaknesses at the phonological pole (phonetics, orthography, some levels of grammar), whereas in other respects, as Vakhtin points out, e.g. the semantics of verb-tense suffixes, Bogoraz’s work is quite outstanding and still has much to offer (Nikolai Vakhtin, personal communication, February 5, 2005).

Forshtein’s Eskimo Transcription

Now, for Forshtein, careful examination of his 1929 Sirenikski notes reveals that his grasp of the sounds is hardly better than Bogoraz’s in 1901, and in some ways not even as good (Fig. 3). There is no trace of any *k/q* distinction, writing only *k*, in spite of Forshtein’s obvious contact also with Chukchi (cf. Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*). – Also, the Bogoraz-Stebnitskii Chukchi dictionary of 1937 fully recognized *k/q*. This is also in spite of the—evidently failed—possibility for Forshtein to learn from Bogoraz not to repeat Bogoraz’s regrettable mistake of missing that contrast in Eskimo as Bogoraz himself had in 1901. Forshtein of course also had a new chance to hear that even if he had learned nothing from Bogoraz, but he does not, and of course misses entirely also the *x/x*’ distinction, only writing indiscriminately a lengthened *h* symbol (similar to what Bogoraz wrote in 1901 for “*r*”) for both. Somehow that symbol based on *h* shows indeed some vague familiarity with Bogoraz’s 1901 materials, though the symbol is used now by Forshtein for the voiceless pair instead of for the voiced (see further the Appendix, A11).

The voiced fricative contrast, *g/g*’, on the other hand, Forshtein happened to recognize significantly better even than did Bogoraz, no doubt for the same Yiddish-Russian reasons. Forshtein writes the non-uvular as *g*, rather regularly, never confusing it with the uvular with his cursive version of Latin *r* (see Fig. 3). Both the *g* and *r* have a micron regularly written over them, which though entirely redundant, does show that the Eskimo sounds are in some way different from

⁶This deficient transcription is evidently the origin of what became the “official” new Soviet ethnonym *Yuit* for Eskimos.

the Russian ones, and perhaps makes the work look more technical or “scientific.” Forshtein’s micron over the *r* might not have had to be totally redundant if he had recognized that Asiatic Eskimo also has a tongue-tip retroflex fricative *r* as well as the uvular, maybe by then (as now) Russianized as a trill, not nearly so frequent as the uvular, but still definitely contrasting with it. Bogoraz had recognized that, writing it always as an *r* without the dot beneath, as noted above, but Forshtein writes that too with the same symbol he uses for the uvular. For example, in the word for the inner skin-curtained part of the Eskimo house, written for St. Lawrence Island Yupik *aagra*, Forshtein writes *agra* with the micron too (over the *r* as well as the *g*), thus with a highly Parisian (or Yiddish) accent!

It is true that since Sirenikski has indeed lost the dual, Forshtein’s notes might in that respect not fare so inadequately, but it is equally clear that his 1929 notes for Chaplinski could only be as good as, or more likely, poorer than Bogoraz’s. This is less excusable for Forshtein than for Bogoraz, however, for three reasons. First, one must seriously wonder at the quality of mentoring or instruction Forshtein got from Bogoraz, or the quality of Forshtein’s learning from him, not to have profited at all from Bogoraz’s experience with the *k/q* contrast, also e.g. not to have noticed the tongue-tip/uvular “*r*” contrast Bogoraz recognized. In fact there is only the vaguest correspondence between their strengths and weaknesses, at least at this phonological level, Forshtein influenced only by the same external factors as Bogoraz. Second, Forshtein in 1929 showed no sign of Bogoraz’s knowledge of the literature, sufficient at least to cite Kleinschmidt and Thalbitzer, in German and English, languages Forshtein knew probably as did Bogoraz, because of his family background and, especially, in view of his recorded correspondence in English and Danish during his trip to Copenhagen in 1936. Third, there were also advances in linguistic theory, especially phonemic theory, the all-important “discovery” of the “phoneme.” That theory could have reorganized the poorly understood welter of Eskimo phonetic details into an insightful structure. Forshtein absolutely had to be aware of those advances somehow. That is proven by the fact that his loose page 1 is explicitly entitled “*Fonemy*” (Phonemes), an extremely early attestation (if that sheet too is 1929, then maybe the very first attestation) in Russian of the new word that was just becoming quite the rage abroad, e.g. Prague, at the time. The rest of that page nevertheless reveals no such structure, only a linear sort of alphabetized list of the consonants, devoid of any new insight in spite of the title. Sloppily, it even leaves out the *g* and “*r*”.

Thus it seems that Forshtein’s work failed for some reason to share at least through 1929 in any of the advances

made either in Eskimo or theoretical linguistics during the first third of the last century. Instead it dwells on phonetics, the turn-of-that century Latin-Anglo-based arsenal of phonetic symbols especially for the details of European vowels. Bogoraz and Forshtein each used about 15 symbols for Eskimo vowels, which in Chukotka form a clear-cut system of four phonemes. Those symbols, one may suppose, provide the work with a highly technical and prestigiously “scientific” appearance. It is at the same time true that those vowel symbols could indeed have partially compensated to show, indirectly, some of the missed consonant distinctions, e.g. they both write ‘kill’ (*tuqu-*) as *toko-*, as the essential *k/q* distinction has an effect which they often heard on the vowels, but hearing only this way, if at all, they missed the essential nature of the system.

Orlova’s 1932 Primer: Different Approach

We now come to a convergence and confrontation of two starkly contrasting approaches to Eskimo linguistics. Elizaveta Porfir’evna Orlova (1899-1976), a trained ethnographer with field-experience in Itel’men, was supervisor of the Eskimo textbook team of [Ivan] Bychkov (ca. 1916-?) and [Nikolai] Leita (Legta, American spelling Legh’ta; 1910-1975) at the Technical School in Khabarovsk in 1931-32. They were faced with the problem of adapting the Alphabet of the Peoples of the North as a practical standard in which to write and print the Chaplinski schoolbooks. Their result, luckily, came from a tradition quite independent of the “scientific” phonetics with which Bogoraz and Forshtein were so unluckily preoccupied. This alphabet was based on a relatively standard Latin alphabet, with fewer symbols, which did not allow for getting lost in a welter of vowel phonetics, and which did allow very conveniently for at least *k/q* as such (Fig. 4). Probably because of that “opening,” and contact with other northern languages with similar contrasts (for example, Orlova also was familiar with Aleut and Itel’men, both of which also have the velar/uvular contrast systematically), the Orlova group made brilliant strides in recognizing at least two of the three pairs, the *k/k’* which they of course wrote *k/q*, and the *g/g’*, which they wrote *h/g*. Another important reason for their success very probably is that Bychkov and Leita were much more actively involved as peer-collaborators with Orlova, whose performance was much more subject to their understanding and approval than was Forshtein’s. Forshtein never even named his sources in the field, e.g. those he supposedly transcribed the Ungaziq folktales from, and who most probably never even saw the results from their “informant-scientist” contact printed in 1935.

The resulting 1932 primer text from the Orlova team also shows a rather separate and maybe less “scientific”

solution in its choice of symbols too, especially in ignoring the “r” for the uvular, using the *g* for that instead, and in their “Russo-Slavic” identification of velar *g* as *h, g* and voiced *h* being variants of the same phoneme in much Russian, especially of a type considered far less “intellectual.” True, their crucial advance did not include the *x/x’* contrast, both still being written with *x*. The reasons for that continuing failure are not clear. It now seems doubtful that the Orlova group was limited from that by Bogoraz’s disapproval—they certainly got that anyway. Most likely, they too did not see the structure as such, but just heard there were five different consonants that had to be written differently, for which they picked *k, q, h, g,* and *x* (Fig 4).

Forshtein and Bogoraz Attack Orlova

The Orlova team’s advance may well in any case have been greeted with sharp ambivalence by Bogoraz in 1932, while Forshtein was away in Chukotka, and by Forshtein no less upon his learning of it, perhaps not before his return to Leningrad in late 1933. The *k/q* contrast and probably also the *h/g* (i.e. *g/g’*) could not have been a surprise to Bogoraz, nor was he probably offended by the reduction of the vowels now to five; in fact, in preparing his Eskimo grammatical sketch for its 1934 publication, as will be noted below, he cites the Orlova work with some implied approval and his transcription is significantly influenced by it. The negative side of that is clearly to be seen later in Bogoraz-Forshtein’s attack on Orlova of late 1934–early 1935 (see the Appendix, C3). It now seems also clear that the proletarian *h/g* spelling may have been just one more disagreeable factor, on top of the Bychkov-Leita Avatmiit dialect, compared to the mainstream Chaplinski represented by several Chaplinski students then available as Yupik consultants in Leningrad, not to mention the personal and political factors of a terrifyingly tense time.

The first salvo was fired by Bogoraz in his formal evaluation of Orlova’s textbook (Appendix, C3: *Otzyv ob eskimoskom uchebnike E. Orlovoi*. RAN Archives, Fond 250-1(or 5?)-175). This very revealing item was written by Bogoraz February 18, 1935. According to my notation, it “disapproves of Orlova’s new ‘Uchebnik’ (which never appeared—M.K.), nearly not revised, so do not use or publish. Interesting. Agrees with Forshtein’s criticism” (for which see below).

I distinctly remember that Bogoraz’s report also mentions Forshtein, recommending him highly as a far better choice for such work than Orlova. To this should be added Reshetov’s (2002) citation of Forshtein’s own “*otzyv*” (evaluation) of Orlova’s 1932 primer, sent to the Administration (i.e., Bogoraz) of the Institute of the Peoples of the North

on December 27, 1934. There the primer is “composed altogether illiterately, and not only does not help the development of a national literature, but on the contrary it shows and continues to show to this day a harmful influence on the language, simplifying the morphological structure into a sort of jargon” (very much parroted, as I recall in Bogoraz’s “*otzyv*” above—translation mine, MK). The cited document is presumably from the MAE Archives. Sometime during the year between Forshtein’s return in late 1933, and December 1934, during which Orlova had been drafting her reader and arithmetic manual to follow up on the 1932 primer which Bogoraz had been at least somewhat favorably inclined to, his evaluation of Orlova’s work changed sharply for the worse. One might imagine that this change might have had some connection with Forshtein’s quite active presence in Leningrad after November 1933 (see Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*).

Bogoraz’s “Grammatical Sketch” of 1934, Forshtein’s Role, and Orlova

During precisely Forshtein’s absence, Bogoraz had been corresponding with Boas, from September 27, 1929 to November 19, 1933, to be exact, about publishing in English his (Chaplinski) Eskimo grammatical sketch. Bogoraz enquires, consistently, to the effect “By the way, anything to report on the publication of my Eskimo grammar?” Boas says at one point, April 24, 1931, that he was thinking about putting it in the *International Journal of American Linguistics*, but in the end nothing, both conceded, was to come of it. Bogoraz to Boas, last letter: “I am sorry that my Eskimo work after all the trouble we had on it, you and me, has found no way to publication. I am afraid that the delay will outlast even the toughness of my life.” Though Boas’s excuse was lack of funds, it seems probable that he recognized that Bogoraz’s sketch did not in any case meet his standards of linguistic quality. Jochelson’s Aleut work was significantly better than Bogoraz’s Eskimo, but in the end Boas did not see fit to publish that either. Boas, no stranger to Eskimo, had himself done far better in his early fieldwork with Canadian Inuit forty years earlier (Boas 1888).

Publication of Bogoraz’s Eskimo grammatical sketch in Russian soon became another matter, however. What must indeed have been the abridged Russian version (Bogoraz 1934) of that same grammatical sketch did then appear the next year as “Yuitskii (aziatsko-eskimoskii) iazyk” (The Yuit [Asiatic Eskimo] Language). It was submitted to the printer January 23, 1934, only two months after Forshtein’s return, perhaps allowing Forshtein some time to have some last-minute involvement in the work, but in any case enough time for Bogoraz to make a last-minute acknowledgement of Forshtein’s contribution. In fact, since that acknowledge-

ment is not in the galley-proof (see below), it was presumably added even after January 1934.

Footnote number one of Bogoraz's paper translates as follows: "The materials forming the basis of the sketch were collected over thirty years ago, namely 1901 at the time of my three-month stay among the Asiatic Eskimos, chiefly in the village of Ungaziq. The work was carried on rather assiduously, and all texts, tables, and phraseology were composed and checked in a circle of young Eskimo friends, who helped me at all times as much as they were able. Chukchi served as the spoken language among us, and many texts have Chukchi and Russian or Chukchi and English as interlinear translations. The material was worked up in 1918, simultaneously in English and Russian, and for various reasons neither version has yet been printed until now. On the other hand, a number of additions and corrections have been introduced from materials of A. S. Forshtein, who spent three years among the Yuits and recently returned to Leningrad. Newer data on the settlements and population of the Yuits are also reported by him" (translation mine-MK).

This brings us to what possibly might be a fourth group of manuscript documents including work by Forshtein, namely his comments on Bogoraz's grammar preserved in Bogoraz's personal collection at the RAN Archives in St. Petersburg (Appendix 4. No title or date. Fond 250-1(or -5?)-57. Cover page "Professor B. G. Bogoraz-Tan. Ocherk grammatiki iazyka asiatskikh eskimosov. Napisano neizvestnoi rukoi." (Grammatical sketch of the Asiatic Eskimo language. Written in an unidentified hand). My note of 1990 reads "62 leaves, in pencil, partly carbon copy, hand Forshtein's [? - This is indeed uncertain, as I had perhaps not yet seen Forshtein's manuscript notes at that moment], with some bits in Bogoraz's [hand]. Spelling as 1935 schoolbooks [!]...." and from the examples copied this is indeed the case, spelling as in Forshtein's folk tales submitted to the printer in late 1934, and the Forshtein-Sergeeva 1935-36 books. From the rest of my notes, it is also clear that this is the manuscript version of the Bogoraz grammatical sketch of 1934 cited above. Also most closely related to this are two other files from the same collection, 250-1-55 and 250-1-54. The file (*delo*) No. 250-1-55 has cover page "Bogoraz-Tan, V. G. Eskimoskii iazyk, korrektura mashinopis' 1934," with my notes, "60 leaves. 1-16 galley proofs of 1934, with corrections and changes, some significant, in Bogoraz's hand (no trace of Forshtein)-typescript [leaves] 17-60, definitely to the galley, corrections etc. on that in Bogoraz's hand and another's (not as in 250-1-57) [so the unidentified hand in ##250-1-57 or 250-1-55 may be Forshtein's, but not in both]); but [text] is rather different, especially introduction in some ordering and sometimes wording, so looks like real ms. is -57, done by Forshtein[?], with acknowledgement

added even later (not in galley)." There is also #250-1-54, noted "Eskimoskii iazyk. Mashinopis' s avtorskimi popravkami" (Eskimo language. Typescript with author's corrections), 2 leaves, typescript only, but of -1-57 version, Forshtein's[?], aborted?"

From these notes it was unclear just what Forshtein's role was in Bogoraz's 1934 Russian published version of his Eskimo grammatical sketch. I then examined this sketch closely in comparison with Bogoraz's manuscript of 1918 published in 1949, to judge how much in fact it owes to Forshtein. Bogoraz called it "my" grammar in writing to Boas, and the Russian 1934 version is under Bogoraz's name only, albeit with the last-minute acknowledgement to Forshtein. Since we are aware that Bogoraz was not above putting his own interests above Forshtein's on occasion, it certainly behooves us to compare the two sketches to see to what extent Bogoraz is indeed indebted to Forshtein for any improvement in the 1934 sketch. A careful comparison of the 1918 and 1934 results clearly shows that any such role for Forshtein must have been more of a clerical or secretarial nature than anything substantive. Bogoraz 1934 does have Forshtein's more up-to-date data on the Siberian Yupik settlements and populations in the introduction, but beyond that I could identify no new data or approaches that should be attributed to Forshtein. The 1934 sketch is of course shorter than the 1918, but it covers generally the same material, many same examples, same paradigms, in much the same order and manner and wording as the 1918, including the same serious faults. For example, Bogoraz cites *kikmik* 'dog' (1934:110-112), but *kikmi-q* 'dog' (singular), correctly *qikmiq*, with the same examples and false information about obsolescence of the dual number as in 1918.

On the other hand, Bogoraz (1934:108) refers to the establishment of Eskimo literature in the new alphabet in the Orlova team's recent primer (1932), which is to be followed by a reader and arithmetic manual for the first two years of elementary school, presumably under Orlova's name, as indicated in his Institute's *Ukazatel'* for 1934. Bogoraz refers moreover to Orlova's primer, taking examples from it four times, each time acknowledged in a footnote, so evidently Bogoraz is still supportive of Orlova. The sample texts appended are Bogoraz's own, from 1901. The spelling there is also influenced by Orlova's. The vowels are simplified similarly, and soft sign is used for schwa as in Orlova 1932. The uvular *g'* is still "r", but the velar (non-uvular), which Bogoraz calls "gamma," when not also "r" is written *g*, except in the first text, where, as in Orlova, it is written *h*.

It is even unclear that Forshtein was involved actively in any way in Bogoraz's preparation of the sketch published in 1934 (beyond perhaps leaving his 1928-29 Eskimo notes

with Bogoraz before his 1929 return to Chukotka, where he had an unknown amount of contact with Eskimo during his 1929-33 stay—see Krupnik and Mikhailova, *this issue*). Forshtein might indeed hardly have been able to identify such things as the *-q* singular ending, let alone worry that that might be inconsistent with the spelling of ‘dog’ on the preceding page. Far from appropriating credit due Forshtein for himself—and presumably having little good reason to fear that Forshtein’s scholarship might surpass his own—it now seems clear that Bogoraz’s acknowledgement to Forshtein in the very late footnote was motivated by personal rather more than by any scientific reasons. It is ironic indeed that the main linguistic improvement by early 1934, clearly based on the “illiterate” Orlova work, and acknowledging Orlova in the text and four footnotes, becomes so dramatically dis-acknowledged by the end of 1934 as to finally “axe” Orlova in favor of Forshtein (and Sergeeva).

Enter Sergeeva

As noted, after drafting at least a new reader and probably also an arithmetic manual for Class 1 sometime at the end of 1934 Orlova was dismissed (“axed,” by the Bogoraz-Forshtein or rather Forshtein-Bogoraz evaluations), to be replaced by Forshtein. Simultaneously perhaps, into this drama enter also Katerina Sergeeva (1899-1975). Sergeeva had been a schoolteacher at Ureliki, at least 1933-34, where she had also worked with especially Wye and Atata, had been posting by 1934 a wall-newspaper; having Chaplinski, Sirenikski, and also “Avatmii” folktales transcribed; and had herself also started transcribing and translating Chaplinski folktales from the gifted storyteller Kivagme, later published, in Russian only (Sergeeva 1962, 1968). We know Sergeeva was back again to Ureliki in 1938-41. She must have been in Leningrad at least part of that interim, 1937-38 certainly, when she taught at the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute, where among her pupils in Eskimo were two former Eskimo schoolteachers, Rubtsova and Menovshchikov. We learn from Budnikova (1989) that Sergeeva “finished in 1935 her third (final) course/year at the Leningrad Institute of History, Philosophy and Linguistics, where Professor V.G. Bogoraz taught.” She must have returned to Leningrad some time possibly in autumn 1934(?), to finish up her last year of studies there (by 1935), and at the same time begin to “translate” all the schoolbooks so noted above, especially “with the help of Amkagun Nynliuvak” (Amqaawen Nengluvak, a Yupik student who was then in Leningrad) and “under the editorship of Forshtein.”

It is quite unclear just what the sequence and procedure was, and what the roles of Forshtein, Amqaawen Nengluvak, and Sergeeva were, in the production of the 1935-36 schoolbooks. Probably throughout 1934 Forshtein

worked in Leningrad first on preparing the folktales he had, it is claimed, transcribed at Ungaziq. Unless Forshtein had a nice and very enlightening stay in or near Ungaziq during his second Chukotka trip, then those tales must have been transcribed by 1929, in a manner far inferior to what was submitted to the printer in 1934. No storyteller’s name or date but also neither Amqaawen’s nor Sergeeva’s appeared on the book. It is impossible to imagine how it came out as well as it did without significant (but uncredited) help from Sergeeva and/or Amqaawen (or someone else from among the Yupik students then in residence in Leningrad). Even more amazing was the short time prior to the December 1934 date of submission to printer, to have revised the transcription that profoundly—unless otherwise Forshtein somehow had amazing insights during his second (undocumented!) stay at Ungaziq. In either case Forshtein became a fast learner.

The new 1935 Latin orthography (Fig.5) had a simplified vowel inventory, like Orlova’s, which could resemble a system. This “new” Eskimo orthography also has *k/q*, like Orlova’s, but it never quite reached the (relative) vowel simplicity or *k/q* accuracy level of the Orlova team’s work. (Such was not to be achieved until the Rubtsova-Menovshchikov era beginning 1938-39—Fig.8.) The main change in the “new” orthography was the conversion of Orlova’s *h/g* for *g/g’*, to *g/r* for that (now ignoring the difference between uvular “*r*” and the tongue-tip *r*). It also converts Orlova’s *x* (for undifferentiated *x/x’*) to *h*. There is no new insight, but only for some reason the maximum change from Orlova the alphabet will comfortably allow, in all three fricatives thitherto distinguished, *h/g/x* becoming *g/r/h*, respectively. (See Figs. 5, 6, and 7 for the subsequent 1937 and 1938 conversions of Sergeeva’s Latin system to the Cyrillic orthography.)

In any case, insofar as the folklore text transcription of 1934 and the rest of the 1935-36 schoolbooks listed above were indeed really Forshtein’s work, one must after all concede that Forshtein must at least have been open-minded and capable enough that he could appreciate the great significance and practicality of the Orlova-Sergeeva advances over his own and Bogoraz’s previous approach, to go along with them in a positive and industrious way, at least now with Sergeeva’s collaboration, insofar as Forshtein did indeed have anything much more than a nominal association with that work. Since the first schoolbook with Sergeeva’s name attached was submitted to the printer in February 1935, it is hard to imagine she became part of the process later than Forshtein, though perhaps her joining in the work was planned or became official a bit later than Forshtein’s. Study of her personal materials reported by Budnikova (1989; 1990) at the Magadan Regional Museum would almost certainly go a long way to unravel this complicated little historical knot.

Conclusions

To be frank, this paper started out with the intention of appreciating Forshtein's forgotten contribution in the martyrology of Soviet science during the 1930s, and that point should not be lost. However, on close scrutiny of what is left of Forshtein's to Eskimo linguistics, his contribution and potential that was lost, both, prove somewhat less substantial than I originally expected to show. (The loss of whatever documentation he did specifically of Sirenikski is especially unfortunate, however.) Instead of revising accordingly the whole paper, I preferred to take the reader along in my "journey" of discovering more of these facts, some of which are not very pretty, about the dramatis personae involved in the history of Soviet Eskimo linguistics. Please note that much goes even beyond the personal, as we are dealing with human beings of fascinatingly different Russian types, all interacting under the mounting stresses of Stalinist terror during the 1930s that aborted Forshtein's academic career and changed his life forever.

Postscript

As this paper was nearly finished, a small file of Forshtein materials, mainly listings and descriptions of photographs and drawings presented in 1936 by Forshtein to the Danish National Museum, was located by Hans-Christian Gulløv (Ethnography Department archives), transmitted by Michael Fortescue, in swift response to our enquiry. The transcriptions of thirty-four Chaplinski words in the manuscript (written in two different Russian hands) is essentially in the 1935-36 Soviet Latin Eskimo orthography, with about 10% error in *k/q* discernment. This is clear evidence that Forshtein had indeed learned the system pretty well at some point.

Still more recently, December 2005, through Bent Nielsen and Daria Morgounova of the University of Copenhagen, we received copies of letters to William Thalbitzer, dated December 30, 1936, March 4, 1937, and April 3, 1937, from Forshtein in Leningrad, the last written the month before his arrest. The letters are in a rough basic Danish. Forshtein does not seem to show awareness of his imminent arrest. He is hoping to revisit Copenhagen and work at the University with Thalbitzer—mortal enemy of Forshtein's erstwhile host Birket-Smith at the Museum (personal communication, Igor Krupnik)—on the "great [pan-?]Eskimo dictionary" or "Eskimo dialect dictionary." His last letter ends with "P.S. I am now translating my Eskimo fairytales in[to] Danish. When I shall finish it, I shall soon send you my translations."

In the March letter, Forshtein includes a table of his 1927-1929 statistics on the Asiatic Eskimo village populations (mostly translated from Bogoraz 1934), and a "linguistic card from my card file. I have about 8,000 words of the east-asiatic dialect and 2,000-2,500 words of the south-asiatic dialect in the card-file (not counting texts)."

The "linguistic card" is revealing. It is on a slip of paper smaller than the March letter it was sent with, but the same small size as the April letter paper; the glossing is in Danish; so it is obviously not of Forshtein's original corpus. The slip is basically in two columns, each headed by a hypothetical stem, first column Chaplinski with Danish gloss, second the Sirenikski ["equivalent["] for each of the six Chaplinski subentries, no gloss, not needed, so no doubt elicited directly from the Chaplinski that Forshtein had earlier elicited. On this 1937 slip the spelling is "modernized" or updated from his experience with the Orlova-Sergeeva system, writing e.g. *q* as well as *k*, but as often as not the *q* is misused for *k* and the *k* misused for *q*, no vowel length is shown, and *e* and *o* are used especially before uvulars, a usage probably reinforced by Greenlandic orthography. But this is without insight: e.g. CSY *ilulluk* 'bad-tempered person' Forshtein has written mistakenly ending with *-q*, not realizing that the reason he originally heard *u* before the final consonant there rather than *o* was because the word ends with *k*, not *q*. He has simply written *q* at the end because he now knows so many Eskimo singulars end with *q*. The Sirenikski equivalent, actually *qungllunghagh*, on the other hand, he has mistakenly starting with *k-*. Forshtein is of course unable to supply the correct spelling from his 1927-1929 notes. Instead of acknowledging this, he now guesses. Moreover, he neither recognizes the pan-Eskimo suffix in *ilulluk* for 'bad,' *-lluk* (not **-lluq*), nor takes the hint that where he heard *u* to sound more like *u* than like *o*, so wrote *u*, that is because what follows is a *k*, not a *q*, so he should not change this particular *k* to *q*. Thus, though he knows more in 1937 than he did in 1929, he is unable, at least for this only sample document that we have, to make any real improvement from what he has learned from Orlova-Sergeeva.

On the other hand, it should be noted that in spite of the serious shortcomings in phonology, the slip shows good insight in the following way. Forshtein has here Chaplinski derivatives he recognizes come from the same root, which he writes *ilu*: namely the derivatives *ilulluk* 'bad-tempered person' (his Danish *rasende*, *bitter*, i.e. 'furious, bitter'), and *ilutuqaq* 'brave one' (his Danish *Helt*, *dristig*, i.e. 'hero, bold'). Beneath, he makes cross-reference to "*iluk*—Midte ['center, middle'], i.e. *ilu* 'interior,' here with good semantic insight somehow correctly seeing—with Danish glosses probably obscuring somewhat the original Russian—the relation "state or quality of inner person" in the Yupik thought.

From his very interesting statement on the number of “words” he had collected, plus this “card,” where one can see that of the six Chaplinski items listed, at least three are predictable derivatives that would not rank as separate dictionary entries, likewise four of the seven Sireniski “equivalents,” we may therewith have the only real indication we shall ever have of the size of Forshtein’s lost lexical corpus. If the 8,000 and 2,000-2,500 figures are realistic, then the Chaplinski and Sireniski corpora would constitute something like 4,000 and 1,000 entries, respectively. No matter how much of this has subsequently been documented, certainly the loss was not trivial.

Finally, I note from Budnikova’s 1990 report that Sergeeva’s papers at the Magadan Museum archive may well include not only important revelations and answers to many personal questions raised in this paper, but also some important documents for Asiatic Eskimo languages, not least further texts, from 1934, in Sireniski, now extinct. I also point out that the papers in the Bogoraz Collection at the St. Petersburg Academy Archives, especially Files 250-1(or -5?)-57, -55, -54, need to be reexamined to determine more exactly how Forshtein was involved in the preparation of Bogoraz’s Eskimo grammatical sketch in 1934 as well as for the evidence of any more field notes and manuscripts by Forshtein himself.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to Igor Krupnik for getting me involved in this tribute to Misha Bronshtein, for his sharing with me his knowledge of Forshtein and Forshtein’s milieu, and for major critical review of the present paper. I also much appreciate the work of Nikolai Vakhtin in finding the archival material on Forshtein’s arrest, and valuable criticism of my initial evaluation of Forshtein’s work. Also much appreciated is the help of Hans-Christian Gulløv, Michael Fortescue, Bent Nielsen, and Daria Morgounova, in locating and copying for me the Forshtein materials in Copenhagen.

Appendix :

Russian Eskimo Schoolbooks with Forshtein’s Name: Commentary

A. Published Yupik Schoolbooks

All published Yupik schoolbooks are entered in order of the date they are listed as received by the printer, since they are all printed in 1935 or 1936. They are each cited for authorship (if any), then the Latin-orthography titles and credits are listed, then the Russian, followed by square-bracketed transliteration of the Latin orthography into American St. Lawrence Island orthography, and translation of the Russian into English. All of the Russian Eskimo textbooks were

handsomely illustrated. Size of all the originals seen and perhaps all items is 22 x 15 cm. pages.

1. A. S. Forshtein (author). *Jupigem ungharatangi. Forstejnym Unghazimi igaqusimakangi. / Skazki aziatskikh eskimosov. Zapisany v poselke Ungazik A. S. Forshteinom. [Yupigem Ungipaghaatangi. Forshteinem Ungazimi Igaqusimakangi. / Stories of the Asiatic Eskimos. Transcribed in the village of Ungaziq by A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Ogiz-Detgiz, 1935. 24 pages. (Submitted to printer November 20, 1934. 1000 copies printed.)*

Six traditional stories, in simplified style, one song text. No Russian translation. See 11. below, identical in content.

2. N. S. Popova (author). *Arifmetika, nutan hatarjubwalhanun aphturevigmun. Sivuleq Ngherghleq. Russim uluna Jupigstun mumihthka K. S. Sergeevam. Kajotkathk k mumihthlermun Wghje Sereinegmi ama Amkagun Nghluvak. Mumihthhe nalkomi A. S. Forshteinym. / Uchebnik arifmetiki, dlia nachal’noi shkoly. Chast’ pervaiia, pervyi klass. Na iuitskii (eskimoskii) iazyk perevela K. S. Sergeeva. V perevode pomogali Vyie Sireinermit i Amkaun Nynliuvak. Perevod pod redaktsiei dots. A. S. Forshteina. [Arifmetika, nutaan ghhataghyuggaallghanun apeghtughivigmun. Sivuliq nenghghelleq. Ruusim ulunga mumigtekaa K. S. Sergeevam. Kayukellukek mumigtelleghmun Weyi Sighinegmii ama Amkagun Nengluvak. Mumigtellghii naallghumi A. S. Forsteynem. / Manual of Arithmetic, for elementary school. Part one, first class. Translated into the Yuit (Eskimo) language by K. S. Sergeeva. Help in translation by Vyie Sireinermit and Amkaun Nynliuvak. Translated under the editorship of A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1935. 68 pages. (Submitted to printer February 20, 1935. 1200 copies printed.)*

Fine introduction to numbers 1-100, addition, subtraction, simple multiplication and division, figures, diagrams, illustrations and word-problems throughout directly relevant to Eskimo life. First class (after preparatory) is comparable to US grades 2-3. For Russian translation see 3. below. Reference found to Popova, Nataliia Sergeevna (1884-?), as author of arithmetic manuals, years 1-3, 1933-1942, some translated into national languages, also Yiddish, English. Probably a replacement by the Sergeeva-Forshtein team for the same planned, and probably drafted, by a team under Orlova, listed under her name in the 1931-1933 Ukazatel’ (1934, page 20), plan for 1934, “Uchebnik arifmetiki 1 god obucheniia, 4 p. l. 1000 ekz.” [Manual of Arithmetic, year 1 of instruction, 4 galley sheets (= 64 pages), 1000 copies.”] Cf. also A.4. below.

3. *Kontrperevod uchebnika arifmetiki s iuitskogo (eskimoskogo) iazyka*. Chast' pervaiia. [Back-translation of manual of arithmetic from the Yuit (Eskimo) language. Part one.] Leningrad: [Uchpedgiz], 1935. 20 pages. (Submitted to printer April 1, 1935. 700 copies printed.)

Russian translation of A2. above. No credit explicit, but back-translator presumably Forshtein; cf. A5 below.

4. K. S. Sergeeva (author). *Igaq atebturjahqaaq, nutan batarjubwalha*. Q̄rphalhitnun takunun iganun kajusmaq Amkagun N̄n̄l̄lvak. Mumih̄t̄the nalhohqomi A S. Forstejn̄m. / *Kniga dl̄ia chteniia, dl̄ia pervogo kl̄assa nachal'noi sbkoly*. Chast' pervaiia. V rabote nad nastoiashchei knigoī pomogal Amkaun Nynliuvak. [Igaq Atightughyaghqaaq, nutaan ghhataghyuggaallgha. Qepghallghitnun taakwnun iganun kayusimaaq Amkagun Nengluvak. Mumigtellghii naallghughqumi A. S. Forshteinem. / Reading-book for the first class of elementary school. Part one. Help in the work on the present book by Amkaun Nynliuvak. Composed under the editorship of A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1939. 96 pages. (Submitted to printer April 30, 1935. 1200 copies printed.)

Noted on Russian title page: "Kniga dl̄ia chteniia" (Reading-book), part 1, of E. [lena] Ia. [kovlevna] Fortunatova and "Kniga dl̄ia chteniia," part 1, of P. N. Zhulev were used in the composition of this book.

Fortunatova is widely listed as author of primers and readers of the time, including those for rural schools. Reference to Zhulev is harder to find. Bulk of text and illustrations specifically relevant to Eskimo life, but also sections on domestic animals, elephants, camels, lions, tigers, cities, factories, October Revolution, Lenin, Stalin, Red Army, May Day. For Russian translation see A5. below. For second printing, see A8. below. For a teaching-aid for this book, see A9. below. Probably a replacement by the Sergeeva-Forshtein team for the reader planned, by a team under Orlova, listed under her name in the 1931-33 (1934, page 20) *Ukazatel'*, plan for 1934, "Kniga dl̄ia ucheniia 1 god obucheniia, 5 p. l. 1000 ekz" [Reading-book, year 1 of instruction, 5 galley sheets (= 80 pages), 1000 copies:]. There is record in Budnikova 1990 that this was actually written, in 1934, with the title *Ap̄xtuset ihat* [Apeghtuusat Igat. Book of Teachings], said to be a translation from a Koryak reader by Zhulev. Cf. also A2. above.

5. K. S. Sergeeva (author). *Kniga dl̄ia chteniia*. Chast' pervaiia. *Perevod s eskimoskogo iazyka A. S. Forshteina*. [Reading-book. Part one. Translated from the Eskimo

language by A. S. Forshtein. Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1935. 24 pages. (Submitted to printer May 13, 1935. 700 copies printed.)

Russian translation of A4. above, issued separately, as "aid for teachers in Eskimo schools."

6. A. Iakobson (author). *Ajwan jugwi*. Russim uluḡa jupiḡstun mumih̄t̄kaa K. S. Sergeevam, kajusimaaq Amkagun N̄n̄l̄lvak. Mumih̄t̄the [sic] nalhomi A. S. Forstejn̄m. / *Liudi Severa*. Perevela na eskimoskii (iuitskii) iazyk K. S. Sergeeva, pri uchastii Amkauna Nynliuvaka. Pod redaktsiei A. S. Forshteina. [Aywaan Yugi. Ruusim ulunga Yupigestun mumigtekaa A. S. Sergeevam, kayusimaaq Amkagun Nengluvak. Mumigtellghii naallghumi A. S. Forstejn̄m. / People of the North. Translated into the Eskimo (Yuit) language by K. S. Sergeeva, with the participation of Amkaun Nynliuvak. Under the editorship of A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Ogiz-Detgiz, 1935. (Submitted to printer June 17, 1935. 1000 copies printed.)

Russian original presumed extant, but no reference found; two other references, 1927 and 1931 found, then 11 more 1950-1964, all juvenile literature, with (co-)author "A. Iakobson," who was perhaps also arrested in or after 1937. Treats Coastal Chukchi, Nenets, Reindeer Chukchi, Evenk, Vogul (Mansi), Nanay, Ude(ge), Nivkh, Yukagir, but not Eskimo.

7. Aleksandr Forshtein (author). *Jupiḡm akuzilba (Bukvar)*. Takut igat nalhohqomanka Leningradmi Ajvani Institutḡani Amkagun-lu. / *Eskimoskoe slovo (Bukvar)*. Bukvar' proveren na zaniatiiakh po eskimoskomy iazyku v Institute Narodov Severa s eskimosom Amkaun. [Yupigem Akuzillgha (Bukvar). Taakut igat naallghughqumaanka Leningradmi Ayvaani Insitutḡani Amkagunllu. / The Eskimo Word (Primer). Primer checked in studies at the Institute of the Peoples of the North with the Eskimo Amkaun.] Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1935. 90 pages. (Submitted to printer September 28, 1935. 1200 copies printed.)

Colophon: "Tirazh 1200 ekz. (1201-2400)" probably implies that this is the second printing, of 1200 more copies. Cf. 8. below, which is a second printing, or rather resetting, with no such indication.

Pages 81-90 are the Russian translation of the Eskimo text, which ends page 80; the translation is issued as part of the book, elsewhere done only in Orlova's 1932 primer, perhaps because they are both relatively short (Orlova's 5

pages), and/or because they are both early in the sequence. In any case, though it is not listed in the *Ukazatel'* either 1934 or 1935, Forshtein's primer is presumably to replace Orlova's of 1932. For teaching-aid for this book, see A9. below. In the 1974 Krauss report to accompany the collections sent to St. Lawrence Island, I had noted of Orlova 1932 that "This primer moves rather fast, and goes on to end up with fairly advanced readings, since for the first four years of the Russian program, 1932-1935, it was the only Eskimo book they had. The spelling in this book is actually quite good, better in fact than anything printed until about 1939." For Forshtein's 1935 primer I had noted "This completely new primer moves more slowly, and is very interesting."⁷

In the section of the 1974 report which introduces the Eskimo primers generally, I noted: "They teach the alphabet, letter by letter, very carefully, never using words with letters that have not yet been introduced. Usually by about the middle of the book [in this case page 50] all the letters have been introduced, and the second half [here 30 more pages] gives continued practice in reading. Like most of the readers as well, these primers contain a lot of material on native life, and also city life and other kinds of Russian life, and also communist teachings, with readings on Lenin and Stalin and the Red Army, and so forth. There have actually been seven primers printed, in 1932, 1935, 1937, 1947, 1953, 1960, and 1965. An eighth is to be printed in 1974." [This was followed by 1985 and 1990, thus ten, or perhaps 11, if this 1935 primer is a second printing. That of 1937 is the Cyrillicization of the 1935, by Sergeeva and a new team. 1947-1965 is the series under Rubtsova, with major or minor changes, and 1974-1990 is by Ainana and Analkvasak, with minor changes.] The report continues, "It is especially interesting to compare them to see how the writing system has changed, and how times have changed to become much more modern in the stories and illustrations, but many things have remained the same."

8. K. S. Sergeeva (author). *Igaq atehturjahqaq...* Mumih̄t̄l̄he nahhomi A. S. Forstejn̄m. / *Kniga dl̄ia chteniia...* Sostavlena pod redaktsiei dots. A. S. Forshteina. [Igaq Atightughyaghqaq... Mumigtellghii naallhughmi A. S. Forstejnem. / Reading-book... Composed under the editorship of Docent A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Uchpedggiz, 1935. 92 pages. (Submitted to printer October 8, 1935. 1200 copies.)

Reprinting, or rather slightly new edition, of A4. above, identical in content and pagination, entirely reset

type, with a few sporadic minor changes in text and spelling throughout, illustrations identical except for new portrait of Lenin, page 59. Colophon page new, as appropriate, with change also of "responsible editor" from S. M. Lazuko to I. S. Vdovin. Change also on Eskimo title page, from "Nahhohqomi A. S. Forstejn̄m" to "Mumih̄t̄l̄he nahhohqomi A. S. Forstejn̄m," meaning "translated under the editorship of ASF" instead of "under the editorship of ASF," significance unclear. No new or reissued Russian translation noted. Probably the absence of indication in the colophon of such a copy-printing number as "(1201-2400)" in A7. above is because this is not a mere reprinting. It is in any case difficult to understand how a second printing of the primer or a second nearly identical edition of this reader could have been needed or justified when already printed in nearly as many copies as there were Eskimos altogether, 1200, to produce now two copies of each for every Eskimo person, unless perhaps, as so often happened, the first 1200 of each were lost in shipment. If that was the case, the losses were indeed quickly recognized and acted upon!

9. G. P. Vasil'ev (author). *Metodicheskoe posobie, k bukvariu "Jupiḡm akuzil̄ha" i k knige dl̄ia chteniia "Igaq atehturjahqaq"* [Methodological aid for the primer "Jupiḡm akuzil̄ha" and reading-book "Igaq atehturjahqaq."] Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 1935. 40 pages. (Submitted to printer November 27, 1935. 700 copies printed.)

Translation of notice on unnumbered page after title page: "In the composition of the present teaching-aid, the author made use of instructions about the structure of the Eskimo language from A. S. Forshtein. The latter also composed the Eskimo text needed for exemplification" ("tekst voprosnika"). This Eskimo language material appears copiously throughout the book, bicolumnar with Russian translation (or original?) thereof.

10. E. Charushin (author). *Puqlahllaḡm nunagan trejkusi.* Jupiḡstun mumih̄t̄kaa K. S. Sergeevam. Kajusimaq Amkagun N̄h̄l̄uvak. / *Zhivotnye zharkikh stran.* Na eskimoskii iazyk pereveli K. S. Sergeeva i Amkaun Nynliuvak, pod redaktsiei A. S. Forshteina. [Puqlaghl̄agem Nunangan Teghikusi. Yupigestun mumigtekaa K. S. Sergeevam. / Animals of Warm Lands. Translated into the Eskimo language by K. S. Sergeeva and Amkaun Nynliuvak, under the editorship of A. S. Forshtein.] Leningrad: Ogiz-Detgiz, 1935. 10 pages. ([Submitted to printer ?]. 1000 copies.) Faulty photocopy,

⁷It also includes a Yupik song text, favorite on both sides. When in 1971 I showed a copy of the book to John Apangalook of Gambell, who probably had never read his own language, Apangalook noticed the song text, and read it out fluently. I remarked I was impressed with the feat. He replied to the effect, "Well, it's my own language, isn't it?"

3. A. S. Forshtein (author). Uchebnik arifmetiki dlia I klassa, 4 p. l., 1200 eks. [Manual of Arithmetic for Class I, 4 galley sheets (64 pages), 1200 copies.] Listed in 1935, page 27. Forshtein is named for what is probably the Popova Manual listed as translated by Sergeeva with Wye and Amkaun, A2. above. Forshtein's back-translation thereof, A3. above, is also listed as planned for 1935, page 28.

4. A. S. Forshtein (author). Kniga dlia chteniia, dlia I klassa, 5. p. l., 1200 ekz. [Reading-book, for Class I, 5 galley sheets (80 pages), 1200 copies.] Listed in 1935, page 27. Forshtein is named for what is probably the Sergeeva Reading-book for Class I, A4. above. Forshtein's (back-)translation thereof is also listed as planned for 1935, page 28.

5. A.S. Forshtein (author). Kniga dlia chteniia, dlia II klassa, 6. p. l., 1200 ekz. [Reading-book, for class II, 6 galley sheets (96 pages), 1200 copies.] Listed in 1935, page 27. There is no indication that any second class reader actually appeared for Eskimo until Rubtsova's of 1948. Unlike the case of the preceding, no (back-)translation of this is listed on page 28.

6. Kurdov (author). Krasnaia armia, 1 p. l., 1000 ekz. [The Red Army, 1 galley sheet (16 pages), 1000 copies.] Listed in 1935, probably to be translated by Forshtein, as Forshtein is the only translator for Eskimo listed in the 1935 *Ukazatel'*. Author is probably V. I. Kurdov, for whom there are references as author and artist for children's books of 1935, 1940, and 1960-65. Translations of the Red Army book were planned also for 11 other northern nationalities' languages of the 15 for which alphabets had been established. No reference to the Russian original of the Red Army book is easily found.

C. Archival Linguistic Materials of Forshtein

This third category of Forshtein's Eskimo language work, in spite of its skimpiness, presents a very different and far more evaluative view of him. All known unpublished materials are limited to those seen at the Academy of Sciences Archive, Leningrad, in the Bogoraz' personal file (Fond 250); they are documented from my notes taken on my visit to that archive in 1990.

1. Bogoraz-Forshtein correspondence, 1927-/,1930 (Fond 250-4-351). In my notes the dates are joined by both hyphen and comma, it being unclear which was the correction, followed by "Vladivostok, Khabarovsk," perhaps an indication that the comma is the correction, and that there are as few as two letters. To this might be added a comment by Bogoraz in "A study of paleoasiatic and Tungus languages" (Fond 250-1-175, pp. 24-25?): "S. G. [sic] Forshtein, a student at the [Leningrad] University, who went to teach

school at Ungaziq, from Leningrad June 1927, arrived by steamer October 1927. He took along wireless for communication, but it hardly works."

2. [Notes on Sireniski language]. No title, but on cover-page: "Forshtein, A. 'Linguisticheskie zametki po eskimosskomu iazyku' [Linguistic notes on Eskimo language], Fond 250-5-84. One notebook, 30 pages, 15x19 cm., numbered as 15 leaves, but 22 pages with writing. Done at Imtuk, no sources named, no date, but probably in 1929, as the work partly takes Chaplinski as a point of departure for checking the Sireniski equivalents, and therefore probably follows a sequence in which Forshtein's contact with Chaplinski precedes that with Sireniski.

C3 (Bogoraz's evaluation of Orlova's textbook, 1935, possibly drafted with the use of Forshtein's earlier evaluation of the same textbook) and C4 (Forshtein's comments to Bogoraz's "Grammatical sketch" of 1934) are listed and covered in the text under "Forshtein and Bogoraz Attack Orlova," paragraph 2, and next section, paragraph 3.

References

- Boas, Franz
 1888 The Central Eskimo. In *6th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology for the Years 1884-1885*. Pp. 399-669. American Philosophical Society, Washington D.C.
- Bogoraz(-Tan) Vladimir G. (Bogoras, Waldemar)
 1901 Materialy po eskimosskomu iazyku. [Eskimo language materials.] Arkhiv Russkoi Akademii Nauk. Fond 250-1-135. St. Petersburg.
- 1909 Materialy dlya izucheniia iazyka aziatskikh eskimosov. [Materials for the study of Asiatic Eskimo.] *Zhivaia Starina* vyp. 2/3, kn. 70/71:178-190.
- 1913 The Eskimo of Siberia. *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History* 12. *The Jesup North Pacific Expedition* 8(3). New York.
- 1918 Linguistic Materials of the Aiwian Dialect of the Eskimo of Asia. Manuscript Division, New York Public Library, New York.
- 1934 Iuitskii (aziatsko-eskimosskii) iazyk. [The Yuit (Asiatic Eskimo) Language.] Pp. 105-126 in *Iazyki i pis'mennost' narodov Severa*, Ia. P. Al'kor, ed. Chast' III. *Iazyki i pis'mennost' paleoaziatskikh narodov*. Uchpedgiz, Leningrad.
- 1949 *Materialy po iazyku aziatskikh eskimosov* [Eskimo language materials]. Uchpedgiz, Leningrad.
- Bogoraz, V.G. and S. N. Stebnitskii
 1937 *Luoravetlansko-Russkii (chukotko-russkii) slovar'*. [Chukchi-Russian dictionary.] Uchpedgiz, Leningrad.
- Budnikova, S. V.
 1989 Katerina Semenovna Sergeeva. *Kraevedcheskie zapiski* 16:50. Magadan.
- 1990 *K voprosu sozdaniia i razvitiia pis'mennosti eskimosov Chukotki*. [On the question of the establishment and development of Chukotka Eskimo literature.] Unpublished manuscript of paper presented at the 10th Inuit Studies Conference, Fairbanks.
- 1935/ *Ezhegodnik knigi SSSR*. [USSR book annual.] Izdatel'stvo Vsesoiuznoi knizhnoi palaty, Moscow. Kleinschmidt,
 1991 Samuel P.
- 1851 *Grammatik der grönländische Sprache*. G. Reimer, Berlin.
- Krauss, Michael E.
 1973 Eskimo-Aleut. in Linguistics in North America. In *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vol. 10, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, pp. 796-902, Mouton, The Hague and Paris.
- 1974 St. Lawrence Island and Siberian Eskimo Literature. Unpublished materials on file Alaska Native Language Center, Fairbanks.
- 1975 St. Lawrence Island Eskimo Phonology and Orthography. *Linguistics* 152(May):39-72.
- Kreindler, Isabelle
 1985 *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet Native Languages: their Past, Present, and Future*. Mouton, The Hague, Paris.
- Krupnik, Igor
 1991 Extinction of the Sireniki Eskimo language: 1895-1960. *Études/Inuit/Studies* 15(2):3-22.

- 1998 Jesup Genealogy, Intellectual Partnership and Russian-American Cooperation in Arctic/North Pacific Anthropology. Part I. From the Jesup Expedition to the Cold War, 1897-1948. *Arctic Anthropology* 35(2):199-226.
- Menovshchikov, Georgii A.
1967 V eskimosskoy shkole [In an Eskimo school]. *Prosveshchenie na krainem Severe* 15:56-60.
- 1977 *Na chukotskoi zemle*. [In the land of Chukotka.] Magadanskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, Magadan.
- Reshetov, Aleksandr M.
2002 Aleksandr Semenovich Forshtein (1904-1968). Stranitsy biografii repressirovannogo uchenogo. [ASF... Pages of a biography of a "repressed" scholar.] Pp. 275-279 in *Dikovskie chteniia II, Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*, A. I. Lebedintsev *et al.*, eds. SVKNII, Magadan.
- Sergeeva, Katerina S.
1935 V Urel'iskom natssoвете. [At the Urel'iki national soviet.] *Sovetskii Sever* 35(1):95-101.
- 1962 *Skazochnik Kivagme*. [The storyteller Kivagme.] Magadanskoe Knizhnoe Izdatel'stvo, Magadan. Second edition, 1968, *ibidem*.
- 1934 *Ukazatel' literatury izdannoi na iazykakh narodov Severa v 1931-1933 gg.* [Directory of literature published in the languages of the peoples of the North in 1931-1933.] Izdatel'stvo Instituta Narodov Severa, Leningrad.
- 1935 *Ukazatel' literatury izdannoi na iazykakh narodov Severa v 1931-1934 gg.* [Directory of literature published in the languages of the peoples of the North in 1931-1934.] Izdatel'stvo Instituta Narodov Severa, Leningrad.