GROUP MARRIAGE, OR, THE RIGHT TO SEXUAL RELATIONS AMONG THE PU AND ANG’REI CLASSES

Shaken through the inexorable march of historical and economic changes, the right to group marriage—to sexual intercourse between individuals of the pu and ang’rei classes—still persists with all its original vigor. Moreover, this right is devoid of all compulsory character. Neither a woman’s kin nor individuals of the pu class can force a woman to have sexual intercourse. Nor do we find here, as among other peoples, the custom of hospitality or hetaerism in which the father, brother, or husband of a woman may ask that she share her bed with a guest who is her pu.² Public exhibition of sexual intimacy is forbidden. No one would dare lie down in an occupied yurta under one cover with his ang’rei, even if the woman’s consent were previously secured. Intercourse must take place privatim and out of sight of the woman’s individual husband.³ Publicity of sexual relations is, moreover, not permitted even in individual marriages [86].⁴

If two people wish to have sexual intercourse at night in a dwelling where outsiders are present, they must lie down apart, and only when all the others are asleep can they join each other. The initiative may come from either party, but is less frequently taken by the woman. In summer, intercourse most frequently occurs outside. During the day, the most favorable spots for “catching” ang’rei are in the areas where berries are picked. In the evening usually some spot outside the village, such as near a

---

¹ [Editor’s note: Earlier titles for this chapter are “Group Marriage” [AMNH English typescript; Shternberg, Giliaki], “Group Marriage: The Right to Sexual Relations among the Pu and Ang’rei Classes” [AMNH Russian typescript], and “The Right to Sexual Relations among the Pu and Ang’rei Classes” [Shternberg, Sem’ia]. For a discussion of the concept of group marriage, please see the Foreword.]

² [Editor’s note: Hetaerism, from the Greek hetairismos, or prostitution, is a recognized system of concubinage, communal marriage in a tribe.] Compare a similar phenomenon among the Tibetans: “In Tibet, where the brothers of a family very often have a common wife, more than one is, according to Warren Hastings, seldom at home at the same time.” Westermarck, Geshichte. 141. [Editor’s note: Shternberg, Giliaki, and Shternberg, Sem’ia, have this reference to, but not the quotation, from Westermarck.]

³ The avoidance of caresses in public by a couple in individual marriage must not be regarded as a peculiarity of the Gilyak. To accept Radlov’s testimony, an Altaian will refrain in public from even touching his wife, notwithstanding the fact that among those peoples the relations between the sexes are characterized by great laxity. V. V. Radlov, Aus Siberien, Vol. I [Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1884], 314.
well, is chosen. At certain periods, however, group-mates are entirely free from restraint. Married men are often gone for weeks hunting on their taiga territories; summer or winter, they are constantly visiting or attending festivals. It is then that group-mates have their chance. There is only one strict requirement: The participants, as well as accidental witnesses to the intercourse, are strictly forbidden from speaking about it to anyone, especially to a person who may be closely interested. This secrecy, required perhaps to prevent possible outbreaks of jealousy, does not in any way affect the public character of the institution of group marriage. These rights are expressed in juridical formulae that have become a part of the common stock of knowledge of the tribe. All parents consider it a religious duty to impart a knowledge of these formulae to their children at an extremely early age. Group-mates not only treat each other publicly with unconstrained familiarity, but always apply to each other such tender epithets as “my little husband” or “my little wife.” The publicity of group matrimonial relations becomes most conspicuous at the death of a man who was not married individually. On such an occasion, one of his group wives, normally the wife of an elder brother, mounts the burial platform just before the cremation of the corpse and publicly laments the deceased as her lover and her husband. It is curious that, amidst negotiations between _pu_ and _ang’rei_, symbolic gestures such as smoking or eating, redolent of marriage ceremonies, are often employed. To suggest to an _ang’rei_ woman, “Urins tamkhtanate!” or “Let us smoke together!” is an invitation to exercise spousal rights.

The public and religious sanction of sexual intercourse between members of the _pu_ and _ang’rei_ is a privilege of vast importance, for sexual intercourse with any other women may lead to serious consequences. At the present time if a woman is a perfect stranger, the act does not constitute a religious infringement, but calls for bloody retaliation in case the culprits are caught in _flagrante delicto_. In any case a duel with sticks (sometimes to the death) follows and a fine may be imposed. If the woman is

---

5 _Editor’s note:_ The last two sentences of this paragraph were not in the AMNH English typescript or Shternberg, _Sem’ia_, but have been restored from the AMNH Russian typescript. In corresponding sections, Shternberg, _Giliaki_, 170, omitted the Gilyak-language words.

6 There are some reasons for believing that in ancient times intercourse with strange women was completely prohibited. This supposition is supported perhaps by the following curious custom. If a woman who is not an _ang’rei_ to a given man tries to seduce him, by perhaps catching hold of his leg in an isolated spot—a symbolic act for offering oneself to a man—the man, presuming he does not succumb, must either face the wrath of the gods or publicly demand a forfeit from the woman. On one occasion I became a witness to such a forfeit ceremony. It took place in the village of Tamlaivo. One of my companions, an aged Gilyak, roused me one morning, and with some anxiety asked me to accompany him to the neighboring dwelling where “court” was to be held. There I found myself in the presence of a large gathering of the family heads of the village. My companion proceeded to present to them his case against one of the local women who, in the evening of the preceding day, had caught him by the leg. Accordingly he demanded his forfeit [_tkhusind_]. The accused was called in. She confessed, and was made to publicly hand over the forfeit to the accuser—namely, a pup and some birch bark ware. In this case the fine imposed was insignificant unless these objects were meant to symbolize specifically female labor. But this seemed clearly due to the fact that the woman lived alone and had no more valuable objects in possession. It must be remembered that the Gilyak are very passionate, and do not like to miss a chance of playing the Lovelace whether the women be strangers or not. The above custom must be considered a survival of a time when there was a religious interdict on intercourse with strange men. _Editor’s note:_ Only the AMNH English typescript contains the first three sentences of this footnote, as well as the replacement of Don Juan for Lovelace.
a class relative within the prohibited categories [not the man’s ang’rei], intercourse with her is followed by public condemnation as a terrible crime, and divine vengeance, remorse, and inevitable expulsion follows. In fact, though, such cases are extremely rare. Even sentiments of mere love are severely condemned and are ascribed to the machinations of an evil spirit. Suicide is a common method of atonement. Self-control towards individuals of the prohibited categories even of the remotest degree has become as instinctive with the Gilyak as it has among us towards mothers and sisters. The right to sexual intercourse therefore asserts itself more powerfully, then, to turn to the pu and ang’rei categories. In that connection, the Gilyak may be described in the terms used by Fison and Howitt, in speaking of the kumi and kroki of the Dieri tribe in Australia. In the entire extent of his territory, wherever a man may find his ang’rei, he also finds a conjugal hearth. He need only know the proper kin terms. Over the course of my travels across Sakhalin I had more than one opportunity to convince myself of this fact. Time and again I visited with Gilyak companions villages which neither they nor their fathers had ever seen. Nevertheless, in the course of a few sentences, bonds of relationship were discovered, and the pu and ang’rei, although complete strangers to each other, would at once set about negotiations for sexual intercourse [87].

In their group marriage rights, girls are lawfully as free as married women, but practically their position differs from the latter’s. The prospect of pregnancy and child-bearing is not pleasant to the Gilyak girl. Given the broader agnostic kinship ideology, the birth of a child by an unknown father is a dangerous situation on account of the uncertainty of the sexual, marital, clan, and especially religious rights of the child, which must be determined by its father.

The pregnant girl is severely scolded by her father, who generally insists on knowing the name of her seducer or forces her to have an abortion. If the child is already born he forces her to kill it. But however hard the moral burden of individual women in such cases may be, in practice things seldom take that turn. In the first place, many women are married as children and few remain single for a very long time. Women are so few that every girl is married by the time she has reached an age at which sexual indiscretions are possible. Finally, those women who are not married and who indulge in free sexual intercourse with men seldom restrict themselves to one lover. The extent to which such polyandric forms of sexual intercourse are carried by some girls may be gathered from the following example. The wife of my friend Pigunaika from the village Arkovo, a pleasant woman, excellent housewife, and the mother of children, had before her marriage no less than 14 lovers at the same time. They all belonged to her native village and called each other navkh, akhmalk [companion or partner]. Curiously enough, navkh means literally the same as punalua in Morgan’s well-known Punaluan family. This woman often had sexual intercourse with all her lovers in one session. They told me in the most good-natured manner how all 14 would gather on a clearing not far from the village, and one after another would exercise their rights; and most curious of all is that one of

7 Morgan discusses the punalua category in *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity*, 451–458; and *Ancient Society*, 427–428.
that gay crowd was Pigunaika himself, the present happy individual husband of this woman [88].

Under such circumstances the Gilyak youth naturally feels in many respects freer and more at ease among ang’rei girls than among married ang’rei. In dealing with married women he encounters various difficulties on account of the preeminent claims of their individual husbands. In his own clan, however, the youth does not find the girls whose company he is thus led to seek; for even with his remotest tuvng he cannot have sexual intercourse or even conversation. In his own clan he can have sexual intercourse only with married women. Ang’rei girls, on the other hand, live comparatively seldom in the same village with their pu. The Gilyak youth’s mother’s brother’s daughters, the sisters of his brothers’ wives, the daughters of his akhmalk, in other words, the entire clan of “wives’ fathers,” is the focus towards which his sympathies converge. He need not hide himself in the home of his akhmalk. Here he is met with open arms. For an imgi as we know is the closest person to the akhmalk and his wife, and he is a favorite hunting companion in summer as well as in winter. He is an ever-welcome guest and the choicest dishes are served to him. But there is another reason for his great popularity. The akhmalk and their sons may neither talk nor jest with their clan brothers. An imgi, on the contrary, is the legitimate partner for fun and joking to one’s heart’s content. In those surroundings the youth finds scores of young girls with whom he may openly talk, fool, and on occasion have sexual intercourse.

Let us now turn to the relations of men to their numerous married ang’rei. The married group-wives of a man constitute the following categories: (1) the wives of all his “brothers”; (2) all married “sisters” of his own wife; (3) all married “sisters” of the wives of his “brothers”; and (4) every married woman in the class of his ang’rei—a large category comprising many scores of individuals spread over the entire Gilyak territory. Now, in accordance with the general norms of Gilyak marriage, “sisters” as a rule marry individuals of one tuvng class, such that one’s own wife’s “sisters” and the “sisters” of “brothers’” wives come under the one rule referring to the wives of “brothers”—that these women must marry one of their pu. Owing to recent departures from traditional norms, however, it sometimes occurs that a man’s ang’rei—his wife’s sister or a sister of his tuvng’s wife—is married either to a total stranger or even to one of the man’s occasional akhmalk. In such cases the norms of sexual intercourse as well as the kin terms cease to be uniform. In the majority of clans, intercourse with women who have thus married outside of their group is lawful, with the participants still calling each other pu and ang’rei. Their children are tuvng and call their mother’s sisters and the husbands of those sisters “mothers” and “fathers,” respectively. Among other clans, however, especially among those adjoining the Ainu, the rules are different. If a man’s wife’s sister marries one of his akhmalk, sexual intercourse with her as an akhmalk’s wife is absolutely prohibited, nor is she any longer ang’rei to the man, but as’kh (“aunt,” “mother-in-law”). If she marries a total stranger, her relations

---

8 I use the term “occasional akhmalk” to describe a speaker’s relative who has opportunistically and secretly taken a wife from a clan contrary to the clan from which the speaker’s relatives normally take wives. Usually the term akhmalk is applied to a clansman related to a person from olden times by matrimonial ties with all his clan.
with him become those of strangers, that is, sexual intercourse between them is neither prohibited nor sanctioned. What is most remarkable, however, is that the offspring of the two families remain, even in cases of the latter type, *tuvng* [88].

This undisputed and traditional right of a man to the "wives" of his *tuvng* has invariably been exercised throughout the entire Gilyak territory and persists to the present time with the one exception mentioned before—that sexual intercourse must not take place in sight of the woman’s individual husband or in public. The right of the individual husband is, of course, of primary importance. The wife must fulfill her conjugal and household duties; she must, at his wish, accompany him on all his wanderings, and he also has the exclusive right to her children. But the subsidiary right of the group-husbands to sexual intercourse is equally accepted. The group-husbands must, of course, wait for favorable occasions on which to exercise their rights, as when the individual husband is absent or asleep. But such opportunities present themselves even more often than is necessary. The men spend a great deal of time outside their home, fishing on the river or going away for several weeks on hunting exhibitions, or visiting. The women, on their part, also absent themselves for entire days, gathering berries or roots in the taiga. Intercourse is also possible at night in the presence of the sleeping husband. The rights of group marriage may thus be exercised

---

Fig. 12. A Gilyak semi-underground winter dwelling, 1890s. The central room at left rises up under the snow peaking at a chimney opening. Photo by Lev Shternberg. Source: AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 162, I. 32.
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9 I shall give an instance which will illustrate the relationship between such *tuvng*, that is, of the children of sisters whose husbands are strangers to each other, as well as their respective wives. Vremgin and Gibel’ka were two Gilyak men belonging to different clans of the villages Tangi and Khoe, but their mothers were “sisters" in one and the same clan (*tuvng*). These two men, notwithstanding the fact that they themselves as well as their fathers are strangers, call each other *tuvng*, for their fathers were married to sisters and had mutual rights to sexual intercourse with each other’s wife. Their wives are “mothers” (*imk*) to their children, and being the junior, Gibel’ka has the right to sexual intercourse with Vremgin’s wife.
without much difficulty. The unmarried *tuvng*, of course, do so more than the married ones, unless they happen to conceive a strong passion for some particular *ang’rei*. But when away from the village and temporarily deprived of their individual wives, the married men indulge as freely as the unmarried ones [89]. It would be safe to say that the relations between *pu* and *ang’rei* are mainly determined by conditions of coresidence. Their relations must obviously be sporadic if they reside in different villages. In many cases group-mates may know of each other only from hearsay. No sooner do they meet than an understanding is reached and a passing union established. Both men and women have a great penchant for adventures of this kind without being much concerned with questions of sympathy or love. Nothing is easier than for a *pu* and *ang’rei* to reach an understanding: One need only, when accidentally encountering an *ang’rei* in a hallway or courtyard to touch a woman’s breast or to make the classic proposal, “Let us have a smoke together!” [Gilyak, “*Renin tamch’tanate!*”]. Sometimes merely an exchange of glances will suffice [90].

In cases where the *tuvng* reside in the same village, firm unions often arise between an unmarried man and the wives of his *tuvng*. In such relatively firm unions, sexual intercourse is often accompanied by an element of sympathy and attachment, which however does not prevent the woman from satisfactorily fulfilling her marital duties to her individual husband, to whom she may even feel sincerely attached. Such relations often result in highly interesting forms of cohabitation. Sometimes two or even three brothers, although quite independent economically and fully able to obtain individual wives, may nevertheless prefer to live together with one common wife. In such cases the senior brother is considered the official husband of the woman. Through marriage he has secured the rights of an individual husband, but it is tacitly understood by outsiders as well as the children of these “brother-husbands” that the wife belongs to all of them. One is likely to find such arrangements in the most prosperous and respected of families. My friend Gibel’ka, from the village of Tangi, who was my first teacher of Gilyak and the richest native of Sakhalin in his time, lived with his younger brother Pleun in this manner. Gibel’ka’s younger brother was fully as able a fellow as Gibel’ka himself; he enjoyed the reputation of an excellent hunter and had managed to lay aside a great store of “valuables” so that he could have easily secured one or more wives had he wished to. Nevertheless he preferred the two-part ownership of his elder brother’s wife. As a boy he had access to Gibel’ka’s wife, being a younger brother. In the course of time a deeper attachment sprang up between them such that he ultimately decided not to marry, and remained permanently with his elder brother’s wife, whom he really loved. Characteristically enough, the surrounding Gilyak, as well as Gibel’ka himself, considered the phenomenon a completely normal one. When I once asked Gibel’ka about the matter, a momentary shadow crossed his handsome, intelligent face, for he knew in what light the Russians regard such relations. Otherwise my question did not particularly phase
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**Editor’s note:** This last paragraph summarizes almost two pages of Russian text as found in the AMNH Russian typescript, 56–59; Shternberg, *Giliaki*, 173–175; and Shternberg, *Sem’ia*, 88–90. As a general rule, here as elsewhere, Shternberg, *Giliaki*, is the more conservative of texts where Gilyak-language translations are concerned, omitting them when Shternberg, *Sem’ia* includes them.
him. He spoke of his wife with enthusiasm and tenderly loved his children, although he could have no assurance as to whether they were his own or his brother's. His son, moreover, a boy of 14, was more attached to his father's younger brother than to his father. Gibel'ka, of course, was perfectly free to deny his house to his younger brother or to put him out of doors together with his wife and obtain another beautiful wife or even several wives from the best families. With his great ambition and his passionate love for popularity, he would not have hesitated to take the most determined steps to save his reputation had he felt that the least shadow of ridicule was cast upon him. It so happened that Gibel'ka outlived his brother, who tragically perished during a winter hunt alone in his hunting tent. When the deceased, amidst a large and solemn gathering of Gilyak who had come from all over the territory, was raised to the funeral platform and the ceremony of cremation was about to begin, Gibel'ka's wife, her hair loose in sign of mourning, ascended the platform. In the presence of all, she began to mourn over her "younger husband" and "beloved" in terms as pathetic and tender as if he had been her individual husband. By this public act, she emphasized better than any maxim the Gilyak view of a man's relation to his brothers' wives.

Permanent cohabitation of brothers with a common wife is not always noticed. In the first place, sexual intercourse is carefully kept from publicity. The Gilyak live in large yurtas, each one sheltering families of several brothers, so that an outsider would find it difficult to delve into their most intimate relations, especially as he would have to overcome a natural reluctance that the Gilyak have in speaking of such matters. Secondly, it is but seldom that a young Gilyak chooses to bind himself to the wife of one of his brothers, as he generally prefers the less regular relations with the various wives of his many tuvng. In such cases of continual cohabitation of many brothers with one wife, we have the typical form of group marriage, for, notwithstanding common possession, one of the "brothers" officially remains the individual husband [91].

There are cases, however, where the brothers are officially common husbands, one of them having preeminent rights over the other. Two or even more brothers choose a wife together through marriage or purchase and live with her in common possession in a common household. It is true that such cases are becoming rarer; nevertheless, during my journey in 1910 I encountered many instances, even among the Amur Gilyak (who, owing to close contact with civilized people, are more individualistic than the Gilyak of Sakhalin).

In Gilyak folklore material one finds unmistakable signs that such forms of marriage were common in ancient times. A great number of the so-called "heroic traditions" (Gilyak, nastund) begin with the words, "Two Gilyak brothers kept one wife" (Gilyak, Nigvin menvin ruvn ang'rei nenkh aivund), and in what follows, this theme is developed in detail. In one of these stories, where the Mountain Man carries off the common wife of two brothers, we find the following passage, which depicts the forms of sexual intercourse and the woman's relations to her two husbands:

The same evening she made those . . . sacrificial cups for her husbands to take along to the dwelling; during the same night, having slept a little (that
is, under one cover with the elder brother], she crept up to her younger
beloved husband, who slept on the middle plank, copulated with him, and
slept. The next day her husbands left.11

The end of the tale is curious. After a long search for the woman, the elder brother
[the official husband in the modern sense] lost hope and returned home; the younger
brother, on the contrary, continued his search with unabated zeal. When he finally
reached the house of his beloved, said the narrator, “The woman ran out to greet her
husband” (p’ivnerknu tokh).

Such use of terms is not confined to tales alone. When a woman speaks of her
husband or a man of his wives, they by no means always refer to the individual hus-
band or wife but any one of the “husbands” or “wives” indiscriminately. Similarly,
when a married woman speaks of her husbands or a married man of his wives, they
always mean to imply the individual husband and his brothers, and conversely the
individual wife and her sisters, that is, the wives of his brothers.

The right to sexual intercourse with the wives of tuvng has become so inti-
mately associated with the daily life of the Gilyak that they find it difficult to imag-
ine a social order in which a woman becomes the exclusive property of one man. The
Gilyak youths were greatly surprised at my frequent and persistent questioning of
these relations, considering them all as too obvious and natural to arouse any doubts.
They would ask me in perplexity, “Is it possible that with you it is not so, that to
sleep with a brother’s wife is bad?” Human nature, of course, is human nature every-
where. The Gilyak is jealous, and in cases where his own tuvng are not concerned,
he may react with the unbridled passion of any man. To kill a strange rival, or to chal-
lenge him to a duel, is a simple matter for the Gilyak. When it comes to “brothers,”
however, not only his own but the most remote agnatic cousins, a lifetime of learned
prohibitions remain too deeply ingrained for him to give vent to whatever instinc-
tive jealousy he might have. He will either not react at all to the flirtations of his
wife, or if he does, it is to a very small degree [91].

Accordingly, certain preventative measures have been adopted to eliminate fric-
tion between brothers. It is customary for elder brothers not only to give their juniors
priority in marriage but also to assist them with “valuables” in the acquisition of
wives. Such a custom appears at first glance somewhat strange, as older brothers have
no special right to, or more plainly, access to the wives of their younger brothers. The
gain, however, is that in marrying off their younger brothers they ensure themselves
against the future pretensions of the younger brother to their own wives. Such pre-
cautory measures, if at all effective, can be only applied only to one’s own broth-
ers, for class brothers are too numerous to be married off in order to be rendered com-
paratively harmless. I know of some exceptional cases where directly after marriage
jealous men have settled in some isolated spot in order to avoid fraternal rivalry [92].

The village of Sakh-Kotan was founded in such fashion. When I visited it in
1897, I saw its founder in the midst of numerous progeny. My Gilyak companions
cracked many jokes at his expense, but he was invulnerable, for his wife had reached
an age at which women are no longer subject to suspicion. Such cases, however, are

---

exceptional. Hostile encounters between brothers on account of jealousy are very rare. With a certain amount of tact, they can always be avoided. Trouble results when an individual wife and unmarried tuvng go beyond the limits of decency and tact—when she openly runs after her lover, is away from home, or neglects her duties to the individual husband. In such cases the lover may sometimes be forced by his brothers to leave the house or even the village, while the woman is sometimes chastised by her husband. I ran across one or two such exiles in northern Sakhalin. As a rule, however, the relations between tuvng are peaceful.

The elder brother may occasionally become angry, but he keeps his temper and nothing happens. All active resentment is sinful, and a duel between two brothers is a great sin. I personally have never heard of such a case. Mr. B. Pilsudskii told me of one but it must be considered quite exceptional. The hero of this incident was a young Gilyak, Lokhmatka (Lokhvun), whom I knew well, a very poor fellow, but one who enjoyed unusual success among the Gilyak ladies. He permitted himself to live too openly with the wife of one of his tuvng. As mentioned before, publicity of such relations is condemned unless the hero happens to be a rich and generally respected man. But Lokhmatka was a homeless Gilyak, always in debt, flighty, and lacking all manly virtues. Even so however, the elder tuvng did not pay any attention to this breach of moral code. Only when hard pressed by his clansmen did he consent to challenge his rival to a duel. Lokhmatka, however, flatly refused to accept so flattering a proposal. Then the husband hit him with a club. But Lokhmatka remained passive and, as the Gilyak moral code forbids hitting a man who does not defend himself, the affair was dropped right there, and Lokhmatka continued his relations with the man’s wife.

Among the Gilyak, I never had an opportunity to witness the behavior of an individual husband on finding his wife in flagrante delicto with one of his brothers. However, here is a scene which I witnessed among the Oroch, whose sexual norms in respect to brothers’ wives are identical with those of the Gilyak. I happened to spend the night in the tent of a most respected and rich Oroch, Ivan Kumnalts.12 Besides Ivan and his wife, I found in the tent Ivan’s young distant relative Timoshka, a poor and shiftless fellow, a great lover of the weaker sex, and one who preferred playing the Lovelace to the responsibilities of a household. Towards evening, when my host went out to attend to his moose, Timoshka without further ceremony crept under the cover of the young hostess. The old man was not expected back before dawn, but unfavorable weather brought him home earlier than expected. On entering the tent, he struck a light and became aware of Timoshka lying in his place by the side of his wife. Ivan was hot-headed and vain, so here, if ever, a passionate outburst of jealousy against poor Timoshka might have been expected, especially as Ivan’s wife was a noted beauty. Ivan, however, merely uttered a strong Russian curse (“I copulate with your mother”), after which Timoshka, smiling and bashful, went back to his place. Ivan lay down with a groan beside his frivolous wife.

Such are the relations between the pu and ang’rei groups. In his own clan the Gilyak has access to scores of wives of his “brothers,” his akhmalk clan, all the

12 [Editor’s note: The AMNH Russian typescript used the surname Kuznets; Shternberg, Gilia - ki, and Shternberg, Sem’ia, replace it with the more common Kuznetsov.]
unmarried daughters of his “mother’s” “brothers,” and finally, outside of these clans, he has a right to the married sisters of his or his tuvng's wives and to the wives of his “mother’s” “sisters’” sons. Moreover, as his own clansmen and members of his akhmalk are spread over most distant villages, there is scarcely a place where a traveling Gilyak may not find someone of his legitimate ang’rei. Mutatis mutandis, we can say of the pu and ang’rei what Fison and Howitt said of kumi and kroki—that a man may find a legitimate wife over the entire extent of his people’s territory [93].

Thus, almost every Gilyak is a party to two forms of marriage—[1] the common individual marriage with one or several women of his ang’rei group [principally with daughters of his mother’s brothers] as well as with no women of foreign clans; and [2] group marriage with all women of the ang’rei group, which may be accompanied by cohabitation in a common household with the women’s individual husbands. In addition, there exists a third form of marriage which is truly communist—that of several brothers with one wife combined in group marriage.\footnote{Editor’s note: Alongside this passage in the AMNH Russian typescript, Kreinovich penned in, “But not quite, in the class sense.” It isn’t clear whether he was referring to “class” as a marriage category or a hierarchical term.}

The form of group marriage we are here confronted with is a typical one, examples of which are well known and may be found among many different peoples of the world. A most curious and typical analog to our system is presented by the Dieri people of Australia, among whom the two forms of sexual intercourse, individual marriage and group marriage, are regulated by the differentiated terms noa and piruari. According to this system, each women is individually married to one man, and they call each other noa; but she is also married to a group of men whom she calls, and by whom she is called, piruari. What must be especially emphasized is that the piruari of the Dieri stand to one another in the same relationship of common unity as the pu and ang’rei of the Gilyak stand to each other. The piruari of a woman are the “brothers” of her individual husband, and the piruari of a man are the “sisters” of his individual wife. This principle is clearly shown by Dieri kinship terms. Thus a man or a woman calls by one and the same term (apiriwak) the piruari of their mother and the “brother” of their father, and accordingly by one and the same term (andri-wakha) the piruari of their father, the sister of their mother, and the individual wife of the father’s brother.\footnote{K. W. Howitt, “Australian Group Relations” [paper presented to the Smithsonian Institution, 1885], 10.}

Two other remarkable analogical features deserve to be noted. All the children of any given noa are brothers and sisters of the piruari group to which the noa belongs, and a woman becomes the noa of a man by being betrothed to him when she is a mere infant, exactly as among the Gilyak.\footnote{Ibid., 79.}

The ritual distinction of the Dieri system comes when the piruari (that is, the partners of group marriage) are solemnly allotted to each other during the session of the great council of the people previous to the circumcision ceremony. Only from that moment does their marriage right begin. The purpose of this measure, in my opinion, seems to be twofold: [1] to strengthen the public consciousness of the legit-
imacy of sexual intercourse between certain groups of individuals; and (2) to make
public the names of these individuals. Among the Gilyak, things have not progressed
so far. They are a small people, and each individual is told in early childhood by his
parents the names of his group pu and ang’rei. Under different circumstances, Gilyaks
would likely have advanced to this Dieri procedure as well.16

16 [Editor’s note: The AMNH Russian typescript and the 1933 Soviet editions conclude this sec-
tion with one to two paragraphs of additional comparison between Gilyak and Dieri kin cus-
toms.]