

## KINSHIP

clan (Gen. 21:5). Similarly Jacob fears lest Laban should refuse to let his daughters go, but should insist—in accordance with his undoubted right—on their staying at home; hence his secret flight (Gen. 31:31). The phrase, 'shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife,' in Gen. 2:24 may be an old saying dating from remote times when the husband went to the house (tent) of the wife, and joined her clan. Still the passage may be merely the narrator's remark, and even if it be an old proverb, we cannot be sure that it really carries us so far back in antiquity.

Another instance of a matriarchal marriage requires notice: that of Samson (Judg. 14). The case is

### 8. 'Beena'-marriage.

thoroughly exceptional; it is exogamy, but reversing the relations. The husband is the alien, and visits his wife, who remains in her own home, and it is in the house of her relations that the marriage feast is held. Samson himself indeed does not become a Philistine; but neither does his wife become Israelite; the intention is that they shall meet only from time to time. Para<sup>1</sup> is not wanting in pre-Islamic Arab history; as al-Buhārī said, such marriages were nothing out of the common up to the period immediately preceding that of Mohammed. The important point lies here:—the wife continues to belong to her own tribe, and the children, naturally, so belong also. It is thus the mother's blood that is the determining factor. This kind of marriage, it is plain, could originally have arisen only under the influence of matriarchal institutions.

From the facts adduced Robertson Smith draws the conclusion that this kind of marriage—which (after J. F. M'Lennan) he proposes to call *beena*-marriage (from the Singhalese)—had been the form universally prevalent among the Semites in the period before the separation of the tribes. After the separation, the Hebrews from the same starting-point arrived at monandrous baal-marriage (cp MARRIAGE, § 2) long before the Arabs did.

Such an inference, however, would be too sweeping. Robertson Smith himself regarded it as not improbable that patriarchy can be carried back to primitive Semitic times (*Kin.* 178); and Wellhausen (*op. cit.* 479) has proved it.

The existence of such old Semitic words as *ham* for wife's father-in-law (see HANU, NAMES WITH) and *kalla* for the daughter-in-law is, with other cases that might be adduced, conclusive. Wellhausen calls special attention to the fact that in the word '*amm*, Arab., Heb., Syr., and Sab., unite the senses of 'people' and 'relations on the father's side' (see AMMI, NAMES WITH). 'Whatever the time and place of origin of this mode of speech, the father's relations must also have been the political ones when it arose.'

Robertson Smith's concession, it is true, is limited to polyandrous baal-marriage—a form of patriarchal marriage which is well attested for the old Arabians (Strab. xvi. 425; cp WRS *Kin.* 133*f.*, We. *op. cit.* 460*f.*). In this description of marriage a group of brothers or nearly related men had the wife in common; the children belonged to the tribe of the fathers. Smith finds a trace of this form of polyandry still surviving in the levirate marriage of the Hebrews (see MARRIAGE, § 7*f.*). The duty of inheriting the wife is originally a right, which, as Smith thinks, must have had its origin in an original community of possession. Wellhausen (*op. cit.* 461) remarks further that the beginning of the law on the subject in D (Dt. 25:5 'if brethren dwell together') finds no explanation in the present context, but would fit in well with the explanation suggested by Smith. Hebrew levirate marriage, however, admits of sufficient explanation from the simple fact that in Hebrew baal-marriage wives in general are property that can be inherited. The right of inheriting became a duty in this one special case as soon as the first son of such a marriage

## KIR-HERES

came to be regarded as son of the deceased husband, and this last finds its explanation in the Hebrew view of the evils of childlessness (cp MARRIAGE, § 5*f.*).

Obviously the form of marriage just described must be older than monandrous baal-marriage; indeed then

### 11. Earliest practice.

is not in the nature of things any reason for regarding it as more recent than even the earliest form of matriarchal marriage. Baal-polyandry was originally in any case marriage by capture. As such it is hardly likely to have been a development of a form of marriage in which the husband married as an alien into the tribe of the wife. It may therefore be best to abandon all attempt to make out a genetic connection or evolutionary relation between the various kinds of marriage, and to concede that marriage by capture as well as matriarchal polyandry (which, strictly speaking, cannot be distinguished from absolute promiscuity) may date from the most remote times. One tribe might count kin from the mother, being endogamous, or else marrying its young women to men of alien tribe only when the men consented to join the tribe of the wife and the children remained with the mother. Another tribe counted kin from the father and therefore sought for its wives, so far as these could not be found within the tribe, by capture of such welcome additions from other tribes.

For literature, see FAMILY, § 15.

L. B.

**KIR** (קִּיר; κῆρη etc., see below; *CYRINE*; *عم*) is mentioned in Am. 9:7 (ἐκ βοθροῦ [BAQ]) as the primitive home of the Aramaeans, and warriors from Kir are introduced in the description of an Assyrian army threatening Jerusalem in Is. 22:6 (om. BSAQ<sup>1</sup>; *parietem*; *1600*).

The name also appears in Am. 1:5 (ἐν κήρῳ [BAQ], i.e., קִּיר = קִּיר; *κῆρη* [Aq.]; 2 K. 16:9 (om. B; *κῆρη* [A and Aq.], *τὴν πόλιν* [L]), where it may possibly have been introduced from Am. 15, which contains a prophecy of the deportations of the Aramaeans to Kir.

Winckler (*AF* 2254*f.*) has given reason to think that 'Kir' should rather be 'Kor' (קִּיר), and identified with the Karians mentioned by Arrian (iii. 85) with the Sittakenians; see also *SBOT*, 'Isa.' (Heb.), 197, and cp KOA. This people seems to have dwelt in the land of Jatbur, the plain between the Tigris and the mountains towards Elam (cp Sargon's Khorsabad inscr., B. 153, 5). For other views see Furrer, *PL* 354, who thinks of *Cyrrhætica*, between the Orontes and the Euphrates (refuted by Schr. *HWT* 845), and Halévy, *RE* 116*f.*, who prefers S. Babylonia.

**KIRAMA** (κίραμας [B], κίραμα [A]), 1 Esd. 5:20 RV = Ezra 2:36, RAMAH.

**KIR-HERES** (קִּיר הָרֵשׁ, Is. 16:11, AV *Kir-hareseth*; Jer. 48:31, 36, *Kir-hareseth* [קִּיר הָרֵשׁ], see col. 2677, n. 2) 2 K. 3:25, AV *Kir-haraseth*;

1. OT *References* of Moab (קִּיר מוֹאָב; Is. 15:1) or *Kir* (קִּיר; var. *קִּירֵת* [Is. 16:7] or *Kir* [Is. 15:1]).

The name is generally supposed to mean 'city of the sun' (שֶׁ for שָׁ); see NAMES, § 95. When, however, we consider (1) that this explanation is unknown to the ancients; (2) that Kir is nowhere supposed to mean 'city' except in the compound names Kir-heres, Kir-hareseth, and Kir-Moab; (3) that הָרֵשׁ, 'sun,' nowhere has a fem. ending; and (4) that in Is. 16:7 S and Aq. indicate *d*, not *r*, in the second part of the name, the question arises whether we should not emend the text and read קִירֵת הָרֵשׁ, 'new city' (cp HADASHAH).

Vg. gives *murus fictilis* (Jer.), *murus cocti lateris* (Is. 16), and *murus Moab* (Is. 15); S, τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Μοαβίτιδος in Is. 15; δεσφ<sup>1</sup> [?] δεσφ [α.α.α.] [BSAQ<sup>1</sup>] in Is. 16:7; τεῖχος δ [om. B.] ἐνεκρίστας [BSAQ<sup>1</sup>] ib. v. 11; κειράδες [κείραρες, κείραρες,

<sup>1</sup> Aq. τοῖς ὄστρον; Sym., τεῖχος τῷ ὄστρον; see Field, Swete. Deceth, quod Aquila transtulit parietem, Symmachus murum (Is. 16:11). Apparently the only reference to Kir in Onom.