traire, et une évidence grossière. Car, comme le montre ici le rapprochement de la prostituée et du "chien" (comme dans l'inscription de Kition le rapprochement des 'lmt et des klblm), les deux jouaient le même rôle dans le rituel hiérogamique. Le qâdës ou këléb n'était pas, comme le pense W. Baumgartner, un "temple paederast". Car ce n'était pas un "érasite"; c'était un "éromène". Comme la qâdëšâ, il tenait le rôle passif. Raison pour laquelle il est mieux de traduire par "chienne", puisque c'est philologiquement possible.3

La fidélité du chien n'a rien à faire ici. Et si en d'autres temps les Dominicani se sont fait gloire des vertus de chiens de garde qui leur avaient valu le surnom de Domini canes, les këlébîm de Deut. xxiii n'étaient que des invertis, méprisés comme des chiennes, par tous les tenants du yahvisme et de son dieu jaloux (connotation de mépris bien absente à Kition, mais certaine dans la Bible). C'était, pour le Deutéronome, une "abomination", qui a dû être réprimée dès la réforme de Josias, et qui par la suite a été si bien cachée, qu'elle a complètement sombré dans l'oubli. En sorte qu'aujourd'hui d'excellents exégètes ont bien de la peine à comprendre de quoi la Bible a parlé.

Paris Gilbert Brunet

1 Exod. xi 7, xxii 30; Judc. vii 5; 1 Sam. xvii 42; 1 Reg. xiv 11, xvi 4, xxii 19, 23, 24, xxii 38; 2 Reg. ix 10, 36; Isa. li 10, 11, lv 3; Jer. xv 3; Ps. lxviii 24; Job xxx 1; Prov. xxvi 11, 17; Qoh. ix 4.
2 1 Sam. xiv 15; 2 Sam. iii 8, ix 8, xvi 9; 2 Reg. xiii 13; Ps. xxi 17, 21, lix 7, 15.

THE SONS OF JUDAH AND THE SONS OF AARON IN BIBLICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Z. Kallai pointed out recently that the historiographical conception which emphasizes the special relationship between the sons of Judah and the sons of Aaron, and highlights the prominent position of the tribe of Judah, can be found in the order of the encampment around the tabernacle in Num. ii 1-34, iii 14-34 and in the system of the Levitical cities in Josh. xxi 1-40; 1 Chr. vi 39-61.1 He proved that the presentation of the relationship between the sons of Judah
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and the sons of Aaron and of the prominent position of Judah as existing since earliest days, related to the age of the wandering in the wilderness and to the early period of the conquest and the settlement in Canaan, is obviously a monarchic conception which was not crystallized before the reigns of David and Solomon.\(^2\)

Accepting Kallai’s attitude, we shall try to prove that his observations are not isolated and that this historiographical conception can be found in other biblical texts. We shall also claim that the passages which were mentioned by Kallai and those which will be studied in this article are parts of one historiographical strata which have not previously been noticed.

In this article we shall study mainly the genealogical text in Ex. vi 13-30 (related to RP), and also the traditions that mention Aaron with Hur in Ex. xvii 8-16, xxiv 1-18 (related to E or J).

I

The most complicated expression of this historiographical conception can be found in the genealogical passage in Ex. vi 13-30. This passage was formulated in a special and sophisticated way. By using stylistic and structural tools the authors succeeded in emphasizing in an indirect way two main ideas: the idea of the separation between the Aaronite priesthood and the remaining families of Levi, and the idea of the covenant between the house of Aaron and the house of David.\(^3\)

1. The division between the Priests and the Levites

The explicit aim of the text in Ex. vi 13-30 was to present the pedigree of Aaron and Moses. The authors did not leave any doubt about it (see vv. 26-27). But it was only one of their aims.\(^4\) The main purpose was to point out the division between the sons of Aaron (the Aaronite priesthood) and the remaining families of Levi (including Moses and his descendants). This purpose was expressed indirectly by using the following means:

1.1 The omission of Moses’ descendants

On the one hand, the authors did not even hint at the descendants of Moses and, on the other, they did not omit even one of the members of Aaron’s house. They mentioned his wife, Elisheba,