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THE expression דַּבֵּכֹת אֵלַי occurs twice in the OT.; viz., in 1 S. 4 21 and 14 3, in each case of the son of Phinehas. The explanation is given in 1 S. 4 22 that the name was used, because נַחֵל הָבֹד מִשְׁרָאֵל ‘the glory had departed from Israel.’ Some scholars, therefore, regard דַּבֵּכֹת as privative = ‘without glory’; i.e., as an abbreviation of דַּבֵּכֹת (thus Jensen, Ztschr. für Völkerpsychologie, xviii., p. 421), but דַּבֵּכֹת can be equally well construed as ‘woe, alas’ (דַּבֵּכֹת ‘woe for the glory’), as in Eccles. 10 18 יִאֱלֵיא; 4 10 יֵאִלְוָא. The similar דַּבֵּכֹת in the proper name דַּבֵּכֹת was probably also an exclamation. The element דַּבֵּכֹת here is unclear, nor does Prätorius (ZDMG, lxxv., pp. 794-795) give any satisfactory explanation of it. In Assyrian zabālu means ‘bring, carry,’ and has as a synonym našū ‘lift up.’ The stem zabālu seems to be connected with the idea ‘tribute’ (i.e., ‘a bringing’), as we find zabil dupṣikki, zabil kudurri ‘tribute-bringer, tax-payer.’ Note also the expression ina zabal ramānišu, probably ‘as his own tribute,’ and also ZA-BA-LAM = mīširlu ‘taxes,’ iv, 20, No. 1, 21. The element דַּבֵּכֹת appears also in the Phoenician names: דַּבֵּכֹת, דַּבֵּכֹת, דַּבֵּכֹת, דַּבֵּכֹת and, of course, in אֶזְכָּר, אֶזְכָּר, אֶזְכָּר, all which may contain the same idea of ‘bringing, giving’ and hence ‘value, treasure.’ The name דַּבֵּכֹת, therefore, may mean ‘woe, alas for treasure,’ and hence be similar in construction to דַּבֵּכֹת. The rendering ‘woe the glory’ for דַּבֵּכֹת is apparently confirmed by the use in the Sumerian hymns of the woe-term a-lig, which appears in most passages as an apparent parallel to

1 It is possible that דַּבֵּכֹת may indicate a god-name: the treasure, precious one(?).
A-lig is seen, especially in Tammuz hymns, in the following constructions:

CT. xv, 20, 4: a-lig lig Da-mu-(mu)
woe the mighty one, mighty one, my Tammuz
5. a-lig dumu u-mu-un Mu-zi-(da)
woe the mighty one, lord Muzida
6. a-lig dimmer silim (KA-DI) i-de za . . . .
woe the mighty one, god of splendor, eye of . . . .
7. a-lig dimmer lamga u-mu-un s(a-par)
woe the mighty one, god, artificer, lord (of the net)
8. a-lig li-bi-ir (BU) an-na-(mu)
woe the mighty one, overseer, lord of . . . .
9. a-lig mu-lu sir (BU) an-na-(mu)
woe the mighty one, my heavenly light.

The same use of a-lig occurs in IV. 27 No. 4, 3: Mu-ul-lil-la-ra a-lig 'for Bel, woe the mighty one.'

The entire question hinges on the exact meaning in this connection of a-lig, which appears in the word-lists with the following equivalents, easily classifiable into three distinct meaning-groups:

A. a-lig = xi-i-lu, Meissner, 883: 'power.' Here a is plainly abstract in force (cf. Prince, Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon, p. xvii, for full discussion) and lig 'power,' a common meaning; cf. Br. 6193f: = danimu, dannu, emêqu, idlu, izzu.

B. a-lig = i-mu, Br. 11537 (cf. Meissner, 8880: i-mu? ša mê 'spring of water').

a-lig (Sum. val. e-la) = mi-lum, Br. 11538: 'flood.'
a-lig = namba'u, Meissner, 8886: 'water-spring.'

a-lig = ta-ti-ik-tum from natâku 'pour out,' connected also with the water-idea.

1 KA-DI with pronunciation si-lim = tašritu 'splendor,' Br. 746.
3 Li-bi-ir = nāgiru 'overseer,' Br. 1133.
4 sir (BU) = nûru 'light,' Br. 7530; napâxu 'shine,' Br. 7527.
In all the above equations, \( a = \text{‘water’} + \text{lig ‘strong’}; \) in connection with water probably ‘copious.’

It is evident that neither of the above groups assist in the interpretation of the a-lig of the Tammuz hymns. Here it should be noted, however, that \( u’a \) ‘oh, woe’ is a common meaning for \( a \); cf. Meissner, 8694, quoting extensively from the Reisner texts, so that a-lig in the context of the Tammuz hymns, where it is clearly an exclamation of distress, can only mean ‘oh, woe’ = \( u’a + \text{‘power’} \) or ‘powerful’ = lig. Such an expression at once suggests נָבָא ‘O the glory’ which seems to be a parallel exclamation applied as a proper name. It should be observed that Heb. נָבָא is adjectival ‘powerful,’ Ezek. 23:41, as well as substantival passim. The rendering of a-lig by ‘O the powerful one’; ‘woe the glory’ or ‘glorious one’ in the Tammuz passages cited above is peculiarly appropriate to the situation, as the singer is lamenting the death of the life-giving sun during the winter months. We may classify then as Group C:

\[ a-\text{lig} = u’a + \text{dannu ‘O the mighty one,’ } CT. \text{ xv. 20, 4 ff; } \]
\[ 24-25 \text{ (see below).} \]
\[ a-\text{lig} = i{l-\text{mu}}, \text{ Br. 11539: ‘weak’ from } \text{alâlu}; \text{ cf. } nllu, \text{ Meissner, 8881 = il-lu.} \]
\[ a-\text{lig} = n{i-i-lu ‘rest,’ from } na\text{’alu, } \text{Meissner, 8864.} \]
\[ a-\text{lig} = \text{saxrarto ‘need.’} \]

The meanings ‘weak, rest, be in straits’ are to be regarded as secondary developments of \( a-\text{lig} = u’a + \text{dannu}, \) a common phenomenon in Sumerian (cf. Prince, Materials, pp. viii-ix).

The only passage which might appear to militate against the comparison of a-lig with נָבָא is \( CT, \) xv, 20,

24. \( \text{ne-šù šeš-zu mulu er-ri ba-an-tu-tu} \)
unto this thy brother, the man of weeping, wilt thou enter?

25. \( \text{ne-šù } \text{Dunu-zi mulu a-lig ba-an-tu-tu} \)
To this one Tammuz, the man of a-lig, wilt thou enter?

In this couplet, a-lig is plainly a substantival parallel to er(Â-ŠI)-ri in the preceding line. Langdon (Psalms, p. 30, note 4) even explained this a-lig as a-ri(b), a supposed philo-
logical equivalent of er-ri. On p. 272, op. cit., however, he rightly saw the improbability of this comparison. The reading lig⁵ = ‘power, powerful’ for KAL seems assured by the frequent -ga-suffix following the KAL-sign (cf. especially Prince, Materials, 223-224).

A-lig, as shown above, is usually an exclamation, but it is used in CT. xv. 20, 25 as a substantive. Similar uses of exclamations as nouns, however, are not uncommon in the cuneiform literature, as, for example, HT. 122, 13: beltu'm ina zurub libbi šimme; zarbiš addiki axulapia, ‘O lady, hearken to the trouble of my heart; bitterly I present to thee my “how long”’; HT. 115, rev. 12: ina u'a u ā šunurut (kabitti) ‘with Ah and Oh my soul is sighing.’

The use of the exclamation a-lig, therefore, as a noun, in no way prevents our comparing its composition and usual construction with the Heb. תָּבֹל, of which it appears to be a satisfactory prototype.

⁵ Zimmern, Tammuzhymmen, p. 290, reads A-DAN; cf. also Vanderburgh, AJSL., xxvii., pp. 86-87.