The studies of my friend Mr. Feigen have placed the old problem of Ariel in a much clearer light, though I am not able to agree with all his suggestions. There can be no doubt that the balance of probability is now in favor of the Assyrian etymology long maintained by Jeremias and others. In Mesopotamian cosmology Mount Araldû, Sum. Arali (for etymology cf. AJSL, XXXV. 191. n. 1), in the far north was the home of the shades, whence Hades was called in Sumerian kûr, mountain, and in Assyrian ḫursûn, mountain, as Zimmern has recently shown. Aralu is written ideographically Ɛ-Ḵû-R-ŬŞ (B.A.D.), House of the mountain of the dead. Araldû is also the mountain of the gods, Ɛ-yarsû-gal-kûr-kûr-ra, House of the great mountain of the lands, and is further identified with the fabulous mountain of gold in the land of the gods. As Ɛ-kûr and Ɛ-yarsû-gal-kûr-kûr-ra were two of the most popular names of zikkurâti, or temple-towers, we may safely suppose that the latter, being the terrestrial representations of the mountain of the gods, shared its name Arallû. Originally, of course, the mountain of the gods and the mountain of the shades were distinct conceptions, but since both were placed in the far north they were naturally confused.
In Is. 29.2, נא נדרש clearly means Hades:

 Thou shalt become like Hades; I will encamp like a wall against thee.

The voice of a shade shall be thine; from the dust thou shalt utter chirps.

The denizens of the underworld were supposed to become birds, clad in feathers (Descent of Istar, line 10). The conception that the soul of a dead man is embodied in a bird, especially an owl, is almost universal. Is. 33.7,

 is evidently, following the Talmudic tradition (see Mr. Feigen’s article), to be rendered as follows:

Behold the Ar’elim cry without; the propitious angels wail bitterly.

The thought seems to be that the destructive spirits of the lower world have invaded the land, howling like jackals without while they spread famine and pestilence; the spirits of heaven weep bitterly over the godlessness of the land and its consequent suffering. The shades were called both Ar’elim and Benè Ar’el (II Sam. 23.20, LXX), just as they are also both Refa’îm and Benè Rafû, ‘Anâkim and Benè ‘Anak. These expressions are used in the Bible just as in Egypt and Mesopotamia for the demigods and heroes of a bygone age as well as for the shades of the lower world in general.

There is no phonetic objection to the combination of Ar’el with Arâli; the final ˚ is dropped in Hebrew loan-words from Assyrian, as in edâ ˚, inundation. The various writings point unmistakably to a loan-word which was adapted to Hebrew by popular etymology in different ways. The pronunciation Ar’el is evidently based on a reminiscence of Nergal-Irra, called šar Arali and usually represented as a lion. The variant har’el in

1 Pronounce metrically köbméres.
2 For the etymology of סמא see Haupt, AJSL., XXXIII, 48; the stem is יגב = rabû, set, of the sun. Similarly סמא may be connected with Ar. ˚naka, set, of the stars (cf. AJSL., XXIV, 142). This is, of course, very doubtful, but is at least more likely than the old combination with ˚nak, long-necked.
Ez. 43:15 means *mountain of god*, like Arallû. That the word should be a genuine Hebrew compound is impossible, as we have no parallels. Moreover, the rendering *hearth of God* is excluded by the fact that there is no word *irījah*, hearth, in Arabic, as lightly assumed by all the commentators. The word supposed to mean *hearth* is one of the many forms of the word *irī, arīj*, *ārij, arījah*, crib, stall, enclosure (cf. Barth, *ZDMG.*, LXXII. 636), a pre-Islamic loan from Aram. *urū*, itself derived from Assy. *urū*, stall, enclosure, another loan from Sum. *ūr* (*Sumerisches Glossar*, p. 49, *ūr VI*), with the same meaning.

As seen by Jeremias, Ariel as the name of Mount Zion is identical with Arallû, mountain of god, Heb. *har kôdes*. Similarly, the highest of the three stages of the altar of burnt-offering in the temple of Solomon and Ezekiel bears the same name. The striking resemblance of this altar to the Babylonian stage-tower was pointed out many years ago by Haupt, who said (Toyn. *Ezekiel*, p. 187): "The Temple resembled, to a certain extent, a Babylonian temple-tower of three stories, and the altar of burnt-offering is practically a Babylonian temple-tower on a smaller scale, or rather, the temple-tower is, as it were, a huge altar." The commonest type of stage-tower had three stages; cf. the illustrations in Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder*, II. 39. Descriptions of stage-altars may be found in Dalman’s *Petra*, pp. 141 (on the summit of a high-place), 288 (on a terrace), and 299, but all of these are crude compared with the Jewish altar, which was certainly based on Mesopotamian models, coming through Phoenicia.

The reconstruction of the altar of burnt-offering (Ez. 43:13–17) given in the commentaries (cf. Kraetzschmar, *Handkommentar*, p. 279, and Toyn. *Ezekiel*, p. 191) requires a slight modification. The *נַחַלָה נָפָל* is not the lowest of four stages, but is the foundation of the altar, just as rendered by the Targum, which gives *אֶדֹחי נָפָל*. Since its surface was then on a level with the

---

3 The name Zion probably mean *mountain* rather than *necropolis*; Ar. *gānah* means *mound* as well as *stone-heap* - Heb. *נֵס* and Eg. *du* means *mountain*.

4 Restore *נַחַלָה* also after *נָפ* in 13, it has fallen out before הָבָא by haplography.
surrounding pavement it becomes clear why the מַקָן, boundary (13, 17), was necessary to mark the limit of the sacred altar-area. Thus, while the total height from the bottom of the foundation to the top of the horns was twelve cubits (1 + 2 + 4 + 4 + 1), the actual elevation of the surface of the אַרְאֵל above the pavement was ten cubits (2 + 4 + 4), agreeing exactly with the ten cubits stated in II Chr. 4:1 as the height of the altar of Solomon's temple, the cubit being here also presumably the Babylonian cubit of 21 inches specified by Ezekiel. Moreover, the boundary (13) was half a cubit (one span) from the base of the lower stage, another span in width (17), while the מַקָן projected a cubit beyond the boundary, so the total length and width of the altar would be 12 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 4 = 20 cubits, just as stated in II Chr. 4:1.

The enigmatical expression מַקָן מַקָן, bosom of the earth, is very important, as it is simply a literal translation of Assyr. ʾirat kigalli, bosom of the kigalli, commonly used to denote the foundation of a temple-tower. The word kigalli, literally great earth, means underworld, site, basis, and foundation-platform, the latter sense arising from the fancy that the temple-tower was the link of heaven and earth (dur-an-ki), founded in the underworld and reaching heaven, a hyperbole recurring countless times in the inscriptions.

No less characteristically Mesopotamian is the use of the term אַרְאֵל for the highest stage of the altar, rather than for the whole altar. Assyr. zikkuratū means properly mountain-peak (zikkurat šadi), and refers primarily to the topmost stage, though it may be extended by metonymy to include the entire temple-tower, whose original name was ekurru, mountain-house,

5 The term מַקָן, generally misunderstood, and even combined with Assyr. ʾururtu, means properly terrace, terrace-platform. Ar. ʿādirah is terraced court before a house, and South. Ar. נְשָׁם has the same meaning (contrast Weber, MVAG., 1901, p. 66). The primary sense is what is supported, upheld from the stem ʿdr, support, help. The מַקָן of Solomon’s temple (II Chr. 4:16) corresponds exactly to Assyr. kisallu, the terrace-platform in front of the temple. Here Solomon erected his bronze מַקָן (also Babylonian, as pointed out JAOS., XXXVI, 232) on which to address the multitude assembled before the temple.
whence Aram. ekurrā, shrine, idol. The cosmic symbolism appears clearly in the four horns, or rather four mountains, if we may judge from the four "horns" on an altar at Petra. If there were any possible doubt regarding the correctness of our interpretation, it should be removed by the variant har-el, mountain of god, in verse 13 (see above).

From Mr. Feigin's discussion it appears that ar'el in the Mesha stone means massēbah, pēsel, and not pillar-altar or altar-hearth, as commonly assumed. As is well-known, among the Western Semites the symbol of deity was rarely more than a stone menhir or a wooden post, and it is seldom possible to distinguish sharply between massēbah and pēsel. It is not certain how ar'el came to mean pēsel. Porphyry says that the altar was regarded as the symbol of deity by the Arabs (cf. Lagrange, Religions sémithiques, p. 191) and Robertson Smith (Religion of the Semites, p. 201ff.) maintains that the altar is a development of the massēbah. While the latter view cannot be seriously defended, it must be admitted that there is often no clear distinction between the two. On the whole I am inclined to favor Lagrange's theory that the massēbah as a stele representing divinity reflects the Mesopotamian temple-tower (op. cit. p. 192ff.), though I would not go as far as he does. The conception is, of course, primitive, taking root in a fetishism found all over the world; the cult-symbolism of later times, however, is often unmistakably Mesopotamian in origin. It is more than likely that Egyptian influences have also been at work here. The Egyptian analogue of the zikkurat is the pyramid, which assumes two forms, the stage-tower surmounted by a pyramidion, which developed into the later stageless pyramid, and the obelisk crowned by a pyramidion. This pyramidion bore the name ẖn or būbat, also applied by metonymy to the

6 For the relation between the obelisk and the pyramidion cf. Breasted, Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt, p. 70ff. The ẖn was further combined by paranomasia with the ẖnu, phoenix, also symbolizing the sun. For the etymology of ẖn, būbat see AJSL, XXXIV, 223, note. Here also belongs Ar. ṣabān, fingers, extremities of the body; cf. Assyr. ušān šadū, mountain peak, it. finger (ušānu); ʿibhām is not etymologically connected with būbat) of the mountain.
whole obelisk, just as in the case of the Babylonian zikkurat. The pyramidion called bn, which stood in the temple of the sun at Heliopolis, corresponds to the massebah or hammān of Šamaš or Ba’al, just as the wooden ďd pillar of Osiris is parallel to the Aširat post, as pointed out by Ember. While the pyramidion was originally only a specialized type of massebah, in the course of time it certainly came to represent the mountain of the earth. Though the obelisk had other symbolism also, one can hardly doubt that the two obelisks flanking the pyla of some Egyptian temples, reappearing as architectural loans in Phoenician and Syrian temples, represent primarily the mountains of dawn, figuring so often in West-Asiatic and Egyptian literature and art. As is well-known, these obelisks finally appear as Iaḥin and Ia’oz(?) in the temple of Solomon, also facing the east, the šīṭ šamši. All this cosmological symbolism is comparatively recent, even though appearing in our oldest monumental sources.