KINGSHIP, STRUGGLE, AND CREATION: THE STORY OF *CHAOSKAMPF*

by

ROSANNA RACKLEY

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of Master of Research

Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology
School of History and Cultures
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
September 2014

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

Abstract

When Hermann Gunkel first put forward the idea of *Chaoskampf* he concentrated on how a struggle between a god and chaos results in creation. Subsequent scholars, such as Rebecca Watson, too have viewed the motif's theme as being about creation. This study uses texts from the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, Babylon, Mari, and Ugarit to show that kingship is a major theme in *Chaoskampf* texts. This study dismantles the current approach to *Chaoskampf* showing that it is an evolving, and changing motif used throughout the Ancient Near East to validate kingship.

Contents Page

Introduction

Chaoskampf is currently defined as the battle between a storm god and a sea god, who represents primordial chaos; after the storm god's victory he goes on to create the world. This study aims to challenge this view and suggest that we should move away from understanding *Chaoskampf* as being solely about creation, while adding in the themes of kingship.

One major problem in scholarship into *Chaoskampf* is that it is a static idea in the mind of many scholars. This can be seen in how they talk about *Chaoskampf.* Throughout my study I use terms such as *Chaoskampfic*, Classical *Chaoskampf*, and Creational *Chaoskampf*; these terms, as I explain below, show how fluid *Chaoskampf* is. I am looking into the *Chaoskampfs* found in the Ancient Near East (ANE), which are present in Babylonian, Canaanite, and Mari texts, as well as the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament (HB/OT). While they use *Chaoskampf* for a common purpose, or for a similar theme, each uses it in a way different way, because of their unique political and religious contexts. This is why we should talk of *Chaoskampfs*, because while both the Baal/Yam conflict and the Marduk/Tiamat conflict are both *Chaoskampfic,* they are not intended for the same purpose and usage, and to treat the *Chaoskampf* elements within them in the same way is problematic.

Current HB/OT scholars offer a prime example of why this is problematic. With the discovery of further examples of *Chaoskampf* texts, which are not mentioned in Gunkel's work, within the HB/OT and other ANE sources, one would expect research into *Chaoskampf* stray outside its HB/OT scholarship confines; yet in recent years, David Tsumura,[1] Andrew Angel,[2] and

---

[1] David Toshio Tsumura, *Creation and Destruction: Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2005).
[2] Andrew Angel, *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaoskampf Tradition in the Period 515BCE to 200CE* (Continuum, London: 2006).

Rebecca Watson[3] have all written on it from a biblical perspective. A new book has recently been published which aims to examine the theory from a wider ANE viewpoint, yet fails by concentrating on the HB/OT and the Baal Cycle.[4] For an idea that is meant to encompass the ANE that shows a cultural link between Israel and Babylonia, the majority of scholarship has really focused on the HB/OT; this shows the chasm of communication between HB/OT scholars and Assyriologists. All sides agree, however, that there are problems with Gunkel's definition of *Chaoskampf* and that it needs to be updated with the latest evidence in mind.

To highlight how adaptable *Chaoskampf* is, I will now give some examples of how it has been used and adapted for more modern usage.

Within Near Eastern material we can see the adaption of the motif the apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon,[5] where the prophet Daniel rips apart the dragon Bel. The links here are that Bel the dragon represents Marduk, who famously defeated his own dragon. The dragon is torn apart by Daniel, much like Tiamat was, by Daniel defeating a dragon in Marduk's own temple, a victory is won for the YHWHists. The story of Bel and the Dragon subverts the story told in *Enūma Eliš* giving the victory instead to Daniel, and by extension YHWH, and by further extension to the Israelites over their conquerors.

The Persian Romance Cycle of Alexander the Great has him defeating a dragon before he can build Alexandria.[6] Here the motif is adapted and used to give credibility to a foreign invader. By using a motif the locals were familiar with Alexander, or the person who originally composed the cycle, is able to make himself more approachable, hopefully reducing

---

[3] Rebecca Watson, *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of Chaos in the Hebrew Bible* (Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin: 2005).
[4] JoAnn Scurlock and Richard H. Beal eds. *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaoskampf Hypothesis* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2013).
[5] Daniel 14.
[6] Daniel Ogden "Sekander, Dragon-Slayer" in *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East* eds. Richard Stoneman, Kyle Erickson, and Richard Netton (Barkhuis Groningen:2012). p 278.

resistance against him. This show the adaptably of the motif, and with the building of the city of Alexandria, we have creation, and finally, the purpose is intrinsically linked to kingship, as Alexander is trying to establish himself a king/leader.

These show the adaption of the *Chaoskampf* throughout time. Interestingly *Chaoskampf* as a motif has survived and is present in modern non-Near Eastern narratives, who has inherited these stories through the spread of Christianity. This can be seen in the example of the children's television program My Little Pony. This example shows, kingship, creation, conflict, and the adaptability of the motif, as I am arguing that this is how we should view *Chaoskampf* I have spent longer on an analysis of this example.

In My Little Pony, Discord, a draconequus or 'dragon-horse', who had once ruled Equestria until he was defeated by Princesses Celestia and Luna, escapes imprisonment and creates chaos by causing chocolate rain to fall from cotton candy clouds.[7] He is eventually stopped and once again is incarcerated.[8] Discord returns where he pretends to be reformed while in reality he is creating chaos and flash floods. However, when he discovers that by using his powers for evil he jeopardises his friendship with Fluttershy Discord does truly reform and uses his powers for good.[9] This contains most of the elements that we will see in the ANE adaptions below. We have a battle for kingship between Discord and his adversaries, Celestia and Luna, plus Discord has control over water, yet there is a lack of creation. This lack is to be expected in a story that is set in a pre-established world and has made no reference to creation before or after this story-arc. The writers have taken the elements of *Chaoskampf* they wanted, and mixed them with other stories to create their own unique story, to fix their

---

[7] "The Return of Harmony Part 1" *My Little Pony: Friendship is Magic*. Season 2 Episode 01. 17th September 2011.
[8] "The Return of Harmony Part 2" *My Little Pony: Friendship is Magic*. Season 2 Episode 02. 24th September 2011.
[9] "Keep Calm and Flutter On" *My Little Pony: Friendship is Magic*. Season 3 Episode 10. 19th January 2013.

intended audience. This shows how fluid *Chaoskampf* really is: that it is not formulaic and has to meet certain rules but that it is changing and usable. The most notable change is that Discord does not remain imprisoned or killed, through the power of friendship he reforms; he no longer is a disruptive force of chaos but lends his power for helping and the betterment of the community. The core theme and values in the My Little Pony mythos is that friendship is powerful and good, it can overcome anything. It overcomes Discord and changes him, making an original ending for a *Chaoskampfic* story but one that fits perfectly into the context in which it is told. This is exactly what we will see with the Baal Cycle and *Chaoskampf*.

It is important to be aware that *Chaoskampf* is a very adaptable motif, and not a strict set of rules to be followed. The general consensus in scholarship at the moment is to not question these rules; this thesis is all about re-evaluating the themes and purposes behind texts with *Chaoskampf* within them.

To do this effectively I have divided this study into three parts. The first, Chapter One, will look at the new terms I am proposing and use throughout my study. The second chapter looks at the creation theme within the texts, and the final chapter will introduce kingship as a theme in *Chaoskampf* texts.

The texts I will be using are extracts from the HB/OT, the Baal Cycle, *Enūma Eliš*, and two Mari letters. These are all texts which either contain the battle scene, or are explicit references to a text with said battle scene. This study is not willing to be involved in questions as to whether certain texts can or cannot be classed as a *Chaoskampf* text, but only analyse what the purposes of the motif were. Unless otherwise stated translations of the texts are my own.

<u>Chapter One</u>

<u>*Chaoskampf* Against a Mesopotamia Background</u>

First put forward by Hermann Gunkel in 1895 *Chaoskampf* is the storyline of god versus chaos.[10] Gunkel studied Genesis 1 in a new way by connecting it to the Mesopotamian genesis described in the Babylonian text *Enūma Eliš*, commonly referred to as the Babylonian creation legend. He pointed out that in both there is a battle which results in an act of creation, and that in both the Hebrew and Babylonian texts this battle involved a struggle between a deity and the sea, a sea god, or sea monsters. Gunkel defined the battle as that of a storm god defeating a sea god or dragon who represents chaos, with the act of creation happening afterwards. In this essay I call this definition Classic *Chaoskampf*.

I will now present what I feel would be a more appropriate way to talk about *Chaoskampf*. Classic *Chaoskampf* is almost the default definition of *Chaoskampf*, and a text must have all the features referred to above lest there be endless debate about whether it is actually a *Chaoskampf* text when it does not have all the features ordained by Gunkel. I am proposing in this dissertation that Gunkel's analysis of over a hundred years ago needs serious revision, not least since there have been so many discoveries since that time.[11] Although current scholarship acknowledges this new material, the classic *Chaoskampf* definition is so ingrained in their approach to the topic that much of the discussion is circular because of the focus on the classic definition.[12]

---

[10] Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religiongeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen: 1985). Recently translated into English as Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12* trans. William Whitney, (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, Michigan: 2006).
[11] Ugarit in 1927 being the most obvious example.
[12] See the discussion on Genesis 1 below.

Another problem with current scholarship is that there has been a tendency to avoid accepting the HB/OT in its ANE context.[13] When the attempt is made to accept that the HB/OT is a product of its time and place, far too much energy is spent trying to convince HB/OT scholars that they should pay attention.[14]

This thesis will sidestep these issues by doing what Assyriologists do not, include HB/OT texts. It will also involve more ANE texts, something which HB/OT scholars do not do. This study will also not be concentrating on Genesis 1 for reasons which are discussed below.

However, first we need to place a definition and limits on the term *Chaoskampf*. Throughout this thesis, I use the term *Chaoskampfic*[15] to mean a text that does not meet all the Classic *Chaoskampf* requirements. For example the Baal/Yam conflict is *Chaoskampfic* because it has the conflict against chaos but no creation. The Book of Job is *Chaoskampfic* because it references a classic *Chaoskampf* text.

For a text to be included in this study it has to describe and deal with a conflict against chaos. The conflict has to be between two gods, or a god and a sea monster, or a god and the sea. The god/monster/sea must represent chaos, either through their actions, or their general being, and their defeat will bring about either creation or some form of social order.

As Rebecca Watson rightly points out, very few studies into *Chaoskampf* define the term chaos.[16] As chaos is a Greek term with Latin connotations and *Chaoskampf* deals with Near Eastern ideas, it is important that we make sure that we are not imposing a Western viewpoint

---

[13] See Watson, *Chaos Uncreated.*
[14] See Scurlock and Beal eds. *Creation and Chaos.*
[15] *Chaoskampfic* is the meshing together of the –ic ending in English and the German word *Chaoskampf.* I chose not to do the –ic ending equivalent in German making the word *Chaoskampfisch* because of the non-German speaking audience of this paper. I also decided against making up my own term because I want to hold onto the history of Gunkel's work, this is not about replacing his work but adapting it.
[16] Watson *Chaos Uncreated* p 13.

upon the chaos in *Chaoskampf*. It is only by fully defining chaos that this study can be comprehensive and useful. From the evidence of Biblical texts we know that chaos is a void[17] or something without order. It was the Ancient Egyptians that most clearly document this form of chaos.

In Ancient Egypt there was an obsession with holding back chaos *isft* through following your *maat*, your duty is to follow your *maat* to help hold back *isft*. Every person at every level of society had their own rules to follow based upon their station in life, and to not follow them ran the risk of chaos breaking forth and destroying the cosmos.[18] For the ancient Egyptians chaos was society fallen and much of pharaonic ritual was believed to play an important role in keeping it at bay. Here chaos and monarchy are diametrically opposed to each other in a cosmological battle for all eternity. Now that we understand what chaos is, or could be, I shall explain why scholarship should move away from understanding *Chaoskampf* as being purely about creation. The reason this is important is because this understanding of *Chaoskampf* is very ingrained in modern scholarship, and it needs to be dismantled before kingship themes can be accepted.

Due to the origins of *Chaoskampf* theory, scholarship has understandably focused on creation, however the creation themes present have been misunderstood. Creation is not central to every *Chaoskampfic* text; the Baal Cycle and Mari letters show this. These were unavailable to Gunkel when he first presented his theory on *Chaoskampf*. What then resulted was scholarship arguing over whether these texts are *Chaoskampfic* instead of realising that Gunkel's work was incomplete. They are trying to fit new evidence into the boundaries of an old theory instead of reworking the theory to fit the new evidence and using it to redefine and

---

[17] See the discussion on תהו ובהו *tohu wavohu* below.
[18] Emily Teeter, "Maat" in *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt Vol. 2 G-O* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001). pp. 319–321.

update our understanding of *Chaoskampf*. This can be seen in the approaches of some scholars such as Rebecca Watson who seems to view old theories as almost sacred. Watson's *Chaos Uncreated* is solely about showing how there are no *Chaoskampfic* texts or references within the HB/OT. She has understood *Chaoskampf* to be as Gunkel presented it as, and because his theory no longer fits in with the evidence then the theory must be dismissed. Gunkel's work is not seen as something malleable that can be adapted, changed, and improved upon; it is either right or wrong. Watson is focused on the Classical *Chaoskampf* definition and her work concentrates on the old, Gunkel's work, there is no review all the evidence with her emphasis being upon HB/OT texts and *Enūma Eliš*. Her critique on the Book of Job is dealt with in Chapter Two.

However, Watson's overall approach to *Chaoskampf* in the HB/OT, one of scepticism, is a safe one to take. There are many psalms which are said to be *Chaoskampfic* yet are not. One example of this is Psalm 29, which is also explored in Chapter Two.

All of the above means that nobody has truly looked at *Chaoskampf* and *Chaoskampfic* texts without the tint of creation colouring what they see. It is *Enūma Eliš* itself that shows the weakness of this approach.

Enūma Eliš comprises various myths, and traditions, which either directly inspired the composers, or subtly influenced them. A simple analysis of the parallels to other ANE texts would be:

1. Parallels between the Marduk/Tiamat conflict and the Ninurta/Anzu conflict.

2. The demons Tiamat gives birth to are the same as the demons born in Gilgamesh and Huwawa.[19]

3. Marduk's fifty names is a reworking of the god list *An : Anum*.[20]

4. The creation of man from the slain Tiamat's blood is similar to the creation of man from the slain god Wê-ila blood in the *Atra-ḫasīs* Epic.[21]

For *Enūma Eliš* to support that the theory of Classical *Chaoskampf* is the only *Chaoskampf* it would need to follow a formula, because for there to be only one version of something, there has to be only one way to do it. And if *Enūma Eliš* is not following set literary rules it means there are no such rules for *Chaoskampfic* texts. As already shown *Enūma Eliš* was influenced by various other myths and traditions, and the evidence does not support the idea that because *Enūma Eliš* has creation in it, so too must all other *Chaoskampfic* texts. With such a mixture of other texts and ideas, you cannot isolate two actions, conflict and creation, and then say that the two are interlinked, and one always follows the other. The composer was adapting, referencing, or borrowing from other texts, whether consciously or not, that suited their purpose, and in such situations there is meaningful choice behind what is contained in the myth. When a myth has been crafted in such a way it is a lot harder to isolate the different ideas in it, because the themes may be multi-faceted and clear connections between the themes are difficult to establish.

Yet, there is some connection between conflict and creation, i.e. the splitting of Tiamat's body by Marduk to make land. For without the conflict there would be no body, and without the body creation would not happen. However, as shown above, elements of creating from a

---

[19] 'Gilgamesh and Huwawa' lines 34–47 on http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/section1/tr1815.htm accessed 10th July 2014.

[20] Andrea Seri, "The Fifty Names of Marduk in 'Enūma Eliš'" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126.4 (2006). p 515.

[21] W.G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 1999). p 59.

deceased god's corpse happens in texts without *Chaoskampfic* elements. For example, Wê-ila is killed and his blood is used, without any physical conflict.[22] This is why always linking the two, conflict and creation, is erroneous, because there are examples where creation does not follow on from conflict, see the discussion on the Baal cycle in Chapter Three for an example of *Chaoskampfic* conflict without creation. There are also examples of creation without conflict, for example Psalm 95, where God creates earth, yet there is no hint of any conflict. So to assume you need both conflict and creation together means that when creation does not follow after a *Chaoskampfic* conflict the validity of the text's *Chaoskampfic* credentials are immediately questioned and denied. This questioning reduces the usefulness of *Chaoskampf* theory as a tool for textual study; I however, argue that instead of replacing *Chaoskampf* theory, we should instead change its definition to include a lack of creation and/or conflict so that it can still be an effective way of interpreting and understanding ANE passages.

Another reason for the steadfast link between creation and *Chaoskampf* in scholarship is the Biblical text Genesis. Genesis is perhaps the most famous of the HB/OT texts which has resulted in a cornucopia of scholarship, some of it more valuable than the rest. It is also the most compared text through an ANE lens, due to both *Chaoskampf* and Deluge myths.

With the growing acceptance of Darwin's Theory of Evolution, and the questions of faith it brought along, a modern obsession with creation began.[23] When Genesis was being composed, and right up until the 18th century CE, the Genesis creation accounts were not deemed fact nor important; creation was not debated to the same extent that it is now.[24] This means that creation may not have been a focal point of Genesis 1. If creation then was not

---

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] Peter J. Bowler, *Evolution: The History of an Idea* (University of California Press, London; 1989). pp.4–5.

[24] Christian theologians, Origen in *On First Principles*, Augustine of Hippo *Confessions*, Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologica* and John Wesley in *Wesley's Notes on the Bible*, were all published before Darwin's *Origins of the Species* and all suggest a non-literal interpretation of the Genesis 1 and 2 creation accounts,

vital to the myth, then creation lacking from *Chaoskampfic* texts does not mean anything significant. It is part of the modern furore surrounding Genesis that creation has become so central for works on *Chaoskampf*. We read what we find culturally important into the texts, when that importance could not have originally been there. A clear way to see the importance of creation myths to the original composers is to look at how they presented it.[25] When dealing with creation in Genesis it is easy to forget in HB/OT scholarship that Genesis is about so much more than just creation acts. Out of the fifty chapters that make up Genesis, the two versions of creation amount to only one and a half chapters. Genesis is an account of history before the covenant; it deals with God's actions up to the death of Joseph in Egypt, with Exodus taking over introducing Moses, the covenant, and setting up the rest of the HB/OT. While in *Enūma Eliš* there is not only creation, but conflict, and generations of gods, and ends with the coronation and adulation of Marduk.

The religious audience now approaches creation from a different viewpoint entirely. There are some for whom the text is used and read literally, with great importance placed on what is said and seen as factually truth. The text is now used in arguments about the debate into the existence of god, because of the debate into Genesis/Evolution. This has meant that non-academics have hijacked HB/OT scholarship, so that the focus is on the creational acts, not the allegories, the other myths, and other literary devices within, which make the text about so much more than creation.[26]

---

[25] One other way to see the significance that was originally given to creation is the word used. The verbs, such as *epêšu* 'to make', are generic verbs for building and making items. They are not special words to designate divine actions, they are common actions. Creation not having the special divine action verb means that creation was not been viewed as something that should be set apart. See Jean Bottéro, *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia* trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 2004). p 83.

[26] Compare the modern Creationist, who believes Genesis to be literal truth to the work of Moses Maimonides. Maimonides argued for creation, not because the Bible is true fact but through philosophy and logic, he ultimately ended his discussion for creation as God needs to be the creator because if he had not created the

That there are two differing creation accounts, one after the other, in Genesis shows the fluidity with which creation was viewed during the time of composition and up until canonisation. It also hints at the possibility of other YHWH cult creation stories which did not survive the canonisation process.[27] This is further hinted at throughout the HB/OT where there are references to creation myths that do not correspond with the Genesis accounts. Two such examples are discussed below in Chapter Two, though there are others, such as Psalm 19, which are not considered or explored within this study.

Genesis 1 clearly has ANE ideas and cosmology within. Genesis 1: 6–8 talks of a dome that separates the waters above from the waters below. This understanding of the world is predominant throughout the ANE.[28]

ויאמר אלהים יהי רקיע בתוך המים ויהי מבדיל בין מים למים:

ויעש אלהים את־הרקיע ויבדל בין המים אשר מתחת לרקיע ובין

המים אשר מעל לרקיע ויהי־כן: ויקרא אלהים לרקיע שמים ויהי־

ערב ויהי־בקר יום שני:

And God said let 'there be a firmament in the midst of the

waters, and let it separate the waters.' And God made the

world then he would not have free will, *Guide For the Perplexed* 2.25. The book of Genesis is not important to his discussion, the *Guide* as a whole is against reading the Hebrew Bible literally.

[27] There is no fixed date on the canonisation of the Hebrew Bible, nor is there any evidence of council like that of Nicaea that Christians indulged in in regards to the New Testament. Canonisation happens through a gradual process where what is popular gains authority, and what has authority becomes popular. The popular authoritative texts are then monitored and sometimes censored by those in power. Often different subsects have their own canon, which are then destroyed if they are defeated. It is important for the mainline version of a religion to tightly control canon, as it is a primary tool in educating people about theology and beliefs. Martin Luther, is an excellent example of this, his approved canon, was different from the Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. He moved the letters of Hebrews and James to the end of his Bible as he viewed them as not as inspired as the other letters. Canon is something that has to regulated because of how powerful a tool it is in controlling a religion and the religious; this is a vital point to remember when reading surviving HB/OT texts, because it means that during canonisation the text was important and meant something positive to both enough people, and to those in power, that the text survived an became canon.

[28] Wayne Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (Esienbrauns,Winona Lake: 1998). p 264.

firmament and separated the waters below the firmament

from the waters above the firmament, and it was. And God

called the firmament heaven, and there was evening and

there was morning, this was the second day.

God divided up water, into the water above the firmament and the waters below. The waters

above are the blue watery sky we see, and the waters below is the water we have here on earth.

This is a clear ANE idea and does show that the HB/OT is not from a cultural vacuum, which

is important for both HB/OT scholars and Assyriologists to remember.

Meanwhile, much has been written and discussed as to the meaning of the Hebrew בראית

beresit, whether creation was *ex nihilo* or not, and the meaning of תהו ובהו *tohu wavohu*.

These discussions question whether Genesis is a *Chaoskampfic* text, the issues of *beresit* and

should it be translated as 'in the beginning' or 'in beginning times', the former would mean

there is no time for a *Chaoskampfic conflict.* If creation was *ex nihilo* then there is again no

place for conflict in Genesis. Meanwhile, *tohu wavohu* could be translated as chaos or it could

be a reference to and Hebrewisation of Tiamat's name.[29] It is both beyond this essay and

unnecessary to rehash the old arguments on these concepts, the general scholarly consensus is

that Genesis is not a *Chaoskampfic* text.[30]

While there may not be *Chaoskampfic* elements in the Genesis accounts of creation there is

certainly *Chaoskampf* in other parts of the HB/OT. With the first Genesis account of creation

---

[29] There are vast amounts written on this, both specialist and more generalised. A simple Genesis commentary is a good introduction to these issues.
[30] Wilfred. G. Lambert, 'Creation in the Bible and the Ancient Near East' in *Creation and Chaos A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis* ed. JoAnn Scurlock, and Richard H. Beal (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2013). pp. 44–47.

not containing *Chaoskampfic* themes, some have used that to suggest that *Chaoskampf* is not real.[31] This is a mistake, for *Chaoskampfic* elements can be found in Job, and the Psalms.

Throughout this study I use the term creationist *Chaoskampf* to easily identify when a text contains creational themes. I am advocating a move away from the understanding that *Chaoskampf* is solely about creation, though I do stress that I am not suggesting that creation is not a theme found within *Chaoskampfic* texts. This is explored in the second chapter of this study.

By moving away from a purely creationist and classical view on *Chaoskampf* the question then becomes, if the major theme of a *Chaoskampfic* text is not only creation then what are the other options? The answer to this is kingship, which will be fully explored in Chapter Three. For *Chaoskampfic* texts which refer to kingship I use the term Kingship *Chaoskampf*.

Now that I have discussed the terms I use throughout this study, I will now discuss what I see as a major flaw in *Chaoskampf* and that is the dragonification of the opponent in the conflict scenes.

A major point of discussion in *Chaoskampf* study is the species of the chaos monster. There has been a move towards a rigid belief that the monster must be a dragon. This can be clearly seen in the Baal Cycle, with the antagonist of the Baal/Yam conflict, Yam. The sea god has been identified as the dragon Tunnan,[32] however, for Brendon Benz questions as to the validity of this identification turn into questions of whether the Baal/Yam conflict is *Chaoskampfic*. Benz dismantles the linking of Tunnan as Yam and then goes on to ask, if Yam is not a dragon, does this mean that the Baal/Yam conflict could instead be about

---

[31] Aicha Rahmouni, *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts* trans. J. N. Ford (Brill, Leiden: 2008). p 328.
[32] Rahmouni, *Divine Epithets* p 310.

kingship?[33] The Baal Cycle in its entirety is about Baal's kingship; the unmistakeable themes of kingship in the Baal/Yam conflict are discussed in Chapter Three.

Benz does clearly illustrate that creation and dragons have become entrenched in *Chaoskampf* scholarship. He does not consider the idea of the chaos opponent being anything but a dragon, so the text cannot be *Chaoskampfic* as Yam is not a dragon.

Tiamat too has undergone dragonification, In the *Enūma Eliš* she is not described. She is the primordial sea, salty water. We only get a sense of her having a physical body at the time of the fight with Marduk, where her corpse is used in creation acts. Had she not been used in this fashion then an argument could be made that she was only ever sea, for nowhere else is a physical body hinted at. Tiamat's body is exclusively only talked about in relation to her fight with Marduk. While at one point there is reference to Tiamat's tail[34] that is not enough to say she was a dragon, as there are more non-dragon creatures with tails than there are dragons.

Despite the lack of any real form of description Tiamat is still understood to be depicted in dragon form. Maureen Kaplan is one scholar involved in the search for Tiamat and believes to have found her in a cylinder seal, BM 89812, Kaplan has found a depiction of a battle with a non-human participant. Because Tiamat is engraved in the imaginations of modern scholarship as being a dragon, Kaplan can state this battle scene is from *Enūma Eliš*.[35] This is a major problem because there is no evidence to support Kaplan or disprove her, we do not know what Tiamat looked like, or how she was depicted. We need to move away from defining Tiamat as a dragon; we need to return to cautiousness and admit that we just do not know.

---

[33] Brendon C. Benz, 'Yamm as the Personification of Chaos?' in *Creation and Chaos A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis* ed. JoAnn Scurlock, and Richard H. Beal (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2013). p 138.
[34] *Enūma Eliš* V: 59.
[35] Maureen F. Kaplan, "Another Slaying of Tiamat" in *Israel Exploration Journal* 26.4 (1976). pp. 174–177.

Chapter Two

Violence in Creation

Enūma Eliš fits the classic *Chaoskampf* definition, and is the perfect place to begin this study. As mentioned in Chapter One *Enūma Eliš* has its origins in various other myths, with the Marduk/Tiamat conflict being copied directly from the Ninurta/Anzu conflict.

The Anzu myth contains the very essence of the core of Classical *Chaoskampf*. It tells of how the hideous Anzu bird, a monster born from the sea, steals the Tablets of Destiny, only to be defeated by Ninurta. It is the defeat of Anzu that gains Ninurta his position among the gods. Through defeating a chaos monster power and position is gained, and this is what is found in every other *Chaoskampfic* text.

The Marduk/Tiamat conflict follows in the same vein. In *Enūma Eliš* the gods are birthed through the mingling of Apsû and Tiamat, the sweet and salty waters. Through a series of minor conflicts and disagreements, Apsû dies. Tiamat, annoyed and angry with her children births demons and attacks, intending to destroy all her progeny. After defeating Tiamat, where no one else could, Marduk is exalted and power and position is gained. The actual conflict scene takes place IV 93–104.

> *in-nen-du-ma ti-amat apkal ilāni*^{meš d}*marūtuk*
>
> *šá-áš-meš it-lu-pu qit-ru-bu ta-ḫa-zi-iš*
>
> *uš-pa-ri-ir-ma be-lum sa-pa-ra-šú ú-šal-me-ši*
>
> *im-ḫul-la ṣa-bit ar-ka-ti pa-nu-uš-šá um-taš-šìr*
>
> *ip-te-ma pi-i-šá ti-amat a-na la-'-a-ti-šá*
>
> *im-ḫul-la uš-te-ri-ba a-na la ka-tam šap-ti-šá*

ez-zu-tum šārī^{meš} *kar-ša-ša i-za-nu-ma*

in-né-sil lìb-ba-šá-ma pa-a-ša uš-pal-ki

is-suk mul-mul-la iḫ-te-pi ka-ras-sa

qir-bi-šá ú-bat-ti-qa ú-šal-liṭ lìb-ba

ik-mi-ši-ma nap-šá-tuš ú-bal-li

šá-lam-taš id-da-a elī-šá iz-zi-za

Tiamat and Marduk, the sage of the gods, gathered
together in battle, [Tiamat] with her many gods and
armour, the he spread his net, he let loose a whirlwind in
her face, Tiamat opened her mouth to swallow the
whirlwind, she could not close her lips, [the wind] was
heavy on her innards, she opened her mouth wide.
[Marduk] sent an arrow at her belly, tearing open her
insides, and innards, he bound her, killing her, and he
stood on her corpse.

There is a big build up to the Marduk/Tiamat conflict scene. Tiamat is angry with all the gods,
her children, and is encouraged by her second husband Qingu to destroy them all. Fearing her,
no god is willing to go against her; Marduk is volunteered by his father. The battle itself is
short, as has been seen above. Using Tiamat's corpse Marduk creates the world, and with
Qingu's blood creates humanity.[36] He goes on to take his rightful place as king of the gods
and all the universe, and the myth ends with the adulation of Marduk.

---

[36] Scholarship is currently bereft of is a feminist critique of *Enūma Eliš* because creation comes about through a
very violent act against a woman.

Enūma Eliš is not a story about creation,[37] it is about Marduk, his kingship, and the justification for his position within Babylon and among the gods. Those using this text would be well aware of other creation myths.[38] This is an important fact to remember, because it means that for the Babylonians there was not an obsession with literal truth, and creation myths. So the act of creation has a purpose other than scientific truth. It is not here to serve as an explanation as to how the world was made, but how and why Marduk is the king of the gods. The creation elements are secondary, this myth is about kingship. This is more fully explored in Chapter Three.

Though the primary purpose of *Enūma Eliš* is to exalt Marduk, and to justify his position within the pantheon,[39] the setting of creation is not a coincidence. Creational acts are often linked to power; it is not a great logical leap that a god who can create is a powerful god. There is a certain level of respect aimed at creator gods, they often receive the first offerings during rituals. So to attribute an act of creation to Marduk, is to attribute power to him, and to place him in a position above and beyond other gods. By creating, Marduk is providing evidence as to why he should be revered by the people of Babylon. Creation is not the purpose here; this is not meant to be an informational piece about the origin of the world. It is instead a tool used to glorify Marduk. Creation in *Enūma Eliš* is a by-product, not the end product.

---

[37] The creational act in *Enūma Eliš* is not logical. If we follow the events of the story, Tiamat and Apsû create gods. And then the course of events play out, Apsû dies, various gods are born, Tiamat enters into a murderous rage, she is defeated by Marduk and her body is used to create land. This means that three generations of gods were born, and lived, and some died, all in water. For land is only created by Marduk towards the end of the epic. The only way to explain why the creation of land happens so late in the narrative is because Marduk had to do it and he had to do it at the culmination of his victory in battle.

[38] Creation myths such as Enmešarra's Defeat, The Slaying of Labbu, and The Theogony of Dunnu.

[39] This is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

Texts which do not have such strong themes of kingship come from the HB/OT. In this dissertation I will look at the Psalms, and the Book of Job, both of which contain creation *Chaoskampfic* texts.

There are various references in the Psalms to water and control of it. References are of the fear of flood water,[40] and God's control of it.[41] When examining *Chaoskampf* in the Psalms, it is important not to take every ימא sea, מבל flood, מים water, and עין spring, and tout it as being an indicator that the text is *Chaoskampfic*. Unfortunately very few scholars have done this, so there is a lot of work needlessly arguing over the *Chaoskampfic* properties of psalms which do not have any.

Rebecca Watson's *Chaos Uncreated* is a prime example of this. She dismantles the suggestion that Psalm 29 is *Chaoskampfic* presenting evidence that it is instead about God's power in relation to thunderstorms.[42] Watson's work is solid. Psalm 29 is obviously not *Chaoskampfic*; it is about the voice of God and its power over water. It is the use of storm-god imagery and the power God has over water that misleads. The '*Chaoskampf*' verses are 3 and 10

קול יהוה על המים אל הכבוד הרעים יהוה על־מים רבים:

[The] voice of the Lord is over the waters, the Lord, god

of glory, thunders over the great waters

יהוה למבול ישב וישב יהוה מלך לעולם:

The Lord, he sits on the flood as the Lord and king forever

---

[40] Psalm 69:15.
[41] Psalm 29:10.
[42] Watson, *Chaos Uncreated* pp. 49–51.

Flood waters are not associated with *Chaoskampfic* texts. This is a very important distinction to make, deluge myths are not *Chaoskampfic*.[43] Instead of themes of creation and kingship they contain themes of punishment. Water also has a different function within these narratives, for in Deluge myths instead of water being seen as a form of chaos it is presented as removing chaos. In the HB/OT God uses flood waters to completely remove and destroy the corrupt human race which he has deemed bad, expect for the one exception Noah, and his family.[44] In the *Atra-ḫasīs* Epic the flood is used to kill the noisy lesser gods.[45] It can be argued that the use of violent flood waters to destroy results in a return to the primeval state. The flood waters are used as a form of 'reset button' where there is the restoration to watery chaos, and from this comes a second creation, one without the world destroyed from the first attempt at creation.[46]

So, the mention of flood waters in this psalm gives it a context of the deluge myth, but not a *Chaoskampfic* one, which means that Watson is right to declare this psalm *Chaoskampf* free. However Watson then carries on and ultimately ends up going too far. By debunking the *Chaoskampf* in various psalms she uses this as evidence that there is no *Chaoskampf* in the HB/OT as a whole. The major problem with this, other than ignoring evidence such as Job,[47] is that Watson is trying to disprove *Chaoskampf* in the HB/OT not *Chaoskampf* in the wider ANE. Watson makes the grave mistake of viewing the HB/OT in an insular way, as what she

---

[43] See Irving Finkel, *The Ark Before Noah: Decoding the Story of the Flood* (Hodder and Stougton, London: 2014) for an amusing, and interesting detailed look into deluge mythology in the ANE.

[44] Genesis 6:9–9:17.

[45] Lambert and Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs*.

[46] Unfortunately this idea is beyond the remit of this study; further research into the second creational aspects of deluge myths is certainly needed. It is almost certain that there is a second creation element in the deluge myths. Taking the HB/OT for example, in Genesis 19:24, when God destroys Sodom and Gomorrah, he גפרית ואש המטיר… 'causes it to rain sulphur and fire'. This means that God has other ways of destroying; the difference between Genesis 6 and Genesis 19 is that God creates again in Genesis 6, while the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah are never rebuilt upon. So god destroys with water, intending to rebuild, and destroys with fire with no such intention, and as mentioned above, by destroying with water there is a return to primordial state that God built his first creation upon. This is definitely something that needs an in-depth study.

[47] See below for a critique on Watson's handling of Job.

is really trying to do is show that the HB/OT is special, that the only ties it has with the ANE are the historical ones found in the HB/OT history books. This implies that the HB/OT grew up in a vacuum, and that it cannot be compared to other ANE texts. This approach is problematic in many ways and it is sadly beyond this study to fully dismantle this way of thinking. But it should be clearly understood that this is the approach Watson has taken to her own study of *Chaoskampf* meaning that there is a weakness in her methodology because of it.

The Biblical scholarship into the Psalms shows how confused *Chaoskampf* studies can be and how misunderstood the concept of *Chaoskampf* is. As mentioned in Chapter One there exists a set list within the minds of some scholars to which a text must adhere to be class as *Chaoskampfic,* yet as Psalm 29 shows, mentions of God controlling water are classified *Chaoskampfic* despite not meeting the rest of the criteria, which results in a general sense of confusion. There are two extremes, the first, 'God is controlling water must be *Chaoskampf*' and the second 'must have God controlling water, must have a dragon, must have creation'. Both of these approaches are damaging to *Chaoskampfic* studies because neither truly looks at nor tries to understand the evidence. The first extreme means that '*Chaoskampfic'* texts are easily debunked, leaving room for scholars like Watson to debunk the entire theory. The second extreme means that there are very few or no texts that can possibly meet the stringent criteria, again leaving room for Watson and others to debunk the entire theory. With all this in mind this study is trying to by-pass this confusion, so as with Genesis it will skip a fair amount of work done on the Psalms.

Psalm 74 is the only psalm with a clear *Chaoskampf* reference with any substance. It is a lament at the 586 BCE destruction of the temple. It is a call to God asking why he has abandoned his people and allowed their enemies to destroy them. It can be divided into two parts, the first is the lament and listing of woes, vv.1–11, the second is looking for a return of

God's favour and a listing of his great deeds, vv.12–23. It is in this second listing part that there is a reference to *Chaoskampf* in verses 13–15.

אתה פוררת בעזך ים שברת ראשי תנינים על המים: אתה רצצת

ראשי לויתן תתננו מאכל לעם לציים: אתה בקעת מעין ונחל אתה

הובשת נהרות איתן:

> You broke the sea with your strength and crushed the
>
> dragon's head in the waters. You crushed Leviathan's
>
> head and gave him as meat for the people in the desert.
>
> You split the streams and wadis, you dried up the ever
>
> flowing river.

God defeats the sea, has power over water, and the larger context of the psalm is about creation. This is not a *Chaoskampfic* text but a reference to one. It is important to remember that references are all we have when it comes to *Chaoskampf* in the HB/OT.

The hymnist declares God as earth's salvation, mentioning God's defeat of Leviathan, his control over water, and his establishing of the sun and moon. Contextually this means that the second part of the psalm is about God's power tied with creation. The creation aspects of this psalm are not related to the creation accounts found in Genesis. Creation here is the drying up of rivers, the setting of the sun and moon, and the making of the seasons.[48] The acts of creation do not happen in the same order as Genesis 1, and here there are creation tasks not mentioned in Genesis. Compare:

     Genesis 1:3–2:3   Psalm 79:13–17

---

[48] Psalm 74:15–17.

Light and dark	Defeating Leviathan
Sky	Drying up springs and streams
Land and seas, vegetation	Sun and moon
Sun, moon, and stars	Summer and winter
Sea creatures and birds	
Land animals and people	
Rest	

While this is not a full account of creation the psalm's differences are clear to see and there is evidence of an unknown YHWH cult creation myth. This is also evidence that creation myths within the YHWH cult coexisted. This psalm would not have survived canonisation in this form, with this differing creation account, if there were not some acceptance of it by the elite, and those with religious power. This means that while we do not have a Classical or Creationist *Chaoskampfic* text in the HB/OT, which does not mean there was not one from the mythic background that the HB/OT grew out of.

This psalm is a lamentation, it is about the pain and fear the people felt at the destruction of the temple and their exile. This is not polemical in an outward sense, it is meant to be reassuring, a reminder to those in the YHWH cult that their god is powerful and entreating him to protect them once more. This explains the kingship bestowed upon God in this psalm. By reaffirming God's position of king, the exiled Israelites have hope. While they may not have an earthly king, they do have their godly king. It is inwardly polemical not aimed at

gaining respect or fear from others, nor is it proselytising, it is for group consumption, to keep it strong and together, and to act as healing in regards to the traumatic event the exile was.

God's power in creating the earth was not what made him king, nor did his kingship give him the ability to tame waters and create. Yet they are side by side in this psalm so there is a link between them. This is a crude attempt at associating *Chaoskampf* and kingship, they are sitting side by side, and the audience has to bring them together, but it is there, and it the motif is beginning to develop.

The point of this psalm is to mourn the loss of the temple, and the destruction and upheaval that came with it. There are many lamentations at this loss, found throughout the HB/OT,[49] since it was a devastating event in the psyche and memory of the YHWH cult.[50] Someone thought, and others agreed, that the best way for them to deal with what happened was by glorifying God and his past deeds;[51] so that they also worked in kingship as a form of comfort. It is a cry for help that renews hope. This is not using *Chaoskampf* as a show of power and polemics, it is meant for internal use, it is something meaningful to reflect upon, and draw comfort from.

The creational aspect of this psalm is not there to explain or tell the story of creation, but as a listing of what God has done. To paraphrase, this text is saying 'God, you did all those great things, so you can save us from these awful Babylonians.' So this is a creationist *Chaoskampfic* text because it talks about creation, however the point of it is not creation.

---

[49] Lamentation being the most famous example.

[50] The effect of the exile is all encompassing in the HB/OT from books such as Daniel and Esther, to the exile encouraging the writing down of the texts.

[51] Simply speaking there are only two major reactions the YHWH cult could have when the temple, God's home, was destroyed. They could have abandoned God because he was not in fact powerful. Or they could find a reason as to why their god abandoned them. Ps 74, and other laments within the HB/OT are clearly the second reaction, questioning why they were abandoned and asking for favour to be reinstated.

Psalm 74 is the only psalm that I feel is fully suitable to discuss in this work. I will now move on to the Book of Job.

The Book of Job was most likely written no earlier than the sixth century BCE, though it would have had an earlier oral composition. Set in pre-Mosaic times, evident in the names of God that are used[52] we know it was not written then as the prologue contains the post-Mosaic יהוה YHWH. [53] The Book of Job is a wisdom text that follows Job of Uz. It is a theodicy, so it tries to answer the question of where does evil come from; here the text specifically asks, why do good things happen to bad people? Intriguingly, God is not a likeable character, he is malicious and petty, the theological implications of this are far reaching and sadly beyond the point of this essay, though they are interesting enough to flag up.

It is important to note that Job is in some respects in a style similar to another ANE genre, in both Sumerian[54] and Babylonian[55] known as the Righteous Sufferer.[56] All also contain the *streitgespräch* device, where there is an argument over the cause of suffering[57].What is particularly interesting, for this essay, is that in the Sumerian and Babylonian versions there is no allusion to *Chaoskampf*; this is fully explored below.

Job is not the *Chaoskampf* story; it does not contain the actual battle scene, or the build up towards it. It does have references to a *Chaoskampfic* battle that are so explicit that there is little doubt that there was such a text, which could be referred to as Classic *Chaoskampf*, which existed with YHWH as the protagonist. It would make no sense for the composer to

---

[52] We also find Job mentioned alongside ancient great men, Ezekiel 14:14,20.
[53] Norman C. Habel, *The Book of Job: a Commentary* (Westminster Press, Dallas:1985). pp. 39–40
[54] S.N. Kramer, "Man and His God: a Sumerian Variation of the Job Motif" in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* ed. M. Noth, and D. W. Thomas (Brill, Leiden:1955). pp. 170–182.
[55] W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1960). pp. 33–62.
[56] Not to be confused with the Repentant Sinner.
[57] Lambert, *Wisdom* pp. 70–89.

make references to a completely unknown, or obscure myth, and even if they did years of editing would have taken their toll, removing them. This means that there had to be a known, and popular YHWH Classic *Chaoskampf* myth within the 'Jewish' imagination up to the second century CE, when the HB was canonised.

The first of the references in Job comes when Job is cursing the day of his birth. He is asking for darkness and chaos to engulf the earth. The whole of chapter three is Job calling for the destruction of his birthday but it is the eighth verse that interests us.

<div dir="rtl">

יקבהו אררי יום העתידים ערר לויתן:

</div>

> Let them curse on it [the day of Job's birth] the curse for
>
> those who rouse the Leviathan.

By invoking this image Job is effectively saying that the day of his birth was such a terrible day that it is equal to wanting to release the Leviathan. Job hates the day he was born so much because if that day did not exist neither would he and then he would not be having the troubles he is having. So he wants to curse it like you would curse those who rouse a chaos monster, because it was a day that brought great trouble and strife, like the Leviathan does.

This is deliberate hyperbole, on the part of the composer, to show how much distress Job was in. It has the added bonus of having a comedic effect, as you are laughing at Job and his dramatics. It is highly recommended that you read the entirety of Job 3 to fully understand just how ridiculous Job is being here.[58]

Between the last reference and this next one in chapter seven, there has been a lot of discussion between Job and his friends. At this point in the narrative, Job's friends are trying

---

[58] For those who cannot read Hebrew I recommend the NRSV version of the HB/OT.

to make it clear to him that he must have done something to deserve his current misfortunes. Job, however, does not agree with them; he can find no reason for why he has such problems, and he responds defensively. Job compares himself to the sea and dragon, asking if he too should be muzzled. Job 7: 11–12 sums this up the best:

גם אני לא אחשך פי אדברה בצר רוחי אשיחה במר נפשי: הים אני

אם תנין כי תשים עלי משמר:

So, I will not withhold my mouth, I will speak in the

anguish of my spirit; I will cry out against the bitterness

from my soul. Am I the sea? A dragon, that you put a

muzzle on me?

Here we find out that, after being defeated, Leviathan was then caged and put under God's control, and this is reaffirmed later by God in 38:8–11. Leviathan was muzzled, and chained, he was unable to speak or cause chaos. By comparing himself to the dragon Job is expressing his feelings of being unable to speak. Job is also admitting to understanding that he is causing chaos, he is challenging the accepted wisdom that bad things only happen to bad people. The comparison here is apt, for if Job is right and is allowed to speak out, then this means that people will learn of a man punished for no reason. This would be an earthshattering revelation, as it goes against the accepted wisdom, and understood world order. So Job does have to be muzzled as if he were the Leviathan. It does not matter that we as the audience know Job's claims to be true, for by the end Job submits to God's authority and Job's wealth, health, and children are restored to him. The point of Job is that if you stay true to God until the very end you will be rewarded. But had he been allowed to speak, to rage against God, Job, would not have accepted that he could have been in the wrong, so would not have been rewarded at the

end. Though Job was right, he had done nothing wrong, his speaking out, truth though it may be, would have caused chaos.

Once again simple logic tells us that this comparison makes no sense if you are unaware of who Leviathan is. The composer has a message, and some wisdom, that they wish to impart and nonsensical comparisons to obscure or unknown figures would not make for effective communication.

This reference, 9:7–14, is in regards to God, his deeds, and power.

האמר לחרס ולא יזרח ובעד כוכבים יחתם: נטה שמים לבדו ודורך

על במתי ים: עשה עש כסיל וכימה וחדרי תמן: עשה גדלות עד אין

חקר ונפלאות עד אין מספר: הן יעבר עלי ולא אראה ויחלף ולא

אבין לו: הן יחתף מי ישיבנו מי יאמר אליו מה תעשה: אלוה לא

ישיב אפו שחחו עזרי רהב: אף כי אנכי אעננו אבחרה דברי מו:

Who commands to the sun and it does not rise, who seals up the stars. Who spreads heaven and walks on the back of the sea. Who makes Aish, Kesil, and Kimah, and the chambers of the south. Who does great things beyond knowing, awesome things without number. Behold he goes past me and I do not see, he passes on and I do not know. Behold he takes away, who can stop him? Who will say to him 'what have you done?' God does not turn back his anger, the helpers of Rahab are bowed under him. How shall I choose my words against him?

Job is listing why God is so much greater than and far beyond mortals. One of these great deeds is God trampling over the back of the sea.[59] Standing on the back of someone was regarded as a way of humiliating your defeated foe.[60] God doing this to the sea, it clearly indicates a battle and God's victory. The passage continues on to mention some of God's less redeemable features. This includes his anger problems; Job says that God will always be angry with Rahab's helpers, who were also humiliated when defeated.[61] We have moved away from humorous exaggerations, and thought-provoking comparisons; we are now dealing with an explicit reference, God won against the sea in battle, and from parallelism found elsewhere within Job, we know that the sea means Leviathan.

Though much later in the text, 26:11–14 is very much in the same vein as 9:7–14.

עמודי שמים ירופפו ויתמהו מגערתו:בכחו רגע הים מחץ רהב:

ברוחו שמים שפרה חללה ידו נחש בריח: הן אלה קצות ומה שמץ

דבר נשמע בו ורעם מי יתבונן:

The pillars of heaven shake, and are stunned from his

rebuke. By his power he stirred up the sea, and in his

understanding and intelligence he shattered Rahab. By his

spirit heaven is clear, his power has defiled the evil

serpent. Behold the entirety of his way, and listen to what

word he whispers for who can understand the power of his

thunder?

---

[59] Job 9:8.
[60] Habel, *Job* p 191.
[61] Job 9:13.

Through his strength, power, and intelligence God defeated Rahab, God is being depicted as being far beyond Rahab. This idea is also found later on in Job, but here it is serious, it uses grand imagery that intends to show how powerful, and awe-inspiring God is, and which is meant to leave a mark on the audience.

Here in 38: 8–11 we have God directly speaking to Job and reminding the man of his own past deeds and his power.

יסך בדלתים ים בגיחו מרחם יצא: בשומי ענן לבשו וערפל חתלתו:

ואשבר עליו חקי ואשים בריח ודלתים: ואמר עד פה תבוא ולא

תסיף ופא ישית בגאון גליך:

And who fenced in the sea with doors, as he burst from the

womb? And I put clouds as clothes on him, the stormy

clouds as baby clothes; and broke it into pieces, according

to the limits of the bars of the gates and doors? And said

'you shall not go beyond the boundaries I have put for

your proud waves'.

God is repeating to Job the deeds which Job recounted to God in 9:7–14. But, this time it is from God's point of view, which moves away from seriousness, and towards humour. God describes his containment of the sea as if it were looking after a new-born baby. He is able to stop and bar the sea with as much effort as it takes to swaddle the child and put it to bed. As far as God is concerned the act of controlling the sea was a simple one while for Job it is almost beyond comprehension. God's blasé attitude is being used as a polemical device to

highlight the gap between humanity and divinity, and between what is possible for humans,

and for God himself.

The final reference, 40:25–41:26,[62] is a long passage where God is describing Leviathan.

הן תחלתו נכזבה הגם אל מראו יטל: לא אכזר כי יעורנו ומי הוא

לפני יתיצב: מי הקדימני ואשלם תחת כל השמים לי הוא: בדיו

ודבר גבורות וחין ערכו: מי גלה פני לבושו בכפל רסנו מי יבוא:

דלתי פניו מי פתח סביבות שניו אימה: גאוה אפיקי מגנים סגור

חותם צר: אחד באחד יגשו ורוח לא יבוא ביניהם: איש באחיהו

ידבקו יתלכדו ולא יתפרדו: עטישתיו תהל אור ועיניו כעפעפי

שחר: מפיו לפידים יהלכו כידודי אש יתמלטו: מנחיריו יצא עשן

כדוד נפוח ואגמן: נפשו גחלים תלהט ולהב מפיו יצא: בצוארו ילין

עז ולפניו תדוץ דאבה: מפלי בשרו דבקו יצוק עליו בל ימוט: לבו

יצוק כמו אבן ויצוק כפלח תחתית: משתו יגורו אלים משברים

יתחטאו: משיגהו חרב בלי תקום חנית מסע ושריה: יחשב לתבן

ברזל לעץ רקבון נחושה: לא יבריחנו בן קשת לקש נהפכו לו אבני

קלע: כקש נחשבו תותח וישחק לרעש כידון: תחתיו חדודי חרש

ירפד חרוץ עלי טיט: ירתיח כסיר מצולה ים ישים כמרקחה: אחריו

יאיר נתיב יחשב תהום לשיבה: אין על עפר משלו העשו לבלי

חת: את כל גבה יראה הוא מלך על כל בני שחץ:

Can you seize Leviathan with a hook? Or rope his tongue to

settle him? Who can put a cord in his nose and with a thorn

---

[62] Job 41 in English bibles.

pierce his jaw? Will he make great entreaty of you? Speak tenderly to you? Pledge with you and will you take him as a servant forever? Will you play with him like a bird? Bind him to your young girls? Will they trade him? Divide him among the merchants? Can you fill his hide with barbs? His head with fish spears? Lay your hand upon him, remember the war, let him not do it again. Behold, his hope is a liar, thrown away at the sight of him. The fierce cannot rouse themselves against him. Who are they to stand against him? Who can come before him in peace, in all of heaven who? I will not be silent about his limbs, and his beautiful body. Who can uncover his clothed face? Who can come among his double jaw? Who can open the door of his face? There is terror around his teeth. His shield is a tight row of pride. One over another, wind cannot get between them. They are brothers clinging together, they cannot be divided. He sneezes lightening and his eyes are like the dawn. From his mouth comes flames, sparks of fire escape. From his nostrils comes smoke, like that blown from a kettle. His soul is burning coals and from his mouth comes flame. In his neck stays strength, and from his face springs dismay. His folds of flesh cling upon him and hardly move. His heart is hard as stone, as hard as the millstone. When he raises up to sojourn the mighty repentant. A sword reaches him without success, spear, dart, and javelin too for iron is like straw and bronze like rotten wood. He

does not flee from the arrows of hunters, sling-stones are as

chaff to him. Darts are chaff to him and he mocks the idea of

them being weapons. Underneath him is spread sharp shard of

clay in the dirt. He boils like a pot the deep, the sea is used like

seasoning. His path behind him he makes shine, so one would

think the sea is white-haired. Nothing on dry land produces fear

like he does. All the mighty see him as king over all the children

of pride.

In the wider context it is part of a speech made by God to Job reminding him why God is a

god, and all that implies, such as Job having to trust him. This passage about the Leviathan

follows a passage about Behemoth. God is explaining his victories over these two terrifying

creatures. Leviathan is described as fire breathing[63], impervious to weapons[64], and a fearsome

beast.[65] By describing him thus, his defeat by God infers a greater level of might upon God,

while also increasing how impressive the action is.

The Book of Job's references to Leviathan, sea, and God defeating them would not make

sense without some form of *Chaoskampf* myth. Using references to a legend that was already

in the literary repertoire of the intended audience, enables the composer to call upon the

authority of the already existing text, and thus add credence to their own text and theories.

This approach of borrowing authority is not unique to the HB/OT, it is so common that we

can see another example of it within Job itself. As mentioned earlier, Job has been given a

Pre-Mosaic setting.

---

[63] Job 41:11–13.
[64] Job 41:18–21.
[65] Job 41:2, 6.

It is also important to bear in mind that the Job passages with the *Chaoskampfic* references become nonsensical without a recognised *Chaoskampf* myth, and a nonsensical Job would not have survived. The reason, however, for the loss of this referenced text is unclear. It is reasonable to assume that if there were an active purge of the myth then all associated references, such as those in Job and the Psalms, would have been removed. Therefore this loss is most likely due to accidental circumstances over theological reasons.

The question of whether this lost text could be described as a YHWH Classical *Chaoskampf* text should also be raised. Without the text itself we can never be certain, though from what can be reconstructed it is safe to assume a creational setting due to Job 38: 4–8.

איפה היית ביסדי ארץ הגד אם ידעת ביה: מי שם ממדיה כי תדע

או מי נטה עליה קו: על מה לדניה הטבעו לו מי ירה לבן פנתה:

ברן יחד כוכבי בקר ויריעו כל בני אלהים: ויסך בדלתים ים בגיחו

מרחם יצא

Where were you when I laid down the foundation of the

earth? Tell me if you know who measured and set the lines?

On what the foundations were fastened to or who laid the

corner stone? [Were you there] when the sons of god and

the morning stars sang together? And [do you know] who

fenced in the sea with doors, as he burst from the womb?

There is a clear follow on to God's acts, which is meant to be one cohesive narrative; he made the earth and then defeated Leviathan with the rest of creation to be finished afterwards, as

only the angels and stars are witnesses. We can establish a temporal setting and thus declare the text to be a Classical *Chaoskampf* myth. While it is not possible to date the YWHW cult and its brand of monotheism, it is almost certain that the YHWH Classical *Chaoskampf* myth would not predate it, and any elements that did would be swiftly edited to fit into theological ideology.

Criticism has been raised about the *Chaoskampfic* references in Job. Watson claims that 38:8–11 cannot possibly be defined as *Chaoskampf*, as God is not describing a battle but caring for an infant.[66] However, Watson is missing the vital point that this passage is humorous.[67] Other references in the passage, such as 9:8, are dealing with a battle between God and the dragon; 38:8–11 is a comedic retelling of the battle using the imagery of childcare to highlight how powerful God was. We find further examples of this approach within the HB/OT in Psalm 33:7.

כנס כנד מי הים נתך באצרות תהומות

'He gathered up in a heap[68] the waters of the sea and

placed them in the depths of the storehouse'.

God's actions are again being compared to a mundane task, in this instance his control and containment of the sea is treated as general cleaning, and organisation, this description is easily comparable to paperwork in an office being sorted. As mentioned above, God's

---

[66] Watson *Chaos Uncreated* p 274.
[67] Humour is present throughout Job, a clear example of this is the Janus parallelism found within it. For a complete study into Janus parallelism in the book of Job see Scott B. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (Bloomsbury, London: 1996).
[68] Some translations such as the NIV translate כנד into 'jars', which while a questionable translation does add to the humour of the imagery. The idea of the sea put away neatly in jam jars, hidden away at the back of a shed, is definitely an amusing one, but not the imagery the composers would have had in mind themselves. Though even without the jam jars the absurdity of being able to gather the sea into one place and keep it locked away in a storehouse remains.

perception of his own miraculous deeds deemphasises the power behind them. So that what we believe to be a mighty task God treats as an everyday one. This forms a gulf between God and people, reinforcing the idea that God should be feared[69] because he has invincible power.

Job is undoubtable proof that there was a *Chaoskampf* myth associated with YHWH and that the references found elsewhere in the HB/OT are not purely copied from other ANE sources. As discussed in the first chapter too much scholarship is obsessed with unproductive arguments over whether certain texts are *Chaoskampfic*, Classical *Chaoskampf* in particular.

Theodicy within the HB/OT is a complex issue; God is described in Exodus 34:6–7:

<div dir="rtl">

יהוה יהוה אל רחום וחנון ארך ורב חסד ואמת: נצר חסד לאלפים

נשא עון ופשע וחטאה ונקה לא 'נקה פקר עון און אבות על בנים

ועל בני בנום על שלשים ועל רבעים

</div>

> The Lord passed by and called out 'Lord, Lord God, who
>
> is merciful, and gracious, slow to anger and abundant in
>
> loyalty and truth. He has kept the covenant loyally for
>
> thousands and forgives transgressions and sins, he does
>
> not clear the guilty, punishing the children of the fathers,
>
> and their children to the third and fourth generations.

Here God is described as both forgiving and harsh in his punishments, with the children up to the fourth generation suffering because of their ancestors' actions. This here is a simple attempt at answering the question of the righteous sufferer: a person is being punished by God because of some unknown action by some unknown predecessor. These statements of

---

[69] This is a particularly common idea within Deuteronomy, where fear of God means to obey him, and his laws.

behaviour seem to contradict each other, God punishes your children for your actions yet is merciful and kind. Surely a merciful god would only punish the perpetrator of the sins?

It should also be noted that the events that take place in the Torah do so in chronological order. In Genesis the world begins and then becomes evil. There are the two accounts of creation and then the incident with Adam, Eve, and the fruit, a simple etiological narrative explaining 'evil', in this case death and pain. From this we can see a clear link between theodicy and creation.

Questions of theodicy have to involve creation, for you are asking where evil has come from, and why. In both Job's context and the Babylonian Righteous Sufferer's the question is not so much, 'why does evil exist' but 'why are evil things happening to me, a good person?' But to understand why evil is happening to you, you first need to understand evil and its origins. Creation, the birth of the world, people, and evil all become important through these questions. So, in order to appeal to your audience, and assuage their fears and worries, relying on popular texts and traditions would make sense.

There is only one reasonable explanation as to why the Babylonian Righteous Sufferer, whom I shall call Bob, does not contain allusions to any *Chaoskampfic* texts. We have established that creation is an important theme for this text, so the absence of *Chaoskampf* is telling. The most reasonable explanation for this is that there was no Creationist *Chaoskampf* text which the author felt was suitable to use. It is well known that there was no compunction about using and referencing other works in antiquity. It is also known that using a popular work to gain attention for your own is good sense, and common practice, so the lack of a *Chaoskampfic* text cannot be due to a reluctance to re-use a text out of respect for the original integrity of it; it has to be because it would not add anything of value for the composer.

With Bob not using a *Chaoskampfic* text in this way, as Job does, suggests that for Bob's author a *Chaoskampfic* creation tradition was not important. This further highlights why creation should not be considered the *raison d'etre* of *Chaoskampfic* texts.

As an aside, it is interesting to note that both Bob and Job use humour in their approaches to theodicy, in the case of Bob it is black comedy with sarcastic elements[70] while, as shown above, Job uses exaggeration and gross understatement to comedic effect. It is pure speculation as to whether this is a reflection upon the ANE sense of humour; or whether it is deliberate by the composer either to A. cheer up the audience due to the depressing material, or B. to trivialise theodicy due to a dislike of the concept, e.g. Job as a caricature of the 'typical' theodicean thinker to attack them and their questioning of the established understanding of the world.

But why is there a prevalence of creationist *Chaoskampf* in the HB/OT? This is simple, 'God' is a mixture of other gods and traditions. We know that the people known as Israel worshipped a god named El, because of the etymology of the word Israel,[71] with YHWH coming later.[72] This is also evident in the lack of polemics against El,[73] compared to other Canaanite gods such as Baal,[74] and Molek.[75] It was very important for the HB/OT to discourage worship of other gods for their brand of monotheism to work, so the lack of attacks on El is very telling. It reveals that the adherents of the YHWH cult were aware of their shared heritage of El worship, this does not clash with early YHWHistic theology, for

---

[70] Lines 23–24 *ku-up-pu ib-ri lìb-ba-ka šá la i-qát-tu-ú na-qab-[šú] ku-mur-re-e gi-piš tam-tim šá la i-šu-ú mi-ṭi-[ta]* 'my friend, your mind is a river, a spring which does not fail, an expanse like the sea that does not diminish' considering that the speaker is talking to his friend, with whom he will ultimately disagree, it is not hard to read a sarcastic tone here.

[71] Mark Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel.* (Harper San Francisco, USA: 1990). p 7.

[72] G. W. Ahlström, "Where Did The Israelites Live?" in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41.2 (1982). p 134.

[73] Smith, *Early History of God* p 8.

[74] See 2 Kings 10:27 where a temple of Baal is destroyed and then used as a toilet.

[75] Molek is the god children are sacrificed to according the HB/OT, Jeremiah 32:35.

while they had to worship one god they did not have to believe that he was the only god. For God to choose the Israelites over all other people, he needs to have some form of relationship with them, and if that involves others worshiping him in the same way, shape or form, then that is fine; they, those of the YHWH cult, still remain the chosen ones.

So, the god of the HB/OT was once known as El, and merged with YHWH, picking up other gods' attributes as well, and is today collectively known as the singular God. It is most likely that the El of the Ugaritic tradition, and the El of the HB/OT tradition were descended from an older Canaanite El. Which El was closer to the original Canaanite El remains unknown.

We also know that one of the gods that God gained the attributes of is the Ugaritic Baal, for example Baal is known as *rkb ʿrpt* 'rider of the clouds'[76] with God also being called 'rider of the clouds', רכב בערבת.[77]

With God being the end-result of the process described above there are going to be various myths and roles intertwined. Baal is not the creator god in Ugarit; El is, so a myth with Baal as the protagonist would not be about creation. However, God as both Baal and El can have, and does have, various myths about creation associated with him. As God replaced Baal in a Baal myth he would bring along those extra attributes and other myths that Baal did not have and they would be added in. So, you end up with God starring in a Baal myth with added extras.

So, simply put, the reason the Hebrew Bible has *Chaoskampfic* creation in it is because God is a hybrid who does a little bit of everything. This is similar to the reason why *Enūma Eliš* contains a myth of creation, namely to further aggrandise the god Marduk. It is undeniable

---

[76] KTU 1.5:II:7.
[77] Psalm 68:5, 68:4 in English translations.

that creation makes for an impressive action to accredit to a god, making him appear more powerful with a higher status than a non-creating god.

We have seen throughout the Creational *Chaoskampfic* texts that creational acts are secondary. The purpose of Job is not to explain how the world was created, nor is it the purpose of *Enūma Eliš*. Creation is a show of power, as is a *Chaoskampfic* storyline. *Chaoskampf* does not rely on creation for a show of power, as each phenomenon in a different way works to show and highlight great power and sheer control. So, creation is not a necessary part of *Chaoskampf* and we should be open to changing Gunkel's original definition of the motif.

Chapter Three

 Kingship

This chapter is about kingship and begins with evidence from two Mari letters, moving on

from there to the Baal Cycle, and then reconnecting with *Enūma Eliš*. The chapter will end

asking why there is a lack of Kingship *Chaoskampfic* texts in the HB/OT. There are only a

few relevant Mari texts and resources available and so any theory put forward inevitably rests

on slender evidence. Some of the texts are however rich in content and much can be inferred

from the first to be discussed, Mari A.1968:

> *a-na be-lí-ia qí-bí-ma*
>
> *um-ma nu-úr-*ᵈ*su'en* ÌR-*ka-a-ma*
>
> ᴵ*a-bi-ia a-pí-lum ša* ᵈIM *be-el ḫa-la-a*[*b*ᵏⁱ]
>
> *il-li-kam-ma ki-a-am iq-bé-e-em*
>
> *um-ma-a-mi* ᵈIM-*ma ma-a-tam₄*(TUM) *ka-la-ša*
>
> *a-na ia-aḫ-du-li-im ad-di-in*
>
> *ù i-na* ᵍⁱˢTUKUL.MEŠ-*ia ma-ḫi-ra-am ú-ul ir-ši*
>
> *i-ia-tam i-zi-ib-ma ma-a-tam ša ad-di-nu-šu*[*m*]
>
> *a-na sa-am-si-*ᵈIM *ad-*[*di-i*]*n*
>
> [... ᴵ]*sa-am-si-*ᵈIM
>
> (lacuna)
>
> *lu-t*[*e-e*]*r-ka a-na* ᵍⁱˢ[GU.ZA É *a-bi-ka*]
>
> *ú-te-er-ka* ᵍⁱˢTUKUL.[MEŠ]
>
> *ša it-ti te-em-tim am-ta-aḫ-ṣú*
>
> *ad-di-na-ak-kum*

To my lord say: "Thus Nur-Sin, your servant: Abiya, the

prophet of Addu, the Lord of Alep[po], he came to me and

thus he said: 'Says Adad: "The land, in its entirety

I had given to Yahdun-Lim, and with my weapons, an

equal he did not encounter,

[yet when] he abandoned me, the land which I had given

hi[m], I g[av]e to Šamši-Adad

[...] Šamši-Adad (lacuna) –let me r[e]store you! On the

[throne of the house of your father]

I returned you, the weapon[s] with which I struck the sea I

have given you"'""[78]

This Mari text is a letter addressed to king Yahdun-Lim from a prophet of Addu.[79] It is

reminding the king of his god's place in his life, establishing that Yahdun-Lim was given his

position as king, and that Adad anointed him and gave him 'the weapons with which I fought

with the sea'. From the sequence of events in the letter, the giving of the throne, the giving of

the weapons, and the anointing with oil, it is reasonable to say that these weapons are linked

with Yahdun-Lim's position as king. It is however important to make the distinction that it is

not the weapons that made Yahdun-Lim king but that as king he was given the weapons by

Adad to act as a symbol of Adad's approval.

---

[78] Translation from Joanna Töyräänvuori, "Weapons of the Storm God in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Traditions" in *Studia Orientalia* 112 (2012). p 180.

[79] Adad and Addu can be used interchangeably. Due to the translation using 'Addu' I have used it in the translation and in the explanation of the translation. Due to the more common use of Adad in scholarly work I have used 'Adad' in my analysis.

The importance of the storm god's weapon and kingship is further demonstrated by the Adad temple in Aleppo. First discovered in 1996 by Kay Kohlmeyer, the storm god's temple in Aleppo has been a fascinating revelation. A large relief with the storm god and king depicted facing each other has been uncovered; it also has various miscellanea in the background including bulls and chariots and finally there is on the monument a large inscription written in Hieroglyphic Luwian confirming that the temple belongs to the storm god and giving details on the king and his titles.[80] There is also another inscription which mentions a weapon, *DEUS.MATTEA* 'god mace',[81] the inscription is near a picture of the storm god holding a weapon over his shoulder, so the inscription is more than likely referring to this. But we know that there was a weapon which belonged to the storm god which had cultic significance.[82]

Further evidence of physical representations of a storm god's cultic weapon comes from Mari letter A.3597, which relates how the weapons arrived safely in the temple of Dagan in Terqa.

> *a-na be-lí-ia*
>
> *qí-bí-ma*
>
> *um-ma su-mu-i-la*
>
> ÌR-*ka-a-ma*
>
> ᵍⁱˢTUKUL.ḪI.A *ša* ᵈIM
>
> *ša ḫa-la-ab*[ki]
>
> *ik-šu-du-nim-m*[*a*]
>
> *i-na* É ᵈ*da-gan*
>
> *i-na ter-qa*ki

---

[80] For a transliteration and translation of this inscription see Aleppo 6 in J. D. Hawkins, "The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple" in *Anatolian Studies* 61 (2011). pp. 40–44.
[81] Aleppo 5 *ibid* p 40.
[82] Kay Kohlmeyer, *Der Tempel des Wettergottes von Aleppo* (Rhema, Münster: 2000).

ka-le-ek-šu-nu-ti

a-na ki-ma be-lí i-ša-pa-ra-am

lu-pu-úš

To my lord say: "Thus Sumuila, your servant: 'The

weapons of Adad of Aleppo have reached [me], in the

temple of Dagan in Terqa I will keep them. As my lord

writes to me, let it be done!'"[83]

This is explicit and it is clear that the storm god Adad's weapons were physical and of great

importance, and had a greater function than simply being placed in the temple as static

objects of worship. The letter tells of how someone, most likely the king, has sent these

weapons to Sumuila in Terqa, where he will keep the weapons. It takes between 78 to 91

hours to walk to from Aleppo to Terqa,[84] and it is doubtful whether they would have been

transported to Terqa by routine caravan. Instead great care, pomp and circumstance would

have been involved and the movement of these weapons would not have been simple or

undertaken lightly, if only because they were connected with a god, and the king would

need assurance of their safe arrival. It is because of the king's interest in these weapons,

and the fact that they belong to Adad that we can connect them to *Chaoskampf*. From the

first letter we know that the king was given weapons which 'struck the sea'. We also know

that storm gods are connected to *Chaoskampfic* myths. So the king being interested in the

---

[83] Töyräänvuori, Weapons of the Storm God. p 180.
[84] Hours taken from Goggle Maps, where Aleppo is modern day Aleppo and Terqa is modern day Al-Asharah. Walking speed would be an average of three miles per hour, it would take over four days to walk there. "Google Maps", accessed 1st September 2014, https://www.google.co.uk/maps/dir/Al+Asharah,+Syria/Aleppo,+Syria/@35.7135613,37.7539064,8z/data=!3m1 !4b1!4m14!4m13!1m5!1m1!1s0x15487f31d6653099:0xe34c180988dc4a37!2m2!1d40.559444!2d34.920278!1m 5!1m1!1s0x152ff813b98135af:0x967e5e5fc542c32a!2m2!1d37.1472998!2d36.2116828!3e2.

weapons belonging to a storm god is too coincidental not to connect these weapons to the weapons that are mentioned in the Mari letter A.1968. Further, if the weapons mentioned in A.1968 are the same weapons in Mari letter A.3597 then this means that not only were they physical weapons that the king would interact with, as they were 'given' to him, but that a *Chaoskampfic* story would have been present in cultic life. It needs to be stressed that if the king is interacting with something then other people are going to be aware of it. If these are the same physical weapons mentioned in the inscription from the storm god's Aleppo temple, occasionally being transported to Terqa, then people are going to be aware of that too. And if people are aware of the physical weapons then they will be aware of their *raison d'être*, which would be a *Chaoskampfic* myth. So, despite not having the actual *Chaoskampfic* text we can confidently say that in a Mari context there must certainly have been one.

What is important about the weapons is that they represent and embody the power and victory of the *Chaoskampfic* and that they are the easiest, long term trophy that can potentially be taken from a battle scene. The symbolism of these weapons being passed on to the human king as a way of a god supporting and legitimising the king's rule is very compelling. If the king is seen as a steadying force in the world, a person who holds back chaos, and keeps civilisation intact, then actually possessing the weapons used to fight against chaos so that civilisation could begin would be very empowering.

A text which shows strong links between kingship and *Chaoskampf* is the Baal Cycle from Ugarit, the Ugaritic *Chaoskampf* text KTU1.2, which contains the Baal/Yam conflict, specifically in tablet IV, lines 8–27. Written by Illimilku and commissioned by Niqmaddu

III–IV,[85] in this text the thunder/storm god Baal and the sea god Yam 'fight' for kingship.

The Baal Cycle of course starts with Yam being declared king. With his new authority he

demands that Baal be given to him so that Yam can take his gold. There is unfortunately a

sizeable gap but when the text is readable again we find that Baal and Yam are ready to

fight, with Baal's supporters, Anat and Kothar, ready to witness the fight. The culmination

of the Baal/Yam conflict, the battle scene, begins with the craftsman god Kothar setting the

terms of the fight that the victorious is to be king.

> *kṯr ṣmdm . ynḫt . w ypʿr . šmthm . šmk at*
>
> *ygrš . ygrš . grš ym grš ym . l ksih*
>
> *nhr l kḫt . drkth . trtqṣ . bd bʿl km nš*
>
> *r . b uṣbʿth . hlm ktp . zbl . ym . bn ydm*
>
> *[ṯp]ṭ nhr .*

"Kothar fashioned two weapons,[86] he called [the first] its

name "you, you are Yagarrish,[87] Yagarrish drive Yam

from the seat of his throne, Nahar from the seat of his

---

[85] N. Wyatt, *Word of Tree and Whisper of Stone, and other papers on Ugaritian Thought* (Gorgias Press, Piscataway: 2008). p 151.

[86] It is not clear what type of weapon *ṣmd* actually is. It cannot be a sword or spear as these were called *ḥrb* and *mrḥ* respectively, while iconographical evidence, such as the *'Baal au foudre'* stele in the Louvre, suggest that *ṣmd* is a blunt weapon, rather than a sharp one, so a mace or a club. This too fits in with the iconographical evidence from Aleppo, and the 'god mace'.

[87] The independent pronoun in apposition in the naming of Yagarrish shows that the weapon is not just being named but being told its name, which give Yagarrish, and Ayyamarri a sense of sentience. Yagarrish is the masculine form of the noun *grš* and means 'he who is in charge of expelling' or as Wyatt calls him 'Expeller', Wyatt, *Religious Texts* p 65. The fact that the weapon is named for what he is meant to do, expel Yam from his throne so that Baal may take it, does certainly inspire curiosity, but is beyond the scope of this study. Theodore J. Lewis, "'Athtartu's Incantations and the Use of Divine Names as Weapons" in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70:2 (2011). pp. 207–227, makes a start on this topic, but does not apply the theory to Kothar and the weapons.

dominion. Fly[88] from the hand of Baal like a falcon and

strike Prince Yam in the chest, between Judge Nahar's

hands."

Kothar has made, named, and 'programmed' a weapon to attack Yam on behalf of Baal, the

weapon does as ordered, however the attack is ineffective.

yrtqṣ . ṣmd . bd bʿl . km . nšr

b uṣbʿth . ylm . ktp . zbl ym . bn . ydm . ṯpṭ

nhr . ʿz . ym . l ymk . l tnġṣn [.] pnth . l ydlp

tmnh .

The weapon flies from the hand of Baal and strikes the

chest of Prince Yam, between the hands of Judge Nahar.

But Yam is strong, his joints do not shake, he does not fall.

Kothar makes a second weapon which is made, named, and given orders, in a scene

paralleling that of the first weapon, this one is called Ayyamarri,[89] and ordered to strike

Yam's head, lines 18–23. Though this time the attack is successful.

ym . bn ʿnm .ṯpṭ . nhr .yprsḫ . ym yql

l arṣ . tnġṣn . pnth .. w ydlp . tmnh

yqṯ bʿl . w yšt . ym . ykly . ṯpṭ . nhr

---

[88] The Ugaritic word used is '*trtqṣ*' and is often translated as leap, Wyatt. *Religious Texts* p 65. However due to the bird of prey imagery used through the passage I feel that 'fly' is a suitable substitution.
[89] Ayyamarri is formed by *ȧy*, the empathetic particle and *mr* 'to drive out' being added together to form 'all-driver' or 'he who drives them all out'. Again the weapon is named after its task and the act of naming it suggests sentience.

> It strikes the head of Prince Yam, between the eyes of
>
> Judge Nahar. Yam fell into a heap, his joints shake, he
>
> falls. Baal gathers, [90] and dries up[91] Judge Nahar.

From here Baal is declared king. It is not clear what happened to Yagarrish and Ayyamarri after the battle, although from the evidence of the Mari letters quoted above, one would expect some form of cultic importance being placed upon them, and there is certainly a possibility of this given the admittedly scant evidence from Ugarit.[92]

The most intriguing feature of this passage is the passivity of Baal and Yam. Kothar is the one to build and order the weapons. They fly from the hand of Baal and attack Yam because Kothar has told them to.[93] Yam too does very little; he is hit twice and never tries to defend himself or strike back at Baal, or Kothar. This passiveness of the two key characters in the fight is certainly strange. Here we have a battle between gods but with neither appearing to be doing much battling. With Kothar creating and ordering the weapons, and the weapons acting out their orders there is very little for Baal to do. The weapons are not wielded by Baal, they act independently of him, and meanwhile Yam stands by and is defeated without once returning an attack. This is not a fight but the two main participants just standing around, as one is attacked and defeated.

---

[90] The gathering up of Yam here could be a parallel to the gathering up of the sea in Psalm 33:7.

[91] There is some debate as to the root for *yšt*, Wyatt suggests *šty* 'to drink' Wyatt, *Religious Texts* p 67, while others suggest *štt* 'to separate' Pierre Bordreuil, and Dennis Pardee, *A Manual of Ugaritic* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2010). p 160. For me it does not make much sense for Baal to gather Yam's broken corpse together only to separate it again, and with '*y*' being a weaker radical than '*t*' it is more likely to disappear, so agree with Wyatt. However, I feel that 'drying' Yam up is a better translation than 'drinking' him as it makes more sense to the modern reader while still conveying the idea of Yam being liquid, and being completely destroyed.

[92] There has yet to be an extensive study into Yagarrish and Ayyamarri, it would seem remiss of Niqmaddu III–IV not to use the cultic symbolism of the weapons as a legitimising tactic, especially considering the context of the composition of the text which is disused below.

[93] Once again the naming and the possible magic involved in this, and how this magic and/or naming effect the sentience of the weapons, and their skills and abilities are intriguing questions raised by the text. And once again see Lewis, "'Athtartu's Incantations" pp. 207–227 for a start at answering these questions.

I have long found this intriguing, and I now suggest the reason for Baal's passivity is because of *Chaoskampf,* weapons, and kingship. We know from Mari A.1968 that receiving Adad's divine weapons acted as a signal of approval for the king. We also know the context for the commissioning of this version of the Baal Cycle, where Niqmaddu III–IV was trying to impress upon his new in-laws his own special 'kingliness' at the event of his marriage.[94] When it would have been recited and presented to the court at Niqmaddu III–IV's marriage there would have been little doubt that Baal is Niqmaddu III–IV, it would also be clear that Baal would be legitimising Niqmaddu III–IV's rule, and right to rule.

Baal receives the divine weapons that give him the right to rule, by defeating Yam, they show his favour with the gods, as the weapons come from the craftsman god Kothar. Kothar has been ordered to build Yam a palace, but it is through his own accord he builds the weapons, and commands them, for Baal. Kothar choses to support Baal and with that support he builds Baal the weapons that give him his victory; this is an explicit metaphor for Baal having the other gods' favour. However, for Niqmaddu III–IV to actually wield this weapons would be going too far, which is why they fly out of the hands of Baal. It is one thing to be given symbols of power and authority but another thing entirely to use them.

The Baal Cycle is really about Niqmaddu III–IV, and him using *Chaoskampf* and other literary traditions to validate his rule. There is no doubt that Yam is representative of chaos, he is not the chosen king with the special weapons, and without a king with such favour civilisation could crumble. The dismemberment of Yam could be a link with *Enūma Eliš* however, dismembering your foe after defeating them is not something strange or unique. It is

---

[94] Pierre Bordreuil, and Florence Malbran-Labat, "Les archives de la maison d'Ourtenou" in *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions'* (1997). pp. 443–449.

highly unlikely that this particular similarity here is deliberate copying, or referencing of the other text but just that dismemberment is a common battle tactic.

To reiterate, the lack of creation within the Baal Cycle can confuse some into thinking that it is not a *Chaoskampfic* text. Despite attempts to strong-arm creation into the text[95] the Baal/Yam conflict does not end with any creation, nor is creation something which happens at any point within the Baal Cycle. With creation being one of the key points of Gunkel's work and how he first defined *Chaoskampf* scholars have since felt that creation is necessary for a text to be *Chaoskampfic*. I say that creational acts make a text either a Classical *Chaoskampf* text, or a Creational *Chaoskampf* text, and that texts without creation will be a Kingship *Chaoskampf* text.[96] The Baal Cycle is about kingship, gaining kingship, and keeping kingship, and the joys of kingship, and the dangers of kingship. The theme of kingship runs strongly throughout the entirety of the Baal Cycle, which makes this a Kingship *Chaoskampfic* text. The theme of kingship also has a strong presence in *Enūma Eliš*. While creation takes place within *Enūma Eliš* its major purpose is not to explain the world's origins but to explain Marduk, and his role as king. The culmination of the text is not the creation of humans, but the naming of Marduk. The act of bestowing names upon gods as a form of honour or reverence is seen throughout religious texts.

To understand why it was important for *Enūma Eliš* to glorify Marduk some cultural context is needed. Marduk was not always a popular god, nor head of the pantheon. Before the time of Hammurabi Anu and Enlil were most commonly seen as the highest powers, it is within the introduction of Hammurabi's laws we see the beginning of Marduk's rise to power.

---

[95] John Day, *God's Conflict With The Dragon And The Sea* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge:1985). pp. 16–17 and Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*: *Essays in the history of the religion of Israel* (Harvard University Press, London:1973). p 112.

[96] A text can be both a Creational *Chaoskampfic* text and a Kingship *Chaoskampfic* text, however it cannot be both Classical and Kingship due to the fact that Classical is Gunkel's definition and he did not mention kingship.

i-nu AN *ṣi-ru-um*

LUGAL ^d*a-nun-na-ki*

^dEN.LÍL

be-el ša-me-e

ù ir-ṣi-tim

ša-i-im

ši-ma-at KALAM

a-na ^dAMAR.UD

DUMU *ri-eš-ti-im*

ša ^dEN.KI ^dEN.LÍL(ut)

KIŠI *ni-šì*

i-ši-mu-šum

in i-gi₄-gi₄

ú-šar-bi-ù-šu

KÁ-^d(RA)^{KI}

šum-šu ṣi-ra-am in-ni-ù

in ki-ib-ra-tim

ù-ša-te-ru-šu

i-na li-ib-bi-šu

šar-ru-tam da-rí-tam

ša ki-ma ša-me-e

ù ir-ṣi-tim

iš-da-šu

šu-úr-šu-da

ú-ki-in-nu-šum

i-nu-mi-šu

ḫa-am-mu-ra-bi

ru-ba-am

na-iḫ-dam

pa-li-iḫ ì-lí ya-ti

mi-ša-ra-am

i-na ma-tim

a-na šu-pí-i-im

ra-ga-am ù ṣi-nam

a-na ḫu-ul-lu-qí-im

dan-nu-um

en-ša-am

a-na la ḫa-ba-li-im

ki-ma ^dUTU

a-na SAG-GÍG

wa-ṣi-e-im-ma

ma-tim

nu-wu-ri-im

AN

ù ^dEN.LÍL

a-na ši-ir ni-ši

tú-ub-bi-im

šu-mi ib-bu-ú

> When Anu, he of first rank, king of the Anunnaki, and
>
> Enlil, lord of heaven and earth, who allots the destinies of
>
> the land, allotted the divine lordship over the multitude of
>
> the people to Marduk, son of Ea, decreed for him power
>
> over the masses and raised him among the Igigi, called
>
> Babylon by its exalted name, caused it to be supreme
>
> throughout the world, and established for him a kingdom
>
> everlasting with foundations in heaven and earth, at that
>
> time Anu and Enlil called me by name, Hammurabi, the
>
> reverent one who fears the gods, for the good of the people
>
> to make justice in the land, to rid it of evil, and protect the
>
> weak over the strong, to be like Šamaš and rise over the
>
> black headed people and give light to the land.

Anu and Enlil are giving Babylon and her people to Marduk to rule over as the city's god, they are also giving power to Hammurabi. What is happening here is that Anu and Enlil are still ultimately in charge, Marduk has been given divine rule over Babylon and Hammurabi mortal rule over the city. Their power and authority comes directly from Anu and Enlil, without their blessing neither Marduk nor Hammurabi have rule over the city. Marduk here is not a supreme god with powers over the universe, his authority over Babylon was gifted to him, the hero god of *Enūma Eliš,* by Anu and Enlil. Nor would Anu or Enlil have any authority over him. But by the time we reach the late Babylon period Marduk is clearly in charge, he is the most powerful of gods '*gaš-ri* ^dMEŠ GÚ.GAL'.

So, between the time of Hammurabi and Nebuchadnezzar Marduk is promoted. And as with any new leader, their supporters begin to present evidence to show that the promotion was

well deserved. And those in support of the ousted leader attempt to claw back control. This can be seen in a boundary stone dating to Nebuchadnezzar I's reign where Enlil is venerated. The boundary stone is overcompensating, praising Enlil too much, most likely in response to the loss of position and power Enlil was going through.[97]

Lambert suggests that there is a build-up towards Marduk's coup from at the very least the reign of Kurigalzu II. With the ideological place of the city of Babylon within the cosmos and with Babylon becoming the first city, so also Marduk's position within the pantheon would have to correspondingly rise. Yet the Kassite kings could, and would not give into pressure and accelerate Marduk's rise.[98]

This promotion, according to Lambert, only happens when Marduk's statue was recovered from Elam. With the statue's return a fresh start seems to come into effect, with Marduk replacing Anu and Enlil, and becoming head of the pantheon.[99] Lambert's theory fits in well with a lot of circumstantial evidence; he himself admitted that there was a lack of hard evidence, but his theory is convincing. As the prominence of Babylon rises, so too would that of her god. Yet an entire cosmology cannot be edited so radically on a whim. It would take time for a new tradition to soak into the collective ideology. And as it does so there would be backlashes, seen in the boundary stone mentioned above. A new dynasty of kings, and the return of the statue which represents the god, after being kidnapped, is the perfect moment for the elevation of the god, raising him to match the prominent position of his city. *Enūma Eliš*, which is quite adamant and forceful in its adoration and veneration of Marduk fits into this context perfectly. The other myths, and references that were put together to create or inspired the creation of *Enūma Eliš* are also explained by this context. For if you are manufacturing the

---

[97] Lambert, *Creation Myths,* p 274.
[98] *Ibid,* pp. 273–275.
[99] Lambert, *Creation Myths* pp. 273–274.

supremacy of your god, replacing the established with something new, then to appropriate those references that traditionally are symbols of authority and power is prudent. To not use and recycle the resources you already have, to completely create something to act as manifesto on behalf of your newly promoted god, would be ineffective. It could also run the risk of people questioning if Marduk really was superior to Enlil, since people have an expectation as to what a god can do, and to not communicate within the framework of those expectations could lead to the alienation between your god and the general population.

To say that not only is Marduk the king of gods, and then to tell a completely new story to highlight his power, and to justify his new position, with a story nobody has heard of before, would be information overload. Too many new concepts and ideas increase the likelihood of confusion, and confusion increasing the chances of discontent, and or people retreating to the comfort of the familiar. This would ensure that Marduk's coup would fail.[100] All of this means that I have to agree with Lambert, from what evidence we have.

This context means that kingship has to be a part of *Enūma Eliš*, and we can see the theme of kingship very clearly in regards to the Marduk/Tiamat conflict and *Chaoskampf*. It is only after his victory that Marduk is declared king. Tablet V 86–88 illustrates this the most clearly.

---

[100] We can see these tactics clearly within the New Testament to establish power and position for Jesus by calling upon the authority of the HB/OT. The linking of John the Baptist to Elijah by using the description of Elijah for John is one example. Another example, is the beginning of the Gospel of John, John 1.1 which deliberately echoes Genesis I. Compare εν αρχη ην ο λογος και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος 'In the beginning was the *logos,* and the *logos* was in reference to God, and God was the *logos*' to Genesis 1 which also begins at the beginning, and God's power is activated through speaking, and words. The author of John is using Genesis to support his high Christology, by pulling upon the association of Genesis 1, via tying together creation and words. Beale, G.K. and D. A. Carson eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Apollos, Nottingham: 2008) is good as a gentle introduction into the topic. Considering the success of the Jesus Movement it is fair to say that these tactics can and do work. I would also like to thank Guy Kirkham-Smith for the Greek translation.

[^d]a₂-nun-na-ki ma-la ba-šu-u ú-na-áš-šá-qu šēpē^{II.meš}-šú

[x (x)-m]a pu-ḫur-šu-nu la-ba-niš ap-pi

[x (x)] x i-zi-zu ik-nu-šu an-na-ma šarru

Each of the Anunnaki were kissing him, they submitted to

him (Marduk), bowed down […] saying 'this is our king'

Through his victory Marduk has earned his position as king of the gods, and the gods all agree, they declare him their king. This earning of his status fits in with the above theory in two ways, the first is that it echoes Ninurta, and then secondly is that it mirrors what is happening outside *Enūma Eliš*. Marduk is raised to his position of king of the gods, which he earns through battle with Tiamat, and through the growth of Babylon, on the world stage.

Due to the context of *Enūma Eliš* it is easy to see how kingship is a major theme and how showcasing Marduk's kingship was an important purpose for the text. Considering that *Enūma Eliš* is the archetypal Classical *Chaoskampfic* text and there is kingship within it we can safely say that Kingship *Chaoskampf* should be considered a prominent *Chaoskampf* within the *Chaoskampfic* genre. With this in mind, we come to the question, where then are the kingship themes in the HB/OT *Chaoskampfic* texts?

Kingship in the HB/OT is made complex by various issues. The most prominent being the relationship between the prophets, priests, and kings, all vying for power within the political sphere, and trying to undermine the other groups.[101] The division into the Northern Kingdom

---

[101] The Book of Jeremiah is an excellent example of how the monarchy, the priesthood, and prophets are all vying for power. All three intuitions are playing off against each other causing fractions and political drama. It should be remembered that due to Moses' unequivocal position as the first prophet, and the importance of the temple to daily ritual life, both the prophetic and priestly fractions find themselves with an added advantage against the monarchical intuition, which in an attempt to try to catch up tries to undermine the other two. This, as the Books of Samuel repeatedly highlights never ends well for the king.

of Israel and the Southern Kingdom of Judah further complicates the relationship the HB/OT has with monarchy.

It only took four generations of kings before discontent reached such a high point that there came a spilt between the tribes. The Biblical account has it that after Solomon's death his son, Rehoboam, did not listen to his people or his older advisors, and listening to his younger advisors he kept working the people hard by forced labour. Ten tribes rebelled and went to the north to form the Kingdom of Israel, while the remaining two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, stayed with Jedidiah and formed the southern Kingdom of Judah.[102] Despite being separate states, the two kingdoms shared the belief they were the chosen people, and that they had to worship one god YHWH. Though there was some disagreement over the role of temple in Jerusalem.[103]

The introduction of the monarchy occurs in 1 Samuel 8 where the people of Israel demand to be like the other nations and have an earthly king. The prophet Samuel does as asked despite God's dire warnings that the people will not like having a king. By asking for a king God says his people have forsaken him ויעזבני there is a sense of betrayal and abandonment on God's part who before was the people's king.[104] After the anointing of Saul as the first king, the people say in 1 Samuel 12:19:

ויאמרו כל העם אל שמואל התפלל בעד עבדיך אל יהוה אלהיך

ואל נמות כי יספנו על כל חטאתינו רעה לשאל לנו מלך:

---

[102] 1 Kings 12.

[103] J. Maxwell Miller, and John H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (SCM Press, London: 1986). p 246.

[104] Kingship imagery in regard to God is a constant through the HB/OT see Numbers 23:21 , Psalm 47, Malachi 1:14 and Isiah 43:15 for just a few examples.

> And all the people they said to Samuel 'pray for us, your
>
> servants, to the Lord god that we do not die, for we have
>
> sinned and done a great evil asking for a king.'

There is instant regret for the people, and they are duly punished with a series of terrible kings until the destruction of the first temple.[105]

It is clear to see that within the HB/OT kings are not a good thing, so for a *Chaoskampfic* text to have a pro-king theme within an HB/OT context would be strange. As seen above kingship in *Chaoskampfic* texts is a device to support the monarch who is the one who commissions the text. At the same time, in the specific cultural context of the HB/OT, from the tense relationship the people have with kings, a text such as this would not survive nor would it be popular. The power struggles between the priest/prophets/kings and the negative imagery attached to kingship, makes it almost impossible for such a text to become treasured or meaningful.

---

[105] Every king within the HB/OT has flaws, King David, who is often lorded as a fine specimen of kingship, abuses his power, see the Bathsheba debacle, 2 Samuel 11. While wise Solomon enforces strict labour upon the people in building projects 1 Kings 9:12–15. It should be remembered that these are the good kings, but generally the people of Israel in the HB/OT have a terrible relationship with their monarchy.

Conclusion

In this work I introduced the concept of *Chaoskampfs* over a *Chaoskampf*, and brought forth the idea of a *Chaoskampfic* genre. Throughout, I have shown the different elements that make these *Chaoskampfic* texts about creation and kingship. And while these themes are different they can and do overlap, *Enūma Eliš* being the prime example. Hermann Gunkel had originally missed the kingship themes present in *Chaoskampfic* texts, and nobody else has yet to deal with them as in-depth as I have here.

Chaoskampfic themes are highly adaptable, from the modern day My Little Pony, which uses it to highlight the power of friendship, to *Enūma Eliš*, where it is used to establish a position of power for Marduk. *Chaoskampf* is about so much more than a struggle against chaos for creation. It is something that people are even today still connecting with. It can be used to comedic effect, and also seriously for change in religious order.

The major problem that future *Chaoskampfic* studies face is the alienation between HB/OT scholarship and Assyriologists. Neither group enters into meaningful dialogue with each other. Assyriologists are not willing to engage with HB/OT texts and HB/OT scholars do not understand the ANE and its wider context. Many scholars, such as Rebecca Watson have aimed to prove that the HB/OT is somehow separate from the rest of the ANE. I hope that this study has shown that this is not a tenable position. There are far too many similarities between HB/OT texts and other ANE texts, Job being the most obvious example from this study.

Bibliography

Books

Angel, Andrew. *Chaos and the Son of Man: The Hebrew Chaoskampf Tradition in the Period 515BCE to 200CE* (Continuum, London:2006).

Avishur, Yitzhak. *Studies in Hebrew and Ugaritic Psalms* (The Magnes Press, Jerusalem: 1994).

Beale, Gregory K. and Donald A. Carson eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Apollos, Nottingham: 2008).

Bordreuil, Pierre and Dennis Pardee. *A Manual of Ugaritic* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2010).

Bottéro, Jean *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia* trans. Teresa Lavender Fagan (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 2004).

Bowler, Peter J. *Evolution: The History of an Idea* (University of California Press, London; 1989).

Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Fortress Press, Minneapolis: 1993).

Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*: *Essays in the history of the religion of Israel* (Harvard University Press, London: 1973).

Day, John. *God's Conflict With The Dragon And The Sea* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 1985).

Finkel, Irving. *The Ark Before Noah: Decoding the Story of the Flood* (Hodder and Stougton, London: 2014).

Gunkel, Hermann. *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12* trans. William Whitney, (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, Michigan: 2006).

Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religiongeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12* (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen: 1985).

Habel, Norman C. *The Book of Job: a Commentary* (Westminster Press, Dallas: 1985).

Horowitz, Wayne. *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (Esienbrauns,Winona Lake: 1998).

Kohlmeyer, Kay. *Der Tempel des Wettergottes von Aleppo* (Rhema, Münster: 2000).

Lambert, Wilfred G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1960).

Lambert, Wilfred G. and Alan R. Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 1999).

Miller, J. Maxwell and John H. Hayes, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (SCM Press, London: 1986).

Noegel, Scott B. *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (Bloomsbury, London: 1996).

Rahmouni, Aicha. *Divine Epithets in the Ugaritic Alphabetic Texts* trans. J. N. Ford (Brill, Leiden: 2008).

Scurlock, JoAnn and Richard H. Beal eds. *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaoskampf Hypothesis* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2013).

Smith, Mark. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. (HaperSanFrancisco, USA: 1990).

Tsumura, David Toshio. *Creation and Destruction: Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament* (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2005).

Watson, Rebecca. *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of Chaos in the Hebrew Bible* (Walter de Gruyter & Co, Berlin: 2005).

Wyatt, Nicolas. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: 2nd Edition* (Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield: 2002).

Wyatt, Nicolas. *Word of Tree and Whisper of Stone, and other papers on Ugaritian Thought* (Gorgias Press, Piscataway: 2008).

Journal Articles and Book Chapters

Ahlström, Gosta W. "Where Did The Israelites Live?" in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 41.2 (1982). pp. 133–138.

Benz, Brendon C. 'Yamm as the Personification of Chaos?' in *Creation and Chaos A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis* ed. JoAnn Scurlock, and Richard H. Beal (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake:2013). pp. 127–146.

Bordreuil, Pierre and Florence Malbran-Labat. "Les archives de la maison d'Ourtenoun" in *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions'* (1997). pp. 443–449.

Hawkins, J. David. "The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple" in *Anatolian Studies* 61 (2011). pp. 35–54.

Kaplan, Maureen F. "Another Slaying of Tiamat" in *Israel Exploration Journal* 26.4 (1976). pp. 174–177.

Kramer, Samuel N. "Man and His God: a Sumerian Variation of the Job Motif" in *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East Presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley* ed. M. Noth, and D. W. Thomas (Brill, Leiden:1955). pp. 170–182.

Lambert, Wilfred. G. 'Creation in the Bible and the Ancient Near East' in *Creation and Chaos A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's* Chaoskampf *Hypothesis* ed. JoAnn Scurlock, and Richard H. Beal (Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake: 2013). pp. 44–47.

Lewis, Theodore J. 'ʿAthtartu's Incantations and the Use of Divine Names as Weapons' in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70.2 (2011). pp. 207–227.

McLay, R. Timothy. "Bel and the Dragon" in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title* ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2007). pp. 1023–1027.

Ogden, Daniel. "Sekander, Dragon-Slayer" in *The Alexander Romance in Persia and the East* eds. Richard Stoneman, Kyle Erickson, and Richard Netton (Barkhuis, Groningen: 2012). pp. 277–294.

Seri, Andrea. "The Fifty Names of Marduk in "Enūma Eliš"" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126.4 (2006). pp. 507–515.

Teeter, Emily. "Maat" in *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Ancient Egypt Vol. 2 G-O* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001). pp. 319–321.

Töyräänvuori, Joanna. "Weapons of the Storm God in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Traditions" in *Studia Orientalia* 112 (2012). pp. 147–180.

Tugendhaft, Aaron. "Unsettling Sovereignty: Politics and Poetics in the Baal Cycle" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 132.3 (2012). pp. 367–384.

Websites and Television

"Google Maps", accessed 1st September 2014,
https://www.google.co.uk/maps/dir/Al+Asharah,+Syria/Aleppo,+Syria/@35.7135613,37.753 9064,8z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m14!4m13!1m5!1m1!1s0x15487f31d6653099:0xe34c180988dc4a3 7!2m2!1d40.559444!2d34.920278!1m5!1m1!1s0x152ff813b98135af:0x967e5e5fc542c32a!2 m2!1d37.1472998!2d36.2116828!3e2.

"Steam Workshop :: Here There Be Monsters," accessed 14th October 2013,
http://steamcommunity.com/sharedfiles/filedetails/?id=81166964.

"The Return of Harmony Part 1" *My Little Pony: Friendship is Magic*. Season 2 Episode 01. 17th September 2011.

"The Return of Harmony Part 2" *My Little Pony: Friendship is Magic*. Season 2 Episode 02. 24th September 2011.