thought to represent cosmic chaos or disorder. <sup>15</sup> The deity's victory secures and is symbolic of their sovereignty, often expressed as their kingship. Isaiah 27:1 represents a clear example of this motif: "In that day, YHWH will visit punishment, with his hard and great and strong sword, upon Leviathan [ $liwy\bar{a}t\bar{a}n$ ], the wriggling serpent [ $n\bar{a}h\bar{a}\bar{s}$   $b\bar{a}riha$ ], and upon Leviathan, the writhing serpent [ $n\bar{a}h\bar{a}\bar{s}$  ' $aqall\bar{a}t\hat{o}n$ ]; and he will kill the monster [ $attann\hat{n}n$ ] that is in the sea." This account bears striking similarities to a passage from the Ugaritic KTU 1.5.i.1–3 that praises Baal for dispatching a creature named Lotan: <sup>16</sup>

k tmhṣ.ltn.btn.brh When you struck Lotan, the wriggling serpent, tkly.btn. 'qltn. you finished off the writhing serpent, slyt.d.šb't.rašm the powerful one with seven heads.

While the final passage refers to a powerful one with seven heads rather than to a *tannîn*, "monster," that lives in the sea, the epithet *šlyt* occurs elsewhere in connection with the Ugaritic *tnn* (*KTU* 1.3.iii.40), which is cognate with the Hebrew *tannîn* and has similar reference to the notion of chaos and disorder (Smith and Pitard 2009, 250–54). There can be little doubt that a tradition directly related to the one underlying *KTU* 1.5.i.1–3 is reflected in Isa 27:1 (Tsumura 2005, 192–95), again demonstrating that the traditions undergirding YHWH's divine profile were drawn from the broader conceptual matrices for deity. Psalm 74:12–14 similarly describes the deity's defeat of *tannînîm* and Leviathan, although in that exilic text the tradition begins to bleed into rhetoric about the deity's creative prowess, particularly in verses 15–17 (Tsumura 2015; cf. Greene 2017). In the Ugaritic literature, divine warfare is tied to rule over the pantheon, and not to creation, although the Babylonian Enuma Elish incorporates both.<sup>17</sup>

The figures prominent in the *Chaoskampf* motif are present in the Priestly account of creation, but those authors seem reticent to describe creation as a product of a battle against antagonistic divine forces, and so while the figures were retained, they were only conceptual husks, stripped of their agency and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Recall that the danger and chaos of the sea conceptually contrasts with the order and safety of civilization. On the use of "chaos" in the Hebrew Bible, see Watson 2005.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> This translation is my own, but cf. Wyatt 2002, 115; Smith and Pitard 2009, 252. The second and third lines appear almost identically in *KTU* 1.3.iii.41–42 (the verb at the beginning of line 2 is different [*mḥšt*], as well as being in the first person). Lotan is cognate with the Hebrew *liwyātān* (Emerton 1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> For a brief outline of some different ways the Ugaritic and Akkadian literature treat the rise to divine kingship, see Smith and Pitard 2009, 16–19. David Tsumura (2005) argues that scholars have been too eager to find Enuma Elish in Gen 1. Cf. Day 1985, but against Tsumura, see Cho 2019.