Tracking the Dragon across the Ancient Near East

Robert D. Miller

In 2001, Michael Witzel called for “exploring the historical development” of the Indo-European and Near Eastern myth-families “by setting up a family tree of such groupings,” to “fill the gap between, say, the reconstructed Near Eastern branch and the individual local mythology, e.g., that of the Sumerians or Hittites.”¹ The present essay is part of a larger project to track the storm god-slays-dragon myth across the ancient Near East, from the Rig-Veda to Iran and Anatolia, from Sumer through the Levant.² This essay is a condensed version of the first half of that trek, “a combination of extremely close reading of text passages in the original … with the traditional Comparative Method.”³ The comparative method used here is genetic; fundamentally, “its goal is history.”⁴ But it must be used with caution. Scholars tend far too often to equate vaguely similar stories by circular reasoning and leap of faith, to blur vegetation gods with storm gods, for example. Broadly shared mythic themes of the Aarne-Thompson sort are the result of any number of non-genetic factors, as Wim van Binsbergen has written, ranging from shared diffusion from the Palaeolithic period (as per Michael Witzel)⁵ to biological-evolutionary factors inherent to the human brain (à la Robert Segal).⁶ As Calvert Watkins noted, the dragon slaying myth “may be quasi-universal. We cannot speak of an exclusively Indo-European dragon; our task is rather to sort out the Indo-European modalities of the myth.”⁷ Here we will compare a relatively concise mytheme, although a bit more broadly defined than Watkins’ linguistic formulas.⁸ We will not hope to derive the fundamental principle of comparison solely from linguistics, although we shall certainly employ this analysis. I am in full agreement with Boris Oguibenine’s lamenting the loose definition of “motif,” and I embrace his definition of “narrative structures generated by agents in a text.”⁹

² N.B., popular Sanskrit names have not been given in academic transcription.
³ Calvert Watkins, How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics, vii.
⁴ Ibid., 4.
⁷ Watkins, How to Kill a Dragon, 297.
⁸ Ibid., 10–11, 299.
It was Watkins who clearly and magisterially synthesized the linguistic data illustrating the relationship between the Vedic myth of Indra defeating Vṛtra, the Avestan myth from Iran of Thraetaona slaying Aži Dahâka, and the Hittite Illuyanka myth. Here he is talking about myths from individual poetic traditions from which he reconstructs the Common Indo-European element:10 the storm god11 defeats the dragon-who-is-water12 and who stands for chaos,13 and this is celebrated in New Years’ rituals.14 The present essay is not so much interested in what is Common Indo-European as in its manifestations in the individual traditions and in their non-Indo-European afterlives. Watkins is correct that the Rig-Veda and the Hittites have this mytheme from their Indo-European heritage,15 and not from each other, although the situation is not simple and we shall see a great deal of relatively late movement of Indo-Europeans across the ancient Near East.16 The common formula is HERO+SLAY (*<h>en in the perfect or imperfect) +SERPENT. In the Rig-Veda, this is Indro vṛtrām (or áhīm) jaghāna or áhann.17

The god Indra’s primary exploit is the slaying of the serpent Vṛtra (RV 8.85.7; elaborated in 1.32 and 1.61.1) – sometimes merely called “the serpent” (3.30.8; 3.32.4; 5.30.6) – which releases pent-up waters (4.19.6; or stolen cows in later 10.108). As hymn 1.32 says, “He slew the serpent (áhīm), drilled through to the waters.” In other hymns, what is released are “seven streams” (RV 4.28.1; 2.12.3). In hymn 2.12, Vṛtra is called the “swelling serpent,” ojāyānam yo áhīm; elsewhere, “the encompasser,” āśāyāna. The verb for Indra’s act can also be avadhīt, “slay” (PIE *wedh-), as in 1.33.4: “You slew the rich Dasyu with your ‘slayer’” – or tur “overcome” (Indreṇa taruṣena vṛtrām; 7.48.2) or bhinātti “split” (PIE *terh₂- or *bheid-).18

Indra came to the battle after all the other gods had fled in fear (RV 3.32.4; 8.85.7; this may be a later stratum of the story).19 Nevertheless, Indra needs help to defeat Vṛtra.20 The weapon with which he defeats Vṛtra is the iconic vajra, or thunderbolt, which becomes Indra’s totem (RV 2.12.10; 4.19.1; and, later, 1.57.2, 6; 1.32.5, 15; 1.73.10; 1.101.1; etc.).21 The weapon was specially made for Indra for the combat by Tvāṣṭr (1.61.6), and it is used to split Vṛtra’s head (8.6.6, 76.2). The
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victory over Vṛtra is mostly treated as a past event, but the tenses fluctuate between past and present (e.g., 1.32.12–13), so that the impression is given that Vṛtra might not quite be dead forever (RV 1.32.14). In any case, Vṛtra is for now consigned to “the deep” (RV 1.32.8).23

Indra himself is the giver of agriculture (RV 5.39; 4.32; 8.24), a storm god (RV 2.12; 4.18.9), and identified as a “bull” (vrṣā; RV 3.50.1; 6.33.1; 8.15.6).26 Indra was sometimes portrayed as a bull.27 Indra is also symbolic of kingship (RV 3.26.2; 3.34.2; 4.19.2), especially in later tradition (Atharva Veda 3.4.6; Aitareya Brahmana; Satapatha Brahmana 10.4.1.5; 2.5.2.27–4.8). In the Puranas, “Indra” becomes merely a title for rotating kingship of the gods (e.g., Vishnu Purana; a tradition as early as the Aitareya Upanishad). Mircea Eliade and Boris Oguibenine consider the Indra-Vṛtra to be a cosmogony: the dragon represents formless watery chaos before creation.28 Indra is the creator in RV 2.12.2, 4, and there are clear references to Indra’s creative acts after the slaying of Vṛtra: RV 5.29.4, “Then he propped both the worlds far apart”; 7.23.3, “Indra with his greatness pushed asunder both the world-halves, as he slew the irresistible Vṛtra.”29 Multiple other explanations have been given over the centuries, but it is probable that like the other myths we shall examine no single meaning explains the myth.30 Raymond Hodgson argued the Indra-Vṛtra conflict was utilized in a cultic setting reflecting the king’s ritual function in the New Year’s ceremony.31 The king overcoming his enemies is homologous to the god of kingship overcoming the dragon.32 It is possible, however, that this myth is not originally about Indra at all.33 Indra performed his deeds “like Trita” (RV 1.52.5), Trita Āptya that is, who in RV 1.187 dismembers Vṛtra.34 In RV 10.8.8, Trita kills three-headed Viṣvarūpa (identified
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28 Ajoy Kumar Lahiri, Vedic Vṛtra, 14. Others consider creating to be Indra’s original myth, the dragon slaying being a later accretion, on which see below; Gonda, The Indra Hymns of the Rgveda, 4.
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with Vṛtra and killed by Indra in Satapatha Brahmana 1.6.3.2; cf. 1.2.3.2\(^{35}\)) with “ancestral weapons.”\(^{36}\) Trita’s name means “third,” or fully “third of waters,” and he is the protagonist of the unrelated story where he is thrown into a pit by his two older brothers (RV 1.105), the story picked up by the Mahabharata.\(^{37}\) These are, in the Rig-Veda, separate myths – Indra delivers Viśvarūpa to Trita (RV 2.11.19), and books 1 and 10 of the Rig-Veda are considered the latest,\(^{38}\) but there is reason to believe the Trita myth is the original.\(^{39}\)

In Iran, Trita Āptya reappears as Thrita, the haoma-presser (like Indra) whose son kills a dragon, but also as Thraetaona son of Āthwya, who slays the three-headed dragon or “snake of evil religion” (Yt. 18.7.490) Aži Dahāka (freeing stolen cows; Yt. 5.9.33).\(^{40}\) The account is preserved in the relatively late Yashts (Yt. 5.29–35; 9.13–15; 14.38–40; 19.34–52; also in the Yasna (Hom Yasht) Y.9.7–8, 11),\(^{41}\) but as Watkins showed, the Avestan yō jana ažīm is the exact cognate of the Vedic áhann áhim, in the same word order.\(^{42}\) The slaying act also occurs as tauruuiiâta (<PIE *terh\(_2\); Yt. 13.38), and vādāya<PIE *wedh also occurs. In Pahlavi literature, the dragon is chained to Mount Demavend until the end of the world.

This Avestan myth is not derived from the Vedic. Although the Iranian migration followed the Indic by several centuries,\(^{43}\) Indic was already differentiated from Iranian much earlier.\(^{44}\) Moreover, as Michael Witzel writes, “Old Iranian in general is too archaic to have moved out of India after the composition of the RV.”\(^{45}\) We have here a separate, probably earlier, derivation from the Indo-European original.\(^{46}\)

However, a derivative of the Avestan Thraetaona-Aži Dahāka story is found in Firdausi’s 1000 AD Shahname or “Persian Book of Kings.” The book mainly covers Sassanian lore of 225–650 AD, but has a mythological section at its beginning,\(^{47}\) which is aware of some historical traditions as far back as Artaxerxes in the 5th century B.C.\(^{48}\) Following the fourth king of the mythical first dynasty, an Arabian
usurper named Zahhāk takes the throne of Persia. Zahhāk had been previously seduced by Iblis or Ahriman (the devil) and bears two live snakes sprouting from his shoulders as a result. After a thousand-year reign, the Persian hero Fereydūn, whom Zahhāk has dreamt of as the “youngest of three” young men, defeats Zahhāk and chains him to Mount Demavend until the end of the world. Zahhāk is from Dahāka; the dragon has become the dragon-shouldered, although Zahhāk is repeatedly called a dragon himself (e.g., 1.177.634); in Dick Davis’ translation, “the Serpent King.” Fereydūn, as Olga Davidson has shown, is Thraetaona. Fereydūn rides a bull, and his weapon against Zahhāk is a bull-headed mace, forged by the smith Kāva (1.61.183–67. 277), and he is depicted with this mace subduing a demon on a Sassanian amulet in the British Museum. Reasons for highlighting this late permutation of the myth will be clear at a later point.

Although the Hittite version of the Indo-European dragon myth has connections with earlier Hattic material, most scholars consider it a direct inheritance from Proto-Indo-European times and not a borrowing from a later period. In fact, M. L. West considers it a better approximation of the Proto-Indo-European mytheme than the Rig-Veda. The Anatolian branch of Indo-European represented by Hittite (or, properly, “Nesili,” as the Hittites called it) and related languages of Asia Minor was the first to diverge from common Indo-European (2900 BC at the latest; perhaps as early as the 5th millennium), and continued to evolve for some time after this divergence before breaking up further. Hittite, Luwian, and Palaic all appear in Anatolia about 1650 BC. But Hittite names occur already in the records of the Assyrian trading colony at Karum Kanesh four hundred years earlier, and Indo-European-speaking peoples were surely well established in Anatolia before 2000, and the geographic distribution concentrating them in southwestern Anatolia
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suggests they or at least the language entered not from the east via the Caucasus but from the west, like the Phrygians and Galatians of later eras.  

There were non-Indo-European peoples already in Anatolia, the so-called Hattic peoples attested from the Early Bronze Age and mentioned in the Assyrian texts from Karum Kanesh. The Hattic centre of Hattuša became the capital for the Hittite Old Kingdom, which include both the Luwian and Palaic lands.

Old Hittite religion was largely Hattic. The name of the Hattic storm god was Taru (KUB 20.10.iv.12; 28.3.obv.1.col.19a, 4 obv.; etc.), and we must note that this cannot possibly be from the PIE *terh₂-, from which came the Vedic tur; the Hatti were pre-Indo-European. We know nothing about Taru except that he was depicted as a bull. The Hittite storm god is Tarḫuna, which certainly is from PIE *terh₂-, as is his Luwian name Tarḫunzas (in cuneiform Luwian, e.g., KUB 35.43. ii.36*, 44 rev.6; in Hieroglyphic Luwian it was Tarḫunt; KUB 32.12.rev.1*1). It was probably easier to syncretize the Hattic and Hittite storm gods because of the coincidental similarity of their names. Tarḫuna was the chief deity of the Hittites. Many of the Hittite rituals are from Luwian regions and reflect Luwian cultic and poetic traditions. The Hittite storm god was represented as or on a bull, as on a vase from Inandiktepe. From the earliest Hittite text onwards, the close relationship between the storm god and the king is emphasized. The Hittite king reigned in the name of Tarḫuna and acted as his chief priest. On a rock relief from Fıraktin, the king and the storm god are depicted almost identically.
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The Old Hittite form of the Indo-European dragon slaying myth, known from several copies, is the Illuyanka Myth (CTH 321). Here, the storm god and “mortal Hupasiyas/Hupashiya [Par II, line 6],” or in a second variant his mortal son (line 22”) defeat the dragon/serpent Illuyanka (i.e., El+yanka [serpent]; COS 1.150-51 #1.56; CTH 321), who is also called “the river of the watery abyss” (Line 17). In the second version, the serpent’s initial overpowering of the storm god is explicit (KBo 3.7 i 11). In the second variant, the victory takes place at the sea and the son dies (voluntarily) at his father’s hand in the course of his father slaying the dragon (Part III, line 26”), and, although the portion of the text is quite fragmentary, it appears that mortal Hupasiyas also ends up dying in the first version. The introduction of a mortal helper who is killed finally even though the god’s victory is largely his doing is “unique, paradoxical and disconcerting,” in the words of Walter Burkert. “Though the text does not make it very clear why this was unavoidable,” he writes, “it is indicated, instead, that he accepts his death out of his own free will. This is suspiciously reminiscent of sacrificial ideology.” This martyrdom and victory is followed by a banquet assembly of the gods (Part IV). The Illuyanka myth was narrated in the Purulli New Year’s festival, with the king presiding.

The linguistic formula is the same here as in the Rig-Veda: "MUŠ illuyankan kuenta (<PIE *g"hen; KUB 17.5 I 17 §12), MUŠ illuyankaš DİM-an tarhta (KBo 3.7 I 11), or MUŠ illuyankan taralhūwan (<PIE *terh). As Calvert Watkins masterfully showed, this myth is the old Indo-European inheritance. However, we should note
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that there were several other Indo-European contacts after the Hittite Old Kingdom. By 1450, the kingdom was crumbling, with Aḫḫiya(ma) from Greece taking the coast and Hurrians invading from Syria. 

The Hurrians themselves had occupied Upper Mesopotamia since 2200 B.C., with some living in Anatolia by 2000, as they are mentioned in the Karum Kanesh texts. They are related linguistically only to the later Urartans. By 1600, following further incursions of Hurrians from the northeast, they established the kingdom of Mitanni in Upper Mesopotamia, although the Hurrian population extended far beyond Mitanni. The kingdom was consolidated in the early 15th century, dominated Syria until the mid-14th, and lasted until the 12th. But in spite of the origins of the Hurrian language, which remained the spoken language of Mitanni, all of the kings of Mitanni have Indo-Aryan or Indic names. Their gods include Indra and other Vedic deities. Either there were certain groups among the later Hurrian immigrants from Transcaucasia who spoke an archaic form of Indo-Aryan, or, since the evidence of Indo-Aryan is confined to names of rulers and gods and technical terms to do with the training of horses, Indo-Aryan settlers in Transcaucasia influenced some Hurrians – the future ruling class – before they
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migrated to Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{99} This bears upon more than the Hittite case, as Indo-Aryan Mitanni names are found in the Late Bronze age all the way down into Palestine.\textsuperscript{100}

By 1425, kings of the dynasty ruling from Hattusha had two names: a Hurrian name and at the same time a Hittite one (throne name). There are Hurrian texts preserved from Hatti, although most documents are in Hittite, and there is also an increasing number of texts written containing Luwian terms. The rulers from Hattusha expanded the territory into a Hittite Empire by 1350.\textsuperscript{101} The empire would last another two hundred years.\textsuperscript{102} Even before the Empire, the Hittite gods had been syncretized with the Hurrian ones of the same nature, identifying Taḫuna with the genuinely Hurrian storm god and patron of vegetation-giving rain Teshub (\textit{KBo} 24.59.iv.12, 14).\textsuperscript{103} The same cuneiform logogram was now used for Taru, Taḫuna, and Teshub.\textsuperscript{104} Increasingly, this god – depicted on or as a bull\textsuperscript{105} – was a god of agriculture, too.\textsuperscript{106} A 13th-century relief from Melid (Arslantepe) shows Teshub with a serpent.\textsuperscript{107} The elaborate Yazılıkaya rock carving at Hattusha illustrates the entire Hurrian pantheon and its mythology, with their Hurrian names given in Luwian hieroglyphs – including Teshub with his two bulls Sherishu and Khuṟi – right in the Hittite capital.\textsuperscript{108} Nothing suggests the Hurrian dynasty of the Hittite Empire was Indo-Aryan, but the Hurrian syncretism in Hatti took place after Indo-Aryan influence (or rule; see above) in the Hurrian homeland.

Another wave of Indo-European immigration came after 1200, when Phrygians came from the Balkans.\textsuperscript{109} It is thus of great importance when the Hittite myths originate, whether in the “pure” period of the Old Kingdom or the Middle or Empire period when Indo-European influence could have come anew. Yet, writes Watkins, “For all that the Indo-European languages of 2nd-millennium Anatolia have been in contact with and doubtless culturally influenced by the poetic traditions of Hattic on the one hand and Hurrian on the other, it is clear there is a significant inherited Indo-European component in their component as well.”\textsuperscript{110}

Of Hurrian origin is the Kumarbi cycle, the general plot of which is the efforts of the storm god Teshub to defeat the ruling usurper earth god Kumarbi and avenge
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his deposed father (KUB 47.48 I 9’–14’). The cycle contains six songs, the order of which is unclear. The fourth and fifth were probably the dragon slaying of Hedammu (preserved in two versions, CTH 348.I.1-29 and II.1–2) and the Song of Ullikummi (also two versions, CTH 345.I.1–10, preserved in Hittite, and II.1–2 in Hurrian). The myth of Ullikummi describes the victory of Teshub over the rock-monster Ullikummi, offspring of Kumarbi. This battle, according to Tablet 2, line 32, takes place on Mount Hazzi, which is 1700m-high Jebel el-Aqra (Keldağ in Turkish), on the Syrian/Turkish border. In other texts, this mountain was deified as one of Teshub’s lieutenants.

In the other song, Kumarbi’s son Hedammu, who has the form of a serpent, comes forth from the sea – or is identified as the sea (Hur. kiiaže) and wreaks havoc on earth before being destroyed by Teshub. Hedammu is also said to have been born on Mount Hazzi, which does in fact overlook the sea. And Teshub is only successful when he is saved by the goddess Ishtar seducing the serpent.

The component songs of the Kumarbi cycle are not all of the same age, but they are not remote in time. Alberto Bernabé argues the Song of Ullikummi was based on the Hedammu myth, although the connection between the two may be one of equivalent products of the creative process. In any case, in all of the songs Teshub needs help from other gods in order to prevail.

Finally, a fragmentary text that may be unrelated (CTH 349) mentions a victory of the storm god over the sea (1.17’), as well as mentioning Mount Hazzi (11.19’–20’).

The first million-dollar question is whether any relationship exists between Illuyanka and Hedammu (or Ullikummi). We do not know how extensively the Hittites modified the Hurrian tales themselves, so even if the two myths began independently, Hedammu may have been shaped to the contours of the Indo-European myth. Copies of Illuyanka date to the 16th or early 15th century,
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although the tale may be much older, while the Kumarbi Cycle to the late 15th-
early 14th.\textsuperscript{126} If they are related, it would probably be dependence from Illuyanka
(and the Indo-European common myth) to Hedammu and Ullikummi.\textsuperscript{127} Hedammu is
described in Hittite as a $\text{MUS}^\text{illuyanked}$, or snake deity ($KUB$ 43.37.ii.14').\textsuperscript{128} The
second big question is whether the Hurrian myth owes anything to the Semitic
world, and we shall return to this issue momentarily.

After the Hittite Empire disintegrated around 1200 B.C., several Neo-Hittite
states emerged between the two zones of Aramean concentration along the Khaibur
River and south of the Orontes around Damascus.\textsuperscript{129} Much of the population was
neither Aramean nor Hittite, but called themselves Hittites.\textsuperscript{130} There were Semitic
peoples living in the area prior to Luwian hegemony, probably Amorites, to whom
we shall return.\textsuperscript{131} A slow Aramaization thereafter took place, especially in contact
with Assyria,\textsuperscript{132} and the Hittite storm god, already Hurrianized, now merged with
the Aramean Haddad, to whom we shall also return (e.g., Malatya 9th century).\textsuperscript{133}
Although there is little textual material from these kingdoms, seals of the storm god
as a bull are found throughout this region.\textsuperscript{134}

Farther north, Luwian worship of Tarḥunt continued through the 1st millennium
down – as far south as Assyria (Tell Ahmar) – until the Roman period, appearing
as the Lycian Trqqas and Pisidian Termessus.\textsuperscript{135} He continues to be represented as
a bull, even in a Roman example from Cappadocia.\textsuperscript{136}

The 14th and 13th centuries were the height of the ancient city of Ugarit, only
few miles south of Mount Hazzi. Ugarit is the source for the most complete Bronze
Age “Storm god vs. Dragon” narrative, the Baal Cycle. The entire cycle is written
on six tablets preserved well enough to understand the general flow of the material
but with several lacunae ranging from ten to forty lines or more.\textsuperscript{137} The first two
tablets describe the battle of the storm god Baal with the Sea god, Yamm, who is
serpentine ($KTU$ 1.83 4–12; 1.3 iii 39–42). The High God El has given Yamm,
his beloved son, the kingship of the gods. Yamm sends messengers to convey the
news to Baal, who does not give in to Yamm’s edict of subjection, while all the
other gods cower in fear ($KTU$ 1.2 i 20–25; 1.2 i 37–45). Instead, with the help
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of his sister Anat and magical weapons made by Kothar-wa-Khasis (KTU 1.2 iv 10–12, 27–28), Baal finally — after a failed first attempt — vanquishes Yamm (KTU 1.2 iv 20–28; 1.3 iii). The next two tablets explain how, after much effort, Baal and Anat get underway with the building plans for Baal’s palace on Mount Hazzi, now called Mount Zaphon, and a victory feast to which all the gods are invited (KTU 1.4 vi 44–46). Cylinders uncovered at Ugarit also depict Baal’s defeat of the monstrous horned serpent (e.g., RS 22.251 (144); RS 10.038 (167)). Most scholars understand the myth to focus on the kingship of Baal and, by extension, of the king of Ugarit.139

In spite of a few caveats — El, not Baal, is a bull;140 this is not a cosmogony, Yamm is not evil and is a threat only to Baal, not to the whole of the divine or the world;141 the Baal myth was not a cultic or liturgical text142 — this is familiar territory. Baal is a storm-god, identified with the human kingship of Ugarit (CAT 1.15 obv. II 11ff).143 The enemy is the sea, which is also a seven-headed “swelling serpent” (KTU 1.5 i 1–2) called “Lord River” like Illuyanka. All the other gods cower in fear of Yamm, as the gods did of Vṛtra. Baal is initially unsuccessful and requires both assistance and specially made weapons. The impression is given that Yamm might not quite be dead forever. Moreover, the story centres on the same mountain as Ullikummi and Hedammu.

Dependence on the Kumarbi Cycle is unquestionable, although the myth was gradually built up from bits of other provenance, as well.144 Moreover, texts in Hurrian have been found at Ugarit, albeit not from the Cycle.145 Nevertheless, we have already seen that Kumarbi is itself an admixture of strands. Whether or not Kumarbi has any Semitic elements, it is nearly certain that Baal does. Prior to falling under Mitanni’s hegemony in 1500, Ugarit had been Amorite. It was periodically subject to the Hittite Empire, as well.

The epithet ba`lu as the proper name of a particular god is attested for all sorts of gods in various eras, but also occurs as the endingless “Ba`al” as early as the 25th century.146 In the course of the 15th century, it had developed on the Levantine coast from an epithet of the storm god Haddad to his primary name, independently
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from the gods called Ba’al centuries earlier.\(^{147}\) Storm gods became mutually interchangeable. A colossal statue from Karatepe in the first millennium bears a Phoenician inscription identifying Luwian Tarḫunt with Baal.\(^{148}\)

The difficulty with the background of the Semitic storm god Haddad, whose origin lies in the Syria-Upper Mesopotamia area,\(^{149}\) is the absence of myths.\(^{150}\) We do have iconography. In 18th–16th century Mesopotamia, Adad is always depicted with a bull and often holding lightning,\(^{151}\) ordinarily a triple trident.\(^{152}\) This representation continues to the 12th century.\(^{153}\) The storm god of Aleppo was at first known as Adad, but by the 16th century had merged with the Hurrian Teshub.\(^{154}\) In the Hittite capital of Hattusa, a temple was dedicated to the “Storm God of Aleppo” already by the end of the 14th century.\(^{155}\) Not only was Hattusa defined as the “city of the storm god of Aleppo,” but the festival of the thunder of the storm god of Hatti was attributed to the storm god of Aleppo.\(^{156}\) Yet, the god “Haddad” continues to be worshipped in the Neo-Hittite kingdoms of the first millennium (e.g., Zenjirli has both a Haddad and a Teshub).\(^{157}\) Thus in the vast region now called Al-Jazira, the same god was known as Haddad, Baal, or Teshub depending on the speaker.\(^{158}\)

The one myth from the East Semitic world that is comparable to the dragon slaying is also the ancient Near East’s most famous, the *Enuma Elish*. The oldest copies we possess of the *Enuma Elish* are from 1000 BC; it was likely composed at the earliest in the 16th century.\(^{159}\) Not earlier. We cannot refer to the *Enuma Elish* as the “Mesopotamian Creation Story,” as there are numerous creation stories much older and they look nothing like *Enuma Elish*, having no battle at all.\(^{160}\)

The story is familiar. The monster Tiamat, who is also the Chaos Sea, threatens to destroy the gods, and no champion can be found. Marduk, the “young bull,”\(^{161}\) offers to defeat her if he can become king of the gods. Wielding lightning (although he is not a storm god, in spite of “Addu” being one of the fifty names given him in

---

\(^{147}\) Ibid., 9.


\(^{150}\) Ibid., 160.

\(^{151}\) Van Buren, *Symbols*, 35.

\(^{152}\) Ibid., 68–69.

\(^{153}\) Ibid., *Symbols*, 67.

\(^{154}\) Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, 50.


\(^{156}\) Ibid., 161.


\(^{161}\) Philippe Talon, “*Enuma Elish* and the Transmission of Babylonian Cosmology to the West,” 266. The late Syrian author Proclus equates Marduk with Haddad; *Plato Latinus* 3.59–61, 95; Talon, “Transmission,” 274.
he is victorious, and from her now-split carcass creates the world—just like Indra. When he finishes, he is declared king, and the gods build a temple-home for him, just as in the Baal Cycle. The subtext is kingship—both of Marduk, and the human king of Babylon, his installation as heir to the cosmic victory.

The myth was ritually rehearsed in the Akitu festival, which although does not appear to be in origin a New Year festival, became so in the Neo-Babylonian period. In the full Neo-Babylonian Akitu, the defeat of Tiamat and creation of the world were ritually linked to the enthronement of the Babylonian king: as we said of Indra, the king overcoming his enemies is homologous to the god of kingship overcoming the monster. This myth-and-ritual complex lasted into the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

In the bilingual gods’ lists at Ugarit, the Akkadian parallel of Yamm is Tiamat. Since no copy of the Enuma Elish predates the Baal Cycle, and the probable origin of the Enuma Elish no more than two hundred years prior to the Baal Cycle, and since the Enuma Elish looks so odd to anyone who has read the Sumerian and Akkadian creation myths, Thorkild Jacobsen once argued that the myth had travelled from northwest to southeast. The myth was Northwest Semitic (Amorite) or even Indo-European, and moved into Mesopotamia in the 2nd millennium (Friedrich Delitzsch thought it was the other way round). It does seem unlikely that Mesopotamians would come up with a battle against the sea.

Unfortunately things are much more complicated. First, there are major differences between the other myths and Enuma Elish. Baal is not a creation myth; the battle takes place on a fully created earth. Baal, Teshub, and even Tarḫuna only defeat the dragon with great difficulty, while Marduk has no trouble. Tiamat is a danger to the entire universe; Yamm is not. And it is not clear Tiamat is a serpent or a dragon. Nowhere is she described as being such, although some iconography suggests she is serpentine (e.g., on Neo-Assyrian seal and the Ain es-Samiya goblet).

Secondly, some of the materials used by the author of the Enuma Elish are much older, such as the list of monsters Tiamat creates (1.141–46), which is found in
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two Sumerian texts (Lugal-E and Angimdimma; their destruction is attributed to Ningirsu or other deities). Tiamat herself is known earlier, but only as a breeder of monsters.

Third and most important are textual snippets that prefigure the narrative of Enuma Elish. A seven-headed muš.SAG.imin is killed by the god Ninurta, as is a bašmu snake dragon (KAR 6; Return of Ninurta to Nippur), and some argue that Marduk in Enuma Elish is modelled on Ninurta. On the other hand, the sea plays no role as the opponent of the gods in any of the Ninurta myths.

A text from Mari in Syria dated to 1780 has, “Thus speaks Haddad, ‘I have brought you back to the throne of your father, and have given you the arms with which I fought against Tiamat’” (ARMT A.1968, 2’). And even more interesting is a 2350 text from Eshnunna in central Mesopotamia: “Steward of Tiamat, fierce warrior, arise! Tishpak, steward of Tiamat, fierce one, arise!” (MAD 1.192). Here Tiamat is neither evil nor chaotic. But Tishpak is interesting. His iconic figure is the Muššuššu dragon, at least from the 25th century. Marduk later takes this symbol over from Tishpak. Some argue that Marduk takes this totem because of Enuma Elish, but the image is attached to Marduk as early as 1800 while not restricted to Tishpak and Marduk, and it does not look serpentine.

To return to Tishpak, he is a storm god of Eshnunna. In an Old Akkadian text, Tishpak fights a different dragon the sea or “River” has created (CT 13.33–34 obv. 6, 23; Eshnunna seal). The other gods cower in fear (CT 13.33–34 obv. 14). Tishpak’s weapon is the thunderbolt (rev. 5–7), and his reward for victory is kingship (obv. 19). The standard representation of Tishpak shows him with two snakes emerging from his shoulders, looking exactly like Zahhāk.
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Many creative scenarios have been proposed to explain the Mesopotamian myth. Some attribute the story to supposedly Indo-Aryan Kassites, a people from the Zagros Mountains first mentioned in the 18th century BC who took over Babylon around 1500. Aside from the fact that this is too early for the *Enuma Elish* and far too late for Tishpak, only a few Kassite words come from Indo-European (e.g., *Šurijaš* “sun god”; *Maruttaš* “divine Marut comrades of Indra”; equestrian terms such as *akriyaš* = *agriya*-s “(running) in front?”, *timiraš* “black?”, etc.) The Kassite language is unrelated to any other known language family. It is minimally possible that a few Indo-European warriors came west with the art of horse-warfare and stimulated the hitherto benign Kassites to their sudden aggressiveness in the 17th century.

Others (William Crooke, Buddha Prakash) have cited parallels to argue for influence from the Mesopotamia to the *Rig-Veda*. All sorts of things are possible, as trade and, no doubt, influence runs from early contacts to the Greek rulers of India in the first century.

The dragon slaying in the *Rig-Veda*, *Avesta*, and Illuyanka are independent manifestations of the common Indo-European heritage. It is also clear *Shahname* is a genetic descendent of the *Avesta*, the Baal myth is directly dependent on the Kumarbi Cycle, and the *Enuma Elish* is indebted to earlier Mesopotamian myths. The relationship within the Near East of Hittite Illuyanka, Hurrian Kumarbi Cycle, Canaanite Baal myth, and Mesopotamian myths remains incredibly complex. The Baal Myth probably combines Indo-European, Hurrian, and Semitic elements; Enuma Elish perhaps has all these plus Sumero-Akkadian influence. *Shahname* could easily take on influence from these stories to its west.

The various dragon-slaying myths of the Near East influenced each other repeatedly and in all directions, each society building its own myth out of various components in a manner unique and particular, as Emily Lyle has described. As the folklorist Slavica Rankovic says, “What we hoped to be a string (something one can actually follow) would immediately start splitting at its tip, shooting innumerable threads both horizontally synchronically … and vertically/diachronically ... The texture of this network is hardly as regular as that of a fishing net or a sweater. … There is no regularity in the way of sprouting, or the intervals in the progression
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of branching: the threads would not always depart from one another – some would occasionally merge into one and the same point, some would also have to loop back into the point from which they started.”

As stated earlier, this is only halfway along the dragon’s elusive trail. Further research is leading northwest, to Zeus slaying Typhon also on Mount Hazzi/Zaphon, forward to St. George or El-Khidr, whom Muslim writers felt connected to Fereydūn, and south to the elusive dragon-slaying bull god known as Yahweh.
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