**The Demonization of the Ugaritic Warrior Goddess Anat\***

**Introduction ⸺ Anat and the Phenomenon of the Warrior Goddesses**

Anat, the Ugaritic goddess of war and hunting, is one of the extraordinary cases of female figures who are portrayed as powerful and violent warriors in the Ancient Near East.[[1]](#footnote-1) This phenomenon is particularly striking in patriarchal cultures where women’s roles in society are typically confined to the domestic sphere.[[2]](#footnote-2)

This essay focuses on the goddess Anat and the question of the ambivalent attitude towards her actions and behavior in the Ugaritic mythological, epic, and ritual-cultic texts.[[3]](#footnote-3) On the one hand, she is worshiped as a glorified female warrior, while on the other hand, she is reproached for her bellicosity and extreme violence. The explicit, implicit, and implied criticism expressed in various descriptions that portray her negatively leads to the demonization of her persona. In ancient traditional societies, feminine roles were restricted to the domestic, familial sphere and this was reflected in the social status of women. Compared to the stereotypical feminine representations in these societies, the model of the female warrior, such as the Ugaritic Anat, the Mesopotamian Inanna/Ishtar,[[4]](#footnote-4) or the Egyptian Hathor/Sekhmet[[5]](#footnote-5) is quite remarkable.[[6]](#footnote-6) The most significant characteristic of these warrior goddesses is the “gender role reversal”, expressed in their free and independent behaviors, actions, and speech. These goddesses represent the non-domestic female and exemplify the crossing of gender lines. Despite the many differences between the various warrior goddesses, they have many more aspects in common. By reexamining descriptions of Anat in comparison with those of other mythical warrior goddesses who were portrayed demonically, this study will contribute to a better understanding of the reason for the presentation of these goddesses in a manner that contrasted so greatly with the stereotypical images of other goddesses in these pantheons. Most importantly, this comparative study will shed more light on the significance, symbolic meaning, and *Sitz in Leben* of Anat’s demonic imagery in Ugaritic culture. The comparative analysis is conducted with the awareness that these female figures belong to different cultures with different social systems, religious beliefs, political structures, and mythologies.

**The Goddess Anat**

The goddess Anat is portrayed in Ugaritic narrative poetry (the Baˁal Cycle, Aqhat) as a goddess of war and hunting.[[7]](#footnote-7) She is presented in many texts with the epithets *btlt ˁnt*, “the maiden Anatu”, and *btlt(m)*,“maiden”. No other goddess in the Ugaritic texts bears the title *btlt*.[[8]](#footnote-8) It is agreed among scholars that this term denotes the social status as a young nubile woman, rather than representing her sexual experience. Anat is known as the daughter of the creator god El, the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, and the sister of the storm god Baˁal; She is also framed as the consort and main ally of Baˁal.[[9]](#footnote-9) Her cult spread between the Levant and Egypt from the early second millennium BCE to the Hellenistic period. Her epithet *bˁlt mlk* presents her as the patroness of heroes and kings. She is a huntress and mistress of animals with predatory and protective aspects.[[10]](#footnote-10) Indeed, hunting seems to be her favorite pastime (KTU 1.6 II:15–17; 1.114:23–24). In the texts and the iconography (Ugaritic and Egyptian), she is frequently described with animals (gazelles, lions, and horses) and weapons (spears, battle axes, bows), which are symbols of masculinity.[[11]](#footnote-11) She has a complex and multifaceted personality and an independent status within the divine realm. As a goddess of war and the hunt who transcends gender, Anat moves freely between the male and female spheres and the divine and human worlds. She is typically depicted as a powerful and ferocious warrior, known for her prowess on the battlefield. Her violence and ruthlessness befit her title *ˁnt hbly*, “Anat destroyer”, as she is referred to in a cultic-ritual text (KTU 1.102:11). Her aggressive nature frightens humans and gods alike (even El and Athirat are terrified of her). The Baˁal Cycle describes her mutilating the bodies of human warriors she has just massacred, cutting off heads and hands and wallowing in blood. She murders Aqhat to acquire his composite bow. Such depictions contribute to her demonization in the Ugaritic corpus.

**Anat’s Battles**

Besides Anat’s violence in war, her unrestrained character is manifested in her aggressive confrontations with El and Aqhat and her ferocious conduct against them. She prides herself on killing the enemies of Baˁal, gods, monsters, and humans (KTU 1.3 III:38–47)⸺among them are the sea serpent Yamm/Nahar, the sea monsters (*bṯn ˁqltm*), Arsh (*ˀarš*), the seven-headed monster (*šlyṭ d šbˁt rˀašm*), the calf of El Atik *(ˁtk*), and two demonesses: Dabibu (*ḏbb*), described as El’s daughter, and Ishatu *(ˀišt*), “Flame”.[[12]](#footnote-13)

For example, in one of the episodes in the Baˁal Cycle, she is described on the battlefield as defeating and killing human warriors, identified as the enemies of Baˁal. She wades in their blood, dismembering and mutilating warriors’ bodies, severing heads, and cutting off hands. She then ties these grisly trophies to her body:[[13]](#footnote-14)

The gates of Anat’s house are closed,

She meets youths at the foot of the mountain.

And look! Anat fights in the valley,

Battles between the two towns.

She fights the people of the se[a]-shore,

Strikes the populace of the su[nr]ise.

Under her, like balls, are hea[ds,]

Above her, like locusts, hands,

Like locusts, heaps of warrior-hands.

She fixes heads to her back,

Fastens hands to her belt.

knee-deep she glea[n]s in warriors- blood,

Neck-deep in the the gor[e] of soldiers.

With a club she drives away captives,

With her bow-string, the foe.

(Baˁal Cycle:KTU 1.3 II:3–16).[[14]](#footnote-15)

Unsated with her killings in the fields, she continues massacring soldiers in her palace:

And look! Anat goes to her house,

The goddess takes herself to her palace,

Unsated with her fighting in the valley,

With battling between the two towns.

She arranges chairs for the soldiery,

Arranges tables for hosts,

Footstools for heroes…

Knee-deep she gleans in warrior-blood,

Neck-deep in the gore of soldiers,

Until sated with fighting in the house,

With battling between the tables.

(Baˁal Cycle: KTU 1.3II:17–22, 27–30).[[15]](#footnote-16)

In another episode, Anat battles with the god of death, Mot, who defeats and kills Baˁal. She performs a series of destructive acts displaying her prowess in battle and primarily her horrifying unrestrained rage by executing her vengeance on Mot’s remains.[[16]](#footnote-17)

She seizes Divine Mot,

With a sword she splits him,

With a sieve she winnowed him.

With a fire she burns him,

With millstones she grinds him,

In the field she sows (scatters) him.

The birds eat his flesh,

Fowl devour his parts,

Flesh to flesh cries out.

(Baˁal Cycle: KTU 1.3 II:30–37).[[17]](#footnote-18)

**Anat in the Epic of Aqhat**

The *Aqhat* epic (KTU 1.17–1.19) is a significant example of Anat’s devious and vindictive behavior. The text tells of Anat’s desire for the magnificent composite bow made for Aqhat by the craftsman god, Kothar-wa-Hasis. She asks Aqhat for the bow and offers him money, kingship, and immortality, but he refuses her offers and insults her. The furious Anat plots to acquire the bow at any cost and goes to her father, El, the head of the pantheon. She demands his consent to murder Aqhat and even threatens to harm him if he refuses:

I will make [your head] run [with blood],

Your old gre[y bea]rd with gore.

Then [cry to](?) Aqhat to rescue you,

To [Daniel’s] son to save you

From the hand of [Anat] the girl!

(Aqhat: KTU 1.18 I:11–14)[[18]](#footnote-19)

Although El is Aqhat’s godfather, he capitulates, saying:[[19]](#footnote-20)

I know you, daughter, as desperate,

[Among the goddesses no]thing resists you.

Go off, daughter, haughty of heart,

[Lay] hold of what’s in your liver,

Set up the […in] your breast.

To resist you is to be beaten.

(Aqhat: KTU 1.18 I:16–19).[[20]](#footnote-21)

After receiving El’s blessing, Anat entices Aqhat to join her on a hunting trip. While the unsuspecting Aqhat is waiting for her in the field, she turns Yatpan, her henchman, into a bird of prey that flies above Aqhat and kills him with blows to his head.[[21]](#footnote-22) She then takes Aqhat’s bow, but it falls into the sea and is lost. Anat mourns Aqhat’s death, but then dismembers his body, and the vultures devour his remains.[[22]](#footnote-23)

**Warrior Goddesses’ Violence and Cruelty ⸺ Comparative Perspectives**

Similar descriptions of violence and ruthlessness also characterize other warrior goddesses. For example, the Mesopotamian Inanna/Ishtar, the most remarkable and multifaceted goddess of love and war, demonstrates violence and brutality in battle in the myth “Inanna and Ebih”. The text describes her battle with the rebellious Kur (the personified mountain/Netherworld monster), who refused to acknowledge her superiority:

She (Inanna) confronts the mountain range…

she sharpened both edges of her dagger.

She grabbed Ebih’s neck as if ripping up esparto grass…

she pressed the dagger’s teeth into its interior…

she roared like thunder.

After she finished destroying the mountain,

its inhabitants, forests, and animals

she addressed the mountain:

“… because of your height and your reaching up to heaven,

because you did not put your nose to the ground…

I have killed you and brought you low”.

Rejoicing in her fearsome terror she spoke:…

“my anger, a harrow with great teeth, has torn the mountain apart…

I imposed my victory on the mountain.

I imposed my victory on Ebih…”

(Inanna and Ebih)[[23]](#footnote-24)

Another example is the description of the Egyptian goddess Hathor in her aspect as the warrior goddess Sekhmet in the myth “The Destruction of Humanity”. According to Lichtheim, “Hathor/Sekhmet is the daughter of Ra/Re, head of the Egyptian pantheon. As a goddess of war and patroness of kings, she accompanied the Egyptian Pharaoh to battle and was often described as his mother. In the iconography, Sekhmet is frequently depicted with a lioness head. She is known for spreading terror everywhere, and humans and gods are afraid of her: When human beings stopped respecting Ra/Re, the sun god, the father of all creation and the head of the Egyptian pantheon he ordered his daughter Hathor to take on her warrior goddess aspect in the form of Sekhmet and kill humans. She obeyed the command and slaughters men, tearing them to shreds, covering the earth blood. After a while, Ra is satisfied with her killings and decides not to destroy all mankind. He commanded Hathor/Sekhmet to stop. But, she disobeys him because she has developed an uncontrollable blood thirst and finds her pleasure in torturing mortals. Ra attempts to stop her but it is to no avail. She continues her massacre among the innocents until Ra with the aid the other gods tricks her by using a huge amount red wine or red colored beer. Hathor/Sekhmet mistakes the wine/beer for blood, drinks it and falls asleep. When she awakes, her blood-lust has subsided and stopped her desire for bloodshed and destruction. Thus Ra saves humanity from annihilation”.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Notably, most male warrior gods in the various pantheons are also described as fierce, invincible, merciless, and violent in their battles with their enemies. They are often said to decapitate, mutilate, and dismember their enemies, actions that were standard wartime practices in the Ancient Near East. This can be seen, for instance, in the description of Baˁal fighting Yamm:

The weapon leaps from Baal’s hand,

[like] a raptor from his fingers,

It strikes the head of Prince [Yamm,]

Between the eyes of Judge River.

Yamm collapses and falls to the earth,

His joints shake,

And his form collapses.

Baal drags and dismembers (?) Yamm,

Destroy Judge River.

(KTU 1.2 IV:23–27)[[25]](#footnote-26)

Another example is the way in which the Mesopotamian god Ninurta/Ningirsu, who is described as a god of war and hunting, fights against the rebellious lands:

Let my mother ([Ninhursag](https://www.mesopotamiangods.com/ninhursag/)) know it.

I, Ninurta, will fell trees, I will strike down forests.

Let my mother know it.

I will clear them away like an … axe.

Let my mother know it.

I will strike down … walls like a huge axe.

Let my mother now it.

I will make their troops tremble like …

Let my mother know it.

I will devour them like storm and flood.

Let my mother know it.

The warrior (Ninurta) … in furious battle, smashes heads.

The Lord curses the disobedient, rebellious lands:

I will …… battering ram, I will …… your venom.”

I will destroy (?) your city gate ……, and reach your …

I will …… shield on (?) your tower, and reduce it to a pile of dust.

I will …… your ……, like a city cursed by [Enlil](https://www.mesopotamiangods.com/enlil/).

I will …… you into ruin mounds, like a city hated by Ninurta.

(Ninurta D:1–14)[[26]](#footnote-27)

However, these examples show that the narrator uses different language and imagery to describe the male warrior gods and the female warrior goddesses. Some of the differences are obvious, while others are implicit. The differences are exhibited in the overly detailed descriptions of the fighting practices of the female warriors and by emphasizing specific characteristics of the goddesses’ behavior and imagery, such as their being too emotional and verging on hysterics and far more frightening than the male warriors.

The most significant distinction between these descriptions is the emphasis on the “gender role reversal” aspect, as expressed in the criticism of the warrior goddess’ use of weapons, which are supposedly masculine. This view is reflected in Aqhat’s words:

“Bows are[weapons of] warriors

Will womankind now be hunting?”

(Aqhat: KTU 1.18 VI:39–41)[[27]](#footnote-28)

The bow and arrow are the most important masculine symbols in ancient Near Eastern cultures.[[28]](#footnote-29) They are part of Anat, Inanna/Ishtar, and Hathor/Sekhmet’s gear. Aqhat’s refusal to give Anat his bow reflects the gender ideology of the patriarchal ideology.[[29]](#footnote-30) Another significant distinction in the narrator’s treatment of male and female warriors is the frequent and extensive physical graphic portrayal of these goddesses’ bodies and anatomical parts compared to other gods, reflecting the significantly different attitude towards warrior goddesses. To emphasize this point, here is a detailed account of the body parts of Anat mentioned in the Baˁal Cycle:[[30]](#footnote-31)

**Anat’s Anatomy**

Feet (*pˀn*): KTU 1.1 II:15; 1.3 III:9, 19, 32; 1.3 IV:11; 1.3 V:4; 1.4 V:21.

Back (*bmt*): KTU 1.3 II:12; 1.6 I:5; (*ksl*): 1.3 III:33, 35.

Knees (*brkm*): KTU 1.3 II:13, 27.

Liver (*kbd*): KTU 1.3 II:25, 26.

Heart (*lb*): KTU 1.3 II:26; 1.6 II:8, 29.

Hand/Hands (*yd/ydm*): KTU 1.3:II 32, 34.

Right hand (*ymn*): KTU 1.3 V:22.

Long arm (*ˀarkt*)[[31]](#footnote-32): KTU 1.3 V:23.

Humeral bone of the arm (*qn drˁ*): KTU 1.6 I:4.

Fingers (*ˀuṣbˁt*): KTU 1.3 II:33, 35.

Breast (*ˀirt*): KTU 1.3 III:5.

Legs (*ˀišd*): KTU 1.3 III:20; 1.3 IV:12.

Face (*pn*): KTU 1.3 II:34; (*pnm*): 1.3 IV:37; 1.3 V:5; 1.4 V:22; 1.6 I:32; 1.6 IV:7.

Vertebrae, spine (*pnt*): KTU 1.3 III:34.

Back muscles (*ˀanš dt ẓr*): KTU 1.3 III:35.

Skin (*ģr*): KTU 1.6 I:2.

Cheeks (*lḥm*): KTU 1.6 I:2.

Beard (*dqn*): KTU 1.6 I:3.[[32]](#footnote-33)

Nipples (*ˀap lb*): KTU 1.6 I:5.

Shoulders (*ktp*): KTU 1.6 I:14.

As Mary Douglas argues, since “the body” is a cultural, social, and religious symbol, descriptions of sexual nudity and the body signify society’s norms.[[33]](#footnote-34) The excessive description of Anat’s body demonstrates her personification and suggests that the authors/narrators/redactors treat her more like a human female than a divine goddess. Certain feminine qualities and behaviors attributed to women, such as laughing and crying, are also emphasized in Anat’s descriptions. However, they usually present something repulsive and destructive in her personality. Here are just a few examples of this phenomenon from the Aqhat epic:

**Laughter:** Anat lets out a seductive laugh and, in her heart, plans the murder of Aqhat:

Anat laughed out loud,

But inwardly she plotted […].

(KTU 1.17 IV:41–42)[[34]](#footnote-35)

**Crying:** After murdering Aqhat, Anat cries and tearfully mourns his death:

[His] life went off like a breath…

[ ] Anat in the slaying,

Her warrior [ ]

[…] Aqhat, and she wept.

(KTU 1.17 IV:36; 37–39)[[35]](#footnote-36)

However, Anat then dismembers his body and leaves his remains for the vultures to consume. Her quick shift from fury to regret and back to fury again further demonstrates her capricious character.

Another insight into the author/narrator/redactor’s attitude towards Anat is reflected in the descriptions of Anat’s femininity, which allow the reader to have a peek at the goddess’ private activities and her boudoir:

**Washing and Make-up:** Anat’s preparations for the battle in the field include bathing, putting on make-up and perfume:

Henna of seven maids,

Scent of coriander and murex.

(KTU 1.17 II:2–3)[[36]](#footnote-37)

**Macabre Adornment:** After killing the human warriors, she adorns herself with the hands of the dead warriors, which she ties around her girdle, and she wears their heads as a necklace:

She fixes heads to her back,

Fastens hands to her belt.

(KTU 1.17 II:11–13)[[37]](#footnote-38)

**Repulsive Playfulness:**

Knee-deep she glea[n]s in warriors-blood,

Neck-deep in the gor[e]of soldiers.

(KTU 1.17 II:13–15)[[38]](#footnote-39)

**Domestic Chores:** After the massacre in her palace, Anat re-arranges some furniture:

She [ar]ranges chairs with chairs,

Tables [with] table<s>;

Footstools she arranges with footstools.

(KTU 1.17 II:36–37)[[39]](#footnote-40)

**Washing and Beautifying:**

[She] draws water and washes

[With D]ew of heaven, Oil of Earth,

Showers of Cloud[r]ider…

She beautifies herself with murex…

(KTU 1.17 II:38–40; III:1)[[40]](#footnote-41)

**Performing Love Songs:**

[She takes her harp in hand,]

[P]uts the lyre to her breast.

She sings the love of Mightiest Baal,

The passion of Pidray, Daughter of Light…

(KTU 1.17 III:4–8)[[41]](#footnote-42)

The feminine descriptions of Anat make her closer and more accessible to humans; therefore, as a female figure, she can be more easily criticized. Likewise, the descriptions of Anat’s unrestrained violence and ruthlessness, combined with the gruesome and repulsive descriptions of her so-called “feminine” traits, also provide another layer in her transformation into a demonic figure.

**Anat’s Connections to Death**:

Two more elements in Anat’s descriptions may have influenced her perception as a sinister and demonic deity. These are her associations with death and the underworld in the Baˁal Cycle (when Baˁal is killed in battle, she goes with *Shapsh*, the sun goddess, to the world of the dead to try to resurrect him), and her frequent mentions in sacrifice and offering lists in the Ugaritic ritual-cultic texts with the Plague god, Resheph. This association with the realm of the dead may potentially be yet another reason that she was demonized.

**Conclusion**

The phenomenon of female warrior goddesses is a dramatic and powerful literary strategy. The portrayals of these unique female figures suggest that they are cultural symbolic projections and a didactic means by which the conceptualization of cultural ideologies, social norms, and values are substantiated in their societies. Gender role reversal is a powerful tool in furthering messages directed at modes of feminine behavior. These independent maiden warrior goddesses with “masculine” attributes and activities cross the boundaries of the expected gender roles and pose a threat to the social order. They challenge the social/religious conventions on the one hand and simultaneously draw the boundaries of the social order, thus constructing them.[[42]](#footnote-43) The ambivalent attitude towards the warrior goddesses is characterized by the opposing ideologies incorporated within the texts that describe them. It is conceivable to assume that there are objectives and a meta-message behind this literary strategy.They tell us much about the authors/narrators/redactors’ ideologies and reflect those patriarchal societies’ larger worldview and agenda. Such descriptions contain educational didactic messages and goals. These goddesses are not only female warriors performing male activities. They are incomplete, liminal female figures with ambiguous identities. The gender role reversal aspect characterizing the warrior goddesses presents them as autonomous, independent females who are not fulfilling “feminine roles” as wives and mothers and could be a threat to the social order. This representation is essential to demonstrating society’s ambivalent attitude towards women. It also clarifies the dialogue of polarity between “positive” and “negative” female behavior in these traditional cultures.

Through the narratives of the anomalous phenomenon of warrior goddesses, the writers acknowledge the existence of contradictions and opposing powers and the importance of the balance between order and disorder. The autonomous, powerful female presents a paradox of coveted-threatening females in androcentric cultures, reflecting patriarchal males’ desires. The demonization of the warrior goddess is also a symbolic representation of the anxieties and concerns about the ability of these independent goddesses to kill and emasculate, with the Ugaritic goddess Anat a leading example.

The liminality of violent heroines gives us a window into the social perception of gender in these societies. Only by placing them neatly within society’s boundaries can they be accepted.

Many interpretative approaches have been given to Anat’s role in Ugaritic culture, mythology, and religion. Many of these interpretations are related to fertility, the change of seasons, war between order and chaos, and conflicts over status within the pantheon. Nevertheless, these interpretations do not provide a satisfactory explanation for the demonization of her character. This essay proposes that her gender role reversal is the primary reason for the negative descriptions of Anat found in the Ugaritic texts.
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