



Citation: Warbinek, L., & Giusfredi, F. (2023). Maliya, Malija, Malis, Athena. From Kizzuwatna to the Aegean: Borrowings, Translations, or Syncretisms? *Asia Anteriore Antica. Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures* 5: 139-151. doi: 10.36253/asiana-1854

Copyright: © 2023 Warbinek, L., & Giusfredi, F. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<http://www.fupress.com/asiana>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

Maliya, Malija, Malis, Athena. From Kizzuwatna to the Aegean: Borrowings, Translations, or Syncretisms?

LIVIO WARBINEK, FEDERICO GIUSFREDI¹

Università di Verona

livio.warbinek@gmail.com; federico.giusfredi@univr.it

Abstract. Notwithstanding her Kizzuwatnean origins, Maliya becomes part of the Bronze Age Hittite State Cult thanks to Queen Puduḥepa, who advocates a renovation of the dynastic cult. Therefore, Maliya and her temple became protagonists of the Hittite religious festivals. In the Iron Age, the goddess cult spreads to Western Anatolian milieus (Lycian and Lydian), developing apparent syncretic convergences with deities of the Aegean context. This paper investigates how Maliya and her Aegean counterparts converged, arguing and discussing the most debated positions.

Keywords: Maliya, Malis, Athena, Luwian and Hittite pantheon, Aegean transmission.

1. MALIYA IN THE BRONZE AGE

Among the so-called Festrivale, the (*h*)*išuwa*-festival² was one of the more prominent Hittite festivals in which the king's participation was essential for the celebrations.³ Initially celebrated in Kizzuwatna but already archived in Hattusa in the Middle Hittite period, the festival was

¹ Livio Warbinek, TeAI Project, authored sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 6; Federico Giusfredi, PALaC Project, authored sections 4. The project TeAI "Teonimi e pantheon nell'Anatolia Ittita" is funded by the Italian Ministry of University, F.A.R.E. programme, whereas the project PALaC has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (Grant Agreement n° 757299). Both the projects are carried out at the University of Verona.

² CTH 628. According to Haas (1994: 848) 'die hurritische Bezeichnung *hišuwa/išuwa* könnte mit dem Namen des in diesem Ritual verehrten Adlers ^D*išuwa*/^D*ešue* zusammenhängen'. See KUB 22.218 ii 19 (Ešue) // KBo 15.49 i 7 (Ešuwa) and Hutter 2021: 169 with note 181.

³ Haas 1994: 848-875; Popko 1995: 150.

rewritten when Queen Puduḥepa ordered the scribe Walwaziti⁴ to find the original in Kizzuwatna and to prepare a new edition for the prosperity of the royal family.⁵ The latest version was written down in 13 tablets, in which ritual acts are evidently Hurrian in character,⁶ and it describes an annual festival of nine days held in Hattusa where the king's celebration was accompanied by that of the Storm-god of Manuzi (Haas 1994: 849),⁷ followed by several deities⁸ worshiped at Kummani.⁹

Among those gods who took part in the (*h*)*išuwu*-festival,¹⁰ Maliya¹¹ was a relevant and well-attested¹² deity of vegetation referred to as “mother of wine and grain”¹³ and associated with rivers.¹⁴ As a vegetation god, Maliya was firstly the patroness of gardens¹⁵ and vineyards¹⁶, often accompanied by the hypostasis *Maliyanni*, where the

⁴ NH 1486.

⁵ See Lebrun 1982: 127; Haas 1994: 848-849; Popko 1995: 151; Rutherford 2020b: 330; Hutter 2021: 169-170, 250-251. Most likely, in connection with the so-called Hurrian “dynastic pantheon”, see Taracha 2009: 92-95, 115; Hutter 2021: 29, 192.

⁶ Haas 1994: 848-849; Popko 1995: 151; Hutter 2021: 169, 234.

⁷ On the Storm-god of Manuzi, see Van Gessel 1998: 804-805; Hutter 2021: 169; RGTC 6: 259-260; RGTC 6/2: 100-101 (city and mountain in Kizzuwatna).

⁸ Particularly, Iṣhara, Allani, Ḫudena-Ḫudellurra, Zimazzalla, the Nubadig-deities, Maliya, Adamma-Kubaba, Annaliya, Ninatta-Kulitta, Kunzizi, Kuzzina-Kuzpazena, Tiyabendi-gods, Kurra.

⁹ Haas 1994: 848-849; Popko 1995: 101, 151; Hutter 2021: 169-170 with note 180. On the Kizzuwatnean holy city of Kummani, the later *Comana Cappadociae*, see RGTC 6: 221; RGTC 6/2: 83-84.

¹⁰ Haas 1994: 401: ‘Im (*h*)*išuwu*-Festritual sind Maliya, Iṣhara und Lelluri die wichtigsten Göttinnen’. See also Hutter 2021: 170.

¹¹ Laroche 1946/47: 85-86; Lebrun 1982; Haas 1994: 410-411; Van Gessel 1998: 294-297.

¹² KBo 2.16 obv. 4 (CTH 527); KBo 3.8 iii 14, 15 (CTH 390); KBo 4.13 i 16, ii 17, iii [35], iv 20, [45], vi 10 (CTH 625); KBo 7.45 rev. r.col. 10' (CTH 628); KBo 9.133 obv. 2[(CTH 628); KBo 10.27 iv 30' (CTH 649); KBo 11.32 obv. 19, 24, 36 low.e. 37, 40 (CTH 645); KBo 13.238 rev. 2[(CTH 529); KBo 14.88 ii 8', 12'[(CTH 694); KBo 15.49 iv 10, [13] (CTH 628); KBo 19.128 ii 6, 39 (CTH 625); KBo 20.114 vi 9, 21 (CTH 628); KBo 20.118 ii 10[(CTH 628); KBo 23.49 iv 2 +KBo 24.110 iv 7 (CTH 652); KBo 23.68 obv. 9' (CTH 670); KBo 24.40 obv. r.col. 4, 10, 11[(CTH 628); KBo 25.109 iii 10, 20 (CTH 652); KBo 25.191 rev. 11, 12] (CTH 630); KBo 29.33 r.col. 7, 9 (CTH 694); KBo 30.69 iii 24], 33 (CTH 616); KBo 30.71 iii 13 (CTH 628); KBo 30.119 rev. 21 (CTH 332); KBo 31.181 rev. 1 (CTH 628); KBo 33.194 vi 25 (CTH 628); KBo 35.262, 17[, [22] (CTH 628); KBo 43.75, 7' (CTH 645); KBo 43.184+ i 25' (CTH 628); KBo 45.27 obv. 11' (CTH 625); KBo 45.29 iii 1' (CTH 616); KBo 45.82b r.col. 22[(CTH 652); KBo 45.214 obv. 12 (CTH 470); KBo 47.71 obv. 10' (CTH 628); KBo 47.241 rev 13[(CTH 645); KBo 55.39 i 27[(CTH 456); KBo 59.87 ii 19' (CTH 591); KBo 59.183 obv. 4 (CTH 458); KBo 70.109 (ex KUB 57.106) ii 15] (CTH 527); KUB 2.3 iii 35 (CTH 627); KUB 2.8 iii 34[(CTH 617); KUB 2.13 iii 22, iv 24 (CTH 591); KUB 12.26 ii 20 (CTH 441); KUB 20.24 iii 26 (CTH 645); KUB 20.49 i 8[, 14 (CTH 628); KUB 20.67 +IBoT 2.77 vi 9 (CTH 669); KUB 25.27 iii 4 (CTH 629); KUB 32.99 v 4 (CTH 628); KUB 35.135 rev. 15'[(CTH 772); KUB 38.33 obv. 5' (CTH 526); KUB 40.101 rev. 8' (CTH 682); KUB 40.103 i 12 (CTH 628); KUB 41.23 iii 12[(CTH 458); KUB 43.23 rev. 50 (CTH 820); KUB 43.30 iii 10' (CTH 645); KUB 44.1 rev. 12[(CTH 526); KUB 46.17 iv 8 (CTH 529); KUB 50.32 ii 1, iii 2 (CTH 568); KUB 54.31 obv. 9] (CTH 694); KUB 55.39 i 27] (CTH 591); KUB 55.54 i 33, iv 5 (CTH 652); KUB 56.45+ iii 11' (CTH 591); KUB 57.58+ ii 7[(CTH 389); KUB 58.3 iii 20 (CTH 670); KUB 58.23 i 9 (CTH 670); KUB 58.38 i 27, ii 10, 12, 19 (CTH 645); KUB 58.106 iii 10 (CTH 780); KUB 60.111, 1] (CTH 590); ABoT 1.14 iv 6[(CTH 568); ABoT 2.141 vi [10' (CTH 628); IBoT 2.23 rev. 11 (CTH 670); IBoT 2.108 rev. 5' (CTH 529); IBoT 3.1 rev. 79 (CTH 609); VSNF 12.28 iii 11 = VAT 7683 ii 11 (CTH 628); VSNF 12.100 iii 6 (CTH 386); HFDC 12, 4] (CTH 670); Bo 3302 obv. 11[(CTH 645); Bo 5480, 8 (CTH 616); Bo 5593 ii 3', 10'-14' (CTH 628).

¹³ E.g., KUB 43.23 rev. 50'-51': ^d*Ma-a-li-ya* GEŠTIN-*aš* *ḫal-ki-<aš>* AMA-*ni*, Haas 1988: 136-137, 141. See also Haas 1994: 156, 410, 478; Hutter 2003: 231; Taracha 2009: 116; Serangeli 2015: 382; Weeden 2018: 351; Payne 2019: 236, 242; Rutherford 2020a: 206; Rutherford 2020b: 331; Hutter 2021: 144, 295.

¹⁴ The well-attested ^{ID}Mala and the less-attested ^{ID}Maliya (RGTC 6: 537-538). Particularly, the river Maliya occurs in KBo 2.16 rev. 4, KBo 47.76 rev. 5], and KUB 38.33, 5; to which should be added KBo 14.88 ii 12' “^{ID}-*aš* ^d*Ma-l[i-ya*” according to Trémouille 2002: 355. See § 2 below.

¹⁵ E.g., KUB 43.23 rev. 49': ^{šA} GIŠ KIRI₆, Haas 1988: 136-137, 141. See also Lebrun 1982: 127 with note 17; Haas 1994: 478; Serangeli 2015: 382.

¹⁶ E.g., KUB 12.44 iii 10'-11': GIŠ KIRI₆ GEŠTIN ^d*Ma-a-li-ya-an-ni-uš a-ša-an-zi*, Haas 1988: 138-139, 142. See also Lebrun 1982: 127 with note 17; Hutter 2003: 231, 250; Taracha 2009: 115; Weeden 2018: 351.

Maliyanni-deities¹⁷ were probably some types of nymphs.¹⁸ In addition to her patronage of the natural environment, Maliya was also the patroness of some workers,¹⁹ possibly through the connection between water-related work activities and rivers.²⁰ Moreover, she also had a variety of “Maliya’s male gods”: DINGIR *pešneš*^d *Maliya=as* / ^d*Maliya=as* DINGIR.LÚ^{MEŠ}-*as*,²¹ whose role as Maliya’s *parhedroi* is far from being clearly understood.²² Finally, she is once referred to as “Maliya of the horn”.²³

I.A. Concerning religious geography, Maliya was originally worshiped in Kummani, but then also in Tapala²⁴ and Ḫattuša, where her temple²⁵ hosted the holy horse Erama, which was a cultic animal fed by the Hittite king himself.²⁶ Furthermore, Maliya’s name possibly shares the root with many other geographical names: the cities of ^{URU}Maliyaša, ^{URU}Maliluḫa, ^{URU}Malita, the rivers of ^{ÍD}Mala and ^{ÍD}Maliya (below, § 2), and the mountain ^{HUR.SAG}Malimaliya.²⁷ For what concerns the cities, we are far from understanding their proper localisation within the Hittite Empire because they are sporadically mentioned in cultic texts. Conversely, Mt. Malimaliya has been identified with the Mamu Dağ, N-E of Tokat,²⁸ far away from Maliya’s traditional places of worship: Kizzuwatna (Kummani) and Hittite core (Ḫattuša and Tapala).

I.B. Chronologically, Maliya is attested in textual evidence no earlier than the 14th century BC. The oldest cuneiform tablets in which we read the name Maliya are paleographically middle-Hittite²⁹ and much fewer in number than the later ones.³⁰ The *post quem* benchmark is Puduḫepa’s reign and her cultic renovation of the (*h*)*išuw*a-festival:³¹ from there, the Hurrian/Kizzuwatnean gods are more frequently attested. Maliya is no excep-

¹⁷ Attestations: KBo 27.108 iii 24, 27, 29; KUB 12.26 ii 21; KUB 12.44 iii 11, 12.

¹⁸ Identification based on the Luwian diminutive suffix *-anna/i-* (Lit. ‘the small Maliya-deities’, Melchert 2003: 196) and the Greek nymphs *Μελίαι/Μελιάδες*. See Laroche 1946/47: 86; Lebrun 1982: 123-125; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305; Haas 1988: 142; Haas 1994: 313, 470; Van Gessel 1998: 297; Hutter 2003: 231; Taracha 2009: 116; Serangeli 2015: 377-379; Steitler 2019: 132; Payne 2019: 242 with notes 41, 45; Hutter 2021: 144.

¹⁹ “Of the leather worker”: *pa-ra-a-ma* <ŠA> ^{LÚ}AŠGAB ^d*Ma-li-ya-as* (KBo 10.27 iv 30, see Steitler 2019: 131 with note 41; Cammarosano 2021: 84); “of the carpenter”: ^d*Ma-li-ya-as* ŠA ^{LÚ}NAGAR (KUB 57.58 ii 7; KBo 70.109+ ii 15, see Cammarosano 2018: 112, 446-447; Cammarosano 2021: 85; Rutherford 2020b: 331); “of the GAD.TAR-functionary”: ^{d1}*Ma-li-ya-as* ŠA ^{LÚ}GAD.TAR (KUB 46.17 iv 8, see Cammarosano 2021: 85; Steitler 2019: 133-134).

²⁰ Steitler 2019: 133; Hutter 2021: 284.

²¹ KBo 4.13 i 16; KBo 11.32 obv. 19, 24, 36-37], low.e. 40 // KUB 43.30 iii 10’-11’; KBo 23.49 iv 2 +KBo 24.110 iv 7; KBo 25.109 iii 10, 20; KBo 29.33 r.col. 9]; KBo 59.183 rev. 4; KUB 2.13 iii 22, iv 24; KUB 55.39 i 27]; VSNF 12.28 iii 10-11; Bo 3302 obv. 11]; Bo 5480, 8. See Van Gessel 1998: 296. For the equation *pešneš* = LU^{MEŠ}, see Neu, Otten 1972: 183-185 and Carruba 1994: 14-16.

²² Lebrun 1982: 128; Carruba 1994: 15-16 with note 7; Haas 1994: 274, 614, 646. Archi (1979: 11) raised the possibility that they could be some spirits of Maliya’s river even though we have no evidence for it; whereas Klinger (1996: 581) argued that they could be ‘die Heptaden’ ^dIMIN.IMIN.BI. However, this last equation is contradicted by VSNF 12 ii 10’, where IMIN.IMIN.BI and DINGIR LÚ^{MEŠ} occur in a row.

²³ KUB 35.135 iv 15: ^{S1}*ša-ú-i-it-ra-as* ^d*Ma-li-ya*[-*an*], see Starke 1985: 322; Hutter 2021: 147.

²⁴ ḪUR.SAG Tapala, see RGTC 6: 397 and Van Gessel 1998: 297.

²⁵ Maliya’s temple is attested in KBo 7.45 rev. r.col. 10; KBo 9.133 obv. 2; KBo 15.49 iv 10; KBo 20.114 vi 9, 21, KBo 20.118 ii 10, KBo 24.40 obv. r.col. 4, KBo 30.71 iii 13, KBo 31.181 rev. 1, KBo 35.262, 17, KBo 47.71 obv. 10’, KUB 20.49 i 14, KUB 32.99 v 4, KUB 40.103 I 12, ABoT 14 iv 6. See Lebrun 1982: 127 with note 18; Haas 1994: 411, 850, 855; Popko 1995: 101; Van Gessel 1998: 296; Taracha 2009: 115.

²⁶ For instance, Bo 5593 ii 2-9 with duplicates. See Haas 1994: 417, 856; Van den Hout 2004: 488; Serangeli 2015: 380-381.

²⁷ Respectively: RGTC 6: 256, 257, 537-538; RGTC 6/2: 99. See also Lebrun 1982: 125-126; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305. The broken piece of evidence of KUB 40.80 obv. 9 ^{URU}*ma-al*-[(RGTC 6: 255) can be referred to whatever town whose name starts with *Mal*-.

²⁸ See RGTC 6: 255; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305 with references.

²⁹ Particularly, KBo 14.88, KBo 23.49, KBo 23.68, KBo 25.109, KBo 25.191, KBo 29.33, KBo 45.82b, KUB 43.30, and KUB 43.23. About the assumed old ductus of KUB 43.30, see Taracha 2009: 51 with note 261 ‘early Middle Hittite script’.

³⁰ Ca. 11,50% of all attestations, *contra* the 69% of jh. and 19,50% of sjh.

³¹ Statistically, the *hišuw*a-festival (CTH 628) is by far the most attested typology (24%) among all Maliya’s attestations, and in general Maliya’s major attestations (64%) concern festivals (*Monatsfest*, *Mond-fest*, AN.DAḪ.ŠUM, *hišuw*a, EZEN₄, KILAM). Finally, to

tion, becoming a central deity of the new State Cult (Lebrun 1982: 126-127, 129) at the time in which new Hurrian dynastic gods were introduced in Hattuša.³² However, onomastics seem to show a larger chronological diffusion for Maliya (§ 1.C).

I.C. Concerning onomastics, proper names related to Maliya appear from the age of the *kārum* at Kültepe (with a group of names that may conceal a form like ^fMal(i)awašḫai³³) until the late Karkamiš kingdom (prince ^mMaliya-^dTeššup³⁴), thus displaying the long cultural survival of the divine name.³⁵ ^fMal(i)awašḫai contains the Luwian element *wašḫa-*,³⁶ thus providing a clue for some Luwian linguistic presence in East Anatolia already in the Old Assyrian period. Of course, even assuming the analysis of the forms is correct, the presence of a theophoric personal name does not demonstrate the presence of a cult in Cappadocia in the Middle Bronze Age (§ 5.A).

I.D. Remarkably, with reference to the state of the art, Maliya has been at the center of two misinterpretations. Firstly, even though the temple inventory text KUB 38.33 obv. 5' reports a female iron statuette of ^{<ID>}Maliya, the determinative in the lacuna is not clearly consistent with a ^{ID}, as recently pointed out by Cammarosano,³⁷ thereby removing any element for speculation about an iconographic and epigraphic evidence of Maliya as a river-goddess.³⁸

Secondly, Maliya has been correlated with Ištar because the two goddesses appear together in a few rituals and because Ištar is traditionally connected with gardens just like Maliya.³⁹ For these reasons, the text KUB 40.101 obv. 8', reporting GAŠAN Maliya “Lady Maliya”, has often been quoted as another clue for a correlation between Maliya and Ištar.⁴⁰ However, the proper reading of line 8' is: *A-NA HUR.SA]G Kam'-ma-li-ya 1 NINDA tu-ḫu-ru-i*.⁴¹ Indeed, although the photo BoFN02002 of KUB 40.101 clearly shows the sign GAŠAN (HZA 336), the duplicate KBo 11.40 v 3' reports without any doubt *A-NA HUR.SAG kam-ma-li-ya*, not to mention that the context of KUB 40.101+ obv. 3'ff. deals with offerings towards mountains.⁴² Therefore, the GAŠAN sign of KUB 40.101 obv. 8' has to be considered as a *lapsus calami* for KAM (HZA 355), so the correlation of “Lady Maliya” with Ištar is incorrect. The two goddesses are close to each other in some texts, but there is no reason to identify one with the other.

I.E. Finally, Maliya is considered to be part of two so-called circles: the “circle of Kaniš”⁴³ with Pirwa, Ḥaššušara, Ašgašepa, and Kamrušepa,⁴⁴ on the one hand; and the “circle of Ḥuwaššanna” of Ḥuپیšna on the oth-

my knowledge, all the findspots related to tablets in which Maliya is attested refer to Hattuša, and, even considering the limits of this *argumentum ex silentio*, it is important to note the lack of reference from other (Kizzuwatnean?) findspots so far.

³² Taracha 2009: 92-95, 115; Hutter 2021: 29, 192.

³³ NH 723-724. See Yakubovich 2010: 220 table 28. See also Lebrun 1982: 125 with note 9 and Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305.

³⁴ NH 727. See Lebrun 1982: 125 with note 9; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305.

³⁵ See Lebrun 1982: 125; Bryce 1986: 177.

³⁶ CLL: 264 ‘sacralized object (or sim.)’. See also Hutter 2003: 257 and Yakubovich 2010: 219.

³⁷ Cammarosano 2021: 85 with note 344. See also Steitler 2019: 132.

³⁸ Haas 1994: 410; Hutter 2003: 231; Taracha 2009: 115; Serangeli 2015: 377.

³⁹ For instance, KBo 30.71 iii 12'-13'; KBo 3.8+ iii 14-17; Bo 5593 obv. 2-9, rev. 10'-14'. See Haas 1988: 124 with note 30; Haas 1998: 411, 412, 850 with note 11, 856 with note 33; Serangeli 2015: 380-381 with note 14.

⁴⁰ So Lebrun 1982: 123 note 1; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 304; Hutter 2003: 231.

⁴¹ According to McMahon 1991: 126-127. For the Mt. Kammaliya, see RGTC 6: 167; RGTC 6/2: 61.

⁴² See McMahon 1991: 117, 126-127.

⁴³ Also referred to as “Pantheon of Kaniš/Neša”, “kanisische- Gruppe/Gottheiten”, “der kappadokische Kreis” but literally “Gods of Kaniš” DINGIR^{MEŠ}-^{as} URU^{URU} Kaniš (e.g., KUB 56.45 ii 7). See Otten 1971: 32 with note 36; Lebrun 1982: 126-127; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 304; Haas 1988: 124; Haas 1994: 281, 412-413, 439, 614, 776, 779, 781; Popko 1995: 89; Klinger 1996: 581; Hutter 2003: 231; Taracha 2009: 30, 133; Cammarosano 2021: 84; Hutter 2021: 48; Warbinek 2022: 12-13 with n. 149.

⁴⁴ For Ašgašepa and Kamrušepa, see respectively Warbinek 2022: 3, 5-6.

er.⁴⁵ However, even though Maliya is attested in KBo 29.33 iii 7', 9',⁴⁶ this is not enough to integrate Maliya into the so-called *Ḫuwaššanna's circle*.⁴⁷ Generally speaking, the definition of "circle" is a rather problematic one. It usually refers to a group of gods with different features that often listed together.⁴⁸ The idea of a *circle* of gods could indeed be an excellent methodological filter, considering that it potentially combines textual, geographical, and linguistic elements. But since very different features characterize the single divine figures, the whole notion of *circle* can easily become misleading. Therefore, we prefer to focus on the features of the single deity in order to attempt a safer contextualisation. For this reason, the (*h*)*išuwu*-festival plays an essential role in our debate. As mentioned above, this festival shows a Hurrian character in the ritual, which was held in the Hittite capital and originally celebrated in Kizzuwatna.

2. MALIYA'S RIVERS

Of special interest is Maliya's affinity with rivers, particularly regarding ^{ÍD}Maliya and ^{ÍD}Mala. On one hand, ^{ÍD}Maliya, although less-attested (KBo 2.16 rev. 4; KBo 47.76 rev. 5'; KUB 38.33, 5; *plus* KBo 14.88 ii 12' "ÍD-*aš* ^d*Ma-l[i-ya*" according to Trémouille 2002, 355), undoubtedly matches the name of the goddess.⁴⁹ On the other hand, the name Mala could also be related to two different rivers, the Euphrates (RGTC 6, 537) and another homonymous one in Anatolia. According to Frayne and Stuckey, ^{ÍD}Mala was an 'important sacred river on the eastern frontier of the Hittite kingdom. The Luwians celebrated a cult of the Mala and the Hurrian god Nubadig. As a result of an oracle indicating how to remove a plague that had beset the land of *Ḫatti*, King Muršiliš II travelled to make offerings at the "Festival of the River Mala". The towns mentioned elsewhere in campaigns of the Hittites reveal that the river flowed near modern Ortaköy [...] located north east of modern Kayseri in Turkey. Lexical texts equate the River Mala with the Puratti, the Hittite name for the Euphrates' (Frayne, Stuckey 2021: 375).

In addition to this picture, Lebrun advanced the hypothesis that ^{ÍD}Maliya was a variant of ^{ÍD}Mala/Euphrates, thanks to the graphic alternation between *-tiya* and *-ta* (for instance, ^{ÍD}Marassantiya/ ^{ÍD}Marassanta)(Lebrun 1982: 125 note 8). While possible, this reconstruction is based on identifying Maliya with the Mala/Euphrates, a hypothesis that is still far from being proven. Instead, ^{ÍD}Maliya and ^{ÍD}Mala in all likelihood referred to two different rivers: whereas Mala can be located in an Eastern context compatible with a Hurrian land next (or equated) to the Euphrates, Maliya could have been a river in the Kizzuwatnean area⁵⁰ or even somewhere in the North-East.⁵¹

3. MALIYA IN THE IRON AGE

Even though there are no attestations of Maliya in Anatolian hieroglyphic texts so far, Maliya's cult spread towards Lydia, Lycia, and the Aegean, where she is mentioned as Malis/Malija and seems to be equated to Athe-

⁴⁵ On the so-called "Ḫuwaššanna's circle" in *Ḫupišna* (classical *Kybestra* and modern *Ereğli*) see Taracha 2009: 117; Hutter 2003: 243-244, 273-274; Hutter 2021: 148-150. For the connection of Maliya with *Ḫuwaššanna* see Trémouille 2002: 354-355; Hutter 2021: 144-145.

⁴⁶ Part of the festival for *Ḫuwaššanna* (CTH 694), see Hutter 2013: 182.

⁴⁷ See Taracha 2009: 117; Hutter 2013: 186.

⁴⁸ This, however, does not exclude the religious and cultic importance of such groups, see Warbinek 2022: 13.

⁴⁹ See Frantz-Szabó 1987: 304; Lebrun 1982: 123, 127; Lebrun 1987: 242; Hutter 2003: 231-232; Lebrun 2007: 458, 461; Serangeli 2015: 376; Payne 2019: 236, 242 with note 41; Cammarosano 2021: 84-85.

⁵⁰ RGTC 6: 538: 'Südosten? (In Kontext die Bergnamen Suwara, Daliya und Arwali[ja]).'

⁵¹ According to KBo 47.76, the river Maliya occurs next to the spring Ku(wa)nnaniya (RGTC 6: 536-537; RGTC 6/2: 206-207) and Mt. Talmakuwa in a context related to the river Zuliya (RGTC 6: 559-560; RGTC 6/2: 212) nowadays identified with the modern *Çekerek*. See Lebrun 2007: 461 and Carnevale 2020: 86, 89.

na.⁵² In fact, even though the routes of transmission from the Bronze to the Iron Age are uncertain, theonyms could have survived the collapse of the Hittite Kingdom.⁵³

3.A. Traces of this continuities are firstly found in Lydia, where in the Iron Age ‘Maliya scheint in der Gestalt der Malis, einer Schlüsselfigur in der Genealogie der lydischen Könige’⁵⁴ and with a strong connection with water, wine, and grain (Payne 2019: 236, 242). The connection of Lydian Malis with the Bronze Age Maliya is mostly based on the syncretism between Herakles and the Anatolian war-god Šanda, with respect to which Malis/Maliya would be the *parhedra*. Furthermore, one can count on the presentation of Malis as one of the three water nymphs in the Argonauts’ event in the Propontis (Theocr. 13: 45).⁵⁵ As for the western interface, Malis has been syncretically equated to Athena, an identification based on the Lydian-Greek bilingual inscription (LW 40) from the Athena Temple at Pergamon and the two literary fragments related to Hipponax of Ephesus and Hesychius of Miletus.⁵⁶

3.B. Cognate of Lydian Malis (Rutherford 2020a: 54, 194), the Lycian goddess Malija was one of the most frequently attested Lycian deities of the 1st mill. BC.⁵⁷ In Xanthos, Malija shared a temple with Artemis and the “Lord of Kaunos”,⁵⁸ whereas in the Pamphylian city of Side the so-called “Artemon-inscription” is most likely dedicated to Malija, a Greek-Sidetic bilingual text (S I.1.1) (Rizza 2019: 543-544) whose language ‘is most plausibly part of the Anatolian branch of Indo-European’, suggesting, ‘an affiliation to the Luvic group in particular’ (Rizza 2019: 536). Most importantly, the Lycian Malija has been equated with Athena⁵⁹ thanks to several pieces of evidence. Firstly, the inscription TL 80.3 reports the epithet *malija brixuwama* (“who watches over”), which is a structural calque of Athena ἐπισκοπος.⁶⁰ Secondly, two inscriptions from Rhodiapolis report the epithet *malija wedrēñni* (M. “of the city/country”), i.e., the Lycian Malija was the protectress of the city (Rhodiapolis), as well as Athena Poliás.⁶¹ However, this correlation does not clarify whether one epithet has been a model or one is the local translation of the other. In fact, it seems to me a case of borrowing between epithets which does not prove any direct parallelism between gods. More decisive is a pottery scene of the “Judgement of Paris” where the Athena figure is labelled as Mal[ija] (N 307.c, see Barnett 1974).

The attributes of the Bronze Age Maliya as protectress of gardens, wine, and grain are not present both for Malis and Malija, thus casting some doubts on a direct association, so that according to Watkins (2007: 123) the link between these gods ‘is rather tenuous, and rests largely just on homophony.’ Nevertheless, and in accordance with the above considerations, it is possible to indirectly associate these deities: Bronze Age Maliya – Lydian Malis – Lycian Malija – Greek Athena. In Rutherford’s words: ‘The equation of Athene with the Lydian goddess Malis, and with the related Lycian Malija is now well established. The question arises of the relation of these 1st

⁵² Lebrun 1982: 124; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 304; Lebrun 1987: 241-243; Hutter 2003: 231; Serangeli 2014: 137-138; Serangeli 2015; Payne, Sasseville 2016: 78; Steitler 2019: 132; Hutter 2021: 144 note 87, 317; Cammarosano 2021: 84.

⁵³ Payne 2019: 245; Rutherford 2020b: 330-331 with reference to the gods Trqqas and Sanda.

⁵⁴ Haas 1994: 411. See also Hutter 2003: 232.

⁵⁵ Watkins 2007: 122 with reference; Rutherford 2020b: 330.

⁵⁶ Neumann 1967: 35-37; Lebrun 1982: 124 with note 6; Watkins 2007: 122; García Ramón 2015: 131; Payne, Sasseville 2016: 66-67, 69-70, 77-79; Payne 2019: 241; Rutherford 2020b: 329.

⁵⁷ Thanks particularly to the inscriptions TL 26: 12; TL 44a: 43; TL 44c: 5, 7-8; TL 75: 5, 6; TL 76: 5; TL 80: 3; TL 149: 2-3, 9, 12; TL 150: 6-7. See Neumann 1967: 35-36; Lebrun 1982: 129-130; Bryce 1986: 174, 177-178; Keen 1998: 202-204; Hutter 2003: 231-232; Melchert 2004: 36; Taracha 2009: 115.

⁵⁸ Bryce 1986: 178, 181-182; Lebrun 1987: 243; Keen 1998: 203; Payne 2019: 239-240.

⁵⁹ Neumann 1967: 37-38; Melchert 2004: 36 ‘native equivalent of Athena’. See also Watkins 2007: 122-123 and García Ramón 2015: 131, 132.

⁶⁰ See García Ramón 2015: 126-136; Serangeli 2014: 136, 138; Serangeli 2016: 193 with reference.

⁶¹ TL 149, 2-3, 9, 12; 150, 6-7. See Neumann 1967: 34-37; Lebrun 1982: 129; Lebrun 1987: 243; Bryce 1986: 178; Keen 1998: 203; Watkins 2007: 123; Serangeli 2014: 136-139; Serangeli 2015: 382-384; García Ramón 2015: 131-132; Serangeli 2016: 193; Parker 2017: 40; Rutherford 2020b: 330.

millennium goddesses to the Hittite-Luwian goddess Malia, known from the *hišuwu*-festival and many other texts, including one from Istanuwa. *Prima facie* she looks different, being associated with rivers and vineyards, whereas Athene's defining features are craft and war,⁶² but 'there are similarities; LBA Malia was associated with horses, like Athene Hippiia in the classical period,⁶³ and a central Anatolian cult inventory mentions "Malia of the Carpenter", which seems anticipate Athene's association with carpenters [i.e., Athene Ergane].⁶⁴ No other Anatolian associations of Athene are convincing' (Rutherford 2020a: 194-195). The last statement is correct, even though scholarship⁶⁵ has stressed the equation even further thanks to the association with watercourses, their nymphs, and horses, taking into account the alleged match of Maliya's features with the traditional attributes of Athena Tritogeneia and Hippiia (Tab. 1).⁶⁶

4. ANALYSIS OF THE THEONYM

The name of the goddess Maliya and those of the related goddesses from the Lycian and Luwian world have been connected to an Indo-European root **mel/mol*. In the present section, we will first discuss the words that would derive from this root, leaving aside, for the moment, the very theonym. After that, in light of the evidence collected and discussed, we will go back to the problem of the very etymology of the divine name Maliya. The group of common nouns and verbs that are attested in the cuneiform sources and that would go back to this root are:

1. Hittite

- a. *māl*, a neutral gender abstract substantive, for which the meaning "power of the mind, mental power" has been cautiously suggested;⁶⁷
- b. *mala(i)-* and/or *mal-*, a verb whose meaning, synchronically, seems to be "to approve";⁶⁸

2. Luwian

- a. *:māl*, a neutral gender abstract substantive, for which the meaning "thought, idea" has been suggested, mostly on etymological grounds (Melchert *in press*, s.v.);
- b. *mal(a)i-*, a verb with the meaning "to approve, consider"⁶⁹ in at least one occurrence (KBo 4.14 ii 78), while all other contexts are fragmentary (Melchert *in press*, s.v.);

This family of words may be related to the Greek verbs μέλω and μέλλω. If **mel* is indeed a verbal root, it would build a simple present **mel-e-* to account for Greek μέλω⁷⁰ and probably also for Hittite *mal(a)-*, while Greek μέλλω may result from **mel-ye/o-*. Following Sasseville (2020: 216-218), we could posit **mel-éye-* for the Luwian verb *mal(a)i-*, although the presence of the plene writing of the /a/ makes it likely that rather than being built on a ver-

⁶² However, Carruba (1994: 15 note 7) pointed out that 'auch die Malija zeigt kriegerische Eigenschaften durch die engeren Beziehungen zu Kriegsgöttern, wie u.a. ^DIštar und der Wettergott'.

⁶³ See Serangeli 2015: 380-382.

⁶⁴ Rutherford 2020a: 195 notes 75-77; Rutherford 2020b: 331-332 with note 8 in reference to ^dMaliyaš^{LÚ}NA.GAR. See also García Ramón 2015: 131 and above, § 1 note 18.

⁶⁵ See, for instance, Hutter 2003: 232 and Serangeli 2015: 377-379.

⁶⁶ So Serangeli 2014: 138; Serangeli 2015: 380-382, with reference to Paus. IX 33: 6-7; Apollod. I 3: 6; Hdt. IV 180: 5; Pind. Ol. XIII 82; Soph. Oed. Col. 1067-1073. See also Rutherford 2020b: 331.

⁶⁷ See Kloekhorst 2008: 546 with reference to CHD M: 124 and Rieken 1999: 49-51. This interpretation moved Carruba (1994: 15 note 7) to present Maliya as 'die Mutige'.

⁶⁸ See Serangeli 2014: 139; Serangeli 2015: 385; Serangeli 2016: 183, 186; Pozza 2020: 16; CHD M: 126-127, 128-129; HED M: 21; CLL: 132.

⁶⁹ For correct morphological analysis see Sasseville 2020: 220-221.

⁷⁰ See the discussion in Serangeli 2016: 183-186, 188-191, 192.

bal root this was, in fact, a denominal.⁷¹ Of course, if we are dealing with denominals, the connection to the Greek verbs would be more complex (at least in the case of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$), and a different scenario would probably emerge.

Limiting ourselves to the Anatolian material, in order to explore this option, it is necessary first to account for the only nominal that is clearly attested: the noun *māl*. This, according to Kloekhorst,⁷² would simply be a root noun on the o-grade **mol*, a possibility that is formally acceptable, but quite isolated in the scenario of Anatolian nouns. If, instead, the final /l/ was not part of the root, we should hypothesize that it was part of a suffix, added to a root ending in a consonant that eventually disappeared. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.) drew my attention to the possibility of a derivation from **meh₁*, which can be achieved positing a syncope from an original **me/oh₁-lo-m* > *maHlm* > *māl*.⁷³

This picture, and especially the meaning of the words involved, should be kept in mind when the forms of the Anatolian **mel*-words are compared, with the similar and parallel root **men*, that is the base for the name of the Italic goddess *Menesua* (Minerva).⁷⁴ Watkins's proposal (2007: 124) that the two roots were the same should be refuted. Invoking *l/n* alternation in Anatolian, which is what Watkins suggested, is certainly not a viable path, unless one could collect evidence for a proper sound law. As for the possibility of an original root **meh₁*, which we just mentioned, although reconstructing **meh₁-lo-* could in principle work for Anatolian, there is no possibility of accounting for all the words that go back to **men* (see LIV²: 435) as going back to an original **meh₁* with some morphological extension containing a nasal element.

Once we have sketched a description of the **meh₁-lo* or **mol-* word family (and ridded ourselves of an unlikely connection to the root **men*), we may proceed to examine whether the name of Maliya must, indeed, be ascribed to the group. As a matter of fact, while this is possible in principle, the following observations are in order:

1. While all other *mal*-words present a consistent rendering with plene writing of the etymologically long /a/, this does not happen regularly for the divine name, which has no long /a/ in more than half of the occurrences;
2. Nothing in the characterisation of Maliya indicates a connection with the semantic field “to approve”, which represents the only meaning that is positively attested in the Hittite corpus for the word family under discussion (“thought” and “mental power” are, indeed, speculative meanings based on the very hypothesis that Maliya should derive from the same root and bear a relationship to Menesua and Athena);
3. The idea of a common origin for the divine features shared by Maliya and Athena/Menesua is mostly based on four features listed by Serangeli (2016): relationship with watercourses, relationship with horses, role in protecting the city, role in punishing mortals. Of these, only the first two emerge (not vividly) from the cuneiform corpora, and they are not shared by Italic Menesua, but only by the Non-Indo-European (Pre)-Greek Athena. The latter two features, on the other hand, are typical of Lycian Maliya and are to be explained as late development deriving from a local syncretism (Tab. 1).

In light of these points, both the connection of cuneiform Maliya to Athena/Menesua and the relationship between her name and a group of words that are connected to the semantics of “approval” (rather than “thinking”) are significantly weakened, leaving us in an undecidable situation. It is possible that the name of the goddess was originally derived from the same Indo-European root as an *-iya-* adjective to *māl*. On the other hand, it is equally possible that the name was simply that of a divine river (which is geographically located in the Eastern regions of Anatolia and not close to an alleged Aegean-Anatolian interface area), and that the late Micro-Asiatic Maliya – Malis – Athena equation, which is the only documented phenomenon, was also the only connection that ever existed between Athena, Menesua, and Maliya.

⁷¹ We thank Craig Melchert, pers. comm. 10 June 2022, for pointing this out to us.

⁷² Kloekhorst 2008: 546; followed by Serangeli 2016: 183.

⁷³ A process that was already identified by Rieken 2008: 242. One should however notice that if the root were, in fact, *meh₁*, the hypothesis of a connection to *meld^h*- discussed by Kölligan (2018: 231-233) would at least require reformulation.

⁷⁴ See Serangeli 2015: 385-386; Serangeli 2016: 193-194 with references.

5. HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

After discussing the etymology of *māl*-words and the limits of a possible connection to the divine name Maliya, two points require discussion: Maliya's affinity with the Luwian milieu in Anatolia on one hand, and her mode of spreading over the Iron Age on the other.

5.A. Concerning the first point and according to Hutter's lists of Luwian gods,⁷⁵ Maliya has to be considered a proper Luwian great goddess, although her 'origin is not to be sought with the Luwians, but she was highly esteemed among them too'.⁷⁶ The evidence supporting a Luwian solution concerns both the textual typology and contents, as well as linguistic elements. Particularly, Maliya is surrounded by Luwian deities both in a Middle Hittite ritual (KUB 43.23: Mamma, Kamrušepa, Ala, *taknaš* ^dUTU),⁷⁷ and in the inventory lists (e.g., KUB 43.40 iii 5' with Kuwanša gods, ^dḪilašši, and ^dWaškuwattašši).⁷⁸ Indeed, Maliya's association with the Luwian milieu can be reinforced by the Luwian suffix *-ašši* in the name of some gods, and by the suffix *-anna/i-* used to refer to her hypostasis Maliyanni (Melchert 2003: 196). Particularly, Hutter pointed out that there were three Luwian-speaking environments in the Bronze Age Anatolia: the Hittite Lower Land, Arzawa and Kizzuwatna,⁷⁹ but, given the fact that Maliya was worshiped only in Kummani among those lands, a Kizzuwatnean origin can be inferred for this deity. However, methodologically speaking, this does not necessarily imply that Maliya was originally Luwian. As far as we know, she may have "become" Kizzuwatnean when she was "imported" in Ḫattuša by Pudeḫepa, who aimed to assert a royal family throughout the worship of a dynastic cult in Hurrian sense.⁸⁰ Most likely, at the time of Pudeḫepa this cult renewal did not rely on the origin of a single god; instead, it embraced deities and religious practices considered culturally Hurrian because they came from the East. Most likely, as the royal house was promoting a new Hurrian dynastic cult, gods of different milieus -like Maliya- were accidentally hired for the cause.

5.B. Regarding the path of diffusion of Maliya – Malis – Malija – Athena throughout different places in different periods, a methodological question of their equations arises. Indeed, the spreading and the reception of the goddess from the far East (Kizzuwatna) into the very West (Lycia and Lydia) is a methodological issue: there is not only a chronological and geographical hiatus between different Maliya-goddesses, but also an epistemological distinction between the Bronze Age (cuneiform texts) and the Iron Age (epigraphs/inscriptions). While the exact details are impossible to reconstruct, and it would be unproductive to speculate about them. Connections certainly exist, but these may have been gradual, indirect and mediated by complex historical circumstances.

We should, instead, briefly consider the possible ways in which two different cultures could equate or associate their gods. According to Rutherford (2020a: 77), when different religious traditions came into contact, the following possibilities of interaction may occur: no influence at all, borrowing, translation, syncretism. Leaving aside the first case that is clear for itself, *borrowing* refers to the adoption by one group of one or more foreign deities; *translation* is the identification of one deity with another god; while *syncretism* consists in the process of creating a new composite deity, which includes the features of both gods.⁸¹

For our purpose in this paper, *translation* concerns the sharing of divine skills and features (e.g., the equine cultic traits in Athena and Maliya), whereas *syncretism* concerns equating two gods *in toto*. According to this, *translation* refers prototypically to the Roman *interpretatio*, the traditional religious Roman practice of identifying a god of another cultural milieu with the (assumed) equivalent of Rome's pantheon (Parker 2017: 33-34).

⁷⁵ Hutter 2003: 219; Hutter 2021: 142. See also Taracha 2009: 100, 101, 107; Hutter 2021: 144, 295; and Cammarosano 2021: 84.

⁷⁶ Hutter 2003: 231. See also Payne 2019: 12.

⁷⁷ Haas 1988: 131, 136-137. See also Popko 1995: 88 and Hutter 2021: 144 with note 87.

⁷⁸ Popko 1995: 73. See also Melchert 2003: 188, 196.

⁷⁹ Hutter 2003: 212, 214, 217-218, 251.

⁸⁰ Above, § 1 with note 4.

⁸¹ See Rutherford 2020a: 77, 187-195.

While Athena and Lycian Malija can be considered to represent a syncretic deity according to the vase scene of the “Judgement of Paris”, the same cannot be said for Maliya and Malis/Malija, also because the transmission routes are often uncertain.⁸² However, it is noteworthy to say that these are only traces of continuity, not a direct development of the Hittite-Luwian beliefs in the Aegean milieu. It is now appropriate to quote Hutter’s words: ‘Lycia cannot be considered as continuing Luwian culture directly. Lycia clearly had religious concepts of its own, of course also sharing some Luwian traditions (e.g., some gods), but also integrating “Greek” and other traditions’.⁸³

6. CONCLUSIONS

According to the evidence we have, Maliya has to be considered as a goddess of vegetation whose cult spread from the city of Kummani (and therefore in an Anatolian, not Hurrian, context), and became a central deity of the new State Cult in the Hittite Kingdom of the Late Bronze Age. Notwithstanding that the deity is attested from the 14th century BC onwards, there is onomastic evidence related to Maliya from the *kārum*-period to the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Karkamiš.

Moreover, there is no clear evidence to define Maliya as a proper Luwian goddess according to the epigraphic evidence. We consider, however, a Luwian/Kizzuwatnean origin of Maliya as the most likely scenario, thanks both to contextual and linguistic analysis.

Geographically speaking, Maliya’s cult spread from Kizzuwatna to the entire Hittite Empire, moving towards the west of Anatolia in the Iron Age. This development could explain both her “fame” –because the capital gave her more opportunities to spread throughout the country– and her “survival” after the collapse of the Hittite Kingdom. This spread does not necessarily imply early syncretic situations outside of Anatolia.

The adoption of the Kizzuwatnean Maliya into the Hittite State Cult should be considered to be a case of religious borrowing; the equation of Lydian Malis and Lycian Malija with Athena as a pure case of syncretism. As for the Bronze Age, however, Maliya and Athena share some features (patroness of the city and carpenters, association with horses), but they do not share their main ones (Maliya as river/water goddess of vegetation; Athena as goddess of wisdom and craft). For this reason and as far as the linguistic analysis and the available evidence is concerned, Maliya and Athena should not be considered to be the same syncretic deity (Tab. 1).

Table 1. Gods’ main features in comparison (X = not shared feature).

Deity	Features						
Bronze Age Maliya	Of the gardens, wine-grain	River goddess (+Maliyanni)	“male gods” <i>parhedroi</i>	Holy horse Erama	Patroness of some workers	X	X
Lydian Malis	X	Malis as water nymph	X	X	X	X	<i>Parhedra</i> of Šanda/Herakles
Lycian Malija	X	X	X	X	X	<i>malija brixuwama</i>	<i>malija wedrēni</i>
Greek Athena	X	Athena Tritogeneia	X	Athena Hippias	Patroness of Carpenters	Athena Episkopos	Athena Poliás
Roman Minerva	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

⁸² Payne 2019: 245. See also Popko 1995: 163-171.

⁸³ Hutter 2003: 265 with reference to Bryce 1986: 172-202 and Keen 1998: 193-213.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABoT K. Balkan, *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri*, Istanbul 1948.
 CHD *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago 1980ff.
 CTH E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris 1971.
 CLL H. Melchert, *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill 1993.
 HED J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin – New York – Amsterdam 1984ff.
 IBoT *Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletlerinden Seçme Metinler*, Istanbul – Ankara.
 KBo *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Leipzig 1916-1923, Berlin 1954ff.
 KUB *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin 1921ff.
 LIV² H. Reix, M.J. Kümmel, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (2nd edition), Wiesbaden 2001.
 LW R. Gusmani, *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1964.
 NH E. Laroche, *Les noms des Hittites*, Paris 1966.
 RGTC 6 G.F. del Monte, J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*, Wiesbaden 1978.
 RGTC 6/2 G.F. del Monte, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement*, Wiesbaden 1992.
 TAM *Tituli Asiae minoris* (Vol. 1, *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*), Wien 1901ff.
 TL *Tituli Lyciae* (see TAM).

REFERENCES

- Archi A. 1979, Associations des divinités hourrites, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11: 7-12.
 Barnett R.D. 1974, A Silver-Head Vase with Lycian Inscriptions, in E. Akurgal, U.B. Alkim (eds), *Mansel'e Armağan (Mélanges Mansel)*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi: 893-903.
 Bryce T.R. 1986, *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*, Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press.
 Cammarosano M. 2018, *Hittite Local Cults*, Society of Biblical Literature 40, Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature Press.
 Cammarosano M. 2021, *At the Interface of Religion and Administration: The Hittite Cult Inventories*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 68, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag.
 Carnevale A. 2020, *La frontiera nord-orientale dell'Impero Ittita. Uno studio sulla provincial di Tapika e sulle terre del fiume Kummešmaḫa*, Monografie dell'Atlante del Vicino Oriente Antico 2, Roma, Artemide.
 Carruba O. 1994, Der Stamm für 'Frau' im Hethitischen, in P. Vavroušek (ed.), *Iranian and Indo-European Studies*, Praha, Enigma: 13-26.
 Frayne D.G., Stuckey, J.H. 2021, *A Handbook of Gods and Goddesses of the Ancient Near East*, Pennsylvania, Eisenbrauns.
 Frantz-Szabó G. 1987, Malija(nni), Malimalija, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7: 304-305.
 García Ramón J.L. 2015, Licio, Griego, Indoeuropeo: I. Lic. *ep̄nēne/i-* 'hermano menor', lat. *opiter*, aaa. *aftero*, IE **h₁op(i)-* 'después, detrás'. II. Lic. *tuue-* 'poner (en pie)', IE **(s)teh₂u-*. III. Lic. *Malija brixuwama-* 'Malia supervisor' (: Atena ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπίτηρανος, ἐπίκουρος), hit. *šēr huūai-*, hom. ἐρι-ούνοιος, in E. Dupraz, W. Sowa (eds), *Genres épigraphiques et langues d'attestation fragmentaire dans l'espace méditerranéen*, Rouen-du Havre, Press universitaires de Rouen et du Havre: 117-138.
 Haas V. 1988, Magie in hethitischen Gärten, in E. Neu, C. Rüster (eds), *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz: 121-142.
 Haas V. 1994, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Leiden, Brill.
 Hutter M. 2003, Aspects of Luwian Religion, in H.C. Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/68, Leiden – Boston, Brill: 211-280.

- Hutter M. 2013, The Luwian Cult of the Goddess Huwassanna vs. Her Position in the ‘Hittite State Cult’, in A. Mouton, I. Rutherford, I. Yakubovich (eds), *Luwian Identities*, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64, Leiden – Boston, Brill: 177-190.
- Hutter M. 2021, *Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens*, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.
- Keen A.G. 1998, *Dynastic Lycia. A political history of the Lycians and their relations with the foreign powers*, Mnemosyne Supplementum 178, Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill.
- Klinger J. 1996, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Kloekhorst A. 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5, Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Kölligan, D. 2018. Funktionsverbgefüge und Sekundärwurzeln, in E. Rieken (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*, Wiesbaden, Reichert: 219-237.
- Laroche E. 1946/47, Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites, *Revue hittite et asianique* 7/46: 7-139.
- Lebrun R. 1982, Maliya, une divinité anatolienne mal connue, in J. Quaegebeur (ed.), *Studia P. Naster oblata II*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 13, Leuven, Peeters: 123-130.
- Lebrun R. 1987, Problèmes de religion anatolienne, *Hethitica* 8: 241-262.
- Lebrun R. 2007, Nouveautés concernant la religion des Hittites tirées du fragment KBo XLVII 76 = 2012/u, in M. Alparslan, M.D. Alparslan, H. Peker (eds), *VITA Festschrift in Honor of Belkis Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, Istanbul, Ege Yayinlari: 457-464.
- McMahon G. 1991, *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*, Assyriological Studies 25, Chicago, Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Melchert H.C. 2003, Language, in H.C. Melchert, *The Luwians*, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/68, Leiden – Boston, Brill: 170-210.
- Melchert H.C. 2004, *Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor – New York, Beech Stave Press.
- Melchert H.C. (in press), *A Dictionary of Cuneiform Luwian*, Ann Arbor – New York, Beech Stave Press.
- Neu E., Otten H. 1972, Hethitisch ‘Mann’, ‘Mannheit’, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 77: 181-190.
- Neumann G. 1967, Beiträge zum Lykischen III, *Sprache* 13: 31-38.
- Otten H. 1971, *Ein hethitisches Festritual (KBo XIX 128)*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 13, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Parker R. 2017, *Greek Gods Abroad: Names, Natures, and Transformation*, Oakland, University of California Press.
- Payne A., Sasseville D. 2016, Die lydische Athene: eine neue Edition von LW 40, *Historische Sprachforschung* 129: 66-82.
- Payne A. 2019, Native Religious Traditions from a Lydian Perspective, in S. Blakely, B.J. Collins (eds), *Religious Convergence in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 231-248.
- Popko M. 1995, *Religions of Asia Minor*, Warsaw, Academic Publications Dialog.
- Pozza M. 2020, On the semantics of the Proto-Indo-European roots *mel-, *men-, and *steh₂: from the external-positional to the internal-cognitive perspective, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 30: 11-22.
- Rieken E. 1999, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 44, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Rieken E. 2008, The Origin of the -l Genitive and the History of the Stems in -il- and -ül- in Hittite”, in J.-B. Katherle, M. Huld, A. Della Volpe, M.D. Robbins (eds), *Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Indo-European Conference, November 3-4, 2007*, Los Angeles, Institute for the Study of Man: 239-256.
- Rizza A. 2019, About the Greek-Sidetic ‘Artemon-inscription’ (S I.1.1)”, in N.B. Guzzo, P. Taracha (eds), *“And I Knew Twelve Languages” A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, Warsaw, Agade Bis: 536-551.

- Rutherford I. 2020a, *Hittite Texts and Greek Religion. Contact, Interaction, and Comparison*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Rutherford I. 2020b, Athene, Maliya and a Carpenter, in G.B. D'Alessio, L. Lomiento, C. Meliadó, G. Ucciardiello (eds), *Il potere della parola. Studi di letteratura greca per Maria Cannatà Fera*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso: 329-334.
- Sasseville D. 2020, *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian*, Brill Studies in Indo-European Languages and Linguistics 21, Leiden – Boston, Brill.
- Serangeli M. 2014, Atena Ἀξιώποιος (Paus. III 15, 6), *Aevum Antiquum* N.S. 14: 131-141.
- Serangeli M. 2015, Heth. Maliya, lyk. Malija und griech. Athena, in C. Zinko, M. Zinko (eds), *Der antike Mensch im Spannungsfeld zwischen Ritual und Magie. 1. Grazer Symposium zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde Graz (14.–15. November 2013)*, Graz, Leykam: 373-385.
- Serangeli M. 2016, PIE **mel-*: Some Anatolian and Greek Thoughts – Gk. μέλω, Hitt. *mala^{-hhi}/malāi^{-mi}*, CLuv. *mali(ya)-**, in D.M. Goldstein, S.W. Jamison, B. Vine (eds), *Proceedings of the 27th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen, Hempen: 183-197.
- Starke F. 1985, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 30, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Steitler Ch. 2019, Hittite Professionals and Patron Deities, in M. Hutter, S. Hutter-Braunsar (eds), *Economy of Religions in Anatolia: From the Early Second to the Middle of the First Millennium BCE. Proceedings of an International Conference in Bonn (23rd to 25th May 2018)*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 467, Münster, Ugarit Verlag: 125-139.
- Taracha P. 2009, *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia*, Dresden Beiträge zur Hethilologie 27, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Trémouille M.-C. 2002, Una cérémonie pour Huwaššanna à Kuliwišna, in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, Agade: 351-369.
- Van den Hout Th.P.J. 2004, Pferd (und weitere Equiden). A. II. In Anatolien, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 10: 482-490.
- Van Gessel B.H.L. 1998, *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*, Leiden – New York – Köln, Brill.
- Warbinek L. 2022, The *-šepa* theonyms in the Hittite pantheon, *Vicino Oriente* 26: 1-19.
- Watkins C. 2007, Hipponactea quaedam, in P.J. Finglass, C. Collard, N.J. Richardson (eds), *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford, Oxford University Press: 118-126.
- Weeden M. 2018, The Good God, the Wine-god and the Storm-god of the Vineyard, *Die Welt des Orients* 48.2: 330-356.
- Yakubovich I. 2010, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden – Boston, Brill.