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Abstract. Notwithstanding her Kizzuwatnean origins, Maliya becomes part of the Bronze Age Hittite State Cult thanks to Queen Puduḫepa, 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.
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1. MALIYA IN THE BRONZE AGE

Among the so-called Festrituale, the (ḫ)išuwa-festival was one of the more prominent Hittite festivals in which the king’s participation was essential for the celebrations. Initially celebrated in Kizzuwatna but already archived in Hattusa in the Middle Hittite period, the festival was

---
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rewritten when Queen Puduhepa 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, 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 (ḫ)išuwa-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 1:486.
⁸ Particularly, Iḫara, Allani, Ḫudena-Ḫudellurra, Zimazzalla, the Nubadig-deities, Maliya, Adamma-Kubaba, Annaliya, Ninatta-Kulitt-ta, Kunzizi, Kuzzina-Kuzpazena, Tiyawendi-gods, Kurr.⁹
¹⁰ Haas 1994: 401: ‘Im (CTH 616); 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 +KBo T 2.77 vi 9 (CTH 645); 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 645); 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 2.13 iii 22, iv 24 (CTH 591); KUB 12.26 ii 20 (CTH 441); KUB 20.24 ii 26 (CTH 645); KUB 20.49 i 8 , 14 (CTH 628); KUB 20.67 +1BoG 2.77 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 40.23 iii 12 (CTH 458); KUB 43.23 rev. 50 (CTH 620); KUB 43.30 iii 10’ (CTH 526); KUB 44.1 rev. 12 (CTH 526); KUB 46.17 iv 8 (CTH 529); KUB 50.32 ii 1, ii 2 (CTH 568); KUB 54.31 obv. 9’ (CTH 694); KUB 55.39 i 27’ (CTH 591); KUB 56.45+ ii 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 ii 27, ii 10, 12, 19 (CTH 645); KUB 58.106 ii 10 (CTH 780); KUB 60.111, 1’ (CTH 590); ABoG 1.14 iv 6’ (CTH 658); ABoG 2.141 vi [10’ (CTH 628); IBaG 2.23 rev. 11 (CTH 645); IBaG 2.108 rev. 5’ (CTH 529); IBaG 3.1 rev. 79 (CTH 609); VSNF 12.28 ii 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).
¹² The well-attested Mala and the less-attested 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 ‘ĪD-aš-4Ma-a-luya’ according to Trémouille 2002: 355. See § 2 below.
Maliyanni-deities\textsuperscript{17} were probably some types of nymphs.\textsuperscript{18} In addition to her patronage of the natural environment, Maliya was also the patroness of some workers,\textsuperscript{19} possibly through the connection between water-related work activities and rivers.\textsuperscript{20} Moreover, she also had a variety of “Maliya’s male gods”: DINGIR pešētu \textsuperscript{d}Malía-aš / \textsuperscript{d}Malía-aš DINGIR.LÚMES-aš,\textsuperscript{21} whose role as Maliya’s parbedroi is far from being clearly understood.\textsuperscript{22} Finally, she is once referred to as “Maliya of the horn”.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{1.A.} Concerning religious geography, Maliya was originally worshiped in Kummani, but then also in Tapala\textsuperscript{24} and Ḥattuša, where her temple\textsuperscript{25} hosted the holy horse Erama, which was a cultic animal fed by the Hittite king himself.\textsuperscript{26} Furthermore, Maliya’s name possibly shares the root with many other geographical names: the cities of URU Maliyaša, URU Maliliḫa, URU Malita, the rivers of IDMala and IDMaliya (below, § 2), and the mountain HUR.SAG Malimaliya.\textsuperscript{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 Māmu Dağ, N-E of Tokat,\textsuperscript{28} far away from Maliya’s traditional places of worship: Kizzuwatna (Kummani) and Hittite core (Ḥattuša and Tapala).

\textbf{1.B.} Chronologically, Maliya is attested in textual evidence no earlier than the 14\textsuperscript{th} century BC. The oldest cuneiform tablets in which we read the name Maliya are paleographically middle-Hittite\textsuperscript{29} and much fewer in number than the later ones.\textsuperscript{30} The post quæm benchmark is Puduhepa’s reign and her cultic renovation of the (h)išuwa-festival:\textsuperscript{31} from there, the Hurrian/Kizzuwatnamean gods are more frequently attested. Maliya is no excep-

\textsuperscript{17} Attestations: KBo 27.108 iii 24, 27, 29; KUB 12.26 ii 21; KUB 12.44 iii 11, 12.
\textsuperscript{19} “Of the leather worker”: \textit{pa-ra-a-ma ŠA} (KBo 10.27 iv 3o, see Steitler 2019: 131 with note 41; Cammarosano 2021: 84); “of the carpenter”: \textit{Ma-li-ya-aš ŠA} (KUB 47.58 ii 7, KBo 70.109+ ii 15, see Cammarosano 2018: 112, 446-447; Cammarosano 2021: 85; Rutherford 2020b: 331); “of the GAD.TAR-functionary”: \textit{Ma-li-ya-aš ŠA} (KUB 46.17 iv 8, see Cammarosano 2021: 85; Steitler 2019: 133-134).
\textsuperscript{20} Steitler 2019: 133; Hutter 2021: 284.
\textsuperscript{21} KBo 4.13 i 16; KBo 11.32 obv. 19, 24, 36-37, lowe. 40 // KUB 43.30 iii 10'-11'; KUB 23.49 iv 2 +KBo 24.110 iv 7; KBo 25.109 iii 10, 20; KBo 29.33 r.ccl. 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 pešētu = LÚMES, see Neu, Otten 1972: 183-185 and Carruba 1994: 14-16.
\textsuperscript{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’ ÎIMIN.IMIN.BL. However, this last equation is contradicted by VSNF 12 ii 10, where ÎIMIN.IMIN.BL and DINGIR LÚMES occur in a row.
\textsuperscript{23} KUB 35.135 iv 15: \textit{ša-ú-i-ta-ra-ša} (KBo 10.27 iv 3o, see Starke 1985: 322; Hutter 2021: 147.
\textsuperscript{24} HUR.SAG Tapala, see RGTC 6: 397 and Van Gessel 1998: 297.
\textsuperscript{26} For instance, Bo 5593 ii 2-9 with duplicates. See Haas 1994: 417, 856; Van den Hout 2004: 488; Serangeli 2015: 380-381.
\textsuperscript{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 \textit{ma-al}-\textit{i}’ (RGTC 6: 255) can be referred to whatever town whose name starts with \textit{Mal}.
\textsuperscript{28} See RGTC 6: 255; Frantz-Szabó 1987: 305 with references.
\textsuperscript{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 ducus of KUB 43.30, see Taracha 2009: 51 with note 261 ‘early Middle Hittite script’.
\textsuperscript{30} Ca. 11,50% of all attestations, contra the 69% of jh. and 19,50% of sjh.
\textsuperscript{31} Statistically, the (h)išuwa-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.DA.H,ŠUM, (h)išuwa, EZE.N, K.I.LAM). 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 Ḫattuša. However, onomastics seem to show a larger chronological diffusion for Maliya (§ 1.C).

1.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 "Mal(i)awašų"), until the late Karkamiš kingdom (prince "Mal(i)awašai"), thus displaying the long cultural survival of the divine name. "Mal(i)awaši contains the Luwian element waša-," 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).

1.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 "IĎ"Maliya, the determinative in the lacuna is not clearly consistent with an ID, as recently pointed out by Cammarosano, thereby removing any element for speculation about an iconographic and epigraphic evidence of Maliya as a river-goddess. 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. 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. However, the proper reading of line 8' is: A-NA ḤUR.SA\G Kam'-ma-li-yu 1 NINDA tu-ḫur-ru-i. Indeed, although the photo BoFN02002 of KUB 40.101 clearly shows the sign GAŠAN (HZL 336), the duplicate KBo 11.40 v 3' reports without any doubt A-NA ḤUR.SA\G kam-ma-li-yu, not to mention that the context of KUB 40.101+ obv. 3'ff. deals with offerings towards mountains. Therefore, the GAŠAN sign of KUB 40.101 obv. 8' has to be considered as a lapsus calami for KAM (HZL 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.

1.E. Finally, Maliya is considered to be part of two so-called circles: the "circle of Kaniš" with Pirwa, Ḫaššušara, Ašgašepa, and Kamrušepa, on the one hand; and the "circle of Ḫuwaššanna" of Ḫupišna on the other.
er.\textsuperscript{45} However, even though Maliya is attested in KBo 29.33 iii 7', 9','\textsuperscript{46} this is not enough to integrate Maliya into the so-called Ūwuwaššanna’s circle.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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)išwa-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 \(\text{id}Maliya and \(\text{id}Mala. On one hand, \(\text{id}Maliya, although less-attested (KBo 2.16 rev. 4; KBo 47.76 rev. 5'; KUB 38.33, 5; \textit{plus} KBo 14.88 ii 15' “\text{id}-\text{aš\n\text{a}-\text{ša}}“ according to Trémouille 2002, 355), undoubtedly matches the name of the goddess.\textsuperscript{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, \(\text{id}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 Hatti, 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 \(\text{id}Maliya was a variant of \(\text{id}Mala/Euphrates, thanks to the graphic alternation between -\text{tiya and -tä (for instance, \(\text{id}Marassantiya/ \(\text{id}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, \(\text{id}Maliya and \(\text{id}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 area\textsuperscript{50} or even somewhere in the North-East.\textsuperscript{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 Athena.\textsuperscript{45} On the so-called “Ḫuwaššanna’s circle” in Ūpušna (classical Kybestra and modern Ereğli) see Tāracha 2009: 117; Hutter 2003: 243-244, 273-274; Hutter 2021: 148-150. For the connection of Maliya with Ūwuwaššanna see Trémouille 2002: 354-355; Hutter 2021: 144-145.
\textsuperscript{46} Part of the festival for Ūwuwaššanna (CTH 694), see Hutter 2013: 182.
\textsuperscript{47} See Tāracha 2009: 117; Hutter 2013: 186.
\textsuperscript{48} This, however, does not exclude the religious and cultic importance of such groups, see Warbinek 2022: 13.
\textsuperscript{50} RGTC 6: 538: ‘Südosten? (In Kontext die Bergnamen Suwara, Daliya und Arwali[ja])’.
\textsuperscript{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.
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. 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.  

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’ 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 parhēdra. 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). 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.

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. In Xanthos, Malija shared a temple with Artemis and the “Lord of Kaunos”, 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 Athena 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 ἐπίσκοπος. 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. 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[j]ia (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 millennium Lydian deities to the Anatolian god Malis, and the associated Anatolian divinity.”

millennium goddesses to the Hittite-Luwian goddess Malia, known from the ḫišuwa-festival and many other texts, including one from Istanuwat. Prima facie she looks different, being associated with rivers and vineyards, whereas Athene’s defining features are craft and war, but there are similarities; LBA Malia was associated with horses, like Athene Hippias in the classical period and a central Anatolian cult inventory mentions “Malia of the Carpenter”, which seems anticipate Athene’s association with carpenters [i.e., Athene Ergane]. No other Anatolian associations of Athene are convincing (Rutherford 2020a: 194-195). The last statement is correct, even though scholarship 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 Hippias (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;
   b. mala(i)- and/or mal-, a verb whose meaning, synchronically, seems to be “to approve”;

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” 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 μέλω 70 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. ḫitar und der Wettergott’.
64 Rutherford 2020a: 195 notes 75-77; Rutherford 2020b: 331-332 with note 8 in reference to ʰMaliyai 1U.NA.GAR. See also García Ramón 2015: 131 and above, § 1 note 18.
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. Of course, if we are dealing with denominals, the connection to the Greek verbs would be more complex (at least in the case of μέλω), 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, 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 *meh ḥ*, which can be achieved positing a syncope from an original *meḥ₁-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). 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 LIV: 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 undecided 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.
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 meldh- discussed by Kölligan (2018: 231-233) would at least require reformulation.
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 i ḪTU),77 and in the inventory lists (e.g., KUB 43.40 iii 5’ with Kuwanša gods, Ḫilašši, and Waškuwattašši).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).

76 Hutter 2003: 231. See also Payne 2019: 12.
78 Popko 1995: 73. See also Melchert 2003: 188, 196.
80 Above, § 1 with note 4.
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. 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'.

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 Kummanti (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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bronze Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maliya</td>
<td>Of the gardens, wine-grain</td>
<td>&quot;male gods&quot; parhedroi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River goddess (+Maliyanni)</td>
<td>Holy horse Erama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malis as water nymph</td>
<td>Patrnoness of some workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydian Malis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycian Malija</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Athena</td>
<td>Athena Tritogeneia</td>
<td>Athena Hippia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Minerva</td>
<td>Athena Hippia</td>
<td>Athena Episkopos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS

KUB *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin 1921ff.
TL *Tituli Lyciae* (see TAM).
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