

THE KINGDOM OF KIZZUWATNA:
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN RESEARCH

PIHANS

onder redactie van

J.G. DERCKSEN, K. VAN DER TOORN, K.R. VEENHOF en W.J.I. WAAL

VOLUME
CXXXVII

THE KINGDOM OF KIZZUWATNA: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN RESEARCH

Proceedings of the Third NINO Postdoctoral
Research Fellow Annual Conference,
Leiden, 23rd–25th March 2023

Edited by

Andrea Trameri



NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR HET NABIJE OOSTEN
LEIDEN

PEETERS
LEUVEN

2026

Cover illustration:

Relief of Fraktin (Gümüşören, Develi, Kayseri Province, Turkey), mid–late 13th century BCE.

Photograph by Tayfun Bilgin.

Two adjacent offering scenes depict the Hittite king Ḫattušili III (left) and queen Puduḫeba (right), each standing before an altar and the Storm God(?) and the goddess Ḫebat, respectively. A third panel beside the queen's depiction bears the inscription: "Daughter of Kizzuwatna, beloved of the god(s)".

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-5514-1

eISBN 978-90-429-5515-8

D/2026/0602/34

© 2026, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

A. Trameri (ed.), *The Kingdom of Kizzuwatna: Recent Developments in Research*. Proceedings of the Third NINO Postdoctoral Research Fellow Annual Conference, Leiden, 23rd–25th March 2023. PIHANS 137, Leiden & Leuven 2026.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

CONTENTS

Preface	VII
I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	
1. Kizzuwatna: History, Sources and Research Questions	1
Andrea TRAMERI	
II. ARCHAEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY	
2. The Archaeology of Kizzuwatna: Data, Research, Questions.....	23
Mirko NOVÁK – Ekin KOZAL (with a contribution by Gabriele ELSÉN-NOVÁK)	
3. Places and Spaces of Kizzuwatna	49
Adam KRYSZEŃ	
4. The Region of Kizzuwatna Viewed from Egypt: The Attestations(?) of Kizzu- watna and its Area in the Egyptian Documentation.....	67
Marco DE PIETRI †	
III. TEXTS, PHILOLOGY AND LANGUAGE	
5. “Into the Mountains and Down to the Sea”	87
Eva VON DASSOW	
6. The Tradition and Recensions of the <i>itkalzi</i> -Ritual	107
Stefano DE MARTINO	
7. Hurrian(s) in Kizzuwatna: An Old Topos Reconsidered	117
Zsolt SIMON	
IV. RELIGION, RITUALS AND CULTURE	
8. What do We Know about ‘Kizzuwatnaean’ Religion?	133
Manfred HUTTER	
9. Interacting with the Dead in Kizzuwatna	147
Alice MOUTON	
10. From Kizzuwatna to Ḫattuša: How Gods were Adopted into the Hittite State Cult.....	171
Livio WARBINEK	

V. KINGSHIP AND IDEOLOGY

11. The Possible Impact of the Annexation of Kizzuwatna in the Involvement of Hittite Queens in the Administration of the Hittite Kingdom.....	185
Sylvia HUTTER-BRAUN SAR	
12. Mechanisms of Kizzuwatnaean Influence on Hittite Royal Ideology in the Empire Period.....	199
Piotr TARACHA	

PREFACE

These proceedings of the third annual ‘NINO Postdoctoral Research Fellow Conference’ titled *The kingdom of Kizzuwatna: Recent Developments in Research*, contribute to a multi-year research undertake on the kingdom of Kizzuwatna. This project began with my PhD research and dissertation on the history of Kizzuwatna and Cilicia in the second millennium BCE, which I defended at the Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, New York University, in May 2020. With the primary goal of publishing the dissertation as a monograph, I joined the NINO in Leiden for a two-year postdoctoral research fellowship. This opportunity allowed me to continue the necessary research activity for the book’s completion, and to organize a symposium closely related to my research topic. On March 23rd–25th 2023, NINO and Leiden University hosted our conference, where eighteen scholars presented contributions on various topics relevant to the research on Kizzuwatna, some of which are published in the present volume.

The monograph based on my doctoral dissertation was recently published as *Kizzuwatna. History of Cilicia in the Middle and Late Bronze Age (ca. 2000–1200 BC)* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/185, Leiden and Boston, Brill, 2024) and this conference volume complements the book by offering additional individual studies on selected topics of interest, spanning various fields of expertise. While the completion of the history monograph aimed to provide a comprehensive study of Kizzuwatna, the conference brought in the voices of other colleagues engaged in this research topic, offering new ideas and perspectives. Our invitations and call for papers were met with interest and enthusiasm by many scholars, allowing us to engage in a multidisciplinary conversation on a broad range of issues and themes. The presentations showcased recent developments and original research from various fields of research, including archaeology and material cultural studies, philological studies, and historical linguistics.

Following an historical introduction to the kingdom of Kizzuwatna (I), this volume is organized into four thematic sections with the submitted contributions, who underwent a process of peer-review: Archaeology and Geography (II), Texts, Philology and Language (III), Religion, Rituals and Culture (IV), and Kingship and Ideology (V).

The personal names of Hittite kings and queens have been standardized throughout the volume. However, the choice for some spellings of Hurrian names have been left to the authors, as variation exists both in the original cuneiform spellings and in the transcription standards used in modern scholarship. Authors’ individual preferences for transliteration conventions of original texts have been also maintained, with minor corrections made for publication purposes.

Bibliographical abbreviations in the volume follow *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (most recent volume Š, concluded in 2019) unless otherwise specified in each contribution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the editor of this conference proceedings, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to all the participants to the conference: (in alphabetic order) Mariateresa Albanese, Virginie Danniau, Stefano de Martino, Marco De Pietri, Mauro Giorgieri, Manfred Hutter, Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar, Ekin Kozal, Adam Kryszewski, Matthias Lange, Alvis Matessi, Alice Mouton, Mirko Novák, Zsolt Simon, Piotr Taracha, Marie-Claude Trémouille, Eva von Dassow, Livio Warbinek, Ilya Yakubovich, Deniz Yaşin.

This conference and the resulting proceedings volume would not have been possible without the generous institutional and financial support of NINO and Leiden University. For the preparation of the volume, in particular, I am indebted to Willemijn Waal, for her invaluable assistance at every stage – from the review process to the final production. I thank also Jan Gerrit Dercksen, chief editor of the PIHANS series, and Peeters Publishers for accepting this volume into their collection.

For her outstanding work in the organization of the conference, I am also especially grateful to Carolien van Zoest of NINO, and to Sara Gebhardt for her kind assistance. I also thank our colleagues at Leiden University who joined our conference as session chairs: Jan Gerrit Dercksen, Bleda Düring, Alwin Klokhorst, Miriam Müller and Lidewij van de Peut.

Finally, several anonymous colleagues are to be thanked for their feedback and valuable critiques during the peer-review process.

Würzburg, October 2024

Andrea Trameri

During the final phases of the editorial preparation of this volume, Marco De Pietri, a young scholar at the University of Pavia and one of the contributors, tragically passed away on May 12th, 2025. We include his posthumous article in these proceedings to honour his memory, with the kind permission of his family. His untimely passing deeply saddened and disconcerted all who knew him.

Marco was an enthusiastic and dedicated researcher, focusing on both Egyptological and Anatolian studies. He was also a long-time member of the archaeological excavations at Kınık Höyük in southern Cappadocia, Türkiye, where I had the pleasure of working with him over many excavation seasons, since our time as students at the University of Pavia.

His article was completed and approved by him at the end of 2024, and no substantial changes have been made. As Marco was unable to review the final proof before publication, as editor of the volume, I made only typographical and formatting corrections where necessary.

Würzburg, June 2025



The speakers and organisers of the conference at the Oude Sterrewacht in Leiden, on March 25th 2023 (left to right): Eva von Dassow, Zsolt Simon, Piotr Taracha; Marco De Pietri, Willemijn Waal, Andrea Trameri, Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar; Virginie Danniau, Adam Kryszewski, Manfred Hutter; Marie-Claude Trémouille, Stefano de Martino; Maria Teresa Albanese, Mirko Novák, Alice Mouton; Livio Warbinek, Alvise Matessi.

FROM KIZZUWATNA TO ḪATTUŠA: HOW GODS WERE ADOPTED INTO THE HITTITE STATE CULT

Livio WARBINEK

Università di Verona

Abstract

When different cultures come into contact, interactions between the respective religions and cultic practices may also occur, which can result in the attempt to equalize deities belonging to the respective cultural milieus. During the reorganization of the Hittite religious system by the royal family with the creation of the so-called “Dynastic Pantheon” in a Hurrian sense, several gods with Kizzuwatnean origins started to play an important new role in Ḫattuša. This paper offers an in-depth analysis of some gods of the Hurrian-Luwian context of Kizzuwatna, which were imported into the Hittite state cult.

1. INTRODUCTION

With the term ‘Kizzuwatna’, modern scholarship identifies both a geographical region of Anatolia and a historical kingdom of the Late Bronze Age.¹ Geographically speaking, the toponyms of the land of Kizzuwatna and the city of Kummani could be used alternatively in the New Hittite period, while referring to a specific single entity.² In contrast, from a linguistic and religious perspective, Kizzuwatna appears to be a melting pot of different cultural traditions: from the western Luwian to the eastern Syro-Hurrian interfaces.³ Indeed, according to Gary Beckman (2004: 315) the religious features of Kizzuwatna “are basically Hurrian in character, with a significant Luwian admixture”. In particular, the scholarship has been focused on what we mean by a ‘mixed’ area in defining the Kizzuwatnean context, a question that depends on whether we consider languages (spoken or written)⁴ or cultural elements (e.g., religion),⁵ as well as their transmission.⁶

¹ See Kümmel 1976/80: 627–631; Yakubovich 2010: 272–285; Trameri 2020; Görke 2022: 148.

² See for instance KUB 7.20 // KBo 9.115 I 1–2 (Trameri 2020: 420). Kummani (RGTC 6: 221; 6/2: 83), later *Comana Cappadociae*, is presumed to be the capital (< Luwian *kumma*- ‘pure, sacred’, CLL: 108, so “holy city”) of the land of Kizzuwatna (RGTC 6: 211–215; 6/2: 81). See Trémouille 1997: 58; Hawkins – Weeden 2017: 281; Trameri 2020: 62–65; and Kryszén in the present volume. On the possible etymology of the toponym Kizzuwatna see Yakubovich 2010: 274 and Trameri 2020: 30–32.

³ Gurney 1977: 16; Hutter 2003: 213–214; Yakubovich 2010: 86–117, 239–245, 274; Görke 2022: 148–149.

⁴ See Yakubovich 2010: 284–285, 302.

⁵ The question is of course even more complicated because of the lack of proper Kizzuwatnean textual evidence: as long as local written sources are missing, we have only some pieces of evidence which refer mainly to the Hittite point of view. See, for instance, Yakubovich 2010: 276–277 with reference.

⁶ Trameri 2020: 327–343.

Although the issue is far from being completely resolved, this paper considers the adoption of the Kizzuwatnean gods⁷ into Ḫattuša following the historical incorporation or integration of Kizzuwatna into the Hittite kingdom.⁸ The question depends first on which Kizzuwatnean deities can be identified as integrated in Ḫattuša, and then on the ways those gods were actually adopted.

2. LIMITS AND GODS

According to Andrea Trameri, “there is evidence that at least to some extent Tudḫaliya I was actively promoting the import of Kizzuwatnean cults and that he was, presumably, the first Hittite king to do so”.⁹ The discussion is far from concluded because such an early dating is hard to prove. The importation certainly happened in the Early New Kingdom’s dynasty (Tudḫaliya II/III and probably Arnuwanda), because we know that Hittites “were always willing to adopt religious elements from neighboring people” (Campbell 2016: 295).¹⁰ In fact, the reasons behind these adoptions are multiple, like political and ideological changes among elites, as we will see later (§ 3). The first question that must be considered consists of defining the Kizzuwatnean traits in general, and specifically the divine ones, that were imported to Ḫattuša. In this paper the Luwian component will be excluded for the following reasons: first, because the status of Luwian in Kizzuwatna seems to be in a minority compared to Hurrian;¹¹ second, because the dialectal continuum does not allow us to easily and completely discern Kizzuwatnean Luwian from the Lower Land Luwian;¹² third, and most importantly, because most of the Luwian deities who entered Ḫattuša may have followed different routes (e.g., from the Lower Land¹³), rather than coming via Kizzuwatna.

These distinctions also reflect the status of Luwian and Hurrian in Kizzuwatna: while the first was probably mostly a spoken language, the latter was seen as an important written

⁷ Particularly from the local cults of the cities of Kummani, Lawazantiya, Iṣtanuwa, and Ḫattarina. See Beckman 2004: 313–315.

⁸ I deliberately avoid any discussion on the ‘integration’, ‘conquest’, ‘annexation’, or even ‘liberation’ (Yakubovich 2010: 276) of the kingdom of Kizzuwatna into the Hittite kingdom. See Gilan 2019: 179–180; Campbell 2016: 297; Trameri 2020: 422–430. The strategic location of Kizzuwatna as the gateway between Anatolian and Syrian lands reflected the political role played by Kizzuwatna between the 15th and the 14th century BC as a buffer-state between the kingdoms of Ḫatti and Mittani.

⁹ Trameri 2020: 412 with reference.

¹⁰ This Hittite manner of facing the different encountered cultures is the basis of the creation of that divine melting pot of the ‘Thousand Gods of Ḫatti’, the peculiar structure of which cannot be considered merely a pantheon, but reflects religious interferences mingled for centuries. See Taracha 2010: 858; Warbinek 2023a: 11–12.

¹¹ Hutter 2021: 141: “Die hurritischen Elemente scheinen dabei etwas stärker ausgeprägt gewesen zu sein als die luwischen”. See also Gilan 2019: 179–180; Görke 2022: 150.

¹² Yakubovich 2023: 288–289. See also Mouton–Yakubovich 2021; Mouton–Yakubovich 2023.

¹³ According to Hutter (2003: 213–214), the Lower Land was one of the three different Anatolian “Luwian zones”, with Arzawa and Kizzuwatna, where Luwian culture, i.e., language and religion, spread. While Arzawa was historically more independent and less influenced by Hittites, the Lower Land was part of the Hittite Kingdom and therefore can be considered a mixed Hittite–Luwian area. See also Warbinek 2023a: 13.

language for recording cultic and religious practice.¹⁴ This has undoubtedly been accentuated by the increasing Hurrian influence in Ḫattuša due to dynastic needs: starting from Tudḫaliya I, continuing with Puduḫepa's interventions under the reign of Ḫattušili III, up to the so-called 're-organisation'¹⁵ of the cults by Tudḫaliya IV. Taking all these aspects into consideration, we may infer that the Luwian divine elements in Kizzuwatna were less pronounced than the Hurrian ones, and therefore it seems more fruitful to follow the latter route.

Once the Hurrian focus has been established, another methodological question arises, which concerns the choice of imported deities in relation to the available cuneiform evidence. Since the major Hurrian gods (i.e., Teššub, Ḫebat, Šawuška, Išḫara) have already been thoroughly investigated in the scholarship, they have been left out of this discussion, which instead focuses on those minor gods about whom the research is still lacking.

As we are considering minor gods from Kizzuwatna, their selection primarily concerns treaties, festivals, and rituals related to that area. Regarding the divine witnesses in the last paragraphs of the treaties between Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna,¹⁶ it would have been extremely interesting to analyse how certain Kizzuwatnean gods reached the Hittite capital alongside the historical and mutual evolution in relations¹⁷ between the two countries. Unfortunately, among those treaties¹⁸ none retained the divine witnesses with the sole exception of the one between Tudḫaliya I and Šunaššura (CTH 41) where, however, we find only major – and generically mentioned – gods (e.g., the 'gods of the country of Kizzuwatna', the 'Stormgod of Ḫatti', without any specific denomination).¹⁹ Therefore, we have to move the focus to the largely Hurrianized Kizzuwatnean festivals (CTH 628, 698–706)²⁰ and to those rituals recorded in Ḫattuša but derived from Kizzuwatnean traditions.²¹ In particular, "the flow of ritual texts from Kizzuwatna has been extensively studied in recent years, both from religious-historical as well as from sociolinguistic, textual, redactional and archival perspectives. These studies provide an excellent vantage point to explore the modes and mechanisms of religious convergence in Hittite Anatolia" (Gilan 2019: 173).

¹⁴ Yakubovich 2010: 272–285; Gilan 2019: 183; Trameri 2020: 327–336.

¹⁵ Goetze (1933: 159–160 with note 1) first suggested the idea of a 'Kultreorganisation', which has been reinterpreted as 'réforme religieuse' by Laroche (1975). Today, however, scholars prefer to see a restoration of the cult, rather than a whole innovation, thanks to the administrative scope of the Tudḫaliya IV's textual evidence. See Collins 2007: 177; Taracha 2009: 133; Cammarosano 2018: 22–27; Hutter 2021: 30–31, 193–194, 201, 236.

¹⁶ See Görke 2022: 148 with reference.

¹⁷ Gilan 2019: 179–180.

¹⁸ CTHs 21, 25, 26, 29, 41, 122, 132. See Devecchi 2015: 63–92.

¹⁹ See Devecchi 2015: 78. Of course, Kizzuwatna signed also treaties in directions different to the route to Ḫattuša here at the centre of the discussion for divine adoptions. For instance, see the treaty between Pilliya of Kizzuwatna and Idrimi of Alalah (ALT 6), where the divine witnesses are the Storm-god, the Sun-god, Išḫara, and "all the (remaining/other) gods", see Trameri 2020: 298–307.

²⁰ See Trémouille 1997: 102–119; Trameri 2020: 323; Campbell 2016: 298; Gilan 2019: 180; Hutter 2021: 169 with n. 181. In particular, Collins (2007: 163): "One major yearly festival, however, was introduced from Kizzuwatna, where Hurrian beliefs and practices were most strongly felt. The nine-day-long *hisuwas* festival was not season-dependent and was performed to honor the Storm-God of Manuzziya (a mountain in Kizzuwatna) and his circle. Eagles, which were sacred to this deity, played a prominent role in the festival and may have given it its name. It included a ceremony for the military success of the king".

²¹ See Miller 2004; Trameri 2020: 413–421.

Nonetheless, the divine recurrence we can infer from these texts is not so decisive, because most of the recurring gods are those related to the *kaluti* lists of Teššub and Ḫebat,²² and the introduction of their cults was associated with a new ideology of kingship in the royal family of the New Kingdom. In such a context it is therefore not surprising to find references to gods like Išḫara, Ištar, Nikkal and Šawuška, which can contribute little towards the evaluation of the adoption of Kizzuwatnean gods in Ḫattuša. Nevertheless, among those gods adopted via Kizzuwatna some came from elsewhere, e.g., the pantheons of Yamḥad or Aleppo, thus providing evidence that the dynastic pantheon also included deities of a Syrian substrate (like Išḫara).

Finally, the goddess DINGIR.GE₆ represents an exceptional case in this scenario, which is the reason why this deity has been thoroughly studied,²³ and here will be extremely useful as a litmus test for any comparison in the conclusive remarks.

3. CASE STUDIES

Notwithstanding the limits we have just identified, it is possible to gather some minor deities in texts of Hurrian content, which can offer some interesting insight (Table 1):

<i>Sources</i>	<i>Authors/Content</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Deities</i>	<i>Order</i>
CTH 475	Ritual of King Pilliya	Installation of a cult statue	^D U ^D matina ^D ḫazzizi	e
CTH 479	Ritual of Kizzuwatna	Purification	Ḫilaššiti	c
CTH 479.3	Festival in Šapinuwa (?)	Cultic	Tašimeti/Tašimi	d
CTH 480.2	Ritual of Šamuḫa	Cultic	Pirinkir, Ištar ‘of the field’, DINGIR ^{MEŠ} Aleppo	f
CTH 485	Ritual for Teššub, Ḫebat, Šarruma	Evocation	Tiyabenti, Tenu	b
CTH 494	Ritual for NIN.GAL	Purification	Zedu, Širinna, Alwil, Kade, Maḫitti, Agaššari	a

The gods featured in the document listed in Table 1 will be presented here according to a thematic order relating to the scope of this paper.

a. Starting from the very end, in the purification ritual for NIN.GAL we find the following deities unknown elsewhere:²⁴ Alwil (KUB 45.47 iii 6, iv 16),²⁵ Agaššari (KUB 45.47 iii 6, iv 17),²⁶ Kade (KUB 45.47 iii 8),²⁷ Maḫitti (KUB 45.47 iii 8, iv 17; KBo 33.107

²² Trémouille 1997: 201–210; Taracha 2009: 102; Warbinek 2023b: 186 with nn. 32–35.

²³ Particularly, Miller 2004.

²⁴ See Haas 1994: 376, 574.

²⁵ Haas 1994: 376; van Gessel 1998: 25–26.

²⁶ Haas 1994: 376; van Gessel 1998: 8–9.

²⁷ Haas 1994: 376 with n. 480; van Gessel 1998: 238.

obv. 11),²⁸ Širinna (KUB 45.47 iii 4, iv 16);²⁹ Zedu (KUB 45.47 iii 3, iv 15).³⁰ Pending the conformation or refutation of the following statement, we can infer that these gods entered Ḫattuša thanks to the imported ritual tradition. Therefore, they are probably only local minor Hurro-Kizzuwatnean gods, but they represent an instance of how local cults spread by participating in the worship of a major deity, here NIN.GAL.

b. On the other hand, the evocation ritual CTH 485³¹ preserves the deities Tiyabenti³² and Tenu,³³ which are part of “le concept kizzuwatnéen des *kaluti*”.³⁴ Tiyabenti is considered to be the vizir or priest (^USUKKAL) of Ḫebat,³⁵ whereas Tenu is Teššub’s.³⁶ Therefore, this text provides a piece of evidence for the transmission of foreign gods in the Hittite capital through the Kizzuwatna tradition, in association with the Hurrian *kaluti* circles.

c. The case of Ḫilaššiti, which is attested twice in the 12th tablet of the Purification Ritual CTH 479 where the ritual operations between the 16th and the 23rd day are described, seems to be similar:

KUB 30.31++ iii 37, iv 25³⁷

(37) ^DḪi-la-aš-ši-ti-ma ma-a-an u-zi-an-za iš-T[U

(25) ^DḪi-la-aš-ši-ti-ya ma-a-an še-ḫé-el-l[i-iš-k]i-i-š e-eš-zi

As well as for the god Ḫilanzepa, the Anatolian first element is *ḫīla(n)* ‘courtyard’ in all likelihood the core part of the temple,³⁸ followed by the Luwian genitival suffix *-šši/a* and with another element *-ti* (adj., gen. sg.).³⁹ Indeed, in most cases, the theonym is Ḫilašši, a Luwian deity involved in several festivals recorded in Ḫattuša.⁴⁰ In particular, the present purification ritual from Kizzuwatna mentions Ḫilaššiti in a fully Hurrian context of offerings related to the *kaluti* lists of Teššub and Ḫebat. The importation to Ḫattuša can be explained by considering Ḫilaššiti a possible local Kizzuwatnean manifestation of Ḫilašši, who entered the Hittite capital together with the Hurrian gods listed.

²⁸ Haas 1994: 376 with n. 481, 399–400; van Gessel 1998: 294.

²⁹ Haas 1994: 376; van Gessel 1998: 404–405.

³⁰ Haas 1994: 376; van Gessel 1998: 580.

³¹ Haas 1998: 106–127.

³² Haas 1994: 309–310, who returns *tiye=bendi* “Gutes sprechend” as a “huritische Fürbittergottheit”; Trémouille 1997: 207–210; van Gessel 1998: 512–515.

³³ Haas 1994: 332; van Gessel 1998: 480–481.

³⁴ Trémouille 1997: 91 with n. 132, and similarly at p. 142.

³⁵ Laroche 1946: 62; Trémouille 1997: 91, 142, 194 *passim*; van Gessel 1998: 514–515.

³⁶ Laroche 1946: 61; Trémouille 1997: 98, 142, 160, 210; van Gessel 1998: 481.

³⁷ See: Ünal (ed.), hethiter.net/:CTH 479.2.1 (INTR 2017–02–23): “Wenn dem Ḫilaššiti aber [...] *uzianza* vo[m ...] / Wenn aber für den Gott Ḫilašši *šeḫelli[iški]* existiert”.

³⁸ See Haas 1972/75: 409; Haas 1994: 133, 259, 281; Warbinek 2022: 4, 10 with references. According to Kloekhorst (2008: 343) the element *ḫīla-* admits no satisfactory etymology in any Indo-European language of the area. From a morphological point of view, because the Akkadian *ḫilani* is in all likelihood non-Semitic, it is impossible to identify the language of origin of the morph, which may have been present, and virtually identical, in Hittite, Luwian, and Palaic.

³⁹ See Starke 1990: 188; Melchert 1993: 68, 226. Differently, Haas 1972/75: 409; Haas 1994: 281, 299.

⁴⁰ Haas 1994: 281–282; Popko 1995: 73; van Gessel 1998: 150–152.

d. The next case I would like to highlight concerns CTH 479.3,⁴¹ where the offering lists reported two Tašimeti, as well as two Šarruma:

KBo 8.82(+) obv.² 4': [... *ša-ša-nu-uš* ZA]BAR A-NA 2 ^D*Te-šī-me*¹[-ti ...]

KBo 38.260+21.37 rev.² 12'/15': nu A-NA 2 ^D*Šar-ru-u-ma* 2 SILA₄^{HLA} *ke-e[l-di-ia]*

Tašimeti (or Tašimi/Tešimit)⁴² was most likely a Hattian spring-goddess and a concubine of the Stormgod of Nerik,⁴³ whereas Šarruma was possibly a Kizzuwatnaean mountain god⁴⁴ only secondarily ‘Hurrianized’ as the son of the royal couple Teššub and Ḫebat, and then syncretized with the Anatolian Telepinu. In the passages quoted above, there are two elements of particular interest: on the one hand, the indication of “two gods” both for Tašimeti and Šarruma. If for Tašimeti one may infer the possibility of two Hattian spring-goddesses as ‘nymphs’,⁴⁵ it is difficult to propose the same for Šarruma, unless one takes into account the reference to the two Šarrumanni,⁴⁶ Šarruma’s hypostasis connected with Ḫebat, which strengthen the interconnections between the Hurrian milieu, the Kizzuwatna land and the Hittite capital. On the other hand, the presence of the Hattian Tašimeti in the Ritual of Kizzuwatna itself sounds odd: a possible explanation refers to the identification of the Hattian goddess as a form of Ištar⁴⁷ and in that guise she may possibly have entered the Kizzuwatnean cult.

e. Another interesting case is that of king Pilliya’s ritual,⁴⁸ which reports several epithets and hypostases of the Stormgod, like Teššub *gimra*- or Teššub *edimašši*, as well as ^DU ^D*mātina* ^D*hazzizi* which, despite the others, present the divine determinatives:

KBo 44.98++ ii 9–15⁴⁹

(9) 1 SILA₄-^rya¹ I-N[A^{HUR,SA}]^G *Kal-za-t[a-a²-p]a pé-en-ni-an-zi*

(10) A-NA ^DU ^rgi¹[-im-r]a²-^raš²¹ 1 SILA₄ A-NA ^DU

(11) e-di-ma-aš-ši[-ya² 1 SIL]_{A₄} A-NA ^DU ^Dma-a-ti-n[a]

(12) ^Dha¹-az-zi-i[z-zi ... x-š]a² *hé-ru-ḫe-e-na*

(13) [1] AMAR za-x[- ... -y]a² A-NA ^DU at-ta-aš-ša

(14) [A]-NA DINGIR.^rMES²¹[LÚ.MES² A-N]A ^DU ^DHal-ki ^DÉ.A

(15) [A-N]A [^DHu-t]e-e-na ^Dr ^DHu¹-te-el-lu-u-ur-ra

“And they drive one lamb off to Mt. Kalzatapa⁵⁰ (and offer it there) to the Storm-god of the Countryside(?). (Further they offer) one lamb for the *edimašši* of the Storm-god, [one lamb]

⁴¹ See: Ünal (ed.), hethiter.net/:CTH 479.3 (2017sqq.).

⁴² Van Gessel 1998: 455–458, 481–482; Taracha 2009: 56.

⁴³ Haas 1994: 447; Popko 1995: 73, 146–147; Klinger 1996: 173; Taracha 2009: 56, 104.

⁴⁴ De Martino 2023: 94. See also Haas 1994: 387, 462, 472.

⁴⁵ Another explanation might concern the possibility that the two gods are the divine dyad Tašammat-Tešimeti (see Haas 1994: 245), but the broken tablet does not permit any further speculation and, again, this solution cannot be applied to Šarruma.

⁴⁶ Haas 1994: 472.

⁴⁷ Popko 1995: 73; Taracha 2009: 56.

⁴⁸ Beckman 2013.

⁴⁹ Beckman 2013: 128.

⁵⁰ *Hapax*. It is not clear whether it has to be considered a Kizzuwatnean mountain or a mountain added later by Hittite scribes. See Beckman 2013: 141.

to the divine wisdom and intelligence of the Storm-god, [. . .], *herubena*, [one] calf ... to the Storm-god of the Fathers, to the [male(?)] deities, to the Storm-god, the Grain-god, Ea, [to] the Fate Deities” (Beckman 2013: 138).

Indeed, Mati and Hazzizi are the divine intelligence and wisdom, actually Ea’s hypostases in Mesopotamia.⁵¹ However, this text seems to report two proper gods, both deriving from the Hurrian Mesopotamian milieu, which entered Hattuša via Kizzuwatna. During this process of adoption they apparently lost their status as Ea’s hypostases and became the Stormgod’s fellows.

f. The Ritual of Šamuḫa CTH 480.2 describes, instead, the better-known deity Pirinikir⁵² ready to receive an unknown offering:

KBo 34.72 obv. 13: *nu PA-NI DPl-ri-in-ki-ri-ya 1 ša* [...]

The ritual continues with offerings for Ištar ‘of the Field’ (*ANA DİŠTAR ŠĒRI*, KBo 24.48 ii 6’) and for the Male Gods of Aleppo (*DINGIR^{MEŠ} LÚ^{MEŠ} URU Halap*, KBo 24.48 ii 9’), thus providing a piece of evidence for a Syro-Hurrian contextualization of the worshipped deities. This context also fits well for Pirinkir because this deity has been recognized by Gary Beckman (1999) as a type of Ištar, Lady of the Country, whose name probably originated from the Sumerian *PIRIG₃.GAL* ‘Great Feline’ and was borrowed by both the Elamites (as *Bine(n)gir*) and the Hurrians (as *Pirinkar*).⁵³ In his thematic study, Gary Beckman noted that in CTH 481, concerning the ‘installation’ of *DINGIR.GE₆*, Pirinkir receives offerings “upon the roof of the temple immediately after the Goddess of the Night has been presented with the same sacrifice within the building”⁵⁴ while in her ritual CTH 644 “once again the worship of Pirinkir takes place upon the roof”.⁵⁵

Once these gods have been presented, together with their main features, two main questions arise: the question of how those deities were adopted in Hattuša, and why they were chosen by the Hittites.

4. HOW: MODES OF INTEGRATION

The structure of the Hittite religious system is well suited to the name Hittites gave to it: the Thousand Gods of Hatti.⁵⁶ Within this system the trend was “thus to accommodate deities from other cultures”⁵⁷ because the Hittite religious tendency was not syncretic, but rather assimilatory:⁵⁸

⁵¹ Laroche 1946: 47, 54; Haas 1994: 297 with n. 27, 312–313.

⁵² Haas 1994: 415–416.

⁵³ Beckman 1999: 27–29. See also Haas 1994: 415.

⁵⁴ Beckman 1999: 30 with reference to KUB 29.4 iii 1–7.

⁵⁵ See ‘roof’ *šubḫ-* in Beckman 1999: 33, 36–37 with reference to VBoT 1.28+ v 4’–5’.

⁵⁶ See Warbinek 2023a: 15.

⁵⁷ Rutherford 2020: 28.

⁵⁸ Archi 1993: 3, 6; Hutter 2003: 217; Campbell 2016: 300; Cammarosano 2018: 51; Rutherford 2020: 28. *Contra* the very syncretistic perspective of Gurney 1977: 18; Popko 1995: 117; Beckman 2004: 308b; 309b.

“The size of the Hittite pantheon may be attributed to a resistance to syncretism, since in general the Hittites tended not to identify their own gods with either foreign or native deities of a similar type, in the way, for example, that members of the Greek pantheon were identified with those of the Roman. Scribes brought a certain order to the system by grouping together local deities who showed a common character. For example, they designated all bringers of rain and thunder with the same Mesopotamian ideogram (U) indicating a storm-god. This system, however, renders it difficult to tell which deity is meant by the generic designation. [...] We know, however, that these gods were worshiped individually because they appear side by side in the texts as separate divinities. Where the original names of the gods do survive, it is often a result of the fact that the Hittites sometimes addressed them in the gods’ native tongue in an effort to please them” Collins (2007: 173).

There are several consequences of this model. First, of course, the number itself of the thousand-worshipped deities. Second, and most importantly for this purpose, the different approaches adopted by the Hittites to accommodate foreign gods. In the 66th *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* held in Mainz in 2022, Valerio Pisaniello and I proposed an integrated linguistic-theological model for classifying cultural interactions between panthea. We suggested the avoidance of the generic definition of ‘syncretisms’ for Anatolian gods under Hittite kingdom, for the reasons outlined above, and we proposed the use of the term ‘equation’ between Anatolian gods of different cultural milieus. Most importantly, our opinion is that any study of the modes of interactions⁵⁹ among gods should always include both the etymology of the related theonyms, the criteria of cult language in which a deity was addressed, and the contexts in which the deities are grouped, worshipped, and equated.⁶⁰ According to our proposed model, which integrates the theological and linguistic issues, those interactions can be summarized as follows:⁶¹

1. when one pantheon lacks gods that functionally correspond to a given deity of another interacting pantheon, the new deity enters the target pantheon. Generally, the divine name is borrowed, calqued, or built by periphrasis;
2. when two gods with partly overlapping functions occur, a hypostasis is created and the name is generally calqued or paraphrased;
3. there are two gods with fully overlapping functions. In this case, syncretism generally triggers a borrowing of the theonym, while the absorption of one of the deities usually produces a calque.

This scenario shows how gods of different cultures and pantheons can be equated according to religion and/or linguistics. In applying this model to the Kizzuwatna *quaestio*, we should always keep in mind that any deity “could become common in a new cultural milieu where she had no counterpart and it was common then for her to be venerated in this new ethnic environment under her old name” (Taracha 2010: 861), and, therefore, in dealing with Hurrian foreign deities the adoptions of these gods and their theonyms must all be considered to be cases of borrowing.

⁵⁹ Cf. Assmann 1996: 33–36; Rutherford 2020: 77.

⁶⁰ Goetze 1953: 263; Taracha 2009: 36; Taracha 2010: 859.

⁶¹ Warbinek–Pisaniello, forthcoming; see also Warbinek 2023a: 15–17.

Finally, the importation of Kizzuwatnean gods and their cults to Ḫattuša, even if we assume that the incorporation of Kizzuwatna was peaceful,⁶² should be considered an imposition from above, i.e., from the ruling dynasty and their members,⁶³ who wanted to take advantage of this religious policy for the reasons summarized below.

5. WHY: REASONS FOR ADOPTING

While the preference of the royal family for the Hurrian cult appears evident in the New Kingdom, the adoption and integration of Kizzuwatnean deities raise questions on the reasons why those deities were chosen. There is no consensus about the answer to this question, but plausible explanations are as follows.

First, an *ideological* purpose behind the adoption of Hurrian deities can be proposed as an instrument of legitimacy by the new ruling dynasty in Hurrian sense.⁶⁴ This was surely true for major Hurrian deities (i.e., Teššub, Ḫebat, etc.), however, “the sudden appearance of a large amount of Hurrian religious material at the Hittite capital does not mean that there was a sudden change in royal ideology. The new cultural ties to Kizzuwatna through the queens of the early New Kingdom provided a means for this material to become integrated into the lifestyle of the ruling elite. That the Hurrian texts did not completely overshadow the preexisting Hattian/Hittite/Luwian mixture from the early period is likely due to the only sporadic importation and development of Hurrian religious texts at Hattusa” (Campbell 2016: 300). This sporadic importation of Hurrian elements also concerned a whole range of minor deities, whose ideological importance is neither measurable nor reliable, but the fact that they have been included in the imported deities should be taken into account.

Second, there was probably a *political* purpose: the religious union of Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna – whose ruler was now a son of the Hittite king with the title of ‘Priest’ – would have reinforced the assimilation of Kizzuwatna as a part of the empire, hiding the military conquest.⁶⁵ To reinforce both the ideological and political purposes, it is important to note that the Hurrian *kaluti* elements, as well as the ideology of kingship, go back to the traditions of Yamhad and Aleppo, showing the Hittite interest in gaining the Syrian lands during the New Kingdom.

Nevertheless, there were probably *theological* reasons behind the adoption of those gods because they could be easily equated with the Central-Anatolian gods.

Finally, I think there could be also an *exotic* reason, that is, that some gods from Kizzuwatna represented something exotic, new, and so of a greater value for the Hittite religious

⁶² Above, note 8.

⁶³ Particularly thanks to the role played by the queens; see Campbell 2016: 298, 300; Rutherford 2021: 176; Görke 2022: 148.

⁶⁴ A Hurrian ‘Dynastic pantheon’ in Ḫattuša was first defined and described by Taracha (2009: 92–95). See also Collins 2007: 177; Campbell 2016: 296; Hutter 2021: 123, 192; Trameri 2020: 403–404.

⁶⁵ Popko 1995: 117: “The fusion of some gods into one was supposed to help different ethnic components of the Hittite society to assimilate”. See also Hutter 2021: 250, and Trameri 2020: 402–403.

system as they came from a place closer to the Mesopotamian world. It cannot be excluded that this was to some degree also a determining factor in the Hittite attitude towards the adoption of foreign gods.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Once the terms and the limits of the adopted Kizzuwatnean deities have been clarified, we can handle these elements with the gods presented above. For a better understanding, the goddesses DINGIR.GE₆ can be used for a fruitful comparison. The Deity of the Night was the greatest deity imported from Kizzuwatna, for whom Jared Miller (2004) coined the term ‘adlocation’ with reference to the progressive adoption of her Hurrian cult into the Hittite core.⁶⁶ In particular, this adlocation occurred in distinct steps, both geographically and theologically speaking.⁶⁷ Initially brought to Šamuḫa, she was then in part equated with forms of Šawuška, Ištar of Šamuḫa, and Išhara according to different interpretations of her lunar features.⁶⁸ According to this model and in relation to the ways and the reasons for the adoption of a Kizzuwatnean god into Ḫattuša, we can infer the following points.

Tiyabenti and Tenu were part of the Kizzuwantenan *kaluti* lists (respectively as ¹⁰SUKKAL of Hebat and Teššub), and in this capacity they entered Ḫattuša. Concerning the theonyms, this is a simple case of borrowing, whereas theologically speaking it is a case of adoption. The purpose of adopting them is not well-defined but is linked with the integration of the *kaluti* circles into the Hittite state cult.

Tašimeti was a Hattian spring-goddess and concubine of the Storm-god of Nerik, whose presence in a Kizzuwatnean ritual sounds peculiar unless we take into consideration the possibilities of either a later Hittite insertion or identification as a form of Ištar. According to the latter solution, we would have a borrowing for a partial syncretism⁶⁹ between the two cultures.

Matina and Ḫazzizi, the divinized intelligence and wisdom, Ea’s hypostases in Mesopotamia, appear in the Pilliya’s ritual as a possible Kizzuwatnean local ‘interpretation’, or even a ‘misadoption’ of Mesopotamian elements into Kizzuwatna. In any case, this seems to be a good example of an exotic reason for adoption through the creation of new – i.e., Teššub’s – hypostases.

Similarly, Pirinkir was not a proper Kizzuwatnean, but a West Hurrian deity with Elamite origins, who entered Ḫattuša via Kizzuwatna and throughout the spread of her Hurrian cult as a type of Ištar. Pirinkir probably followed the same route as DINGIR.GE₆, with an adoption (borrowing) for an unknown theological reason.

Finally, Ḫilaššiti was a Luwian god, perhaps the Kizzuwatnean form of Ḫilašši, who took part in rituals of Hurrian nature. This adoption seems to be somehow similar to what

⁶⁶ Popko 1995: 114; Miller 2004: 259–260; Collins 2007: 158; Yakubovich 2010: 276; Gilan 2019: 180.

⁶⁷ Miller 2004: 259–261, 350–356.

⁶⁸ Miller 2004: 370–376.

⁶⁹ Haas 1994: 447; Popko 1995: 73; Klinger 1996: 173; Taracha 2009: 56.

happened to the deity of vegetation Maliya: she was a relatively well-known Luwian deity of South Anatolia who became more and more important in Ḫattuša after the renovation of the dynastic cult, and thus was also included the *ḫisuwa* festival.⁷⁰ From the Hittite perspective, all the deities recorded in that festival or ritual appear to be important as both Hurrian and exotic, and so the Hittites embraced those ‘foreign’ gods, ignoring the fact that they were neither Hurrian nor particularly exotic. We can therefore infer that the presence in Ḫattuša of deities like Ḫilaššiti represents a case of convergence between Anatolian cultures in the Kizzuwatnean context. Perhaps, but this is only speculation, we might recognize Ḫilaššiti as a god of the Kizzuwatnean *substratum* merged into the Luwian-Hurrian melting pot of the cults developed in Kizzuwatna.

In conclusion, to use Yakubovich’s words (2010: 276), it is very likely that “Kizzuwatna functioned as a transit point for the transmission of Hurrian written texts from Mittani and Syria to Hatti”. This transmission also concerned the deities and their related cults in several forms, according to different strategies and purposes for adopting them into the Hittite state cult, as the cases analysed here show. The adoption of Kizzuwatnean gods primarily refers to those deities taking part in the *kaluti* lists of the Hurrian Teššub and Ḫebat: their presence in the Hittite sources from Kizzuwatna is overwhelming, because of their political function for the creation of a dynastic pantheon in Ḫattuša, as well as of a religious union between Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna kingdoms. In this context, the main and the most representative gods are Hurrian in character and they were directly adopted or syncretized with their Hittite counterparts. However, in the case of minor deities, it is possible to note how the desire of the royal family to take possession of the Hurrian heritage produced a ‘god-grabber’ wish to import everything felt and perceived as Kizzuwatnean, including gods whose origins were closer to Ḫattuša than previously thought.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is a result of the project TeAI ‘Teonimi e pantheon nell’Anatolia Ittita’, funded by the Italian Ministry of University, F.A.R.E. program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archi, A. 1993: How a pantheon forms. The case of Hattian-Hittite Anatolia and Ebla of the 3rd millennium B.C., in: Janowski, B., Koch, K. and Wilhelm, G. (eds.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, Freiburg–Göttingen: 1–18.
- Assmann, J. 1996: Translating gods: religion as a factor of cultural (un)translatability, in: Budick, S. and Iser, W. (eds.), *Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Space Between*, Stanford: 25–36.
- Beckman, G. 1999: The goddess Pirinkir and her ritual from Ḫattuša (CTH 644), *Ktéma* 24: 25–39.

⁷⁰ Warbinek–Giusfredi 2024: § 5 with references.

- Beckman, G. 2004: Pantheon. A. II. Bei den Hethitern, *RLA* 10: 308–316.
- Beckman, G. 2013: The ritual of Palliya of Kizzuwatna (CTH 475), *JANER* 13: 113–145.
- Cammarosano, M. 2018: *Hittite Local Cults* (WAW 40), Atlanta.
- Campbell, R.M.D. 2016: The introduction of Hurrian religion into the Hittite empire, *Religion Compass* 10: 295–306.
- Collins, B.J. 2007: *The Hittites and Their World*, Atlanta.
- de Martino, S. 2023: Hurrian theophoric names in the documents from the Hittite kingdom, in: Warbinek, L. and Giusfredi, F. (eds.), *Theonyms, Panthea and Syncretisms in Hittite Anatolia and Northern Syria* (Studia Asiana 14), Firenze: 88–98.
- del Monte, G.F. 1992: *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement* (RGTC 6/2), Wiesbaden.
- del Monte, G.F. and Tischler, J. 1978: *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* (RGTC 6), Wiesbaden.
- Devecchi, E. 2015: *Trattati internazionali ittiti*, Brescia.
- Gilan, A. 2019: Religious convergence in Hittite Anatolia: the case of Kizzuwatna, in: Blakely, S. and Collins, B.J. (eds.), *Religious Convergence in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religions 2), Atlanta: 173–190.
- Goetze, A. 1933: *Kleinasien*, München (1st ed. 1933; 2nd ed. 1957).
- Görke, S. 2022: Hurrian and Luwian elements in Kizzuwatna religious texts, *AoF* 49/1: 148–157.
- Gurney, O.R. 1977: *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion*, Oxford.
- Haas, V. 1972/75: Ḫilaš(š)i, *RLA* 4: 409–410.
- Haas, V. 1994: *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (HbOr I/15), Leiden–New York–Köln.
- Haas, V. 1998: *Die hurritischen Ritualtermini in hethitischen Kontext* (ChS I/9), Rome.
- Hawkins, J.D. and Weeden, M. 2017: Kizzuwatna and the Euphrates States: Kummaha, Elbistan, Malatya, in: Weeden, M. and Ullman, L.Z. (eds.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography* (HbOr I/121), Leiden–Boston: 281–294.
- Hutter, M. 2003: Aspects of Luwian religion, in: Melchert, H.C. (ed.), *The Luwians* (HbOr I/68), Leiden–Boston: 211–280.
- Hutter, M. 2021: *Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens. Vom Ende des dritten bis zum Beginn des ersten Jahrtausends*, Stuttgart.
- Klinger, J. 1996: *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht* (StBoT 37), Wiesbaden.
- Kloekhorst, A. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden.
- Kümmel, H.M. 1976/80: Kizzuwatna, *RLA* 5: 627–631.
- Laroche, E. 1946: Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites, *RHA* 7/46: 7–139.
- Laroche, E. 1975: La réforme religieuse du roi Tudhaliya IV et sa signification politique, in: Dunand, F. and Lévêque, P. (eds.), *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'Antiquité. Colloque de Besançon (22–23 Octobre 1973)*, Leiden: 87–94.
- Melchert, C.H. 1993: *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (CLL), Chapel Hill.
- Miller, J.L. 2004: *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (StBoT 46), Wiesbaden.
- Mouton, A. and Yakubovich, I. 2021: Where did one speak luwili? Geographic and linguistic diversity of Luwian cuneiform texts, *Journal of Language Relationship* 19/1–2: 25–53.

- Mouton, A. and Yakubovich, I. 2023: *Luwili. Hittite-Luwian Ritual Texts Attributed to Puriyanni, Kuwattalla and Šilalluḫi (CTH 758–763). Volume I: Edition and Commentary; Volume II: Discussion and Glossary* (StBoT 72/1–2), Wiesbaden.
- Popko, M. 1995: *Religions of Asia Minor*, Warsaw.
- Rutherford, I. 2020: *Hittite Texts and Greek Religion. Contact, Interaction, and Comparison*, Oxford.
- Rutherford, I. 2021: Diplomatic marriage as an engine for religious change: the case of Assuwa and Ahhiyawa, in: Bianconi, M. (ed.), *Linguistic and Cultural Interactions between Greece and Anatolia. In Search of the Golden Fleece* (CHANE 122), Leiden–Boston: 167–181.
- Starke, F. 1990: *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31), Wiesbaden.
- Taracha, P. 2009: *Religions of Second Millennium Anatolia* (DBH 27), Wiesbaden.
- Taracha, P. 2010: Studying Hittite religion: selected issues, in: Süel, A. (ed.), *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 25–31 Ağustos 2008 – Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25–31, 2008*, Ankara: 857–868.
- Trameri, A. 2020: *The Land of Kizzuwatna. History of Cilicia in the Second Millennium BCE until the Hittite Conquest (ca. 2000–1350)*, PhD dissertation, ISAW – New York University.
- Trémouille, M.-C. 1997: *Ḫebat, une divinité syro-anatolienne* (Eothen 7), Firenze.
- van Gessel B.H.L. 1998: *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon* 1 (HbOr I/33), Leiden–New York–Köln.
- Warbinek, L. 2022: The -šepa theonyms in the Hittite pantheon, *VO* 26: 1–19.
- Warbinek, L. 2023a: Introduction, in: Warbinek, L. and Giusfredi, F. (eds.), *Theonyms, Panthea and Syncretisms in Hittite Anatolia and Northern Syria. Proceeding of the TeAI Workshop Held in Verona, March 25–26, 2022* (Studia Asiana 14), Firenze: 11–19.
- Warbinek, L. 2023b: Defining the Hittite ‘pantheon’, its hierarchy and circles: methodological perspectives, in: Warbinek, L. and Giusfredi, F. (eds.), *Theonyms, Panthea and Syncretisms in Hittite Anatolia and Northern Syria. Proceeding of the TeAI Workshop Held in Verona, March 25–26, 2022* (Studia Asiana 14), Firenze: 181–191.
- Warbinek, L. and Giusfredi, F. 2023: Maliya, Malija, Malis, Athena. From Kizzuwatna to the Aegean: borrowings, translations, or syncretisms?, *Asia Anteriore Antica* 5: 139–151.
- Warbinek, L. and Pisaniello, V. forthcoming: Borrowing, Translation, and Syncretism of deities in ancient Anatolia, *Proceedings of the 66th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Mainz* (2022).
- Yakubovich, I. 2010: *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden–Boston.
- Yakubovich, I. 2023: Cuneiform Luwian in the Hattuša archives, in: Giusfredi, F., Pisaniello, V. and Matessi, A. (eds.), *Contacts of Languages and Peoples in the Hittite and Post-Hittite World*, Leiden: 284–312.

