This second example shows the fundamental problem, which is not the appeal to adhocity in itself. One must not be hypocritical—all of us who engage in linguistic analysis deal with recalcitrant data by resorting to accounts that are to varying degrees ad hoc. The underlying reason for the disproportionate number of ad hoc explanations in the present case is that Kloekhorst is mostly attempting to solve pseudo-problems that "exist" only because of the false premise that every spelling pattern must be accounted for in linguistic terms, no matter what the cost.

Make no mistake—by attempting a comprehensive account of Hittite accent, Kloekhorst has broken new ground and significantly advanced the state of the question, and subsequent studies of this complex topic will have to address innumerable genuine issues that he has raised. It is regrettable that the methodological failings described above vitiate most of his specific claims about changes in vowel length within the historical period of Hittite and the sometimes far-reaching prehistoric implications that he draws from them.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT
CARRBORO, NORTH CAROLINA

REFERENCE

Kimball, Sara. 2015. Review of Alwin Kloekhorst, *Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014). *Kratylos* 60: 18–42.

The babilili-*Ritual from Hattusa (CTH 718)*. By GARY BECKMAN. Mesopotamian Civilizations, vol. 19. Winona Lake, Ind.: EISENBRAUNS, 2014. Pp. xiii + 97. $49.50.

The so-called *babilili* ritual is one of the most interesting compositions retrieved in the Hittite capital city, Ḫattuša, which Gary Beckman has now edited and translated in a masterly manner for the series *Mesopotamian Civilizations*.

Beckman has dedicated several years to the analysis of this ritual (see bibliography in the present book), which is named after expressions such as ^{LÚ}*šankunniš*/SANGA ^{URU}*bābilili kiššan memai* "The priest speaks as follows in Akkadian," *maḫḫan* ^{LÚ}SANGA *AWĀTE*^{MEŠ URU}*bābilili memiyawanzi zinnai*, "When the priest has finished speaking (these) words in Akkadian," recurring in the text body. Actually, neither the incipit of the first tablet nor the colophon with the original title of the composition have come down to us, with the exception of a fragmentary colophon in KUB 39.71++ IV 49–50: DUB.˹N˺[. KAM . . .] *Ú-U*[*L QA-TI*] "N Tablet. Not finished."

For sake of precision, we should say that only the spells addressed in the text to an aspect of Ištar, that is, Pirinkir, are accompanied by the adverb *bābilili*, which can be compared to *ḫattili*, *ḫurlili*, *nešumnili*, *luwili*, and so on, serving to introduce spells and songs in a specific language. These terms are usually inserted in the texts when the priests address a deity, thus using his language, so that the message can reach him. The deity of this ritual is never addressed in Hittite, the language used in the ritual spells for cleansing of the ritual patron, or even Hurrian, whose cultural and religious influence is clearly recognizable in the whole text. There is only one broken spell in this language [F1 iii 10], but we cannot say if it referred to the deity.

Beckman's edition is made up of an introduction, in which he mainly reaffirms his ideas about the text as published in his previous studies; transliterations and translations of the main texts and fragments; a short commentary; and a chapter devoted to the incantations. The ritual serves for the purification of a client, generically mentioned as ritual patron (EN.SISKUR), requesting the intervention of the goddess Pirinkir (named Ištar in the Akkadian spells) and inviting her to a meal. The water of purification is prepared, offerings are presented to the deity, and several performative rites are carried out to obtain the cleansing of the client.

The preserved description of the ritual actions starts *ex-abrupto* on the second day. Several scholars have already shown the relationship between CTH 718 and other rituals, such as CTH 481: "The

Expansion of the Cult of the Deity of the Night," and CTH 482: "When My Forefather Split the Deity of the Night" (editions and commentaries by Miller 2004: 259–349). There is no doubt that these texts share more than one feature with these rituals (Miller 2004: 432–37; Strauß 2006: 193–97 adds also CTH 480, MH), as evident from the peculiar terminology and rites recurring in all of them. H. M. Kümmel even proposed that KUB 32.133 (CTH 482) could be the first tablet of the composition (Kümmel 1969: 323).

Although these compositions pertain to a common cultural layer, it is difficult to demonstrate their belonging to the very same work divided into several days or tablets. I follow Beckman, who speaks of a proper expression of the same ritual workshop (p. 5), where similar ritual texts were elaborated from a common source or by mutual exchange of tablets (see, for example, Miller 2004: 432–37). Especially the colophons of these texts, when they preserve the scribal signature, show a coordinated action of the scribes: The rituals CTH 481 and CTH 482 are signed by Ziti, son of NU.$^{\text{GIŠ}}$KIRI$_6$, and Angulli, son of Palla, respectively, both working under the supervision of the court official Anuwanza (Torri 2015: 579–82).

In 2014 a small fragment, KBo 70.1, part of a two-column tablet, was found in the Lower City of Ḫattuša in a secondary find spot near Kesikkaya (Schwemer 2015: 100–101. I thank D. Schwemer for giving me a copy of his article and the autography of the fragment prior to its publication). The tablet contains part of a ritual strongly resembling CTH 718. The last three lines of the obverse contain an invocation in Akkadian addressed to a female deity with the epithet MUNUS.LUGAL "queen," probably attributable to CTH 718, thus becoming text F 24, following Beckman's edition, although in this case the words of the priest are introduced by an imperfective form *memiškezzi* (obv. I §10) never attested in the texts of CTH 718. The reverse of the fragment preserves a colophon that states that it is the sixth tablet (of a Festival) of I[štar] (for the restoration see Schwemer's arguments [2015: 101–2]; note that the deity of ritual CTH 718 is called Pirinkir in the descriptive part, Ištar in the invocations), and that it is the text of the *ambašši*-ritual and *šarlatta*-ritual.

Another scribe usually employed in Anuwanza's circle, named Ḫapatiwalwi (elsewhere known as the son of the physician Tuwataziti; Torri 2015: 579), signed this tablet on the reverse. It is probably not a coincidence that rituals sharing a similar content and cultural origin were copied by a group of scribes who worked in the same circle in the thirteenth century. The mutual dependence of some passages of these three rituals (Miller 2004: 216–17, 433–36; Schwemer 2015: 101–2 with nn. 80, 81) was probably the result of the common engagement of some scribes on the same group of sources (whether KBo 70.1 was the colophon of a tablet of CTH 718 or another similar composition).

As for the dating of the manuscripts of CTH 718, Beckman briefly remarks that all of them go back to the Empire period (p. 3), with the exception of fragments F 17 and F 18, both very small, but clearly MH. It is impossible to assign these fragments to a precise part of the ritual text, and so they could be an archetype or simply rituals with a common background and invocations in *bābilili*. Although Beckman does not offer an in-depth analysis of the dating of each manuscript, as would be desirable, there is no doubt that the texts of the main versions go back to the early empire period (photos at Košak 2015: s.v. CTH 718). It is surely significant that the main versions A and B are replete with signs consistently written with an older shape, as for example LI, ḪA, IK, AK, DA, and IT with a broken central wedge (see also Miller 2004: 44 with n. 692). They might well depend on a former tradition of this and other similar rituals. We cannot forget that another text clearly connected with the same cultural layer and showing several similar features, CTH 480, shows a MH ductus (Strauß 2006: 193–97).

After a concise introduction, the author presents his reconstruction of the main versions of the texts and a full translation with a short philological commentary. He also extensively analyses the Akkadian invocations and classifies them according to their content and language, a west peripheral dialect not always correctly handed down by the Hittite scribes (pp. 5–6 and 72–79). For this reason, and because of the way in which Akkadian spells were embedded in a Kizzuwatnean text, it is not fully clear whether this particular text was originally composed in Akkadian and later translated except for the incantations, or composed in another language, such as Hurrian or Hittite. This question and deserves further study (see also Schwemer 2013: 145–71).

In this ritual the name of the goddess Pirinkir, to whom the ritual is addressed, appears only in the ritual description. Invocations always refer to her as Ištar (except the manuscripts 1.R and 1.S, as remarked by Miller 2004: 367). This is in my opinion an element that shows how spells and text could have been

assembled by a (Hittite?) scribe who used older invocations to Ištar in a ritual dedicated to Pirinkir, knowing quite well that the latter was in any case an aspect of the Mesopotamian goddess. That the reworking of one or more texts in a final product was not a mechanical action but a careful intervention with the entire text is demonstrated by several examples in Hittite literature (see now Metcalf 2015).

Beside this, it should be noted that the Akkadian invocations are always spoken (*mēma-*) by the priest, as are the utterances in Hittite, with the exception of two invocations (§10, §14). These are sung (*išḫamai-*) by a singer ([LÚ]NAR, not in the index), who does not otherwise play any role in the text (and is rarely mentioned at all in the rituals; see Goetze 1964: 95). We could compare his presence here to that in the Hattic ritual CTH 733, where he invokes the gods (the verb in this case is *mald-*, restricted only to the Hattic parts; Torri 2009: 215).

The words of the singer in CTH 718 are in both cases accompanied by a waving of the *lueššar-* element by the priest (Görke 2010: 206–7). The first is a plea with a number of rhythmic repetitions and assonances, and is the longest direct speech in Akkadian of the whole ritual. In comparison, the spells spoken by the priest are rather short and repetitive.

In conclusion, Gary Beckman presents a concise, accurate edition of the *babilili* ritual, leaving open the possibility of several further studies on the topic. In comparison with many editions of ritual texts, Beckman proceeds on firm ground, producing a publication that recalls the editing style of Heinrich Otten, to whose memory this book is dedicated.

Giulia Torri
University of Firenze

references

Görke, S. 2010. *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy / Ḫattuša*. Leiden: Brill.

Goetze, A. 1964. Review of H. Otten, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 39. *JCS* 18: 89–92.

Košak, S. 2015. *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*. Mainz (on-line version 1.91).

Kümmel, H. M. 1969. Review of H. Otten, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* 39. *ZA* 59: 319–25.

Metcalf, Ch. 2015. *The Gods Rich in Praise*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Miller, J. L. 2004. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2004.

Schwemer, D. 2013. Gauging the Influence of Babylonian Magic: The Reception of Mesopotamian Traditions in Hittite Ritual Practice. In *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on Social and Political Norms in the Ancient Near East*, ed. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, J. Klinger, and G. G. W. Müller. Pp. 145–72. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

_____. 2015. Textfunde der Kampagne 2014. *AA*: 100–103.

Strauß, R. 2006. *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Torri, G. 2009. The Old Hittite Textual Tradition in the "Haus am Hang." In *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period: New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research*, ed. F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti. Pp. 207–22. Rome: Herder.

_____. 2015. Hereditary Transmission of Specialized Knowledge in Hittite Anatolia: The Case of the Scribal Families of the Empire Period. In *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*, ed. A. Archi. Pp. 579–88. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

The Reign of Tudhaliya II and Šuppiluliuma I: *The Contribution of the Hittite Documentation to a Reconstruction of the Amarna Age*. By Boaz Stavi. Texte der Hethiter, vol. 31. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2015. Pp. xviii + 236. €45 (paper).

Boaz Stavi's new book, which is based on his doctoral dissertation from Tel Aviv University, is an insightfully combined study of the Hittite sources and the Amarna archive in an attempt to bring