

rate, balanced, and remarkably comprehensive picture of the current state of affairs and other specialists' new findings and the stimulus for further research and debate.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT
CARRBORO, NORTH CAROLINA

REFERENCES

- Durnford, Stephen. 2010. How Old Was the Ankara Silver Bowl When Its Inscriptions Were Added? *Anatolian Studies* 60: 51–70.
- Hawkins, J. David. 2004. The Stag-god of the Countryside and Related Problems. In *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. John H. W. Penney. Pp. 355–69. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Leiden: Brill.

Accent in Hittite: A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics. By ALWIN KLOEKHORST. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, vol. 56. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2014. Pp. xxv + 716. €98.

This very ambitious attempt to present a comprehensive analysis of Hittite accent (primarily, but not exclusively, word accent) consists of parts of quite unequal size. After a short introduction setting forth his premises, working methods, and database, Kloekhorst treats in detail in five chapters comprising over five hundred pages the evidence for word accent provided by synchronic vowel length—which in turn is deduced primarily from the distribution of so-called “plene” and “non-plene” spellings. Three shorter supplementary chapters follow: chapter 6 discusses what may be inferred about Hittite accent from the effects of prehistoric lenition and fortition of consonants; chapters 7 and 8 treat aspects of accent at the clause level as reflected in the behavior of clitics and in poetic meter. The volume is completed by an “accentuated” word list of Hittite plus indices of words cited from other languages and of text passages discussed.

Space limitations preclude any remotely adequate engagement with Kloekhorst’s many specific arguments and conclusions, and in any case serious differences in working premises would render any list of “hits and misses” so subjective as to be largely useless. The following review will focus on larger methodological issues with necessarily very selective illustrations. For a far more thorough review see Kimball 2015.

I begin with marked strengths of the work. First, the philological foundation is excellent. One may differ with the reading or analysis of a handful of examples, but I found virtually nothing that may rightfully be termed an error. Careful rechecking of the autographs and photographs of some examples also allows Kloekhorst to identify likely ghost forms. Second, the material basis for the heart of the analysis, that involving the spelling of vowels, is impressively broad, and it is unlikely that any further overlooked examples will materially change the picture.

Third, Kloekhorst is gratifyingly explicit about his assumptions regarding the relative dating of each example in terms of both the composition and the manuscript, something too often lacking in longitudinal studies of Hittite grammar. Fourth, the prose style is direct and uncluttered, and the argumentation linear. This is emphatically not faint praise: given the unavoidable density of much of the material (see, e.g., pp. 53–60 on the suffix *-ēššar*), it is crucial that Kloekhorst constantly keeps the reader’s focus on the point being made and its relevance for his larger conclusions. The interim summaries of conclusions are also helpful. In sum, one may disagree with or be skeptical of many of his claims, but one is in little doubt about what they are.

The strengths just enumerated enable Kloekhorst to make several original new contributions, such as: 1) in Hittite spellings of the type ^o*u/ú-e-eC* and ^o*i-e-eC* the *-e-* does not mark vowel length, but

serves to mark the preceding glide in /we/ and /ye/ sequences, in the absence of CV signs parallel to *wa* and *ya* (pp. 138–61); 2) in consonant-stem nouns there is a strong (exceptionless?) pattern by which those spelled in the dative-locative singular with logogram plus *-i* (e.g., KI-*i* ‘earth’) point to desinential accent and a long final /-i:/ (cf. *ták-ni-i*), while those spelled logogram plus *Ci* correspond to root or stem accent and a short final /-i/, as in *É-ni = pá-r-ni* ‘house’ (pp. 444–61); 3) he confirms the phonemic contrast in Hittite between short and long diphthongs /ay/ and /a:y/ and /aw/ and /a:w/ (pp. 392–97); 4) he correctly concludes that the match in the stem of the Hieroglyphic Luvian dative-locative plural *á-pa-ta-za* and Lycian *ebette* means that “Čop’s Law” is not exclusively Luvian and must be defined as $*^{\circ}\check{e}.C_1V > *^{\circ}\check{e}C_1.C_1V$ (pp. 571–74, with reference to Goedegebuure for the Luvian).

Unfortunately, however, the core of the work dealing with plene spellings and vowel length is fatally marred by serious methodological errors. First, in a study that makes extremely strong claims based on the relative number of plene vs. non-plene spellings in a given word, it is in the second decade of the twenty-first century simply unacceptable that nowhere are the cited figures subjected to any formal statistical analysis. Without such an analysis, we cannot even be sure that some of the alleged patterns are statistically significant.

Second, since Kloekhorst also makes very strong claims about changes in the spelling and hence phonetics of vowels from Old to Middle to New Hittite, it is likewise methodologically unacceptable (contra p. 9) to base claims about Middle and New Hittite grammar on text corpora that include copies of Old Hittite compositions. In order to determine whether given features of such copies reflect the grammar of Old Hittite, the grammar of the copyist, or neither, one must first determine the grammar of the period in which the copy was made, based on assured original compositions of that period.

As in the case of Old Hittite grammar, such an initial restriction will have the unhappy effect of severely limiting the data for certain phenomena, but there is no shortcut: One must *begin* with original compositions of each period and then carefully supplement the results on the basis of copies. In several instances, such a restriction may well enhance Kloekhorst’s figures for changes from Old to New Hittite, but there is no way to know which. What it will certainly do is eliminate many isolated spellings that Kloekhorst himself subjectively concludes are “aberrant” on the objective basis that they are attested only in copies of older texts, not in contemporary manuscripts of any period.

Third and most seriously, Kloekhorst subscribes to the widespread fallacy that every non-random orthographic pattern must inevitably represent a linguistically real contrast (p. 30 and passim). This viewpoint reflects a profound misunderstanding of how orthographic systems work. All orthographies are to some degree conventional, and the conventions may change, for reasons that may or may not be determinable.

There is therefore no assurance that all of the changes in Hittite spelling practice observed over a period of more than three hundred years necessarily reflect genuine changes in the grammar. This includes those that are statistically significant. It is widely acknowledged in epidemiology that statistically significant correlations do not always reflect causality. Likewise, not every orthographic alteration implies a change in the language. Since we know that other aspects of Hittite grammar did change within the historical period, some changes in the phonology are to be expected, and it is always proper to test the possibility in any given case and also to revisit it, since new facts or arguments may permit a convincing analysis where there had been none. But the sole criterion for judging a given claim is the synchronic and diachronic plausibility of the linguistic analysis. The spelling pattern is merely a necessary, not a sufficient criterion.

Most of Kloekhorst’s individual claims for changes in vowel length during the historical period of Hittite do not meet the plausibility criterion, as shown by blatant contradictions and the need for massive appeal to ad hoc explanations. For example, on p. 76 we are told that the word *ú-te-e-ez-zi* ‘moisture’ attested in Middle Script with a plene spelling represents /udēt^si/ with a long vowel (a spelling possibly taken over from an Old Hittite archetype). But on the following page Kloekhorst claims that the present third singular of verbs with the same shape and from the same prehistoric source represent /-ét^si/, because “*already in OH* an original long /ē/ was shortened before dental consonants” (emphasis mine—HCM). Based solely on the ratio of plene to non-plene spellings of the first syllable, Kloekhorst is forced to claim (pp. 193–95) that the verbs *pēhute-* and *pēda-* had a long first vowel in Old Hittite, which was shortened in Middle Hittite, only to then somehow be lengthened again in New Hittite.

This second example shows the fundamental problem, which is not the appeal to ad hocity 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,” *maḥḥan* ^{LÚ}SANGA ^{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.ʹNʹ[. 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*, *nešumili*, *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