widely circulated. Gil's contribution, therefore, lies not only in the significance of his topic, but in his having brought his unique sources before a broad scholarly audience in such exemplary fashion.

A few, final words concerning this book's suggestive and wide-ranging introductory essay are in order. A simple list of the major section headings will give some idea of its scope: (1) historical survey; (2) origination of pious foundations, a) the act of donation and its motivation, b) legal and formal aspects of donations, c) the qôdesh as a legal person; (3) administration and revenue, a) upper level administration, b) parrâsim (social service officers), c) the accounts and the records of the qôdesh, d) transactions of the qôdesh, e) the budget of the qôdesh, f) lease of agricultural properties; (4) use of revenue, a) maintenance, building operations, and repairs, b) government taxes and payments to Muslim officials, c) maintenance of synagogues, d) emoluments and charity; e) apportionment and expenditures. The style of the introduction is rather condensed, sometimes almost outline in form. The transition from each of the 146 subsections to the other is not always entirely smooth. This is, however, offset by the richness of content. Gil throws out many ideas that will stir continuing debate on the history and the character of the various pious foundations of the medieval Middle East. For example, he maintains (following Cahen in part) that the earliest form of Muslim pious foundation was the waqf ahli which benefited the donor's kin, rather than the waqf khayrî which was for the commonweal (p. 28). My own reading of the early Muslim traditions on the ancient waqf lead me to doubt this. There is practically no discussion of Byzantine piae causa in the introduction, since Gil apparently does not feel that there was much of a parallel, much less organic link between them and the Jewish qôdesh or the Muslim waqf (e.g., see p. 29). At least with respect to the waqf, this point of view is not entirely shared by this reviewer (see my "Charity and Social Service in Medieval Islam," Societas 5 [1975]: 108 f.). However, whether one agrees or disagrees with this or that position taken by Professor Gil, no serious scholar dealing with charitable foundations in the medieval Islamic world can afford to ignore this major contribution.

Norman A. Stillman

State University of New York
at Binghamton


The three lectures contained in this small volume do not, as the author himself states (p. 3), present a "closely integrated theme" but, rather, constitute an overview of the field of Hittite religion by a scholar who has worked in it for many years and who has made substantial contributions to it. The first lecture sketches the development of the Hittite pantheon from the earliest stages recoverable from myth and saga to the "thousand gods of Ḫatti" of the Empire period. The second lecture describes the formal worship of the Hittites, distinguishing between provincial practices on the one hand, as revealed primarily by the so-called cult-inventories, and the state cult of Ḫattuša and the great peripatetic festivals of spring and fall on the other. The final lecture deals with the magical rituals, briefly discussing the personnel involved in such activities before proceeding to a clarification of the terms employed to designate the ritual carrier or "scapegoat" (nakkuššâ-) and the ritual substitute (tarpallî- or tarpašša-) and concluding with a description of the royal funerary rites.

Lending a unity to the three lectures is the discussion in each of the designation and function of the rock-sanctuary Yazılıkaya, which is located a short distance outside the ruins of the Hittite capital (pp. 19–24, 40–43, 62–63). Gurney effectively presents the case for recognizing this outcropping of rock as not only the "permanent peak" (hekur sag.uš—a topographic term), but also as the
the "Myth of Illuyanka" (CTH 321) alludes to the first Hittite occupation of Ḫattuša because the house in question was probably located in Kiškiliša (KBo III 7 ii 15: I-NA URUKi-š-ki-i-š-ša).

Pp. 9 f.: a ritual for the erection of a new palace (CTH 414) contains a passage (KUB XXIX 1 i 23–25) in which the Throne-goddess Ḥalmašuitt brings authority and a (royal) coach to the king "from the sea." Is this perhaps a reference to Zalpa "by the sea," a city situated on the coast of the Black Sea which seems to have been particularly important as a royal residence in the Old Hittite period? See Otten, StBoT 17, pp. 60–61.

Pp. 11 ff.: Gurney here expresses the opinion that the mention of the Sun-goddess of Arinna in the "Annals of Ḫattušili I" (CTH 4), a text which is preserved only in copies from the Empire period, is original and not, as many scholars have maintained, an innovation introduced by a later copyist. Further support for this position is found in KUB XXX 29 obv. 9–15, a passage from a Middle Hittite ritual composition which probably accurately reflects pre-Hittite, Hattic mythology. Here the Sun-god(dess) is said to take her seat in Arinna, an act parallel to the positioning of several other deities in their cult centers, including Telepinu in Tawiniya and Ḫuзи (known from proper names in the Kültepe texts) in Ḥakm/piš. It is likely that the proper name of this solar deity was Esṭan, while Arinittu (Hattic—"she of Arinna") — IBoT 1 29 obv. 39, 42, and 47) and Wušumu (meaning unclear) were probably both epithets serving on occasion independently to designate the same goddess.

P. 14: did the designation "Sun-god of Heaven" arise as a doublet to, and as a differentiation from, the chthonic "Sun-god(dess) of the Earth"?

P. 41: additional evidence against interpreting Yazilikaya as a ḥuvaši-stone is the fact that according to the Hittite Law Code II §23, a ḥuvaši could be stolen. It is unlikely that the same word designated both a portable object and an immovable topographic feature.

Pp. 44 ff.: the second-person of the verb is occasionally attested in Hittite ritual texts. Note, for example, ḥu-uk-ki-š-ši, "you shall repeatedly confine," in KUB XXX 29 obv. 8, and te-ši, "you say," in the "First Military Oath" (Oettinger, StBoT 22, Glossar, p. 115).

Pp. 44 f.: SALAT.TI = Hittite SALHAKAUA-, "old woman," seems to have been a general term for a female ritual practitioner, including various, more
specialized occupations under its rubric. Note that Tunnawiya is called $\text{SAL\text{	ext{"u}}.GI}$ in $\text{KUB VII 53 + KUB XII 58}$, but $\text{SAL\text{	ext{"u}}.ZU}$, "midwife," in $\text{KBo XVII 61}$. The corresponding "cover-term" for male ritual practitioners was apparently $\text{L\text{	ext{"u}}.S\text{ANGA}}$, "priest." See Gurney, p. 45, n. 6.

P. 46: basing his opinion on the admonition of Ḥattušili I to Ḥaššayar not to consult the "old women" ($\text{KUB I 16 iii 65 ff.}$), Gurney suggests that these women and their male counterparts practiced magic "without official sanction." This view is belied by the very presence in the Hittite royal library of a great many rituals of magical character specifically naming such cultic personnel as their authors. A general condemnation of the activities of the "old women" is not to be read into the "Testament of Ḥattušili I," nor is it to be found anywhere in the Hittite corpus, despite the remarks of S. R. Bin-Nun, $\text{Theth 5}$, pp. 122 ff.

To conclude, Professor Gurney has produced a well-written synthesis of what sixty years of research by many scholars has revealed about Hittite religion. Although this field of study still offers more questions than answers, there is little in Gurney's book with which one might take serious issue. It should serve as a convenient introduction to the subject for students, particularly for those whose first language is English.

GARY M. BECKMAN

Yale University