**68)** The *huwaši*-precinct and the use of metonymy — Thanks to the recently published article by David Hawkins (*NABU* 2019/65), we are getting much closer to the understanding of the Emirgazi inscriptions<sup>1)</sup>. I do warmly thank David Hawkins for asking me to answer him in another short note and to publish the content of our discussions.

The meaning given by D. Hawkins is that of *huwaši* being an installation, a monument or more precisely a "precinct" as it seems it would be possible to enter in it.

In *HW* (2013, 830) *huwaši* is translated as "Stele, Kultstein; Stelen (-Areal)" and several categories are created to distinguish different kinds of *huwaši*. The object is sometimes described as "good" (*aššu*-) or "polish" (*hašhaš*-) (KUB 25, 23 (+) i 34), "covered with metal" (KUB 15, 1 ii 3 sq.) or "cut up" (Bo. 2004/1). It is normally made of stone, as indicated by the determinative NA<sub>4</sub>, but can also be attested in wood or metal. Two different metals are known for *huwaši*: silver (KÙ.BABBAR in KBo 26, 228 i 9. and KBo. 26, 197: 4) and iron (AN.BAR in KUB 17, 35 ii 35). Finally, the *huwaši* can be plated (*hališšiant*-), mostly with silver (Bo. 4071 = CTH 790, KBo 2, 1 ii 12 sq. and KUB 17, 35 ii 6 sq.), or decorated (CTH 525, KUB 17, 35 ii 6 and CTH 584, KUB 15, 1 ii 3-4). In the difficult Cult Inventory KBo 2, 1 ii 33, it is attested once with relief on it. Size is also variable as portable *huwaši* are as well attested (KUB 35, 133 (+) I 15 sq.).

Following the given definitions, a *huwaši* is normally used in a ritual context and is made of stone (with determinative NA<sub>4</sub>), but can also be attested in wood with GIŠ (and thus being a portable object?) or even in metal. From most of the ritual texts and Cult Inventories, one understands that a *huwaši* could be considered a *standing stone* and that offerings are indeed attested for *huwaši* such as it is suggested in CTH 517<sup>4</sup>) (KUB XXVII 70, col. II, 31: (offerings) *ANA* <sup>na</sup>ZI.KIN EGIR-*pa tianzi*).

There seems however to be an ambiguity of hwaši being used both for a cultic object and for a sanctuary (Ort von Opfern, Stelen-Areal). In the 3rd tablet of the KI.LAM festival text, one can read that the hashi (standing stone) of the Storm-god is situated in a built area that has a center (B x + i 20) and a wooden door (B x + i 22) and is surrounded by walls (B x + i 21 et F iii 12). Following Singer<sup>5)</sup>, Van

den Hout<sup>6)</sup> interpreted the *huwaši* in this context as a structure which it was possible to enter. This interpretation is developed again by Hawkins (2019: 115).

As it appears to me, the KI.LAM text does not primarily say "in the *huwaši*" but rather in front of it: B x + I 8 "na4 hu-u-wa-ši-ia (-)x pi-ra-an" also attested in line 10; 16 et F III 10 "na4 hu-wa-ši-ia pi-ra-an". Further, however, the KI.LAM festival text CTH 627 (KUB 2, 3: 32-33) gives another formulation, saying literally that one could enter into a na4 huwaši: LUGAL-uššan du-aš na4 huwašiya anda paizzi. And the same expression is also attested in CTH 636.2 (KUB 20, 99 ii 4).

What does then *anda paizzi*, with a dative-locative of <sup>na</sup>4 huwaši, mean? In the KI.LAM, the dative-locative of <sup>na</sup>4 huwaši is attested either with *piran* or *anda*. The key is to be found in the text CTH 636.3 (KUB 20, 99 ii 4) that gives <sup>na</sup>4 huwašiya peran anda paizzi which should be translated "go inside /enter in front of/in the presence of the standing stone". From this passage, it seems rather that the stone stands in a built area, which the king enters. The text continues indeed with the king kneeling in front of the holy stone.

For these reason, I would suggest that the understanding of the *ljuwaši* concept, and thus its translation by "precinct", would be the result of a metonymy process: the standing stone giving the name of a place of worship.

The comparison with ancient Sarissa could be useful, even if "speculative". As stated by Hawkins, I believe that the Emirgazi texts could refer to a cultic installation similar to the one that existed on the Kulmaç dağ.

## Notes

- 1. At present time, for a general discussion, one should also consider the recent publication by CAMMAROSANO, M., 2019, "Huwasi. Cult Stelae and Stela Shrines in Hittite Anatolia", in: Engels, B., Huy S., Steitler, Ch. (eds.), *Natur und Kult in Anatolien* (Byzas 24), p. 303-332. Concerning my linguistic analysis of the Emirgazi inscription, CAMMAROSANO (2019, p. 323) does not agree that the demonstrative meaning "these stelae" could refer to the very objects on which the inscription is written even if the claim making *hwi/ a-i(a)-sa- ti-sa* (§ 11, 12) a Luwian cognate of Hittite *huwaši* may prove correct (see also by HAWKINS, D., 2019, "Emirgazi: a huwasi-precinct", *NABU* 2019-3, n°65, p. 114-115).
  - 2. DURAND, J.-M., 1988, "Le nom des bétyles à Ebla et en Anatolie", NABU 1988-8, p. 5-6.
  - 3. Bossert, H. Th., 1952, "Das H-H Wort für 'Malstein,", Belleten (Türk Tarih Kumuru 16), n°65, p. 495-546.
  - 4. Vs. CAMMAROSANO, 2019, p. 323.
- 5. SINGER, I., 1986, "The *huwaši* of the Storm-God in Hattuša", *IX. Türk Tarih Kongresi* (Türk Tarih Kumuru Basimevi), p. 254-253. For a discussion on Singer's hypothesis, see also Cammarosano, 2019, p. 321-323.
- 6. VAN DEN HOUT, Th., 1993, "Some remarks on the third tablet of the Hittite KI.LAM festival", *Jaarbericht, ex Oriente Lux* 32, p. 101-108.
- 7. CAMMAROSONA, 2019, p. 320 "any assumption on the nature of the rocks must remain entirely speculative". See also now MICHEL, P., 2019, "What does a *huwaši* look like?", *in*: Süel, A. (ed.), *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology (Corum, 08-14 September 2014)*, p. 579-594.

Patrick M. MICHEL <patrick.michel@unil.ch>
Université de Lausanne (SWITZERLAND)