

STEFANO DE MARTINO

Ura and the boundaries of Tarhuntassa

The two treaties between Hatti and Tarhuntassa that have survived – one stipulated by the Hittite king Tuthaliya IV with Kurunta (Bo 86/299)¹ and the other stipulated by a king of Hatti, whose name is unknown due to the fragmentary nature of the document², with Ulmi-Tešub (KBo IV 10 +)³ – contain a description of the frontiers and territories of Tarhuntassa.⁴

As various scholars have already pointed out⁵ in the two treaties the frontiers are indicated according to successive segments: the starting point is form-

¹ See H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy* (StBoT Beih. 1), Wiesbaden 1988.

² This king is identified by some scholars as Hattušili III, by others as Tuthaliya IV; in the former case the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub would precede the one with Kurunta, on this see now S. Alp, *Zur Datierung des Ulmitešub-Vertrags*, AoF 25 [1998] 54–60 (consequently Ulmi-Tešub and Kurunta would be respectively the birth-name and dynastic name of the same person; for a different point of view, see now C. Mora, *Kurunta prince*, in: *Studi e Testi I* [Eothen 9], Firenze 1998, 85–91), in the latter case it would come after it; refer here to the literature quoted, most recently, by M. Giorgieri – C. Mora, *Aspetti della Regalità ittita nel XIII Secolo a.C.*, Como 1996, 19–20; A. Dinçol, *Die Entdeckung des Felsmonuments in Hatip und ihre Auswirkungen über die historischen und geographischen Fragen des Hethiterreichs*, Tüba-Ar 1 [1998] 29–30.

³ See Th. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag* (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden 1995.

⁴ Bo 86/299 I 18ff.; KBo IV 10 + obv. 16'ff. With reference to the studies on the frontiers and territories of Tarhuntassa see the literature listed by A. Dinçol, Tüba-Ar 1, 30. It seems to me we must agree with the reconstruction recently proposed by D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, (StBoT Beih. 3), Wiesbaden 1995, 49–53, according to which the area of the river Hūlaya might be identified as the river system linking lake Beyşehir with lake Suğla and then flowing into the plain of Konya; this region would mark the frontier between the kingdom of Hatti and that of Tarhuntassa; the heart of the latter region, that is Tarhuntassa itself, would be situated, instead, in Cilicia Aspera around the valley of the river Göksu (on this see also beyond n. 63).

⁵ See, among others, H. Otten, *Die 1986 in Boğazköy gefundene Bronzetafel*, in: *IBS, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften* 42, Innsbruck 1989, 15–19; J. Freu, *Hittites et Acheens*, L. A. M. A. XI [1990] 47–53; Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *The Tablet of Tudhaliyas IV and its Geographical and Historical Relations*, ZA 82 [1992] 249–257; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih. 3*, 49–53.

ed by the north-western boundary of the kingdom of Tarḫuntašša, a limit corresponding to the Hittite region of Pitašša⁶; from here the border proceeds in a roughly clockwise direction towards the north-east, then goes south-east and again north-west, finally linking up to the first segment mentioned.

The southern frontier of Tarḫuntašša and the territories that extended into that area are not clearly delineated either in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub or in the one with Kurunta. As far as the south-western frontier is concerned, in the treaty with Kurunta (I 61) it is said that the country of Tarḫuntašša extended as far as river Kaštaraya, the modern Aksu.⁷ In neither of the above-mentioned documents, however, is there any explicit reference to the south-eastern border; on this D. Hawkins⁸ observes: "What is curious but seems to be the case is that after Saliya, the Hatti-Tarḫuntašša-Kizzuwatna frontier, both the Ulmi-Tešub treaty and the Bronze Tablet jump abruptly from the eastern frontier of Tarhuntassa to its extreme west". As a result, the theories advanced by scholars diverge: the south-eastern frontier of Tarhuntassa is placed, for example, by H. Otten⁹ in the area of the modern sites of Silifke–Anamur–Alanya; by Ph. Houwink ten Cate¹⁰ and by F. Starke¹¹ near the river Lamas; and by D. Hawkins¹² in the region between Mersin and Silifke.

As regard to the southern border of Tarḫuntašša, it must be said that neither in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub nor in the treaty with Kurunta is any mention made of the important port of Ura, which was situated on the coast of Cilicia, even though – as we know – its precise location (or at the mouth of the river Göksu, near the modern site of Silifke¹³, or at the mouth of

⁶ Near to the modern site of Ilgın, see, most recently, D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51 n. 177.

⁷ See most recently, H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 37; O. R. Gurney, *Hittite Geography: thirty years on*, in: *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp* (Fs. Alp), Ankara 1992, 218; J. Börker Klähn, *Neues zur Geschichte Lykiens*, *Athenaeum* 82 [1994] 326; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 52; M. J. Mellink, *Comments on Continuity and Discontinuity in South Anatolian Coastal Toponymy*, in: *Studia Historiae Ardens* (Fs. Houwink ten Cate), Leiden 1995, 189; F. Starke, *Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend*, *Studia Troica* 7 [1997] 450; A. Dinçol, *Tüba-Ar* 1, 30.

⁸ *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51.

⁹ *StBoT Beih.* 1, 36.

¹⁰ *ZA* 82, 252.

¹¹ *Studia Troica* 7, 450.

¹² *StBoT Beih.* 3, 52.

¹³ See the literature quoted by G. del Monte, *RGTC* 6, Wiesbaden 1978, 458; 6/2, Wiesbaden 1992, 179, to which we must add now: J. Freu, *L. A. M. A.* 11, 52; O. R. Gurney, *Fs. Alp* 217; A. Lemaire, *Ougarit, Ougarit et la Cilicie vers la fin du XIIIe s. av. J.-C.*, *UF* 25 [1993] 227–236; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 56 and n. 202. E. Neu, *Hethiter und Hethitisch in Ugarit*, in: *Ugarit I*, Münster 1995, 118; Such a location is in agreement with what is found in Hittite and in Babylonian sources and it is supported by considerations relative to the topography of the territory: the valley of the Göksu river, in fact, constitutes the easiest passage between the coast and the interior of Anatolia in the direction of Konya and, therefore, the presence of the port of Ura is well justified at the southern extremity of this.

the river Lamas¹⁴, or near Mersin¹⁵, or near Aydıncık¹⁶) is still the object of debate.

Scholars have assessed in various ways the absence of the city of Ura from among those names mentioned in the definition of the frontiers and territories of Tarḫuntašša in the two treaties – the one with Ulmi-Tešub and the one with Kurunta. Some¹⁷ believe that Ura belonged to Tarḫuntašša and that it was not mentioned precisely because it lay in that part of the country of Tarḫuntašša of which the two treaties seem to provide no description.

Other scholars¹⁸, instead, claim that Ura was situated in Hittite territory, and justify this theory both on the basis of the absence of its name from those cities belonging to Tarḫuntašša, and on the basis of observations of a political and economic nature, namely that it would seem highly unlikely to hypothesize Hatti's renunciation of control over the main port of the kingdom.

With reference to this last point, there is hardly any need to mention the commercial importance of the port of Ura and its function as a link between the Anatolian interior and the coastal areas of the eastern Mediterranean and, in particular, the city of Ugarit – as emerges from Hittite sources as well as from the sources of Ugarit.¹⁹

It must be said, however, that in these sources there are no elements that clearly indicate whether or not Ura was an integral part of Hatti or whether it was subject to the king of Tarḫuntašša.

Certainly it is significant that Tarḫuntašša is not mentioned in the edict issued by Hattušili III to regulate the economic activities of the merchants of Ura in Ugarit²⁰: this might suggest, in fact, that Ura was actually a part of Hatti. R. Beal²¹ points out, however, that even if Ura had belonged to the king of Tarḫuntašša it would have been Hattušili in any case who issued the edict since he was the Great King of Hatti, that is, the highest authority both in Tarḫuntašša and in Ugarit.

An indication supporting the idea that Ura was an integral part of the Hittite kingdom might be inferred from text RS 17.316 Vo 7'–11'²², in which some mer-

¹⁴ See F. Cornelius, *Geschichte der Hethiter*, Darmstadt 1973, 186.

¹⁵ See. D. Smith, *The Hittite Corridor*, *Talanta* 22–23 [1990–91] 113–115.

¹⁶ See R. Beal, *The Location of Cilician Ura*, *AnSt* 42 [1992] 65–73.

¹⁷ See R. Beal, art. cit. 70; I. Singer, *Great Kings of Tarḫuntašša*, *SMEA* 38 [1996] 65–66.

¹⁸ D. W. Smith, *Talanta* 22–23, 113–115; J. Freu, *L. A. M. A.* 11, 50–51; A. Dinçol, *Tüba-Ar* 1, 33; see also A. Lemaire, *UF* 25, 230.

¹⁹ See most recently, R. Beal, *AnSt* 42, 66 n. 6; H. Klengel, *Syria*, Berlin 1992, 138; A. Lemaire, *UF* 25, 228–230; R. Lebrun, *Ougarit et le Hatti à la fin de XIII^e s. av. J.-C.*, in: *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.*, Paris 1995, 87; E. Neu, *Ugarit I*, 118–119; I. Singer, *SMEA* 38, 65–66.

²⁰ RS 17.130; RS 17.461; RS 18.03; see most recently G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta 1996, 162–163.

²¹ *AnSt* 42, 70–71.

²² See J. Nougayrol, *PRU* IV, 190.

chants of Ura are named as merchants of the Great King of Ḫatti²³; in fact if Ura really had been subject to Tarhuntašša, we would expect these merchants to be indicated as inhabitants of this country, considering the fact that in other documents of Ugarit, such as RS 17.158, 2, 5, 11, and RS 17.42, 3²⁴, reference is made to a merchant of the king of Tarhuntašša.

Furthermore, as A. Dinçol observes²⁵, if Ura had been assigned by Ḫattušili III to the country of Tarhuntašša, we would expect to find some clause among those of the two surviving treaties with the latter country, safeguarding mercantile traffic and Hittite economic interests associated with the port of this city.²⁶

What is surprising, instead, is the absence of any specification of this kind, especially in the Bronze Tablet which certainly dates from the time of Tuthaliya IV, that is, when the state of political equilibrium in the eastern Mediterranean that had previously been established was changing considerably. In connection with this we may recall that Tuthaliya himself, in the treaty with Šaušgamuwa of Amurru²⁷, intervenes to regulate the mercantile activities of this country by imposing a commercial embargo against Assyria, an embargo which seems to involve the ships of Aḫḫiyawa.²⁸

Such observations, then, might support the hypothesis that Ura had remained under Ḫatti's direct rule; nevertheless, in order to understand the precise nature of Ura's political position at the end of the Bronze Age, we need to re-examine the paragraphs concerning the territories of Tarhuntašša in the treaties with Ulmi-Tešub and Kurunta.

As we know, the description of the frontiers and territories of the southern part of Tarhuntašša is not the same in the two treaties: in fact, the frontiers established for this country in the two documents are different as a consequence – as will be discussed later – of territorial extensions granted by Tuthaliya IV to Kurunta in the Bronze Tablet.

In the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub – after having defined the eastern border, corresponding to various peaks/mountain ranges of the Taurus chain (that is,

²³ Thus A. Lemaire, UF 25, 230; see however the observations of R. Beal, AnSt 42, 71.

²⁴ See J. Nougayrol, PRU IV, 169–171.

²⁵ Tüba-Ar 1, 33.

²⁶ See, for instance – even though it is a comparison with a treaty belonging to a later age and to a different political context – the clauses of maritime rights found in the treaty stipulated by the Neo-Assyrian king Esarhaddon with Baal of Tyre (III 15'–30'), cf. S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (SAA II), Helsinki 1988, 25–27.

²⁷ IV 14–18; 25; cf. H. Otten, *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag* (StBoT 16), Wiesbaden 1971, 14–17; this treaty, however, is chronologically successive to the stipulation of the treaty with Kurunta.

²⁸ See, most recently, H. Klengel, *Historischer Kommentar zum Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag*, Fs. Houwink ten Cate 171.

Mount Šarlaimmi²⁹ and the “High Mountain”³⁰, obv. 28') and to the region near the Hittite city of Šaliya³¹ (obv. 29') – there is a jump to the south-western border; this is established through the indication of a series of sites, Walwara, Mata, Šanḫata, Šurimma, Šarantuwa and Tattašši (obv. 29'–30'), which are found “on/in the direction of³² the outer side” (*arahzenaz*).³³

The fact that some of these sites, i.e. Mata, Šanḫata, Šurimma and Šarantuwa³⁴, are mentioned in the Bronze Tablet (I 56–59) among those cities situated “on/in the direction of the side of the seacost” (*arunaz pedaz*, I 56)³⁵ might lead us to suppose that the expression “on/in the direction of the outer side” documented in KBo IV 10 + indicates the south-western part of Cilicia Aspera beyond the Taurus chain, towards the coast.

The treaty with Ulmi-Tešub then specifies that any territories which may be conquered by Ḫatti beyond the city of Šarantuwa will be assigned to Ulmi-Tešub (obv. 30'–31'). Then the north-western area of the country of Tarhuntassa is described, by means of the mention of the sites situated on the Walma side (obv. 31'–32').³⁶

²⁹ On the mount Šarlaimmi see most recently H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 35–36; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51 n. 171; A. Lombardi, Note su Šarpa e Šarlaimmi, montagne sacre di Ḫupišna, *Eothen* 9, 77–79.

³⁰ Thus, among others, M. Forlanini, La regione del Tauro nei testi hittiti, *VO* 7 [1988] 132; J. Freu, *L. A. M. A.* 11, 50; CHD P, 161; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51; A. Lombardi, *Eothen* 9, 78 and n. 60; otherwise see H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 13, 35; G. Del Monte, *RGTC* 6/2, 40; R. Stefanini, On the Tenth Paragraph of the Bronze Tablet, in: *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 77 [1992] (Gs. Pisani), 149; Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38, 31.

³¹ The text specifies that Šaliya belongs to the Hittite country; this city lies on the border between Ḫatti and Kizzuwatna, see G. Del Monte, *RGTC* 6, 334; 6/2, 135, with previous literature and, most recently, D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51; J. Börker Klähn, Grenzfälle: Šunaššura und Sirkeli oder die Geschichte Kizzuwatnas, *UF* 28 [1996] 47–49; O. R. Gurney, The Annals of Hattusilis III, *AnSt* 47 [1997] 132.

³² See R. Stefanini, Gs. Pisani 140–141, 149.

³³ See M. Forlanini, *VO* 7, 148; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51 n. 178; J. Freu, Les relations entre Troie et le monde hittite, in: *Quaestiones Homericae*, Louvain 1998, 110; otherwise see J. Lorenz, Der Vertrag mit Ulmi-Tešub von ^dU-ašša (CTH 106), Hausarbeit vorgelegt am Fachbereich 11 – Aussereuropäische Sprachen und Kulturen – der Philipps-Universität Marburg 1986, 46 (with previous literature); Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38, 57–58.

³⁴ See, moreover, H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 36–37 n. 35, according to which the geographical names Tattašši (KBo IV 10 + obv. 30'), on the one hand, and Tatta and Taša (Bö 86/299 I 58–59), on the other, would be equivalent forms due to a scribal error; see also G. Del Monte, *RGTC* 6/2, 141; Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38, 58.

³⁵ See H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 13; Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *ZA* 82, 258; R. Stefanini, Gs. Pisani 149.

³⁶ To be located in all probability near the modern site of Çay, see most recently D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51 n. 178; O. R. Gurney, *AnSt* 47, 137.

As various scholars have already pointed out³⁷, and as has been mentioned above, in the description of the border areas of Tarḫuntašša the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub passes directly from the south-eastern limit to the south-western one without giving any information about the southern territories.

According to Th. van den Hout³⁸ the fact that KBo IV 10 + does not provide any information about the southern limit of Tarḫuntašša might mean that the southern border followed the line of the coast.

If the sea had formed the southern frontier of Tarḫuntašša, we would expect, however, to find in the treaty some mention of one of the sites located in the area between the Taurus mountains (south of Šaliya) and the coast, that is, in the area that must have separated Tarḫuntašša from Kizzuwatna.

It must be said, moreover, that in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub the sea is never mentioned explicitly³⁹ to define the frontiers and territories of Tarḫuntašša, as opposed to what we read in the Bronze Tablet (I 56, 60).⁴⁰ In my view, this may be seen as a significant fact and might induce us to hypothesize that, in accordance with the territorial clauses provided for in this act, the country of Tarḫuntašša did not reach the coast of the Mediterranean, even though, perhaps, it came near to it (that is, up to the area of Šarantuwa).⁴¹

Following the hypothesis expounded above, that is, that the absence of information on the southern limit is due to the fact that this was marked by a natural element of the landscape, I would suggest identifying this element not with the sea, but with the Taurus massif; we might suppose, therefore, that the frontier followed the line of this mountain chain, proceeding directly from the peaks of Šarlaimmi and the “High Mountain”, in the east, as far as the area of lake Suġla, to the west.⁴²

Going on to examine the Bronze Tablet, we note that the description of the southern frontier of the country of Tarḫuntašša is here more extensive; indeed, in this treaty – after having placed the south-eastern limit in the area of the mountains of the Taurus chain and Šaliya (I 48–50), similarly to what we read in KBo IV 10 – we find two series of cities, which do not appear in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub. The first group of cities is located on the side of Ušaula (I 50–52), the second, instead, on the side of Ḫawaliya (I 53–56).

³⁷ See, among others, H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 36–37; Th. van den Hout, *StBoT* 38, 57; D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 51.

³⁸ *StBoT* 38, 57.

³⁹ See, however, what Th. van den Hout observes (*StBoT* 38, 57).

⁴⁰ See below.

⁴¹ Indeed, this city, as will be said further on, is mentioned in the Bronze Tablet (I 60) among the sites situated “on/in the direction of the side of the seacost”.

⁴² The chain of the Taurus marks, even today, roughly the northern border of the administrative districts of İçel/Mersin and Antalya.

The text continues with a list of cities that lie “on/in the direction of the side of the seacost” (I 56–59)⁴³, some of which, as mentioned above, also appear in KBo IV 10 +. The treaty with Kurunta mentions the sea as marking the frontier: “on/in the direction of the side of Šarantuwa the frontier (is) the sea (I 60)”. Further west, on the side of Parḫa⁴⁴, the boundary is marked by the course of the river Kaštaraya/Aksu⁴⁵ (I 61); other lands that may have been conquered by the Hittite king in the direction of Parḫa will be assigned to Kurunta (I 62–64). Then the description of the frontiers and territories of Tarhuntašša proceeds northwards in the direction of the Walma district.

According to D. Hawkins⁴⁶ the name Ušaula mentioned in the Bronze Tablet (I 50) can be identified as the Ušawala present in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (Ro 32’), even though it appears in a different geographical context, that is, among the cities located on the Walma side.⁴⁷

Accepting this identification, however – as D. Hawkins himself⁴⁸ and O. R. Gurney⁴⁹ observe – the order in which the various segments marking the western frontier of Tarhuntašša are listed in the Bronze Tablet would be peculiar. The treaty with Kurunta, in fact, without making any mention of the region between Šaliya to the east and Ušau/wla to the west (a region that, according to D. Hawkins⁵⁰, also comprised the coast of the Mediterranean), would define the south-western frontier starting not from the sea, but from the inner and more northern part of the territory (from Ušau/wala)⁵¹; then, the frontier would proceed in a south-easterly direction until reaching the sea (beyond Šarantuwa) and then, after having followed the coast westwards as far as the area of Parḫa, it would again proceed northwards in the direction of Walma.

Otherwise, if the two sites of Ušaula and Ušawala are kept distinct and Ušaula is located along the south-eastern frontier⁵², the description of the southern limit of Tarhuntašša would follow a continuous circuit: the frontier, starting from the east (from Šaliya), could be marked by the Taurus mountains

⁴³ Among them, as has been written above, also some cities mentioned in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (obv. 29’–31’).

⁴⁴ Identifiable as the Greek city of Perge, see H. Otten, *StBoT Beih.* 1, 37–38; G. Del Monte, *RGTC* 6/2, 121; R. Lebrun, *De quelques cultes lyciens et pamphyliens*, *Fs. Alp* 357–361.

⁴⁵ Cf. n. 7.

⁴⁶ *StBot Beih.* 3, 51 n. 178.

⁴⁷ For the presumible location of Walma cf. n. 36.

⁴⁸ *StBoT Beih.* 3, 52.

⁴⁹ *AnSt* 47, 138.

⁵⁰ *StBoT Beih.* 3, 52.

⁵¹ That is from the region of Walma, on the basis of the position of Ušawala, as is understood from KBo IV 10 +.

⁵² See O. R. Gurney, *AnSt* 47, 138.

– as in KBo IV 10 + – as far as the area of Ušaula and Ḫawaliya⁵³, it would then proceed towards the coast (with the sites lying “on/in the direction of the side of the seacoast”)⁵⁴ and – differently what we read in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub – would reach, beyond Šarantuwa, the Mediterranean sea which it would follow as far as its westernmost point and from there it would continue northwards.

The fact that the sea, as a boundary marker, is mentioned only in connection with the city of Šarantuwa suggests – in my view – that only starting from this city did the coast belong to Tarhuntassa⁵⁵ and that further east the frontier was marked – as mentioned above with reference to the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub – not by the sea, but by the Taurus mountains.

Indeed, if we accept the opposite hypothesis – that is, that the whole stretch of coast between an imprecise point south of Šaliya and the river Kaštaraya, belonged to Tarhuntassa – the reason why in the Bronze Tablet only the coastal line between Šarantuwa and the river Kaštaraya is described, while any information on the more extensive territory to the east of this city is ignored, would be incomprehensible.

The outlet to the sea in the area between Šarantuwa and the river Aksu, a region which is not mentioned in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub, would be one of the territorial extensions granted by Tutḫaliya IV to Kurunta in the Bronze Tablet. These are precisely the territories west of the city of Šarantuwa which are described in KBo IV 10 + obv. 30'–31' as those that would be assigned to Tarhuntassa after their possible conquest by the Hittites.

At the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to identify the precise whereabouts of Šarantuwa⁵⁶ and, consequently, establish the limit to the west of which the coastal region of Tarhuntassa started; since in the Bronze Tablet (I 58) Šalluša is mentioned among the sites near Šarantuwa, and accepting the proposal advanced by D. Hawkins of identifying Šalluša as the classical site of Selinus, we might surmise that this limit was situated near the modern site of Alanya.⁵⁷

Again in relation to the hypothesis that the southern frontier of Tarhuntassa ran along the Taurus chain, it is opportune to recall here that two rock reliefs have been found in the area of the Taurus; one is at Keben, in the valley of

⁵³ M. Forlanini, ASVOA 4.3, Roma 1992, proposes placing Ḫawaliya north of Alanya; on this see also O. R. Gurney, Fs. Alp 218.

⁵⁴ As R. Beal observes, AnSt 42, 70, the fact that in the Bronze Tablet these cities are indicated as situated “on/in the direction of the side of the sea coast” does not necessarily imply their position along the coast; rather, some of them might be situated between the mountains and the coast.

⁵⁵ On this see also M. Giorgieri, OLZ 93 [1998] 180.

⁵⁶ On this see G. Del Monte, RGTC 6, 350; 6/2, 141 (with previous literature); O. R. Gurney, AnSt 47, 138 n. 21.

⁵⁷ StBoT Beih. 3, 52 n. 181.

the river Göksu, while the other, now destroyed, was situated further west near Ermenek. These reliefs, which are dated by some scholars to the late Hittite imperial age⁵⁸, might be interpreted as monuments erected to mark the southern limit of the domains of Tarhuntassa in the region of Cilicia Aspera.

On the use of reliefs or inscriptions as frontier markers, we must mention the hypothesis, advanced by some scholars, of attributing to monuments like those of Yalburt, Köylütolu yala and Emirgazi, the function of marking the south-western frontier of Hatti towards Tarhuntassa.⁵⁹ In this context we may also mention here the relief of Kurunta recently discovered at Hatip⁶⁰, which – according to I. Singer⁶¹ – might indicate the extreme northern limit reached by Tarhuntassa during the reign of Kurunta.

There may have been various reasons why Hattušili III, first, and Tuthaliya IV, later, defined the southern frontier of Tarhuntassa along the chain of the Taurus, leaving out the coastal area from this region.

As already mentioned above, it is highly likely that these two Hittite kings had an interest in maintaining direct control over the port of Ura, judging it to be too dangerous to entrust it to a dynasty certainly subordinate to them, but whose loyalty they never seem fully convinced of.⁶² It is true that the most direct passage between Ura and central Anatolia presumably passed through Tarhuntassa, and commercial traffic to and from the interior of Hittite territory would certainly have been affected by a situation of political crisis between Hatti and Tarhuntassa; however, in case of necessity it would also have been possible to resort to alternative itineraries, such as that which starting from Ura must have followed the coast as far as Mersin and from there continue northwards through the Cilician Gates.

⁵⁸ For the relief of Keben, see most recently H. Ehringhaus, *Das hethitische Felsrelief von Keben*, *Antike Welt* 26 [1995] 215–219 (with previous literature); N. Postgate, *The site and the setting*, in: H. D. Baker et alii, *Kilise Tepe 1994*, *AnSt* 44 [1995] 142; for a different dating see K. Kohlmeyer, *Felsbilder der hethitischen Grossreichszeit*, *AcPrAr* 15 [1983] 102; on the relief of Ermenek, see most recently R. Beal, *AnSt* 42, 69 (with previous literature); for a different dating see K. Kohlmeyer, art. cit. 102–103; on both reliefs see also M. Forlanini, *VO* 7, 148 n. 92.

⁵⁹ See E. Masson, *Les Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques d'Emirgazi*, *Journal des Savants* [1979] 37; id., *Les Hittites*, Dijon 1994, 55; H. Otten, *Die 1986 in Boğazköy gefundene Bronzetafel* cit. 18; I. Singer, *SMEA* 38, 65.

⁶⁰ See now A. Dinçol, *Tüba-Ar 1*, 27–35; id., *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*, Ankara 1998, 159–165.

⁶¹ *SMEA* 38, 65; otherwise see A. Ünal, *Zur historischen Geographie von Kizzuwatna und Lage von Sirkeli – Eine Bilanz*, in: B. Hrouda, *Vorläufige Bericht über die Ausgrabungsergebnisse auf dem Sirkeli Höyük/Südtürkei von 1992–1996*, *IM* 47 [1997] 148.

⁶² In relation to this we may recall that, according to what is written in the Bronze Tablet III 47–50, also the site of Ikkuwaniya/Konya seems to remain under the control of Hatti (on this passage see D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 50–51); as J. Börker Klähn, *Athenaeum* 32, 326, observes – this might reveal the Hittite will to conserve its rule of an area where a communication centre of strategic importance was situated.

Furthermore, if – as seems likely – the city of Tarḫuntašša was situated along the valley of the river Göksu⁶³, the choice, by the kings of Ḫatti, of denying the direct link between this city and the coast would also have had an important political significance. It would in fact have been a way of limiting the possibility of an excessive economic and political expansion of the city⁶⁴ – so near to the lines of maritime communication with Syria and the entire eastern Mediterranean – an expansion that might have been damaging to Ḫattuša which was significantly removed from these routes.

Lastly, the concession to Kurunta of the kingship of Tarḫuntašša – that is the country where the capital lay which Kurunta's father, Muwattalli II, had founded – and at the same time the mutilation of this country by depriving it of its natural outlet to the sea, is perfectly in keeping, in my view, with the ambiguous policy adopted by Ḫattušili III and later Tuthaliya IV towards Tarḫuntašša: as in fact both KBo IV 10 + and the Bronze Tablet reveal, the concessions and privilege which the kings of Ḫatti decree in favour of the dynasty of Tarḫuntašša, are accompanied in equal measure by suspicion towards this dynasty and by attempts to limit its power.⁶⁵

⁶³ Thus, most recently, D. Hawkins, *StBoT Beih.* 3, 56; for other locations of Tarḫuntašša see K. Kohlmeyer, *AcPrAr* 15, 99 n. 920; S. Alp, *Zur Lage der Stadt Tarḫuntašša*, in: *Atti II CIH*, Pavia 1995, 1–11, both with previous literature.

⁶⁴ In relation to this it is important to mention here the hypothesis advanced by D. Sürenhagen, *Untersuchungen zur Bronzetafel und weiteren Verträgen mit der Sekundogenitur in Tarḫuntašša*, *OLZ* 87 [1992] 369–370; according to this scholar the exemption from military duties granted by the Hittite kings to Tarḫuntašša (in *ABot* 57 and in the Bronze Tablet) could be interpreted as an attempt to delimitarize this country with the idea of making it inoffensive.

⁶⁵ See, for example, the observations of F. Imparati – F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Le relazioni politiche tra Hatti e Tarhuntassa all'epoca di Hattusili III e Tuthaliya IV*, in: *Quattro Studi Ittiti* (Eothen 4), Firenze 1992, 63–68; for a different view, which I do not share, of the relations between Kurunta and Tuthaliya, see D. Smith, *Kurunta and Tuthaliya (IV): A "Greek" Practice among the Hittites?*, *Talanta* 24–25 [1992–93] 85–97.