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THE BORDERS OF TARHUNTASSA REVISITED

H. Craig Melchert

In 2000 Ali and Belks Dinçol published together with colleagues Jak Yakar and Avia Taffet an article on the borders of Tarhuntassa (henceforth Dinçol et al. 2000). One of the most significant conclusions of their reassessment was that the southeastern boundary of Tarhuntassa ran along the northern slopes of the Bolkar, Göktepe, and Pusatlı mountain ranges, reaching the coast at Saranduwa, which they follow Gurney (1997: 132) in identifying with classical Kelenderis (modern Gilindere/Aydincik).1 This claim has been accepted by Freu (2005: 400), but it contradicts the identification by Beal (1992) of ancient Ura with Gilindere, as well as the views of those like Hawkins (1995: 52, 1998: 31) and Starke (2002: 306) who place the southeastern boundary of Tarhuntassa much farther east, along the Lamos. My goal in what follows is to affirm the conclusion of the Dinçols and others by correcting misinterpretations of the relevant textual evidence and by showing that the equation Saranduwa/Kelenderis is linguistically sound.

In the time of Tuthaliya IV the western boundary of Tarhuntassa is quite clear. The text of the treaty with Kurunta preserved on the bronze tablet from Boğazköy (Bo 86/299 i 61) assures us that Tarhuntassa was bounded on the west by the Kastaraya River (classical Kestros, modern Aksu). For the western boundary at the time of the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty see below.

There also appears to be a broad consensus on the basic position and orientation of the northern boundary of Tarhuntassa. It began at or near Lake Eğiridir in the northwest and ran east-southeast, south of Konya, terminating near the Bolkar Dağ (see among others Otten 1988: 35, Hawkins 1995: 51, Starke 2002: 306, Dinçol et al. 2000: 12). I leave aside debate regarding the precise extent of the northwestern frontier and the relative positioning of Walma and Pedassa. As to the eastern end, the phrase pargauwaz HUR.SAG-az in the Kurunta Treaty (Bo 86/299 i 49) must mean “towards the High Mountain”, as per Garstang and Gurney (1959: 72) and Dinçol et al. (2000: 12), and refer to another peak besides Mt. Sarlaimmi. The attempt of Otten (1988: 35) to interpret the phrase as “from the height of the mountain” (i.e. Sarlaimmi) is wholly unjustified. I find persuasive the identification by Garstang and Gurney (1959: 72) and Dinçol et al. (2000: 13) of the “High Mountain” with the Bolkar Dağ.2 The northeastern terminus of the frontier was thus somewhere near or a little to the east of modern Eregli. The major point of dispute is: in which direction did the boundary run after it left the northeastern terminus—south and then southeast along the Lamos or southwest along the Pusatlı range, reaching the sea at Kelenderis?

Crucial to answering this question are the following passages from the treaties with Kurunta and Ulmi-Teshub that prescribe the boundaries of Tarhuntassa. Pivotal clauses are in bold. Justification of my translations follows.

Treaty of Tuthaliya IV with Kurunta (Bo 86/299 i 49-66)

\[
pargauwaz = ma = šši \ HUR.SAG-az \ URUŠšiyaš ZAG-\text{aš} \ URUŠšiyaš = ma = kan ANA KUR \ URUḪatti ăššanza \ URU\Ušzial = ma = šši \ ZAG-za \ URUḪaššuwantaš \ URU Milaš \ URU\Palmataš \ URUḪaššašaš \ URUŠuraš \ URUŠimmuwantaš \ ZAG-aš kūš = ma = kan \ URU.DIDLIḪI.A INA KUR IDḪulaya ăššanteš \ URUḪauwaliyaz = ma = šši \ ZAG-za \ URUWalwaraš \ URUḪarḫšuwantaš \ URTarapaš \ URSarrantaš \ URTūpišaš \ URParayaššaš \ URUNātaš \ upati ZAG-aš kūš = kan \ URU.DIDLIḪI.A URUNātaš = ti\]

---

1 Except for the identification of Saranduwa with Kelenderis, the same analysis of the southeastern and southern boundary of Tarhuntassa was made independently by de Martino (1999: 297-298).
2 I leave open as not crucial to the present issue the question of the precise identification of Mt. Sarlaimmi (per Garstang and Gurney 1959: 72 the Ivriz Dağ, per Dinçol et al. 2000: 13, the Karaca Dağ).
Towards the High Mountain Saliya is his boundary. Saliya belongs to the land of Hatti. Towards the outside Walwara and whatever is the demesne of Walwara, Mata, Sanhada, Surimma, Saranduwa (and) Daddassi are his boundary. From the border territory of Saranduwa to whatever place he bears arms, it belongs to the Hulaya River Land. Towards the land of Walma Waltanna, Usawala, Alluprata (and) Huhura are his boundary. These cities belong to the Hulaya River Land.

Hawkins (1995: 511) asserts that in the Kurunta Treaty the place names following Saliya are linked with Parha (Perge), leading him to suppose (1995: 52) that the specifications “towards Usauliya” and “towards Hawaliya” refer to the Aksu valley. There is thus an unexplained “jump” from the eastern frontier to the extreme west. Assumption of such a jump may have still been viable when we had only the evidence of the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty, but the wording of the Kurunta Treaty is quite unequivocal and totally excludes such an interpretation. The clauses IŠTU ZAG Šaranduwa = ma šši arunaš ZAG-aš could not possibly be more explicit: “From the border territory of Saranduwa the sea is his boundary. From the border territory of Parha the Kastaraya River is his boundary.”

Most ablatives in the boundary descriptions mean “in the direction of, towards” (thus correctly Garstang and Gurney 1959: 66-67 and Beckman 1996: 109-110), with the unstated point of reference being the city of Tarhuntassa. The frequent translation “from” (e.g. Oten 1988: 11-13 and van den Hout 1995: 25-31) is misleading and confusing. In the case of IŠTU ZAG Šaranduwa and IŠTU ZAG Parňa, however, the nature of the boundary, respectively the sea and the river Kestros, forces a reading “from”. To translate here with Beckman (1996: 110) “in the direction of the border district of the city of Saranduwa his frontier is the sea” is inadequate, because from the point of view of Tarhuntassa, most of the sea frontier is not in the direction of Saranduwa, only its southeast terminus. Likewise the entire course of the Kestros that forms the western boundary is not in the direction of Parha/Perge as seen from Tarhuntassa, only its southern terminus. In these two instances the description
takes advantage of the two natural boundaries, whose presence removes the need for painstakingly specifying the boundaries by reference to cities or lands that lie beyond the frontier in a given direction from Tarhuntassa, as in the rest of the description.

In the Kurunta Treaty the “jump” from east to west manifestly is from Saranduwa to Parha, between which the sea forms the southern boundary of Tarhuntassa. This means that just as Parha (Perge) is the southwestern terminus, Saranduwa must be the southeastern terminus, likewise on the seacoast (thus already correctly Beal 1992: 70 and de Martino 1999: 297-298).

In the west, the boundary again “jumps” from Parha/Perge to Walma in the northwest (meaning that it runs along the course of the Kastaraya/Kestros), where the regular practice of specifying the boundaries in terms of other place names resumes. In the east, all of the place names mentioned from Saliya up to Saranduwa must inexorably form the eastern boundary of Tarhuntassa. Contrary to Hawkins’ assertion, these place names are most emphatically not linked with Parha. The entire stretch of seacoast between Saranduwa in the southeast and Parha/Perge to Walma in the southwest lies between them. The resemblance of Usaula in the Kurunta Treaty in the east with Usawala in the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty in the northwest near Walma can only be another instance of homonymous place names, a common enough occurrence in ancient Anatolia.

The clear testimony of the Kurunta Treaty that Saranduwa is the southeastern terminus of the boundary on the seacoast also forces a reinterpretation of the corresponding passage in the much less explicit Ulmi-Teshub Treaty. Van den Hout (1995: 57) assumes here a “jump” from east to west similar to that proposed by Hawkins. In the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty there is indeed a jump, but it is from Saranduwa, which we now know to be in the southeast, to Walma in the northwest. As noted by van den Hout, the description of this portion of the boundary for Ulmi-Teshub is dramatically shorter and much less explicit than that for Kurunta.

In the case of Ulmi-Teshub the Hittite king spells out in detail only the northern boundary of Tarhuntassa that faces him. All the rest is sweepingly referred to as aralzenaza “towards the outside”. Van den Hout suggests that this means “from the (sea)shore”, but the meaning is much broader. Unlike all other specifications in the boundaries, where the unstated point of reference is Tarhuntassa, here the viewpoint is that of Hattusa. The term “towards the outside” means simply on the far side of Tarhuntassa away from Hattusa, and it is used for the (south) eastern, southern and western portions of the boundaries.

As stressed by van den Hout, even for the (south)eastern portion of the boundary extending from Saliya the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty refers merely to “Walwara and whatever is the demesne of Walwara”, which covers the entire extent of the boundary that is spelled out in detail in the Kurunta Treaty beginning with “towards Usaula...” and ending with “…the demesne of Nata”. Nevertheless, the close match between the cities listed thereafter in both treaties (beginning with Mata and ending with Datta and Dasa, respectively Dattassi) shows that the boundary ended in the southeast at or near Saranduwa in both cases. The major difference is that in the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty the Hittite king leaves the southern and western boundaries entirely undefined, all the way up to Walma in the northwest.

In this treaty the southern and western boundaries are to run as far as the King of Tarhuntassa can reach by force of arms. In my view this difference versus the

---

3 Thus with Gurney (1997: 138) and de Martino (1999: 297). The unequivocal testimony of the Kurunta Treaty must be given precedence over that from the fragmentary Annals of Hattusili III (contra Hawkins 1995: 52 and 56 with notes and van den Hout 1995: 57). As per Gurney (1997: 136-138) and Dinçol et al. (2000: 14), there is no evidence that the list of cities named in that text form an itinerary and thus no reason that Walwara and Sanhata must be placed in the west in the area of classical Kolbasa.

4 It thus does serve to point the direction in which that section of the boundary lay (Garstang and Gurney 1959: 72), but from the viewpoint of Hattusa, not Tarhuntassa.

5 The clear position of Saranduwa as the southeastern terminus precludes these cities being in the southwest, contra de Martino (1999: 295).

6 De Martino (1996: 296) suggests that in the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty the southern boundary of Tarhuntassa ran only as far south as the western ranges of the Taurus, but the presence of the same cities that are characterized as arunaz pedaz in the Kurunta Treaty, especially that of Saranduwa itself, argues that at least in the area of the Göksu valley the boundary did approach the seacoast. Farther west, however, it may well not have reached so far. The main point is that the Hittite king in the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty was not vitally concerned with the extent of this boundary.
Kurunta Treaty makes it certain that the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty precedes that with Kurunta. The latter must reflect the new situation following Tuthaliya’s conquest of Lukka (Lycia). It is obvious that once Tuthaliya had conquered the Lukka lands to the west, he would insist that the western limit of Tarhuntassa be defined as stopping at the Kestros. The only exception provided for is the possible conquest of Parha. On the other hand, it cost him little in practical terms to concede that the southern boundary of Tarhuntassa reached the seacoast between Saranduwa and Parha/Perge. This probably reflects merely formal acknowledgement of Tarhuntassa’s de facto control of this territory remote from Hattusa and of limited strategic importance.

The text of the Kurunta Treaty shows beyond doubt that Saranduwa must be located on the seacoast some distance east of Parha/Perge. Its precise location is a separate issue, but several factors support its identification with Kelenderis (Gilindire). First of all, as argued by de Martino (1999: 299-300), it is not credible that the Hittite king would have allowed the appanage kingdom of Tarhuntassa to control the vital seaport of Ura. This port is surely to be located in the vicinity of Silifke (Lemaire 1993) or farther east at classical Korykos (Dinçol et al. 2000: 14-15). A boundary as far east as the Lamos is thus excluded. Second, the Bolkar, Göktepe and Pisatlı mountains form a natural barrier between the Konya plain and the Mediterranean littoral (Dinçol et al. 2000: 14). It would have made no sense to draw a boundary through this formidable barrier and then along the Lamos. The natural place for the boundary to have turned south towards the coast would have been the valley of the Kalykadnos (modern Göksu), which does make a significant break in the Taurus range and which has formed a well traveled route from the interior to the coast since ancient times (Lemaire 1993: 232, citing French, Dinçol et al. 2000: 11 and Ehringhaus 2005: 112).

The border description just preceding Saranduwa further supports this interpretation and the identification of Saranduwa with Kelenderis. In the Kurunta Treaty the last few cities of the boundary before it ends on the coast at or near Saranduwa are Mata, Sanhata, Surimma, Saranduwa, Istapanna, Sallusa, Tatta and Dasa. Here the Ulmi-Teshub Treaty shows a closely matching list: Mata, Sanhata, Surimma, Saranduwa and Daddassi (the last a garbled version of the Tatta and Dasa of the Kurunta Treaty). These cities are described as being arunaz pēdaz (for arunaš pēdaz with “partitive apposition”), that is “towards the place of the sea”, i.e. towards the seacoast (thus correctly Beal 1992: 70 and de Martino 1999: 295). This is a very apt description for the last section of the southeastern boundary as it turns from the northern foothills of the Pisatlı Dağ and runs more sharply south southwest towards the coast ending at Saranduwa/Kelenderis.

The precise trajectory of this last section of the frontier as it approached the coast remains an open question, depending on whether one understands arunaz pēdaz “towards the seacoast” as referring to a line of cities that ran from the mountains to the sea or a line of cities along the seacoast (for these alternatives see Beal 1992: 70). Dinçol et al. (2000: 14 and 19) assume the former, supposing that the boundary ran across the Göksu near Şarlak via Gülmar to Saranduwa/Gilindire. There is some evidence for an ancient route in this direction across the Akcali mountain range (but see the remarks of Lemaire 1993: 232), and I do not exclude

---

8 As described in the Hieroglyphic Luvian YALBURT inscription, for which see Poetto (1993) and Hawkins (1995: 66-85).
10 Thus with Otten (1988: 363) against van den Hout (1995: 58). The latter’s proposed equation of Daddašši with classical Lalassi, following Gurney and Garstang (1959: 73, with doubts!), makes no sense geographically and is highly dubious linguistically. While a single intervocalic -d- in Luvian might well be rendered as -i- in the Greek, this is entirely unexpected for geminate -tr-. A corruption of a pair of names Datta and Daša into a single Daddašši is also far more likely than the reverse (what could motivate the latter?). Finally, it is highly suspicious that the allegedly genuine Dadašši would be the only city name in the entire text to occur in the form of an i-stem. The anomalous animate ending -iš and the omission of ZAG-aš immediately following also show that the scribe of KBo 4.10 was struggling at this point in the text.
11 The interpretation of Dinçol et al. (2000: 14-15) that arunaz pēdaz refers to some particular landmark on the coast, in particular to the ancient harbor of Ura, is highly unlikely.
this hypothesis. However, in terms of landscape features it would make more sense for the boundary to have taken advantage of the natural breach in the Taurus range made by the Kalykadnos/Göksu, following its course southeast until near the coast and then proceeded southwest to Saranduwa along the coastal plain. By this interpretation the cities “towards the seacoast” would in fact have run in a line along the coast a few miles inland. Tuthaliya in this scenario allowed the southeastern boundary to follow the natural pattern of the landscape features to the extent that it served his purposes: Tarhuntassa was kept to the northern side of the Taurus until the Göksu. However, even this far west he did not concede control all the way to the mouth of the river, which would have been the natural place for the boundary. He reserved for himself the seacoast itself all the way west to Saranduwa/Gilindere, keeping Tarhuntassa well away from the strategic port at Ura and even farther from Kizzuwatna.

I find further possible support for this view of the final section of the southeastern frontier in the relief at Keben (for which see now the excellent photographs and discussion by Ehringhaus 2005: 112-118). Ehringhaus considers the possibility that the female figure depicted, who faces down the valley towards the coast, is a boundary marker, but rejects this because he assumes that the boundary of Tarhuntassa lies to the east along the Lamos. However, if as I have just suggested the boundary followed the course of the Kalykadnos/Göksu for some distance before turning southwest towards Saranduwa/Gilindire, then the relief at Keben could well mark the frontier of Tarhuntassa (cf. the remarks of de Martino 1999: 298-299).

Diçol et al. (2000) do not address the formal aspects of the proposed equation Saranduwa/Kelenderis, while Gurney (1997: 138) merely refers to “a suggestive resemblance”. The formal match hardly imposes itself and calls for detailed comment. I begin with the premise that this place name goes back to a non-Indo-European “substrate” and that the attested forms in both the Hittite cuneiform texts and classical sources reflect independent attempts to render a foreign word that may have contained sounds for which there were no exact equivalents in the respective Indo-European languages. The location of the city makes it likely that in the former case the Hittite form reflects a Luvian intermediary.

The discrepancy in vocalism between Saranduwa and Kelenderis presents no problems, since it matches a widespread pattern in western Anatolian place names: Hittite Lazpa vs. Greek Lesbos, Hittite Apasa vs. Greek Ephesos, etc. It is possible that this variation reflects attempts to represent an original low front vowel [æ]. However, since Luvian, the intermediary for the Hittite form, had only three vowels /i/, /a/ and /u/, it is equally possible that the source vowel was a mid front [ɛ] that Greek could render quite accurately, but which could only be represented by /a/ in Luvian.

The difference between the initial sibilant in the Luvo-Hittite form versus the velar stop in the Greek is not a serious obstacle to the equation. Each may be an attempt to represent a voiceless palatal stop [c]. As a parallel I may cite the variable Greek renderings of such a stop in Lycian: personal name Ṭikeukēprē > Τισευσεμβραν, but Ṣbikaza > Σβιγασα. Likewise, the difference between the r of the Luvo-Hittite form and the l of the Greek is unsurprising: cf. Lycian Pınałe versus Greek Pinara. The earlier Hieroglyphic Luvian form pi-na-tai suggests that the original sound in this place name may have been a voiced dental flap, but a replacement of r by l or vice versa in the borrowing of our place name is also quite possible. I cite merely as one possibility that the original name had two r’s (approximately *[cɛrɛndere]) and that the l in Greek results from dissimilation. Alternatively, whatever the precise nature of the second and final consonants was in the original, Greek may have chosen to represent the first by l and the second by r to avoid an awkward repetition of the same liquid.

The difference between the final -eris of the Greek and the -(u)wa of the Hittite cannot be explained in strictly phonetic terms. I suggest that here we have rather in the case of the Luvo-Hittite an adaptation of a foreign

---

12 It is unfortunate that the earlier felicitous transliteration of this consonant by the letter c has since been replaced in the standard system with the misleading k.
place name to a productive pattern in the borrowing language, while the Greek form is likely closer to the original. I assume a similar process in Hittite Millawanda versus Greek Miletos, following Niemeyer (1998: 237), who cites the apt parallel of German Mailand for Milano. The Luvo-Hittite equivalent of Miletos has been reshaped as if it contained the suffix -want(a)- so frequent in Luvo-Hittite place names (e.g. Wiyanana-wanda “possessing/rich in grapevines”). As first suggested by Carruba (1979: 95) and elaborated by Starke (1997: 469), Luvo-Hittite place names also frequently contain a suffix -wa-. This suffix originally formed ethnic adjectives, but ellipsis of the word for “land” in X-wa- “(the land) of city X” led to use of the wa-form effectively as synonymous with the original base form: thus doublets such as Zalpa/Zalpuwa, Ahhiya/Ahhiyawa, and so on. I therefore propose that an original *[cəɾəndɛɾe] (or similar) was “normalized” from the Luvian point of view by replacing its final sequence with -wa-, just as the original form behind Miletos was reshaped into Millawanda. Just what kind of folk etymological “reasoning” was involved in these alterations we cannot recover.

In sum, I believe that the equation of Saranduwa with Kelenderis is fully viable linguistically, while a correct reading of the relevant text of the Kurunta Treaty shows that Saranduwa has to have been the southeastern terminus of the boundary of Tarhuntassa, located on the seacoast. As already argued by Ali and Belkıs Dinçol and colleagues, identification of Saranduwa with Kelenderis (Gilindire) also leads to a southeastern boundary of Tarhuntassa that is consistent with the natural topography of the region and makes good sense in terms of the strategic interests of the contemporary Hittite kings.
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