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In 1940 Albrecht Goetze was able to show that the important country of Kizzuwatna was situated in south-western Anatolia. Its western part included classical Cilicia; after establishing the relative position of Kizzuwatna Goetze pointed to a series of geographical names coinciding with those in antiquity or modern ones such as Tarša-Tarsos and Ataniya-Adana.

The border-description of the treaty between Suppiluliuma and the king of Kizzuwatna⁴ starts from the sea. It mentions Lamiya, Aruna and Saliya on the Hittite side before reaching the river Samri, identified by Goetze as the Seyhan (classical Saros). Consequently, the Hittite districts mentioned before the Samri are to be situated to the west of Kizzuwatna.

The district of Saliya is also mentioned on the Hittite side in the two border-descriptions of the vassal-kingdom of Tarhuntassa, in which Saliya appears before Sarantiwa. In KBo IV 10, the only text of the two available to Goetze, the extent of Tarhuntassa from the direction of Sarantiwa is described, somewhat enigmatically, as “as far as one can throw a spear”. However, since the discovery of the Bronze Tablet it is known that the sea, i.e. the Mediterranean, was intended. The sea-coast of Tarhuntassa run as far west as the hostile city of Parha across the river Kastaraya. These two have been identified by Otten, on excellent grounds, as classical Perge and the river Kestros respectively.

There is little information on the status of Kizzuwatna after Suppiluliuma, but it was still recognized in 1274 by Ramses II as a Hittite vassal-state. One may infer from this that Kizzuwatna, whether a vassal-kingdom or a province, had some form of tax-regulation of its own when the treaty with Tarhuntassa was drawn up. This would explain the interest of the Hittites in a corridor between Tarhuntassa and Kizzuwatna, providing them with a short route from Bor/Tuwanuwa through the Cilician Gates.

⁴ KBo I 5 IV 40-51, see Goetze 1940: 50-51.
to Saliya and the sea\(^2\). If this route favoured Hittite commercial enterprise (and after the conquest of Syria there hardly could have been a military need for it), we may expect the corridor to lead to a major sea-port, the only plausible candidate for which is the important city of Ura, which was in direct contact with Ugarit. If so, the Mediterranean end of the corridor run from Sarantuwa in the west via Ura to Lamiya. At present, there are two alternative identifications of Ura:

A) Classical Olba, a trading-center with a theocratical government in Roman times. Olba is not situated on the coast itself, but other classical sites such as Korasion or Korykos may have have served as its sea-port after the Bronze Age\(^3\). In this identification the district of Lamiya gave its name to the modern river Lamas (classical Lamos), which served as a border in Byzantine times. On the other hand Olba is perhaps too far from the southern end of the Gates. Furthermore, most of the low-lying area east of the Gök Sü (Kalykadnos) is, in this view, taken away from Tarhuntassa, a country which, according to KBo IV 10, could “feed all of Hatti”. The remaining part of Tarhuntassa south of the Taurus-range seems to be too small for this.

B) A site more to the east, e.g. Mersin (Yümük Tepe) or Kazanlı, abandoning the Lamiya-identification. Mersin had two Hittite layers, the second of which is dated by the building-style of its fortress in the reign of Tuthaliya IV. However, both are rather close to Tarsos and may have been part of (Hitticized) Kizzuwatna.
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\(^2\) Unlike Goetze, I will situate Saliya at the southern end of the Gates, the more so because the district south of it is called Aruna, to be translated as “sea(-land)”. Perhaps the enigmatic “High Mountain” north of Saliya is the Hittite name for the Gates.

\(^3\) The main settlement may have been transferred from the coast to the interior in the Dark Ages.
Map I. Relative position of the Hittite corridor in southeast Anatolia.