

The Hittite Queen Šata(n)duḫepa

Stefano de Martino (Turin)

1. We owe the discovery of the existence of a Hittite queen called Šata(n)duḫepa to Gernot Wilhelm, as Philo Houwink ten Cate has already written¹. This is only one of the many significant contributions that Gernot Wilhelm has made to the study of the history and philology of the ancient Near East.

The personal name Šata(n)duḫepa (*sà-tà-tu-ḫa-pa*), next to the name of Tuthaliya, had already appeared in the impressions of a royal seal on two tablets of Maṣat/Tapigga (Mst 75/39 = HBM 4 and Mst 75/110 = HBM 14)². However, Sedat Alp believed that *sà-tà-tu-ḫa-pa* and Taduḫepa were different writings of the same name. The seal of the two Maṣat tablets was, according to this scholar, the seal belonging to the royal couple of Tuthaliya III – Taduḫepa.

On the other hand, Gernot Wilhelm³ has shown that the name of Šata(n)duḫepa is also preserved in the text KBo 9.137 + KBo 23. 2. Furthermore, he has explained the etymology of this personal name: it is composed with the Hurrian verb *šad-* “to give back, to replace, to compensate” (with or without *Wurzelerweiterung -and-*) and the divine name Ḫebat.⁴

Therefore, Šata(n)duḫepa is a different name from Taduḫepa and the woman who bears such a name is, however, a Hittite queen who has been little documented till the present day.

Following on from this, Philo Houwink ten Cate has provided further proof of the presence of this name in the text KBo 27.95 IV? 4’ (ChS I/1 37)⁵. Further possible attestations of Šata(n)duḫepa has been gathered by Marie-Claude Trémouille⁶ and,

¹ Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 52-53.

² See Alp 1991, 48-52.

³ See Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 101-102.

⁴ See Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 102 and n. 78.

⁵ Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 53 n. 5.

⁶ Trémouille 2006, 26-27.

lastly, an important piece of documentary evidence has been published by Jared Miller in KBo 53 (no. 10 = 1691/u, (+) KUB 31.124 (+) Bo 8671 (+) KUB 48.28)⁷.

This brief essay, which is dedicated to my colleague and friend Gernot, with all my admiration and gratitude for all the work he has accomplished, intends to provide a summary of the information in our possession on the queen Šata(n)duḫepa.

2. Let us look first of all at the documents which mention Šata(n)duḫepa.

2.1. Certain attestations of Šata(n)duḫepa.

2.1.1. The impressions of the seal of Tuthaliya and Šata(n)duḫepa, preserved on two letters from Maṣat, have already been mentioned.

2.1.2. The most significant text is undoubtedly the tablet KBo 53.10 (+)⁸. This text is considered to be one of the versions of the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal to the Sun-goddess of Arinna about the ravages of the Kaška (CTH 375)⁹. Erich Neu had already emphasised the importance – from a historical point of view¹⁰ – of the tablet 1691/u (= KBo 53.10) which, in its final part of the obverse (col. II), duplicates the fragment 577/u¹¹. On the other hand, the 577/u fragment, despite being quoted among known manuscripts, was not taken into consideration by the editors of this prayer¹².

This part of the text deserves to be examined in a detailed way:

KBo 53.10 obv. II¹³

19	<u>nu-uš-ša-an</u> ka-a-ša ú-e-eš [mAr-nu-wa-an-da LUGAL.GAL]
20	Ú[Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL [
21	<u>nu-uš-ma-aš-kán</u> ḫu-u-ma-an-d[a(-)

22	<u>šu-me-eš-ša-aš-ša-an</u> DINGIR.MEŠ x[..... mAr-nu-wa-an-da LUGAL.GAL]
23	Ú[Aš-mu-ni-kal MUNUS.LUGAL m[Tu-ut-ḫa-li-ya ¹⁴ (<u>tu-ḫu-kán-ti</u>)]
24	[I]Ša-ta-an-du-ḫé-pa ¹⁵ mPa-r[i-ya-wa-at-ra (<u>DUMU.NITA SANGA</u>)]
25	[iMu-šu-ḫé-p]a (?) ¹⁶ kat-ta [

⁷ On Šata(n)duḫepa see also Klinger 1995, 80-81; Soysal 2003, 51; Miller 2004, 7-9.

⁸ 1691/u = KBo 53.10 (+) Bo 2374 (+) Bo 3190 = KUB 31.124 (+) Bo 8617 (+) Bo 10058 (= KUB 48.28). All these manuscripts are MH, see www.hethiter.net, Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte; see also Neu 1983, 393-396.

⁹ See Lebrun 1980, 132-154 ("version B"); Singer 2002a, 40-43, 112.

¹⁰ Neu 1983, 396.

¹¹ Neu 1983, 394 n. 10.

¹² This fragment has been published in transcription only by Marizza 2007, 16-17 n. 62.

¹³ Underlined words are preserved in 577/u.

¹⁴ So Neu 1983, 396.

¹⁵ So Miller 2004, 9 n. 12.

¹⁶ So Neu 1983, 396 n. 14; Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 55.

In these few lines we come across a sort of choral invocation coming from members of the royal family¹⁷. At this point, Tuthaliya (III) is still only the heir to the throne. In this period of his life – as we may glean from this passage – he is mentioned alongside Šata(n)duḫepa, who most probably was his wife (see also *ultra*). Beside him his brothers Pariyawatra and Kantuzili (= DUMU.NITA SANGA)¹⁸ are also mentioned and along with the latter Mušuhēpa¹⁹ is also mentioned.

2.1.3. The MH tablet KBo 9.37 + KBo 23. 22 (ChS I/1 39; ChS I/2, Nachtrag 1) is in Hittite with some sentences in Hurrian. V. Haas considers this document an edict: “Erlass anlässlich der Inthronisation des Tašmišarri”²⁰. On the basis of what we read in KBo 9.137 rev. III 18’ ff., the interpretation of this text given by Philo Houwink ten Cate²¹ would seem highly probable: according to this scholar, this text mentions the appointment of Tašmišarri as “priest” in Hattuša by Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (the latter is mentioned in KBo 9. 137 rev. III 22’²²). In my opinion, the installation of Tašmišarri as “priest” might correspond to the designation of this prince as the heir of Arnuwanda²³. In rev. III? 35’ the name [f]Ša-ta-an-du-ḫé-pa is preserved²⁴.

2.1.4. KBo 33. 5 (ChS I/1 53) is a MH²⁵ fragmentary ritual. The name [f]Ša-ta-an-d[u-ḫé-pa] can be read in rev. III? 15’. In obv. II? 11’ also mŠaḫurunūwa is mentioned.

Since the lines rev. III? 7’-13’ of this text duplicate the lines rev. III? 12’-18’ of KBo 27.96 (ChS I/1 28), the personal name partially preserved in KBo 27. 96 rev. III? 20’ might be restored as: fŠa-ta-an-d[u-ḫé-pa].

2.1.5. The fragment KBo 27.95 (ChS I/1 37) preserves both the name of Šat[a(n)duḫepa (l. 4’)²⁶ as well as the name of T[aduḫepa (l. 11’)²⁷.

2.1.6. In the fragmentary text KBo 35.60 (ChS I/1 8) which mentions Tašmišarri (right col. 6’[, 13’[), we find a further attestation of fŠa-t[a-an-du-ḫé-pa (right col. 11’).

2.2. Uncertain attestation of Ša-ta-an-du-ḫé-pa.

2.2.1. In KUB 45.19 (ChS I/1 29) Tašmišarri (obv. II? 7’) and Taduḫepa (obv. II? 6’, 11’) are mentioned. Within the very same paragraph the name of the queen Taduḫepa may also be restored in obv. II? 8’ e 12’.

¹⁷ So Marizza 2007, 17.

¹⁸ On Kantuzili “priest” see lastly Singer 2002b, 301-313 with previous literature.

¹⁹ On Mušuhēpa see Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 68-69 and n. 51.

²⁰ Haas 1984, 209.

²¹ Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 59-60.

²² For the join see also KBo 35.250.

²³ For the political meaning of the designation of Tuthaliya as priest, see Imparati 2003, 240 and n. 49.

²⁴ See Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 101-102; differently see Otten 1995, 11.

²⁵ See H. Otten - Chr. Rüster, KBo 33, Inhaltsübersicht p. IV.

²⁶ See Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 53 n. 5.

²⁷ See moreover l. 3’: -d[u-ḫé-pa-aš.

In rev. III? 10' we read:]-du-ḫé-pa-aš. Concerning this last passage, Marie-Claude Trémouille has written: “les lignes Vo III? 1'-10' étant duplicats/parallèles de KBo 33.5 III? 7'-15' on devra lire fŠa-ta-an-d]u-ḫé-pa et non pas fTa-d]u-ḫé-pa”²⁸.

In my opinion, in very fragmentary Hurrian tablets – as in the case of KUB 45.19 – it is difficult to distinguish with any amount of precision between duplicates of the same document and cases in which we find repetitions of the same ritual words and sentences in different texts. It was perhaps for this reason that V. Haas²⁹ has not considered KUB 45.19 neither as a duplicate nor as a parallel of KBo 33.5. Since there is no apparent correspondence between column II? of KUB 45.19 and column II of KBo 33.5 and since the similarities between the two texts only concern a fragmentary passage in both, I believe that a higher level of prudence is also called for in the interpretation of the name of obv. III? 10'. In my opinion, this name might be restored either as fŠa-ta-an-du-ḫé-pa or fTa-du-ḫé-pa.

2.2.2. The text KBo 15.70 + (ChS I/1 19), a Hurrian ritual for Tašmišarri and Taduḫepa, mentions several times Taduḫepa. In line 45' of the first column there is a fragmentary personal name which is written: fŠ[a-.

The editor of this volume of the *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler*, V. Haas³⁰, believes that at this point the scribe had mistakenly used the sign ŠA instead of the sign TA; according to V. Haas the name of the queen Taduḫepa was intended here. Marie-Claude Trémouille³¹ is, on the other hand, convinced that the name of Šata(n)duḫepa was intended for this passage.

In my opinion, the following elements should be taken into consideration: a) in this text the name of Taduḫepa frequently appears; b) no other personal name (apart from Tašmišarri and Taduḫepa) appears neither in this tablet nor in its duplicate and parallel texts; c) the passage obv. I 45'-46' (with the fragmentary name fŠ[a-) is very similar to the passage obv. I 5'-6' where Taduḫepa is mentioned; d) nothing would lead us to surmise that in this passage, where both Taduḫepa (I 44') and Tašmišarri (I 46') are mentioned, there lies a reference to the past, that is to Šata(n)duḫepa; e) the tablets which preserve this text are jh copies.

In light of these considerations, I believe that V. Haas' hypothesis is still the most correct, therefore we can quite reasonably presume that the scribe mistakenly wrote the name fT[a'-duḫepa.

2.3. Šatanduḫepa does not appear in the so called ‘Offering Lists’; moreover she is not mentioned in the listing of Hittite queens in the texts of the *nuntarriašḫa*-festival³².

²⁸ Trémouille 2006, 27.

²⁹ Haas 1984, 197-198.

³⁰ Haas 1984, 158.

³¹ Trémouille 2006, 27.

³² See Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 69.

This queen does not either appear in the ‘Cruciform Seal’; on the obverse, in the top wing, where the name of Tuthaliya is preserved, the left side of the wing (where one would have expected to find the name of the queen) is blank³³. In the right wing there is the name of the queen Taduḫepa. The traces of the name of the Hittite king, who was mentioned with Taduḫepa, are unfortunately illegible³⁴ (see also *ultra*).

3. Thanks to the above-cited texts we see that Šata(n)duḫepa is mentioned together with Tuthaliya/Tašmišarri: she appears in two documents of the time of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal where, on the other hand, the name of Taduḫepa does not appear; this might lead us to presume that Šata(n)duḫepa had the role at the Hittite court as the wife of Tuthaliya both during the time he was heir to the throne as when he then became king. Afterwards, she would have been replaced by Taduḫepa³⁵.

As has already been said, the seal of Tuthaliya and Šata(n)duḫepa is impressed on two letters from Mašat; both letters were sent by the king to Kaššu. In the letter HBM 4 no other personal name appears; in the second letter, HBM 14, we only find a certain Maruwa, a man from the city of Gagadduwa³⁶. However, we do not possess any more precise information on Maruwa.

If we accept that Šata(n)duḫepa was the wife of Tuthaliya III only during the first part of his reign, it follows that the two letters HBM 4 and 14 date to this same period³⁷. This is not in contrast with what we already know about the life and career of Kaššu: M. Marizza³⁸, following detailed research into the career of the latter, concludes that he had been in the service of the Hittite court in the period between the final part of Arnuwanda’s reign and the first part of Tuthaliya III’s reign.

To this same time we might date KBo 33. 5; this text mentions Tašmišarri, Šata(n)duḫepa as well as a person by the name of Šaḫurunuwā. Šaḫurunuwā figures in two letters of Mašat, HBM 67, 1 and HBM 88, rev. 14’. Given that these documents are practically contemporary as well as the fact that the name Šaḫurunuwā only rarely appears in Hittite texts, the hypothesis that this is actually the same person would appear more than probable³⁹.

³³ See Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 92.

³⁴ See Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 91.

³⁵ As it was already stressed by Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 101-102. On the other hand, other scholars (see Freu in Freu & Mazoyer 2007, 27-28; Carruba 2008, 80) continue to support the hypothesis concerning the identity of the two names of Šata(n)duḫepa and Taduḫepa.

³⁶ See Alp 1991, 15-16, 79-80.

³⁷ I believe that the archive of Mašat covers a time comprised between the final part of the reign of Arnuwanda I and at least some years of the reign of Tuthaliya III (see de Martino 2005, 313-315), as the prosopographical study of Marizza 2007 shows (see p. 6). For a different point of view see van den Hout 2007, 393.

³⁸ Marizza 2007, 93-111.

³⁹ So Heinhold-Krahmer 2002, 365.

The first of the above-mentioned letters was sent by Šaḫurunuwa to Mešeni (who is mentioned only here)⁴⁰ and to Kaššu; the second letter is fragmentary and preserves neither the name of the sender nor the receiver; furthermore, it does not contain any useful element which might lead to the text being dated with any amount of precision.

As J. Klinger⁴¹ has suggested, the personal name Šaḫurunuwa might be restored in KBo 8.55 obv. 4⁴². In this text Pišeni is also present; he appears in some of the letters of Mašat and in other MH texts⁴³. On the basis of these texts we may say that Pišeni was active during the last part of Tuthaliya I/II's reign and a part of Arnuwanda I's reign⁴⁴.

Therefore, if we accept the restoration of the name Šaḫurunuwa in KBo 8.55 and in consideration of the fact that this dignitary was contemporary with Kaššu, Šaḫurunuwa most probably lived in the period between the last part of Arnuwanda I's reign and the first part of Tuthaliya III's reign⁴⁵.

In conclusion, Šata(n)duḫepa might have married Tuthaliya and become part of the Hittite royal family during the time of Arnuwanda I. She would have been queen only in the first part of Tuthaliya III's reign, even though we do not know when exactly she died (or left the court) and when Tuthaliya married Taduḫepa.

4. If we accept this afore-mentioned hypothesis, we still need to explain the silence in some official sources concerning Šata(n)duḫepa (as for example the 'Offering Lists' or the 'Cruciform Seal') and this type of *damnatio memoriae* which condemned Šata(n)duḫepa to oblivion.

Jared Miller has hypothesised that in the 'Cruciform Seal', in the right wing of the Obverse, Tuthaliya (= TUR) might be restored and in the top wing Šata(n)duḫepa: "the scheme has the advantage of providing both Šata(n)duḫepa and Taduḫepa with a Tuthaliya"⁴⁶.

However, in my opinion the silence in official sources concerning Šata(n)duḫepa is not coincidental. Also, the fact should be added that the left side of the top wing of the obverse of the 'Cruciform Seal' probably never contained writing, as we have already said⁴⁷.

We might actually hypothesise that Šata(n)duḫepa was Tuthaliya TUR's mother. Upon Šata(n)duḫepa's death, Tuthaliya III married Taduḫepa and the latter could have been Šuppiluliuma's mother. Philo Houwink ten Cate had already written that the presence of Taduḫepa in the Cruciform Seal intended to relate Šuppiluliuma to the royal family⁴⁸.

⁴⁰ See Alp 1991, 80.

⁴¹ Klinger 1998, 108 n. 16.

⁴² On this text see Klinger 1998, 108-111; Marizza 2007, 35-40.

⁴³ See Marizza 2007, 34-44.

⁴⁴ See Klinger 1998, 111; de Martino 2005, 315-316; Marizza 2007, 43-44.

⁴⁵ See Marizza 2007, 130.

⁴⁶ Miller 2004, 8-9.

⁴⁷ So Dinçol, Dinçol, Hawkins & Wilhelm 1993, 92.

⁴⁸ Houwink ten Cate 1995-1996, 55.

In this contrast between Šuppiluliuma I and Tuthaliya TUR we might see a precedent in what would after occur – although in a different way – during the time of Hattušili III, when the latter awarded Tuthaliya, one of the children he had had with Puduḫepa, the position of *tubkanti*, removing from this position another one of his children, maybe from a previous marriage⁴⁹. On the other hand, upon Tuthaliya III's death, his succession had been established and the sovereign had left the throne to his son Tuthaliya⁵⁰. Therefore, it was Šuppiluliuma who took power by force.

If we accept this reconstruction the choice undertaken by Muršili II in the 'Cruciform Seal' would have been wholly understandable – that is, the non-mentioning of Šata(n)duḫepa as the mother of the sovereign who had been deposed and the highlighting of Taduḫepa, his grandmother.

Lastly, if we follow this hypothesis, we have also to suppose that Tuthaliya III reigned for quite a lengthy amount of years. Indeed, the period following the marriage to Taduḫepa, that would have already occurred after some years of his reign, had necessarily to include the birth of Šuppiluliuma and all those years leading up to the adulthood of the latter⁵¹.

Bibliography

- Alp, S. 1991, *Hethitische Briefe aus Maṣat-Höyük*, Ankara.
- Carruba, O. 2008, "Analisi delle liste reali etee", in: K. Strobel (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Historical Geography and Topography of Anatolia in the II and I Millennium B.C.* (EOTHEN 16), Firenze, 63-85.
- Dinçol, A., Dinçol, B., Hawkins, D. & Wilhelm, G. 1993, "The 'Cruciform Seal' from Boğazköy-Hattusa", *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 87-106.
- Freu, J. & Mazoyer, M. 2007, *Le débuts du Nouvel Empire hittite*, Paris.
- Haas, V. 1984, *Die Serien itkaḫi und itkalzi des AZU-Priesters, Rituale für Tašmišarri und Tatuḫepa sowie weitere Texte mit Bezug auf Tašmišarri* (ChS I/1), Roma.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S. 2002, "Zur Erwähnung Šaḫurunuwās im 'Tawagalawa-Brief'", in S. de Martino & F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Anatolia Antica*, Firenze 359-375.
- Van den Hout, Th. 2007, "Some observations on the tablet collection from Maṣat Höyük", *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49, 387-398.

⁴⁹ See Klengel 1999, 287.

⁵⁰ Miller 2004, 9, writes that Tuthaliya TUR might have been king even if for a short time; for a completely different reconstruction of the history of this period see Soysal 2003, 48-54.

⁵¹ For Tuthaliya's death see Klengel 1999, 147.

- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. 1995-1996, "The Genealogy of Mursilis II", *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap „Ex Oriente Lux“ (JEOL)* 34, 51-72.
- Imparati, F. 2003, "Significato politico dell'investitura sacerdotale nel regno di Ḫatti e in alcuni paesi vicino-orientali ad essi soggetti", in *Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues*, Wiesbaden, 231-242.
- Klengel, H. 1999, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, Leiden – Brill – Köln.
- Klinger, J. 1995, "Das Corpus der Maṣat-Briefe und seine Beziehungen zu den Texten aus Ḫattuša", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 85, 74-108.
- Klinger, J. 1998, "Zur Historizität einiger hethitischer Omina", *Altorientalischen Forschungen* 25, 104-111.
- Lebrun, R. 1980, *Hymnes et Prières Hittites*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Marizza, M. 2007, *Dignitari ittiti del tempo di Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, Tuthaliya III* (EOTHEN 15), Firenze.
- de Martino, S. 2005, "Hittite Letters from the Time of Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tuthaliya III, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 32, 291-321.
- Miller, J. 2004, *Studies on the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* (StBoT 46), Wiesbaden.
- Neu, E. 1983, "Überlieferung und Datierung der Kaškäer-Verträge", in R. Boehmer & H. Hauptmann (eds.), *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens*, Mainz am Rhein, 391-399.
- Otten, H. 1995, *Die hethitischen Königssiegel der frühen Grossreichszeit, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Jahrgang 1995*, Nr. 7.
- Singer, I. 2002a, *Hittite Prayers*, Atlanta.
- Singer, I. 2002b, "Kantuzili the Priest and the Birth of Hittite Personal Prayer", in P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica*, Warsaw, 301-313.
- Soysal, O. 2003, "Kantuzili in Siegelinschriften, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 60, 41-54.
- Trémouille, M. C. 2006, "Nouvelles attestations de la reine hittite Šatanduheba", *NABU*, 26-27 (n. 26).