

## Duane Smith's Translation Notes: Taanach Letters

June 20, 2007

What follows are my translation notes and a few odd comments on the Taanach letters.

### **Please do not cite these incomplete working notes:**

According to Rainey, II 31, TT 5 and 6 are "almost identical" to the Amarna letters from Megiddo in ductus. TT 1 and 2 are a mixture of Old Babylonian and some Canaanite elements. "Their ductus is similar to" EA 63 and 64 both from Abdi-Aširta, Amurru. "Therefore, we have in the Taanach epistles our earliest testimony for the use of the system of verbal morphosyntax discovered in the Amarna letters from Canaan." I agree with Rainey's observations with regard to ductus but think TT 6 is also from Megiddo. Note Taanach is 7.7 km (4.8 miles) south by southwest of Megiddo, the nearest significant town in any direction.

### **Taanach 1: A letter from Ehli-Tešub to Talwashur**

#### **TT 1:1-3**

(obverse)

ṛa-na <sup>1</sup> m <sup>1</sup> tal-wa-šur	To Talwashur
qí-bí-ma	say.
um-ma m <sup>1</sup> eh-li-d <sup>1</sup> IM	Thus says Ehli-Tešub:

Both names are Hurrian or have Hurrian elements. I follow Horowitz and Oshima, 130, in my rendering of the names.

#### **TT 1:4**

bu-lu-uṭ dam-qi-ṛiṣ<sup>1</sup>                      Live well.

I rather like Horowitz and Oshima, 130, translation which I follow. Rainey notes the imperative form bu-lu-uṭ, "live," follows the standard Akkadian *qutul* form for a G stem strong verb. In TT 2:13 we see the standard Akkadian imperative *qitil* form, pí-qí-id, "command!".

#### **TT 1:5-7**

DINGER.ṛMEŠ <sup>1</sup> li-iš-a-lu	May the gods have concern for
ṛšu <sup>1</sup> -lum-ka šu-lum	your wellbeing (and) the wellbeing
É-ka DUMU.MEŠ-ka	of your house (and) your children (lit. sons).



in line 8. Rainey, III 92, notes the use of *in ki* TT 1:11 as a conjunction in what amounts to an oath. He translates the clause "(god forbid) that I should not do so!" He notes the use of the conjunction repeated several times in EA 254:38-46.

### TT 1:12-14

ša-ni-tam ṛa-na miṛ-n[im]	Furthermore, wh[y]
laṛ-aṛ tu-wa-š[a-ru-ni]	don't you send me (something about)
(reverse)	
šu-lum-ka a-na i[a-šu]	your wellbeing to m[e]?

Rainey, II 165 and 238, notes, with reference to this passage as the earliest example, the frequent use of the energetic in questions. Perhaps the redundancy, "send me"/"to me," is for emphasis. Whatever the origin of this form, it does not appear to be standard Akkadian. So we may be dealing with a Canaanite usage in the line. Rainey suggests that it may survive in Hebrew and Aramaic energetic forms. While some care is required one might also look at the Ugaritic energetic forms, *yqtn*. But the Ugaritic seems to prefer the *Gt* stem.

### TT 1:15-18

ù a-wa-tam m[i]-i[m-ma]	And anything (lit. what[ever] word)
ša ti-iš-mé	that you heard
iš-tu aš-ra-nu-um	from there,
šu-up-ra-am it-<ti>-i[a]	write to me (about it).

Rainey, I 102, points out that a determined clause, in this case the one beginning with *ša*, can be an object. II 39 highlights the correct Babylonian form of *ti-iš-mé*. In II 267 the imperative, *šu-up-ra-am*, is noted as a departure from the normal Akkadian imperative form. Horowitz and Oshima, 131, and Rainer, III 38, restored *it* in *it-<ti>-i[a]*, but the "defective spelling may be a Canaanitism. Note Hebrew and Phoenician *'t*. See Rainey, III 37-38 and EA 114:47; 85:31; 209:15, 283:14 and 130:24 where it is also spelled "defectively."

### TT 1:19-23

ša-ni-tam ù šum-ma	Furthermore, and if
i-ba-ši ú-ba-an	there is (only) a small amount (lit. finger)
<sup>giš</sup> za-ar-ni-nu	of ??? wood
ù mu-ur-ru	or myrrh
ù id-na-am	then give (it) to me.

*ubanu* may mean 1/30 of a cubit but here it almost certainly means "a tiny amount" or "any amount at all." Although not noted by Rainey, III 98-108, the *ù* in line 22 functions much like the conjunctive *w* in Hebrew and Phoenician. As Rainey, III 102, points out in the general case, the usage of the *ù* in line 23 "is quite at home in the WS dialects, it must

be noted that the use of *u* to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence was already in vogue in normative Akkadian dialects." Na'aman, 177, suggested that *zārninu* may be a Hurrian term. Why is *zārninu* and *murru* not in the genitive following *ubān*? On the ventive *a(m)* with an imperative see Rainey, II 205 where he discusses *uššira*.

### TT 1:24-30

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>25) à a-wa-tam ti-ra-ni<br/> aš-šum SAL.TUR <sup>f</sup>Ka-x-x-<br/> <sup>r</sup>ša<sup>1</sup> i-na <sup>URU</sup>ru-bu-<sup>r</sup>tī<sup>[kī]</sup><br/> [a]-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup> ša-al-mi-ša<br/> (left edge)<br/> ù šum-ma i-ra-bi<br/> [<sup>l</sup>]i-id-di[n]-ši a-na KÚ.BABBAR ip-<sup>r</sup>tī<sup>1</sup>-ri</p> <p>30) ù lu-ú a-[n]a be-lim</p> | <p>Also, send me word (lit. return word to me)<br/> about the young woman, Ka???<br/> who is in Rubbuti<br/> regarding her wellbeing.</p> <p>And when she grows up,<br/> let him giv[e] her in exchange for ransom<br/> payment<br/> and even (by so doing, give her) to a husband.</p> |
|---|---|

But Horowitz and Oshima, 131, transcribe it SAL.TUR and rendered "young woman/junior servant, Ka . . ." Rainey, *Bridge*, 75, also translates this expression "servant Girl. They both take the feminine name starting with Ka(n) to be the name of the young girl. My first temptation was to read GEME.DUMU rather than SAL.TUR and take the Akkadian to have been <sup>f</sup>marat Ka-x-x, "daughter of Ka-x-x." However, this can not be the case. According to CAD, PBS 2/2 89.3 and several other places reads SAL.TUR PN DUMU.SAL.A.NI. PN means personal name. A now agree with Horowitz and Oshima in reading SAL.TUR and take it to represent Akkadian *batultu* meaning unmarried "adolescent girl. So on *irabi* in line 28, although masculine in form, it seems to me to refer to the girl (but see Rainey, *Bridge*, 75, below) and likely reflects Babylonian usage as seen in the Mitanni letters rather than what is often seen where there is West Semitic interference. See Rainey, II 37-38, for a discussion of the 3rd feminine singular forms. Contrary to what is seen elsewhere in this letter, this form either predates the usage of a *t* prefix from the 3rd feminine singular as seen in most of the Amarna letters from Canaan or that form (t-) was not taken up by this scribe at Taanach. Rainey, *Bridge*, 75, translates line 28-30, "and whether he is willing to sell her for redemption money or to a husband." Rainey appears to take *irabi* to be masculine meaning "to be willing" but the base *rabû*, "to grow," very often means "grown up" and I cannot find an example of it meaning, "to be willing." Rainey, *Bridge*, 75, speculates that the girl may have been borne a child of Ehli-Tešub. I think it more likely that the girl is someone else's child who had attracted Ehli-Tešub's interest on some other occasion. In my view, Ehli-Tešub wishes to marry the young woman and is willing to pay a "ransom" for the privilege. But he's being a little coy about it, just a feeler at this point.

## Taanack 2: A letter from Ahiami to Talwashur

### TT 2:1

(obverse)

ṛa-na<sup>1</sup> ṁtal-wa-šur [q]i-bi

To Talwashur say.

### TT 2:2-4

um-ma ṁŠEŠ-ia-mi EN DINGER.MEŠ-nu  
ZI-ka lí-iš-šur ŠEŠ at-ta  
ù na-ra-mu i-na aš-ri šu-wa-at

Thus says Ahiami: May the Ba'al, the god,  
watch over your life. You are a brother  
and a loved one in this very place.

EN DINGER.MEŠ-nu likely should be read *ba 'al ilānu* as suggested by Horowitz and Oshima, 134. They note the singular *liššur* and compare this usage with Hazor tablet 10:20-22 where the singular *ip-ta-ra-{erasure}-aš-ni* is used with DINGER.MEŠ. Nonetheless, they, 81, translate DINGER.MEŠ in the Hazor tablet "gods." But the verb is plural in TT 1:5-6. Rainey, I, 147, reflecting on TT 2:2-3; EA 96:5-6 (Byblos) and EA 189:r. 13-15 (Qadesh) says, ". . . there are also passages where the verb is in the 3rd m.s. and the impression is that the plural of the substantive was conceived as a kind of abstract." Rainey, II, 214 points out that the verb *liššur* comes at the end of the clause in keeping more with Akkadian than West Semitic practices. Rainey, *Bridge*, 76 translates lines 2b-3a, "May Ba'lu the deity preserve your life." I have written in some detail on this in my blog post "[May Ba'al, Even the God Himself, Watch Over Your Life!](#)" Rainey, I 98, 147, notes the locative use of the pronoun *šuwāt*. I rely on Rainey, *Bridge*, 76 for the rendering "this very." At first reading, one might render it "that" but then it would not have a referent. Rendering it "this" provides the place or origin of the letter, presumably Rehov, as the referent. Does it refer forward to the *É raqi* of line 6? But, as he points out this is also a rather common formula. ŠEŠ is to be read *aḫi* in line 2 and *aḫu* in line 3. ZI likely is to be read *napšat*.

### TT 2: 5-12

5) ù i-na ŠÀ-bi-ka i-nu-ma  
ar-ba-ku i-na É ra-qi

ù id-na-an-ni ú-ba-an

2 <sup>gis</sup>ma-ga-ri-ma ù GIŠ.PAN

ù 2 <sup>tug</sup>up-pa-aš-ia-ma ù

10) šum-ma ga-am-ra-at GIŠ.PAN

i-pé-ša-am ù uš-ši-ra-aš-ši

i-na ŠU<sup>m</sup>pu-ur-da-ya

Now, you know (lit. it is in your heart) that

I have entered into an empty house,

so give me a small token (lit. finger):

2 (chariot?) wheels and a bow

and 2 ????. Now,

if the bow is finished

being made, then send it to me

with (lit. in the hand of) Purdaya.

I read ŠÀ-bi-ka *libbika*. Rainey, II 283, indicates that the form *arbaku* is what one would expect for an Akkadian 1st common singular G-stem in the suffix conjunction (stative). I read GIŠ.PAN <sup>gis</sup>*qašta* or perhaps just *qašta*. Note the Ugaritic administrative text where pairs of wheel are allocated to various persons (KTU 4:88). <sup>tug</sup>*up-pa-aš-ia-ma* is

likely some leather component of a chariot, perhaps from the Hurrian *abšānu*. See Horowitz and Oshima, 134, n. 18, AHw, 1424, Black, et al, 424 and Na'aman, 177. One might also note Sumerian *absanu*, "rope." Rainey, I 24, 37; II 376, claims that the *i* in *i-pé-ša-am* is the earliest documented example of the *i* where one might expect an *e*. He attributes this to possible contamination. Rainey, II 278-279, notes the West Semitic like syntax of using an imperative, *uššira*, as the apodosis of a conditional sentence. He claims that this example is the earliest one documented. See also Rainey, I 80-81, where he notes the dative 3rd f.s. suffix with an imperative. He sees this as an Akkadian as opposed to a West Semitic phenomenon. Canaanite scribes used *še* in EA 161:40 and EA 117:64. Rainey, II 272, also note the suffix *ašši* with the ventive in line 11.

## TT 2: 13-16

ša-ni-tam pí-qí-id a-na URU.DIDLI.ĜÁ-ka ù lu-ú ti-pu-šu ip-ša-šu-nu (Reverse) UGU SAG.DU-ia ma-am-ma-an	In addition, command your villages that they do their work.  I am responsible for (lit. on my head is) everything
ša it-tab-šu a-na URU.DIDLI.ĜÁ	that is produced in the villages.

Rainey, II 267, notes the *qitil* imperative *piqid*. Read URU.DIDLI.ĜÁ-ka, with the collective determinative rather than the plural, *ālānuka* or the like. One might translate it "your towns" as did Horowitz and Oshima, 133, but, for reasons I cannot quite justify, I thought a somewhat smaller scale is called for. Rainey, I 24, 37-38; II 376, also notes the *i* in *ipšašunu* (see line 11 above). He also calls our attention to the *-šunu* suffix in standard Akkadian form as opposed to the likely West Semitic *-ā/ēmô* in EA 287:14-16 from Jerusalem. My translation is nearly identical to Rainey, III 54, on which it, in part, relies. Horowitz and Oshima, 133, translate these two lines, "On my head is everything which took place in the cities." Which they, 134, explain as meaning, "I am responsible for everything that took place in regard to the cities." However, I, like Rainey, Bridge, 6 take the infinitive Ntn stem of *bašû* as having a more durative quality and as referring to what is made in those towns. Read *eli* for UGU. Rainey, III 28, considers the use of this preposition to mean "incumbent upon" as a possible example, when all examples are taken into account, of West Semitic intrusion (see Rainey III 25ff. and 54). Read *rêš* for SAG.DU. Horowitz and Oshima, 133, render lines 15 and 16, "On my head is everything which took place in regard to the cities." Rainey, II 333, notes the use on Ntn preterite in line 16 as a rare (singular) use N stem of *bašû* in Akkadian from Canaan (Note, Rainey incorrectly references TT 2:26 rather than TT 2:16 here).

## TT 2:17-18 II 275; III 169

ṛi-na-an-na a-mur-ni i-nu-ma i-pu-šu DÛG.GA it-ti-ka	Now, behold me, I will do a good thing for you.
---	--

Rainey, II 275, calls this use of the imperative of *amāru* a "presentation partial." He notes a similar use of Egyptian *ptr* in the Egyptian version of the treaty between

Ramesses II and Hattusili. Of the usage he says, "It would appear that this is a claque within the sphere of Egyptian control over the Canaanite population." One most frequently sees the usage in the Amarna letters from Egypt and Canaan. See also Rainey, III, 169. DÜG.GA is should be read *tâbta*.

### TT 2:19-20

ša-ni-tam šum-ma ʾGI.GAGʾ.Ú.TAG.GA URUDU.ĤÁ In addition, if there are (any)  
copper arrows,  
i-ba-aš-šu ù lu-ú tu-da-na-wa then let them be given (to me).

Read GI.GAG.Ú.TAG.GA URUDU.ĤÁ, <sup>gi</sup>*šiltāhū* (*mulmullū* or *ūšū* are also possible) *erū*<sup>ĤÁ</sup>, "arrows of copper." Horowitz and Oshima, 133, saw "GI.GAGʾ.Ú.TAG.GA URUDU.ĤÁ," but I had did not think that even the GI was completely clear from their autograph (p. 218). Rainey, II 76, reads "GI.GAGʾ.[NI].Ú.TAG.GA URUDU.ĤÁ." However, not only is there no room for the NI, as Rainey's brackets indicate but it is not necessary. Rainey, II 76, points to this sentence as the "earliest attestation of the use of the G passive" as a reflection of West Semitic practice. There does not appear to be a "true Akkadian" G-passive. See also Rainey, II 45 on the prefix *tu-*. Rainey, II 180, notes the use of *lū* with this same verb in a letter from Kâmid el-Lôz (KL 72-600:19-20).

### TT 2:21-24

ša-ni-tam li-ru-ba-am ʾDINGER-ra-pí-i In addition, allow Ilu-rapî to enter  
a-na <sup>URU</sup>ra-ĥa-bi ù lu-ú into Rahābu and I will certainly  
i-wa-šū-ra LÚ-ia a-na maḥ-ri-ka send my man to you.  
ù lu-ú i-pu-šū ĥa-at-nu-tam And I will certainly arrange a marriage.

Rainey, II 157, lists line 23 among the examples of *wuššuru* without "orthographic gemination." With regard t line 24, Rainey, III 194, says, "It would seem that we have here a strong promise rather than a mere cohortative." I take the last line to be independent of lines 21-23. Lines 21-23 indicate a desire for Ilu-rapî to come to Rahābu in exchange of Ahiami's man. The promise of an arrangement of marriage is not necessarily contingent on that exchange.

### Taanack 5: A letter from Amanhatpa to Talwashur

#### TT 5:1-3

(obverse)  
a-na tal-wa-šur To Talwašur  
um-ma a-ma-an-ĥa-at-pa thus says Amanhatpa

𐎠IM ZI-ta-ka li-iš-šur

May Ba'al guard your life.

Line 3 has <sup>d</sup>IM rather than EN as we saw in TT 2:2. IM is the ideogram for the storm god and as Horowitz and Oshima, 140, say, it "was most likely realised [sic] as Ba'al at this time and place." ZI is followed by both a phonetic determinative and a pronoun in this text while it has only the pronoun in TT 2:2. Read ZI-ta-ka *napištaka*. TT 6:1-3, as restored, reads exactly like TT 5:1-3. Rainey, II 214, notes that the verb comes at the end of line 3. This is in keeping with the normal Akkadian practice.

### TT 5:4-12

uš-še-ra-am-mi 𐎠ŠEŠ.𐎠MEŠ-ka	Send me your brothers
5) qa-du GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-šu-[nu]	together with the[ir] chariots.
ù uš-š-ra-am-mi	And send to me
ANŠE.KUR.RA GUN-ka	the horse(s), your (usual) tribute
ù IGI.DU <sub>8</sub> -HÁ	and an audience gift,
ù ka-li	and all
10) 𐎠LÚ.MEŠ a <sup>ṽ</sup> si <sub>17</sub> -ri	the prisoners
(reverse)	
ša i-ba-aš-ša-ú <sup>ṽ</sup>	who are now
it-ti-ka	with you.

Rainey, I 143, suggests that the i in a<sup>ṽ</sup>si<sub>17</sub>/ši-ri is an example of the "Akkadian oblique suffix." He takes the word to be *asirī* or *aširī* and here understands it to mean "captive" or "troop." But in *Bridge*, 76, he translates it "*aširu* men." Horowitz and Oshima, 140, translate it "captives" reading the sign as ši rather than ši. Of course, they are both the IGI sign. si<sub>17</sub> is uncommon in texts of this general period while ši is fairly common. However, as Huehnergard, 449, points out, one must read si<sub>17</sub> in a few cases of the Akkadian Ugarit. See EA 173:13; 268:19; 287:54; 288:21. Moran translates three of these occurrences "prisoners" clearly reading *asiru*. In EA 268:19 simple transliterates only grammatical plural among the four examples, *aširūma*, this time reading ši. The other three cases must be understood as plurals also because they are in every case preceded by numbers. It is not clear to me that "prisoners" is not the only possible fit for the four Amarna examples and something like "troops" would work as well. However, in our context, I think "prisoners" is the best choice. While the larger context of the letter might argue for military personnel, it is unlikely that thus says Amanhatpa would have asked Talwašur to deplete himself of all of some type of soldier ("Send . . . all the *asirī* or *aširī* who are now with you."

### TT 5:13-15

uš-še-ra-šu ʾnuʾ	Send them (all) to me
u <sub>4</sub> -mi ma-ḥa-ri	tomorrow
a-na <sup>URU</sup> ma-gi-id-/da	to Megiddo.

Māḥāri is Canaanite word for "tomorrow." Together *ûmi māḥāri* may mean something like "ASAP." See Hebrew expression מחר מ׳ with meaning "tomorrow" or simple the word מחר. Given the West Semitic word for tomorrow, should one read u<sub>4</sub>-mi as U<sub>4</sub><sup>mi</sup> and take it as *yōmi* instead of *umi*? The -i endings in both *ûmi* and *maḥari* is likely adverbial rather than genitive. See Rainey, III, 8.

### Taanack 6: A letter from Amanhatpa to Talwashur

#### TT 6:1-3

(Obverse)

[a-na ta]l-wa-šur	[To Ta]lwašur
[um-ma a]-ma-an-ḥa-at-pa	[thus says A]manhatpa,
[ <sup>d</sup> IM] ZI-ta-ka li-[iṣ-šur]	[May Ba'al gu]ard your life.

These are lines are restored from TT 4:1-3 and were with little doubt identical to them.

#### TT 6:4-11

[pa-n]a-nu-um ba-az-ú-nu	[Prev]iously, you were sending Bāzunu
5) ʾDUMUʾ na-ar-sí tu-wa-še-ru	son of Narsi
a-na ia-a-ši ša-ni-tam la-a-mi	to me. In addition,
ʾi <sup>1</sup> -na ma-an-ša-ar-ti i <sup>1</sup> -ba-šu <sup>1</sup>	your elite troops (?) are no longer (lit. "not") in
ḥa <sup>1</sup> -na-ku-u-ka ù la-a-mi	the garrison and
ti-il <sub>5</sub> -la-ku en-na at-t[a]	you yourse[f] do not come
10) a-na maḥ-ri-ai ù šum-ma-mi	to me nor do you
tu-wa-še-ru-na ŠEŠ-ka	send your brother here.

Rainey, II 163, notes use of *waššuru* in the imperfect in line 5 to indicate repeated action as an indication of West Semitic usage. See also Rainey, II 40. On page 158 Rainey (II) notes the thematic *i* in this verb and on page 243 he speculates that the verb may be energetic if a final -na is restored. Both the right edge and the right side of the tablet are clearly visible in Horowitz and Oshima, 237, photographs. I see no reason to restore Rainey's suggestion. Rainey, I 54, calls our attention to the use of *ana yāši* as indicating the simple dative, a common proactive in Amarna letters from Canaan. See my discussion of ḥa<sup>1</sup>-na-ku-u-ka a possible Egyptian loanword at [Abnormal Interests](#). Note also the enclitic *m* in *lāmi* in lines 6 and 13 and in *šummami* in line 10. On this see

Rainey, III 244. It also appears in several Amarna letters. With regard to ma-an-ša-ar-ti in line 7, Rainey, I 40, notes the nasalization of *maššartu*. Rainey, III 186, following the lead of Gordon and Albright, notes the unique negative disjunction use of *lā . . u šummami* which he compares to אֵל . . . אֵל in Proverbs 27:24. Rainey, II 40, correctly asserts that the *ti-* prefix in *ti-il<sub>5</sub>-la-ku* "violate(s) the Akkadian paradigm" in the second person in lines 9 and 14. One would expect a *ta-* prefix in standard Akkadian. Is it possible that one should read -un for the EN sign in en-na (line 9) with Rainey II 235, suggests or is it more likely that it's very existence is an error and it should be omitted? Compare *ti-il<sub>5</sub>-la-ku-na* in line 14. See Rainey, II 158. In either case, one should understand the verb as a West Semitic energetic form. I think the probability that one should understand *enna* as an early example of the neo-Babylonian word for "now" very low.

### TT 6:12-14

ša-ni-tam i-na <sup>URU</sup> ḥa-za-t[i]	In addition, (when) I was in Gaza
i-ba-ša-ti ù la-a-mi	you did not
ti-il <sub>5</sub> -la-ku-na a-na na[ḥ-ri]-ia	come to me.

There is a clear West Semitic like energetic in line 14 (Rainey, II 142). See my comments on line 9 with regard to the *ti* prefix. My translation tends to follow Horowitz and Oshima, 143. Exactly how one understands these line affects how one understands the relationship between letter TT 5 and TT 6 and how one understands this small window of visibility into the history of Taanach and Megiddo and Egyptian activity in 15th century BCE Canaan. It also affects how one sees the origin of this letter. Following Rainey, 1977, 64, I take the verb in line 13, (from *bašû*) to be West Semitic stative, in this case, but against Rainey, a past completed action, a stative imperfect. The form of the suffix follows the Assyrian paradigm. Rainey, 1977, 64, translates, "Furthermore, I am (was) in Gaza and you do not come to me." But by 2005, 76, he translates, "Furthermore, I am in Gaza and you do not come before me" dropping the parenthetical "was" completely. A very similar form of the same verb may appear in line 17 but the context is too broken to be certain as to meaning. The common ductus of TT 6 and TT 5 would favor the same scribe or scribal tradition. Their ductus is also similar to the ductus of Amarna letters from Megiddo. It is hard to believe that Amanhatpa would have a scribe from Megiddo come down to Gaza to work for him. Rather, I think it is more likely that both letters were written from Megiddo.

### TT 6:15-16

(reverse)

15 a-nu-[m]a a-ṛna <sup>1</sup> -[x x x -n]a	Now I [ am going forth]
a-na nu-kur-t[i] . . .	to war [ . . . ]

[i]-ba-ša-ṛtaṛ [ x x x x -k]a	you are [ . . . of yo]urs.
[š]a-ni-tam ṛŠEŠṛ.M[EŠ x x LÚ]. MEŠ	In addition, [your brothers [
[š]e?-eḥ-ru-t[i x x x ]-mi	[your y]oung men
20 [ x w]a-ṛšeṛ-ru-u[š x x x x m]aḥ-ri-ṛiaṛ	send [them t]o me.
[ . . . -k]a	[ . . . of ] yours
[x x] maḥ-ṛri-ṛia u[š- x x x x]	s[end them to] me.
[x x u]m-ma LÚ. MEŠ ḥu-ub-t[e]	Now, in regard to the captives (lit. booty)
[š]a ap-ta-aṭ-ru	that I have ransomed,
25 [ x š]e-ra-šu-nu ṛŠEŠ.MEŠṛ-ka ù	[se]nd them. As you your brothers
[ x x ] ? ? -šu-nu [ . . . . .	[ . . . ] their [ . . . ]
[ x x x š]a-ni-tam ? [ . . .	[ . . . In] addition [ . . . ]
[ x x x ] a-na m[aḥ x x x x ]	[send] to m[e]
[ x x x ḥ]a-ri ù ? [ . . .	[tomo]rrow and [ . . .

Reasonably enough, Horowitz and Oshima, 143, restore all of lines 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, and 28. I think there restorations are in every case well founded. But as they correctly say (141) "our restorations are not as bold as those of Rainey 1999." In addition to the lines restored by Horowitz and Oshima, Rainey, 159\*, restores all of lines 16, 17, 21!, 26!, 27!, and 29. He reads and restores a line 30 of which only traces of signs can be seen on the left edge. It's not that Rainey doesn't have some support for these restorations. He does. And some seem more secure to me than others but none of his unique restorations seem completely convincing and a couple seem well beyond any evidence.

### References:

- Albright, William F., "A Prince of Taanach in the Fifteenth Century," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 94, 1944, 12-27
- Horowitz, Wayne and Takayoshi Oshima, *Cuneiform in Canaan, Cuneiform Sources from the Land of Israel in Ancient Times*, Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2006, 127-151
- Na'aman, Nadav. "The Hurrains and the End of the Middle Bronze Age in Palestine," *Levant*, 26, 1994, 175-187
- Rainey, Anson, F., *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets, A linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by the Scribes from Canaan*, Leiden: Brill, 1996
- Rainey, Anson, F., "Taanach Letters," *Eretz-Israel*, 26, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1999, 153\*-162\*

Rainey, Anson, F., "Verbal Usages in the Taanach Texts," *Israel Oriental Studies*, VII,  
Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, 1977, 33-64

Rainey, Anson F and R. Steven Notley, *The Sacred Bridge: Carta's Atlas of the Biblical  
World*, Jerusalem: Carta, 2005, 75-76