

ON §§56, 162, AND 171 OF THE HITTITE LAWS

H. Craig Melchert
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Of all the Hittite cuneiform documents from Boghazköy, perhaps none is of greater significance than the series of provisions known as the Hittite Laws.¹ Their composition dates back to the Old Hittite period, and a large portion of the text has been preserved in both Old Hittite manuscripts and later recensions.² The Laws are therefore of primary importance both in determining the linguistic features of Old Hittite and in tracing the subsequent development of the language within the historical period. That the Laws also play a major role in the study of Hittite culture and society is self-evident. However, the very fact that the text is practically unique, in terms of both language and content, also makes it one of the most difficult Hittite documents to interpret. The sense of many passages remains obscure, and the elucidation of the Laws is an on-going process. The following remarks are intended as one small contribution to this continuing effort.

The original text of §56 of the Laws may be established as follows, on the basis of the Old Hittite ms. KBo 22 62+6 2 iii 21-22 (restorations after the Neo-Hittite duplicate KBo 6 6 i 30-32):

eki BÂD-ni LUGAL-aš KASKAL-š-a *takšuanzi*
GIŠ.SAR.GEŠTIN-aš *tuhhušuanzi* [(ŠALÚ.URUD)]JU.NAGAR/
natta kuiški arawaš LÚ.MEŠ.NU.GIŠ.SAR *hūmanti-ya-pat luzzi*
[(*karp*)]ianzi

The key to understanding this paragraph is the recently published fragment KBo 22 62, which shows that in the original text the first sentence began with the word *eki*. The Middle Hittite copy KBo 6 3 iii 24 replaces *eki* with ANA (redundantly marking BÂD-ni as dative-locative), while KBo 6 6 i 30 omits *eki* entirely. It is apparent that the later copyists did not understand the function of *eki*, and Starke (StBoT 23 [1977] 58-59) likewise finds the form problematic. But *eki* is the perfectly regular dative-locative singular of *ega*- "ice" (on the latter, see Hoffner, JCS 24 [1971] 31-36).

1. On the status of this traditional designation, see J. Friedrich, Die hethitischen Gesetze (1959) 1, and F. Imparati, Le leggi ittite (1964) 3ff., with references. The latter work also contains a lengthy bibliography of studies of the Laws up to 1964.

2. On the establishment of the Old Hittite manuscripts of the Laws, see Güterbock, JCS 16 (1962) 17ff., and Kammenhuber, BiOr 18 (1961) 77ff. A complete study of the relative chronology of the remaining manuscripts based on the "ductus" remains to be done. The terms Old, Middle, and Neo-Hittite are used here as express equivalents of the German Alt-, Mittel-, and Jung-hethitisch as defined by Neu, StBoT 21 (1975) vii, and by others.

Furthermore, the word makes good sense in the context, if the rest of the syntax is properly understood.

The phrases with the infinitives *takšuanzi* and *tuh(hu)šuanzi* represent the Hittite continuant of the Indo-European "double dative" construction (cf. the Vedic type *drśāye sūryāya* "to see the sun"). This construction is well documented in Hittite: see KUB 39 71 i 24-25, *n-aš šeḥḫill[i]yaš wetenaš hanuwanzi paizzi*, "He goes to draw the waters of purification"; KUB 12 26 ii 8-9, *nu-war-an ANADUMU.LÚ.ULÛ.LU aniyawanzi ḥarkir*, "They held/kept it for treating mankind"; see also KUB 134 iv 13, 19 10 i 10-11, 21 17 iii 9-10, and 12 62 passim. Thus just as *GIŠ.SAR.GEŠTIN-aš tuhḫušuanzi* means "to cut vineyards," so *eki*, *BĀD-ni*, and *LUGAL-aš KASKAL-š-a* (that is, *ḥaššuwaš palšaš-a*) are all datives construed with *takšuanzi*, "to make ice, fortifications, and the king's roads."

If *eki*, *BĀD-ni*, and *LUGAL-aš KASKAL-š-a* are three coordinated datives as claimed, the position of the enclitic *-a*, "and," appears to be irregular. One would expect *eki BĀD-ni LUGAL-ašš-a KASKAL-aš* . . . However, *ḥaššuwaš palša-* was surely a fixed expression (in effect, camino real, "royal road"), and there is evidence that enclitic *-a*, "and," could follow an entire syntagm instead of its first member. Compare KBo 16 25 obv. 10-11: *ANA EN SISKUR.S[ISKUR E]GIR-pa TI-tar . . . [IG].I.ḪI.A-wa<š> uš[kiw]ar GÛ-tar šarā appātarr-a piški*. Carruba (StBoT 2 [1966] 3) translates *GÛ-tar* as "Muskelfkraft," and *šarā appātar* as "Aufstehen." But *šarā ēp-* does not mean "stand up," but rather is to be translated as "hold/pick up": see KBo 6 29 ii 10, 15 33 ii 33, KUB 23 127+21 12 iii 7, and 29 7 r. 52.³

GÛ-tar šarā appātar is a constituent, the nominalization of the verb-object phrase *GÛ šarā ēp-* attested in KBo 4 14 iii 38-39: *zik-ma-za [LUGAL]-i karšiš-IR-iš ēš GÛ UGU lē ēpti*, "But may you be a mere slave to the king. Do not be stiff-necked" (lit.: "do not hold up your neck/shoulders").⁴ In the latter instance, the phrase has a negative connotation "stiffen the neck" > "rebel, revolt." In the former passage, the phrase implies steadfastness (compare the colloquial English "backbone" = "resolve, courage"). The relevant point for us is that *GÛ-tar šarā appātar* is a constituent conjoined with the preceding nouns by enclitic *-a*, which

3. Nor does the passage KUB 24 5+ obv. 25ff., cited by Carruba, StBoT 2 (1966) 19, establish the meaning "stand up" for *(-za) šarā appatar*. In its first two occurrences (obv. 5 and 26), *-za UGU appatar DÛ-zi* follows a list of metals. In the second instance, after the king performs the action, he goes to wash. In the third occurrence (obv. 28), after the king performs the action of *UGU appatar*, he then "performs the house-ritual, the pure ritual." The context strongly suggests that the understood object of this elliptical expression is the materials of the sacrifice. Here as elsewhere *šarā ēp-* refers to the solemn "holding up" of sacrificial objects. Compare especially KUB 29 74. 52: *EGIR-ŠU-ma EN-LUM KUBABBAR ŠA 3 GIN šarā ēpzi*, "Next the master (of the sacrifice) holds up silver weighing three shekels."

4. *GÛ-tar (kuttar)* probably referred to the nape of the neck and the upper shoulder, as opposed to *paltana-*, which designated the area of the shoulder-blade.

follows the entire phrase: "Give back to the master of the sacrifice life . . . the power of sight and holding up of the shoulders (that is, resolve)."⁵ Similarly, then, the enclitic *-a*, "and," attaches itself to the constituent *ḥaššuwaš palšaš* in our passage from the Laws. The original version of §56 thus reads: "None of the metalsmiths is exempt from making ice, fortifications, and the king's roads (or) from cutting vineyards. The gardeners also perform corvée in every (respect)."

Since we know that the Hittites kept ice in icehouses (see Hoffner, JCS 24 [1971] 35), it did have to be "made" in that it had to be cut into manageable blocks and stored. The verb *takš-* here has its usual concrete meaning of "make, construct." In the later versions, where *eki* was no longer understood, *KASKAL (palša-)* was taken in its derived sense of "campaign, trip," and *BĀD-ni* was then reinterpreted as the goal of the action. We thus arrive at: "undertake/carry out royal campaigns against a fortress" (note that KBo 6 6 i 30 actually substitutes *pāuwanzi*, "to go," for *takšuanzi*). Working from the later versions (without benefit of KBo 22 62 in the old manuscript), modern scholars have generally followed the interpretation of "going on a campaign," although sometimes with considerable doubts (see Imparati, Le leggi ittite 245). There was indeed cause for misgivings about an interpretation which assigned metalworkers the highly asymmetrical duties of going on a military campaign and harvesting vineyards. The restoration of the Old Hittite manuscript through KBo 22 62 now reveals that the original sense was quite different: the metalworkers were required to perform various craftsman's tasks which required cutting and thus the use of metal tools.

§162 of the Laws is available to us in various Neo-Hittite copies, of which only KBo 6 26 i 18-21 is complete:

*takku PA₅-an EGIR-an arḫa kuiški nāi 1 GIN KUBABBAR/ pāi
takku PA₅-an EGIR-izziaz kuiški/ <<šarā nāi>> (scil. šer dāi) ta
larputta (sic!) takku kattann-a/ dāi n-aš apēl-<pat>*

The variants *šer dāi* and *apel-pat* are taken from KBo 6 15:7-8. Note also KUB 29 31:11, *[EGIR-iz]ziyan* for *EGIR-izziaz*.

The interpretation of this passage depends on correctly understanding the function of the adverbs *EGIR-an*, *EGIR-izziaz/EGIR-izziyan*, *šer*, and *kattan*. As already seen by E. Neufeld (The Hittite Laws [1951] 178), the basic issue here is that of interference in someone else's irrigation system. The two crucial factors are secrecy and the distinction of upstream versus downstream. Neufeld translates the first sentence as "If anyone diverts a canal secretly, he shall pay one shekel of silver." There are two problems with this interpretation. First, it is impossible to divert a canal, that is,

5. For an accusative object with a verbal noun, compare KUB 2 1 ii 36-37, *NĪ.TE.ḪI.A-uš iškiyawaš LAMA-i*, "to the protective god of anointing the body/limbs." See also KUB 6 45 ii 34 and iv 47-48.

change its course, secretly, without its owner's knowledge. Second, EGIR-an (*appan*) is not an independent adverb, but must be taken with *arḥa* and *nāi*-, as shown by other occurrences of this combination.

Typically, the first of two adverbs construed with a verb indicates place where, while the second expresses motion: see, for example, KUB 43 23 r. 15ff., *nu šer katt[a] nēpišza* ⁴I[ŠKUR]-aš . . . *piški[ddu] katta-šarā-ma taknaz šuhmiliš taganzip[a]š* . . . *piškiddu*, "Down from heaven above may the Storm-god give . . . but up from the earth below may the nurturing (?) Earth give. . ." The adverbs *šer*, "above," and *katta(n)*, "below,"⁶ mark the starting point of the action, while *katta*, "down," and *šarā*, "up," indicate the direction of the action (compare English "out from under the table"). One would thus expect EGIR-an *arḥa nāi*- to mean "turn away from behind." This does not seem to fit our passage, where one immediately asks: from behind what?

Other instances of *appan arḥa nāi*- show that this combination came to mean simply "turn away" > "divert": compare KUB 7 53 iii 10-11, *idālu-šši papra<tar> EGIR-an arḥa halkiš nāu*, "May the grain turn the evil impurity away from him." The loss of meaning of *appan* in this phrase is due to the fact that *appan* came to mean not only "behind," but also more generally "at, by, with." This development is neatly illustrated by ABoT 65 r. 9-11: *ABU-KA-wa-mu-ššan EGIR-an-pat kittari EGIR-an-arḥa-war-aš-mu Ūlamma nēāri*, "Your father will continue to stand behind me. He will never again turn away from me."⁷

The sense of "stand behind" (lit.: "lie behind") here is clearly "to be on one's side, stand by," and hence *appan arḥa nāi*- is "turn away from" or, more precisely, "turn away from the position of being with/by someone." Thus *appan arḥa nāi* in reference to a canal means no more than "divert" (from its present course). For the act of diverting someone else's irrigation canal a penalty of one shekel of silver is imposed.

On the other hand, one may also obtain water from a canal without changing its course. One can simply steal water by breaching the side and running an additional ditch to one's own fields. In the circumstance where one man's canal runs past another's fields, the theft could be accomplished easily and secretly. The canal could be breached at night, the water taken, and the canal restored by morning. I therefore take the adverb EGIR-izziaz/EGIR-izziyan here to mean "secretly, stealthily" < "behind (one's back)."

Since we are now dealing with the theft (taking) of water, not diverting the canal, the proper verb is *dā*-, "take." Therefore one should adopt the reading of KBo 6 15:7, *šer dāi*, in place of the *šarā nāi* of KBo 6 26 i 20. The

6. In *kat-ta-ša-ra-a-ma* the final -n of *kattan* has been assimilated to the following s-, as often at a morpheme boundary; see Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* 1² (1960) §36.

7. The particle -pat here indicates the continuation of a given state or circumstance; see Hart, *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1971), 146.

choice of *šer dāi* is supported by the fact that it forms a natural pair with *kattan dāi*. In each case we find the locative adverb: *šer*, "above," and *kattan*, "below." We have two contrasting possibilities with different legal consequences: if someone takes water from an irrigation canal above the point at which the owner takes his water, this is obviously to the latter's detriment. On the other hand, if the water is taken below that point, it is of no concern to the owner, and the one who takes it may keep it.

In the former instance we expect the imposition of a penalty. What we find in KBo 6 26 i 20 is a hapax legomenon, *ta larputta*. Friedrich (*Die hethitischen Gesetze* 109) emends this to *t-at arputta*. The verb *arputta* would also be hapax, but it could be related to the family of *arpuwant*-, *arpa*-, *arpašai*-, and so on, which seems to have a basic meaning of "(be) difficult, unfavorable" (see Neu, *StBoT* 5 [1968] 15-16). The received interpretation of this passage has thus been: "it (the matter) becomes difficult." This interpretation is not unreasonable (theft in such circumstances might be difficult to prove), but hardly imposes itself. Moreover, Professor H. G. Güterbock has kindly brought to my attention the existence of an unpublished duplicate, 684/c ii 2, which he is publishing in *Welt des Orients*. It also reads *ta l[a-ar-pu-ut-ta]*, with a clear *la*-sign and preceding word boundary. This evidence raises considerably the odds against Friedrich's emendation, particularly since the form resulting from the emendation is hardly assured, a point conceded by Friedrich himself.

We should therefore begin with the manuscript form *ta larputta*, which appears to contain a present middle third singular of a verb stem *larpu*-. Grammatically, since the subject is not overtly marked, it may be either the thief or the irrigation canal. Contextually, we expect either imposition of a punishment or provision for restoring the breached canal. The complete isolation of the verb stem *larpu*- makes a choice between these two possibilities difficult. It should be pointed out that the phraseology of several Hittite legal punishments remains obscure to us: see KBo 6 26 iv 15 (Laws §198), *hurkin hali[e]nzi*, "they kneel (to) the wheel" (??); ii 19 (Laws §175), *Ū DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU išhunanzi*, "and they mutilate (??) her children"; KUB 13 9 iii 11 (Instructions for the *bēl madgalti*), *n-an šakuwanzi*, "They hang (??) him." Each of the above expressions is isolated and ill-understood, so it is not surprising if the nature of the punishment expressed by *larputta* likewise remains beyond our ken.⁸ With the exception of this feature, we may reconstruct the original sense of this paragraph as: "If someone diverts a canal, he gives one shekel of silver. If someone secretly

8. The form [] (-)ar-pu-ut-ta in KBo 19 104:5 immediately following a break does not settle the question of *larpu*- vs. *arpu*-. If we read [?]arputta, it may be noted that the context, to the extent that we have it, concerns agricultural activities (see the edition by Siegelová, *StBoT* 14 [1971] 14). We may therefore not entirely exclude the possibility that in our passage the verb *larpu*- is a technical term referring to the restoration of the breached canal or the destruction of the thief's diversionary ditch.

takes (water from) a canal above, he is . . . -ed. If he takes (it) below, it (the canal, that is to say, the water) is his."⁹

This paragraph in its original form deals with two distinct but related situations: the diversion of an irrigation canal and the taking of water from one. The consequences of the latter differ depending on whether the water is taken above or below the point at which the canal's owner takes his water. In KBo 6 26 the copyist incorrectly construed *šer* with the verb, and thus "corrected" *šer dāi* to *šarā nāi*, mistakenly trying to associate this sentence with that which precedes it instead of with that which follows it. Fortunately, KBo 6 15 faithfully preserves the original syntax.

For §171 we have available only two Neo-Hittite copies, neither of which reflects the original with complete accuracy. We may take as our basic text KBo 6 26 ii 3-8, with corrections taken from KBo 6 13 i 13-18:

takku anna<š> TUG-SÚ DUMU.NITA-ši *edi nāi nu-za-kan*
DUMU.<<MEŠ>>-ŠU *parā/ šūzzi mān* DUMU-ŠU EGIR-
pa(!) *anda uizzi/ ta* GIŠ.IG-ŠU *dāi ta idi nāi* GIŠ.škiššana-ššit/
GIŠ.hūppulli-ššit *dāi/ ta edi nāi t-uš* EGIR-pa *dāi/ nu-za*
DUMU.NITA-ŠU EGIR-pa DUMU-ŠU *iēzzi*

KBo 6 13 has correctly *annaš* in i 13, the singular DUMU-ŠU in i 14, and EGIR-pa *anda* in i 15 (versus EGIR-panda in 6 26 ii 4). KBo 6 13 also reads DUMU.NITA-i-šši TUG-SÚ in i 13 and in i 14 has simply *mān* DUMU-aš, "when the son" for *mān* DUMU-ŠU, "when her son" in KBo 6 26 ii 4.¹⁰

The crux here is the meaning of the phrase *edi nāi*, which has been generally translated as "carries/throws out" (cf. Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze* 77, Neufeld, *Hittite Laws* 47, and *Imparati, Le leggi ittite* 157).¹¹ However, no one has presented any evidence to show that *edi* means "out" or that *nāi* means "carry" anywhere else in Hittite.

Formally *edi* appears to be the dative-locative singular of the pronoun *a*-. However, in all its occurrences in complete contexts it functions as an ablative. In §72 of the Laws, *edi* ID-az means "on that side of the river," where *edi* marks direction (or relative location) just like the ablative *kunnaz*, "on/to the right."¹² More importantly, *edi* also functions as an

9. The expression "takes a canal" for "takes water from a canal" is a simple case of synecdoche.

10. The incorrect use of Akkadian -ŠU, "his," to mean "her" is typical in Hittite texts. See Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* 1² §353d.

11. Goetze, *ANET*² (1955) 195, renders *edi nāi* as "draws away" in the first occurrence, as "moves" thereafter.

12. When Starke, *StBoT* 23 (1977) 96, defines this use of the ablative as "instrumental," he states the grammatical facts precisely backwards. As shown by the usage in nouns and adjectives (*kunnaz*, ID-az, and so on), the expression of direction in Hittite is a function of the ablative case. Starke cites not a single example of the instrumental of a noun or adjective meaning "towards . . ." or "on/to the . . . of." He cannot, because there are none. As in other Indo-European languages, the ablative in Hittite can indicate not only direction from, but also direction toward, and relative location. For the facts in Sanskrit, see B. Delbrück, *Altindische*

ablative in its other occurrences with *nāi*-. The clearest is KUB 31 4+KBo 3 41 obv. 13 (a Neo-Hittite copy of an Old Hittite text): *ḪURSAG-an tarmaemi t-ašta edi natta nēari*, "I nail down the mountain, and it does not budge from its place" (lit.: "turn from that side"). This example shows that *nāi*- in conjunction with *edi* has its usual attested sense of "turn." Furthermore, the phrase *edi nāi*- appears to have the specific nuance of "turn from its accustomed/proper place." This sense is also apt for the paragraph from the Laws.¹³

The meaning of TUG-SÚ *edi nāi* is "turns her dress from its accustomed place," that is, turns it around so that the back is in front and vice versa. This is a symbolic act which means rejection of the son (DUMU-ŠU *parā šūzzi*). The act of turning one's garments around to symbolize anger is attested in Hittite mythological texts. Compare KUB 33 67 i 26-31 (restorations from 33 36 ii 1ff.): ^a*Anziliš-za šait* ^a[*Zukkišš-a-za šait*] GÜB-lan-za KUŠ.E.ŠIR. ZAG-naz [*šarkutta* ZAG-an-za-ma KUŠ.E.ŠIR] GÜB-laz *šarkutta* TUG-za x[. . .] TUG.DINGIR-LIM-waš-za-kan 2 TUDITTI.ḪIA EGIR-[(*pa paškit*)] *nu-šši*(!) TUG.hūpiki *āppizzi* [(*piran huinut*)] *hantezzi-ma-za appizziaz* [(*huinut*)],¹⁴ "Anzili became angry, [and Zukki became angry]. (Each) put on her left shoe on the right, while she put on her right shoe on the left. . . . She fastened the two breast ornaments on her divine robes in back. She moved the rear *h*. in front, but she moved the front *h*. behind."

Just as the mother symbolizes the rejection of the son by turning her dress around, if the son wishes to regain his status, he must undo the symbolic act by taking various parts of the house, turning them around, and

Syntax (1888) 198-99, and *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (1893) 558. A correct comparison of the Hittite usage with parallel developments in Latin and Romance languages was already made by Neu, *StBoT* 18 (1974) 62. The use of the instrumental form *kēt* in Old Hittite (Laws §72, *kēt* ID-az, "on this side of the river") represents a suppletive use of the instrumental for the ablative at a time when no ablative forms existed in the demonstrative (compare the use of the instrumental for the missing ablative in the enclitic possessive pronouns). Later *kēt* was replaced in its ablative functions by *kēz*, and in turn *edi* by *etez*.

13. The other instance of *edi nāi*- is KUB 1 16 iii 41: [. . . *ud*] *dār-šet* UL DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU *edi nāi*, "Did his sons not turn his words around?" (i.e., "controvert, undo"). It is not certain that the beginning of the sentence is complete as given, but the surrounding context concerns the betrayal of the King's grandfather by his sons, and their punishment. The sense "turn from their proper place" > "controvert" thus seems appropriate.

14. The reading TUG-an-ši-wa-za-kan of Güterbock apud Laroche, *RHA* 23 (1965) 136, is syntactically impossible. Neither the accusative TUG-an, the enclitic -ši, nor the particle -wa- fits the context. The -aš after -wa- is clear in the autograph, and a dative-locative is needed. That TUG in the sense of "robe, garment" is a *u*-stem is supported by the accusative plural TUG.ḪIA-muš in KUB 20 4 i 12 (where a possessive "my" does not fit the context of third-person verb forms). As I intend to show in detail elsewhere, the Hittite word behind TUG-(u)- "robe, garment" (coll. pl., "clothing") is *šeknu*-. See particularly KBo 3 34 i 20-22.

putting them back in their place backwards¹⁵: "If a mother turns her dress around in the face of her son, then she rejects her son. Whenever the son comes back in and takes her door and turns it around, takes her *i* and *h*, and turns (them) around, and puts them back (in their place), then she may make her son her son again."

In agreement with Imparati (Le leggi ittite 159 n. 5), I assume that there is a contrast here between *ta* marking a series of coordinated actions and *nu* marking the apodosis of the long preceding condition: *mān . . . nu . . .* Note that *nu* also introduces the apodosis in the first conditional sentence. *takku . . . nu . . .*¹⁶

Grammatically one could interpret the last clause as "Then her son makes himself her son again." I have rejected this alternative for two reasons. First, it would imply that the son could regain his status merely by performing the symbolic acts prescribed. The mother would have no say in the matter. I find it more likely that the symbolic acts are merely a prerequisite for reacceptance, and that the decision to restore the son's status remains with the parent. Second, all the preceding clauses back to *mān EGIR-pa anda uizzi* have "the son" as the subject. If "the son" were also the subject of the last clause, I would not expect it to be overtly marked by DUMU.NITA-ŠU. Rather, the subject would continue to be unmarked, as in the preceding clauses: "then he makes himself her son again."

Whether one takes the mother or the son as the subject of the last clause, the overall meaning of the paragraph is clear: the mother symbolizes the rejection of her son by turning her dress around, and in order to regain his status, the son must perform a similar action on various parts of the house.

15. In the case of GIŠ.IG, "door," the action is clear: he removes the door, turns it around, and replaces it backwards. The meaning of GIŠ.*iškišš(a)na*- and GIŠ.*hūppulli* is not known. The latter is hapax, but GIŠ.*iškišš(a)na*- also occurs in the "Building ritual" KUB 29 1 iii 18 where it clearly is part of a building. Therefore I cannot accept the suggestion of Eichner (Die Sprache 21 [1975] 163 n. 12), who proposes that *iškišš(a)na*- means "Kiepe, Tragekorb." Since both GIŠ.IG and GIŠ.*iškišš(a)na*- are indisputably parts of a building, I assume the same for GIŠ.*hūppulli*, which forms a set with them. Incidentally, Eichner's interpretation of *edi nāi*-, "verkehren, umdrehen," agrees with that proposed here, though it is arrived at by different means.

16. One finds the same contrast in the Laws §10 (KBo 6 3 i 25-26): *takku LÚ.ULÙ.LU-an kuiški hūnikzi t-an ištarnikzi [(nu apū)]n šaktāizzi*, "If someone injures a person and makes him ill, then he nurses him . . ." This distinction in the use of *nu* and *ta* deserves further study, beginning with Old Hittite manuscripts.