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1. Introduction

As is well known Etruscan was the language of the Etruscan people who once inhabited the area in northwest central Italy between the Arno, the Tiber and the Tyrrhenian Sea. It was written in a set of alphabets derived from a Greek prototype and there is therefore little apparent difficulty in reading the language although there is considerably more difficulty in understanding it. Written Etruscan is attested from 700 BCE to AD 50. Because it is now a dead language Etruscan remains incompletely understood and the interpretation of Etruscan inscriptions and texts remains conjectural to some extent. In addition a few Etruscan texts come from other areas of Italy, especially from Campania, Emilia and from Corsica, and isolated examples are known from Provence, Tunisia, Greece and Egypt. Unfortunately a major hindrance to present-day understanding of the language is that several works on Etruscan written by the Roman emperor Claudius (10 BCE – AD 54) are now lost. These documents included dictionaries of the language as used by its last speakers.

Ultimately Etruscan is primarily known thanks to inscriptions. They number about 9000 according to Rix (2008: 141) and more than 13 000 according to Bonfante (1994: 437), depending on what is called an “inscription”. Many are funerary inscriptions, which are most often short and repetitive and limited to nothing more than the deceased’s name. The second largest source comprises the short texts on daily-life objects which indicate the owner, the manufacturer or the purpose of the object. Another source is the inscriptions next to pictorial representations. Beside these numerous short inscriptions there exist longer documents of legal or ritual character. The Pyrgi bilingual has a parallel text in Phoenician and reports the dedication of a cult building and is one of the clearest documents; the Perugine cippus records a contract about a piece of land; the Capua clay tablet is 300 words rich and is the longest Etruscan inscription, it describes a ritual calendar; and the Cortona bronze tablet records the treatment of tenant farmers after the sale of an estate rented by them (Cf. Agostiniani and Nicosia 2000). The longest known Etruscan text is 1,500 words rich and describes a calendar of rituals. A good half of this linen book is preserved in spite of having been torn up and used as wrappings on a mummy in Egypt. It is called the Zagreb mummy after its present location. A third source is the glosses of Etruscan words given by Latin and Greek authors: for example, aesar . . . etrusca lingua deus, [“aesr . . . the Etruscan word for god”] in Suetonius, The Life of Augustus 97). This source is not as reliable as one may expect because in fact aesar is a plural and means gods. A fourth source is loanwords. To these sources can be added toponyms as will be shown below.

It is now generally accepted that the Etruscan population can be traced back to the so-called Villanovan culture at least up to -1200 BCE. The introduction of the Greek alphabet reveals their existence in Etruria but they were already there for some time (Cf. Bonfante & Bonfante 2002: 52).
The deeper prehistory of Etruscans remains disputed. Historians of the 5th century BCE (Herodotus 1.94, Hellanicus in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.28.3–4) claimed immigration from the Aegean. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1st century BCE) argued from the lack of related languages that Etruscans were autochthonous in Italy. So far archeological arguments (Pallottino 1988: 77–101) have been poorly conclusive, so have genetic arguments. The relationship between Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean proposed in this paper does not mean that Etruscan “arrived” in Etruria at a low dating. The differences indicate that the split cannot be extremely recent. It must nevertheless be noted that several Etruscan words appear to be Akkadian loanwords which are also represented in Hurrian as will be shown below. One of the conspicuous differences is that Etruscan seems to have always initial stress on the first syllable but this sometimes results from the lost of the preceding and originally initial syllable. Several Etruscan words appear to have lost initial syllables when compared to Hurro-Urartean, especially when the original initial syllable started with a vowel.

During their history from the 7th to 1st centuries BCE the Etruscans never formed a centrally governed state. Rather they lived in separate city-states, which were first ruled by princes or kings and which later on from around 500 BCE became oligarchies and were tied to each other through common cult festivals. The Etruscans who possessed citizenship: the Rasenna (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.30.3; < Etruscan rasna ‘Etruscan people’; see Rix 1984b) made up only a part of the population. There was also a rural population: Penestai (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 9.5.4) with personal freedom and economic independence, but without political rights and at least in part of Italic origin. Only in the third to second centuries did this section of the population acquire Etruscan full citizenship (Cf. Rix 1963: 372–376). Until the beginning of the 5th century BCE the Etruscans were the dominating power in upper and central Italy. The defeat inflicted by the Greeks at Cumae in 474 BCE marks the beginning of the Etruscan decline which worsened after the Celtic invasions in the 4th century BCE. Politically the Etruscans became dependent allies of Rome at the beginning of the third century and two hundred years later Roman citizens. Shortly after the turn of the millennium Etruscan ceased to be written. Around that time the language probably ceased to be spoken as well. The Roman emperor Claudius is said to have been among the last speakers of that language. Contacts between Etruscan and Italic speakers must have been both ancient and intense as the words l(a)uc(h)um ‘king’ and l(a)uc ‘to rule’ seem to be direct borrowings of an Indo-European word like *deuk-o-mu ‘that who leads’. It is quite extraordinary that such a word with a political meaning is borrowed from a foreign source. It can also be noted that the suffix -alch ‘number-ty’ sounds like PIE *dék and displays a similar change from *d to l.

Etruscan is very close to three poorly attested languages: Lemnian in the Northeast of the Aegean (6th century BCE; Cf. Agostiniani 1986), Camunic and Rhaetic in the Alps (5th to 1st centuries BCE; Cf. Schumacher 1992: 246–248; Rix 1998). They are so close to Etruscan that it can be used to understand them. The date of the common proto-language which can be called Proto-Tyrsenic can probably be fixed to the last quarter of the second millennium BCE according to Rix (2008: 142). In the present paper Etruscan will provide most of the material to be compared to Hurro-Urartean.

2. A sketch of Etruscan phonology

Etruscan writing appears at the end of the 8th century BCE out of an alphabet of Western Greek origin. The Marsiliana Tablet (ca. -700 BC) has the following archaic school alphabet: a b c d e v z h th i k l m n t s o p s q r s t u ks ph ch.

As is well known historical Etruscan never used voiced letters like b and d, and used c for [k] instead of [g], a voiced velar phoneme that did not exist in historical Etruscan. Greco-Latin loanwords with voiced phonemes were adjusted to voiceless phonemes: Pachana ~ Bacch-, Zi(u)mites ~ Diomèðèς, Creice ~ Graec- ‘Greek’, Aliysantre ~ Aleksandros, etc. As a result of that phonological feature of Etruscan only a subset of letters is actually used. What is more a new letter was added for a sound that Etruscan had but for which there was no grapheme available: 8 which stands for /l/. It must be noted that early loanwords have a different treatment which suggests that Proto-Etruscan used to have voiced phonemes: word-initially *d in early loanwords becomes /l/ as in (Umbrian?) *doukonn >
lauchum ‘leader, king’, Greek diphthera > Etrusco-Latin littera. Cf. Greek daphne > Latin laurus as well. In inherited morphemes the same change can be observed: *-d- hence Etruscan -l ‘Genitive-Dative’ ~ Hurrian -da ‘Dative-Allative’. It can also be noted that tular ‘boundary stones’ is the probable etymon of the Italian city of Todi, located at the border between Etruscan and Umbrian territories. This toponym confirms the phonetic relationship between l and d in Etruscan. A devolving of labial /b/ can be observed in Apennin(us) ~ Hurrian fiaban, Urartean baban ‘mountain’ or Etruscan pruth ‘dictator’ ~ Hurrian ebru, erwi ‘lord, king’. These considerations mean that at some time between the first contacts with Italo-Celtic speakers and the introduction of writing Etruscan phonology underwent a general shift in consonants which eliminated voice from the system.

As a consequence of the absence of voiced phonemes the letter z can hardly stand for a voiced phoneme like /d/ in contrast with a plain sibilant /s/, as is the case in Greek where z is usually considered to have been a sort of complex sound like [zd]. In addition this situation confirms that the transmission of the Phoenician alphabet was indirect with a Greek intermediary because the Semitic value of the letter ‘samekh’ was an affricate as shown by Egyptian renderings: the root *spr ‘to write, scribe’ is written spr not *spr in hieroglyphic Egyptian. This letter is not used in Etruscan to write what can be inferred to be an affricate as would be expected if the transmission were direct. On the whole the picture for sibilants is quite confused as different four letters and graphemes are attested for what seems to amount to only two actual phonemes, conventionally written s and ś. These two phonemes respectively correspond to Hurro-Urartean t and d word-internally and ś in all positions. For example *ait- ‘god’, *aitak- ‘sacred’. Etruscan ais ‘god’, sac- ‘sacred’ ~ Hurrian itka, etku ‘sacred’. It can be noted that Etruscan sac- lost the initial syllable, a not infrequent feature of Etruscan words. Besides Etruscan Genitive -si can be compared to Hurro-Urartean Genitive plural -świ. In addition the Latin word asinus ‘donkey’ can be compared with Semitic atan with the same change t > s, similarly rosa ~ Greek (F)rodon ‘rose’ is a case of d > s. Those words are very probably of Etruscan origin. It can be noted that in spite of the change of *-t/d- > -s-. Etruscan still has a number of non initial t and th. It would seem that these words are either fairly transparent loanwords like tut(h)i ‘community, state’ < Italic *teut- or that they involve morpheme boundaries: i-ta but ta or i-ca ‘this’; *-ae ‘Instrumental-adverbial’. Etruscan -th-i ~ Hurro-Urartean -ae. In the latter example it can be noted that Latin has a similar tendency to mark morpheme boundaries with -i-. Some other items are baby-talk words: ait ‘mother’ ~ tet ‘grand-mother’. The case of tusurthiri is more complex: it is glossed ‘spouse (?)’ in Bonfante-Bonfante (2002-111) and ‘married couples (in the double urn?)’ in Bonfante-Bonfante (2002-219). It appears that this ‘word’ potentially amounts to two words and maybe three morphemes: tusur ~ šiduri ‘woman’ and thi(r) = tahti ‘man’. In addition it can also be noted that not infrequently -th- in Etruscan words is preceded by a nasal, most of time n. The changes affecting the dental stops are therefore quite complex to fathom and describe.

As regards the aspirate letters th, ph, kh, there does not seem to be any phonological contrast between t and th: šuth = sut ‘to stay, place ?’, tuthi = tuti ‘community, state’. It can be noted that th is found in words where t would be expected: thina ‘vase, crater’ < Greek dinos; theyr ‘bull’ < Greek tauros. At the same time t is found where th might be expected: *triumpe ‘triumph’ < Greek thriambos, lechum < Greek lekythos. In my opinion the level of incoherence is such that it is hard to posit any phonological contrast on that basis: t and th are better treated as a single phonemic unit /l/. As regards ph it seems to be a positional variant of p word-finally. There is nearly no word that has ph word-internally and only one item with initial ph. The contrast between p and ph is therefore just as elusive and non existent as that between t and th. As for velars like kh Rix (2008: 145) observes that there is a “complementary distribution of <h> (word-initially) and <g> (word-internally and word-finally).” A minimal pair nevertheless exists: cekha ‘ceremony’ and cehen ‘this one here’. As with t and th the contrast between c and kh is fairly elusive but Bonfante-Bonfante (2002:79) nevertheless draws a distinction between: “turce ‘he gave’ and -che [the] passive ending, as in me menache ‘I was given’. An interesting inscription with a kind of minimal pair is Etruscan TLE 890: felsnas la lethes svalce avil CVI murce capue tleche hanipuluscne ‘Felsnas Laris son of Lethe lived 106 ans, lived (?) in Capua, was captured (?) by those of Hannibal’. It can be noted that Bonfante-Bonfante (2002:102) also has examples of passives aliqum and zinaku. In addition Rhaetic tinachc apparently equates
Etruscan *zinace, so that the situation is again extremely confused with velars. There is hardly any firm graphic basis to posit a phonological contrast between plain letters and apparently aspirate letters. “Aspiration” as reflected in Etruscan inscriptions, letters and words seems to be a free and therefore phonologically irrelevant feature. The opposition between passive ~ active seems acceptable but it cannot be excluded that such an opposition is not conveyed by an elusive and contradictory opposition of c ~ ch but is conveyed by a vocalic contrast between a ~ i. This latter hypothesis would be coherent with the system of verbal valencies that Hurrian shows to have: -a- for intransitive verbs of movement, -i- for transitive active verbs and -u- for transitive passive verbs.

On that basis, Etruscan had at least the following system of consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*p</th>
<th>*t</th>
<th>*ts</th>
<th>*k</th>
<th>(*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*f</td>
<td>*š</td>
<td></td>
<td>*h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table1: Minimal system for Etruscan consonants

There is no clear reason to posit that Etruscan had a phonological glottal stop as words with vocalic hiatus are very rare. In addition *h was lost word-internally in most cases so it seems very little probable that a glottal stop would have been kept in those conditions.

3. Etruscan glossary

The Etruscan glossary is taken from Bonfante-Bonfante (2002), while Hurrian is from Laroche (1980) for the most part. Obvious Greek loanwords are not included. Correspondences for labials are fairly straightforward: *m is stable, *b > p in Etruscan, *p becomes f word-initially but disappears word-internally. As for *w it seems to be lost in Etruscan because Etruscan w is generally the reflex of *h and not that of inherited *w. Correspondences for velars are fairly complex because of a number of changes with divergent results. In Etruscan *t has three reflexes: t when morpheme initial, th after a nasal, s otherwise. In Hurrian *t has two reflexes: š when followed by i or u, otherwise t. That change in Hurrian is shown by loanwords like Akkadian libittu ‘brick’ > Hurrian alipši. Normally Etruscan and Hurrian -l- and -r- regularly correspond but Hurrian geminated -ll- seems to correspond with Etruscan -r-. In Hurrian these phonemes cannot be initial. That feature would also explain the prothetic a of Etruscan alpan ‘gladly’ < Latin liben(ter) which can be compared to Akkadian libittu ‘brick’ > Hurrian alipši with a similar prothetic vowel. As regards velars Etruscan fused *k and *g which surface as c or ch. *h changed to w word-internally in Etruscan but was possibly retained as h word-initially.

ac- ‘to make, offer’ (Bonfante-Bonfante 2002:214) ~ (?) Hurrian ag- ‘to bring, lead’. Possibly a cognate *ag-.


acil ‘work, thing made’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian agul- ‘to carve’ (Catsanicos 1996). Probably a cognate *agvl-.

acnan- ‘to give birth, beget’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian ag- ‘to bring, lead’. The causative of ac- with suffix -an-. A cognate *ag-.


aisine ‘sacrifice’ (B-B 2002:214). A derivative of *(a)it-ak-.

aisiu, aisna, eisna ‘divine’ (B-B 2002:214). A derivative of *(a)it-ak-.

al- ‘to give’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian al- ‘to bring near to’. A cognate *al-.

Suffix -alch ‘-ty, ten’ (B-B 2002:96). Possibly a loanword of IE *dek(m) ‘ten’.

alpan, alpnu ‘(1) gift, offering; (2) gladly’ (B-B 2002:214). A borrowing of Latin libens with phonological prothesis #a-.
am- ‘to be’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian man- ‘to be, he/she/it’, Urartean ma-ši ‘his’. A cognate *\(m(a)\)-. Cf. mi(ni).
an ‘he, she; this’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian an- ‘this’. A cognate *\(\hat{a}n\)-. Cf. enach(h).
apa ‘father’ (B-B 2002:214). A nursery word possibly influenced by some Italic reflex of IE *patēr.
Apennins ‘ononym’ ~ Hurrian ñaban, Urartean baba- ‘mountain’. A cognate *\(baban\)-.
ar-, er- ‘to do, make’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ (?) Hurrian ar-, er- ‘to grow, increase’ (Catsanicos 1996).

Possibly a cognate *\(\hat{a}r\)-.
arac [gloss] ‘falcon’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian eradī ‘bird’. A cognate *\(\hat{a}r\)-.
asun- ‘donkey’ in Latin asinus. A borrowing of Semitic *atan-.
ati ‘parents, ancestors’ (B-B 2002:214). The plural of *at-.
ati ‘mother’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian attai ‘father’. A cognate *\(\hat{a}t-v\)-. The preservation of word-
internal r in Etruscan is irregular.
ativu ‘dear mother’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian attai ‘father’. A cognate *\(\hat{a}t-v\)-. In my opinion at-
ivu means ‘my mother’ instead of ‘dear mother’.
ats, aters, aturs ‘ancestor’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ Hurrian attardi ‘forbear’. A derivative of *\(\hat{a}t-v\)-
with the suffix -ard-.
avil ‘year’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ (?) Hurrian šawala, Urartean šali ‘year’. The initial is a problem.
ca, eca ‘this’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ attested in Hurrian aga-bi ‘on this side’. With unstable initial
vowel in Etruscan.
cana, kan(n)a ‘gift’ (B-B 2002:215). A Semitic loanword *\(\hat{q}n\) ‘to give’.
cape ‘vase, container’ (B-B 2002:215). A kind of IE wanderwort: Cf. cu(p)pa, etc.
cenheim ‘this one here’ (B-B 2002:215). Probably a compound ce-hen as h is only attested word-
initially. A derivative of ca.
cen- ‘to make, place’ ~ Hurrian kiban- ‘to bring’. This word is a causative derivative of *\(k\)ī(w)-.
cerine ‘sacred place, building?’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ Hurrian kirarni ‘base, foundation’. This word is
most probably a Semitic loanword with a native suffix: Cf. Akkadian karāru ‘to lay
(foundations)’.

ces- ‘to place, be placed, to lie’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ (?) Hurrian kī(w)- ‘to place, deposit’. Possibly a
cognate. Cf. cen-, ever-.
cez ‘eight?’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ Hurrian kī(g)- ‘three’, kiške ‘third’. Seems to be a derivative 3+5
based on ci. Cf. cezpalch ‘eighty’.

ci ‘three’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ Hurrian kī(g)- ‘three’, kiške ‘third’. A cognate *\(\hat{k}i(g)\)-. Cf. cialch,
chealth ‘thirty’.
cilith ‘people, nation’ (B-B 2002:215). Unknown origin. Note that this may be a derivative of cel
‘earth, land’. Cf. PIE *\(\hat{g}dh\)hom ‘earth’ > *\(g\)dhhomon ‘human being’.
clan, (Pl) clenar ‘son’ (B-B 2002:215). Unknown origin. Note that this may be a derivative of cel
‘earth, land’. Cf. cilith ‘people, nation’.
A Tentative Etymological Glossary of Etruscan

cleva ‘offering’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ (?) Hurrian kiw-, kib- ‘to put, set’. A variant of civl (?).
cupe ‘cup’ (B-B 2002:215). A kind of IE wanderwort: Cf. cu(p)pa, etc.
cver, cvil ‘gift, offering’ ~ Hurrian kiw-, kib- ‘to put, set’.


ep-l ‘up to’ (B-B 2002:215) ~ Hurrian abi-da ‘in front of’. The word abi means ‘face’ and can be used as a preposition in Hurrian: abi-da is abi used in the Dative-Allative case. Epl tulari aulesi velthinas (TLE 570.1,8) ‘before the boundaries stones [it belongs] to AuleVelthina’.

et(h) ‘thus, in this way’ (B-B 2002:216). Unknown origin.
etnam ‘and, also, again, thus’ (B-B 2002:216). Sounds like a word of Indo-European origin.


fleress ‘statue’ (B-B 2002:216) ~ (?) Urartean (NA) pulusi ‘stela’. Possibly a cognate.


Suffix -c(h) ‘Past’ ~ Hurrian -uh ‘Past Passive’. Apparently Etruscan reinforced this morpheme into a stop instead of changing it into w as expected. It can nevertheless be noted that verbal “forms in -u seem to be past participles” in (B-B 2002:102).

[h]?jan- ‘to bear, beget’ (B-B 2002:104) ~ Hurrian han- ‘to beget’. The Etruscan word is attested in a mutilated inscription: eic elenar [...] annance ‘she bore three sons’. Etruscan should logically keep trace of initial *h.

hath ‘to be favorable’ (B-B 2002:216). Unknown origin.
hec(h)- ‘to put, place, add’ (B-B 2002:216). Unknown origin.
hel(s) ‘own, proper’ (B-B 2002:216). Unknown origin.


hus ‘child’ (B-B 2002:216) ~ (?) Hurrian hubidi ‘calf’. Unclear status. This presupposes that the meaning was originally ‘young’. Cf. Latin puér and pullus for a similar semantic development.

huth ‘four’ (B-B 2002:216). Unknown origin. Connections with either PIE *kwetwer or Hurrian tummi ‘four’ are extremely difficult. The comparison would be easier if the reading huth was mistaken for thuh but Charun huths (TLE 885) shows that huth cannot be read in the other direction.

ica, ita ‘this’ (B-B 2002:216). Cf. eca.

in, inc, inci ‘it’ (B-B 2002:216) ~ Hurrian inna ‘at some time’, inu(me) ‘as’. Possibly a cognate of deictic nature. Cf. an- ~ in-.


*itu, [gloss] ‘to divide’ (B-B 2002:214) ~ (?) Hurrian id- ‘to break’ (Catsanicos 1996). This is only possible is the root is *i-, plus a suffix. Otherwise Etruscan should be *isu-. Possibly a cognate.


lautni ‘of the family, freedman’ (B-B 2002:217). Probably an Italic loanword *leudhynos. Cf. the feminine equivalent lautnin(h)a and laut(um) ‘family, gens’.


lein- ‘to die’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ Hurrian ullul- ‘to die’. A cognate *уль-. With loss of initial vowel in Etruscan.


lu-pu ‘died’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ Hurrian ullul-ub ‘he died’. A cognate. With loss of initial vowel in Etruscan. Cf. lein. Etruscan lu-pu is to be understood as an archaic past form -b ‘he died’: Hurrian tantib ‘he did’, ullulub ‘he died’.

leu(pu) ‘stone, temple’ (B-B 2002:217). Looks like some Italic borrowing of PIE *leHu ‘stone’.

Suffix -(u)m ‘and’ (B-B 2002:104) ~ Hurrian -ma ‘and’. A cognate *-m(a).


malena ‘miror’ (B-B 2002:217). A (causative) derivative of mal-.


mas(a)n ‘december’ (B-B 2002:217). Unknown origin.


men ‘to make, offer’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ (?) Hurrian amm- ‘to arrive at, reach’. With loss of initial vowel in Etruscan (?). Unclear status.


mi(ni) ‘I, me’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ (?) Hurrian man- ‘to be, he/she/it’, Urartean maši ‘his’. A cognate *ам-. The meaning of Etruscan is clearly a problem: it is based on the assumption that Italian artefacts speak in the 1st person. For example TLE 242 mi mamarces velthienas translates ‘I (am the grave of) Mamarce Velthiena’. From the Hurro-Urartean point of view, this interpretation is not possible: this means ‘this is (the grave of) Mamarce Velthiena’.


Minio ‘River name’ ~ (?) Urartean (ID) mun ‘river’. Possibly a cognate.

mul- ‘to offer, dedicate as an ex-voto’ (B-B 2002:217). Unknown origin.

mulnsa ‘one who sacrifices, dedicates’ (B-B 2002:217). Unknown origin. Cf. mul-.


mut(a)na ‘sarcophagus’ (B-B 2002:217). A Semitic loanword possibly from Phoenician.


nac ‘how, as, because, since’ (B-B 2002:217). Cf. enac(h).


naper ‘measure of surface’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ Hurrian naw- ‘to graze, pasture’. A cognate(?)?

nef(t)s ‘nephew, grandson’ (B-B 2002:217). A borrowing of Italic *nepos.


nesna ‘belonging to the dead?’ (B-B 2002:217). Unknown origin.
nethšra ‘haruspica’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ Hurrian nibašuri ‘liver’. Phonetics is a bit confused [t(h) ~ b] but the connection is obvious.
nu(th) ‘to hear [my proposal]’ (B-B 2002:217) ~ Hurrian nui ‘hear’. A cognate *\sqrt{un}. The meaning ‘to hear’ nun- fits the context: for example, the Table of Cortona read: V. cn zic zicuche spazrete thu ‘that inscription was written in the spot here’ VI. cnil nuth malec ‘(of) this one, let him nuth [= hear] see to it’ (B-B 2002:181).
nurph ‘nine’ (B-B 2002:217). A borrowing of Italic *no\{n\} with a suffix -rp(h) of unclear origin.
ipa ‘who’; -pu ‘Past tense P3Sg’ ~ Hurrian -b ‘Past tense P3Sg’. A bound form in Hurrian.
parnich ‘a kind of magistracy or priesthood’ (B-B 2002:218). Unknown origin.
patna ‘a kind of vase’ (B-B 2002:218). From Greek πατάνη ‘flat dish’.
pe\{\}nthu ‘a kind of magistracy, dictator?’ (B-B 2002:218). From Latin promatōs ‘pitcher, vase’.
pi ‘for; prepositional’ (B-B 2002:218). Cf. abi.
pi\{\}ua ‘wife’ (B-B 2002:218). Sounds Indo-European: Cf. IEW 842 *pōu ‘little, few’ and pava.
Suffix -(a)\{\}r ‘Plural’ ~ Hurrian -lla ‘Absolutive Plural’. This morpheme has been extended in Etruscan to the whole paradigm of Plural cases, whereas in Hurrian it is used only for one case in allomorphy with =Value.
rach- ‘to prepare’ (B-B 2002:218). Unknown origin.
ril ‘at the age of’ (B-B 2002:218) ~ Hurrian -ar\{\}bu- ‘n years old’. If the comparison is correct then Etruscan lost the initial syllable (√arp-il).
*rosa ‘rose’ in Latin rosa. A wanderwort *wro\{\}da ‘rose’.
r\{\}uva ‘brother’ (B-B 2002:218) ~ Urartean ar\{\}hi ‘child’, ar\{\}mu\{\}za ‘family’. Etruscan lost the initial vowel. A cognate *\{\}ar\{\}u.
sal- ‘to make, carry out’ (B-B 2002:218) ~ (? Hurrian šiyal- ‘to put, install’. Possibly a cognate.
san\{\}su\{\}a ‘bones?’ (B-B 2002:218). Unknown origin. A derivative of san (?).
šuth-, šut- as well with apparent metaphor.
sec(h) ‘daughter’ (B-B 2002:218) ~ Hurrian aštī ‘woman’, aštakka ‘little woman’. A cognate
*κατ-ak- with loss of initial vowel in Etruscan.
semph ‘seven’ (B-B 2002:218) ~ Hurrian šindi ‘seven’. From Akkadian šin ‘two’ with divergent
suffixes. Etruscan also has -p(h) in cezph ‘eight’ (< ci three + five) and murph ‘nine’ (< four +
five ?).
srenath ‘maid, companion’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ (?) Hurrian šenni ‘brother’.
span ‘surface measure, two naper’ (B-B 2002:219). Unknown origin.
sren ‘ornament, image’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ Hurrian šīrni ‘splendor, jewel’. A cognate *śirīn-
štath-, šat- as well with apparent metaphor.
štuth ‘seat, tomb’ (B-B 2002:219). Cf. sath-, šat-, šuth-, šut-.
śv-.
sveler ‘living creature?’ (B-B 2002:219). A derivative of sval-.
ta, tal, tel, tei ‘this’ (B-B 2002:219). Cf. thi.
tamera ‘a kind of magistracy’ (B-B 2002:219). Unknown origin.
ten- ‘to act as a magistrate’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ Hurrian tan- ‘to do’. A cognate *ten-, tan-.
tes-, tesam- ‘to care for’, tesinh ‘caretaker’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ Hurrian tad- ‘to love’. A cognate
*ta-.
tev, tvā ‘to show, see?’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ Hurrian tehan- ‘to show’. A cognate *teh-.
tham-, them- ‘to build, found’ (B-B 2002:119). An Italic loanword of *tem-.
thaurch ‘funerary’, thaura ‘tomb’ (B-B 2002:220) ~ (?) Hurrian tur- ‘below, inferior’. 
Possibly a cognate.
strange.
thes ‘make an offering’ (B-B 2002:220) ~ Hurrian tašē ‘gift’, tašul- ‘to give, grant’. A cognate
*taš-, tēs-.
Suffix -thi ‘locative’ (B-B 2002:220) ~ Hurrian -i ‘Locative’. Etruscan has an extra -t-.
thunina ‘the first’ (B-B 2002:220). The definite plural -na of thuni (?).
t(h)junur ‘one at a time’ (B-B 2002:220). The comitative -ur of thu(n).
thuthu ‘in the middle of the people, (for) the state’ (B-B 2002:220). An Italic loanword of toutā
‘tribe, whole people’.
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tiss ‘lake’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ (?) Hurrian širi ‘day’. Possibly a cognate *\tel-. Etruscan TLE 890 reads: felsnas la lethes svalce avil CVI murce capue teche hanipuscle ‘Felsnas Laris son of Lethe lived 106 ans, lived (?) in Capua, was defeated (?) by those of Hannibal’. He is known to have been defeated by Hannibal in Cuma.


trut(th) ‘libation, sacred action’, truthnuth ‘priest’ (B-B 2002:219). A derivative of tur(a) (?).

tusur-(thir) ‘spouse ?’ (B-B 2002:219) ~ (?) Hurrian šiduri ‘young woman’. Possibly a cognate *√tidur-.


ut- ‘to carry out, perform, give’ (B-B 2002:220). The phonetics does not sound Etruscan.

vac(a)l ‘libation?’ (B-B 2002:220). Unknown origin.

urthun ‘to make, cause to be’ (B-B 2002:220) ~ Hurrian ur- ‘to take place, happen’. A cognate *\ur-.
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Besides Etruscan also displays a number of Akkadian loanwords which tend to show that Etruscan cannot have settled in Italy very long ago: (1) *damk-: Etruscan mlac(h) ‘beautiful’ ~ Hurrian ta(n)gi ‘beautiful’. This word is probably based on the Akkadian loanword damq̄u, daqqu ‘beautiful, excellent’; (2) *ebr-: Etruscan pruh ‘dictator’ ~ Hurrian ebru, erwi, Urartean euri ‘lord, king’. This word can be suspected of being an Akkadian loanword of abāru ‘strength, power’; (3) *ker-: Etruscan ša ‘six’ ~ Hurrian šēši ‘six’. This word is probably based on the Akkadian loanword šin- ‘two’ with different suffixes.

4. A comparative survey of Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean morphology

Both Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean have a case system. Etruscan can be deduced from Hurro-Urartean with only one change: the suffix of the Absolute Plural *-lla- > Etruscan -r- has been generalized in all Plural forms. The result of that innovation is that the suffixes which used to oppose Singular and Plural are now syncretic and sometimes are used as free variants. Etruscan seems to have several suffixes which are considered to be all Genitive. On the basis of Hurro-Urartean it is probably possible to assign more precise meanings to all these apparently equivalent suffixes.

2. Ergative: Hurrian *s = Etruscan -s. Apparently only used for the singular in Etruscan.
4. Dative: Hurrian Singular *wa ~ Plural *-š-wa = Etruscan -ša. In Etruscan this form works as a variant of the Genitive for Person names.
6. Instrumental: Hurrian *-ae = Etruscan Locative -th-i. Etruscan has an intruding -th-, which is not always used.
7. Comitative: Hurrian *-ra = (?) Etruscan -r. (1) Hypothetically attested in tusur-thi-r ~ šiduri tahi-ra ‘woman with man’. (2) zelur ‘two by two’ (B-B 2002:220) is the comitative -ur of zel ‘two’, (3) t(h)junur.

The verbal morphology is rather poorly known and only a number of forms are known, most referring to P3Sg or P3Pl. Among them some appear to be closely related with similar functions. As is frequent in most languages Present does not have an explicit marker.

1. Past P3Sg Active: Hurrian Archaic -b, Later -ša = Etruscan -u(ce), Participle -asa. Etruscan reveals that the standard Hurrian form is based on a participle. Hurrian ullulub ‘he died’ = Etruscan lupu-(ce). The root in lupu is probably lu- in light of Hurrian.
2. Past P3Sg Passive: Hurrian -h = Etruscan -(u)c(h)e. It is not clear if Hurrian -h is only Etruscan u (suffixed by the pronoun ca) or reinforced into -(c)h.

Other forms are more difficult to compare.

Several derivational suffixes are clearly shared by Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean:
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2. *-ant- ‘used to create adjectives’: Hurrian *pisu- ‘to rejoice’ > Etruscan *tes ‘to care for’ > *tesinth ‘caretaker’. This suffix seems to be used in Person names: Arnth.

3. *-ard-: Hurrian *attai ‘father’ > *attardi- ‘forefather’ ~ Etruscan *ati ‘mother’ > *atrs ‘ancestor’.


5. *-ni ‘used to create deverbal derivatives’: Hurrian *sidar- ‘to curse’ > *sidarni ‘curse’ ~ Etruscan *car-, cer- ‘to make, build’, cerine ‘sacred place, building’?

6. *-si- ‘used to create abstract nouns’: Hurrian *šarri- ‘king’ > *šarrašši- ‘kingship, royalty’ ~ Etruscan *cecha-se ‘name of magistracy’.

7. *-sk-: Hurrian *summi ‘hand’ > *šummiški ‘apprentice’ ~ Etruscan *culscva ‘doors, gates’ (Cf. PIE *kleu ‘to close’), Hanipaluske ‘follower of Hannibal’.


These morphological coincidences in addition to lexical cognates prove beyond doubt that Etruscan is a close relative of Hurro-Urartean.

5. Conclusion

This survey of the clearest lexemes and morphemes of the Etruscan language reveals that this language bears very strong genetic affinities with Hurro-Urartean. In my opinion the discovery that Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean are related should have positive consequences when it comes to understanding the language and disentangling its vocabulary and morphology. I hope to have contributed with this paper to an improved decipherment of Etruscan.

Appendix

Etruscan and Hurro-Urartean sound correspondences are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E f/Ø ~ HU p</th>
<th>E t/s ~ HU tšš</th>
<th>E z ~ HU s/s̄</th>
<th>E c(h) ~ HU k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E p ~ HU b</td>
<td>E d/s ~ HU dšš</td>
<td>E s/lš ~ HU šš</td>
<td>E c(h) ~ HU g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E m ~ HU m</td>
<td>E n ~ HU n</td>
<td>E v ~ HU w</td>
<td>E r ~ HU r̥̊l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E l ~ HU l</td>
<td>E i ~ HU y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sound correspondences
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