

ETRUSCAN–HURRO-URARTIAN RELATIONS

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews earlier comparisons of Etruscan with North Caucasian, Hurro-Urartian with North Caucasian, and Etruscan with Hurro-Urartian. After critical evaluation, the most promising correspondences are retained and supplemented with new comparanda, forming a synthesis that supports a genealogical Etruscan–Hurro-Urartian relationship. The comparative minicorpus includes 47 lexical items; morphology is excluded (reserved for future study). Though modest in size, this sample is representative given the limited corpus of Etruscan words with known or probable meaning and the divergent semantic profiles of Hurrian and Urartian.

1. MOTIVATION

This study evaluates the hypothesis of an Anatolian origin for Etruscan and its relatives via a genetic link with Hurro-Urartian, as an alternative to proposed ties with Indo-European languages of Anatolia (e.g., Adrados 1989, 1994, 2005; Georgiev 1962, 1974, 1979; Woudhuizen 2019; critically, Neu 1991; Simon 2021).¹

2. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The Etruscan language is the best-documented member of the Tyrsenian language family, which also includes two other epigraphic languages: Raetic and Lemnian. The family was named by Helmut Rix (1998). The close relationship between Lemnian and Etruscan was first demonstrated by Brandenstein (1948, cols. 1925–1929) and subsequently refined by Eichner (2012, 2013, 2019).

The Hurro-Urartian language family is a well-established genealogical unit, first proposed by Hrozný (1915: 42) and definitively demonstrated by Friedrich (1935; cf. also Kapancjan 1936: 61–63). It comprises two languages attested in cuneiform: Hurrian (2nd millennium BCE) and Urartian (first half of the 1st millennium BCE). A third member, Kassite, has been suggested (Schneider 2003), but is not considered here. Early comparisons with North Caucasian, particularly the Nakh branch, were pioneered by Bork (1909) and summarized by Trombetti (1922–23: 105–108).

¹ First recorded by Herodotus (Hist. 1.94) ca. 440 BCE. See Appendix.

The Etruscan–North Caucasian relationship was first anticipated by Thomsen (1899: 375–381). Hrozný (1917: 57; 1928: 172–173) discussed and expanded these grammatical comparisons, though he attributed them to Indo-European influence. A new era in Hurro-Urartian diachronic studies began with Igor M. Diakonoff, a leading specialist in cuneiform languages. His comparative grammar (1961) marked the first milestone, followed by studies (1967; 1979) that noted ties to East Caucasian without specific evidence. In later works (1971; 1978), he incorporated East Caucasian comparanda into his Hurro-Urartian grammar sketch. Collaborating with Sergei Starostin, Diakonoff (1986; Russian 1988) advanced the field by integrating preliminary East Caucasian reconstructions into Hurro-Urartian comparisons. This lexical material was included in *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary*, where Nikolaev and Starostin (1994) presented their Proto-North Caucasian model. Meanwhile, Ivanov (1988) explored Etruscan parallels with Hurrian, Urartian, and early reconstructions of North Caucasian branches. Independently, Orel and Starostin (1990) compared Etruscan with reconstructed East Caucasian, first at the 1988 Ann Arbor Symposium on Language and Prehistory. Their study offered 59 Etruscan–East Caucasian correspondences, including 13 involving Hurro-Urartian. Similar tripartite comparisons appear in Robertson (2006) and Blažek (2010). Exceptions include Facchetti (2002; 2018) and Akulov (2024), which focus directly on Etruscan–Hurrian relations.

The Etruscan data in this study draw primarily from Steinbauer (1999), supplemented by Wallace (2008), Facchetti (2008), Rix (2004), Bonfante (2002), and d’Aversa (1994). Lemnian follows Eichner (2019). Hurrian relies mainly on Richter (2012, 2016), with additional material from Laroche (1980), Wilhelm (2004), Wegner (2004), and Nozadze (2007). Urartian is based chiefly on Arutjunjan (2001), supplemented by Wegner (2004b), Salvini and Wegner (2014), and Diakonoff (1963).

3. COMPARATIVE WORDLIST

1. Etruscan *ac-* ‘machen’ (Steinbauer 1999, 391)

// Hurrian *ag-* ‘to lead, bring, take up’ (Steinbauer 1999, 4-5); Urartian *ag(u)-* ‘to lead’ (Arutjunjan 2001, 431).

Note 1: Concerning semantics, cf. Latin *agere* ‘to lead, drive, conduct’ and ‘to do, act, labor’.

Note 2: In Etruscan there were no voiced stops.

Note 3: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 57, n. 142) connected HU **ag-* with North Caucasian **ʔVrkV-* ‘to drive’ = **=ər̥kĕw* (NCED 267).

Note 4: Orel & Starostin (1990: 63, n. 47) compared Etruscan *ac-* ‘to have; to do’ with North Caucasian **ʔǎGGV* ‘to hold, take’ = **-ǎGĀr* (NCED 254–55).

2. Etruscan *ali-* ‘geben, schenken, weihen’ (Steinbauer 1999: 396)

// Hurrian *al(e)-* ‘nahe heranbringen, annähern; heranreichen; apportare, avvicinare’ (Richter 2012: 11).

Note 1: Orel & Starostin (1990: 61, n. 1) compared Etruscan *al-* ‘to give’ with HU **ar-* ‘to give.’

Note 2: Cf. East Caucasian **-iĭV* ‘to give’ > Čečen *-al-a* id. etc. (NCED 640–41).

3. Etruscan *am-* ‘to be’ (Steinbauer 1999, 397)

// Hurrian *amm-* ‘to reach, arrive at; ankommen, gelangen, erreichen; atteindre, arriver, faire parvenir’ (Wegner & Bomhard 2020/2023, 99; Richter 2012, 23).

Note 1: The semantic difference is compatible, cf. Czech *přibýt* ‘to arrive’ vs. *být* ‘to be’.

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1990, 61, 4) compared Etruscan *am-* ‘to be’ with Hurrian *mann-*, Urartian *man-* and Proto-Lezgian **ʔi-ma(n)-* ‘to be’.

4. Etruscan *an* ‘he, she; which’; *in* ‘it’ (Pfiffig, while Rix preferred the relative function; see Steinbauer (1999: 93, 397)

// Hurrian *anni* ‘this’ vs. *ani* ‘that’ (Kassian 2010 [2011]: 418–19), Urartian *ini* ‘this,’ anaph. *ina* (Arutjunjan 2001: 448; Wilhelm 2004: 128; Salvini & Wegner 2014: 37).

5. Etruscan *ara-* ‘to put, place; make’ (Wallace 2008: 247)

// Hurrian *ar-*, Urartian *ar(u)-* ‘geben’ (Richter 2012: 41–43; Arutjunjan 2001: 436).

Note 1: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 51, n. 125) compared HU **ar-* ‘to give’ with East Caucasian **ʔi-ʒʒV* ‘to give’ > Čečen *-al-a* id. etc. = **-iLV* (NCED 640–41).

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1990: 61, n. 1) compared HU **ar-* ‘to give’ with Etruscan *al-* ‘to give.’

6. Etruscan *atia-* ‘Mutter’ (Steinbauer 1999: 400)

// Hurrian *ašte/i* ‘(Ehe)Frau,’ *atte* ‘Frau’ (Richter 2012: 59–60, 69).

Note 1: Cf. Lithuanian *môtė* ‘wife,’ *móteris* ‘woman’ vs. Latvian *māte* ‘mother,’ Latin *māter* id.

Note 2: Independently identified by Akulov 2024: 42.

Note 3: Orel & Starostin (1990: 63, n. 42) compared Etruscan *ati* ‘mother’ with East Caucasian **ada(j)-* ‘mother’ = **ʔadaj* ‘mother / father’ (NCED 397–98).

Note 4: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 39, n. 86) compared Hurrian *ašti* ‘woman, wife’ with East Caucasian **ć(V)dV* > Dargwa *cade* ‘female’; Čečen *stē* id. = **cVjdV* (NCED 375).

7. Etruscan *avil* ‘year’, Lemnian *aviz* ~ Etruscan gen. sg. *avils* (Steinbauer 1999: 401–402)

// Hurrian *°arbu* ‘year’ in such compounds as *šin=arbu* ‘two years old,’ *kig=arbu* ‘three years old,’ (Nuzi) *tumun=arbe* ‘four years old,’ etc. (Wilhelm 2004: 115; Richter 2012: 201, 381, 468).

Note 1: The comparison is acceptable only in the case of the compatibility of Etruscan *l* and Hurrian *r* and the metathesis in one of these languages. Alternatively, it is possible to speculate about the Etruscan proto-form **arvil*.

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1990: 62, n. 30) compared Etruscan *avil-* ‘year’ with Hurrian *šawali* ‘year’, Urartian *šāli* id., but for the correspondence of HU **š-* vs. Etruscan *ø* there are no supporting arguments. That is why it is possible to offer an alternative solution: the HU compound **ša(w)-* + **(a)wali*, ‘full year’ vel sim., cf. Hurrian *ša(w)-* ‘vollmachen’ (Richter 2012: 340).

8. Etruscan *calusu-* ‘ausgezeichnet, blühend, best-’ (Steinbauer 1999: 403)

// Hurrian *kel-* ‘beneficare, zufrieden/wohl sein, to be/make well, please’ (Richter 2012: 202).

9. Etruscan *cap(i)*- ‘take’ (Wallace 2008: 248)

// Hurrian *kab-*, *kapp-* ‘(aus)füllen, aufschütten’ (Richter 2012: 186).

Note: Compared by Facchetti (2018: 14).

10. Etruscan *caru* ‘gebaut’, *cerixunce* ‘er baute, ließ bauen’, *cerinu* ‘errichtet’ (Steinbauer 1999: 407–08) ~ *car-*, *cer-* ‘to make, build’ (Bonfante 2002: 215)

// Hurrian *kur-* ‘herstellen’ (Richter 2012: 227).

11. Etruscan *cel-* ‘Erde’ (Steinbauer 1999: 407)

// Urartian *kaquli-* ‘stone’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 451).

Note: Cf. North Caucasian **qwiłə* ‘rock, cliff, stone’ (NCED 939).

12. Etruscan *ci-* ‘three’, *ciem* ‘minus three’, *citz*, *ciz(i)* ‘three times’, *cis-um* ‘aber dreier’, *ciemzaθrum-* ‘17’ = ‘20 – 3’, *cialχ-/cealχ-* ‘30’, besides *cezp-* ‘8’, *cezpz* ‘8 times’, *cezpālχ* acc. ‘80’ (Steinbauer 1999: 96, 100, 408–09), if *cezp-* originates from **ce-z=p(i)* ‘three times on {five}’ (Robertson 2006: 6).

// Hurrian *kige* ‘three’, *kigae* ‘dreifach’, *kiški* ‘three times’ or ‘third’ < **kikši* < **kig(a/e)=ži*, *kikmani* ‘13’ or ‘30’ (Richter 2012: 201–202).

Note 1: Gluhak (1978: 26) compared the Etruscan and Hurrian numerals, the latter he mistakenly designated as Urartian.

Note 2: Ivanov (1988: 214) and Orel & Starostin (1990: 61, n. 10) already compared Etruscan *ci-* ‘three’ with Hurrian *kig-* ‘three’ and Proto-Nakh **qo* id.

13. Etruscan *clan* ‘Sohn’, gen. *clens/ś* (Steinbauer 1999: 409), pertinentive pl. *celeniarasi*, besides *clenaraši*, gen. pl. *cliniaras* (Wallace 2008: 248)

// Hurrian *kalge* ‘small, weak’ (Richter 2012: 181).

Note: The semantic dispersion corresponds to Sumerian *tur* ‘small, little, young; child’, *tur₅* ‘newborn; weak, sick’ (Halloran 2006: 282).

14. Etruscan *ei* ‘not’ (Bonfante 2002: 215; cf. Steinbauer 1999: 416)

// Hurrian *oia* (*u-ia-*) ‘nein’ (Wilhelm 2018: 573) ~ *ua* / *uja* ‘nein’ (Richter 2012: 481), Urartian *ui* ‘not’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 47) ~ *ú-i* ‘nein’ (Salvini & Wegner 2014: 114).

Note: Cf. Robertson (2006: 18).

15. Etruscan *-em* ‘minus’ (in subtraction), e.g. *θunem* ‘minus one’, *eslem* ‘minus two’, *ciem* ‘minus three’ (Steinbauer 1999: 416, 489; Bonfante 2002: 215)

// Hurrian *-ma* ~ *-mma* ‘negative forms of the 3rd person’ (Kassian 2010 [2011]: 408), Urartian *mi* ‘negative (prohibitive) proclitic in the optative’ (Diakonoff & Starostin 1986: 94) ~ *me(i)* ‘пусть не; ни’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 454).

Note 1: Cf. Robertson (2006: 18).

Note 2: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 94) compared HU with North Caucasian **ma* ‘a prohibitive and negative particle’ (NCED 797).

16. Etruscan *ena-* ‘jetzt, heute, gegenwartig’ (Steinbauer 1999: 417)

// Hurrian *henne/i* ‘jetzt, damals, nun’, Urartian *hini(e)* ‘jetzt’ (Richter 2014: 151; Arutjunjan 2001: 446). In HU, it is probably a compound of the deictic element **hi*, which is identified in Urartian *ikukaḫini* ‘the same’ < **iki=uka=hi=ni* vs. *ikukani* ‘the same’ < **iki=uka=ni* (Salvini & Wegner 2014: 37, 110), and **eni/*ini*; cf. Hurrian *inna* ‘now; if’ or temporal ‘wenn, als’ (Richter 2012: 86).

Note: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 32, n. 61) compared HU with North Caucasian **hVnV* ‘now’ = **h[ä]nV* (NCED 487).

17. Etruscan *esvi-* ‘später, nachher’ (Steinbauer 1999: 418)

// Hurrian *ešawa* ‘on the far side’ (Richter 2012: 102–103).

18. Etruscan *eši* ‘vom selben’, *sa-* ‘dasselbe’ (Steinbauer 1999: 418, 462)

// Urartian *isi* ‘всякий’, i.e. ‘every’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 449) or *aišei* ‘irgendjemand’ (Salvini & Wegner 2014: 107).

19. Etruscan *heva* ‘all, jeder’ (Steinbauer 1999: 418)

// Hurrian *heyari*, pl. *heyarunna* / *hé-pa-ru-un-na* ‘alle, every’ (Nozadze 2007: 153).

Note: Cf. North Caucasian **xwE* ‘together, close to’ (NCED 1063–1064).

20. Etruscan pl. *hušur* & *husiur* ‘Kind, Nachkomme’ (Steinbauer 1999: 430)

// Hurrian *hišši* ‘Sproß’ (Richter 2016: 418).

Note: Orel & Starostin (1990: 62, n. 19) compared Etruscan *hus-*, *huš-* ‘boy, son’ with Urartian *aršə* ‘adolescents, boys’ and East Caucasian **u-išwV* = **išwĖ* ‘son, daughter’ (NCED 671–672).

21. Etruscan *ica* ‘this’, later *eca*, acc. *ican*, *ikan*, later *ec(u)n*, loc. *ec(-s)*, with postp. *ecθ(i)*; proclitic nom. *ca*, acc. *cn*, gen. *cla*, loc. *ce(-ś)*, *cei(-ś)*, *c(-ś)*, with postp. *calti*, *clθ(i)* (Steinbauer 1999: 92–93, 430; Bonfante 2002: 92)

// Urartian **iki* in *ikukaḫini* ‘the same’ < **iki=uka=hi=ni* & *ikukani* ‘the same’ < **iki=uka=ni* (Arutjunjan 2001: 448; Salvini & Wegner 2014: 37, 110).

22. Etruscan *ilacva-* ‘Monat, Fest’ with the suffix *-cva-* (Steinbauer 1999: 431, 87)

// Hurrian *eli* ‘Fest’ (Richter 2012: 82).

Note: Independently identified by Facchetti (2018: 14).

23. Etruscan *ipa-*, later *epa-* ‘who, which’ (Bonfante 2002: 94)

// Hurrian *abi* ~ *awi* ‘who’ (Kassian 2010 [2011]: 425, #98; Richter 2012: 38; Wegner & Bomhard 2020/2023: 55).

24. Etruscan *ita* ‘this’, later *eta*, acc. *itan*, *itun*, later *et(a)n*, gen. *etula*, loc. *etule*; proclitic nom. *ta*, acc. *tn*, loc. *tei*, *tei(-ś)* (Steinbauer 1999: 92; Bonfante 2002: 92)

// Urartian *ute* ‘nobody’, analyzable as *u-te*; the first component can be identified with Urartian *ui* ‘not’, *ui aini* ‘nobody’, where the second component means ‘another’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 471; Salvini & Wegner 2014: 107, 114).

Note: Cf. East Caucasian **tV* ‘that’ > Dargwa: *Akušā it*, *Čirag it*, *taś* etc. (NCED 993).

25. Etruscan *lautn* ‘family’, *lautni* ‘freedman’, *lautnita* & *lautniθa* ‘freedwoman’ (Wallace 2008: 250)

// Urartian *lutu*, attested in several variants: ^{SAL}*lu-tú*, ^{LU.SAL}*lu-tú-ni*, ^{SAL}*lu-tú-ni-e* ‘woman’ (with the same suffix as the synonym ^{LU/SAL}*uediani*), ^{SAL}*lu-tú*^{MEŠ} ‘women’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 453).

Note: Robertson (2006: 12) made the same comparison, adding Avar *ḷ:ádi*, pl. *ḷ:ud-bí* ‘wife’ (NCED 764–65).

26. Etruscan *max* ‘five’, *muvalx* ‘fifty’, Lemnian *mav* ‘five’ (Steinbauer 1999: 439; Wallace 2008: 220), if the final *-x* was the ordinal suffix as in *θunx-* ‘first’ (Jacemirskij 2007: 190)

// Hurrian *eman* ‘ten’ (Richter 2012: 83–85), if the final *-n* can be identified with the Hurrian plural relator *-na* (cf. Wilhelm 2004a: 106–108).

Note 1: First compared by Blažek (2010a: 121).

Note 2: If the final *-x* was the enclitic conjunction (Wallace 2008: 116), it is legitimate to interpret Tyrsenian **mu(va)-x* as ‘plus X’, where X = ‘4’ with regard to the interpretation of Etruscan > Latin *mundus* as **“four cardinal points”* (see below). In this case the Etruscan/Tyrsenian numeral ‘5’ would be formed as the sum **θu-mu(va)-x* ‘1+4’. This hypothesis supports the existence of the common numeral ‘4’ in Tyrsenian **mu(va)-* & *mundus* and Hurrian **(ta-)muni-* (see #29). Accepting it, this isogloss conspicuously resembles the Anatolian numerals ‘4’: Hittite *me(i)u-/meia-*; Cuneiform Luwian *māuṽa-* ‘four’, Hieroglyphic Luwian *miwa-*, reconstructed on the basis of the sign IIII *mi* and the record nom.-acc.pl.c. IIII-*wa/i-zi*; Lycian *mupm̃m-* ‘fourfold’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 571), and it is legitimate to ask, who borrowed from whom.

27. Etruscan *men-* ‘errichten, setzen, weihen’ (Steinbauer 1999: 443)

// Hurrian *min-* ‘geben, nehmen’ (Richter 2012: 250).

28. Etruscan *mi* ‘I’, acc. *mini* ‘me’ (Steinbauer 1999: 91)

// Urartian *-me* enclitic dat. ‘me’ (Arutjunjan 2001: 454; Salvini & Wegner 2014: 37).

29. Etruscan > Latin *mundus* ‘heavens, sky; world, earth; subterranean vault’ [Plautus+], originally perhaps ‘four cardinal points’ with regard to the probable equivalence *Roma quadrata* = *mundus* (cf. Carter Platner 1901: 420–25; 1908: 180; Toporov 1983: 123–24), which is applicable to both ‘sky’ and ‘world’

// Hurrian *tumni* ‘fourth’, *tumunzi* ‘fourth’, *tumnadi* ‘consisting of four; Vierheit’ (Richter 2012: 468–69). With regard to the ordinal *tumunzi* ‘4th’ and cardinal *tamri* ‘9’ (Richter 2012: 436), the numeral ‘4’ is derivable from **tamuni* and ‘9’ from **tamun-nari-* ‘4 + 5’ (cf. Blažek 2010: 118–

19). It is tempting to identify in the first syllable the Hurrian form *tea*, which has been interpreted as ‘much, many, very, numerous, big, completely’. The hypothetical compound **tea-muni-* would mean ‘completely four’, perhaps about fingers of a hand without the thumb. Without the first component, but with the derivational suffix *-adi* we have got *munadi* ‘consisting of four’, which perfectly corresponds to Latinized Etruscan *mundus*.

Note: Cf. Quechua *tahuantinsuyu* /*tawantinsuyul* ‘four regions of Andes’ (*tawa* ‘four’; *Anti* ‘Andes’; *suyu* ‘region’ – DQEQ 16–17; 595, 617) = ‘the Inca empire’.

30. Etruscan *netei* ‘Schwiegermutter’ (Steinbauer 1999: 449)

// Hurrian *nera* ‘Mutter’ (Richter 2012: 275) ~ ‘жена деверя’ (Nozadze 2007: 257).

Note 1: Perhaps a primary compound of the type **ner-atia* ‘man’s mother’; cf. Urartian *nara* ‘people, nation’.

Note 2: Kapancjan (apud Martirosyan 2010: 505) connected the Hurrian kinship term *nera* with Armenian *nēr*, gen.-dat.sg. *niri* ‘husband’s brother’s wife; husband’s the other wife’. The latter has been derived from IE **(H)jēnh₂-ter-ih₂-*.

31. Etruscan *nu-θe* ‘to listen to’ (Wallace 2008: 251); the suffix *-θ-* is productive in the Etruscan verbal morphology (Steinbauer 1999: 142)

// Hurrian *nui* ‘ear’ (Richter 2012: 281).

32. Etruscan *nun-* ‘to bring, involve’, *nuna* ‘offering’ (Bonfante 2002: 217)

// Urartian *nun(a)-* ‘to come, arrive’ (Arutjunan 2001: 456); cf. Hurrian *un-* ‘kommen’, trans. ‘bringen’ (Richter 2012: 490).

Note: Connected by Robertson (2006: 9).

33. Etruscan *rasna* ‘etruskisch; national’ (Steinbauer 1999: 459) = *Ῥασέννα* by Dionysius Halicarnassus (*Antiquitates Romanae*, 1.30.3: ‘Their own name ... is the same as that of one of their leaders, *Ῥασέννα*’)

// Urartian *arše* ‘child, boy, lad, youth’ (Arutjunan 2001: 436). The Hurrian counterpart may be identified in the Ugaritic alphabetic record *aršm* ‘young boy’? (Richter 2012: 48).

Note 1: The ethnonyms motivated by the meaning ‘child, boy, youth’ are relatively frequent in Indo-European traditions: e.g. *Čech* can be etymologized on the basis of the appellative preserved in Slovenian *čèh* ‘boy from 10 to 15 years; herdsman’, Kašubian *čex* ‘youngster, child’, all from Common Slavic **čexъ*; *Goth* of the same origin as Norwegian *gut*, Swedish *gutt* ‘boy’; the Germanic tribe of *Buri* [Tacitus: *Germania* 43] of the same origin as Old Norse *burr*, Old English *byre* ‘son’ etc. (Blažek 2010b: 17).

Note 2: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 36, n. 71) compared the Urartian word with such the North Caucasian forms as Lak *ars* ‘son’, Dargi *urši* ‘son, boy’ etc. (NCED 671–672: North Caucasian **=iřwĒ*, where the forms with the medial *-r-* are explained through the metathesis of the *r*-suffix of the oblique stem).

34. Etruscan *rene-θi* ‘in der Hand; zur Verfügung’ (Facchetti 2008: 231; cf. Steinbauer 1999: 460 without any translation)

// Hurrian *nariya* ‘five’ (Wilhelm 2004: 115).

Note 1: Facchetti (2018: 20) connected these forms, accepting metathesis in one of the compared languages.

Note 2: The probable external cognates from other branches of the Sino-Caucasian macrofamily indicate that the sequence *r...n* is primary: Burušaski of Hunza *-rín* & *-rín*, pl. *rínčín*, Nagir pl. in *očan*, Yasin *-rén*, (together with the root): pl. *-rén(čin)* ‘hand’ (Berger 1998: 364–65); Yeniseian **rɔŋ* ‘hand’ > Ket *l’añ*, Yug *l’ɔŋ* ‘hand’, Arin *lan-t’ūŋ* ‘wing’ (Starostin 1995: 178). In North Caucasian a promising cognate can be identified in the numeral **ʔrānλE* ‘6’ (NCED 219–220), if it is analyzable as a compound of **ʔrān-* ‘5’ & **λE*. The latter component is derivable from the North Caucasian verb **=ālĒw* ‘to lie, put, lead’ > Nakh **=ill-* ‘to lie, put upon (something)’, **t-ill-* ‘to put (from above)’, Čamalal *=al-* ‘to begin’, Tsezian *ɔL* ‘to be’, Bežta *=ol-*, Gunzib *=ol-* ‘to finish’, Lezgian *ʔel:wi-* ‘to put, lie’, West Caucasian **λə-* ‘to lie’ (NCED 278–79). The primary semantics could be ‘six’ = ‘(one) put upon five’ or ‘beginning the (new) five’. A similar structure is assumed for Indo-European **(K)syeḗs* ‘6’, namely **ḡhes-* ‘hand’ & **yeḗs-* ‘to grow, rise’ (**-ḡ-* is confirmed by Lithuanian *vešėti* ‘to grow vigorously, thrive; prosper, flourish’), i.e. ‘overgrowing the hand’ (see Blažek 1999: 239–41).

35. Etruscan *ruva* ‘Bruder’ (Steinbauer 1999: 462)

// Hurrian *ewuru* / *ewiru* ‘heir, Erbe’ (Nozadze 2007: 131).

Note 1: These forms are compatible only in the case of metathesis in one of the compared languages. It seems, it was Hurrian, where the initial *r-* was probably impossible in the inherited lexicon (see n. 24).

Note 2: The semantic difference has analogy e.g. in Old Irish *orb* ‘heir’, *com-arbe* ‘successor’, Gothic *arbi* ‘heir’, vs. Russian *rebēnok* ‘child’, *rebjáta* ‘children’ (Pokorny 1959: 781–82).

36. Etruscan *sex* ‘Tochter’ (Steinbauer 1999: 463), if it is derivable from *selχ*; cf. *mex* ‘Herrin, Königin’, if it represents an adaptation of Phoenician *mlkt* ‘queen’ (Krahmalkov 2000: 289); cf. Hebrew *malḡah* ‘wife of the king’ (HAL 592)

// Hurrian *šala* ‘Tochter’ (Richter 2012: 344), Urartian *sila* ‘wife’ (Arutjunan 2001: 460).

Note 1: Cf. Ivanov (1988: 212). Independently identified by Akulov (2024: 42).

Note 2: Related can be Common Burušaski **salé-n* > Yasin *salén*, *selén* ‘sister(s) and daughter(s) of a man’, Hunza & Nagir *silažín* ‘woman, female relatives’ (Berger 1998: 373, 378).

Note 3: Orel & Starostin (1990: 63, n. 43) compared Etruscan *sec*, *sex* ‘daughter’ with East Caucasian **CVkwā* ‘female’.

Note 4: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 42, n. 94) connected Hurrian *šala* ‘daughter’ and Urartian *sila* ‘wife’ with East Caucasian **-ilčéwi* ‘female relative’ = **rīlčwī* (NCED 952).

37. Etruscan *snaenθ* ‘Genossin, Zofe, Magd’ (Steinbauer 1999: 467) ~ ‘maid, companion’ (Bonfante 2002: 219)

// Hurrian *šena* ‘brother’ (Richter 2012: 384–85).

Note 1: Concerning semantics, cf. Egyptian *sn* ‘brother; companion’ (Erman & Grapow IV: 150–151) ~ *sn* ‘brother’ vs. *snw* ‘companion, fellow’, *snt* ‘sister’ vs. dual *snwt(y)* ‘female companions’ (Faulkner 1962/1991: 230).

Note 2: Independently identified by Akulov (2024: 42).

Note 3: Cf. East Caucasian: Avar-Andi **ccVnV* ‘second cousin’ (NCED 322).

38. Etruscan *sval(a)-* ‘lebend(ig)’ (Steinbauer 1999: 469) ~ *sval* ‘alive, living’ (Wallace 2008: 252)

// Hurrian *šawali* ‘year’ (Richter 2012: 351), Urartian *šāli* id. (Arutjunan 2001: 462).

Note 1: Cf. Vedic *āyu-* ‘life, lifetime’ vs. Latin *aevum* ‘period of time’.

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1986: 30, n. 55) compared HU **šawal-* ‘year’ with North Caucasian **swērHo* ‘year; old’ (NCED 968–69).

Note 3: Orel & Starostin (1990: 62, n. 30) compared Hurrian *šawali* ‘year’ with Etruscan *avil-* ‘year’, while Etruscan *sval-* ‘to live’ they combined with Hurrian *zurgi* ‘blood’ and East Caucasian **čāžwV* ‘alive; blood’ = **čāLwV* (NCED 376).

39. Etruscan *ten-, tn-* ‘to act as magistrate’ (Bonfante 2002: 219) ~ ‘ableisten’ (Steinbauer 1999: 476)

// Hurrian *tan-*, dial. (Ugarit) *tin-* ‘tun, machen’ (Richter 2012: 436–438), Urartian *tan-* ‘machen’ (Salvini & Wegner 2014: 114) ~ *tanu-* ‘to found’ (Arutjunan 2001: 466).

40. Etruscan *tinia-* ‘Tag; Zeus, Juppiter’ (Steinbauer 1999: 478)

// Hurrian *tueni* ‘Tag’ (Richter 2012: 478).

Note: Orel & Starostin (1990: 62, n. 31) compared Etruscan *tin-* ‘day’ with PNakh **dē*, obl. **dēni-* ‘day’ < East Caucasian **rīhV* (NCED 952).

41. Etruscan *trepu-* ‘Handwerker, Zimmermann’ (Steinbauer 1999: 481); Lemnian *tover* ‘Schmiedegott’, reconstructed on the basis of the Lemnian city-name *Toverona*, corresponding to ancient Ἡφαίστῖα [Herodotus, 6.140] according to Eichner (2019: 120)

// Hurrian *tabiri* ‘smith’ > Sumerian *TABIRA/TIBIRA* ‘coppersmith’ > Assyrian *tabīru* id. (Richter 2012: 439).

42. Etruscan *trutnuθ* ‘Blitzdeuter’ = Latin *fulguriator* (Steinbauer 1999: 482), if it is analyzable as **t(V)ru-* ‘fire’ & *ten-/tn-* ‘to act as magistrate’ ~ ‘ableisten’ (see above), together perhaps ‘that one which attends to {celestial} fires’

// Hurrian *tari-* ‘fire’ (Richter 2012: 444).

Note: The semantic development from ‘fire’ to ‘lightning’ has analogy e.g. in Old Norse *elding* ‘lightning’ vs. *eldr* ‘fire’ or in Irish *teintreach* ‘lightning’ vs. *teine* ‘fire’ (Buck 1949: #1.57).

43. Etruscan *Tursikina* ‘gens’ from Chiusi, 7th cent. BCE; cf. Greek Τῦρσενοί, later Τῦρρενοί, Umbrian *Tursko-*, Latin *Tusci* (d’Aversa 1994: 55; Steinbauer 1999: 483)

// Hurrian *tarše* ‘Mensch’, *taršuwan(n)i* ‘Menschheit’ (Richter 2012: 447); Urartian ^{LÚ}*taršuani(e)* ‘man, human being’, ^{LÚ}*taršuanarani* ‘people, settlement’ vs. *nara* ‘people, nation’ (Arutjunan 2001: 456, 467).

Note: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 39, n. 87) reconstructed the HU compound **tar-s(u)wa-*, where the first component was connected with Hurrian *turohḫə* ‘male’ and the second one with North Caucasian **čwījo* ‘man, male’ (NCED 336).

44. Etruscan *θi* ‘Wasser; Bach, Fluß’ (Steinbauer 1999: 488)

// Hurrian *šije* ‘eau’ ~ *ī* in the Ugaritic transcription (Richter 2012: 366, 544).

Note 1: Independently identified by Facchetti (2018: 14) and Akulov (2024: 43).

Note 2: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 49, n. 118) connected Hurrian *šije* ‘water’ with East Caucasian **ʔä-šV* ‘to become wet’; alternatively with East Caucasian **xxänšy* ‘water’ > Karata *ššēji* id. etc. = **xǎñhĩ* (NCED 1060).

45. Etruscan *θu(n)-* ‘eins’, later *θu*, further *θunem* ‘weniger eins’, *θunz* ‘einmal’ (Steinbauer 1999: 100, 489)

// Hurrian *šukki* ~ *šugi* ‘one’, *šukši* ‘erstens’ (Richter 2012: 406–407), Urartian *šuki* ‘once’, *šusi(ni)* ‘ein ... einzig’ (Arutjunan 2001: 466; Salvini & Wegner 2014: 114).

Note 1: The first one who compared the Etruscan and Urartian numerals ‘1’ was probably Stoltenberg (1943: 243).

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1990: 62, n. 20) compared Etruscan *θu* ‘one’ with Urartian *š(V)-usə* ‘first’ and North Caucasian **cHš* ‘one’ (NCED 323–324).

46. Etruscan *un* acc. sg., *une* dat. sg.; *unu* acc. pl. ‘you’ (Rix 1991; Bonfante 2002: 91, 220; cf. Wallace 2001: 58–59, 254)

// Hurrian *we* ‘selbständige Person der 2Ps. Sg.; *wella* 2Ps. Pl. (Richter 2012: 309–310).

Note 1: The comparison with Etruscan nom. *mi*, acc. *mini* ‘I’ indicates the unattested nom. sg. *u* vel sim.

Note 2: Diakonoff & Starostin (1986: 82) compared Hurrian *we* with East Caucasian **w_lV* ‘thou’ > Lezgin *wun*, Arči *un* id. etc. < North Caucasian *uō* id. (NCED 1014).

Note 3: Related are also Burušaski *un* ‘thou’ (Berger 1998: 456); Yeniseian **ʔaw/ʔu* id. > Ket *ū*, Yug *u*; Kott *au*, pl. *auoŋ*; Arin *au*; Pumpokol *úe*.

47. Etruscan *zal* ‘zwei’, loc. *esals*, subtracted *eslem*, multiplied *eslz* ‘zweimal’, *zelur* ‘two at the time’ (Bonfante 2002: 97); *zaθrum* ‘zwanzig’ (Steinbauer 1999: 96–100, 499); Raetic *pal* ‘zwei’ (Rix 1998: 57; Salomon 2020: 283); Lemnian *azlas* ‘den zweien’ (Eichner 2019: 96).

// Hurrian *ošella* in *šinišella*, which should correspond to Hittite *2-an-ki* ‘twice’ by Kammenhuber (see Laroche 1980: 234; Richter 2012: 382), but a more fitting interpretation could be ‘two both’² or German ‘zwei beide.’³ Friedrich (1934: 314–316), followed by Laroche (1980: 171, 288) also mentioned the Hurrian suffix *-ššil* appearing in the theonyms of Mitanni-Aryan origin, namely ^{DINGIRmeš}*Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il* and ^{DINGIRmeš}*ú-ru-wa-na-aš-ši-il*. They apparently correspond to the Vedic divine names in dual *Mitrā* ‘both Mitras’, i.e. ‘Mitra and Varuṇa’, and *Vāruṇā* ‘both Varuṇas’, i.e. ‘Mitra and Varuṇa’. Both the theonyms are also attested as the copulative compound of the type dvandva, with the common dual ending: nom. *Mitra-Vāruṇau*, gen.-loc. *Mitra-Vāruṇayoḥ*, dat.-abl.-instr. *Mitra-Vāruṇābhyām*. Laroche (1980: 171) interpreted the suffix *-ššil* as ‘les deux’.

Note 1: The Etruscan-Hurrian comparison was identified by Ivanov (1988: 214).

Note 2: Orel & Starostin (1990: 61, n. 12) compared Etruscan *zal* ‘2’ with HU counterparts: according to more recent sources Hurrian *šina*, *šine/i* ‘2’ (Richter 2012: 380), Urartian *šinamdini* ‘вдвое’ (Arutjunan 2001: 464), plus Nakh **ši?*, obl. **šina-* ‘2’ (NCED 845–846). But HU **šina-* ‘2’ is apparently of Semitic origin, cf. Akkadian m. *šina* (status absolutus), Eblaite *šina* ‘2’ (Blažek 2010: 118; Robertson 2006: 9; Facchetti 2018: 18, following p.c. with Mauro Giorgieri in 2011), while Nakh **ši?*, obl. **šina-* ‘2’ looks as a result of the areal influence of Hurrian or Urartian.

Note 3: The comparison of Etruscan *zal* ‘2’ with HU **šina-* ‘2’ would imply the correspondence of Etruscan *-l-* and HU *-n-*, but for it are missing other supporting arguments.

4. CONCLUSION

Of the 47 proposed comparisons, 20–21 are nouns (substantival or adjectival), 11 are pronouns, adverbs, or grammatical words, 6 are numerals or numeral-derived, and 9–10 are verbs. Given the small size and low semantic overlap of the attested Etruscan, Hurrian, and Urartian lexicons, this distribution supports—tentatively—a genetic relationship between Etruscan (or more broadly Tyrsenian) and Hurro-Urartian. The connection appears stronger than any with North Caucasian, though the latter awaits systematic quantification.

Additional evidence includes Hurro-Urartian etymologies for Greek mythological names (*Apollo*, *Artemis*, *Leto*, *Athene*, etc.; cf. Blažek 2007, 2014, 2016, 2017, 2022) and archaeological-linguistic traces of Hurro-Urartian dialect(s) in western Anatolia, the Aegean, and possibly Cyprus. Northwest Anatolian origins for pre-Etruscan Tyrsenians are also defended (Beekes 2003; Kloekhorst 2021: 58–72). The present data allow the hypothesis that these two population movements reflect a single ethno-linguistic continuum.

² E.g. two both of our own.

³ E.g. zwei beide von unseren Selbst.

APPENDIX A₁: CORRESPONDENCES AMONG CONSONANTS

Etruscan	Hurrian	etymologies (##)	Etruscan	Uartian	etymologies (##)
<i>c-</i>	<i>k-</i>	8, 9, 10, 12, 13	<i>c-</i>	<i>-q-</i>	11
<i>-c-</i>	<i>-g-</i>	1	<i>-c-</i>	<i>-g-</i>	1
			<i>-c-</i>	<i>-k-</i>	21
<i>h-</i>	<i>ḫ-</i>	19, 20			
<i>-i- (= ṡi)</i>	<i>-j-</i>	14	<i>-i- (= ṡi)</i>	<i>-ṡi-</i>	14
<i>-l-</i>	<i>-l-</i>	2, 11, 13, 22	<i>l-</i>	<i>l-</i>	25
<i>m-</i>	<i>m-</i>	27			
<i>m-</i>	<i>-m-</i>	26, 29	<i>m-</i>	<i>-m-</i>	28
<i>-m-</i>	<i>-m(m)-</i>	3, 15			
<i>n-</i>	<i>n-</i>	30, 31	<i>n-</i>	<i>n-</i>	32
<i>-n-</i>	<i>n-</i>	34			
<i>-n-</i>	<i>-n(n)-</i>	4, 16, 37, 39	<i>-n-</i>	<i>-n-</i>	4, 16, 32
<i>-p-</i>	<i>-b-</i>	41			
<i>-p-</i>	<i>-b-/-pp-</i>	9			
<i>-p-</i>	<i>-b-/-w-</i>	23			
<i>r-</i>	<i>-r-</i>	34, 35	<i>r-</i>	<i>-r-</i>	33
<i>-r-</i>	<i>-r-</i>	5, 10, 41, 42, 43	<i>-r-</i>	<i>-r-</i>	5
<i>s-</i>	<i>š-</i>	36, 37	<i>s-</i>	<i>s-</i>	36
<i>-s-</i>	<i>-š-</i>	43	<i>-s-</i>	<i>-š-</i>	33, 34
<i>-s-/-ś-</i>	<i>-š-</i>	20	<i>-ś-</i>	<i>-s- or -š-</i>	18
<i>sv-</i>	<i>š(a)w-</i>	38			
<i>-sv-</i>	<i>-š(a)w-</i>	17			
<i>t-</i>	<i>t-</i>	39, 40, 41, 42, 43	<i>t-</i>	<i>t-</i>	39, 43
			<i>-t-</i>	<i>-t-</i>	24, 25
<i>-ti- (= tṡi)</i>	<i>-št-/-tt-</i>	6			
<i>θ-</i>	<i>š-</i>	44, 46	<i>θ-</i>	<i>š-</i>	45
<i>-v-</i>	<i>-y-/-p-</i>	19			
<i>-v-</i>	<i>-rb-</i>	7			
<i>z-/-s-</i>	<i>-š-</i>	47			

APPENDIX A₂: CORRESPONDENCES AMONG VOWELS OF THE FIRST SYLLABLE

Etruscan	Hurrian	etymologies (##)	Etruscan	Uartian	etymologies (##)
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 26, 33	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	1, 5, 33
<i>a/e</i>	<i>e/i</i>	8, 47			
<i>a/e</i>	<i>u</i>	10	<i>e</i>	<i>u</i>	11, 14
<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	15, 36			
<i>ø/e</i>	<i>a</i>	13			
<i>ø/e</i>	<i>a/i</i>	39	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	16, 18, 36
<i>ø</i>	<i>a</i>	42			
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	16, 17, 19, 30			
<i>i</i>	<i>e</i>	22	<i>i</i>	<i>e</i>	28
<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	12, 44	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	4, 21
<i>i</i>	<i>a</i>	23			
<i>i</i>	<i>ue</i>	40	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	24
<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	29, 31, 45	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	45
<i>u</i>	<i>u/i</i>	35			
<i>u</i>	<i>a</i>	43	<i>u</i>	<i>a</i>	43
			<i>au</i>	<i>u</i>	25

APPENDIX B: TEXT PASSAGES

Dionysius Halicarnassus: *Antiquitates Romanae*, 1.27

1.27.1. οἱ δὲ μετανάστας μυθολογοῦντες αὐτοὺς εἶναι Τυρρηγνὸν ἀποφαίνουσιν ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἀποικίας γενόμενον ἀφ’ ἐαυτοῦ θέσθαι τῷ ἔθνει τοῦνομα: τοῦτον δὲ Λυδὸν εἶναι τὸ γένος ἐκ τῆς πρότερον Μηονίας καλουμένης, παλαιὸν δὴ τινα μετανάστην ὄντα: εἶναι δ’ αὐτὸν πέμπτον ἀπὸ Διὸς, λέγοντες ἐκ Διὸς καὶ Γῆς Μάνην γενέσθαι πρῶτον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ βασιλέα: τούτου δὲ καὶ Καλλιρόης τῆς Ὠκεανοῦ θυγατρὸς γεννηθῆναι Κότυν: τῷ δὲ Κότυϊ γήμαντι θυγατέρα Τύλλου τοῦ γηγενοῦς Ἀλίην δύο γενέσθαι παῖδας Ἀσίην καὶ Ἄτυν:

2. ἐκ δὲ Ἄτυος καὶ Καλλιθέας τῆς Χωραίου Λυδὸν φῦναι καὶ Τυρρηγνόν: καὶ τὸν μὲν Λυδὸν αὐτοῦ καταμείναντα τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχὴν παραλαβεῖν καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ Λυδίαν τὴν γῆν ὀνομασθῆναι: Τυρρηγνὸν δὲ τῆς ἀποικίας ἡγησάμενον πολλὴν κτήσασθαι τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ τοῖς συναραμένοις τοῦ στόλου ταύτην θέσθαι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν.

3. Ἡροδότῳ δὲ εἴρηνται Ἄτυος τοῦ Μάνεω παῖδες οἱ περὶ Τυρρηγνόν, καὶ ἡ μετανάστασις τῶν Μηόνων εἰς Ἰταλίαν οὐχ ἐκούσιος. φησὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἄτυος ἀρχῆς ἀφορίαν καρπῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ Μηόνων γενέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους τέως μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς φιλοχωρίας κρατουμένους πολλὰ διαμηχανήσασθαι πρὸς τὴν συμφορὰν ἀλεξήτρια, τῇ μὲν ἑτέρα τῶν ἡμερῶν μέτρια σιτία προσφερομένους, τῇ δ’ ἑτέρα διακαρτεροῦντας: χρονίζοντος δὲ τοῦ δεινοῦ διανείμαντας ἅπαντα τὸν δῆμον διχῇ κλήρους ταῖς μοίραις

ἐπιβαλεῖν: τὸν μὲν ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τῆς χώρας, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ μονῇ, καὶ τῶν Ἄτυος παίδων τὸν μὲν τῇ προσνεῖμαι, τὸν δὲ τῇ.

4. λαχούσης δὲ τῆς ἅμα Λυδῷ μοίρας τὴν τοῦ μεῖναι τύχην, ἐκχωρήσαι τὴν ἐτέραν ἀπολαχοῦσαν τῶν χρημάτων τὰ μέρη, ὀρμισαμένην δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐσπερίοις μέρεσι τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἔνθα ἦν Ὀμβρικοῖς ἡ οἴκησις, αὐτοῦ καταμείνασαν ἰδρύσασθαι πόλεις τὰς ἔτι καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον οὔσας.

1.27.1. 'But those who relate a legendary tale about their having come from a foreign land say that Tyrrhenus, who was the leader of the colony, gave his name to the nation, and that he was a Lydian by birth, from the district formerly called Maeonia, and migrated in ancient times. They add that he was the fifth in descent from Zeus; for they say that the son of Zeus and Gê was Manes, the first king of that country, and his son by Callirrhoê, the daughter of Oceanus, was Cotys, who by Haliê, the daughter of earth-born Tyllus, had two sons, Asies and Atys:

2. from the latter of whom by Callithea, the daughter of Choraëus, came Lydus and Tyrrhenus. Lydus, they continue, remaining there, inherited his father's kingdom, and from him the country was called Lydia; but Tyrrhenus, who was the leader of the colony, conquered a large portion of Italy and gave his name to those who had taken part in the expedition.

3. Herodotus, however, says that Tyrrhenus and his brother were the sons of Atys, the son of Manes, and that the migration of the Maeonians to Italy was not voluntary. For they say that in the reign of Atys there was a dearth in the country of the Maeonians and that the inhabitants, inspired by love of their native land, for a time contrived a great many methods to resist this calamity, one day permitting themselves but a moderate allowance of food and the next day fasting. But, as the mischief continued, they divided the people into two groups and cast lots to determine which should go out of the country and which should stay in it; of the sons of Atys one was assigned to the one group the other to the other.

4. And when the lot fell to that part of the people which was with Lydus to remain in the country, the other group departed after receiving their share of the common possessions; and landing in the western parts of Italy where the Umbrians dwelt, they remained there and built the cities that still existed even in his time.'

1.30.3. Ῥωμαῖοι μέντοι ἄλλαις αὐτὸ προσαγορεύουσιν ὀνομασίαις: καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας, ἐν ᾗ ποτε ὤκησαν, Ἑτρούριαν προσαγορευομένης Ἑτρούσκους καλοῦσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμπειρίας τῶν περὶ τὰ θεῖα σεβάσματα λειτουργιῶν, διαφέροντας εἰς αὐτὴν ἐτέρων, νῦν μὲν Τούσκους ἀσαφέστερον, πρότερον δ' ἀκριβοῦντες τοῦνομα ὥσπερ Ἕλληνες Θυοσκοὺς ἐκάλουν: αὐτοὶ μέντοι σφαῖς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων τινὸς Ῥασέννα τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνῳ

1.30.3. 'The Romans, however, give them other names: from the country they once inhabited, named Etruria, they call them Etruscans, and from their knowledge of the ceremonies relating to divine worship, in which they excel others, they now call them, rather inaccurately, Tusci, but formerly, with the same accuracy as the Greeks, they called them Thyoscoi. Their own name for themselves, however, is the same as that of one of their leaders, Rasenna.'

Dionysius Halicarnassus: *Antiquitates Romanae*, Vol I-IV, ed. Karl Jacoby. Leipzig: Teubner 1885.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. I, with an English translation by Earnest Gary, on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press – London: Heinemann 1937.

Herodotus: *Historiae* 1.94

[3] ἐπὶ Ἄτυος τοῦ Μάνεω βασιλέος σιτοδείην ἰσχυρὴν ἀνὰ τὴν Λυδίην πᾶσαν γενέσθαι, καὶ τοὺς Λυδοὺς τέως μὲν διάγειν λιπαρέοντας, μετὰ δὲ ὡς οὐ παύεσθαι, ἅκεα δίζησθαι, ἄλλον δὲ ἄλλο ἐπιμηχανᾶσθαι αὐτῶν. ἐξευρεθῆναι δὴ ὧν τότε καὶ τῶν κύβων καὶ τῶν ἀστραγάλων καὶ τῆς σφαίρης καὶ τῶν ἀλλέων πασέων παιγνιέων τὰ εἶδεα, πλὴν πεσσῶν τούτων γὰρ ὧν τὴν ἐξεύρεσιν οὐκ οἰκηιοῦνται Λυδοί. [4] ποιεῖν δὲ ὥδε πρὸς τὸν λιμὸν ἐξευρόντας, τὴν μὲν ἐτέρην τῶν ἡμερέων παίζειν πᾶσαν, ἵνα δὴ μὴ ζητέοιεν σιτία, τὴν δὲ ἐτέρην σιτέεσθαι παυομένους τῶν παιγνιέων. τοιοῦτῳ τρόπῳ διάγειν ἐπ' ἕτεα δυῶν δέοντα εἴκοσι. [5] ἐπεῖτε δὲ οὐκ ἀνιέναι τὸ κακὸν ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐπὶ μᾶλλον βιάζεσθαι οὕτω δὴ τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν δύο μοίρας διελόντα Λυδῶν πάντων κληρῶσαι τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ μόνῃ τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ ἐξόδῳ ἐκ τῆς χώρας, καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τῇ μένειν αὐτοῦ λαγχανούσῃ τῶν μοιρέων ἑωυτὸν τὸν βασιλέα προστάσσειν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ἀπαλλασσομένῃ τὸν ἑωυτοῦ παῖδα, τῷ οὐνομα εἶναι Τυρσηνόν. [6] λαχόντας δὲ αὐτῶν τοὺς ἐτέρους ἐξίεναι ἐκ τῆς χώρας καταβῆναι ἐς Σμύρνην καὶ μηχανήσασθαι πλοῖα, ἐς τὰ ἐσθεμένους τὰ πάντα ὅσα σφι ἦν χρηστὰ ἐπίπλοα, ἀποπλέειν κατὰ βίου τε καὶ γῆς ζήτησιν, ἐς ὃ ἔθνεα πολλὰ παραμειψαμένους ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Ὀμβρικούς, ἔνθα σφέας ἐνιδρύσασθαι πόλιας καὶ οἰκέειν τὸ μέχρι τοῦδε. [7] ἀντὶ δὲ Λυδῶν μετονομασθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέος τοῦ παιδός, ὅς σφεας ἀνήγαγε, ἐπὶ τούτου τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ποιευμένους ὀνομασθῆναι Τυρσηνοὺς. Λυδοὶ μὲν δὴ ὑπὸ Πέρσῃσι ἐδεδούλωντο.

<<https://sacred-texts.com/cla/hh/hh1090.htm>>

[3] 'In the reign of Atys son of Manes there was great scarcity of food in all Lydia. For a while the Lydians bore this with what patience they could; presently, when the famine did not abate, they looked for remedies, and different plans were devised by different men. Then it was that they invented the games of dice and knuckle-bones and ball and all other forms of game except dice, which the Lydians do not claim to have discovered. [4] Then, using their discovery to lighten the famine, every other day they would play for the whole day, so that they would not have to look for food, and the next day they quit their play and ate. This was their way of life for eighteen years. [5] But the famine did not cease to trouble them, and instead afflicted them even more. At last their king divided the people into two groups, and made them draw lots, so that the one group should remain and the other leave the country; he himself was to be the head of those who drew the lot to remain there, and his son, whose name was Tyrrhenus, of those who departed. [6] Then the one group, having drawn the lot, left the country and came down to Smyrna and built ships, in which they loaded all their goods that could be transported aboard ship, and sailed away to seek a livelihood and a country; until at last, after sojourning with one people after another, they came to the Ombrici, where they founded cities and have lived ever since. [7] They no longer called themselves Lydians, but Tyrrhenians, after the name of the king's son who had led them there.'

Herodotus: *The Histories*, with an English translation by A. D. Godley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1920.

‘In the reign of Atys the son of Manes their king there came to be a grievous dearth over the whole of Lydia; and the Lydians for a time continued to endure it, but afterwards, as it did not cease, they sought for remedies; and one devised one thing and another of them devised another thing. And then were discovered, they say, the ways of playing with the dice and the knucklebones and the ball, and all the other games excepting draughts (for the discovery of this last is not claimed by the Lydians). These games they invented as a resource against the famine, and thus they used to do: on one of the days they would play games all the time in order that they might not feel the want of food, and on the next they ceased from their games and had food: and thus they went on for eighteen years. As however the evil did not slacken but pressed upon them ever more and more, therefore their king divided the whole Lydian people into two parts, and he appointed by lot one part to remain and the other to go forth from the land; and the king appointed himself to be over that one of the parts which had the lot to stay in the land, and his son to be over that which was departing; and the name of his son was Tyrsenos. So the one party of them, having obtained the lot to go forth from the land, went down to the sea at Smyrna and built ships for themselves, wherein they placed all the movable goods which they had and sailed away to seek for means of living and a land to dwell in; until after passing by many nations they came at last to the land of the Ombricans, and there they founded cities and dwell up to the present time: and changing their name they were called after the king's son who led them out from home, not Lydians but Tyrsenians, taking the name from him.’

The History of Herodotus: translated into English by George Campbell Macaulay. London: Macmillan and Co. 1904.

REFERENCES

- Adrados, Francisco R. 1989. “Etruscan as an IE Anatolian (but not Hittite) Language”. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 17, 363–383.
- Adrados, Francisco R. 1994. “More on Etruscan as an IE-Anatolian Language”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 107, 54–76.
- Adrados, Francisco R. 2005. “El etrusco como indoeuropeo anatolio: viejos y nuevos argumentos”. *Emerita* 73, 45–56.
- Akulov, Alexander. 2024. “Etruscan is related to Hurro-Urartian”. *Cultural Anthropology and Ethnosemiotics* 10/1, 40–44.
- Arutjunjan, N.V. 2001. *Korpus urartskix klinoobraznyx nadpisej*. Erevan: Izdatel'stvo Gitutjun – Nacional'naja akademija nauk Respubliki Armenii.
- d'Aversa, Arnaldo. 1994. *Dizionario della lingua etrusca*. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.
- Beekes, Robert S.P. 2003. *The Origin of the Etruscans*. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.
- Berger, Hermann. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nagir, Teil III: Wörterbuch Burushaski-Deutsch, Deutsch-Burushaski*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Neuindische Studien, Bd. 13).
- Blažek, Václav. 1999. *Numerals. Comparative-Etymological Analyses and their Implications*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

- Blažek, Václav. 2007. “Theonymica Helleno-Semitica II: Pallas Athānā / Athānā Potnia Virgin or Lady?”. *DO-SO-MO. Fascicula Mycenologica Polona* 7, 161–176.
- Blažek, Václav. 2010a. “Hurrian Numerals”. In: *Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike. Sbornik statej k jubileju Vjač. Vs. Ivanova*, red. T.M. Mixajlova. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskix kutur, 117–123.
- Blažek, Václav. 2010b. “Czechs = Young Men?”. In: *Sprache und Leben der frühmittelalterlichen Slaven. Festschrift für Radoslav Katičić zum 80. Geburtstag*, hrg. von Elena Stadnik-Holzer & Georg Holzer. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (Schriften über Sprachen und Texte 10, 224) 2010, 13–28.
- Blažek, Václav. 2014. “Etymologizing ‘unetymologizable’ Greek dendronyms”. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 19/1, 41–50.
- Blažek, Václav. 2016. “Artemis and her family”. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21/2, 37–48.
- Blažek, Václav. 2017. “Apollo the Archer”. In: *Ancient Greek Linguistics: New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, ed. by Felicia Logozzo & Paolo Poccetti. Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 643–662.
- Blažek, Václav. 2022. “Greek γέφυρα ”dam; bridge“”. In: *Greek – Latin – Slavic. Aspects of Linguistics and Grammatography*, edited by Barbora Machajdíkova & Ľudmila Eliášová Buzássyová. Tübingen: Narr, 141–160.
- Bonfante, Giuliano & Larissa. 2002. *The Etruscan Language: An Introduction*². Manchester – New York: Manchester University Press.
- Bork, Ferdinand. 1909. “Die Mitanni-Sprache”. *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft*, 14 (Berlin: Peiser).
- Brandenstein, Wilhelm. 1948. “Tyrrhener”. In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft VIIA*. 2nd ed. by Konrat Ziegler. Stuttgart: Metzler, cc. 1909–1938.
- Brugnatelli, Vermondo. 1982. “Questioni di morfologia e sintassi dei numerali cardinali semitici”. *Firenze: La nuova Italia editrice*.
- Buck, Carl D. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago – London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bugge, Sophus. 1883. *Beiträge zur Erforschung der etruskischen Sprache*. Stuttgart: Heitz.
- Carter, Jesse B. 1908. “Roma Quadrata and the Septimontium”. *American School of Classical Studies in Rome* 12/2, 172–183.
- Diakonoff, Igor M. 1971. *Hurrisch und Urtäisch*. München: Kitzinger (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft Neue Folge 6, translated from Russian by Karl Sdrembek).
- Diakonoff, Igor M. & Starostin, Sergei A. 1986. *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language*. München: Kitzinger (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 12. Neue Folge).
- D’jakonov, Igoř M. 1961. “Sravnitel’no-grammatičeskij obzor xurritskogo i urartskogo jazykov”. In: *Peredneaziatskij sbornik – Voprosy xettologii i xurritologii*, red. I.M. Djakonov & G.V. Cereteli. Moskva: Izdatel’stvo vostočnoj literatury, 369–423.
- D’jakonov, Igoř M. 1963. *Urartskie pišma i dokumenty*. Moskva – Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- D’jakonov, Igoř M. 1967. “Xurritskij i urartskij jazyki”. In: *Jazyki drevnej Perednej Azii*, ed. by Igoř M. D’jakonov. Moskva: Nauka, 111–165.
- D’jakonov, Igoř M. 1978. “Xurrito-urartskij i vostočno-kavkazskie jazyki”. In: *Hin arevelk’ / Drevnij Vostok III*. Erevan: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk Armjanskoj SSR, 25–38.

- D'jakonov, Igoř M. 1979. "Xurritskij i urartskij jazyki". In: *Jazyki Azii i Afriki III: Jazyki drevnej Perednej Azii (nesemitskie). Iberijskokavkazskie jazyky. Paleoaziatskie jazyki*, red. G.D. Sanžeev, A.N. Kononov, I.F. Vardul'. Moskva: Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury, 50–78.
- D'jakonov, Igoř M. & Starostin, Sergej A. 1988. "Xurrito-uratskie i vostočnokavkazskie jazyki". In: *Drevnij Vostok: Ėtnokul'turnye svyazi*, red. G.M. Bongard-Levin & V.G. Ardzinba. Moskva: Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury izdatel'stva 'Nauka', 164–207.
- DQEQ = *Diccionario quechua - español – quechua*. Cusco: Gobierno regional Cusco 2005.
- Eichner, Heiner. 2012. "Neues zur Sprache der Stele von Lemnos (Erster Teil)". *Journal of Language Relationship / Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva* 7, 9–32.
- Eichner, Heiner. 2013 "Neues zur Sprache der Stele von Lemnos (Zweiter Teil)". *Journal of Language Relationship / Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva* 10, 1–42.
- Eichner, Heiner. 2019. "Die Stele Lemnia: Vorstellung ihrer neuen Interpretation samt angestrebter Beweisführung". In: *'And I Knew Twelve Languages'". A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Natalia Bolatti Guzzo and Piotr Taracha. Warsaw: Agade Bis - University of Warsaw - Faculty of Oriental Studies, 91–133.
- Erman, Adolf & Grapow, Hermann. 1971. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, I–V. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Facchetti, Giulio M. 2002. *Appunti di morfologia etrusca. Con un'appendice sulle questioni delle affinità genetiche dell'etrusco*. Rome: Olschki.
- Facchetti, Giulio M. 2005. "The Interpretation of Etruscan texts and its Limits". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 33/3–4, 359–388.
- Facchetti, Giulio M. 2008. "Etruskisch". In: *Wieser Enzyklopädie: Sprachen des europäischen Westens*, I. Band (A–I), herausgegeben von Ulrich Ammon & Harald Haarmann. Klagenfurt: Wieser Verlag, 221–235.
- Facchetti, Giulio M. 2018. "I numerali hurrici: note etimologiche e interlinguistiche". In: *EXPRESSIO. Rivista di Linguistica, Letteratura e Comunicazione* 2, 13–22.
- Faulkner, Raymond O. 1962/1991. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford: Griffith Institute – Ashmolean Museum.
- Festus, Sextus Pompeius: *De verborum significatione quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, emendata et annotata a Carolo Odofredo Muellero. Leipzig: Sumptibus Simmelii eiusque socii 1880.
- Festus, Sextus Pompeius: *De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, edidit Æmilius Thewrewk de Ponor. Budapest: Sumptibus academiae litterarum hungaricae 1889.
- Fiesel, Eva. 1936. "Bemerkungen und Berichtigungen". *Studi Etruschi* 10, 321–325.
- Francfort, H.-P., Tremblay, X. 2010. "Marhaši et la civilisation de l'Oxus". *Iranica Antiqua* 45, 51–224.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1934. "Mitraššil Uruṇanaššel". *Orientalia* 12, 311–317.
- Friedrich, Johannes. 1935. "Zum Subaräischen und Urartäischen". *Analecta Orientalia* 12, 122–135.
- Georgiev, Vladimir I. 1962. *Hethitisch und Etruskisch. Die hethitische Herkunft der etruskischen Sprache*. Sofia: Academie Bulgare des Sciences (*Linguistique Balkanique* 5.1).
- Georgiev, Vladimir I. 1974. "Etruskisch und Hethitisch. Ein Vergleich der bekannten Tatsachen der etruskischen Grammatik." *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 17/1, 5–40.
- Georgiev, Vladimir I. 1979. *La lingua e l'origine degli Etruschi*. Roma: Editrice Nagard.
- Gluhak, Alemko. 1978. "Etruscan Numerals". *Linguistica* 17/1, 25–32.

- Hadas-Lebel, Jean. 2017. “Le nombre ‘cent’ en étrusque. À propos de étr. *sran*.” *Rasenna* 5, 1–7.
- HAL = *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, I-II, by Ludwig Koehler & Walter Baumgartner, translated by M.E.J. Richardson. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Halloran, John Alan. 2006. *Sumerian Lexicon*. Los Angeles: Logogram Publishing.
- Hoenigswald, Henry M. 1941. “On Etruscan and Latin Month-Names”. *The American Journal of Philology* 62/2, 199–206.
- Hrozný, Bedřich. 1915. “Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems”. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 56, 17–50.
- Hrozný, Bedřich. 1917. *Die Sprache der Hethiter – ihr Bau und ihre Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm*. Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Hrozný, Bedřich. 1928. “Etruskisch und die ‘hethitischen’ Sprachen”. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 38, 171–180.
- Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. 1988. “Drevnevostočnye svjazi ètrusskogo jazyka”. In: *Drevnij Vostok: Ètnokul’turnye svjazi*, red. G.M. Bongard-Levin & V.G. Ardzinba. Moskva: Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury izdatel’stva ‘Nauka’, 208–218.
- Jacemirskij, Sergej. 2007. “Ètrusskie čislitel’nye: problemy i itogi issledovanija”. In: *Aspekty komparativistiki 2: Orientalia et Classica. Trudy Instituta vostočnyx kul’tur i antičnosti XI*. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj humanitarnyj universite, 187–196.
- Kapancjan, Gr. 1936. *Obščie élementy meždu urartskim i xettskim jazykami*. Èrevaň: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel’stvo SSRA.
- Kassian, Alexei. 2010 [2011]. “Hurro-Urartian from the lexicostatistical viewpoint”. *Ugarit-Forschungen. Internationales Jahrbuch für die Altertumskunde Syrien-Palästinas* 42, 383–452.
- Klimov, Georgij A. 1967. “Zaimstvovannye čislitel’nye v obščekartvel’skom?” *Ètimologija* 1965, 307–310.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2021. “Luwians, Lydians, Etruscans, and Troy: The linguistic landscape of Northwestern Anatolia in the pre-classical period”. In: *The Political Geography of Western Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, ed. Ivo Hajnal, Eberhard Zangger, Jorrit Kelder. Budapest: Archaeolingua (Series Minor, 45), 49–75.
- Krahmalkov, Charles R. 2000. *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*. Leuven: Peeters en Department Oosterse Studies.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1921. “Pelasger und Etrusker”. *Glotta* 11, 276–285.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1929. “Υπηρία”. *Glotta* 18, 110–111.
- Lejeune, Michel. 2009. “Les termes de la numération. Notice rédigée par M. Lejeune pour le ThLE II”. In: *Autour de Michel Lejeune*. Actes des Journées d’étude organisées à l’Université Lumière Lyon 2 – Maison de l’orient et de la Méditerranée (2–3 février 2006), ed. Frédérique Biville et Isabelle Boehm. Lyon: Maison de l’orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux (Collection de la Maison de l’orient, 43), 308–317.
- Liddell, Charlton T. & Scott, Charles. 1958. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Laroche, Emmanuel. 1980. *Glossaire de la langue hourrite*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mańczak, Witold. 1983. “Das etruskische Numerale *ša*”. *Glotta* 61/1–2, 103–105.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- NCED = *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary*. Sergei L. Nikolayev & Sergei A. Starostin. Moscow: Asterisk Publishers 1994.

- Neu, Erich. 1991. "Etruskisch – eine indogermanische Sprache Altanatoliens?". *Historische Sprachforschung* 104, 9–28.
- Nozadze, Nana. 2007. *Leksika xurritskogo jazyka / Vocabulary of the Hurrian Language*. Tbilisi: Tbilisi State University.
- Orel, Vladimir & Starostin, Sergei. 1990. "The position of Etruscan". In: *Proto-Languages and Proto-Cultures*, ed. by Vitaly Shevoroshkin. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 60–66.
- Oštir, Karl. 1921. *Beiträge zur alarodischen Sprachwissenschaft I*. Wien: Beyer.
- Pallotino, Maximo. 1968. *Testimonia linguae etruscae*². Firenze: La nuova Italia.
- Patri, Sylvain. 2009. "Aspects de la position génétique du hurrite". In: *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 11/2 in Honor of David I. Owen on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. (October 28, 2005), ed. by Gernot Wilhelm. Bethesda: CDL Press, 341–354.
- Pauli, C. 1882. "Die etruskischen Zahlwörter". *Etruskische Forschungen und Studien III*, ed. W. Deecke & C. Pauli. Stuttgart: Heitz.
- Platner, Samuel Ball. 1901. "The Pomerium and Roma Quadrata". *The American Journal of Philology* 22/4, 420–425.
- Richter, Thomas. 2012. *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Richter, Thomas. 2016. *Vorarbeiten zu einem hurritischen Namenbuch*, Erster Teil: *Personennamen altbabylonischer Überlieferung vom Mittleren Euphrat und aus dem nördlichen Mesopotamien*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rix, Helmut. 1991. "Etrusco un, une, unu «te, tibi, vos» e le preghiere dei rituali paralleli nel Liber Linteus". *Archeologia Classica*, 43/1: *Miscellanea etrusca e italica in onore di Massimo Pallottino*, 665–691.
- Rix, Helmut. 1998. *Rätisch und Etruskisch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. Vorträge und kleinere Schriften, 68).
- Rix, Helmut. 2004. "Etruscan". In: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, by Roger Woodard. Cambridge: University Press, 943–966.
- Robertson, Ed. 2006. *Etruscan's genealogical linguistic relationship with Nakh-Daghestanian: A preliminary evaluation*. Ms.
<<https://www.theelen.info/%5B20151101%5D%20Etruscan%20numerals%20-2-.pdf>>
- Salomon, Corinna. 2020. "Raetic". *Palaeohispanica* 20, 263–298.
- Salvini, Mirjo & Wegner, Ilse. 2014. *Einführung in die urartäische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schneider, Thomas. 2003. "Kassitisch und Hurro-Urartäisch: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zu möglichen lexikalischen Isoglossen". *Altorientalische Forschungen* 30, 372–381.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2021. "The alleged Anatolian loanwords in Etruscan: A reconsideration". In: *Studies in the languages and language contact in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia*. Federico Giusfredi & Zsolt Simon, eds., with the editorial assistance of Elena Martínez Rodríguez.
- Skutsch, F. 1895. "Zu den etruskischen Zahlwörtern". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 5, 256–265.
- Slotty, Friedrich. 1937. "Die etruskischen Zahlwörter". *Archiv orientální* 9, 379–404.
- Slunečko, Vladimír. 2003. "Etruské číslovky {status quaestionis}". *Auriga* 45, 25–34.
- Smeets, Rieks. 1989. "On Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 46, No 3/4, cols. 259–279.
- Starostin, Sergei A. 1995. "Sravnitel'nyj slovar' enisejskix jazykov". In: *Ketskij sbornik: Lingvistika*. Sergei Starostin, ed. Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura, 176–316.
- Steinbauer, Dieter H. 1999. *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*. Scripta Mercaturae Verlag.

- Stephani Byzantii. *Ethnica*, volumen iv: π-υ, recensuerunt Germanice verterunt adnotationibus indicibusque instruxerunt Margarethe Billerbeck et Arlette Neumann-Hartmann. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2016.
- Stephanos Byzantini. 1849/1992. *EΘNIKΩΝ. A geographical lexicon on ancient cities, peoples, tribes and toponyms*. A. Meineke, ed. Berlin: Reimer / reprint Chicago: Ares Publishers.
- Stoltenberg, Hans L. 1943. “Die Bedeutung der etruskischen Zahlenamen”. *Glotta* 30, 234–244.
- Thomsen, Vilhelm. 1899. “Remarques sur la parenté de la langue étrusque”. *Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs* 1899, 373–398.
- Toporov, Vladimir N. 1983. “K semantike četveričnosti (anatolijskoe **meu-* i dr.)”. *Ėtimologija* 1981, 108–130.
- Trask, Robert Lawrence (Larry). 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Basque*. Edited for web publication by Max W. Wheeler. Falmer (Brighton): University of Sussex.
- Trombetti, Alfredo. 1922–23. *Elementi di glottologia*. Bologna: Zanichelli.
- Trombetti, Alfredo. 1928. *La lingua etrusca. Grammatica. Testi con commento. Saggi di traduzione interlineare. Lessico*. Firenze: Rinascimento del libro.
- Urbanová, Daniela & Blažek, Václav. 2008. *Národy starověké Itálie, jejich jazyky a písma*. Brno: Host.
- Wallace, Rex E. 2008. *A Manual of Etruscan*. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Wegner, Ilse. 2007. *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*². Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 2004a. “Hurrian”. In: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* by Roger Woodard. Cambridge: University Press, 95–118.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 2004b. “Urartian”. In: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Roger Woodard, ed. Cambridge: University Press, 119–137.
- Woudhuizen, Fred C. 2008. *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language: The Comprehensive Version*. Amsterdam: Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society.

Václav Blažek
 Department of Linguistics & Baltic Studies
 Masaryk University, Brno – Czech Republic
blazek@phil.muni.cz