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Abstract
It is well known that many of the major island-names of the archipelago consisting politically of Ireland, the United Kingdom and Crown dependencies are etymologically obscure. In this paper, I present and analyse a corpus of those which remain unexplained or uncertainly explained, for instance Man and Ynys Môn, Ar(r)an, Uist, Seil, Islay, Mull, Scilly, Thanet, Sark, among others. It is timely to do this, since in the disciplines of archaeology and genetics there is an emerging consensus that after the last Ice Age the islands were repopulated mainly by people from a refuge on the Iberian peninsula. This opinion is at least superficially compatible with Theo Vennemann’s Semitic and Vasconic hypotheses, i.e., that languages (a) of the Afroasiatic family, and (b) ancestral to Basque, are important contributors to the lexical and onomastic stock of certain European languages. The unexplained or ill-explained island names form a sufficiently large set to make it worthwhile to hope for the emergence of some hard evidence bearing on their collective linguistic heritage, and therefore to give – or fail to give – preliminary support to Vennemann’s hypotheses.

***

The Shakespearean scholar A.D. Nuttall once began a lecture at the University of Sussex about the difficulties he perceived in Darwin’s theory of natural selection by saying: “This lecture is the rashest act yet committed in an admittedly rather unadventurous life.”¹ I feel rather the same way about what I have written here.

It is commonly accepted that the final glacial advance of the last Ice Age (so far) in the British Isles was during the very cold event called the Younger Dryas (Oppenheimer 2006: 151–5). This happened at the end of the Würm interglacial, about 12,800–11,500 years before the present and therefore ending by approx. 9,500 B.C.E. The glaciers of the Loch Lomond Readvance covered much of southern Scotland and northern England and left the remainder of Britain under cold desert or tundra conditions. At this period, the region now occupied by the islands is believed to have been uninhabited.

Stephan Oppenheimer (2006) presents a synthesis of convincing genetic evidence that, after the Younger Dryas, Britain and Ireland were resettled by modern humans mainly emerging from the Ice Age refuge of the Iberian peninsula about 10,000 years ago. These people(s) had a Mesolithic material culture. Oppenheimer’s view is consistent with the archaeological evidence cited by Barry Cunliffe (1997; 2001), which is interpreted as showing that a succession of material cultures, including those of the megalith-builders responsible for monuments such as Carnac, Newgrange, Callanish and Stonehenge, spread up from the south along the Atlantic coast to the British Isles. The route may have been maritime or terrestrial, and the alternatives available depend on the date. We know that the land-bridge joining Britain to the continent was not finally broken till about 6,500 B.C.E. Before that, people and their artefacts could have arrived by either land or sea, and after that only by sea.
Those who headed north as Europe warmed up must have spoken some language or languages. We have no historical knowledge of this period, of course. But we do have some archaeological knowledge of the languages spoken in the Iberian peninsula before the beginning of the Roman Empire (fully: Untermann 2001), and that knowledge will have to act as a proxy for an understanding of the local cultures of the first millennium B.C.E.

Some linguists group together certain poorly-evidenced and incompletely-understood Iberian languages as Palaeohispanic, a term intended to exclude the colonial and economic languages arriving late, namely Punic, Greek and Latin.

**Palaeohispanic**

*Tartessian* in south-western Iberia, 7th–2nd centuries B.C.E.; linguistic affiliation unknown (Anderson 1988: ch. 5); uninterpreted texts; minimal detectable morphology (suffix *-ipon*).

*Iberian* in eastern and south-eastern Iberia, 7th century B.C.E. – 2nd century C.E.; linguistic affiliation unknown, and a relationship with Basque no longer seriously entertained (many works of Tovar and Michelena; against Román del Cerro 1993); uninterpreted texts on stone, metal and coins, fairly rich anthroponymic, and some toponymic, records (Untermann 1998; Moncunill Martí 2007: esp. 55–6)

*Lusitanian* in inland western Iberia, 6th century B.C.E. – year 0; an Indo-European language of uncertain relationship with Italic or Celtic (briefly García Alonso 2000: 31–2); 5 texts and some toponymic, anthroponymic and theonymic data.

*Celtiberian* or Hispano-Celtic in north-central Spain, 2nd–1st centuries B.C.E.; a branch of Continental (Q-)Celtic (survey by Eska and Evans 1993: 30–5); not fully interpreted texts; onomastic evidence; its existence is consistent with ancient Irish stories in Lebor Gabála Érenn ‘Book of the Taking of Ireland’ (“books” 2 and 8) about Gaelic migration from Iberia, the so-called “Milesian” invasion (on the relevant archaeology see Cunliffe 1997: ch. 7), though it is questionable what the linguistic effect of an invasion of male warriors would have been (as also observed by Mac Eoin 2007:117).

**Aquitanian**

A very close relative of reconstructed ancient Basque, with which it is practically identical; wider linguistic affiliation unknown (Trask 1997: 398–403). There is no clear justification for classifying this as a Palaeohispanic language. The strongest evidence for its existence in Roman times comes from north of the Pyrenees (Trask 35–42), and it cannot be ascertained how widespread it was before the year zero in the part of modern Spain where Basque has been spoken in historic times (but NB Michelena 1961–2; Trask 402–3). There is a considerable amount of anthroponymic and theonymic evidence for this language, offering lexical insights, but little else.

**Colonial and economic languages**

*North-West Semitic* (Phoenician, Punic) in some colonies of Carthage, e.g., Cartagena, Ibiza, Málaga and Cádiz, on the Mediterranean coast; inscriptions found even after the year zero.

*Ancient Greek* in some colonies on the Mediterranean coast, e.g., Ampurias, Hemeroskopeion (?Alicante) and Zakynthos (Zakantha; Sagunto).

*Latin* which eventually occupied almost the whole of Iberia.

There is little prospect of establishing the existence of any native non-Indo-European in the British Isles from historical sources. Most scholars accept that most of pre-Roman Britain and Ireland spoke some variety of Celtic (pace Oppenheimer 2006: ch. 7). It is still uncertain whether
all the evidence for Pictish indicates that it was a Celtic language or not (for a review, see Forsyth 1997). There are certainly non-Celtic or doubtfully Celtic place-names recorded from (esp.) northern Scotland (Nicolaensen 2001: ch. 9, esp. 244–5), but whether these might usefully be called Pictish or not is a controversial and unproductive matter. Ivernian or Ivernic, said to have been spoken in Ireland well into historic times and alluded to in Cormac’s glossary (*Sanas Cormaic*; 9th/10th century; Meyer 1912; Russell 1988), is not fully recorded and it is only in evidence as a vocabulary source for a formal register of Old Irish. It may have been a P-Celtic language, and it cannot be concluded that it was non-Celtic. Some scholars of Irish have recently allowed the possibility of the existence of pre-Celtic languages contributing to toponymy without conceding explicitly that a particular non-Indo-European language might be involved (e.g., Mac Eoin 2007; De Bernardo Stempel 2007: 138; Tempan 2008b).

It has been known from the earliest times that speakers of the languages mentioned in bold type above, which I will collectively call “Southern”, could possibly have penetrated for economic reasons as far as the British Isles. Latin would have been the last of the line. Greeks from Massilia visited the islands perhaps in the sixth century B.C.E. (an anonymous sailor, as reported by Avienus, though that has been challenged by Hawkes 1977: 17–25), and in the fourth century (Pytheas, as reported somewhat sceptically by Strabo, Pliny and Polybius).² Strabo says that the Phoenicians used British tin, but that does not necessarily mean that they ever came to Britain. However, in Elizabethan times, the schoolmaster and antiquarian John Twyne (1590) suggested that Phoenician/Punic tin-speculators had indeed reached Britain, bringing the coracle with them. Twyne’s biographer calls this “a notion that beguiled much later generations” (Martin 2004), but it is not inherently implausible.

If there is any substance in the theory that the British Isles were resettled from Iberia after the Younger Dryas, then our knowledge of these languages represents the only hope of being able to offer any linguistic support to the settlement hypothesis arising from the joint venture of genetics, archaeology and Irish mythology. Looking for points of systematic resemblance between Insular Celtic and “Southern” would be well motivated in the light of these recent advances. We could look for “Southern” traces in the most problematic vocabulary of the Celtic languages, i.e., that which has been identified as uncertainly Indo-European (as others have done for a relation between Basque and Celtic; Trask 1997: esp. 368–72), and we could look for toponymic links between Iberia and the British Isles starting with the most obscure surviving toponyms in the islands. The latter task can be performed in two ways. We could look at the little available evidence of the “Southern” languages and see whether there is anything that illuminates the most problematic place-names. Or we could look at the most problematic place-names and see whether anything reminds us of the minimal “Southern” evidence. In practice, we could do these simple-minded tasks at the same time. But doing them is methodologically problematic: the evidence base at both ends of the task is so small and so semantically restricted that we are unlikely to discover anything systematic; and the danger of theorizing on the basis of individual snippets of data runs risks which are too well known to need emphasizing. We also need to bear in mind the probability of unknown linguistic changes in the relevant languages between the recording of texts and names at different times. Something is known about the history of Aquitanian/Basque (Michelena 1954 and subsequent work), Punic (Krahmalkov 2000, 2001) and of course Greek, and a fair amount about Continental Celtic (Eska and Evans 1993; Sims-Williams 2006); nothing is known of the evolution of the other languages. We need to bear in mind the risk of the obliteration of some sorts of evidence, for example phonological, when a name is adopted and adapted by speakers of another language. The additional risk of completely normal so-called folk-etymological pressure is constantly present.³

We could conclude straight away that we are looking for needles in a haystack even though we are unsure exactly what needles look like and suspect that the haystack contains a few things
which look a bit like what needles might look like. It would be foolish to expect anything more than some hints and possibilities to emerge from the present paper, and I do not want to raise expectations. We will be playing with similarities in the interpretation of which we risk an excessively naïve approach to the little data we have. But it is a task worth doing. If another discipline produces a serious hypothesis with linguistic implications, then linguists are right to see what light they can shed on the problem. And our own discipline, independently of the genetic findings, has come up with a serious proposal: Theo Vennemann has proposed in a long series of articles that the vocabulary of northern European languages has both a Semitic-like (Semitic) and a Basque-like (Vasconic) strand. Vennemann’s hypothesis (as set out for example in his 1998a paper) is at least superficially compatible with aspects of the story told by genetics, archaeology and Celtic mythology. It is against the background of this prima facie possibility that I want to explore possible Insular-“Southern” relations.

The rest of this paper presents selected evidence from one category of names in Britain and Ireland – island-names – that has proved resistant to analysis or controversial. No other single group of names offers so much dark material, though I shall mention other names from time to time, and strike off in a new but related direction at the end. A complete onomastic analysis would deal also with river-names and personal names in the early Irish and Romano-British (RB) record, and we ought also to consider historically unexplained lexical items in Celtic: but let’s start with island-names as a well-defined category.

The Island Mysteries

There are two small sets of difficult island-names sharing similarities, and these are of particular interest in a study where too much may easily be read into a single name. Here, the default strategy of previous investigators has been to attempt an explanation in terms of known elements in known languages, and that is of course perfectly reasonable: it respects the evidence as we have it. It does not always produce a credible solution, but sometimes it does.

1. Mann (Man) and Môn (Anglesey)

We need to examine these names in the present context because of Vennemann’s (e.g., 1993: 460–8; 1995) attention to a supposed Vasconic root seen in Basque mu(i)no ‘hill’ and muna ‘slope, bank’ appearing in many European place-names. These words are, however, likely to be Romance borrowings in Basque (Trask 1997: 367, following Corominas and Pascual 1980, who propose a Romance stem *bunn-), and if that is the case Vennemann’s suggestion that these words may appear in Vasconic place-names in Europe is compromised.5

Mann and Môn have often been confused, partly for phonological and orthographic reasons and partly because the islands share the Irish Sea with each other. Despite massive orthographic variation in the sources, philology demands that Mann be referred to a British *Manaw(j)ā (see Rivet and Smith 1979: 410 for a summary of discussion up to that date). Such a form may also be responsible for the name Manaw Gododdin (Manau Guotodin), an early-recorded district at the head of the Firth of Forth, and for Irish names of the type Mano (Loth 1934). There seems no reason to give credit to Pliny’s spelling Monapia, which might have induced us to look at the Tartessian suffix including -p-, of unknown meaning. Rivet and Smith refer *Manaw(j)ā to a root meaning ‘high’. It might be cognate with the root of British *monijo- ‘upland’ which may also be seen in Mona, Môn; De Bernardo Stempel (2007: 158) actually suggests that the name of Man means ‘the one related to Mona’. The relation might be underpinned by the well-evidenced change of [o] to [a] before a resonant consonant when followed by another [a] (Schrijver 1995: 94–7), and if that is right then the name is Celtic, specifically Brittonic. Rivet and Smith cite continental analogues. Broderick (2006: xi) offers a more cautious “Indo-European” suggestion involving the root *men- ‘rise’, and Hamp (2003) suggests more specifically for Anglesey *mon-ā
'the high one’. These three ideas are compatible (though in part curious, since Anglesey is not literally high; perhaps Holyhead Mountain/Mynydd Twr on adjacent Holy Island was meant).

Verdict: *Mann* and *Môn* are probably Celtic, and almost certainly Indo-European. *Môn* may be British of an archaic suffixless morphological type. No relevant root is known in the Palaeohispanic languages. Indeed neither Iberian nor Aquitanian/Proto-Basque has root-initial /m/, and their prehistoric forms would therefore be incapable of transmitting lexemes beginning with /m/ to other languages.

2. *Eilean Arainn* (Isle of Arran) in historic Buteshire, Scotland, an old dative form where the -n is part of the inflectional suffix;
   *Oileáin Árann* (Aran Islands) in Co. Galway, Ireland; base name of the largest island: Árainn;
   *Árainn Mhóir* officially, earlier simply Árainn (Arranmore) in Co. Donegal, Ireland.
   In forthcoming work, Paul Tempan identifies other possible instances.

   It is very tempting to associate these three island-names with each other, despite the short vowel in the first syllable of the Scottish name as opposed to the long vowel in the two Irish ones. Flanagan and Flanagan (1994: 17) suggest, in a rather careful wording, that the two Irish names embody Irish árainn ‘ridge’. Watson (1926: 87) suggests Irish áru ‘kidney’ for Arranmore in Donegal, citing its shape. The eye of faith could no doubt see reason for both suggestions, but neither ‘kidney’ nor ‘ridge’ is really convincing for the Donegal name, and a view from a very high-flying bird’s eye is needed before the island in Bute appears kidney-like. Watson adduces some Welsh names with a historic short vowel, of which one is that of a river, one is applied to two adjacent hills, and one with a diminutive suffix is again a pair of adjacent hills. Owen and Morgan (2007: 17–18) are confident that the hill-names can be derived from a diminutive form aran ‘little ridge’ with an original long vowel in the first syllable (like others mentioned by Thomas 1938: 180); *Arenig* would contain therefore a double diminutive. The variety of application is troublesome, as is the phonological disparity. ‘Ridge’ is arguably suitable for Aran and the hill-names in Wales, but a generalized ‘elevation’ word would suit all except Arranmore, which is not exceptionally high, to judge from the photographic evidence I have seen on the Web. An etymological long vowel is compatible with the known forms of all except Arran.

   Verdict: no single solution seems possible. Vennemann has suggested that a phonologically suitable word, the ancestor of Basque aran ‘valley’, is found throughout north and west Europe – and in at least one English place-name (*Arundel*; 1999a: 30–3), but this can be shown with near-certainty to be wrong (Coates 2000: 5–6). It is semantically out of the question that it should figure in any of these island-names, and Vennemann has not suggested that it does.

We are now reduced to examining singletons, individual island-names which might hold out some promise of revealing their origins through a “Southern” magnifying-glass. What might give us confidence that this is worth doing?

3. *Uist*

In an obscure little paper in which Vennemann has taken a gratifying interest (Coates 1988b), I suggested an etymological link between *Ibiza* in the Balearic Islands (Catalan *Eivissa*; *Ebusos* in Manlius and Pliny and *Ebusos* in Didorus Siculus) and the two Hebridean islands called *Uist* (Scottish Gaelic *Uibhist*, /ˈuːbɪʃt/). I followed Hübner in the first edition of *Pauly-Wissows Real-Encyklopädie* (1905) in proposing that *Ibiza* represented a Semitic name possibly meaning ‘island of some fragrant plant, e.g., balsam or pine’ (cf. Proto-Semitic [PrSem] *ḥēm* ‘balsam’), and suggested that *Uist* had the same origin (not ruling out transfer), gaining its modern final /t/ under analogical influence from Old Norse *ivist* ‘inner dwelling’, this form being on record (*Iuist*) as the
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Scandinavian name of the islands. Armed with this hint (to put it no more strongly than that), we might look closely at some of the remaining obscure names.

I shall use the term Proto-Semitic below as a way of characterizing lexical roots without suggesting that the names discussed must go back to the date when Proto-Semitic was a spoken language, and without precise implications of period, dialect, or vocalization of the roots cited unless more detail is given; that is, the term should be taken to include the daughter language Proto-North-West-Semitic [NWSem] and to be non-dogmatic about morphology.

4. Iona

Iona (more correctly Ioua; Old Irish Í, sometimes spelt with a decorative initial <h>) is of unknown origin. It can scarcely mean ‘yew’ as Watson (1926: 89) suggests, unless the name was given commemoratively. There is no evidence on this well-excavated island for yew at any period, and it has always been notoriously barren. Herbert Sauren (2005) documents an epigraphically well attested Punic word, the most usual variant of whose base-form he analyses as ‘y, meaning ‘island, isolated place’. Sauren notes that the word appears in royal correspondence from Byblos as yw (2005: 279–80; morphology unclear to me), which brings us somewhat closer to the name of Iona as known to history.

Although there is little indeed to go on phonetically, it is not beyond possibility that this root is what is represented in Ioua. If the form Ioua contains more than Í does, rather than simply a now-silenced root-integral /w/, then perhaps it is a lost second element. Vennemann has suggested several other island-name etymologies with the structure PrSem *’y XXX, i.e., with a generic-first structure.

5. Seil

An island called Sóil is recorded in the Book of Leinster (Watson 1926: 41). This is generally acknowledged to be the one called in modern Gaelic Saoil (English Seil). No etymology has been proposed, but it seems worth comparing Arabic sāḥil ‘coast’, PrSem root *šḥl. This is not as fanciful as it might sound; Seil is the closest of all the Inner Hebrides to the mainland, and is linked to it by Clachan Bridge (built in 1792–3), which the local tourist office claimed for many years to be the only bridge in the world over the Atlantic Ocean (as illustrated below).

6. Islay

Islay is of doubtful Celticity (Watson 1926: 86–7, offering some problematic comparisons). It appears as Ilã or Ila in ancient Irish literature, as Ilea insula in Latin, and in modern Gaelic it is Eilean Ìleach. Here, too, there is little to go on. One might consider the unexplained name of the ancient town of Ilipa near Seville in Tartessian territory, suggesting that the -ip- in this might
represent the only securely identified suffix in that language. But given the notable European propensity for regarding islands in the west as sacred, noting that Islay is the westmost in its sector of the Inner Hebrides, and following the hint of Semitic involvement, perhaps we should not rule out a connection with PrSem *hl ‘pure, holy’, or better even with the root of the divine word or name seen in Phoenician ‘l, with the second syllable in the modern name attributable to an extended form of the root comparable to those seen in Hebrew ‘Eloah, Biblical Aramaic ‘Ĕlāhâ and Arabic Allāh (< *al-ilâh). Maybe here too we have survival of the generic *y in initial position: ‘island of the god.’

7. Mull

Mull is probably recorded in the Ravenna Cosmography as Malaia, and in Ptolemy as Maleos. Watson (1926: 38) gives a convincing phonological account of the development of the modern form in Gaelic, Muile, and thus English Mull, from some such form. He offers a Celtic etymology from a root meaning ‘praise’, and speculates on an application of this root in the sense ‘lofty’. De Bernardo StempeL (2007: 153) suggests the meaning is ‘the evil one’, which is formally acceptable, but she offers no motivation. If these suggestions are considered semantically somewhat contrived, it might be worth reserving a glance for the PrSem *ml ‘salt’: cf. Hebrew mallaḥ, a salt-marsh plant (?marsh mallow). Whilst Mull is not archaeologically known for sea-salt production, it certainly has saltmarsh (Gillham 1957), which is the prerequisite for the industry. Several such sites on Mull are mapped by Burd (1989), though none is a large one, and the presence of small areas of saltmarsh in the Western Isles is not unusual.

8. Scilly

It has been suggested by Vennemann (1999a: 40–2) that Scilly, a name with a very diverse and inconclusive record of spellings, might be compared with a PrSem root “s-l-” meaning ‘rock, cliff’, as seen in Hebrew sela. With mean sea level as it is at present, Scilly has plenty of rocks, but not much significant cliff except on the island of Tresco. Some time ago, when considering the name of The Solent (1988a), I evaluated some of the same evidence without finally coming to this conclusion.

9. Hebrides

In the same article (1999a: 46), Vennemann also suggests a PrSem origin for the ancient name of (some of) the Hebrides (Ebudae), involving the plural of the generic *y we have seen previously (*yyym) and a specifier related to one of two PrSem roots of the form *phd, namely ‘lamb’ and ‘fear’. He avoids the difficulty of the general loss of prehistoric */p/ in the borrowing Celtic languages by proposing that */m-p/ is rendered by Ancient Greek β, and that a reflex of this is what surfaces in the attested forms. Perhaps this relies too heavily on the analogy of Modern Greek spelling conventions, and for me it undermines the proposal; we should be looking instead for an explanation internal to PrSem. But I leave it on the table because of the evident semantic and toponomastic attractiveness of the ‘lamb’ possibility seen in the light of the various Scandinavian ‘sheep islands’ of the north and west, such as the Faroes, more than one Soay, and Lambay, the Eilean nan Caorach in Durness, Sutherland, and the English Sheppey in Kent. De Bernardo StempeL (2007: 155) suggests instead that the name is a modification of Epidion, an island-name in Ptolemy, but like Vennemann has to resort to the unmotivated phonetic development [p] > [b] to account for it.

10. Thanet

Vennemann (2006) explores the possibility of a PrSem origin for Thanet. I myself mentioned that such a possibility had been suggested in the past, but did not pursue it, in a paper whose main
topic was the alternative recorded name Ruoihin or the like (2000: 32–9); Vennemann’s more sophisticated work on this persuades me that I may have missed an opportunity. He concludes, arraying a great deal of evidence which I have no space to repeat here, that the name enshrines that of the Phoenician goddess Tanit.

11. Sark

In Coates (1991: 73–6), I regarded the ultimate source of Sark as unknown; its early attestations suggest a root *Sarg-. One might compare PrSem *sraq ‘reddens; rise (as of the sun); east’ (cf. Arabic šarq ‘east’). Sark is of course the easternmost, and outermost, island of the Guernsey geological group.

12. Echri

This Welsh name of Flat Holm in the Severn estuary is unexplained, except as a possible variant of “Echnus”, maybe to be equated with Éogan (Owen and Morgan 2007: 153), an Irish saint having no known connection with the place. On the other hand, PrSem *’hr ‘behind, back’ is suggestive: Flat Holm is the last usable island heading up the Severn, i.e., one reaches it after Lundy, Stert Island, Sully Island and Steep Holm. Denny, which comes after, is an uninhabitable rock.

I must remind readers that, for me, these observations taken together do not amount to a proposal with worked-out consequences. They are suggestive juxtapositions of some ancient and modern island-names with some ancient roots. In almost all cases so far, the morphology of the suggested original name is not fully elucidated. There are some sparse hints of contact effects in the phonology (of an unsurprising kind), viz. the non-transfer (elision) of *h (except perhaps before [r]; see 12.), the elimination of *p in line with the known development of Celtic, and the substitution of /s/ for *š and *ś. But a direction is emerging: with whatever diffidence these suggestions are put forward, Proto-Semitic at least provides something to consider in relation to insular toponymy, and I shall suggest below some further evidence that points in the same direction.

Other similarities between British island-names and Continental evidence

13. Wight

We might re-examine Wight (RB Vectis), which has generally been given a not entirely convincing Celtic derivation, cf. Middle Welsh [MW] gweith ‘turn, occasion, course, [etc.]’. Rivet and Smith (1979: 488–9) cite Förster’s quotation of a thirteenth-century interpretation of Nennius associating the island-name with a MW term “Gueid vel Guith”, which is equated with Latin divorcium, in the sense ‘fork in a road’, possibly meaning the island where the Solent splits at the end of Southampton Water, or the island which generates double tides in the Solent by splitting the surge of the Atlantic waters at its western end. Both of these ideas offer difficulties about how these phenomena might have been perceived and toponymically encoded. But note also that Vectis might usefully be compared with the name of the insulae Vacetae (Collins 1988), a generic name in the Ravenna Cosmography for the islands of Oléron and Ré in the French sector of the Bay of Biscay. If a form ancestral to the latinized Vacetae was stressed on the first syllable (which we can’t tell, but cf. Namnetes > Nantes), it could, via a syncopated form */wakt-/, give Vect(is), though the RB stressed vowel is then in need of explanation. No etymology can be given for Vacetae, but it cannot have been Aquitanian/Basque for phonological reasons; and even though the continuator of Fredegar’s Chronicle equates the eponymous tribe called the Vaceti with the Basques, there is no philological connection between the names. We are left with the
possibility of a Southern connection for Wight, but cannot even associate it with a particular language.

14. Bass Rock
In the light provided by this direction, we might re-examine Bass Rock (East Lothian, Scotland), whose earliest recorded form seems to be universally Bas,¹¹ and compare the equally unexplained name of the island of Batz, close to Roscoff (Brittany, France), recorded early as Battha, Baz and now Baz in Modern Breton (Enez Vaz).¹² The difference between the final consonants may offer some difficulty, but an early *Bats could have undergone cluster simplification in any variety of Insular Celtic.

15. Coll
The island of Coll in the Inner Hebrides is recorded twice as Colosus in Adamnán’s Life of Columba (Watson 1926: 84–5). Any form with an intervocalic /s/ is a problem to explain in Celtic, and Watson accordingly suggests it might be pre-Celtic. Accepting the dangers of identifying this form naïvely with Greek kolossós (of uncertain origin, not originally Greek; see most recently Lindner 2003: 107), we should by no means find it incredible that there could have been a large standing stone of humanoid shape here, as on other Hebridean islands such as North Uist and Lewis. There are at present two smallish stones, the Totronald Stones (personified in Gaelic as Na Sgeulaichean, ‘The Storytellers’), 5’ and 6’ tall. These underline an earlier possibility even though they are themselves not exactly convincing as human figures (RCAHMS).
The name could have been given at a time when *kolossói* were a well-known feature of Hellenic and therefore Mediterranean culture, or by speakers of a language in which the ancestor of the word was a native term. This suggestion leaves the island-name without a generic, but there is no shortage of other islands in the Western Isles whose current names have no apparent (surviving reflex of a) generic term: Seil, Islay, Rum, Eigg and Mull, for example.

*Coll* is generally explained as deriving from Gaelic *coll* ‘hazel’. It is true that hazel is a component of the native flora of certain islands in the Inner Hebrides (Gilbert 1984; Coppins, Coppins, and Quelch 2002), but the modern word does not in itself fully explain the form of the name in Adamnán’s *Life of Columba*.

**Conclusions negative and positive?**

This is only a short paper, and it is already time to take stock. My first conclusion is probably unsurprising: there is no definite evidence for any Palaeohispanic impact on island nomenclature, except to the extent that the presence of Q-Celtic Gaelic may itself represent a strand of such evidence. Perhaps there could not be any in the present limited state of our knowledge. My second conclusion is that the same island nomenclature offers no support at all for Vennemann’s Vasconic hypothesis, but Vennemann himself would not expect his Vasconic herdsmen to be involved in the naming of island habitats (personal correspondence, 18/08/2008).13

There is, however, some further tantalizing evidence beyond what I have presented here which suggests that Vennemann’s other hypothesis of a Semitic connection should not be dismissed out of hand, and which tends to make the suggestions above less incredible. Beyond the small fistful of singleton island-names just presented (Uist, Iona, Seil, Islay, Mull, Sark, and perhaps Scilly, *Ebudae* and Thanet), there are further hints of contact with Semitic, this time in the common topographical vocabulary of Celtic and other place-names of the Celtic-speaking lands.

The Proto-Celtic *ros-* is semantically problematic, having the meanings ‘promontory’ and ‘moor’ (Padel 1985: 199–203). Within Indo-European, a single possible Indic comparandum has been suggested (Sanskrit *prasthas* ‘plateau’, = literally ‘that which stands forth’). But perhaps in the first of these senses, which seems to be the earlier (esp. in Irish and Cornish), it could be compared with PrSem *ra’s* ‘headland, promontory’, in the specifically NWSem form with a backed and raised vowel (Phoenician *rōš* ‘head, headland’).14

Another height-word in Semitic is *rām* as in the modern place-names *Ramat Gan*, Israel, and *Ramallah*, Palestine (PrSem root *rwm*). I have elsewhere argued cautiously that this might be seen in the Cornish place-name *Rame* which may allude to the conspicuous conically-shaped hill on a headland in this parish guarding the entrance to Plymouth Sound, and whose modern pronunciation can be explained in terms of local English dialect conditions (Coates 2006: 7–8). The same root might be seen in a vocally different form in the name of the island of *R(h)ium* (recorded ostensibly in 677 as *Ruim*), whose name is not satisfactorily explained. Mac an Tàilleir (2003) is willing to call it “pre-Gaelic” in defiance of a *prima facie* case for Gaelic *rūim* ‘space’ and of an earlier Indo-European proposal by Stokes, quoted by Watson (1926: 95, n.3). Rum happens to have the highest mountains anywhere in the Western Isles except the Cuillins group on Skye, including therefore the highest non-Cuillin peak (Askival, 2664’, 812m).15

There is a problem with Cornish *tor* ‘belly’, which seems to appear in place-names referring to hills, like its Welsh counterpart *tor* and Irish *torr*. There is an (originally dialectal) English word *tor* applied to rocky outcrops or crags, and this is widely believed to come from the Cornish word (as mentioned by Padel 1985: 221–2). The semantic aspect of this idea is problematic, and it is open for us to wonder whether the English word is really an application of PrSem *ṭur* ‘rock’, as seen in the name of the city of Tyre, Lebanon, on its offshore rock. Padel notes the difficulty that *tor* does not appear in Cornish with the sense of ‘tor, crag’, which creates a problem in any
theory of the transmission of the term to English. But formally, there is no problem: *tor, a feminine noun, could be for “British” *turā, a formally celticized version of *tūr. 16

The much-discussed but still unexplained OW cair ‘fort; (later) village’, Cornish ker ‘univallate curvilinear hillslope enclosure; village’, Breton kér ‘village’ (Padel 1985: 51), can be compared with the PrSem root *kpr ‘village’ (cf. Ancient Hebrew kāpār (bound form kapar), Modern Hebrew kfar, Arabic kafr), with pan-Celtic loss of /p/.

The suggestions in this part of the paper too are advanced with all due caution. The possibility of coincidental resemblances cannot be dismissed, but for me, there are too many to do that casually. No cultural context is given except the general probability of the settlement of the British Isles from the south, and the possibility that one linguistic strand might be represented by North-West Semitic with no detailed regard for the reasons that might have taken it there. 17 There may be (but need not be) inconsistencies in the implied phonological development of the items discussed here (as implicitly in Rame and Rum), and I have only touched on the question of how PrSem consonant phonemes might have been represented in Celtic. There is hardly anything that can said on the basis of this evidence about vowels, or about morphology, that of Semitic being of course typologically quite different from that of Indo-European. All that remains is the possibility of glimpsing through a glass darkly the lexis of a language used in the British Isles in periods of settlement more remote than we can see through the lens of the known languages of the area.18, 19

Notes

* I am grateful for magnanimous comment on this paper by Theo Vennemann given in the face of nearly twenty years of scepticism on my part about his larger theses. I am also grateful to Paul Tempan for sight of two pre-publication articles of his, on the discovery that we are working with similar ideas; and also to Tony Oliver for permission to use his image of a Totronald Stone. This paper covers some of the ground of my unpublished paper, “On a recent view of the linguistic prehistory of Europe”, read to the Linguistics Association of Great Britain conference, University of Sussex, Brighton, April 1996.

2. Relevant texts by these writers are printed in Rivet and Smith (1979).
3. Vennemann appears to subscribe to the notion that modern linguistic evidence may disguise earlier evidence through wholesale folk-etymology (in one of two senses: Vennemann 1999b).
4. More specifically, he believes that Germanic is “substratally Vasconized, superstratally Hamito-Semiticized Indo-European” (Vennemann 2000: abstract). The possibility of a Semitic substrate in Irish was first articulated systematically by Pokorny (1927).
5. I should make it perfectly clear that Vennemann has not uttered an opinion on the two names in this section, and that his views on the elements mentioned are given here to provide a wider context for my remarks. He believes, moreover, that Vasconic influence on these or any other island-names is unlikely, since its speakers “were no seafarers” (personal correspondence, 18/08/2008).
6. See Coates (1988b) for the full argument; the loss of final /m/ is an effect of Greek phonotactics. Note also the alternative Ptolemaic name of the group consisting of Ibiza and Formentera, Pityussa, taken to mean “Pine Islands” after Greek πίτυς ‘pine’; and the argument of Rivet and Smith (1979: 452) that the unidentified garble Saponis in the Ravenna cosmography refers to fir or pine in a Celtic language.
7. Bennett et al. (1990: 289), citing Wilkins (1984), have noted pine (Pinus sylvestris) from the archaeobotanic record of peat-bogs in South Uist, even though this tree is now extinct in the Western Isles.
8. I discussed this element in relation to an etymology for the waterway known as The Solent before opting for an Indo-European solution (Coates 1988a).
9. It may be significant that the other front vowel in the Gaulish phonological system, [e], may be raised to [i] after [w] (Lambert 1997: 41); an analogous effect on the lower vowel [a] could account for Vectis, assuming that Gaulish and British shared some phonological characteristics.
10. «... cum exercito magno et plurima Wasconorum qui ultra Garonnam commorantur, quem antiquitus vocati sunt Vaceti.» Quoted by Collins (1988: 214).

11. E.g., Wyntown’s *Cronykil*, 1404, 1426; Hector Boece 1526.


13. For completeness’ sake, I should draw attention to the Iberian anthroponymic and toponymic element *urke, orke-, urka* identified by Untermann (1998: 77, 81) as a possible comparandum for the first element of *Orkney*, but this resemblance is the only one that can be derived from his list and should therefore be put down to chance.

14. This idea has been published recently independently by Vennemann (2006: 349–50 and notes), picking up earlier work by R. Henning. Tempan (2008a; 2008b) has independently suggested the alien origin of Irish *ros*.

15. The fact that the names *Rame* and *Rum* end in /m/ poses a problem for Celtic derivation. Since intervocalic lenition of */m/ would be expected, my account suggests implicitly that these exotic names were indeclinable and suffixless in Common Celtic, in much the same way that one finds *Les Écrehou* for certain cluster of rocks in the Channel Islands, whose name is of foreign (in this case Scandinavian) origin. Otherwise, the source of the /m/ must be found in a geminate or a bilabial cluster, which are inconsistent with the present suggestion.

16. On the corresponding Irish *torr*, see now also Tempan (2008b).

17. That is, nothing is concluded about whether PrSem might be substratal, superstratal or adstratal to the familiar languages of the islands. Further to my note 3, “Vennemann appears to subscribe to the notion that modern linguistic evidence may disguise earlier evidence through wholesale folk-etymology”: if one starts with that perspective, one may doubt the acceptable Celtic solutions available for such names as *Eigg* from Ir. *eag* ‘notch’, *Hinba* (?Jura) from Ir. *inbe* ‘incision’ (Watson 1926: 85 and 82–3), and *Ériu* (Ireland) ultimately from PIE *piHwerjon-* ‘fat (land)’ (Schrijver 1995: 288). For the last of these, Vennemann (1998b) has counter-proposed an origin in PrSem *’y-wr(m) (?) = *’iy-weri’um* ‘copper island’, which might or might not suggest that he regards the modern form of the name as having been subjected to IE/Celtic folk-etymology.

18. In making the suggestions in this paper, I commit myself to no other aspect of any Semitidic hypothesis than those specifically mentioned. I am not a Semiticist, and have relied throughout on others’ accounts of Semitic roots and their meanings, aware that, in some cases, reconstructions of the same root have differed and that they have been transcribed and vocalized in different ways.

19. Note the very interesting recent paper by Mac Eoin (2007) suggesting that a language substratal to Irish must have had intervocalic /ӄ/. This suggestion is incompatible with that language’s being PrSem at the stage of phonological development suggested by the evidence presented here.
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