Naming Practices and Class Differences in Twentieth-Century Britain

Quentin Outram

University of Leeds

Q.Outram@lubs.leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

This article is concerned with an often-overlooked aspect of social life, the practices deployed in naming people. Names, by linking people with a family, endow people with a past history. Names frequently identify a person's gender, and help to identify other aspects of their present social identity. Where identities are subject to discrimination a name can lead to harm or advantage which renders the topic of importance. This article focuses on the role of names in identifying and projecting social class in twentieth-century Britain, and is thus concerned with the social history of the 'symbolic power' discussed by Pierre Bourdieu. While social class has often been linked to specific names in Britain, this article discusses a more basic feature of personal names: their number. The article reviews the hypothesis that the average number of personal names borne by a group of people is positively related to their social class, a suggestion first put forward by Ron Hall in 1960. Examining name samples of the British peerage, British financiers, industrialists and trade unionists as they were in mid-twentieth-century Britain, it finds the hypothesis validated and concludes that these personal names were not only denotative but also connotative.

Key Words: Names; Identity; Multiple naming; Socio-economic class

Len Fairclough—A character in the television soap opera

Coronation Street, 1961–1983

Claude Cattermole 'Catsmeat' Potter-Pirbright—A character in novels by

P. G. Wodehouse, 1938–1971

Names are all but universal. A single name may serve to individuate within a given gender ('William') or classify ('William's son', classifying the child by gender and into a group with other members of William's family). Nevertheless, since the general adoption of second names in England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the transformation of those second names from the personal to the inherited and hence familial from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, English names have served both functions: one name individuates within a gender, the other classifies.[1] Such names may classify by clan or lineage as well as by family and gender. In doing so, a name may endow a person with a past and a history through his or her parents and more remote ancestors as well as a social identity in the present.[2] As such, it may be possible to infer from a person's name, though possibly with some degree of uncertainty, a person's nationality, mother-tongue or ethnicity. These points are easy to understand and until recent decades have not been treated as significant. Pierre Bourdieu's writings on 'symbolic power' have been instrumental in changing academic attitudes to the significance of naming firstly among sociologists and more recently among historians, as we shall see below.[3]

The volume of research on names and naming among social historians has been limited, particularly in the anglophone world. One stream of research, conducted largely in Italy, France and Germany, has been concerned with the *longue durée*. David Herlihy has pointed out that while the 'poor and lowly' of medieval Tuscan society left few records

behind, they did bear personal names which have often survived. Christiane Klapisch-Zuber has emphasized the role of naming in memorializing and solidifying the lineage in renaissance Florence, an interpretation which also has the advantage of explaining the early adoption of multiple forenames by the wealthy, powerful and prestigious families of the city and its region. It is possibly this and other studies by Klapisch-Zuber and Herlihy that brought the history of names into the main stream of European historiography, best exemplified by Robert Bartlett's histories of medieval Europe.[4] Bartlett uses the homogenization of given names in the middle ages to illustrate the 'Europeanization of Europe' and, in England, the disuse of Anglo-Saxon in favour of Norman names in the eleventh and twelfth centuries to show the developing cultural hegemony of the invaders.

Scott Smith-Bannister, in a major study of the English sixteenth and seventeenth centuries based on parish registers, family reconstitutions, marriage licences and other quantifiable data, documented a shift from naming children after god-parents to naming after parents.[5] This he related to changes in the role of god-parents which he thought might be related in turn to the supposed decline in the extended family and the rise of the nuclear. He also noted the increasing proportion of children named after neither parents nor god-parents and suggested that this was consonant with an extension of 'freedom of choice' to this sphere of life.[6]

Moving forward to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Michael Wolffsohn and Thomas Brechenmacher have shown how changes in naming practices in Germany can be used to deepen our understanding of the changing social and political orientations of Germans from the *Kaiserreich* to the era of the Federal Democratic and German Democratic Republics.[7] Jürgen Gerhards has found evidence of all the grand processes of modern social history reflected in the choice of German forenames: secularization,

modernization, rising individualism, globalization, as well, of course, as the political turmoil engraved in the history of twentieth-century Germany.[8]

The *histoire événementielle* has yielded insights at least as important. 'Germanic' names were 'voluntarily' bestowed on infants by Jewish and Gentile parents after 1933 and 'Jewish' names were forced on German Jews in 1938.[9] Other notorious cases of forced renaming include the name changes incident on enslavement and its end and the forced assimilation of native north Americans; the imposition of French forms of personal names on Arabs in colonial north Africa beginning in Algeria in 1882; name changes forced on residents of Trieste after it passed from Austro-Hungary to Italy and was taken over by the fascists; the outlawing in Turkey up to the end of the 1980s of giving typically Kurdish names to children and the renewed official hostility to the practice in the 2000s.[10] These studies are unanimous in a conclusion, best expressed by Susan Benson, that forced re-naming is injurious and a source of grief, not only to those re-named but to their descendants, also, who feel not only a natural sympathy with their ancestors but also that their own connection with their own past has been ruptured or, sometimes, erased.[11] These studies reinforce Bourdieu's view that the ability to manipulate symbols, including names, is a source of social power.

However, little of the research conducted by specialist onomasticians or more general social historians has addressed an aspect of personal naming which has been fairly obvious to lay observers in England at least during the twentieth century: the link between personal names and social class. In 1950 the lexicographer Eric Partridge pointed out that 'In C20, the irreverent are apt to poke fun at *Claud* [and *Claude*]' because it was assumed to denote someone both effete and upper-class.[12] More recently, in 1998, Stephen Wilson provided a brief review of the class associations of particular forenames in Britain while remarking that little research has been done.[13] In 2004 Kate Fox, on the basis of evidence

which is not specified except to name it 'participant observation', identified *Jamie* and *Saskia* as names of children of the then contemporary upper-middle class in contrast to *Kevin* and *Tracey* whose class position was said to be implied by their attendance at a 'local comprehensive'.[14] However, this research considers only the choice of name and ignores something possibly more basic – the number of names – which is the focus of this article.

Hall's hypothesis

Research published by Ron Hall in 1960 put forward and attempted to validate the hypothesis that the average number of personal names borne by a group of people in Britain was positively related to their social class.[15] Hall found that the upper reaches of the British peerage bore an average of over 3.9 names, barons and baronets about 3.5. Directors of the major merchant banking houses scored about 3.3, of retail banks about 3.2, of major industrial companies 3.1. Labour MPs, the only convenient list Hall could find of a group at least partly working-class, scored only 2.7. The hypothesis referred to British naming practices and was validated on data pertaining to the late 1950s. Originally presented as a comment on contemporary British society its importance is now historical, offering a contribution to the social and cultural history of class in the middle of the twentieth century.

Hall's hypothesis was published in *Crossbow*, a quarterly magazine of politics issued by the Bow Group, a society of Conservative university graduates, and received little notice in the wider media and none in academia. Its originator, Ron Hall (1934—2014), born Jack Ronald Hall, was the son of a Sheffield insurance agent. He attended Cambridge University (1954—1957) where he read mathematics and then economics. He became one of the new generation of university educated journalists and joined the *Sunday Times* in 1962 where, with Clive Irving and Jeremy Wallington, he set up the Insight Team of investigative

journalists. It was here that he made his name, eventually becoming deputy editor of the paper. He was dismissed from this post at the behest of its new owner, Rupert Murdoch, in 1982, a dismissal which he was later said to regard as an honour.

In the early 1960s, before his career in journalism was well established, Hall published two pieces of sociological analysis, a study of the family background of Etonians and the piece which is the subject of the present article, announced as 'Hall's Law: A new use for initials as a guide to class' on the cover of *Crossbow's* issue for the summer of 1960.[16] It was presented in a light-hearted manner, illustrated by cartoons, and did not forbear to express delight in some of the more extravagant names borne by the upper classes or sadness at the demise in the trenches of the First World War of Major L. S. D. O. F.-ff. Tollemache-Tollemache de Orellano Plantagenet Tollemache-Tollemache. Many readers of this piece may well have begun to wonder whether Hall's quantitative results were entirely accurate or even if they were reading an elaborate spoof satirizing simultaneously the quantitative academic sociology and the British class system of the time. It is for this reason that we cannot simply accept Hall's hypothesis as we would the results of a sociological investigation published in a refereed academic journal. It is necessary to replicate Hall's calculations, where it is possible to do so. This is the first task of the present article, which shows that Hall's arithmetic was accurate and that if satire was meant it was not written in disregard of actuality. These replications also enable the presentation of clearly documented and statistically tested versions of his results based on samples of data more suitable in some cases than those Hall was able to find. Further, Hall's results are extended by distinguishing forenames from surnames, by calling attention to disused names, and by documenting and discussing features of the statistical distributions of the number of names around their means.

Names and classes

Hall was not an academic sociologist and his work reflects the lay perceptions of class current at the time. Contemporary perceptions of class are evident in the 1959 book edited by Hugh Thomas *The Establishment*, Sam Aaronovitch's 1961 *The Ruling Class*, and Anthony Sampson's 1962 *Anatomy of Britain*.[17] Such writers were reacting against several aspects of pre-War and post-War social science and political debate, often originating from the USA: the treatment of social class as no more than an income scale; the interpretation of the rise of the joint-stock corporation and the divorce of its ownership from its control as a fundamental change in the distribution of power and property; the assumption that rising incomes and widening affluence were extinguishing class divisions; the celebration of limited social mobility as an 'equality of opportunity', and the assertion that 'the old ideas of class distinction and class hatred were dead', as Cmdr John Maitland, a backbench MP, had declared in 1959.[18] Such ideas were superadded to an apparently contradictory feeling, a widely-shared nostalgia for the class society of the pre-war period expressed by Richard Hoggart in his immensely influential *Uses of Literacy* of 1957, a society which Hoggart thought was being replaced by a 'culturally "classless" society' formed by the printed mass media and nationally marketed, sometimes internationally marketed, popular songs.[19] The reaction was fuelled by the demonstration by Thomas, Aaronovitch, Sampson and others that wealth remained highly concentrated; that the social origins and educational backgrounds of the rich, the powerful, and the influential, remained remarkably narrow; and that social and economic linkages between members of the aristocracy, the political, governmental, military, legal, clerical, academic, and business elites were sufficiently close to merit the term 'establishment', a usage originated in this sense by Henry Fairlie in 1955.[20]

Hall's work clearly stands with those writers and sociologists insisting on the then continued existence and relevance of social classes. He demonstrated this in a novel way,

by documenting, with an economist's rigour and resort to systematically analysed numbers, the existence of basic, public, and continuing distinctions between the classes in their personal names. Few English people of Hall's generation were in any doubt when they encountered the double-barrelled, for example, that they were meeting members of the British upper-middle or upper classes. Hall's work built on this perception. In current terms it can be interpreted as an essay in the history of social 'distinction' as that term was used by Bourdieu.

Social distinction

In *Language and Symbolic Power*, Bourdieu, writing of names of all types, claimed that

> the social sciences must take as their object of study the social operations of *naming* and the rites of institution through which they are accomplished. But on a deeper level, they must examine the part played by words in the construction of social reality and the contribution which the struggle over classifications, a dimension of all class struggles, makes to the constitution of classes – classes defined in terms of age, sex or social position, but also clans, tribes, ethnic groups or nations.[21]

This remains a programme, only, in *Language and Symbolic Power* but it is a programme that has started to be fulfilled, particularly by sociologists interested in gender and ethnicity. Sociologists interested in gender have discussed the use and dis-use of 'Ms', 'Miss', and 'Mrs', the increasing numbers of women who choose not to change their names on marriage, the solutions adopted by parents who do not wish their children to bear a family name which is their biological or social father's family name; and solutions to other naming problems precipitated by divorce, remarriage, adoption and fostering, and among the trans-gendered.[22]

Sociologists interested in ethnicity, multiculturalism, and cultural globalization have discussed first name choices in multilingual families as 'acts of identity' rather than as attempts to attain or retain a standing in their families or communities.[23]

Bourdieu's later work on *Distinction* has also produced a literature on the 'consumption' of names as 'symbolic goods'. Some have seen personal names as the ideal example of differences in tastes between classes and between other social groups. A person who eats at McDonald's may have the same tastes as a person who eats at Michelin-starred restaurants; they do so simply because they are poor. The question of taste is thus entangled with income. But names are free, gratis and for nothing. If the poor choose to name their children differently from the rich, it is, or so it is argued, a matter of taste alone. That the poor and the rich name their children differently does, therefore, demonstrate the difference in tastes that Bourdieu has emphasized as a marker of class.[24] That such choices are, in the modern era, plainly influenced by fashion shows, depending on how fashion is understood in this context, the influence of social emulation and its converse, non-conformity, or of advertising and other texts disseminated via the mass media, or of both.[25] However, all this literature is concerned with understanding the changing popularity of particular names, rather than the fashion, if such it be, for single or multiple names.

Social history

The history of names and naming practices shows an influence of class and status from early times.[26] Hereditary surnames seem to have been unknown in England before the Norman Conquest. Major landholders under the early Norman regime had 'by-names', or secondary names, such as the *de Montgomery* in *Roger de Montgomery*, but these were rarely inherited and by-names only became common among the elite of the landed classes in the twelfth century. The practice then diffused among knights, other landholders, and wealthier

merchants but it did not become common among all classes throughout England until well into the fourteenth century. By-names often became hereditary after one or two generations, the practice following the same path of social and geographical diffusion as followed by by-names themselves. The process of diffusion in England was slow, however, and in parts of northern England hereditary by-names were not universal until the fifteenth century or even later.[27] In Wales the process took much longer as we shall see below.

Research on France and Italy has documented a similar history. Monique Bourin led a comparative group of studies of medieval cartularies mainly from France and concluded that the shift from a single name to various forms of two-part names in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was led by nobles.[28] Similarly, François Menant, surveying the evidence provided by lists of names compiled by the bureaucracies of Bologna, Bergamo and Cremona in the thirteenth century, noted that the names of the Bolognese serfs 'expressed to the highest degree the cultural inferiority of the peasantry' with an excess of augurative names (for example, *Benvenutus*) and an enormous number of hypocoristics (terms of endearment, often diminutives, for example, *Ventura* formed from *Bonaventura*).[29] Serfs might have only a single name supplemented by a description where necessary (*Johannes —the blind man*). As in France, those higher up the social scale appeared to have been the first to adopt the modern two-element name composed of a forename and an inherited family name. Nikonov reported similar results for Russia over the fourteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries.[30]

Smith-Bannister's study of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England asked whether men from different social groups from the gentry downwards had different names and found the answer for his place and period was, broadly, 'No'.[31] *John* was the most common male name in all social groups below the peerage and a man named *John* might be a wealthy gentleman or his lowliest stable lad. But in the peerage, those named *Charles*,

Edward, *Francis*, *George,* and *Henry* outnumbered the *Johns*.[32] It was also in the peerage, and only in the peerage, that multiple forenames were found but even there the practice of multiple forenaming remained rare. By the 1690s about nine per cent of peers were baptized with two forenames.[33] Smith-Bannister suggests that where likely reasons for multiple forenaming can be found in this context they are largely to do with acknowledging or honouring wealthy ancestors in the female line and do not represent attempts at aggrandizement.[34] It would seem that this is the only attempt by a historian to document a correlation between social class and numbers of names in modern Britain. Apart from this, Hall's research appears to be unique.

Hall's hypothesis and the use of names

Hall's conception of what constitutes a personal name is indicated by his rules for counting names. All forenames and surnames are counted, double-barrelled names are counted as two, triple-barrelled as three, and so on. Hall counted *à*, *De*, *D'*, *de la*, *De La*, *Du*, *Le*, *L'*, *St,* and *van* as full names with *de* counted as one and *de la* also counted as one, not two. (Guéguen's research, although carried out on modern data, suggests that counting the nobiliary particle as a full name is appropriate.[35]) Hall ignored all honorifics (*Mr*, *Sir, The Rt. Hon. the Lord*), ranks (*Captain*), and other terms of personal address or reference. Where people had titles of nobility he did not count the title but only the name, so that John Clotworthy Talbot Foster Whyte-Melville Skeffington, 13th Viscount of Massereene and 6th Viscount of Ferrard counted as seven not sixteen. He treated ecclesiastical and academic titles similarly and ignored all post-nomial letters. He disregarded by-names and nicknames so that Bernard 'Monty' Law Montgomery, 1st Viscount of Alamein, counted as three not four.

While we might quibble with the treatment of nobiliary particles, the main difficulties with the concept of a personal name implied by these rules are two-fold. In one respect, we might argue that Hall's names include too much for, of course, the 13th Viscount was not normally referred to by his full name and title but simply as 'Massereene'.[36] Similarly, Admiral the Hon. Sir Reginald Aylmer Ranfurly Plunkett-Ernle-Erle-Drax (1880—1967) was normally referred to as Reginald Plunkett or, after 1916 when he acquired the additional surnames, Reginald Drax. Nor are such practices of abbreviation confined to the upper classes or the excessively accoutred. Hugh Todd Naylor Gaitskell (1906—1963), James Harold Wilson (1916—1995), Roy Harris Jenkins (1920—2003), and Patrick Chrestien Gordon Walker (1907—1980), leading lights in the Labour Party of the late 1950s, were each normally known by abbreviated names. Thus to suggest that these rarely used or unused names might have helped communicate a class identity, or a status, when the names were barely known to the public stretches credulity.

In another respect, we might argue that Hall's names do not include enough. If, as the 13th Viscount of Massereene, we had wanted to parade our class or status, it would have been more effective to say 'Look here! I'm the 13th Viscount of Massereene, don't you know!' than to say 'Look here! I'm John Clotworthy Talbot Foster Whyte-Melville Skeffington!' and to ignore this is to close our eyes to one of the main ways in which noble status is communicated.

The first objection, that to count full names is to include too much and that we should restrict ourselves to the names by which people are normally known, their 'call name', has weight but goes too far. Both a person's full name and their call name are of interest but the nature of our sources usually prevents the large-scale study of call names in a historical context. However, some progress on this matter is possible for some social groups, as may be seen in the analysis of disused names presented below.

The second objection, that to count names only is to omit much that communicates class and status, is clearly correct. Indeed, the omissions are more extensive than we have mentioned. At this point it is helpful to compare the names in the epigraph of this essay.[37] How do we know, from his name alone, that Len Fairclough was working-class? That he had only two names may be the least of it. More effective in communicating his class status was that his first name was *Len*, not *Leonard* (and not *Ambrose*, nor *Alexander*).[38] Possibly also of significance was his family name. *Fairclough* sounds like, and indeed is, a Lancashire name.[39] Lancashire was a working-class county where the upper classes were rarely encountered.[40] How do we know, from his name alone, that Claude Cattermole 'Catsmeat' Potter-Pirbright was an upper-class character? That he had four (or five) names is part of it. As we noted earlier, *Claude* was, and is, not a proletarian name. That Potter-Pirbright still has a school-boy's nickname ('Catsmeat') is also important because of apparent class differences in nicknaming practices, although the evidence for this is of uncertain temporal reference, somewhat contradictory and, apart from one study, little more than anecdotal. Working-class people in England appear to have left school nicknames behind and in adult life nick-named largely by abbreviation (*Leonard* to *Len*; *Albert* to *Bert*; *Montgomery* to *Monty*); upper-class people preserved the flamboyance and occasional cruelty of their boarding school or childhood family nicknames.[41] But the clincher, of course, in determining the class position of Potter-Pirbright is the double-barrelled family name. While modern family names may be double-barrelled for reasons such as a respect for marital or co-parental gender equality as the sociological literature cited earlier makes clear, in the England of the late 1950s double-barrelling was an almost wholly upper-class and upper-middle-class practice.

Thus names communicated class positions in a number of ways: by honorifics, ranks, and titles; by the number of forenames and surnames (as we shall show); by the association

of some forenames and some surnames with the upper or working classes; and by some features we have not yet mentioned: by the use of a *y* where an *i* would be expected (*Gyles*, *Sydney, Smyth*, *Vyvyan*); by the use of surnames pronounced in radical disregard of the normal rules of English speech (*Cavendish*, *Cholmondeley*, *Mainwaring*, *Marjoribanks*); by the hyphenation of forename or surname; by the use of elements such as the nobiliary particle and the initial lower-case *ff* of, for example, the family name of Peter Martin Joseph Charles John Mary ffrench, 7th Baron ffrench (1926—1986); and by the use of post-nomial letters.[42] Hence a count of 'official' names is only a partial study. Nevertheless it is a study of parts that seem to have mattered. When the militant suffragette Lady Constance Georgina Bulwer-Lytton (1869—1923) rejected her class and status, she did not merely drop her title, she also pared down her four names to two: usually to Constance Lytton but sometimes, when she wished to adopt a working-class persona, to Jane Warton (not Warburton, as had first occurred to her, for this was 'too distinguished a name').[43] The study of 'official' name numbers also offers some advantages to the researcher. It is objective. It requires only the initials of a person's forenames. It is, for men, usually stable throughout life. This significance and these advantages are sufficient to render a study of the number of names worthwhile.

Hall's hypothesis and the evidence

This author's replication of Hall's results for the 1959 British peerage is given in Table 1.[44] Table 1 shows that the upper reaches of the peerage (dukes, marquesses, and earls) bore an average of over 3.9 names, barons about 3.5 and baronets about 3.4 while knights bore an average barely above 3.0. These results are very close to those found by Hall in 1960. The peerage, baronetage and knightage showed an internal hierarchy of name frequency largely matching the hierarchy of noble precedence. The viscounty was anomalous; at 3.36 the

average number of their names was below that of barons and below even that of baronets. The breakdown into first names and last names shows that double-barrelled last names were quite rare: even dukes bore an average of well under two last names; among the barons the average was only 1.12. The bulk of the names in this class were first names.

Table 1 About Here

Hall did not offer any statistical tests of his results. Here I offer the results of analyses of variance to test whether or not the differences between the mean number of names found in the different groups might be the result of sampling error or, where we are dealing with a universe rather than a sample, of variations analogous to sampling errors. Here the null hypotheses that the mean numbers of first names, of last names, and of all names are each equal across the seven groups identified in Table 1 can be rejected at the five per cent significance level. The complete set of test results is available in the Supplementary Online Material; from this point attention is called to them only if they suggest that the measured differences may be due to sampling or similar variations or if they are otherwise remarkable.

While the data provided in Table 1 refer to the peerage, baronetage, and knightage as it was in 1959 the names these men bore were bestowed not in the late 1950s, of course, but at the time of these men's birth many decades previously. Table 2 gives details of the birth years of these men. It shows that they stretch from 1862 to 1951, covering almost a century of aristocratic naming. The middle half of the peerage, those whose birth years lay between the first and third quartiles of the distribution, were born between 1889 and 1912 with the median at the turn of the century. The names of these men therefore

tell us about what names were considered attractive, useful or appropriate by their usually late-Victorian or Edwardian parents. The birth years of the knightage tell a similar story except that the knights, at the median, are about ten years older than the peerage and baronetage, a consequence, one supposes, of the necessity of attaining a knighthood rather than simply inheriting it. The great majority of these knights were born while Victoria was still on the throne. One needs to remember therefore that the men studied in this paper were members of what one might call the 'old establishment', personified by Harold Macmillan, the prime minister from 1957 to 1963, not the 'new establishment' of Harold Wilson and Ted Heath.

Table 2 About Here

Personal names therefore bring the past into the present. This is most obvious with the choice of forenames. When one encounters a historical person with the forename *Kitchener*, one can be fairly sure that they were born in the 1890s or the 1900s.[45] A person forenamed *Gladstone* is dated less precisely with the numbers so named in Britain rising from a handful (of all ages) before 1871 to a peak of 470 in 1911. The *number* of names is much less telling because, as we indicated above, this has changed only slowly in Britain, over the *longue durée*, until recently when double-barrelling has spread to the gender-conscious middle classes.

Hall's results for bankers and industrialists were based on lists of names given in a contribution by Victor Sandelson to Hugh Thomas's then recently published book on *The Establishment.*[46] This contribution was in turn based on a study of the 'controllers' by Michael Barratt-Brown in the *Universities & Left Review*.[47] These lists suffer from various deficiencies which led me to create more appropriate and better-defined lists of names.[48]

For bankers, I took all those listed as directors of merchant or retail banks in the 1959 *Stock Exchange Year Book*. For insurers, I took the directors of the largest 25 life and composite insurance companies (as assessed in the mid-1960s). For the top industrialists, I took all the directors of the biggest 100 industrial companies (again, as assessed in the mid-1960s). There were no women at all among the bankers and insurers and very few indeed among the top industrialists and use of these sources therefore restricts this study to the names of men and explains why, in earlier parts of this essay, I have examined only the male peerage, knightage and baronetage. To find a sample of company directors from small-scale industry and commerce, I again took a sample from the 1959 *Directory of Directors* but this time excluded all those found among the bankers, insurers and industrialists of the previous sample. These samples are more representative of male directors than those Hall used and better defined.

However, there are problems in using the *Directory of Directors*. While it includes directors of public and private companies it does not claim completeness and is likely to be substantially biased in its coverage towards public companies.[49] Copeman's investigation of an earlier issue of the *Directory* suggested that the great majority of those listed (between perhaps 70 and 85 percent) were directors of companies that were both public and listed on the London Stock Exchange.[50] Private companies were typically family businesses or former partnerships. The *Directory* excluded directors of public corporations such as the National Coal Board and managers of government services such as the National Health Service and did not include partnerships, sole traders or the owners of unincorporated enterprises. These exclusions put substantial parts of the economy outside the scope of the *Directory*. Sectors noticeable by their absence included farming, coal mining, construction, the utilities, much retail trade, transport, law and accountancy, health, education, government and the armed forces (although former civil servants and military officers took

directorships elsewhere). The 1959 *Directory* is instead dominated by manufacturing, including steel (not re-nationalized until 1967) and brewing (not at this time controlled, as it is today, by a small number of large companies). It also included a substantial number of relatively small companies involved in colonial exploitation: operators of tea and rubber estates, gold and other metal mining companies, and 'junior' oil companies, as well as the well-known larger firms such as Brooke Bond and Sime, Darby.

Table 3 gives the mean number of names of these bankers, insurers and industrialists and analyses them into first and last names.

Table 3 About Here

These results differ a little from those Hall published and which I summarized earlier in this paper. However, the hierarchy Hall found is confirmed. The range covered by our results for bankers and industrialists, from 2.93 to 3.20 is somewhat less wide than that reported by Hall which ran from 2.94 to 3.26. The members of these samples were of a similar age to the members of the peerage documented in Table 2. The merchant bankers had a birth years running from 1874 to 1925 with a median lying between 1900 and 1901; the insurers were born between 1870 and 1937 with a median birth year of 1895; the retail bankers between 1874 and 1921 with a median of 1896; the directors of the top 100 industrials, between 1873 and 1920 with a median of 1897.

Directors of small scale industry and commerce bore an average number of names smaller than the bankers, insurers and directors of large scale industry (the top 100 companies) given higher up the table, although the differences among the industrial and commercial group were slight. Of the difference of 27 points (where a point is one one-hundredth of a unit) between the merchant bankers (3.20) and the directors of small-scale

industry (2.93), the majority (22 points) comes from differences in the number of forenames; only four points come from differences in the number of surnames.

Let us now turn to the working classes. Hall had difficulty finding a suitable list of working-class names and had to resort to a listing of Labour Party MPs to generate his results. While many of these men and women had authentically working-class backgrounds (for example Alice Bacon, Aneurin Bevan, Jim Griffiths, Roy Mason, and Tom Williams —all daughters and sons of coal miners or themselves former coal miners), a substantial minority, like Hugh Gaitskell, the son of a civil servant, did not. Instead, I have used the listing of delegates to the 1959 Trades Union Congress (TUC) in Blackpool. Over a thousand delegates attended the Congress. The delegates were usually union officials, not lay members, and one could argue that these men and women were by 1959 members of the middle class with white-collar jobs paid by salary and carried out in warm, dry, clean offices. The great majority of these men and women had however worked in the trade they represented and at the time of their birth and naming were probably not expected to do much differently. It is therefore legitimate to take their names as examples of the names of the organized working class as it was constituted in 1959. Table 4 gives the mean number of their names, analysed by their 'trade group', a somewhat unhappy classification used by the TUC to group unions by industry.

Table 4 About Here

Means of the sum of the numbers of forenames and surnames are referred to as 'Hall's Combined Numbers'. The mean of this number over all male delegates is 2.45, lower even than the combined number Hall found for Labour MPs which was 2.7. The results

given here suggest that Charlotte M. Yonge's statement that double [first] names 'only grew really frequent in the present [nineteenth] century' was exaggerated and Katharina Leibring's even more adventurous assertion that the convention of multiple forenaming 'was established in all social classes [in England] around 1800' need revision.[51] Perhaps the most striking feature of Table 4 is, however, the almost complete absence of multiple surnames. Among the almost one thousand men whose names are tabulated in Table 4 only one, T.W. Cynog-Jones of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers (USDAW), was double-barrelled and none at all had a name involving a nobiliary particle. Cynog-Jones was, of course, Welsh and Welsh surnaming practices appear to have been more hospitable to double-barrelling than English and Scottish as we shall see below.

Unsurprisingly, given this lack of variation in the number of last names, an ANOVA test accepted the hypothesis that this number was equal across all Trade Groups; but the test rejected the hypothesis of equal numbers of first names and equal numbers of all names across the Groups. Table 5 considers whether there is a difference between 'operatives', or manual workers, and 'salaried staffs' or non-manual workers. The table is based on a classification of unions into manual and non-manual groups. Such classifications are difficult and often controversial not least because of the disrespect in which manual labour has been and is held in some circles.[52] The consequence is that work which is respected, despite its requirement for physical, not merely mental, capabilities, may be socially defined as 'non-manual'. Prominent examples are surgery, dentistry, and the performing arts, whether theatrical or musical. One other source of difficulty is the association of 'non-manual' with 'white-collar', that is with jobs that can be performed without protective clothing, usually because of the cleanliness of the environment in which they are carried out. Hence, retail shop work may be taken to be 'non-manual' even though one of its main tasks is often fetching and carrying. Further confusions arise with the gendered nature of work. A job

that is considered 'a suitable job for a woman', perhaps because it is clean or because it is 'people work', may be regarded as 'non-manual' despite the physical labour involved. Prominent examples include nursing and serving food and drink in bars, restaurants and hotels.[53]

Table 5 About Here

Here, it is important to follow such assumptions, since they are likely to correlate with other cultural practices such as naming. For example, we would be unsurprised if the naming practices followed by the parents of future surgeons were different from those followed by the parents of future joiners and engineering fitters, though each occupation is a manual one in that each involves the skilled manipulation of parts of the material world. Hence my approach has been to begin with the distinction between workers 'by hand' and workers 'by brain' but to modify it in recognition of differences in social valuation. For example, the Musicians' Union is classified here as a union of 'non-manual' workers but the Professional Footballers' Association is classified as a union of manual workers; the British Airline Pilots' Association (BALPA) is treated as a union of non-manual workers although the Association of Locomotive Enginemen and Firemen (ASLEF) is treated as a union of manual workers. Fortunately, difficult cases such as these involved small unions. The difficulties that arise with retail shop work, nursing, food preparation, and similar occupations, are also limited here because of the small size or low level of unionization of some of these occupations in 1959. Where a possibly controversial decision has had to be made I have adopted a conservative approach, opting for a classification as 'manual' rather than 'non-manual'. Thus USDAW is treated as a union of manual workers as are the Confederation of Health Service Employees (COHSE) and the National Union of Public

Employees (NUPE).[54] Table 5 shows a 22 point difference between the delegates of manual and non-manual unions, suggesting that about a quarter of the 88 point range between different unions might be the result of underlying differences between manual and non-manual trade unionists.

Table 6 puts the results found so far together for ease of comparison. The table gives results for the upper peerage, that is, dukes, marquesses and earls, which were combined on the basis of pairwise tests of the equality of the mean numbers of (all) names which showed that these means were each indistinguishable from the mean or means of its neighbouring group or groups. Similarly, the means for viscounts, barons and baronets were found to be each indistinguishable from their neighbour or neighbours.

Table 6 About Here

England, Wales and Scotland

The example of T.W. Cynog-Jones raises the question of whether the connection between class and naming documented in this article held consistently across England, Wales and Scotland. An examination of the case of T.W. Cynog Jones is revealing.

Thomas Walter Cynog-Jones (1908—1995) was born to a Welsh father, John Cynog Jones (b. 1867), who was a tailor and draper, and an English mother, Ada Lillian Clarke (b. 1869). Both Thomas Walter and his father John were born in Merthyr Cynog, a small village in Breconshire, now Powis, which includes the shrine of St Cynog, a fifth-century Welsh saint and martyr. John Cynog Jones appears to have been the first to take the name *Cynog* as part of his own, his own father being known simply as Thomas Jones and he himself as John Jones in official records until his marriage to Ada Lillian in 1899. There seems no obvious dynastic reason for adopting the name *Cynog* at this point whereas a reason based on a

desire to differentiate oneself seems plausible: the additional naming is close to referring to oneself as 'the John Jones from Merthyr Cynog'. Whether the name *Cynog* was a second forename or part of a surname was at first unclear as *Cynog* and *Jones* were not normally hyphenated before 1939. However, both of Thomas Walter's siblings were named *Cynog Jones* suggesting it was originally intended as an unhyphenated double surname.

Thomas Walter Cynog-Jones and his father therefore appear to exemplify a process of nominal multiplication in order to achieve a greater degree of individuation. That it was felt necessary was plainly a consequence of the very large numbers of people named Jones in Wales. This and the similarly large numbers of people named Davies, Evans, Williams, Thomas and so on is almost always related by onomasticians to the small size of the surname stock in Wales. This in turn is clearly related to the low stock of forenames and the very late survival of patronymic naming systems in Wales but the underlying causes are unknown.[55] A contributory factor may have been the early demise of the Welsh nobility leading to less name-doubling for dynastic reasons in Wales than in England or Scotland.[56]

The differences in the size of the name stock between England and Wales are startling indeed. The size of the name stock is normally assessed by considering the proportion of the population bearing the ten, twenty, or one hundred most popular names. To establish the size of the name stock for Wales, Rowlands and Rowlands conducted a survey of all surnames recorded in the marriage registers of every parish in Wales for the years 1813 to 1837.[57] No survey for Wales separately from England based on later data has been conducted. Using methods which are not fully explained, they also compute data for England alone based on their survey for Wales and a Report of the Registrar General for 1853 giving statistics for England and Wales together. Their results showed that the ten most frequent names in Wales accounted for 55.9 per cent of all names. The ten most frequent in England accounted for only 5.2 per cent of all names. Because of the weight of

the English population compared to the Welsh the comparable statistic for England and Wales combined is only 7.26 per cent. Later data up to the end of the twentieth century for England and Wales together suggests little change has taken place since the mid-nineteenth century surveyed by Rowlands and Rowlands.[58]

The practice of surname doubling began in Wales in the later nineteenth century among the 'better-educated and more ambitious' and among the professions which would help to preserve the link between class and nominal abundance.[59] In the contemporaneous Welsh working class nicknames were used for the same purpose, leading to examples such as Jones the Post and Jones Hallelujah, a device which would not add to the number of names recorded officially or formally as counted here.[60] Nevertheless, the difficulty illustrated by Jones the Post may have led to an increase in the number of forenames and surnames in the Welsh working class and thus a weakening of the connection between the number of names and social class.

One might expect formerly Gaelic areas of Scotland to present a somewhat similar case to that of Wales although for different reasons. Again the name stock appears to be low. The first (and one of the few) useful investigations of this was by James Stark (1811-1890) the first Superintendent of Statistics for Scotland, reporting to the Registrar General of Scotland. Stark's work was based on the public birth register of 1855. He counted 6823 separate names among 104,018 newborns or 6.5 names per hundred newborns. In England the comparable figures was 11.9. Stark attributed the low name stock in Scotland to the Clan system:

> [for] both among the Celtic race in the Highlands, and the Lowland races on the Border, it was the custom for all to assume as their surname the name held by the

> head of the family, either because they were actually his descendants, or because they were his vassals and property.[61]

Where this was the case the variety of surnames was threatened and methods of differentiation involving the multiplication of names might become attractive. However, Stark also drew attention to a countervailing process which was the then recent Irish migration to Scotland. This had brought people who shared their name with the existing Scots but also people bearing new names. Dynastic reasons for nominal multiplication also survived. Despite the forfeitures consequent to the 1745 Jacobite rebellion, the Scottish nobility remained almost unimpaired and the nineteenth- and twentieth-century British aristocracy showed no lack of double-barrelled Scottish nobles. However it must be admitted that these remarks are somewhat speculative and further research is plainly warranted.

Further analyses: disused names

The counts of names discussed so far are counts of the 'official' names borne by a person, not those actually used in addressing someone or in referring to someone. *Who's Who* (and to a lesser extent *Burke's*) allow us to investigate this distinction.[62] Where a name was not normally used in address or reference *Who's Who* (and less frequently *Burke's*) listed it in brackets. Thus the knight normally known as 'Sir Harry Pilkington' was listed by both *Who's Who* and *Burke's* as 'Sir Harry (William Henry) Pilkington Kt.'. I accepted any name bracketed either by *Burke's* or by *Who's Who* as a disused name; those bracketed by *Burke's* were almost always bracketed by *Who's Who* as well.

Table 7 shows the mean numbers of disused names in the peerage, baronetage, and knightage by rank. Such disused names were found fairly frequently among the baronetage

and knightage, reminding us of the convention that baronets and knights should be addressed and referenced as *Sir [Forename]* or *Sir [Forename] [Surname]* or, if necessary, *Sir [Forename Initial] [Surname]* but definitely not *Sir [Forename] [Forename]* or *Sir [Surname]*. Disused names were, however, extremely rare among the peerage, despite the great plurality of forenames in this group; only 14 peers had retired one or more of their forenames. The most dramatic move from proliferation to simplicity was by Lord Louis Francis Albert Victor Nicholas Mountbatten, the 1st Earl Mountbatten of Burma, who used only Louis according to *Who's Who*. Sir Victor Gilbert Lariston Garnet Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, the 5th Earl of Minto, was the only peer to retire elements of his surname, using only Elliot according to *Who's Who*. His example was followed by too few others in the peerage, the baronetage or the knightage to warrant a statistical analysis. The only example known to *Who's Who* among the knightage was Winston (Leonard Spencer) Churchill. It is clear that this pattern of disuse does not weaken the correlation between class and numbers of names among the titled but reinforces it.

Table 7 About Here

Forename disuse among financiers and industrialists, reported earlier in Table 3, largely reflected the presence or absence of knights and baronets among them. Data on name disuse among the directors of small-scale industry and commerce and among trade unionists was not available. We know that some names were disused in the latter group, for example Alex Moffat, miner and President of the Scottish Trades Union Congress in 1959, was always known as such, not as Alexander Bennet Moffat, the name that appeared on his birth certificate. However, very few trade unionists appeared in *Who's Who 1959*, and

there is no systematic data which would enable us to compare disuse among peers and industrialists on the one hand and trade unionists on the other.

Further analysis: the distributions of numbers of names

Many class signifiers—accent, education— are all but universal, borne by almost every member of the class concerned. The number of names is not, however. Even in the highest ranks of the nobility, some bore very few names as Tables 8 and 9 show.

Table 8 About Here

We can see that at almost every rank the peak of the forenames distribution was at an entirely middle-class two forenames; for marquesses it was at three. At each rank except the marquessate approaching half or more bore only one or two forenames. Broadly speaking the proportion bearing only one or two forenames rises as rank falls: over 85 per cent of knights have no more than two forenames. It is perhaps not so surprising to discover that the ever-modest Earl Attlee was simply Clement Richard Attlee, or that the Quaker Baron Gainford was plain Joseph Pease. But the modestly accoutred included some of the grandest: the Duke of Hamilton was just Douglas; the Duke of Norfolk, hereditary Earl Marshal of England, was merely Bernard Marmaduke; the immensely wealthy Marquess of Bute was plain John; the Earl of Wemyss and March who traced his family back to 1202, was Francis David. The high average numbers of names that Hall discovered in the aristocracy were not driven by the generality of nobles but by a relatively small number who held a highly unusual number of names: four, five, six, even seven. Consequently, a small number of forenames did not identify a person's class: *John Smith* might have been a bus

driver or a duke. But a large number did: *William John George Charles Frederick Arthur Smith* was very unlikely to have been a paviour, a school teacher, or a businessman in the Britain of 1959 as we shall see below.

Table 9 About Here

Similar conclusions can be drawn from the distributions of surname numbers. The majority of peers, rising to about 90 per cent among viscounts and barons, possessed a single surname. The proportion of baronets and knights with only a single surname was similarly high at over 80 and 90 per cent respectively. The number of peers with two or three surnames was small indeed. There was but a single example of a peer with four surnames: Alan James Montagu-Stuart-Wortley-Mackenzie, the 4th Earl of Wharncliffe. Again, the conclusion follows that *John Smith* may have been a bus driver or a duke, but *John Smith-Brown* was unlikely to drive buses for a living, and *John Smith-Brown-Robinson* was almost certainly not in possession of a public service vehicle driving licence.

Table 10 (for forenames) and Table 11 (for surnames) show the distributions of the number of names among bankers, insurers and industrialists. Table 10 shows that the proportions with the middle-class convention of two forenames is very high and, broadly speaking, rises as we go down the table. Those with one or two forenames dominate, rising to 90 per cent among directors of small scale industry and commerce. Those with more than two forenames are 'outliers'. Similarly Table 11 shows that the proportions with a conventional single surname are very high, above 90 per cent in all groups and above 95 per cent among the industrialists. Multiple surnames were relatively rare even among the merchant bankers, carried by only 22 men out of the 297 in the sample or by about seven per cent. Of these, 13 were double-barrelled, including three members of the Money-

Coutts family and nine had names which included nobiliary particles, including three members of Leopold de Rothschild's family. Similarly among the insurers and retail bankers: there were only 29 insurers and 27 retail bankers bearing multiple surnames (eight per cent in both cases). The 1097 directors of large-scale industry included only 39 multiply-surnamed men (four per cent) and among the directors of small-scale industry there were just 24 men who had multiple surnames out of the 911 in the sample (three per cent). None of these had a surname with a nobiliary particle. While the double-barrelled were rare, the triple-barrelled were confined to a single individual among the insurers (Lord Patrick Robin Gilbert Vanden-Bempde-Johnstone, the 4th Baron Derwent, chair of the Reinsurance Corporation Ltd), another among the retail bankers (Walter John Montagu-Douglas-Scott, the 8th Duke of Buccleuch, governor, or chair, of the Royal Bank of Scotland), and another among the small-scale industrialists (the by now familiar John Clotworthy Talbot Foster Whyte-Melville Skeffington, 13th Viscount of Massereene and 6th of Ferrard, a director of the Aviation & Shipping Co Ltd, a company of some obscurity). It is notable that in each of these cases the person concerned bears a title of nobility and represents the peerage 'slumming it', so to speak, among the middle classes.

Table 10 About Here

Table 11 About Here

Again the conclusion follows that the modestly named may still be found among the 'princes' of the merchant banks as well as among much more modest occupations; only the numerously named identify themselves as members of the upper or upper-middle classes.

Table 12 shows the distribution of numbers of forenames by TUC Group and by the manual / non-manual distinction. No delegate sported four forenames or more and no delegate had a doubled forename. The distributions of forenames therefore reduce to counts of those who had one, two or three forenames. Three forenames were very rare. Overall, only two per cent of delegates, 21 men in all, had three forenames. There seems no rhyme or reason to why these 21 had been favoured with so many names. Although one was from the Medical Practitioners' Union (H.B.O. Cardew) and one from the Merchant Navy and Airline Officers' Union (J.G.K. Gregory) and four others were from the non-manual group where three forenames might not be so surprising, there were also S.W.G. Ford and J.R.A. Machen from the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM), W.A.J. Case and G.S.W. Hall from the National Union of Agricultural Workers, and E.V.W. Marshall and A.R.T. Marsh from the Union of Post Office Workers. Little is known of these men except Joseph Robert Alwyn Machen (1900—1960), usually known as Alwyn Machen, President of the Yorkshire Area of the NUM. He was born in Clowne, a pit village in Derbyshire. Most of the other boys on his street in 1901, 29 out of the 46 and almost all of them sons of coal miners, had one first name; the rest had two. [63]

Table 12 About Here

The distribution of the number of surnames in this group is very simple: as we have seen, 975 of the 976 male delegates had a single surname; one, T.W. Cynog-Jones, of the Shop Workers, did not. One could be all but completely certain that any man one encountered in 1959 with a double- barrelled name was not, unless, possibly, he was Welsh, a member of the unionized working class. Some surnames proclaimed one's class in 1959 even more precisely than forenames proclaimed one's gender. One might be muddled

about whether the Hilary or Evelyn one was about to meet in 1959 was man or woman; one would be in no doubt of the class position of Patrick Robin Gilbert Vanden-Bempde-Johnstone. [64]

Summary and conclusions

This article confirmed that Hall's Combined Number for the men of the British peerage ran from about 4.00 to about 3.50 and for the baronetage and knightage from about 3.40 to about 3.00. It showed that for bankers, insurers, and directors of large-scale and small-scale industry and commerce, it ran from about 3.20 down to about 2.90; for male non-manual and manual trade unionists from about 2.70 to about 2.10 according to trade group. If we are willing to accept a definition of 'class' as a ranked socio-economic grouping that includes aspects of status and that the titled nobility stood at the top of this ranking then Hall's Hypothesis, that the number of names was positively correlated with class, is validated.

For how long this function of names has subsisted is difficult to estimate in the current state of research. We know that over the *longue durée* the tendency has been for the number of names borne by individuals to increase and for this process to begin, at each stage, with the higher social classes, giving rise to the connection between class and nominal abundance which we have seen here. But precisely when multiple forenaming became the norm in England is unclear with existing statements on this matter standing in need of revision. We have also seen that the process is likely to have had a varied history in England, Scotland and Wales. Similarly, precisely when double-barrelling became sufficiently well-known in England as an upper and upper-middle-class practice to communicate something other than mere eccentricity is largely unknown in the present state of research.

Literary history gives some hints. The scholar K.C. Phillipps suggested that William Thackeray was the first to satirize double-barrelled names in his *Book of Snobs* first published

in 1848 and that Thackeray, indeed, invented the term 'double-barrelled'.[65] Before this, Isaac Disraeli had suggested that 'the authors of certain periodical publications always assume for their *nom de guerre* a triple name, which doubtless raises them much higher in their reader's esteem than a mere christian and surname'. Similarly, he suggested that a long name also aroused esteem and a short name, he offered that of John Cuts, a wealthy gentleman of Queen Elizabeth's reign, as an example, provoked contempt.[66] Charles Dickens followed up the suggestion by giving Jo, the crossing sweeper in *Bleak House*, one of the shortest names possible in Britain, its shortness symbolic of Jo's cultural, educational and material poverty.[67] As we have seen, it was a view with which 'Jane Warton' concurred. These hints suggest that the length of a person's name said something of their class status as early as the first half of the nineteenth century.

Literary history provides questionable evidence for social history. However, the printed compilations of names used in this article have been produced for some considerable time and would allow historical investigations of naming and class to be pursued far back into the nineteenth century. Before then parish registers rapidly become the preferred source as demonstrated by Alice Crook's recent research on early modern Scotland.[68] Research may also be pushed towards the present in what appears to be another promising field of work. In the period since 1960 there have clearly been great changes. Significant migration from south Asia has added Islamic names to the English name stock: *Muhammad* is now the most popular boys' name in England, though *Maryam*, the most common girls' name with similar origins ranks only 56, and *Fatima* only 73.[69] Double-barrelling has ceased to be a sure connotation of the higher classes.[70] Naming for individuality rather than from a common name stock has become fashionable, at least among celebrities. Frank Zappa named his first child, born in 1967, Moon Unit and the trend was continued by Bob Geldof and Paula Yates (Fifi Trixibelle, born 1983; Peaches

Honeyblossom, born 1989; and Little Pixie, born 1990) and others. Nevertheless, baby naming manuals, magazines and web-sites continue to discuss the class connotations of various names, which names are 'pretentious' and which should be avoided as too redolent of the working class.[71] The scope for future research using the methods demonstrated here to develop the snapshot given here into a more dynamic picture is therefore wide.

Hall's Hypothesis may have been dismissed as entertaining but trivial. We argued that subsequent research has shown that names also have significance as a means of acquiring and communicating a social identity and expressing social distinctions. This study is therefore one among a broad group of studies that suggest that names are not arbitrary signs and sounds but words that mean something beyond the person who bears them and may be read, and usually read correctly, as statements or suggestions of gender, nationality, religion, ethnicity, lineage, and, as we have shown here, at least for some times and places, social class. In short, personal names are connotative, not merely denotative.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the late Ron Hall and to Pat Glossop for conversations about numbers and for their hospitality. Helpful comments were given by seminar participants in the Economics Department of the University of Leeds and by anonymous referees.

Disclosure statement

Ron Hall (1934—2014) was a cousin of the author of this article. The author has no financial or other beneficial interests to declare.

Funding

No external funding was sought for this research.

ORCID

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3433-9761

TABLES

Table 1. Mean Numbers of Names in the Male Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, UK, 1959.

	Sample (S) or Universe (U)	n	All Names	First Names	Last Names
Members of the Male English, Scottish, British or UK Peerages					
Dukes	U	24	4.00	2.50	1.50
Marquesses	U	30	4.03	2.80	1.23
Earls	U	156	3.92	2.71	1.21
Viscounts	U	105	3.36	2.28	1.09
Barons	S: 1 in 2	252	3.51	2.39	1.12
Members of the Male UK Baronetage and Knightage					
Baronets	S: 1 in 2	243	3.42	2.25	1.17
Knights	S: 1 in 15	254	3.04	1.96	1.07

Notes

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage, Baronetage & Knightage*, 102nd edn., (London, 1959); *Who's Who 1959: An annual biographical dictionary with which is incorporated 'Men and Women of the Time'* (London, 1959) and *Dod's Parliamentary Companion 1959* (London, 1959).

Table 2. Birth Years of the Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, UK, 1959.

	n	Earliest	Q1	Median	Q3	Latest
Peerage	567 (a)	1862	1889	1901	1912	1944
Baronetage	243 (b)	1865	1891	1900	1911–12	1951
Knightage	230 (c)	1863	1885	1890	1897	1926

Notes:

(a) Comprising all dukes, marquesses, earls, viscounts and the 1 in 2 sample of barons used to construct Table 1.

(b) The 1 in 2 sample used to construct Table 1.

(c) The 230 knights among the 254 members of 1 in 2 sample used to construct Table 1 for whom birth years were given in either *Burke's* or *Who's Who 1959*.

Sources: as for Table 1.

Table 3. Mean Number of Names: Male Bankers, Insurers, and Industrialists, UK, 1959.

	n	All Names	First Names	Last Names	Disused Forenames
Merchant Bankers (a)	297	3.20	2.12	1.07	0.07
Insurers (b)	383	3.13	2.05	1.08	0.10
Retail Bankers (c)	348	3.08	2.00	1.08	0.12
Above Three ('Financiers')	*1028*	*3.13*	*2.05*	*1.08*	*0.10*
Directors of Top 100 Industrials (d)	1097	2.97	1.94	1.04	0.20
Directors of Small Industrial & Commercials (e)	911	2.93	1.90	1.03	n.a.
Above Two ('Industrialists') (f)	*2008*	*2.93*	*1.90*	*1.03*	*n.a.*

Notes

(a) All directors and partners listed by the *Stock Exchange Year Book* 1959 of every company described as 'merchant bankers' or 'merchants and bankers' or similarly by the *Year Book* in its 'Banks and Discount Companies' chapter.

(b) All directors of the top 25 life insurance companies by funds and the top 25 composite insurance companies by premium income in 1964 or financial year 1964/65 as given by *The Times*, 21 June 1965.

(c) All directors and partners listed by the *Stock Exchange Year Book* 1959 for all companies described as 'bankers' by the *Year Book* in its 'Banks and Discount Companies' chapter that were also members of the Bankers's Clearing House.

(d) The 'Top 100 Industrials' are defined as those companies listed as such by *The Times* newspaper in its issue of 21 June 1965, adjusted to a 1959 basis. Companies were ranked by capital employed not employment. The list excluded the nationalized industries, insurance companies, and banks.

(e) A 1 in 30 sample of all directors listed in the 1959 *Directory of Directors* excluding those who were on the boards of merchant banks, retail banks, insurance companies, and the top 100 industrial companies as defined for previous rows in the table.

(f) These means are weighted 1:30 to reflect the sampling of the directors of small scale industry and commerce. Hence the closeness of the means for industrialists as a whole to the means for the directors of small scale industry and commerce.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage, Baronetage & Knightage*, 102nd edn. (London, 1959); *Who's Who 1959: An annual biographical dictionary with which is incorporated 'Men and Women of the Time'* (London, 1959); *The Directory of Directors* [1959] (London, 1959); *The Stock Exchange Year Book* [1959] (London, 1959); *The Times*, 'Britain's largest business groups', *The Times* [London], 21 June 1965.

Table 4. Mean Numbers of Names of Male Delegates to the 1959 UK Trades Union Congress by TUC Trade Group.

Trade Group (and its largest member or members)	n	All Names	First Names	Last Names
1. Mining & Quarrying (NUM)	145	2.28	1.28	1.00
2. Railways (NUR, TSSA)	41	2.68	1.68	1.00
3. Other Transport (T&GWU)	95	2.44	1.44	1.00
4. Shipbuilding (Boilermakers)	19	2.42	1.42	1.00
5. Engineering (AEU)	131	2.48	1.48	1.00
6. Iron & Steel (I&STC)	46	2.43	1.43	1.00
7. Building &c (ASW)	67	2.48	1.48	1.00
8. Printing & Paper (NUPB&PW)	54	2.65	1.65	1.00
9. Cotton (Weavers)	28	2.14	1.14	1.00
10. Other Textiles (Dyers & Bleachers)	29	2.24	1.24	1.00
11. Clothing (NUT&GW)	21	2.38	1.38	1.00
12. Boot & Shoe (NUBSO)	22	2.55	1.55	1.00
13. Distribution &c (USDAW)	66	2.56	1.55	1.02
14. Agriculture (NUAW)	16	2.50	1.50	1.00
15. Public Employees (NUPE)	27	2.30	1.30	1.00
16. Civil Servants (CSCA)	64	2.66	1.66	1.00
17. Non-Manual Workers (CAWU, NFIW)	47	2.45	1.45	1.00
18. General Workers (G&M)	58	2.47	1.47	1.00
All	*976*	*2.45*	*1.45*	*1.00*

Notes

The delegates included 36 women; all have been excluded from the data given above. Five delegates gave an address in the Republic of Ireland and have also been excluded from the data given above. No other delegate, other than fraternal delegates, gave an address outside the UK.

Abbreviations: AEU: Amalgamated Engineering Union; ASW: Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers; Boilermakers: The United Society of Boilermakers, Shipbuilders and Structural Workers; CAWU: Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union; CSCA: Civil Service Clerical Association; Dyers & Bleachers: National Union of Dyers, Bleachers and Textile Workers; G&M: National Union of General and Municipal Workers; I&STC: Iron and Steel Trades Confederation; NFIW: National Federation of Insurance Workers; NUAW: National Union of Agricultural Workers; NUBSO: National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives; NUM: National Union of Mineworkers; NUPB&PW: National Union of Printing, Bookbinding, and Paper Workers; NUPE: National Union of Public Employees; NUR: National Union of Railwaymen; NUT&GW: National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers; T&GWU: Transport & General Workers' Union; TSSA: Transport Salaried Staffs Association; USDAW: Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers; Weavers: Amalgamated Weavers' Association.

Source: TUC, *Report of Proceedings at the 91st Annual Trades Union Congress Held at the Opera House, Blackpool, September 7 to 11 1959* (London, 1959).

Table 5. Mean Numbers of Names of Male Delegates to the 1959 UK Trades Union Congress. Manual and Non-Manual Trade Unionists.

Delegates of Unions of:	n	All Names	First Names	Last Names
Non-Manual Workers	129	2.64	1.64	1.00
Manual Workers	847	2.42	1.42	1.00
All	*976*	*2.45*	*1.45*	*1.00*

Notes

See the notes to Table 4.

Trade Unions classified as manual are all trade unions not classified as non-manual.

Trade Unions classified as non-manual. Thirty trade unions classed as non-manual sent delegates to the 1959 Congress; of these, eight sent only one delegate. The other 22 were (numbers of delegates following in brackets): TSSA: the Transport Salaried Staffs Association (16); the Merchant Navy and Air Line Officers' Association (3); the Association of Engineering and Shipbuilding Draughtsmen (12); ASSET: the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians (5); NUJ: the National Union of Journalists (3); the National Union of Co-operative Officials (2); CSCA: the Civil Service Clerical Association (18); CSU: the Civil Service Union (5); IRSF: the Inland Revenue Staff Federation (8); the Ministry of Labour Staff Association (3); the Association of Post Office Controlling Officers (3); the Society of Technical Civil Servants (2); the British Actors' Equity Association (2); NUBE: the National Union of Bank Employees (6); CAWU: the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union (5); the Guild of Insurance Officials (3); NFIW: the National Federation of Insurance Workers (8); the London County Council Staff Association (2); the Medical Practitioners' Union (2); the Musicians' Union (5); the Association of Scientific Workers (3); and the National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees (5).

Source: as for Table 4.

Table 6. Mean Numbers of Names in Samples of British Men, 1959.

	n	All Names	First Names	Last Names
The Upper Peerage (a)	210	3.94	2.70	1.24
The Lower Peerage & Baronets (b)	600	3.45	2.32	1.14
Financiers	1028	3.13	2.05	1.08
Knights	254	3.04	1.96	1.07
Industrialists (c)	2008	2.93	1.90	1.03
Trade Unionists	976	2.45	1.45	1.00

Notes

(a) Dukes, marquesses and earls.

(b) Viscounts, barons and baronets. Data for barons and baronets, which are 1 in 2 samples, have been double-weighted in forming the means reported here.

(c) Data for the directors of small-scale industry and commerce, which are from a 1 in 30 sample, have been combined with the data for the directors of the top 100 industrial companies using a weighting of 30:1.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: as for Tables 1, 3 and 4.

Table 7. Mean Numbers of Used and Disused Names: The Male Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, UK, 1959.

	Sample (S) or Universe (U)	n	All Names	All First Names	Disused First Names
Members of the Male English, Scottish, British or UK Peerages					
Dukes	U	24	4.00	2.50	0.00
Marquesses	U	30	4.03	2.80	0.00
Earls	U	156	3.92	2.71	0.03
Viscounts	U	105	3.36	2.28	0.01
Barons	S: 1 in 2	252	3.51	2.39	0.06
Members of the Male UK Baronetage and Knightage					
Baronets (a)	S: 1 in 2	241	3.42	2.25	0.52
Knights (b)	S: 1 in 15	252	3.04	1.96	0.47

Notes

(a) The mean for disused names is based on the 241 baronets of the 243 sampled who had an entry in *Who's Who 1959*.

(b) The mean for disused names is based on the 252 knights of the 254 sampled who had an entry in *Who's Who 1959*.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: as for Table 1.

Table 8. Distributions of the Number of Forenames in the Male Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, UK, 1959.

			Number of Forenames and Percent							
	Sample or Uni-verse	n	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	One or Two (%)
Members of the Male English, Scottish, British or UK Peerages										
Dukes	U	24	3	10	7	4	0	0	0	*54*
Marquesses	U	30	2	7	17	3	1	0	0	*30*
Earls	U	156	14	57	54	25	4	1	1	*46*
Viscounts	U	105	10	61	29	5	0	0	0	*68*
Barons	S (a)	252	22	121	98	11	0	0	0	*57*
Members of the UK Baronetage and Knightage										
Baronets	S (a)	243	29	141	62	8	1	2	0	*70*
Knights	S (b)	254	51	164	37	2	0	0	0	*85*

Notes

(a) The sample is of 1 in 2. (b) The sample is of 1 in 15.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: as for Table 1.

Table 9. Distributions of the Numbers of Surnames in the Male Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, UK, 1959.

			Number of Surnames and Percent				
	Sample (S) or Universe (U)	n	One	Two	Three	Four	*One (Per cent)*
Members of the Male English, Scottish, British or UK Peerages							
Dukes	U	24	15	6	3	0	*63*
Marquesses	U	30	24	5	1	0	*80*
Earls	U	156	130	21	4	1	*83*
Viscounts	U	105	96	9	0	0	*91*
Barons	S (a)	252	225	23	4	0	*89*
Members of the UK Baronetage and Knightage							
Baronets	S (a)	243	204	37	2	0	*84*
Knights	S (b)	254	236	17	1	0	*93*

Notes

(a) The sample is of 1 in 2. (b) The sample is of 1 in 15.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental Online Material.

Sources: as for Table 1.

Table 10. Distributions of the Numbers of Forenames of Financiers and Industrialists, UK, 1959.

			Number of Forenames and Percent					
	Sample or Universe	n	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	One or Two (%)
Merchant Bankers	U	297	46	179	63	8	1	*76*
Insurers	U	383	67	233	80	3	0	*78*
Retail Bankers	U	348	58	238	47	5	0	*85*
Directors of Top 100 Industrials	U	1097	225	728	133	11	0	*87*
Directors of Small Industrial & Commercials	Sample (a)	911	193	623	90	5	0	*90*

Notes

See the notes to Table 3. (a) The sample is of 1 in 30.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental

Online Material.

Sources: as for Table 3.

Table 11. Distributions of the Numbers of Surnames of Financiers and Industrialists, UK, 1959.

			Number of Surnames and Percent				
	Sample or Universe	n	One	Two	Three	Four	One (%)
Merchant Bankers	U	297	275	22	0	0	93
Insurers	U	383	354	28	1	0	92
Retail Bankers	U	348	321	26	1	0	92
Directors of Top 100 Industrials	U	1097	1058	39	0	0	96
Directors of Small Industrial & Commercials	S (a)	911	887	23	1	0	97

Notes

See the notes to Table 3. (a) The sample is of 1 in 30.

Further notes on the universes and samples used here are available in the Supplemental

Online Material.

Sources: as for Table 3.

Table 12. Numbers of First Names of Male Delegates to the 1959 UK Trades Union Congress by TUC Trade Group. Means and Distributions.

Trade Group (and its largest member or members)	n	Mean	One first name (%)	Two first names (%)	Three first names (%)
1. Mining & Quarrying (NUM)	145	1.28	74	25	1
2. Railways (NUR, TSSA)	41	1.68	34	63	2
3. Other Transport (T&GWU)	95	1.44	57	42	1
4. Shipbuilding (Boilermakers)	19	1.42	58	42	0
5. Engineering (AEU)	131	1.48	55	42	3
6. Iron & Steel (I&STC)	46	1.43	59	39	2
7. Building &c (ASW)	67	1.48	52	48	0
8. Printing & Paper (NUPB&PW)	54	1.65	37	61	2
9. Cotton (Weavers)	28	1.14	86	14	0
10. Other Textiles (Dyers & Bleachers)	29	1.24	76	24	0
11. Clothing (NUT&GW)	21	1.38	62	38	0
12. Boot & Shoe (NUBSO)	22	1.55	50	45	5
13. Distribution &c (USDAW)	66	1.55	48	48	3
14. Agriculture (NUAW)	16	1.50	63	25	13
15. Public Employees (NUPE)	27	1.30	70	30	0
16. Civil Servants (CSCA)	64	1.66	41	53	6
17. Non-Manual Workers (CAWU, NFIW)	47	1.45	60	36	4
18. General Workers (G&M)	58	1.47	53	47	0
Unions of Manual Workers	847	1.42	60	39	2
Unions of Non-Manual Workers	129	1.64	40	55	5
All	976	1.45	57	41	2

Notes

See the notes to Tables 4 and 5.

Source: as for Table 4.

[1] S. Wilson, *The Means of Naming: A social and cultural history of personal naming in western Europe* (London, 1998), 115-17, 154-55. Vladimir Nikonov's sceptical comments on the possibility of perfect individuation are salutary: V.A. Nikonov, 'The personal name as social symbol', *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology*, 10, Fall (1971), 168–95.

[2] S. Benson, 'Injurious naming: aming, disavowal and recuperation in the contexts of slavery and emancipation' in G. vom Bruck and B. Bodenhorn (eds), *An Anthropology of Names and Naming* (Cambridge, 2006), 180.

[3] P. Bourdieu, *Distinction : A social critique of the judgement of taste*, trans. R. Nice (London, 1984); P. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. J. B. Thompson, trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson (Cambridge, 1991).

[4] D. Herlihy, 'Tuscan names, 1200-1530', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 41, 4 (1988), 561-82; C. Klapisch-Zuber, *La maison et le nom: stratégies et rituels dans l'Italie de la renaissance* (Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1990); C. Klapisch-Zuber, 'Le nom "refait": la transmission des prénoms à Florence (XIV^{e} – XVI^{e} siècles)', *L'Homme*, 20, 4 (1980), 77-104; R. Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, colonization and cultural change, 950-1350* (London, 1994); R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225* (Oxford, 2000).

[5] S. Smith-Bannister, *Names and Naming Patterns in England, 1538-1700* (Oxford, 1997).

[6] *ibid.*, 188.

[7] M. Wolffsohn and T. Brechenmacher, 'Nomen est omen: The selection of first names as an indicator for public opinion in the past', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 13, 2 (2001), 116-39.

[8] J. Gerhards, *The Name Game: Cultural modernization and first names* (London, 2005).

[9] R.M. Rennick, 'The Nazi name decrees of the nineteen thirties', *Names* 18, 2 (1970), 65-88, D.O. Bering, *The Stigma of Names: Antisemitism in German daily life, 1812-1933*, trans. N. Plaice (Ann Arbor MI, 1992); V. Klemperer, *The Language of the Third Reich: LTI, Lingua Tertii Imperii: A philologist's notebook*, trans. M. Brady (London, 2006), 69-77; Wolffsohn and Brechenmacher, *op. cit.*; I.M. Laversuch, 'Margarete and Sulamith under the swastika: Girls' names in Nazi Germany', *Names*, 58, 4 (2010), 219-30.

[10] Among others on slavery see: E.D. Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The world the slaves made* (London, 1975), 443-50; T. Burnard, 'Slave naming patterns: Onomastics and the taxonomy of race in eighteenth-century Jamaica', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 31, 3 (2001), 325-46; J. Hébrard, 'Esclavage et dénomination: imposition et appropriation d'un nom chez les esclaves de la Bahia au XIX^{e} siècle', *Cahiers du Brésil Contemporain*, 53/54 (2003), 31-92; Benson, *op. cit.*; P. Chanson, *La blessure du nom: une anthropologie d'une séquelle de l'esclavage aux Antilles-Guyane* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2008). Native Americans: D.W. Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence KS, 1995), 108-12. French colonialism: S. Slyomovics, *The Performance of Human Rights in Morocco* (Philadelphia PA, 2005), 102-105. Trieste: M.E. Hametz, ' "To have what was mine": Reclaiming surnames in Trieste', *Names*, 50, 1 (2002), 3-22. Kurds: S. Akin, 'La dénomination des personnes et la construction identitaire: le cas des prénoms Kurdes en Turquie', *bulletin vals-asla, Bulletin Suisse de Linguistique Appliquée*, 80, (2004), 27-38.

[11] Benson, *op. cit.*

[12] E. Partridge, *Name this Child: A dictionary of modern British and American given or Christian names*, 3rd ed. (London, 1951), 74.

[13] Wilson, *op. cit.*, 330-32.

[14] K. Fox, *Watching the English: The hidden rules of English behaviour* (London, 2004), 282.

[15] R. Hall, 'The sociologue or the initial advantage', *Crossbow: A Quarterly Journal of Politics*, 3, 12 (1960), 46–49.

[16] R. Hall, 'The family background of Etonians' in R. Rose (ed.), *Studies in British Politics: A reader in political sociology* (London, 1966).

[17] H. Thomas (ed.), *The Establishment: A symposium* (London, 1959); S. Aaronovitch, *The Ruling Class: A study of British finance capital* (London, 1961); and A. Sampson, *Anatomy of Britain* (London, 1962).

[18] Cmdr John F.W. Maitland (1903—1977), Conservative MP for Horncastle, reported in the *Skegness Standard*, 18 November 1959, 9; similarly, Frederick M. Bennett (1918—2002), Conservative MP for Torquay, reported in the *Torbay Express and South Devon Echo*, 28 November 1959, 5. Such ideas received support from academic observers such as F. Zweig in his book *The Worker in an Affluent Society: Family life and industry* (London, 1961).

[19] R. Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy* (London, 1957), 13.

[20] In his column 'Political commentary', *The Spectator*, 23 September 1955, 5-7.

[21] Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power, op. cit.,* 105.

[22] See, for example, K. Augustine-Adams, 'The beginning of wisdom is to call things by their right names', *Review of Law and Women's Studies*, 7, 1 (1997), 1–35; D.R. Johnson and L.K. Scheuble, 'What should we call our kids?', *Social Science Journal*, 39, 3 (2002), 419–29; C. Goldin and M. Shim, 'Making a name: Women's surnames at marriage and beyond', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18 (2004), 143–60; J.S. Kushner, 'The right to control one's name', *UCLA Law Review*, 57 (2009), 313–64; D. Dempsey and J. Lindsay, 'Surnaming children born to lesbian and heterosexual couples: Displaying family legitimacy to diverse audiences',

Sociology, 51, 2 (2017), 1–18; and J. Pilcher, Z. Hooley and A. Coffey, 'Names and naming in adoption: Birth heritage and family making', *Child & Family Social Work*, 25, 3 (2020), 568-75.

[23] E. Aldrin, 'The choice of first names as a social resource and act of identity among multilingual families in contemporary Sweden' in W. Ahrens, S. Embleton and A. Lapierre (eds), *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, August 17–22, 2008, York University, Toronto, Canada* (Toronto, 2009). See also J.-P. Hassoun, 'Le choix du prénom chez les Hmong au Laos puis en France: Diversité, complexification et processus d'individuation', *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 36, 2 (1995), 241-71; and S. Brun, 'Au nom de la mixité. Choisir le prénom des enfants adoptés à l'étranger et issus de couples mixtes en France', *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 64, 4 (2024), 597-624.

[24] However, the point was originally due to P. Besnard, 'Pour une étude empirique du phénomène de mode dans la consommation des biens symboliques: le cas des prénoms', *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 20, 2 (1979), 343–51; see also P. Besnard and G. Desplanques, 'Les catégories socioprofessionnelles à l'épreuve de la stratification temporelle des goûts', *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 40, 1 (1999), 97-109.

[25] Simmel's 'Fashion' of 1904 (G. Simmel, 'Fashion', *International Quarterly*, 10, October (1904), 130–55, reprinted in *The American Journal of Sociology*, 62, 6 (1957), 541–558) and his closely related 'Philosophie der mode' in H. Landsberg (ed.), *Moderne Zeitfragen*, 11 (Berlin, 1905), 5-41 are foundational in the sociological literature. The two central articles in the French literature are P. Besnard, 'Pour une étude', *op. cit.* and G. Desplanques, 'Les enfants de Michel et Martine Dupont s'appellent Nicolas et Céline', *Économie et Statistique*, 184 (1986), 63–83; B. Coulmont, *Sociologie des Prénoms*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 2022) gives a useful review. M. Young and P. Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London* (London, 1957), 25–26 and, in a more quantitative style, G. Lansley and P. Longley, 'Deriving age and gender from

forenames for consumer analysis', *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Service*s, 30 (2016), 271-78 illustrate and document changes in twentieth-century forename fashions in England; A. Bennett, *Telling Tales* (London, 2001), 30–33, gives a less technical account.

[26] Wilson, *op. cit.* remains the main work in English on western Europe. The field has received much more attention in France. M. Bloch, 'Noms de personne et histoire sociale', *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale*, 4 (1932), 67–69 gave an enthusiastic early review of its possibilities which doubtless encouraged his compatriots. The most well-known researcher in the field in France is perhaps still Jacques Dupâquier (1922—2010) (J. Dupâquier, A. Bideau and M.-E. Ducreux, *Le prénom: mode et histoire* (Paris, 1984) and J. Dupâquier, J.-P. Pélissier and D. Rébaudo, *Le temps des Jules: Les prénoms en France au XIX*[e] *siècle* (Paris, 1987). More recent contributions include M. Bourin and P. Chareille, *Noms, prénoms, surnoms au moyen âge* (Paris, 2014).

[27] R.A. McKinley, *A History of British Surnames* (London, 1990), 25–39; Wilson, *op. cit.*, 115–17, 154–55.

[28] M. Bourin (ed.) *Genèse médiévale de l'anthroponymie moderne: études d'anthroponymie médiévale, I*[re] *et II*[e] *rencontres, Azay-le-Ferron* (Tours, 1988), 238–42.

[29] F. Menant, 'Le nom, document d'histoire sociale ou: l'anthroponymie comme outil de classment social', paper prepared for the 2010–11 seminar series *Les sociétés européennes au moyen âge: modèles d'interprétation, pratiques, langage*s, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, available online at https://histoire.ens.psl.eu/IMG/file/Menant/Menant,%20Anthroponymie%20s%C3%A9minaire%20janvier%202011.pdf, accessed 15 August 2021.

[30] Nikonov, *op. cit.,* 177.

[31] Smith-Bannister, *op. cit.*, 82–83.

[32] *ibid.*, 119.

[33] *ibid.*, 124–25.

[34] *ibid.*, 125-27.

[35] N. Guéguen, ' "Mr de Bussy" is more employable than "Mr Bussy": The impact of the particle associated with the surname of an applicant in a job application evaluation context', *Names*, 65, 2 (2017), 104–11.

[36] See, for example, his obituary in H. Massingberd, *The Daily Telegraph Fifth Book of Obituaries: 20th-century lives* (London, 1999), 179-83.

[37] For Len Fairclough, see D. Little, *40 Years of Coronation Street* (London, 2000) or any of the large number of books with similar titles; for Potter-Pirbright, see D.H. Garrison, *Who's Who in Wodehouse*, rev. ed. (New York, 1989).

[38] B. Cottle, *Names* (London, 1983), 113, remarked that the abbreviated name *Bertie* was acceptable to the then contemporary upper and upper-middle classes along with *Bill*, *Bob*, *Dick*, *Harry*, *Frank*, *Freddy*, *Geoff*, *Jack*, *Jim*, *Reggie*, *Ronnie*, *Ted* and *Ned*, *Tim* and *Tom*, but that *Bert* along with *Alf*, *Cliff*, *Cy*, *Des*, *Ed*, *Fred*, *Len*, *Les*, *Lew*, *Norm*, *Reg*, *Ron*, *Sid*, *Stan*, *Vern*, *Vic*, *Vince* and *Wal* were definitely not.

[39] P. Hanks, F. Hodges, A.D. Mills and A. Room, *The Oxford Names Companion* (Oxford, 2002).

[40] The *1961 Census* showed that male members of socio-economic groups 8 to 11, comprising manual workers and their supervisors, formed 65.2 per cent of the economically active male population in Lancashire. At the other end of the scale stood counties such as Surrey where the same grouping formed 42.5 per cent of the equivalent population, and Rutland (33.1 per cent) (Registrar-General, *Census 1961: England and Wales: Socio-economic group tables* (London, 1966)). Hall, 'Etonians', *op. cit.*, found that, of all English counties,

Lancashire had the lowest number of parents per 100,000 population sending a child to Eton.

[41] See J. Morgan, C. O'Neill and R. Harré, *Nicknames: Their origins and social consequences*, (London, 1979), ch. 5; R. Harré, 'What's in a nickname?', *Psychology Today*, 31, January (1980), 78–81, at 81; P. McClure, 'Nicknames and petnames: Linguistic forms and social contexts', *Nomina*, 5, (1981), 63–76; R. Pelling, 'What's in a name? You'd better ask Poo, Pants or Tubby', *The Daily Telegraph*, 30 July 2013, 18 and A. Jenkins ('Tibbs'), 'Why Sloanes have nicknames', *The Tatler*, 25 May 2016, available online at https://www.tatler.com/article/why-sloanes-have-nicknames, accessed 1 October 2025.

[42] See J.M. Robson, 'Surnames and status in Victorian England', *Queen's Quarterly*, 95, 3 (1988), 642–661 at 646.

[43] C. Lytton and J. Warton, *Prisons and Prisoners: Some personal experiences* (London, 1988), 237.

[44] I use 'British peerage' as a short-hand for the English, Scottish, British and UK peerages. The Welsh and Marcher lordships were incorporated into the English peerage in the sixteenth century and no separate Welsh nobility has existed since then.

[45] TheGenealogist ® website, at https://www.thegenealogist.co.uk/, which allows exact counts of precise forenames, shows three such people listed in the 1891 censuses of England, Wales and Scotland, born in about 1842, 1872 and 1881; forty-one listed in the censuses of 1901 all but one born in the period 1899-1901; and twenty-two listed in the 1911 censuses, all but two born between 1899 and 1904.

[46] V. Sandelson, 'The confidence trick' in Thomas (ed.), *op. cit.*

[47] M. Barratt-Brown, 'The controllers: A research document on the British power elite', *Universities & Left Review*, 5, Autumn (1958), 53–61.

[48] These deficiencies are noted in detail in the Supplemental Online Material.

[49] Now, bar some exceptions, known in the UK as public limited companies (PLCs or plcs).

[50] G.H. Copeman, *Leaders of British Industry: A study of the careers of more than a thousand public company directors* (London, 1955), 68.

[51] C. Yonge, *History of Christian Names*, 2 vols. (London, 1863), II, 487; K. Leibring, 'Given names in European naming systems' in C. Hough (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming* (Oxford, 2016), 208.

[52] For discussions of the 'dignity of labour' see: P. Gilabert, 'Labor, human rights and human dignity', *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 42, 2 (2016), 171-99 and A. Veltman, *Meaningful Work* (New York NY, 2016).

[53] Modern ethnographies which remain relevant to the UK in the late 1950s include the pioneering C. Griffin, *Typical Girls? Young women from school to the job market* (London, 1985) and the recent E.K. Johnson, 'The costs of care: An ethnography of care work in residential homes for older people', *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 45, 1 (2023), 1-16.

[54] For COHSE, originally a union of mental hospital attendants and nurses, see M. Carpenter, *Working for Health: The history of the confederation of health service employees* (London, 1988). For NUPE, originally a union of local government and health service manual staff including nurses and nursing ancillaries, see W.V. Craik, *Bryn Roberts and the National Union of Public Employees* (London, 1955) and J. Neale, *Memoirs of a Callous Picket: Working for the NHS* (London, 1983), 38-42.

[55] T.J. Morgan and P. Morgan, *Welsh Surnames* (Cardiff, 1985), 10-24; R.A. Fowkes, 'Welsh naming practices, with a comparative look at Cornish', *Names*, 29 (1981), 265–72.

[56] A.D. Carr, 'An aristocracy in decline: the native Welsh lords after the Edwardian conquest', *Welsh History Review*, 5 (1970), 103-29.

[57] J. Rowlands and S. Rowlands, *The Surnames of Wales* (Birmingham, 1996) 2-4 and 37-44. The most useful survey of the available data on name stocks is: P. Dance, *Modern British Surnames: A resource guide* available online on the website of the Guild of One-Name Studies, at https://one-name.org/modern-british-surnames/, accessed 26 September 2025.

[58] Dance, *op. cit.*

[59] Rowlands and Rowlands, *op. cit.*, 34.

[60] The nicknames are from L.A. Dunkling, *The Guinness Book of Names*, 3rd rev. ed. (London, 1986), 85, relying on *The Times*, 21 December 1970, 4; see also W.R. Davis, 'Welsh bynames on the Allegheny', *Names*, 49, 3 (2001), 137–210.

[61] *Sixth detailed annual report of the Registrar-General of births, deaths, and marriages in Scotland*, (Edinburgh, 1864), lv; see also R. McKinley, *op. cit.*, 44-47.

[62] *Who's Who 1959: An annual biographical dictionary with which is incorporated 'Men and Women of the Time'* (London, 1959) and *Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage*, 102nd ed. (London, 1959).

[63] The counts are of the names of all boys under 15 years old living on the same street as Machen, namely, Jubilee Park, Clowne, then spelled 'Clown', Derbyshire. The original data consists of the census enumerators's books formed for the *Census of England, 1901* (The National Archives, London, reference: class RG13, piece 3129, folio 129, pages: 22–38). They were accessed via Ancestry.com ®.

[64] Ernest Weekly also gives Cecil, Noël and Sidney as examples of 'names given indifferently to boys and girls' though their use as girls' names in Britain has been rare (*Jack and Jill: A study in our Christian names*, 2nd ed. (London, 1948), 7). The few examples include Cecil Woodham-Smith (1896—1977), the historian, and Mary Noël Streatfield (1895—1986), the author of children's books.

[65] K.C. Phillipps, 'Thackeray's proper names', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 75, 3 (1974), 444-52 at 451.

[66] I. Disraeli (ed. Earl of Beaconsfield), *Curiosities of Literature*, New ed., 3 vols. (London, [1882]), 69. (The earliest edition to include the essay 'Influence of a Name' from which these remarks are taken was published in 1838 or before.)

[67] C. Dickens, *Bleak House* (London, 1853), ch. XI; J. Suddaby, 'The crossing sweeper in *Bleak House*: Dickens and the original Jo', *The Dickensian*, 8 (1912), 246-50; G.J. Werth, 'The genesis of Jo the crossing-sweeper', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 60, 1(1961), 44-47. Jo had no surname. The only other British boys' names as short are *Al* (for *Albert*, *Alfred* or *Alexander* at this date), *Ed*, and *Si*. It is germane to note that although Jo is a boy, Dickens did not give him the name *Joe* usual among boys.

[68] A.L. Crook, 'Personal Naming Practices in Early Modern Scotland: A comparative study of eleven parishes, 1680-1839' (Ph.D., University of Glasgow).

[69] Office for National Statistics: 'Baby names for boys in England and Wales: 2024', Table 2; 'Baby names for girls in England and Wales: 2024', Table 2, both released 31 July 2025, and both available online at https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/babynamesinenglandandwales2024, accessed 29 September 2025.

[70] P. Cunliffe-Jones, 'Britain and class: dropping the double-barrels', *Agence France Presse – English,* London, 19 January 1992; P. Cocozza, 'Keeping up with the Smith-Joneses', *Guardian Online*, 2 November 2017 available online at https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2017/nov/02/keeping-up-with-smith-joneses-no-longer-posh-double-barrelled-surname (accessed 29 September 2025).

[71] The Tatler, 'The poshest baby names of all times', *The Tatler*, 19 December 2017, available online at https://www.tatler.com/article/poshest-baby-names-of-all-time, accessed 29

September 2025; Mumsnet, 'Working-class names?', 29 May 2019, available online at https://www.mumsnet.com/talk/baby_names/3597977-Working-class-names?flipped=1&page=3, accessed 29 September 2025; and, notoriously, K. Hopkins, *The Class Book of Baby Names* (n.p., 2013).