

edition that might hinder, deter or mislead the very research that its publication should promote.

However, I don't wish to end this review on a negative note. While there is something to criticise, there is also much to be grateful for. This unusually important and fascinating manuscript is for the first time printed in full and in a handsome format, and for all its imperfections, the edition undoubtedly opens up substantial opportunities for significant research, as I have shown in the first half of this review. Although as a limited edition it may not be widely available, I hope that its publication will help to stimulate the research the document deserves, and that Dublin Corporation will continue its admirable policy of publishing modern, scholarly editions of its archival records.

The Distinction of Gender? Women's Names in the Thirteenth Century

David Postles

Department of English Local History,
University of Leicester

Attendant etiam sacerdotes, ne lasciva nomina que scilicet mox prelata sonant lasciviam, imponi permittant parvulis baptizatis, sexus precipue feminini. Et si contrarium fiat, per confirmantes episcopos corrigatur.¹

Let priests take care, that they do not allow frivolous (*lascivus*) names, which, when spoken, readily give an impression of wantonness (*lascivia*), to be bestowed upon young people being baptized, particularly of the female sex. If the wrong thing happens, it is to be corrected by bishops at confirmation.

Archbishop Pecham's injunction to the clergy of the southern province at the Council held at Lambeth in 1281 provides a contemporary perception of a cultural change in personal naming by the late thirteenth century. Although Pecham conceded that there was a general problem, he intimated that the naming of female children was of particular concern. The meaning of his testimony, however, may be ambiguous. Pecham, after all, might have preferred the conferment of Christian names—that is Saints', particularly, or Biblical

This is a shortened version of a paper read at the regional meeting of the Society for Name Studies at Bristol in November 1995 and I am grateful to the participants for their tolerance and feedback. I am, as usual, indebted to Richard Smith and Judith Bennett for consultation on these matters over several years, without in any way committing them to any of the perceptions made here. It is intended as a speculative attempt to indicate pathways to problems. The paper in particular has been influenced by some recent work on sociolinguistics, especially J. Coates, *Women, Men and Language*, 2nd edn (London, 1993), especially chapters 4–5 and 8. Finally, this paper could not have been written without the pioneering research of the late Cecily Clark.

¹ *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*, II, ii, 1265–1313, edited by F. M. Powicke and C. R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964), p. 897 [cap. 3], *De baptismo*. I am grateful to Oliver Padel for suggestions in the translation of the passage.

names. Moreover, there may be a problem of social group here. Pecham's knowledge of the naming of children might have been confined to higher social groups, nobility and gentry, rather than the entire social spectrum. If that was the case, then the higher social groups might have been more adventurous in their naming practices and the lower echelons more conservative—an interesting hypothesis.

Perhaps some interesting confirmation of this speculative notion occurred in the naming of the daughter of John Arundel, lord of Sandford in Somerset, in the mid thirteenth century. John and his wife, Isabella, had issue two daughters and a son, the cadet sibling. The youngest two children, Joan and John, received superficially rather nondescript common personal names, but perhaps these names were informed by a patrilineal sentiment, the transmission of the paternal forename, even across gender. The eldest child, a daughter, who married Richard Crispin, was named Arundella.² Here then is a created name, derived from the familial surname, received by the first child of this knightly or gentry family. Infused in this name are several meanings, of which the most obvious is the patrimonial influence on the naming of the first child. Equally, the name has been created and created for a daughter. The sex of the first child is fortuitous, but it is less conceivable that a son would have been attributed a newly created name. This phenomenon occurred too in France—for example, Carbonella, a daughter of the Carbonel family, but possibly also more widely there: '... il faudrait rattacher l'usage de décliner au féminin et d'utiliser comme nom le surnom d'une famille'.³ To just such an episode might Pecham have been objecting

Pecham's language also needs some consideration. His choice of word to denote the extraordinariness of the names is itself unusual—*lasciva* [adjective]—and these names, he continued, sound *lascivia* [noun]. The precise meaning of these terms is important, but perhaps elusive. The emotive meanings of *lascivia* in Classical Latin may be positive—playfulness, fun, jesting—or more negative and pejorative—unruliness, licentiousness, wantonness, indiscipline,

² *The Cartulary of Canonsleigh Abbey*, edited by V. M. London, Devon and Cornwall Record Society, n.s. 8 (Exeter, 1965), pp. 45–47 (nos 125, 129 and 131).

³ *Genèse médiévale de l'anthroponymie moderne*, II-2, edited by M. Bourin and P. Chareille (Tours, 1992), 'Conclusion', p. 220.

irresponsibility, luxuriance and even sexual freedom.⁴ Although both genders were involved in Pecham's statement, it was especially and emphatically (*precipue*) female names which caused his concern and it seems to ensue that it was female names which had the imputations of 'indecently publicly flaunted'. John Bromyard, shortly afterwards, referred in his *Summa Predicantium* to public indecency in dress (*in habitu lascivo*) and song, and names were, and are, in part public expressions.⁵

Perhaps inherent in Pecham's injunction were the gendered dichotomies of male order and female disorder, male reason and female emotion, which were stereotypical representations in past patriarchal societies—although it must not be forgotten that formal names were given and received rather than assumed by free agency. The definition of patriarchy accepted here is the recent one by Anthony Fletcher: 'institutionalised male dominance over women and children in the family and the subordination of women in society generally'.⁶ Much recent research has begun to intimate how far naming processes and patterns may have been informed by gender relationships, without any consensus on the matter.⁷ The lack of agreement is not surprising because more general research into the historical position and actions of women has produced similar divergences, not least for the late middle ages. In part, differences of conclusion result from differences

⁴ *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968), p. 1004; C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1951 issue), pp. 1037–38; R. E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist* (Oxford, 1989) has only a compound of the word meaning 'a swelling'.

⁵ I am grateful for comments of 20 October 1995 by Peter Binkley concerning the meaning of the words on the electronic discussion list *Mediev-L*.

⁶ *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500–1800* (Yale, 1995), p. xv.

⁷ R. M. Smith's research to be published in *Naming, Society and Regional Identity*, edited by D. A. Postles (Oxford, forthcoming) and the remarks of J. M. Bennett, *Women in the Medieval English Countryside. Gender and Household at Brigstock before the Plague* (Oxford, 1989), p. 69, relate to the peasantry; C. Clark, 'Women's names in post-Conquest England: observations and speculations', *Speculum*, 53 (1978), 223–51, reprinted in *Words, Names and History. Selected Writings of Cecily Clark*, edited by P. Jackson (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 117–43, is concerned with all levels of society in the twelfth century; see also C. Clark, 'Onomastics', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, II, 1066–1476, edited by N. Blake (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 542–606 ('Women's names', pp. 583–87).

of research agenda: concern with women's general oppression or, whilst recognising that social phenomenon, engaging with women's (limited) agency and opportunities in the past. Despite its constant presence, the nature of patriarchy altered, so that its meanings and significances were different at different times, as well as different for different (men and) women at the same time: 'But patriarchy clearly has existed in many forms and varieties, and its history will, in fact, be a history of many different historical patriarchies . . .'.⁸ The agenda for women's social relationships in the past is now concentrated on, for example, not only women's limited agency and how some women exploited the circumscribed opportunities which opened to them, but also whether there were periodic 'crises' of gender relations. The reverse of that coin is how far women were complicit in the perpetuation of patriarchy—implicitly.⁹ The study of personal naming patterns cannot contribute fully to those sorts of questions, but it may illuminate some aspects of the relative position of the sexes in the late middle ages.

Naming belongs to both the (artificially-divided) private and public spheres. It belongs to the private because it is first conceived within the family. Its relationship to the public sphere is more ambivalent because other, colloquial forms of name and nickname may supplant the given, formal name. Many reasons have been suggested, however, as to why the naming process might have been less intimately private and more public—again still an artificial divide. The interposition of the clergy in the naming-giving ceremony is one possible public aspect, whilst the influence of spiritual kinship as a social convention is another. Both still had gendered implications. The clergy represented a male patriarchal profession with firm ideas of the sorts of names which should be conferred. Apart from Pecham's views above, the bishop of Worcester, Simon, was responsible for the naming of the son of Walter de Beauchamp, Simon, as he baptised him, conferring a truly Christian name and later land: 'Hanc dedit Simon Episcopus cuidam filio Walteri de Bellocampo Simoni dicto, quem ipse baptizavit'.¹⁰ If spiritual

⁸ J. M. Bennett, 'Feminism and history', *Gender and History*, 1 (1989), pp. 251–72 (at p. 260).

⁹ Bennett, 'Feminism and history', p. 41.

¹⁰ *Red Book of Worcester*, edited by M. Hollings, Worcestershire Historical Society (Worcester, 1934–50) p. 83 (survey of Kempsey, 1182).

kinship was a formative influence on naming processes, it was divisive by gender, since male godsibs were named by male godparents and female children by female godparents, since two of the three godparents were required to be of the same sex as the child and it was indeed the principal godparent who bestowed the name when the child was raised from the font.¹¹ On this supposition, males conferred names on males and females on females, so that any gendered predilections for names were perpetuated. In the 1350s, for example, a female godsib was named for her godmother, Alice.¹² On the other hand, given patriarchy and lineage, is it not also conceivable that some part of the decision about children's names was negotiated between the sexes within the close, nuclear, family, sometimes the extended family? Indeed, Paul Hyams has encountered some evidence that some husbands left naming to their wives.¹³

Already there is a significant historiography on the difference of naming by gender in the late middle ages and it seems only fair to recite those interpretations first, since my own reflections are an attempt to reconcile their differences by making some modifications and thus presenting a new synthesis for further discussion. As in the spirit of much recent writing about the female situation, the concern here is as much with the varieties of female experience as with the universals, and women, in a complex way, may be linguistically conservative (repositories of traditional culture) or initiators of linguistic change.¹⁴

At the highest social level in the late twelfth century, female names had already become fairly concentrated, exhibiting a strong tendency towards a small number of newer name forms. Thirty-one forenames comprehended the ninety women with names enumerated in the *Rotuli de Dominabus* of 1185, women of the nobility in the wardship

¹¹ M. Bennett, 'Spiritual kinship and the baptismal name in traditional European society', in *Principalities, Powers and Estates. Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Government and Society*, edited by L. O. Frappell (Adelaide, 1979), pp. 95–107.

¹² P. J. P. Goldberg, *Women in England c.1275–1525* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 62 and 69.

¹³ P. R. Hyams, 'Maitland and the rest of us', a paper presented to the Maitland Conference, Cambridge 1995, p. 26, n. 39. I am grateful to Professor Hyams for providing me with a pre-publication copy of his paper.

¹⁴ Coates, *Women, Men and Language*, pp. 183–86.

of the Crown, twenty of whom bore the name *Matilda*, twelve *Alice*, seven *Agnes*, and six *Margaret*.¹⁵ Half the women were thus encompassed by four of the thirty-one names. The margins of their names reveal only a few (at that time) unusual forms, including a few Classical names (such as one *Basilis*, one *Eugenia*, one *Claricia* and one *Clemencia*) and one new diminutive cross-gender form, *Lauretta*.

In c.1200–04, Anketil de Berley conveyed land to Southwick Priory because he was indebted to the Jews, with the consent of his wife, Olimpias or Olimpiadis.¹⁶ Richard fitzHerbert was conjoined in his gift to Tutbury Priory of a virgate in Twycross (Leicestershire) by his wife, Preciosa (1262 x 1266), and the wife of John fitzHerbert in 1230 bore the moniker Emelina, a diminutive form.¹⁷ The Abbey of Bury St Edmunds acquired land in 1260–93 from Robert Peytevyne and his wife Sabina, Robert son of Ralph son of Ivo de Hilgay, a servant of the almoner, and his wife Marsilia, and John Curteys of Fornham St Martin and his wife, another Marsilia. Later, the Abbey received a grant of land in Fornham from Orabilia the widow of William de Westhorpe (1303–04).¹⁸

Many unusual female names therefore existed in the English countryside in the thirteenth century, particularly amongst the free tenantry, sometimes below the level of the knightly and gentry families. For example, Henry *Pistor* of Normanton (Derbyshire) had two daughters in the mid thirteenth century, named Eustacia and Matania; whilst he was of free condition, his byname (*pistor*, 'baker') and the nature of the charters involving him suggest that he was of peasant status.¹⁹ Amphelina of Kelham (Nottinghamshire), who made

¹⁵ *Rotuli de Dominabus et Pueris et Puellis de xii Comitibus (1185)*, edited by J. H. Round, 2 vols, Pipe Roll Society, 34–35 (London, 1913), II, *passim*.

¹⁶ *The Cartularies of Southwick Priory*, edited by K. A. Hanna, 2 vols, Hampshire Record Society, 9–10 (Winchester, 1989), II, 88–91 (nos III, 260–68).

¹⁷ *The Cartulary of Tutbury Priory*, edited by A. Saltman, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Joint Publication, 2 (London, 1962), pp. 176 and 203 (nos 250 and 291).

¹⁸ *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmund*, edited by R. M. Thompson, Suffolk Record Society, 21 (Ipswich, 1980), pp. 63–65 (nos 143, 149, 152 and 155).

¹⁹ *The Darley Cartulary*, I, edited by R. R. Darlington (Kendal, 1945), pp. 322 and 327 (nos G57 and G63).

benefactions to Rufford Abbey, was of similar condition.²⁰ An exceptionally interesting example is Placentia, who married Richard de Besthorpe; whilst it was not apparently a case of hypergamy, Richard assumed her forename as his byname after her death, henceforth known as Henry Plesence *alias* Plesens (before 1250).²¹ At perhaps a slightly higher social level, Preciosa, wife of Richard fitzHerbert, gave a virgate of land to Tutbury Priory in 1262 x 1266, and Felicia, daughter of Robert le Kenist, a bovate in c.1240.²²

In the very early thirteenth century, these exotic names began to appear amongst the free tenantry engaged in litigation in the common law courts—in 1204, a *Nigasia*; in 1207 *Sabina* (Kent); in 1208, *Camilla* (Essex), three *Basilias* in Norfolk, another in Suffolk, an *Estrangia* in Cambridgeshire, and Prudencia wife of Ralph in Norfolk in 1209.²³ Whilst these name forms had been introduced during the twelfth century, their relatively wider proliferation seems to have occurred only in the thirteenth, although twelfth-century examples of *Theofania* (*Tiffanies*) in Yorkshire were daughters of Peter de Dalton (before 1192) and Roald *constabularius* (1158 x 1171) and Alan *constabularius* had a daughter Amphelisa.²⁴ Whilst associated more, it seems, with the more affluent free tenantry than with the small peasantry, some of these names did permeate down to even the unfree peasantry by the late thirteenth century, such as Constance and Scholastica amongst the unfree tenantry of Kibworth Harcourt (Leicestershire) in the late thirteenth century and Blissota, wife of William Rodayn at Yarcombe, Devon, in 1327.²⁵ By and large, however, their occurrence seems to have been related to social group.

²⁰ *Rufford Charters*, edited by C. J. Holdsworth, 2 vols, Thoroton Society Record Series, 29–30 (Nottingham, 1973), II, 154 and 193 (nos 271 and 368)—in her widowhood c.1240–60.

²¹ *Rufford Charters*, II, 258–60 (nos 497 and 500–1).

²² *Cartulary of Tutbury Priory*, pp. 204 and 126 (nos 293 and 157).

²³ *Pleas before the King or his Justices 1198–1212*, edited by D. M. Stenton, vols III and IV, Selden Society, vols 83–4 (London, 1966–7), III, 172–3, and IV, 40, 57, 151–2, 156, 167 and 177.

²⁴ *Early Yorkshire Charters*, edited by C. T. Clay, 9 volumes, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, Extra Series, 4–12 (Leeds, 1935–65), V, 74–75, 130 and 153 (nos 171, 227 and 262).

²⁵ Merton College, Oxford, MM 6367–6389; Devon Record Office CR 1430; Bennett, *Women in the Medieval English Countryside*, p. 69.

Perhaps it was particularly in burgh families that the more exotic names were adopted for daughters. Especially is that so amongst the burghal elite of the metropolis, according to the names of female testators and legatees in the wills proved in the London hustings court. It has indeed been maintained that Londoners in general drew on a much larger and more imaginative resource of names than did rural inhabitants. Whilst there was concentration in both male and female names, it has been suggested that there was an exotic margin for both males and females.²⁶ As propounded, however, that suggestion has an inherent problem, which is that the more unusual names for males which it enumerated, presumed to have been contributed by foreigners, are not exotic at all—*Geoffrey, Alan, Bartholomew, and Alexander*.²⁷ The principal difference was, indeed, at the margins of naming, but for different reasons: whilst male forenames were heavily concentrated, there was only a slight margin of unusual names; by contrast, although female names were also concentrated, the margin of exotic names was more pronounced. The widow Tiphania was a legatee in a will of 1307 and her name is representative of this distinctive and idiosyncratic margin.²⁸

Several features of naming which occur in the wills are distinctly associated with females. First is the occurrence of new forms of cross-gender names, by contrast with the established forms such as *Johanna* or *Joan*. *Elicia, Elisia* or *Elycia* was a recurrent name of this new type: *Elicia* wife of John de Hampine (1304); *Elycia* daughter of John Geryn (1305); *Elisia* wife of William de Hundesdich (1307); *Elicia* wife and legatee of Peter Adrian (1311) are but a few examples.²⁹ Similarly, *Nicholaa* was a daughter and legatee of Adam le Blound in

²⁶ B. Hanawalt, *Growing Up in Medieval London. The Experience of Childhood in History* (Oxford, 1993), p. 47.

²⁷ Hanawalt, *Growing Up in Medieval London*, p. 47.

²⁸ See Bourin and Chareille, *Genèse médiévale*, II-2, 222, 224 and 226; P. A. Sigal, 'L'anthroponymie féminine en Provence d'après *Le Livre de Miracles* et le procès de canonisation de Saint Louis d'Anjou (fin xiii^{ème} - début xiv^{ème} siècle)', in *Genèse médiévale*, II-2, 203-5; D. Herlihy, *Women, Family and Society in Medieval Europe. Historical essays 1978-1991* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 33-34.

²⁹ *A Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London, A.D. 1258 - A.D. 1688*, edited by R. R. Sharpe, 2 vols (London, 1890), I, 161, 170, 186 and 215.

1308, whilst *Laurencia* was a daughter of John le Long, another testator in 1309.³⁰ Another, seemingly novel, cross-gender name is *Egidia*, the female equivalent of *Egidius* (Giles) as also *Benedicta, Jacobina* and *Philippa*. *Nicholaa*, indeed, recurred frequently in wills between 1258 and 1300, but the name was recorded in Huntingdonshire and Suffolk in 1207, and, most interestingly in Gayton (Staffordshire) before 1274, *Nicholaa*, daughter of Nicholas Meverel, who married Lucy, was named for her father.³¹

Apart from cross-gender names, another phenomenon constantly encountered in wills between 1258 and 1300 is the revival of names from Classical Antiquity for females, much rarer amongst males. These names encompassed *Bona, Felicia* which was quite popular, *Letitia* or *Letia, Idonea* which was also popular, *Sibilla, Orabilia, Marsilia, Sabina, Floria, Cassandra, Constancia, Celestria, Claricia, Salerna, Tiffania, Meliora, Florencia, Amabilia, Castanea, Basilia, Dyamanda* and *Anastasia*.³² Less well represented were newly created names in Norman French or Latin which were effectively sobriquets used as forenames, for example *Frechesaunchia* and *Bonejoia*, but where they did exist such names were distinctively female.³³ Moreover, some of these Classical (Latin) names contained a lexical and lexicographical content (such as *Constancia* or *Prudencia*, for example) and their meanings reinforced the social construction of gender.

Particularly associated with women in the wills proved in the hustings courts were saints' names. That phenomenon was much wider too. Although Christian names increased amongst the male population from the last two decades of the twelfth century, that expansion was

³⁰ *Calendar of Wills*, edited by Sharpe, I, 198 and 207.

³¹ *Pleas before the King*, edited by Stenton, IV, pp. 36 and 38; *The Kniveton Leiger*, edited by A. Saltman, Derbyshire Archaeological Society Record Series, 1 (Derby, 1972-73), pp. 184-85 (no. 375).

³² Most of these examples relate to 1258-1300; see also *Calendar of Wills*, edited by Sharpe, pp. 190 and 192 (*Tiphania* and *Tiffania*, 1307), 150 (*Bona*, 1301), 179 (*Idonea*, 1306), 192 (*Salerna*), 207 (*Clarcia*, 1309), 213 (*Basilia* and *Sabina*, 1310) and 236 (*Dyamanda*).

³³ *Calendar of Wills*, edited by Sharpe, p. 198. Compare O. Guyotjeannin, 'L'ononastique émilienne xi^e-milieu xiii^e siècle. Le cas de Reggio Emilia d'après le fonds de San Prospero', in *Genèse médiévale de l'anthroponymie moderne: l'espace italien chronique*, Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Moyen Age, 106, ii (Rome, 1994), pp. 381-446 (pp. 405-06).

greater amongst women. There seems to be no evidence, however, to support the suggestion that their progress amongst women preceded the adoption of Christian names amongst males. For example, even in 1222 on the Ely episcopal manors, 23 percent of male peasant tenants bore Christian names, by comparison with 16 percent of female peasant tenants.³⁴ By contrast, their real development amongst women seems to have occurred in the thirteenth century, whereas male saints' names had become established by the 1180s. Nevertheless, it does seem that in the thirteenth century a greater proportion of women bore saints' names than men. The stimuli to this association may have been first the greater recognition of women's religious experience in the twelfth century and secondly the increase in the number of female saints canonised by the thirteenth century, associated with particular qualities of nurturing, caring and virginity.³⁵ There are fairly strong reasons for assuming that this efflorescence of the religious ideal for women attained its apogee in the early thirteenth century and the establishment of St Margaret's Day as a major feast in the English calendar by the Council of Oxford in 1222 reflects this timing.³⁶

How then should we conceive of female naming in the middle ages? The following points might be appropriately made. Although in female naming the same sort of concentration occurred as amongst males, there was more variety at the margin of female names than male by the thirteenth century. Whilst male names were excessively concentrated and the margin still comprised conventional names, women's names at the margin could be more exotic. Nevertheless,

³⁴ British Library, MS. Cotton Tiberius B. ii.

³⁵ Compare, for example, D. Weinstein and R. M. Bell, *Saints and Society. The Two Worlds of Western Christendom 1000-1700* (Chicago, 1982), pp. 45-47, 98-99, 123-24, 220-22, 229, and 247-49; and M. Goodich, 'A profile of thirteenth-century sainthood', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 18 (1976), pp. 429-37; M. Goodich, *Vita Perfecta. The Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century* (Chicago, 1982); S. Thompson, *Women Religious. The Founding of English Nunneries after the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1991); and S. Elkins, *Holy Women of Twelfth-Century England* (Chapel Hill, 1988).

³⁶ B. Millett and J. Wogan-Browne, *Medieval English Prose for Women from the Katherine Group and Ancrene Wisse* (Oxford, 1992); and J. Wogan-Browne, 'Clerc u lai, muine u dame: women and Anglo-Norman hagiography in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries', in *Women and Literature in Britain 1150-1500*, edited by C. Meale (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 61-85 (pp. 62-64).

some caveats must be made about that difference. First, it seems likely that, in general, such exotic margins obtained more amongst the upper echelons of society—burgesses, gentry and nobility—and to some extent the free peasantry, than amongst the unfree peasantry. Secondly, that exotic margin is more visible in the thirteenth century than at other times; for example, the florid nature of women's names appears to have disappeared during the later middle ages. One reason why women's names might have been more ornate at the margins involves the nature of inheritance in a patriarchal society.³⁷ That suggestion might be extended further, so that in the thirteenth century some women were more allowed an individualism reflected in their names, a wider phenomenon remarked upon by anthropologists:

My impression is that, to women, personal names are more closely bound up with notions of personhood or selfhood than they are for men, whereas Atavip men were more concerned about the ritualised and political symbolism of names.³⁸

That circumstance partly comprehended inheritance in a patriarchal society, but it was also a much wider phenomenon. Names might thus be considered part of linguistic culture, which differed by gender and social group—heterogeneous cultures rather than homologous culture. More importantly, names were an integral part of the use of language as a socialization process which initiated gender rôles, at least for some female children.³⁹ In the case of many women, the names attributed to them at childhood contained either a lexical and lexicographical meaning (such as in the case of Classical names formed in Latin or Anglo-Norman sobriquets) or an emotive content (as in Saints' names), whilst men's names did not have these personal significations but reflected and were imbued with different gender-related social values.

³⁷ Bennett, *Women in the Medieval English Countryside*, p. 69.

³⁸ S. Harrison, *Stealing People's Names. History and Politics in a Sepik River Cosmology* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 156; by analogy, F. Riddy, 'Mother knows best: reading social change in a courtesy text', *Speculum*, 71 (1996), 66-86.

³⁹ Coates, *Women, Men and Language*, p. 166.