NAMING PRACTICES IN WESTERN IRELAND

RICHARD BREEN

Economic and Social Research Institute
Dublin

Naming and nicknaming in south-west Ireland are shown to be classificatory practices. How the potential embodied in such a system of classification is used to express certain socially significant relationships is described. Like all such practices they establish two kinds of relationship in the case of naming, relationships of similarity, in the case of nicknaming, relationships of difference. The latter system is compared with that described for Tory Island where nicknames reflect very different kinds of relationships. These differences are, it is claimed, related to differences in local kinship organisation and inheritance patterns.

The conferring of names and nicknames on individuals is a recurrent interest of social anthropologists and discussion on this topic covers practices from a wide range of societies (see for example, Beattie 1957; Dorian 1970; Fortes n.d.; Fox 1978; Grottanelli 1977; Hart 1930; Needham 1954; Ryan 1958; Thompson 1937; Tonkin 1980). There has been an almost equal variety of approaches to the analysis of these practices. A number have been concerned with the social function of names and nicknames. For example, Kenny (1961: 89) and Loizos (1975: 96–7) suggest that a knowledge of nicknames acts to distinguish those inside the community from those outside it, while Pitt-Rivers (1954: 169) and Kenny (1961: 88) suggest that nicknames function as communal moral sanctions, as 'social satire ridiculing a man's non-conformity' (Kenny 1961: 88). Both these suggested functions are entirely plausible; on the other hand they are also rather trivial. For example, Pitt-Rivers shows that the majority of nicknames in the Spanish village of Alcala de la Sierra are quite innocuous. Many are purely descriptive of occupation or place of origin, while others are patronyms or matronyms, and yet more have unknown origins. The hypothesis that the knowledge of nicknames distinguishes insiders from outsiders is not unlike one proposing that the function of a particular language is to distinguish those who understand it from those who do not.

A contrasting approach is that of Lévi-Strauss. His central concern is with naming as a classifying activity. He identifies two extreme cases or name types: in the first 'the name is an identifying mark which, by the application of a rule, establishes that the individual who is named is a member of a pre-ordained class' (1966: 181). In the second, 'the name is a free creation on the part of the individual who gives the name and expresses a transitory and subjective state of his own by means of the person he names' (1966: 180). In both these cases, however, naming is an act of classifying. 'One classes someone else if the name is given to him in virtue of his characteristics and one classes oneself if . . . one

names someone else "freely", that is, in virtue of characteristics of one's own'
(Lévi-Strauss 1966: 181).

   There are two immediately discernible advantages of an hypothesis such as
this. First, it treats all forms of naming as a unitary phenomenon, rather than
assuming a separation of the logic underlying naming from that underlying
nicknaming; and secondly, it attempts an explanation of the phenomenon at a
level prior to that of the functional hypotheses. On the other hand, a number of
problems are attendant upon Lévi-Strauss's approach. The suggestion that in
naming 'freely' one is necessarily classifying oneself is simply erroneous, unless
one takes 'classifying' in a very trivial sense. Any form of naming can be seen as
classifying the namer as a member of the society which recognises the name as a
name, but this is, in general, a not very illuminating insight. Furthermore, the
example that Lévi-Strauss gives of such 'free' naming—of a pet dog—is less
than convincing. One can, without difficulty, think of English names for
dogs—and children—which do not unequivocally classify the owner. For every
name which classifies the namer as 'commonplace . . . as eccentric [or] . . . as an
aesthete' (Lévi-Strauss 1966: 182) are others which, of themselves, are quite
neutral in this respect.

   Lévi-Strauss's notion of a class seems to confuse what in any empirical
investigation of society would be regarded as different things. In speaking of
naming according to rule, he mentions 'pre-ordained' classes of which the name
makes the bearer a member, while in speaking of 'free' naming, he says only that
'one classes oneself'. The likening of the two forms by the use of the idea of a
class is somewhat misleading. In the former instance what Lévi-Strauss seems to
have in mind is 'an objective order' (1966: 180), a socially recognised class which
has importance for the actors, whereas in the latter a class is simply an observer's
category (whether this observer is a member of the society or not). In the latter
case the name is inessential; one can be an aesthete, or one can be commonplace,
without naming one's dog in any particular way; on the other hand, in the
former case, the name may be an essential, necessary criterion of membership of
a social group. This is not unrelated to the nature of these classes or groups, the
one being based on an arbitrary typology (aesthetes, eccentrics) and therefore of
little social relevance, the other corresponding to a grouping that, for the actor,
is socially real (a clan, a kin group, a trade union).

   In this article I put forward an approach to the study of names based on the
premiss that naming is a form of classifying. Although it draws on Lévi-
Strauss's work, this approach is rather simpler. It attempts to demonstrate, in
two specific cases, the manner in which the potential of a system of classification
for setting up certain kinds of relationships may be utilised to demonstrate
certain socially significant relationships.

   The activity of classifying not only distinguishes but likens. Items placed in
different categories or classes are distinguished, while items in the same category
are considered the same or similar. In the case of names the distinction lies
between individuals who share a name (setting up relationships of similarity
between them) and those who have different names (setting up relationships of
difference). Analysis of systems of names and nicknames in these terms requires
that we first define the units to which these names apply and then attempt to

discover what importance or meaning—if any—is attached to the sharing or the non-sharing of names and in what contexts this occurs. Such an investigation is an undertaking at a logically prior level to that which attempts to explain names or nicknames on the basis of their substantive content (the communal sanctions theory) or of individuals' knowledge of them (the insider/outsider theory), but does not deny the possibility of either.

The data were collected in 1977 and 1978 during fieldwork in the rural parish of Tuogh in County Kerry, south-west Ireland. Here the practices of naming, and, to a lesser extent, of nicknaming, were closely related to a certain economic and social setting, a form of agriculture and a way of life very like, in some respects, that described for County Clare in the 1930's by Arensberg and Kimball (1968).[1] The processes of accelerated change of the post-war period have led to the demise of certain of the aspects of naming discussed here and this can be seen as part of the weakening of a normative structure legitimated by tradition. However, nicknames are still commonly used, although they too are probably less common nowadays. The discussion of names in this article relates to the period 1900–1950, while that of nicknames applies equally well to the period of my fieldwork.

Forenames

An examination of the baptismal register for the parish of Tuogh shows that until about 1920 it was usual to give a child two names at baptism—an event which generally followed within a few days of birth. These two names were a surname, which would be that of the father or, if the child were illegitimate, that of the mother, and a forename (henceforth FN) or Christian name. After 1920 it became common to give a child a second FN as well. A similar trend can be discerned in some English baptismal registers at a slightly earlier date. Here the giving of more than one FN did not become common (except among the upper classes) until the end of the nineteenth century (Williams 1969: 229).

The rules that governed the conferring of first names were as follows. The first-born male child was named after his father's father; that is, he received the first FN of his paternal grandfather as his first FN. The second-born male child was named after his mother's father. The first-born female child was named after her father's mother and the second-born female child after her mother's mother. This system was only specific up to the naming of the second child of each sex; for subsequent children relatives' names were usually chosen. Very often names of relatives who had died, even the name of a deceased sibling, would be given to a child and it was also common to name one's child after oneself or one's spouse. Relatives who enjoyed some degree of local prestige —uncles who were priests for example—were frequent sources of names, and unmarried relatives, generally siblings of the parents, were likewise popular, usually in the hope that the sharing of a name would encourage that relative to favour the child when it came to disposing of his property or money in his will or on his retirement from the farm. Such bonds might be further strengthened by having the relative in question stand as the child's god-parent at baptism, which placed a more definite obligation on the former to make some practical

RICHARD BREEN

recognition of the relationship between himself and his god-child. The choosing of a name for a child is, then, in the case of the first two children of each sex according to *rule* and for subsequent children according to certain socially recognised *principles*. These principles of naming were designed to secure prestigious names ('he has Michael after his uncle, Father Michael') or to try to secure economic benefits for children.

The consequence of parents selecting a 1FN for a child because it was a relative's 1FN was that a restricted set of FNs appear in the baptismal records. For the period up to 1940 one finds only 35 male and 26 female names occurring as either 1FN or 2FN. After 1940 new names begin to appear, many of them only once, and it is clear that the traditional principles of child naming were being adhered to less rigidly.

Taking the period from 1925 to 1950 we find 57 male FN (that is, both 1FN and 2FN) and 45 female. Of these only 19 for each sex appear as either 1FN or 2FN more than five times and out of 742 occurrences of male 1FN and 2FN in the baptismal records of the period, the 19 male names account for 673; similarly of the 755 occurrences of female 1FN and 2FN the 19 female names account for 713. Just as the child's 1FN was drawn from a restricted set so too was his or her 2FN, but these two sets, for each sex, were discrete. In other words a child did not receive the 1FN of a relative as his 2FN nor the 2FN of a relative—if any of his relatives had them—as his 1FN. In total then there were four distinct sets of names to be drawn on, two for males and two for females. Table 1 shows the four sets of names (based on the 19 most common names for each sex) for the period 1925–1950.

TABLE: Four name sets, 1925–1950 (inclusive)

	MALES			FEMALES		
NAME		OCCURRENCE AS		NAME		OCCURRENCE AS
	1FN	2FN			1FN	2FN
Patrick	63	14	Mary	113	84
Bartholomew	8	1	Anne	30	23
Cornelius	7	0	Nora/Hanora	39	1
Daniel	35	0	Ellena/Helena	54	2
Denis	19	0	Joan/Joanne	32	1
Edward	6	3	Catherine	42	3
Eugene	6	0	Julia	26	1
James	35	5	Brigid	43	8
Jeremiah	34	0	Margaret	35	8
John	86	5	Deborah	8	2
Maurice	8	0	Elizabeth	7	2
Michael	66	6	Josephine	1	13
Thomas	21	1	Patricia	1	14
Timothy	33	1	Frances	1	26
Anthony	0	10	Agnes	0	13
Brendan	3	16	Christine	0	36
Christopher	0	34	Theresa	2	29
Francis	0	36	Bernadette	0	6
Joseph	5	106	Philomena	0	7

Source: Parish Register of Baptisms, Tuogh.

Marriage, residence and inheritance

The Irish marriage and residence pattern is well known (Arensberg & Kimball 1968; Connell 1962) and I will only briefly recapitulate on it. The economic base of the community was made up of family farms, usually worked by a man and his wife and their children and in the case of slightly larger farms in Tuogh (over about 50 acres of good quality land) with the help of hired labour, though the demand for labour was dependent on the size and age composition of the farmer's family (see Breen in press). Inheritance in Tuogh was impartible and based on a weak rule of primogeniture. It was felt that, ideally, the eldest son would take over the farm from his father. In practice this meant that the eldest son was usually given the option of taking the farm before his younger siblings; however, it was common for sons to prefer to emigrate, and in many cases this resulted in ultimogeniture when the youngest son was the only one left to take over the farm.

In order to marry, a man had to wait until his father relinquished the farm. During this period of his dependency he was known as a 'boy', even though many 'boys' might be over forty years old. The mean age at first marriage, for men, was high (34 years 3 months was the average for marriages 1935–39) and slightly less for women (30 years 8 months for the same period). On marriage the bride's father paid a 'fortune' or dowry in cash to the groom's father; this gave the girl the right to her place as wife on the farm. The bride took up residence with her husband and his family after marriage—this family usually consisted of her husband and his surviving parents but might also include unmarried relatives, an uncle, aunt or sibling perhaps.[2] Despite the payment of dowry, the wife had no legal rights to the property of the farm and her position was often tenuous; should her husband die before the birth of any children then his relations might make strenuous efforts to turn her off the property. Meanwhile the dowry that she had brought with her was then used, according to the ideal model, to dower the husband's sister in her marriage.[3]

The chief feature of this system, from our point of view, was that it precluded anything other than single ownership of the farm. Those children who did not inherit were, for the most part, obliged either to emigrate or to remain at home as unmarried, assisting relatives. If the naming system were linked to the ideal workings of the norms of inheritance, then each household would have alternated the 1FN of its head, and, hence, families and land would have been distinguished, despite the extensive duplication of surnames within the parish.[4] Ideally, the name of the household head would be that of his father's father and a name would be passed to him, as a form of symbolic property, attached to the land. In reality it did not happen like this; eldest sons died or emigrated, other children did in fact remain in the parish, and so their eldest child also received the name of his paternal grandfather, even though he did not receive his land. Equally, it was not always the eldest daughter who was dowered and so married into a farm.

The naming of the first two children of each sex after their grandparents seems to have been seen as no more than a traditional way of recognising or showing respect for them. The precedence taken by the paternal over the maternal side reflected the greater importance of the former to the family: they were, after all,

of their father's, rather than their mother's, family house, both literally through residence and in virtue of the fact that rights transmitted through men took precedence over those transmitted through women (Arensberg & Kimball 1968: 133 note the agnatic bias within the Irish kinship system).

The rules of naming thus reflected ideal relations between cognates (particularly agnates) and affines. However, the principles underlying the choice of names for subsequent children reflected the *de facto* relations between the two. For example, if the mother's brothers or uncles were of greater influence or renown than those of the father, or if some were heirless and had property to dispose of, then children of that family were more likely to be named after 'the mother's people' than the father's. Of course, there is also a demographic argument here; since names were usually those of close kin, then the availability of names from either side depended upon the number and sex of such kin. It was the 1FN that established the relationship between kin sharing the same name: 2FN were of less significance. Only having been introduced in the 1920's they were perhaps peripheral to a system that had been in operation a good deal longer, and this may account for their separation from 1FN.

While 1FNs and 2FNs had religious connotations—biblical or saintly or both—it seems that 2FN were chosen specifically because they were saints' names. For example, the male 2FNs were Francis, Patrick, Brendan (the patron saint of Kerry), Joseph and Anthony. Of those names which break the discreteness of the positional sets—Patrick, Mary and Anne—Patrick, as the patron saint of Ireland, is the most important of male saints, while Mary, the mother of Jesus, is the paramount female saint. Thus, the religious significance of these names seems to have been such as to enable them to have been extended from their use as 1FNs to 2FNs as well.

Girls were very often named after Mary, the Blessed Virgin, and nowadays are also named after one of her feast days. This can be explained not only by the preponderance of such feasts in the liturgical calendar, but also by the position of the Blessed Virgin in the Irish Church. Since she was the figure after whom women were to model themselves (and also the standard against which they might be judged), then there was clearly an element of instrumental intent in naming a child after her, in much the same way as there was in giving a child the name of an unmarried relative from whom he or she might hope to inherit something. Other saints who were also conspicuous in their possession of feminine virtues have since served as sources of names in a similar way. For example, one common girls' name in recent years—Goretti—commemorates the Italian saint Maria Goretti, who, in refusing to submit to a rapist, lost her life in defence of her virginity.

In naming a child after a saint, the relationship between the two was felt to be personalised, so that the saint was directly amenable to prayer from or on behalf of that person. In time of illness or misfortune this saint would be prayed to. Similarly this saint was also charged with watching over the person's spiritual and moral well-being. In the case of girls named after the Blessed Virgin, this meant that Mary would concern herself with watching over the girl and helping her to act according to those qualities of the Blessed Virgin which demarcated what, ideally, a woman should be. Those ends which religion defined as desirable

—purity and chastity, motherhood and meekness, for example—were also socially defined ends by virtue of the prominent place of the Church's teachings, so that living up to these standards was a practical as well as a religious requirement.

It remains common for children to be named after saints, just as it remains common for them to be named after relatives, but, the discrete positional sets having broken down, a child might receive the name of a saint as 1FN or 2FN. Often spatial or temporal chance establishes the appropriateness of a particular saint's name. Counties and diocese each have a patron saint and hospitals are frequently named after saints; these names are often taken by children born there. Similarly the liturgical calendar of the Catholic Church allots particular feast days to particular saints and sometimes devotes longer periods to one saint or to an aspect of a religious figure so that, for example, the month of May is devoted to the Blessed Virgin, June to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. It is frequently the case that children whose birth falls on or near the feast of a well-known saint will be given the name of that saint. Many of the major feasts of the Catholic Church commemorate some event in the life of Jesus or the Blessed Virgin —Christmas, Easter, the Epiphany, the Annunciation, the Assumption, the Ascension, the Immaculate Conception and so on. Some of these act as sources of names too—Noel for boys born near Christmas; Concepta, Immaculata and Assumpta for girls.

Nicknames

The thesis that I have to offer in relation to the function of nicknames in Irish rural society is quite simple: nicknames acted to distinguish individuals, but particularly individual households, in a situation in which there was considerable duplication of formal names. However, nicknames were only one way of making this distinction and not all families had a nickname.

A nickname was a name given informally, initially to an individual, by the community and other than that with which he was baptised. In certain contexts the nickname took over the function of the surname and there was a tendency for it to displace the surname entirely.

There were numerous sources of nicknames in Tuogh. Messenger (1979: 75), Fox (1978: 75–6) and Synge (1979: 109–10) report that an individual might be given the name of his father or mother as an adjunct to his baptismal name in order to indicate his lineage and to distinguish him from others with the same fore- and sur-names. This form of nicknaming, which commonly occurred in Tuogh, utilised the 'proper' naming system and might take the form of a matronym or more usually a patronym. However, there were other common sources of nicknames, for example one's physical appearance ('the Bantam', 'Foxy Jack', 'the Hopper'), habits or abilities ('the Bugler', 'the Champion', 'the Doctor'), occupation ('the Master'—a schoolteacher, 'the Forge'—a black-smith, 'the Presbytery'—the priest's housekeeper), place of residence ('the Rock', 'Chapel', 'the Gap') and so on. These nicknames might be in English or Irish, since the latter was still common in the parish in the first twenty years of this century; so one finds John 'Broughall' (from *broghail* meaning dirt), Jim

'Shown' (a corruption of *sròn*, nose) and 'Cullig' (from *coileach*, a cock).

Nicknames were often less direct; they might be based on metaphor, and were frequently ironic. So local footballers, particularly if they had a high regard for their own abilities, might be named after county footballers, and local politicians or those who constantly expressed their opinion on such matters might be named after national politicians. Finally, there are nicknames whose origin though not their meaning is unknown. Such English nicknames are 'the Ram', 'Skipper'; examples derived from Irish are 'Brack' (possibly from *breac*, speckled) and 'Fodder' (from *fada*, long).

A man's own nickname would apply to the members of his household; for example, they might collectively be called 'the Hoppers' or 'the Jack Chapels'. Furthermore, the nickname might be inherited, so that the household established by a man would be known by the same nickname as that of his natal household. This, however, was not always the case, and even where nicknames were inherited, they do not seem to have persisted for very long. Of nicknames currently found in Tuogh, few have existed for more than two generations. This is not a consequence of the decline of the practice; rather it seems that nicknames have been relatively short-lived throughout this century. This would lead us to hypothesise that nicknames were not generally used in order to set up relationships of similarity between successive generations of a family household, but rather to set up relationships of difference—to distinguish—between current households. The most common alternative method of accomplishing this was to locate households by geographical reference. This usually took a form such as 'the Sullivans of Coolgown' or 'Doyles at the Cross'. These were not nicknames as such—they did not tend to displace the surname—and their use was limited to geographical areas that contained only one family having a particular surname. Another alternative was to use the FN of the head of the household to make the distinction between, for example, the 'Timmy O'Sheas' and the 'Mickey O'Sheas'. In such cases, these FNs might become the inherited nicknames of each of these families in the next generation.

The role of the co-resident family group—the household (but excluding unrelated individuals such as lodgers and servants)—as the central economic, political and moral unit of peasant society has been widely discussed (see Shanin 1975*a*). In peasant societies the family is not only an economic enterprise but also the source of ultimate allegiance. The family bears responsibility for the acts of each of its members and as such one's family is responsible for one's standing within the community. For example, Campbell (1967: 187) writes of Greek Sarakatsan shepherds: 'In this community an individual cannot exist simply *qua* individual, he can only be taken account of and evaluated in relation to his family membership'. Shanin (1975*b*: 31), in his discussion of the Russian peasantry, says much the same thing; 'Both the social prestige and the self-esteem of the peasant were defined by the household he belonged to and his position in it, as were his loyalties and self identification'.

The same was true of rural Ireland. The standing enjoyed by an individual was to a great extent determined by the reputation of his family, a reputation built up over several generations and expressed as the standing of 'one's stock'. In Tuogh, heredity, rather than environment, was the prime source of explana-

tions for and predications of behaviour; likewise, one's deviations from norms endangered not only one's personal standing, but that of one's family. Although this co-responsibility extended beyond the household to one's non-resident kin, it was of most relevance to one's immediate co-resident kin. As one moved, figuratively speaking, away from the household to more distant kin, the responsibilities of kin to each other and the influence of each on the other's reputation or standing declined.

Kinship was seldom reckoned beyond the level of second cousins, that is, to one's parent's parent's sibling's child's child. Indeed, one of the most notable features of the kinship system of Tuogh and much of the rest of Ireland was the lack of any kinship grouping of major significance above the level of the family household. The family was nuclear in form for most of its developmental cycle, but included, for a short time after the marriage of the head, a three-generational and extended phase (Breen in press). Kin who were not co-resident did have some mutual obligations, but there were no kinship groupings, corporate or otherwise, which enjoyed any shared rights in land or other forms of wealth or property. A kinship grouping, to exist, must guarantee, conditionally or not, rights for its members in or to something; in rural Ireland the primary object to which rights were held was land. Land formed the basis of the class and status systems[5] and rights to land were held by single households—in fact, by the head of a household. The potential for the growth of wider kinship groups was curbed by the refusal of farmers in post-Famine Ireland to allow the subdivision of land between their children. Rights were confined to one heir and were not allowed to diverge—hence there could be no growth of 'pyramidal' kinship groupings.

Kinship was reckoned by counting back to the children of a shared direct ancestor. The relationship between ego and his father's brother's son's son would be reckoned by counting back from ego to his father (one generation) and counting down from ego's father's brother to the latter's grandson (two generations). Thus, these two would be 'first and second cousins'. Ego's son would, more simply, be a 'second cousin' to the same person. The shallowness of 'vertical' kinship in genealogies—only stretching back two or three generations—and the lack of any breadth of lateral kinship—going no further out than second cousins—are of course two sides of the same coin. It is instructive, therefore, at this point to compare this situation with that described for Tory Island by Fox. Here the system of inheritance is markedly different.

> Every child of a household has a right to a portion of his or her land, and no matter what happens to the land all the heirs retain a claim to it in the event of its falling vacant through intestacy or emigration (Fox 1978: 99).

Such partible inheritance is associated with a kinship system that recognises fifth cousins and beyond (Fox 1978: 72), tracing them back to the ancestor in whom the lines of descent of the two fifth cousins converge: obviously this is a far more distant ancestor than any that would be used in Tuogh to reckon kinship.

The kinship system on Tory has at least one important level above that of the household; this is the 'clann'. An individual's nickname (or 'personal name' as Fox calls it) is built up through the retention of patronyms or matronyms as far back as the apical ancestor of the clann (or clanna, since these are overlapping,

TABLE 2: Inheritance and kinship, Tory Island and Tuogh

	TORY ISLAND	TUOGH
Inheritance	Partible	Impartible
Kinship groupings above the level of the household	Present-associated with rights to land	Absent
Reckoning of horizontal kinship (synchronic)	Very broad	Very narrow
Reckoning of vertical kinship (diachronic)	Very deep	Very shallow
Nicknames	Long-lasting cumulative, complete coverage of population	Short-lived, frequent replacement, incomplete coverage

cognatic groupings). Fox gives the example of a woman whose full genealogical name is 'Nora—Thomais—John—Eoin—Neili' (1978: 76). Membership of a *clann* is associated with rights to inherit land:

> the rendering of genealogies coincides perfectly with the conceptualisation of kinship, in both the reckoning of cousinship and the construction of personal names. This exquisite system of classification . . . is used for settling stern questions of [land] ownership and the like (1978: 81).

Personal names on Tory Island set up relationships, within very broad kinship groupings, of different degrees of similarity between individuals who share, to some extent, their personal names. These individuals are placed, relative to each other, in a genealogy which illustrates their claim to any property within the *clann*. The competing claims of individuals to this property can be assessed by the extent of the duplication of their sets of personal names with that of the individual from whom the property is devolving.

In Tuogh this was not the situation. Here the head of each household (usually male) had the right to dispose of his property within the household to the single heir of his choice. There was no question of more widely distributed rights to this property and therefore no question of genealogical validation of claims to this property through the possession of a nickname set. Indeed, one can think of circumstances under which the growth of nickname sets, or the inheritance of a nickname by successive generations, would have been misleading, in so far as it would have established relationships of similarity between separate households. This might occur, for example, if two brothers married and resided locally. Certain aspects of the social structure militated against this possibility: impartible inheritance being the most obvious, and, more broadly the generally restricted range and number of occupations open to men which would allow them to marry and found a branch of the family distinct from the main stem. Non-inheriting children were expected to emigrate; alternatively they might remain resident in their brother's house as unpaid 'assisting relatives'. Despite this, it sometimes happened that non-inheriting children remained in Tuogh and set up their own households. In the case of men this could come through marriage 'into' a farm, that is, marrying a female heir (though the possibility of becoming a *cliarhman isteach*—an in-marrying son-in-law—was restricted by the necessity for such men to pay dowries) or through finding employment as a labourer (which would entail a loss of status) or through inheriting from a childless uncle

or aunt. The sharing of a nickname between two such households would have implied a type of relationship between them which did not exist.

In summary, I have compared Tory Island and Tuogh and the contrasts are noted in table 2. Tory Island has a complete system of nicknaming involving the addition of patronyms or matronyms to successive generations, allowing individuals to trace their genealogies back to distant 'apical ancestors'. Tuogh, on the other hand, had short-lived nicknames—often they were not inherited —and, indeed, not all families were identified by nicknames. In the case of Tuogh, rights to inherit were restricted to the household, seldom extending beyond it, and inheritance involved tracing one's genealogy only as far back as one's father.[6] On Tory Island, partible inheritance within a *clann* has led to rights to inherit being extended beyond the household to all members of a *clann*, and inheritance involves validating one's claim through one's place in the genealogy of the *clann*. Nicknames indicate the degree of similarity between members of the *clann* whereas in Tuogh they acted to distinguish—setting up relationships of difference between—separate households.[7] Since the emphasis lay on difference, not similarity, scope existed not only for the accomplishing of this in other ways, but also for a variety of types or motivation of nicknames, allowing for the possibility of nicknames being moral sanctions, insults, ironies and so on.

Tuogh forenames and nicknames had separate domains of importance. I have suggested that FNs set up relationships of similarity between individuals within the confines of the entire (co-resident and otherwise) family. This was accomplished according to rule or, in the majority of cases, according to principle, with the intention of bringing about the transmission of real or symbolic property from one individual to his namesake. This principle was also found in the naming of children after saints. Nicknames were of primary importance in setting up relationships of difference between households in a situation in which there was an extensive overlap of surnames and forenames.

Certain general implications follow from the type of approach used in this article. It is clear, for example, that not all name sharing is indicative of some socially relevant similarity; the duplication of surnames in Tuogh is a case in point. The definition of similarity is a social one which names can be used to express, not vice-versa. I have also shown that names themselves are not the only means of establishing relationships of difference between individuals or families; it would be of considerable interest to look at means of establishing relationships of similarity between individuals through classifications other than those based on names.

Finally, the structure of the entire name set has implications for the type and number of relationships of similarity and difference that can be established. Where an individual has only one name, the relationships this can set up are restricted straightforwardly to either similarity or difference. Where individuals have more than one the possibility arises for them to be used either in the same context, to express different degrees of similarity or difference (as on Tory Island), or in different contexts, so that different elements of the name set express relationships that exist in separate contexts (as among the Jlao of Liberia; see Tonkin 1980). Names might also be given to the individual at different times, either as additions to his present set, as at confirmation in Tuogh when

children take a confirmation name of a saint, or as replacements, as would be the case in which someone passing from childhood to adulthood exchanged, as it were, his child name for his adult name. In other words the structure of the entire name will determine the degree and range of relationships that can be indicated in this way.

NOTES

[1] Though there were important differences, particularly in the extent of stratification in Tuogh which appears to be relatively unimportant in the work of Arensberg and Kimball (for a critique of this aspect of their work see Gibbon 1973).

[2] The usual composition of the household at the marriage of the heir altered during this century. Until the time of the second world war the household was 'uncleared' as Symes (1972; 1973) has called it, that is, it contained unmarried siblings of the groom. After the war households were more likely to be 'cleared' of such siblings before the marriage of the heir.

[3] There were, however, marriages contracted without dowry: indeed, the necessity for a dowry or fortune increased the greater one's local status. Nevertheless, impartible inheritance ensured that the number of places in the society was restricted, and obliged large numbers to emigrate.

[4] The extent of such duplication in that period may be gauged from the present situation. In a census carried out in May 1978 of 398 households in Tuogh, the heads of these households shared 97 surnames, giving an average of 4.1 households per surname. The frequency of each varied widely from one name that occurred 58 times to 48 that applied only once. Most of the latter arose not from the dying out of previously more numerous families, but from the migration into the parish of outsiders who came from some distance away. Removing these 48 names probably gives us a frequency of occurrence of surnames that corresponds more closely to the situation of thirty years ago and more when the introduction of new names into the parish could only have come about through men marrying into the parish from some distance—which was unlikely—since the common names of the parish are shared with neighbouring ones. There would have been almost no migration into the parish at this time except for that occasioned by marriage and for servants who might only remain for a few months and would not constitute a separate household anyway. This would leave 49 names and 349 households, an average of 7.1 household heads per name. Ten names are shared by the heads of ten or more households, with an average of 27 per name. Nicknames seem to have been commonest among families sharing these names.

[5] On the basis of the class and status systems of rural Ireland, see McNabb 1964.

[6] On occasion individuals might inherit from non-co-resident kin, but this usually extended no further than inheritance from a parent's sibling. Furthermore, this uncle or aunt would often nominate his or her heir before death; indeed, in many areas of rural Ireland it was common for the heir to be informally adopted by a childless property holder. Holder and heir would thus co-reside for some period preceding inheritance.

[7] The kind of nicknaming which uses patronyms and/or matronyms—but particularly the former—and builds up strings of two or three of these attached to an individual is found in areas of rural Ireland other than Tory Island. Furthermore, Hannan (1979: 81–3) in discussing kinship structures in rural Ireland, finds some evidence in the work of Kane (1968) for the existence of local lineages. These would tend, he suggests, to be 'patrilineal', since wives often married into parishes other than their natal parish, under the practice of patrilocal residence. The precise nature of these hypothesised lineages is unclear, and their growth would, of course, be dependent upon local migration rates, since a lineage could only develop if not only the heir to a farm but also one or more of his brothers remained in the area. Under the conditions of high emigration in the period 1900–1926 and 1946–1961 this would, one imagines, have been unlikely. In Tuogh there were no lineages of this type: however, Tuogh had a much higher rate of population loss than the national average. The decline in population between 1901 and 1926 was about 20 per cent. compared with a national decline of 7.7 per cent. One can hypothesise, that where local 'patrilineages' have developed (perhaps under conditions of relatively low emigration) it may be that one will be more likely to find nicknames or personal names that approach the Tory Island model.

REFERENCES

Arensberg, C. M. & S. T. Kimball 1968. *Family and community in Ireland* (2nd edn). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.

Beattie, J. H. M. 1957. Nyoro personal names. *Uganda J.* **21**, 99–106.

Breen, R. in press. Farm servanthood in Ireland, 1900–40. *Econ. Hist. Rev.*

Campbell, J. K. 1967. *Honour, family and patronage: a study of institutions and moral values in a Greek mountain community.* London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Connell, K. H. 1962. Peasant marriage in Ireland—its structure and development since the famine. *Econ. Hist. Rev.* **14**, 502–523.

Dorian, N. 1970. A substitute name system in the Scottish Highlands. *Am. Anthrop.* **72**, 303–19.

Fortes, M. n.d. *Names among the Tallensi of the Gold Coast.* (Deutsche Akad. der Wiss. Berl. Inst. Orientforsch. Veroffent. **26**). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Fox, R. 1978. *The Tory Islanders: a people of the Celtic fringe.* Cambridge: Univ. Press.

Gibbon, P. 1973. Arensberg & Kimball revisited. *Econ. Soc.* **2**, 479–98.

Grottanelli, V. L. 1977. 'Personal names as a reflection of social relations among the Nzema of Ghana. *L'Uomo* **1**, 2.

Hannan, D. F. 1979. *Displacement and development: class, kinship and social change in Irish rural communities.* Dublin: Economic and Social Research Institute.

Hart, C. W. M. 1930. Personal names among the Tiwi. *Oceania* **1**, 280–90.

Kane, E. 1968. Man and kin in Donegal: a study of kinship functions in a rural Irish and an Irish American community. *Ethnology* **7**, 245–58.

Kenny, M. 1961. *A Spanish tapestry: town and country in Castile.* London: Cohen & West.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1966. *The savage mind.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Loizos, P. 1975. *The Greek gift.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

McNabb, P. 1964. Social structure. In *The Limerick rural survey* (ed.) J. Newman. Tipperary: Muintir na Tire.

Messenger, J. C. 1967. *Inis Beag: Isle of Ireland.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Needham, R. 1954. The system of teknonyms and death names of the Penan. *S West. J. Anthrop.* **10**, 416–31.

Pitt-Rivers, J. A. 1954. *The people of the Sierra.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Ryan, D. 1958. Names and naming in Mendi. *Oceania* **29**, 109–16.

Shanin, T. 1975*a*. Introduction. In *Peasants and peasant societies.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

——— 1975*b*. A Russian household at the turn of the century. In *Peasants and peasant societies.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Symes, D. G. 1972. Farm household and farm performance: a study of twentieth century changes in Ballyferriter, south-west Ireland. *Ethnology* **11**, 25–38.

——— 1973. Stability and change among farming communities in south-west Ireland. *Acta ethnogr. Acad. Sci. Hungar* **22**, 89–105.

Synge, J. M. 1979. *The Aran Islands.* London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Thompson, D. F. 1937. Names and naming in the Wik Munken tribe. *J. R. anthrop. Inst.* **74**, 19–46.

Tonkin, E. 1980. Jealousy names, civilised names: anthroponomy of the Jlao Kru of Liberia. *Man* (N.S.) **15**, 653–64.

Williams, W. M. 1969. *The sociology of an English village: Gosforth.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.