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*Monastic Surnaming in Late Medieval and Early Tudor England Reviewed*

**Abstract** This article examines the apparent practice among monks and regular canons in England before the Dissolution of dropping their family surnames on admission/profession, and adopting instead a new ‘monastic byname’, derived from a place name (toponym) or, by the late fifteenth century onwards, from a saint’s name (hagionym) or a virtue. The article begins by reviewing evidence that this onomastic practice existed and determining how widespread it was. The nature and distribution of the toponymic, hagionymic, and virtue bynames are then examined in turn. The article concludes by considering the underlying reason for the adoption of monastic bynames and argues that this practice served as a means of reflecting symbolically the new monk’s or canon’s separation from lay society, and from his family in particular, and his incorporation into the monastic community.
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Historians have long recognized that most male members of monastic orders in England during the late medieval and early Tudor periods ceased to be known by their secular or family surnames on admission to a monastery (or on profession) and assumed instead alternative ‘monastic’ surnames or bynames. The new byname has been variously termed religious name, community name, monastic name, and name in religion. Thus, for example, Dom David Knowles stated:
The modern practice of taking a new name from a patron saint on entering religion had not begun in the true medieval period. The monk was known by his Christian name, and as the number of these in common use was extremely limited, the toponymic or surname of provenance was by no means superfluous … Round about the year 1500 a sudden change of fashion is noticeable. Many of the brethren now bear names which were clearly assumed on entering religion and in some cases follow their Christian names. These names are of two types. The one is made up of the names of saints, usually either fathers of the Church or national figures … More curious is another group of names found at Westminster, harbinger of Puritan taste: Goodhaps, Vertue, Charity, Goodluck.¹

Here, Knowles states that the original practice was to assign a postulant monk or regular canon a toponymic surname which indicated his place of birth or recent origin, in order to distinguish him from fellow brethren who had the same forename. More recently, Joan Greatrex has made a similar point, with reference to monks of English cathedral priories until the early fifteenth century: ‘in the majority of cases … the monks were known by their places of origin (toponyms), the baptismal name usually being followed by the preposition “de” and the name of the town, village, or hamlet. Some, probably most, had family names (patronyms), but these are only occasionally found in the records’.² Furthermore, Knowles added that, by the start of the sixteenth century, the use of toponyms was supplemented, in some religious houses at least, by assigning saints’ names as monastic bynames³ and, in very few cases, by assigning instead words denoting what might be termed ‘Christian virtues’.

There is, to my knowledge, no surviving medieval document that explicitly describes this apparent onomastic tradition or explains its underlying rationale. For example, the arrangements for admission to a monastery and ceremonies of profession are described in a number of monastic customaries but none of these makes reference to the adoption of a new surname or byname by the postulant or novice. However, the use of toponyms as monastic bynames can be traced readily in records of ordination, episcopal visitation, and abbatial election, among others, from at least c. 1300 down to the dissolution of the monasteries. The purpose of this article is to review the evidence for so-called monastic bynames in England, drawing largely but by no mean exclusively on twenty monasteries in the pre-Reformation diocese of Worcester.⁴ To avoid

¹ Knowles, Religious Orders, ii, 231–32.
² Greatrex, English Benedictine Cathedral Priories, p. 42.
³ Greatrex is possibly referring to this practice when she adds, in a footnote, that ‘[a] few monks are known to have been given a new Christian name’ (English Benedictine Cathedral Priories, p. 42 n. 206).
⁴ For a brief summary of some of the ideas presented in this paper, with special reference to hagionyms, see Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’. For the monasteries in the diocese of Worcester, see Thornton, ‘How Useful are Episcopal Ordination Lists’.
potential semantic confusion, I will employ the word surname to refer primarily to patrilineally inherited family surnames, which had become established among the laity in southern England by the first half of the fourteenth century. In contrast, I will use the term ‘monastic byname’ to indicate those names which were seemingly given to, or adopted by, individual religious. Those monastic bynames derived from a place name will be termed toponymic bynames or toponyms; for those apparently derived from saints’ names, I will use hagionymic bynames or hagionyms; and finally, the handful of bynames thought to refer to virtues will be called virtue bynames. It should be stated at the outset that this study is based primarily on the names of male members of monasteries in England. The names of nuns and canonesses have not been examined in any detail here, though this is certainly a topic worth future exploration.5

Monastic Bynames in Late Medieval and Early Tudor England

As stated above, there is no direct reference in any medieval sources to this apparent practice among members of monastic orders in late medieval and early Tudor England of assuming a new name on entering religion. However, there is plenty of indirect evidence to suggest that the names borne by monks and regular canons in England constituted a distinct onomastic pattern. Both comparison with the naming patterns of the contemporary laity and analysis of the names of monks and regular canons at the time of the Dissolution would support this conclusion. For example, if monks and canons had continued to use their family surnames after entering religion, then we would expect the distribution of surname types in male monasteries to be similar to the distribution of types of surname in the contemporary lay society from which the monks and canons themselves had originated. Medieval English surnames were derived from a variety of socio-linguistic sources and can be categorized accordingly.6 The earliest surnames in England were derived from French ‘pseudo-surnames’ introduced after 1066, but most English surnames originated as personal bynames, assigned to their individual bearers, that became fixed or hereditary in subsequent generations. Sources for English surnames include

5 A reading of the studies of nunnerys in medieval and early Tudor England by, amongst others, Eileen Power, Marilyn Oliva, and Robert Gilchrist gives the impression that female religious did not adopt specific bynames on admission. Indeed, many of those mentioned in the wills of their fathers or brothers often bore the same surnames as these male relatives. However, an examination of the particular conventual lists for nunnerys, at the time of an election or clerical subsidy, reveals as many as half of the nuns had toponymic ‘surnames’ which is not as high as among male religious but is certainly higher than among the laity (see below). See Burton, ‘Looking for Medieval Nuns’, pp. 116–17.

6 Oxford Dictionary, ed. by Hanks, Coates, and McClure, 1, xvi–xxv; McKinley, History of British Surnames; Reaney, Origin of English Surnames.
place-names (toponyms); topographical features in the landscape; father’s, and rarely mother’s, personal names (patronymics, metronymics); occupations and titles; and descriptions of physical or behavioural characteristics (nicknames). The majority of landowners in England did not have family surnames until the mid-thirteenth century, and only during the first half of the fourteenth century did lesser rural and urban families in the south and midlands of the country adopt hereditary surnames. The use of fixed family surnames took about a century longer to become generally established in the north of England.7 While there was considerable variation in the distribution of different surname-types both over time and in different counties, generally no single type accounted for more than 50 per cent of the total.8 Surnames derived from place-names were often the most common, especially in the fourteenth century, but even then they usually accounted for no more than about 20–30 per cent of the attested surnames.9 By the sixteenth century, in many counties, surnames derived from personal names were also very common, sometimes more so than toponymic surnames.

Therefore, if most monks and regular canons had continued to use their family surnames after being admitted to their respective monasteries, then we might expect the typological distribution of their surnames to mirror, more or less, that of the laity. Accordingly, Table 8.1 analyses the ‘surnames’ of 3876 out of 4256 monks and regular canons recorded as brethren of monasteries in the diocese of Worcester from c. 1300 until 1537/8, as there is evidence, presented below, that many male religious resumed using their hereditary family surnames at the surrender of their houses to the royal government.

Table 8.1. Distribution of surnames/bynames of monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester, before 1537/8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagionymic</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronymic</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toponymic</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical or toponymic</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Exceptions include Lancashire where, in both 1332 and 1524, such toponymic or locative surnames accounted for over half, and Shropshire in 1327 when 40 per cent of surnames were locative.
Toponymic or locative names account for about 80 per cent of the surnames borne by monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester between 1300 and 1537. This percentage is more than double that for locative surnames of the laity and would suggest that members of the regular clergy in that diocese at least were not simply using their family surnames when entering their monasteries. The pattern has parallels elsewhere. For example, Dobson estimated that about 80 per cent of monks of Durham Cathedral Priory and up to 75 per cent of the brethren at Christ Church Canterbury bore toponymic surnames. Indeed, the total for the diocese of Worcester increases to 86 per cent if we include topographically derived surnames (some of which may equally be toponymic in origin) and in turn to almost 90 per cent if we include the saintly (hagionymic) and virtue surnames of supposed ‘monastic’ usage. Therefore, less than 20 per cent of monks and regular canons of monasteries in the diocese of Worcester before 1537/8 are recorded with non-toponymic surnames, and only 10 per cent were surnames not traditionally regarded as ‘monastic’ in character.

If we make a similar analysis of surnames of those monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester whose names are first attested in documents from the final phase of the Dissolution in 1538 or later, we see a significant change in the distribution of name types. Here the total number of names is 181, of which 173 have been readily analysed by type.

Table 8.2. Distribution of surnames/bynames of monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester after 1537.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagionymic</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patronymic</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toponymic</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical or toponymic</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 8.2 shows, toponymic names are still the most commonly attested, though at 36 per cent, well below the rate before 1537. Even including topographical and possibly topographical names, the percentage is still less than half. In contrast, we find other surname types, notably those derived from

---

10 Dobson, *Church and Society*, p. 56; Dobson, ‘Recent Prosopographical Research’, p. 118.
11 These figures are a little misleading, in that they may include the names of some monks and canons who were in fact already counted ‘before 1537’ but who (if my arguments below hold) changed their names at the dissolution of their houses.
occupations and patronyms increasing to about 20 per cent. These figures are certainly closer to the patterns found for the contemporary laity. There are two possible explanations for this statistical change: either the naming patterns of male religious in the diocese of Worcester shifted suddenly and drastically between 1538 and 1540; or, as seems more likely, many monks and regular canons changed their names at the dissolution of their respective monasteries. There is additional evidence to support the former conclusion.

Very occasionally, monks or canons are recorded in late medieval sources with two surnames, the second distinguished by the word *alias*. However, the use of a ‘surname’ plus an alias is particularly notable in documents from the period of the Dissolution. Thus, for instance, of the 3699 monks, canons, and nuns whose pensions are recorded in The National Archives manuscripts E315/232, 233 and 234, about 5 per cent (195) occur with two surnames, and in virtually every instance, at least one of the ‘surnames’ was either a toponym or in a few cases a hagionym or virtue. Where the individuals in question can be identified in earlier documentation, the monk is recorded by means of the toponym. Other sources, again especially from the end of the period under study, provide the identity of relatives of monks and canons, thus allowing their names to be compared. For example, in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century many monks were entered into the *Liber Vitae* of Durham Cathedral Priory in association with their family members. Examination of these ‘monastic family’ entries reveals that some Durham brethren at least had adopted a different name and in many cases reverted to using their family surname at the surrender of the priory. Thus, for example, Edward Hebburn, monk at Durham in the early 1530s, is described in the *Liber Vitae* as son of John Robinson of Newcastle and his wife Maiona, and his name is even glossed ‘Robyns[on]’ in the manuscript. Similarly, William Wylam (*Wylom*), monk from c. 1513 until the surrender, is recorded among the relatives — presumably children — of John Watson and his wife Alice, and he occurs later as William *Watson*, prebendary of the secular cathedral (1541–1556). On the other hand, quite a few monks of Durham appear never to have ceased using their family surnames rather than adopt a monastic byname. Thus, for instance, John Earsdon (*Eyrsden*), monk of Durham from

---

12 *Letters and Papers*, ed. by Brewer and others, xiii. 1, 574–77 (no. 1520); xiv. 1, 596–603 (no. 1555); xv, 542–55 (no. 1032).
13 For example, for Biddlesden Abbey, ten monks were assigned pensions on 6 February 1539, and eight of these occur with an additional *alias*. All eight can be traced in the ordination lists under their toponyms. Thus, John Auckland alias Robinson had been ordained between 1531 and 1535 simply as John Auckland: TNA E315/233; *Faculty Office Register*, ed. by Chambers, p. 179; TNA E314/77/29.
14 *Durham Liber Vitae*, ed. by Rollason and Rollason, iii, 42–44.
16 *Durham Liber Vitae*, ed. by Rollason and Rollason, iii, 427.
17 *Durham Liber Vitae*, ed. by Rollason and Rollason, iii, 420–21.
c. 1510 until the surrender and then minor canon at the cathedral until c. 1550, is recorded twice in the Liber Vitae with a number of other individuals all surnamed Eyrsdon. More specifically, Robert Keith (Keth), monk between c. 1496 and 1539, is recorded in the Liber along with “Thomas Keth his father, Margaret (his) mother, John Keth and Richard his brothers.” In cases such as these, the brethren in question seem to have been known by their family surnames while they were monks, and did not assume a monastic byname. It might be significant that, of the four Durham monks discussed here, the two who appear to have changed their names had patronymic family surnames (Robinson and Watson), whereas the two who did not change names bore surnames derived from place names (Earsdon and Keith). We will return to this issue below. A further potential source of information about the surnames of the last generation of monks and canons are the wills which they made as secular clerks after the Dissolution. John Wakeman, last abbot of Tewkesbury and later bishop of Gloucester, had been known as John Wiche while ‘in religion’, but shortly after the surrender of the abbey he used the surname Wakeman. In his will, dated 30 July 1549, Wakeman made various bequests to the children of his two brothers Wakeman and Richard Wakeman whom he also appointed his executors, as well as to one William Wakeman of Longford, of no specified relationship. A similar pattern can be seen for Philip Hawford, abbot of Evesham at the Dissolution and later dean of Worcester Cathedral. In his will, dated 14 January 1558, he styles himself Phillip Ballard alias Havard and makes bequests to his brothers, John Ballard and Richard Ballard, as well as a servant Joan Ballard, and his witnesses include one James Ballard. The conclusion in such cases is that, while at their monasteries, these religious had been known by names different from those of their families.

The data summarized above relates of course to a period of almost two and a half centuries, during which time changes may well have been taking place in surname usage. For the monastic clergy of the diocese of Worcester between c. 1300 and 1540, the evidence would suggest a significant change in the last decade or so of the period. Figure 8.1 plots the percentage of toponymic and topographical bynames borne by monks and canons in the diocese between c. 1300 and 1540 chronologically by decade of earliest attestation in the documentary record. (Only the 1530s are divided into two

---

18 Durham Liber Vitae, ed. by Rollason and Rollason, iii, 415–16.
19 Durham Liber Vitae, ed. by Rollason and Rollason, iii, 407.
21 He was ordained subdeacon and deacon as such in 1503: Taunton, Somerset Heritage Centre (hereafter TSHC), MS D/D/B Reg. 9 (Reg. King), p. 122; Worcester Record Office (hereafter WRO) MS b706.093-BA2648/8(i) (Gigli and others), p. 403.
22 TNA E315/494/1, p. 83; TNA E315/234, fol. 436v.
24 Barnard, ‘Philip Hawford’. 
units, 1531–1535 and 1536–1540, because of the evidence, discussed above, that many monks and canons resumed using the supposed family surnames at the time of the Dissolution).

For the most part, the percentage of toponymic/topographical bynames is relatively consistent between c. 80 per cent to 90 per cent, in keeping with the pattern for the data as a whole. Only in the last two decades do we see a marked decline: for the 1510s, we have 80 per cent which is a little low but not significantly so, but this falls to 72 per cent for the 1520s and is 71.4 per cent for the first half of the 1530s. More extremely, the corpus of names for the period 1536–1540 only contains about 50 per cent that were toponymic or topographical. The decline in toponymic bynames during the 1520s and early 1530s must be explained by apparent changes in monastic surnaming practices, whereas the sharp drop in the late 1530s is to be explained, largely, by the resumption of hereditary family surnames at the time of the surrender of monasteries.

This apparent change in the 1520s and early 1530s is reflected in the usage of saints’ names as monastic bynames. Figure 8.2 tabulates these hagionyms as a percentage of names by decade.

For the fourteenth and much of the fifteenth century there are at most one or two possible hagionymic bynames per decade, amounting to less than 1 per cent. As Figure 8.2 shows, the percentage of saintly bynames begins to creep up in the 1490s and 1500s, reaching its peak in the 1520s (21.4 per

---

25 I suggest below that many apparent hagionyms before the late fifteenth century may equally have been patronymic or even toponymic in origin: see pp. 225–26.
cent), then falling off slightly in the early 1530s (16.5 per cent) and further to 2.3 per cent in the second half of the decade. These percentages for the 1520s and early 1530s clearly account for the decline in the percentage of toponymic and topographical bynames during the same period. Taken together, Figures 8.1 and 8.2 would suggest that in the 1520s and even during the first half of the 1530s, the vast majority of monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester (85–90 per cent) were still adopting special monastic bynames on admission, but that a significant number of them had opted for saints’ names rather than place names. Only during the late 1530s do we see a significant decline in the percentage of new monastic bynames — both toponymic and hagionymic — or, more likely, evidence of the resumption of family surnames.

These patterns are based primarily on the names of regulars from the diocese of Worcester but, as I have discussed elsewhere, there is strong evidence to suggest that in the north of England during the sixteenth century at least a significant number of monks and regular canons were no longer adopting monastic bynames at all. The monks of Durham discussed above are a case in point. Furthermore, analysis of wills made by ex-religious of northern houses after the Dissolution shows not only that many former brethren continued to use the same name which they had borne when in religion but in addition that they made bequests to close relatives who also had that surname. For the remainder of this article, I will consider the toponyms, hagionyms, and virtue bynames separately and in more detail, and will conclude by seeking to

26 Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
27 Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
answer the question of why late medieval and early Tudor monks and regular canons in England adopted these bynames.

**Toponyms as Monastic Bynames**

As discussed above, the vast majority of monks and regular canons in the diocese of Worcester between c. 1300 and 1540 had bynames that were toponymic, that is, they were derived from place names. To these may be added topographical names that primarily refer to features in the landscape but, in many cases, also underlie place names. Historians have generally assumed that these toponymic names were not merely chosen at random, but rather indicate either the place of birth or the place of recent residence of the monks and canons in question.\(^\text{28}\) If this assumption is correct, when studied collectively, these toponyms can reflect the patterns of recruitment not only for individual religious houses but for the monastic orders as a whole. This is of course a vast topic, but some preliminary comments about the toponymic bynames may be ventured here.

One notable characteristic of medieval English monastic toponyms was the regular use of the Latin preposition *de* before the place name, especially in the fourteenth century. Figure 8.3 tabulates the occurrence of toponymic bynames with the preposition *de*, by decade of the earliest attestation for individual monks and canons in the diocese of Worcester, as a percentage of the total number of toponyms for the same decade.

As Figure 8.3 indicates clearly, the use of the preposition *de* with toponyms started to decrease significantly in the middle of the fourteenth century.\(^\text{29}\) Before c. 1350, over 90 per cent of attested monks or canons with toponymic names had the preposition as part of their bynames. During the 1350s, that fell to 73.5 per cent and to less than 50 per cent in the 1360s. The rate continued to decrease to a mere 2 per cent of recorded toponymic bynames using *de* by the last decade of the century. It is presumably relevant that during the same period, as we have noted above, lesser rural and urban families began to use hereditary family surnames. Ignoring French surnames with *de* that were mostly derived from Anglo-Norman proto-surnames, English locative ‘surnames’ with *de* in the early fourteenth century could easily have indicated the actual place of origin of their bearers, to be translated literally as ‘of’. As the use of hereditary surnames took hold among the major part of the population recorded in the documentation, then the practice of indicating one’s place of origin would have become increasingly obsolete. So, too, among the religious

\(^{28}\) In addition to Knowles and Greatrex cited above, see also Dobson, *Church and Society*, pp. 55–60; Burne, *Monks of Chester*, p. 101; Frost, ‘Thornton Abbey’, p. 262; Hockey, *Quarr Abbey*, p. 43.

\(^{29}\) *Oxford Dictionary*, ed. by Hanks, Coates and McClure, i, xxviii.
clergy, the need for *de*, meaning literally ‘of’, also disappeared, as the toponym on its own would have been sufficient to indicate place of origin or provenance.

The pattern found for the diocese of Worcester was not necessarily the case throughout England. In particular, ordination lists from the registers of the archbishops of York suggest that the preposition *de* continued in (decreasing) use with monastic toponyms in the north into the early fifteenth century, finally disappearing around 1420.\(^{30}\) The continuation of *de* with monastic bynames in the north of England may reflect that it also took longer for hereditary family surnames to become universally fixed within most levels of lay society in the north. Thus, as the use of the preposition *de* in the names of laity to indicate (often) that the bearer was literally ‘of’ that particular place declined in both the south and (later) the north, so too the need to employ *de* in the toponymic bynames of regular clergy to show explicitly that the monk or canon in question was ‘of’ the place underlying his toponym will also have decreased. To what extent, therefore, is it demonstrable that male members of monastic orders in late medieval England were indeed of these places?

Historians have long assumed that the toponyms borne by late medieval English religious were derived from the place of birth of the monks and canons in question. Writing over two centuries before Knowles, Browne Willis certainly

---

\(^{30}\) For example, of the 23 monks and canons of the diocese of Worcester ordained in 1397 who bore a toponymic byname, none are recorded with the preposition *de*; whereas of the 57 religious with toponyms ordained in the same year in the York registers, 20 (35 per cent) are recorded at least once with *de*, though 5 of them are also recorded in the same year without the preposition: WRO MS b706.093–BA2648/4(v) (Winchcombe), pp. 133–37; York, Borthwick Institute for Archives (hereafter BIA), Abp Reg. 15 (Waldby), fols 14r–16v.
made that assumption with reference to a number of English abbots.\(^{31}\) However, as we lack in general the sort of biographical data necessary to confirm the suggestion, it remains an assumption. Occasional information may be found in the documentation to support the suggestion in individual cases. For example, Robert de Weston, monk of Worcester (1323–1362), was apparently known as Robert \textit{de Glastonbury} when he first approached the cathedral priory seeking admission in 1323 with letters of recommendation from Glastonbury Abbey, at whose school he had studied.\(^{32}\) We are informed that his father was a tenant of Glastonbury Abbey at Weston, Somerset, and he was subsequently admitted as \textit{de Weston} and continued to use that byname for the rest of his monastic career. Similar details are sometimes known of the lives of monks who went on to become superiors of their houses. Thus, the early fifteenth-century \textit{Vitae Abbatum Croylandie}, in BL Cotton MS Vespasian B.XI, claims to record the place of birth of the abbots of Crowland for the period 1281 to 1427 (\textit{… et natus in villa de …}) and, in each case, the alleged place of birth does correspond to the toponym generally assigned to the relevant abbot in other documents.\(^{33}\) While it could be argued that these places may have been retrospectively deduced by the compiler of the \textit{Vitae} from the abbots’ bynames, this very possibility ought in itself to lend credence to the association of these bynames with the abbots’ places of birth, given that the compiler was himself a late medieval monk writing, presumably, for a monastic audience more familiar than later historians with the mechanics of contemporary monastic naming practices.\(^{34}\)

When historians have assumed that monastic toponyms do indicate the place of birth/residence, then it seems the monks and canons were generally recruited from within the locality of a monastery. However, estimates of the distances between the postulants’ homes and the relevant monasteries vary significantly according to individual houses. For instance, in the generation immediately before the Dissolution, most of the Cluniac monks of Pontefract would appear to have come from within a 10-mile radius of the priory and about two-thirds of the Cistercians of Byland from within 15 miles.\(^{35}\) On the other hand, Kirkstall Abbey and Durham Cathedral Priory seem to have cast their respective nets somewhat further afield, perhaps up to 35 miles.\(^{36}\) There are often notable exceptions to these patterns. From the diocese of Worcester,


for example, I have recorded ten regulars with the byname London who, if they were indeed natives of the capital, would have travelled between 85 and 100 miles to get to their respective religious houses. These men were hardly ‘local’ recruits, though it is worth noting that three of the monasteries in question — Evesham, Cirencester, and Winchcombe — held property in London. Even more extreme is the case of Thomas Penwortham, Benedictine monk of Winchcombe in the early fifteenth century, who had apparently travelled almost 130 miles as the crow flies from the small town of Penwortham, Lancs. Distance from the monastery was undoubtedly an important factor, but clearly other influences, including the location of the temporal and spiritual properties of religious houses, as well as the relative wealth of the monasteries and/or the size of their respective religious communities, may have played a part in the process of recruitment. The property in question may have been that of other religious houses, and this could account for the bynames of monks who bore toponyms derived from the names of other monasteries of the same order. The example of Penwortham above is a case in point: the Lancashire town had no direct association with Winchcombe Abbey, but it was the location of a Benedictine priory dependent on Evesham Abbey. The reputations of particular abbots, especially those appointed from another monastery, may also have played a part in recruitment patterns.

While many historians have assumed that toponymic bynames refer to the place of birth or origin of their monastic bearers, a number have urged caution in this respect. James Clark, for instance, has stated ‘their precise connection with place of birth or family remains obscure’. Furthermore, if, as we have seen, a percentage of monks and canons did not adopt toponyms as bynames but continued using their occupational or patronymic surnames, then it is not impossible that a similar proportion may have continued using their locative surnames: perhaps if a monk’s surname was already locative, then he was not required to assume a toponymic byname. Thus, it would be the fact of bearing a toponym as one’s monastic byname that was important — and not the actual place signified by that byname — since a locative family surname does not necessarily refer to the place of origin of a later bearer but rather to that of the ancestor who first bore it. We noted above four monks of Durham in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries who bore toponymic names

37 Register of Richard Clifford, ed. by Smith, pp. 98–99, 104.
38 Of the 1930 Benedictines in the diocese of Worcester between 1300 and 1540 who bore toponymic bynames, about 17.5 per cent (340) had toponyms that may have referred to other Benedictine houses or their location. For the Cistercians, see Thornton, ‘Stability or Mobility?’, pp. 93–102.
39 For Pershore under William Compton, see below pp. 233–34; for Hailes see Thornton, ‘Stability or Mobility?’, pp. 102–04.
40 Clark, Benedictines, p. 90. Note also Greatrex, English Benedictine Cathedral Priories, pp. 42–43.
41 Harvey, Living and Dying, pp. 75–76.
and whose close family members were recorded in the Durham Liber Vitae. Of these, two bore the same name as their relatives but two had different names: in the latter instances, the family surnames were patronymic. The implication therefore is that the former two monks did not need to change their names on admission to the cathedral priory because their family surnames were already locative. This hypothesis may be readily tested, for the sixteenth century at least, by examining cases where monks or canons appear with an alias (byname plus surname), as discussed above, and what conclusions that may be drawn would suggest that the practice was not as straightforward as the Durham material appears to suggest. Thus, of the 195 former religious cited above who were recorded with an alias in the pension warrants in TNA E315/232–234, just under a quarter (44) bore two toponyms. Similarly, in cases where the monks or canons of a monastery seem to have all reverted to using their family surnames at the Dissolution and the individuals in question can be also identified in earlier documents, we do find cases of the monastic bynames and family surnames both being toponymic. This would suggest that, for the later part of the period under study at least, members of male monastic orders were not able to avoid assuming a toponymic byname on admission or profession simply because they already bore some sort of locative family surname, though in the case of Durham, a number certainly did.

Saints’ Names as Monastic Bynames

As quoted above, Knowles stated that the tradition of using toponyms as monastic bynames was supplemented around 1500 by employing saints’ names and, to a lesser extent, by what might be termed virtue names. Elsewhere he refers to these as ‘uncouth “religious” names in the new fashion’. The total number of saintly and virtue bynames from the diocese of Worcester is relatively small (less than 100), so in addition I have attempted to collect instances of monks and canons from elsewhere bearing alternative bynames. To date, I have collected about 1150 monks and regular canons whose bynames appear to have been hagionymic in character, dating from the late thirteenth century until the Dissolution. The names categorized among these 1150 as hagionymic or possibly hagionymic are mostly the names of universal male saints, but also include those of some early medieval English abbots and notable lay figures, both historical (Anglo-Saxon kings) and legendary (King Arthur). There is also a handful of female saints’ names.

42 Thus, of the 15 former monks of Pershore who received pensions, all had borne toponymic bynames as religious and 4 of them (26.5 per cent) also had locative family surnames: see Thornton, ‘Prosopography’, pp. 45–47, and also below, pp. 233–34.
43 For hagionymic bynames, see also Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
44 Knowles, Religious Orders, iii, 84.
Knowles states that these new types of byname appeared suddenly around 1500, but the evidence from the diocese of Worcester would suggest that the use of hagionyms began a little earlier, during the 1490s, and reached its peak in the 1520s when over 20 per cent of (newly attested) monks and regular canons bore bynames derived from saints’ names. Additional, more general, evidence, presented in Figure 8.4, points to a more gradual increase of saintly names during the preceding decades.

Figure 8.4 presents the chronological distribution of the 1150 hagionymic and possibly hagionymic bynames by decade, according to date of first attestation. The figure indicates a gradual though fluctuating increase during the fourteenth and most of the fifteenth century, with a significant increase in the 1490s and then more so from the 1510s onwards. This gradual increase may in part reflect the increase in the number of surviving documents. The sudden doubling for the 1490s, however, evidently indicates something rather different, and would support the view that there was a change in naming around this time.

It should be stated at the outset that many of the 1150 or so ‘saintly’ bynames discussed here may not necessarily have been hagionymic, in that they may not have been intended to refer explicitly to a saint. For example, some saints’ names were also relatively common forenames and so might occur as patronymic surnames. Those surnames with the genitive –s or patronymic suffix –son may be immediately discounted and have not been included in any statistical comment in this paper; but others are ambiguous: personal

---

names already ending in ‘s’, such as Francis, James, Lawrence or Thomas to which the genitive –s had been assimilated, would occur in the same form as hagionyms and as patronyms. Some abbreviated forms are also ambiguous: while John Andrew’, monk of Bindon at the time of the Dissolution, occurs also as Andrews and Andrewes and may be discounted therefore, in other cases the expanded form of a name may be lacking. In addition, the names underlying some apparent hagionyms were also relatively common forenames in medieval England and therefore might be patronymic: do the bynames John, Thomas, Robert, Gilbert, and Hugh all refer to the English saints John of Beverley, Thomas Becket, Robert of Knaresborough, Gilbert of Sempringham, and Hugh of Lincoln? In some cases, it is not even clear that the byname in question is based on a personal name, whether hagionymic or not. Thus, while the byname of John Werburgh, monk of Milton, Dorset, ordained in 1431–1434, may seem superficially to refer to St Werburga of Chester, other attested forms Warburgh and Warborow would suggest a place name, perhaps Worbarrow Bay, Dorset, or Warborough, Oxon. Similarly, what about the byname Faith: does this refer to the saint, the virtue, or in some cases, as I will argue below, a place?

Analysis of the 1150 or so hagionymic bynames by religious order shows that these saintly names would appear to have been especially popular among the Benedictines. Not only do the Benedictines account for over half of the attested hagionyms in my data set, but also this is out of proportion to their percentage of the monastic population.46 This disproportionate association of hagionyms with Benedictine monks may, in part, be the product of their over-representation in the documents: exempt orders, such as the Cistercians and Carthusians, were not subject to episcopal visitation or episcopal involvement in the election of superiors, and consequently lists of their monks are very rare in bishops’ registers. On the other hand, the use of hagionymic bynames would seem to have been more prevalent at particular Benedictine houses than at others, and especially in the south of England: these names are attested in relatively large numbers at Glastonbury (see below), Canterbury Christ Church, St Albans, Winchcombe, and Westminster.47 Non-Benedictine monasteries in the south where hagionyms are found, though in smaller numbers, include the Augustinian Llanthony Secunda and Southwark, and Cluniac Lewes.

A relatively significant number (92) of monks and canons with apparently hagionymic bynames who are attested before 1490 did not simply have the saint’s name but also had the Latin preposition de plus sancto/sancta before the personal name: for example, William de Sancto Clemente, prior of the alien priory at Monks Kirby, Warks., 1335–1350; Thomas de Sancta Ositha, canon of Colchester c. 1379; and Thomas de Sancto Neoto, monk of Woburn

46 For more detailed discussion, see Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
47 Again, Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
in 1434. As many as 30 religious with this *de sancto* formula are attested in thirteenth-century documents, and most of the remaining examples occur in fourteenth-century documents, with about 10 in the first half of the fifteenth. It seems likely however, that these *de sancto* hagionyms are in fact not direct references to the respective saints but rather refer to place-names that contain the names of these saints. This is highly likely for the three most common *de sancto* names: *de sancto Botolpho*, *de sancto Albano* and *de sancto Neoto* which probably indicate the bearers in question had an association with Boston, Lincs., St Albans, Herts., and St Neots, Cambs. The handful of instances of the byname *de sancto Vedasto* — all borne by monks of alien priories (of Bec) — may have taken their names from one of a number of places in Normandy called Saint-Vaast; and quite a few other *de sancto* names were also borne by brethren of alien priories. The *de sancto* names therefore are probably toponyms rather than hagionyms, and the occurrence of *de* is to be explained by the use of that preposition for the earlier toponymic bynames, as discussed above. It is perhaps significant here that most female hagionyms are recorded relatively early (before the late fifteenth century) and occur with the phrase *de sancta*: Sts Bega, Faith, Margaret, Osyth, and Radegund. It seems likely that the monks and canons who adopted hagionymic bynames during the last decades of English monasticism avoided using female saints’ names. This aversion to female hagionyms may be significant and will be reconsidered below.

If toponymic bynames perhaps reflected some sort of special association of the bearer with the place in question — place of birth or recent origin — then how might we account for the choice of particular saints’ names by individual monks and canons? Determining the signification of individual hagionymic bynames partly depends on identifying the eponymous saint, which is not always straightforward, as in some cases there are more than one possible saintly candidate. For example, assuming that at least some of the late attestation of the byname *Austin* and *Augustine* are hagionyms and not patronyms, do they refer to St Augustine of Hippo, or in an insular context, Augustine of Canterbury? In many instances, however, the eponymous saint may be more readily identified and also associated closely with the bearer’s monastery. Most notably at Glastonbury Abbey during the second half of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, at least 62 monks had hagionymic bynames and almost all their names (60) can be identified with saints and other legendary figures whose relics were allegedly at Glastonbury in the late Middle

48 I have also collected ten cases where the byname incorporates the vernacular word *saint* without the Latin *de*: for instance, John Sent (*Sante*) Vyncent, monk of Abbotsbury between c. 1515 and 1539. Over half of these date from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and clearly represent a different phenomenon distinct from the earlier *de sancto* bynames.

49 There is one outlier, John *de Sancto Neoto*, monk of St Neots, ordained in 1474.

50 The most generous estimate would number the female hagionyms at 1.7 per cent, but that is probably an overestimation, as many were probably not hagionyms at all, below, p. 236.
Ages and/or who were associated with the history and pseudo-history of the abbey.51 Similar patterns can be established for some of the other larger and older Benedictine houses. For example, at Canterbury Christ Church, of the 58 possible hagionyms, 47 (81 per cent) can be associated with the relics and saints’ cults of the cathedral priory and, again, most of those which cannot thus be linked to the priory are attested before the late fifteenth century. The same is the case for about 73 per cent of the hagionyms associated with Durham Cathedral Priory, and 63 per cent for St Albans Abbey. At other monasteries, individual saints had demonstrable associations. For example, hagionymic bynames at Athelney Abbey include Alfred (twice), the abbey’s royal founder, and Athelwyn (to whom the monastery was dedicated). Alfred also figures at Hyde Abbey, along with Grimbald abbot of the abbey, St Barnabas and Valentine whose head the abbey claimed to possess.52 For St Albans, we find at least nine instances of Alban, six dating from the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, plus two for Amphibalus, whose cloak Alban had allegedly worn, and Oswine and Wolstone (twice), which may refer to St Wulfstan whose relics the abbey possessed. At Milton Abbey, there were monks with the bynames Athelstan, the royal founder, and Sampson, the patron saint of Dol whose relics they claimed to possess. This distinct correlation between the eponymous saints of individual hagionymic bynames and the relevant monasteries of their bearers, especially at Benedictine houses, may have been a product of the Benedictine interest in cults of saints and, during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, a revived interest in the ‘monastic past’ in England, particularly though not exclusively in the Benedictine Order.53

Virtues as Monastic Bynames

Around the same time that some monks and regular canons took on hagionyms, rather than toponyms, as their monastic bynames, a very small number of English religious instead assumed bynames that refer to what might be termed Christian virtues. These virtue bynames, or what Harvey has termed ‘pious names’,54 were extremely rare however: for the diocese of Worcester, they account for no more than 0.1 per cent of the monastic bynames in my database. In a wider survey of monks and canons between c. 1300 and 1540, I have collected between fifty and sixty names that might, to varying degrees of certainty, belong to this group, plus an additional fifteen or so other non-toponymic and non-hagionymic bynames that would appear to have had a similar religious or moral reference. The relatively small number of these

51 For a detailed discussion, see Thornton, ‘Northern Saints’ Names’.
54 Harvey, Living and Dying, p. 75.
virtue and miscellaneous bynames means that they do not lend themselves readily to statistical analysis, though some general comments may be ventured.

For the most part, virtue bynames took the form of nouns, usually in English: Charity, Faith, Grace, Hope, Humility, Joy, Justice, Love, Meekness, Mercy, Patience, Peace, Reason, Verity, and Virtue. These include the three theological Christian virtues (or graces), along with a number of the secondary or sub-virtues, as depicted for example, in the medieval 'trees of virtues and vices'.55 There were also a few adjectives: Meek (one attestation) besides Meekness (three), and Latin Placidus (two). The most common virtue name, among those collected to-date, is Grace. This occurs in both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries but, in addition to the possible derivation from Latin gratia, there are examples in medieval England of Grace as a regular hereditary surname, with various alternative derivations.56 Similarly, whereas the byname Faith certainly refers to the virtue in at least a few cases (see below), in others it may equally indicate the saint or the ecclesiastical place-name Horsham St Faith. The same ambiguity applies to the name Hope which, in some of the earlier attestations, may derive from OE place-name element hop, ‘valley, etc.’ and occurs as various place-names Hope. However, in some instances, these names are clearly not ambiguous: George Faith, Edward Hope, and Robert Charity were Benedictine monks of Tynemouth, Northumberland, ordained acolyte together in 1535.57 The occurrence here of the theological virtues as monastic bynames for three contemporaries clearly indicates that the choice of byname was a deliberate reference to these virtues. There were also three monks of Westminster around 1530 with the bynames Faith, Hope, and Charity, although it is less certain that they had been named together like their northern counterparts.58

Knowles correctly noted the relative popularity of virtue bynames at Westminster, terming it a 'harbinger of Puritan taste' and, while that abbey does provide the largest selection (with at least 14 monks), there are other monasteries with more than one. For example, we find instances of Humility, Patience, and Virtue as monastic bynames at Bath Abbey in the 1530s; Faith, Hope, and Charity at Tynemouth, as mentioned above; and Charity and Virtue at Hyde Abbey around the same time. Knowles was indeed perceptive in pointing to the parallel with the later sixteenth- and seventeenth-century usage of similar names, this time as forenames, in England but also among settlers in New England. These so-called Puritan 'grace names', though not as widespread as their conspicuous character has often suggested, included

55 Newhauser, Treatise on Vices and Virtues.
56 A nickname from OF gras, crus, 'big, gross', or topographical from ME atte Grass.
57 Durham University Library, MS DDR/EA/ACT/1/2; Faculty Office Register, ed. by Chambers, p. 182.
58 Pearce, Monks of Westminster, p. 188; London, Metropolitan Archives (hereafter LMA), MSS DL/ A/A/005/MS09531/010 (Tunstall) and /011 (Stokesley). For the earlier Humphrey Charity, see Pearce, Monks of Westminster, pp. 185–86.
many that had been used earlier as monastic bynames — Faith, Hope, Charity, Grace, Humility, Joy, Mercy, Patience, and Virtue — as well as other similar names not attested (to date) as monastic bynames — Abstinence, Faithful, Obedience, Repentance, Temperance, etc.\(^5^9\) Another, more contemporary parallel to the virtue bynames was the common practice of personifying vices and virtues in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century morality plays or interludes, where recurring characters include Charity, Humility, Mercy, Patience, Peace, Virtue, etc.\(^6^0\)

In addition to this handful of virtue bynames proper, there are a few other groups of names borne by monks and canons during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century that probably represent similar monastic bynames. Alongside the virtue bynames **Vertue** and **Charity** at Westminster, Knowles noted **Goodhaps** and **Goodluck**. In fact, these form part of a wider, though still very small, corpus of bynames based on the words good and God. Another monk of Westminster, from the same period, was called William **Allgood** (\(1510/1–31/2\)) who had a namesake at the Gilbertine priory of Chicksands, c. 1494.\(^6^1\) We might also note John **Dogoode**, Augustinian canon of Woodspring, c. 1508–9, and Thomas **Togood**, canon of Barnwell in 1534.\(^6^2\) Another Gilbertine canon, of Sempringham, c. 1514, was called Otwell **Godbehere**; and a monk of the Cistercian abbey of St Mary Graces, London, in the early 1490s was known as John **Godesave**.\(^6^3\) Of the same order was William **Gowdstrought**, monk of Swineshead in 1523.\(^6^4\) To these may be added Robert **Hapey**, canon of Burne in 1514, and Thomas **Haplys**, monk of St Augustine’s Canterbury at the surrender.\(^6^5\) A very small number of English hereditary surnames were derived from such exclamations and oaths,\(^6^6\) and it is possible that some of these bynames were in fact surnames. Other interesting monastic bynames attested largely during the same late period, include a handful which refer to important points in the ecclesiastical year: John **Christemas**, Augustinian canon of Norton, Cheshire, in 1496; Nicholas **Lent**, Augustinian of Coxford at the time of the supremacy; and Thomas **Pentecost**, alias **Rowland**, monk and abbot of Abingdon, 1512–1538. Perhaps of a similar nature were William **Lammas**, Premonstratensian canon of Dale, Derbyshire, 1475–1500, and a monk of St Benet Holme called John with the same byname recorded around 1532.


\(^{60}\) Potter, *English Morality Play*.

\(^{61}\) Pearce, *Monks of Westminster*, p. 181; Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives (hereafter LA), Bishop’s Register XXII.

\(^{62}\) TSHC, MS D/D/B. Reg. 10 (Reg. Castello); Cambridge, University Library, MS EDR/G/1/7 (Goodrich).

\(^{63}\) LA, Bishop’s Register XXV; LMA, MS DL/A/A/005/MS09531/008 (Hill).

\(^{64}\) LA, Bishop’s Register XXVI, fol. 6v; but note Williams, *Tudor Cistercians*, p. 459.

\(^{65}\) LA, Bishop’s Register XXV; TNA E322/49.

Some of these names are attested as family surnames but it is equally possible that they may have served as monastic bynames. While the reason for adopting such bynames as Christmas and Pentecost may have been that the monks and canons in question had been admitted to their respective monasteries during those particular time periods, the motivation for choosing a particular ‘virtue’ as the basis for a monastic byname is more obscure. Virtue bynames may be compared with nicknames, which often serve to describe the appearance or behaviour of the bearer and of course are normally bestowed by others. One might postulate therefore whether the virtue bynames referred to personal and moral characteristics of their bearers, perhaps as perceived by their novice masters. On the other hand, these bynames may have been intended, like the later Puritan grace names — bestowed at birth — to encourage the bearer to aspire to a particular virtue. The fact that we have the neat triad of ‘Faith, Hope, and Charity’ occurring together in at least one context might suggest that there was some degree of institutional coordination and control over the selection of names, rather than personal or individual choice.

The Function of Monastic Bynames

The question remains: why did up to 80 per cent, if not more, of monks and regular canons in late medieval and early Tudor England cease using their hereditary family surnames following admission to their monasteries and adopt instead bynames which, in some cases, they continued to use even after the dissolution of the monastic orders? As we have seen, Knowles suggested that toponyms served the purpose within the monastery of distinguishing between brethren who had the same forename. Indeed, of male religious in the diocese of Worcester between 1300 and 1540, more than two-thirds were called one of just four names: John (almost 30 per cent of all forenames), William (16.5 per cent), Thomas (15 per cent), and Richard (11 per cent). Knowles may well have had a point therefore except, in that case, why not simply continue using a family surname as a way of differentiating between the multiplicity of Johns and Williams? Of the six monasteries in the diocese of Worcester where all the brethren are recorded in surrender and/or pension lists c. 1538–1540 with their reinstated family surnames, there is only one case where two former monks of a house had the same forename and surname.

---

70 There were two monks of Bordesley called Thomas Taylor: Letters and Papers, ed. by Brewer and others, xiv. 1, p. 597; TNA E314/20/31, fol. 5v. Both were still alive in 1555–1556: BL Add. MS 8102; TNA E164/31.
On the other hand, it is possible that more monks or canons could have had the same toponymic bynames: if most religious were recruited to monasteries within a short distance of their home (20–25 miles radius of the monastery), then we might expect some toponyms to appear more than once. The instances of the same forename and toponym are of course far less frequent, and this would only become a problem of course if two namesakes were also contemporaries. Overall, it would seem that such contemporaneous exact namesakes were not common in medieval English monastic communities, though instances can be found. For the diocese of Worcester, I have identified only two cases where two members of a monastery at the same time had the same forename and byname: two Cistercian monks called John Stowe are recorded in the clerical subsidy for that abbey in 1379, and the case of the two John Comptons of Pershore will be discussed below. However, other cases can be found elsewhere. For example, there were two different monks of the Cistercian abbey of Netley called John who both had the toponymic byname Stanlake and were both ordained in 1369–1371. Similarly, a century later, two other Cistercians, of Bindon Abbey, also called John, both bore the byname Matthew, and were ordained more or less contemporaneously. The fact that these namesakes were undergoing ordination during the same period indicates that they must have been admitted to their respective houses within a year or so of each other. Occasionally, such exact namesakes are differentiated in the records by the use of senior and junior, including cases of contemporaneous ordination. On the other hand, there is evidence for contemporaneous exact namesakes in cases where the senior one had himself become superior and would, within his community at least, not be referred to by his forename and byname (see below), thereby enabling a newly admitted brother to take on the same byname without causing confusion. Thus, during the abbacy of Thomas de Birmingham at Halesowen (1331–1343+), a canon

---

71 For Pershore Abbey, 205 monks bore toponymic bynames: 110 had toponyms that occurred at least twice, in some cases more frequently: Broadway (5 times), Hawksbury (7), Pershore (7), Mathon (5), Upton (6), Walcott (4), and Worcester (4).

72 Thus, for example, at Tewkesbury Abbey, there were at least four monks called John with the byname Aston, four Williams from Bristoll/Bristow, five Johns associated with Evesham, and three monks called John surnamed Teynton.

73 TNA E179/58/54. The ordination of one of these is recorded (1377–1380): Calendar of the Register of Henry Wakefield, ed. by Marett, pp. 170, 174, 179.

74 Winchester, Hampshire Archives and Local Studies, MSS 21M65/A1/9 and /10 (Edendon and Wykeham): the first John Stanlake was ordained subdeacon on 22 Sept. 1369, deacon on 21 Sept. 1370, and priest on 20 Dec. 1371; the other was ordained acolyte on 20 Sept. 1371, subdeacon on 20 Dec. 1371, and deacon on 24 Sept. 1373.

75 Chippenham, Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre, MS D1/2/11 (Beauchamp): one was ordained acolyte and subdeacon on 22 Dec. 1470 and the other became subdeacon on Easter Sunday 1471; one was ordained priest on 21 Dec. 1471, and the other on 2 April 1473.

76 For Abbey of Thorney, Robert de Multon‘ senior and Robert de Multon‘ junior, and John Depyng senior and John Depyng junior: Cambridge, University Library, MS EDR/G/1/1 (de Lisle), fol. 99, and MS EDR/G/1/3 (Fordham), fols 267r, 270v.
with the same forename and byname was admitted to the abbey and was ordained in 1333–1336.77

The evidence presented so far would suggest that, while it was not entirely unknown for two monks or canons to have been inmates of a late medieval English monastery at the same time and to have borne the same forename and byname, instances were very rare and could be accommodated, if necessary, by the use of the words senior and junior. However, there was at least one case where a monk opted, probably in mid-career, to change his toponymic byname, perhaps to avoid the sort of confusion discussed above. There seem to have been two contemporaneous monks of Pershore, Worcs., called John who took the toponym Compton in the early sixteenth century: one was ordained subdeacon in 1507 and deacon in the following year; the other John Compton was ordained subdeacon in 1512 and deacon in 1513.78 Indeed, Compton appears to have been quite common as a monastic byname at Pershore in the early sixteenth century.79 The earliest bearer was William Compton, a monk of Tewkesbury (ordained 1478–1488) who was appointed abbot of Pershore in 1504, and it might be conjectured that the other monastic Comptons of Pershore were in some way associated with the new abbot or with his previous religious house, as Tewkesbury Abbey held lands in Little Compton, Glos.80 By 1534, when the monks of Pershore acknowledged the Oath of Supremacy, there appears to have been only one John Compton at the abbey, then almoner.81 However, two letters preserved in the correspondence of the Evesham monk Robert Joseph, both dated ‘11 April’ and assigned to 1530 by the modern editors, throw light upon this onomastic problem. One letter is addressed to a monk of Pershore called John Caddecroft and concludes with the request to convey brother Robert’s salutations to certain Pershore brethren, including one John Compton (Coptonum) and also the precentor, who had the same toponymic byname.82 More significantly, another letter, apparently of the same date, is addressed to a John Compton ‘of Pershore’ and also conveys greetings to, among others, a Comptonum minimum and the precentor who, it is said, had previously shared the addressee’s surname

77 Smith and London, Heads of Religious Houses, II, 504; Stafford, Staffordshire Record Office, MS B/A/1/1 (Northburgh), fol. 170; Calendar of the Register of Simon de Montacute, ed. by Haines, p. 120.
78 WRO, MS b706.093-BA2648/8(i), pp. 296, 298, 311, 320.
79 In addition to these two Johns, there was a Thomas Compton (ordained 1511–1514); Nicholas (ordained 1526–27); and William (ordained 1526–1532).
81 TNA E25/102/6. This John Compton was probably the John Compton alias Theale, bachelor of divinity and, among of things, canon of the second prebend of Worcester Cathedral, from 1546 until his death in 1555: see Emden, Biographical Register, p. 670; The Clergy of the Church of England Database 1540–1835 (CCEd), https://theclergydatabase.org.uk/: Person ID: 79937.
but was now called ‘Fladbury’. There would appear to have been at least three Pershore monks named Compton of Robert Joseph’s acquaintance: John Compton, recipient of the second letter who was possibly the John Copton of the first; a Compton who was precentor but, according to the second letter, had changed his name to Fladbury; and a younger Compton nicknamed minimus. The only Pershore monk with the byname Fladbury from the sixteenth century was an appropriately forenamed John Fladbury, who in 1534 is listed as prior, so probably not a recent recruit, but for whom no earlier references have come to my notice. If the Fladbureus of Robert Joseph’s letter was the same person as John Fladbury of 1534, then it seems probable that one of the John Comptons had eventually changed his monastic toponym, presumably to avoid the confusion of having two members of the conventual community with the same name.

The Compton minimus of Robert Joseph’s letter may have been the William Compton ordained 1526–1532 and probably admitted shortly before the resignation of his abbatial namesake in August or September 1526. In this case, the use of the adjective may not have served to distinguish this young monk from his abbot, but to distinguish him from the plethora of other Pershore monks with that byname. I have encountered at least one other example where the adjectives senior-junior were used to distinguish between brethren with the same byname but not necessarily the same forename. The clerical subsidy list for Swineshead Abbey in 1381 would seem to contain three namesakes, recorded consecutively in the list: Alexander de Hollebech senior, Adam de Hollebech medius, and Adam de Hollebech minor. The forename Alexander is probably not a scribal error (it occurs in another subsidy list) so the three Latin adjectives served, in this case, to distinguish between men who bore the byname Holbeach, two of whom happened to have the same forename. The byname becomes important if it was not simply a means of differentiating individuals with the same forename, but was significant as a means of referring to or addressing a particular monk or canon.

We have very little evidence to demonstrate in what ways monks and regular canons may have addressed and referred to one another within their monasteries. Members of the late medieval and early Tudor religious clergy are named frequently in primary sources, at various stages of their careers. For the most part, these are formal and relatively impersonal sources relating to the administration of the relevant monasteries. In such documents, the monks are usually recorded using the forename and byname/surname,

83 Letter Book of Robert Joseph, ed. by Aveling and Pantin, p. 64.
84 John Fladbury, using his resumed surname Sandford, made his will on 27 August 1545 when he was rector of Naunton Beauchamp, Worcs: Fry, Calendar of Wills, i, 77, 113.
85 WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/9(i) (Ghinucci), p. 186, and MS b706.093-BA2648/7(ii) (Ghinucci and Morton), p. 172; Smith, Heads of Religious Houses, iii, 57.
86 TNA E179/35/16.
87 TNA E179/35/7.
along with the monastic title dominus or dompnus (normally abbreviated dom., English dan) or frater. Monastic superiors are sometimes mentioned using the official title abbass or prior plus forename only, or without any name at all. However, one source that presents a rather different perspective on monastic life and inter-personal relations of the religious named therein are, as we have seen above, the letters composed by Robert Joseph. These Latin letters are addressed mostly to a varied circle of bro. Robert’s monastic and clerical acquaintances, including academic friends from his time at Oxford, and they do not deal with the official business of the abbey or the great affairs of the day, but rather with the private and intellectual concerns of the writer and his correspondents. What is of interest therefore, given the nature of this collection, is the manner in which Robert Joseph addresses his monastic friends or refers, in the third-person, to mutual monkish acquaintances. Most of the letters in Robert Joseph’s collection have what might be termed a heading in which he indicates the recipient of the letter and names himself (invariably as Josephus) as the writer, but which do not seem to constitute a traditional salutation. I would estimate that about 54 per cent of the ‘headings’ addressed to other monks refer to the addressee using both the forename and byname, and about 35 per cent use only the byname. However, the recipient is also frequently addressed within the body of the letter — in the vocative case — and, in these instances, about 60 per cent are named using the byname only and the remainder with forename only. Furthermore, bro. Robert also often makes references to other monks, mentioning them in the third-person during the course of a narrative or when conveying his greetings to them via his correspondent at the end of a letter: in such cases, he mostly uses the byname only (80 per cent). It was very frequent therefore, though by no means universal, for Robert Joseph to address other monks, and also to refer to them (as well as to himself), by employing their bynames only. That this pattern was not merely the individual quirk of a single person is suggested by the near contemporary account of the visitation by Bishop Clerk of Bath and Wells to Glastonbury Abbey in July 1538. The individual monks’ comments and complaints are recorded in English and involve about 43 references to fellow brethren: of these, 17 use the title of office in the case of the abbot and obedientiaries, but 26 use the names of fellow monks. Of the latter, about 60 per cent give the byname only or the title ‘brother’ plus byname; and only 27 per cent refer to a monk using both his forename and

90 About 8 per cent of these third-person references use forename only; 11 per cent use a monastic or academic title plus forename and/or byname; and a handful employ forename and byname.
91 Watkin, Dean Cosyn, pp. 159–64; see also Knowles, Religious Orders, iii, 327.
bysnme.92 These two sources may indicate therefore that, by the sixteenth century at least, the use of monastic bynames was not simply of secondary importance, for instance as a means of distinguishing between two men with the same forename, but may also have come to serve a more primary function, as a method of address and reference within the monastic community, especially for non-office-holding brethren. This referential practice, should it have existed, may also explain the lack of female hagionyms mentioned above: in this case, it may have seemed rather anachronistic to address or refer to a male religious using a female name, especially after a grammatically masculine title (*dominus, frater*).

Perhaps it was less the literal signification of a byname, whether toponymic or hagionymic, that was important and meaningful, but rather the very act of changing one’s name. The early stages of the monastic career, from admission and clothing, through noviciate, to profession, correspond rather neatly with Arnold van Gennep’s stages or ‘rites’ of passage whereby an individual becomes detached from his or her community (separation), then enters an uncertain, temporary status (transition), and finally enters a new community or achieves a new status in society (incorporation).93 Such rites are often accompanied by a change in name which serves to reflect the change in status.94 So it may be argued that many monks and canons in late medieval and early Tudor England demonstrated their new ‘regular’ status and rejection of their previous secular lifestyle, associated closely with their families, by dropping their surname and adopting instead a different, more neutral or (in the case of later hagionyms and virtue names) explicitly religious byname.95 Indeed, if the arguments above hold, the fact that members of monastic orders may have often been referred to and even addressed within their cloisters by means of their second name alone, then the use of the hereditary surname here would have been a constant reminder of the individual’s secular and familial origins, thereby strengthening the value of employing instead a completely different byname. While both the surname and toponymic byname would refer to the origins of the bearer, the geographical origin embodied in the toponym would perhaps have been seen as more neutral or impersonal.

If the interpretation offered above is valid — that the adoption of monastic bynames by monks and regular canons in England between c. 1300 and c. 1540 was motivated by the wish to indicate symbolically their rejection of the secular world and especially family life — then why, we might ask, does it seem that in some regions at least as many as 20 per cent of monks and

---

92 The remaining references are unclear due to damage to the manuscript.
93 van Gennep, *Rites of Passage*.
94 Emmelhainz, ‘Naming a New Self’, p. 162.
95 Despite this ‘separation’ from secular life, late medieval and early Tudor monks and canons did not necessarily lose all contact with their families. The inclusion of monks’ relatives, often alongside the monks themselves, in the Durham *Liber Vitae* cited above, is a case in point. For similar patterns at St Albans, see Clark, ‘Monastic Confraternity’.
canons did not take a toponym or, later, a hagionym or virtue name? One possible reason that a recently admitted monk or canon might retain his family surname, rather than adopt a monastic byname, might be that he had already started, or even completed, the process of ordination as a secular clerk, and had only subsequently decided to pursue a regular vocation. Indeed, some orders were known to encourage older recruits and/or often attracted those who had spent a number of years as a secular. I have discussed elsewhere a number of religious from the diocese of Worcester recorded in the clerical subsidy lists for 1379–1380 but for whom no ordination records survive and, more significantly, whose ‘surnames’ were not toponymic: William Ffaukoner, monk of Gloucester, John Green, monk of Worcester Cathedral Priory, John Samon, and John Lange canons of Bristol, and William Conys, monk of Winchcombe.96 If these individuals had been ordained, as seculars, before entering their respective monasteries — as seems likely in the case of John Green97 — then they had already undergone a series of ‘rites of passage’ — from first tonsure to priesting — in order to acquire clerical status, and perhaps there was less need to emphasize the change of status involved in becoming a monk or canon. On the other hand, previous ordination as a secular cannot account for all the cases of monks or canons who did not have a typical monastic byname, for the ordination lists do record religious with non-toponymic and non-hagionymic surnames. Among bearers of one of the occupational surnames cited above, we find for example a William Fawkener, Benedictine monk of Tewkesbury Abbey, who was ordained in 1415, and a Nicholas Fawkener, canon of Llanthony Secunda, ordained 1464–1466.98 Other instances occur in the ordination lists.99 On the other hand, Claire Cross has noted that many of the last generation of canons of Bridlington, Yorks., seem to have become regular canons after they had been ordained acolyte as seculars.100 The same, we might note, can also be determined for brethren of a number of other houses of Augustinian canons in the same county, notably Healaugh Park, Kirkham, and Newburgh.101 This pattern can be established


98 WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/5(ii) (Peverel), pp. 203, 205; WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/6(ii) (Carpenter I), pp. 560, 563, 566.

99 William Sperman (Tewkesbury, ordained 1416); William Blount (Worcester, 1423–1425); and Richard Harryes (Kingswood, 1443–1446); WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/5(ii), p. 209; WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/5(iii) (Morgan), pp. 198, 200, 208; WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/6(i) (Bourchier), p. 207; WRO MS b706.093-BA2648/6(ii), p. 509.


101 To these may be added a handful of canons from Bolton, Drax, North Ferriby, Marton and Nostell, as well as some brothers of St Leonard’s Hospital, York, who followed the Augustinian rule. See Cross, York Clergy Ordinations 1510–1539, pp. 61, 84, 125, 150, 167; Cross, York Clergy Ordinations 1520–1559, pp. 15, 34–35, 38, 42, 69, 73, 80, 96, 98, 101, 111, 121, 123, 136, 143, 154, 176, 186, 188, 207–09.
because, for much of the sixteenth century, the York episcopal ordination lists record, for secular acolytes only, both the ordinand’s surname and his (apparent) place or parish of origin. For example, William Chamer, ordained acolyte on 24 February 1526, is said to be de Walton. This individual may be identified with the William Chamer or Chamber, canon of Healaugh Park, who was ordained subdeacon and deacon in March 1528. Other brethren of Healaugh who also seem to have been ordained acolyte prior to admission include John Bucktrowte ‘of Spofforth’, William Oldfield ‘of Skipton’ and Richard Styane ‘of York’. In each case, the canon in question continued to be known by his surname after entering the priory, some of which were not toponymic (Chamer, Styane). This pattern may explain why for most houses of Augustinian canons in Yorkshire in the sixteenth century, and all four Gilbertine houses in the county, the canons in question do not appear to have adopted monastic bynames at all. The evidence cited above demonstrates that at least certain monks and regular canons who had previously started the process of ordination, as secular clerks, before admission, retained their family surnames instead of adopting a monastic byname.

In addition, it has been suggested that regular clergy of noble ancestry might have been less inclined or willing to drop their surnames on entering monastic orders, because of the significance and associations of that name. For example, Hockey stated that most Cistercians had toponyms, ‘unless they happened to have a distinctive family name’. A notable Benedictine example is Thomas de la Mare, abbot of St Albans (1349–1396), who was related to various noble families and retained his family surname after profession. Interestingly, Abbot Thomas also chose to derive his personal coat of arms from that of his family, in contrast perhaps to other less well-born abbots and priors whose arms were based upon elements in their monastic bynames. On the other hand, de la Mare’s contemporary, Nicholas Litlyngton, abbot of Westminster (1362–1386), bore a nondescript toponymic byname, probably derived from the abbey’s property at Littleton, Middlesex, or possibly Littleton, Worcs., but his arms suggest that he was a Despenser, one of the most powerful families in fourteenth-century England. Similarly though less aristocratic, we might note that the last abbot of St Peter’s Gloucester, William Malvern (1514–1539), had the surname Parker and his arms as abbot were those of

---

102 BIA, Archb. Register 27, fol. 208v.
104 Hockey, Quarr Abbey, p. 43.
105 Deeds of the Abbots of St Albans, ed. by Preest and Clark, pp. 759–60; Clark, ‘Mare, Thomas de la’.
107 Whether Abbot Nicholas was legitimate is not entirely clear, which may account for the slight difference in the arms. See Harvey, Westminster Abbey, p. 42 n. 3; and Wackett, ‘The Litlyngton Missal’, pp. 12–18.
Parker of Northleach, Glos.\textsuperscript{108} Evidently, not all superiors of noble, gentry or ‘armigerous’ families retained their distinctive surnames on profession, though a number certainly did. Many seemingly ‘distinguished’ surnames would largely fall within the 2.6 per cent of monastic names classified above as French (Table 8.1 above).\textsuperscript{109} A significant proportion of these ‘French’ surnames date from the fourteenth century, though later examples do also occur. Historians have generally noted that, where it is possible to know, the vast majority of male religious in late medieval England were drawn mostly from the middling classes — minor gentry, yeoman and mercantile, and artisan families — with relatively few of noble or aristocratic origin.\textsuperscript{110} This fact might account for the relatively few noble/French names, especially in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; on the other hand, if a noble monk or canon had followed the prevailing trend and adopted a toponym as his monastic byname, like Nicholas \textit{Lytlington}, then there would be no means of determining his social origin without additional biographical data.

\section*{Conclusions and Further Thoughts}

The evidence presented in this article supports the view that between c. 1300 and the 1530s, most monks and regular canons in England ceased using their family surnames on profession and adopted instead what are termed here monastic bynames. These were for the most part toponyms, though by the 1490s at least a significant minority of professed monks, at certain Benedictine houses, had started to use the names of saints (hagionyms) and, very occasionally, Christian virtues instead, and this fashion soon spread elsewhere. It is highly likely, as historians have generally assumed, that the toponymic bynames were often derived from the places of birth or recent origin of their bearers. The later saintly and virtue bynames, on the other hand, are more difficult to explain, though in the case of the former there is strong evidence that many hagionyms were derived from saints and other figures associated with the monasteries of their respective bearers. Furthermore, it is possible, during the later period at least, that monks may have often been referred to, and addressed directly, within the cloister by means of their monastic bynames alone. However, I have argued that it was not so much the taking of a byname

\begin{thebibliography}
\bibitem{109} Examples from the diocese of Worcester include William \textit{Bewmont}, monk of Alcester in 1393, Robert \textit{Cammyle} monk of Evesham in 1351, Robert \textit{de Boys} canon of Cirencester 1312–1515, and William \textit{de Peyto} monk of Worcester 1321–1330: Calendar of the Register of Henry Wakefield, ed. by Maret, p. 219; \textit{Registrum Johannis de Trillek}, ed. by Parry, p. 505; \textit{Register of Walter Reynolds}, ed. by Wilson, p. 98; \textit{Register of Thomas de Cobham}, ed. by Pearce, p. 113.
\end{thebibliography}
that was important, but rather the dropping of the family surname which the byname, whether toponymic or hagionymic, came to replace. The act of losing the surname and assuming another, completely different name served as a means of symbolically demonstrating the monk’s or canon’s separation from secular life, defined largely by his family, and his subsequent incorporation into the cloistered community of his monastery.

Since there is no explicit, contemporary account of monastic naming practices in late medieval and early Tudor England, much of the foregoing argumentation is based on the cumulative evidence of onomastic data combined with occasional biographical details preserved for a few individual monks and regular canons. Accordingly, there remain questions unanswered. Why as many as 20 per cent of the monks and canons do not seem to have taken a toponymic, hagionymic or virtue byname certainly requires further consideration. The process of adopting a monastic byname may also be clarified: were bynames adopted at admission or profession, or either?\footnote{111} Who chose the specific byname for an individual novice, the monk or canon himself, or his superior? Further studies might serve to show changes in bynaming over time, and regional variations. In addition, were the onomastic patterns discussed above limited to monks and regular canons in England? What about the contemporary nuns and canonesses, or even the friars: the impressionistic conclusion here is that these groups of religious did not adopt bynames or, if they did, certainly not to the same extent as the monks and canons. In addition, for Wales, it seems that the occupants of monasteries closer to the English border may have adopted bynames whereas those further west were more likely to continue using their Welsh patronymics.\footnote{112} This matter could be investigated further, and perhaps comparable studies of Scottish and Irish monasteries might also be worthwhile. Comparison with monastic naming patterns on the Continent might also throw light on this seemingly English practice.

\footnote{111}{There is occasional evidence of regulars adopting bynames even later in their careers. For instance, two canons of Westacre, Norfolk, were ordained in 1407 as John Sley de Southlenn and William Langham de Geyton’ but occur subsequently simply as John de Lenn and William de Geyton’: London, Lambeth Palace, Canterbury Register Arundel, fols 546r, 547r, 548r. Similarly, Robert Cowker, John Sheppard, John Pidsley and William Godson, monks of Glastonbury ordained acolyte in 1516, are recorded subsequently with hagionymic bynames as Robert Yder, John Deruvian, John Phagan and William Dunstan, but seem to have reverted to using their surnames after the Dissolution: TSHC, MS D/D/B. Reg. 10; TNA Ex2/57/1; Willis, History of the Mitred Parliamentary Abbies, i, 108; Weaver, ‘The Fate of the Dispossessed Monks’, p. 337.}

\footnote{112}{See Thornton, ‘A Mynach by Any Other Name’.
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