



HAL
open science

Naming for Kin during World War I: Baby Names as Markers for War

Nicolas Todd, Baptiste Coulmont

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Todd, Baptiste Coulmont. Naming for Kin during World War I: Baby Names as Markers for War. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 2021, 52 (1), pp.55-67. 10.1162/jinh_a_01663. hal-03448091

HAL Id: hal-03448091

<https://hal.science/hal-03448091>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Naming for kin during World War One

Nicolas Todd¹, Baptiste Coulmont²

Abstract

Tastes and beliefs influence the choice of baby names. During periods of intense social change, names thus inform on how rapidly individuals adapt to new circumstances. Using a large, crowdsourced French genealogy database of 5.5 million individuals born between the years 1905-1925, we leverage this well-known characteristic of baby names to analyze reactions to the First World War, a time of unexpected and extreme family disorganization characterized by the hasty separation of millions of couples followed by uncertainty on the soldiers' survival. We investigated paternal (father to son/daughter) and avuncular (uncle to nephew/niece) name transmission during the conflict. We found that immediately following mobilization, the rate of paternal name transmission increased by about 50% for both males and females. Heightened transmission correlated with predictors of the level of risk the father was exposed to. These results suggest that paternal name transmission accurately reflects ordinary people's perception of the risks taken by the soldiers in the first months of the War.

¹ Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, todd@demogr.mpg.de

² École normale supérieure Paris-Saclay, baptiste.coulmont@cnrs.fr

17 Increased transmission of an uncle's name following his death was found both for
18 uncles who died in peacetime and during the War, but significantly more sustained in
19 the latter case. This phenomenon is strong evidence that the 'cult of the fallen soldier'
20 was widely and persistently practiced in French society.

21 **Introduction**

22 The structure of the family has long influenced the choice of baby names. 'Naming for
23 kin', or the transmission of names from one generation to the next, is known to be more
24 frequent in families with many children or comprised of multiple generations. Naming
25 children after kin as a general rule for name choices has dominated the European
26 naming system of the early modern period. From the late 18th century onwards, naming
27 for kin gradually declined, giving way to choices more closely determined by parental
28 tastes and beliefs. In such circumstances where baby names are the outcome of
29 parental choices, they enable the study of how people react to historical events. Names
30 have for instance been used to investigate popular support to Regime change before
31 the era of public opinion polls, reactions to the Chinese Cultural Revolution, mass
32 incarceration of US citizens of Japanese descent following the attack on Pearl Harbor,
33 or diplomatic crises. In all cases, rapid changes in the popularity of specific names could
34 be observed, e.g. in the United States an increased frequency of presidential name

35 following a presidential assassination attempt. Less attention has been paid to
36 systematic modifications of naming behavior.³

37 World War One (WW1) unquestionably caused major social disruptions in France.
38 Starting on Sunday, August 2, 1914, millions of young men were mobilized, many
39 among them to join fighting units. Couples were hastily separated. The majority of
40 women immediately faced dire practical problems. The most pressing issue was harvest
41 in the countryside, while urban areas saw an alarming rise in unemployment. Violent
42 combats began in the third week of August and, immediately following, large parts of
43 North-Eastern France were invaded by the German army. The attitude of European
44 populations during the War has been researched at least since the seminal effort of
45 Jean-Jacques Becker. The very early phase of the conflict has been of special interest.

³ For the traditional naming for kin practice in Western Europe, see Agnès Fine, “L’héritage Du Nom de Baptême,” *Annales ESC*, IV (1987), 853–877; Ólöf Garðarsdóttir, “Naming Practices and the Importance of Kinship Networks in Early Nineteenth-Century Iceland,” *The History of the Family*, IV (1999), 297–314; Frans Van Poppel et al., “Naming for Kin and the Development of Modern Family Structures: An Analysis of a Rural Region in the Netherlands in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *The History of the Family*, IV (1999), 261–295. For baby names as reactions to historical events, see; Michael Wolffsohn and Thomas Brechenmacher, “Nomen Est Omen: The Selection of First Names as an Indicator for Public Opinion in the Past,” *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, XIII (2001), 116–139; Elena Obukhova, Ezra W. Zuckerman, and Jiayin Zhang, “When Politics Froze Fashion: The Effect of the Cultural Revolution on Naming in Beijing,” *American Journal of Sociology*, CXX (2014), 555–583; Martin Saavedra, *Kenji or Kenneth? Pearl Harbor and Japanese-American Assimilation* (Oberlin College, 2018); Robert Urbatsch, “The American Public’s Attention to Politics in Conflict and Crisis, 1880–1963,” *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, XLVI (2015), 225–244.

46 Previous work notably found that only very late in July 1914 did French people realize a
47 war could actually break out. The fighting was then expected to be short: most thought
48 the conflict would be over by the end of 1914. Furthermore, it seems to have been
49 unclear how much risk soldiers leaving to the front would be exposed to, before it
50 became obvious to all that modern weapons were causing unprecedented casualties.⁴

51 The historical sources used so far have been diverse: administrative reports, letters,
52 diaries or newspapers have all shed some light on the perception of the War by ordinary
53 people. None are as systematic as baby names, the exploration of which remains in its
54 infancy in the context of WW1. Recently, heightened transmission of the father's name
55 as a response to his death at the front has been found in an urban cohort of war
56 orphans born 1914-1916. Specifically, a prenatal loss of father was associated with a
57 2.7-fold increase in the probability of transmission of the father's name, both to male
58 and, in a feminized form, to female offspring (e.g. Joseph → Joséphine). This increased
59 transmission was highest among officers, leading to the hypothesis that this naming
60 practice was a concrete expression of the 'cult of the fallen soldier' phenomenon first
61 put forward by George Mosse. This heroization process had so far been most readily
62 investigated either on case studies or at the community level, e.g. through the

⁴ See Jean-Jacques Becker, *1914 : Comment Les Français Sont Entrés Dans La Guerre Contribution à L'étude de L'opinion Publique, Printemps-été 1914* (Paris, 1977) and; Jean Jacques Becker, *Les Français Dans La Grande Guerre* (Paris, 1980) for early works; for more recent reviews see Jean-Jacques Becker, "Willingly to War. Public Response to the Outbreak of War," Berlin, *1914-1918-Online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, (2015); André Loez, *14-18, Les Refus de La Guerre : Une Histoire Des Mutins* (Paris, 2010).

63 examination of the war memorials (“*Monuments aux Morts*”) erected by municipalities
64 after 1918. Previous work on orphans’ names was nevertheless limited by a small
65 sample size, an exclusively urban context, a lack of comparison to the antebellum
66 period and the sole focus on paternal names.⁵

67 This research note aims at moving forward the systematic description of attitudes during
68 the First World War by focusing on the determinants of kin (father and uncle) name
69 transmission, going beyond the aforementioned limitations of previous work. Our
70 objective was twofold. First, document ordinary people’s perception of the conflict.
71 Second, investigate whether any evidence for heroization of soldiers could be found in
72 naming practices following kin death.

73 **Data and methods**

74 **Genealogical data.** *Geneanet* is a crowd-sourced genealogy website on which
75 registered users can choose either to share their family tree (‘open records’) or to keep

⁵ For early work on first names during the War, see Édouard Lévy, “Les Prénoms de La Guerre (1914-1918),” *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, XXVI (1918), 508–513; Édouard Lévy, *Manuel Des Prénoms* (Paris, 1922); for the analysis of paternal name transmission to orphans, see Nicolas Todd, Alain-Jacques Valleron, and Pierre Bougnères, “The Naming of Orphans in France During World War One: A Study of a Nationwide Cohort of Pupilles de La Nation,” *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History*, LI (2018), 82–91; for classic references on the cult of the fallen and mourning practices during the Great War, see George Lachmann Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers : Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (New York Oxford, 1990) ; Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau and Annette Becker, *14-18, Retrouver La Guerre* (Paris, 2003).

76 it private. *Geneanet* granted us access to the 5.5 million open records of individuals
77 born 1905-1925 in France, to which information on the father and uncles was also
78 attached. Specifically, the following information was available for these individuals:
79 family name, first and middle names, sex, place and date of birth, date of death; for their
80 fathers: first and middle names, dates of birth and death; and for their uncles: line
81 (maternal/paternal), first and middle names and date of death.⁶

82 **Record linkage.** Since every time a descendant mentions a person as part of their
83 family tree, that person is recorded in the database, one person can be recorded
84 multiple times. To identify and merge such duplicates, we used the EM algorithm
85 implemented by the *RecordLinkage* package of the R programming language. This
86 procedure also helps correct for errors in data, since each characteristic of merged
87 individuals is chosen by majority voting among duplicates (see Table 1 for an illustrative
88 example). Due to the high computational cost of the deduplication process, we stratified
89 on sex and year of birth and ran it on a computer cluster. This procedure yielded N =
90 3,056,387 distinct individuals born in France between 1905 and 1925.

91 All computer codes needed to replicate the deduplication process can be found at
92 <https://github.com/nptodd/NamingForKinWW1>.⁷

⁶ Geneanet is available: <https://www.geneanet.org/> .

⁷ R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* (Vienne (Autriche), 2019);
Murat Sariyar and Andreas Borg, “The RecordLinkage Package: Detecting Errors in Data,” *The R Journal*,
II (2010), 61–67.

93 Table 1: Illustration of the deduplication process. Four versions ('duplicates') of the same
 94 individual are identified, and contribute information to the merged version (bottom line) used
 95 in subsequent analyses.

Family name	Names	Date of birth	Father's names	Father's date of birth
Lafforgue	Robert Joseph	1905	Jules	1888-06-05
Laforge	Robert Joseph	1905-02-07		1888-05-06
Laforge	Robert	1905-07-02	Jules Philippe	1888-05-06
Laforge	Joseph Robert	1905-02-07	Jules Philippe	
Laforge	Robert Joseph	1905-02-07	Jules Philippe	1888-05-06

96 **Name transmission.** We focused on first names. In order to include females in the
 97 analysis, comparison of father's and offspring's names was limited to the first 4 letters,
 98 e.g. transmission is considered to have occurred when the father's name is **Simon** and
 99 the daughter's name is **Simone**. This definition is conservative, since it misses some
 100 forms of transmission (e.g. Albert → Berthe), though those are likely to be quantitatively
 101 of minor importance. There was also the question of hyphenated first names. Until the
 102 mid 20th century, hyphenated names were both unstable and hard to identify, since a
 103 hyphen could sometimes be used to separate different names. The present study
 104 therefore treats both spaces and hyphens as name separators.

105 **Diachronic analysis of paternal transmission.** We studied the rate of transmission of
 106 paternal first name (the 'transmission rate' for brevity) according to the date of birth. We
 107 first focused on the very beginning of the war, subdivided into 3 periods: diplomatic

108 crisis of July 1914 ('July Crisis' starting with the assassination of Archduke Franz
109 Ferdinand on June 28); early mobilization (from the mobilization order on August 1 to
110 first significant fightings on the third week of August); combat phase (late August and
111 September). We then analyzed the whole war period. Excluding those for whom exact
112 date of birth or father's name was missing, this analysis is based on $N = 2,311,909$
113 individuals.

114 **Kin name transmission following kin death.** For the $N=1,421,152$ individuals for
115 whom father's date of death was known, we studied the association between paternal
116 name transmission and age at father's death. We analyzed separately kin deaths in
117 wartime and peacetime. While a child's birth can only occur at most 9 months after their
118 father's death, the same is evidently not true for uncles, who may have died many years
119 before the birth of a nephew or a niece. This enables the investigation of naming after
120 deceased kin on a much longer time scale. One methodological difficulty is that if a child
121 has exactly one father, he or she may have many uncles, and conversely an uncle
122 many nieces and nephews, so that several definitions of the rate of transmission may
123 be adopted. In the present work, we consider the proportion of uncle–nephew/niece
124 dyads for which the first four letters of the two names match, and group the dyads
125 according to the duration between the death of the uncle and the birth of the
126 nephew/niece ('age at uncle's death' for short, even if avuncular death occurred prior to
127 nephew/niece's conception). Here the dataset analysed is that of uncle - nephew/niece
128 dyads where both uncle's and child's name are known ($N = 6,055,890$).

129 **Results**

130 **Paternal transmission rate during WW1**

131 **Prewar trend.** On the brink of WW1, about 12% of all baby boys and 4% of all baby
132 girls were given the first name of their father (Figure 1, top panel, inset). Transmission
133 to boys was declining, as parents increasingly turned to fashion. By contrast, until the
134 beginning of the 1920s, transmission to girls was becoming more common, in part due
135 to the general increase in popularity of male names' variants (e.g. Marcelle or Paulette)
136 that enabled fathers' names to be transmitted as fashionable names. No period before
137 1914, including the 'Moroccan crises' of 1905 and 1911 when France and Germany
138 threatened warfare, saw any disruption to these trends.

139 **July Crisis and early August 1914.** We found no evidence for an increase in the
140 transmission rate during the July Crisis. This stability echoes that which was observed
141 during the Moroccan crises. Even for those born in the last week of July (Monday, July
142 27 to Sunday, August 2), no increase in the transmission rate was found. By contrast, a
143 surge is visible in the first week of August (Monday, August 3 to Sunday, August 9),
144 immediately following the mobilization order but before any actual fighting: 14.0% (95%
145 Confidence Interval (CI): 11.9%–16.0%) of boys born during the last week of July were
146 named after their father, and 17.7% (95% CI: 15.5%–19.9%) of boys born during the
147 following week. A similar increase in transmission by about 50% was observed in
148 female births (Figure 1, lower panel).

149 **First combats and subsequent months.** After the early August surge, the
150 transmission rate remained stable until around May 1915, when it fell back to its prewar

151 level. This phenomenon helps formulate hypotheses regarding both the mechanisms
152 behind heightened transmission and the subpopulation involved. First, it suggests that it
153 was not the large scale social disruption caused by the War that induced the
154 phenomenon, since social disruption evidently did not vanish in May 1915 when large
155 parts of France were still occupied, and combats were still ongoing. Second, the fact
156 that the return to baseline was specifically centered on May 1915 suggests increased
157 transmission mostly occurred in families where the father was mobilized. Children born
158 after May 1915 were conceived after August 1914 – and hence predominantly by
159 fathers who were not separated from their spouse when mobilization took place: the
160 men available for conception after August 1914 were in their vast majority those free
161 from military obligations. Of note, it has already been observed that for the same reason
162 the monthly proportion of orphans in the total population of births plummeted in May
163 1915 in a fashion consistent with this ‘mobilization effect.’⁸

164 **Heightened transmission of paternal first name as a measure of risk perception.**

165 Having identified mobilization (and the subsequent separation of couples) in August
166 1914 as strongly associated with increased transmission, we wondered whether
167 separation alone was its reason, or if this phenomenon was more specifically related to
168 the risks taken by the soldiers who were mobilized. Consistent with the notion that the

⁸ It is only in July 1915 that a leave system was organized by the French army, so that a few times a year soldiers could spend a few days at the rear. For a detailed analysis of the mechanism behind the May 1915 plunge, see Nicolas Todd, “Long-Term Health Effects of World War I Stresses” (Université Pierre-et-Marie-Curie thesis, 2017), 69–76.

169 increase in name transmission was indeed correlated to the level of risk incurred by the
170 father, we found that for infants born to men older than 35 (and therefore expected to be
171 mobilized in less exposed, ‘territorial’, units), the increase is negligible (Figure 2).
172 Accordingly, the surge in transmission observed in August 1914 almost exclusively took
173 place for babies born to young fathers (below 35).

174 If risk incurred by the father was actually the factor driving higher transmission, name
175 transmission and paternal death during the War must be correlated, since by definition
176 fathers who died were statistically more at risk. Among those born to young fathers, one
177 can assess name transmission depending on whether the father died during the War
178 (excluding the trivial case of a prenatal death of father – see below) or not. Indeed, the
179 transmission rate was 11.0% (95% CI 10.8–11.2) for babies whose fathers died after
180 the War, but 15.7% (95% CI 14.9–16.5) for those whose father died during the War.

181 **Naming for dead kin in war and peace**

182 **Prenatal loss of father.** Between 30 and 55% of all prenatal orphans (those still in the
183 womb when the father died) received the first name of their father, irrespective of
184 gestational age at father’s death (Figure 3). Transmission rates were consistently, albeit
185 moderately, higher for those whose father died during the War vs. in peacetime. At
186 large, a loss of father during pregnancy leads in our sample to a 2.7-fold increase in the
187 transmission rate, consistent with previous estimates. Due to a higher baseline value
188 (transmission rate for a postnatal loss of father), the fold-increase is lower in wartime
189 (e.g. in boys: 2.2) than in peacetime (boys: 2.8). The loss of a father during the first
190 trimester of pregnancy further led to increased transmission, while a death occurring in

191 the last month of pregnancy was associated with a more modest increase (2-fold
192 increase). Competing hypotheses are that for these births, (1) the mother was still not
193 aware of the death of her husband, (2) the parents had already agreed upon a baby
194 name, (3) the need to symbolically link a baby to his or her father was less important
195 when the pregnancy was already well-established at the time of the father's death.

196 **Prenatal loss of uncle.** In our sample, the transmission rate of avuncular name to
197 nephew was about 5% at baseline, i.e. for uncles still alive at nephew's birth (Figure 4).
198 The transmission rate was distinctly higher in uncle–nephew/niece dyads in which the
199 uncle died before the birth of his nephew/niece. Within the prenatal period, a marked
200 difference was also visible between wartime and peacetime avuncular deaths. For
201 deaths within the year preceding the birth, the rate of transmission to nephews was
202 14.0% (95% CI: 13.2-14.8) for a death in peacetime vs 16.0% (95% CI: 15.0-16.9) for a
203 death in wartime. The response induced by a wartime death of uncle was also more
204 lasting, so that the differences between wartime and peacetime avuncular deaths are
205 still extremely notable ten years after the uncle's death.

206 **Discussion**

207 A simple behaviour, child naming, can yield considerable insight into the reactions to a
208 historical event.

209 In order to investigate this behaviour at the population level, we relied on digitized
210 genealogies, a data source that, due to the sample size and chronological coverage it
211 offers, is becoming increasingly popular in fields such as population genetics and social

212 history. Yet it has several shortcomings. The distribution of producers is skewed, so that
213 few users contribute a large number of records, possibly for religious reasons (as is the
214 case with members of the Mormon Church). Amateur genealogists tend to focus on the
215 prestigious branch(es) of their family. Lower class individuals are underrepresented
216 because of common law marriages, unregistered birth, illegitimate birth, infant mortality,
217 child abandonment and everyday resistance to policing. If it may be the case that the
218 precise effect sizes we measure in our sample do not generalize to the population of all
219 those born 1905-1925 in France, we have no reason to believe selectivity could explain
220 our results, all based on large differences measured between groups *within* our
221 dataset.⁹

222 July 1914 retrospectively appears as the tragic month during which the European
223 governments made the decisions that led to the World War. Though newspapers of

⁹ For a recent use of crowdsourced genealogies in population genetics, see: Joanna Kaplanis et al., “Quantitative Analysis of Population-Scale Family Trees with Millions of Relatives,” *Science*, CCCLX (2018), 171–175; in social history: Arthur Charpentier and Ewen Gallic, “Using Collaborative Genealogy Data to Study Migration: A Research Note,” *The History of the Family*, XXV (2020), 1–21; Tine De Moor et al., “Long-Term Trends in Marriage Timing and the Impact of Migration, the Netherlands (1650-1899),” *Historical Life Course Studies*, VI (2017), 40–68; for resistance to state policy in relation to names: James C Scott, John Tehranian, and Jeremy Mathias, “The Production of Legal Identities Proper to States: The Case of the Permanent Family Surname,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, XLIV (2002), 4–44; for an in-depth assessment of demographic characteristics of the Geneanet genealogies, see Arthur Charpentier and Ewen Gallic, “La Démographie Historique Peut-Elle Tirer Profit Des Données Collaboratives Des Sites de Généalogie ?” *Population*, LXXV (2020), NN–NN.

224 course reported the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and the diplomatic
225 tensions that followed, the importance of this stream of events was essentially
226 misunderstood and downplayed by the press for weeks. Unsurprisingly, no evidence for
227 changes in paternal transmission rates could be found during this time period. The
228 possibility of a war then brutally materialized during the last week of July. For instance,
229 while the international crisis was still reported on page 3 only in the newspaper
230 *L'Humanité* as late as July 24, on the next day a front-page article by Jean Jaurès, the
231 head of the newspaper and a major socialist figure, made clear to all readers that war
232 was most likely, with only a “*suprême chance de Paix*” left. Unions and the socialist
233 party also organized demonstrations in large cities during this week. Yet we found no
234 evidence for a change in naming behavior, suggesting French parents did not grasp the
235 enormity of the threat. Only with mobilization did the naming pattern change. On the
236 whole, the study of paternal name transmission in July 1914 is congruent with previous
237 work: as stated by Becker, “when the church bells began to ring on 1 August and it
238 became clear that this was not to warn of fire but to announce mobilisation for war, the
239 first reaction was one of stunned shock and consternation”.¹⁰

240 Our analysis then shows a quick change in behavior: during the first weeks of August,
241 before the first deadly military engagements, paternal names suddenly became more
242 popular than ever. This change was so brutal it was certainly not driven by imitation: it is
243 extremely unlikely that mothers even realized a change in naming practices was under
244 way. The change is quantitatively more important for children born to young fathers (the

¹⁰ Becker, “Willingly to War. Public Response to the Outbreak of War.”

245 majority sent to fighting units) than for children of older fathers (mostly sent to non-
246 fighting units). Risks taken by the father, rather than the separation of parents alone,
247 seem to have boosted the father's name transmission. The fact that the rate of
248 transmission did not change in late August - early September is puzzling, since one
249 could have expected that mothers initially underestimated the risk of paternal death,
250 then re-estimated a higher risk once the first casualty rates were known. This stable
251 transmission suggests that parents correctly estimated a high risk of death from the very
252 beginning of the war. Past experience of the 1870 Franco-Prussian War or knowledge
253 on lethality of modern weapons gained from the Balkan wars may have been sufficient
254 to inform people's risk assessment. At odds with previous narratives, we conclude that
255 even in its earliest phase, ordinary people did not underestimate the severity of the
256 conflict.

257 Localized family de-structuration rather than large-scale social disruption seems to lie at
258 the root of the change in behavior we observe. The war and the mobilization of young
259 men away from their village might have changed the established social hierarchies. If
260 responsible for the over-transmission we observe, this large-scale disruption of the
261 social order should have affected each and every parents of babies born after July
262 1914. By contrast, we observe that after May 1915, the transmission rate fell back to its
263 pre-war level even as the war continued. The general disruption of social order went on
264 without influencing the parents. Furthermore, only a modest increase in paternal name
265 transmission could be found for babies born to older fathers, mobilized in territorial units
266 ("*armée territoriale*"). To the best of our knowledge, the most likely explanation for our
267 results is that changes in naming behavior were located in families where the separation

268 of parents entailed a heightened risk of death. This hypothesis could further be tested
269 using microdata linking individual military experience and name transmission.


270 Turning to the subpopulation of children who lost their father or an uncle, we could
271 systematically investigate differences in mourning practices in war and peace. Many
272 studies have already been devoted to the unprecedented mass grief induced by the
273 First World War. Its best-known aspects relate to the postwar period, namely the
274 construction of war memorials in virtually every French town and village, and
275 pilgrimages to military cemeteries. Documentation regarding intimate rituals, their
276 frequency and their temporality, has been more scattered. Testimonies have reported
277 photographs and medals played an important role in preserving a trace of the dead after
278 the war. Case studies have frequently mentioned children who were given the name of
279 a dead kin during the war, without being able to assess how widespread and how
280 specific to WW1 this behaviour was.

281 We found that in early 20th century France, even in peacetime, the death of the father
282 during pregnancy led to a high probability that his name would be given to his offspring.
283 The traumatic nature of the event was apparently sufficient to elicit a sharp increase in
284 transmission. During WW1, paternal name transmission, already boosted in the general
285 population of births by the risks soldiers leaving to the front incurred, was further
286 stimulated for prenatal orphans. It is also likely that the practice took a new meaning,
287 since the name given was not only that of the father, but also that of a patriotic hero.
288 Browsing the wartime *Social Announcements* section of the conservative, upper class
289 oriented, newspaper *Le Figaro*, it is not infrequent to find birth announcements which
290 specifically stressed that the father had 'gloriously died for France'.

291 The study of uncle to nephew/niece transmission enabled us to disentangle the effect of
292 trauma from the cult of a fallen hero. The names of uncles who died during the War
293 were significantly and lastingly more transmitted to nephews and nieces than those of
294 uncles who died in peacetime: we show that, during the War and after the Armistice,
295 first names were indeed massively used by the French population to maintain alive the
296 memory of fallen soldiers.

297 To conclude, we found a weakening anthropological tradition, naming for kin, was
298 brutally given renewed impetus in a matter of days in early August 1914 by families that
299 were suddenly confronted to a horrendous prospect they could never have anticipated.
300 In families plunged into mourning, naming for kin additionally stressed the sacrifice that
301 had been made by the dead soldier, and therefore happened to comply with the patriotic
302 ideology of the time. Our study highlights there is no contradiction between
303 anthropological stability and behavioral fluidity. A social theory of action should be able
304 to take into account both the durability of habits and the fluidity of practice.


305



An indicator of the daily number of combat fatalities is shown in orange. Vertical dashed line: outbreak of war. Insets: Quarterly rate of transmission, 1905-1925.

306


307 Figure 1: Weekly paternal name transmission rate \pm standard error (s.e.).



308

309 Figure 2: Monthly paternal name transmission (\pm s.e.), according to paternal age, May 1914 -


310 April 1915.



311

312 Figure 3: Paternal transmission rate (\pm s.e.), according to age at father's death. Prenatal ages

313 at father's death were computed assuming a fixed duration of pregnancy.



314

315 Figure 4: Avuncular transmission rate (\pm s.e.) according to age at uncle's death.