

For the October 2005 meetings, printed January 6, 2006

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from Elisabeth Laurel, Jeanne Marie Wreath, and Margaret Pelican, greetings.

[Note for the electronic copies: the printed letter was dated "January 2005". The date above of "January 6, 2006" was the postmark date.]

The October Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, October 30, 2005 and the Wreath decision meeting held on Sunday, October 23, 2005. The meetings considered the following letters of intent: Calontir (10 Jun 05), Artemisia (20 Jun 05), Æthelmearc (22 Jun 05), Caid LoItP (22 Jun 05), West (22 Jun 05), Ansteorra (23 Jun 05), Atlantia (23 Jun 05), Ealdormere (23 Jun 05), Caid (24 Jun 05), Drachenwald (24 Jun 05), Meridies (25 Jun 05), Middle (25 Jun 05), An Tir (27 Jun 05), Atenveldt (30 Jun 05), and Trimaris (30 Jun 05).

The November Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Saturday, November 12, 2005 and the Wreath decision meeting held on Sunday, November 27, 2005. The meetings considered the following letters of intent: Æthelmearc (20 Jul 05), East (20 Jul 05), Middle (20 Jul 05), Atlantia (21 Jul 05), Meridies (21 Jul 05), Drachenwald (24 Jul 05), Outlands (25 Jul 05), West (26 Jul 05), Lochac (27 Jul 05), Atenveldt (29 Jul 05), Laurel (29 Jul 05), Gleann Abhann (30 Jun 05), and An Tir (31 Jul 05).

The December Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Saturday, December 10, 2005 and the Wreath meeting held on Sunday, December 18, 2005. The meetings considered the following letters of intent: Calontir (20 Aug 2005), Artemisia (24 Aug 2005), Middle (24 Aug 2005), Caid (25 Aug 2005), Drachenwald (26 Aug 2005), Lochac (27 Aug 2005), Outlands (27 Aug 2005), Atlantia (28 Aug 2005), An Tir (31 Aug 2005), Atenveldt (31 Aug 2005), and Trimaris (31 Aug 2005).

For the information about future scheduling please review the status table located on the web at: <http://www.sca.org/heraldry/status.html>.

Not all letters of intent may be considered when they are originally scheduled on this cover letter. The date of mailing of the LoI, date of receipt of the Laurel packet, or other factors may delay consideration of certain letters of intent. Additionally, some letters of intent received may not have been scheduled because the administrative requirements (receipt of the forms packet, receipt of the necessary fees, et cetera) have not yet been met.

REMINDER: Until all administrative requirements are met, the letter may not be scheduled.

From Laurel: E-Letters of Intent

I would draw your attention to the Admin. Handbook, V. B. f. -

Timely Distribution - All letters must be distributed to all commenting members of the College of Arms in a timely manner. If a delay in excess of one week occurs between the completion of a letter and the time it is mailed, each letter must be appropriately redated.

This means electronic Letters of Intent as well. We have a number of commenters who choose to receive LoIs electronically, and these must be distributed at the same time (preferably the same date) as the paper copies are mailed. Failure to distribute the e-LoIs promptly will result in the Letter of Intent being rescheduled, even if the paper copies were mailed on time. Submissions heralds, please take note and adjust your procedures accordingly.

From Pelican: On Using Latin Patronymic Markers in Gaelic Patronymics

In most cases, we would return or change a patronymic that combined the Latin patronymic markers *filia* or *filius* with a name in a vernacular because this would be a violation of RfS 3.1.a, Linguistic Consistency. However, for languages where the practice of mixing Latin with vernacular spellings in a patronymic is well documented, such combinations may be allowed. This is the case for Old and Middle Irish; an examination of the various Irish Annals and other Irish manuscripts found at the CELT site (www.ucc.ie/celt) reveals numerous examples where both the given name and patronymic are in not Latinized (e.g. in their standard Gaelic forms), while the patronymic marker used is the Latin *filia* or *filius*. The *Annals of Ulster* entries for 730 have *Bran filius Eugain* and *Oitecde m. Baithectde, filius Blathmicc*, in 580 *Colggu filius Domnaill filii Muirchertaigh mc. Muireadhaigh*, and in 801 *Be Fáil filia Cathail*. The *Annals of Tigernach* show *Sebdand filia Cuirc* in 732 and *Martha filia Maic Dubain* in 758. While using the Latin patronymic marker is not the usual thing in these manuscripts, it happens often enough to form a distinctive pattern in Old and Middle Irish manuscripts. However, we do not find this pattern in Early Modern Irish documents. Therefore, because of a well established pattern showing the pattern of Latin patronymic markers used with Gaelic patronymics in Old or Middle Irish, either a Latin or a Gaelic patronymic marker may be used in patronymics where the name is Old or Middle Irish. For patronymics where the name is Early Modern Irish, only the Gaelic patronymics markers may be used.

From Pelican: The Grandfather Clause: Not for Elements only (but should it be?)

I would like to hear more of the College's opinion on whether we should continue to interpret the grandfather clause to include patterns, or whether it should be narrowed to include only the actual words found in a registered name. In particular, I would like the commenters to consider these questions:

- Does grandfathering patterns produce names further from historical practice than just grandfathering specific elements?
- Would groups and others not extremely familiar with the heraldic community be confused by grandfathering elements only?
- Does grandfathering patterns serve a larger purpose with the Society?

Thanks to the commenters; I look forward to hearing your opinion on this matter. The answer to whether patterns should continue to be grandfathered will be decided on the April 2006 LoAR.

From Pelican: What information makes a good bibliographical citation?

The topic of what bibliographical information needs to be included with a submission and in the summarization came up several times on this month's letter. What is appropriate bibliographical information? In short, it is sufficient information for a person unfamiliar with the work in question to be able to find it in a library or order it from a bookseller. For books, this is the name of the book, edition, and author. For works with multiple editions, the year of printing may be substituted for the edition number. For websites, this is the name of the website, the author (if that information is available), and the URL.

Why is bibliographical information important? It is important because it allows the commenters to double-check the work done by the submitter and the submissions herald -- this can only help a submission. It also allows everyone who reads the LoIs, from the random web surfer who just happens across on online LoI to the senior commenter, to learn more about interesting and useful sources of information and to follow the line of reasoning for each submission--this helps the college in educating new heralds and keeping old heralds up-to-date on new findings. Finally, it is important because it is the ethical and mannerly thing to do to properly credit other's research and work when you use it in your own work -- and courtesy, especially scholarly courtesy, is important as an end in itself.

Send What to Whom

For all Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera, send one paper copy directly to each of the Sovereigns of Arms, Laurel, Pelican and Wreath at their mailing addresses as shown on the College of Arms Roster.

Send Laurel office copies of all submissions-related paper, including

- Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera (note: such paper copies are *in addition to* the personal copies for Laurel, Pelican and Wreath mentioned above)
- Submission packets (**one** copy of each name form plus documentation, including petitions; **two** colored copies of each armory form plus **two** copies of any associated documentation, including petitions)

to the SCA College of Arms, PO Box 31755, Billings, MT 59107-1755.

Send the required electronic copies of all submissions-related files to submissions@sca.org. This applies to all LoIs, LoCs, LoRs, et cetera.

Cheques or money orders for submissions, payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms" are to be sent directly to the Society Chancellor of the Exchequer, who is temporarily acting as Laurel's chancellor of the exchequer, at Laurel Chancellor of Exchequer, 4N400 Church Rd, Bensenville, IL 60106-2928.

Send roster changes and corrections to Laurel. College of Arms members may also request a copy of the current roster from Laurel.

For a paper copy of a LoAR, please contact Laurel, at the address above. The cost for one LoAR is \$3. Please make all checks or money orders payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms". For subscriptions to the electronic copy of the LoAR, please contact Laurel at herald@sca.org. The electronic copy is available free of charge.

For all administrative matters, or for questions about whom to send to, please contact Laurel.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Elisabeth de Rossignol
Laurel Principal Queen of Arms