

Laurel Letter of Pends and Discussion (LoPaD): May 31, 2006

Society for Creative Anachronism
College of Arms
16308 SE 165th St
Renton, WA 98058-8221
+1-425-277-0763
herald@sca.org

For the March 2006 meetings, printed May 31, 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.

This letter contains the issues raised in the March 2006 LoAR for CoA discussion. The text in this letter is copied verbatim from that LoAR; it is provided here for convenience. As with a May 2006 LoI, these matters are currently scheduled for the Pelican and Wreath meetings in September 2006. **Original commentary must be in the College's hands no later than July 31, 2006. Responses and rebuttals to commentary must be in the College's hands no later than August 31, 2006.**

1. **Abrahe çaragoça.** Device change. Or, on a fess dovetailed gules a drawknife Or.

The blazon for this device was missing on the LoI. While a Letter of Correction was issued, unfortunately the comments provided by the CoA indicate that the majority of the commenters did not have that correction while doing commentary. This must therefore be pended.

The dovetailed line of division is acceptable though we recommend fewer, wider dovetails with thinner outlining.

While not noted on the LoI, the form indicates that his currently device *Sable, an abacus bendwise Or within a bordure argent* is to be retained as a badge if this device is registered.

This was item 1 on the An Tir letter of November 30, 2005.

2. **Caitríona inghean Raghnaill.** Device. Per saltire argent and gules, two arrows sable and two crosses patonce argent.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Per saltire gules and argent, two arrows sable in pale and two crosses flory gules in fess*, the submitted device is actually *Per saltire argent and gules, two arrows sable and two crosses patonce argent*. While a Letter of Correction was issued correcting the tinctures, unfortunately the comments provided by the CoA indicate that the majority of the commenters did not have that correction while doing commentary. This must therefore be pended.

This was item 2 on the Ealdormere letter of November 25, 2005.

3. **Cristian Noell.** Name.

Originally submitted as *Christina Noëlla*, the name was changed to *Cristian Noell* at kingdom because no documentation was found for *Noëlla* and to partially fulfill an authenticity request. The LoI noted "cares for 16th century English/French (Englishwoman married a frenchman and living in France)," but the forms noted this as an authenticity request -- the submitter checked the authentic for time period box, then wrote the line above in the corresponding text field. In consequence, the commenters were confused (and loudly expressed their confusion in commentary) about the submitter's wishes. We are pending this submission to make clear the submitter's wishes and allow the commenters to address them.

The original summarization and additional information added during external commentary appears below:

[Christina] -- Reaney and Wilson, "Dic of Eng. Surnames," p. 321 s.n. [Netter] dates "Christina Netter" to 1367

[Noëlla] -- According to the paperwork: "Could not document this spelling at the consult table. If this is not registerable, the submitter prefers <Noell> found as a surname in Hitching and Hitching "References to English Surnames 1601," on p. lii and okays this change."

Documentation for other spelling variants of this name are on the attached work sheet.

Name was changed from < **Christina Noëlla** > based on Talan's comments.

Talan's Comments - The name is cited from court rolls, which in the 14th century were Latin documents. Bynames were typically left in the vernacular (except that the documentary French article usually replaced Middle English <the>), but forenames were almost always Latinized. Modern editions very often convert standard Latin forms like <Johannes> to their modern English equivalents, in this case <John>; indeed this was evidently done in the case of <John le Netmaker> 1336, cited by Reaney & Wilson from the same modern edition. It appears that the editors left <Christina> alone, presumably because it is as much a standard modern form as <Christine> is.

The first point of this is that <Christina> is a documentary Latin form; it isn't clear what the vernacular forms were in the mid-14th century, but <Cristin> is one good bet, as is the much more common <C(h)ristian> (Reaney & Wilson s.nn. <Christin>, <Christian>). The second point is that a mid-14th century Latinized form is no evidence at all for 16th century use.

In the 16th century <Christian> (and variants) was still a much more common feminine name than <Christine> (and variants), to judge by the considerable amount of data that I've been able to examine. I did finally find some examples of the latter in Douglas Galbi's collection of names from the Guild of the Holy Cross, Our Lady, and St. John the Baptist, Stratford-on-Avon, at <<http://www.galbithink.org/names/guild.txt>>:

<christine> 1425, 1528, 1530

<christin> 1426

<crisina> 1500

<cristonne> 1512

And whatever form she used in England, we would expect the usual French <Christine> in France.

> [Noëlla] -- According to the paperwork: "Could not document this spelling at the consult table. If this is not registerable, the submitter prefers <Noell> found as a

> surname in Hitching and Hitching "References to English Surnames 1601," on p. lii and okays this change."

<Noëlla> and <Noella> are thoroughly unlikely as French surnames. <Noelle> is a possibility, if only as a feminization of the masculine surname <Noel> (Dauzat s.n.

<Noël>), though I have no actual example on hand. <Noell> is of course English. If she's serious about the stated persona, I'd suggest <Christine Noelle> or <Christine Noel>; if not, <Cristina Noell> is the form closest to her other preferences that is well supported by the available documentation.

Aryanhwy merch Catmael adds:

No documentation was provided for the spelling <Cristian>. Without such documentation, the name as submitted isn't registerable. If she's living in France, she'd be using the French form of her name. I've found three examples of <Christine> in the 16th century (see my "Late Period French Feminine Names" <http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/french/latefrench.html>); my source modernized the spellings of the given names, but I'll take Talan's word for it that <Christine> is probably a reasonable 16th C French spelling as well. My "French Names from Paris 1421, 1423, & 1438" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/french/paris1423.html>) has <Noel> as a given name and a surname three times each. Based on this, I agree with Talan's recommendation that <Christine Noel> is the most likely form that her name would have taken in 16th C France.

<Noelle> is quite unlikely; S. Gabriel Report #2734 (www.s-gabriel.org/2734) says:

"We've found just one instance of <Noelle> in pre-1600 sources, in 14th century Picardy [1]. We doubt the name was used much earlier -- the word <noel> itself didn't appear until 1175 [2] -- and <Noelle> clearly didn't become popular until much later. It also seems to be a development unique to the northern -- and perhaps the northwestern -- parts of France."

I've never seen an example of <Noella>, medieval or otherwise.

Her device has been registered under the holding name *Cristian of Stonecroft*.

This was item 16 on the Middle letter of November 15, 2005.

4. Rashida bint Rashid. Device. Argent, two dragonflies in fess purpure and on a chief triangular sable a sun argent.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Argent, two dragonflies purpure and on a chief triangular a sun argent*, the chief is sable. This is pended to allow conflict checking with the correct tinctures.

This was item 22 on the Outlands letter of November 27, 2005.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Elisabeth de Rossignol
Laurel Principal Queen of Arms