

Society for Creative Anachronism
College of Arms
427 W Ave
Spokane, WA 99203
+1 509 570 4189
laurel@heraldry.sca.org

For the May 2018 meetings, printed July 2, 2018

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from Juliana Laurel, Alys Pelican, and Cormac Wreath, greetings.

From Laurel: Thanks from Known World Heraldry and Scribes 2018

Thanks to the Barony Marche of the Debatable Lands for hosting Known World a few weeks ago. That's where I started in the SCA, and they pulled out all the stops to make us feel welcome. Specific thanks to Alaric MacConnal and his amazing staff; everything went smoothly and well. Thanks to Thomas Byron of Haverford and Ariella of Thornbury for welcoming us into their home (when they say their home is their castle, they're not exaggerating) Friday night and to Odriana vander Brugghe for feeding us. Thanks to all the instructors -- it was a great set of classes -- and to the performers who entertained us Saturday evening. I look forward to seeing the proceedings soon.

From Laurel: Known World 2019 and 2020

It's my pleasure to announce that the 2019 Known World Heraldic and Scribal Symposium will be held July 5-7, 2019, in the Barony of Coeur d'Ennuie and the Canton of Axed Root, Calontir. The site will be the Holiday Inn & Suites - Des Moines Northwest, in Urbandale, IA. The event steward, Lady Alexandra Vazquez de Granada (called Shandra), will be sharing more details as the time comes.

I'm also announcing that the 2020 Known World Heraldic and Scribal Symposium will be held in Lochac in early July. The details will be forthcoming as they continue planning, but we wanted to give everyone time to save their pennies to join us all in Lochac.

From Wreath: On "Ululant" and Post-Period Steps from Period Practice

SENA A2B4 defines elements which are a step from period practice under core rules. They include non-European armorial elements, non-European plants and animals, and other European artifacts, all of which must be documented before 1600. These three categories are demonstrably objective.

But there's a fourth category, SENNA A2B4d, which allows for certain charges and motifs which appear neither in European heraldry nor in the previously mentioned categories. These include elements such as paw prints, compass stars, and birds (other than an eagle) displayed. These are tolerated because they're remarkably popular and function effectively as armorial elements without causing undue confusion. However, inclusion or exclusion of these charges in past rulings was far more subjective, and such elements could cease being registerable if they became problematic.

It is with this background in mind that we come to the subject of ululant wolves. First appearing in the May 1982 LoAR, the use of ululant, or howling, wolves (and other canids) is long and broad, with just under 200 existing registrations of the term. The term and practice have no basis in period armory or art, but its use in post-period motifs (notably in the American southwest) has led to its popularity in the SCA.

As a head posture on a full or demi-beast, its use is not wholly remarkable. Due to period heralds being largely unconcerned with consistency in head placement and orientation on animate charges, the College of Arms doesn't grant any difference between beasts with heads guardant, regardant, or facing the same direction as the torso. In

these instances, use of ululant had no impact on conflict, and was merely a note to artists to place the head in the preferred orientation for the submitter.

Heads as stand-alone charges, however, present an altogether different scenario. A head facing dexter gets a DC from either a head affronty or a head contourny, and (because SENA A5G7 grants a DC for orientation) also has difference from a head bendwise or palewise. However, ululant heads blur the distinction between orientations, with the angle of registered examples ranging from midway between fesswise and bendwise to fully palewise. This ambiguity in blazon demonstrates the problem with including this post-period motif in SCA heraldry.

Therefore, we will be discontinuing use of the term ululant in SCA armory and removing it from Appendix G. When used with a whole or demi wolf, a raised head will be treated as an unblazoned artistic detail and allowed as long as identifiability of the creature is maintained. Depictions of animal heads as stand-alone charges should have the heads in a clearly recognizable orientation, with the neck either perpendicular to the head (couped, erased) or parallel (couped close).

Pending documentation, submissions using ululant heads appearing on external letters after September 30, 2018, will no longer be registered.

From Wreath: Orientation of Maintained and Sustained Charges

In the August 2015 Cover Letter, SENA A5C3 was modified with the following ruling:

Therefore, effective immediately, we are adopting the following definition: a charge, held or conjoined, which is clearly not a co-primary charge is equivalent to the former definition of sustained if it is identifiable, no matter what its size. Sustained charges grant a cadency difference - currently referred to as a "DC". This standard is intended to include charges which are much smaller than the current definition: a charge large enough to grant difference as a tertiary charge will grant one as held/conjoined charge. Held/conjoined charges must have good contrast with their background.

While this ruling resolved the long-disputed and ultimately untenable distinction between maintained and sustained charges, subsequent interpretation of the precedent raised a new issue: If a sustained charge is the equivalent of a secondary or tertiary charge (in that it must be at least as large as a tertiary charge would be), and if both secondary and tertiary charges receive a DC for orientation, then the orientation of sustained charges must be blazonable so that they can be appropriately compared.

Unfortunately, this interpretation had the unforeseen consequence of several returns for armory with held charges blurring the distinction between orientations, despite the charges being held in a natural manner as seen in period heraldry. Emulating period heraldic style is one of the goals of the College of Arms.

Therefore, effective immediately, maintained and sustained secondary charges will no longer receive a DC for orientation, and as such will no longer be returned for blurring the distinction between orientations.

From Pelican: Alternate Titles in Latin and Estonian

The February 23 Palimpsest letter proposed changes to the Latin and Estonian lists of alternative titles. We thank fride wlfssdotter and Pietari Uv, Töllöö Herald, for their research into Estonian titles.

We approve *nobilis* as a gender-neutral title in medieval Latin at the rank of an Award or Grant of Arms. This title was typically used after a given name, as in *Haroldus nobilis*.

In Estonian, we approve *Perris Würst* as a masculine title at the rank of a Coronet. This title is appropriate for an heir to the throne rather than a territorial ruler. Likewise, we approve *Perris Würsti Prawwa* as a feminine Estonian title at the rank of a Coronet. This title is also appropriate for an heir.

We release the following Estonian titles, since we have no evidence they were used in our period: *Krahv* (formerly a masculine title at the County level), *Krahvinna* (formerly a feminine title at the County level), *Vikont* (formerly a masculine title at the Viscounty level), *Vikontess* (formerly a feminine title at the Viscounty level), *Parun* (formerly a masculine title at the baronial level), *Paruness* (formerly a feminine title at the baronial level), and *Söör* (formerly a masculine title for Knight).

From Pelican: Lingua Anglica and Lingua Societatis

The March 1 Palimpsest Rules Letter proposed changes to SENA that would replace our current Lingua Anglica rules, which allow the use of modern English in names in certain contexts, with Lingua Societatis, which will permit the use of other modern languages in certain contexts. Commentary raised many excellent questions about the intent and scope of the proposed rules. Accordingly, we are directing Palimpsest to revise the proposal with the following questions in mind.

The draft rules proposed allowing submitters to use either the language of their country of residence or the language of their country of citizenship and required a letter of attestation to prove country of citizenship. Commentary was mixed about the value of Lingua Societatis for country of citizenship and skeptical of the need for elaborate attestations. We ask Palimpsest to focus on country of residence in the revised proposal.

Commenters also raised important questions about grammar for bynames using SCA branch names. The current Branch Name Allowance allows the use of registered branch names in their exact form, together with the English word "of". However, some modern languages, such as Finnish, typically render locatives in an inflected form. We ask Palimpsest to propose Lingua Societatis rules and examples that take this linguistic difference into account.

From Pelican: Changes to SENA PN.3.C

The Palimpsest February 10 Rules Letter proposed multiple changes to the personal name conflict rules in SENA PN.3.C. We are approving those changes, with the addition of some examples. We hereby direct Palimpsest to propose parallel changes to the non-personal name conflict rules.

Proposed Text

C. Standards for Identity Conflict: To be clear of identity conflict, two names must be substantially different in both sound and appearance. Because conflict is a modern concept, we consider matters such as meaning, language, etymological origin, etc. to be irrelevant for conflict. Only sound and appearance are considered for difference. Thus, the Latinized form of a name may be clear of conflict with the vernacular form. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

To be substantially different, a pair of names must meet at least one standard for substantial difference in sound and at least one standard for substantial difference in appearance, as described below. Names may be different in sound under one standard and appearance under another standard. Names are compared as complete items, so that *Lisa Betta Gonzaga* conflicts with *Lisabetta Gonzaga*, although the elements are different.

Analyzing substantial changes in sound often requires counting sound changes. Under these standards, a single sound is defined as a consonant sound, vowel sound, or diphthong (two vowels combined in a single syllable).

For example, the English given name *Ann* has two sounds: the vowel sound represented by 'A', and the consonant 'n'. For example, in the classical Roman name *Gaius*, the 'a' and the 'i' combine to form a diphthong that has the same sound as the vowel in the English word *my*. Thus, the name *Gaius* has four sounds: the consonant represented by 'G', the diphthong 'ai', the vowel 'u', and the consonant 's'.

A change to appearance involves the insertion, deletion, or substitution of a letter or space. Changes to accents and punctuation do not contribute to substantial changes in appearance. Changes between upper- and lowercase also do not contribute to substantial changes in appearance.

Insert/Delete Version

C. Standards for Identity Conflict: To be clear of identity conflict, two names must be substantially different in both sound and appearance. Because conflict is a modern concept, we consider matters such as meaning, language, etymological origin, etc. to be irrelevant for conflict. Only sound and appearance are considered for difference. Thus, the Latinized form of a name may be clear of conflict with the vernacular form. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

To be substantially different, a pair of names must meet at least one standard for substantial difference in sound and at least one standard for substantial difference in appearance, as described below. Names may be different in sound under one standard and appearance under another standard. Names are compared as complete items, so that *Lisa Betta Gonzaga* conflicts with *Lisabetta Gonzaga*, although the elements are different.

Analyzing substantial changes in sound often requires counting sound changes. Under these standards, a single sound is defined as a consonant sound, vowel sound, or diphthong (two vowels combined in a single syllable).

For example, the English given name *Ann* has two sounds: the vowel sound represented by 'A', and the consonant 'n'. For example, in the classical Roman name *Gaius*, the 'a' and the 'i' combine to form a diphthong that has the same sound as the vowel in the English word *my*. Thus, the name *Gaius* has four sounds: the consonant represented by 'G', the diphthong 'ai', the vowel 'u', and the consonant 's'.

A change to appearance involves the insertion, deletion, or substitution of a letter or space. Changes to accents and punctuation do not contribute to substantial changes in appearance. Changes between upper- and lowercase also do not contribute to substantial changes in appearance.

Proposed Text

1. Changes to the Sound of Two Syllables: Names are substantially different in sound if changes in sound affect at least two syllables (including adding, removing, or reordering them). If the changes only affect adjacent sounds, they must affect more than two sounds to be considered under this allowance. Changes to any part of the name count, including articles and prepositions.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to changes in more than one syllable. *Richard Wainham* is substantially different in sound from *Richard Warman*, because two syllables have changes to them. Similarly, the name *Alana Red* is substantially different in sound from *Elena Reed*, because at least two syllables change in sound. Note that the changes to the first and second vowels are not adjacent, because they are separated by the consonant sound 'l'.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to changes that include adding or removing syllables. *Maria le Smyth* is substantially different in sound from *Marian Smith*, because the second name removes one syllable and changes the sound of another. Similarly, *John de Aston* is substantially different in sound from *John Asson*, because the second name removes one syllable and changes the sound of another. *Anne Jones London* is substantially different in sound from *Anne Joan of London*, because the second name changes the sound of one syllable and adds another. *William Undertheliff* is substantially different in sound from *William Cliff*, because the second name removes three syllables. *Margaret atte Mor* is substantially different in sound from *Margaret de la Mor*, because the change in prepositions affects the sound of two syllables. The name *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in sound from *Margot du Bois*, because both syllables in the byname have changed. Note that the change in the vowel from *de* to *du* is not adjacent to the removal of the 'l' from *Blois*, because these sounds are separated by the 'B' consonant sound.

For example, here are some pairs of names that are not substantially different in sound under this rule. The name *Andrew Anser* is not substantially different from the name *Andrew Aster*. The change from the 'n' to the 's' sound and the change from the 's' to the 't' sound are directly adjacent, so although these changes are in two different syllables, they are not enough to clear conflict. Similarly, the name *Kathrin Tricker* is not substantially different from the name *Catlin Tricker*. Again, the change from the 'th' sound to the 't' sound and the change from the 'r' sound to the 'l' sound are directly adjacent; moreover, the letters 'K' and 'C' represent the same sound.

Insert/Delete Version

1. Changes to the Sound of Two Syllables: Names are substantially different in sound if changes in sound ~~and appearance~~ affect at least two syllables (including adding, removing, or reordering them). If the changes only affect adjacent ~~letters or sounds~~, they must affect more than two ~~letters or sounds~~ to be considered under this allowance. ~~Change in spacing is a change in appearance, but is not considered a change in sound.~~ Changes to any part of the name count, including articles and prepositions.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to changes in more than one syllable. *Richard Wainham* is substantially different in sound from *Richard Warman*, because two syllables have changes to them. Similarly, the name *Alana Red* is substantially different in sound from *Elena Reed*, because at least two syllables change in ~~both sound and appearance.~~ sound. Note that the changes to the first and second vowels are not adjacent, because they are separated by the consonant sound 'l'.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to changes that include adding or removing syllables. *Maria le Smyth* is substantially different in sound from *Marian Smith* ~~is substantially different from Miriam Smith, because it,~~ because the second name removes one syllable and changes ~~another in both sound and appearance.~~ *Richard Loudeham* is substantially different from *Richard Loveman*, because two syllables have ~~changes to them.~~ the sound of another. Similarly, *John de Aston* is substantially different in sound from *John Asson*, because the second name removes one syllable and changes the sound of another. *Anne Jones London* is substantially different in sound from *Anne Joan of London*, because ~~it changes the second name~~ changes the sound of one syllable in both sound and appearance and removes and adds another. *John de Aston* is substantially different from *John Asson*, because ~~it adds one syllable and changes another in both sound and appearance.~~ *William Underthecliff* is substantially different in sound from *William Cliff*, because ~~it adds the second name~~ removes three syllables. *Margaret atte Mor* is substantially different in sound from *Margaret de la Mor*; ~~because it changes,~~ because the change in prepositions affects the sound of two syllables. The name *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in sound from *Margot du Bois*, because both syllables in ~~both sound and appearance.~~ the byname have changed. Note that the change in the vowel from *de* to *du* is not adjacent to the removal of the 'l' from *Blois*, because these sounds are separated by the 'B' consonant sound.

For example, here are some pairs of names that are not substantially different in sound under this rule. The name *Andrew Anser* is not substantially different from the name *Andrew Aster*. The change from the 'n' to the 's' sound and the change from the 's' to the 't' sound are directly adjacent, so although these changes are in two different syllables, they are not enough to clear conflict. Similarly, the name *Kathrin Tricker* is not substantially different from the name *Catlin Tricker*. Again, the change from the 'th' sound to the 't' sound and the change from the 'r' sound to the 'l' sound are directly adjacent; moreover, the letters 'K' and 'C' represent the same sound.

Proposed Text

2. Substantial Change to the Sound of One Syllable: Names are substantially different in sound if a single syllable between them (excluding articles and prepositions, such as *de* and *the*) is changed in sound as described here. The addition or removal of a syllable makes two names substantially different in sound. Two names are also substantially different in sound if the sound of a syllable is substantially changed in one of the following ways. If a vowel and the consonant or group of consonants on one side of this vowel is different between the two names, we consider a syllable to be substantially changed. When the sounds of the consonant or group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are completely different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, both *Maria Smith* and *Marian Smith* are substantially different in sound from either *Mary Smyth* or *Marie Smyth*: *Maria* and *Marian* both have three syllables, while *Mary* and *Marie* have only two syllables, so in each case the number of syllables in the name is changed. Likewise, *Phillip Hollins* is substantially different in sound from *Phillip Hollinshead*, because the bynames have different numbers of syllables. Similarly, *Dorrian Brady* is substantially different in sound from *Dorrian O Brady*: the bynames have different numbers of syllables, and the relationship marker *O* is neither an article nor a preposition.

For example, *Connor MacRobert* is substantially different in sound from *Conan MacRobert* or *Conall MacRobert*, because the vowel and the final consonants of the second syllable of the given names are different in each case. For example, *William Dulford* is substantially different in sound from *William Mutford*, as the consonants on both sides of the vowel in the first syllable of the byname have been changed. Likewise, *Mary Catford* is substantially different in sound from *Mary Radford*, and *Godric of London* is substantially different in sound from *Godwin of London*.

For example, *Brian mac Duinn* is not substantially different in sound from *Brian mac Cuinn*, because only one group of consonants in the final syllable of the byname has been changed. (In this case, the group consists of a single consonant.) *Margerie Clutter* is not substantially different in sound from *Margery Catter*, because the given names sound identical and, although the first syllables of the bynames are different, the *cl* and *c* groups of consonants share a sound and the other consonant group is identical. *Lucas Smith* is not significantly different in sound from *Lucas le Smyth*. The only difference in sound is contributed by the word *le*, which is an article translating as "the" and thus cannot contribute difference under this rule. *Mary Jones* is not substantially different in sound from *Marie Jones*. While the most common modern pronunciation of the given names uses different vowel sounds for the first syllables of the given names and breaks the syllables in different places, one important late period and modern pronunciation makes both names the same (as MA-ree). Thus they conflict. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

Insert/Delete Version

2. Substantial Change to the Sound of One Syllable: Names are substantially different in sound if a single syllable between them (excluding articles and prepositions, such as *de* and *the*) is changed in both sound and appearance sound as described here. The addition or removal of a syllable makes two names substantially different in sound. Two names are also substantially different in sound if the sound of a syllable is substantially changed in sound and appearance. This means that the one of the following ways. If a vowel and the consonant (or group of consonants) consonants on one side of the this vowel is different between the two names. In either case, the change in spelling (including addition or removal of letters) must affect at least two letters in that names, we consider a syllable to be substantial-substantially changed. When the sounds of the consonant or group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are completely different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, both *Maria Jones* and *Miriam Jones*~~*Smith*~~ and *Marian Smith* are substantially different in sound from either *Mary Jones*~~*Smyth*~~ or *Marie Jones*~~*Smyth*~~: *Maria* and *Marian* both have three syllables, while *Mary* and *Marie* have only two syllables, so in each case the number of syllables in the name is changed. Likewise, *Phillip Hollins* is substantially different in sound from *Phillip Hollinshead*, because ~~those~~ the bynames have different numbers of syllables. Similarly, *Dorrian Brady* is substantially different in sound from *Dorrian O Brady*: the bynames have different numbers of syllables, and the relationship marker *O* is neither an article nor a preposition.

For example, *Connor MacRobert* is substantially different in sound from *Conan MacRobert* or *Conall MacRobert*, because the vowel and the final consonants of the second syllable of the given names ~~add a syllable~~. ~~*Miriam Jones* is also substantially different in appearance from~~ are different in each case. For example, *William Dulford* is substantially different in sound from *William Mutford*, as the consonants on both sides of the vowel in the first syllable of the byname have been changed. Likewise, ~~*Mary Jones* and *Marie Jones*~~. However, *Maria*

~~Jones~~Catford is substantially different in sound from Mary Radford, and Godric of London is substantially different in sound from Godwin of London.

For example, *Brian mac Duinn* is not substantially different in ~~appearance from Marie Jones~~ sound from *Brian mac Cuinn*, because only one ~~letter is~~ group of consonants in the final syllable of the byname has been changed. Also, (In this case, the group consists of a single consonant.) *Margerie Clutter* is not substantially different in sound from *Margery Catter*, because the given names sound identical and, although the first syllables of the bynames are different, the *cl* and *c* groups of consonants share a sound and the other consonant group is identical. *Lucas Smith* is not significantly different in sound from *Lucas le Smyth*. The only difference in sound is contributed by the word *le*, which is an article translating as "the" and thus cannot contribute difference under this rule. *Mary Jones* is not substantially different in sound from *Marie Jones*. While the most common modern pronunciation of the given names is ~~different, uses different vowel sounds for the first syllables of the given names and breaks the syllables in different places,~~ one important late period and modern pronunciation makes both names the same (as MA-ree). Thus they conflict. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

New Text

3. Substantial Change to the Sound of a Single-Syllable Name Phrase: Two names with a comparable single-syllable name phrase are eligible for this rule. A pair of name phrases are said to be comparable if they both have the same position in the name, such as given name or first byname. Comparable single-syllable name phrases are generally substantially different in sound if a group of adjacent vowels or of adjacent consonants within a word are completely changed, so that it shares no sound in common. In rare cases, the sound may still be too similar for this rule to clear the conflict. On a case by case basis, two-syllable name phrases may be eligible for this rule, such as *Harry* and *Mary*.

For example, *John Smith* is substantially different in sound from *Jane Smith*. *Anne Best* is substantially different in sound from *Anne West*. *Ellen Lang* is substantially different in sound from *Ellen Long*. *James Ed* is substantially different in sound from *James Lead*. In each case, an adjacent group of vowels or consonants is completely changed in sound.

For example, *Emma Deth* is substantially different in sound from *Gemma Deth*. Although the given names both have two syllables, the change to the sound of the beginning of the names is enough to clear them under this rule.

For example, *Matthew Joan* is not substantially different in sound from *Matthew Jones* because the *n* and *nz* consonant groups share a sound. *Richard Blott* is not substantially different in sound from *Richard Lot* because the *bl* and *l* consonant groups share a sound. *Katerine de la Mar* is not substantially different in sound from *Katerine de la Mor* because they don't have comparable single-syllable name phrases and cannot use this rule.

Insert/Delete Version

3. Substantial Change ~~of~~ to the Sound of a Single-Syllable Name Phrase: Two names with a comparable single-syllable name phrase are eligible for this rule. A pair of name phrases are said to be comparable if they both have the same position in the name, such as given name or first byname. Comparable single-syllable name phrases are generally substantially different in sound if a group of adjacent vowels or of adjacent consonants within a word are completely changed, so that it shares no sound in common. In rare cases, the sound may still be too similar for this rule to clear the conflict. ~~The change of a single letter is sufficient for two eligible name phrases to be different in appearance, as such name phrases are quite short.~~ On a case by case basis, two-syllable names name phrases may be eligible for this rule, such as *Harry* and *Mary*.

For example, *John Smith* is substantially different in sound from *Jane Smith*. *Anne Best* is substantially different in sound from *Anne West*. *Ellen Lang* is substantially different in sound from *Ellen Long*. *James Ed* is substantially different in sound from *James Lead*. In each case, an adjacent group of vowels or consonants is completely changed in ~~sound and appearance~~ sound.

For example, *Ema Deth* is substantially different in sound from *Gemma Deth*. Although the given names both have two syllables, the change to the sound of the beginning of the names is enough to clear them under this rule.

For example, *Matthew Joan* is not substantially different in sound from *Matthew Jones* because the *n* and *nz* consonant groups share a sound and a letter sound. *Richard Blott* is not substantially different in sound from *Richard Lot* because the *bl* and *l* group consonant groups share a sound and a letter sound. *Katerine de la Mar* is not substantially different in sound from *Katerine de la Mor* because they don't have comparable single-syllable name phrases and cannot use this rule.

New Text

4. Changes to the Appearance of Multiple Letters

If a change in spelling (including addition or removal of letters and insertion or deletion of spaces) affects at least two letters or spaces, a name is substantially different in appearance.

For example, *Miriam Jones* is substantially different in appearance from both *Mary Jones* and *Marie Jones*. *Harry Jones* is also different from *Mary Jones*, because the first letter has been changed and another letter has been removed. However, *Maria Jones* is not substantially different in appearance from *Marie Jones*, because only one letter is changed.

For example, *Colin L'Estrange* is not substantially different in appearance from *Colin Lestrangle*: the insertion of the apostrophe does not contribute to substantial difference, and no letters have been changed. The Norse names *Sleitu-Einarr* and *Sléttu-Steinarr* are substantially different from each other in appearance, but *Sleitu-Einarr* is not substantially different in appearance from *Sléttu-Einarr*, because the accent change does not contribute to difference, and thus only one letter has been changed.

New Text

5. Substantial Change to the Appearance of a Short Name Phrase

Two names with a comparable one-word name phrase are eligible for this rule. A pair of name phrases are said to be comparable if they both have the same position in the name, such as given name or first byname. Changing one letter in words that both have four or fewer letters suffices for substantial difference in appearance. On a case by case basis, changes to the beginning of longer words, such as *Harry* and *Larry*, may also be eligible for this rule.

For example, *Noe Wariner* and *Joe Wariner* are substantially different in appearance, because we have changed one letter in a three-letter given name. However, *Amice de Bailly* is not substantially different in appearance from *Avice de Bailly*, because only one letter in a five-letter given name has changed. *Mary Jones* is not substantially different in appearance from *Marry Jones*, because one of the given names has more than four letters.

New Text

6. Examples of Personal Name Conflict Checks

Here are some examples of pairs of names that are clear of identity conflict.

For example, *Maria Smith* is substantially different in sound from *Mary Smyth* under PN.3.C.2, because the given names have different numbers of syllables. The name *Maria Smith* is substantially different in appearance from *Mary Smyth* under PN.3.C.4, because two or more letters (in this case, two letters in the given name and one in the byname) have been inserted, deleted, or changed. Thus, *Maria Smith* and *Mary Smyth* are clear of identity conflict.

For example, *Anne Best* is substantially different in sound from *Anne West* under PN.3.C.3, because the bynames are single syllables and an entire consonant group has been changed. The name *Anne Best* is substantially different in appearance from *Anne West* under PN.3.C.5, because one letter in a four-word byname has changed. Thus, *Anne Best* and *Anne West* are clear of identity conflict.

Here are some examples of pairs of names that have an identity conflict.

For example, *Richard Blott* has an identity conflict with *Richard Lot*. *Richard Blott* is not substantially different in sound from *Richard Lot* under PN.3.C.1 because only one syllable has been changed, and thus the rule does not apply. *Richard Blott* is not substantially different in sound from *Richard Lot* under PN.3.C.2 or PN.3.C.3 because the *bl* and *l* consonant groups share a sound, and thus no consonant group has been completely changed. Because the names are not substantially different in sound under any rule, they have an identity conflict. As it happens, the names have a substantial difference in appearance under PN.3.C.4, because in changing from *Blott* to *Lot* two letters are deleted. However, because the names are not substantially different in sound *and* appearance, they are in conflict.

For example, *Hilaris de la Barre* has an identity conflict with *Hilaria de la Barre*. The names happen to be substantially different in sound under PN.3.C.2, because the given names have different numbers of syllables. However, *Hilaris de la Barre* is not substantially different in appearance from *Hilaria de la Barre* under PN.3.C.4, because only one letter is changed. *Hilaris de la Barre* is not substantially different from *Hilaria de la Barre* under PN.3.C.5, because the rule does not apply: the given names both have more than four letters, the change to the given names does not appear at the beginning of the names, and the bynames are identical. Because the names are not substantially different in sound *and* appearance, they are in conflict.

Society Pages

On June 9, 2018, at Known World Heraldic and Scribal Symposium, Malcolm Brigantia created Yehuda ben Moshe, most recently Blue Tyger Herald, a Herald Extraordinary for his extensive work for the East Kingdom and the Society.

Send What to Whom

Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera are to be posted to the OSCAR online system. No paper copies need be sent. All submission forms plus documentation, including petitions, must be posted to the OSCAR online system. While black-and-white emblazons must be included in the Letter of Intent, only colored armory forms need to be posted in the forms area.

Cheques or money orders for submissions, payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms" are to be sent to Stephanie Ray-Solum, Blue Bug Bookkeeping, 2144 Westlake Ave. North Suite F Seattle, WA 98109.

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". The electronic copy of the LoAR is available free of charge. To subscribe to the mailings of the electronic copy, please see the bottom of <http://heraldry.sca.org/heraldry/lists.html#lists> for more instructions.

For all administrative matters, please contact Laurel.

Scheduling

Items listed below in square brackets have not been scheduled yet. For information about future scheduling, please review the status table located on the Web at <http://oscar.sca.org/index.php?action=137>.

The May Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, May 6, 2018 and the Wreath meeting held on Sunday, May 13, 2018. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Calontir (06 Feb, 2018), Palimpsest Rules Letter (10 Feb, 2018), Middle (13 Feb, 2018), West (15 Feb, 2018), Æthelmearc (17 Feb, 2018), An Tir (20 Feb, 2018), Atenveldt (20 Feb, 2018), Palimpsest Other Letter (23 Feb, 2018), Ealdormere (25 Feb, 2018), Atlantia (27 Feb, 2018), Lochac (27 Feb, 2018), Ansteorra (28 Feb, 2018), Artemisia (28 Feb, 2018), Drachenwald (28 Feb, 2018), East (28 Feb, 2018), Meridies (28 Feb, 2018), Northshield (28 Feb, 2018), Outlands (28 Feb, 2018), and Palimpsest Rules Letter (01 Mar, 2018). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Monday, April 30, 2018.**

The June Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, June 17, 2018 and KWHSS and the Wreath meeting held on Sunday, June 3, 2018 and KWHSS. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Gleann Abhann (06 Mar, 2018), Ansteorra (09 Mar, 2018), Calontir (09 Mar, 2018), Æthelmearc (12 Mar, 2018), An Tir (18 Mar, 2018), Atlantia (23 Mar, 2018), Ealdormere (24 Mar, 2018), Lochac (24 Mar, 2018), Atenveldt (25 Mar, 2018), Middle (28 Mar, 2018), Caid (29 Mar, 2018), Laurel (29 Mar, 2018), Drachenwald (30 Mar, 2018), Outlands (30 Mar, 2018), West (30 Mar, 2018), Artemisia (31 Mar, 2018), Avacal (31 Mar, 2018), East (31 Mar, 2018), Laurel LoPaD (31 Mar, 2018), Meridies (31 Mar, 2018), and Northshield (31 Mar, 2018). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Thursday, May 31, 2018.**

The July Laurel decisions will be made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, July 22, 2018 and the Wreath meeting held on Sunday, July 15, 2018. These meetings will consider the following letters of intent: Calontir (08 Apr, 2018), Æthelmearc (11 Apr, 2018), An Tir (15 Apr, 2018), Caid (24 Apr, 2018), Ealdormere (24 Apr, 2018), West (24 Apr, 2018), Atenveldt (25 Apr, 2018), Avacal (25 Apr, 2018), Lochac (26 Apr, 2018), Artemisia (28 Apr, 2018), Atlantia (29 Apr, 2018), Ansteorra (30 Apr, 2018), Drachenwald (30 Apr, 2018), East (30 Apr, 2018), Gleann Abhann (30 Apr, 2018), Laurel LoPaD (30 Apr, 2018), Middle (30 Apr, 2018), Outlands (30 Apr, 2018), and Trimaris (30 Apr, 2018). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should be entered into OSCAR by Saturday, June 30, 2018.**

Not all letters of intent may be considered when they are originally scheduled on this cover letter. The date of posting 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.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Juliana de Luna
Laurel Queen of Arms