

Society for Creative Anachronism
College of Arms
601 S Washington #137
Stillwater, OK 74074
+1 405 428 3662
laurel@heraldry.sca.org

For the December 2020 meetings, printed February 3, 2021

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from Emma Laurel, Elisabetta Pelican, and Oddr Wreath, greetings.

From Laurel: Greetings Once Again!

It's a new year, and a new Laurel. My thanks to my predecessor, Mistress Juliana de Luna, for all her hard work; we've worked together for many years, first as Wreath to her Pelican, and then as postmeeting clerk to her Laurel, and many little projects inbetween. She's long been a valuable source of advice, and I look forward to continuing to work with her. She's also graciously agreed to continue as my drop-dead deputy. I know she already has many ideas and plans for things to do now that she has a bit more time!

I look forward to working with all of you as well -- the other Sovereigns and the rest of the Laurel staff, Principal Heralds, and all you wonderful folks in the College of Arms. As always, we have plenty of projects in the works, such as the current virtual consult table that's ongoing as I write this! If nothing else, the current pandemic has made us all more adept at virtual online meetings, and I'll likely be holding regular virtual office hours soon. Regardless, please feel free to reach out to me at any time!

From Laurel: Known World Heraldic and Scribal Symposiums

We've just finished our first mid-year (plague edition) KWHSS, held entirely virtually and practically around the clock. With over fifty classes and teachers and attendees from all around the Known World, the event was so successful we've decided to make it an ongoing tradition. Next January, dates still to be announced, will see our second mid-year vKWHSS -- the 'v' is for Virtual! Many thanks to the event staff Alexandra Vazquez de Granada from Calontir, Sara al-Garnatiyya from Meridies, Groza Novgorodskaia from Gleann Abhann, and the many volunteer moderators for a fantastic event.

Typically at each regular KWHSS we announce where the next year's KWHSS will be held. This past year presented its own challenges, and while we do see the glimmer of a return to normalcy in the future, it seems best to err on the side of caution for the 2021 KWHSS. Therefore, this summer's KWHSS, sponsored by the Kingdom of the West, will also be held virtually, on the weekend of July 9-11. As with Lochac, we do commit to a near-future KWHSS in-person in the West when circumstances permit. Expect more details of this year's KWHSS soon!

From Wreath: On the Contrast Requirements of Augmentations of Arms

We recently asked for discussion about contrast requirements for augmentations.

The item in question presented an overall canton which had poor contrast with the field. Nevertheless, the majority of the canton's perimeter had good contrast, since it was over a wide, good-contrast bordure. However, if the canton had good contrast with the field, it would be forced to have poor contrast with the bordure, hindering overall visibility. There was, ultimately, no winning situation: either it was SENA-legal and *poor* contrast overall (undermining the tincture requirements of Core Style), or it was contrary to SENA, yet visibly *good* contrast (supporting those same tincture requirements).

Commenters were asked to consider whether we should relax SENA's contrast requirements for augmentations and, if so, what limits if any should be imposed. Period evidence illustrating contrast in cases like this was sought, and a number of examples were identified by Iago Coquille.

A late 16th century English armorial manuscript, *University of Victoria Library Ms. Brown. Eng. 2*, offered several examples of cantons (presumably augmentations) and one escutcheon of pretense, with low contrast. In its sole example of a canton surmounting a bordure, the canton has good contrast with the field but generally overlays low contrast elements.

- *Argent, a cross sable and a canton ermine*
- *Or, two bars gules and on a canton argent an escallop sable*
- *Or, a bend gules, and on a canton argent two bars and issuant from the chiefmost bar a demi-wolf sable*
- *Or, a chevron gules and a canton ermine*
- *Argent, fretty gules and overall a canton ermine*
- *Or, fretty gules and overall on a canton per pale ermine and Or a ship sable*
- *Or, three (four?) roundels azure and a canton ermine*
- *Argent, fretty gules a bordure engrailed sable, overall on a canton gules a lion passant Or*
- *Argent, a cross flory sable, in canton an inescutcheon Or chevronelly gules*

From a Belgian armorial dating to the 1st half of the 15th century (Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, *ms. II 6570*).

- *Azure, two (three?) fleurs-de-lys argent, overall on a canton gules a lion argent*
- *Azure, three fleurs-de-lys argent, overall on an inescutcheon gules three fleurs-de-lys argent*
- *Argent, in cross five escallops gules, overall on a canton Or an inescutcheon [...] the canton surmounted by a bend component argent and gules*
- *Or, on a saltire gules an inescutcheon gules charged with two (three?) lion's sable*

... as well as several others.

In addition, Porfinn Hund also provided the example of the arms of Thomas Howard, 2nd Duke of Norfolk, augmented for his services at the Battle of Flodden, 1513: *Gules, on a bend between six crosses-crosslet fitchy argent an escutcheon Or charged with a demi-lion pierced through the mouth by an arrow within a double tressure flory counterflory gules.*

Given this support, we are relaxing the contrast requirements for augmentations of arms, permitting charged cantons and inescutcheons of pretense to have poor contrast with whatever they happen to overlay, whether the field or another charge, provided identifiability is maintained. Despite the example provided of an entirely no-contrast case, we choose at this time not to relax the contrast requirements to that extent.

From Wreath: On *Oriental*, Part 2

In the November 2020 Cover Letter we announced the first in a series of reblazons to remove the term *Oriental*. We continue this month.

- The single instance of an *Oriental griffin* is just a *griffin*. There were no distinguishing characteristics to this charge.
- The single instance of an *Oriental bat* is just a *bat*. There were no distinguishing characteristics to this charge.
- The single instance of an *Oriental sea-dog* is just a *sea-lion*. The emblazon and the note in the O&A make it clear that this monster is based on the stylized stone lions found throughout East Asia, replacing the hindquarters with a fish tail. It is worth taking this moment to remind all that a *sea-dog* is a quadruped, unlike the *sea-wolf* or the *sea-lion* which are fish-tailed.
- The thirty instances of *Oriental dragons* are reblazoned as *East Asian dragons*. We continue to specify the variant due to the serpentine body and lack of wings.

No other instances of *Oriental* exist in the blazon of non-obsolete armory.

From Wreath: On Ordinaries of Chain

This month we were asked to consider potential conflict between a *saltire of chain* and a *saltire*.

Saltires of chain are not new to Society armory, but notably appear in period armory such as the arms of Benini, *Or, a saltire of chain gules* found in *Insignia Florentinorum*, BSB Cod.icon. 277, f.26r. (https://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00001424/image_59), and the arms of Castiglionchio, *Argent, a saltire of chain azure*, from *Priorista, ou catal. des prieurs de Florence, par famille, avec les armoiries*, Bibliothèque municipale de Auxerre 103, c 1535 Italian (<https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/iiif/23901/canvas/canvas-2377439/view>), f. 91v, and other saltires of chain are borne by Alberti, Benci, Fantoni, Tegna, Volognano, and Zati.

In addition, multiple chains bendwise (i.e. *bendlets of chain*) can be found in the arms of Bancozzo, Centinaia, Gerini, and Tizzoni. Giamboni bears *Argent, a cross of chain sable between four mullets Or*. Canacci bears *Gules, a pall of chain sable*, sometimes with a dog's head in chief.

In none of these cases is there any evidence of families of the same name bearing plain ordinaries instead.

Aside from *Insignia Florentinorum*, sources for the above include:

- Florentine Priorista, c. 1530 Italian (Chicago, Newberry VAULT Case MS folio J 035 .714) (https://collections.carli.illinois.edu/digital/collection/nby_dig/id/21753)
- Priorista, ou catal. des prieurs de Florence, par famille, avec les armoiries, c 1535 Italian (Auxerre, Bibliothèque municipale, 103) (<http://medium-avance.irht.cnrs.fr/ark:/63955/md311n79h689>)
- The Priori of Florence, c. 1583-1595 Italian (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, Banco rari. 22-23) (<https://teca.bncf.firenze.sbn.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=BNCF00004585787>, <https://teca.bncf.firenze.sbn.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=BNCF00004585788>)

Thanks are due Iago Coquille for the citations above.

Given this and the cited evidence of charges of chain generally, we consider there to be an SC between an ordinary and an ordinary of chain.

From Wreath: On Monster Parts

Our typical practice when blazoning body parts has been to decline to blazon a body part as that of a monster when we could as well blazon it as part of a normal beast. However, period blazon practices do support naming the part for a monster.

Arms found in *Armorial lorrain de la première moitié du XVIe siècle*, 1496-1543 French (Paris, BnF, ms. Français 18649), p. 55, which are blazoned as *D'argent, a deux pattes de gryphon de gueules, armées de sable, et contregriffée, au chef d'azur et une estoille d'or* (*Argent, two gryphon's paws gules, claws to center sable, on a chief azure an estoille Or*) clearly reference the paws of the gryphon as a charge, though the emblazon is indistinguishable from the jambes of any standard eagle.

In addition, a 1605 edition of Siebmacher that includes blazons, found at <https://books.google.ca/books?id=GQdnAAAACAAJ>, for die im Staal, blazons a bird-like jambe as *der Greiffenfuß* (*griffin foot*), and for Villach, blazons a similar jambe as *der Greiffenbein* (*griffin leg*).

Based on this, we will consider reasonable requests for blazoning the body parts of monsters, rather than strictly using the term for the non-monstrous beast's part. This is a blazon practice only, and does not affect conflict.

Our thanks to Iago Coquille for finding these examples.

From Wreath: On Spears and Tinctures

Over the years we have been inconsistent in how we treat spears whose steels (heads) and hafts have different tinctures for purposes of conflict and contrast. In some cases they have been treated like axes, taking their main tincture from the steel. In other cases, they have been treated like arrows, taking their main tincture from the haft. The way they have been categorized in the O&A has also varied, with some categorized based on the tincture of the steel and others on the tincture of the haft.

To clarify the issue of tincture:

- Long, skinny charges, such as arrows, spears, and javelins, take their tincture from the haft. The haft tincture should be blazoned first when it differs from the tincture of the steel or head. The steel needs some contrast, but not necessarily good contrast, with the field.
- Charges with large or broad heads, such as axes, take their tincture from the blade. The blade or head tincture should be blazoned first when it differs from the tincture of the handle. The handle needs some contrast, but not necessarily good contrast, with the field.

A *spear proper* has a brown (wooden) haft and a sable steel. A *spear proper steeled argent* has a brown haft and an argent steel; it is considered color for contrast purposes. A *spear argent steeled sable* has an argent haft and a sable steel; it is considered metal for contrast purposes. *Steeled* is the period term used in period blazon for the head. For example, when granted William Shakespeare's arms were blazoned as "a Speare of the first [i.e., Or] steeled argent".

The seven instances of spears that do not meet these standards are reblazoned on this LoAR. We have not reblazoned armory where the only change would mutate *headed* to *steeled*; however, if submitters prefer the latter term they may request a reblazon.

We thank Jeanne Marie Palimpsest and Bruce Batonvert for their work in researching this matter.

From Wreath: Kudos

I have a strong dislike of heraldic myth, and those who eagerly await these letters may have noticed a level of activity in the Wreath office the past six months, centered around long-held beliefs about period armorial design and how the Society emulates it: A number of long-standing precedents have been altered if not outright torn asunder.

Changes of this nature do not happen without work, and there are several in the College who have contributed at various levels, from research to hard discussions about how the research can (or should) affect our practice. Those

who have followed along with the research have probably noticed one name in particular attached to the lion's share, as is appropriate for a herald of An Tir: Iago ab Adam, Coquille Pursuivant.

By exploring such matters as "Do we see birds displayed aside from eagles?", "What do flames actually look like?", and "What depictions of ermine spots can we attest?", he's helped remind us to question those answers given decades ago when we first established our ideas of what period armory was like, allowing us to better fulfill our charter.

While it is true that none of this would be possible without modern institutions busily scanning manuscripts for public consumption, it nevertheless requires someone to seek out these repositories and see what they find. And so we owe Iago some measure of thanks for doing exactly that, and for taking us along for the ride. We also thank him -- ahead of time -- for the rides he takes us on in the future. He's made it exciting for armorists in the Society.

From Pelican: Transliterations of Arabic Names

This month we were asked to consider the transliteration *A'isha*, which appears in "Period Arabic Names and Naming Practices (2nd edition)" by Da'ud ibn Auda along with several other transliterations of the same name. Since this article was published in 2003, academic work regarding the transliterations of Arabic names has improved. It was shown during the commentary process that *A'isha* was no longer an acceptable transliteration of its underlying name. Therefore, as of this Cover Letter, we will no longer register this transliteration.

Heralds are reminded that SENA Appendix D has the accepted transliterations for Arabic names (<http://heraldry.sca.org/sena.html#AppendixD>). As we find other transliterations that no longer meet this standard, we will slowly remove them from use on a case-by-case basis.

From Pelican: On Names of Nazi Camps

On the May 2020 Cover Letter, Alys Pelican discussed the offensiveness of explicit references to Nazis, and acknowledged that banning every place associated with Nazis would ban over a thousand place names from use. A letter was forthcoming from Juliana Laurel dated September 10, 2020, including 50 of these names for consideration. We wish to thank the efforts of all who took the time to provide thoughtful commentary on this particular issue, especially those in Drachenwald who live in or near these places and encounter them in their everyday lives.

As a result of this discussion, we are hereby banning the following names from being used in personal or non-personal names, effective as of this writing. This ban extends to all forms of these place names, regardless of language.

- Auschwitz, Poland
- Babi Yar, Ukraine
- Banjica, Serbia
- Bełżec, Poland
- Bergen-Belsen (Belsen), Germany
- Breitenau, Germany
- Buchenwald, Germany
- Chełmno (Kulmhof), Poland
- Dachau, Germany

- Drancy, France
- Flossenbürg, Germany
- Majdanek, Poland
- Marzahn, Germany
- Mauthausen (Mathausen-Gusen), Austria
- Mittelbau-Dora (Dora, Dora-Mittelbau, Nordhausen-Dora), Germany
- Natzweiler-Struthof (Struthof), France
- Neuengamme, Germany
- Płaszów, Poland
- Ravensbrück, Germany
- Rumbula, Latvia
- Sachsenhausen, Germany
- Sobibór, Poland
- Sztutowo (Stutthof), Poland
- Treblinka, Poland
- Westerbork, Netherlands

We remind heralds and submitters alike that the April 2020 Cover Letter allows submitters to request name changes that address offensiveness concerns free of charge (including both Laurel and kingdom charges).

The following names, while not banned, are recommended for use with caution. Heralds are reminded of the new updates to SENA NPN5B5 and SENA PN5B5 as published on the September 2020 Cover Letter regarding Offense by Association when considering names with these elements.

- Bernburg, Germany
- Bogdanovka, Ukraine
- Crveni Krst, Serbia
- Działowo (Soldau/Soldov), Poland
- Falstad, Norway
- Fossoli, Italy
- Grini, Norway
- Gross-Rosen (Rogoznica), Poland
- Hinzert, Germany

- Jägala, Estonia
- Janowska, formerly Poland, present-day Ukraine
- Kaiserwald (Me{zv}aparks), Latvia
- Kauen (Kovno), Lithuania
- Kaufering, Germany
- Klooga, Estonia
- Koldichevo, Belarus
- Mielec, Poland
- Niederhagen, Germany
- Vaivara, Estonia
- Wewelsburg, Germany

Accordingly, we direct Palimpsest to create Appendix N in SENA to house these two lists of names.

These lists are not intended to be exhaustive; five of the fifty proposed names purposefully do not appear on either list. Names that do not appear here may still be found offensive per SENA NPN5b or SENA PN5b. Names may also still be found offensive due to a combination of proposed name and armory.

We are indebted to Mistress Alys Mackyntoich for her work on researching the items that went onto this letter, as it would not have been possible otherwise.

From Pelican: Changes to the Sound of One Syllable

The Sept. 8 Palimpsest Rules Letter proposed changes to SENA PN3C2 and NPN3C2 that would allow changes to part of a consonant cluster to contribute difference to the sound of a name. We are approving these changes with the addition of further examples.

SENA PN3C2

New Rule

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 part of the group of consonants on one side of this vowel are different between the two names, we consider a syllable to be substantially changed. When the sounds of each consonant or part of each group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to addition or removal of one or more syllables. 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, *Dorrin*

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, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to appropriate changes to the sound of a single syllable. *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, *Margerie Clutter* is substantially different in sound from *Margery Catter*, because in the first syllable of the byname, the first group of consonants has changed from *cl* to *c* and the vowels are different. *Elyas Misson* is substantially different in sound from *Elyas Smithson*, because in the first syllable of the byname, the first group of consonants has changed from *sm* to *m* and the second consonant has changed from *s* to *th*.

For example, here are some names that are not substantially different in sound. *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.) *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

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 part of the group of consonants on one side of this vowel ~~is~~ are different between the two names, we consider a syllable to be substantially changed. When the sounds of ~~the each~~ each consonant or part of each group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are ~~completely~~ different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, ~~both here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to addition or removal of one or more syllables.~~ 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, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to appropriate changes to the sound of a single syllable. *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, *Margerie Clutter* is substantially different in sound from *Margery Catter*, because in the first syllable of the byname, the first group of consonants has changed from *cl* to *c* and the

vowels are different. *Elyas Misson* is substantially different in sound from *Elyas Smithson*, because in the first syllable of the byname, the first group of consonants has changed from *sm* to *m* and the second consonant has changed from *s* to *th*.

For example, here are some names that are not substantially different in sound. *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.

SENA PN3C6

New Rule

6. Examples of Personal Name Conflict Checks: Here are some examples of pairs of names that are clear of identity conflict.

For example, *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in sound from *Margot du Bois* under PN.3.C.1, because both syllables in the byname have changed. The name *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in appearance from *Margot du Bois* under PN.3.C.4, because two or more letters have been inserted, deleted, or changed. In this case, changing from *de Blois* to *du Bois* changes one letter and deletes a second letter. Thus, *Margot du Bois* and *Margot de Blois* 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-letter 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 because only one consonant group is changed. Moreover, the names are not substantially different in sound under PN.3.C.3 because the *bl* and *l* consonant groups share a sound, and thus the consonant group has not 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.

For example, *Gene Berrie* has an identity conflict with *Jean Berrie*. In a common modern pronunciation, the two names sound identical. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements. As it happens, the names have a substantial difference in appearance under both PN.3.C.4 and PN.3.C.5. However, because the names are not substantially different in sound and appearance, they are in conflict.

Insert/Delete Version

6. Examples of Personal Name Conflict Checks: Here are some examples of pairs of names that are clear of identity conflict.

For example, *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in sound from *Margot du Bois* under PN.3.C.1, because both syllables in the byname have changed. The name *Margot de Blois* is substantially different in appearance from *Margot du Bois* under PN.3.C.4, because two or more letters have been inserted, deleted, or changed. In this case, changing from *de Blois* to *du Bois* changes one letter and deletes a second letter. Thus, *Margot du Bois* and *Margot de Blois* 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~~ four-letter 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~~ because only one consonant group is changed. Moreover, the names are not substantially different in sound under PN.3.C.3 because the *bl* and *l* consonant groups share a sound, and thus ~~the~~ the consonant group has not 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.

For example, *Gene Berrie* has an identity conflict with *Jean Berrie*. In a common modern pronunciation, the two names sound identical. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements. As it happens, the names have a substantial difference in appearance under both PN.3.C.4 and PN.3.C.5. However, because the names are not substantially different in sound and appearance, they are in conflict.

NPN3C2

New Rule

2. Substantial Change to the Sound of One Syllable: Names are substantially different in sound if a single syllable in their substantive element (excluding articles, prepositions, and conjunctions, such as *de*, *the*, or *and*) 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 part of the group of consonants on one side of this vowel are different between the two names, we consider a syllable to be substantially changed. When the sounds of each consonant or part of each group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, the *Shire of Charford* is substantially different from *Shire of Northcharford*, as a syllable is removed. Similarly, *House of Charring* is substantially different from *House of Charring Cross*, as a syllable is removed.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to appropriate changes to the sound of a single syllable. *Canton of Caldbek* is substantially different in sound from *Canton of Caldwell*, because the consonants on each side of the vowel in the second syllable of the substantive elements are different. The branch name *Canton of Caldbek* is also significantly different in sound from *Barony of Birkbek*; in this case, the consonants on each side of the vowel and the vowel in the first syllable of the substantive element are different. *Northwood House* is substantially different in sound from *Southwood House*: comparing the syllables *North-* and *South-*, we see that the first consonant group is completely changed, as is the sound of the vowel. *Margerie Clutters Tavern* is substantially different in sound from *Margery Catters Tavern* because in the first syllable of the second word in the substantive element, the first group of consonants has changed from *cl* to *c* and the vowels are different.

For example, here are some names that are not substantially different in sound. *Caldwell Herald* is not substantially different in sound from *Coldwell Herald*; the change only affects the vowel sound of the first syllable. *The Green Band* is not substantially different in sound from *Green House*, because no change has been made to the substantive element *Green* (excluding *the*). Similarly, *Award of the White Cat* is not substantially different in sound from *Order of the Wyte Cat*, because the substantive elements *White Cat* and *Wyte Cat* sound identical.

Insert/Delete Version

2. Substantial Change to the Sound of One Syllable: Names are substantially different in sound if a single syllable in their substantive element (excluding articles, prepositions, and conjunctions, such as *de*, *the*, or *and*) 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 part of the group of consonants on one side of this vowel ~~is are completely different, different between the two names,~~ we consider a syllable to be substantially changed. When the sounds of ~~the each~~ consonant or part of each group of consonants on both sides of a vowel are ~~completely~~ different, we also consider the syllable to be substantially changed.

For example, the *Shire of Charford* is substantially different from *Shire of Northcharford*, as a syllable is removed. Similarly, *House of Charring* is substantially different from *House of Charring Cross*, as a syllable is removed.

For example, here are some names that are substantially different in sound due to appropriate changes to the sound of a single syllable. *Canton of Caldbek* is substantially different in sound from *Canton of Caldwell*, because the consonants on each side of the vowel in the second syllable of the substantive elements are different. The branch name *Canton of Caldbek* is also significantly different in sound from *Barony of Birkbek*; in this case, the consonants on each side of the vowel and the vowel in the first syllable of the substantive element are different. *Northwood House* is substantially different in sound from *Southwood House*: comparing the syllables *North-* and *South-*, we see that the first consonant group is completely changed, as is the sound of the vowel. ~~(The second consonant group in this syllable shares the *-th* sound, so cannot contribute difference under this rule.)~~ vowel. *Margerie Clutters Tavern* is substantially different in sound from *Margery Catters Tavern* because in the first syllable of the second word in the substantive element, the first group of consonants has changed from *cl* to *c* and the vowels are different.

For example, here are some names that are not substantially different in sound. *Caldwell Herald* is not substantially different in sound from *Coldwell Herald*; the change only affects the vowel sound of the first syllable. *The Green Band* is not substantially different in sound from *Green House*, because no change has been made to the substantive element *Green* (excluding *the*). Similarly, *Award of the White Cat* is not substantially different in sound from *Order of the Wyte Cat*, because the substantive elements *White Cat* and *Wyte Cat* sound identical.

Society Pages

Better late than never: On September 19, 2019, David B. Appleton (Da'ud ibn Auda, al-Jamal Herald, former Laurel King of Arms) was elected an Associate member of L'Académie Internationale d'Héraldique / The International Academy of Heraldry at its Colloquium held in Antwerp, Belgium. He was nominated by former Chief Herald of Canada Robert Watt at the suggestion of then-Chief Herald Claire Boudreau. Congratulations!

At the final Court of Their Majesties Alexander and Tahira of Caid on January 9, 2021, Mary Dedwydd verch Gwallter stepped up as Crescent Principal Herald, taking over from Ariana verch Gwellian.

At the same Court, Their Majesties of Caid invested Ariana verch Gwellian as a Baroness of Their Court.

Also at the same Court, Their Majesties of Caid offered Nikolaos Phaistios, a Silent Herald for the kingdom, elevation to the Order of the Pelican, which he accepted. He will be elevated at a date to be determined.

Also on January 9, 2021, Their Majesties Anton and Luned of Atlantia awarded Eldred Triton and Alisoun Metron Ariston augmentations of arms.

On January 23, 2021 at the Andalucia Court at the Alhambra, Their Majesties Anton and Luned elevated Estienne Le Mons d'Anjou, Sea Stag Herald to the Order of the Pelican.

Please send information about happenings to major heralds and major happenings to all heralds to Laurel, so that it can be published here.

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 Trent Le Clair, 928 Frazier Dr, Walla Walla WA 99362

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 December Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, December 13, 2020 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, December 5, 2020. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Lochac (01 Sep, 2020), Meridies (01 Sep, 2020), Middle (03 Sep, 2020), Palimpsest Rules Letter (08 Sep, 2020), An Tir (10 Sep, 2020), Laurel Other Letter (10 Sep, 2020), Trimaris (19 Sep, 2020), Avacal (23 Sep, 2020), Ealdormere (24 Sep, 2020), Calontir (25 Sep, 2020), Atlantia (28 Sep, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (28 Sep, 2020), West (28 Sep, 2020), Æthelmearc (29 Sep, 2020), Artemisia (29 Sep, 2020), Outlands (29 Sep, 2020), Ansteorra (30 Sep, 2020), Atenveldt (30 Sep, 2020), Caid (30 Sep, 2020), Drachenwald (30 Sep, 2020), East (30 Sep, 2020), Northshield (30 Sep, 2020), West Other Letter (30 Sep, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (21 Oct, 2020) (redraws). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Monday, November 30, 2020.**

The January Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, January 10, 2021 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, January 16, 2021. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Trimaris (01 Oct, 2020), Meridies (02 Oct, 2020), Calontir (04 Oct, 2020), An Tir (09 Oct, 2020), Palimpsest Other Letter (13 Oct, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (22 Oct, 2020), Ealdormere (24 Oct, 2020), Æthelmearc (26 Oct, 2020), Outlands (26 Oct, 2020), Atlantia (27 Oct, 2020), Avacal (28 Oct, 2020), Caid (29 Oct, 2020), Atenveldt (30 Oct, 2020), Ansteorra (31 Oct, 2020), Drachenwald (31 Oct, 2020), East (31 Oct, 2020), Northshield (31 Oct, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (05 Nov, 2020) (redraws), Laurel LoPaD (02 Dec, 2020) (redraws). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Thursday, December 31, 2020.**

The February Laurel decisions will be made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, February 7, 2021 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, February 6, 2021. These meetings will consider the following letters of intent: Meridies (01 Nov, 2020), Calontir (05 Nov, 2020), Middle (05 Nov, 2020), An Tir (09 Nov, 2020), West (17 Nov, 2020), Gleann Abhann (21 Nov, 2020), Ealdormere (24 Nov, 2020), Æthelmearc (27 Nov, 2020), Lochac (27 Nov, 2020), Avacal (28 Nov, 2020), Atlantia (29 Nov, 2020), Ansteorra (30 Nov, 2020), Drachenwald (30 Nov, 2020), East (30 Nov, 2020), Northshield (30 Nov, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (02 Jan, 2021) (redraws). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Sunday, January 31, 2021.**

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,

Emma de Fetherstan
Laurel Queen of Arms