

For the February 2003 meetings, printed May 27, 2003

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from François Laurel, Zenobia Wreath, and Mari Pelican, greetings.

The following is a table showing the status of Letters of Intent, Laurel Letters of Pend and Discussion, and Letters of Intent to Protect. The header rows are the dates of the meetings that will consider them, the dates when primary commentary is due, and the dates when responses to primary commentary are due. The key follows.

Wreath meeting	Feb 08	Mar 22 & 30	Apr 19 & 13	May 17	Jun 14 & 08	Jul 12	Aug 16?
Pelican meeting	Feb 08	Mar 22 & 12	Apr 26	May 17	Jun 21 & 08	Jul 19	Aug 23?&Pens.
Comment by					too late	May 31	Jun 30
Respond by					May 31	Jun 30	Jul 31
Letters of Intent being considered:							
Aethelmearc	Oct 22 [P Oct 30]	Nov 23	Dec 19	-	Feb 24	(Mar 24)	Apr 26
An Tir	Oct 30	Nov 29	Dec 27	Jan 27	Feb 25	(Mar 28)	(Apr 29)
Ansteorra	Oct 20 [P Oct 30]	-	Dec 18	Jan 19 [P Jan 27]	Feb 20	Mar 20	(Apr 21)
Artemisia	-	Nov 30	-	Jan 31	-	Mar 30	(Apr 30)
Atenveldt	Oct 20	-	Dec 20	Jan 20	Feb 15 [P Feb 26]	Mar 15	Apr 25
Atlantia	Oct 26 & Oct 27	-	Nov 24 & Dec 20	Jan 26	-	Mar 25	(Apr 26)
Caid	Oct 01 & Oct 25	-	Nov 10 [P Dec 03]	-	Feb 21	(Mar 01)	(Apr 20) & (Apr 30)
Calontir	Oct 16	Nov 13	-	-	-	Mar 19	Apr 24
Drachenwald	Oct 25	Nov 23	Dec 23	Jan 23	Feb 24	(Mar 25)	(Apr 25)
Ealdormere	-	Nov 22	-	Jan 31	(Feb 19)	-	(Apr 20 [P Apr 28])
East	Oct 27	-	Nov 24 & Dec 15	Jan 07 & Jan 23	Feb 23	-	Apr 06
Lochac	-	-	-	-	-	(Mar 25)	(Apr 15 [P Apr 28])
Meridies	-	Nov 30	Dec 31	Jan 31	Feb 28	Mar 31	Apr 30
Middle	Oct 14	Nov 11	Dec 14	Jan 15	Feb 17	Mar 24	Apr 07
Outlands	Oct 23	Nov 23	Dec 23	Jan 23	(Feb 23)	(Mar 23)	(Apr 28)
Trimaris	Oct 15	Nov 15	Dec 14	-	Feb 15	-	-
West	Oct 29	Nov 27	-	Jan 21	Feb 26	Mar 26	(Apr 22)
Laurel LoPaD [LoAR date]	-	Nov 14 [Aug LoAR]	Dec 18 [Sep LoAR]	Jan 31 [Nov LoAR]	Feb 27 [Dec LoAR]	-	Apr 21 [Jan LoAR]

Month day: the date on the Letter of Intent, Letter of Pend and Discussion, or Letter of Intent to Protect.

(Month day): for administrative reasons, this LoI has not yet been scheduled.

[P Month day]: postmarked on that bracketed date, so the LoI is redated or postponed.

"-": no LoI is scheduled for that meeting from that kingdom.

?: tentative.

March: Wreath's meeting occurred March 22, with a road-show meeting on March 30 at the Outlands' Heraldic Symposium.

April: Wreath's meeting occurred April 19, with a road-show meeting on April 13 at An Tir's Heraldic Symposium.

June: On June 8, there will be the usual Sunday-morning road-show meeting at Known World Heraldic Symposium, Saint Louis, Missouri, with all the sovereigns of arms. Pelican's regular meeting is scheduled for June 21. Wreath's regular meeting is scheduled for June 14.

August: Wreath's meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 16. Pelican's regular meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 23, and she will have a road-show meeting at Pennsic War.

September: Wreath's meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 13. Pelican's meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 26.

October: Wreath's meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 18. Pelican's meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 11.

November: Pelican's meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 15.

December: Pelican's meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 20.

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

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

From Laurel: Rules Change Proposal: Extension of RfS X.2 to Cover Substantial Changes to Posture as well as to Type

As noted in the January 2003 Cover Letter, our rule change proposals are supposed to address the following major dissatisfactions in the SCA populace, without further diverging from the period bases of our rules for submission:

1. People consider the rules to be too difficult or too complicated to use.
2. People find it difficult to register submissions in general, due to style and conflict constraints.
3. People find it difficult to register period-style submissions, due to style and conflict constraints.

RfS X.4 gives the codified cadency changes for armory: changes that indicate a father-son relationship. The first categories of RfS X.4 are well established cadency steps (X.4.a-e): changing the field, adding charges to the field, adding overall charges, changing the tincture of charges, and changing the type of charges. Changing the number of charges is less common (X.4.f) but is also fairly well established. Addition of, and changes to, charges on charges (X.4.i and j) are also quite common cadency methods.

This leaves X.4.g ("Arrangement Changes") and X.4.h ("Posture Changes") as cadency changes which are quite rare in period heraldry.

On doing research into these sorts of changes, it appears that when two pieces of armory differ only by a change in arrangement of the primary charges, both pieces of armory are often attributed to the same surname. This implies that the changes are either due to cadency or a less significant change (artistic/recording error or artistic variation). Thus, a CD for arrangement changes is appropriate. However, when two pieces of armory differ only by a substantial change in the posture of the primary charge group, the two pieces of armory are generally attributed to different surnames. This implies that the change is not generally due to cadency, but is usually due to a more significant change that would not be found as a result of a father-son relationship.

Certain types of changes not generally used for cadency, such as adding or removing a primary charge or substantially changing the type of the primary charge group, are already sufficient under X.1 and X.2 to clear a conflict. Therefore, we should consider extending X.2 to other changes that were not generally used as cadency steps.

Broadly speaking, there are three kinds of changes: changes which were effectively interchangeable, for which we give no difference; changes which would generally not have been used for cadency but are found in unrelated families, which should make two devices clear of conflict, as in X.1 and X.2; and changes which would have been used for cadency, for which we should give a CD. Certain postures seem to be interchangeable (such as statant and passant). We currently do not give difference under X.4 for these changes. Other changes, such as the change from rampant to passant, do not seem to have been generally used for cadency. There are many examples in the Dictionary of British Armorial (DBA) that indicate unrelated families are using arms that differ only in the change of posture of a beast from rampant to passant. For example: *Argent, a lion passant Gules* is attributed to Ogilvy and Querzeton, while a column and a half of *Argent, a lion Gules* includes no one with either surname; *Azure, a lion passant Or* is attributed to Liband, while a column of *Azure, a lion Or* includes no one of that surname; and *Gules, a boar passant argent* is attributed to Boor or Bore, while *Gules, a boar salient Argent collared and chained Or* is attributed to Eyre. In Scotland, *Argent, a lion passant Gules* is attributed to Ogilvy, while Dundas bears *Argent, a lion rampant Gules*. This implies that the change is not generally due to cadency, but is due to a more significant change that would not be found as a result of a father-son relationship. As such, such a change should be sufficient difference for two devices not to conflict.

Posture or orientation changes which turn charges to (or from) sinister have been considered different under X.4.h (and thus worth a CD) for some time, but would not be sufficient to remove the appearance of relatedness, and thus should not be a substantial change under any proposed change to RfS X.2.

Most changes to posture and orientation that currently are worth a CD would thus be sufficient for two pieces of armory to be clear under X.2. Changes to animal or bird posture, changes to orientation (palewise, fesswise, bendwise), and the inversion of objects would all be included under this rules change. Changes in whether charges face to dexter or to sinister would not, as this kind of change is not found primarily as a difference between unrelated families.

The proposal is thus to change RfS X.2 as follows:

Substantially Different Charges: Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the type, posture, or orientation of every primary charge is substantially changed. These types of changes were normally seen between complete strangers in blood, and were not usually used to indicate any form of cadency.

For purposes of this rule, simple armory is defined as armory that has no more than two types of charge directly on the field and has no overall charges.

The following examples are simple, with at most two types of charge on the field: *Argent, a fess sable. Sable, three lions Or. Vert, two eagles and a maunch argent. Vair, a bordure gules. Per pale gules and argent, a fess between three lozenges counterchanged. Or, on a chevron between three clarions gules, three garbs argent. Purple, on a pale dancetty within a bordure semé-de-lys argent, a millrind sable between two roses gules.*

The following examples are all non-simple, with more than two types of charges on the field, or with one or more overall charges: *Argent, a fess between two lions and a lozenge azure. Vert, a chevron between three swords, a bordure Or. Gules, a bend between two roundels argent, overall a lion Or. Per bend argent and sable, a bend gules between a tree and a cross crosslet counterchanged. Argent, a dragon sable, overall a bend gules.*

- a. Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the type of every primary charge is substantially changed.

Argent, a fess sable does not conflict with *Argent, a lion sable. Vert, two eagles and a maunch argent* does not conflict with *Vert, three lozenges argent. Azure, a fess between three cups Or* does not conflict with *Azure, a chevron between three cups Or*. In each case the designs are simple and the type of every primary charge has been substantially changed.

Per chevron gules and argent, three oak trees counterchanged does conflict with *Per chevron gules and argent, three fir trees counterchanged*, because the type of charge has not been substantially changed; they both conflict with *Per chevron gules and*

argent, two mullets and a fir tree counterchanged because not all of the primary charges have been substantially changed. *Vert, two mullets and a clarion argent within a bordure Or* conflicts with *Vert, three gauntlets argent within a bordure Or* because the first design is not simple, with three different types of charge on the field.

b. Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the posture or individual orientation of every primary charge is substantially changed.

Argent, a wolf rampant sable does not conflict with *Argent, a wolf passant sable*. *Gules, two lions passant and a pheon argent* does not conflict with *Gules, two lions couchant and a pheon inverted argent*. *Azure, a cup between three fleurs-de-lys Or* does not conflict with *Azure, a cup bendwise between three fleurs-de-lys Or*. In each case the designs are simple and the posture of every primary charge has been substantially changed.

Per chevron azure and Or, three lions rampant counterchanged does conflict with *Per chevron azure and Or, three lions rampant contourny counterchanged*, because the posture not been substantially changed; they both conflict with *Per chevron azure and Or, two lions passant and a lion rampant counterchanged* because the posture of all of the primary charges has not been substantially changed. *Vert, a lion and a unicorn combattant within a bordure Or* conflicts with *Vert, a lion and a unicorn passant respectant within a bordure Or* because the designs are not simple, with three different types of charge on the field.

This proposal appears to fit the criteria for rules changes mentioned in the January LoAR cover letter:

1. This proposal does not make the rules much more difficult to use. Most of the complexity of RfS X.2 is in the definition of simple armory, and this definition is unchanged.
2. This makes submissions in general somewhat easier to register by reducing conflict.
3. This makes period-style submissions particularly easier to register by increasing the ease of registering simple "European core style" armory.
4. This does not diverge substantially from the current philosophical basis of the rules. As noted above, there are very few cases of cadency due to posture. In many more cases, changes to posture are found between unrelated individuals. Our current rules are only an approximation of period practice, not a perfect capture of period practice. Our rules already include one major example of a case where one type of period cadency, Addition of Primary Charge, may be used to completely avoid conflict (RfS X.1) even though some examples may be found in period where Addition of Primary Charge is used as a cadency step (particularly when the primary charge is an ordinary.) This proposed change to RfS X.2 is no worse from a philosophical perspective than our current RfS X.1.

Comments on this rules change proposal should be sent to the entire College of Arms. Siren Herald, Juliana de Luna, will be moderating the rules discussion on this rules change proposal, so please ensure that all comments (from inside or outside the College) are directed to Siren Herald as well as to the Sovereigns of Arms. Please submit your commentary by the usual commentary deadlines, your primary commentary complete by the end of July and your responses to the primary commentary complete by the end of August.

From Laurel: Applications for the Next Laurel and Staff

Enclosed with this LoAR are three applications from people interested in assuming the Laurel office in January 2004. (There is no significance to their order here; it was chosen by coin flips.) There will be a discussion session with the candidates on Saturday night, June 7, at the Known World Heraldic Symposium.

Comments about the applications are due by the end of June for consideration at the July 19 meeting of the SCA Board of Directors, where the decision will be made. The comments should be directed to the College of Arms Ombudsman, Gary Raine, at faucou@atlantic.net, or by phone at 352-447-1518.

From Laurel: Trends in the Number of Items Processed by the College of Arms

Master Alaric MacConall, who has done the Laurel finances for the last two Laurel tenures, has provided the number of items the College has processed in the last few years. He went through LoARs and counted acceptances, returns, transfers, and administrative items (reblazons, protected items, and such), whether paid or unpaid. He omitted pended items. We thought these numbers might be of interest.

- 1999 Jul through Dec: 1465
- 2000 Jan through Jun: 1500
- 2000 Jul through Dec: 1606
- 2001 Jan through Jun: 1092
- 2001 Jul through Dec: 1865
- 2002 Jan through Jun: 1781
- 2002 Jul through Dec: 2016

From Pelican: A Clarification Regarding the Legal Name Allowance

Discussion has been raised regarding various details of the Legal Name Allowance, so a clarification is in order. The two main points of discussion are (1) whether or not use of the Legal Name Allowance carries a weirdness, and (2) how the language of the legal name element(s) should be judged. Precedent states:

Beginning with the 5/96 meeting, therefore, use of two individually permissible non-period elements in a single name will be considered two 'weirdnesses' and will be grounds for return. Such elements include non-period names allowed under the Legal Name Allowance as well as those names, apparently not used by human beings in period, that have been declared

'SCA-compatible', e. g., Briana, Ceridwen (in several variants), Gwendolen/Guendolen, R(h)onwen, and Rowena. (Talan Gwynek, Cover Letter to the January 1996 LoAR, pp. 3-4)

Therefore, a name which falls in the category of "non-period names allowed under the Legal Name Allowance" (emphasis added) described in the ruling cited above carries a weirdness.

If the name element can be documented as being used in the submitted position in period, there is no weirdness for use of this name element. As an example, if *John* is submitted as a masculine given name under the Legal Name Allowance, there is no weirdness for use of this element, because it is documentable as a masculine given name in English in period. On the other hand, if *Craig* is submitted as a masculine given name under the Legal Name Allowance, there would be a weirdness for use of this element. In this case, *Craig* would be the submitter's legal given name. While *Craig* is a commonly accepted masculine given name today, no evidence has been found of it being used as a given name in period. It is registerable as a given name only through the Legal Name Allowance and so carries a weirdness.

In some submissions, multiple elements from the submitter's legal name are used. In these cases, there is only a single weirdness for invoking the Legal Name Allowance, not one weirdness for each element submitted from the submitter's legal name. As an example, a submitter whose legal name contains both a non-period given name and a non-period surname could register [*legal given name*] [*legal surname*] of *London*, because these portions of this name, which use only the Legal Name Allowance as documentation, would only have one weirdness for use of the Legal Name Allowance and so would be registerable.

It is important to note that we have traditionally ignored the language of the legal name element, just as the language of a branch name is traditionally ignored when of [*branch name*] is used as part of a personal name. The exception, in the case of the Legal Name Allowance, occurs when the legal name element is excessively obtrusive when combined with other elements of the name, as can be seen in the rulings:

While we allow real-world name elements in SCA names without further documentation, this is restricted to cases where "such elements are not excessively obtrusive." Combining a Gaelic Irish given name with what appears to be a non-European surname falls afoul of this restriction. [Ciarmhac Sayenga, 07/00, R-Æthelmearc]

[...] Combining an English given name with a Hindi byname is no less obtrusive. [Margaret Singh, 02/01, R-Outlands]

[...] Combining a Russian given name with a Scots byname is no less obtrusive and so would be returned. [Vaska McCormick, 04/02, R-Calontir]

The combination of a legal name element from one language with elements from a different language in an SCA name will be judged on a case by case basis. Only if the combination is felt to be excessively obtrusive, will the submitted name be returned. The standard of whether or not a name combination is excessively obtrusive is, of necessity, a subjective standard. The best description of this level of obtrusiveness was provided by Bruce, Laurel, in regards to the different topic of joke names:

Intrusively modern names grab the listener by the scruff of the neck and haul him, will he or nill he, back into the 20th Century. A name that, by its very presence, destroys any medieval ambience is not a name we should register. (Porsche Audi, August, 1992, pg. 28)

While joke names are a separate topic from the Legal Name Allowance, the standard described by Bruce is appropriate in this case. If the combination of a legal name element when combined with other elements of the name produces a name that will "grab the listener by the scruff of the neck and haul him, will he or nill he," out of any medieval ambience upon hearing the name, it is not a name we should register.

Roster Changes

Æthelmearc's Silver Buccle Principal Herald has changed. The former Silver Buccle Principal Herald, Edmund Lambert of Tregelles ... has turned over the office and is no longer on the roster and mailing list. The new Silver Buccle is Giulietta da Venezia She is added to the roster and mailing list.

Ansteorra's Bordure Herald (external submissions) has changed. The former Bordure, Alden Drake ..., is no longer on the roster and mailing list. Replacing him is Borek Vitalievich Volkov (Brent Ryder), 5603 Elisa Ln, Allen, TX 75002-6307, e-mail borekvv@hotmail.com (e-mail LoIs and LoCs welcome), 214-215-4203 (cell phone). He is added to the roster and mailing list.

Ansteorra's Arbalest Herald notifies submitters of results and also consults on resubmissions. The former Arbalest, Eirik Halfdanarson ..., is no longer on the roster. Replacing him is Meadhbh inghean Rois ..., e-mail arbalest@ansteorra.org. She is added to the roster but not the mailing list.

Rouge Scarpe Herald (the Middle's external submissions herald), Paul Wickenden of Thanet ..., has resigned. He is no longer on the roster or mailing list. He is replaced by Rory mac Feidhlimidh (Kevin L. Conlin), 820 E Monroe St, Bloomington, IL 61701-4138, phone: 309-828-8582, e-mail: rougescarpe@midrealm.org. Rory is added to the mailing list; he continues on the roster as keeper of Free Trumpet Press (listed under Laurel staff).

Send What to Whom

For all Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera, send one paper copy to each of Laurel PKoA and Wreath QoA at their mailing addresses as shown on the College of Arms Mailing List.

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

- Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera (note: such paper copies are *in addition* to the personal copies for Laurel and Wreath mentioned above)
- Submission packets (**one** copy of each name form plus documentation, including petitions; **two** colored copies of each armory form plus **two** copies of any associated documentation, including petitions)
- Cheques or money orders for submissions, payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms"

to Pelican QoA at her roster address:

Send Laurel office copies of all submissions-related electronic files to submissions@sca.org. In particular, the Laurel Clerk would very much appreciate e-mailed copies of all LoIs, LoCs, LoRs, et cetera.

Send roster changes and corrections to Lord Symond Bayard le Gris, Bruce R. Nevins, 2527 E. 3rd St., Tucson, AZ, 85716-4114, 520-795-6000, 520-795-0158 (fax), bnevins@nexiliscom.com. College of Arms members can also request a copy of the current roster from Symond.

For subscriptions to the paper copy of the LoAR, please contact Symond, above. The cost for an LoAR subscription is \$25 a year. Please make all checks or money orders payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms". For subscriptions to the electronic copy of the LoAR, please contact Laurel at herald@sca.org. The electronic copy is available free of charge.

For all administrative matters, or for questions about whom to send to, please contact Laurel Principal King of Arms, whose contact information heads this letter.

Pray know that I remain

In service

François la Flamme
Laurel Principal King of Arms