

For the July 2003 meetings, printed September 29, 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.

<b>Wreath meeting</b>	<b>Jul 12</b>	<b>Aug 16</b>	<b>Sep 13</b>	<b>Oct 18</b>	<b>Nov 22</b>	<b>Dec 13?</b>
<b>Pelican meeting</b>	<b>Jul 19</b>	<b>Aug 23 &amp; 13</b>	<b>Sep 27</b>	<b>Oct 11?</b>	<b>Nov 15?</b>	<b>Dec 20?</b>
<b>Comment by</b>				<b>too late</b>	<b>Sep 30</b>	<b>Oct 31</b>
<b>Respond by</b>				<b>Sep 30</b>	<b>Oct 31</b>	<b>Nov 30</b>
<b>Letters of Intent being considered:</b>						
AEthelmearc	-	Mar 24 & Apr 26	May 28	Jun 26	Jul 24	-
An Tir	Mar 28	Apr 29	May 28	Jun 26	Jul 28	(Aug 28)
Ansteorra	Mar 20	Apr 21	May 21 [P May 29]	Jun 22	Jul 18 [P Jul 26]	Aug 21 [P Aug 29]
Artemisia	Mar 30	Apr 30	-	Jun 30	-	(Aug 29)
Atenveldt	Mar 15	Apr 25	-	Jun 25	Jul 25	(Aug 25)
Atlantia	Mar 25	-	Apr 26 & May 29	Jun 25	Jul 22	-
Caid	Mar 01	Apr 20 & Apr 30	May 28	-	Jul 05 & Jul 30	(Aug 25) & Aug 26
Calontir	Mar 19	Apr 24	-	Jun 25 & (Jun 25)	-	(Aug 08)
Drachenwald	Mar 25	-	Apr 25 & May 29	Jun 26	(Jul 24)	(Aug 28)
Ealdormere	-	Apr 20 [P Apr 28]	May 20 [P May 29]	-	Jul 17 [P Jul 26]	-
East	-	Apr 06	-	(May 17) & (Jun 20 [P Jul 01])	-	-
Lochac	Mar 25	-	Apr 15 [P Apr 28]	-	-	-
Meridies	Mar 31	Apr 30	May 31	Jun 30	Jul 31	Aug 31
Middle	Mar 24	Apr 07	May 12	Jun 25	-	Jul 25 [P Aug 14] & (Aug 25)
Nebuly	-	-	-	-	-	(Aug 21)
Northshield	-	-	-	-	Jul 01 [P Jul 31]	-
Outlands	Feb 23 & Mar 23	Apr 28	May 30	Jun 25	(Jul 23)	(Aug 28)
Siren (RfS X.4.j)	-	-	-	-	-	Aug 30
Trimaris	-	-	May 26	-	(Jul 31 [P Aug 02])	-
West	Mar 26	Apr 22	-	Jun 18	-	(Aug 27)
Laurel LoPaD [LoAR date]	-	Apr 21 [Jan LoAR]	May 27 [Feb LoAR]	Jun 03 [Mar LoAR] & Jun 30 [Apr LoAR]	Jul 16 [May 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.

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

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

December: Wreath's meeting is very tentatively scheduled for December 13. 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 Wreath: Clarification and Explication of Some Rulings on Posture

First, a clarification of terms which appears to be necessary given recent commentary: when we speak, in general, of rulings on *posture*, these rulings are understood to apply both to postures for animate charges (like a *lion rampant*) and individual orientation of animate or inanimate charges (like a *snail bendwise* or a *sword palewise*). This usage follows the general definition in RfS X.4.h, which is called "Posture Changes" though its explanation explicitly addresses "changing the posture or individual orientation of charges."

The term *posture* may be used to refer to both inanimate and animate charges. It is idiomatically correct to say "the sword is in a *palewise* posture", and it is also correct to say "the lamb is in a *passant* posture." The term *orientation* is usually used to refer to the major orientations that are described as [*ordinary*]*wise*, as well as inverting charges (turning them upside down) or reversing them (turning them right to left). So it is also idiomatically correct to say that "the sword is in a *palewise* orientation."

Some questions have been received concerning some of the recent rulings on posture, particularly the rulings on the return of the joint badge of Brenna of Storvik and Gauss Magnússon in April 2003 and the device of Bran mac Conchobair in May 2003. We here hope to clarify these rulings and our current policies concerning posture.

We were faced with the need to make a large number of difficult rulings in late 2002 and early 2003 in which posture played a role. Each of these rulings hinged on whether two CDs should be given for a given charge group (for changing the type and posture of the charge group) or if only one CD should be given (for changing just the type of the charge group). The pertinent rule on posture changes, RfS X.4.h, reads:

**Posture Changes** -Significantly changing the posture or individual orientation of charges in any group placed directly on the field, including strewn charges or charges overall, is one clear difference.

Changing the posture of at least half of the charges in a group is one clear difference. Changing a *sword fesswise* to a *sword palewise*, or from a *lion rampant* to a *lion passant*, is one clear difference. Multiple changes to the posture or orientation of the same charges may not be counted separately, so a *lion passant bendwise* is one clear difference from a *lion couchant to sinister*. Changes of posture or orientation of separate charge groups may each be counted. A change of posture must affect the orientation of the charge, or significantly change its appearance. Changes in the position of the head, for instance, are not significant, nor is the change from statant to passant, which essentially moves only one leg. Changing from passant to couchant, however, visually removes the legs from the bottom of the charge and is considered significant.

All the rulings which we found to be difficult included a substantial change of type in the charge as well as a (possible) interpretation of a change in posture. RfS X.4.h is very good in explaining how to give difference between the posture of identical types of charge: the examples compare lions to lions, and swords to swords. RfS X.4.h is ominously silent on the matter of how to compare the posture of two very different types of charges: there are no examples which discuss how we might compare lions to swords.

While considering these difficult rulings, we found to our chagrin that past rulings on these issues and recent commentary on the pertinent submissions were often quite inconsistent from submission to submission, month to month, and commenter to commenter. It was also particularly difficult to refer to previous precedent. In cases where Laurel felt that there were obviously two CDs (for type and posture), the submission was often accepted without any discussion from Laurel. In cases where Laurel felt that there was obviously only one CD for changing the type of charge, the ruling would generally not refer to posture at all, but would simply mention that only the type of charge had changed. Neither of these types of ruling are generally incorporated into precedent, as they appear to be routine applications of the rules. Lastly, because the charge types were substantially different, this issue often was masked when the charges were primary and the armory was simple under RfS X.2, as the substantial difference in type alone would then be sufficient to remove conflict. The issue would only arise concerning secondary or tertiary charges, or in complicated armory which is often clear of conflict for other reasons. Despite these obstacles, we have attempted to codify a consistent - and usable - policy for future decisions.

It is generally agreed that certain very different types of charge do not have any sort of meaningful posture comparison. When two charges do not have a meaningful posture comparison, no posture difference is given between charges of these different types.

Animate and inanimate objects are not generally considered to have a meaningful posture comparison. When comparing lions with swords, we do not give posture difference between these charges - even when we compare the "sort of fesswise" *lion passant* to a *sword palewise*, or the "sort of palewise" *lion rampant* to a *sword fesswise*.

Very different sorts of compact inanimate charges - for example, pheons and crescents - are not generally considered to have a meaningful posture comparison. A *pheon* in its default posture has its shaft to chief, and a *crescent* in its default posture has its horns to chief. However, we do not give posture difference between a pheon and an increscent - even though that comparison could be viewed as changing the type of charge from pheon to crescent, and then rotating the crescent ninety degrees.

Some substantially different types of charge may be meaningfully compared for their overall orientation, but the inversion or reversing of the charge is not meaningful. This is generally agreed to be the case for inanimate objects which are not compact ("long skinny" objects). We would give a posture CD between an *axe fesswise* and an *arrow bendwise*, because the charge has had a major change to its overall orientation. However we would not give a posture CD between an *axe fesswise* and an *arrow fesswise reversed* because the overall orientation of the charge is the same (fesswise), even though the arrow is reversed. After all, in this comparison, the "pointy end" of each weapon is to dexter - but the arrow is reversed and the axe is not. It is hard to compare inversion or reversal for this sort of charge.

Different types of quadrupeds (which may also be winged) are generally agreed to have meaningful posture comparisons, even when there is substantial type difference between these quadrupeds. Griffins and wolves are compared with the standard quadruped posture comparisons. Therefore, a *griffin passant* has a CD for type and a CD for posture when compared to a *wolf rampant*.

The point where heralds start to disagree - and where past rulings cease to be consistent - is when the rulings compare animate charges which have very different sorts of overall anatomy and which have very different postures in general use. Quadrupeds (winged or not), animal or bird heads, birds, and insects all have very different sorts of anatomy from each other, and are found in markedly different sorts of postures. These posture comparisons have, so far, been ruled on in a fashion which is influenced by what the standard period (and SCA) postures are for the charges, but which does not seem clear enough to codify an ongoing SCA practice for such charges.

Let us consider, for example, a cat and a bee. Cats in the SCA are found in postures which face to dexter, to sinister, and affronty. The SCA gives difference between these three general orientations for all quadrupeds. Bees in period are invariably in the tergiant posture

(which is not found for cats), but bees in the SCA are allowed to be postured as statant to dexter or to sinister - and when so postured, are given difference from bees tergiant. When comparing a cat sejant and a bee tergiant, should we consider them to have a posture change (from a profile orientation to an affronty orientation)? Most rulings have not given such a posture difference, but only type difference. Similarly, when comparing quadrupeds and birds in their very different postures, the rulings have generally not given difference for posture between a *lion rampant* and an *eagle displayed*, even though it is possible to interpret the changes to their postures as a shift from a profile orientation to an affronty orientation.

The change between full animal postures and animal head postures is particularly vexing. If we give a CD for posture change between a lion passant and a lion's head erased contourny (because the first is facing dexter, and the second is facing sinister), how should we give difference between a lion passant regardant and a lion's head erased contourny (where both of the faces are looking to sinister, but the overall body posture of the lion is facing to dexter)? The answer is by no means intuitive, especially when one considers that RfS X.4.h does not give difference between a lion passant and a lion passant regardant because, by the text of that rule, "changes in the position of the head, for instance, are not significant".

After consideration of the many cases on which we have had to rule (some of which, we admit, we handled without writing express precedents on the issue), we adopted the following policy: Quadrupeds, insects, birds, and heads do not have comparable postures, because of the very different sorts of postures these charges hold in heraldry. When two types of charge do not have comparable postures, we do not give posture difference between them. This lack of posture difference applies to all the possible postures the charges might take. Because a quadruped is not comparable to an insect, bird, or animal head, a lion rampant is given no posture difference from a bee tergiant, a raven close contourny, or a lion's head bendwise coupé.

That being said, we continue to uphold the ruling by Elsbeth Laurel which noted that, even though two types of charge may not have comparable postures, two groups of charges may be comparable for purposes of determining whether the groups are facing in the same direction, or are respectant/addorsed. Please see the ruling on the device of Bran mac Conchobair in the May 2003 LoAR for more discussion of this issue. The short relevant excerpt from that ruling reads:

We do allow meaningful posture difference between groups of charges which would otherwise not have comparable postures when the following conditions apply:

- both groups consist of charges which have the ability to be addorsed or respectant
- one group is addorsed or respectant (both charges face in opposite [sic] directions) and the other group is not (both charges face in the same direction)

So, while it is not possible to compare the posture of a bird and a cat, it is possible to compare the posture of two cats rampant addorsed versus two doves close, and see that the cats are facing in opposite directions and the doves are facing in the same direction.

#### **From Pelican: Regarding SCA-Compatible Status of Forms of the Name "Megan"**

Issues were raised this month regarding the SCA-compatible status of forms of the name *Megan*. There is a precedent that states:

There are some twenty Megans, Meghans, and Meggans already registered. As with Fiona and Corwin, I consider the name to be so much a part of SCA culture as to be acceptable, even if it is recent coinage. [BoE, 14 Apr 85, p.4]

There are two significant factors that come into play when judging whether or not a name should be considered SCA compatible: number of registrations and continual popularity. SCA-compatible names that fall out of popularity may have their SCA-compatible status discontinued.

There are several forms of *Megan* that need to be addressed. These are:

- **Meggan:** The spelling *Meggan* has been registered twice; once in 1971 and once in 1979. Given the lack of popularity of this form, we will discontinue registration of *Meggan* with the February 2004 decision meeting.
- **Meghan:** The spelling *Meghan* has been registered 19 times, with the most recent registration being in September of 1993. An additional registration appears this month. Therefore, this name was moderately popular for a time, but has generally fallen out of popularity. Due to the lack of continual popularity of this name, we will discontinue registration of *Meghan* beginning with the February 2004 decision meeting.
- **Megan:** The spelling *Megan* has been registered 39 times, most recently in 1998. In the few years up through 1998, the number of registrations of *Megan* per year were: 1998 (1), 1997 (2), 1996 (1), 1995 (3). Therefore, the form *Megan* was declared SCA compatible in 1985 and maintained a low level of popularity through 1998, when it was last registered. While this level of registration does not demonstrate sufficient continued interest in this name to warrant its retaining SCA-compatible status, three submissions this month included some form of the name *Megan* (one *Megan*, one *Meghan*, and one *Megen*). Given this level of interest in the name in general, we are continuing the SCA-compatible status of *Megan* for now. Its status may be reevaluated in the future to determine if *Megan* continues to be popular or not.
- **Megen:** The spelling *Megen* is dated to 1547 in Wyllyam Salesbury's *A Dictionary in Englyshe and Welshe* (London: John Waley, 1547). Therefore, this form is registerable as a rare, but documented, Welsh feminine given name.

#### **From Pelican: Regarding SCA-Compatible Status of the Name "Kendra"**

The name *Kendra* was ruled SCA compatible:

Kendra long since joined the select list of names which, like Fiona and Gwyneth, have been deemed "compatible", although they cannot be documented in period. (LoAR 26 Apr 87, p. 6)

However, this name has not retained popularity. It has been registered a total of 16 times, with the last registration being in 1992. Given the lack of popularity of this name, we will discontinue registration of *Kendra* with the February 2004 decision meeting.

#### **Roster Updates**

The new Summits Principality Herald (An Tir) is Finngall McKetterick .... He is added to the roster but not the mailing list. The previous Summits Herald, Trudchen von Bayen ..., is removed from the roster.

The East will soon be having a new pursuivant-at-large emitting letters of intent: Rowen Cloteworthy .... He prefers e-mailed LoIs and LoCs. He is added to the roster but not the mailing list for now. Blue Tyger Herald, Reynard des Montaignes ..., remains on the mailing list and roster.

Red Hawk Herald (a Calontir commenter), Gotfrid von Schwaben ..., is returning from parts foreign and will be resuming commentary. Please direct his mailing list mail to his new address: ....

There is a new Dragon Principal Herald (Middle). The new Dragon is already on the roster and mailing list as Rouge Scarpe Herald (Middle external submissions) and Free Trumpet Press West: Rory mac Feidhlimidh (Kevin L. Conlin), 820 E Monroe St, Bloomington, IL 61701-4138, 309-828-8582, klconlin@ilstu.edu (e-mailed LoIs and LoCs accepted). The office of Rouge Scarpe Herald is being eliminated for now. Elena de Vexin ..., the former Dragon, is retained on the roster but not the mailing list as a herald-at-large for the Middle Kingdom; she will be Rory's emergency replacement for a few months as the transition proceeds.

The office of Black Lion Principal Herald (An Tir) is changing hands. The incoming Black Lion is Frederic Badger .... The outgoing Black Lion, Marco Valentino ..., is removed from the roster and mailing list.

### **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. Please also send them to Laurel Clerk, preferably by e-mail to submissions@sca.org, or by mail to Tim McDaniel, 6805 Wood Hollow Dr Apt 212, Austin, TX 78731-3104. 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