

Laurel Letter of Pends and Discussion (LoPaD): January 6, 2006

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

For the October 2005 meetings, printed January 6, 2006

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from Elisabeth Laurel, Jeanne Marie Wreath, and Margaret Pelican, greetings.

This letter contains the issues raised in the October 2005 LoAR for CoA discussion. The text in this letter is copied verbatim from that LoAR; it is provided here for convenience. As with a January 2006 LoI, these matters are currently scheduled for the Pelican and Wreath meetings in May 2006. **Original commentary must be in the College's hands no later than March 31, 2006. Responses and rebuttals to commentary must be in the College's hands no later than April 30, 2006.**

[The printed letter was dated "January 2005". In the electronic copies, the date is given as "January 6, 2006", because that was the postmark date. Also, the printed LoPaD referred to "December 2005 LoI", with the corresponding commentary deadlines in February and March, and scheduled for April. In the electronic copies, they are corrected to a publication date in January 2006 with the subsequent deadlines pushed a month.]

1. Grandfather Clause. Discussion.

I would like to hear more of the College's opinion on whether we should continue to interpret the grandfather clause to include patterns, or whether it should be narrowed to include only the actual words found in a registered name. In particular, I would like the commenters to consider these questions:

- Does grandfathering patterns produce names further from historical practice than just grandfathering specific elements?
- Would groups and others not extremely familiar with the heraldic community be confused by grandfathering elements only?
- Does grandfathering patterns serve a larger purpose with the Society?

Thanks to the commenters; I look forward to hearing your opinion on this matter.

This item was on the Cover Letter for the October 2005 LoAR.

2. Melodia de Okhurste. Device. Per bend Or and argent, a tree blasted and eradicated azure.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Per bend argent and Or, a tree blasted and eradicated azure*, the field is actually *Per bend Or and argent*. This is pended to allow commenters to check under the correct tinctures.

This was item 7 on the Trimaris letter of June 30, 2005.

3. Thomas Whitehart. Device. Azure, in pall a stag courant argent between three harps Or.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Azure, a stag courant argent between three harps Or*, the four charges are co-primary. We have pended this submission to allow the College to research for possible conflicts based on the proper visual weight of the charges.

This does not conflict with Megan Rhys, *Azure, a Pegasus statant argent between three harps Or*. Megan's pegasus is clearly a primary charge between three secondary harps.

This was item 50 on the Caid letter of June 24, 2005.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Elisabeth de Rossignol
Laurel Principal Queen of Arms