

Laurel Letter of Pends and Discussion (LoPaD): September 29, 2003

Society for Creative Anachronism
College of Arms
15910 Val Verde Drive
Houston TX, 77083-4921
713-918-2947
herald@sca.org

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.

This letter contains the issues raised in the July 2003 LoAR for CoA discussion. The text in this letter is copied verbatim from that LoAR; it is provided here for convenience. As with a September LoI, these matters are currently scheduled for the Laurel meetings in JANUARY 2004. **Original commentary must be in the College's hands no later than November 30, 2003. Responses and rebuttals to commentary must be in the College's hands no later than December 31, 2003.**

1. Decimus Furius Maximus. Name.

Submitted as *Maximus Furs*, the submitter requested authenticity for "Early Roman (4th Century)" and allowed any changes. He indicated that the meaning of 'thief' (*Furs*) was most important.

During the commentary period, Hund contacted the submitter regarding the authenticity of his name for his desired time period. Here is the information relayed by Hund in his commentary:

This submission consists of two cognomen or bynames and no given name as required. A properly constructed Roman name, even as late as requested by the submitter should have at least a family name (nomen) preceding the cognomen and the knightly noble class would also have a p[er]sonal given name (praenomen). On having this pointed out to the submitter, he requested from the list of praenomen used after the 2nd century (only 18 names), Decimus. Also, from Cassel there is the nomen Furius. Thus combined to give Decimus Furius Maximus, which should be the form registered.

The request to modify the submitted name to *Decimus Furius Maximus* came in late enough in the commentary period that not all members of the College had an opportunity to comment on this form before the end of the primary commentary period. As this new form is dramatically different from the submitted form, we are pending the modified submission in order to give the College an opportunity to comment on the new form of this name.

2. Duncan Silverwolf McTyre. Badge. Per fess azure and vert, a boar statant to sinister argent within an orle of oak leaves stems outwards Or.

The Letter of Intent arranged the oak leaves *in annulo* but the submitter's blazon arranges them *in orle*. Per the LoAR of January 2002, "There is normally a CD for changing the arrangement of a group of unnumbered (and thus 'many') charges from *in orle* to *in annulo*, even on a round badge form." We give difference between these arrangements because they are different in depiction on almost all escutcheon shapes used for heraldic display in period. The two arrangements only appear to be the same on the relatively uncommon roundel escutcheon shape, which is (unfortunately) the traditional SCA shape for a badge form. This submission is therefore pending for further conflict research under the correct blazon.

3. Nathaniel Mendoza de Guadalajara. Device. Ermine, on a cross gules a seraph argent.

Some commenters asked if this should be blazoned as a *standing seraph* rather than a *seraph*. A standing seraph is a six-winged angel with a robe covering the lower part of the body (and the wings in a stereotypical posture). This charge is a seraph, which has a head surrounded by six wings (also in a stereotypical posture). The seraph drawn here has a few of the primary feathers on the bottom two wings extending to base, and perhaps that might have appeared to some viewers to be the robe of a standing seraph.

This was originally blazoned as a *seraph proper* but it is not. A seraph proper has multicolored wings. This charge is all argent. It must therefore be pending for further research.

4. Sebastian of Ventbarré. Badge. Quarterly gules and Or, an eagle's wing terminating in a hand grasping a sword in sinister canton sable.

RfS XI.3.b on marshalling states "Such fields [that are commonly used for marshalling, such as quarterly] may only be used when no single portion of the field may appear to be an independent piece of armory." In this submission, a single portion of the field contains an eagle's wing terminating in a hand grasping a sword. The College espoused two distinct opinions about whether or not this armory was registerable under RfS XI.3.b.

Some commenters believed that this was registerable because they believed that a wing terminating in a hand grasping a sword was, effectively, a single "combined charge", noting that this combination is often found in German heraldry. An example of a single "combined charge" found in real-world heraldry would be the *Paschal Lamb*, which is considered a single charge although it consists of a lamb maintaining banner over its shoulder. If this wing+hand+sword combination is a single combined charge, then there is only one charge on the single portion of the field, and there is no problem under RfS XI.3.b.

Other commenters believed that this wing+hand+sword combination is a multiple charge combination, not a single "combined charge". It is, of course, important to note that just because charges are often found together in period armory does not mean that they must be a single "combined charge." Under this opinion, this armory uses multiple types of charge on one portion of a quarterly field, and is not registerable under RfS XI.3.b.

This submission is being pending for consideration of this issue.

Pray know that I remain, in service, François la Flamme, Laurel Principal King of Arms