

For the September 2002 meetings, printed December 18, 2002

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	Sep 07	Oct 19	Nov 23	Dec 21	Jan 18	Feb 08	Mar 22?
Pelican meeting	Sep 07	Oct 05	Nov 16	Dec 21	Jan 18	Feb 08	?
Comment by					too late	Dec 31	Jan 31
Reply/Respond by					Dec 31	Jan 31	Feb 28
LoIs being considered:							
Æthelmarc	-	Jun 27	Jul 17	Aug 17	Sep 17	Oct 22 [P Oct 30]	(Nov 23)
An Tir	May 29	Jun 28	Jul 30	Aug 30	Sep 30	Oct 30	(Nov 29)
Ansteorra	May 19 [P May 28]	Jun 17	Jul 14 [P Jul 22]	Aug 17	Sep 15	Oct 20 [P Oct 30]	-
Artemisia	-	Jun 18	Jul 30	-	Sep 30	-	Nov 30
Atenveldt	May 01 [P May 23]	Jun 15 [P Jun 25]	Jul 15 [P Jul 25]	Aug 20	Sep 15	(Oct 20)	-
Atlantia	May 28	Jun 27	Jul 18	Aug 20	Aug 30 [P Sep 30]	Oct 26 & Oct 27	(Nov 24)
Caid	Apr 05 [P May 01] & May 10 & May 15	-	-	-	Sep 10	Oct 01 & Oct 25	-
Calontir	May 25	-	-	-	Sep 03	Oct 16	Nov 13
Drachenwald	May 23	Jun 18	Jul 16	Aug 22	Sep 19	(Oct 25)	(Nov 23)
Ealdormere	-	-	-	Aug 19	-	-	(Nov 22)
East	May 12	Jun 09 & Jun 23	-	-	Sep 01 & Sep 22	Oct 27	(Nov 24)
Lochac	May 17 [P May 28]	Jun 16	-	Aug 20	-	-	-
Meridies	May 31	Jun 30	Jul 31	Aug 31	Sep 30	-	Nov 30
Middle	May 12	Jun 17	Jul 12	Aug 19	Sep 16	Oct 14	Nov 11
Outlands	May 17 [P May 28] & May 20 [P May 28]	-	Jun 17 & Jul 17	Aug 23	Sep 23	(Oct 23)	(Nov 23)
Trimaris	-	Apr 29	Jun 28 & Jul 30	-	Sep 30	Oct 15	(Nov 15)
West	May 30	Jun 25	-	Jul 24 [P Aug 01]	Sep 25	Oct 29	Nov 27
Kraken LoftP	-	-	Jul 16	-	-	-	-
Laurel LoPaD [LoAR date]	May 21 [Mar LoAR]	Jun 21 [Apr LoAR] & Jul 20 [Apr LoAR]	Jul 20 [May LoftP]	Aug 31 [Jun LoAR]	Sep 19 [Jul LoAR]	-	Nov 14 [Aug 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.

Mar: Wreath's meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 22.

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 Pelican: Registerability of the Name *Aífe/Aoife*

An item this month raised discussion regarding registerability of the name *Aoife*. *Aoife* is listed in Ó Corráin and Maguire (p. 16 s.n. *Aífe*). However, this entry lists only legendary women with this name. Lacking evidence that this name was used by humans in period, this name would not normally be registerable. Nonetheless, it was registered (in the form *Aífe*) as recently as July of 2001. To date, there have been nine registrations of *Aoife* and two of *Aífe*. Of these registrations, only four date from after the previous rules change in November of 1995. Given these numbers, this name does not have the popularity of other SCA compatible names such as *Fiona* and *Ian*, and so does not warrant being declared SCA compatible. Therefore, we will stop registration of this name beginning with the April 2003 decision meeting.

From Pelican: Registerability of the Name *Corwynn*

An item this month raised discussion regarding exactly which spellings of *Corwin* are considered SCA compatible. The name *Corwin* is SCA compatible in the spellings *Corwin* and *Corwyn*. The spelling *Corwynn* has only been registered twice, once in a name in 1975 and once as part of a holding name in 1999. As the spelling *Corwynn* does not have the same level of popularity as *Corwin* and *Corwyn*, we will discontinue registering the form *Corwynn* beginning with the April 2003 decision meeting.

From Wreath: Coloring Problems

We remind the College that we rule on an emblazon's acceptability based on the appearance of the emblazon on the form at the Wreath meeting. This includes determining whether all the tinctures on the form are acceptable heraldic tinctures. We have multiple people at the meeting looking at the forms and helping to make this decision. This policy is in accordance with previous practices:

We want to remind the College that we register what is submitted, and not the blazon. We are getting more and more submissions that were done using color copiers or color printers. While we have nothing against using modern technology (Laurel has been known to use it now and then), the colors must be identifiable. If the copier/printer can not produce recognizable tinctures, it shouldn't be used. If it is used, the submission may be returned. (Cover Letter June 1997)

We also note that Laurel (at this time, via Wreath) may, at any time, be called on to reblazon old armory based on the appearance of the old forms in the file. Certain sorts of pigment tend to change or fade so that they are very difficult to make out correctly in old forms. If the pigments used in old forms have changed drastically from their original state while sitting in the files, this may result in an incorrect reblazon.

We have seen quite a few problems in the last year with a particular color which is blazoned as purpure, but (when viewed at the Wreath meeting) is instead some shade between purple, fuchsia, and bright pink. The culprit for the particular problem appears to be some standard variety of color printer ink, which is very fugitive and may change its tincture within a few weeks of printing. Computer printer inks also seem to be responsible for a dark tincture which is somewhere between purpure and azure, which seems to be generally meant as azure. It is not yet clear to us whether this latter confused tincture is due to the inks changing color after the forms were mailed, or whether the color was always ambiguous.

We have no intention of mandating the particular techniques used to color in the forms. However, it is certainly in the best interest of each kingdom to discourage submitters from using pigments that will be likely to result in a return at Laurel, or an incorrect later reblazon. Discouraged coloring methods include:

Color Computer Printers: the colors may change even in the few months between the time the forms leave the kingdom and when they are ruled on by Wreath. Computer printer colors sometimes continue to change while the forms are in the files.

Metallic Markers and Paints: These tend to oxidize over time, so that what began as gold or silver ends up as dull brown or dark grey. If the marker or paints are used to detail an underlying dark charge, this oxidation may cause the details to be almost invisible when the form is viewed in later years.

Colored Pencils: The pale shades of color pencil cause difficulties in identifying tinctures and charges on the forms. Colored pencil is the only standard medium in which a 'light grey' (and thus argent) tincture is often difficult to distinguish from a 'black' (and thus sable) tincture. The pale shades also make it hard to get good identifiability of

charges due to the low contrast between tinctures when viewing the form. We try hard at the Wreath meetings to keep any emblazon's medium from interfering with our decisions about identifiability and visual difference, but it is best to choose a pigment that avoids the problem.

Wax Crayons, Oil Paints, Oil Pastels, Other Sticky Pigments: These pigments can cement paperwork together in the files. It is hard to do a visual comparison with a form which is stuck ineradicably to the paper in front of it, or has had half its pigment peel off onto the paper in front of it.

We continue to support, without any commercial incentive to do so, the humble yet effective Crayola(R) Classic Colors Markers. While Crayola markers are not waterproof, they have good intense heraldic colors that keep "true" as long as the forms are in the files and out of direct sunlight. Note that there are other types of Crayola marker than the "Classic Colors" markers, and these are not recommended. ("Crayola" is a registered trademark of Binney & Smith.)

From Wreath: Maily and Other Field Treatments

Field Treatments in General

The CoA Glossary of Terms currently defines the term "field treatment" as follows:

A repeating pattern drawn in a tincture with good contrast over the field or a charge. Field treatments leave more of the underlying tincture showing than they cover, and are considered a part of the field or charge tincture. Field treatments include masoned, honeycombed, and so on. [Note: honeycombed is an SCA invention that was ruled to be unregistrable in the LoAR of September 2001]. Field treatments do not include the ermined furs or strewn charges.

The term "field treatment" is not a standard real-world heraldic description for a class of armorial designs. There are very few period armorial designs that meet the SCA's description of a "field treatment". The period armorial designs closest to "field treatments" are *fretty*, *masoned*, *papellony/scaly*, and the very uncommon element *diaspré*. The term "field treatment" is not found in Brooke-Little's *An Heraldic Alphabet*, Woodward's *A Treatise on Heraldry, British and Foreign*, Fox-Davies' *A Complete Guide to Heraldry*, Parker's *A Glossary of Terms used in Heraldry*, Friar's *A Dictionary of Heraldry*, Franklyn and Tanner's *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Heraldry* or Boutell's *Heraldry*. Nor do these standard heraldry books have a different term that clearly describes the type of armorial designs that the SCA calls "field treatments". These books appear to find the few armorial designs mentioned above as difficult to classify as we find them to be: they are period armorial designs that diverge significantly from standard heraldic practices. Thus, while the term *field treatment* continues to be useful to the SCA as a means of including these oddities of armorial design in the Rules for Submission, it should not be considered to represent a standard period armorial class of designs.

To consider the period armorial designs which most closely resemble the SCA's definition of field treatment:

Fretty was originally considered a field treatment by the SCA, but it has been given further study and has been considered a charge since the Cover Letter for the September 1992 LoAR. *Fretty* therefore cannot be used as guidance for styles of period field treatments: it falls into a different category, that of charges.

Masoned is also a special case. In period armory it is virtually always used to detail the stones in an architectural charge, such as a tower or a wall, or to detail a portion of a field or geometric charge that suggests an architectural charge. As an example of this last, a masoned field under an embattled chief visually suggests that the field (with its embattled top and brickwork details) is a sort of very large architectural element, even though the field is not strictly an architectural charge. This special purpose design provides little or no general guidance for determining what should be acceptable as a "field treatment".

Papellony represents a geometric pattern of overlapping scales which are variously described as the scales on a butterfly's wing, or fish scales. It comes in two forms: *papellony [x] and [y]*, which is a division like *checky* or *lozengy*, and *[x] papellony [y]*, where tincture [y] is used to form voided scales on a background [x], and thus fits the SCA's definition of a "field treatment". This last form of *papellony* is found with some frequency in period armory, but is still uncommon. *Scaly* is the SCA's version of the French blazon term *ecaillé*. *Ecaillé* is used in real-world blazon to describe scales of a fish, but it is also used to describe a geometric voided scale pattern that is apparently interchangeable with [x] *papellony [y]*, as noted on p. 726 of Woodward's *A Treatise on Heraldry, British and Foreign*.

Diaspré has not yet been registered in the SCA and is met with very infrequently in period heraldry. In some cases the *diaspré* does appear to be a genuine high contrast armorial design, rather than the purely artistic "diaper" treatment where a single color is patterned in two shades to give the appearance of a damask fabric, for artistic interest. *Diaspré* is described in (among other places) Brault's *Early Blazon*, which states in part that "in medieval heraldry, diapering [*sic*; *diaspré* is clearly meant given the context] is usually represented as a pattern of golden rings enclosing alternately an eagle and a lion on a green or blue background".

Thus, it can be seen that there are very few, perhaps only two, period armorial designs which might fall into the SCA's definition of "field treatment". Neither of them is a common element, even in period. It is hardly possible to extrapolate general period armorial practices from so small a set of examples.

The rule allowing registration of undocumented, but compatible, armorial elements is RfS VII.6:

Compatible Armorial Elements. - Any charge, line of division, line of partition, field treatment, or other armorial element that has been ruled compatible with period heraldic style may be registered in armory.

The line of partition dovetailed and field treatments designed to imitate chain mail and honeycombs are some examples of undocumented armorial elements that have already been ruled compatible with period heraldic style. [Note: it is of course field treatments that are under discussion here.]

There are two traditional principles for ruling an element compatible. It may be so popular as to make the increased authenticity not worth the confusion and potential loss of good will inherent in its abolition. This is most commonly true of names, such as Rhiannon or Ceridwen, but a prominent example of a charge that falls in this category is the compass star.

The second reason is that the element, while undocumented, is a reasonable extrapolation from period practice. This is more prominent in the name rules, where constructed and invented names are explicit categories, but can apply to armorial elements as well. Dovetailed is an example of this. There is a pattern of various lines of division, including some late-period innovations. Dovetailed is a plausible fit within this pattern. Indeed, some period representations of embattled are very close to dovetailed. The only novelty is giving it a special name.

Without knowledge that the concept of a "field treatment" is a period armorial concept, and with so few examples of period designs that might fall into the SCA's category of "field treatment", it does not seem reasonable to extrapolate new "field treatments" from these very few existing examples. Until such time that documentation can be provided showing a substantial period pattern of use of designs like "field treatments", and reasonable ways in which these designs could be extrapolated to develop other period-compatible "field treatments", we will consider SCA-invented "field treatments" not to be "compatible with period heraldic style", and thus unacceptable by RfS VII.6.

Maily

Maily is a field treatment which covers the treated area with a pattern of linked rings representing chain mail. It is a modern invention. The SCA's original May 1982 registration stated that *mailly* is "a new type of treatment of the field, so we named it for SCA usage." A similar design was apparently invented in England some time after 1954. J. P. Brooke-Little's annotations on A. C. Fox-Davies' *A Complete Guide to Heraldry* (1969 edition) p. 77, note 35, state that "Another new and curious design is a field which is blazoned 'vert, a network of annulets interlaced Or'."

As a 20th C field treatment, *mailly* is not compatible with period heraldic style per the general discussion of field treatments above. *Maily* has been registered infrequently since its introduction, for a total of 13 registrations, the most recent in 1998. This registration history is not large enough to require that we continue to register it due to the design's popularity.

One might consider whether *mailly* could be considered something other than a field treatment, such as a charge or group of charges. Chains are period armorial charges, and *mailly* depicts a mesh of interlinked chain. Some period armory does use chains which are interlinked at some points. The most famous, and apparently most complicated, period example of such armory is the arms of Navarre (important non-SCA armory): *Gules, an escarbuncle of chain within and conjoined to an orle of chain Or*. In the arms of Navarre, the chains maintain their individual identifiability as chains. Such individual identifiability is lost when the chains are interwoven into the *mailly* design, just as knots (which are period charges) lose their individual identifiability when woven together into knotwork. Because *mailly* cannot reasonably be viewed as anything other than a "field treatment", and because SCA-invented "field treatments" are too far from period practice to be acceptable, *mailly* will no longer be accepted after the LoAR of April 2003.

Roster Changes

[removed]

Free Trumpet Press West is moving. As of January 1, 2003, the new address will be: SCA - Free Trumpet Press West, c/o Kevin L. Conlin, 820 E Monroe St, Bloomington, IL 61701-4138.

Hund is Hund again. That is, at the Royal Court at Lochac Crown Tournament, after the hiatus of transferring titles from the West to Lochac, Porfinn Hrolfsson was re-appointed to the position of Hund Herald.

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** 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 [removed].

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