

For the January 2003 meetings, printed April 21, 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	Jan 18 & 19	Feb 08	Mar 22 & 30	Apr 19 & 13	May 17	Jun 14 & 08	Jul 12
Pelican meeting	Jan 18 & 19	Feb 08	Mar 22 & 12	Apr 26	May 17	Jun ? & 08	?
Comment by					too late	Apr 30	May 31
Respond by					Apr 30	May 31	Jun 30
<b>Letters of Intent being considered:</b>							
AEthelmearc	Sep 17	Oct 22 [P Oct 30]	Nov 23	Dec 19	-	Feb 24	(Mar 24)
An Tir	Sep 30	Oct 30	Nov 29	Dec 27	Jan 27	Feb 25	(Mar 28)
Ansteorra	Sep 15	Oct 20 [P Oct 30]	-	Dec 18	Jan 19 [P Jan 27]	Feb 20	(Mar 20)
Artemisia	Sep 30	-	Nov 30	-	Jan 31	-	Mar 30
Atenveldt	Sep 15	Oct 20	-	Dec 20	Jan 20	(Feb 15 [P Feb 26])	(Mar 15)
Atlantia	Aug 30 [P Sep 30]	Oct 26 & Oct 27	-	Nov 24 & Dec 20	Jan 26	-	(Mar 25)
Caid	Sep 10	Oct 01 & Oct 25	-	Nov 10 [P Dec 03]	-	Feb 21	(Mar 01)
Calontir	Sep 03	Oct 16	Nov 13	-	-	-	Mar 19
Drachenwald	Sep 19	Oct 25	Nov 23	Dec 23	Jan 23	Feb 24	(Mar 25)
Ealdormere	-	-	Nov 22	-	Jan 31	(Feb 19)	-
East	Sep 01 & Sep 22	Oct 27	-	Nov 24 & Dec 15	Jan 07 & Jan 23	Feb 23	-
Lochac	-	-	-	-	-	-	(Mar 25)
Meridies	Sep 30	-	Nov 30	Dec 31	Jan 31	Feb 28	Mar 31
Middle	Sep 16	Oct 14	Nov 11	Dec 14	Jan 15	Feb 17	Mar 24
Outlands	Sep 23	Oct 23	Nov 23	Dec 23	Jan 23	(Feb 23)	(Mar 23)
Trimaris	Sep 30	Oct 15	Nov 15	Dec 14	-	Feb 15	-
West	Sep 25	Oct 29	Nov 27	-	Jan 21	Feb 26	Mar 26
Laurel LoPaD [LoAR date]	Sep 19 [Sep LoAR]	-	Nov 14 [Aug LoAR]	Dec 18 [Sep LoAR]	Jan 31 [Nov LoAR]	Feb 27 [Dec 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.

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.

August: Wreath's meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 16.

*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: Regarding the Delay**

The long-awaited January decisions are contained in this letter. This letter has taken much too long to produce. I could offer excuses but I will not. Instead, I would like to thank you for your patience and understanding, this once. Changes are being made that will speed the process of getting the decisions to you and the submitters. I appreciate the uncomfortable spot you were placed with the submitters. Please accept my apology for the delay.

#### **From Laurel: Glossary of Terms Changes for Review**

The College may recall that in the April 2002 cover letter we solicited comments for changes to the Glossary of Terms. We received very little commentary on this topic, with the notable exceptions of Siren, Ruby, and Nebuly (thanks!). This mailing includes proposed changes to the Glossary. Please have your comments in for consideration at the August 2003 decision meetings.

#### **From Laurel: Requests for Reconsideration**

The following definition, Request for Reconsideration, is to be added to the Administrative Handbook in section IV, General Procedures for Submissions, following IV.E, Right of Appeal. The current section IV.F, Heraldic Wills, will be redesignated as section IV.G.

F. Request for Reconsideration - A submitter may request reconsideration of changes made as a result of a request for authenticity in a name submission. All requests must either: (a) be supported by new documentation supporting the original name as complying with the requested authenticity, (b) submit a timely request for a name based on information provided in Laurel's decision, or (c) include a request that the original name be considered with no request for authenticity. Such reconsideration may be considered with the standards in effect at the time of the request. Requests for reconsideration must be submitted through the appropriate heraldic officers specified for such actions by the submitter's kingdom of residence. Such officers must forward the request in a timely manner, with or without recommendations, to Laurel. Requests for Reconsideration will be considered "resubmissions" for the purposes of section IV.D, Payment of Fees.

We would like to thank everyone for the commentary. It was suggested that we extend this clause to also include changes made by Laurel at registration. At this time we decline to extend the scope beyond changes made to meet an authenticity request.

#### **From Laurel: Rules Change Proposal**

##### *General Principles*

We can all agree that rules changes should never be made lightly. However, there is no doubt that there are some major dissatisfactions amongst both heralds and non-heralds with the state of heraldry in the SCA, and some of these dissatisfactions may be ameliorated by rules changes. Of course, much of this discontent has been present since the dawn of SCA heraldry, and is unlikely to ever disappear entirely, but this should not keep us from trying to improve. The most prominent of the dissatisfactions fall into the following categories:

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.

It has been thirteen years since the last sweeping revision of the rules, which included some notable changes to the underlying general principles of some of our major rules. It is quite likely approaching a time when the College should revisit the underlying philosophical principles behind our current rules. Such discussions, if they occur, will be long and time-consuming. Even if such discussions were to begin in our tenure, they would not be complete until well after we step down from office in January 2004.

At this time, we would like to consider the possibility of implementing rules changes that address the three major dissatisfactions above without either (a) changing the philosophical basis of the current rules or (b) diverging further from the basic philosophical principles of the current rules.

##### *Specific Proposal: Revision to RfS X.4.j (Changes to Charges on Charges)*

In this spirit, we propose the following change to RfS X.4.j:

**X.4.j. Changes to Charges on Charges** - Changes to a group of charges placed entirely on other charges may create one clear difference.

No more than one clear difference can be obtained from changes to the same group of charges on other charges.

Significantly changing the type, number, tincture, or posture of the whole group of charges entirely placed on other charges is one clear difference. *Sable, on a chevron argent an escallop vert* is one clear

difference from *Sable, on a chevron argent an escallop gules*, because the tincture of the whole group has significantly changed. *Gules, on a saltire Or four mullets gules* is not a clear difference from *Gules, on a saltire Or five mullets gules*, because the change in number from four to five is not significant by RfS X.4.f. *Vert, on a chief argent three cinquefoils vert* is not a clear difference from *Vert, on a chief argent a cinquefoil vert between two mullets gules*, because no change has been made which affects the whole group of charges on charges.

A change of arrangement of a group of charges entirely placed on other charges is one clear difference, provided that the change is not caused by other changes to the design.

The reasons behind this proposal are as follows:

1. The proposal makes the rules much easier to use. The new rule is simpler in construction: instead of having X.4.j.i and X.4.j.ii.a-d, it simply has X.4.j. The rule is also less than one-fourth the length of the previous X.4.j and its subsections. We also note that we get more complaints about RfS X.4.j.ii than almost any other armorial rule (largely due to the complex construction of the rule, and the second definition in RfS X of the term "simple" armory). This proposal removes the cause of those complaints.
2. The proposal makes armory in general easier to register by reducing conflict.
3. The proposal also makes period-style armory easier to register by reducing conflict: period-style armory benefits from this rule as much as non-period-style armory.
4. The proposal is philosophically consistent with the general philosophy of the rules for submission. The general text for RfS X (Conflicting Armory) states:

A piece of armory may not be too similar to other pieces of armory, as is required by General Principle 3a of these rules. Period armory frequently distinguished between immediate relatives, like a father and his son, by making a single change to the arms in a process called "cadency". The changes made in such circumstances can be considered the smallest change that period heralds would recognize. This section defines ways in which submitted armory must be changed to be sufficiently different from protected armory.

RfS X.4, Significant Armorial Differences, effectively codifies these cadency changes for SCA use.

We are not aware of a period basis for the complexity of the current version of RfS X.4.j. This complexity seems to be due to the retention of some previous codifications of purely visual difference found in the 1986 and earlier versions of the rules. In order to preserve the need for a change to a group of tertiary charges to have some notable visual impact (even in complicated armory), we have kept the requirement from the current version of RfS X.4.j.i, which states that "Generally such changes must affect the whole group of charges to be considered visually significant." We do, however, note that in some cases, period cadency only affects one of a group of three tertiary charges (see Gayre's *Heraldic Cadency*, p. 38, in re the family of Grandison in the 13th and 14th C).

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 June and your responses to the primary commentary complete by the end of July. Please ensure that your commentary is going to Siren Herald's latest (Oregon) address, originally published in the cover letter to the July 2002 LoAR and repeated here: ....

### **From Laurel: Beyond the Encyclopedia**

The College of Arms protects the names of people outside of the Society for two reasons: to limit sanctioned presumption and to limit names that "destroys any medieval ambience" when used. There have been many period style names that have been returned because they were also used by someone "in period" or since because they conflicted with a name with an entry in an encyclopedia. Few of these conflicting names would be considered significant by the average member of our Society.

The Administrative Handbook section concerning protection of names begins "Names of Significant Personages Outside the Society - Contemporary or historical personages will generally be considered significant if they appear in standard references such as an encyclopedia." The effect of using the encyclopedia as an indicator of the level of the person's importance is that we give the decision of who is significant to the encyclopedia's editor. To understand the implications of giving the decision to the editors of the encyclopedia, we must review the reasons we protect the names of people outside of the Society.

One of the tenets of our recreation is that we strive to be someone who could have lived during our period of study. There is no formal enforcement of this premise; rather, we let social pressure encourage compliance. The acceptance and registration of a name by the College of Arms is an official recognition of the name. If someone submits the wonderfully period name "Elizabeth Tudor", we do not wish to be in the position of giving her official permission to "be" Elizabeth I, Queen of England.

We protect names and limit registration of names that would intrude upon our recreation by recognition or association with a famous person. Although a good period name, most people's first thoughts are distinctly modern when they hear the

name *Michael Jackson*. Traditionally the College has worked to protect such intrusion by limits on the names we accept for registration.

An entry in a general-purpose encyclopedia is the defined method for determining whether a name is significant enough to protect. This method has the advantage of accessibility so that most people can easily check for real-world conflicts before submitting a name. We can be assured the editors will include virtually everyone that we would consider significant. But the editors have a broader educational purpose that includes a wider scope than ours. This larger scope causes any general encyclopedia to include many entries for people that few in our society would recognize or consider significant.

Until recently, an editor was forced to balance the importance of a person with the cost associated with publication when considering including an entry. One effect of this balance is evidenced in the length of each entry. Typically, the more significant a person the larger the entry. The advent and proliferation of online and electronic publication has allowed the editors to widen the scope of entries with little or no additional costs. The reduced cost improves and broadens the usefulness of the encyclopedia as a general educational tool but does reduce its usefulness for our purpose.

In this letter you will find a name registered even though there is a conflicting encyclopedia entry. From the informal polling I have conducted, the name does not have the instant recognition that would be presumptuous or provoke thoughts outside the recreation to the average person.

In order to bring the decision back within the College of Arms and to realign with our scope of protection, we are refining the process by which we decide which names to protect. Beginning with this letter, each name will be evaluated individually. The initial factor will continue to be an entry in a general-purpose encyclopedia. However, now we consider the prominence of this person (including when they lived and the length and contents of their encyclopedia entry) when determining whether they are important enough to protect.

In the future, we would ask that commenters state whether or not they feel a person is important enough to protect when citing a potential conflict in the form of a person listed in an encyclopedia. Ideally this statement would be provided early enough to allow other CoA commenters time to provide input to Laurel as comments on comments. Until a metric can be developed for weighing the importance of an individual we will give the most weight to the existence of an entry in a printed encyclopedia.

I would appreciate your ideas for a consistent and repeatable method for determining if a person is significantly well known or significantly important historically to protect. Comments should be sent to the entire College of Arms. Please have your primary commentary complete by June and your responses to the primary commentary complete by July.

(Daniel, Laurel Clerk, reminds everyone that commentary on a LoPaD item should be included under the LoPaD header verbatim, in this case "Beyond the Encyclopedia", to keep the automated collation process from coughing up a hairball.)

### **From Wreath: The Trillium**

A *trillium* is a New World flower with three equal-sized large pointed petals. It is sometimes depicted with sepals showing between the petals, like the barbs of the heraldic rose. The trillium is relatively popular in the SCA, with over thirty registrations.

It has become apparent that, over the SCA's registration history, there has been no consistent default orientation for this flower. All agree that it is affronty by default, but the registration history differs on whether it should be drawn with one petal up by default (with the petals in pall inverted) or with one petal down by default (with the petals in pall). Precedent indicates that the orientation of a trillium is not an artistic choice, but is worth difference:

[a wild ginger flower vs a trillium inverted] ... there is one CD ... for the inversion of the flower.  
Three-petaled flowers have a distinct orientation, unlike flowers with more petals. (LoAR September 2000)

It is thus incumbent on us to declare a clear default for the trillium. The earliest registration of the trillium in the SCA was by Catherine de Bellefleur in August 1979, *Azure, semy of Silver-Bell flowers, a Large-Flowered Trillium flower, all proper. [Halesia carolina, Trillium grandiflorum]*. The trillium in her armory is depicted with the petals in pall. The best-known registrations of a trillium belong to the Kingdom of Ealdormere, who have always emblazoned their trillium consistently with the petals in pall (with the exception, ironically, of the Principal Herald's seal). This is also the more common orientation for a trillium in SCA armory. This orientation thus seems to be the correct default for the charge:

PRECEDENT: The default orientation for a trillium has one petal to base, so the petals are *in pall*. A *trillium inverted* has one petal to chief, so the petals are *in pall inverted*.

In this LoAR, we have reblazoned the armory using the trillium to comply with the new default.

Frequent users of the *Pictorial Dictionary* should note that the trillium illustrated in that work is a *trillium inverted* by the default stated above. The *Pictorial Dictionary* only declares that a trillium is *affronty* by default and does not otherwise specify its orientation. The *Pictorial Dictionary* demonstrates that the ambiguity in the default orientation of the trillium goes back quite some time. Both its cited examples were blazoned as *a trillium* in their registered blazons. However, one of the examples (Cedric of Thanet, registered in 1989) uses a trillium with the petals in pall inverted, and the other example (the Prince of Ealdormere, also registered in 1989 and now the arms of the Kingdom of Ealdormere) uses a trillium with the petals in pall.

### **From Pelican: Regarding Registerability of Tibetan Names**

This month, a submission again raised the issue of whether Tibetan names should be registerable. Previously, names from Tibet have been ruled unregistrable. The submission considered this month had to be returned for other issues with the name. At this time, we are declining to rule on whether the ban on Tibetan names should or should not be lifted. However, this issue comes up from time to time. Therefore, we are presenting the current status of collected information regarding contact between Tibetan culture and Western Europeans in period, so that members of the College may consider these points and contribute their opinions when this question is raised again.

Previous precedent states:

[returning Vairocana Belnon of Uddiyana] There are several problems with this name... More important, significant interaction between Tibet and pre-seventeenth century Western culture has not been demonstrated. The Encyclopædia Britannica dates the first visits to Tibet by Western missionaries to the 17th century, and the fact that the 8th century Tibetan kingdom had some contact with the Arab conquerors of Iran still leaves Tibetans at least two removes from Western Europe. (Talan Gwynek, LoAR November 1995, p. 16).

The key point in the precedent cited above is the word significant in the phrase "significant interaction between Tibet and pre-seventeenth century Western culture has not been demonstrated". In order for names from a particular culture to be available for registration, evidence must be presented of significant contact between that culture and Western European culture previous to 1600.

The Middle's September 16, 2002, LoI (under the submission for *Gorum Bodpa*) puts forth the argument:

The client argues that in the late 16th century, Tibetan monks and lamas frequently traveled to Buddhist shrines in India (according to R.A. Stein, *Tibetan Civilization*, p. 59). One such shrine close to the Tibetan-Indian border in the village of Sarnath was also close to the Portuguese seaport of Hoogly, occupied from 1537-1640 (according to the *Oxford Atlas of World History*, p. 62 and 118). The client argues that the proximity of these places made interaction possible, even if the actual event is not recorded. To extend the argument further, if it is beyond dispute that the inhabitants of India had period interaction with Europeans (and that should be apparent), it is plausible that peoples residing in the areas frequented by Europeans would have had just as much chance of interaction, whether they were indigenous to the regions or not. In sum, while not asserting that Tibetans (in Tibet) had contact with Europeans in period, it is possible that travelling Tibetans could have.

That a few Tibetans could have had contact with some Portuguese in an area in India is not evidence of significant contact between Tibetan culture and Western Europeans.

Members of the College put forth significant effort re-researching this issue and we would like to thank them for their contributions to this topic. The documented contact between Tibetans and Western Europeans in period found by the College, in addition to that supplied by the submitter, consists of:

- a physician from Rome invited to Tibet in the 7th C (R.A. Stein, *Tibetan Civilization*, p. 61)
- a physician from the Byzantine Empire came to Tibet and was court doctor to Srong-btsan-sgam-po. (*Ancient Tibet*, p. 220). This may be the same person mentioned above.

Additionally, the northern overland route of the Silk Road is shown going around the Taklamalean Desert of Central Asia and through Tibet (Elizabeth Grotenhuis, *Along the Silk Road*). Because of this route, there may have been some contact between Tibetans and Europeans who travelled on the Silk Road. The level of such contact would need to be discussed by the College to determine whether such contact was significant enough to support registration of Tibetan names.

We would ask members of the College to consider these points, especially in comparison to registerability of other Asian cultures, that they may offer their opinions when this issue is raised again.

### **Roster Updates**

The Crescent Principal Herald of Caid has changed. Dietmar Reinhart von Straubing ... is taking some time off to be with his new family and is no longer on the roster and mailing list. The new Crescent Principal Herald (Caid) is Jeanne Marie Lacroix ..., currently Sommelier Pursuivant. Her e-mail address should be updated to crescent@castle.org. Her phone number and postal address are unchanged: ...

As Dolphin Herald (Caid), Lachlan Erskine of Cromarty ..., e-mail dolphin@castle.org, is added to the roster and mailing list. Dolphin will be publishing the Letters of Intent for Caid.

Battlement Pursuivant (Caid), Manus le Dragonier ... is no longer on the roster.

Also from Caid, Selene Colfax ... is added to the roster under the title of Sable Fret Pursuivant (the baronial herald for Altavia).

The Brigantia Principal Herald of the East has recently changed as well. Kenrick Burne of Northampton ... is no longer on the roster and mailing list. The new Brigantia is Avelina Keys ..., e-mail brigantia@eastkingdom.org (no calls after 10:00 P.M. Eastern time). She is added to the roster and mailing list. ...

The Trillium Principal Herald of Ealdormere will be changing in early May. The current Trillium Principal Herald, Arwyn of Leicester ..., will no longer be on the roster and mailing list. The new Trillium Principal Herald will be Erick of Longacres .... He was on the roster and mailing list without title, and remains on the roster and mailing list (as all principal heralds are). His contact information again: ....

Meridies had a change in Principal Herald at Gulf Wars. The Beacon Principal Herald, AElfgifu Haraldsdottir ..., is no longer on the mailing list and roster. Cairbre mac Siomaigh ..., currently listed as Lambent Herald, is now Beacon Principal Herald of Meridies and remains on the roster and mailing list. Please note his new email address: beacon@meridies.org. His other contact information remains unchanged: ....

Stepping in as Lambent Herald (Meridies) is Colm Dubh ..., previously Black Dove Pursuivant on the roster. He is now added to the mailing list as well. He has a new e-mail address: lambent@meridies.org.

We are adding a couple of Principality of Northshield heralds to the mailing list and roster. Polaris Herald (Middle), Alasdair Montgomery ..., e-mail herald@northshield.org is added to the roster and mailing list. Polaris is the Principality Herald for Northshield.

Also added to the roster and mailing list is Keythong Herald (Middle), Gevehard von Baden .... Keythong is the submissions herald for the Principality of Northshield.

Palimpsest Herald (Laurel Staff), Rouland Carre ... is no longer on the roster and mailing list. For the next few months, rules discussions will be delegated to various members of the College of Arms.

Brenna Lowri o Ruthin ... and Irene von Schmetterling ... were on the roster (but not the mailing list) as untitled Laurel staff. They are no longer on the roster.

### **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