

Laurel Letter of Pends and Discussion (LoPaD): May 27, 2003

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

For the February 2003 meetings, printed May 27, 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 February 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 May LoI, these matters are currently scheduled for the Laurel meetings in September 2003. **Original commentary must be in the College's hands no later than July 31, 2003. Responses and rebuttals to commentary must be in the College's hands no later than August 31, 2003.**

1. Dana Callaghan of Fair Isle. Device. Gules, on a pale argent between two goblets Or a pine tree couped proper.

The pale was not blazoned as argent on the Letter of Intent, which (given the rest of the blazon) led the College to believe that the pale was Or. This is thus pending for further conflict research.

(This submission was item number 12 on Caid's LoI of October 25, 2002.)

2. Extension of RfS X.2. Issue.

As noted in the January 2003 Cover Letter, our rule change proposals are supposed to address the following major dissatisfactions in the SCA populace, without further diverging from the period bases of our rules for submission:

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.

RfS X.4 gives the codified cadency changes for armory: changes that indicate a father-son relationship. The first categories of RfS X.4 are well established cadency steps (X.4.a-e): changing the field, adding charges to the field, adding overall charges, changing the tincture of charges, and changing the type of charges. Changing the number of charges is less common (X.4.f) but is also fairly well established. Addition of, and changes to, charges on charges (X.4.i and j) are also quite common cadency methods.

This leaves X.4.g ("Arrangement Changes") and X.4.h ("Posture Changes") as cadency changes which are quite rare in period heraldry.

On doing research into these sorts of changes, it appears that when two pieces of armory differ only by a change in arrangement of the primary charges, both pieces of armory are often attributed to the same surname. This implies that the changes are either due to cadency or a less significant change (artistic/recording error or artistic variation). Thus, a CD for arrangement changes is appropriate. However, when two pieces of armory differ only by a substantial change in the posture of the primary charge group, the two pieces of armory are generally attributed to different surnames. This implies that the change is not generally due to cadency, but is usually due to a more significant change that would not be found as a result of a father-son relationship.

Certain types of changes not generally used for cadency, such as adding or removing a primary charge or substantially changing the type of the primary charge group, are already sufficient under X.1 and X.2 to clear a conflict. Therefore, we should consider extending X.2 to other changes that were not generally used as cadency steps.

Broadly speaking, there are three kinds of changes: changes which were effectively interchangeable, for which we give no difference; changes which would generally not have been used for cadency but are found in unrelated families, which should make two devices clear of conflict, as in X.1 and X.2; and changes which would have been used for cadency, for which we should give a CD. Certain postures seem to be interchangeable (such as statant and passant). We currently do not give difference under X.4 for these changes. Other changes, such as the change from rampant to passant, do not seem to have been generally used for cadency. There are many examples in the Dictionary of British Armorial (DBA) that indicate unrelated families are using arms that differ only in the change of posture of a beast from rampant to passant. For example: *Argent, a lion passant Gules* is attributed to Ogilvy and Querzeton, while a column and a half of *Argent, a lion Gules* includes no one with either surname; *Azure, a lion passant Or* is attributed to Liband, while a column of *Azure, a lion Or* includes no one of that surname; and *Gules, a boar passant argent* is attributed to Boor or Bore, while *Gules, a boar salient Argent collared and chained Or* is attributed to Eyre. In Scotland, *Argent, a lion passant Gules* is attributed to Ogilvy, while Dundas bears *Argent, a lion rampant Gules*. This implies that the change is not generally due to cadency, but is due to a more significant change that would not be found as a result of a father-son relationship. As such, such a change should be sufficient difference for two devices not to conflict.

Posture or orientation changes which turn charges to (or from) sinister have been considered different under X.4.h (and thus worth a CD) for some time, but would not be sufficient to remove the appearance of relatedness, and thus should not be a substantial change under any proposed change to RfS X.2.

Most changes to posture and orientation that currently are worth a CD would thus be sufficient for two pieces of armory to be clear under X.2. Changes to animal or bird posture, changes to orientation (palewise, fesswise, bendwise), and the inversion of objects would all be included under this rules change. Changes in whether charges face to dexter or to sinister would not, as this kind of change is not found primarily as a difference between unrelated families.

The proposal is thus to change RfS X.2 as follows:

Substantially Different Charges: Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the type, posture, or orientation of every primary charge is substantially changed. These types of changes were normally seen between complete strangers in blood, and were not usually used to indicate any form of cadency.

For purposes of this rule, simple armory is defined as armory that has no more than two types of charge directly on the field and has no overall charges.

The following examples are simple, with at most two types of charge on the field: *Argent, a fess sable. Sable, three lions Or. Vert, two eagles and a maunch argent. Vair, a bordure gules. Per pale gules and argent, a fess between three lozenges counterchanged. Or, on a chevron between three clarions gules, three garbs argent. Purple, on a pale dancetty within a bordure semé-de-lys argent, a millrind sable between two roses gules.*

The following examples are all non-simple, with more than two types of charges on the field, or with one or more overall charges: *Argent, a fess between two lions and a lozenge azure. Vert, a chevron between three swords, a bordure Or. Gules, a bend between two roundels argent, overall a lion Or. Per bend argent and sable, a bend gules between a tree and a cross crosslet counterchanged. Argent, a dragon sable, overall a bend gules.*

a. Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the type of every primary charge is substantially changed.

Argent, a fess sable does not conflict with *Argent, a lion sable. Vert, two eagles and a maunch argent* does not conflict with *Vert, three lozenges argent. Azure, a fess between three cups Or* does not conflict with *Azure, a chevron between three cups Or*. In each case the designs are simple and the type of every primary charge has been substantially changed.

Per chevron gules and argent, three oak trees counterchanged does conflict with *Per chevron gules and argent, three fir trees counterchanged*, because the type of charge has not been substantially changed; they both conflict with *Per chevron gules and argent, two mullets and a fir tree counterchanged* because not all of the primary charges have been substantially changed. *Vert, two mullets and a clarion argent within a bordure Or* conflicts with *Vert, three gauntlets argent within a bordure Or* because the first design is not simple, with three different types of charge on the field.

b. Simple armory does not conflict with other simple armory if the posture or individual orientation of every primary charge is substantially changed.

Argent, a wolf rampant sable does not conflict with *Argent, a wolf passant sable. Gules, two lions passant and a pheon argent* does not conflict with *Gules, two lions couchant and a pheon inverted argent. Azure, a cup between three fleurs-de-lys Or* does not conflict with *Azure, a cup bendwise between three fleurs-de-lys Or*. In each case the designs are simple and the posture of every primary charge has been substantially changed.

Per chevron azure and Or, three lions rampant counterchanged does conflict with *Per chevron azure and Or, three lions rampant contourny counterchanged*, because the posture not been substantially changed; they both conflict with *Per chevron azure and Or, two lions passant and a lion rampant counterchanged* because the posture of all of the primary charges has not been substantially changed. *Vert, a lion and a unicorn combattant within a bordure Or* conflicts with *Vert, a lion and a unicorn passant respectant within a bordure Or* because the designs are not simple, with three different types of charge on the field.

This proposal appears to fit the criteria for rules changes mentioned in the January LoAR cover letter:

1. This proposal does not make the rules much more difficult to use. Most of the complexity of RfS X.2 is in the definition of simple armory, and this definition is unchanged.
2. This makes submissions in general somewhat easier to register by reducing conflict.
3. This makes period-style submissions particularly easier to register by increasing the ease of registering simple "European core style" armory.
4. This does not diverge substantially from the current philosophical basis of the rules. As noted above, there are very few cases of cadency due to posture. In many more cases, changes to posture are found between unrelated individuals. Our current rules are only an approximation of period practice, not a perfect capture of period practice. Our rules already include one major example of a case where one type of period cadency, Addition of Primary Charge, may be used to completely avoid conflict (RfS X.1) even though some examples may be found in period where Addition of Primary Charge is used as a cadency step (particularly when the primary charge is an ordinary.) This proposed change to RfS X.2 is no worse from a philosophical perspective than our current RfS X.1.

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 July and your responses to the primary commentary complete by the end of August.

3. Oriana Luisa della Francesca. Device. Per chevron vert and per pale Or and gules, a chevron dovetailed on the upper edge argent between three compass stars Or and a fleur-de-lys florency per pale gules and Or.

The original blazon, *Per chevron vert and per pale Or and gules, a chevron dovetailed on the upper edge argent between in fess three compass stars and a fleur-de-lys florency counterchanged*, was unclear about the tincture of the counterchanged charges on this field, as there is no well-defined behavior for counterchanging charges on a field per chevron and per pale. In particular, the College was unable to ascertain the tincture of the compass stars. This must therefore be pended for further conflict research.

There were some questions about the contrast of this field. We note that the Cover Letter for the LoAR of October 2000 gives substantial discussion of "medium contrast" fields, defined as fields "divided so that half was a solid color and half was evenly divided between color and metal." Such fields are, given the Cover Letter discussion, clearly acceptable as long as the charges

on them have acceptable contrast (which is the main topic of discussion in the Cover Letter). By the guidelines in the Cover Letter for the October 2000 LoAR, in this submission, both the field and the charges upon it have acceptable contrast. The submitter should be advised, at the completion of the pend of this armory, to draw fewer and larger dovetails on the chevron.

(This submission was item number 14 on Ansteorra's LoI of October 20, 2002.)

4. Trimaris, Kingdom of. Heraldic title Sea-Griffin Herald.

This item appeared in different forms in the electronic and paper copies of the LoI. As a result, some commenters provided commentary on *Sea-Dog Herald* and some on *Sea-Griffin Herald*. The forms indicate that the submitted name was *Sea-Griffin Herald*, which matches the paper LoI rather than the electronic LoI.

The text for this item that appeared in the paper copy of the LoI is as follows:

New title "Sea-Griffin" Herald. Sea-Griffin is listed as a heraldic charge in the *Pictorial Dictionary of Heraldry as used in the SCA*, s.n. Sea-Monster and is therefore acceptable as a heraldic title under RfS III.2.b.iii.

We are pending this item to allow the College to provide commentary.

(This submission was on Trimaris's paper LoI of October 15, 2002.)

Pray know that I remain

In service

François la Flamme
Laurel Principal King of Arms