

Laurel Letter of Pends and Discussion (LoPaD): 27 April, 2007

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

For the January 2007 meetings, printed 27 April, 2007

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 January 2007 LoAR for CoA discussion. The text in this letter is copied verbatim from that LoAR; it is provided here for convenience. As with an April 2007 LoI, these matters are currently scheduled for the Pelican and Wreath meetings in August 2006. **Original commentary must be in the College's hands no later than June 30, 2007. Responses and rebuttals to commentary must be in the College's hands no later than July 31, 2007.**

1. Máirghr ad NicChlurain. Device. Purpure, in pall a three-headed thistle between three triquetra Or.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Purpure, a plant of three thistle flowers between three triquetra Or*, the charges are co-primary. This is pended to allow conflict checking as four co-primary charges.

This was item 10 on the Caid letter of September 20, 2006.

2. Matillis atte Hethe. Badge. Argent, three bendlets purpure and overall a tower azure.

Blazoned on the LoI as *Argent, three bendlets purpure on a tower overall azure a Latin cross pometty argent*, the cross appears to be a standard arrow slit and not worth a CD. This is pended to allow conflict checking without the tertiary. This is similar to the way that portals and windows are treated.

A field with three bendlets must also be conflict checked as if it were a bendy field. This is clear of the badge of Serena Lascelles, (*Fieldless*) *A chessrook azure*. In December 2001 Laurel ruled:

[*Sable, a chess rook argent*] This is clear of conflict with ... *Sable, a tower argent*. There is substantial difference between a tower and a properly drawn chess rook, so RfS X.2 applies.

In the LoAR of October 1996, it was stated that there was "nothing for the difference between a tower and a chess-rook". This precedent is hereby overturned: a tower and a chess rook were considered different charges in period and have substantial visual difference. The period heraldic chess rook is drawn consistently in a form where the top is forked into two prominent curled points. This was a standard depiction for the period chess piece, as illustrated in Caxton's 1474 "Game and Playe of the Chesse". The period heraldic chess rook does not resemble any sort of fortification and cannot be mistaken for a tower. On examining the collated commentary for the October 1996 ruling, it appears that perhaps the commenters mistakenly believed that the particular chess rook in the possible conflict was drawn as a tower, rather than as a period chess rook. [William fitzBubba, 12/01, A-East]

Serena's chess rook is a properly drawn, period chess rook and thus has a substantial difference from a tower.

This was item 7 on the An Tir letter of September 27, 2006.

3. Ormond of Ormonde Pursuivant. Release of heraldic title.

There was some question about the actual registered form of this title. While the titles *Ormond* and *Ormonde Pursuivant* are both titles belonging to the Lyon Court in Scotland, and which have been used by that court in the past, the title *Ormond of Ormonde Pursuivant* does not exist. We are investigating whether the *of* was originally intended to be *or*. The decision on the ultimate disposition of this item is pended until this determination can be made.

This was item 27 on the Siren letter of September 30, 2006.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Elisabeth de Rossignol
Laurel Principal Queen of Arms