

Society for Creative Anachronism
College of Arms
601 S Washington #137
Stillwater OK 74074
+1 405 428 3662
laurel@heraldry.sca.org

For the March 2021 meetings, printed May 7, 2021

To all the College of Arms and all others who may read this missive, from Emma Laurel, Elisabetta Pelican, and Oddr Wreath, greetings.

From Laurel: KWHSS 2022 Bids Requested

It's that time again! (Actually, past that time!) For those considering bidding on the 2022 Known World Heraldic and Scribal Symposium, the deadline to have your bid entered into OSCAR is July 1, 2020. This deadline may be extended as needed, given the short timeframe and the ongoing uncertainty due to COVID-19, but we would prefer to be able to announce the bid's award within a few months. Ideally, we'll be able to announce it at the 2021 KWHSS held virtually via the Kingdom of the West, on July 9-11, at the Road Show.

Please remember that bids posted to OSCAR are publicly readable. Because of this, any personal information, such as legal names, addresses, phone numbers, and email, should not be included in these bids without signed written permission. Such information as is necessary for the entire College of Arms to see should be posted as a comment after the bid is finalized; any identifying information that the Sovereigns might need should be included as a Sovereign Note.

Please send a copy of the full unredacted bid to Laurel at laurel@heraldry.sca.org.

As a reminder, there is a KWHSS domain and web hosting space available on the SCA's servers. Please do not register a new domain.

There is some information available at <https://heraldry.sca.org/kwhss/>, but it is woefully out of date (and being worked on). Please contact Laurel if you have any questions.

From Pelican: French Inn Sign Names

This month we considered a submission using the construction *Housse X* for a French inn sign-style household name. This construction appears in "Inn Signs and House Names in 15th Century Paris" by Juliana de Luna (<http://medievalscotland.org/jes/ParisInnHouseNames/>) under the heading "Houses Named After Their Owners: Surname".

Further research by Brunissende Dragonette revealed that *Housse Gilet* does not refer to a household name at all by itself. Rather, it is a reference to *la housse gilet*, a type of waistcoat cover or vest in the 14th and 15th centuries. The other example in this article of *housse gilet* is *Maison de la housse gilet*, which we now know to be an inn sign name based on a heraldic charge. Therefore, moving forward, we will no longer register the construction *Housse X* where X is a French surname.

From Pelican: The Spanish household designator *Tercio*

This month we registered a household name using the Spanish designator *Tercio*. This designator was used in period to refer to military units, and it is therefore suitable for construction of household names. Without further evidence, it is not suitable for registration in order names or for use in Spanish inn sign names. Though period names of *tercios* frequently included the leader's rank or title, ranks and titles may only be used when they do not create an presumptuous claim to rank under the standards of NPN4.B.1 of SENA.

Suitable substantive elements for registering a *Tercio* are locatives (place names), given name + surname, and surname alone.

From Pelican: Addition to Baltic section of SENA Appendix A

The December 29th Rules Letter proposed changes to the Baltic section Appendix A. This proposal is accepted and Palimpsest has been directed to update the appendix. The changes remove Latvia and update the patterns in Lithuanian that do not need further documentation. We wish to thank ffride Morelle for her research into this area, allowing us to expand our data further into Eastern Europe.

From Wreath: Named Motifs Table in Glossary of Terms

The December 31st Rules Letter implemented the Named Motifs that were approved on the November 2020 Cover Letter. Table 6 - Named Motifs is accepted as proposed and will be added to the Glossary of Terms.

From Wreath: On Primary Charges Between Flaunches

This month we found cause to reblazon a device consisting of two flaunches and a central cross "overall", to clarify the fact that, under current standards, the cross was a *primary* charge, not an *overall* charge.

SENA Appendix I.A reads in part, "If there are no central ordinaries and the armory has a central charge or charges, they are the primary charge group." Appendix I.D says (emphasis added), "An overall charge group is a charge or group of charges which crosses the center of the field, lying partially on the field and partially on other charges. *It can only appear on a design that has a primary charge group.*" Both of these definitions deny consideration of the cross on this device as an *overall* charge. It must instead be considered *primary*, despite overlapping (very slightly) the flaunches.

While this may appear to produce an apparent contradiction in charge group theory (how can a charge overlap without being considered overall?), we must give weight to period practice, where artistry ultimately defines armory. To that end, Iago Boar notes the very comparable example of the arms of Hobart, which can be found under the heading "1 Estoile between 2 flaunches" in *DBA 3* with 3 examples, and under "2 flaunches & over all estoile" in *DBA 4* with 4 examples. Additional examples can be found in *Arms B*, c. 1650 Irish (Genealogical Office Manuscripts Collection, National Library of Ireland, Department of Manuscripts, GO MS 61), <http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000540616>, which includes both the overall version on p. 55 and the "mullet-primary" version on p. 108. Based on this evidence, it is apparent that a primary charge between flaunches can sometimes be depicted partially overlapping the flaunches *without compromising their identity as primary charges*. While such a depiction would likely result in a return for ambiguity of charge group or for having a "barely overall" charge group under current practice, this level of artistic license should be kept in mind when researching period arms or prior Society registrations.

From Wreath: On the Default Orientation of Hoes

This month, we revisited a quirk of Society armory that defined the default orientation of the *hoe* as *blade to base*, contrary to what is typically seen in period armory. After reviewing the period evidence, we are reversing existing precedent, and adopting the period model. Starting with this letter, the default orientation of a hoe is *blade to chief*.

From Pelican: Change to SENA NPN4B2

This section of SENA dealing with Non-Personal Names Presumption is modified as proposed in the December 8th Rules Letter to include the fact that the addition of a branch name to a protected historical order name does not remove presumption. The revised section:

2. Names of the Peerage Orders: Order and award names may not include the names of the peerage orders or overt references to famous knightly orders such as *the Garter*. Other types of non-personal names may only use such elements in contexts where no reference to the order is likely to be perceived by members of the order and the general populace. The addition of a branch name to a protected historical order name does not remove the appearance of a reference to that name.

For example, while the name *Order of the Garter and Laurel* is clear of conflict with the *Order of the Laurel*, it is presumptuous and we would not register it. Likewise, we would not register *Order of the Rose of the West*, even though the addition of the element of *the West* clears the conflict with the *Order of the Rose*. We would not register *Order of the Ermine of the West*

because this name appears to reference a regional offshoot of a protected historical knightly order, the *Order of the Ermine*, which was founded by a fourteenth-century Duke of Brittany.

For example, *House of the Blue Garter* could be seen as a reference to the blue garter badge of the *Order of the Garter* and would not be registered. We would register *House of the White Garter*, because the addition of the color word *White* clearly distinguishes the household name from the famous historical order, which used a blue garter badge.

The insert/delete version:

2. Names of the Peerage Orders: Order and award names may not include the names of the peerage orders or overt references to famous knightly orders such as *the Garter*. Other types of non-personal names may only use such elements in contexts where no reference to the order is likely to be perceived by members of the order and the general populace. The addition of a branch name to a protected historical order name does not remove the appearance of a reference to that name.

For example, while the name *Order of the Garter and Laurel* is clear of conflict with the *Order of the Laurel*, it is presumptuous and we would not register it. Likewise, we would not register *Order of the Rose of the West*, even though the addition of the element *of the West* clears the conflict with the *Order of the Rose*. We would not register *Order of the Ermine of the West* because this name appears to reference a regional offshoot of a protected historical knightly order, the *Order of the Ermine*, which was founded by a fourteenth-century Duke of Brittany.

For example, *House of the Blue Garter* could be seen as a reference to the blue garter badge of the *Order of the Garter* and would not be registered, ~~but *House of the White Garter* would be allowed.~~ We would register *House of the White Garter*, because the addition of the color word *White* clearly distinguishes the household name from the famous historical order, which used a blue garter badge.

From Wreath: Change to SENA A5F

The December 23rd Rules Letter proposed changes to SENA A5F to allow a substantial difference for changes to the field for all fielded armory, not just field-primary armory. Those suggestions, with some modifications are accepted. The revised wording for A5F:

F. Standards for Difference through a Single Substantial Change of Field for Fielded Armory: A new submission does not conflict with a piece of protected armory if the two fields have a substantially different partition as defined below.

Field-primary armory, that is, armory which has no primary charge group, including armory with peripheral ordinaries, whether they are charged or uncharged, may also be clear of conflict by the addition or removal of a primary charge group, as described in A.5.E.1 above. Field-primary armory may also derive substantial difference from a substantial change of tincture as defined below.

All fielded armory may also be clear of conflict by having two independent changes, including two independent changes to the field itself, as described in A.5.G.1 below.

1. Substantial Change of Partition: A new submission is clear of any other piece of protected armory when it substantially changes the partitioning of the field.

a. **Total Addition or Removal of Division:** Any divided field has a substantially changed partition from any plain field. The multiply divided furs are considered plain fields for this purpose.

For example, *Per pale azure and vert* is substantially different from *Vert*, and thus clear of conflict with it. It is also substantially different from *Vair* or *Potent*.

NOTE: Section A5F1b is unchanged.

2. Substantial Change of Tincture for Field-Primary Armory: If the field of a new field-primary submission has no tinctures in common with the field of a protected piece of armory, they do not conflict. If a new submission with a field divided into two sections, three sections, *quarterly*, or *per saltire* has changed the tincture of each section of that field and each has at least one tincture on the field that the other does not, the two are substantially different and do not conflict.

Furs are considered to be different from one another and from their base tincture. The addition of a field treatment is also a change of tincture.

For example, *Per chevron azure and gules* and *Per chevron sable and argent* do not conflict, because the fields do not share a tincture. *Per pale azure and gules* and *Per pale gules and argent* do not conflict, because they are a type of field division with two sections, they have changed the tincture of each section, and each one has a tincture that differs. Similarly, *Quarterly azure and gules, a bordure argent* and *Quarterly gules and Or a bordure argent* do not conflict because they are four-section field divisions, they have changed the tincture of each section, and they each have a tincture that differs - the tincture of the bordure is not relevant.

For example, *Per pale azure and gules* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Per pale gules and azure* because neither has a tincture the other does not. *Barry bendy vert and argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Barry bendy sinister vert and Or* because both share a tincture in the same section. *Paly azure and gules* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Paly gules and argent* because they are divided into multiple sections (such that the order of the tinctures makes little visual difference) and they share a tincture. This is true even for *Paly of four parts*.

For example, *Per bend ermine and azure* is substantially different from *Per bend erminois and gules* and from *Per bend argent and sable*. *Per fess argent and gules* is substantially different from *Per fess argent masoned gules and sable*. In each case, the two pieces of armory have no tinctures in common.

The insert/delete version:

F. Standards for Difference through a Single Substantial Change of Field for

Field-Primary Fielded Armory: This rule applies only to field-primary armory; that is, armory which has no primary charge group, including armory with peripheral ordinaries, whether they are charged or uncharged. Field-primary armory is discussed further in Appendix I. A new field-primary submission does not conflict with a piece of protected field-primary armory if the two fields have a substantially different partition or tincture as defined below.

Field-primary armory, that is, armory which has no primary charge group, including armory with peripheral ordinaries, whether they are charged or uncharged, may also be clear of conflict by the addition or removal of a primary charge group, as described in A.5.E.1 above. Field-primary armory may also derive substantial difference from a substantial change of tincture as defined below.

Field-primaryAll fielded armory may also be clear of conflict by having two independent changes, including two independent changes to the field itself, as described in A.5.G.1 below.

1. Substantial Change of Partition: A new field-primary submission is clear of any other piece of protected field-primary armory when it substantially changes the partitioning of the field.

a. **Total Addition or Removal of Division:** Any divided field has a substantially changed partition from any plain field. The multiply divided furs are considered plain fields for this purpose.

For example, *Per pale azure and vert* is substantially different from *Vert*, and thus clear of conflict with it. It ~~would~~is also be substantially different from *Vair* or *Potent*.

NOTE: Section A5F1b is unchanged.

2. Substantial Change of Tincture for Field-Primary Armory: If the field of a new field-primary submission has no tinctures in common with the field of a protected piece of armory, they do not conflict. If a new submission with a field divided into two sections, three sections, *quarterly*, or *per saltire* has changed the tincture of each section of that field and each has at least one tincture on the field that the other does not, the two are substantially different and do not conflict.

Furs are considered to be different from one another and from their base tincture. The addition of a field treatment is also a change of tincture.

For example, *Per chevron azure and gules* and *Per chevron sable and argent* do not conflict, because the fields do not share a tincture. *Per pale azure and gules* and *Per pale gules and argent* do not conflict, because they are a type of field division with two sections, they have changed the tincture of each section, and each one has a tincture that differs. Similarly, *Quarterly azure and gules, a bordure argent* and *Quarterly gules and Or a bordure argent* do not conflict because they are four-section field divisions, they have changed the tincture of each section, and they each have a tincture that differs - the tincture of the bordure is not relevant.

~~For example In contrast,~~ *Per pale azure and gules* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Per pale gules and azure* because neither has a tincture the other does not. *Barry bendy vert and argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Barry bendy sinister vert and Or* because both share a tincture in the same section. *Paly azure and gules* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Paly gules and argent* because they are divided into multiple sections (such that the order of the tinctures makes little visual difference) and they share a tincture. This is true even for *Paly of four parts*.

For example, *Per bend ermine and azure* is substantially different from *Per bend erminois and gules* and from *Per bend argent and sable*. *Per fess argent and gules* is substantially different from *Per fess argent masoned gules and sable*. In each case, the two pieces of armory have no tinctures in common.

The changes to A5F require that several examples in other parts of SENA be revised, which will be done when SENA is updated.

From Wreath: Change to SENA A5G1

The December 23rd Rules Letter proposed changes to SENA A5G1 to allow all fielded armory to receive multiple DCs for changes to the field which previously only applied to field-primary armory. Those changes are accepted. The revised wording is:

1. Changes to the Field: Distinctly changing the tinctures, direction of partition lines, style of partition lines, or number of pieces in a partition of the field is one distinct change (DC).

Armory can be cleared of conflict by a single substantial change to the field as described in A.5.F above, through two distinct changes under this rule, or through two distinct changes under any combination of rules in A.5.G, including changes to peripheral ordinaries and tertiary charges on them.

For example, *Per chevron argent and azure, a lion gules* does not conflict with *Chevronelly argent and sable, a lion gules*; there is a DC for changing at least half the tincture of the field (A5G1a), and a DC for changing the number of pieces of the field (A5G1d). For example, *Per pale indented argent and azure, a lion gules* does not conflict with *Per fess argent and azure, a*

lion gules; there is a DC for changing the direction of the partition lines (A5G1b), and a DC for changing the style of the partition lines (A5G1c). For example, *Per pale azure and argent, a lion gules* has one DC from *Per pale azure and bendy argent and sable, a lion gules* (A5G1d), but does not receive a DC for the difference in tincture (A5G1a) as it is less than half of the field.

The insert/delete version:

1. Changes to the Field: Distinctly changing the tinctures, direction of partition lines, style of partition lines, or number of pieces in a partition of the field is one distinct change (DC). ~~For armory with a primary charge group, at most one distinct change can come from changes to the field.~~

~~For example, *Lozengy Or and azure, a martlet gules* has only one DC from *Per pale indented argent and sable, a martlet gules* even though these fields are dramatically different.~~

~~Field-primary armory~~Armory can be cleared of conflict by a single substantial change to the field as described in A.5.F above, through two distinct changes under this rule, or through two distinct changes under any combination of rules in A.5.G, including changes to peripheral ordinaries and tertiary charges on them.

For example, *Per chevron argent and azure, a lion gules* does not conflict with *Chevronelly argent and sable, a lion gules*; there is a DC for changing at least half the tincture of the field (A5G1a), and a DC for changing the number of pieces of the field (A5G1d). For example, *Per pale indented argent and azure, a lion gules* does not conflict with *Per fess argent and azure, a lion gules*; there is a DC for changing the direction of the partition lines (A5G1b), and a DC for changing the style of the partition lines (A5G1c). For example, *Per pale azure and argent, a lion gules* has one DC from *Per pale azure and bendy argent and sable, a lion gules* (A5G1d), but does not receive a DC for the difference in tincture (A5G1a) as it is less than half of the field.

The remaining sections of A5G1, that is A5G1a through A5G1e, are unchanged.

From Wreath: Change to SENA Appendix K

The December 31st Rules Letter proposed a change to SENA Appendix K to implement the November 2020 Cover Letter decision on how pairs of charges in saltire are treated when determining if they collectively are in a standard arrangement on the field. Those changes are accepted. The revised wording adds the second paragraph in the text below:

This appendix is a tool to determine if two charge groups of different sizes with different arrangements have comparable arrangements. First, identify the number of charges in each group and their arrangement. If the arrangement of either group is not listed below, then they are not in a standard arrangement and no DC can generally be given for arrangement between the two designs.

Pairs of charges in saltire and sheaves of charges are special cases for determining number. When there are multiple sets of charges each set counts as one charge for purposes of determining standard arrangement. So, for example, *three pairs of axes in saltire* and *three sheaves of arrows* both count as three charges for standard arrangement.

Next, check to see if the arrangement of the first group is also listed for the number of charges in the second group. Also check to see if the arrangement of the second group is also listed for the number of charges in the first group. If the answer is yes for both, then the arrangements are comparable and there is a DC between them for change to arrangement. If the answer is no to either one (or to both), the change to arrangement is forced and there is no DC between them.

The rest of the appendix, "List of Standard Arrangements by Number of Charges in a Group" is unchanged.

Society Pages

On April 18, 2021, Their Majesties of Meridies, Timothy and Ysmay, inducted Vitruvia Drusilla, Meridies's Clerk of Precedence, into the Order of the Burning Trumpet. The Order of the Burning Trumpet is a

non-armigerous order, for those who have enriched the kingdom greatly through their service in the Herald's office.

During the same court, Sara al-Garnatiyya, Torch Herald, was made a Baronesa of the Court.

Please send information about happenings to major heralds and major happenings to all heralds to Laurel, so that it can be published here.

Send What to Whom

Letters of Intent, Comment, Response, Correction, et cetera are to be posted to the OSCAR online system. No paper copies need be sent. All submission forms plus documentation, including petitions, must be posted to the OSCAR online system. While black-and-white emblazons must be included in the Letter of Intent, only colored armory forms need to be posted in the forms area.

Cheques or money orders for submissions, payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms" are to be sent to Trent Le Clair, 928 Frazier Dr, Walla Walla WA 99362.

Send roster changes and corrections to Laurel. College of Arms members may also request a copy of the current roster from Laurel.

For a paper copy of a LoAR, please contact Laurel, at the address above. The cost for one LoAR is \$3. Please make all checks or money orders payable to "SCA Inc.-College of Arms". The electronic copy of the LoAR is available free of charge. To subscribe to the mailings of the electronic copy, please see the bottom of <http://heraldry.sca.org/heraldry/lists.html#lists> for more instructions.

For all administrative matters, please contact Laurel.

Scheduling

Items listed below in square brackets have not been scheduled yet. For information about future scheduling, please review the status table located on the Web at <http://oscar.sca.org/index.php?action=137>.

The March Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, March 7, 2021 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, March 6, 2021. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Meridies (01 Dec, 2020), Trimaris (01 Dec, 2020), Calontir (02 Dec, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (03 Dec, 2020), Middle (03 Dec, 2020), Palimpsest Rules Letter (08 Dec, 2020), An Tir (09 Dec, 2020), Artemisia (15 Dec, 2020), Æthelmearc (18 Dec, 2020), Palimpsest Rules Letter (23 Dec, 2020), Ealdormere (24 Dec, 2020), Atlantia (28 Dec, 2020), Caid (28 Dec, 2020), Palimpsest Rules Letter (29 Dec, 2020), Avacal (30 Dec, 2020), East (30 Dec, 2020), Outlands (30 Dec, 2020), Ansteorra (31 Dec, 2020), Caid (31 Dec, 2020), Drachenwald (31 Dec, 2020), Northshield (31 Dec, 2020), Palimpsest Rules Letter (31 Dec, 2020), Laurel LoPaD (07 Feb, 2021) (redraws). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Sunday, February 28, 2021.**

The April Laurel decisions were made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, April 11, 2021 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, April 10, 2021. These meetings considered the following letters of intent: Laurel LoPaD (03 Jan, 2021), Lochac (04 Jan, 2021), Calontir (06 Jan, 2021), Palimpsest Rules Letter (07 Jan, 2021), An Tir (10 Jan, 2021), Palimpsest Rules Letter (10 Jan, 2021), West (13 Jan, 2021), Middle (17 Jan, 2021), Æthelmearc (19 Jan, 2021), Æthelmearc (23 Jan, 2021), Outlands (23 Jan, 2021), Ealdormere (24 Jan, 2021), Ansteorra (30 Jan, 2021), Atenveldt (30 Jan, 2021), Caid (30 Jan, 2021), Northshield (30 Jan, 2021), Atlantia (31 Jan, 2021), Avacal (31 Jan, 2021), Drachenwald (31 Jan, 2021), East (31 Jan, 2021), Palimpsest Rules Letter (31 Jan, 2021), Laurel LoPaD (10 Mar, 2021) (redraws). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Wednesday, March 31, 2021.**

The May Laurel decisions will be made at the Pelican meeting held on Sunday, May 16, 2021 and the Wreath meeting held on Saturday, May 8, 2021. These meetings will consider the following letters of intent: Trimaris (01 Feb, 2021), Meridies (02 Feb, 2021), Calontir (04 Feb, 2021), Laurel LoPaD (05 Feb, 2021), Palimpsest Rules Letter (06 Feb, 2021), An Tir (11 Feb, 2021), Palimpsest Rules Letter (14 Feb, 2021), Æthelmearc (20

Feb, 2021), Ealdormere (24 Feb, 2021), Atenveldt (25 Feb, 2021), Lochac (25 Feb, 2021), Caid (27 Feb, 2021), Ansteorra (28 Feb, 2021), Avacal (28 Feb, 2021), Drachenwald (28 Feb, 2021), East (28 Feb, 2021), Palimpsest Other Letter (28 Feb, 2021). **All commentary, responses, and rebuttals should have been entered into OSCAR by Friday, April 30, 2021.**

Not all letters of intent may be considered when they are originally scheduled on this cover letter. The date of posting 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.

Pray know that I remain,

In service,

Emma de Fetherstan
Laurel Queen of Arms