

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Introduction

This document contains the standards Laurel uses to evaluate all submissions of names and armory for registration. These are the authoritative standards – other documents may summarize or provide simplified versions, but submissions must meet the criteria as laid out here. However, these Rules are not a step-by-step procedure for devising names or armory. Policies for heralds and for the submissions process are in other documents, such as the Administrative Handbook, available on the Laurel website.

This document is primarily for Laurel to use when making decisions on whether a name or piece of armory can be registered. Laurel evaluates each submission to ensure that it is period within the framework that these Rules requires, does not conflict with other registered items, and is not presumptuous or offensive.

We make these Rules available so that anyone interested can read and learn about the standards. They are also used by the members of the College of Arms in advising Laurel on whether a submission meets these standards.

We encourage submitters and newer heralds to use the training materials available on the Laurel website. These materials give instructions for creating medieval-style names and armory. They explain the processes for submitting those names and armory for registration. They give overviews of these rules that are sufficient to answer most questions. However, in the case of any differences between the Rules for Submissions and the other documents, the Rules for Submissions take precedence over other documents.

These Rules are divided into four main sections, plus appendices. The General Principles section describes some of the fundamental principles that underlie these rules. It also defines some common terms used throughout these rules. The other three main sections each address the standards that each type of submission – personal names, non-personal names, and armory – must meet. Each main section first lays out the standards for content and style (how submissions must be put together). It then lays out the standards for avoiding conflict (being “too close” to registered items). Finally, it lays out the standards for avoiding presumption (claims that are not allowed) and offense.

The appendices contain supplemental information that expands on the Rules. One appendix contains the table of languages that can be mixed in a name submission. Other appendices contain information which consolidates decades of Laurel rulings. These appendices will be updated regularly to keep the material up to date.

Rules for Submissions:
The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Table of Contents

GP. General Principles

GP.1. Principles of the Rules for Submissions.	pg 3
GP.2. Registration and Documentation.	pg 4
GP.3. Definition of Period.	pg 4
GP.4. Definitions of Terms Used in these Rules.	pg 5

PN. Personal Names

PN.1. Personal Names Content.	pg 7
PN.2. Personal Names Style.	pg 12
PN.3. Personal Names Conflict.	pg 14
PN.4. Personal Names Presumption.	pg 16
PN.5. Personal Names Offense.	pg 19

NPN. Non-Personal Names

NPN.1. Non-Personal Names Content.	pg 21
NPN.2. Non-Personal Names Style.	pg 26
NPN.3. Non-Personal Names Conflict.	pg 27
NPN.4. Non-Personal Names Presumption.	pg 30
NPN.5. Non-Personal Names Offense.	pg 32

A. Armory

A.1. Armory Style Principles.	pg 34
A.2. Armory Content.	pg 35
A.3. Armory Style.	pg 38
A.4. Armory Individually Attested Patterns.	pg 47
A.5. Armory Conflict.	pg 48
A.6. Armory Presumption.	pg 66
A.7. Armory Offense.	pg 71

Appendices

Appendix A: Patterns That Do Not Need Further Documentation by Language Group	
Appendix B: Types of Bynames	
Appendix C: Regional Naming Groups and Their Mixes	
Appendix D: Acceptable Transliteration Systems for Non-Latin Scripts	
Appendix E: Currently Registerable Designators for Non-Personal Name Submissions	
Appendix F: Some Armorial Elements that Do Not Need Further Documentation	
Appendix G: Some Specific Elements that are a Step from Period Practice	
Appendix H: Low-Contrast Complex Lines of Division	
Appendix I: Charge Group Theory	
Appendix J: Documented and Forbidden Arrangements of Charge Groups on Armory	
Appendix K: Standard Arrangements for Charge Groups of Different Number	
Appendix L: A Partial List of Postures and Orientations	
Appendix M: Some Resources for Conflict Checking	

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

GP. General Principles

This section of the Rules for Submissions discusses general principles for considering submissions, including definitions of some terms used in multiple sections of the Rules for Submissions.

GP.1. Principles of the Rules for Submissions

A. Governing Documents: The Governing Documents of the SCA say that "Laurel shall define standards suitable to the type of item to be registered, and apply them uniformly to all such submissions. These standards shall be designed to support the historical re-creations of the Society and to provide sufficient difference from names and armory registered within the Society to avoid undue confusion, to avoid the appearance of unearned honors or false claims, and to provide sufficient difference from historical or fictional personages to prevent offense due to obvious usurpation of identity or armory. Members are encouraged to develop unique, historically valid names and armory."

These rules define those standards and how submissions can meet them.

B. These Rules: The Rules for Submissions are based on the principles expressed in the governing documents, including the following.

1. Reasonably Period: A submission must be reasonably period in nature, to support our historical re-creations. The rules regarding the standards for what is reasonably period in nature are labeled as "content" and "style" rules.

- a. Content rules focus on the elements (words, charges, tinctures) which may be included in a submission.
- b. Style rules focus on how those items may be combined to make a complete submission. Style rules describe common period patterns and how to document less common patterns. Submissions demonstrated to be period in style may be registered as individually attested patterns even if they are not explicitly described as registerable in the general style rules.

2. Conflict and Presumption: A submission should not cause confusion, create a false claim, nor usurp identity or armory. The rules regarding the standards for what causes confusion, false claims, and usurpation are labeled as "conflict" and "presumption" rules.

- a. Conflict rules focus on how to determine if a submission is too close to or claims too close a relationship to the owner of an item someone else in the SCA has already registered. The owner of a registered item may give permission for someone else to register a conflicting but non-identical item.
- b. Presumption rules focus on how to determine if a submission creates a false claim of position or powers, or usurps the identity or armory of an important non-SCA person. It is not possible to register an item which is presumptuous.

3. Offense: A submission should not be offensive to the populace or the general public. The rules regarding the standards for offensiveness are labeled as "offense" rules.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

GP.2. Registration and Documentation

A. The Nature of Registration: Registration does two things. First, it attests that a submission meets the standards laid out by Corpora and the Rules for Submissions at the time of registration. Second, it prevents others from registering anything that conflicts with or presumes upon the registered item without the explicit permission of the owner.

Some items are considered too generic to be registered. This means that they may be used by anyone and may not be reserved to one person or group by registration. One such category is generic identifiers such as *Brewer's Guild* and *Queen's Guard*. These names may be used by any branch to identify the owner or association of a badge, but no group may register them. Another category that may not be registered is an armorial design consisting only of abstract charges such as letters, runes, Arabic script, astrological symbols, and the like. Such a registration might prevent someone from using a form of their name or monogram. These generic items are not restricted by the College of Arms, but may not be registered to anyone. Other such categories are a personal name consisting of only a single given name or armory consisting of only a plain tincture. Such registrations might prevent people from using those given names or colors.

B. The Burden of Proof: The College of Arms and the kingdom colleges of heralds should work to provide suitable documentation to register a submission. However, it is ultimately the submitter's responsibility to demonstrate that a submission meets the standards set forth in these rules; a complete lack of documentation can be cause for return. It is not the responsibility of the Laurel office to demonstrate that a submission does not meet these standards. When the evidence is equivocal, such as when there is limited reliable dated information about a specific culture, in general the submitter should be given the benefit of the doubt.

GP.3. Definition of Period

Various rules, especially the content and style rules, refer to the idea of period. This section explains what the term period means for the purposes of these rules.

A. Temporal Definition: The center of the Society is medieval and Renaissance Europe. As in the Governing Documents, period is defined as "pre-17th Century". Elements and patterns of names and heraldry found in the Middle Ages and Renaissance (in those places defined below) are allowed. We allow elements and patterns from before the Middle Ages, but require them to be from cultures that were known to medieval and Renaissance Europeans. Therefore, classical Greek and Roman names are registerable, but names from Pharaonic Egypt are not.

Elements and patterns documented in use during the "grey period," between 1600 and 1650, are generally allowed. This is on the grounds that they might have been in earlier use. The use of a name element by a human being during the grey period is generally sufficient to allow this use, even if it is the name of an infant. However, if there is evidence that the element or pattern could not have been in use before 1600, such as documentation for a name in 1615 which specifically says that it was coined in that year, then it will not be allowed.

As we require elements and patterns to be temporally compatible, artistic designs that are only in use before a heraldic tradition existed may not be registered as part of armory.

In any case, elements and patterns are only allowed when they do not otherwise violate the rules, such as offense or presumption rules.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

B. Geographic Definition: The center of the Society is medieval and Renaissance Europe.

In names, elements and patterns found in Europe (in the times defined in Section A above) are allowed for all types of personal and non-personal names. We allow elements and patterns for personal names from beyond Europe, but we require them to be from cultures that were known to medieval and Renaissance Europeans or whose members might reasonably have traveled to Europe. We allow non-personal names from places beyond Europe only when the entity in question could have traveled to Europe. Thus, we allow household names of non-European origin, but not branch names. For the same reason, we do not register heraldic titles in languages from cultures that did not use heraldic titles.

In armory, we allow elements and patterns from European heraldic traditions. We also allow elements and patterns from "heraldic" traditions from other regions when their owners might have reasonably traveled with that armory to Europe. However, we do require those elements to follow more stringent rules. As we require elements and patterns to be from the same location, artistic designs that are not part of a heraldic tradition may not be registered as part of armory.

In any case, elements and patterns are only allowed when they do not otherwise violate the rules, such as offense or presumption rules.

GP.4. Definitions of Terms Used in these Rules

There are some terms which are used in heraldry and in these rules with specific meanings beyond or somewhat different from their common meanings. This section explains a few such words which are used throughout these rules. Other sections of these rules define additional terms specific to those sections.

A. Element: An element is, in a broad sense, the smallest part that a submission can be broken into. In names, it may be a word, such as *of* or *the*, or a part of a word, such as *-gar* in *Ælfgar* or *-shire* in *Lincolnshire*. In armory, it may be a charge, such as a *lion* or a *trivet*; a division, such as *per fess* or *compony*; an arrangement of charges such as *in bend* or *a charge between in cross four other charges*; a tincture, such as *vert* or *ermine*; or other parts of an armorial design.

B. Attested: Attested is the term we use for the idea that a name phrase, the structure of a complete name, a charge, a combination of charges or tinctures, a line of division, or other element is found in period sources. One way of documenting an element or pattern is to demonstrate that it is attested in period.

C. Documentation: Documentation is the term we use for demonstrating that a name phrase, the structure of a complete name, a charge, a combination of charges or tinctures, a particular heraldic arrangement, a line of division, or other element is registerable.

This may involve demonstrating that it is attested to period. Alternately, it may involve demonstrating that it is legal for the submitter to use for some other reason. In some cases, required documentation may include petitions of support from the populace, letters of permission, etc. The rules for the types of submissions which require petitions, letters, etc. are found in the Administrative Handbook.

D. Substantial, Distinct, and Significant: These terms are used in defining conflict. For armorial conflict, the terms substantial and distinct are both used to describe differences between items. Substantial changes (sometimes abbreviated as SC) are larger than distinct changes (sometimes abbreviated as DC). Generally a single substantial change is sufficient to bring two pieces of armory clear of conflict, while two distinct changes are required to do so. In prior precedent regarding armory, significant was used to mean much the same thing as distinct. In names, substantial and significant have previously been used somewhat

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

interchangeably. In these rules, a single substantial change or two smaller changes create names that are clear of conflict.

E. Precedent: Precedent is the collective term used for rulings by Laurel which address issues that the rules do not explicitly answer. While these are often are rulings on specific submissions, they sometimes appear in Cover Letters without reference to a specific submission. In action they are similar to legal precedent, although rulings without comment do not set precedent. This includes topics such as whether two specific charges have substantial, distinct, significant, or no difference, whether two languages are registerable together, whether an element is registerable at all, and so on.

F. Step from Period Practice: A step from period practice is an element or combination of elements not found in period names or armory that we nonetheless allow. While this is mostly used in terms of armory, it may also appear in older precedents on names. In older rulings this same concept may also be described as a *weirdness*.

Rules for Submissions:

The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

PN. Personal Name Registration

Personal names are names that identify a single human being (as opposed to a group of people, a branch, an order, and the like, which are non-personal names). To be registered, a personal name submission must meet the following standards:

- Each name phrase (a complete given name or byname) must be demonstrated to be suitable for a specific time and place or otherwise meet the standards set out in PN.1.
 - The name as a whole must be demonstrated to be grammatically (structurally) correct and meet the standards for lingual and temporal compatibility set out in PN.2.
 - The name must be free of conflict and presumption as set out in PN.3 and PN.4.
 - The name must not be offensive as set out in PN.5.
-

PN.1 Personal Names Content

A. Definitions: Several terms are used in this section of the rules.

A *name phrase* consists of a complete given name or byname with associated prepositions, articles and the like. The elements which make up a name phrase are referred to in these rules as name elements. Name elements may be words or pieces of words. A name phrase may consist of a single word or multiple words.

For example, *of*, *the* and *Dell* are all whole word name elements. Some examples of pieces of words which are name elements: *Arnulfs-* and *-dottir* or *Ælf-* and *-gar*. Some examples of name phrases: *Smith*, comprised simply of a single word, and *de la Torre*, comprised of *de*, *la*, and *Torre*.

There are many types of name phrases; in personal names, all name phrases can be categorized as one of two types:

1. Given Name: A given name is the main personal name, often given at birth or in some kind of naming ceremony. In most European languages, the given name is usually the first name element; however, this is not true for all cultures or time periods. All personal name submissions are required to have a given name.

In some languages, a person may have two given names. For example, there are examples of people with two given names in late period English and Spanish. Other languages, such as Gaelic and Arabic, do not seem to have ever used multiple given names before 1600. A discussion of name formation patterns, including multiple given names, is found in Appendix A.

2. Byname: A byname is a part of the name other than a given name. It may identify someone as the child of an individual, as being from a particular place, describe some distinctive physical or personality feature, describe their occupation, or place someone as a member of a family (as an inherited surname).

A discussion of types of bynames found in period Europe is found in Appendix B. Note that no single language has all the types of bynames discussed there. That is, any given language has only some types of bynames. A discussion of name formation patterns, including multiple bynames, is found in Appendix A.

B. Standards for Name Phrases: A registerable name phrase must meet the following standards:

1. Single Time and Place: A registerable name phrase must follow the rules of grammar and structure for a single time and place. It may not mix languages unless that mixing of languages within a name phrase is attested as a period practice.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, the name phrase *de London* is typical of medieval English documentary practice. Therefore, it is a registerable name phrase. However, *von Saxony*, which mixes the German *von* with the English version of the German place name, is not. It must be made completely German, as *von Sachsen*, or completely English, as *of Saxony*. For example, *inghean Áeda*, which mixes the Early Modern Irish Gaelic *inghean*, with the Middle Irish Gaelic *Áeda*, is not registerable. It must be made completely Middle Irish Gaelic, as *ingean Áeda*, or completely Early Modern Irish Gaelic, as *inghean Aodha*.

2. Sources of Name Phrases: We allow registerable name phrases to be created in a variety of ways. The following types of name phrases may be registered:

a. Attested Name Phrases: Name phrases may be attested to period as a complete name phrase (i.e., found in a period document). A single example of an attested name phrase clearly dated to period is sufficient to demonstrate its use. Minor spelling variants are allowed when those spelling variants are demonstrated to be compatible with the spelling conventions of the time and place of the attested name.

For example, in Renaissance English, the letters *i* and *y* are frequently interchanged. Therefore, a name attested as *Annis* could also be spelled *Annys*. The letters *k* and *q*, on the other hand, are not interchangeable in Renaissance Scots. So, a name attested as *Kintyre* does not justify the spelling *Qintyre*.

b. Constructed Name Phrases: Name phrases may be constructed from attested period name elements. To do this, documentation must be provided to demonstrate that the name phrase follows a period pattern. We generally require at least three examples to consider something a pattern, as sometimes a single name phrase can create the appearance of a pattern that does not actually exist. The examples should closely match the constructed name phrase.

For example, taken alone, the English given name *Rose* appears to originate from the name of the flower; however, research suggests that it originates from an Old English word *hros*, 'horse'. Therefore, it cannot be used to justify names like *Hyacinth*.

All of the elements and patterns for a constructed name phrase must come from a single time and place. We do not allow constructed name phrases that are created by using patterns from one time and place with elements from another time and place. Some examples of constructed names are:

1. Diminutives Constructed from Given Names: In many languages, diminutive forms can be made from existing given names, often by adding endings or removing part of the name (and even both).

For example, in Italian, diminutives are regularly constructed by adding *-ino* after dropping the final *-o* from an already existing given name. The diminutive *Urbanino* can be constructed from the attested given name *Urbano*.

2. Constructed Dithemic Given Names: In several Germanic languages, including Old English, given names are frequently composed of two pieces, a prototheme (first part) and a deutertheme (second part). New names can be constructed from attested protothemes and deuterthemes. A new name cannot be constructed by combining other parts of the names or by combining elements other than a single prototheme and a single deutertheme.

For example, the attested Old English name *Ælfgar* has the prototheme *Ælf-* and the deutertheme *-gar* and the attested Old English name *Eadmund* has the prototheme *Ead-* and the deutertheme *-mund*. Therefore one could combine the prototheme *Ælf-* and the deutertheme *-mund* to make the given name *Ælfmund*. However, *Garmund* or *Ælfead* are not documentable through this pattern, nor is *Ælfgarmund*, as these do not combine a single prototheme with a single deutertheme.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

3. Bynames Constructed from Given Name Elements: In many languages, bynames of relationship can be formed from attested given names. The specific pattern used to form the byname must be found in the language of the elements used to form it.

For example, in Old Norse, the standard patronymic byname for men consists of the possessive form of the father's name joined to the word 'son', so *Sveinsson* is the son of *Sveinn*. For example, the attested Old Norse given name *Bjartmarr* could be used in this construction to create *Bjartmarsson*, even if this particular patronymic was not attested in period sources. For example, Gaelic also has patronymic bynames formed from the possessive form of the father's name, but they are prefaced with 'mac' instead of joined to 'son'. Thus, the attested Gaelic name *Donnchadh* could be used in this construction to create *mac Donnchaidh*; it could not be used to create *Donnchadhson*.

4. New Placenames Constructed from Attested Elements and Patterns: New placenames can be created by combining attested elements.

For example, the attested English place names *Oxford*, *Swinford* and *Hartford* indicate a pattern of kinds of large hooved animals with *-ford*. Therefore, this pattern would support a similar name like *Sheepford*. This pattern would not, however, support constructing *Bookford* or *Duckford*, since neither *books* nor *ducks* are large hooved animals.

For example, there is a pattern of adding family names to existing placenames in English. Following this pattern, the attested family name *Peveler* can be added to the attested placename *Bercroft* to construct the compound placename *Bercroft Peveler*.

c. *Lingua Anglica* Allowance: We allow the registration of translations of attested and constructed descriptive and locative bynames into standard modern English. We call this the *lingua Anglica* rule. We allow this because the meanings of these bynames would have been clear to the speakers of these languages, but may be unclear to modern speakers. The translation of descriptive bynames must be a literal and plausible translation. Under *lingua Anglica*, locative bynames use standard modern English forms rather than period spellings of the placenames. Under no circumstances will translations of the meanings of given names or placenames be registerable under this rule.

For example, the Norse byname *inn rauði* may be translated as *the Red*. It may not be translated as *the bloody*, *the scarlet*, or the like, as these are not literal translations. For example, the Middle English descriptive byname *le nymell* may be translated as *the Nimble*, as the original term may be unclear to modern speakers, even though it is in an earlier form of English.

For example, the Spanish byname *de Castilla* may be translated as *of Castile*. The Arabic byname *al-Dimashqi* may be translated as *of Damascus* or *the Damascene*. However, while *Cairo* is derived from a word which means "the victorious", its *lingua Anglica* form is *of Cairo*, not *of The Victorious*, as "The Victorious" is a translation of the meaning. Additionally, while *al-Qahira* is the Egyptian spelling of the city, *of al-Qahira* is not registerable as the *lingua Anglica* form, as it is not the standard modern English form either.

d. Borrowed Names: Name phrases may be borrowed from secular literature, from the Bible or other religious literature, or from the names of saints, either as whole name phrases or as name elements to construct a name phrase. In either case, the name phrase must be demonstrated to meet the following requirements.

1. Linguistically Appropriate Form: The name phrase must be shown to be a form by which the character or person was known in that time and place. Generally this means finding it in the literature of that time (such as a Renaissance Italian Bible, or an English publication of an Arthurian romance).

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

In the case of a saint, evidence for that saint's veneration through the naming of churches is generally allowed. Only the form of the name used in that culture is allowed under this allowance.

For example, the Arthurian character *Lancelot* is found in Italian as *Lancilotto*. Therefore, *Lancilotto*, not *Lancelot*, is the form allowed in Italian context. Similarly, the saint known in her lifetime as *Æthelthryth* was venerated by late period English people as *Audrey*. So *Audrey* is the form allowed in late period English context.

- 2. Pattern of Borrowing Names:** The culture must be shown to have a pattern of using name phrases from that type of source. Demonstrating such a pattern requires at least two independent examples of normal people using such name phrases in the target time and place.

The type of name phrase must match. Evidence of given names from a literary source does not demonstrate the use of bynames from that source. The demonstrated pattern must also address the type of character. The use of the given names of major characters does not demonstrate the use of the given names of minor characters. So, the pattern of using the given names of major Arthurian characters in medieval England would justify the name *Bedivere* even if it were not attested. It would not justify a name from the Bible or the name of a minor Arthurian character like *Gwinas*, who is only mentioned once. As there is no similar pattern of borrowing in Gaelic, the Gaelic forms of Arthurian characters cannot be registered under this allowance.

Certain kinds of borrowed names were rarely used. These will only be allowed if a pattern explicitly includes the use of name phrases of that type. These include:

- allegorical names (like *Everyman*)
- the names of characters mentioned only briefly in stories
- names from stories that take place in legendary time
- the names of superhuman characters (including gods and monsters, but also characters that interact with gods or engage in superhuman acts of prowess)
- the names of characters from the life stories of saints (like the parents and siblings of saints)
- the names of literary places

- e. Legal Name Allowance:** Name phrases from the submitter's legal names may be used. To do this, the submitter must demonstrate the name phrase on a legal document, such as a birth certificate, driver's license, or the like. Only the full name and the nature of the document must be visible; identification numbers and the like may be obscured. Official religious documents are considered evidence for religious names (Hebrew names, confirmation names), which are also allowed under this allowance. Birth names and maiden names, when documented, are also allowed under this allowance. In some cases, providing a photocopy of the document may not be possible; in such cases, a herald or heralds may attest that they have seen the document and this can be sufficient documentation.

The name phrase must be used in precisely the way that it is spelled on the legal document. As some legal documents obscure capitalization (by using all capitals) or omit punctuation (and markings like accents, such changes may be allowed on a case by case basis. Name phrases must be used in their entirety, including any prepositions and articles. Thus, nicknames that do not appear on legal documents cannot be registered.

For example, the legal name *Ruby* justifies *Ruby*, but not *Rubie* or *Rube*. The legal name *Smith* justifies *Smith*, but not *the Smith*. This is true even though one can find occupational bynames in English both with and without articles. The legal name *von Volvorth* justifies *von Volvorth*, not *Volvorth* or *de Volvorth*, though one can find examples of bynames formed from German placenames using those forms.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Name phrases documented in this way are categorized as given names and bynames based on type (surnames are a type of byname). They may be used in any way that a given name or byname of that type may be used. Modern "middle names" are a special case. Some people in the modern world have middle names derived from given names. Others have middle names derived from surnames, through shifts in naming practice, through marriage, or for other reasons. Therefore, middle names are registerable based on the type of name they are: given names or surnames. Middle names which originated as surnames but are modernly used as given names may be used as given names.

For example, someone whose legal middle name is *Elizabeth* may use it as a given name, because *Elizabeth* is a given name by type. However, someone whose legal middle name is *MacGregor* may not use it as a given name, because it is a surname by type. The name *Madison*, while it originated as a surname, is modernly used as a given name. Therefore, someone whose legal middle name is *Madison* may also use it as a given name through the legal name allowance.

This rule can allow a name phrase which is not attested in period, but the name as a whole must still meet the other requirements for names. This includes issues with overall construction, conflict, presumption, and offense.

For example, *Earl* is a modern given name, but it is also a title of rank within the SCA. Therefore, we would not register it, even if documented as the submitter's legal given name.

f. Branch Name Allowance: Name phrases may be created from the registered forms of SCA branches. Only the exact registered form of the branch name may be used, and they are registered in the *lingua Anglica* form, 'of *Branchname*'. Translated forms will not be registered under this allowance, even if it matches the intended origin of the submission or of the branch.

For example, this would allow the bynames *of the East* or *of Fontaine dans Sable*, as these are the expected *lingua Anglica* forms. However, this would not allow *von Osten* as a German translation of "of the East", even if the given name was German. It would also not allow *de la Fontaine dans Sable* as a fully French version of "of Fontaine dans Sable" under this rule as it is not the *lingua Anglica* form of the branch name, even though the branch name is French. If *Fontaine dans Sable* can also be documented as an attested or constructed French name, *de Fontaine dans Sable* could be used in forming a fully French name; however that would not be through the use of the branch name allowance.

g. The Grandfather Clause: In a new personal name submission, an individual may use name phrases already registered to them, even if that name phrase would no longer be allowed under the current rules. Only the exact, actual name phrase from the registered form may be used, not variants, patterns, etc. The use of the grandfather clause does not allow the submitter to evade new style problems (as discussed in PN.2 below). It only allows the submitter to keep style problems that already exist with the registered name.

A name phrase from a registered name of an individual may also be registered by a close legal relative (such as parent, spouse, child, sibling, etc.). To do this, the submitter must demonstrate the relationship through legal documents or through attestation of relationship from the individual whose name is already registered. Documentation under the grandfather clause does not exempt a name or name phrase from conflict, presumption, or offense rules, unless that rules violation is itself grandfathered.

Rules for Submissions:

The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

PN.2. Personal Names Style

A. Definitions: A name phrase is a complete given name or byname with associated prepositions, articles and the like. It is defined more thoroughly in PN.1 above, which deals with the construction of name phrases. A naming pool refers to the group of name phrases that are in use in a particular time and place. These naming pools are organized into regional naming groups, each of which includes a group of naming pools that are geographically and culturally linked. These regional naming groups are used to determine whether name phrases can be combined in a registerable name. The list of established regional groups is listed in Appendix C.

B. Name Phrase Requirements: A registerable personal name must be made up of at least two name phrases: a given name and at least one byname (which may appear to be a second given name). While it is easy to document individuals who are identified only with a single given name, we do not allow the registration of single element personal names. Individuals may use those names, but may not register them.

Each name phrase must be grammatically correct for its position in a name. In some languages, spelling changes are used to indicate aspects of relationships in bynames. Some languages capitalize some bynames, but consistently use lower case for others.

For example, because of the way Gaelic grammar works, the byname *mac Fearchair* 'son of Fearchar' must be changed to *mhic Fhearchair* when it occurs after another byname of the form *mac X* (i.e., when your father was the son of Fearchar). So, the son of *Donnchadh mac Fearchair* would be *Fionn mac Donnchaidh mhic Fhearchair*. For example, most Norse descriptive bynames are consistently in lower case. Thus, *Halla* the skald would be *Halla skaldkona*, not *Halla Skaldkona*.

C. Name Requirements: A name submission must be consistent with the standards laid out in this section for temporal and geographical compatibility. The position of each name phrase in the overall name must be shown to be appropriate for that type of name phrase in its language and cultural tradition. Some patterns for name grammar in important European languages can be found in Appendix A. Any pattern found there does not need further documentation; a reference to Appendix A will be sufficient. Other patterns require documentation.

For example, there is evidence for names in Spanish with two bynames in certain patterns. One pattern is a patronymic byname followed by a placename, as in *Ruy Diaz de Bivar*. That would justify *Juan Perez de Madrid*, but would not support the registration of *Juan de Madrid Perez*.

In addition, the name as a whole must follow a period pattern for personal names. Any name must follow the pattern described in one of the two sections below.

1. Culturally Uniform Names: A culturally uniform name matches a pattern of the grammar of names for a single time and place, such as fourteenth century England. This requires that the overall pattern be documented to a particular time and place, in addition to each name phrase meeting the standards set out in PN.1 and PN.2.B above. This documentation may be a reference to Appendix A.

2. Culturally Mixed Names: Names that mix name phrases from different times and/or places are allowed if the name meets one of the following conditions.

- a. The name mixes name phrases found in a single regional naming group as listed in Appendix C that are dated to within 500 years of one another.
- b. The name mixes name phrases from two regional naming groups that are listed in Appendix C as combinable and those name phrases are dated to within 300 years of one another.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Names that combine more than two regional naming groups or that combine two regional naming groups that are not listed as combinable will not be allowed under this rule (though they may be registered under the allowances in sections c and d below).

- c. The name mixes name phrases from naming pools that can be documented as having been used together in the personal names of real people; for such combinations, the name phrases must be within 300 years of one another (and within 300 years of the documented examples). For such documentation, at least three period examples must be included in which the names can only be understood as combining from separate naming pools. The borrowing of names from one naming pool into another is not sufficient to demonstrate this, nor is the translation of names into another language.
- d. A name which includes name phrases documented under the legal name allowance, the grandfather clause, or the branch name allowance follows special rules. These name phrases are treated as neutral in language and time. Such name phrases may be combined with name phrases from a single regional naming group dated to within 500 years of one another. They may not be combined with name phrases from two or more regional naming groups. If a name phrase can also be documented as either an attested or constructed name, it may be treated in whichever way is more favorable for registration.

In addition, if a grandfathered name phrase was found in a registered name that combined languages from two or more regional naming groups, the new submission may combine those same regional naming groups. If this allowance is used, then no new regional naming group may be added.

D. Names Not Recorded in a Latin Script: Names will only be registered in the Latin script, so that both heralds and the populace can easily read them. Thus, we will not register Norse names in runes, Russian names in Cyrillic, Japanese names in kanji, and so on. Submitters are encouraged to use those names in the original scripts for other purposes. Names and name phrases that would not have been written in a Latin script are treated for purposes of registration as if they are created in the relevant script (Norse, Arabic, Russian, etc.). They are then transcribed for registration into the Latin script following a single orthographic system, which may include common diacritics such as *ó* (o with an acute accent), ligatures such as *æ* (ash, representing {ae}), and other characters such as *þ* (thorn, representing the unvoiced {th} sound). Names that mix two orthographic systems for transcription are not allowed because some systems use the same letters to represent different sounds, which creates confusion. This includes the use (or lack) of accents in a name – their usage should be consistent. A list of acceptable transliteration systems for some languages can be found in Appendix D. The use of a transliteration system not listed there must be justified with the submission.

For example, the Arabic given name often transliterated as *Amina* can be equally well transliterated as *Aminah* (ending in *-ah* instead of just *-a*). In combination with the Arabic locative meaning 'of Hamdan', which is either *al-Hamadaniyya* or *al-Hamadaniyyah*, either *Amina al-Hamadaniyya* or *Aminah al-Hamadaniyyah* is registerable. However, neither *Aminah al-Hamadaniyya* or *Amina al-Hamadaniyyah* is registerable, as these two mix the transliteration systems.

For example, the Irish Gaelic given name *Tomás*, when combined with the Irish Gaelic descriptive byname *Mór*, can be rendered either as *Tomas Mor* or as *Tomás Mór*. However, it cannot be rendered as *Tomás Mor* or *Tomas Mór*, as these use the accents inconsistently.

E. Obtrusive Modernity: No name will be registered that either in whole or in part is obtrusively modern. Something is said to be obtrusively modern when it makes a modern joke or reference that destroys medieval ambience and drags the average person mentally back to the present day. Obtrusiveness can be either in the written form or when spoken. A period name that has a modern referent will not generally be considered obtrusively modern. Only extreme examples will be returned.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, names that have been ruled obtrusively modern and hence returned include *Porsche Audi*, *Artemisian Tank Corps*, and *Geky Herald* (pronounced like "Geeky Herald"). Names like *Edmond Fitzgerald*, *Red Boke Herald*, *Drew Steele*, and *Mould de Cheder* have been allowed.

PN.3. Personal Names Conflict

A. Definitions: Conflict, as it is used in these rules, is a modern concept which derives from the requirement in the Governing Documents that names have sufficient difference to avoid undue confusion. To be registered, a new submission must be clear of conflict with all registered personal names; this means that it must avoid undue confusion with them. There are two types of confusion which must be avoided: being too close to a registered personal name itself, and claiming to be a close relative of a registered personal name. These are described in these rules as "identity conflict" and "relationship conflict".

For identity conflict, a name submission is in conflict with a registered name when they are too similar either in sound or in appearance. A name submission that is substantially different in sound and substantially different in appearance from a registered personal name is clear of conflict with it. For relationship conflict, a name that makes an unmistakable claim of close relationship to a registered personal name is in conflict with it. This section of the rules sets the standards for how names can be substantially different.

B. Individuals Protected from Conflict: A new personal name submission must be clear from conflict with all registered personal names. Non-personal names and personal names do not conflict. A name is registered and protected from the moment it is listed as accepted on a published Letter of Acceptances and Returns. Registered names will be listed in the Ordinary and Armorial as soon as possible, but they are protected as soon as the Letter of Acceptances and Return is published. We also protect the names of important people outside the SCA; they are addressed in PN.4 Presumption below.

C. Standards for Identity Conflict: To be clear of identity conflict, two names must be substantially different in both sound and appearance. Because conflict is a modern concept, we consider matters such as meaning, language, etymological origin, etc. to be irrelevant for conflict. Only sound and appearance are considered for difference. Thus, the Latinized form of a name may be clear of conflict with the vernacular form. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

To be substantially different, a pair of names must be different in sound and appearance under the standards laid out below. Names may be different in sound under one standard and appearance under another standard. Names are compared as complete items, so that *Lisa Betta Gonzaga* conflicts with *Lisabetta Gonzaga*, although the elements are different.

1. Changes to Two Syllables: Names are substantially different if changes in sound and appearance affect at least two syllables (including adding, removing, or reordering them). If the changes only affect adjacent letters or sounds, they must affect more than two letters or sounds to be considered under this allowance. Change in spacing is a change in appearance, but is not considered a change in sound. Changes to any part of the name count, including articles and prepositions.

For example, *Alana Red* is substantially different from *Elena Reed*, because at least two syllables change in both sound and appearance. *Maria Smith* is substantially different from *Miriam Smith*, because it removes one syllable and changes another in both sound and appearance. *Richard Loudeham* is substantially different from *Richard Loveman*, because two syllables have changes to them.

For example, *Anne Jones London* is substantially different from *Anne Joan of London*, because it changes

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

one syllable in both sound and appearance and removes another. *John de Aston* is substantially different from *John Asson*, because it adds one syllable and changes another in both sound and appearance. *William Undertheclyff* is substantially different from *William Cliff*, because it adds three syllables. *Margaret atte Mor* is substantially different from *Margaret de la Mor*; because it removes one syllable and changes another in both sound and appearance.

- 2. Substantial Change to One Syllable:** Names are substantially different if a single syllable between them (excluding articles and prepositions, such as *de* and *the*) is changed in both sound and appearance as described here. The addition or removal of a syllable makes two names substantially different in sound. Two names are also substantially different if a syllable is substantially changed in sound and appearance. This means that the vowel and the consonant (or group of consonants) on one side of the vowel is different between the two names. In either case, the change in spelling (including addition or removal of letters) must affect at least two letters in that syllable to be substantial.

For example, both *Maria Jones* and *Miriam Jones* are substantially different in sound from either *Mary Jones* or *Marie Jones*, because those names add a syllable. *Miriam Jones* is also substantially different in appearance from both *Mary Jones* and *Marie Jones*. However, *Maria Jones* is not substantially different in appearance from *Marie Jones*, because only one letter is changed. Also, *Mary Jones* is not substantially different in sound from *Marie Jones*. While the most common modern pronunciation of the given names is different, one important late period and modern pronunciation makes both names the same (as \MA-ree\). Thus they conflict. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

For example, *Connor MacRobert* is substantially different from *Conan MacRobert* or *Conall MacRobert*, because the second syllable of the given names is substantially different in both sound and appearance. Likewise, *Colin L'Estrange* is substantially different from *Colin Strange*, because a syllable of the byname is removed. *Colin L'Estrange* is not substantially different from *Colin Lestrangle*, because the change in sound is negligible, and the change in appearance does not substantially change the syllable.

- 3. Substantial Change of Single-Syllable Name Phrase:** Two names with a comparable single-syllable name phrase are eligible for this rule. A pair of name phrases are said to be comparable if they both have the same position in the name, such as given name or first byname. Comparable single-syllable name phrases are generally substantially different in sound if a group of adjacent vowels or of adjacent consonants within a word are completely changed, so that it shares no sound in common. In rare cases, the sound may still be too similar for this rule to clear the conflict. The change of a single letter is sufficient for two eligible name phrases to be different in appearance, as such name phrases are quite short. On a case by case basis, two-syllable names phrases may be eligible for this rule, such as *Harry* and *Mary*.

For example, *John Smith* is substantially different from *Jane Smith*. *Anne Best* is substantially different from *Anne West*. *Ellen Lang* is substantially different from *Ellen Long*. *James Ed* is substantially different from *James Lead*. In each case, an adjacent group of vowels or consonants is completely changed in sound and appearance.

For example, *Matthew Joan* is not substantially different from *Matthew Jones* because the *n* and *nz* groups share a sound and a letter. *Richard Blott* is not substantially different from *Richard Lot* because the *bl* and *l* group share a sound and a letter. *Katerine de la Mar* is not substantially different from *Katerine de la Mor* because they don't have comparable single-syllable name phrases and cannot use this rule.

- D. Standards for Relationship Conflict:** To be clear of relationship conflict, the submitted name must not unmistakably imply close relationship with a protected person. This includes, but is not limited to, a claim to be the parent, child, or spouse of a protected person. An unmistakable implication generally requires the use of the entirety of a protected name. The relational marker does not need to be in the new submission for

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

conflict to apply. That is, if a registered item includes a relational marker followed by a complete name and the new submission is the same as that complete name, it is in conflict. Names are still protected from relationship conflict even if grammar requires that the name be modified in order to demonstrate the relationship. Adding an element not in the protected name is generally enough to remove relationship conflict.

For example, *Miryam bint Da'ud* is not an unmistakable claim to be the child of *Da'ud ibn Auda*, but *Miryam bint Da'ud ibn Auda* is. *Felicia uxor Willemi le Tailor* is an unmistakable claim to be the wife of a registered *Willemus le Tailor*, even though there is a change in appearance of the given name, because the change is necessitated by the grammar. However, *Felicia uxor William Taylor* is not an unmistakable claim to be the wife of *Willemus le Tailor*, as *William Taylor* and *Willemus le Tailor* are different enough to be clear of identity conflict under our rules. Similarly, *Llewelyn ap Owen* is an unmistakable claim to be the father of a registered *Morgan ap Llewelyn ap Owen*.

For example, *Mary Elizabeth Smith* is an unmistakable claim to be the daughter of *Elizabeth Smith* even though a relational marker is not included. This type of relationship conflict occurs only in languages, such as English, where unmarked patronymics or matronymics are used. However, *Giulia Maddelena di Giacomo* is not an unmistakable claim to be the daughter of *Maddelena di Giacomo*, as Italian did not mix marked (*di Giacomo*) and unmarked (*Maddelena*) relationships in the same name. Thus, in this case, *Maddelena* must be considered a second given name.

E. Registration with Permission to Conflict: The owner of a registered item may grant permission to conflict to a new submission for either identity conflict or relationship conflict. Such permission may be granted either individually through a letter of permission to conflict or universally through a blanket letter of permission to conflict.

For identity conflict, any change to appearance and sound is sufficient to allow the registration of a personal name with a letter of permission to conflict. A submission identical to the registered item will not be registered even with permission to conflict.

For relationship conflict, a letter of permission to claim relationship from the owner of the registered item is sufficient to allow the registration of a personal name. This does not require demonstrating that the individual has that legal relationship. You can give a stranger permission to have a name that appears to be the name of your child, parent, or spouse.

PN.4. Personal Names Presumption

A. Definitions: Presumption is a false claim. This includes claims of restricted rank or powers that the submitter does not possess within the Society or that we do not allow anyone to claim. It also includes claims of identity or close relationship with a person outside the SCA who is considered quite important by many people within and outside the Society. Presumption is not dependent on intent; even if such a claim was not intended, the appearance of such a claim is not allowed. Items which presume will not be registered, even if a letter of permission could be obtained.

B. Claim to Rank: Names may not contain a claim to a protected and/or restricted rank that the submitter does not have within the Society. This includes the following:

1. Use of Elements that Appear to Be Titles: Names may not contain an element or group of elements that create the appearance of a claim to have a specific protected rank or title that the submitter does not possess within the Society, even if that name element or elements are attested. Those titles which are so protected

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

can be found in the List of Alternate Titles.

Attested bynames which are identical to titles used in the Society are generally not allowed for individuals who do not have that rank. Relatively minor changes to the form of the byname can remove the appearance of a claim to rank.

For example, only a knight can register the byname *Knight* or *Chevalier*, as both are titles used in the Society for a knight. However, while the family name *Visconti* is derived from the word for viscount (*visconte*) it is not actually the restricted title. Thus the byname *Visconti* is not a claim to be a viscount, and can be registered.

Bynames using titles not used within the SCA cannot be considered a claim to a rank. Nonetheless, such names will only be registered if they were used as bynames by normal people who did not have that rank.

For example, *Pope* is a surname also used by normal people. Therefore, it can be registered in a personal name.

Attested given names that are identical to titles and forms of address may be registered in contexts that make it clear that they are given names and not titles.

For example, a given name like *Regina* may be registered in a name like *Regina the Laundress* or *Regina Smith*. Names like *Regina of England* or *Regina Juliana of York* will not be registered. They create the appearance of a claim to the restricted title *Queen*. Similarly, *Miles* is the approved Latin alternate for knight; however, *Miles* is also used as an English given name in period. Thus, *Miles Martin* would not create the appearance of a claim to the restricted title *Miles*.

Attested bynames incorporating the names of Society peerage orders and real-world knightly orders are not considered a claim to rank or membership in those orders.

For example, the use of an attested byname *de la Rose* or *atte Pelican*, both derived from inn-sign names, is not a claim to be a member of the order.

Submitters may register names that create a claim to rank that they do possess within the Society. Only permanent ranks may be used in names. Documentation must be provided that the submitter is entitled to this rank.

For example, no submitter may register a byname meaning *king* or *princess*, as those are not permanent ranks. Landed barons who are not court barons may not register a byname meaning *baron*.

- 2. Dynastic Names:** Names may not contain a byname uniquely used by a single dynasty. Dynastic names used by both a royal family and normal people are acceptable. While some kingdom names were originally used primarily or exclusively by royalty, those names came to be used so widely that they are not considered a claim to rank.

For example, the byname *Hohenstaufen* was used only by a single ruling dynasty, and thus cannot be used for SCA names, as it makes a claim to be a member of that specific dynasty. We do not limit the use of bynames like *Tudor*, *Stuart*, or *Bourbon*, as these bynames were used by many people who were not part of those ruling dynasties.

- 3. Combination of Family Name and Location:** Names may not contain both a family name used by an important noble family and the area from which that family derives their title or the seat of the family. Such a combination is considered a claim to rank. Generally this name pattern is limited to Scottish clan chiefs and to barons, counts, and other members of the high nobility.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, a name submission cannot use the byname combinations *Campbell of Argyll* or *Tudor of England*. The bynames *Campbell*, *of Argyll*, *Tudor*, and *of England* are each registerable individually.

4. Honorific Names: Name phrases that were only granted as an honor or award by rulers cannot be registered. Such names are a claim to rank.

For example, the Arabic titles *Salah al-Din* or *Saif al-Mulk* were always honors given by a ruler, and thus are a claim to rank.

5. Combination of Occupational and Locative Bynames: Names may not combine an occupational byname and a locative byname in a way that seems to be a claim to rank or official position. Most such combinations do not have this appearance. This should not be understood to suggest that the Crown cannot make such appointments; however, as they are not necessarily permanent, such appointments may not be used as justification for registered names.

For example, a name submission cannot use the combinations *the Bard of Armagh* or *Abbot of Saint Giles* or *Champion of Ealdormere*. However, *the Seamstress of York* is unlikely to be understood to be the only seamstress, or an official seamstress and so would be registerable.

C. Claim of Powers: Names may not contain an unmistakable claim of superhuman abilities, magical powers, or divine origin.

In general, a name phrase used by normal human beings during our period is not considered to be a claim to superhuman abilities or divine origin.

For example, we will register *Odinson*, because *Odin* was used as a human given name in Middle English and in Norwegian. Similarly, we will register an English byname *Devil*, because it is attested as a human descriptive byname in medieval England. On the other hand, we will not register a name like *Lokasson* as a patronymic constructed from the name *Loki*, because the only known use of *Loki* is as the name of an Old Norse god. Such a name would be a claim to a divine origin.

There are examples of attested given names and bynames that are claims to magical abilities or other superhuman abilities. Such names will not be registered unless they can be demonstrated to have been used in contexts that are not claims to magical abilities. Use of them by multiple individuals is often sufficient to do so, unless they all were understood to have the same magical power.

One example is the Norse byname *sundafyllir*, which is a reference to a story in which the owner filled a strait with fish through magic. Such a name would not be registerable.

D. Claim of Identity or Close Relationship with an Important Non-SCA Person: A personal name may not be too close to the name of a protected individual or make claims to be a direct relative of a protected individual.

A name is said to presume on a protected name if it is not substantially different in sound and appearance from it or creates an unmistakable claim to close relationship with that protected individual in any of the forms we protect. The standards for substantial difference and unmistakable relationship claims are set out in PN.3 above as "identity conflict" and "relationship conflict" respectively, except that such items are not registerable, even with permission.

People from all periods of history including the present may be important enough to protect. Given the nature of the Society, people who lived within the scope of our period are somewhat more likely to be considered important enough to protect than people from other places and times. For individuals important enough to

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

protect, we protect all forms in which their name was known, including in other languages, but not hypothetical forms. We only protect names that are used either today or in the time when they were alive to refer to these protected persons.

For example, we protect *Christopher Columbus*, *Cristobal Colon*, *Christophorus Columbus*, etc. as these were known forms of the name of the famous explorer. However, while *Carlos V of Spain* was also the count of Barcelona, we do not protect him as *Carlos of Barcelona*, as his name was not recorded or referenced in this form.

1. Non-SCA People Protected from Presumption: A personal name submission is only considered to presume on protected personal names. Names of important non-SCA individuals are protected from presumption. People who are not important enough to have an entry in a standard print encyclopedia, such as the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, are generally not important enough to protect. Newly famous individuals may rarely be considered important enough to protect even if they have not yet appeared in a print encyclopedia. Individuals who do have an entry must be further considered. People are considered important enough to protect if they meet the following standards.

Sovereign rulers of significant states are generally important enough to protect. Some historical city-states are not considered significant states. Provinces or regions integrated into larger units like the Holy Roman Empire are not generally considered significant states. Sovereigns of small states that did not give rise directly to modern countries will not be protected under this clause, nor will legendary kings of any state (though these kings may be individually important enough to protect).

Individuals whose names are recognized by a significant number of people in the Society without having to look them up in a reference are generally important enough to protect. Individuals recognized only by specialists in a subject are unlikely to be important enough to protect. Individuals who are only recognized with the assistance of reference books are unlikely to be important enough to protect.

Individuals whose work and/or life are still influential today are generally important enough to protect. Those whose work significantly shaped the course of world history, science, or the arts are generally important enough to protect. This is generally measured by examining measures like the length of encyclopedia articles about the person and his/her work, numbers of search engine hits for the individual, and the like.

Fictional characters may also be considered important enough that their names need to be protected. Fictional characters are generally important enough to protect when two conditions are met. They are: a) a significant number of people in the Society recognize the character's name without prompting and b) the use of the name would generally be considered by those people a clear reference to that character.

Even if a piece of armory is not considered important enough to protect from presumption, the use of a piece of historical armory combined with the family name of the holder may be presumptuous. For details, see A.6, Presumption below.

PN.5. Personal Names Offense

A. Definitions: No name that is offensive to a large segment of members of the SCA or the general public will be registered. Offense is a modern concept; just because a name was used in period does not mean that it is not offensive to the modern observer. Offense returns are rare because the bar for determining offensiveness is quite high; it has not been unusual for years to pass between returns for offense.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Offense is not dependent on intent. The fact that a submitter did not intend to be offensive is not relevant. The standard is whether a large segment of the SCA or the general public would be offended.

Similarly, offense is not dependent on clarity. A foreign language name that has an offensive meaning may be considered offensive, even if many English-speaking listeners would not understand the term without explanation.

B. Types of Potentially Offensive Names: Several types of names are defined as potentially offensive:

1. Vulgar Names: Names which include pornographic or scatological terms will not be registered. While some documented bynames refer to body parts, those which refer in explicit ways to genitals will not be registered, such as certain Old Norse bynames. Bynames which refer to other body parts are not generally vulgar and may be registered. Likewise, names that have been used as euphemisms for genitals are not considered vulgar and may be registered.

Names that will be understood by the modern English listener to be offensively vulgar will be considered vulgar even if the meaning in the original language is not vulgar. Relatively small changes to name elements can remove the appearance of vulgarity.

2. Offensive Religious Terminology: Names which include religious terms used in a way that mock the beliefs of others will not be registered. This includes both incongruous combinations and combinations that are excessively religious and may be offensive to believers and non-believers alike. Most religious terminology is not offensive. Names with non-offensive religious terminology may be registered.

For example, the incongruous combinations *Muhammad the Pope* or *Mary the Harlot of Babylon* would not be registerable.

3. Derogatory Stereotypes: Names which include ethnic, racial, or sexuality-based slurs and references to derogatory stereotypes will not be registered. This is not dependent on the period associations of the usage. It is an issue based on modern understandings of the offensiveness of terms. General references to ethnic, racial, or sexual identities are not offensive and may be registered.

4. Offensive Political Terminology: Names which include terms specifically associated with social or political movements that are offensive to a particular race, ethnicity, religion or similar group will not be registered. Likewise, names with references to events or ideas that are offensive to a similar group will not be registered. Even if used without prejudice in period, such terms are offensive by their modern context.

For example, name phrases that suggest participation in pogroms or repressive movements, such as *Judenfeind*, a period German name meaning "enemy of the Jews," will not be registered.

C. Names as a Whole: Even when no name phrase is itself offensive, an entire name may be offensive. A name that mocks a public person or another member of the Society by adding an element like "le Idiot" is not allowed. In general, such a reference must be unmistakable; this generally requires multiple elements from a protected name. Likewise, a name that creates an offensive idea through a combination of words is not allowed.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

NPN. Non-Personal Names

Non-personal names are names other than personal names. They include branch (local group) names, award and order names, household and association names (including guilds), and heraldic titles. To be registered, a non-personal name submission must meet the following standards:

- The designator and substantive element must be demonstrated to be suitable for the type of item. Each type of element must be suitable for a specific time and place or must otherwise meet the standards set out in NPN.1.
- The name as a whole must be demonstrated to be grammatically (structurally) correct. This means meeting the standards for lingual and temporal compatibility set out in NPN.2.
- The name must be free of conflict and presumption as set out in NPN.3 and NPN.4.
- The name must not be offensive as set out in NPN.5.

NPN.1. Non-Personal Names Content

A. Definitions: Non-personal names consist of two parts: the designator and the substantive phrase. A designator is the word or group of words that describe what kind of non-personal name it is, such as *House*, *Barony* or *Order*. The substantive element is the part of the name that is specific to the item being submitted. That is, it specifies which household, branch, etc. is being referred to. The preposition and article which often link the designator and substantive element are for the most part treated as part of neither, but in general should match the designator in language.

For example, in the name *Barony of Carolingia*, *Barony* is the designator and *Carolingia* the substantive element. In the name *Black Lion Principal Herald*, *Principal Herald* is the designator and *Black Lion* the substantive element. In the name *the honorable Ordre of the Gartier*, *the honorable Ordre* is the designator and *Gartier* the substantive element. In the name *Hous of Julyane Huxster*, *Hous* is the designator and *Julyane Huxster* is the substantive element. In each case, the preposition and article that may link them are part of neither one.

B. Designators: The designators which may be used are determined by the type of non-personal name submission. In general, if the *lingua Anglica* form of a designator is used, the prepositions and articles which join the designator to the substantive element will also take the *lingua Anglica* form. *Lingua Anglica* allows English translations of certain elements; it is discussed in greater detail in C.2.c below.

1. Branch Designators: The designators for branches (local SCA groups) are fixed by the Governing Documents. The list may be found in Appendix E of this document. These designators are considered to be compatible with any place name construction. This is true whether or not period forms can be found with such a designator. Shires are not limited to the forms of English shires, nor baronies to the kinds of names found for baronies in period. In addition, each type of branch may be registered with other designators suitable for that branch type. A college may be named following the pattern of medieval colleges. These designators may take the *lingua Anglica* form, using the form *Designator of X* regardless of the language of the substantive phrase. Alternately, a translation for the appropriate type of branch may be proposed. A list of translations that have been registered can be found in Appendix E.

In general, changes of status for a branch, such as changing from shire to barony, do not need to be submitted. The Laurel office does not track those changes in status (that being a duty of the Seneschal and Board of Directors). However, it will acknowledge them when a new submission is made. The exception is when a branch wants the approval of a new alternate form of the branch designator, such as a non-English form. Such approval requires Laurel approval, but is an administrative action (which does not require fees)

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

and does not delay the change in status.

As discussed in GP.3.B, we only allow non-personal names from locations beyond Europe when the entity in question could have traveled to Europe. As branches could not have so traveled, designators for branch names may only be in languages used in medieval and Renaissance Europe.

2. Order and Award Designators: The designators for order names must follow a documented pattern for medieval order names. The standard designators are *Order* and *Award*. Any pattern suitable for one such designator is suitable for the other. These designators may take the *lingua Anglica* form, using the forms above regardless of the language of the substantive phrase. Alternately, they may take the language of the substantive element. A list of some translations of these designators is listed in Appendix E. In general, designators which are used for household and association names cannot be used for orders and awards.

For example, either *Order of the Levrier* or *Ordre du Levrier* is registerable for the meaning 'order of the hound', but *Order du Levrier* and *Ordre of the Levrier* are not; in each one, the preposition and article do not match the language of the designator.

For example, *Order of the Levrier* is registerable as an order name, but not as a household name. Similarly, *Company of the Levrier* is registerable as a household name, but not as an award or order name.

3. Household and Association Names: The designators for household names must be documented as a form describing a group of people in a particular culture. It must be compatible with the substantive element in terms of content and style. There is no standard designator which is considered compatible with all types of names for groups of people.

Several kinds of groups of people have served as models for household names. They include a noble household, a military unit, a guild, a group of people associated with an inn or tenement house, a university or school (noting that the word college is reserved for branches), clans, and an organized group of musicians or actors. Designators may be registered in the original language or may take the *lingua Anglica* form. Suitable substantive elements (like simple descriptions) may take the *lingua Anglica* form as well. In general, designators which are used within the SCA for orders and awards cannot be used for household and association names, even if they were so used in period.

For example, either *Compagnia di Santa Lucia* or *Company of Santa Lucia* is registerable for the meaning 'company of Saint Lucia, but *Company di Santa Lucia* and *Compagnia of Santa Lucia* are not; in each one, the preposition and article do not match the language of the designator.

For example, *Compagnia di Santa Lucia* is registerable as a household name, but not as an order name. Similarly, *Order of Santa Lucia* is registerable as an award or order name, but not a household name.

4. Heraldic Titles: The designators for heraldic titles must follow a documented pattern for heraldic titles. The standard terms for heraldic titles for kingdoms and local branches are *Herald* and *Pursuivant*. Any pattern suitable for one such designator is suitable for the other. These designators may take the *lingua Anglica* form, using the forms above regardless of the language of the substantive phrase, or they may take the language of the substantive element. The designator *Principal Herald* is restricted to the chief herald of a kingdom. The designator *King/Queen/Sovereign of Arms* is restricted to the Laurel office. In general, changes of designator, for example from pursuivant to herald, do not need to be submitted to the Laurel office; if submitted, they are administrative actions, which do not require fees.

For example, a heraldic title based on the German placename *Funffprun* could be *Funffprun Herold* or *Funffprun Herald*, as *Herold* is found as a German term for heralds, but it could not be *Funffprun Herault*, as *Herault* is a French term for heralds.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

As discussed in GP.3.B, we do not register heraldic titles in languages from cultures that did not use heraldic titles. This applies to both the designator and the substantive elements of such heraldic titles.

C. Standards for Designators and Substantive Elements: To be registerable, those designators whose form is not fixed in NPN.1.B above (including those with modifiers, such as *Noble Order*) must meet the standards laid out below. All substantive elements must also meet the standards laid out below.

1. Single Time and Place: A substantive element must follow the rules of grammar and structure for a single time and place. It may not mix languages unless that mixing of languages within a name phrase is attested.

For example, the attested English heraldic title *Rougecrosse Pursuivant* is partially French and partially English, but this does not necessarily mean that all French and English words may be so combined.

2. Sources of Designators and Substantive Elements: We allow registerable name phrases to be created in a variety of ways. A designator is a name phrase. A substantive element is a name phrase. Those designators that are discussed in NPN.1.B above do not need to be justified under the terms of this section.

a. Attested Name Phrases: Name phrases may be attested to period as a complete name phrase. A single example of an attested name phrase clearly dated to period is sufficient to demonstrate its use. Minor spelling variants are allowed when those spelling variants can be demonstrated to be compatible with the spelling conventions of the time and place of the attested name.

For example, in Renaissance Scots, the letters *i* and *y* are regularly interchangeable. So, a name attested as *Armyltoun* could also be registered as *Armiltoun*. The letters *k* and *q*, on the other hand, are not interchangeable in Renaissance Scots. So, a name attested as *Kintyre* does not justify the spelling *Qintyre*.

b. Constructed Name Phrases: Name phrases may be constructed from attested period name elements. This requires demonstrating that the combination follows a period pattern. We generally require at least three examples to consider something a pattern. This is because a single name phrase can appear to follow a pattern that it does not actually follow.

For example, the German placename element *-katz* does not derive from the name of the animal but from the name of a river. Thus, this element cannot be combined with an element that is incompatible with a river name.

All of the elements and patterns for a constructed name phrase must come from a single time and place. We do not allow constructed name phrases that are created by using patterns from one time and place with elements from another time and place. Some examples of constructed names are:

1. New Placenames Constructed from Attested Elements: New placenames can be constructed from attested placename elements following an attested pattern.

For example, the attested English place names *Oxford*, *Swinford* and *Hartford* indicate a pattern of kinds of large hooved animals with *-ford*. Therefore, this pattern would support a similar name like *Sheepford*. This pattern would not, however, support constructing *Bookford* or *Duckford*, since neither *books* nor *ducks* are large hooved animals.

For example, there is a pattern of adding family names to existing placenames in English. Following this pattern, the attested family name *Peverel* can be added to the attested placename *Bercroft* to construct the compound placename *Bercroft Peverel*.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

- 2. New Heraldic Titles Constructed from Attested Elements:** New heraldic titles can be constructed by using attested elements in attested patterns for a given time and place.

For example, attested English titles include *Blaunche Sanglier Pursuivant* and *Rouge Dragon Pursuivant*. These can justify *Rouge Sanglier Pursuivant* and *Blaunche Dragon Pursuivant*. They can also justify the use of other animals or heraldic monsters, like *Rouge Griffin Pursuivant* or *Blanche Leopard Pursuivant*.

- c. *Lingua Anglica* Allowance:** We also allow the registration of translations of attested and constructed household names, heraldic titles, and order names into standard modern English, which we call the *lingua Anglica* rule. We allow this because the meanings of these names would have been clear to the speakers of these languages, but may be unclear to modern speakers. The translation must be a literal, plausible and complete translation. Under no circumstances will translations of the meanings of given names or placenames be registerable under this rule.

For example, *Blanche Sanglier Pursuivant* can be translated as *White Boar Pursuivant*, but not *White Sanglier Pursuivant*, *Snowy Boar Pursuivant*, or *White Piggy Pursuivant*.

For example, the Spanish byname *de Castilla* may be translated as *of Castile*. The Arabic byname *al-Dimashqi* may be translated as *of Damascus* or *the Damascene*. However, while *Cairo* is derived from a word which means "the victorious", its *lingua Anglica* form is *of Cairo*, not *of The Victorious*, as "The Victorious" is a translation of the meaning.

- d. Borrowed Names:** Name phrases may be borrowed from secular literature, from the Bible or other religious literature, or from the names of saints. Name phrases may also be constructed from name elements borrowed from those types of source. To borrow a name phrase or element, the following conditions must be met:

- 1. Linguistically Appropriate Form:** The name phrase must be shown to be a form by which the entity was known in that time and place. Generally this means finding it in the literature of that time (so a Renaissance Italian Bible, or an English publication of an Arthurian romance). In the case of a saint's name, evidence for their veneration through the naming of churches is generally sufficient. Only the form of the name used in that culture is permitted under this allowance.

For example, the Greek mythological object known in English as the *Golden Fleece* was known to the medieval French as the *Toison d'Or*. It is *Toison d'Or* that was borrowed for the name of the period Burgundian order. Similarly, the saint known in her lifetime as *Æthelthryth* was venerated by late period English people as *Audrey*. *Audrey* is the form allowed in late period English context to create a name like the *College of Saint Audrey*.

- 2. Pattern of Borrowing Names:** The culture must be shown to have a pattern of using name phrases from that type of source. Demonstrating such a pattern requires at least three independent examples of normal entities using such name phrases in the target time and place.

The demonstrated pattern must address the type of name phrase. Evidence of the use of the given names of saints does not demonstrate the use of the bynames of saints. The demonstrated pattern must also address the type of character or entity. The use of a non-personal name derived from the given name of a major character in a source does not demonstrate the use of a non-personal name derived from the given name of a minor character.

For example, there is a pattern of using the given names of major Arthurian characters in medieval England. This would justify a non-personal name derived from the name *Bedivere* even if it were not attested. However, it would not justify a non-personal name derived from the name of a minor

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Arthurian character like *Gwinas*, who is only mentioned once. It would also not justify a non-personal name derived from a Biblical name. As there is no similar pattern of borrowing in Gaelic, a non-personal name derived from the Gaelic form of an Arthurian character cannot be registered under this allowance.

- e. Legal Name Allowance:** Name phrases from an individual submitter's legal names may be used. To do this, the submitter must demonstrate the name phrase on a legal document, such as a birth certificate, driver's license, or the like. Only the full name and the nature of the document must be visible. Identification numbers and the like may be obscured. Religious names (Hebrew names, confirmation names) are also considered legal names. With appropriate evidence, they can be used under this allowance.

A personal name can be used in the construction of a household name. Surnames are used to construct household names, on the pattern of *Surname Hall*. Personal names can be used in the construction of heraldic titles. Surnames are used to construct heraldic titles on the pattern of *Surname Herald*.

For example, someone whose legal surname is *Smylie* could register *Smylie Hall* under the legal name allowance.

The name phrase must be used in precisely the way that it is spelled on the legal document. As some legal documents obscure capitalization (by using all capitals) or omit punctuation (and markings like accents), such changes may be allowed on a case by case basis. Name phrases must be used in their entirety, including any prepositions and articles. Non-personal names based on nicknames which do not appear on legal documents cannot be registered.

For example, the legal surname *Westwick* justifies *Westwick Herald*, but not *Westwyck Herald* or *Westwik Herald*. The legal surname *von Volvorth* justifies *von Volvorth Hall*, not *Volvorth Hall* or *de Volvorth Hall*, even though the expected form in a period construction would drop the preposition *von*.

- f. Branch Name Allowance:** Name phrases may be created from the registered forms of SCA branches. Only the exact registered form of the branch name may be used, in the *lingua Anglica* form "of *Branchname*". Translated forms will not be registered under this allowance.

For example, we would allow the forms *of the East* or *of Fontaine dans Sable*, as these are the expected *lingua Anglica* forms. However, this would not allow *von Osten* as a German translation of "of the East", even if the rest of the submission was in German. Similarly, it would not allow *de la Fontaine dans Sable* as a fully French version of "of Fontaine dans Sable", even though the branch name is French. That is, we would allow *Ordre du Levrier of Fontaine dans Sable* or *Order of the Levrier of Fontaine dans Sable*, but we would not allow *Ordre du Levrier de la Fontaine dans Sable* under this rule, as this is not the *lingua Anglica* form of the branch name, even though it matches the intended origin of the submission. If *Fontaine dans Sable* can also be documented as an attested or constructed French name, *de Fontaine dans Sable* could be used in forming a fully French order name; however that would not be through the use of the branch name allowance. For example, we would not allow *of the Midrealm*, as this is not the registered form of the *Kingdom of the Middle*.

- g. The Grandfather Clause:** Name phrases from a name registered to an individual or branch may be used in a new non-personal name submission by that individual or branch, even if the name phrase is no longer registerable under the rules. The use of the grandfather clause does not allow the submitter to evade new style problems (as discussed in NPN.2 below). It only allows the submitter a pass on style problems that already exist with the registered name. Documentation under the grandfather clause does not exempt a name from conflict, presumption, or offense rules, unless that rules violation is itself grandfathered.

The element used may be the entire substantive element, the designator, or part of the substantive

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

element. Only the exact, actual name phrase from the registered form may be used, not variants, patterns, etc. with the exception of submissions of branch heraldic titles and order names.

A name phrase from a registered name of an individual may also be registered by a close legal relative (such as parent, spouse, child, sibling, etc.). To do this, the submitter must demonstrate the relationship through legal documents or through attestation of relationship from the individual whose name is already registered.

Branches may register new heraldic titles and order names based on patterns used in their existing heraldic titles or order names. To use the grandfather clause, the new submission must be similar in content to the existing pattern.

For example, if a branch had registered an order name *Crimson Sleeve*, they could use that to modify a new, similar object such as *Crimson Glove*. However, they could not register *Crimson Bowl*, as a bowl is not the same type of object as a sleeve. Likewise, the owner of *Diamond Herald* and *Ruby Herald* could use the grandfather clause to register *Order of the Sapphire*. The owner could not register *Order of the Diamond Ring* or *Order of the Gold*, because the pattern of registered items is limited to precious stones, not jewelry or precious items in general.

Branches may also utilize the grandfather clause to register non-personal names incorporating name phrases from the registered names of individuals closely associated with the branch. This generally means a resident of the branch or an active supporter. The permission of the individual or their heraldic heir is required for this use. Only the whole, exact, actual name phrase from the registered form may be used, not variants or patterns. Under no circumstances will this privilege be extended to use names or to other unregistered names.

NPN.2. Non-Personal Names Style

A. Definitions: A complete non-personal name must consist of a designator, which says what kind of name it is (like *Shire*, *Herald*, *Award*, etc.), and a substantive element, which says which one it is (such as *New London* or *Blanche Lyon*). Any name that lacks one of the two cannot be registered, though the designator may sometimes be omitted in casual use.

B. Name Requirements: A complete non-personal name must be relatively consistent with a single time and place in structure and grammar, as defined in these rules. Unlike personal names which are made up of multiple name phrases, the designator and substantive phrase create a single name phrase for the purpose of our rules. Therefore, there are no registerable lingual mixes beyond the use of the *lingua Anglica* rule for designators following the rules that are laid out in NPN.1 above. In general terms, a non-personal name submission including elements separated by more than 300 years or that cannot be demonstrated to be typical of a single language and culture will not be registered.

In a submission, the structure and grammar of the overall name must be demonstrated to be compatible with period practice or with those patterns described in NPN.1 above. That includes, but is not limited to, documenting the order of the words in the name, ensuring that any necessary grammatical changes are included (such as making a name possessive), and documenting that the designator and the substantive element are appropriate for use with one another.

C. Names Not Recorded in a Latin Script: Names will only be registered in the Latin script, so that they can be easily read by heralds and the populace. We will not register Norse names in runes, Russian names in Cyrillic, Japanese names in kanji, and so on. Submitters are encouraged to use those names in the original

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

alphabet for other purposes. Names and name phrases that would not have been written in a Latin script are treated for purposes of registration as if they are created in the relevant script (Norse, Arabic, Russian, etc.). They are then transcribed into the Latin script following a single orthographic system, which may include common diacritics such as ó (o with an acute accent), ligatures such as æ (ash, representing {ae}), and other characters such as þ (thorn, representing the unvoiced {th} sound). Names that mix two orthographic systems for transcription are not allowed because some systems use the same letters to represent different sounds, which creates confusion. This includes the use (or lack) of accents in a name – their usage should be consistent. A list of acceptable transliteration systems for some languages can be found in Appendix D. The use of a transliteration system not listed there must be justified with the submission.

D. Obtrusive Modernity: No name will be registered that either in whole or in part is obtrusively modern; something is said to be obtrusively modern when it is such that it makes a modern joke or reference that destroys medieval ambience and would drag the average person mentally back to the present day. In general, a period name that has some modern referent will not be considered obtrusively modern.

Names that have been ruled obtrusively modern include *Porsche Audi*, *Artemisian Tank Corps*, and *Geky Herald* (pronounced as "geeky herald"), while names like *Edmond Fitzgerald*, *Red Boke Herald*, *Drew Steele* and *Mould de Cheder* have been registered.

E. Generic Identifiers: As discussed in GP.2.A, some items are considered too generic to be registered; this means that they may be used by anyone and may not be reserved to one person or group by registration. One category of items that may not be registered is generic identifiers like *Brewer's Guild* and *Queen's Guard*; these names may be used to identify the owner of a badge or to designate its intended use, but no group may register it (and hence prevent others from registering it). These generic items may be used by anyone without registration, but may not be registered to anyone.

NPN.3. Non-Personal Names Conflict

A. Definitions: To be registered, a new submission must be clear of conflict with all registered names. Conflict, as it is used in these rules, is a modern concept which derives from the requirement in the Governing Documents that names have sufficient difference to avoid undue confusion. There are two kinds of confusion which must be avoided: being too close to a protected non-personal name directly, and indicating ownership by or affiliation with any protected name, including personal names. These are described in these rules as "identity conflict" and "affiliation conflict".

For identity conflict, names that are substantially different in both sound and appearance are said to be clear of conflict. Names that are not substantially different in sound and/or appearance are said to be in conflict. For affiliation conflict, a name that makes an unmistakable claim of ownership by or affiliation to a protected name is in conflict with it. This section of the rules sets the standards for how names can be substantially different and avoid such an unmistakable claim.

B. Items Protected from Conflict: A new non-personal name submission must be clear from identity and affiliation conflict with all registered non-personal names of any type. Non-personal names do not have identity conflict with personal names, but may have affiliation conflict with personal names. A name is registered and protected from the moment it is listed as accepted on a published Letter of Acceptances and Returns. Registered names will be listed in the Ordinary and Armorial as soon as possible, but they are protected as soon as the Letter of Acceptances and Return is published.

C. Standards for Identity Conflict: To be clear of conflict, the substantive elements of two names must be substantially different in sound and appearance. Matters such as meaning, language, etymological origin, etc.,

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

are completely irrelevant, as conflict is a modern concept. Designators and the prepositions or articles which link them to the substantive elements do not count for difference (though they can be sufficient to allow registration with permission to conflict). Only sound and appearance of the substantive elements are considered for difference. Thus, the Latinized form of a name may be clear of conflict from the vernacular form. While we do not go out of our way to consider variant pronunciations, we do consider important period and modern pronunciations of name elements.

For a pair of non-personal names to be substantially different, the substantive elements of two non-personal names must be different in sound and appearance under the standards laid out below. Substantive elements may be different in sound under one standard and appearance under another standard. Substantive elements are compared as complete items, even if the elements have different capitalization or spacing.

For example, in *House of Lancastre*, *Lancastre* is the substantive element; in *Grimwithshire*, *Grimwith* is the substantive element. In the case of *House of the Black Bear*, *Black Bear* is the substantive element. Additionally, the *Shire of South Hamton* conflicts with the *Shire of Southam Ton* and *Shire of Southamton*, because the substantive elements are the same, just with different spacing and capitalization. The *Order of the Whistle* does not conflict with the *Order of the Whistle of Drachenwald*, because the substantive elements being compared are *Whistle* and *Whistle of Drachenwald*.

1. Changes to Two Syllables: Names are substantially different if changes in sound and appearance to the substantive element affect at least two syllables (including adding, removing, or reordering them). If the changes only affect adjacent letters or sounds, they must affect more than two letters or sounds, in general. Change in spacing between elements counts as a change in appearance, but is not considered a change in sound.

For example, *College of Saint Barbary* is substantially different from *College of Santa Barbara* because two syllables change in both sound and appearance, and another is added. *Barony of Denituna* is substantially different from *Barony of Denton*, because one syllable has changed and two have been added. While the names are etymologically linked (with the first an earlier Latinized version of the second name), multiple syllables have difference in sound and appearance.

For example, *Sign of the White Eagle* is not substantially different from *Sign of the Whyt Egle*; while they are substantially different in appearance, they are not substantially different in sound. *Hamdon House* is not substantially different from *Hampton House*; the changes affect two syllables, but only two adjacent letters and their sounds (the *md* and *mpt* group in the middle of the first word).

For example, *Order of the Wolf and Falcon* is substantially different from *Order of the Falcon and Wolf* and *Blanche Rose Pursuivant* is substantially different from *Rose Blanche Pursuivant*. In both cases, the substantive element has been reordered. Reordering of the substantive element and the designator does not clear conflict, so *House of Lancaster* is not substantially different from *Lancaster House*.

2. Substantial Change to One Syllable: Names are substantially different if a single syllable in their substantive element (excluding articles, prepositions, and conjunctions, such as *de*, *the*, or *and*) is changed in both sound and appearance as described here. The addition or removal of a syllable makes two names substantially different in sound. Two names are also substantially different if a syllable is substantially changed in sound and appearance. This means that the vowel and the consonant (or group of consonants) on one side of the vowel is different between the two names. In either case, the change in spelling (including addition or removal of letters) must affect at least two letters in that syllable to be substantial.

For example, *Canton of Caldbek* is substantially different from *Canton of Caldwell* and from *Barony of Birkbek*; in each case one syllable of the substantive element is changed in both sound and appearance. *Northwood House* is substantially different from *Southwood House* because the initial syllable of the substantive element is changed in both sound and appearance (two letters are changed). *Caldwell Herald* is

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

not substantially different from *Coldwell Herald*; the change only affects the vowel sound (and a single letter). *The Green Band* is not substantially different from *Green House*, because no change has been made to the substantive element (excluding *the*).

For example, the *Shire of Charford* is substantially different from *Shire of Northcharford*, as a syllable is removed. Similarly, *House of Charring* is substantially different from *House of Charring Cross*, as a syllable is removed.

3. Substantial Change of Single-Syllable Name Element: Two names whose substantive elements are two words or less and have a comparable single-syllable name element (excluding articles and prepositions, like *de* and *the*) are eligible for this rule. Comparable single-syllable name elements are substantially different in sound if a group of adjacent vowels or of adjacent consonants within a word is completely changed, so that they have no sound in common. In rare cases, the sound may still be too similar for this rule to clear the conflict. The change of a single letter is sufficient for two eligible name phrases to be different in appearance, as such name phrases are quite short. On a case by case basis, two-syllable names phrases may be eligible for this rule, such as *Harry* and *Mary*.

For example, *House of the White Cat* is substantially different from *House of the White Hat*; each has a single syllable word in the substantive element with an initial consonant cluster that is different in both sound and a single letter difference in appearance. *Bill House* is substantially different from *Birch House*; each has a single syllable word with a final consonant cluster that is different in sound and appearance. *Roune House* is not substantially different from *Broun House* because the *r* and *Br* groups share a sound; they are substantially different in appearance.

For example, *College of Saint John* is substantially different from *College of Saint Jane*, because each has a single syllable word in the substantive element that is substantially different in sound and appearance. However, *College of Saint John of Essex* is not substantially different from *College of Saint Jane of Essex* because they both have substantive elements longer than two words and cannot use this rule.

D. Standards for Affiliation Conflict: Non-personal names may not unmistakably imply ownership by or affiliation with any name we protect. An unmistakable implication generally requires the use of multiple elements/phrases from a protected name. A non-personal name that uses two or more elements from a protected name may be presumptuous, if it can be understood to be a claim to be a relative of that person. In cases where the protected name has only a single element, the use of that element may be considered presumptuous on a case-by-case basis.

For example, *House of Cariadoc of the Bow* unmistakably implies that the owner is *Cariadoc of the Bow*, and thus cannot be registered, but *Cariadocs House* does not unmistakably imply that claim. *Order of Bela of Eastmarch* unmistakably implies affiliation with *Bela of Eastmarch*, but *Order of Bela* does not unmistakably imply that claim. For example, *Company of the Blue Shield of Caid* as a household name submission from an individual unmistakably implies ownership by the *Kingdom of Caid*, while *Company of the Blue Shield* does not. A person may make a claim of ownership by or affiliation with a protected person or entity with their permission.

There are period examples of using personal names in a way that does not make such a claim. For example, saint's names were used to create the names of places, orders, colleges, and religious confraternities. While they were dedicated to these saints, they did not make a confusing claim of the sort prohibited here. Thus, such names are registerable. Other names that use the name of a protected individual or entity can be registered only if they can be shown to follow a period pattern of naming that does not make a claim to be owned by a protected person or claim a confusing relationship with a protected person.

For example, *Ordre de Monsieur Saint Michel Archange*, is an order name which makes reference to Saint Michel but does not make a confusing claim. Similarly, both *Saint Marie Magdalene College*, and the

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Cofradia de San Juan Bautista are dedicated to these saints, but cannot be mistaken to be owned by them. The *Order of Saint William the Cooper* is registerable, even though this is a constructed saint's name, as long as there is no registered *William the Cooper*.

E. Registration with Permission to Conflict: The owner of an item may grant permission to conflict to a new submission for either identity conflict or affiliation conflict. Such permission may be granted either individually through a letter of permission to conflict or universally through a blanket letter of permission to conflict. A submission identical to the registered item will not be registered even with permission to conflict.

Any change to the sound and appearance of the substantive element is sufficient to allow the registration of a non-personal name with a letter of permission to conflict. Any change to the sound and appearance of the designator is sufficient to allow the registration of a non-personal name with a letter of permission to conflict, except when both items are branches, orders or awards, or heraldic titles or when one item is an order or award and the other is a heraldic title. This is because designators for branches and heraldic titles may change over time, we consider the designators for orders, awards, and honors to be equivalent, and we allow branches to register heraldic titles formed from their registered order and award names. However, household and affiliation designators do not change over time and are considered an integral part of the name.

Is a designator change, with letter of permission, sufficient?	Branches	Orders and Awards	Households and Affiliations	Heraldic Titles
Branches	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Orders and Awards	Yes	No	Yes	No
Households and Affiliations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Heraldic Titles	Yes	No	Yes	No

NPN.4. Non-Personal Names Presumption

A. Definitions: Presumption is a false claim. This includes claims of rank or powers that the submitter does not possess within the Society or that we do not allow anyone to claim. It also includes claims of identity with, ownership by, or affiliation with a person or entity outside the SCA that is considered quite important by many people within and outside the Society. Presumption is not dependent on intent; even if such a claim was not intended, the appearance of such a claim is not allowed. Items which presume will not be registered, even if a letter of permission could be obtained.

B. Claim to Rank: Names may not contain a claim to a protected and/or restricted rank that the submitter does not have within the Society. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to:

1. Use of Elements that Appear to Be Titles: Names may not contain an element or combination of elements that create the appearance of a claim to have a specific rank or title that the submitter does not possess. Submitters may register names that create a claim to rank that they do possess. Only permanent ranks may be used in names. No submitter may register a name using an element that claims to be *king* or *princess*. Landed barons who are not court barons may not register an element which creates a claim to be a baron. Titles may be used as elements where they are not a claim to rank.

For example, no submitter may register a name like *Kynges House*, as that appears to be the household belonging to the king. However, in the *Barony of Kingestenton*, even though the first element refers to the fact that the town once belonged to the king, it was used for normal towns and so is not a claim to rank.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

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.

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*. 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.

3. Elements that are Presumptuous in Personal Names: Names may not contain a name element or group of elements we would consider presumptuous in a personal name (see PN.4). Examples include a byname uniquely used by a single dynasty, the combination of a surname and the title or seat of the family, or names granted as an honor.

C. Names that Claim Powers: Non-personal names may not contain an unmistakable claim of superhuman abilities, magical powers, or divine origin.

In general, a name phrase used by historical people is not considered to be a claim to superhuman abilities or divine origin. In general, a non-personal name using an element that would be considered such a claim in a personal name will not be registered.

For example, *Odins House* would be registerable, because *Odin* was used as a human given name in Middle English. Similarly, a name like *Gods House* would be registerable, as it is the attested name of an English college. On the other hand, *Lokasson House* or *Lokison House*, formed from the name *Loki*, would not be allowed. Because the only known use of *Loki* is as the name of an Old Norse god, such a name would be a claim to a divine origin or relationship.

D. Claim of Identity, Ownership, or Affiliation with an Important Non-SCA Entity or Person: Non-personal names may not be too close to the name of a protected entity. Non-personal names also may not make an unmistakable claim of ownership by or affiliation with any name we protect.

A non-personal name submission is said to presume on a protected name if the substantive element of the submission is not substantially different in sound and appearance from the substantive element of the protected name, or if it makes an unmistakable claim of ownership by or affiliation with the protected name. The standards for substantial difference and unmistakable claims are set in NPN.3 above as "identity conflict" and "affiliation conflict" respectively, except that such items are not registerable, even with permission.

For non-SCA entities and people considered important enough to protect, we protect all forms in which their name was known, including in other languages. We do not go out of our way to find obscure or hypothetical forms of names that might be too similar to a submission. We protect only the names by which entities were actually known and can easily be found by a modern person.

For example, we protect *London*, *Londres*, and *Londinium*, as all are forms by which London has been known.

1. Non-SCA Entities Protected from Presumption: A non-personal name submissions is only considered to presume on protected non-personal names. Names of important non-SCA entities are protected from presumption. Entities that we protect include places (countries, regions, and cities), chivalric orders and heraldic titles, and the names of organizations (colleges, businesses, and other such entities).

Places and organizations that are not important enough to have an entry in a standard print encyclopedia,

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

such as the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, are not important enough to protect. Entities that do have an entry must be further considered to determine if they merit protection. In general, entities recognized (without having to look in a reference) by a significant number of people in the Society as the name of a single unique place or entity are likely to be important enough to protect. Historical places or entities that are still influential today or significantly shaped the course of world history, science, or the arts are generally important enough to protect.

In rare cases, places and entities from fiction may be considered important enough to protect, when both a significant number of people in the Society recognize the name of the entity without prompting and the use of the name of the entity would generally be considered by those people a clear reference to that entity.

NPN.5. Non-Personal Names Offense

A. Definitions: No name that is offensive to a large segment of members of the SCA or the general public will be registered. Offense is a modern concept; just because a name was used in period does not mean that it is not offensive to the modern observer. Offense returns are rare because the bar for determining offensiveness is quite high; it has not been unusual for years to pass between returns for offense.

Offense is not dependent on intent; the fact that a submitter did not intend to be offensive is not relevant. The standard is whether a large segment of the SCA or the general public would be offended.

Similarly, offense is not dependent on clarity. A foreign language name that has an offensive meaning may be considered offensive, even if many English-speaking listeners would not understand the term without explanation.

B. Types of Potentially Offensive Names: Several types of names are defined as potentially offensive:

1. Vulgar Names: Names which include pornographic or scatological terms will not be registered. Names that will be understood by the modern English listener to be vulgar will be considered vulgar even if the meaning in the original language is not vulgar. Non-personal names derived from bynames that are themselves offensively vulgar will generally be considered vulgar as well. Occasionally, the alterations required in the creation of a new name, like a household name, will remove the appearance of vulgarity. Relatively small changes to name elements can remove the appearance of vulgarity.

2. Offensive Religious Terminology: Names which include religious terms used in a way that mock the beliefs of others will not be registered. This includes both incongruous combinations and combinations that are excessively religious and may be offensive to believers and non-believers alike. Most religious terminology is not offensive. Names with non-offensive religious terminology may be registered.

For example, *Canton of Devilles Chirche* is an incongruous combination which would not be registerable. However, constructed saint's names may be registerable in order names, such as the *Order of Saint William the Cooper*.

3. Derogatory Stereotypes: Names which include ethnic, racial, or sexuality-based slurs and references to derogatory stereotypes will not be registered. This is not dependent on the period associations of the usage, but is an issue based on modern understandings of the offensiveness of terms. General references to ethnic, racial, or sexuality-based identities are not offensive and may be registered.

4. Offensive Political Terminology: Names which include terms specifically associated with social or political movements that are offensive to a particular race, ethnicity, religion or similar group will not be

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

registered. Likewise, names with references to events or ideas that are offensive to a particular group will not be registered. Even if used without prejudice in period, such terms are offensive by their modern context.

For example, a name including name elements that suggest participation in pogroms or repressive movements, such as *Judenfeind*, a period German name meaning "enemy of the Jews," will not be registered.

C. Names as a Whole: Even when no name element is itself offensive, an entire name may be offensive. For example, a name that mocks a group by adding an insulting element to the existing placename, such as the attested family name *Dam*, will not be registered.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

A. Armory

Armorial submissions fit into four categories: primary armory, fielded badges, fieldless badges, and augmentations of honor. The first two follow identical rules and are just administrative categories. Primary armory refers to the single main armorial device for an individual or branch. Fielded badges are similar secondary items; they may function as badges or as devices for alternate personas. Fieldless badges, which can be displayed on any background, are more typical of period badges. They have some special rules for style and conflict, discussed in the relevant sections. Augmentations of honor are additions to existing pieces of primary armory to reflect an honor bestowed by the Crown of an individual kingdom. See A.3 for discussion of the rules which apply specifically to augmentations of arms. There is no separation between personal armory and non-personal armory for style, conflict or presumption. The Ordinary and Armorial contains some other types of items, such as flags of important non-SCA entities; these are also considered armory for the purposes of conflict and presumption.

To be registered, an armorial submission must meet the following standards:

- The armorial elements, charge groups, and overall design must be demonstrated to be compatible with period style. That means demonstrating that it follows the rules in A.2 and A.3 or the rules in A.4. A.1 explains how to do this in more detail.
- The armory must be free of conflict and presumption as described in A.5 and A.6.
- The armory must not be offensive as described in A.7.

A.1. Armory Style Principles

A. Definitions of Rule Sets: We require an armorial submission to be compatible with period armorial content and style. We consider a design that follows attested patterns for armorial content and style within our period to meet this requirement. There are two ways to follow attested patterns:

1. Core Style Rules: Designs that follow the Core Style rules in A.2 and A.3 below meet this requirement. These sections comprise our *core style*. Our core style is not identical to the style of any single specific place and time, although it is based on the dominant style in medieval Western Europe, the Anglo-Norman style.

Some of those rules require documentation of an element, demonstrating that it is attested or constructed. In some cases, these rules or the Appendices are sufficient documentation. For example, a submitter might demonstrate that a plant was known to period Europeans.

Submissions that are documented under the Core Style rules are allowed to have a single *step from period practice*, sometimes denoted as SFPP. In older rulings this same concept was described as a *weirdness*. A step from period practice is an element not found in period, core style armory that we nonetheless allow. Some types of elements which are designated as a step from period practice are mentioned in the style rules. In addition, a partial list of elements that are a step from period practice is found in Appendix F. Any armorial submissions with more than one step from period practice will not be registered under the Core Style rules.

2. Individually Attested Patterns: Designs which follow period examples but do not fall within the core style rules in A.2 and A.3 may instead meet the style standards of the Individually Attested Pattern rules as explained in A.4.

Under the Individually Attested Pattern rules, all elements (including charges, arrangement, complexity,

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

etc.) of the armorial design must be documented as appropriate for the armorial style of a single time and place within the temporal scope of the Society. Elements which would be considered a step from period practice under the Core Style rules may only be used under the Individually Attested Pattern rules when documented as being used in the time and place as the rest of the submission.

Non-European armorial designs often do not fit into the core style rules, and thus may need to use the Individually Attested Pattern rules in order to be registered.

- B. Blazon and Emblazon:** The image of the armory is known as the *emblazon*, and the written heraldic description of the image is known as the *blazon*. We register the *emblazon*, rather than the *blazon*. Any discrepancies between the image and the description will be resolved by changing the description to match the image. The Laurel office reserves the right to change the description of an image at any time, even after registration. The image will never be changed by the Laurel office. For this reason, we do not consider alternate emblazons included with a submission.
- C. Reproducibility:** We require that the emblazon be describable in heraldic terms. This means that the submitted emblazon must be reproducible by a competent heraldic artist, with only normal heraldic variation, from the written blazon. Designs which depend on careful alignment of items in a way that cannot be reliably blazoned using standard period heraldic terms will not be registered. This is discussed in more detail in A.3.F below. Designs which use elements (charges, postures, orientations, tinctures, arrangements, etc.) that cannot be blazoned using standard period heraldic terms will not be registered.
- D. Recognizability:** Because we register the image and not the words, we require that the elements in the image be recognizable from their appearance. We are willing to give some allowance for poor drawing, but depictions which are ambiguous as to tincture, the identity of a charge, the posture or orientation of an element, the arrangement of a group, etc. cannot be reliably blazoned and will be returned for a redraw. This is discussed in more detail in A.2.C below.
-

A.2. Armory Content

- A. Definitions:** Armorial elements include tinctures, charges, lines of division, complex line treatments, postures/orientations, arrangements, and the like. Essentially, each piece of an armorial submission is an element.

On first registration of any particular element, documentation must be presented that the element and its depiction may be registered. This means presenting evidence that the element is eligible to be registered and that the specific depiction is attested or is otherwise compatible with period style. Elements which have been registered without comment in the last decade or are listed in one of the Appendices as acceptable elements do not usually need to be documented in a new submission. Items which have not been registered in over a decade, have only been registered a few times, or have recent registrations only via the Grandfather Clause may need to be documented. Occasionally new research will require new documentation of a more recently registered element.

- B. Standards for Elements:** To be used in armorial submissions without penalty, armorial elements must meet one of the following standards.

- 1. Attested Elements:** Armorial elements are registerable if they are attested in period European armory. Designs found in a period roll of arms or a treatise on armory meet this standard, even if it is unclear from the treatise if the element was used in actual heraldry. Elements used in arms, in badges, and in crests all meet this standard. Elements must be used and combined in the same ways they were used in period

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

armory.

For example, while both *bees* and the *rampant* posture are found in period armory, we do not allow a *rampant bee*, because only quadrupeds were found in the *rampant* posture in period armory.

Tinctures and their classifications are discussed in A.3.B.1 below. Discussions of charges and other elements that do not need to be further documented can be found in Appendix F.

2. Constructed Elements: Elements that follow a pattern for the formation of period charges are registerable. Some patterns that have been documented include:

a. Tools: There is a pattern of creating new charges from European tools and other everyday artifacts. Thus, an item that can be documented as this sort of period artifact is registerable.

b. Plants and Animals: There is a pattern of creating new charges from European plants and animals. Thus an item that can be documented as a plant or animal found in period Europe is registerable.

European plants and animals that did not appear until after 1600, such as many breeds of dogs, are not registerable. Those attested during the gray period receive the benefit of the doubt, unless there is a reason to believe they first appeared after 1600.

c. Constructed Monsters: There is a pattern of creating monsters by combining elements from different animals and monsters used in heraldry. Thus, a new monster that follows these patterns is registerable. Items which can be constructed using this rule are registerable, even if it recreates a named heraldic monster which is demonstrated to be a wholly post-period invention in real-world heraldry.

For example, there is a pattern of combining the top half of quadrupeds with a fish tail to make a creature, as in a heraldic *sea-horse*. This pattern can be used to create an unattested *sea-bear*.

3. Grandfather Clause: Armorial elements which are registered to an individual may be used in a new submission by that individual, even if they are no longer allowed under the rules. Only the exact, actual elements which are registered may be used, not variants or patterns. The use of the grandfather clause does not allow the submitter to evade new style problems (as discussed in A.1 through A.3). It only allows the submitter to evade style problems that already exist with their registered armory.

An armorial element from a registered piece of armory of an individual may also be registered by a close legal relative (such as parent, spouse, child, sibling, etc.). To do this, the submitter must demonstrate the relationship through legal documents or through attestation of relationship from the individual whose armory is already registered.

Documentation under the grandfather clause does not exempt a design from conflict, presumption, or offense rules, unless that rules violation is itself grandfathered.

4. Elements which are a Step from Period Practice: Some elements are allowed but are considered a step from period practice. An armorial design may have no more than one such step. A design submitted under the Core Style Rules with more than one step from period practice will be returned. For charges, a single example of that charge used in European armory during our period is usually sufficient to allow its use without being a step from period practice.

a. Non-European Armorial Elements: Elements found only in non-European armorial traditions (e.g., Islamic and Japanese heraldry) are registerable but a step from period practice. The use of two such elements requires the use of the Individually Attested Pattern rules, discussed in A.5. These elements

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

must still be describable in standard SCA heraldic terms. The use of elements found in period European armory is not a step from period practice, even if they were also used in non-European contexts.

b. Non-European Plants and Animals: Plants and animals from outside Europe which were known to Europeans in period are registerable but a step from period practice. This includes plants and animals from the New World, Africa, and Asia. The few such animals used as period charges or crests are registerable as period charges, without a step from period practice. However, there are not enough of them to allow a general pattern for the use of any non-European animals and plants. Plants and animals which cannot be documented to be known to Europeans before 1600 (from the interior of Africa, northern Asia, or parts of the United States that were not systematically explored by Europeans before 1600, for example) will not be registered. While grey period citations will be considered, the great expansion of knowledge Europeans gained about the rest of the world between 1600 and 1650 means that the burden of proof of pre-1600 knowledge here is slightly higher.

c. Other European Artifacts: There is no pattern of using European artifacts other than tools and general, everyday artifacts in armory. The use of such an artifact, such as an *aeolipile*, as a charge is considered a step from period practice.

d. Post-Period Elements: A handful of elements not found in period heraldry have been explicitly allowed, though their use is a step from period practice. A list of them is included in Appendix G.

5. Unregisterable Elements: Some items are generally unregisterable. Examples include heraldic elements that first appear after the end of the grey period (as described in GP.3.A) and period artistic elements that are not found in armory, such as the Greek 'key' pattern or Celtic knotwork.

C. Standards for Heraldic Art: Elements must be drawn to meet the following requirements.

1. Appropriate Drawing: Elements must be drawn in their period forms and in a period armorial style. In general, this means that charges should be drawn as a flat depiction with no perspective. A few special charges are drawn with perspective, such as dice and wedges of cheese, because they are depicted this way in period heraldry and are largely unidentifiable without perspective. Complex lines of division should be drawn with relatively few and deep repeats. Generally three to seven repeats are expected across an axis of the shield.

Depictions that are excessively modern may be returned. This includes, but is not limited to: depictions from comic books and video games, the use of post-1600 art techniques like Impressionism or pointillism, and fantasy art from book covers.

For example, *a pen* must be drawn as a quill pen or other period form, not as a ballpoint pen. Similarly, *a wheel* must be drawn as a wagon wheel, not a rubber tire from an automobile.

Animals and plants must be drawn in a stylized heraldic form, not in a naturalistic or photorealistic style. This does not mean that only heraldic forms of charges may be used, only that they must adhere to heraldic drawing style. Postures other than defined heraldic postures are not allowed. While depictions that are somewhat more naturalistic than the flat stylized depictions of heraldic charges will be registered, animals and plants may not be drawn in trian aspect (with perspective) or in ways that require detailed zoological knowledge to identify or reproduce. Immature plants, animals, and flowers are allowed only when those forms can be documented as period charges.

For example, we allow both *a sea-horse* as the attested heraldic charge made of the front half of a horse and the back half of a fish and *a natural seahorse* as the type of fish found in oceans, but both must be drawn in

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

the stylized artistic style and in a standard heraldic posture. For example, *lambs* are attested in period armory and are allowed, but *rosebuds* are not.

2. Identifiability: Elements must be drawn to be identifiable. While some allowance will be made for lack of artistic skill, the identity of elements must not be ambiguous. Ambiguity can be created when a depiction falls between two states that contribute to difference, such as tincture, posture, or type of charge. We sometimes say that such a depiction blurs the distinction between the two states, and it may not be registered. Additionally, internal detailing can cause issues with identification. This may be due to a complete lack of internal detail, or through excessive internal detail such as can easily occur with clip art. Excessive internal detail can also cause issues with identification of the tincture of the charge or cause it to be seen as primarily sable, instead of the intended tincture.

For example, a *point pointed* creates a triangular shape taking up only the bottom third of the field. A *per chevron* field division is typically drawn to take up as much space as possible, dividing the area of the field in two roughly equal parts centered around the mid-line of the space available. Therefore, a *per chevron* field that does not cross or barely crosses the mid-line blurs the difference between a *per chevron* line and a *point pointed*. A *per fess* field division that is too high can be confused with a *chief*. A *fess* that is too large can be confused with a *chief and a base*. A charge that is not clearly either *fesswise* or *bendwise* is confusing as we give difference between those orientations. None of these can be registered.

For example, a *lion* which is drawn so badly it cannot be identified, even when considering the wide variation in depictions of lions in heraldry in period, cannot be registered; we give difference between a lion and other non-feline animals, so it must be identifiable as some type of cat. For example, a line of division which is partly *indented* and partly *engrailed* cannot be registered, as we give difference between the jagged *indented* and curved *engrailed* lines of division. Many animals *dormant* look the same, so care should be taken to make the depiction identifiable.

For example, a charge colored as teal or blue-green may be returned because it is ambiguous between *azure* and *vert*. Similarly, some shades of *purple* are so dark that they cannot easily be distinguished from *sable*.

Some charges have identifying characteristics, such as the comb of a rooster; without those identifying characteristics, they may be unregistrable or may only be registered as a generic version of the charge.

For example, *doves* are identified by a tuft of feathers on their head; ones drawn without this tuft are likely to be blazoned simply as *birds*. For example, a *lion* must have a mane and tufted tail.

In general, a drawing which matches a period heraldic depiction is identifiable. An unusual depiction should probably be documented, as the College of Arms may or may not recognize it.

3. Appropriate Size: Elements must be drawn at an appropriate size for their role in an armorial submission and must be generally large enough to be identified as charges. Charges that are too big or too small may blur the difference between charge groups. Small charges may be unrecognizable. Complex lines of division that are too shallow or have too many repeats may be unrecognizable from any distance. Charges strewn on the field in too large a number or too close together may be unrecognizable.

A.3. Armory Style

A. Types of Designs: There are three types of designs (one with sub-types) that have slightly different style rules.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

- 1. Fielded Designs:** We categorize these as devices and badges. The introduction in A. Armory above discusses the differences between these two categories. The field creates a background for charges and creates a unified design. There are no limitations to the types of charges which may appear in these designs, beyond those in A.2.B above. They may have any combination of charge groups that may be legally combined or may have no charges at all.
- 2. Fieldless Designs:** We categorize these as badges; devices must have a field. All the charges in these designs must touch one another to create a single self-contained design. Fieldless designs must follow all other style rules. They must include a primary charge, and may also include secondary, overall, or tertiary charge groups. Additionally, no charges may be used that are defined in terms of the field or its outline, such as a bordure, chief, or an ordinary that isn't couped.

A special subset of fieldless designs is tinctureless designs. These designs are those which do not specify a tincture for the charge or background, such as the English badge, (*Tinctureless*) *A pheon*. These designs may only be registered as seals for the use of principal heralds of kingdoms, although some earlier registrations to individuals exist.

- 3. Augmentations of Honor:** An augmentation is a mark of honor bestowed by the Crown that is added to an existing device. An augmentation may not be added to a badge. An augmentation may take many forms, including but not limited to a charged canton, a charged chief, charges in canton or chief, a charge associated with the Crown, or a charge associated with the individual receiving the honor.

While the right to an augmentation is bestowed by the Crown, its specific form must be determined through the normal registration process. Both the augmentation itself and the augmented device must follow the style rules and restrictions on charges. Because an augmentation adds complexity, augmented devices are often allowed to violate certain style rules, such as allowing charges on tertiary charges or a complexity count of greater than eight, as long as the identifiability of the design is maintained. However, they may not violate the rules on contrast.

For example, the arms of a branch may not be granted as an augmentation, because they contain a laurel wreath, which cannot be registered to an individual.

An augmentation that appears to be a display of independent armory, such as a charged canton or a single charged escutcheon, must also be evaluated as if the augmentation itself were a submission of independent armory for purposes of style, conflict, offense, and presumption. Kingdoms may designate a badge as a standard augmentation for its subjects who receive augmentations. Such a badge is considered to be grandfathered to the submitter and does not need to be further checked for style, conflict, offense, or presumption. However, it must maintain good contrast with the field or charge that it is on.

- B. Armorial Contrast:** Contrast refers to the patterns of the use of tinctures in armory. All armorial submissions must meet the standards for contrast as set out here and in period practice.

- 1. Tinctures and their Classifications:** Tinctures are primarily divided into colors and metals. Colors and metals are said to have good contrast with one another. Each tincture may be depicted in a variety of shades; contrast is determined not by their shade, but by their categorization into color and metal. Shades that are overly pastel may be considered too light to be registered; baby blue is not an acceptable shade of *azure*.

The colors are *azure* (blue), *gules* (red), *sable* (black), *vert* (green), and *purpure* (purple).

The metals are *argent* (white or silver) and *Or* (yellow or gold). We capitalize *Or* for clarity, but do not capitalize other tinctures.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Furs are a group of named patterns used as tinctures. For the purposes of tincture, ermined furs are grouped in the same way as their background color. *Ermine* (a white background with black tails) and *erminois* (a yellow background with black tails) are metals. *Counter-ermine* (a black background with white tails) and *pean* (a black background with yellow tails) are colors. Furs such as *vair* and *potent* are two different patterns of multiple pieces in blue and white by default. As they are made up of multiple pieces, divided evenly between a color and a metal, they are treated as neutral and are considered to have good contrast with both colors and metals, as long as they do not share a tincture with the color or metal.

Proper is a term used for a charge in its "natural" or "standard" tincture. Items that were used in *proper* tinctures in period armory may be used. A list of proper tinctures is found in the Glossary of Terms. Any animal (not including monsters) that can be brown in nature can be blazoned as a *brown X proper*. Such an animal would be expected to be completely brown, as opposed to drawn naturalistically. Similarly, tools that can reasonably be wooden can be described as a *wooden X proper*, and are brown. Brown is considered to be a color, not a metal, and it is not identical to black or *sable*. While a few monsters have a defined *proper*, most of them do not because they do not exist in nature. Thus, monsters constructed from animals which can otherwise be *proper* may not be *proper*.

For example, a *rose proper* is defined to be *gules barbed vert seeded Or*. Some proper animals include: *a brown bear proper*, *a brown falcon proper*, and *a brown rabbit proper*. Tools and other wooden objects include: *a wooden staff proper*, *a wooden barrel proper*. A heraldic *dolphin proper* is green with red fins while a *natural dolphin proper* is light grey (effectively argent).

In general, charges that do not have a heraldically defined *proper* may be described as *proper* when a normal person would be able to color them appropriately from knowing only the sort of item with no further color description. So, a tree, a thistle, and an elephant can be *proper*. On the other hand, a female American kestrel, an Arctic fox in winter phase, or a bay horse cannot be *proper*.

Proper charges are classified as a color, a metal, or neutral depending on their dominant tincture. Grey and light skin tones are treated as a metal (equivalent to argent); brown and other darker skin tones are treated as a color.

	Metal	Color	Neutral
Plain tinctures	Argent Or	sable gules azure vert purpure	
Fur	Ermine erminois	counter-ermine pean	vair potent
Proper	light grey light skin tones	Dark grey dark skin tones brown wood dark pink	

Divided fields and charges are considered metals or colors based on the tincture class that dominates across the entire field or charge. If fields or charges are evenly divided into color and metal, they are treated as neutral and have good contrast with both colors and metals. If they are over half color, they are treated as colors and have good contrast with metals. If they are over half metal, they are treated as metals and have good contrast with color. This is not dependent on how much of the charge is made up of any particular tincture or fur. A charge may only share a tincture with the field when both the charge and the field maintain identifiability. A charge which has minor details of the same color of the field is registerable, as long as identifiability is maintained.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, *Lozengy vert and Or, a chief Or* may be registered, but the vert portions of the field must touch the chief to maintain identifiability. *Vair, a griffin argent* cannot be registered, because the complex outline of the griffin will be obscured by the portions of white vair bells that touch the griffin. *Argent, a fox proper* may be registerable, even though the identifying characteristic of the white-tipped tail is against a white field, but the depiction must retain identifiability.

2. Definition of Good Contrast: Good contrast between two tinctures means that they are not from the same classification. Pairings such as a color and a color or a metal and a metal are said to have poor contrast. Pairings of the same tincture are said to have no contrast, and are allowed only as artistic details. The following pairings are said to have good contrast:

- a color and a metal
- a color and a neutral tincture
- a metal and a neutral tincture

In some cases, two neutral tinctures may have good contrast with each other, but identifiability must be maintained. This occurs most often when a charge is counterchanged over a line of division. In such a case, both the field and the charge are, as a whole, classified as neutral, but all edges that touch have good contrast with each other.

3. Contrast Requirements for Divided Fields and Charges: Divisions are categorized in terms of how many parts they create (two, three, four, and many) and whether those parts are equal or not. Equality is not based on literal size, but on the ways in which they were conceptualized in period heraldry.

a. Elements Divided in Two Parts: Elements evenly divided into two parts (*per pale, per fess, per bend, per bend sinister, per chevron, per chevron inverted*) may use any two tinctures or furs, as long as the two sections do not have the same base tincture. Elements that further divide one of those two parts must have good contrast between its sections. Effectively, that means that either they must be made up of a color and metal or one half must be evenly split between color and metal, and identifiability must be maintained.

For example, a field divided *per pale* may consist of *azure and gules, argent and Or, Or and ermine, or vert and vairy gules and argent*. No field may consist of *argent and ermine* or *gules and gules masoned Or*, unless the sections are separated by an ordinary. *Per pale argent and vair*, where the *argent* bells of the *vair* were against the *per pale* line, would not be registerable because the line of division would be obscured. However, if the *azure* portions of the *vair* section were against the *per pale* line, it would be identifiable and thus registerable.

For example, both *per pale vair and per fess sable and Or* and *per fess azure and lozengy argent and azure* are registerable. *Per pale sable and per fess gules and azure* would not be registerable, because it does not have good contrast between the sections. *Per fess ermine and lozengy argent and sable*, where the *argent* lozenges were against the *per fess* line, would not be registerable because *ermine* and *argent* share a background tincture and the line of division would be obscured.

While we find fields or charges divided into two parts with poor contrast, we do not generally find complex lines of division separating regions with poor contrast. Thus, any pairing of low-contrast tinctures with a complex line of division must be attested in order to be registered. A discussion of currently allowed low-contrast combinations and their designs is included in Appendix H.

b. Elements Divided in Three Parts: Elements divided *per pall* or *per pall inverted* must have one part that has good contrast with the other two parts. No two parts may share a background tincture, but a part

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

may share a tincture with another part which is multiply divided as long as identifiability is maintained.

For example, *per pall azure, vert, and argent* and *per pall azure, vert, and checky sable and argent* are both registerable. However, *per pall azure, vert, and sable* would not be registerable. *Per pall argent, sable, and counter-ermine* is also not registerable, as counter-ermine has a sable background tincture.

- c. Elements Divided Quarterly or Per Saltire:** Elements divided *quarterly* or *per saltire* may use any two tinctures or furs, as long as they do not share a base tincture. A section of such a field may generally not be further divided except in a pattern of multiple divisions. Effectively, that means that either they must be made up of a color and metal or one half must be evenly split between color and metal, and identifiability must be maintained.

For example, the following are all registerable: *per saltire azure and gules*, *per saltire argent and Or*, *per saltire Or and ermine*, and *per saltire vert and vairy gules and argent*. However, a field divided *per saltire* may not consist of *argent and ermine* or *gules and gules masoned Or*. In both cases, they share a background or base tincture and the division will not be identifiable. For example, *per saltire checky azure and argent and gules* is registerable.

While we find fields and charges divided into four parts with poor contrast, we do not generally find complex lines of division separating regions with poor contrast. Thus, any pairing of low-contrast tinctures with a complex line of division must be attested in order to be registered. A discussion of currently allowed low-contrast combinations and their designs is included in Appendix H.

- d. Elements Otherwise Divided:** Elements not already mentioned must have good contrast between their parts. These include fields or charges evenly divided into four parts other than quarterly or per saltire, fields or charges evenly divided into more than four parts of two different tinctures, and fields or charges unevenly divided into multiple parts of two different tinctures must have good contrast between adjacent parts of the field.

For example, *Paly of four azure and Or* would be acceptable, but *Paly of four azure and purpure* would not. For example, *Checky argent and gules* would be acceptable, but *Checky azure and gules* would not. *Barry azure and checky gules and argent* would be acceptable. *Per fess argent and per pale azure and Or* would be acceptable, but *Per fess argent and per pale azure and ermine* would not.

- 4. Contrast Requirements for the Placement of Charges:** The contrast requirements for the placement of charges follow the requirements for good contrast in A.3.B.2 above.

- a. Placement of Charges:** Charges must have good contrast with the background on which they are placed. Primary, secondary, and overall charge groups are considered to be placed on the field and must have good contrast with it. Tertiary charge groups are considered to be placed on the underlying charge group and must have good contrast with that charge group.

Charges that are touching, either sustained or maintained, do not have to have good contrast with each other, though they must retain identifiability, as described below. This is also true of overall charges and the charge or charges they overlie.

- b. Identifiability:** Charges and fields must retain identifiability. A field that is neutral may have good contrast with a charge that shares a tincture with it, but it may only be registered if both the charge and the field remain identifiable. Thus, the field and charges on it may share a tincture only if (1) the charges appear only on a section of the field with a different tincture or (2) only one of the two is multiply divided and the charge(s) is an ordinary or simple geometric shape arranged in a way that both the type of field division and charge are clearly identifiable.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, *Per pale gules and argent semy of billets gules* is acceptable, because the red billets are only and entirely on the white part of the field. For example, both *Vair, a chief argent* or *Checky Or and vert, a lozenge vert* can be acceptable, if drawn so that the shared tinctures are not against each other.

Even if it meets these requirements, a particular depiction may still be unclear as to the identity of the field and the charge that lies on it, including whether the charge has a complex line of division. Such a depiction will not be registered. In general, any depiction that creates a situation in which predominantly low contrast sections of a multiply divided field and charge(s) are adjacent is likely to have identifiability issues.

For example, if the design *Vair, a chief argent* were drawn so that the vair bells against the chief were nearly completely argent, it would be difficult to identify the charge as a chief, and whether or not it had a complex line. Therefore, it would not be registerable.

Similarly, when a primary charge and an overall charge that overlies it share a tincture or have poor contrast (which will generally be true), the identity of the primary charge and the overall charge must remain clear.

C. Voiding and Fimbriation: Voiding and fimbriation are terms that describe the situation in which the interior of the charge is a different color than a strip around the outside of the charge. The term voiding is used for the case in which the interior part of the charge is the same color as the field. The term fimbriation is used for the case in which the interior part of the charge is of a different color than the field.

Voiding and fimbriation may only be used with ordinaries or simple geometric charges when they are part of a primary charge group. Peripheral ordinaries may not be voided or fimbriated, nor may other secondary, tertiary, or overall charges. All central ordinaries may be fimbriated, even those with complex lines, as long as there are no breaks in the outline of the ordinary. All central ordinaries with more than two ends, such as *palls*, *crosses*, and *saltires*, may be voided, even those with complex lines, as long as there are no breaks in the outline of the ordinary. As central ordinaries with two ends which are voided would give the unmistakable appearance of being multiple ordinaries, they may not be voided.

For example, both *a cross* and *a cross engrailed* may be either voided or fimbriated. However, *a fess* may only be fimbriated; a design that appears to be a fess voided must be blazoned as *two bars*. For example, *a pale rayonny* and *a fess dancetty* may be fimbriated, while *a chevron rompu* or *a bend bevilled* may not be fimbriated, as the latter are broken in their outlines.

A simple geometric charge is a charge that, when drawn at a smaller scale, will continue to match the outline of the larger charge closely. Simple geometric charges include *lozenges*, *roundels*, *delfs*, and *mullets*. However, as counter examples, *estoiles* and *suns* are not simple.

Voiding and fimbriation is generally used with a single central charge. For this reason, using voiding or fimbriation with charge groups that contain more than three charges will only be registered with documentation of such a pattern. Additionally, voided charges may not be registered in fieldless designs, as they do not have a field that can show through the voided portion of the charge.

For example, a design such as *Azure, three delfs voided Or* would be registered, but *Azure semy of delfs voided Or* would not be. Also, while *Azure, a mullet voided argent* is registerable, *(Fieldless) A mullet voided argent* is not, as the voided area would not have a defined tincture.

Charges which are voided as part of their type, such as *mascles* or *mullets voided and interlaced*, are not affected by these restrictions. They may even be tertiary charges or maintained charges, and may be used in fieldless designs.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Armorial designs with voided or fimbriated charges must be considered for purposes of conflict as equivalent to multiple designs. See A.5.C for further details.

D. Clarity and Simplicity of Charge Groups: The style and conflict rules are built around the idea of a charge group. A charge group is a group of charges of approximately the same size and visual weight that act as a single visual unit. This idea is not a period heraldic idea, but a modern SCA invention. It is our attempt to codify what we see happening artistically, stylistically, and for cadencing in medieval armory. The types of charge groups are discussed in Appendix I.

1. Clarity of Charge Groups: Charges in an armorial design must be clearly organized into charge groups. Depictions of charges that blur the distinction between charge groups will not be allowed. Depictions of charges that are ambiguous as to what sort of charge group they belong to will not be allowed. Documented armorial depictions will only be allowed if a method for describing them in blazon can be devised.

For example, the design *a water bouget between in cross four estoiles* must be clearly drawn to be either as a large primary water bouget and four smaller secondary estoiles or blazoned as *in cross a water bouget and four estoiles* and drawn as five charges of approximately equal visual weight. If the estoiles are drawn just a little smaller than the water bouget, it is not clear if the estoiles are intended to be part of the primary charge group or a secondary charge group. Such a design will not be registered.

Having identical types of charges in multiple charge groups on the field blurs the distinction between charge groups. Thus, it is not allowed, except for cotises and endorses around an ordinary. Charge types with identical blazons are allowed to be both on the field and in a tertiary charge group or in two separate tertiary charge groups.

For example, *Azure, a cup Or and in base a cup argent* would not be registerable. *Azure, a fess between three cups Or and overall a cup argent* would not be registerable. However, *Azure, on a fess between three cups Or, three cups sable* is registerable, as is *Azure, on a bend Or three cups sable and on a chief Or a cup sable*.

Having two close variants of a charge in a design is confusing and makes the charge groups difficult to identify. Thus, two charges or depictions of charges that are artistic variants of one another or that otherwise are considered to have less than a distinct change (DC) between them in are not allowed in a single armorial design. A.5 defines distinct changes in more detail. This is true even if one charge is on the field and the other charge is on another charge. In precedent, this is sometimes referred to as 'sword and dagger'.

For example, both *Azure, a lion and a catamount combatant Or* and *Azure, a lion between three catamounts Or* are not registerable, because we do not consider there to be a distinct change between a *lion* and a *catamount*. *Azure, a hound and on a chief Or a wolf sable* is not registerable, because we do not consider there to be a distinct change between a *hound* and a *wolf*. *Sable, a sword and a dagger in saltire proper* is not registerable, nor is *Sable, a rapier between six daggers Or*, because we do not consider there to be a distinct change among any forms of swords, including daggers.

2. Simplicity of Charge Groups: A charge group is most frequently a group of a single type of charges of a unified tincture in a single posture/orientation. However, more complex examples are found in period armory. The rules below discuss which complex designs are allowed and which are not allowed.

a. Slot Machine: There are some period examples in which a single charge group contains charges of more than one type. Therefore, we allow two types of charges in a single charge group. Common patterns change the centermost of charges in a row or the bottommost of charges arranged two and one. However, a charge group with more than two types of charges is not allowed.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

b. Mixing Ordinaries and Other Charges: While charge groups may have different types of charges, charge groups consist of either identical ordinaries or complex charges. Thus, a single charge group may not mix ordinaries with non-ordinaries or mix two types of ordinaries.

For example, a design like *Or, in pale an acorn proper and a bar gules* or *Sable, in pale a fess and a chevron* would not be registered. However, such mixtures of charges can be found in entire designs and can be registerable. For example, *Azure, a chevron argent between three sea-horses and a chief Or* is registerable, consisting of a primary chevron and two secondary charge groups. Similarly, *Gules, a fess between two chevrons argent* is registerable; the fess is primary and the chevrons secondary.

c. Unity of Posture and Orientation: The charges within a charge group should be in either identical postures/orientations or an arrangement that includes posture/orientation (*in cross, combatant, or in pall points outward*, for example). A charge group in which postures for different charges must be blazoned individually will not be allowed without period examples of that combination of postures. Arrangements of charges which cannot be blazoned will not be allowed. Some standard arrangements for period charge groups are discussed in Appendix K.

For example, a design such as *Argent, two lions passant respectant and a lion statant erect affronty vert* would not be allowed. Likewise, a design such as *Azure, two pheons bendwise, and a pheon inverted Or* would not be allowed. However, *crescents, increscents, decrescents, and crescents pendant* were used occasionally in the same armory, so armory which includes more than one of these is allowed.

d. Allowable Differences within Charge Groups: Some differences are found in period amongst charges within a charge group. Thus, we allow some differences within a charge group, as long as they remain blazonable. This includes the changes to the tincture of charges (including partitions) within a charge group, and a tertiary charge group that is only found on part of a group of charges. Other changes not discussed here are generally assumed to be allowable.

E. Armorial Simplicity: Period armory was mostly simple in nature, having only a few charge groups on the field and a few tinctures.

1. Arrangement of Charge Groups: Charge groups must be arranged upon the field in a period fashion.

Appendix J gives lists of those arrangements of charge groups which do not need further documentation. All arrangements of two or fewer charge groups on the field are considered compatible with period style, except for those listed as not documented in Appendix J. Only a limited number of arrangements of three or more charge groups on the field are documented; those are listed in Appendix J. Other arrangements of charge groups must be documented.

2. Complexity Count: We require that any submission not exceed a certain "complexity count," measured by adding the number of types of charges to the number of tinctures. Items with a complexity count of eight or less receive no penalty for complexity from this rule. Furs, such as *ermine* and *vair*, count as a single tincture rather than their component tinctures. Charges that have different names in different tinctures or orientations (roundels, crescents, gouttes) are considered one type regardless of the term used for them. All charges, including maintained charges, are counted, though objects worn by an animal or person do not. All tinctures are counted except those used only for normally unblazoned artistic details like teeth, claws, and eyes. Proper is not a tincture, but a description of a group of tinctures, each of which is counted separately.

For example, *Vert, in fess two straight trumpets palewise Or and a chief argent* has a complexity count of five, while *Vert, in fess two straight trumpets palewise and a chief Or* has a complexity count of four. *Vair, a squirrel gules* has a complexity count of three. *Argent, a brown monkey proper vested gules* has a complexity count of four, because the tincture of the vest is also counted. For example, *a rose proper* has

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

three tinctures, each of which is counted for complexity, so *Per fess sable and azure, on a fess argent, three roses proper* has a complexity count of eight.

An item with a complexity count of nine or higher that follows a period pattern of charges and tinctures may be registered, but may need to be documented as an Individually Attested Pattern.

- 3. Excessively Simple Designs:** Designs that consist only of a single tincture will not be registered. Designs must consist at least of a divided field or a plain field with at least one charge. Likewise, designs that consist only of letters or other abstract symbols, such as astrological signs, will not be registered. This is because their registration might limit someone from using their initials or a written version of their name or motto. Designs like these may be used by anyone. They simply cannot be registered.

For example, neither *Gules* nor *Peau* would be registerable as plain fields without charges or lines of division would be registerable but *Per chevron gules and ermine* would be registerable.

F. Designs that Are Not Allowed: Some designs that meet the other style rules are too far from period armorial design to be registered.

- 1. Excessively Pictorial:** Designs may not be excessively pictorial, defined as a relatively naturalistic depiction of a scene. Tincture alone does not create an excessively pictorial impression. Any design which can be found in period armory is not excessively pictorial for the purposes of this rule.

For example, we do not consider the use of *per fess azure and vert* to be an unmistakable representation of the sky and ground, so that field division does not by itself cause a design to be excessively pictorial. For example, *Azure, a wolf passant argent atop a trimount vert* is a design found in Hungarian armory, and thus is not considered excessively pictorial. However, *Per fess wavy argent and azure semy of natural dolphins argent, issuant from the line of division a wooden ship proper, sails set gules and in canton a roundel Or enflamed proper*, depicting a ship sailing on the ocean under a clear sunny sky and a sea full of dolphins, is likely to be excessively pictorial.

- 2. Excessively Naturalistic:** Heraldic beasts and plants are generally depicted in stylized heraldic depictions, postures, and tinctures. While we allow real-world forms of some charges whose period heraldic forms were quite unlike their real-world forms, such as the dolphin, they must still be drawn in the same art style as heraldic depictions. While we allow charges to be tinctured and blazoned as proper, as described in A.4.B.1, designs that use multiple types of proper charges may be allowed only if the overall design and the sorts of proper charges used are compatible with period style. Any design which is attested in period armory is not overly naturalistic.

For example, we allow both *a sea-horse* as the attested heraldic charge made of the front half of a horse and the back half of a fish and *a natural seahorse* as the type found in oceans, but both must be drawn in the stylized artistic style and in a standard heraldic posture. For example, *Argent, a brown bear and in canton a rose proper* would be allowed, as both of these charges are attested in these tinctures. However, *Or, an orca and in chief a loon between two penguins proper* would not, even though we would allow armory in which any one of these charges was tinctured and blazoned as proper.

- 3. Obtrusively Modern:** A design that makes an overt reference to modern insignia or designs may be considered obtrusively modern. References that require explanation to be seen as modern or are close to core style period armory will generally not be returned under this rule.

For example, *a bend within a bordure gules* to parody the international "No Entry" sign, especially when the bend lies over a primary charge, would not be registerable. Also, variations on the geometric Peace sign, despite being close to core style armory, would not be registerable.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

4. Excessive Counterchanging: While counterchanging was common in period armory, it was used mainly with two or four part divisions of the field. Counterchanging of charges over more complex field divisions (barry, gyronny, etc.) is allowed with a semy or similar group of charges; in that design each charge should be drawn so that it is entirely on a single portion of the field. The counterchanging of a single charge over a field division with more than four sections must be attested to be allowed. Central ordinaries may be counterchanged over other simple ordinaries, as there are a few examples of patterns like *Argent, a pile sable, overall a chevron counterchanged* in late period England. Any other counterchanging of charges over other charges must similarly be attested to be registered.

5. Depictions Which Cannot Be Reproduced Reliably: Depictions that require the careful description of the relative positions of charges, tinctures, etc. in order to produce a visual effect cannot be registered. Designs must be able to be described in standard heraldic terms to be registerable.

For example, we do not use terms like the Victorian *honor point* to describe locations on the field. We do not have terms to describe the tinctures of a jester's hat in which each point is a different color.

A.4. Armory Individually Attested Patterns

A. Definitions: Any armorial design that does not fit within our core style rules may still be registered if it can be documented as following a pattern of period practice within the armorial style of a single time and place within the temporal scope of the Society. This time and place may be in Europe or may be from a non-European period armorial tradition, such as Islamic or Japanese heraldry. We call such a design an *Individually Attested Pattern*. All elements in an Individually Attested Pattern must be found in that single time and place, including charges, arrangement of charge groups, and lines of division. Documentation under the Individually Attested Pattern rules does not exempt a design from conflict, presumption, or offense rules.

For example, *Sable, a torii gate Or between three panthers argent, spotted of many tinctures* would not be registerable as an Individually Attested Pattern, as it mixes charges from both Japan and England.

Any submissions documented under this section of the rules must be able to have the overall design blazoned in Western European blazon, including tinctures. If necessary, when there is no Western European term for a charge, a non-Western European term may be registerable on a case by case basis, presuming that a term can be found which will allow reproduction from the blazon. If the submission is not otherwise blazonable without creating or borrowing terms that cannot be easily understood by the average herald, the submission will not be registered.

For example, we will not use the blazon terms *dark* or *light*; we require a Japanese design to use standard European tinctures. A so-called *cross Osmorog* will be blazoned as a *cross fourchy between the tines of each fork a roundel argent*, as this is the blazon we have already used for this charge. We will register an arrangement that would not be registerable under the core style rules, such as *a roundel within roundels in annulo*, but we will not create new terms to describe arrangements of charges.

B. What Must Be Documented: Each element of the armory which falls outside the core style rules must be documented. If armory has multiple elements which fall outside the core style rules, the combination of these non-core style elements should be documented, although larger numbers of examples of each non-core style element may suffice, as described below. The overall design of the submission must be similar to the types of designs that document the use of the non-core style elements. In general, examples must match the submission in style and complexity.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, the attested *Gules, a fess sable* is not evidence for the submission *Gules, on a fess sable between three mullets argent three bezants* nor is it evidence for the submission *Gules, a lion sable*.

C. Number and Origin of Examples: The number of cases that must be used to demonstrate a pattern of usage depends on how closely they match the submission in style.

1. Source and Style: All examples should come from a single heraldic style or culture; the submissions should match the style of that culture as well. This is true even when documenting multiple elements which fall outside the core style rules.

2. Independence: Only independent devices count as examples. Multiple depictions of the same design, or of arms cadenced from an original device, are not independent examples. In general, two depictions of an identical armorial design or very closely related armorial designs from the same part of Europe will be considered not to be independent examples unless their owners can be identified and confirmed to be unrelated.

Some elements or combinations of elements are so closely associated with one family that finding multiple independent examples seems improbable. If independent examples cannot be found, such an element will not be registerable under the individually attested pattern rules.

One example is the design often labeled "Mortimer": *Barry Or and azure, on a chief azure two pallets between two gyrons Or and overall an escutcheon argent*. While it appears in different tinctures, it is always associated with that family; therefore, there is only one example of this combination of elements.

3. Number: In general, three closely matching examples of the exact practice are sufficient to demonstrate a pattern. When closely matching examples are not found, six examples that bracket the submission in complexity should be sufficient. In no case will multiple examples of a pattern with ordinaries or simple geometric charges be sufficient evidence of that pattern for animate charges (though that pattern with ordinaries and complex charges that are not animate may be). Likewise, in no case will multiple examples of an element or combination of elements in simple designs be sufficient evidence for that same pattern in complex designs. However, the use of an element or combination of elements in complex designs may allow its use in simpler designs.

For example, "A single black primary charge with a complex outline on a red background" is the type of pattern we would call "closely matching". Some examples that would bracket such a submission are "a red complex-outline primary charge on a black background"(the tinctures match, but are swapped) or "multiple black complex primary charges on a red background".

For submissions with multiple elements which fall outside the style rules, three closely matching examples which all include all of the non-core style elements will be sufficient to allow registration. If no example of the combination can be found, six independent examples of each non-core style practice should be sufficient to give the submitter the benefit of the doubt that the practices might have been used together. As with single non-core style elements, the examples should be of comparable complexity to the submitted design.

A.5. Armory Conflict

A. Definitions and General Principles: To be registered, a new submission must be clear of conflict with all registered armory. Conflict is both a period concept and a modern part of the requirement in the Governing Documents that armory has sufficient difference to avoid undue confusion. There are two types of confusion a

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

submission must avoid. The first is confusion of identity and is based on the ideas of visual similarity and heraldic equivalency. In this case, confusion is caused by the appearance of owning armory that is the same as or has effectively no difference from registered armory which belongs to someone else. The second is confusion of relationship and is based on the idea that children would use armory that was similar to but differenced or cadenced from that of their parents.

The methods by which children would difference their arms from their parent's arms were sometimes known as cadency steps, and the standards which developed for these differences are collectively called "cadency". Cadency in our period was a complex, changing set of guidelines that varied widely. These rules are designed to treat as cadency steps most of the important period forms of cadency while ignoring changes that were used rarely, only in exceptional cases, or only during the early proliferation of heraldry.

In general, we require two armorial designs to have a level of difference greater than a single cadency step, so that they do not make the claim to be close relatives of each other or confuse their identities. This can be either a single greater change, of types not generally used for cadencing, or two changes that are equivalent to cadency steps. Two designs which differ in one of these ways are said to be clear of conflict, or "independent designs". In some cases, two armorial designs, despite having sufficient technical differences, may have overwhelming visual similarity, causing undue confusion and thus these two designs will be considered to be in conflict.

In general, we call changes which are equivalent to cadency steps "distinct changes", abbreviated as DC. Older rulings may refer to these types of changes as "significant differences", "clear differences", "CD"s, or even "clear visual differences" and "CVD"s. There are other types of changes which are greater than that, normally seen between "strangers in blood" rather than related individuals. We call these larger changes substantial changes, abbreviated as SC. Older rulings regarding substantial changes may also refer to "substantial difference" or "X.2". There are also changes which are smaller than a cadency step. These changes do not contribute to difference between two armorial designs, and are discussed in A.5.C.3 below.

B. Armory Protected from Conflict: To be clear of conflict, a new submission must be clear of conflict with all registered armory. A piece of armory is registered and protected from the moment it is listed as accepted on a published Letter of Acceptances and Returns. Registered armory will be listed in the Ordinary and Armorial as soon as possible, but it is protected as soon as the Letter of Acceptances and Return is published. We also protect armory of important people and entities outside the SCA; they are addressed in A.6 Presumption below.

C. Comparisons of Armory: When considering armory for purposes of possible conflict, there are a number of factors which should be considered. However, which piece of armory is the currently registered item is not a factor which needs to be considered.

1. Blazons Which Must Be Considered: While we register the emblazon, rather than the blazon, most conflict checking is done from the blazon. Thus, when considering armory for purposes of possible conflict, all reasonable blazons for a specific design must be considered. You may not blazon your way out of conflict. Blazons that are unregistrable under our core style rules (such as blazons that would produce quaternary charges or contrast issues) or that require unlikely understandings of an armorial design do not need to be considered for conflict purposes, unless that blazon is due to the use of an Individually Attested Pattern, is due to voiding or fimbriation, or is the existing blazon of a piece of registered armory.

For example, *a lozenge throughout* must also be considered as *vêtu*. Thus *Vert, on a lozenge throughout argent, a rose proper* must be considered both under that blazon and as *Argent vêtu vert, a rose proper*. For example, *three fesses* must also be considered as *barry*. Thus, *Gules, three fesses ermine* must be considered both under that blazon and as *Barry gules and ermine*. This is true whenever armory uses three or more identical ordinaries.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, *Gules, a fess Or* does not need to be considered as *Or, a chief and a base gules*, as this is an unlikely understanding of the armorial design. *Gules, a tree within an annulet argent* does not need to be considered as *Gules, on a roundel argent, a roundel gules charged with a tree argent* because this requires the tree to be a quaternary charge. However, the registered *Gules, a bear passant sable* must be considered as it is blazoned, even though it violates the core style rules on contrast.

Armoial designs with voided or fimbriated charges must be considered for purposes of conflict in multiple ways. In most cases, voided charges are considered as a base charge with a tertiary charge and as a base charge with fimbriation (the fimbriation being an artistic detail worth no difference). However, this does not always work in reverse - two ordinaries are not considered as a single ordinary voided. Fimbriated charges are considered as a base charge (with the fimbriation being an artistic detail worth no difference), or as a base charge with a tertiary charge.

For example, *Azure, a mullet voided argent* must be considered as *Azure, on a mullet argent a mullet azure* and as *Azure, a mullet azure fimbriated argent*, with the fimbriation worth no difference (even though this blazon would be unregistrable). Similarly, *Or, a mullet argent fimbriated gules* is must be considered as *Or, a mullet argent* even though this violates our core style rules on contrast, and as *Or, on a mullet gules another argent*.

For example, *Erminois, a cross argent fimbriated vert* must be considered as *Erminois, a cross argent*, even though this violates our core style rules on contrast, and as *Erminois, on a cross vert a cross argent*. However, *Argent, a bend Or fimbriated gules* is not considered as *Argent, a bend Or between two bendlets gules* because this blazon would have *argent* stripes separating the *Or* and *gules* stripes. Similarly, *Argent, two bendlets gules* is not considered as either *Argent, a bend argent fimbriated gules* or *Argent, on a bend gules a bendlet argent*.

2. Comparing Charge Groups: In general, only charge groups that are comparable in type should be compared for specific difference under the rules below. That is, a primary charge group should be compared to a primary charge group only, a secondary charge group should be compared to a secondary charge group only, a tertiary charge group should be compared to a tertiary charge group only, and an overall charge group should be compared to an overall charge group only.

a. Addition and Removal of Charges from a Single Charge Group: Within a single charge group, changes that can be described as the addition or removal of certain charges are treated as a single change. When the changes cannot be simply described as an addition or removal of charges, the entire charge group must be compared as a whole.

For example, there is only one distinct change between *Gules, a fess and in chief two water bougets Or* and *Gules, a fess between two water bougets and two mullets two and two Or* for the change in number in the secondary charge group. This is because the addition or removal of the two *mulletts* creates a group identical to the comparable group in the other armory. Which piece of armory is registered does not matter for purposes of this rule. However, there are two differences between *Sable, a fess between four water bougets two and two Or* and *Sable, a fess between two water bougets Or and three mullets two and two and one Or*. The first is for the change of number in the secondary charge group. Since removing a single *mullet* does not result in a group of charges which is identical to the comparable group in the other armory, there is a second difference for changing the type of the charge group.

These examples hold true even if none of them have the *fess*, where the *water bougets* and *mulletts* are the primary charge group; in the first case, the difference is a substantial change (under A.5.E.3), and in the second case both differences are distinct changes (under A.5.G.4 and A.5.G.5).

b. Comparing Secondary Charge Groups: Several kinds of secondary charge groups can occur together in a design. If two designs each have a single kind of secondary charge group, those secondary charge

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

groups are treated as comparable for purposes of style and conflict, regardless of the type of each group. When multiple types of secondary charge groups are found in a design, identical types of secondary charge groups are compared first and then the remaining secondary charge groups can be compared independently.

For example, *Argent semy-de-lys azure, a fess cotised and a chief sable* has three secondary charge groups: the semy-de-lys, the cotises, and the chief. For example, when comparing *Argent semy-de-lys azure, a fess and a chief sable* with *Argent, a fess sable cotised azure, a chief sable*, the chiefs would be compared, and then the cotises and fleurs-de-lys would be compared. However, for the designs *Argent, a fess and in base a portcullis sable* and *Argent, a fess and a chief sable*, the secondary portcullis must be compared to the secondary chief.

c. Comparing Tertiary Charge Groups: Tertiary charge groups can occur in several places on a design, as they may appear on multiple types of charges. Tertiary charge groups can only be directly compared when they are on comparable charge group types. That is, a tertiary charge group on a primary charge cannot be directly compared to a tertiary charge group on a secondary charge group.

d. Defining Half of a Charge Group: Some of rules in this section apply when "half" of a charge group is changed. In general, "half" is literal: half of four charges is two charges and half of a single charge is 50% of it. However, there are the following special cases:

- When a group of three charges on the field is arranged two and one, the bottom charge is considered half the charge group.
- When a tertiary charge group of three charges is on a central ordinary or chief, the centermost charge is considered half the charge group.
- A central charge or charge group balanced around the center of the device, when divided by a line of division splitting the field into two parts, is considered to be divided in half by that line. This is true whether or not the total area contained in the charges is evenly distributed between the halves, such as when the charge is not symmetric across the line of division. Thus, this is a common occurrence with animate charges.
- When a primary or secondary charge group is split so that part of it lies on each side of a line of division or ordinary splitting the field in two parts, the section containing the smaller number of charges is considered half the charge group, even if it is less than half numerically.

For example, in *Argent, two crosses couped vert and a brown bear proper*, the *crosses couped* are considered half the primary charge group and the *bear* is considered the other half. In *Pean, on a chief Or a fleur-de-lys between two roundels azure*, the *fleur-de-lys* is considered half the tertiary charge group and the *roundels* are the other half. In *Per fess sable and argent, a horse salient counterchanged*, the half of the *horse* below the line of division is considered half of the primary charge group, even though the bottom half of a horse is visually smaller than the top half. In *Per chevron vair and gules, three roses gules and a lozenge argent*, the *three roses* are considered half the primary charge group and the *lozenge* is considered the other half.

In each of these special cases, a maximum of one distinct change, as defined in A.5.G, can be derived from changes to the smaller of the sections defined as half under these rules.

3. Some Changes Which Do Not Count for Difference: Changes that are smaller than a cadency step, as described below, do not contribute to difference between two armorial designs, no matter how many of them there are. These sorts of changes were often understood as artistic variation or details which could be included or omitted in display of the armory. This includes maintained charges and differences in artistic style, including details like arming and languing. It also includes minor variation in the placement of charges and changes in outline due to different artistic representations. Additionally, for certain charge

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

types, all variants of that charge are considered equivalent for conflict purposes.

For example, *a lion Or armed gules*, where the claws and teeth are red, would not be different from *a lion Or*, where the lion is wholly gold, nor would either be different from *a lion Or langued azure*, where the mouth is open with a blue tongue. *A moon in her plenitude*, with a face on it, would not be different from either *a moon* or *a roundel*. Similarly, *a dragon maintaining a sword* would not be different from either *a dragon maintaining a mouse* or *a dragon* and the exact positioning of the maintained sword would likewise not matter.

For example, *a lion* is not different from any other type of natural feline. This includes, but is not limited to: *a domestic cat*, *a catamount*, *a mountain lion*, *an ounce*, *a tiger*, and so on. However, it is different from a heraldic *tyger*, which is a heraldic monster. Other types which include many variants are dogs (which includes wolves and foxes) and swords/daggers.

- 4. Augmentations:** As discussed in A.3.A.3, in a submission of augmented arms where the augmentation appears to be a display of independent armory, such as a charged canton or a single charged escutcheon, the augmentation must be checked for conflict as if it were a submission of independent armory.

D. Standards for Visual Conflict: Despite being technically clear of conflict under the rules below, some armorial designs and elements are still too visually similar to be considered clear of conflict.

- 1. Visually Equivalent Blazons:** The use of different terminology to describe two designs that are visually similar does not affect any potential for conflict that may exist. Another way of putting this rule is: you can't blazon your way out of a conflict. Two charges can also be overly visually similar, though period depictions of charges that were considered different in period will generally be considered to be different (at least a distinct change (DC) apart).

For example, *Or, a fess vert* has a visual conflict with *Vert, a chief and a base Or* even though the two blazons should theoretically have sufficient difference, and we would not currently register the second blazon. For example, *Purple, three scarpes argent* has a visual conflict with *Bendy sinister purple and argent* even though one appears to have primary charges and the other appears to have no primary charges.

- 2. Total Design:** Occasionally, two arrangements of charges may create a design that is nearly indistinguishable visually, even though there is sufficient technical difference between them. In general, any significant visual difference between the designs will be enough to give the submitter the benefit of the doubt.

For example, *a rose and overall a sword argent* is not different from *a sword and overall a rose argent*, because it is quite difficult to tell which one is overall the other when they are the same tincture. However, the arrangement *a rose Or and overall a sword argent* is easily distinguishable from *a sword argent and overall a rose Or*.

E. Standards for Difference through A Single Substantial Change to the Primary Charge Group: A new submission that differs from a piece of protected armory by one of the following changes does not conflict with the piece of protected armory. These are the types of changes that were not commonly used for cadency; they are the kind of changes most likely to be seen between unrelated people - "strangers in blood".

In most cases, these changes must affect the entire primary charge group; changes to other charge groups and changes which affect only half the primary charge group may contribute to difference as described in A.5.G below.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

1. Adding or Removing the Primary Charge Group: A new submission does not conflict with any protected armory if it adds a primary charge group or removes a primary charge group. Thus, any armory which is field-primary does not conflict with any armory which has a primary charge group.

For example, *Per bend azure and Or, a clarion and a trefoil counterchanged, a chief indented argent* does not conflict with *Per bend azure and Or, a chief indented argent*, because it adds a primary charge group of the *clarion* and the *trefoil*. For example, *Counter-ermine, a bordure argent pellety* does not conflict with *Counter-ermine, three lozenges argent, a bordure argent pellety*, because it removes the primary charge group of the *lozenges*.

2. Substantial Change of Type of the Primary Charge Group: A new submission which substantially changes the type of each primary charge from a piece of protected armory does not conflict with it. When possible, each charge in the new armory is compared to the charge in the corresponding location in the protected armory. Some charges which are not substantially different may qualify for a distinct change, as described in A.5.G below.

For example, *Argent, a fess sable* does not conflict with *Argent, a lion's head cabossed sable*. For example, *Vert, two eagles and a maunche argent* does not conflict with *Vert, three lozenges argent*. For example, *Azure, a fess between three cups Or* does not conflict with *Azure, a chevron between three cups Or*. For example, *Gules, four wolves two and two argent* does not conflict with *Gules, semy of lions argent*. For example, *Per fess ermine and Or, two unicorns and a raven sable, an orle azure* does not conflict with *Per fess ermine and Or, three sea-horses sable, an orle azure*. In each case the type of every primary charge has been substantially changed.

Per chevron gules and argent, three crequiers counterchanged is not clear of conflict with *Per chevron gules and argent, two mullets and a crequier counterchanged* under this rule because not all of the primary charges have been substantially changed. However, *Per chevron gules and argent, two crequiers and a mullet counterchanged* does not conflict with *Per chevron gules and argent, two mullets and a crequier counterchanged*. Here, the type of each primary charge has been changed even though the two charge groups contain identical charge types.

3. Change of Number of the Primary Charge Group: A new submission which substantially changes the number of charges in the primary charge group from a protected piece of armory does not conflict with it. A primary charge group with one, two, or three charges does not conflict with armory having a primary charge group with any other number or semy. A primary charge group with four or more charges, including semy of charges, is not clear of conflict under this rule with armory whose primary charge group has four or more charges, including semy of charges. Other changes in number do not qualify for this rule, but may qualify for a distinct change under A.5.G below.

	1	2	3	4+, Semy
1	Not clear	Clear	Clear	Clear
2	Clear	Not clear	Clear	Clear
3	Clear	Clear	Not clear	Clear
4+, Semy	Clear	Clear	Clear	Not clear

For example, *Sable, a mascle Or* does not conflict with any of: *Sable, in fess two mascles Or*; *Sable, three mascles Or*; *Sable, four mascles two and two Or*; *Sable, five mascles in saltire Or*; *Sable, six mascles Or*; or *Sable, semy of mascles Or*. Additionally, *Per chevron Or and azure, two trees proper and a nesselblatt Or* does not conflict with *Per chevron Or and azure, a tree proper*. In each case, the number of primary charges has substantially changed. Likewise, while the most common number of charges is partly determined by the ways in which a field is divided, *Per chevron sable and Or, three annulets*

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

counterchanged is substantially changed from *Quarterly sable and Or, four annulets counterchanged* because the number of annulets has changed from three to four.

For example, *Gules, four boars two and two argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Gules, semy of boars argent* because both have four or more boars. *Per fess Or and purple, a rose proper and a vol Or* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Per fess Or and purple, a rose proper and a maunche Or* because the number of charges remains two in both cases.

4. Change of Arrangement of the Primary Charge Group: A new submission which substantially changes the arrangement of the primary charges from a piece of protected armory does not conflict with it. In cases where armory has an arrangement which is forced by the field, no difference can be obtained for arrangement of those charges. It does not matter whether the forced arrangement is in the registered item or the new submission. The following groups of arrangements are substantially different from each other, while arrangements listed in the same group are not substantially different from each other; other arrangements cannot apply this rule, but may still qualify for a distinct change under A.5.G below:

- *in pale*
- *in fess*
- *in bend*
- *in bend sinister*
- *in saltire, and two and two, and crossed in saltire*
- *in cross*
- *two and one, and three, two, and one*
- *in orle and in annulo*

For example, *Gules, in fess two lions argent* does not conflict with *Gules, in pale two lions argent* or with *Gules, in bend two lions argent* or with *Gules, in bend sinister two lions argent* because the arrangement of the lions is substantially different. *Per saltire Or and argent, in cross four suns gules* does not conflict with *Per saltire Or and argent, in saltire four suns gules* because *in cross* is substantially different from *in saltire*. *Argent, six mullets gules, three, two, and one* does not conflict with *Argent, eight mullets in orle gules* because *three, two, and one* is substantially different from *in orle*.

For example, *Quarterly gules and argent, two ravens argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule from *Gules, in fess two ravens argent*, because the *in bend* position of the ravens in the first item are forced there by the field – the white ravens could not overlap either of the white quarters. Similarly, *Sable, in pale two anchors Or* is not clear of conflict under this rule from *Per fess sable and Or, in fess two anchors Or* because the anchors in the second item are forced to the top half by the field - no yellow anchor could be on the yellow part of the field.

5. Change of Posture of the Primary Charge Group: A new submission which substantially changes the postures or orientations of each of the primary charges from a piece of protected armory does not conflict with it, when the posture of the individual charges are comparable. Charges which fall into separate categories of animate charges do not have comparable postures; animate charges and inanimate charges do not have comparable postures or orientations. These categories are listed below in this section. Postures and orientations not listed in this section cannot apply this rule, but may still qualify for a distinct change under A.5.G below. Primary charge groups which are not comparable under this rule may still qualify for a distinct change under A.5.G below.

For example, *Per fess gules and azure, a hound courant and a lymphad argent* cannot apply this rule when being compared to *Per fess gules and azure, a hound rampant and a dragon passant argent* because, while the hounds are in different postures, a lymphad and a dragon do not have comparable postures or orientations. However, *Per bend purple and argent, a sword fesswise and an lion rampant*

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

counterchanged can apply this rule when being compared to *Per bend purpure and argent, a sword palewise and a lion passant counterchanged* because the corresponding charges have comparable postures and orientations. That is, the swords are comparable to each other and the lions are comparable to each other.

a. Animate Charges: Animate charges are considered to fall into categories of posture based on their type. Within those categories, there are limited groups of postures which are each considered substantially different from other groups in that category. Charges in different categories do not have comparable postures for this rule.

Quadrupeds, including winged ones such as dragons, have comparable postures, in the following groups:

- *rampant, segreant, salient, sejant erect, sejant*, and the contourny versions of these
- *courant, passant, statant, couchant, dormant*, and the contourny versions of these
- *affronty, sejant affronty, sejant erect affronty*

Birds have comparable postures, in the following groups:

- *displayed*
- *close, naiant* and the contourny versions of these
- *rising, striking, roussant*, and the contourny versions of these

Fish have comparable postures, in the following groups:

- *haurient, urinant*
- *naiant, naiant contourny*

Insects and other creatures normally found in tergiant positions follow the same categories as inanimate charges: compact charges and long charges. Animate tergiant charges which are generally square or round in overall shape, such as *butterflies*, are compact charges and are not generally considered to have comparable postures or orientations for the purposes of this rule. Animate tergiant charges with a single long axis, such as *dragonflies*, are long charges and have limited groups of orientations which are each considered substantially different from other groups:

- *palewise, volant en arriere, palewise inverted*
- *fesswise, fesswise contourny*
- *bendwise, bendwise inverted*
- *bendwise sinister, bendwise sinister inverted*

Other animate postures may be given substantial difference between comparable creatures on a case by case basis.

For example, *Gules, a rabbit passant Or* does not conflict with *Gules, a rabbit rampant Or* or with *Gules, a rabbit sejant affronty Or*. *Gules, a rabbit passant Or* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Gules, a rabbit couchant contourny Or* because *passant* and *couchant contourny* are in the same category. For example, *Vert, three eagles displayed vair* does not conflict with *Vert, three eagles close vair*. For example, *Azure, a dragonfly volant en arriere* does not conflict with *Azure, a dragonfly tergiant fesswise*.

For example, *Sable, a lion dormant argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Sable, a lion statant argent* or with *Sable, a lion dormant contourny argent* because these postures are not substantially different. For example, *Argent, two bears combatant vert* is not clear of conflict under this rule with

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Argent, in fess two bears rampant vert because each share one rampant bear; *combatant* is shorthand for 'in fess one beast rampant contourny and another rampant'. For example, *Argent, a fish haurient gules* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Argent, a fish urinant gules* because the reversal does not create a meaningful visual difference. For example, *Purple semy of stags courant Or* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Purple, six stags couchant Or* because the postures are not substantially different.

b. Inanimate Charges: Inanimate charges also may be divided into two categories: compact charges and long charges.

Inanimate charges which are generally square or round in overall shape, such as *pheons* and *crescents*, are considered compact charges. Compact charges are not generally considered to have comparable postures or orientations for the purposes of this rule.

Inanimate charges with a single long axis, such as *swords* and *arrows*, are considered long charges. Long charges have limited groups of orientations which are each considered substantially different from other groups:

- *palewise, palewise inverted*
- *fesswise, fesswise reversed*
- *bendwise, bendwise inverted/reversed*
- *bendwise sinister, bendwise sinister inverted/reversed*

For example, *Or, two straight trumpets palewise purple* does not conflict with *Or, two straight trumpets fesswise purple*, but it is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Or, two straight trumpets palewise inverted purple*. For example, *Azure, a sword fesswise proper* does not conflict with *Azure, a sword bendwise inverted*, but it is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Azure, a sword fesswise reversed proper* because the two orientations are not substantially different. For example, *Counter-ermine, a tower bendwise sinister argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Counter-ermine, a tower bendwise argent* because these two orientations are not substantially different.

For example, *Gules, a mullet argent* is not clear of conflict under this rule with *Gules, a mullet inverted argent* or with *Gules, a mullet bendwise argent* because the rotation of the compact *mullet* does not create a meaningful visual difference.

F. Standards for Difference through a Single Substantial Change of Field for Field-Primary 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 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 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 also be substantially different from *Vair* or *Potent*.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

b. Substantial Change of Direction of Division: A change in direction of the lines of partition creates a substantial change of partition. Most of the standard lines of division are substantially different. Any field division which differs only by the number of partitions in a single direction is not substantially different. The pairs *per bend* and *bendy*, *per bend sinister* and *bendy sinister*, *per chevron* and *chevronelly*, *per fess* and *barry*, and *per pale* and *paly* are not substantially different from the other half of their pair. Each of the above mentioned divisions is otherwise substantially different from all other divisions. Therefore, the pairs *chevronelly* and *paly*, *per bend* and *per bend sinister*, etc., are substantially different.

For example, *Per pale argent and gules* is substantially different from *Per fess argent and gules* and from *Per chevron argent and gules*. However, *Per pale argent and gules* is not substantially different from *Paly argent and gules*.

Per pall, and *per pall inverted* are clear of all other divisions.

Quarterly and *per saltire* are substantially different from all two-part divisions and three-part divisions. They are also substantially different from all other four-part divisions (such as *per pale* and *per chevron* or *per bend* and *per fess*). The other four-part divisions are only substantially different from one another if they share no lines of division in common. All four-part divisions are substantially different from divisions that split the field evenly into more than four partitions.

For example, *per pale* and *per chevron* is substantially difference from *per fess* and *per bend sinister*, as they have no lines of division in common.

Checky is substantially different from all other fields. While *checky* is substantially different from all other grid-like partitions (*i.e.*, those formed by two sets of parallel lines, such as *lozengy* and *barry-bendy*); these other grid-like partitions are **not** substantially different from one another. This is because they all create a general impression of lozenges of some sort. These grid-like partitions are all substantially different from partitions that split the field into six or fewer partitions.

For example, *Barry* and *per pale argent and vert* is substantially different from *Checky argent and vert*, but is not clear of conflict under this rule from *Bendy* and *per pale argent and vert*.

Gyronny (of any number of pieces) and *party of six* are substantially different form all other partions. Other multiply parted divisions (*bendy*, *barry*, etc., are discussed in the first paragraph of this section.

Lines of division not mentioned here explicitly may be determined to be substantially different on a case by case basis.

As a reference, these categories are all substantially different from each other:

- *per pale*, *paly*
- *per fess*, *barry*
- *per bend*, *bendy*
- *per bend sinister*, *bendy sinister*
- *per chevron*, *chevronelly*
- *per chevron inverted*, *chevronelly inverted*
- *gyronny* (any number of pieces)
- *per pall*
- *per pall inverted*
- *per saltire*
- *quarterly*

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

- other divisions into four equal parts
(may have substantial difference between themselves, if they share no lines in common, such as *per pale and per chevron* compared to *per fess and per bend sinister*)
- *party of six*
- *checky*
- *lozengy* and all other grid-like partitions (such as *barry bendy* and *per pale and chevronelly*)

2. Substantial Change of Tincture: 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.

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*.

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.

G. Standards for Difference through Two Distinct Changes: A distinct change (DC) is a change that was generally used as a cadency step or is similar in visual weight and meaning to changes that were used as cadency steps. Any new design which has at least two distinct changes from a protected design does not conflict with it. In older precedent, two elements which have a distinct change between them were sometimes said to be significantly different, or that there was a CD between them; in current precedent they are said to be distinctly changed, or that there is a DC between them. The types of changes which are substantially different when applied to primary charges under A.5.E above generally count as a distinct change when applied to other charge groups.

When comparing two armorial designs, the procedures outlined in A.5.C above should be followed.

For any given section below, only one distinct change (DC) can be derived from one type of change to a single charge group, no matter how radical the changes. Multiple distinct changes (DCs) may be derived from multiple types of changes to a single charge group or by changes to multiple charge groups. In general, a change to half the charge group (as defined in A.5.C.2.d above) is sufficient for a distinct change. However, for a half which is defined as a special case in A.5.C.2.d above a maximum of one distinct change can be derived from all changes to that half, no matter how radical the changes.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

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 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.

a. Change of Tincture: If the tincture of at least half the field is changed, the fields will be considered different enough to be a distinct change (DC). There is a distinct change for swapping or rotating the tinctures of a field evenly divided into two, three, or four parts. There is not a distinct change for swapping the tinctures of a field divided into more than four parts. Furs and fields with field treatments are considered different tinctures from their underlying tincture and from other variants which share an underlying tincture.

For example, each of the following has one DC from the other two: *Argent, a tree vert, Ermine, a tree vert* and *Argent masoned sable, a tree vert*. In each case, the field tincture is distinctly changed. *Per pall sable, gules, and argent* has one DC from both *Per pall azure, gules, and Or* and *Per pall gules, argent, and sable*. In each case at least half of the field tincture has been changed.

For example, *Quarterly argent and azure, a Lucy gules* has one DC from *Quarterly azure and argent, a Lucy gules*. However, *Checky argent and azure, a Lucy gules* does not have a DC from *Checky azure and argent, a Lucy gules*.

b. Change of Direction of Partition Lines: A change of direction of partition lines creates a distinct change (DC). The major single partition lines include: *per bend, per bend sinister, per pale, per fess, per chevron*, and *per chevron inverted*; a change from one to another (whether as single lines or multiple forms) is a distinct change. In addition, a change from any of these to *per saltire, quarterly, gyronny* (of any number of pieces), *per pall*, and *per pall inverted, checky*, and *lozengy* or a change between any of these is considered a distinct change. A change in direction of half the lines of a design gives a distinct change. In general, the addition, removal, or change of a partition line or group of partition lines that changes the organization of tinctures in ways that affect at least half the field will be considered a distinct change.

For example, *Per bend vair and gules* is a DC from *Per pale vair and gules*. For example, *Barry bendy sable and Or* is a DC from *Paly bendy sable and Or*. For example, *Barry wavy azure and argent* is a DC from *Per pale and Barry wavy azure and argent*.

c. Change of Style of Partition Lines: All partition lines have a style, either plain (straight) or complex. A change of style of half the partition lines is a distinct change (DC). The types of complex lines which are distinctly different are discussed in Appendix M.

For example, *Per pale* is a DC from *Per pale embattled*. For example, *Barry wavy* is a DC from *Barry enrailed* and from *Barry* (plain). For example, *Quarterly* is a DC from *Quarterly per fess indented*.

d. Change of Number of Pieces: Changing the number of pieces into which the field is divided is a distinct change (DC). When considering the field as a whole, a field with one, two, three, or four pieces has a distinct change from armory with any other number, but above that there is no distinct change. When considering changes to only half of an already divided field, a half with one, two, or three pieces can have a distinct change from armory with a half of any other number of pieces, but any number beyond that is

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

considered the same.

For example, *Per chevron gules and argent, a pale azure* has one DC from *Chevronelly gules and argent, a pale azure*. *Quarterly Or and sable, a fleur-de-lys gules* has one DC from *Checky Or and sable, a fleur-de-lys gules*. *Per pale azure and argent* has one DC from *Per pale azure and bendy argent and gules*. In each case, the change of number of pieces is significant.

For example, *Gyronny of six ermine and vert, a roundel sable* does not have a DC from *Gyronny (of eight) ermine and vert, a roundel sable*. There is no DC between *Barry wavy of six argent and azure, a dolphin gules* and the same design drawn with more traits, and we generally do not blazon that difference.

The one exception is *party of six*, which is divided in a different pattern (effectively *per fess and paly of three*) and was seen as a distinct field division in period. Therefore, it has one DC from *checky* and designs that create large numbers of lozenges (such as *paly bendy*). However, it does not have a DC from designs such as *Paly and per fess* which create the same overall impression.

e. Fieldless Armory: A piece of fieldless armory automatically has one distinct change (DC) from any other armory, fielded or fieldless.

Tinctureless armory, as described in A.3.A.2, is treated as fieldless armory for this purpose. However, no DC may be given for tincture of charges when comparing a tinctureless badge to any other design, including changes of tincture due to addition of lines of division.

For example, *(Fieldless) A mullet purple* has a DC for fieldlessness from *(Fieldless) A mullet of six points purple*, but no other DCs. For example, *Per fess gules and argent, a lion counterchanged* has a DC for tincturelessness from *(Tinctureless) A lion* but no other DCs for tincture, even though one of the lions is divided *per fess*.

2. Adding or Removing a Charge Group: Adding or removing a secondary, tertiary, or overall charge group is a distinct change (DC). The addition or removal of a primary charge gives greater difference and is described under A.5.E.1 above. We count additions and removals in terms of the charge groups they affect, so that adding or removing multiple charges from a single group is only one distinct change. Adding or removing charges from multiple charge groups may give multiple distinct changes.

For example, *Sable, a ram argent* has one DC from *Sable, a ram argent and a chief Or* and from *Sable, a ram argent and overall a bend Or*. In each case one charge group is removed. *Sable, a ram argent and a chief, overall a bend Or* has two DCs from *Sable, a ram argent*. Similarly, *Sable, a ram argent and on a chief Or three roses sable* also has two DCs from *Sable, a ram argent*. In each case two charge groups are added. *Sable, a ram argent and a chief Or* has two DCs from *Sable, a ram argent and overall a bend Or*, as a secondary charge group has been added and an overall charge group removed.

As discussed in A.5.C.2 above, when two pieces of armory have the same number of secondary charge groups, they may not be considered to have added or removed a secondary charge group, even if those secondary charge groups are different kinds of secondary groups.

For example, *Sable, a lion argent and a chief Or* has only one DC from *Sable, a lion argent and in canton a mullet Or*, for the change in the type of the secondary charge (under A.5.G.4 below), rather than one DC for removing the chief and a second DC for adding the mullet.

As discussed in A.5.C.2 above, tertiary charge groups are considered comparable for the purposes of this rule if they are on the same type of underlying charge group (primary, secondary, or overall). The addition or removal of comparable tertiary charge groups is a distinct change.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

For example, *Sable, a cross flory argent mullety gules and a chief Or* has two DCs from *Sable, a cross flory argent and a chief Or mullety gules*, because the tertiary charge group on the secondary charge has been removed and a tertiary charge group on the primary charge group added. These tertiary charge groups are not comparable. However, both of those designs have only one DC from *Sable, a cross flory argent and a chief Or*, as in each case only one tertiary charge group has been added.

- 3. Change of Tincture Within a Charge Group:** Distinctly changing the tinctures, direction of partition lines, style of partition lines, or number of pieces into which a charge group is divided is a distinct change (DC). At most one distinct change may be derived from changes to tincture of a single charge group.

However, no distinct change for tincture may be given under any section of this rule when comparing a tinctureless badge to another design, as described in A.5.G.1.e above.

- a. Tinctures:** If the tincture of at least half the charge group is changed, the charge group will be considered different. There is a distinct change (DC) for swapping or rotating the tinctures of a charge group evenly divided into two, three, or four parts. There is not a distinct change for reversing the tinctures of a charge group divided into more than four parts. Furs and field treatments are considered different from their underlying tincture.

For example, *Azure, a cross crosslet argent* has one DC from *Azure, a cross crosslet per pale argent and gules*. *Per fess gules and argent, an annulet counterchanged* has one DC from *Per fess gules and argent, an annulet counterchanged argent and sable*; the first example is a shorthand for *Per fess gules and argent, an annulet per fess argent and gules*. Each of the following is a DC from the other two: *Vert, a tree argent*; *Vert, a tree ermine*; *Vert, a tree argent masoned sable*.

For example, *Gules, a fess argent between three lions quarterly argent and azure* has one DC from *Gules, a fess argent between three lions quarterly azure and argent*, because the tinctures have been swapped. However, *Gules, a fess argent between three lions checky argent and azure* does not have a DC from *Gules, a fess argent between three lions checky azure and argent*, because the *lions* are divided into more than four parts.

Certain tincture changes are considered part of the type of the charge and do not contribute to difference. Charges such as towers and castles that are made of masonry are not considered to be different when drawn with or without masoning, though fields and charges that are not made of masonry are. Some creatures, such as panthers and yales, are often but not always spotted; the absence or presence of these spots does not contribute to difference, though the addition of roundels to another type of charge is considered to be adding a tertiary charge group.

- b. Direction of Partition Lines:** A change of direction of partition creates a distinct change (DC). The major single partition lines include: *per bend*, *per bend sinister*, *per pale*, *per fess*, *per chevron*, and *per chevron inverted*. A change from one to another (whether as single lines or multiple forms) is a distinct change. In addition, a change from any of these to *per saltire*, *quarterly*, *gyronny* (of any number of pieces), *per pall*, *per pall inverted*, *checky*, and *lozengy* or a change between any of these is considered a distinct change. A change in direction of half the lines of a design gives a distinct change. In general, the addition, removal, or change of a partition line or group of partition lines that changes organization of tinctures in ways that affect half the tincture will be considered a distinct change.

For example, the following all have one DC from each other: *per bend argent and sable*, *per pale argent and sable*, and *lozengy argent and sable*. The change from *barry bendy* to *paly barry* is a DC. There is a DC between *barry wavy azure and argent* and *per pale and barry wavy azure and argent*.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

c. Style of Partition Lines: All partition lines have a style, either plain (straight) or complex. A change of style of half the partition lines is a distinct change (DC). The types of complex lines which are distinctly different are discussed in Appendix M.

d. Number of Pieces: Changing the number of pieces into which the charge is divided is a distinct change (DC). When considering the overall number of pieces, more than four pieces are considered the same, but smaller numbers are considered different. Alternately, changes that only affect half of an already divided charge can give a distinct change; in that case, more than three pieces are considered the same.

For example, there is a DC between *a mullet per chevron gules and argent* and *a mullet chevronelly gules and argent*. There is a DC between *an elephant quarterly Or and sable* and *an elephant checky Or and sable*. In each case, the change of number of pieces is significant. *A roundel gyronny of six ermine and vert* is not a DC from a *roundel gyronny (of eight) ermine and vert*. *Barry wavy of six argent and azure* is not a DC the same design drawn with more traits, nor do we blazon such a distinction.

4. Change of Type Within a Charge Group: The change in type of at least half of a charge group is a distinct change (DC). Types of charges considered distinct in period are considered distinctly changed. A charge that was not used in period armory will be considered different in type from another charge if their shapes are distinctly changed. Additional discussion of difference between some specific charges can be found in Appendix M.

For example, there is a DC for the change from *a lion* to *a heraldic tyger*, from *a mullet of five points* to *a sun*, or from *an oak tree* to *a pine tree* (because of their very different shapes). *A claymore* is distinctly changed from *an axe* but not from *a rapier*.

Only one distinct change will be given for change of type of a single charge group, though multiple distinct changes can be given for changes of type of multiple charge groups.

For example, *Per chevron gules and argent, a chevron sable between two roundels and a sun counterchanged* is only one DC from *Per chevron gules and argent, a chevron sable between two tygers and a mullet counterchanged*. The charges on both sides of the chevron are in a single charge group. However, *Per chevron gules and argent, a chevron sable semy-de-lys argent between two roundels and a sun counterchanged* is two DCs away from *Per chevron gules and argent, a chevron sable crusilly argent between two tygers and a mullet counterchanged*. Here, the type of charges in two separate charge groups is changed.

The edges of ordinaries and similar geometric charges have a style, either plain (straight) or complex. These styles are part of the type of the charge; thus, a change to the style of the edge of an ordinary or similar charge is a distinct change. The types of complex lines which are distinctly different are discussed in Appendix M.

For example, the change from *a pale wavy* to *a pale embattled* is one DC, as is the change from *a bordure* to *a bordure nebuly*. Changing from *a chief wavy* to *a lozenge embattled* is also one DC; the changes from *a chief* to *a lozenge* and from *wavy* to *embattled* edge are considered a single change of type.

5. Change of Number Within a Charge Group: Distinctly changing the number of charges in any charge group is one distinct change (DC).

A charge group with one, two, three, four, and five charges is a distinct change from groups of any other numbers. A charge group with six or more charges, including semy of charges, is not a distinct change from a group of any number within this size category. Changes to independent charge groups may give multiple distinct changes. Even when the number of charges is fixed by their type, there is a distinct change for changing the number under this rule.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

	1	2	3	4	5	6 +	Semy
1	No DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC
2	DC	No DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC
3	DC	DC	No DC	DC	DC	DC	DC
4	DC	DC	DC	No DC	DC	DC	DC
5	DC	DC	DC	DC	No DC	DC	DC
6 +	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	No DC	No DC
Semy	DC	DC	DC	DC	DC	No DC	No DC

For example, there is a DC between *Gules, a talbot statant and in chief a fleur-de-lis argent* and *Gules semy-de-lis, a talbot statant argent* because the number in the secondary charge group has been distinctly changed. There are two DCs between *Argent, a chief azure* and *Argent, flaunches azure*, one for change of type (under A.5.G.4) and a second for change of number of the secondary charge group. This is true even though chiefs always appear singly and flaunches always appear in pairs.

For example, while the most common number of charges is partly determined by the ways in which a field is divided, there are two DCs between *Per chevron sable and Or, a sexfoil argent between three annulets counterchanged* and *Quarterly sable and Or, a sexfoil argent between four annulets counterchanged*, one for the change of the field (under A.5.G.1) and a second for the change in number of the secondary charge group.

6. Change of Arrangement Within a Charge Group: Changing the arrangement of a group of charges is generally a distinct change (DC). Arrangement in this rule refers both to the relative positions of the charges (*in pale, two and one*, etc.) and to their positions on the field (*in canton, in base*). Arrangement may also apply in the case of a tertiary charge group which only appears on some charges within a charge group with multiple charges. Only one distinct change may be derived from changes to arrangement of a single charge group, though multiple distinct changes can be given for independent changes of arrangement to multiple charge groups.

Changes to other parts of the design frequently cause changes to the arrangement of charge groups. We call these changes forced; there is no distinct change for a forced change of arrangement. A change to the primary charge group can force the change of arrangement of a secondary charge group. When a type of a charge requires a specific arrangement, there is no distinct change for arrangement when the type of charge is changed.

For example, changing from *Argent, a fess between two unicorns within bordure purpure* to *Argent, a pale between two unicorns within a bordure purpure* requires that the unicorns move from *in pale* to *in fess*. As the change is forced, there is not a DC for the change in arrangement of the unicorns.

For example, there is no DC for change in arrangement between any of: *Per pale gules and sable, a clarion and a bordure Or*, *Per pale gules and sable, a clarion and a base Or*, and *Per pale gules and sable, a clarion and in chief a garb Or*. The position for the base and bordure are forced by their type of charge.

Changes in tincture of a divided field or the tincture of a charge group can force the charges into different positions on the field. These forced changes are also not worth a distinct change.

For example, there is no DC for change in arrangement between *Gules, a goat argent between three lozenges Or* and *Per fess gules and Or, a goat argent and in chief three lozenges Or*. There is no DC for

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

the arrangement of the *lozenges*, because the *lozenges* in the second design may not be in the center of the field, because they share a tincture with the bottom half of the field.

For example, there would also be no DC for change in arrangement between *Gules, in fess three lozenges Or* and *Per fess gules and Or, in canton three lozenges two and one Or*. Even though the relative arrangements are different, the *lozenges* in the second design cannot be in the same arrangement as in the first design. However, there is a DC for change in arrangement between *Gules, in fess three lozenges Or* to *Per fess gules and argent, in chief three lozenges Or*, because the *lozenges Or* could be in the center of a neutral field with which they do not share a tincture.

Changes in number can also cause a change in arrangement. In general, changes in arrangement only count for difference if the two charge groups are able to have identical arrangements but don't. You may determine whether two charge groups have comparable arrangements by referring to Appendix K, which lists the standard arrangements for charge groups of different numbers. If the two charge groups (based on the number of charges within them) can both take on the arrangement the other is in, then the arrangements are said to be comparable and a distinct change can be given for the difference between them.

For example, *two charges in pale* and *three charges in fess* have a distinct change for difference in arrangement, but neither has a distinct change for arrangement against a single central charge.

In general, tertiary charges are unlikely to have changes in arrangement, because the shape of the charge they are on limits their placement. One exception to this is a charge group with multiple charges, only one of which has a tertiary charge group on it. In this case, there may be a distinct change for changing which portion of the charge group has the tertiary.

For example, *Potent, in pale two roundels gules, the one in chief charged with an eagle Or* has one DC from *Potent, in pale two roundels gules, the one in base charged with an eagle Or*.

7. Change of Posture or Orientation Within a Charge Group: Animate charges have a posture, which includes their stance, position of limbs, facing, etc.; inanimate charges have an orientation which includes their radial orientation and facing. Distinctly changing the posture or orientation of half of the charges in any charge group, when the charges are comparable, is one distinct change (DC). Only one distinct change can be derived from the changes in posture and/or orientation of any given charge group, though multiple distinct changes can be given for independent changes of posture or orientation to multiple charge groups. Multiple changes to the posture or orientation of the same charges may not be counted separately. Some charges, such as roundels, do not have a posture or orientation to be compared. In general, changes of position and/or orientation that considerably change the appearance of a single type of charge will count for a distinct change. Animate charges do not have comparable postures with inanimate charges. A partial list of postures and orientations that are distinct can be seen in Appendix L.

For example, changing *a sword fesswise* to *a sword palewise* or *a lion rampant* to *a lion passant* is one DC. Similarly, *a lion passant bendwise* is only one DC from *a lion couchant contourny*. For example, while *a lion passant* may be mostly fesswise, there is not a DC for change of posture between *a lion passant* and *a sword palewise*.

a. Change of Posture for Animate Charges: Animate charges are considered to fall into categories by the type of animal for posture. Quadrupeds have comparable postures, birds have comparable postures, insects and other creatures normally found in tergiant positions have comparable postures, fish have comparable postures. Animate charges which fall into separate categories do not have comparable postures.

For example, there is not a DC for change of posture between *a griffin segreant* and *an eagle displayed*, although one is to *dexter* and the other *affronty*, because while a *griffin* could be described as *displayed*,

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

an *eagle* is unable to be *segreant*, which is the equivalent of *rampant* for winged quadrupeds.

To count as a distinct change, a change of posture or orientation among comparable charges must distinctly change the appearance of a charge. For animate charges, a change in the position of the head or tail is not significant; nor is the change from *statant* to *passant*, which essentially moves only one leg. Changing from *passant* to *couchant*, however, visually removes the legs from the bottom of the charge and is considered significant. Changes that distinctly affect the number of extended wings (from wings folded to raised, or from wings seen on one side of the body to both sides) are sufficient for a distinct change. Changes which alter the orientation of the body or direction of facing are generally significant, though some very different descriptions may result in a similar appearance, such as *passant bendwise* and *rampant*. Also, some postures, such as *rampant*, have a wide range of acceptable depictions which do not count for difference.

Groups of animate charges or their parts may have comparable postures/orientations as a group even if their individual postures are not comparable. For example, there is a distinct change between two groups of animate charges or their parts that can be said to be *addorsed* versus *respectant*.

For example, there is a DC for orientation between *two lions combatant* and *two hawks addorsed*, even though a lion cannot be *close* and hawks cannot be *rampant*. There is a DC for orientation between either of those and *two griffin's heads* (both to dexter).

b. Change of Posture for Non-Identical Inanimate Charges: Inanimate charges also may be divided into two categories: compact charges and long charges. Inanimate charges which fall into separate categories do not have comparable postures.

Compact charges are generally square or round, such as *crests* and *mullets*. Non-identical compact inanimate charges such as *pheons* and *crests* are not generally considered to have comparable postures or orientations. Some compact inanimate charges, like *roses* and *mullets*, are not considered to have meaningful orientations.

For example, whether a five-pointed mullet has a point to base or chief is blazonable, but does not give a distinct change (DC). For example, there is not a DC for orientation between *a crescent* and *a pheon bendwise*.

Inanimate charges with a long axis, like swords and arrows, are considered to have some comparable orientations: we give a distinct change for orientations that change the direction of the long axis of the charge (palewise, fesswise, bendwise, bendwise sinister), but not those that change the direction of the point or head.

For example, there is not a DC for orientation between *an arrow fesswise* and *a sword fesswise*, even though each has the point in a different direction. But there is a DC for orientation between *an arrow palewise* and *a sword fesswise*.

c. Change of Orientation for Identical Inanimate Charges: When comparing two identical types of inanimate charges in different orientations, additional differences in posture can also be granted a distinct change (DC). When the compared charges are identical, compact charges that have clearly distinguished directionality can receive a distinct change for differences in facing. Long charges may receive a distinct change for reversing their direction when the ends are easily distinguished. More details may be found in Appendix L.

For example, crests, escallops, and pheons are all compact inanimate charges but also have a distinguishable top and bottom. Thus, there is a DC for orientation between *an escallop* and *an escallop inverted* and between *a crescent* and *an increscent* and *a decrescent*. For example, axes have easily

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

distinguished ends. Thus, there is a DC for orientation between *an axe fesswise* and *an axe fesswise reversed*. However, bows and staves do not have different ends. Thus, there is no DC for orientation between *a bow* and *a bow inverted* (and they would likely both be simply blazoned as *a bow*, since the inversion would not be meaningful).

G. Registration with Permission to Conflict: The owner of a piece of armory may grant permission to conflict to a new submission. Such permission may be granted either individually through a letter of permission to conflict or universally through a blanket letter of permission to conflict.

Any blazonable change is sufficient to allow the registration of armory with a letter of permission to conflict. A blanket letter of permission to conflict must specify the level of conflict allowed; it may allow registration of armory either with any blazonable change or which has only one distinct change. A submission identical to the registered armory will not be registered even with permission to conflict.

Giving permission does not require that the individual have a legal relationship with the person granting permission. You can give a stranger permission to have armory that appears to be the armory of your child, parent, spouse, etc..

A.6. Armory Presumption

A. Definitions: Presumption is a false claim. This includes claims of restricted rank or powers that the submitter does not possess within the Society or that we do not allow anyone to claim. It also includes claims of identity or close relationship with a person or entity outside the SCA who is considered quite important by many people within and outside the Society. Presumption is not dependent on intent; even if such a claim was not intended, the appearance of such a claim is not allowed. Items which presume will not be registered, even if a letter of permission could be obtained.

B. Claims through Restricted and Reserved Charges: There are charges whose use is limited because their use would be a form of presumption.

1. Restricted Charges: Restricted elements and designs cannot be registered by anyone. These are charges that are either restricted by treaty (such as the emblems of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies) or used only by people with specific high ranks outside the SCA (such as the rulers of specific places, clan chiefs, or baronets). A complete list of restricted charges can be found in the Glossary of Terms Table 2.

2. Reserved Charges: Reserved elements and designs can only be registered by submitters who have a certain rank or in certain types of branch submissions. A list of charges that are reserved is given in the Glossary of Terms Table 1. To register a design that includes such an element or design, the submitter must demonstrate his or her entitlement to use such an element. Generally a reference to the kingdom order of precedence is sufficient.

C. Claims through Arms of Pretense and Unearned Augmentations: In period and modern heraldry, an individual may assert a claim to land or property by placing the armory associated with that property on an escutcheon in the middle of their existing armory. An augmentation of honor often takes the form of a charged canton; occasionally it takes the form of a charged escutcheon. Therefore, either a canton or a single escutcheon may be used in an armorial submission only if it is uncharged and of a single tincture. Multiple escutcheons do not have to follow this limitation.

For example, *Argent, a fess gules surmounted by an escutcheon sable charged with a roundel argent* is not

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

allowed, because it appears to be arms of pretense. *Or, in saltire five escutcheons sable each charged with three roundels argent* is registerable, because multiple identical escutcheons were not used for arms of pretense or augmentations.

The rules governing earned Augmentations are discussed in A.3.A.3.

D. Claims of Identity or Close Relationship with an Important Non-SCA Entity or Person: If a submission is too close to the protected armory of a person or entity outside the SCA who is considered quite important by many people within and outside the Society, it presumes on that armory and may not be registered. Presumption is closely tied to conflict, as our system of armorial conflict is based on the appearance of close relationship through cadency.

All armorial items currently identified as important enough to protect are listed in the Ordinary and Armorial. Rarely, new non-SCA items that may be important enough to protect may be identified during the submissions process. The fact that they are not listed in the Ordinary and Armorial or a Letter of Acceptances and Returns does not matter. If the new non-SCA item is ruled important enough to protect, it will be added to the Ordinary and Armorial and the new submission will be returned for presumption.

In general, the flags and arms of period and modern countries and similar entities are protected, while the flags and arms of smaller units are not protected. The arms of exceptionally important individuals and places as well as arms that are famous by themselves are protected. Decisions to protect new famous people and places are quite rare.

In rare cases, armory associated with fictitious characters and entities may also be considered important enough to protect, when both a significant number of people in the Society recognize the armory of the entity without prompting and the use of the armory of the entity would generally be considered by those people a clear reference to that entity. Only a few pieces of fictitious armory have ever been ruled important enough to protect.

All currently protected armory is listed in the Ordinary and Armorial; it is protected in those forms. If new forms are identified, they will be listed. New protected armory is protected from the moment it is listed as such on a published Letter of Acceptances and Returns. As soon as possible, such armory will be listed in the Ordinary and Armorial, but they are protected as soon as the Letter of Acceptances and Return is published. Submitters and heralds do not need to look for other forms of protected armory.

Armory that is protected from presumption is protected with the same standards as conflict for SCA-registered armory. Those standards are described in A.5 above, including visual conflict.

E. Claims through Combination of Family Name and Armory: Even if a piece of armory is not considered important enough to protect from presumption under A.6.D above, the use of a piece of historical armory combined with the family name of the holder may be presumptuous. In order for this to be an issue, the name and device must be sufficiently well known that a significant number of SCA members would find this combination a claim to be that person without resorting to obscure reference works. In general, the combination of the family name of a clan chief and the chiefly arms will be considered presumptuous, even if the arms themselves are not important enough to protect. Families that are less important than the family of a clan chief are not important enough for this rule to apply.

A slight modification of the arms, so that there is one distinct change (DC) between the submission and the arms on which it presumes, is sufficient to remove this problem. Likewise, a modification of the family name such that it would be clear of conflict with the family name is sufficient to remove this problem. In the case of a combination that is considered presumptuous, the name will generally be registered but the armory returned.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

A few special cases follow more stringent rules. For example, the Lancaster and York rose badges are very widely associated with those families in many forms. Therefore, we do not allow anyone to register the byname (*of*) *Lancaster* with armory including a red rose, or the byname (*of*) *York* with armory including a white rose. Again, the name will normally be registered but the armory returned.

F. Claims through Marshalling: Marshalling is the combination of two or more arms into a single design. By doing so, it makes a claim about the person that we do not allow in registered arms. This claim can be to a marital or inheritance relationship or about an office that the person holds. In some cases, such designs may be displayed, even though they cannot be registered.

Arms combined using the *per pale* field division generally combined either marital arms or the arms of an individual and an office. They are often called impaled arms and were not inherited. The display of registered arms impaled to show a marital relationship is encouraged, even though it is not registerable.

Arms combined using the *quarterly* field division generally combined inherited arms from armigerous parents. They are often called marshalled arms or quartered arms. Once inherited, they were sometimes further cadenced as a whole. While the Spanish occasionally used *per saltire* divisions for marshalled designs, they more commonly used quarterly divisions for this, so we do not consider fields divided *per saltire* as potentially marshalled designs.

Marshalling in these rules refers to both impaling and quartering collectively. Arms which appear to be marshalled cannot be registered.

Both *quarterly* and *per pale* divisions were used in single armorial designs and also in marshalled designs. Therefore, *quarterly* and *per pale* divisions of the field may be registered only when there is no unmistakable appearance of marshalling. Most designs are either clearly not marshalled or clearly marshalled, but some require more careful examination:

1. Designs which do Not Create the Appearance of Marshalling: A design with one of these features is not marshalled.

a. Plain Field or Other Field Division: Only designs with *per pale* and *quarterly* field divisions are potentially marshalled. Designs with another field division or no field division are not marshalled under these rules.

b. Complex Lines of Division: As marshalling was only used with plain line divisions, the use of a complex line of division with a *quarterly* or *per pale field* division does not create the appearance of marshalling.

For example, *Per pale azure and Or, a talbot and a hart rampant addorsed* has the appearance of marshalling. However, *Per pale raguly azure and Or, a talbot and a hart rampant addorsed* does not.

c. Single Primary Charge Group Over The Entire Field: A design that contains only a primary charge group of certain kinds does not have the appearance of marshalling. The primary charge group must be one of: semy of identical charges over the entire field, a single identical charge in each charged section, a group of multiple identical charges in a standard arrangement covering the entire field, or a single standard arrangement of multiple primary charges with at least one charge crossing the *per pale* line of division. Special rules affect designs with peripheral ordinaries and quarterly field divisions with primary ordinaries like crosses; they are discussed in section 3 (A.6.F.3) below.

For example, *Per pale azure and argent all semy of cinquefoils counterchanged* does not have the appearance of marshalling. *Quarterly gules and Or, four crescents counterchanged argent and sable* does

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

not have the appearance of marshalling. *Per pale gules and sable, six cauldrons two, two and two argent* does not have the appearance of marshalling. *Quarterly vair and Or, three crosses moline gules* does not have the appearance of marshalling. All of these are registerable.

2. Designs which Create the Appearance of Marshalling: In general, when any section of the field can only be understood as an independent piece of armory, it creates the unmistakable appearance of marshalling.

a. Charges which Terminate at the Edge of a Section: When a charge or charges terminate at the edge of a section, it creates the unmistakable appearance of marshalling. This most commonly occurs with ordinaries. This includes both the situation where a field division appears to be multiple ordinaries and the situation where multiple ordinaries appear to be a field division.

For example, *Quarterly gules and chevronelly argent and azure* creates the appearance of marshalling and is not registerable.

b. Sections which are Subdivided: A section of the field which is divided further into multiple parts generally creates the unmistakable appearance of marshalling. Such designs can only be registered when it is demonstrated to have been used in similar designs which are not marshalled.

For example, *Per pale gules and quarterly argent and azure, a heart argent* has the appearance of marshalling and cannot be registered. However, *checky* is found in quarters of armory that is not marshalled. Thus, *Quarterly gules and checky argent and azure, a heart argent* does not have the appearance of marshalling.

c. Multiple Types of Primary Charges: When different sections of the field contain different types of charges, it creates the appearance of marshalling.

For example, *Quarterly gules and azure, in bend two crosses crosslet and in bend sinister two roses argent* creates the appearance of marshalling, as does *Quarterly vert and erminois, in bend a badger and a fleur-de-lys argent*. *Per pale argent and sable, a unicorn sable and a dragon Or combatant* creates the appearance of marshalling. In each case, the different types of charges create the appearance of marshalling.

d. Multiple Charges in a Section: When any section of such a field contains multiple charges of the same type in a way that cannot be described as a standard single pattern covering the entire field, it creates the appearance of marshalling.

For example, *Quarterly, azure and Or, in canton three crosses fleury argent* creates the appearance of marshalling, because the charges cannot be blazoned as a single pattern covering the entire field. Similarly, *Per pale sable and erminois, each section charged with three billets two and one counterchanged* creates the appearance of marshalling, because each section appears to be an independent piece of armory. However, *Per pale sable and erminois, six billets two, two, and two counterchanged* does not create the appearance of marshalling, because the arrangement of all the charges can be blazoned as a single coherent pattern.

3. Designs which May or May Not Create the Appearance of Marshalling: Designs which do not fit into section 1 or 2 above must be considered more carefully.

a. Plain Sections Without Charges: When each section of the design appears to be an independent coat of arms, it creates the unmistakable appearance of marshalling. A section of the design does not appear to be an independent coat of arms if it is a plain tincture, including a fur, which we do not protect as arms.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

As the protected arms of Brittany are *Ermine*, the use of an uncharged *ermine* section or sections when combined with a charged section creates the appearance of marshalling. However, since flags would not be used as part of quartered arms, the use of an uncharged *vert* section or sections does not create the appearance of marshalling, even though we protect the flag of Libya as *Vert*.

For example, *Per pale ermine and gules, a leopard's face argent* has the appearance of marshalling, but *Per pale argent and gules, a leopard's face argent* does not. *Quarterly azure and ermine, two maunches argent* has the appearance of marshalling, but *Quarterly azure and argent, two maunches argent* does not.

b. Quarterly Fields with Multiple Charge Groups: In many cases, a design with a charge or charges that cross the quarterly lines of division does not create the appearance of marshalling.

For example, *Quarterly azure and erminois, a gauntlet sable between two annulets azure* does not have the appearance of marshalling, as the primary gauntlet is partially in all four quarters. Similarly, *Quarterly azure and erminois, a bend argent between two annulets azure* does not have the appearance of marshalling, as the bend is partially in all four quarters. For example, *Quarterly Or and vert semy-de-lys Or, two millrinds vert, a chief gules* does not have the appearance of marshalling.

However, marshalling using a *quarterly* line of division was inherited. Once inherited, the quartered arms might be further cadenced with added bordures, labels, or other charges used for cadency in period. Therefore, adding those charges does not remove the appearance of marshalling for armorial designs with a *quarterly* line of division. Crosses throughout were also added to marshalled designs, so the addition of a cross throughout that overlies a quarterly field does not remove the appearance of marshalling.

For example, *Quarterly ermine and gules, in bend two salamanders gules and in bend sinister two open books Or and in chief a label sable* has the appearance of marshalling; the *label* does not remove this appearance. *Quarterly azure and Or, a cross between in bend two millrinds and in bend sinister two annulets counterchanged* has the appearance of marshalling; the *cross* does not remove this appearance.

c. Per Pale Fields with Multiple Charge Groups: As marshalled arms using a *per pale* line of division were not inherited, the addition of a charge or charge group which crosses the *per pale* line is generally sufficient to remove the unmistakable appearance that a portion of the field is independent armory. The addition of a bordure or chief that does not itself appear to be part of two distinct original arms also removes that appearance. In general, a chief or bordure which has poor contrast with one side of the field or one that is charged so that identical charges or parts of charges appear on both sides of the line of division or bordure meets this standard.

For example, *Per pale gules and ermine, a boar's head and a eagle displayed counterchanged, a chief azure* does not have the appearance of marshalling. *Per pale vert and Or, a billet and a sun counterchanged, in chief a label argent* does not have the appearance of marshalling, because the *label* crosses the *per pale* line. The *label* cannot be unmistakably seen as a mark of cadency, since impaled armory was not inherited.

On the other hand, in *Per pale purple and Or, a chief per pale argent and sable* the chief divided *per pale* creates the appearance of marshalling *Purple, a chief argent with Or, a chief sable*. For example, in *Per pale Or and sable, a lozenge and a roundel counterchanged and on a chief argent a hare and a fox sable*, the dissimilar charges on the chief create the appearance of marshalling. However, *Per pale Or and sable, a lozenge and a roundel counterchanged and on a chief argent a hare between two foxes sable* does not create the appearance of marshalling, because the hare crosses the center line. Similarly, same armory with *two hares* or with *two foxes* on the chief would also not create the appearance of marshalling.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

A.7. Armory Offense

A. Definitions: No armorial design that is offensive to a large segment of members of the SCA or the general public will be registered. Offense is a modern concept; just because an armorial design was used in period does not mean that it is not offensive to the modern observer. Offense returns are rare because the bar for determining offensiveness is quite high; it has not been unusual for years to pass between returns for offense.

Offense is not dependent on intent. The fact that a submitter did not intend to be offensive is not relevant. The standard is whether a large segment of the SCA or the general public would be offended.

Similarly, offense is not dependent on clarity. An element commonly used by modern neo-Nazis, for example, may be ruled offensive even if many people have to look it up. However, an element used broadly in both potentially offensive and inoffensive contexts may not be considered offensive.

B. Types of Potentially Offensive Armory: Several types of armory are potentially offensive:

1. Vulgar Amory: Armory which includes pornographic or scatological references will not be registered. Depictions of monsters and human beings who are partially nude or the depiction of the genitals on beasts will not generally be considered vulgar. Some period elements such as those depicting human genitals may be considered vulgar on a case by case basis. Certain depictions may be considered pornographic or scatological even if a standard depiction would not be. This is true even if the design or element can be attested in period armory.

2. Offensive Religious Armory: Armory which uses magical or religious symbolism in ways that mocks the beliefs of others or is likely to be offensive to someone who respects the tradition in question will be returned. Magical or religious symbolism is not inherently offensive, but can offend by context. Normal armorial designs including single or multiple elements that identify the person with one religious tradition or another are not offensive. Offense requires a level of religious iconography that would raise eyebrows even for believers. This level of offense will be determined on a case by case basis. Whether or not the submitter is a follower of the tradition whose symbols are being used is not relevant for the purposes of this rule.

For example, while both a *Paschal Lamb* and a *mullet of five points voided and interlaced within and conjoined to an annulet* (modernly called a pentacle) are registerable charges, a *Paschal Lamb dismembered surmounted by a mullet of five points voided and interlaced inverted within and conjoined to an annulet* is a design that would be found offensive by many individuals.

3. Derogatory Stereotypes: Armorial designs that refer to derogatory stereotypes or slurs will not be registered. This is true whether the stereotype is inherent in the usage or created by context. General references to ethnic, racial, or sexual identities are not offensive and may be registered.

For example, while a *Moor's head* is a registerable charge, a *Moor's head within an orle of watermelons* is a design that would be found offensive by many individuals.

4. Offensive Political Terminology: Armorial designs associated with political movements or events that may be offensive to a particular race, religion, or ethnic group will not be registered.

Designs identical to those used by or suggestive of groups like the Nazis, the SS, the Ku-Klux Klan, or similar organizations may not be used. Some elements that were inoffensive in period may be offensive because of modern associations. Some designs are offensive because of individual charges: a swastika is inherently offensive because of its association with the Nazis. Others are offensive only in the overall

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

design. The s-rune is not offensive as a charge, but is offensive in a design which closely resembles that used by the SS.

- 5. Other Offensive Armory:** Other sorts of armorial designs may be ruled offensive on a case by case basis, such as one that mocks armory registered to another group.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix A: Patterns That Do Not Need Further Documentation by Language Group

This appendix lists patterns for naming that do not need further documentation. For the patterns listed below, mention of the pattern and of this appendix is sufficient to document the pattern. Patterns not listed here need further documentation, often including examples. For languages not listed here, all patterns must be documented.

Bynames in many of these languages require grammatical changes to elements. Those changes are not explained here; refer to the listed sources for instructions on creating the correct forms. Each element within this construction must still be documented. Any grammatical changes must be documented as well.

For more information about types of bynames, refer to Appendix B.

In the table below, name patterns are written using a consistent system:

- N is the given name of the person bearing the name in the nominative case.
- B, C, etc. are the given names of relatives or ancestors of the person bearing the name.
- X is used to indicate a place name or region; Y is used to indicate a generic toponym (e.g., 'the woods' or 'the dell'); Z is used to indicate the charge or other name in an inn-sign type location (e.g., star or lion).
- Unmarked means "using the element – location, father's name, etc. – in an unmodified form as a byname;" marked for bynames means using a term such as "son" or "daughter" often with a modified form of the father's name. Using a modified form of the father's name without any other marker is labeled as "genitive alone."
- In "order," byname means "any byname described to the left." Pat = patronymic byname; Loc = locative byname

For example, *N filius B* would be 'N, the son of B' or 'N, B's son'. *N de X* would be "N from X".

Boxes that are unmarked or patterns not listed require further documentation to use that pattern. "Rare" means that such names are sufficiently rare that a constructed, as opposed to attested version, of such a byname generally requires the help of an expert in that language to determine if it is plausible.

Arabic

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Arabic	No	Adjectival; <i>al</i> -[adjectival form of place name].	For men <i>ibn</i> B "son of B" for women <i>bint</i> B "daughter of B"	Multi-generational patronymics; <i>Abū</i> B and <i>Umm</i> B (where B is the child's name)	<i>al</i> -[occupation or description or ethnic group]	No	Yes	Multiple possible variations; see articles below for more information

Notes: Locative and descriptive bynames must match the gender of the person described; see articles below for more details.

Diacritics (long marks, emphatic marks, etc.) may be used or omitted as long as it is done consistently; see Appendix D for more details about transliteration.

Please refer to Juliana de Luna, "Arabic Names from al-Andalus" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/juliana/alandalus/>) or Da'ud ibn Auda, "Period Arabic Names and Naming Practices" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/names/arabic-naming2.htm>) for additional information.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Baltic

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Lithuanian, Latvian, etc.	Late; 14th cen. and after		Yes; N B <i>sūnus</i>			Late; 14th cen. and after		given+patronymic given+ <i>alias</i> +given given+ <i>alias</i> +given+pat

Note: In late period, some other family names are found, but must be documented individually.

Dutch

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Dutch, Frisian, etc.	No	Phrase; <i>van X, van den Y</i> or <i>van der Y</i> ,	Marked; genitive alone, or unmarked (see notes)	Brother, wife	May use article <i>de/den/der/die</i> or may omit it	Early (see Latinized names for details)	Yes; second byname usually a locative	given+byname given+patronymic+loc

Notes: Bynames based on relationship can be formed with Latinized particles, or with their Dutch counterparts, such as *sone/soen/zoen/zone* ‘son’, *broeder* ‘brother’, *dochter* ‘daughter’, and *wijf* ‘wife’ (usually with the relative’s name in the genitive case). Bynames of relationship are also formed with the father's name unmodified or placed in the genitive form.

For more details, see Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Names from Dutch Records Between 1584-1585" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/dutch/vandermeulen.html>).

English/Welsh

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Old English	No	Phrase (<i>æt X</i> or <i>of X</i>)	Marked, unmarked		Rare	Yes; using <i>Cognomento</i>		given+byname
Middle/Early Modern English	Late	All forms: Phrase (<i>de X, of X, atte Y, de la/del Y</i>); unmarked, adjectival, inn sign (<i>atte Z, of the Z</i>)	Marked, genitive alone, unmarked	Matronymic, many others, marked and unmarked	Yes, may use article <i>the/le</i> or omit it.	Yes; marked	Yes; all patterns late (these are generally unmarked)	given+byname given+byname+loc given+patronym+descrip given+byname+byname
Anglicized Irish	No		Marked, multi-generation	Clan names	Rare		Yes	given+byname given+pat+pat given+patronym+clan
Welsh	Late	Phrase, unmarked	Marked, unmarked, multiple		Yes		Yes	given+byname given+pat+pat
Scots		Phrase (as in English), unmarked	Marked (with <i>Mac</i> or as in English), unmarked	As in English only	Yes		Yes	given+pat+ loc given+pat+pat given+pat+descriptive

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Notes: Old English: Patronymics take form of *X sunu/sune* or *Xdohtor* (X is father's name in genitive); they must match the given name's gender. Alternately, they may follow the Latinized patterns. Locatives use *æt* or *of* followed by the placename in dative form. See the introduction to Reaney and Wilson *A Dictionary of English Surnames* for more details.

Middle/Early Modern English: Marked patronymics may use *Fitz X* or *Xson*; women may use these or use *Xdaughter*. These forms may all use the father's name unmodified; *Xson* and *Xdaughter* may also use the possessive form. Alternately, they may follow the Latinized patterns. Late period family names tend to drop articles and prepositions. See the introduction to Reaney and Wilson *A Dictionary of English Surnames* for more details.

Anglicized Irish: See Mari ingen Briain meic Donnchada, "Names Found in Anglicized Irish Documents" (<http://medievalscotland.org/kmo/AnglicizedIrish/>) for details of how patronymic bynames are marked.

Welsh: See Tangwystyl verch Morgant Glasvryn "A Simple Guide to Constructing 13th Century Welsh Names" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/welsh13.html>) and "A Simple Guide to Constructing 16th Century Welsh Names" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/welsh16.html>) for more details.

Scots: See Black *Surnames of Scotland* for more details.

French

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Frankish French	Late	Phrase (see notes), unmarked, or inn sign name	Marked, unmarked are more common	widow, other	Yes; may use article <i>le, la, l', les</i> or <i>un/une</i> or omit it	Yes; usually combining surnames using <i>dit</i>	Yes; second byname is usually locative; double surnames are rare	given+by given+byname+locative given+byname <i>dit</i> byname
Occitan/ Provençal	Late	Phrase (see notes), unmarked	Marked, unmarked	widow, other	Yes; may use article <i>le, la, li, l', les</i> or <i>un/une</i> or omit it	Yes; usually combining surnames using <i>alias</i>	Yes; but rare for men; second name usually locative	given+byname given+byname+locative given+byname <i>alias</i> byname

Notes: All patterns in Frankish must be documented.

Acute accents may be written or omitted, as long as they are used consistently. Other diacritics must be documented to be used, as they were rare in period. Capitalization patterns are inconsistent, but combinations of lower and uppercase elements must be documented.

French: Locatives may be derived from place names, in the form *de X* (or *d'X*, if X starts with a vowel); from generic toponyms, with *du X*, *de la X*, or *des X*; or from signs, with *au Z*, *à la Z*, or *aus/aux Z*.

Occitan: Marked locatives look like those from French; inn sign names have not been found in Occitan to date.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Gaelic	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Pictish			Marked; <i>mac</i> B or <i>filius</i> B "son of B"; <i>filia</i> B "daughter of B"	Nephew/grandson, <i>nepos</i> B				given+by
Oghamic (c.500-c.700)	No		Marked; <i>maqqas</i> B "son of B"; <i>inigena</i> B "daughter of B"		Descriptive	No		given+byname
Old/Middle Gaelic (before c.1200)	No	Rare	Marked; <i>mac</i> B "son of B"; <i>ingen</i> B "daughter of B"	Clan affiliation; two-generation patronymics; "wife of" for women	Descriptive; rarely occupational	No	Multi-generational, descriptive and patronymic	Varied; see articles below
Early Modern Gaelic (after c.1200)	No	Rare	Marked; <i>mac</i> B "son of B," <i>inghean</i> B "daughter of B"	Clan affiliation; two-generation patronymics; "wife of" for women	Descriptive; rarely occupational	No	Multi-generational, descriptive and patronymic	Varied; see articles below
Scots Gaelic	No	Rare	marked; <i>mac</i> B "son of B" <i>ingen</i> or <i>inghean</i> B "daughter of B"	Two-generation patronymics; "wife of" for women	Descriptive; rarely occupational	No	Multi-generational, descriptive and patronymic	given+pat given+descrip+pat given+pat+descrip given+pat+pat

Notes: Pictish: Please refer to Tangwystl verch Mogrant Glasvryn, "A Consideration of Pictish Names" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/tangwystyl/pictnames/>).

Oghamic: Please refer to Mari Elspeth nic Bryan, Index of Names in Irish Annals (<http://medievalscotland.org/kmo/AnnalsIndex/>).

Old/Middle Gaelic: For appropriate spellings, refer to Mari Elspeth nic Bryan, Index of Names in Irish Annals (<http://medievalscotland.org/kmo/AnnalsIndex/>). For structure, please refer to Effric Neyn Ken3ocht Mcherrald, "Quick and Easy Gaelic Names" (<http://medievalscotland.org/scotnames/quickgaelicbyname/>).

Early Modern Gaelic: Please refer to Effric Neyn Ken3ocht Mcherrald, "Quick and Easy Gaelic Names" (<http://medievalscotland.org/scotnames/quickgaelicbyname/>) for more details on Gaelic names.

Scots Gaelic: Please refer to Effric Neyn Ken3ocht Mcherrald, "A Simple Guide to Constructing 12th Century Scottish Gaelic Names" (<http://medievalscotland.org/scotnames/simplescotgaelicnames12.shtml>).

All patronymics are created using the genitive form of the father's name. Byname elements may need to have their spelling modified to soften the pronunciation (lenited) or change the grammar. For guidance on when lenition is required, please refer to Effric Neyn Ken3ocht Mcherrald, "The Spelling of Lenited Consonants in Gaelic" (<http://medievalscotland.org/scotlang/lenition.shtml>).

Accents may be used or omitted as long as it is done consistently. Capitalization is inconsistent in period records, but must match a period pattern.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

German

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
German	Yes	Adjectival (common), marked, and inn signs	Unmarked, rarely marked	Women may use feminine form (see notes)	Yes; usually without articles	Early (see Latinized names)	Rare; second byname is usually locative or descriptive	given+byname given+byname+locative given+byname+descript

Notes: Locatives based on place names use the forms *von X*; generic toponymics use *vom Y*, or another form of *der*; the form *de X* is found before about 1300. Locatives based on generic toponyms, house names or inn-sign names use the form *zum Z*.

Women commonly used a feminized form of their husband's or father's surname, either by adding the suffix *-in/-yn*, or used a genitive form ending in *-s/-z* or *-en*. Unmodified surnames were also used. Further discussion of women's bynames can be found in Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Women's Surnames in 15th- and 16th-Century Germany" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/german/womenssurnames.html>).

Greek: Please refer to Bardas Xiphias, "Personal Names of the Aristocracy in the Roman Empire During the Later Byzantine Era" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/names/byzantine/introduction.html>). All patterns documented in this article are registerable.

Hungarian/Romanian:

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Hungarian		Adjectival (vernacular), phrase (<i>de X</i>), unmarked (Latinized)	Unmarked, rarely marked (as B-fi)	metronymics (late period); wife (see notes)	Yes; without articles			byname+given (vernacular) given+byname (Latinized)
Romanian		Phrase, adjectival (see article)	See notes		Yes			given+byname

Notes: Hungarian: Women often have marital bynames that add *-ne* to her husband's complete name. See Walraven van Nijmegen, "Hungarian Names 101" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/names/magyarnames1012.html>) or various articles by Kolosvari Arpadne Julia in the KWHSS Proceedings for more details.

Romanian: See Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Names from the Royal Lines of Moldavia and Wallachia" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/other/romanian.html>) for more details. The article does not document patronymic bynames, but that appears to be an artifact of the (royal) data.

Iberian

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Castilian (Spanish)	Late	Phrase (<i>de X</i> ; <i>del Y</i> or <i>de la Y</i>), unmarked;	Marked (see notes), unmarked		Yes; usually without article		Yes; second byname usually locative	given+byname given+pat+locative given+byname+locative

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Catalan	Yes	adjectival Phrase (<i>de X</i> , <i>del Y</i> or <i>de la</i> <i>Y</i>), adjectival	Unmarked or marked as in Castilian	viuda "widow"	Yes; usually without article	<i>alias</i> with two bynames	Yes; second byname usually locative	given+pat+descriptive given+byname given+given+byname given+byname+locative
Basque								
Portuguese		Phrase (<i>de X</i> , <i>da</i> <i>X</i> , <i>do X</i> , <i>d'X</i>)	Marked (see notes), unmarked		Yes; usually without article		Yes; second byname usually locative	given+byname given+pat+locative

Notes: Castilian: A patronymic byname may be Latinized (*filius B*) or in the vernacular, usually formed by adding *-ez* to the father's name (and dropping terminal *-o*). Patronymics may also be formed by using an unmodified version of the father's name. For more details see Elsbeth Anne Roth, "16th Century Spanish Names" (<http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~kvs/heraldry/spanish16/>) or Juliana de Luna "Spanish Names from the Late 15th Century" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/juliana/isabella/>).

Catalan: For further details see Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Catalan Names from the 1510 census of Valencia" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/spanish/valencia1510.html>), especially the surname section.

Basque: All patterns in Basque must be documented; Basque names often closely resemble Castilian or Catalan names.

Portuguese: A patronymic byname may be Latinized (*filius B*) or in the vernacular, usually formed by adding *-ez* to the father's name (and dropping terminal *-o*). Patronymics may also be formed by using an unmodified version of the father's name or as *de B* or *d'B* (when the father's given name starts with a vowel). See Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Portuguese Names from Lisbon, 1565" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/portuguese/lisbon1565.html>) for more details.

Italian

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Italian	Yes; triple names very late	Phrase (see notes), unmarked, Latinized	Marked (as <i>di B</i>), multi-generational, unmarked, Latinized	Family names (see notes), matronymics (as <i>di B</i>)	Yes; rarely use articles	Early, Latinized only	Yes; patronymic bynames in these patterns are generally marked with <i>di</i>	given+byname given+pat+pat given+pat+family given+pat+locative given+family+locative

Notes: Italian is incredibly variable in period, with names from Venice, Tuscany, and the south all significantly different. For Venice, see Juliana de Luna, "Names from 16th Century Venice" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/juliana/16thcvenice.html>). For Tuscany see Juliana de Luna, "Names in 15th Century Florence and her Dominions: the Condado" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/juliana/condado/>) and Aryanhwy merch Catmael, "Names from Arezzo, Italy, 1386-1528" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/italian/arezzo.html>). For the south, see Aryanhwy merch Catmael "Names from 15th Century Naples" (<http://www.ellipsis.cx/~liana/names/italian/naples.html>). Latinized patronymic bynames usually are just the father's name in the genitive form, without *filius/filial*.

Locative bynames in the northern and central areas normally take the form *da X*, but *de X* and *di X* are rarely found. Generic toponymics take the form *della/dalla/dello/dallo Y*. In the south, *de X* and *di X* are far more common. Family names typically modify a patronym or byname by removing the last vowel (if there is one) and adding *-i*. Unmodified forms are found as well.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Jewish	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Hebrew	No		Marked; multi-generational	Tribe name (men only), like ha Levi	<i>ha</i> [noun], feminized for women		Multi-generation patronymic	given+byname given+pat+pat
Vernacular		(see notes)	(see notes)		(see notes)		Multi-generation patronymic	given+byname

Notes: Jews lived in a location where a vernacular was spoken (German, Arabic, etc.) Men generally had a Hebrew language name and a vernacular name. The vernacular name may be the equivalent of their Hebrew name or an unrelated vernacular name. Women generally had vernacular names only (often the same as local naming pool).

Hebrew: Patronymic bynames are formed using *ben B* "son of B," and *bat B* (Sephardic) or *basB* (Ashkenazic) "daughter of B"

Vernacular: Vernacular bynames often follow the Hebrew forms (so mostly patronymic), but are generally written following the standards for the local vernacular. Occasionally, the particles are transliterated from the Hebrew (e.g., "N *filius B ben C*" in a Latin document). Other kinds of bynames (especially locative bynames and the byname meaning "Jew" in the vernacular) are found as well.

Latinized: Latinized names are not a single thing; they must follow the rules of the naming pool from which they are taken.

Bynames based on relationships can be marked with Latinized particles such as *filius* 'son', *filia* 'daughter', *uxor* 'wife', and *relicta* 'widow'. These are usually followed by the Latinized form of the person in the genitive case, though sometimes the name is not declined.

Locatives can use the preposition *de* 'of/from,' despite the fact that such usage was not proper in classical Latin. In this case, the locative may be Latinized, but is often left in its vernacular form.

In the early Middle Ages, a second given name is often used as a byname; it is preceded by a term like *alias*, *dictus*, or *cognomento*. In later usage, two bynames will often be connected by these same terms.

Mongol: Mongol names are quite different in structure from European names. All patterns documented in Baras-aghur Naran, "On the Documentation and Construction of Period Mongolian Names" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/baras-aghur/mongolian.html>) are registerable.

North Slavic	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Polish		Phrase, adjectival (see notes)	Marked, Unmarked (see notes)	Brother, wife, widow	Rare		Yes; patronymic + locative (<i>N B-ówna z X</i>).	given+byname given+pat+locative
Czech								

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Notes: Polish: In Polish, i/y/j switches are common, and the use of accents is inconsistent. Names will be registered with or without accents as long as they are consistent.

In Polish, bynames based on relationships can be marked with Latinized particles or with their Polish vernacular equivalents, such as *B syn* 'B's son', *B brat* 'B's brother', *B żona* 'B's wife', and *B wdowa* 'B's widow'. Alternately, the relationship could be indicated by a suffix added to their relative's name, such as *Bwic(z)/Bwicc* ('son of B') or *Byk/Bik* ('little B', forming a diminutive). Women's bynames use feminine forms. Most frequently, patronyms are changed by adding the diminutive suffix *-ina/-yna*, or by adding *-ówa* (married name) or *-ówna* (maiden name), making *Bina* or *Bówa*. What look like double given names may well be unmarked patronymic bynames.

Locative bynames in Polish-language documents normally take the preposition *z/ze* 'from/of', followed by the place name in the genitive case. Alternately, an adjectival form can be created by adding *-ski* for men or *-ska* for women to the location's name in its grammatically required form.

Czech: All patterns in Czech must be documented. Academy of Saint Gabriel report 3244 (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/3244.txt>) gives some leads for documenting Czech forms.

Persian: Persian name structures are quite different from European name structures. All patterns found in Ursula Georges, "Persian Masculine Names in the *Nafah.ât al-uns*" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/ursula/nafahat/>) are registerable. The most common structure is a single given name followed by a locative byname derived from the adjectival form of a placename (usually adding *-î* to the placename for both men and women). Descriptive bynames are also found. A few examples of women's bynames (all locative) can be found in Aryanhwy merch Catmael and Ursula Georges, "Persian Feminine Names from the Safavid Period" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/ursula/persian.html>).

Romany: Romany are known to have used two names: a private name used only in their community, and a vernacular use name, used in interactions with locals. We do not currently have evidence of the elements or structure of private names before 1600; without such evidence they cannot be registered. In general, forming a name appropriate for the desired region/language where a Romany persona is living (e.g., "A from X") follows period usage.

Russian/East Slavic: All patterns found in Paul Wickenden of Thanet's "A Dictionary of Period Russian Names" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/paul/>) and "Locative Bynames in Medieval Russia" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/names/toprus.html>) are registerable.

	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Russian	Yes; one Christian, one Slavic	Adjectival, rarely other forms	Marked (see notes)	Matronymics, wife	Yes		Yes; multiple patronymics (or patronymic from father's whole name)	(see notes)
Other		(see notes)						

Notes: Russian: The construction of Russian bynames is complicated; see Paul Wickenden of Thanet's "A Dictionary of Period Russian Names" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/paul/>) for structures both of individual bynames and for names as a whole. His and "Locative Bynames in Medieval Russia" (<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/names/toprus.html>) is also useful for constructing locative bynames.

Other East Slavic languages, like Ukrainian and Belorussian, follow similar patterns to Russian; they must generally be documented individually.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Scandinavian	Double Given Names	Locative	Patronymic	Other relationship	Descriptive/ Occupational	Dictus	Double Bynames	Order
Old Norse/ Old Icelandic	No	Phrase, adjectival; see notes	Marked; <i>-son</i> or <i>-dóttir</i> added to the genitive of father's name	Two-generation patronymic; <i>Bson Csonar</i> , wife (<i>Bkona</i>)	Descriptive, occupational are rare		Descriptive byname + patronymic or two-generation patronymic	given+by given+descriptive+pat given+pat+descriptive given+pat+pat
Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Norwegian, Icelandic, etc.		Phrase, adjectival; see notes	Marked; <i>Bson</i> or <i>Bsen</i> using genitive of father's name; see notes for feminine	Wife (using the genitive form of the husband's name)	Rare			given+by

Notes: For Old Norse/Old Icelandic, see Geirr Bassi Haraldsson's *The Old Norse Name* and Lindorm Eriksson's "The Bynames of the Viking Age Runic Inscriptions". See Lindorm's article for more information on locative bynames.

Accents and other diacritics (like þ, ð, and {o,}) may be used or omitted, as long as the system is consistent; see Appendix D for more details.

For Old Norse/Old Icelandic, by precedent, prepended bynames (nicknames that precede the given name) are capitalized, but nicknames that follow the given name are not.

For later Scandinavian languages (Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Norwegian, Icelandic, etc.), the feminine forms of patronymics are variable. Swedish forms include *Bdotter*, *Bdotther*, *Bdottir*, and *Bdatter*, while Danish forms include *Bdother*, *Bdotter*, *Bdaatter*, *Bdaater*, and *Bdaather*. Other forms must be documented.

Locative bynames take the form *i X* in Swedish, *af X* in Danish, for example. The placenames must be grammatically correct forms to follow those prepositions..

For details of construction in Swedish, see <http://www.s-gabriel.org/2296>. Swedish: Wife (using genitive form of husband's given or full name)

South Slavic (Serbian, Croatian, etc.): All patterns must be documented. Our sources for South Slavic names are quite limited. One useful source is Walraven van Nijmegen, "Early Croatian Given Names" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/walraven/croat/>), which documents the pattern of a single given name followed by a single patronymic byname which is either the father's name unchanged or a construction formed by adding *-ov*, *-ovic*. Other sources suggest *-ic* may sometimes be used to construct a patronymic byname.

Turkish: Turkish names are quite different from European names; they are somewhat like Arabic names, but do not follow all Arabic patterns. All patterns found in Ursula Georges, "Sixteenth-Century Turkish Names" (<http://www.s-gabriel.org/names/ursula/ottoman/>) are registerable.

Rules for Submissions:

The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix B: Types of Bynames

A byname is a name phrase added to a given name to specify which *William* or *Mary* you're discussing. Bynames fall into several categories, discussed below. For a list of the types of bynames available in various languages, see Appendix A.

A. Bynames of relationship: A byname of relationship describes an individual as someone's child or describes some other important relationship. Patronymic names are found widely; other types of bynames of relationship are far more limited in their use.

1. Patronymic bynames describe someone as their father's son or daughter; they are the most common and broadly found type of byname of relationship.

Examples include the English *Johnson*, *Williams* and *Robert*, the Spanish *Perez*, the Gaelic *mac Néill* and *inghean Domhnaill*, the Scots *Makdowall*, the Arabic *ibn Sulaymān*, the German *Hainrich*, the Italian *di Antonio* and the Old Norse *Bjarnarson*.

2. Historical ancestor bynames describe someone as the descendent of their grandfather or earlier ancestors: the Gaelic *Ó Ruairc*, *inghean Uí Bhriain*, and the Arabic *al-Ḥasanī* 'descendant of Ḥasan.'

Others do the same thing by listing multiple generations: the Gaelic *mac Conchobair mhic Fhearchair*, the Welsh *ap Ris ap Madoc*, and the Norse *Ketils son Grims sonar*.

3. Matronymic bynames describe someone as their mother's son or daughter; these are far less common than patronymic bynames. In England they are relatively common, while in Arabic and German, they are quite rare. In other languages, they do not happen at all.

Examples include: the English *Maddison* 'Maud's son', *filia Agnetis* 'daughter of Agnes' and *Rosedoghter*; the Arabic *Ibn Fatimah* and *Ibn al-Labanah* 'daughter of the milkmaid'; the German *Katerinen son*; and the Italian *di Maddalena*.

4. Other bynames of relationship are found only in very limited times and places. They include the following:

a. Marital bynames describe a woman as her husband's wife. In most cultures in period, women did not change their bynames upon marriage (especially bynames of relationship: your father doesn't change when you get married).

Examples include the Old Norse *Végauts kona*, the English *Jackewyf* and *Hobsonwyf*, and the Gaelic *bean Cormaic*. Sometimes marital bynames are identical in form to patronymics like the Italian *di Giovanni* or German *Dieterlins*.

b. Kunyas are Arabic bynames that describes someone as the parent of a child, most frequently their eldest son. Examples include *Umm Badr*, *Abū al-Jafnā* 'father of the curly haired girl', and *Abū 'l-Barakāt* 'father of blessings'.

c. Other bynames of relationship: Occasionally, someone will be described in terms of another relationship. Examples include: English *Parsonbrother*, *Robertstepson*, *Parsoncosyn*, and *Vikersister*. A few Arabic examples have very complex descriptions like *Ibn ukht Ibn Abi 'Uqba* 'son of the sister of the man who was the son of the father of 'Uqba.'

d. Work relationships describe someone as someone's current or former servant. Examples include the English *Mathewservant*, *Websterman*, *Gibmayden* and *Prestewoman* as well as the Arabic *mawlā Faraj* 'freedman of Faraj'.

B. Locative Bynames: A locative byname describes an individual in terms of a place where they were born, they have lived, or are otherwise associated with. We categorize these in two ways: in terms of the structure, which can either be a phrase such as *of London* or an adjective like *Londoner*, and in terms of whether the locative element is a specific named place like *London* or a generic toponym like *Mill* or *Meadow*. Some languages use all of these, while others use only some of these patterns.

1. Locative Bynames from Specific Toponyms: Locative bynames are most frequently formed from the name of a town or city. Locative bynames generally use a single word, though in English there are some examples of compound (two

Rules for Submissions:

The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

word) placenames used in locative bynames.

Most frequently these use a prepositional phrase, like *de Paris*, *von Massenbach*, or *da Bologna*. Sometimes the preposition is dropped, and simply an unmodified placename is used as a byname, like *York*, *Langenberg*, or *Villanova*.

2. Locative Bynames from Generic Topographical Features: Locative bynames are also formed from generic descriptions such as *Broke* 'brook', *Vega* 'meadow', or *Bois* 'wood'.

Most of these bynames are created as a prepositional phrase like *atte Broke*, *de la Vega*, or *du Bois*. Sometimes the preposition is dropped and an unmodified toponymic is used, like *Castle*, *Molin* and *Serra*.

3. Adjectival Bynames of Location: Some bynames describe someone as being associated with a place as an adjective, like *l'Alemant* 'the German,' *Cornyshe*, *Aragones*, or *al-Ishbilī* 'the guy from Sevilla.'

Some languages only use this type of locative byname (rather than types 1 & 2 above), like Arabic and Russian. In Russian, a variety of forms are used to indicate locations, such as *Novgorodets*, *Novgorodtsev*, and *Novgorodski*, all meaning 'from Novgorod.'

4. Inn-sign Names: Some languages – English, French, and German – include bynames that identify people as living near a sign of the sort used for taverns as well as houses of various sorts. Examples include English *atte Rose*, German *zum Grifēn*, and French *aux Deux Espees* or *du Cat Rouge*.

- C. Occupational Bynames: An occupational byname describes an individual in terms of an occupation, generally one that they hold, but sometimes one that a parent or other relative holds. They are common in some languages. Other languages, like Gaelic, Spanish, and Russian, use only a few specific occupational bynames.

Most are literal occupational terms, like the English *Draper* or *Dyer*, French *Boulangier*, German *Bauer*, or Spanish *Guerrero*. Other occupational bynames take the names of the items that people make, sell, or work with; this are called metonymic bynames. Examples include the English *Coffyn* or the Italian *Sardello* 'sardine.'

- D. Descriptive Bynames: A descriptive byname describes an individual in terms of their mental or physical characteristics. The names are literal in nature and the sorts of descriptions another person would immediately recognize. Therefore, the suitability of a constructed byname of this sort must be shown with attested bynames that are similar in content and level of abstraction. Examples include the Old Norse *gullskæggr* 'gold-beard' and the English *le Proude* 'the proud'.

One unusual (and less literal) type of descriptive byname found in English is the "phrase name," which gives a typical phrase the owner uses as a byname, such as *Fallinthewell*.

- E. *Cognomento* or *alias* Bynames: Especially in earlier European names, a byname is another given name by which a person is known. They are generally, but not always marked by a phrase like *alias*, *dictus*, or *cognomento*. Both the suitability of the phrase and the name that follows it must be demonstrated for a particular language and culture.
- F. Inherited Family Names: In many languages and cultures, literal bynames of the sort described in A through E above gave way to inherited surnames over time (though in most cultures, some literal bynames continued until after 1600). Some cultures will never adopt inherited family names.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix C: Regional Naming Groups and Their Mixes

Regional Groups:	By Time Period:	Languages Included In This Group:	Can Be Combined With Groups:
Arabic	550-1100	Arabic, etc.	Greek Italian Iberian
	1100-1600	Arabic, etc.	Greek Italian Iberian Turkish
Baltic	550-1100	Lithuanian, Latvian, etc.	German North Slavic Russian/East Slavic/East Slavic Scandinavian
	1100-1600	Lithuanian, Latvian, etc.	German North Slavic Russian/East Slavic Scandinavian
Dutch	550-1100	Dutch, Frisian, etc.	English/Welsh French German
	1100-1600	Dutch, Flemish, etc.	English/Welsh French German
English/ Welsh	550-1100	Old English, Welsh, Cornish, Cumbric, etc.	Dutch French Gaelic Scandinavian
	1100-1600	Middle and Modern English, Middle and Early Modern Scots, Welsh, Cornish, Anglicized Irish, Manx, etc.	Dutch French Gaelic
French	550-1100	Frankish, French, Occitan/Provençal, Gascon, etc.	Dutch English/Welsh German Italian Scandinavian Iberian
	1100-1600	French, Occitan/Provençal, Gascon, etc.	Dutch English/Welsh German Italian Iberian
Gaelic	550-1100	Old Irish Gaelic, Middle Irish Gaelic, Scottish Gaelic, Manx Gaelic, Oghamic Irish, Pictish, etc.	English/Welsh Scandinavian
	1100-1600	Middle Irish Gaelic, Early Modern Irish Gaelic, Scottish Gaelic, Manx Gaelic, etc.	English/Welsh
German	550-1100	High German, Low German, Swiss German, etc.	Baltic Dutch

**Rules for Submissions:
The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory**

			French Italian North Slavic Scandinavian
	1100-1600	High German, Low German, Swiss German, etc.	Baltic Dutch French Italian North Slavic Scandinavian
Greek	550-1100	Byzantine Greek, etc.	Arabic Italian South Slavic
	1100-1600	Byzantine Greek, etc.	Arabic Italian South Slavic Turkish
Hungarian/ Romanian	550-1100	Hungarian, Romanian, etc.	German North Slavic South Slavic
	1100-1600	Hungarian, Romanian, etc.	German North Slavic South Slavic
Iberian	550-1100	Spanish, Catalan, Portuguese, Basque, Visigothic, etc.	Arabic French Italian
	1100-1600	Spanish, Catalan, Portuguese, Basque, etc.	Arabic French Italian
Italian	550-1100	Italian, Sicilian, Venetian, etc.	Arabic French German Greek South Slavic
	1100-1600	Italian, Sicilian, Venetian, etc.	Arabic French German Greek South Slavic
Jewish	550-1100	Hebrew, Yiddish, etc.	Special: Jewish names documented from location X are registerable with (1) other names documented from the languages for that language group and (2) with other Jewish names documented from other parts of Europe
	1100-1600	Hebrew, Yiddish, etc.	Special: Jewish names documented from location X are registerable with (1) other names documented from the languages for that language group and (2) with other Jewish names documented from other parts of Europe
Mongol	1100-1600	Mongol, etc.	Arabic Hungarian/Romanian Persian Russian/East Slavic Turkish
North Slavic	550-1100	Polish, Czech, Slovak, etc.	Baltic

**Rules for Submissions:
The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory**

			German Hungarian/Romanian Russian/East Slavic
	1100-1600	Polish, Czech, Slovak, etc.	Baltic German Hungarian/Romanian Russian/East Slavic
Persian	1100-1600	Persian, etc.	Arabic Mongol Turkish
Romany	1100-1600	Romany, etc.	Special: Romany names documented from location X are registerable with (1) other names documented from the languages for that language group and (2) with other Romany names documented from other parts of Europe
Russian/ East Slavic	550-1100	Russian, Ukrainian, etc.	Baltic North Slavic South Slavic
	1100-1600	Russian, Ukrainian, etc.	Baltic North Slavic South Slavic
Scandinavian	550-1100	Old Icelandic, Old Norse, etc.	Baltic English/Welsh French Gaelic German
	1100-1600	Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Finnish, etc.	Baltic German
South Slavic	550-1100	Serbian, Croatian, Bulgarian, etc.	Greek Italian Russian/East Slavic
	1100-1600	Serbian, Croatian, Bulgarian, etc.	Greek Italian Russian/East Slavic Turkish
Turkish	1100-1600	Turkish, etc.	Arabic Greek Italian South Slavic

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix D: Acceptable Transliteration Systems for Non-Roman Scripts

We require each submission to follow a single transliteration system, as different systems may use the same letter to indicate different sounds. In general, we allow both relatively formal systems and relatively casual ones.

Transliteration systems not listed here must be documented by the submitter as appropriate. For languages written in a non-Roman script that is not listed here, the submitter needs to document the system of transliteration.

Western European Languages:

A. Runic Old Norse: The runic system used by the Norse lacks information used in the later forms written in Latin script. Therefore, we require that the runic forms be registered using a Standardized Old Norse spelling as explained below. A discussion of the problem of making sense out of runic forms can be found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_Norse_orthography.

B. Non-Runic Old Norse: We will register documentary forms for names (such as those found in Lind).

In addition, we will register names written using the conventions of Standardized Old Norse (which appears in Geirr Bassi's *The Old Norse Name*, dictionaries by Zoega and Cleasby & Vigfusson, and header forms in *Nordiskt runnamnslexikon*) which includes several special characters, including accents, thorn and edh, and {o,} (o-ogonik). We will register forms that include all of those characters, those that omit accents but include other special characters, forms that use only thorn and edh, or forms that include none of them. All of these forms are found in documentary forms.

We will not register forms that replace æ or œ with ae or oe, as no evidence of that replacement is found. Moreover, these characters are easily used and represent different sounds than one would expect from the separate letters.

C. Irish Gaelic: Irish Gaelic uses some characters that we do not use in the English alphabet, particularly the punctum delens (a dot above the letter). We register lenited characters using the current convention in Gaelic, which is to add an h after the character that would otherwise have a dot above it. As documentary forms sometimes have and sometimes omit accents, we will register transliterations that systematically either have or omit accents.

Eastern European languages:

Many Eastern European languages use the Latin script with special characters; in general we require the use of those characters. However, the forms used in period are often simpler than modern forms, as some special characters did not come into use before 1600.

D. Russian: We have registered Russian names using the Library of Congress system, the International Phonetic system, and the Revised English system. These are described in Paul Wickenden of Thanet, *A Dictionary of Period Russian Names*, particularly: <http://heraldry.sca.org/paul/zpreface.html>

E. Other languages using the Cyrillic alphabet: These generally use the same transliterations systems as Russian.

Middle Eastern Languages:

F. Arabic: We have registered Arabic names using the Hans Wehr (Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft) system, American Library Association/Library of Congress system, and the Encyclopedia of Islam system.

For each, we will register a simplified form that omits macons (long marks) over letters and replaces emphatic (dotted) consonants with undotted ones. We also allow transliterations that omit `ayn (ˆ) and (ˆ) hamza or that use ' for both, but only if they also omit the macrons and emphatic marks.

G. Turkish: Turkish was written until recently using the Arabic script. We will register transliterations that follow the standards for Arabic above as well as those that use the modern Turkish letters (such as that used in the articles by Ursula Georges).

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Oriental Languages:

- H. Chinese: We have registered Pinyin, Wade-Giles, and the Yale system (these are often called Romanization systems). A good starting point is the articles in Wikipedia; a useful source for the systems is found at <http://denner.org/reinhard/neijia/romanisation/mapping.html>.
- I. Japanese: We have registered the Hepburn system, as well as that system with two modifications: one that omits all macrons (long marks) and another that uses ou for o-macron. A good starting point is the Wikipedia article; another is http://www.omniglot.com/writing/japanese_romaji.htm.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix E: Currently Registerable Designators for Non-Personal Name Submissions

A. Branch Names: The English language and the *lingua Anglica* forms of the officially recognized branch designators are:

- Kingdom
- Principality
- Barony
- Province
- Shire
- Canton
- Riding
- College
- Stronghold
- Port

We will be pleased to register a designator in an appropriate language. To register a form in another language, the submitter must demonstrate that the term is an appropriate and precise translation. In addition, the submitter must demonstrate that it is a term that was in use before 1600 or is otherwise appropriate for SCA use.

For example, *scola* and *universitas* are not considered appropriate translations for college, so that they are available for use in household and association names. Terms such as *Collegium* (for College), *Forteleza* (for Stronghold), and *-scir* (for Shire) have been registered.

B. Award and Order Names: The appropriate English and *lingua Anglica* forms for order names are *Award* and *Order*. Terms like *Company*, *Companions*, and *Defenders* are not registerable as designators for orders and awards. *Company* is allowed as the designator for household and association names. *Companions* can be used to describe the members of an order, but such terms were not used in order names, and will not be registered. *Defenders* may be used in the substantive element of an order, but may not be registered as a designator.

Order has been found in attested forms in many languages:

- Orden Spanish
- Ordre French
- Gesellschaft, orden German
- Geselsscaf, Geselschap Low German
- Ordo Latin
- Ordine Italian

There are other terms used for knightly orders in period. Many of them use words that refer to knighthood; these are not registerable, because they are considered a claim that the members are peers.

C. Heraldic Titles: The English and *lingua Anglica* terms for heraldic titles for kingdoms and local branches are *Herald* and *Pursuivant*. Appropriate translations into other languages can be found in Juliana de Luna's "Heraldic Titles from the Middle Ages and Renaissance."

<http://medievalscotland.org/jes/HeraldicTitles/index.shtml>

D. Household Names: This category includes guilds, military companies, and similar groups of people. A variety of designators have been registered for households; in any case both the designator and substantive element must follow a single pattern for a group of individuals found in period. Models that have been used include groups like a guild or military company, members of a dynastic or personal household, and the people resident at an inn or other named residence.

Discussions of registerable designators for household names can be found at:

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

- Sharon Krossa, "A Brief, Incomplete, and Rather Stopgap Article about European Household and Other Group Names Before 1600"
<http://medievalscotland.org/names/eurohouseholds/index.shtml>
- The Compiled Names Precedents: Designations
<http://heraldry.sca.org/laurel/precedents/CompiledNamePrecedents/Designations.html>

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix F: Some Armorial Elements that Do Not Need Further Documentation

Charges

Charges which were listed as being in use before 1600 in standard references such as Bruce Draconarius of Mistholme and Akagawa Yoshio, *A Pictorial Dictionary of Heraldry*, Gerald Brault's *Early Blazon*, and James Parker, *A Glossary of Terms used in Heraldry* do not need to be further documented. *A Pictorial Dictionary of Heraldry* is available from the SCA Stock Clerk. Parker can be found online at: <http://www.heraldsnet.org/saitou/parker/>

Many charges which were registered in the distant past are not currently registerable; as our knowledge of pre-1600 practice becomes better, we can say clearly that some charges are not used. It is generally safe to assume that most charges registered in the last decade do not need to be documented to be used (but beware grandfathering, which allows a submitter to register charges that would otherwise not be registerable). Charges which have not been registered in over a decade should be redocumented.

Complex Lines

The following complex lines of division and complex lines for ordinaries and similar charges were in common use for most of our period:

- embattled
- engrailed
- indented
- wavy

Others are less common, but clearly attested to period:

- bretessed
- dancetty
- dovetailed
- embattled counter-embattled
- enarched/ployé
- flory-counterflory
- indented fleury at the points
- invected
- lozengy
- potency
- raguly
- rayonny
- urdy

A few complex lines of division that are allowed only with restrictions:

- bevilled: only allowed for per bend, per bend sinister, a bend and a bend sinister; use with charges around it is a step from period practice, use with dissimilar charges around it returnable.
- denticulada: only allowed for bordures
- right step/left step: only allowed for per fess
- rompu: only allowed for chevrons
- triangular: only allowed for a chief
- engouled: only used for bends (and bends sinister)

Other complex lines of division must be documented as having been used before 1600 to be used in an armorial submission. Such lines will generally only be allowed with restrictions, as they were normally used only in certain kinds of simple designs.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

A Partial list of Registerable Postures

Creatures fall into several categories: quadrupeds, birds, insects (and other invertebrates whose default position is tergiant), fish, humans (and humanoid monsters), and sea-creatures (along with a few other creatures whose default posture is erect). Each has specific defined postures and cannot be registered in the postures suitable for another category without further documentation. This list of postures does not include head positions (such as guardant and regardant) or wing positions (such as inverted, elevated, addorsed, and displayed; these are often not blazoned).

Quadruped Postures:

- Rampant (to dexter or sinister)
- Salient (to dexter or sinister)
- Courant (to dexter or sinister)
- Passant (to dexter or sinister)
- Segreant (to dexter or sinister)
- Statant (to dexter or sinister)
- Sejant (to dexter, to sinister, and affronty)
- Sejant Erect (to dexter, to sinister, and affronty)
- Statant Erect (to dexter, to sinister, and affronty)
- Couchant (to dexter or sinister)
- Dormant (to dexter or sinister)
- Winged ones may be displayed, but this is generally a step from period practice

Bird Postures:

A more complete discussion of period bird postures can be found at <http://heraldry.sca.org/loar/2003/11/03-11brd.html>

- Close (to dexter or sinister)
- Displayed (for a bird other than an eagle, this is a step from period practice)
- Volant (to dexter or sinister)
- Migrant (to chief or to base)
- Rising/rousant (to dexter or sinister)
- Naiant (for water birds, to dexter or sinister)
- Striking (to dexter or sinister)

A few birds have specific postures: Peacock in his pride, Pelican in her piety, Crane in its vigilance

Insects (also frogs, lizards, turtles):

- Tergiant (in any direction, except possibly inverted)

Fish:

- Haurient (may be embowed or embowed-counterembowed)
- Naiant (to dexter or sinister, may be embowed or embowed-counterembowed)
- Urinant (may be embowed or embowed-counterembowed)

Humans and Humanoid Monsters:

- Statant (affronty, to dexter, or to sinister)
- Riding a horse or other mount

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Sea-Creatures, Wyverns, etc.:

- Sejant/passant (to dexter or sinister)
- Erect (affronty, to dexter, or to sinister)
- Winged ones may be displayed, but this is generally a step from period practice

A Partial List of Registerable Tinctures

The main heraldic tinctures are listed in A.4.B.1. Other heraldic tinctures may only be registered as part of an Individually Attested Pattern.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix G: Some Specific Elements that are a Step from Period Practice

As discussed in A.2.B armorial designs documented under the Core Style rules may only have a single step from period practice. This is a list of some specific items that are a step from period practice. In general, types of charges and motifs similar to these are likely to be ruled a step from period practice. However, if they can be demonstrated as being used as period charges in European heraldry, they will no longer be considered a step from period practice.

A. Charges: The following charges have been ruled a step from period practice:

- compass star
- pawprint, footprint, etc.
- valknut
- hexagon
- non-European plants and animals
- non-European armorial charges
- complex machines known to Europeans
- standing balance
- chief doubly-enarched
- cross of Saint Brigid

B. Motifs: The following motifs have been ruled a step from period practice:

- counterchanging a bordure over a central ordinary
- a roundel between an increscent and a decrescent
- a spiderweb covering part of the field
- a bend bevilled with charges around it
- a gorges as a tertiary charge
- a schnecke with secondary or tertiary charges
- counterchanging a field treatment across a field and ordinary
- an annulet with a complex line on only one edge
- birds other than eagles in the displayed posture
- dragons in the displayed posture
- jessant-de-lys with any charge other than the head of a leopard or lion
- the head of a leopard or lion jessant of any charge other than a fleur-de-lys
- ululant (howling) posture
- a central charge on a gyronny arrondi field

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix H: Low-Contrast Complex Lines of Division

All combinations of tinctures which have good contrast (as defined in A.3.B.2) are allowed with plain line and complex lines of division.

Combinations that share a background tincture (e.g. *argent* and *ermine*) are not allowed.

Combinations of tinctures which do not have good contrast and do not share a background tincture are allowed for:

- Plain lines of division
- Complex lines of division if the armory is field-primary

Fields with low-contrast tinctures separated by complex lines of division may be obscured by primary charges. Thus, divided fields with low-contrast tinctures with complex lines of division will be registered with an overlying charge only if the identity of the line of division is clear.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix I: Charge Group Theory

The style and conflict rules are built around the idea of a charge group. A charge group is a group of charges of approximately the same size and visual weight that act as a single visual unit. This idea of explicitly organizing an armorial design in terms of charges groups is not a period heraldic idea, but a modern SCA invention. It is our attempt to codify what we see happening artistically, stylistically, and for cadencing in medieval armory.

Charges that are held by, suspended from, or are otherwise touching another charge fall into two categories. Those that are large enough to be of equal weight with the charge holding them are called sustained charges and are considered to be part of the same charge group as the charge holding them. Those that are smaller we call maintained charges and treat as artistic details. Maintained charges are described below in more detail.

A. Primary Charge Group: The primary charge group is the charge or group of charges which are directly on the field in the visual center of the shield. Not every device has a primary charge, but most do. The primary charge group will typically be the largest charge or charges on the field.

If the armory has at least one central ordinary, they are the primary charge group. This is true even if there are other charges around it or the ordinaries are drawn narrowly. If there are no central ordinaries and the armory has a central charge or charges, they are the primary charge group. This is true even if the charges are on opposite sides of a field division. If there are no central ordinaries or central charges, but there are semy of charges on the field, those charges are the primary charge group. If there are two or more charges of similar visual weight or size in the center of the field which are touching, they are sustained and all part of the primary charge group.

In armory with a divided field, there are two potential situations. Either each of the charges is entirely in a single section of the field, or one or more charges overlie the line(s) of division. In the first situation, the charges are collectively the primary charge group. This is true even when the bottom charge is drawn larger than the others, as this is common in period depictions. This is true even when one of the divisions contains semy of charges. This is true even if you use blazon terms like "in chief" or the line of division is blazoned as "enhanced". In the second situation, where one or more charges overlie the line of division, those charges are the primary charge group and the other ones are in a secondary charge group.

A peripheral ordinary (chief, base, bordure, orle, etc.) can never be a primary charge. If there are only peripheral ordinaries (or no charges whatsoever) in a piece of armory, it is known as field-primary armory. Field-primary armory is discussed in A.3.B.2 below, and has special conflict rules as described in A.6.F and A.6.G.1. However, if there are no central ordinaries or central charges, but there are non-ordinary charges in chief, in base, in canton, or in orle, they are the primary charge group.

B. Secondary Charge Group: A secondary charge group is a single charge or group of charges directly on the field around the primary charges. Therefore, you cannot have a secondary charge group without a primary charge group to surround, except in field-primary armory. In general, secondary charge groups will be drawn smaller than the primary charge group.

Several kinds of secondary charge groups can occur together in a design. Armorial designs with multiple secondary charge groups must generally match a pattern for period arrangement of charge groups.

Types of secondary charges include:

1. Peripheral Ordinary: This type of secondary charge group consists only of peripheral ordinaries: the chief, the bordure, the base (including the point pointed), the quarter, the canton, the gyron, the orle, the double tressure, the tierce, and flaunches.
2. Semy: This type of secondary charge group consists of charges strewn over all or over one part of a field. Charges semy are almost always in a separate charge group from all other charges. However, when a divided field (with or without a central ordinary) has a semy of charges (or charges semy) on one half of the field and another charge or group of charges on the other, the charges form a single secondary charge group around the primary ordinary.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

3. Cotises, Endorses, Etc.: This type of secondary charge group consists of charges that tightly mirror the line of a primary ordinary but are slimmer.

4. Other Types of Charges: Other kinds of secondary charge groups exist. They may consist of a single charge in canton, a group of three charges around an ordinary, and the like.

C. Tertiary Charge Group: A tertiary charge group is a charge or group of charges which are entirely on another charge and are not on the field themselves. Tertiary charges may be found on other types of charge groups, including an overall charge group, but not on maintained charges.

A single charge group may only have one tertiary charge group on it. However, a piece of armory may have different tertiary charge groups on different underlying charge groups. Charges on tertiary charges are known as quaternary charges and are not allowed, unless documented as an Individually Attested Pattern.

D. Overall Charge Group: 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. The underlying charge is the primary charge, while the overlying charge is an overall charge. There can be only one overall charge group in any design. In period heraldry the overall charge is almost always a bend.

An overall charge must overlie a primary charge; if there is no other primary charge, there is no reason to refer to a charge as "overall". An overall charge must have a significant portion on the field; a design with a charge that has only a little bit sticking over the edges of an underlying charge is known as "barely overall" and is not registerable. We do not allow overall charges to overlie peripheral ordinaries, except as an Individually Attested Pattern.

E. Maintained Charges: Charges that are held by, suspended from, or are otherwise touching another charge fall into two categories. Those that are large enough to be of equal weight with the charge holding them are considered to be part of the same charge group (primary, secondary, overall) as the charge holding them. We call these sustained charges. Those that are smaller we treat as artistic details. They are not part of any charge group. They do not contribute to difference for conflict purposes. They are allowed to violate the contrast rules, though they must have some contrast so that they can remain identifiable. Despite that, they contribute to complexity count, because they still add to visual complexity. We call these charges maintained charges.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix J: Documented and Forbidden Arrangements of Charge Groups on Armory

This appendix describes arrangements of charge groups that are documented, as well as a few that are not allowed. Other arrangements must be documented.

All designs with a single charge group are presumed to be registerable except those listed below.

All designs with two charge groups are presumed to be registerable except those listed below. New designs may be ruled unregistrable from time to time, if they cannot be found in period armory.

Designs with One or Two Charge Groups that We Don't Allow (barring evidence that they were used in period):

- A design with charges only in sinister chief and in central base and variants (like in chief and dexter base)

All designs with three or more charge groups on the field must be documented to be registerable. A list of groupings that have been documented is listed below.

Designs with Three or More Charge Groups On the Field that Have Been Documented:

- A central ordinary, a secondary charge group around the ordinary (semy or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary
- A central ordinary, a secondary charge group around the ordinary (semy or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with a tertiary charge group on the central ordinary
- A central ordinary, a secondary charge group around the ordinary (semy or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with a tertiary charge group on the peripheral ordinary
- A central ordinary, a secondary charge group around the ordinary (semy or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with tertiary charge groups on both the central and peripheral ordinary
- A central ordinary, cotises or endorses, and another secondary charge group
- A central ordinary, cotises or endorses, and another secondary charge group, with a tertiary charge group on the central ordinary
- A primary charge group, a secondary charge group around the primary charge group (semy, in orle, or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary
- A primary charge group, a secondary charge group around the primary charge group (semy, in orle, or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with a tertiary charge group on the primary charge group
- A primary charge group, a secondary charge group around the primary charge group (semy, in orle, or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with a tertiary charge group on any ordinaries
- A primary charge group, a secondary charge group around the primary charge group (semy, in orle, or numbered charges), and a peripheral ordinary, with tertiary charge groups on the primary charge group and any ordinaries
- A primary charge group, any type of secondary charge group, and an overall charge (a label only can be overall and in chief)
- A primary charge group, any type of secondary charge group, and an overall charge (a label only can be overall and in chief), with a tertiary charge group on the primary charge group
- A primary charge group, any type of secondary charge group, and an overall charge (a label only can be overall and in chief), with a tertiary charge group on any ordinary
- A primary charge group, any type of secondary charge group, and an overall charge (a label only can be overall and in chief), with a tertiary charge group on the primary charge group and any ordinary

Other arrangements of charge groups must be individually documented.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix K: Standard Arrangements for Charge Groups of Different Number

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.

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.

List of Standard Arrangements by Number of Charges in a Group:

- For groups with one charge: in chief, in canton, in sinister chief, central, in base
- For groups with two charges: in pale, in fess (whether respectant, facing the same way, or addorsed), in (fess in) chief, in bend, in bend sinister, crossed in saltire
- For groups with three charges: two and one, one and two, in pale, in fess, in (fess in) chief, in bend, in bend sinister, in annulo
- For groups with four or more charges: in cross, in saltire, in pale, in fess, in (fess in) chief, in bend, in bend sinister, semy, in annulo, an orle of charges

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix L: A Partial List of Postures and Orientations

This is a list of postures and orientations that can be used to determine whether two charges or groups of charges conflict or whether there is a distinct change for posture/orientation.

Animate Charges

- A. Quadrupeds: The postures listed within each group generally conflict, though a distinct change may be given for facing to dexter or to sinister.
- rampant, segreant, salient, sejant erect, statant erect
 - passant, statant, courant
 - sejant, sejant erect
 - couchant, dormant
 - sejant erect affronty, sejant affronty
- B. Birds: The postures listed within each group generally conflict, though a distinct change may be given for facing to dexter or to sinister.
- close, naiant
 - displayed, migrant
 - volant
 - rousant, rising, striking
- C. Insects and Other Tergiant-Default Creatures: This category is for insects and other creatures whose default is tergant. The postures listed within each group generally conflict.
- tergant
 - tergant inverted
 - bendwise
 - bendwise sinister
- D. Fish: The postures listed within each group generally conflict, though a distinct change may be given for facing to dexter or to sinister.
- haurient, urinant
 - naiant
- E. Humanoids: This category is for humans and humanoid monsters. The postures listed within each group generally conflict.
- statant
 - statant affronty
 - mounted on a horse or other creature
- F. Sea creatures and other Erect-Default Creatures: This category is for sea creatures and other creatures whose default is erect. The postures listed within each group generally conflict.
- erect
- G. Other Animate Charges: Animate charges with postures that do not fit into these categories may be classified into one of those categories on a case by case basis, or may be ruled to receive complete change of posture against none of them.

The posture is also changed if the orientation is changed from one of these to another (noting that some of these postures are not allowed for some creatures):

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

- head to chief
- bendwise
- bendwise inverted
- bendwise sinister
- bendwise sinister inverted
- fesswise
- fesswise contourny
- head to base

Inanimate Charges

Inanimate charges are split into two types: compact charges and long charges.

Compact charges of different types do not have a distinct change for orientation changes.

Compact charges that are radially symmetric, like roses, mullets, and suns, do not have a distinct change for orientation changes under any circumstances.

Compact charges with a clear top and bottom may have a distinct change for changes when the two orientations are different and on this list:

- top to chief
- bendwise
- bendwise inverted
- bendwise sinister
- bendwise sinister inverted
- fesswise
- fesswise reversed
- top to base

Long charges of different types may have a distinct change for changes that alter the orientation of the long axis of the charge, so

- palewise (upright or inverted)
- bendwise (upright or inverted)
- bendwise sinister (upright or inverted)
- fesswise (to dexter or reversed)

Long charges of identical types may also receive a DC for facing – the change from dexter facing to sinister facing and from upright to inverted – if they have a clearly defined point or head. There is a DC between *a sword palewise* and *a sword palewise inverted*. Long charges may also receive a DC for facing if they have another clearly defined axis, like right and left or up and down. Thus there is a DC between a bow fesswise and a bow fesswise inverted.

Rules for Submissions: The Standards for Evaluation of Names and Armory

Appendix M: Some Resources for Conflict Checking

Some notes about conflict and types of charges

In general, two charges that were considered independent charges in period will have at least a distinct change. Charges that were used interchangeably are considered not to have a distinct change for type.

For the most part, the Ordinary lists types of charges that conflict in a single category.

We do not distinguish among types of canines/lupines, because creatures like wolves and foxes or wolves and dogs were often distinguished in period armory based on the cant of the owners name (so *Woulf* would have a wolf, while *Vuhs* would have a fox). The variety of kinds of canines we register also makes it difficult to draw lines between types of dogs.

We do not distinguish among most types of fish for similar reasons.

We do not distinguish among various types of cats because the animals are normally drawn very similarly.

Birds, on the other hand, can be substantially different. Birds fall into four categories:

- "regular-shaped" birds (like martlets, ravens, eagles, falcons)
- swan-shaped birds (like swans, geese, and ducks)
- poultry-shaped birds (like chickens, quail, and peacocks)
- crane-shaped birds (like cranes, herons, and storks)

Birds in a different category can be substantially different in type if they are in two different groups and are in a period posture for that sort of bird (see <http://heraldry.sca.org/loar/2003/11/03-11brd.html> for the list). So, *Sable, a duck close argent* and *Sable, a stork close argent* are clear; both are also clear of *Sable, a falcon close argent*.

Dragons and wyverns were considered artistic variants of the same beast in period armory. Therefore, there is not a DC between them.

Suns, mullets, and estoiles are all in conflict when they have a large number of points (seven or more). There is a DC between them and a default mullet (of five points) or estoile (of six points).

Trees are divided into two categories: regular or round shaped, and fir or pine tree shaped. There is a DC between the two types, when the type is specified. There is not a DC for blasting or eradicating a tree.

Complex lines of division that conflict:

Broadly, complex lines of division fall into several groups. In general, there is a DC between variants that belong to different groups. There is in general a DC between any two lines in the "jagged" group; as research has proved that these lines were common and were considered distinct by period heralds unlike the situation for the "square" group and the "wavy" group. In addition, there is in general a DC between any two lines in the "other" group, as it is a catch-all with no relationship between them. Those listed as "variants of straight line" also conflict with a straight line.

- Straight line variants: plain, ployé, enarched,
- Square: embattled, dovetailed, bretessed, embattled counterembattled, raguly, denticulada
- Wavy: Wavy, nebuly, urdy
- Long: Rayonny
- Jagged: indented, engrailed, invected, dancetty, lozengy
- Other: bevilled, potency, flory-counterflory, indented fleury at the points, left step/right step, rompu, triangular