

**CIHM  
Microfiche  
Series  
(Monographs)**

**ICMH  
Collection de  
microfiches  
(monographies)**



**Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques**

**© 1995**

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/  
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>									

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



National Library of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper cover are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol  $\rightarrow$  (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol  $\nabla$  (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole  $\rightarrow$  signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole  $\nabla$  signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

# MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



4.5



5.0

5.6



6.3


7.1



8.0


9.0

10.0



**APPLIED IMAGE Inc**

1853 East Main Street  
Rochester, New York 14609 USA  
(716) 482 - 0300 - Phone  
(716) 288 - 5989 - Fax



# Le Armiger



---

by  
**Edward Marion Chadwick**

---

Printed for Private Circulation

---

The Church of England Publishing Company,  
Limited  
Toronto, - 1901

Can. Pam.

C

Chadwick, Edward M.

880931

not in C.A.

10.

1790

# Le Armiger

By

Edward Marion Chadwick

Printed for Private Circulation

The Church of England Publishing Company,  
Limited

Toronto, - 1901

Can. Pa

CR191

C42

C

1901

p\*\*\*



CR  
C4  
190

pt.

## ERRATA, ETC.

---

- Pp. 3 and 4, read "plebeian."
- P. 17, line 11, after "number" insert "of coats."
- P. 19, footnote. The reference is to Riddell, a distinguished lawyer and antiquary.
- P. 24, line 11, for "Queen" read "mother."
- P. 25, line 6, read "temp."
- P. 29. Add to footnote. In the preface to *Armorial Families* it is stated that twenty-two Peers, and over thirty Baronets "have no right to the arms they bear"; that is, they bear arms not recorded. But those arms are recognized by peerage authors without question. Foster even describes such arms as unrecorded, and he suggests no question as to their validity.
- P. 34. Since this pamphlet was in print, a copy has reached the writer of a work quite recently published "Studies in Peerage and Family History," by J. Horace Round, from which quotations might have been advantageously made in support of the writer's opinions, though as Mr. Round considers the questions incidentally and not directly, he does not pursue the subject to the same conclusion as the writer.
- P. 35. A correspondent considers that "Solicitors" should be substituted for "barristers-at-law," an opinion in which the writer, upon consideration, concurs.

## The Armiger

---

**I**<sup>n</sup> THE revival of interest in the Science of Heraldry which has taken place during the latter part of the nineteenth century, the question of how people acquire armorial bearings and by what right they use them has naturally come under a good deal of consideration. There is perhaps no heraldic subject which has been so little understood and has been the subject of so much misapprehension. In its consideration a wide difference of opinion has appeared, some maintaining that armorial bearings are honours, and therefore to be acquired only by Royal grant in the same manner as peerages and knighthoods and the like. This opinion has its origin in the continental notion, derived by imitation from the social conditions of ancient Rome, that all persons are divided into two classes, "patricians" or "nobles" and "plebians," and that the patricians or nobles are those who bear arms and the plebians

those who do not. That such a notion, in modern times at any rate, must inevitably lead to absurdities is evident. It is one which does not prevail in England, where the "patrician" and "plebian" are unknown, and none are accounted "noble" excepting peers. It is true there are some who assert the contrary, but it is merely fanciful assertion unsupported by any facts of difference in blood or circumstances attending social conditions. There is not, and never has been, any servile class in England, or any distinction caused by difference of nationality or origin except during the period after the Norman "conquest"; but as Normans and Saxons were near akin they soon became fused into one people; and since then the English people have been of but one blood and the only distinction between classes is that which is caused by individual circumstances. Any person may rise from the bottom of the social scale to a higher place, and no "ennobling" is required to enable him to do so.\*

---

\*As the assertion of a royal prerogative in respect of arms is founded upon the continental idea that armorials are honours, it may be interesting to note that in "The Last Colonel of the Irish Brigade," (London, Kegan Paul & Co., 1892. Vol. ii., p. 73), apropos of difficulties experienced by Colonel O'Connell at the Court of the King of France, with regard to the rules of Court etiquette and Court privileges, Ross O'Connell, apparently a herald of some skill, explains that

Many of those who maintain the opinion that arms can be borne only by Royal grant probably do so more as a matter of expediency than as a matured and well-founded opinion, no doubt considering it advisable to uphold the authority of the officers of arms, and to require that all armorial matters should pass under the cognizance of such officers. In these pages it is proposed to consider matters as they are, and not as either the writer or any other person may think that they ought to be.

**A**rms ARE borne by four titles, viz. :  
 inheritance, grant, transfer,  
 and assumption. The mention of the last will no doubt be greeted by some readers with a note of interrogation, but the explanation of the term, and the reason for its use, will appear subsequently. In mentioning such titles it is usual to include prescription, although some regard that as debatable, but it

---

a distinction was made between *Pairie* (anglice, nobility), and *Noblesse* (anglice, gentlemen), as clear,—and the same—as between peers and gentlemen-commoners in England. He says: "The King in France was the fountain of hereditary title, but not the fountain of noblesse." In other words, the creation of noblesse, even by the King's patent, did not proceed from the "Fountain of Honour." The rank of noblesse might be attained independently of any royal act, as in the case of one "ignoble" attaining to public office of sufficient importance to confer the social grade of noblesse, by the mere fact of tenure.

is here omitted because prescription is founded upon and necessarily derived from inheritance, and forms but a branch of that source or manner of title.

Armorial bearings are a  
**Inheritance** freehold of inheritance descending from father to son.

And here we may observe a material difference between heraldic insignia and "honours," properly so-called, for the latter, if not for the life only of the possessor, descend to one person only, to the exclusion of all others, except only in the case of falling into abeyance, which, however, is not really an exception, for one only of the coheirs can inherit, and the abeyance only exists until that one is indicated. But heraldic insignia descend to all the sons of the possessor, and to all his daughters also; but in the case of the latter for life only, unless the male descent fails. According to strict heraldic rule when armorials descend to brothers, all but the eldest should assume differences, but this rule is nowhere observed except in Scotland, where cadets are forbidden to use or display their arms until they have been "matriculated" or entered in the office of

Lyon King of Arms, when a proper difference is assigned. But there are few Scottish cadets who consider themselves under obligation to comply with this rule. It is confidently asserted that Scottish heraldry rigidly reserves to the male representative of each family the exclusive right to the undifferenced family coat, and that no Scottish arms of cadets are recognized unless duly differenced. Two instances occur to the writer where this rule has not been observed. The arms of Munro of Foulis, chief of the name, are, *Or, an eagle's head erased gu.* These arms without difference were borne by a cadet of another branch of that family, Sir Hector Munro, installed Knight of the Bath 1779. The arms of Strachan of Glenkindie are, *As., a stag trippant or, attired and unguled gu.* The same arms are recorded as borne in 1776 by William Strachan, a cadet of another branch, that of Thornton; and in 1839 by Bishop Strachan of Toronto. In England and Ireland differences are formally assigned where a new branch of a family arises, and desires official recognition, and such differences are assigned with but slight regard to nearness or otherwise of relationship to the previously

recorded possessor of the arms. In the case of descent of armorials to the daughters, they all take alike and without regard to seniority. If, and so long as, they have a brother or descendants of a brother, they only bear the arms for life, but if they have no brother, or having had a brother and all his descendants male and female have failed, then they bear the arms as a freehold of inheritance and transmit them to their own descendants. A woman thus bearing arms is heraldically known as an heiress. Her husband bears her arms on an escutcheon of pretence, and her children bear them quartered with their paternal coat.

Heraldic purists strenuously dispute the right to bear arms by prescription, and, while admitting that such right is recognized by Irish practice, assert that no arms can exist in England which have escaped notice in the course of the Heralds' Visitations.\* Although such assertion is by no means conclusive, it may be passed over for the present.

\*And, consequently, that no arms can be borne by a valid title unless officially recorded. But a writer in the "Contemporary Review" (Vol. 76 p. 257) mentions two instances of unrecorded arms borne by heraldic grants, one dated 1590, and the other of about the same date.

But it may be observed, *en passant*, that it is tolerably plain that the heralds in their visitations recognized arms prescriptively borne. In Scotland many armorial bearings have been borne by prescription from time immemorial, and are borne to this day in entire disregard of the statute enacted in that kingdom forbidding the bearing of arms unless registered; this statute we shall have occasion to refer to again. In Ireland arms are entered in Ulster's office on proof of user for three generations, but if they are the same as already recorded as borne, either in that or one of the other kingdoms, a proper difference is assigned.

The term "grant" is commonly **Grant** used to signify the assigning of arms by some person in authority; but the expression is not accurate. The Crown "grants" lands, as does also a private person, the lands being already in existence and in the possession of the grantor. The sovereign "creates" a title of honour; *creare est aliquid ex nihilo facere*. Arms newly devised might, perhaps, be better spoken of as "assigned," using that word as a heraldic technical term in the sense of designating or appointing. But as

the word "grant" is commonly employed, it will be convenient to use it in these pages. A grant of arms may be made by the King, or by any officer deputed or appointed by him for that purpose: this much all heralds are agreed upon as a statement which is not open to question; but there is a difference of opinion as to whether any exclusive prerogative in the Crown to make or authorize such grants exists or not. The writer who uses the *nom de plume* of "X" may be presumed to have said, in his work on the Right to Bear Arms, all that can be said in favor of a jurisdiction over armorials being an exclusive royal prerogative, and this he has entirely failed to establish, for he quotes no authority to show that such prerogative has ever exclusively vested in the sovereign, excepting a recital in a grant of arms by Charles I, which was of no validity, and cannot be quoted as a precedent or authority, for much more than such a recital is and was necessary to change the laws of England; that quotation, therefore, does not close the argument or settle the point.

Now the earliest written statement of the heraldic law of England is the famous Boke of

St. Alban's, printed in the first year of the reign of Henry VII, and being supposed to be the printing of a long previously existing manuscript work used in the education of the young gentlemen of England. After stating how arms are borne, firstly by descent; secondly by conquest, a manner then used but now obsolete; the Boke continues, "On the thride maner of wise whe have armys the wich we beere by the graunting of a prince or of sum other lordys," i. e., In the third manner of wise we have arms which we bear by the grant of a prince or some other lord. Here we have a statement which is in effect that any person of prominent position, who in feudal days would have retainers of various degree, might grant arms. This law has never been abrogated or altered. Armorial bearings are theoretically of a military character, and, therefore, it is a reasonable proposition that any person having a military command and power to grant military commissions may, in due consistency with the theory and principles of heraldry, grant arms.\*

\*On this consideration, and in view of the fact that armorial bearings (with certain exceptions) are not "honours," the writer has pointed out, in an article published in an American magazine, that arms might be

This mode of acquiring title to **Transfer** arms is referred to, as the writer is not aware of any good reason for its omission, although it is not now practised, unless, perhaps, by the not unusual condition in wills and settlements requiring a beneficiary to assume the name and arms of the testator or settlor. But there are known instances of persons having transferred their own armorial insignia to others in a manner similar to a conveyance of lands: See Woodward's *Heraldry British and Foreign*, ii, 402.

Now let us again consult **Assumption** the Boke of St. Alban's, and we find the following: "The  
 "faurith maner of whise we have thoos armys  
 "the wich we take on owre awne ppur auctor-  
 "ite. as in theys days opynly we se. how  
 "many poore men by thayr grace favoure lab-  
 "oure or deservyng: ar made nobuls. Sum  
 "by theyr prudens. Sû bi ther mahod. sù  
 "bi ther strength. sù by ther conig. sù bi  
 "od vtuous. And of theys men mony by theyr  
 "awne autorite have take armys to be borne

granted to American citizens who should desire to acquire them in an official manner, by the President of the United States, and, concurrently within his own State, by each State Governor.

"to theym and to ther hayris of whoom it  
 "nedys not here to reherse ye namys. Nev  
 "the lees armys that be so takyn they may  
 "lefully and frely beer. Bot yit they be not  
 "of so grete dignyte and autorite as thoos  
 "armys the wich ar grauntyt day by day by  
 "the autorite of a prynce or of a lorde. Yet  
 "armys bi a mannys propur auctorite take: if  
 "an other man have not borne theym afore:  
 "be of strength enogh." It is interesting to  
 add the paragraph of the Boke immediately  
 following the above: "And it is the opynyon  
 "of moni men that an herrod of armis may  
 "gyve armys. Bot I say if any sych armys  
 "be borne by any herrod gyvyn that thoos  
 "armys be of no more auctorite then thoos  
 "armys the wich be take by a mannys  
 "awne auctorite." In modern language the  
 above is as follows: The fourth manner of  
 wise we have those arms which we take on  
 our own proper authority; as in these days  
 openly we see how many poor men by their  
 grace, favour, labour, or deserving, are made  
 nobles (i.e., rise in the social scale), some by  
 their prudence, some by their manliness, some  
 by their strength, some by their cunning (i.e.,

knowledge or skill), some by other virtues. And of these men, many by their own authority have taken arms to be borne to them and their heirs, of whom it needs not here to rehearse the names. Nevertheless, arms that are so taken they may lawfully and freely bear. But yet they are not of so great dignity and authority as those arms which are granted day by day by the authority of a prince or of a lord. Yet arms by man's proper (i.e., own) authority taken, if another man have not borne them before, are of validity enough. And it is the opinion of many men that a herald of arms may give arms. But I say, if any such arms be borne by any herald given, that those arms are of no more authority than those arms which are taken by a man's own authority.

Here we have a voice, plain and unequivocal, from the palmy days of heraldry in England.

Five years before the book quoted was published (or rather republished, the modern edition being a fac-simile of an original black-letter copy, reproduced by photographic process), the writer contributed an article on heraldry

to *The Week*, in which he ventured the opinion that arms might be assumed by any person of his own will, provided two rules were observed, viz: the arms must be properly heraldic in design and character; and they must not be the same as, or so similar as to be confounded with, arms already borne by some other person. The observations then made by the writer are closely and quite curiously paralleled by the passage quoted. The opinions expressed, and which at the time required some little courage to put forth, were arrived at after careful consideration of the subject, the writer, however, retaining an open mind and being prepared to accept any good and well founded statement to the contrary, until the appearance of "X's" work, which seemed to him to fail so completely in establishing a contrary opinion, that a perusal of it only tended to confirm the views of the writer, who is now able to quote in support of such views an authority which seems to him to be conclusive.

It will be urged, no doubt, that a recognition of the liberty to persons to assume arms as they please, will lead to heraldic chaos; but

that is not the result of experience, for it is a fact which cannot be disputed that many persons have assumed arms, within the past century at the least, and we do not find any such arms (borne by private persons) of an incongruous or non-heraldic character, for those arms which are of such description have, in fact, been devised by professional heralds and formally granted. It is, of course, very desirable that all arms should be officially registered, but the question of expediency is one thing and the actual state of the law is another. The opinions which may be held by one person or many persons as to what is expedient does not make law.

Those who maintain that arms **Honours** may be, granted only by the King or those authorized by him, found their strongest argument on the assertion that armorial bearings are "honours," and therefore proceed from the Fountain of honour. But this is altogether fallacious. Armorials may be and often have been honours conferred as such in particular cases, such as honourable augmentations, and certain coats which have been especially conferred to

mark or record some famous exploit of the bearer. It is one of the common delusions regarding heraldic matters that all arms are what may be termed historic memorials, and many legends have been invented to fit particular coats, but such stories are in most cases mere fairy tales, and the fact is that memorial arms are quite exceptional, and there are very few which can be so classed with any reasonable certainty or even probability. Compared with the vast number (certainly 25,000, perhaps twice as many), borne in the British Empire, honourable augmentations are extremely rare. It is another delusion which sometimes affects people whose arms are differentiated, that the change in their arms, which they perceive but do not rightly comprehend, is an honourable augmentation. Supporters, as they are usually accessories to the arms of a nobleman, and are inherited with the title, approach nearly to the status of honours; but not altogether so, because they are frequently borne by corporations (such, for example, as the Hudson's Bay Company, the East India Company, and various others); and in modern times they have come to be regarded

as proper accessories to arms of colonial governments, e.g., Cape Colony, long borne, but only lately granted, or perhaps rather recognized, for the grant has been made in an exceptional manner; also British Columbia, where the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, about five years ago, assumed arms as an official act, with supporters.

There is another consideration **Custom** bearing upon the question of the right to assume arms, which must receive attention. Long established custom has the force of law. Disregarding the chivalric era, which has spoken to us through the Boke of St. Alban's, and passing over the Stuart and Georgian period. of heraldic debasement,\* it is now a long established custom, or practice of widely spread usage, to bear arms which are unknown to the Heralds' College. There is no law or authority in England or Ireland which can interfere with or prevent any person bearing arms by an assumptive title. If

---

\* Those periods are well described by Boutell (English Heraldry, p. 9), who observes: "No nonsense appeared too extravagant and no fable too wild, to be engrafted upon the grave dignity of the Heralds' early science," and that science was "brought into disrepute, and even into contempt, by the very persons who loved it with a genuine but most unwise love."

any herald should attempt in these days to impose upon any person any indignity because he chose to bear arms of his own devising, it is the herald whom the law would punish, and not the other.

All persons in England who use armorial bearings are required to obtain a license to do so, and to pay an annual tax; and anyone infringing the law in this respect is liable to a fine. But it must be observed that the Court which imposes the fine makes no enquiry as to the right or title which the bearer has to the armorials he uses, but only as to the fact of the use, and the non-payment of the tax.

In the foregoing observations we have made some exceptions with regard to Scotland, for here the right to bear arms has been the subject of parliamentary enactment. In 1662 an act was passed forbidding "cadents," or cadets, to bear arms unless matriculated and differenced, but this act was repealed in the following year. Ten years later another act\*

\* This Act was pronounced in 1818 by an "eminent legal antiquary to be "now nearly obsolete." Seaton's Scottish Heraldry, p. 67.

ordered all persons using arms to give in description of them, with their lineage, to the Lyon Clerk, so that they might be registered, and that after a year and a day no one should "use any other armes." With regard to this enactment we may observe, firstly, that it was passed in the period of heraldic decadence; and secondly, that it has been, and is, more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and it is arguable that it has become effete by reason of long non-observance—but on this point the writer does not venture a definite opinion; and thirdly, that it is not in force out of Scotland.

In the preamble of the Act referred to it is recited that "many have assumed to themselves armes who should bear none, and many of those who may in law bear have assumed to themselves ye armes of their Chieff without distinctions, or armes which were not carried by them or their predicesors." The Statute unmistakably recognizes arms borne by prescription—in view of Scottish, and especially Highland, social history, it could not possibly do otherwise—so that the meaning of the reference to those assum-

ing arms "who should bear none" is not very clear. Read together with some following references in the Statute to those "who may in law bear," we may possibly have some suggestion of the notion, sometime prevalent, which connected the bearing of arms with possession of land; or perhaps it may be a vague shadow of the French ideas which had been introduced into Scotland. That it can be intended to refer to any previously defined law or regulation regarding the acquisition and use of armorials is negatived by the whole tenor of the Statute.

Whether the act is still in force or not, it is, at any rate, still the heraldic rule in Scotland that "cadents" or cadets must matriculate their arms and procure differences to be assigned to them; and this rule is also applied whenever the opportunity occurs, in case of persons of Scottish descent living in the Colonies. Thus, upon a title being conferred upon any such person, it becomes necessary for him to matriculate his arms. Except in such cases there is nothing to prevent any one of Scottish descent living in the Colonies from using the arms of his family as freely as those of other origin may do.

The consideration of this subject unavoidably requires notice of "The Right to Bear Arms," lately put forth by "X" (to which reference has already been made), and of which a second edition has been issued by him, probably because he has been conscious that the first failed to establish his contention, a position which the second does not greatly amend. It may be advantageous to refer very briefly to two or three of the more important arguments or evidences which he adduces. "X," while without hesitation declaring the Judges of the Courts of Law to be incompetent to adjudicate upon heraldic matters, when their decisions are against his opinions, quotes certain cases which he considers to support his contention, but which on examination do not at all appear to do so. For example, *Joicey-Cecil v. Joicey-Cecil* (p. 146), in which a testator imposed a condition of the taking of his name and arms, and on the occasion for doing so arising, it was discovered that the arms used by the testator were wrongfully used, being those of another person, and consequently could not

be assumed in compliance with the direction, and it appearing that the testator never used or claimed any other arms, it was held that the condition so far as concerned arms was ineffective and compliance with it not requisite. This case goes no farther than to declare the law that one man cannot acquire title to the armorials of another by assuming or using them. The ancient and oft-quoted contest between Scrope and Grosvenor (p. 40), was also decided upon the principle that one having used certain arms another could not adopt the same or a similar coat. "X" refers to this case as supporting his contentions of an exclusive royal prerogative, which it does not do, but rather the reverse.

Much stress is laid by "X" upon a warrant of K. Charles II, which he quotes (p. 48), granting to a certain person and his wife authority to assume a certain surname and arms, reciting in the document that "neither of which may regularly be done according to the laws of arms without the special dispensation and license of us, as we are by Our Supreme power and prerogative the only fountain of honour." Such a recital

could not override or alter previously existing law or create a new law. Its value may be gauged, firstly, by the fact that the Stuarts brought into England notions of the Royal prerogative which the English people would not accept, as the troubles of that period amply attest; they were for four generations or more closely intimate with the Court of France, where such notions prevailed to the fullest extent; and Charles II himself lived for twelve years in France, and his Queen was a French princess; secondly, this was the period of heraldic decadence, in which all sorts of absurdities were foisted upon heraldry, leading to the utter debasement into which it fell in the ensuing Georgian period; and, thirdly, the law of England regarding changes of name has been plainly declared by judicial decision to be that anyone who chooses, and does so in good faith, may change his name of his own accord;\* therefore if the recital in K. Charles' warrant has not made a change of name illegal or irregular, neither has it made the assumption of arms, not being those of

---

\*Changes of name by persons of their own will are very frequent in England. They are usually notified in the *London Gazette*.

another person, illegal or irregular; both things are in the same category.

In the opinion of the writer the strongest evidence brought forward by "X" in support of his contention, is the early heraldic visitation (tenp. Henry VIII) where the King of Arms is commissioned to examine armorials in his province and to deface, etc., arms improperly borne, and to inflict dire punishments and indignities upon offenders; for at this time the debasement of heraldry had only begun. But the tenor of such commissions does not seem to be really more than the grandiloquent language of the period, for, as "X" shows, the actual execution of their powers by the visiting heralds was done in a very mild-mannered way. It will be well to observe, too, that the heralds were commissioned not only to regulate armorials, but also "to reforme and comptroll" the mourning to be worn at funerals, and in various ways to interfere with the liberties of the King's lieges in a manner which would certainly not be tolerated in a later age—and probably were not generally submitted to even in Tudor times.

The attitude of the heralds in their visita-

tions, while positively picturesque in its terribleness to the contumacious, was most lenient in its practice to the more amenable. And while they maintained an appearance of requiring the very strictest evidence of right to armorial bearings found in use, and of laying down rigid rules by which such right must be determined, in their actual practice they made confirmations easily obtainable by those whose evidence fell short of the standard—even to the extent of gauging their "fees" by the depth of purse of the visited. And in this respect they did right, and their actions were more in accordance with true heraldry than their words. Indeed, it is evident that the heralds themselves often had a truer appreciation of heraldry (and surely have still, though etiquette does not permit them to say so) than their unprofessional advocates.

But the writer has no intention to go through "X's" work and refute his arguments or point out his fallacies; time and space at his disposal will not permit, for it would require a volume to do so fully; and it is needless, because generally speaking the arguments are inconclusive, and the fallacies obvious;

every one of his arguments is capable of easy refutation, and his evidences may all be explained, and sometimes, indeed, shown to lead to conclusions quite different from those he wishes to establish.

But the proclamation of Henry V, which he mentions (p. 44), deserves attention. In order to support his arguments "X" sets out this document under the heading of "Writ of Henry V regulating coat armour," which is misdescriptive and misleading, for it is no more than an order that the persons to be enrolled for a certain service must be those who have borne arms previous to that time, and that those who assume armorials for the occasion are not to be admitted. In a later page (199) "X," more suo,\* refers again to the writ quoted, stating that "Henry V decreed that arms borne "without authority were to be stripped off and "broken up," a statement which the document does not support; "without authority" is "X's" rendering, and is not the language or effect of the original. The translation of the docu-

---

\*The very characteristic method of argument—if it can be called argument—which "X" employs, was pretty severely criticised in the article in the *Contemporary Review*, to which we have already had occasion to refer. The article, which is cleverly written, virtually tears "X" and all his opinions to tatters.

ment is also coloured in order to bring it into seeming harmony with "X's" opinions; e.g. "status" is translated "rank," which is a forced rendering. So far from being a "decree" forbidding the assumption of arms, the writ is evidence of the fact that arms were granted and assumed without any act on the King's part.

It is, no doubt, quite unconsciously that "X" furnishes evidence which overthrows the very contention which Mr. Fox-Davies, the editor of "Armorial Families," who writes in the same strain as "X," (and is generally supposed to be the same person), strenuously insists upon, and which is indeed the key of their position, namely, that no person can be a "gentleman," either in theory or in fact, unless he possesses a coat of arms by actual grant to himself, or can prove descent from an armorial ancestor. He prints (p. 113) a copy of a grant of arms made in 1885 to a man and his wife, who of course up to the moment the official seal was attached to the grant, must, upon the theory referred to, have been absolutely wanting in the condition of gentility, and their parents of course no better; never-

theless the grant itself with due solemnity describes the grantees as the son of "S. F. of etc., *gentleman, deceased*," and the daughter of "T. P. of etc., *gentleman, deceased*."

Professional heralds are understood to be precluded by the **Heraldic Opinion** etiquette of their office from publicly expressing opinions on such

a question as that now under consideration, so what their views are can only be surmised. It may be noted, however, that Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, in his work on Colonial Gentry recognizes many coats of arms as used, which are not recorded.\*

In Seton's "Scottish Heraldry" there is a paragraph (p. 86) which contains what may be assumed to be the opinions of three successive heralds of acknowledged authority, namely, the writer himself, as he quotes with seeming approval, firstly, Nisbet, a well-known writer of about the beginning of the Eighteenth Century, and secondly, Camden, a professional herald. The paragraph is as follows:—

\* For so doing, Sir Bernard Burke was roundly abused in print by "X," but Mr. Fox-Davies (alias "X") himself was afterwards constrained to take note, in "Armorial Families," of arms as "used." Among these there is one rather notable instance, namely, the arms of Viscount Lisimore, which have been recognized in all peerages, but are referred to as not recorded. Lord Lisimore's family is a very ancient one, and the arms are undoubtedly ancient.

"Besides an elaborate chapter in his larger  
 "work, the laborious Nisbet has produced a  
 "separate treatise entitled 'An Essay on Addi-  
 "tional Figures and Marks of Cadency, shew-  
 "ing the ancient and modern practice of differ-  
 "encing descendants, in this (Scotland) and  
 "other Nations.' Towards the commencement  
 "of the volume he introduces the following  
 "advice of the learned Camden, Clarenceux  
 "King of Arms in England:—'No gentleman  
 "ought to bear the differences in Armories  
 "otherwise than the office of Armorie requir-  
 "eth, and when younger brethren do marry,  
 "erect and establish new Houses, and accord-  
 "ingly do bear their Arms with such a dis-  
 "tinction and difference that they might be  
 "known from the families from which they are  
 "descended, the King-of-Arms ought to be  
 "consulted withal, and such differences of  
 "houses are to be assigned and established by  
 "his privity and consent, that so he may ad-  
 "vise them best and keep record thereof; oth-  
 "erwise, gentlemen, by taking unfit brisures,  
 "may either prejudge themselves or the prin-  
 "cipal houses they are come of.' 'This advice,'  
 "adds Nisbet, 'is congruous to our law, and

"consonant to the principles of prudence and  
 "reason; and I wish from my heart that our  
 "gentry may take more heed to this than  
 "hitherto they have done, and may apply to  
 "the Lyon office for suitable differences, and  
 "not assume them at their own hand, or by  
 "the advice of some presumptuous sciolist,  
 "whereby oftentimes their posterity suffer pre-  
 "judice."

This plainly recognizes the fact of the as-  
 sumption and use of armorials without the aid  
 of those in authority, and does not suggest  
 that a breach of any law is thereby committed;  
 though expressing a desire for heraldic acts  
 being done under competent advice—in which,  
 no doubt, all persons will agree.

Dr. Woodward, perhaps the most learned  
 writer on heraldic matters of recent time, in  
 his "Ecclesiastical Heraldry" (p. 22), says:

"In our own country (Great Britain) men  
 "of all ranks have always been eligible for  
 "the highest ecclesiastical positions, and on  
 "obtaining them have often, down to the pre-  
 "sent day, assumed armorial bearings for use  
 "upon their seals, etc., though frequently  
 "the connection of the prelate with the family

" whose arms were adopted was, to say the  
 " least, extremely difficult of proof. Occa-  
 " sionally permission to use their arms was  
 " sought by the Prelate from the head and  
 " other members of the family to which he  
 " desired to attach himself. In France, and  
 " probably in other countries, it is usual for a  
 " Bishop to invent for himself a coat of  
 " arms, if he is not entitled by birth to bear  
 " one."

And again (p. 81): " I have alluded to the  
 " practice by which a Bishop who possessed  
 " no armorial bearings by inheritance generally  
 " assumed for himself either a coat borne by a  
 " family of the same name, from whom he  
 " supposed he might have descended; or, and  
 " with much greater propriety, an entirely new  
 " coat; and this is the custom still both among  
 " Anglican Bishops and those of the Roman  
 " obedience."

In this work Dr. Woodward describes and  
 illustrates many arms of modern Sees, espe-  
 cially Colonial, which are officially unknown  
 to the Heralds' College, and these are so  
 shown *pari passu* with more ancient Episco-  
 pal armorials.

Dr. Woodward, as he informed the writer,\* purposed writing a treatise on the Law and Practice of Heraldry, and had collected material for the work, but he died before its completion, to the great loss of heraldic literature, to which such a work by so eminent and able a writer would have been a valuable contribution. It is, of course, impossible to say what the contents of such a book might have been, but the writer has good reason to believe that it would have been widely different in substance, as it undoubtedly would have been in manner of expression, from "The Right to Bear Arms" ("X") and "Armorial Families" (Fox-Davies).

Since the foregoing pages went into the printer's hands, the writer has obtained a copy of Hulme's "Heraldry" (2nd ed. 1897; an excellent work), in which he finds inserted at full length, the passages in the Boke of St. Alban's on the manner in which arms were acquired and rights by which they were borne, of which

\*As this little work is written for friends, and not for the general public, the writer may be pardoned for mentioning that it was his good fortune to have carried on a correspondence on heraldic subjects with Dr. Woodward; and also the fact that the learned Doctor in the last edition of his principal work ("Heraldry, British and Foreign," ii, 247) thought proper to refer to the writer's heraldic work in a manner which, though expressed in the briefest of sentences, he has always felt to be a high compliment.

the part immediately relating to the subject now under consideration are quoted in a previous page of this work. Hulme discreetly refrains from expressing any opinion of his own, but as he allows the quotations to stand in his work without comment, his silence is eloquent.

Our subject naturally leads to this inquiry being made, **Who may bear Arms?** and it is one which is not very easy to answer. Title by inheritance vests in all descendants of the ancestor, no matter what their social status or condition may be. So that the question is rather, **Who may acquire arms?** the answer to which involves drawing an arbitrary line somewhere between the worthy and the unworthy; and as all will not agree upon how and where such a line should be drawn, the question becomes one of opinion. In forming such an opinion it should be borne in mind that ordinary armorials are not "honours,"—"X" and all his school to the contrary notwithstanding—but merely the insignia by which families may be symbolically or pictorially distinguished from other families. The writer will no doubt be expected to express an opinion, which he

therefore does, but speaking only for himself and in a general way, leaving it to others to concur or not as they may think best. The following are those whom he considers to be of sufficient social degree to appropriately bear arms in Canada: Members of Parliament, and of the Provincial Legislatures; Officers of the civil service of at least the grade of Chief clerk, or, in outside service, of an equivalent grade, such as Collectors of customs in important ports, and Postmasters of the larger cities; Mayors of towns, and Aldermen of cities, Wardens of counties, Sheriffs and Registrars; Professors in the universities, and Masters of arts; Priests of the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches\*—(there is no equivalent line which can be drawn with regard to ministers of other religious bodies, but they will easily find places in other classification); Captains of militia, Lieutenants in the Royal Navy and Royal Naval Reserve, and officers of equivalent rank in the colonial naval services; Barristers-at-law; Doctors of medicine; Civil engineers, Architects,

\*It is held by some heralds that crests being of an especially military character, should not be used by clergymen. Dr. Woodward, however, who was the Rector of a parish of the Scottish Episcopal Church, used a bookplate displaying a full achievement; but as he was the Chaplain of a knightly order, his case may perhaps be regarded as exceptional.

and Land surveyors ; Bankers, wholesale Merchants, and Manufacturers ; Yeomen possessed of lands of the value of \$8,000, and of suitable education, (but not farmers†); and all others who are of liberal education, or of independent means, and of manners so far refined as to admit of their associating on fairly even terms with such persons as are above particularly mentioned.

THE foregoing pages have been written, partly so that the writer may be able to hand to his friends a statement of reasons for opinions which he has expressed in conversation and correspondence, and partly because of a desire to protest, feebly though it may be, against the extravagant and impudent distortions of true heraldry which have been put forth by "X," and (or, alias) Mr. Fox-Davies. The writer does not expect an acceptance of all his views, as deeply-rooted prejudices are not to be

† The "Yeoman" is a freeholder while the "Farmer" is one who holds under another, colloquially termed a "tenant," and therefore clearly inferior in social position to the freeholding yeoman. In Scotland it was enacted in 1400 and 1430 that every freeholder should have his proper seal of arms, for the due execution of documents. (Seton's "Scottish Heraldry," p. 16).

The above qualification of fitness is according to the writer's own ideas of propriety, and that of value of estate is founded upon ancient English ordinances which required that every man, possessed of landed estate of a certain value should become a knight.

overcome by a little pamphlet; nor does he invite such acceptance, for it is to him a matter of small moment whether his views prevail widely or not, excepting so far as they are a vindication of the right of the many thousands of persons who, in perfect good faith, use armorials of which the Heralds' College has no (official) knowledge.

---

*[In case of this work coming into the hands of persons to whom the writer is unknown, it may be well (only lest any supposition of the contrary might be considered to weaken his arguments), to explain that the writer personally is not one of those whose rights he upholds, but is, in fact, a person whom Mr. Fox-Davies names in "Armorial Families," and "guarantees to be genuinely armigerous," and therefore feels that he may command attention when he speaks for those whom Mr. Fox-Davies—most unjustly—refers to in a manner quite as impudent as the expression quoted, and much less polite.]*

## Colonial Public Arms

**A** QUESTION which has especial interest for us in Canada, and which is closely connected with the subject of discussion in this pamphlet, though to be considered from a somewhat different point of view, is that of the powers of colonial governments respecting their own armorials.

Every government, paramount or subordinate, must have a great seal, and therefore has an inherent right to compose, as it may please, the devices to be displayed on such seal. Such devices are heraldic, that is, pictorially symbolic. By the common custom of Christendom, such devices, whether skilfully and tastefully composed or otherwise, are generally, at least, if not quite always, in armorial form. Therefore every government has a generally recognized inherent right to devise arms for its own use. In the case of subordinate governments, such right may be limited by the superior government, but

by some express act and not merely by implication. In the absence of any such express act, the inherent right stands good.

Colonial arms so assumed and borne are expressly recognized by the Admiralty, apart from the seal on which they are borne; the seal, bearing the arms, is, of course, recognized by all authorities.

The question was raised in a case of *Lenoir v. Ritchie*, S.C. III. 575, where the validity of a Nova Scotian patent was challenged on the ground that it was not sealed with the proper Great Seal of the Province. Before the case was disposed of, however, the Parliament of Canada interfered and passed a Declaratory Act, 40 Vic., c. 3, by which it was declared that "the Lieutenant-Governor of each Province in Council has the power of appointing and of altering from time to time the Great Seal of the Province."

In 1895 the Province of British Columbia, by Order-in-Council, assumed a complete achievement, with supporters, which is borne on the Great Seal of the Province.

