

tion, for legal as well as social purposes. Equally true is this of the helmet, crest, mantle or flourish and motto. Supporters, particularly in England, are the part of the coat-of-arms whole, which belongs to those ennobled as a notice to that effect. But in this country there is no reason why they should not be used when inherited. In this country we preach that all men are equal, and long before that doctrine was accepted politically, coat-armor made all men above servants equal. There is absolutely no class or distinction in heraldic bearings, all coat-armor is complete, and finished, and equal, one shield to another, the armes of a king are no more, no less, and no better than those of the poorest commoner of the kingdom. Men have made a distinction as royal, noble, and commoner, but it is a purely personal attribute having no connection or relation with the usage of coat-armor. Indeed, many English and Continental families are far older and of a purer blood than most of the ennobled and royal houses of Europe to-day. In fact, abroad, as here at home, the true nobility of a country is the old families who seek no tinsel distinctions, but are content to be the backbone of the country. And these are the folk who bear coat-armor. In the English roll of armes to-day, there are some sixty-six thousand blazonings. Of these, less than three thousand are in the peerage and baronetage, the others are the gentry or people of England.

In Europe the roll contains over one hundred thousand names, of which not over ten thousand are ennobled with titles. The French considered a gentleman as being noble—indicated by “de”—and all were equal as such—also true of their coat-armor. Their descendants here to-day have the same right as those of English descent. So it is true of the Dutch, German and other settlers from the continent.

Again, we find coat-armor in the earliest times was closely connected with the bearing of surnames, the one begetting the other. These being called *armes parlantes*, *canting armes*, or *armes* which denote through the charge the surname; as castle & lion for Castile and Leon—stand and dish for Standish—sharp fusils for Montacute, Corbeau for Corbet, Herons for Heron, falcon for Falconer, swineherd for Swinbourne, penfeathers for Coupenne, *hironnelles* for Arundell, hammers for Hamerton, cottonhanks for Cotton, oxen for Oxenden, column for Colonna, broken bread for Frangipani, bear for Ursini, suns for Pierson, apples for Appleton, rose for Roosevelt, fox heads for Foxcroft, cranes for Cranstovn, three hands conjoined for Tremaine. Thus is shown the close connection between heraldry and the surname. The latter began with designating the place of residence, abode, occupation and personal attributes.

Not until after the XIII century were surnames established, and almost, if not at the same time, heraldry became a regulated usage. So from the first, *armes* and surnames in Europe have been synonymous for centuries. A man without armor, was one *ignobilis* or non noble—that is, not bearing coat-armor—and it was unnecessary for him to have a surname, as he was either a