de Brewes; and William *de* Poher held of the said Ranulph." In the Red Book text these names are "Ranulfus *le* Poher" and Willelmus Poer" respectively; in the Black Book they are "Ranulphus Poher" and "Willelmus Poher." So too in Leicestershire, Mr. Redmond tells us, "A.D. 1166, Robert *de* Poher held five and a half knights' fees," but in the Red Book he is "Robertus Poer" and in the Black Book "Robertus Poher."

It is quite needless to multiply instances, for the name, as I said, "is very frequently met with in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and in the cases known to me, some scores in number, it is invariably Le Puher or Puher, le Poher or Poher, or Poer." As the name, therefore, has no "De," and is not derived from a locality, no question can arise as to what the locality was. There were certainly "Vicomtes *de* Poher" in Britanny, but it was a "titre simplement honorifique," as the *Comté* of Poher ceased to exist as a separate organisation in 937.[1] The Comtes de Porhöet, on the contrary, were in existence, from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries, and the *Comté* was well known in the twelfth. I concluded, therefore, that Mr. Redmond, when classing "Le Poher" as an "independent" state, referred to it. If, as it seems, he really meant Poher, it brings, as we have seen, the Irish name no nearer a territorial status.

J. H. Round.

"THE GILLMAN OR GILMAN FAMILY."

Although a notice of the above work has already appeared in this magazine, I should like to take the opinion of the readers of *The Genealogist* upon the alleged Welsh origin of this family.

On p. 21 we are told that Richard ap Robert ap Meredydd, "who we have seen in the last chapter took the surname of Gylmyn, becoming Richard Gylmyn after his ancestor Cilmin, came to London, and joined the Yeomen of the Guard in the early part of Henry VIII's or end of Henry VII's reign." There is no doubt that Richard Gylmyn was a Yeoman of the Guard in 1537, when he was promoted to be Yeoman of the Chamber. The real question is, was he a Welshman? The only evidence is a sheet pedigree, the authority for which is the "Heraldic Visitation of Wales," by Lewis Dwnn in 1586, "The Report of Henry VII's Commissioners," *circa* A.D. 1490, and Caradoc's "History of Wales," written *circa* A.D. 1150. The pedigree, as printed in the work, begins with Coel[2] Godeboc, King of Britain, and Duke of Colchester *circa* A.D. 300, whose daughter Helena married Constantius Chlorus, Governor of Britain, A.D. 292, who died at York A.D. 306, and was mother of Constantine, the Roman Emperor, 306-337 A.D. (Helena, the mother of Constantine, is usually said to have been a native of Bithynia, but this view is swept away by Mr. Gillman

[1] *Nouveau Dictionaire de Geographie Universelle* (1890).
[2] No doubt the King Cole whose jollity is recorded in the ballad.

in a footnote.) This pedigree, of which the earlier parts are, of course, beneath criticism, seems the chief evidence that can be offered of Richard Gylmyn being of Welsh descent. It shows (p. 15) sixty-eight generations previous to Coel Godebroc, tracing him to Brutus, grandson of Aeneas, of the Aenid, but these seem to have been dropped by the author (why I cannot see, for if a pedigree is right, one end of it ought to be as good as the other), who mainly depends on an extract from the Cambrian Register, pub. 1796, which alleges that Robert ap Meredydd, "a wise gentleman who lived in the time of Henry VII" was the ancestor of a family of Glynne, whose arms are the same as those of Gilman, and especially bore their arms, *the man's leg couped sa;* and on p. 5, we are told that Arthur Gilman, a former writer on the pedigree, "bases his opinion that the Gilmans are descended from the Cilmin Troed-dhu, from the fact that the Norfolk Gilmans have always borne as their coat of arms *a man's leg coupé a la cuisse;* the same as borne by Cilmin Troed-dhu." On the same page, we are told that this Cilmin Troed-dhu, who bore coat armour, lived in the year 843, which will be sufficient even for smatterers in heraldry to show the absurdity of the whole thing; and again, the Yeoman of the Guard's family did not bear any arms, for they obtained a *Grant* (not a Confirmation) see p. 33.

Besides, coming to the other end of the argument, the Gilmans of Norfolk never were entitled to bear arms, and never had a grant of them. They only began to use unauthorised arms about the year 1724 at Hingham. The first time they used arms was when Hester, wife of Samuel Gilman, and daughter of William Le Neve, was buried in 1724. One cannot help thinking that one of the Le Neves found the coat of arms for them, having no doubt, followed the bad old custom of turning up an ordinary and assuming the arms of the family whose surname sounded the nearest to their own. Examples of this may be multiplied *ad nauseam*, *i.a.*, the ancestor of Blomefield, the Norfolk historian, assumed or had granted to him the arms of Brounfield.

As a matter of fact, there is little doubt that Richard Gilmyn, who was Yeoman of the Guard in 1537, so far from being imported direct from Wales, was son or grandson of another Richard Gylmyn,[1] who was appointed a Serjeant-at-Arms of the King in 1461-3 (Close Roll, 1 Edw. IV, m. 3), and who was alive in 1467-8 (Rot. Parl., v, p. 593), and in 1473 (*ib.* vol. vi, p. 89).

There is no need to go so far as Wales for progenitors of the family, for there were Gilmyns of Surrey long before the descendants of the Yeoman of the Guard settled (or resettled) there. He himself married a Reigate woman (p. 24) and he himself died there.

Richard Gilmyn, the Serjeant-at-Arms, may have been the Richard Gylman, who with Thomas Gylmyn, were parties to a fine in 1445-6 as to land in Burstow (*Surrey Feet of Fines*, 24 Hy. VI, No. 19), and Thos. Gylmyne had a quit-claim of land in Burstow in 1469 (*Addl. Charters*, 7,608). This is the more likely, as a descendant of the

[1] This elder Richard was not discovered by the author till after the first sheets of his book were printed off, and an account of him is given in an inserted page 132b. Had his existence been known from the first, I doubt if Mr. Gillman would have adopted the Welsh romance.

Yeoman of the Guard (Charles) married Alice Taylor of Burstow, *ante* 1633 (p. 58), and Mary, the daughter and heiress of Thomas Gilmyn, married John de Burstow (see Pedigrees in *Manning and Bray*, ii, p. 286, but unindexed). The earliest Surrey reference I have is to Thomas Gylemyn, chaplain, who was party to a fine in Bandon in 1350 (*Feet of Fines, Surrey*, No. 48). John Gyleman was of Kingston in 1351 (p. 43), and Thomas Gilming was Vicar of Woking 1389-1402.

Now for a few arguments why the name is not Welsh at all. To begin with, Mr. Gillman is in error in stating that the reference to John Gilemyn, the King's Marshal at Bristol in 45 Hen. III (1261), is the earliest reference to his name in England. An earlier one is that on the Assize Roll of 40 Hen. III (1255) for Northumberland (*Surtees Society*), where Thomas Gilemyn of Hewedon "scoticus," is mentioned as having killed one Thomas Smelt and fled to Scotland. Here, therefore, we have the earliest bearer of the name a *Scotchman*, not a Welshman. The name occurs again in the same volume (p. 316), when in 7 Edw. I we learn that William Gileman was killed by Reginald le Scot in Lowick.

What the real derivation of the name may be I will leave others to propound. Personally, I should guess Gilman to mean a man or servant of some Scotch Abbey dedicated to St. Gill, if there is one, and compare the similar surname of Gylemaide, which one finds in the "Return of Members of Parliament," p. 195.

However, the fact that there is a village called Gilmonby in York would almost seem to point to an even earlier origin.

It may, however, be a diminutive of Wil or Gil. Among the Rougham (Norfolk) Charters, calendared by Dr. Jessopp, who has kindly given me access to them, Cath., the widow of John Wilemyn of Wesenthorpe, occurs very early (No. 15), while later on (No. 693) a charter dated 1425 refers to Elizabeth, wife of Robert Gilmyn, and her son Roger.

Then it does not occur at all in the Welsh "Returns of Owners of Land." Again Mr. Gillman is in a dilemma. If Richard ap Robert, etc., the Welshman, only assumed the name of Gilmyn after his very remote ancestor Cilmin, somewhere about the reign of Henry VII, how comes it that we find the name scattered all over England very many centuries before in places not at all subject to Welsh influences?

Besides the Gilemyn, the Scotchman of 1255, there were other very early instances, *e.g.*, John Gilemyn, the King's Marshal in 1261; William Gilemon, of 1279, mentioned above; John Gylemyn of Bucks; Anketin, son of Gilmeyn, a villein in Cambridge; Reginald Gylemyn, a villein in Hunts; and Walter Gilmin, a 'servus" in Oxford (see *Rot. Hun., temp.* Edw. I); John Gilmin, a juror in Hunts (*Quo Warranto*); "Gylemyn the Cook" of Lord Simon de Grey in Rochester (ditto); Peter Gylmyn of Shropshire 1278 (Coram Reg., No. 37, Easter, 6 Edw. I, m. 13); Christiana Gilemyn of Colchester 1301 (Rot. Parl., p. 255); Geoffrey Gilmyn of Norwich 1300-10; Wm. Gilemyn, M.P. for Canterbury in 1326-7; Reginald Gylmyn of Pagrave, and Cecilia, his wife, of Shipdham, Norfolk, in 1333; William Gilmyn of St. Edmund's 1340; and John Gylemyn, M.P. for Salisbury 1388; John Gylmyn, Prior of Ipswich in 1412; John, son of Wm. Gylmyn of Beds, husbandman (Coram Rege. Roll, Easter, 6 Hen. V, mem. 71); Isabel, daughter and

heiress of Alice Gilmyn of Warham, Dorset, who married Wm. Hore (Close Roll, 9 Hen. VI, pt. 1); Thomas Gylmyn in Gloucester (Close Roll, 34 Henry VI, pt. 1, d.m. 11); and Robert Gylman of Poklyngton, York, weaver, and William, his son, weaver, who were accused of murder, etc., in 1504 (Coram Reg. Roll, No. 73, Mich. 19, Henry VII, mem. 10, 2nd pt.).

All arguments based on the supposed resemblance of arms fall to the ground when it is admitted that they were *granted*, not confirmed, to one of the Yeomen of the Guard's family in 1553. When I say that the authority given is that of the arch-forger Vincent, whose pedigree frauds have been exposed so often, heraldic students will know what to think.

It may be well that the arms belonged to a Welsh family of Gilmin of Troyle, and that Glover, *more suo*, when applied to for a pedigree and arms used the stale old trick of giving the applicant the nearest he could on the *idem sonans* principle, and that one of the Le Neves followed his lead when applied to by his relation by marriage in Norfolk last century.

But until Mr. Gillman can adduce better evidence than Vincent's to show that Richard Gylmyn, the Yeoman of the Guard, and his son, were rightly described "of Troyle" (at present there is nothing to shew that he had anything to do with that place except the statement on the pedigree), I must abide by the probabilties which I have shewn, that they were nothing of the sort, but of a Surrey family. If it is granted, as is extremely probable, that Richard Gylmyn, the Serjeant-at-Arms in 1461-2, was father or grandfather of Richard Gylmyn, the Yeoman of the Guard, *ante* 1537, there is an end of the Welsh tabular pedigree altogether, for no earlier Richard appears therein.

WALTER RYE.

THE ORIGIN OF THE LINDSAYS.

By SIR GEORGE R. SITWELL, BART.

Had I been aware that Mr. Round had seriously considered this question, I should have written with more modesty of the labours of other genealogists. I have no doubt that the evidences I gave (with the important exception he mentions) must have been known to him, though they certainly were not to others who have endeavoured to trace the origin of the Lindsays; but I doubt whether he had also founded upon these evidences the conclusion that there is a strong presumption of a descent from de Bocquencé. If so, I should welcome his independent judgment as a valuable confirmation of my own.

Mr. Round suggests that Baldric of Lincolnshire may have been described as "de Lindissi" in order to distinguish him from the Baldric of Cheshire. Baldric was not, however, I think, so named in