THE INVENTION OF TRADITION, HIGHLAND-STYLE

William Gillies

In the sixteenth century the house of Argyll had a foot in two worlds, being on the one hand deeply involved in the court and administrative life of the Scottish realm, and at the same time playing a fully integrated part in the world of Gaelic politics in Ireland and Scotland.¹ The Gaelic dimension of the Campbells in time withered away at the highest levels in terms of their own family aspirations, and likewise became marginalised in the Gaelic consciousness. Yet their policies continued to be a prime determinant of developments over a great part of the Highlands while, at less exalted levels, Campbell lairds and their families continued a life-style comparable to that of other members of the minor gentry of the Highlands. This, however, was not yet the case in the sixteenth or earlier seventeenth centuries, when we know the house of Argyll itself to have actively cultivated Gaelic learning and culture, in keeping with the political image and ambitions of the family.² This study is concerned with genealogy, an important aristocratic concern at any time; more particularly, with the way in which claims regarding family origins formed a currency whereby contemporary political preoccupations and ambitions could be expressed. The matter to be discussed forms a relatively clear-cut episode within the not uncomplacent story of Campbell origins.³

In the medieval Gaelic world a family's status could be measured in terms of the alliances they could command, their expectations as regards marriage ties, or the numbers and standing of those who were their followers. It might also be expressed in genealogical terms, in accordance with a well-articulated and widely-understood dialectic developed over the centuries by the Gaelic literati. For a variety of reasons the learned genealogies of the Campbells are particularly instructive in this respect.⁴ Both the Campbells' involvement in Scottish affairs as a whole and the tendency for Gaelic genealogical learning and Scottish historiography to become interactive in the sixteenth century make an investigation of this area a pertinent addition to the more familiar themes of the Scottish Renaissance.⁵

In the dialectic of the learned Gaelic poets and historians, eminence was expressed in terms of nearness to the senior line of Milesean invaders who, in the Leabhar Gabhála Eamann (the pseudo-historical 'Book of the Conquest of Ireland'), were supposed to have established Gaelic rule in Ireland and held the High Kingship of Ireland in the prehistoric period.⁶ It is worth noting that this pseudo-historical edifice was dynamic in the sense that it was continually being worked over and revised in detail by the medieval historians: to reconcile, for example, the inconsistencies which kept springing up between the tenets of the general theory and the genealogical claims of individual families and kindreds. In particular, it could respond to fluctuations in family fame and fortune; for a family pedigree could be 'unplugged' from its existing connection within the schema and plugged in again via a different connection to reflect a material change in the status of the family in question. Thus the latest learned Irish sources showed the Campbells as descended from a Milesean ancestor—from Lúghaid, son of Íth, son of Míl of Spain, who was considerably more of an 'establishment' figure than the ancestors whose claims are discussed below. This promotion reflected the Irish learned poets' and historians' acceptance of the Campbells as a family worth taking seriously in the last century before the collapse of the medieval Gaelic policy.⁷

This pragmatic flexibility was achieved in various ways. For instance, it could be attained by creating extra younger sons or brothers at key points within the Milesean framework, as hooks on which to hang additional family lines. Such procedures are not confined, of course, to the medieval exponents of the Milesean myth. They have been part of the stock-in-trade of creative genealogists from biblical and classical times down to the present

² W. Gillies, 'Some aspects of Campbell history', TOSZ, I (1976-8), 256-95.
⁴ Gillies, 'Some aspects', 280-85.
day. But they flourished spectacularly in the Gaelic context on account of the scale of the edifice and the multitude of vested interests in it. An alternative procedure, more strictly applicable to the Gaelic model, was available in the case of families which had sprung up—as it were from nowhere—in relatively recent times. This involved assigning them ancestors from amongst the invaders who had peopled Ireland in the period before the coming of the Milesian Gaels. Thus, for instance, the families known to the Irish genealogists as Breathnaigh Earrain ('The Britons of Ireland') were said to derive from the stock of Nemed (later spelling Neimeadh), i.e. from surviving members of an anti-diluvian colony which had been driven out of Ireland by the Fomorians (who in their turn were driven out by the Tuatha Dé Danann, who in their turn were subjugated by the Milesians). The genealogists had recourse to the fiction that they had fled into exile in Britain, whence they were deemed to have 'returned' to Ireland in historical times. This segment of Irish pseudo-history was of relevance when the Campbells were first adjudged suitable to be connected up with the genealogical 'system'; for some of the Nemedian exiles were deemed to have stayed on in Britain, and to have had issue there.  

If the genealogical origins claimed over the centuries for the house of Argyll are gathered together, a first impression can only be one of astonishment at the multiplicity of explanations offered. The number of distinct traditions as to their origins is indeed great, and a considerable degree of variation remains even when a chronological framework has been established for the rise and fall of the principal orthodoxies. This study is concerned solely with the learned Gaelic tradition: as opposed, on the one hand, to the popular Gaelic tradition and, on the other hand, to the non-Gaelic antiquarian tradition which sprang up in the seventeenth century. Even within this more limited sphere of activity there is evidence for a considerable degree of variation. The particular concern here is with a group of genealogies whose date of composition corresponded to the highest level of prestige attained by the Campbells in the Gaelic world. Sandwiched between an earlier, less elaborated group of learned genealogies and a succeeding group which begins to show the influence of popular and exotic concerns, this group seems to reflect the activities of the MacEwen professional poets and historians to the earls of Argyll, and to have had its vogue during the ascendancy of this learned family, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.  

The version of the Campbell genealogy under discussion occurs in several incomplete or imperfect sources, from which it is possible to deduce its complete form with a fairly high degree of confidence. It is proposed to begin by setting it out in the form of an edition based on the extant sources, and then to proceed to a discussion of those features of its contents and construction which are of interest for the mentality and materials of the Gaelic professional poets during the last centuries of the classical early modern period.  

The sources, in chronological order of compilation, are as follows:  

(1) The copy of the lost NLS MS. 72.1.32 (i.e. Kilbride XXXII; see D. MacKinnon, A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts (Edinburgh, 1912), 217-21), printed by W.F. Skene in Collectanea de Rebus Albanicis (Edinburgh, 1847), 360 (cf. idem, Celtic Scotland (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1888-90), iii, 458). The original was apparently compiled during the earldom of Gilleasbuig, 4th earl of Argyll, with whom the genealogy ends, between 1530 and 1558. The text printed by Skene in Collectanea suffers from some obvious misreadings, but the genealogy he printed in Celtic Scotland is a composite, and the earlier printing is hence preferred for present purposes. It is designated K, and the lost original *K.  

(2) NLS MS. 72.1.36, written in 1690-91, contains several pieces of syllabic verse to seventeenth-century earls of Argyll, including the poem Triadh na Gaothdeal Gilleasbuig ('Gilleasbuig is the prince of the Gaels'), addressed to the 8th earl. This poem contains at
att. 26-32 a summary of the descent of the house of Argyll from Adam which clearly belongs with the Kilbride version. Although it only mentions a handful of names from our section, it provides some valuable name-forms and generation gaps. Since the poem contains a pretty certain allusion to the 8th earl's elevation to the rank of marquis, its composition may be dated between 1641 and 1661; shortly after the former date, one suspects. The genealogical section of the extant poem is designated W hereafter, and the full genealogy that lies behind it 4W.

(3) NLS MS. 72.2.2, a collection of pieces of diverse origin, includes a version of the Campbell genealogy written in a late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century hand. The latest name in the genealogy is that of Gillesbaug, 9th earl, who was 'Mac Caimin' from 1661 to 1685, and it was presumably written between those years. This source is designated N.

(4) MacLagan MS. 196 (in GUL) contains a Campbell genealogy which, although written by James MacLagan himself, claims to be o lainsigh Dho'nachaidh Uil Mhurghesain ('from the hand of D[un]can O Meighheasain')—a valuable reference in that it connects the pedigree with one of the families of the Highland literati, if not that of the MacEwens themselves. The Donnchadh mentioned here may have been the 'Duncan McDiconch, MacLeod's Irish poet' who received 20 merks 'for gravitie allow'd him after MacLeod's decease ... for an Epitaph made upon him' in 1706. At all events, this genealogy terminates, like N, to which it is closely related, with the 9th earl. It is here designated M.

None of these sources depends directly on another, and there are some inconsistencies in their testimony. Nevertheless, they may fairly claim to be grouped together when compared with other phases of genealogical activity by the Campbells or on their behalf. They are to be regarded as giving the 'authorised version' of the Campbells' own poet-historians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and, by extension, the official doctrine about ultimate Campbell origins which was to be disseminated by the learned poets as a professional caste. Given that the main thrust of Campbell genealogical claims, already established before the sixteenth century, was of descent from King Arthur and inheritance of the 'leadership of the Britons' (by contrast with the MacDonals' Dalriadic and Milesian claims and the MacLeods' claims to inherit a Norse title to supremacy), the main innovation of the group presently under consideration was the elaboration of the pedigree from King Arthur, who is already present in the earliest genealogy extant, up to the point at which it could be tied into the framework of Leabhar Gabhla. The junction point was that already mentioned in the case of the 'Britons of Ireland', the eponymous Briton son of Fergus Red-side, son of Neimhead. Having filled in that gap, the Campbell genealogists were able to draw on established doctrine to fill in the rest of the genealogy, from Briton up to 'Adam son of God'.

Here, then, is the reconstructed genealogy from Arthur up to the eponymous Briton son of Fearghus Leitdearg. In the left-hand column are given in regular spellings (i.e. normalised to a classical early modern Irish standard) the genealogy as it may be supposed to have been in *K* (the lost original of K, as previously explained). In the right-hand column are given significant variants from K, W, M and N.

---

14 Or 4c as uaidle don fhaisl Bhreasaimh / see bheas tarla d’ordaigh dhair. 'Since you are the noblest of British blood, whom history has exalted beyond the rank of earl... (st. 35ab).
15 The genealogy, which occurs at p.40 of the MS, was printed in part by Wason, 'Unpublished Gaelic poetry', 140.
16 Quoted from A. Morrison, 'The Contillich papers, 1706-25', TGIS, xlv (1964-6), 510-48 (see 521); cf. W. Matheson, The Blind Harper (Edinburgh, 1970), p. xiii, and N.M. Brodie, 'The O'Muirghesain bardic family', Notes & Queries of the Society of West Highland and Island Historical Research, vi (1978), 5-7. That an exemplar in Gaelic script lies behind MacLagan's version is suggested by the reading Fearghus (in the section immediately above the 'British' section) which must surely be a misreading of Feorhais, i.e. with the Gaelic u-contraction (written 'y') being taken as a g by someone who was not conversant with Gaelic scribal practices.
17 The truncated version of the Campbell genealogy found in the Black Book of Cluainrind (p. 176; printed in A. Cameron, Reliquiae Gheise (Inverness, 1892-4), ii, 99) reflects lack of sympathy (given the Black Book's MacDonald orientation), lack of interest (given the decline of the 'Gaelic dimension' of the Clan Campbell by the end of the seventeenth century), or a combination of these factors.
18 i.e. 'MS 1467' (NLS Gaelic MS 72.1.1), which refers to 'Arthur son of Uther' (was Uther MS) and calls him 'King of the world, without doubt'.
19 Printed by Wason, 'Unpublished Gaelic poetry', 140.
transmission must be borne in mind, it need not act as a deterrent as regards the present enquiry. In fact, it is possible to explain the principles of construction of this section of the genealogy in quite a detailed way. There are a handful of difficulties, but they can be whittled down to the point at which the scheme shows through beyond doubt.

In order to understand the construction of this section of the genealogy, a start may be made by recognising that its author’s fundamental motive was to fill a void. The chronological scheme of the medieval Irish antiquarians, the invasion of Ireland by Neimheadh and his followers, their subsequent expulsion by the Fomorians and the colonisation of parts of Britain by Briotian were set in remote prehistoric times; whereas on any reckoning one had to cope with the ‘fact’ that King Arthur had flourished at the end of the Roman period within the Christian era. The author would seem to have proceeded in the first instance from two basic beliefs: the bald assumption that his patrons were ‘British’, and the strategic relevance of the name ‘Arthur’. He then constructed the genealogy by a mixture of multiplication (involving replication or cloning of the basic data) and addition (involving importation of fresh data by association). In the following presentation the discernible categories are analysed in sequence; it is not pretended that the pedigree-maker’s thought-processes have been replicated in detail.

(1) When noting the Arthur’s who recur every few generations in the section under review it is necessary to recall the name-giving habits of Gaelic families in later times. It would have been perfectly natural for a Campbell pedigree-maker used to the Collins and Archibalds of the Early Modern period to attribute similar conservatism to the era he was creating. (The same thing can be seen happening in the later fictions of Campbell pre-history, where Daibhne is the strategic name that gives rise to a whole series of characters.) Similarly, the assignment of the epithets mór and òg to the first two Collins of the ‘historical’ period is an example of a familiar tendency amongst the Highland she nanoches to assign the epithet mór ‘(the) Great’ to the eponymous ancestor and òg ‘(the) Young(er)’ to the next bearer of the

---

20 The addition by M and N of m’ic Isomhach between the latest Arthur and Ambro” is the only serious divergence of this sort. The implications of this omission will be discussed in a moment.

21 Compare the later elaboration, following very similar principles, of the period from ‘King Arthur’ down to the earliest historical Campbells, as detailed by Sellars, ‘Earliest Campbells’.
numinous name. This practice was naturally exploited when it came to differentiating the multiplicity of Arthurian names, but for the rest, one needed a sprinkling of appropriate-sounding epithets to break the monotony implicit in further repetitions of the strategic name, and to impart an air of authenticity to the genealogy. One needs to look no further than the proliferation of epithets attaching to the Collins and Archibalds of later times to exemplify the practice of recording (and where necessary creating) epithets in order to distinguish characters and provide the more shadowy figures with an element of personality. This explains the presence of 'Arthur the Younger' and 'Arthur the Great' and suggests the psychology underlying the other Arthur. They are 'Arthur of the Hand' (A. na láimhe), 'Arthur Red-hand' (A. láimhdeargh), one Arthur with an opaque and perhaps textually corrupt epithet (A. f... o...), and one plain Arthur (the son of Alliddid), whose distinguishing feature is perhaps his unique lack of an epithet.22

(2) Intermingled with the Arthur are names evocative of the 'British' connection, which had its own eponyms to contribute. While Briston (i.e. Briston Mael, son of Fearghus Leithdearg) was an obvious recruit to the genealogy, he was not the only eponym of the Britons known to the medieval Gaelic literati, or even the best supported one in medieval Gaelic writings. That honour went to Brutus mac Iscain (i.e. Brutus, son of Ascanius), who appears in such widely differing sources as the Irish version of the Nennius Historia Britonum, in the Irish version of Sex Aestates Mundhi, in the Leabhar Gabhail itself, and in the Scottish-oriented Duaid Albanach.23 Our pedigree-maker has simply allotted himself of the duplication of eponyms and made one the son of the other. In the same frame of mind he has imported 'Béinne the Briton', a character from early Irish literature.24 Béinne then receives two slots in the genealogy by a simple duplication.

(3) Arthur's immediate ancestry is usually given at the beginning of Arthurian romances in Gaelic. In these sources it standardly appears as 'Arthur, son of Joboar, son of Ambrose, son of Constantine', where Joboar corresponds in Gaelic tradition to Uther (Pendragon).25 The genealogical sequence of these sources has clearly been founded on the regnal sequence in Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae. There is a slight complication here, in that K and W, our two earlier witnesses, omit Joboar, and make Arthur the son of Ambrosi, while M and N have the significantly differing Iombar as Arthur's father. Here it must be borne in mind that Joboar was already present in the Campbell genealogy before our genealogist set to work: he appears in the early fifteenth-century pedigree contained in 'MS 1467', in the alternative sixteenth-century pedigree contained in the Book of Genealogies of the Irish genealogist MacFirbis, and in a genealogical reference in an early sixteenth-century bardic poem in the Book of the Dean of Lismore.26 The reading of M and N, the later sources, may be explained as an attempt to square the genealogy with the more widely accepted tradition as to Arthur's paternity; a subsidiary aim may have been to provide a connection whereby the Clann Iomhaire (MacVers) of Glassary

---

22 The undifferentiated Arthur may not be original to the genealogy. While the appropriateness of the name Alidiad ("Mighty-fat") is supported by reasons to be given shortly, the MSS may suggest something else. Bearing in mind the association of Arthur in later Campbell tradition and in Gaelic Arthurian texts with a place called 'the Red Hall' (located at Dumfubert) one might speculate that the MS readings point to something like 'Arnulfr an Alida Raddi' ("A. of the Red Hall"). Admittedly, the Red Hall elsewhere involves dearg ("blood-red") rather than ruddi ("russet-red"), but the famous Cruachrath ("Red-branch (Hall)" of the Ulster Cycle of tales could conceivably have exercised an influence. (On these matters, see W. Gille, "Arthur in Gaelic tradition. Part II. romances and early lore"). Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies, II (1982), 49, 69.) Alternatively, but with the Dumfubert connection still in mind, it could be suggested that Alida Chwaich of Dumfubert might originally have been intended. (Compare Scottish Gaelic mac (pail) 'echo' (literally 'son of a rock/hall') for the genitive singular form alla and for confusion between the old word for 'rock' and the loan-word (Ayalla/alla based on English 'hall'). There is also a difficulty about the style of the Arthur who is named as father of Alladiad. I cannot make much sense of the readings of M and N, except that they would appear to contain 

23 See D.N. Dumville, "The textual history of 'Lobor Bretunach': a preliminary study", Eigh, viii, (1975-6), 255-73, for the eleventh-century 'Irish Nennius', which seems to be the main intermediate by which subsequent Gaelic tradition became acquainted with Brutus.


25 Ibid., 50, 71-2.

26 The testimony of "W" may be inferred from statements in W: "Arthur ... son of Ambrose" (ed. J.A. 1938); cf. also the ten generations said to separate Arthur from Aarin Laichdaloch (st. 50). For "MS 1467" and MacFirbis, see Sellari, Ealles "Earliest Campbell", 117. For the poem in the Dean's Book, see W.J. Watson (ed.), Scottish Yrue from the Book of the Dean of Lismore (Edinburgh, 1957), p. 116, st. 22a, where we should read Arthur as aor for Watson's "Aor er aor." (7).
could be attached to the Campbell genealogy.\footnote{For the MacEvans cf. Highland Papers, ii, 82; W.D.H. Sellar, 'Family origins in Cowl and Knapdale', Scot. Stud., xvi (1971), 21-57, and idem, 'Earliest Campbells', 115, 119.} The problem is therefore to explain why Iobhar is absent in K and W. Was he deliberately omitted by the creator of our version of the genealogy, or inadvertently left out by a copist who was followed by our sources? Since reference to Arthur’s Round Table can in general be taken as a sign of indebtedness (direct or indirect) to Geoffrey of Monmouth, and since the poem upon which we depend for *W* contains ample evidence for acceptance of the Round Table, it might be guessed that the creator of the pedigree must likewise have had access to the ‘standard’ Gaelic doctrine of the time. Moreover, he had no reason to shorten the pedigree; quite the reverse, in fact. It is therefore difficult to envisage an accidental omission at this juncture; yet it is difficult to suggest any reason why Iobhar should have been omitted deliberately. But at all events, the identification of *Historia Regum Britanniae* as the ultimate source of Ambrós and Constatinín is reasonably secure; their immediate provenance may have been a literary one.\footnote{Cf. Gillies, ‘Arthur’, 50. The Constantine who appears further up the genealogy may simply be a doublet of the first see below, however, for an alternative suggestion regarding Constantine.}

(4) With the remaining names it is necessary to proceed more cautiously. It is noteworthy that of the epithets attached to the Arthurs in the body of the genealogy the two transparent ones involve mention of a ‘hand’: Artáir na lámh ‘A. of the Hand’ and Artáir lámh-árd ‘A. Red-hand’. It may be suggested that some traditional or antiquarian link between ‘Arthur’ and ‘hand’ was known to our pedigree-maker, and that it spurred him to include some more names involving ‘hand’.\footnote{Could the lám Artáir (‘hand of A.’) which slew 840 Saxons at Arthur’s twentieth battle (see J.H. Todd, *The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum of Nennius* (Dublin, 1848), 110-12) be the germ from which this theme developed?} On this hypothesis, it should be possible to account for other names occurring in the genealogy and containing lámh ‘hand’ or díd ‘fist’, i.e. Lámh-fhiont ‘White-hand(ed)’ and Altáid ‘Mighty-fist’ (if it is correct to extrapolate them from our sources) and Lámh-árd ‘Fist-hand’ (if that is what is intended).

(5) The last-mentioned names belong to a class of ‘utility’ names which recur in various literary and genealogical sources in Gaelic literature, their common denominator being simply that they convey suitable connotations and associations. While it is thus impossible to be certain where a learned Gaelic historian working in the sixteenth century might have come by his knowledge of them, it may be recorded, for what it is worth, that forms of Lámh-fhiont and Lámh-árd occur in texts relating to the ancestry of the kings of Scots, where one can also find forms of Fear Mara (‘Man of the Sea’, itself an ‘utility’ name with the connotation of ‘incomer’ in the dialectic of the genealogies) and of Fionnluach (perhaps ‘White’, ‘Bright’, ‘Fair Warrior’); while the same sources would provide the possibility of associating the difficult Amgeal/Aineall (MSS) with forms of Amhchéileach, and the equally perplexing Conmuc/Chomhrusg/Comhruiog (MSS) with forms of Conaing.\footnote{See, for example, *Chron. Pict-Scot*, 134-5; cf. Anderson, *Early Sources*, l. p. cs. M.O. Anderson, *Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2nd edn., 1980), 237. The fact that there are Constantines in the Scottish king-lists as well as in Geoffrey of Monmouth could perhaps have been the spark that caused this source to come under the scrutiny of the Campbell genealogists. One should stress, however, that the ‘utility names’ recur widely in Irish literary and antiquarian sources.}

(6) Last of all, Toisid (MSS) may simply be for Gaelic tóisich or tóiseach ‘leader’. Names for ‘ruler’, like names for ‘lawgiver’ or ‘warrior’, are to be expected in any tradition of creative genealogy. On the other hand, it might just represent an unnoticed doublet of Constatinín.\footnote{Given the similarity of r and t in the Gaelic script, and the presence of the spelling *Constáin* in K, one could imagine *cónaid* (i.e. *conaidh*) being taken as *hinds*, or similar.}

To sum up, the principles of construction visible in this version of the Campbell genealogy consisted of the elaboration of a couple of basic themes according to principles which are familiar enough from other Celtic, and indeed non-Celtic, examples of the genre. The two basic themes were (‘King’) Arthur and ‘Briton’, and the principal types of elaboration were (1) duplication (sometimes with differentiation by the addition of evocative epithets), and (2) importation of names with appropriate associations from literary and (pseudo-)-historical sources. These could be supplemented by ‘off-the-peg’ space-fillers from the resources of the genealogical tradition.

The sources drawn on are to some extent identifiable, though questions, especially those of immediate provenance, remain. There are a couple of hints that the author of our genealogy may have had access to some items of oral-traditional knowledge; but...
it is evident that his first instinct was to seek his inspiration in learned (i.e. written) sources. Some shared textual errors suggest that the surviving sources share a common ancestor derived from the original composition; but their relative homogeneity suggests that the transmission was fairly short and self-contained. The date of composition is hard to calculate with certainty, but most probably fell within the first half of the sixteenth century. It may well be associated with the arrival of the MacEwen bardic family as official poets and historians to the earls of Argyll.\[^{56}\]

\[^{31}\] Note the stress which is laid on ancient, learned tradition in the poem containing W, which refers to *slàn coinne* ‘the guarantee of chronicle’ (st. 54b), *cumhaine druidh* ‘the memory of sages’ (st. 19d), and *ugphais* ‘authorities’ (st. 32a). Such references do not, of course, preclude the possibility that a fairly near relative of the poem’s MacEwen author had created at least part of the genealogy de *nesch*. Hints of oral-traditional sources include the ‘Red Hall’ (*ex emendatione*) and the curious form *Aver* in W (st. 295, 35a), which I can only explain as an oral derivative of a (presumably Cumbric) form of the name Arthur borrowed before the twelfth-century loss of /p/ from the Gaelic consonant system.

\[^{33}\] Reasons for this belief are set out in Gillies, ‘The “British” genealogy of the Campbells’.
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Stephen Rawles

Anyone interested in Rabelais will inevitably connect a Scot living in Paris in the 1530s with Panurge and his outburst in ‘Scots’ in chapter nine of *Pontaguel*.\(^{1}\) Anyone interested in Rabelais inevitably has at least a passing interest in the printer Chrétien Wechel, who printed the first edition of the *Tiers Livre* in 1546 as well as the volume under scrutiny here.\(^{2}\) Anyone interested in Rabelais who is confronted with a book which used to belong to the real Bibliothèque Saint Victor in Paris will inevitably think of the spoof catalogue of that institution, also in *Pontaguel*,\(^{3}\) especially since the book under discussion here was written by a visitor to the Abbey of Saint Victor. The subject of the Scots in Paris has been considered by several scholars. Geneviève Guilleminot-Chrétien of the Bibliothèque Nationale is currently working on the output of Chrétien Wechel for the ‘grand Renouard’.\(^{4}\) The Library of Saint Victor would be worth several books in itself.\(^{5}\) I shall therefore confine myself largely to the considerable

---

\(^{1}\) The chapter numbering of *Pontaguel* varies according to the edition cited. Reference is made here to the earliest known edition of the work, printed by Claude Nourry in Lyons (n.d.). See Rawles and Serceio, *Neu Rabelais Bibliography* (NRB), (Geneva, Droz, 1967), i. However, the ‘Scots’ of Panurge did not appear until 1538 (NRB, 7), in the first edition printed by François Juste, who was probably Rabelais’s preferred printer, at least for the first two books. The only known copy of this 1538 edition was destroyed during the allied bombing of Dresden in 1945, so that the earliest surviving edition to contain it is the Juve edition of 1534 (NRB, 8) of which one of the four known copies is also in GUL (CR; f.24v).

\(^{2}\) NRB, 28

\(^{3}\) *Pontaguel*, ch. 7.


\(^{5}\) See Alfred Franklin, *Les antiquites bibliophiles de Paris: églises, monastères, collèges, etc. 3 vols.* (Paris, Imprimerie Impériale, 1867-75), i, 135-85; *Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l’abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude de Granvire, 1514*, ed. Gilbert Oury et al. (Paris, CNRS, 1985). The 1534 catalogue is now in the Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 418. A later catalogue of the printed books, made by Estienne Regnard in 1523 is now in BN, M 5 lat.15169. I have not been able to check whether this edition is listed there.