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INTRODUCTION.

Before taking up in detail the object of this study: The Relation between the Middle Dutch Poem "Van den Vos Reynaerde" and the branches of the Old French "Roman de Renard" (1), it seems advisable to set forth the estimate in which the Dutch and French poems are held by the present day scholars and some of the theories which bear on their relationship.

a. Roman de Renard.

It was in the Roman de Renard that the French animal epic flourished. Beginning with a modest number of poems in the 12th century, it gradually expanded so that it became one of the popular creations in France. Renard, the fox, and his comrade Isengrin, the wolf, are the heroes of a series of adventures, which in the 12th and 13th centuries were treated by many poets.

Authors.

The authors of these poems, generally called branches, are unknown. Only three names are mentioned in the branches. They are: Richard de Lison, a Norman, author of branch XII,(2) Pierre de Saint-Cloud,

1. In this discussion the modern spelling Renard accepted by Foulet will be used.
2. cf. branch XII v.1478.f. Ce vos dit Richard de Lison, also, Martin, Ernest. Observations p.72
to whom we owe the first poem of Renard and Isengrin, (1) and the third, a "prestre de la Croix en Brie", who wrote branch IX (2). Little or nothing is known about these writers.

Cohesion of the Branches.

Of the twenty seven branches which we find in Martin's edition of the Roman de Renart, few have any relation to each other. The style varies, the dialects show that many persons took a hand in ordering, copying, or writing the different stories. Some of the poems consist of a collection of adventures which follow each other without a connecting thought; others, however, show a continuous narration. The same episode is often related in different branches with many modifications.

Age.

The exact age of these versions is still a question of doubt, though the last investigator, Foulet, comes to the conclusion that fifteen of the principal branches were written between 1174 and 1205.

1. cf. branch I v.1, referring to another branch. Perrot, qui son engin et s'art Mist en vers fere de Renart.
also Foulet, Lucien. Le Roman de Renard. Ch Xi, p. 237

2. cf. branch IX v.1 Un prestre de la Croiz en Brie, also, Sudre, Leopold. Les Sources du Roman de Renart, p. 22.
Place of Origin.

They developed in the North-East of France where the French and Dutch were in frequent intercourse. Most of the poets lived in Flanders, Picardy and in Champagne. (1) In this country which was a center of intellectual and literary life, the Roman de Renard flourished, spread quickly to the South and the North, over France and Flanders, and from the latter country gradually over the whole of Europe.

Source.

The date and place of origin are fairly well established, but the source of this rich flow of literature is in many cases still an open question, although many eminent philologists have investigated it. The first was Jacob Grimm who in a learned study discussed the origin of the animal epos in his "Reinhard Fuchs"; he noted that the names of many of the animals, such as: Renard, Isengrin, Hersent, Brun, Tiecelin, are of Germanic origin and used this as one of his principal arguments in his contention that the Roman de Renard was founded on animal fables which had originated in the old Germanic world. This theory has since long been refuted and

1. Sudre, p. 48
Sudre contributed the most exhaustive study on this question in his "Sources du Roman de Renart". Not amongst the old Germanic tribes does he find the origin of the *Roman de Renard*, but (1): "Comme les Jâkatas, comme le Panchatantra, comme les apolôgues épociques et phédriens, le *Roman de Renart* est à sa manière et dans sa plus grande partie un fragment de l'immense édifice de la tradition orale et populaire. Ces compilations indiennes et grêco-latines nous donnent une image du folk-lore animal de l'antiquité, celle de nos poètes nous donne l'image du folk-lore animal du moyen-âge. Telle est la thèse que je me propose de soutenir."

Sudre tries to show how, out of the obscurity of folklore, fabliaux, and animal fables, partly of oriental and partly of classical origin, the animal epos, as we know it now, developed though oral tradition. He writes: "Il semble, je pense, suffisamment démontré par les recherches précédentes, d'abord que le *Roman de Renart* est une œuvre purement traditionnelle," and he adds, in speaking of the traditions followed by the authors (2): "En outre, la tradition à laquelle

1. Sudre, p. 18
2. Sudre, p. 339
ils se sont respectueusement asservis n'a été ni écrite, comme ils le prétendent quelquefois, ni une, ainsi qu'on l'a cru souvent. Une seule branche est la transcription d'un ouvrage latin. Partout ailleurs, les témoignages des poètes et la comparaison des rédactions de nos contes avec celles des " écrits " antérieurs m'ont conduit à la constatation certaine d'une transmission orale." In concluding Sudre writes (1) : " Aussi cette tradition n'est-elle ni purement classique ni purement orientale", and : " Presque tout entière, on peut le dire, l'œuvre de nos trouvères est sortie de leur mémoire, où s'était emmagasiné, avec sa riche complexité, le vaste trésor des récits vieux comme le monde."

Sudre, an enthusiastic "folkloriste", magnifies the importance of the medieval animal fables at the expense of the creators of the epos. He even writes : (2) " Arrivé au bout de ma tâche, après avoir détruit pièce par pièce la réputation d'originalité des auteurs du Roman de Renart, dois-je me laisser aller à un regret ?"

From Sudre's study in Petit de Julleville, it will be seen, that three years after he wrote the foregoing statement he judged the authors of the Roman de

1. Sudre, p. 339
2. Sudre, p. 340
Renard less harshly when he declared (1): "Mais qu'ils se soient servis des fables classiques ou des contes populaires les auteurs du Roman de Renard n'ont pas été de simples imitateurs; ils ont su faire œuvre originale."

Foulet makes a plea for the originality of the authors of the branches of the Roman de Renard. And alluding to the folklorists he says (2): "Il est à craindre que ces critiques aient fait fausse route, et on peut se demander si le folklore ne leur a pas caché la littérature. Nous voulons dans ce livre rendre aux branches françaises l'intérêt qu'on leur a injustement enlevé. Productions très personnelles d'artistes très conscients, elles ne méritent nullement l'espèce de discrédit qui pèse sur elles."

Foulet recognizes the influence of the other written works of the same period on the composition of the Roman de Renard and says (3): "Nous verrons avant tout dans le Roman de Renard une œuvre du XIIe siècle que nous chercherons à expliquer par le XIIe siècle. Nous en étudierons les sources et à côté de la fable ésoipique et du conte populaire nous ferons place à une influence que nous croyons prépondérante: celle de l'Ysengrimus. Nous en étudierons la composition, et c'est le Roman de Troie.

---

2. Foulet, p.17
3. Foulet, p.18
c'est Tristan que nous aurons à mentionner et l'Ysengrimus encore, c'est-à-dire, si l'on y regarde de près, Virgile et Ovide."

Not only does Foulet defend the authors of the known branches against the folklorists, but he also denies the often made statement that probably older versions have existed which have disappeared. He writes: (1) "Si les successeurs de Grimm n'apportent pas de preuves plus solides de l'existence au Xle ou au XIIe siècle d'un Renard antérieur à celui que nous possédons, il ne faudra voir dans ces originaux disparus qu'un produit arbitraire de l'imagination romantique." Again (2): "...... nous n'avons pas rencontré une seule preuve valable en faveur de la thèse qui voit dans nos branches françaises des remaniements, bien qu'avec une seule exception cette même thèse ait été soutenue par tous les critiques."

And referring especially to the branch which is of most interest for the comparison with the Reinaert he writes: "Quant à I, nous avons vu que ce n'est pas non plus un remaniement.(voir Chapitre XV )." (3)

Purpose.

The character of the Roman de Renard is of a

1. Foulet, p. 59
2. Foulet, p. 73
3. Foulet, p. 403
satirical nature. Though Sudre did not admit this in his "Sources", where he states (1) : "Pour nous en effet le Roman de Renart n'offre ni dans ses éléments primordiaux, ni dans la plupart de ceux qui s'y sont successivement ajoutés un caractère vraiment satirique;" he later admits in Petit de Julleville (2) that the fabliau developed into a satire. "On conçoit facilement, que ......... chaque branche d'histoire plaisante d'animaux ait abouti à un fabliau, et de fabliau soit devenu une satire, et tout cela successivement dans le cadre invariable, immuable de la même épopee."

Another critic, Willems, had already declared that he could not agree with Sudre's first view. He writes (3) : "Mais là où nous émettons des doutes, c'est lorsque M. Sudre essaie d'établir que les diverses branches du Renard n'ont eu primitivement d'autre but, que d'amuser le public: en conséquence à leur origine ces contes ne renfermeraient aucune portée satirique."

Willems distinctly sees in the Roman de Renard a poem of satirical nature, and after sketching its development he concludes (4): "C'est une épopee satirique qui en est résultée."

4. Willems, p.135
Origin of Names.

Closely connected with the problem of the source is that of the origin of the names. The names borne by the animals are different in kind as well as in origin. They are different in kind for in one group the animals are indicated by a name identifying them with some well-known characteristic of the species, whereas in another group the name seemingly has no connection whatever with the characteristics of the animal. The names are also different in origin inasmuch as they are partly of Germanic, partly of French extraction.

Fudre, in *Petit de Julleville* (II), gives a very clear exposition of this problem. "Les uns sont, comme on l'a dit, "parlants", le rapport entre le signe et la chose signifiée y est nettement visible. Tels sont ceux du lion Noble, de la lionne Pièce ou Orgueilleuse, du taureau Bruissant, du mouton Belin, du coq Chantecler, du limaçon Tardif, du rat Pelé, du lièvre Courart, etc. Ils sont évidemment les plus récents; car ils ne sont portés par aucun des acteurs primitifs.

Les autres, au contraire, sont attribués aux personnages principaux, et, de plus, par leur forme même, ils présentent un intérêt plus grand. Pourquoi le goupil s'appelle-t-il Renard, le loup Isengrin, la louve Hersent, la goupille Richeut ou Hormeline, l'ours Bruno

l'âne Bernard, le chat Tibert, le corbeau Tiecelin, le moineau Drouin, le blaireau Grimbert?"

Ces dénominations sont incontestablement allemandes et le célèbre Jacob Grimm s'était appuyé sur ce fait pour établir que le Roman de Renard était d'origine allemande.

Is it possible to explain the introduction of these Germanic names in poems so decidedly French, by the fact that the first branches originated in a region which through its close proximity to the Germanic world was influenced by the Germanic language? It may be suggested, considering the origin of the oldest poems of the animal eido, the Yeongrinus written by Nivardus, a "Flamand du Midi" (1), and branches II and Va by Pierre de St Clou'd in Arras (2), that these names were introduced into the Roman de Renard through a Flemish, rather than a German influence. Foulet acknowledges that (3): "Le Roman français doit son existence à l'Yeongrinus qu'il a en plus d'un cas imité de près."

Still, though these names may have been introduced in this way, it does not account for the fact that a certain animal received a certain name.

After the first names were established new names

1. Willems, p.101
2. Foulet, p.225
3. Foulet, p.110
were gradually introduced into the poems, and we shall in the course of this study, have several opportunities to see how new names may be added by a new author.

**Personification of Animals.**

For the creation of a popular epos, the personification of the animals was all important. "Illens points out that Sudre does not attach any importance to this phase of its development. He writes (1): "Les idées exprimées ci-dessus s'éloignent beaucoup de celles de M. Sudre. Ce savant n'a pas attaché la moindre importance à la personification des animaux, sinon il n'aurait pas jugé nécessaire de s'excuser vis-à-vis de son pays, de lui enlever l'honneur d'avoir créé le Roman de Renart. Cette personification sans laquelle celui-ci n'aurait pu naître, s'est faite en France; c'est donc ce pays seul qui peut revendiquer comme sienne l'épopée animale."

But in Petit de Julleville Sudre fully agrees with this theory. We read (2): "Et l'on peut dire que du jour où un poète s'avisa de chanter, non pas le goupil, le loup, la louve, mais Renard, Isengrin, Hersemt, l'ensemble des aventures de ces héros et des autres s'élèva au rang d'une épopée."

The honor of creating this great cycle evidently belongs to France.

---

1. Illens, n. 138.
Popularity.

It is interesting to observe, that while after the Middle-Ages its popularity waned in that country, we find outside of France a continuous interest in the adventures of Renard. To one branch especially is due its popularity in other European countries. The scene of the Judgment in branch I is the foundation for many versions which have followed one another in uninterrupted succession so that even in modern times we find that the escapades of the fox live on in different forms.

b. Van den Vos Reynaerde.

Branch I inspired a Fleming to write the poem "Van den Vos Reynaerde," which forms the link between the French Roman de Renard and the Germanic epos of later ages. Foulet declares (1): "On sait quel a été le succès prodigieux du Reinaert de Vos, dont dérivent toutes les versions modernes: il y en a en anglais, en bas-saxon, en allemand, en danois, en suédois, en islandais, et sans doute dans d'autres langues encore."

About the author of this poem nothing is known except that he announces himself as:

v.l

Willem, die Madde maecte,
Daer hi dicken omme waecte,
Hem vernoyde so haerde
Dat die avonture van Reynaerde
In dietsche onghemaket bleven
(Die Willem niet hevet vulschreven,)
Dat hi die vyte van Reynaerde dede soucken
Ende hise na den walschen boucken
In dietsche dus hevet begonnen.

1. Foulet, p. 557
We possess two manuscripts of the Reinaert: one, discovered at Komburg by Graeter and published in 1812; another discovered in Amsterdam in 1836 and sold to the library of the City of Brussels containing, in addition to the original Reinaert a continuation, generally known as the "second book".

Grimm republished the original Reinaert in his Reinhart Fuchs, 1834, p. 115-234. (1) It contains 3474 lines, whereas the second manuscript numbers 7616 lines. The so-called "second book" is weaker than the original Reinaert and Grimm writes (2), it "ist aus einzelnen guten und schlechten abenteuern zusammengetragen, die nur den eindruck des vorhergehenden schicken; auch die einkleidung ist viel schlechter und gemeiner." This Reinaert in two parts, later put into prose, was translated into English by Caxton, and, with new adaptations travelled through the Middle-Ages down to the time of Goethe, to whom it gave the inspiration for his well-known Reineke Fuchs. (3).

The Reinaert is much longer than its chief source, branch I of the Roman de Renard which numbers 1620 lines; Willem has added the confession of the fox, the episode of the treasure, and Reinaert's revenge upon his enemies (vv.2064-3474).

- Poulet, pp. 223, 557
In comparing the Dutch and the French poems it will be seen, that in the first part of the former also, some short episodes are added.

Grimm (1) claims that the Reinaert was written about 1250 (Reinhart CL) an opinion shared by Foulet, (2) whereas branch I of the Roman de Renard's was written at least sixty years earlier.

The author Willem stands high as a poet. His descriptions are vivid, his action is logical and he appeals to the interest of the reader by his clear pictures, well chosen language and the absence of vulgarity.

Foulet, in comparing the German Reinhart Fuchs with the Dutch Reinaert says: "Le poète allemand avec moins de talent sans aucun doute, fut plus ambitieux," (3) acknowledging that Willem has more talent than Heinrich de Glichezaere, the writer of the German poem.

And Willems sets Willem higher than Nivardus, the author of "Ysengrinus", when he declares (4): "Car il faul bien le dire, l'Ysengrinus est d'une valeur bien inférieure au Reinaert flamand."

Sudre also praises Willem's interpretation when writing of branch I, he says, p. 30: "L'on sait que c'est la branche ainsi composée qui, dans la première moitié du XIII e siècle, passa en Flandre pour y être fine-


ment interprétée par le poète Willem et devenir le point de départ de toutes les imitations postérieures au delà du Rhin.”

All these critics are unanimous in acknowledging the importance and value of Willem's poem. When it comes to the relation of the Reinaert to the branches of the Roman de Renard we find two widely different opinions.

Conflicting Theories regarding the Reinaert and Roman de Renard.

Foulet holds that the Reinaert was written:
"vers 1250 par un poète flamand, qui n'a pas cru pouvoir mieux faire, que de traduire, très librement d'ailleurs, la branche I" (1).

This opinion is not shared by Sudre, who claims that the Reinaert must have been founded upon a version older than branch I and now lost. He writes (2):
"En a-t-il tiré et le principal et les accessoires de sa propre imagination ou bien a-t-il trouvé le sujet ainsi présenté dans une des innombrables branches que nous avons perdues? La seconde hypothèse est la plus vraisemblable; car il serait étrange qu'ayant calqué la première partie de son poème sur un poème français il se fût érigé en auteur original pour la seconde partie.

1. Foulet, p. 323  
2. Sudre, p. 89
Neither Foulet nor Sudre, however, supports his statement with any definite proof. It seems strange that Foulet does not devote a more exhaustive study to the relation of the Reinaert and the branches of the Roman de Renard, for if Sudre's contention were true that the Reinaert is founded upon an original older version which has been lost, Foulet's theory, to which the main argument of his book is devoted, that no such older versions existed, (1) would break down.

There seem therefore to exist two important reasons to investigate the relation between the Dutch poem and the French branches; in the first place because of its great influence on the development of the animal epos outside of France, in the second place to see whether such an investigation would reveal any facts in favor of either Sudre's or Foulet's theory.

This same question whether older French versions of the Roman de Renard ever existed has been discussed by some of the foremost French and German philologists in connection with another poem, written outside of France, the Reinhart Fuchs by Henry the Glichezaere. J.Grimm together with Wackernagel, Jonckbloet and recently Voretzsch, claim that versions of the Roman de Renard older than those which are known to us, must have served as the original version for the Glichezaere. (2)

The opposite view is taken by Paulin Paris, Martin and Büttner, and we must thank Foulet for a convincing defense of the opinion of the latter group in his special chapter, devoted to the relation of the Reinhart Fuchs to the French Roman de Renard (1). Foulet heads his chapter with the words: "On a eu tort de voir dans le Reinhart Fuchs une traduction presque littérale de branches françaises disparues. En réalité le Glichezâtre a, non sans talent, donné et fondu en un poème unique une demi-douzaine de branches que nous avons encore. On ne peut s'appuyer sur son récit pour voir dans les poèmes conservés de Renard des remaniements tardifs."

This is a strong argument in favor of the contention that the existing branches are also the original for the Reinaert.

By carefully comparing the Dutch Reinaert with the French Roman de Renard, it is possible that a definite conclusion may be reached and the object of this study is to show:

1. that the Dutch poem "Van den Vos Reynaerde" is an adaptation of Branch I of the French "Roman de Renard".

1. Foulet, pp. 393-432
2. that Willem does not translate nor always closely follow branch I and that he omits certain passages and adds others.

It will be shown that these additions can be traced back to three sources:

a. other French branches, such as must have been known to Willem,

b. oral tradition, fables which were generally known;

c. references to local stories or happenings, which give the poem a decidedly local coloring.

COMPARISON.

For the purpose of a comparison between the *Reinaert* and branch I of the *Roman de Renard* it will be desirable to divide the *Reinaert* (1) into episodes, each of which will be considered in connection with the corresponding passages of branch I. Thus it will be seen in each instance to what extent Willem follows the French text or deviates from it; in the latter case an attempt will be made to account for such deviations and to point out the sources.

1. Hereafter indicated as *R.* and *Roman de Renard* as *R.R.*
The different parts, into which the Reinaert has been divided, are:

a. Prologue .................................................. vv. 1-40
b. Poem
i. Call for a Court-day ..................................... 41-60
II. Ysengryn's Complaint ................................. 60-97
III. Cortoys's Complaint ................................. 98-105
IV. Tybeert's Defense ....................................... 106-125
V. Pancr's Complaint ....................................... 126-176
VI. Grimbert's Defense ...................................... 177-283
VII. Canticler's Complaint ................................. 284-465
VIII. The King speaks and sends Brun
to Reinaert ................................................. 466-496
IX. Brun and Reinaert ....................................... 497-988
X. Brun complains, the King sends a second messenger......................................................... 989-1014
XI. Tybert and Reinaert ..................................... 1015-1335
XII. Grimbert the third messenger
and Reinaert's confession................................. 1336-1754
XIII. Reinaert before the court, his defense,
the complaints, his deathwarrant...................... 1755-2051
XIV. Reinaert's confession; he is forgiven
in the absence of his enemies; the
treasure.......................................................... 2052-2799
XV. Ysengryn and Brun come back, are arrested
and punished.................................................. 2800-3056
XVI. Belin, the ram, and Cuwaert, the hare,
accompany Reinaert........................................... 3057-3474
When it was admitted that the Dutch poem was a free adaptation of branch I (cf. p.12), Foulet's statement: "Willem, n'a pas cru pouvoir mieux faire, que de traduire, très librement d'ailleurs, la branche I ", was not accepted without reservation. A translation is out of the question, when we consider the freedom with which the Flemish writer follows the French branch. It is rather important to note the characteristic independence with which Willem treats his subject throughout his work.

2. Prologue.

The first forty lines, important as they may be with reference to the name of the writer and the reason which led him to write his poem, as will be explained later, are not of primary importance here, where an endeavor is made to compare two texts. What is significant, is the admission of the writer that he used the French books for his original, inasmuch as the plural, den boucken, justifies the assumption that Willem was acquainted with more than one of the branches of the R.R.

b. Poem.

I. Call for a Court-day.

Coming to the first episode,
the "Call for a Court-day" (vv.41-60), the two poems read:

R.R. branch I

v.11  
Ce dit l' estoire el premer vers  
Que ja estait passe i vers  
Et que la rose espaniscoit  
Et l'aube apine floriscoit  
Et pres estoit l'asencions,  
Que sire Noble li lions  
Totes les bestes fist venir  
En son pales por cort tenir.  
Onques n'i ot beste tant ose  
Qui remansist por nule chose  
Qui ne venist hastivement:  
Fors dan Renart tant solement,  
Le mal lere, le souludiant  
Et empirant devant li roi  
Et son orgueil et son desroi.

R. v.41  
Het was in eenen tsinxen daghe  
Dat beede bosch ende haghe  
Met groenen loueren waren bevæn.  
Nobel die econo hadde ghedaen  
Syn hof crayeren ouer al  
Dat hi waende, hadde lyys gheval,  
Houden ten wel groeten loue.  
Doe quamen tes scorninx houe  
Alle die diere, groot ende cleene,  
Sonder vos Reynaert alleene.  
Hi hadde te houe so vele mesadaen  
Dat hire niet dorste gaen:  
Die hem besculdich kent, ontsiet.

v.57  
Doe aldait hof versamet was,  
Was daer niemen sonder die das,  
Hine hadde te claghene over Reynaerde,  
Den fellen metten grïysen baerde.

There can be little doubt but that Willem closely followed the French branch. Though his first episode cannot be considered a literal translation, yet many words and even verses are identical. While the R.R. mentions
the time as "pres estoit l'asencions," the R. indicates that it was a "tsinxendaghe", a Pentecostday.

II. Ysengryn's Complaint.

The second episode, Ysengryn's Complaint, (vv. 60-97), is in both poems substantially the same. Willem enlarges somewhat in his description of the scene, thereby emphasizing the complaint by adding the lines (vv. 89-94): "Reinaert did me so much injury, that if all cloth, now made at Ghent, were parchment, I could not write it all thereon (127). These words refer to local conditions and are significant with reference to the extensive cloth trade even then established in Ghent.

R. R. v. 35

Et compisa toz mes lovaux:

R. v. 74

Ende mine kindre so mesvoert
Pat hise beseekede daer si laghen;

R. R. v. 37

Renart prist jor de l'escondire
Qu'il n'avoit fet tel avoiltire.
Quant li seint furent sporte,
Ne sai qui li out enorte,
Si se retrect mot tost arere
Et se remist en sa tesnere.

R. v. 79

Het was sint so verre comen
Datter eenen dach af was ghencmen,
Ende Reynaerd soude hebben gedaen
Sine onsculde, ende also saen
Alse die heleghe waren brocht,
Was hi ander-sins bedocht
Ende ontfoer ons in sine veste.

This is an almost literal translation. In the R. R. the King apparently is not favorably disposed towards Isengryn's complaint and seems to consider it of not too
much importance, thereby indicating perhaps, that his sympathies are more with Renard. (1). This trait is not found in the R., in which "Ysengryn's Complaint" is followed immediately by "Cortoys's Complaint" (vv. 98-105)

III. Cortoys's Complaint.

This incident, related in six lines, is not to be found in branch I, nor is the dog found as one of the actors in this part of any of the French branches. The way in which Willem introduces this new figure is quite original:

v. 99 Stont up een hondekyn, hiet Cortoys,
Ende claghede den conino in francsoys.

Willem makes the little dog appear "courteous" indeed by making him speak French, an accomplishment which was undoubtedly held to be connected with polite manners. As this incident must be an addition due to a non-French writer, it may well be ascribed to Willem.

The complaint itself is:

Hoet so arem was wylen eere,
Dat alles goeds en hadde meere

1. Foulet, p. 326
In eenen winter, in eene vorst,
Dan alleene eene worst,
Ende hem Reynaert, die felle man,
Die selve worst stal ende nam.

This and the next episode "Tybeert's Defense" are not to found in branch I.

IV. Tybeert's Defense.

Tybeert, the cat, waxes angry, when he hears this complaint. He jumps into the middle of the circle and addressing the King related that this happened many years ago. The sausage was his, and he does not complain. He had gained it by his wit, when one night he entered a mill where he took it from a sleeping miller.

The story of Tybert and the sausage, though not to be found in branch I is not unknown in the R.R. Branch XV tells us of Tybert, Renard and the sausage which they found, but here it is Tybert who plays Renard a trick, for he carries away the sausage and eats it on the top of a cross, where the fox cannot reach him. (br.XV vv.115 ff.) Martin in his "Observations" (1) claims that this episode of Tybert and Renard was based on the fable of the fox and the cat, adding,

(referring to branch XV): "L'histoire de l'andouille pourrait bien avoir été inventée par notre poète lui-même". But if Martin is correct and it can be accepted that the story of the sausage was added and invented by the writer of branch XV, would it not be equally possible that Willem, knowing this branch, should have taken advantage of this incident and given some further details, 1. by having Cortois complain, 2. by having Tybeert at once "angrily" refute his complaint and, according to the original, assert that he, Tybeert, was the owner of the sausage.

There can be no doubt but that branch XV was Willem's source for this episode. This moreover would agree with his own admission, namely, that he made his R. according to the "walschen boucken" the French books, viz. more than one.

The defense is followed again by an accusation.

V. Pancer's Complaint.

In this episode, the castor, vv. 126-176, Pancer complains and the discussion becomes heated. He says that Reinaert is a murderer, a cheat, a thief, and goes on to tell that only the day before, he, Pancer, saved Cuwaert, the hare. Reinaert had found Cuwaert and promised to teach him his "Crède" and make him a chaplain. The lesson started, Cuwaert sitting between the legs of Reinaert. Together they
were singing the credo. Panoer heard it in passing and coming quickly saw that Reinaert had Cuwaert by the throat. Reinaert had stopped his lesson and would have killed the hare if Panoer had not come up in time.

Things begin to look dark for Reinaert, for Pancer brings Cuwaert with him. The latter shows his wounds, so that it is hard to doubt the truth of Pancer's story. Ysengryn of course chimes in at once and again demands vengeance.

Pancer's story is original, forceful and convincing; Willem has succeeded in bringing the accusations to a climax before Grimbert takes up his famous defense. Pancer's accusation, like the two preceding episodes, is not found in branch I. It is evident that Willem is trying to strengthen the legal procedure of the case.

In branch I we find only the complaint of Ysengryn which is immediately followed by the disastrous appearance of the murdered Coppe. In the R. Ysengryn's complaint is followed by the accusation made by Cortoys, the defense by Tybeert, another accusation by Pancer and finally the defense by Grimbert.

It seems important to find an explanation for Pancer's accusation. The fact that there is no love lost between Renard and Couart is also apparent in
branch I, (cf. vv. 1327, 1360) where Couart throws a stone at the convicted Renard, and where the fox finding the frightened hare under a hedge "le sè sist au frein"; (1) Willem did not take over the incident of the hare or fox on horseback. Renard is going to punish Couart, but the latter escapes. May not this episode have inspired Willem? The main idea, viz., that Renard is Couart's enemy, is clearly expressed in branch I. In both RR. and R., Couart is attacked by Reinaert, in both instances the former escapes. Pancer, the beaver, is a new character and does not appear in any of the French branches.

VI. Grimbert's Defense.

In the next episode Grimbert the badger takes up the defense of his uncle Reinaert and answers all the complaints made against him. Using a well-known proverb (v. 182) "Viants mont sëit seldem wél", he starts first to refute the charges of Yeengoyn and cleverly changes front. From defending Reinaert, he proceeds to attack his accusers. Willem introduces here a defense by Grimbert, without following branch I. Still this cannot be called an original conception of Willem's inasmuch as he remains within the limits which this branch gives to the character of Grimbert.

1. Foulet, p. 341
In lines 1886, 1910 ff. R.R. it is also Grimbert who undertakes the defense of the fox. The defense itself needs a more detailed investigation.

"How often," says Grimbert, "did Ysengryn hurt him with his sharp teeth, "And how often did he cheat my uncle", he continues, relating the story of the fishes:

\[\text{R. v.208} \]

Ghi mesleettene van den pladýsen

Die hi hu warp van der kerren,

Doe ghi hem volghtet van verren.

Ende ghi die beste pladýse uplaset,

Daer ghi hu ane hadt versadet.

Ghine gaeft hem no goet no quæt,

Sonder alleene eenen pladýsen-graet,

Does not Renard in his confession later (R.R. vv. 1061,1062), in branch I, acknowledge that he cheated Isengrin with the "plaz"?

\[\text{R.R.} \]

Et si refu par moi traïz

Devant la charete as plaïz.

This episode is more fully described in branch XIV, § cf.540 ff.), where it is Primaut (1), Isengrin's brother who is tricked by Renard. Here also there are

---

1. The name of Primaut is explained by Sudre, p.237, p.206 note I, as being an equivalent of Isengrin, so that it is only natural that Willem did not hesitate to use this and other episodes of br.14
certain lines which lead one to believe that Willem, as well as the writer of branch I, was acquainted with branch XIV.

R.R. br.XIV v.594

La charrete vit en la voie
Qui vint descendant d' un laris
Tote cargie de plais.

Willem having this incident in mind, used it in Grimbert's defense, but reversed it. It is no longer Reinaert who cheats Ysengryñ, it is Ysengryñ who is accused by Grimbert of having eaten all the fish, leaving only a bone for the hungry fox. It will be shown in several instances that Willem was acquainted with branch XIV.

The incident of the fishes is old and well-known. It is partly treated in branch III (vv.22-165) though here the wolf does not figure in the story.

Grimbert continues his defense, and tells about the episode of the bacon in which Ysengryñ again tricked Reinaert, eating it all and leaving Reinaert for his share only the string, and Grimbert adds (v.229): it was of little advantage to him, that he procured the bacon with so much danger, for a man caught him and put him into a sack. This pain and trouble he has
suffered through Ysengryñ. The incident of the sack (vv.229,230) is not found in the French branches and must be ascribed to Willem. The whole episode is told in a clear, original way; the reference that Reinaert was caught and escaped with difficulty cannot be traced back, but its shortness, its lack of clearness in connection with the story, which does not explain how he was caught, nor how he escaped, would lead to the belief that Willem put these words into the mouth of Grimbert to show that Reinaert really had obtained this bacon with great risk, and thus proving that it was the wolf who behaved badly towards the fox.

The episode of the "bacon" is quite old, and we find it already in the Ysengrinus (1) and in branch V vv. 63-135. (2)

The four last episodes do not appear in branch I and are evidently additions of the Flemish poet's, but it seems not necessary to admit that Willem knew another, or an older version of branch I from which he took the material for his Reinaert. Though the defense of Reinaert is original, each of the episodes is clearly taken from other branches.

1. Foulet, p.245 2. Willems,p.38; Sudre, p.133
This is therefore a deviation from branch I which is explained by Willem's acquaintance with other branches, which he freely used.

VII. Canticler's Complaint.

In the next episode, Canticler's complaint (vv.284-465) Willem takes up again the order of branch I. Here again we observe that he does not translate literally. We have seen accusations and defense, skilfully following each other, lead to the tragic entrance of Canticler with his followers and the dead Coppe. This entrance comes as a real climax. Grimbert has just finished his defense telling that Reinnaert had renounced all meat and was living, no longer in his castle "Malcrois", but as a recluse, a hermit in a small hut, and was lean, pale from fasting etc.

RR. v.298

Et Chantecler paumes batant

R. v.291 Canteclere .................
Sine vaderen zeere slaende.

R.R.v.316 Qar ainc Renart ne l'en laissa
De totes cinq que une soule:
Totes passerent par sa goule.

R. v.410 So vele es tghetal nu mindre
Dant ghewona was te zine
Dat die XV kindre mine
Syn ghedeghen al tote vieren.
R.R. v. 413
Quant la vigile fu chantee
Et ce vint a la matinee
Le cors porterent enterrer.
Mes einz l'orent fet encerrer
En un molt bel vaisssel de plom,
Oques plus bel ne vit nuz hom.
Puis l'enfoièrent soz un arbre
Et par desus mirent un marbre,
(S'i ot escrit le non la dame
Et sa vie) et commandent l'ame.
Ne sai a cisell ou a grafe
I ont escrit en l'espitafe
Desoz cest arbre enmi ce plain
Gist Copée la sor Pintein

R. v. 450
Doe die vygelyen ghehent was,
Doe leidemen Coppen in dat graf.
Dat bi engiene ghemaect was
Onder die linde in een gras.
Van maerber-steene slecht was
Die saerc die daer up lach.
Die letteren, diemen daer an sacht,
Deden an tgraf bekinnen
Wie daer lach begravden binnen.
Dus spraken die bouc-stave
An den zaerc up den grave:
"Hier leghet Coppe begraven"

Instead of Pinte, as in the French branch, Canticler himself makes the complaint. With more details than in branch I, Willem relates how Reinaert killed Coppe. He introduces new names, the two brothers of Coppe, Cantaert and Craient, the latter the most beautiful rooster between "Portaengen ende Polanen".

The analogy between the two episodes is without doubt great. All the principal facts, the complaint, the singing of the "vigilie" (cf. R.R. v.408; R.v.440) the burial we find in branch I; in fact only indetail
does Willem deviate from his original.

The miracle happening on Coppes's grave which is found in the R.R. he did not take over.

VIII and XI. Brun and Reinaert.

In the next two episodes, "The King speaks and sends Brun to Reinaert" (vv. 466-496) and "Brun and Reinaert" (vv. 497-988) there are many lines which show that Willem closely followed branch I.

R.R. v. 481 S'estoit devant la barbecane.
Et Renart qui le mont engane,
Por reposer ert traïs arere
Enmi le fonz de sa teusere.

R. v. 523 Doe ghinc hi voer d'ëre barbacane
Sitten over sien staert.

R.R. v. 525 "Renart", fait il, "parlez a moi!
Ge sui Brun messagier lo roi.

R. v. 525 Ende sprac: 'sidi in huus Reynaert?
Lo benn Bruun, deo coninx bode.

R.R. v. 495 Renart set biekenue c'ost li crs,
Reconneû l'avoir au cors:
Or se commence a porpenser
Con se porra vers lui tenser.

R. v. 538 Bi der tale die Bruun heeft begonnen,
Bekenden al te-hant Reynaert
Ende tart bet te dale waert
In sine donkerste haghedochte.
Hoe hi vonde sulken raet
Daer hi Bruun, den fellen vraet,
Te scherne mede mochte driven
Ende selve ziere eeren bliven
'Brun' fet Renart, 'bauz doz amis,
En molt grant peine vos a mis
Qui ou vos a fet avaler
Ge m' en devoie ja aler:
Mes que j'aie mangieancois
D'un merveillos mangier francois.

Heere Brunn, wel soete vrient
Hi hevet hu qualic ghedient
Die hu beriet desen gans,
Ende hu desen berch lance
Over t' loepene dede bestaen.
Io soude te hove syn ghegaen
Al haddet ghi mi niet ghefaden
Maer mi es den buuc so ghefaden
Ende in so uter-maten wyse
Met eere vremder nieuwer apise:

Cel meula, Renart, dont vos abonde?
Ce est la chose en tot le monde
Que mes las ventres plus desire.
Car m'i menes, baux tres doz aire,
Por le cuer be, dex moie cope!

Honich is een soete spyse
Die ic voer alle gherchten pryse,
Ende icse voer alle gherchten minne.
Reynaerd, helpt mi dat ics ghewinne.

'Brun,"dit Renart,"se je savoie
Que je trouvasse en vos fiance
Et amistie et aliance,

De est bon miel fres et novel
Vos enplirai encui le ventre

Ic saels hu so vele beraden,
Ghine hatet niet met hu tienen,
Waendic hu hulde daer-met verdienen.

Un chesne ot commence a fendre.
Deus coins de cesane toz entiers
I avoit mis li forestiers
R. v.651  Eene ecke brocht huten woude
         Die hi ontwee clieven soude,
         Ende hadde twee wagghen daer in ghesleghen

R.R. v.590  Et brun li ors mist le musel
          El ceane deus et ses pies devant.

R. v.677  Ende Brune liet hem so verdoren
         Dat hi thoeft over die horen
         Ende die twee voerdere voete in stac.

R.R. v.603  Renart a les coinz enpoigniez
          Et a grant poine descoigniez

R. v.680  Ende Reynaert poghede dat hi brac
          Die wegghen beede huter eecken:

R.R. v.606  La teste Brun et li coste
          Furent dedens le ceane enclos

R. v.694  Hi was ghegrepen bi zier mulen
          So vaste ende bi den voeten voren:

R.R. v.634  Qui porte tinel, et qui hache,
          Qui flael, qui baston d'espine.

R. v.722  Sulc was die eenen bessem brachte,
          Sulc eene vleghel, sulc een rake,
          Sulc quam gheloopen met eenen stake,

R.R. v.641  Qui devant vient a une hace

R. v.734  Voer hem allen quam gheronnen
          Lamfroyt met eere scerper haex

R.R. v.645  Tent li cuirs et la teste gasse
Here follows in the *Reinaert* a long description of Brun's escape, see below.

**R. v.740**

So dat hem scorde
Van sinen aensichte al die huut.

**R.R. v.648**

Onc nus ne vit si leide beste.
Li sans li vole del musel,

**R. v.746**

Nye maecte God so leelic dier
Dat bloet liep hem over dие hoghen.

**R.R. v.670**

Et li prestres de la parose
Une force tint en ses meins.

**R. v.726**

Selve die pape van der kerke
Brochte eenen cruus-staf,

**R.R. v.677**

Cil qui fet pinnes et lanternes.

**R. v.604**

Eene hout-makighe van lanternen.

Here follows in the *Reinaert* a long description of Brun's escape, see below.

**R.R. v.698**

De quel ordre voles vos estre
Que roge caperon portes ?

**R. v.943**

In wat ordinen wildi hu doen,
Dat ghi draghet roeden approen ?

**R.R. v.711**

Et si n'aporte nule oreille.

**R. v.854**

Daer hi zyn hoere in hadde ghelaten.

**R.R. v.713**

Li rois dit "Brun qui t'a ce fet ?

**R. v.987**

Ay God, wie heeftene so meemaeet "?
Some of the quotations show an almost literal translation. In the description of the escape of Brun, however, there is a marked deviation. When Lamfroit, followed by the whole village, comes out to punish Brun, we see how the latter, beaten, wounded, flees, to find himself amidst some women; some of whom fall into the river. Amongst them is Julocke, wife of the priest. The latter forgets Brun and wants everyone to help to fish his wife out of the water, promising to whoso will help absolution of sins for a year. Brun escapes by the river and swims down a little distance before he lands.

Characteristic is the enumeration of names (R.785-804), which though following in general the description in R.R. (vv.655-677) have been carefully changed so as to become more familiar to the Flemish. Instead of: Bertot le fils sire Gilein; Hardcin, Copevilein, et Gonberz, et le filz Galon, and many others in the French branch, the R. has: Lottram lancvoet, Vrouwe Vulmaerte, Abel Quac ende Vrouwe Bave, Ludolf metten crommen vingheren; Hughe metten crommen benen; vrouwe Oghernen.

Still the last line proves that Willem did not lose sight of his original, for it is literally translated. (see above R.R.v.677; R.v.804) X Brun's Complaint.

The next episode Brun's Complaint,
(vv.989-1014) also follows the R.R.

R.R. v.718 .......... ainsi m'a bailli
Renart com vos poes veoir.

R. v.997 Ende hevet mi ghemaect als ghi siet.

R.R. v.724 'Brun' fit li roi ...........
Je t'en ferai si grant venance
Qu'en le saura par tote France.

R. v.998 Die coninc sprac:' of ic dit niet
Ne wreke, so moetic zyn verdoomt!

The second messenger to be sent to Reinaert is

Tybeert. (1)

XI. Tybert and Reinaert.

The episode of Tybert and Reinaert (vv.1014-1035) follows again branch I. The R.R. indicates that Tybert is not greatly pleased with his mission. (v.737) Tybers ne l'osa refuser. Willem probably influenced thereby, makes Tybert address the King trying to convince the latter that he is too little to succeed where the strong Brun failed. King Nobel, however, points out that he will have more success in using his skill and cleverness than his strength. Tybert starts out not free from fear. Willem takes over almost literally the incident of the St Martin bird, an incident which shows the superstition of Tybert.
R.R. v. 756  A veû l'oisel Saint Martin
           Asez huca a destre,a destre!
           Mes li oisauls vint a senestre

R. v. 1046  Sach hi ..................
           Sente Martins voghel, ende quam ghevlogen,

R.R. v. 760  Or vos di que ce fu la choses
           Qui plus l'esmaie et plus le doute.

R. v. 1051  Nu vliegh te miere rechten hand.

R.R. v. 777  'Tybert'ce dist Renard, 'welcombe'

R. v. 782  Neve, ghi zït mi willecombe

R.R. v. 782  Mes sa parole que li coste?

R. v. 1076  Wat coste Reynaerde scone tale?

R.R. v. 770  Ce dit Renart entre ses denz
           Tot corement que il ne l'oihe
           Si serez vos, s'engin ne faut'.

R. v. 1077  Al seghet sine tonghe wale,
           Sine herte die es binnen fel.

In both the Reinaert and branch I we find that
the fox tries to keep Tybert till the next morning.

R.R. v. 810  Demein einz le soleil levant
Maerghen metter degheraet'.

Martinet qu'puis ot le froc
Et qui puis fu moines rendus
Avaist au trou deus las tendus
Por Renart prendre le gorpil

Des papen sone Martinet,
Ende hadde voer dat gat gheset
Een stree den vos mede te vane:

Passe outre, saoule ton ventre!

Crupet in dit selve gat.

Ge t'atendrai au trou ca fors'

Keert weder huut als ghi zyt sat.
Is sal hier blyven voer dit gat
Ende sal hu hier buten beiden:

Qui ja aprent si bel barat

Die papen connen vele baraet.

, con tu es cuart!

'Owy, Tibeert, twi sidi bloode?

Et or se pot tenir por fol,
Que li las l'a pris par le col.

Want eer hyt wiste, was hem een strec
Omme sinnen hals arde vast.
Con plus tret, plus estreint li las

Ende sprang voert; dat strec liep toe.

Qar Martinez li clercons saut
'Or sus, or sus' fet il,'bel pere!
Aide,aide,bele mere!

So lude, dat Martinet ontsprong.
Ende wecte moedre ende vader.

Li prestres,..............
S'est erraument du lit sailliz.

Selve die pape ne wilde niet sparen,
Quam hute einen bedde moeder-naect.

La mere Martinet s'esveille
Saut sus, s'alume la chandelle

Fen offer- keersce nam vrouwe Julocke
Ende ontstacce metter haest.

Here Willem goes into more details in the description of the incident.

Tybert s'en eschape li chaz,
Qu'il ot as denz mangiez les laz

So dat hi metten tanden zine
Die pese midden beet cntwee.

In vv.1330-1331 the King calls his barons together for advice. The same takes place in 435 R.R.
Here also the name of "barons" is bestowed on his
principal officers.

XII. Grimbert the third Messenger.

In the following episode "Grimbert sent as the third messenger " (vv.1336-1754) we shall again find many literal quotations from branch I. The incident in R.R., in which Grimbert does not leave on his journey without royal letters, has been omitted by Willem. Reinaert this time listens to reason and follows Grimbert, after taking leave of Hermeline, his wife, Reynardine and Rossel (v.1416) his sons.

Neither of these names is to be found in branch I, to designate the children of the fox; Rossel is generally the squirrel in the French poems, (1).

R.R. v.1021 Rent toi a moi verai confes, 
     Qar je n'i voi prestre plus pres'

R. v.1438 Te biechten hier te di: 
     Hier nes andre pape bi.

R.R. v.1028 Et se je muir, si serai sax.

R. v.1442 Mine ziele sal te claerre wesen.

In the confession which now follows Willem shows again that he did not intend to translate, but adds such details and episodes as might be interesting to his readers. We shall follow this confession closely and see, that whenever he adds some episode to the story as given in I it can always be traced easily to an-
other source.

First Willem reviews the incidents against Brun, and Tybert, (compare R.R. 1073-1074; R. 1466-1468) showing that he does not intend to lose the thread of the story. Reinaert also acknowledges that he behaved badly to Canticler, and so he comes to Ysengryn. He made him monk at Elmare, where he tied him with both feet to the rope of the bell, which Ysengryn wanted to learn to ring; but the people came and almost beat him to death. Reinaert called Ysengryn "uncle", though it seems that the latter had no right to this title.

\[\text{R. v.1483} \quad \text{Ende Ysengryn, dat verstaet,}\]

\[\text{Hietic oem dor beraest.}\]

Though the incident of the church bell is not found in Branch I, lines 1065-1066 clearly refer to it.

\[\text{Li fis je tant qu'il devint moines}\]

\[\text{Puis dit qu'il volt estre chanoine.}\]

The story of the wolf who wants to become a monk can be found in Branch XIV, to which we already had occasion to refer (cf. Branch XIV, 199-538). Here also there is related the shaving (410 ff., Branch XIV) which Willem does not omit. The latter even adds that the water was so hot that it burned Ysengryn's hair. (R.v.1505.) Willem adds to the incident, that Ysengryn is tied to the rope,
which episode is not to be found in R.R. Here, on the other hand, the wolf has been drinking, a fact which Willem omits to mention. In R. the incident is treated as a passing event and some details are left out. (1) The origin of this episode (2) seems of less importance here, than that Willem must have been acquainted with branch XIV.

The fishing episodes which follow are parallel in both poems.

R.R. v.1055 Gel fis pecher en la gelee
     Tant qu'il out la queu engelee.

R. v.1506 Up thys,daer icken leerde visschen
     Daer hi mi niet conste ontwisschen

This confession continues with the incident of the stealing of the bacon, also known in branch XIV (vv.658-851), which is identical in both poems.

R.R. v.1053 N'en get issir, tant fu ventrez,
     Par la u il estoit entres.

R. v.1523 Als hi weder uten gate
     Waende keeren huten noet,
     Hem was dien leeden buuc so groot
1528 Ne condi sat niet commen huut

Willem gives here a rather long description of the stealing and how Reinaert in the general confusion carries off a chicken.

R.R. v.1143 Or s'en vont li baron a cort,

R. v.1693 Die heeren hebben den wech bestaen
     Tote des conincs hove waert.

J.Compare Br.VIII,v.126 ff. 2. Sudre,p.241
Qu'il s'avoient parmi un pleins
Deles un grange a noneins
La meson est molt bien garnie
De toz les biens que terre crie,
De let, de formaches et d'ues,
De berbis, de vaches, de bues,
D'unes et d'autres norricons.

Nu was buter rechter vaert,
Dien si te gane hadden begonnen,
Een Pryorit van zwarten nonnen,
Daer meneghe gans ende menich cappoen
Plaghen te weedene buten muere.

Con tu es fole criature!
Onsalich men, wat wilddi doen?

Et as pris la confession.
Daer ghi te biechten zyt ghegaen?

Fet il ge l'avoie oblie
Ic hads vergheten, lieve neve.

Et neporoc sovent colie
Vers les jelins cele part.
Molt est dolant, quant il s'en part,
Et qui la teste li coupast,
As gelines tot droit alast.

Hoe dicken säch Reinaert achter rugghe
Weder daer die hoenre ghinghen!
Hine conste hem niet bewinhen
Hine moeste ziere zeden pleghen:
Al haddemen hem thoert af geverghen,
Het ware ten hoenren waert ghevloghen.
The next episode is Reinaert before the Court,vv.1755-2051, his defense, the complaints, his deathwarrant. Again we find many parallel passages.

'Reois' fet Renart, je vos salu
Ic groet hu, coninc ende hebbe recht
Et Bruns qui la teste at vermeille,
Die noch bloedich es zijn crune.
Qar cil qui serf par nature
Die scalcheit es hem binnengheboren,
'Renart, Renart ' dist l'enperere,
Die coninc sprac: 'o wy Reynaert,
Dat en can hu niet ghehelpen een caf
Ben saves parler et plaidier
Mes ce que vaut ? ce n'a mestier.
The complaints, which arise against Reinaert after his defense, are numerous. Here again Willem introduces new names (vv.1848–1860). Hawi, the wife of the ram, Forcondet and Dieweline are not to be found in any of the French branches. It was noted before that Willem does not hesitate to introduce new names in his poem. In lines 295–299 we found Cantaert and Craiant, in 785ff.
many of the proper names are new; Lottram; Vrouwe Vul-
maerte; Abel Quae; Vrouwe Bave; in 1412 and 1416 we
meet Reynaerdine and Rossel; in 99 Cortoys and in 126
Pancer.

As far as can be discovered there exists no source
from which Willem might have taken the names of Diewe-
line or Hawi nor the other new names introduced by him
in the R. These additional names must be attributed to
the writer himself. (cf. Sudre p. 87). Whether he invented
these names is difficult to ascertain; they may have
existed in oral tradition, but Willem's treatment of
other proper names, his changing the enumeration of
French into Flemish names (cf. 765ff) has already been
emphasized as a proof that his independence and in-
genius were great enough to change names and create
new ones.

R.R. v. 1295 Tel con jugeont mi baron
Que l'en doit fere de laron.

R. v. 1880 Die coning dreef die hooghe barocene
Te vonnesse van Reynaerts saken.

We have followed Reinaert's defense and the com-
plaints of his enemies in detail and found again that
many passages in R. and in branch I are identical. As a
result of the complaints the fox is judged, and in both
poems he is convicted and soon thereafter pardoned by the King. This is the main idea from which Willem never deviates. In working out the details, however, we shall find that the Flemish poet adds many interesting incidents which are not found in any of the French branches. It is in these lines, following the condemnation of Reynaert that Willem's poem differs much from branch I or rather adds so much to the story as told in branch I, that it will be necessary to follow R. carefully, in order to determine whether this addition to R. may be accepted as a contribution of Willem's or whether there may not have existed another version now lost.

Foulet remarks (p.332) when speaking of the short trial and condemnation of Renard in Branch I: "Vraiment une telle hâte est indécente". The author of branch I seems in a great hurry to finish his story. It may be added that the suddenness, which the King forgives Renard after all his crimes, is insufficiently motivated. Without any pleading, without even trying to convince his judges, Renard announces (R.R. 1390) that he wants to take the cross and go "outre la mer". The King (v.1396) feels at once "molt grant pitiez" and pardons the fox;
The queen, in taking leave of the penitent, asks him to pray for her and on his request gives him the ring and Renard departs on horseback.

The only one who had taken up the defense of Renard is Grimbert, who, cries out:

Undoubtedly this last part of branch I is the weakest of the poem, as it lacks the motivation of actions and the vivid descriptions which we find in the earlier part. It is quite probable that Willem, feeling this weakness made an endeavor to strengthen this part by working out a more satisfactory ending.

The first deviation in the Reinaert is in Grimbert's defense. Grimbert shows his sympathies with the fox in a different way than he does in the R.R. He departs, followed by the nearest relatives of Reinaert. They cannot see Reinaert punished and hanged.
It is an influential party which leaves the court. The King is well aware of this fact and tries to find a better solution for the problem. While in branchl the pardon follows almost at once, as has been shown above, Willem paves the way for Reinaert's confession before the court by sending away his enemies on a very important mission. The king advises Ysengryn and Brun to hurry away to prepare the gallows, before nightfall. Ysengryn is willing enough. There is a gallows quite near, he says, but no rope. Tibert, the third enemy, reminds Ysengryn that it was Reinaert who caused two of the wolf's brothers "Rume ende Widelanken" (v. 1914) to be hanged on the same gallows, thus further increasing Ysengryn's zeal. The question of the rope is solved by Reinaert himself:

R. v.1935  "Ghi heren, cort mine pine
Tibert heeft ene vaste line,
Die bejaghede an sine kele. (1)

The three are ready at last, and set out, but not before they have once more shown their enmity, by telling Reinaert that he deserves his fate.

Doubtless the situation is critical. Reinaert, however, does not despair, and Willem shows us the cha-

1. Has not Tibert a rope round his neck from the lasso at the priest's house?
racter of the fox when Reinaert declares, that his three enemies will not escape his vengeance, provided he saves his life;

\[ R. \ v.2037 \] Levie, si sullent noch beeopen,
Hare overdaet ende hare scample,

His immediate care is to devise means for escape. This he finds in his confession for which he asks the King's permission.

**XIV. Reinaert's Confession.**

It is a very long story which the Flemish author puts before us, remarkable in its ingenuity. Reinaert begins to relate how, as a youngster, he was induced to kill and how his taste for meat and blood developed. Then he tells about his uncle Ysengrîn, with whom he went hunting. When it came to a division of the spoils, Reinaert did not get much however. Not that it mattered, he had money enough, silver and gold, so much that a wagon could not carry it in seven loads;

\[ R. \ v.2137 \] "Ic hebbe noch selver ende gout,
Dat al es in miere ghewout,
So vele, dat cume een waghren
To VII werven scude gedraghen."

The king becomes interested. "Whence came this treasure"? he queries. Reinaert confesses that he stole it, but if he had not done this, the King might have been
murdered. Now the queen shows fear and wants to know how this could be. The fox has succeeded in interesting both the Lion and the Lioness, and, as Willem predicts (v.2166 ff.) now he will by his wiles skilfully incriminate his enemies and at the same time win the good will of the King and Queen. Reinaert accuses Tibert, Brun and Y-cengryn of a conspiracy against the King, and the latter is the more inclined to believe him, since he does not hesitate to accuse "sinen liefsten maghen" (v.2233) his nearest relations, viz., Grimbert, the badger, and "si-nen ertscom vader", his earthly father. It was their intention together to take the throne from the Lion, while his father, who had found the treasure of King Hermelinx was to supply the money. Reinaert had discovered the place where the treasure was hidden and taken it away, so that the conspirators, without money, could not carry out their plans. When they hear about this wonderful treasure, which Reinaert now describes in detail, the King and Queen become more and more interested. Eager to obtain these riches, they conduct the fox outside of the court and ask him to disclose the place where the treasure is hidden. He refuses, unless they will pardon him. The King, urged by the Queen, decides to give in and Reinaert tell this story:
In the East of Flanders there is a spring called Kriekepit, just to the South-West of a wood called Hulsterlo. It is a desert place where sometimes for half a year no one comes. A tree, the nearest to the spring, indicates where the treasure is hidden. When the King doubts Reinaert's words, the latter calls Cuwaert as witness and asks him: "Waetatu waer Krieke-putte steet"? (v.2559). Do you know where Kriekeputte is? and Cuwaert admits at once, shuddering with fear, that he knows it is the place where "Reincut de ries" (or Vrões?) forged his money. It is quite near Hulsterlo. The King is convinced, Reinaert receives his freedom, and the King asks the fox to accompany him and the Queen to the spring and show them the treasure. The wily Reinaert at once is ready with an excuse. He cannot go in the company of the King as long as he is excommunicated. He intends to go to Rome at once and from there "over see", over the sea. (cf.2721 FF.) In the meanwhile the three enemies, who were preparing the gallows, are warned, on their way back to court, by Tiecelin, the crow, that the fox is in full favor. They are not well received. The King influenced by the story
told by the fox believes that they have conspired against him. Ysengrýn and Brun are caught and punished.

XV. Ysengrýn and Brun punished. (vv.2799-3056)

A piece is cut from the skin of Brun's back, which serves as a sack for the pilgrim. From Ysengrýn and Hersent he obtains shoes which will serve him well on his long journey and which are cut from the feet of the wolf and his spouse.

The way in which Reinzaert, apparently resigned to die, makes his public confession, the cleverness which he displays in exciting the curiosity of the Lioness and the greed of both her and the Lion, have been presented by the writer in a logical and interesting way. The scene is laid in Flanders, and we find references to many Flemish names. Tibert was sent to the "Ardennen", where he found Brun (v.2251), whom he told to come to Flanders. (v.2254). He came in "Faes" (v.2259) "int soete Iant". They met (v.2265) somewhere between "Hýfte ende Ghent" where they took counsel. Again, a Flemish name "Hulstelo" is given, the wood near which the treasure was hidden. (v.2276 ff.). The reference to the forger "Reinout de ries", who forged his money in the selfsame spot, seems of local importance and must refer to a known tradition. From the above it is clear that Willem greatly
added to branch I.

At this point the other French branches do not offer any incidents parallel to the confession of Reinsert, as Willems develops it. The question now under consideration is, whether Willem followed here a lost French branch, or whether this addition must be considered as his own.

Several reasons indicate that the latter is the case. In the first place, if Willem had a French original, there would undoubtedly have been some indication of this in the names of persons or places, or in the story of King Hermelinx's treasure. As remarked above, however, the scene is laid in Flanders and no indication of such a connection with a French original can be found. Still, the main idea, on which Willem founded his story is not foreign to the French branches. Regarding the treasure, we find in Ia, that, when Reinsert has been chased into Maupertuis, and taken prisoners, his wife and children offer for his ransom:

R.R. v. 2061 Un somier tot ourgie d'avoir.

Here also the King decides to accept the treasure (vv. 2064-2065). The possibility of buying the King's favor
with money is not only clearly expressed in Ia, but also hinted at in branch I:

*R.R.* v.1003 *Si n'i aport or ni argent.*

Willem may have been inspired by any of the above mentioned incidents, when he wrote the story of the treasure of King Hermelinx. (1). There is another point of contact between the two stories, *viz.*, the role played by Reinaert's wife. In branch Ia she is introduced into the story, when she brings the horse laden with the treasure, while in *R.* it is she who discovers that there is a hidden treasure and a conspiracy.

Nor is the idea of a confession new to the French branches. Renard confesses his sins to Grimbert: (v.1020) "Confessiez vos a moi brement," when they start out for the court, and later in Ia (v.1964) Grimbert advises him:

"Si vos douüssiez confesser".

We can, therefore, trace back the main ideas upon which Willem built up his story, *viz.*, the confession, the gaining of the King's good will by the promise of a

1. Ermenrich, King of the Goths is the subject of many tales in the early Germanic literature. He died in 375. His tribe lived near the Black sea and was vanquished by the Huns.
treasure, to the French branch altho the description added by Willem has a decided Flemish character. That Willem never lost sight of his main source is proved by the fact that in R. as well as in R.R. the fox leaves the court as a pilgrim, going to the holy land.

R.R. v.1890  
La merci deu outre la mer  
Si je la muir, ci serai sax

R. v.2721  
Van Rome willic over see:  
Dane en keric nemmermee,  
Eer ic so vele hebbe ghedaen,  
Coninc,dat ic met u mach gaen.

Willem clearly turns back to branch I.

XVI. Belin the Ram and Cuwaert. (vv.3057-5472)

In the next episode Willem has also added to the story as told in R.R. In branch I Renard discovers Cuwaert under a hedge. He bites the hare. Cuwaert escapes and appears bleeding before the King. Willem has him accompany Reinaert and Belin to Reinaert's home Maupertuis. Here Cuwaert is killed and Reinaert sends Belin back with Cuwaert's head in his pilgrim's bag. In both poems, Cuwaert serves (though indirectly) to arouse the anger of the King and though the episode has been changed the same motive is discernible in both.

Willem, who does not closely follow the French, fails to explain why the fox should thus mistreat
Cuwaert, and it is interesting that it is necessary to turn to branch I, in order to find the motive. When Cuwaert appears before the King to ascertain the truth of Reinaert's words, he is afraid:

R. v.2625  " Cuwaert, hebi soude? 
Ghi bevet, zyt blide al zonder waer,

Why should Cuwaert be afraid to appear before the King and speak the truth? Willem does not explain why, but in branch I it is clear that the hare, when Renard was about to be hanged, had thrown a stone at the fox and

R.R. v.1364  En a crolle le chef Renart,
he had run away:

1366  Que onques puis ne fu veûs
1368  Lors s'est muchez en une haie:
D'illoc, ce dit, esgardera
Quel justice l'en fera.

No wonder that he was afraid when the fox was pardoned. No wonder also that Willem, who shows Reinaert revenged on all his enemies, did not forget Cuwaert, though he did not tell us why the fox was angry with the hare. It is to branch I that we must turn for his motive.

The different episodes of the two poems, viz., the Reinaert and branch I of the Roman de Renard have been submitted to a careful comparison. Before reaching
any conclusion, there are certain additional points of interest to be offered concerning the construction and general presentation of the material involved in these episodes.

**Introduction of Animals.**

In the French poem, as well as in the Reinsert the animals are introduced nearly always with their appellative names. These names represent a certain kind of animal and rather the genus than the individual.

**R.R. v.**

16 Nobel li lions
55 Brun li oars
79 Bruianz li tors
283 Chantecker li cos
359 Coars li levres
413 Brichemers li cerf
425 Copee la sor Pintein
473 Tybert li chat
107 Tybeert die Cater
1301 Grimbert li tessons
1316 li motons Sire Belin
1318 Tiecelin li corbeaux
1321 Espinaz li hericons
1322 Petipas li poons
1323 Frobers li gresillon
Whenever Willem introduces a new name, however, he unconsciously follows another method than that of branch I. He does not assume that the name is already known. He does not say: "Cortoys dat hondekyn," but

R. v.99 een hondekyn, hiet Cortoys
295 die eene hane hiet Cantaert
299 die ander hiet ...........
331 Rode, die vroede

Die goede hane Crayant,
1849 Ende sine hye, die met hem quam,

Dat was dame Hawi.

Ysengryn, (v.63), Cuomoerde (v.137), Canticler are introduced without further ceremony like Renard and Isengrin in the French poem.

The fact that the names not found in the French branch, are introduced in such a different manner, seems to be a clear proof of Willem's originality in this regard.
If these had been taken over from another and older French version, they would doubtless have been introduced in the same way as were the other characters. This seems to be an additional proof that Willem did not use an older version as the original for his poem.

In their actions, moreover, the actors stay within the limits set in branch I. Willem avoids such improbable things as Reinaert's climbing a tree found in Ia. He may add to it here and there but always keeps the tone of branch I.

In comparing the R. with the R.R., an endeavor has been made to explain deviations in the treatment of certain episodes or additions with which Willem enriched the scene of the judgment. It might be of interest to say something more about the literary value of the Reinaert. Like branch I of the R.R., the R. is written in dialogue form, with very few interpolations of the author. It is only in the latter part in which Willem deviates most from branch I, that he announces before each episode what it contains. He often uses such expressions as: "Hi peinsade" (v.2036); "Nu hort" (v.2166); "Nu vernent" (v.2229); "Nu hort" (v.2425); again "Nu hort" (v.2902); "Mi dinct" (v.3019).
In the description of the thoughts or emotions of his main actors he is vivid, and in the art of composition he excels. A repetition of episodes or of words is absent except in the case of the introductory "Nu hort". (See above).

If the poem may be considered as an epic it should show a certain central motive, which set forth in the beginning, gradually develops and leads to a climax at its conclusion.

Willem wrote his poem at a time when the struggle for preeminence between the fox and the wolf had been decided in favor of the former. Whereas the wolf, it seems, was originally the main actor, later the fox had become the principal character in the animal epos, in whom the interest was centered, whose character had been more developed than that of any other animal and consequently Willem took him for the central figure of his poem. He made him his hero. Does he not declare in his prologue:

R. v.3

Hom vernoyde so huerde
Dat die avonture van Reynaerde
In dietsche onghemaket bleven.

There is here no question of the adventures of the wolf, no, he was sorry that the adventures of Reinaert remained undone in Dutch; and v.7, Dat hi die výte van
Reynaerde dede soucken. He had the definite purpose to find the description of Reinaert's life. Again v.30: Soe bat mi dat ic scude maken Dese avonture van Reynaerde.

An immediate result of making the fox and his adventures the main object of his poem would be that Reinaert's character had to be more developed, and that he especially through his wiles in escaping from dangerous situations, emerged victoriously from all his adventures.

It is to this motive that Willem strictly adheres. The added episodes in the beginning (complaint of Cortoys, Defense of Grimbert, Complaint of Pancer, Defense of Grimbert) all tend to show us better the character of the fox. The action itself is intensified, the interest in the main actor increased.

That the same motive led Willem to add considerably to the latter part of Branch I (admittedly the weakest part of the French branch) seems acceptable. If the fox, as hero must overcome his enemies, the extreme shortness of this part of branch I could hardly satisfy him.

This induced Willem to introduce the fox' confession and the episode of the treasure. Already in line 1995 we read: "Her Ysengryn, soete Cöm, .................
v. 2005 Gheonneert werden alle drie; and again is the idea of the coming revenge expressed in V.2036 ff.

With clearness Willem outlines his plans when he makes an announcement of the way in which Reinaert will overcome the enmity of the King and Queen; that with great cleverness he will gain not only the King's favor but bring misfortune to Brun and Ysengryn.

It is clearly Willem's purpose to have the fox overcome all obstacles. This unity of thought and action which permeates the whole poem is one of Willem's great merits. The immediate result has been, that the narration is broken by but few digressions, that the poet does not give long descriptions of settings of nature, but the story progresses without diversions. Whereever Willem expands a given incident it is with the purpose to add interest, by referring to local conditions, by more detailed description of the incidents or of the character of his hero.
CONCLUSION.

As a result of this comparison it may be concluded:

I. that in the text of the R. there are many verses, which are either a literal or a free translation of passages in branch I of the R.R.

II. that Willem has followed very closely the leading idea expressed in branch I, to which branch, even after more or less lengthy deviations, he always returns;

III. that many additions are clearly taken from other known branches, such as:

- Branch XV, see episode IV, p. 24
- Branch XIV, see episodes VI and XII, pp. 28 ff. 43 ff.
- Branch Ia, see episodes XIV and XV, p. 56 ff.
- Branch V, (probably) see episode XVI

IV. that other additions indicate that Willem enriched his subject with many incidents which may or may not have been taken from oral tradition but show a decided Flemish character.

- see episode II, reference to the clothtrade in Ghent,

VII. addition of names Cantaert, and Craiant

the most beautiful rooster between
Portaengen ende Polanen.

see episode XIII, introduction of new personal names.

V. that the traditional conceptions of the animals are held closely within the limits of the French branch. Willem shows also in his additions a decided endeavor to follow the general style of that branch.

In conclusion it may be stated, that the Flemish poem though not a literal translation, is a free adaptation of the first branch of the Roman de Renard. That, moreover, the Flemish poet, notwithstanding his freedom in adaptation, has succeeded in creating a work of great value, on a par with the celebrated French branch, a poem which is well worthy of the wide influence which it has had on the literature of the animal epos.