YSENGRIMUS AND THE EARLY ROMAN DE RENARD

L.G. Donovan—University of Calgary

The Latin language maintained its dominance in intellectual and in "serious" literary matters for over eight hundred years after the fall of Rome to Alaric in 410 A.D. To be sure, non-Latin works designed to inspire religious or heroic fervor, the **Lives of Saints,** or indeed the various **Chansons de geste** were not uncommon, but it is only in the twelfth century that we begin to see adaptations into the vernacular languages of the more philosophical, historical or literary texts. These early adaptations were selfconsciously designed to adapt, transmit and preserve knowledge, "chose digne por ramanbrer"[1]. Recent studies have begun to establish a number of principles and procedures of adaptation used by medieval authors as they "modernized" their Latin models into French or as they rewrote French texts in German (**Erec, Perceval, Tristan,** etc.) thus making the most significant parts of them available in a new form to those who preferred to read or hear the story in their native tongue. It is our intention, in this paper, to show how the adaptation from Nivard's **Ysengrimus** into the early branches of the **Roman de Renard** was carried out, and to attempt to shed new light on some of the methods, aims and procedures of the medieval adaptor.

The **Ysengriumus** is itself a complex and ambitious satire written in clerical circles by a competent latinist well versed in biblical and classical literature. The various articles which accompany this paper will undoubtedly show, with respect to Nivardus, that "...in his skilled delight in parody, his mastery of three different traditions, classical, Christian and popular, and his command of language, he was a literary master of the highest rank"[2]. Despite this complexity, a certain Pierre de Saint-Cloud, writing between 1174 and 1179, was able to make extensive if subtle use of the **Ysengrimus** as he composed the earliest branches of the **Roman de Renard** in the French language. The scope of this paper will permit an analysis of some procedures used by Pierre de Saint-Cloud and by his immediate imitators (between 1174 and 1190) as they created the immensely popular and significant **Roman de Renard** which was so widely read, admired and imitated throughout Europe for the next several hundred years[3].

In the first place, we note that only a few names, those of the main characters, Renard and Ysengrim, and one or two well-designed animal names are kept as they are. Others are recreated in French using principles laid down by Nivard himself who asks us to notice how each name is suited to the animal's station in life: "Officiis quorum nomina iuncta uide" (IV, 4), but who takes pleasure in creating his own obscure onomastical allusions. For example, Berfrid, the goat, who, with the help of Joseph, the Satrap of all rams, aided in protecting the convoy of pilgrims with the weaponry of his forehead

> Berfridus caper et ueruecum satrapa Ioseph
> Presidium aramata fronte tuentur idem (IV, 7-8)

may well take his name from the concept of a military offensive or defensive fortification, **berfroi** in old French, **bergvrid** in middle high German, but his colleague in the endeavour seems to take his from a literal and humorous interpretation of the biblical passage: "Qui regis Israel, intende, qui deducis velut ovem Joseph" (You who govern Israel and who **lead Joseph as a lamb**": Psalm 79, 2).[4] Nivard's horse, **Coruigarus sonipes** (V, 1135) "loudfooted Corvigar", may perhaps, as is suggested in Voigt's introduction, be derived from the raven color of the horse's coat, "von der schwarzen Rabenfarbe, wie wir Rappe, d.i. Rabe sagen," [just as] "das rothe Pferd nach dem Fuchs benannt wird" (op.cit. p. LXXVI), but the color of his coat is not mentioned and plays no part in the episode, rather his "noisy hooves" and his joyful, earthy, speed-loving nature:

> Mox uolucri saltu perlatus ad arida, pedit,
> Voluitur, est, cursat, gaudia mille furit. (V, 1165-66)
>
> (With a flying leap, he attained the dry land in a moment's time. He farted, rolled over, fed, ran, and went wild with a thousand delights.)

It is much more probable that **uigarus** is designed to suggest the idea "vigor", "strong", "full of force" (cf. **vigorare**), and that **cor** evokes the idea of running, as in twelfth century French **corre,** "to run" from **currere** in Latin, which in medieval Latin was often written **correre,** as in modern Italian, or indeed, since the gelding courageously defends himself against the wolf, **coruigarus** may mean "strong hearted", from **cor, cordis.**[6] In other cases, Nivard, who seeks to reveal and conceal at the same time, and who delights in making fun of everyone, including no doubt his readers, is not averse to using Greek forms (**phas** for the Latin **fas** "suitable for"; Greek accusative **Carcophanta** IV, 103), with reference to the donkey "who was adept at bearing burdens" and "took his name from the nature of his service":

> Carcophas asinus, portandis molibus aptus,
> Nomen ab officii conditione trahit; (IV, 9-10)

The form -phas, -phanta evokes also the Latin **elephas, elephantis** which is in accord with the extraordinary size of the ass who "was very heavy

— as big in size as six oxen bred on the Frisian coast, plus three grains of salt." (IV, 503-504)[7]

The rich complexity of these and other allusions was understood and appreciated by the French adaptors. They use some names which no longer give a key to their derivation: Renard's wife Hermeline, Tibert the cat, Tiecelin the crow, for example, but in most cases, they created an expressive French name whenever the Latin allusions gave difficulty. They maintained Ysengrimus, of course, which we recognize as **iron mask** (Ger. **eisen,** and old Saxon **grima,** middle Dutch **grime,** "mask"), because of his natural lack of beauty, or else because the iron horseshoe from the vigorous and "noisy" foot of Corvigar was embedded in his not too swift skull. (V, 1281 sqq.)

Renard's name was also maintained. It is said to come from the German form Regin-hart and may appropriately signify that the fox was an astute, sharp (hart) and indeed unscrupulous counsellor on legal matters:

> Dictatum Reinardus agens prohibetque inbetque,
> Ut clauus facilem torquet utroque ratem, ... (IV, 11-12).
> (Reynard laid down the law, and said what not to do, and what to do, the way a rudder turns the compliant bark to one side or the other).

The name of Belin, the ram, is also maintained, since the allusions are apparent in French. The name evokes the French work **bêler,** (Latin **belare**), the sheep's cry, and has within it a play on words, **beautiful wool,** in both French and Latin, **belle laine, bella lana.** This play on words was explicitly referred to by Nivard in the **Ysengrimus** when he stated that Belin was so called on account of his spotless wool:

> At nomen quarto dat uitrea lana Belino (II, 279).

Indeed, the popularity of his name in the widely known **Roman de Renard** most probably played a role in imposing the word as the name first of the sheep in Old French then, with a change of suffix, as the name of the ram, **bélier** in modern French, in preference to the various derivatives of the latin word **aries.** And finally, the **Roman de Renard** maintains the name of Bruno, "who presided over the bears" (III, 49) since the color of the bear has significance in Old French.

Most of the other names which occur in the **Roman de Renard** are created in accordance with the ironic and facetious principles established by the **Ysengrimus.** The rooster, who supposedly sang with his eyes closed, is called Chanteclin (**chanter** and Old French **clignier,** to blink), his son who sings clearly, Chantecler, the trembling rabbit, Couard, the pint-sized hen who lays the biggest eggs, Pinte, and her small sister Coupee "the cut off hen". The rat is called Pelé "devoid of hair" and his wife Chauve ("the bald one"); the snail's name becomes Tardif, "he who is always slow or late". It is he who, naturally, leads the king's troops on the field. Rufus the "reddish maned" lion becomes Noble, his wife the proud "Fiere"; the den of Renard, where he so ungraciously rapes Ysengrin's wife when she becomes trapped in the small entrance is appropriately called Maupertuis ("the ill-fated opening"), his children Malebranche (the wild or bad descendant) and Percehaie, "he who penetrates hedges"; the camel Musart, "the one who stands around looking foolish" and so on. These numerous creations, adroitly coined, are indicative of the ingenious ability of the adaptor to follow and indeed to improve on the inventive procedures of the erudite Nivard. It is worthy of note that, although Nivard does give a name to each of the characters as they appear in his fascinating if difficult work, he generally does not refer to them by their name later but rather by either the role they play at any particular moment, such as the marker (in the field), the doorkeeper, the chief physician, the old beast, the distraught abbot, the priest, and so on, or else by the animal they represent: the boar, the bear, the cruel sow, the alert cook, the ram. This is not true in the **Roman de Renard,** where, after the introduction of each character, it is generally his or her name that is used in subsequent pages, so that the personal attributes of each animal tend to play a more important role than the underlying animal characteristics.

This increased personalization of the characters, which mixes human and animal features in very subtle ways, is not, let us repeat, a creation of Pierre de Saint-Cloud: it is merely the skillful extension of an existing procedure which was understood and followed through in the adaptation. In Nivard's early incidents, the theft of the ham and the ill-fated fishing expedition where the wolf lost most of his tail, the wolf and the fox were in all respects a wolf and a fox, except for their conversation. When the animals reached the court of the king however, like true human courtiers they were seated in order: "the princes who had been summoned, on either side above, and the mass of commoners on either side below." (III, 89-90). Later, the goat and the ram, displeased with Ysengrimus, **"With their horns,** set against him, ... knocked him flat anyway they could..." (III, 215) Still later, however, as a human physician would, "Reynard gathered up all sorts of healing herbs. Then with a lot of old shoes full of gaping holes hanging from his neck, he went off on his way." (III, 311-312) Similarly, at the inn, Bertiliana and her seven companions "were sitting at the table" (IV, 117) as humans should. The donkey, "leaving his place at the door,... headed for the fireplace and ran over to some plates that had been put down there and grabbed some scattered bits of food." (IV, 117sqq.) These cases of truly human situations and behavior are not, however, extremely common in the **Ysengrimus.** In the **Roman de**

Renard, their potential is more fully realized so that a finer level of humor and, indeed, of irony is obtained. When Ysengrin and his wife Hersent pursue Renard, he flees and doesn't stop **putting the spurs to his horse** until he arrives at his refuge of Malcrues:

Onc ne fina d'esperonner
Jusques au recept de Malcrues. (II, 1248-49)

Then, animal fashion, he lifts Hersent's tail with his teeth in order to take advantage of her when she is trapped in the narrow entrance of his "castle", but when Ysengrin comes by, he swears that he has not lifted her skirts nor taken off her undergarments:

Pour Dieu, biau sire, ne creez
Que nulle rien i aie faite,
Ne draps levez, ne braie traite. (II, 1312-14)

At a later date, when Renard appears before the king to reply to the complaints of Ysengrin and of Brun the bear, he discovers that he has fallen into a trap. As he flees "teste levee" (Va, 1179), the guard dogs, true knights, ride after him, their spears carried in their felt-covered holders:

Primes i cort ainz que li autre,
Lance levee sor le fautre,
Roonel le chien dant Frobert
Et Espillars le chien Robert, ... (Va, 1185-88)

This subtle mixing of animal and human characteristics which adds much to the quality of the literary work, and the skillful characterization of each animal in the tale, clearly derived directly from the **Ysengrimus** itself, are expanded in such a way as to create a breadth and significance that had not been achieved in the erudite tale from which they came.

And yet, critics have often maintained that the French author or authors could not have known the **Ysengrimus** since he is not, or they are not successful in maintaining the coherence that is clearly an important feature of the original.[9] In the first place, the story is inevitably modified by a change in perspective since the real hero, or anti-hero, of the Latin version is the "wolf in sheep's clothing", Ysengrimus himself. We begin with his successful theft of hams from the fox, then proceed through progressive stages of degradation: he loses his tail, his hide, is mangled by the rams, kicked by the horse, beaten by the monks, loses his foot in a trap and finally is eaten by a herd of swine. In the **Roman de Renard,** it is no longer the wolf who plays the central role, but the fox: wily, clever, unscrupulous. What is of extreme significance is that this change of emphasis is carried out, as in the case of the characters and their names, by using the same underlying principles that we find in the Ysengrimus itself. In both works, the protagonist is on the prowl in search of food for his empty stomach. A difference occurs in that, since the reader (or listener) is expected in the end to be unsympathetic to the wolf in the **Ysengrimus,** he is shown as winning the first contest against the fox by devious and dishonest means. When we later discover that the rape of Ysengrimus' wife preceded the theft of the hams, it is too late, our sympathies are already in place, more so since the rape **follows** in time the scene in which the pack of wolves unsuccessfully attempt to eat the band of eight pilgrims on their way to visit sacred shrines.

In the **Roman de Renard,** since it was written by someone, as we believe, who had a thorough knowledge of the **Ysengrimus,** and whose fellow "clercs" were known by him to have the same knowledge, the picture is fairly complex. In the Latin text, the earliest event—in terms of the time sequence of the narrative — appears to be a pilgrimage with eight animals. As the group disintegrates, Renard is attempting to persuade Sprotin (Chanteclerc) the rooster to close his eyes as he sings. In Latin he meets him in a granary; in the French text, the scene is carefully prepared so as to justify the subsequent pursuit of the fox. Indeed the Latin text fails to prepare the scene where "a furious crowd of countryfolk" suddenly and rather inexplicably spy Renard who has captured the imprudent rooster. (IV, 990 sqq.). This omission is dealt with by having Renard in the French text make off with the rooster from the farm of the properous Contans de Noës,

Un vilain qui mout ert garnis (II, 30-31)

The scene permits a humorous parody of the dream sequence in the **Chanson de Roland** where a sense of impending doom cannot be dispelled (II, 131-275) and also justifies the fact that the farmer, his family, helpers and his dogs immediately begin to pursue Renard as he carries off the rooster (II, 369 sqq.). In both the Latin and the French text, the outcome is the same: the rooster, in his turn, goads the fox into taunting his pursuers, then takes advantage of the momentary lapse and flies into the nearest tree (**Renard,** II, 435-440; **Ysengrimus,** IV, 1023-25). In the subsequent scene of the latter work, the fox returns to try to induce Sprotin to read a letter which he claims ensures that peace has been sworn among all who inhabit the kingdom. (V, 137 sqq.) This scene is the same in the **Roman de Renard,** except that Pierre de Saint-Cloud, more concerned with the sequence of events and with **vraisemblance** than with the pithy aphorisms that embellish the Latin text, modifies the scene in such a way that it is the titmouse or chickadee that meets the fox after he allows the clever rooster to escape (II, 463 sqq.) There seems little doubt that this is adapted and somewhat modified from the corresponding episode with the rooster in the **Ysengrimus.** In both scenes, the bird is in a tree or high bush; in both cases Renard declares that peace has been proclaimed by royal decree; in the two scenes, the rooster (or titmouse) sees hunting dogs coming and taunts the fox as he is forced to flee, telling him that he ought, in his turn, to trust the general decree which has created peace in the realm.

Up to this point the order of events and of the details is such that there is little doubt that the **Roman de Renard** is being adapted from the **Ysengrimus.**

There follow two episodes which are not found in the Latin model. In the first, the devious Renard is once more tricked as he tries to get the better of someone else, the cat Tibert in this case. This is the third time in this opening scene that Renard comes out second best. The repetition of an episode in this manner is a common feature of medieval adaptations. In addition, the **Ysengrimus** contains brief mention of a cat letting a mouse escape, this while the wolf in fact tries unsuccessfully to hold on to the fox that he has temporarily in his power:

> "Thus a nimble cat, when he plays with the mouse he has caught, puts down his catch, and catches what he puts down. The mouse stays still when caught, and goes no place when let go, as much afraid of running as pained by staying. But if the one who is confidently in control looks away, the other forgets about the cat's confidence and remembers to run off. The joke is then on the joker, and the mouse scurries into his hole without a good-bye and without complaining that no one saw him off. Once he has got free, the mouse won't go back in that mouth for all the ruddy coin of an Arab sheik." (**Ys.** I, 63-72)

This reference could well have placed in Pierre's mind the idea that a wild cat would be a worthy opponent for the fox, a role that Tibert effectively plays throughout the **Roman de Renard.** The idea that the story must begin with a series of events in which Renard, despite his craftiness, is unsuccessful, is no more than a developed adaptation of the same principle which occurs in reverse form in the **Ysengrimus,** where the reader is precisely **unfavorably** disposed towards the wolf because of his initial success in outwitting the fox. The closing episode in this Branch (II) returns finally to the rape scene which, in both the Latin and French versions, play a central role in the deep-seated antagonism between the wolf and the fox. There is little doubt that this scene in the **Roman de Renard** is directly adapted from **Ysengrimus.** The order of events is identical: Renard comes upon the wolf's den where he finds Ysengrin's wife who, very recently, has given birth to cubs. He urinates and defecates on the cubs in order to demonstrate his real opinion of Ysengrin. Immediately thereafter in the Latin text, a short while later in the French, Hersent vigorously pursues Renard who flees to his castle with its rather small doorway. The she-wolf becomes stuck, whereupon the fox, having used a second exit, comes around and rapes her. In the Latin text we read: "The book tells how she enjoyed these tricks and how the fornicator cuckolded his uncle." (V, 817-18) From this allusion, the adaptor modified the initial meeting in the "house", of Renard and Hersent. In the Latin text she does not hear or see Renard until he has ill-treated her offspring, at which point she attempts to catch him and take vengeance on him (V, 739 sqq.). In the French text the author develops considerably the character of Hersent who becomes a coquettish wife, more than ready and willing to "raise her thigh" in response to advances from the admired Renard:

> Hersens a la cuisse hauciee
> Qui moult plaisoit itel atour. (II, 1116-17)

This modification creates a problem, in that Hersent cannot immediately pursue Renard even though he mistreats the wolf couple's cubs before going on his way. She merely asks them to avoid telling their father anything at all, but the distressed cubs do not heed her words. She is prepared to swear to her husband that she has done no wrong (later in Branch I she is prepared to swear that she has not done anything that a nun wouldn't do!), but in order to prove her innocence she is required by Ysengrimus to pursue Renard with a maximum of effort. It is in this pursuit, "less than a week later" (II, 1216) that she finds herself trapped in the too narrow entrance of Renard's abode. Even here, as her husband aids her in escaping from the constraining entrance, the small modification carried out by the adaptor is motivated once more by the Latin text. Pierre de Saint-Cloud, in his adaptation, does nothing to make the original work more palatable for polite society. In this case, while describing Ysengrin's struggle to free his wife he enlarges considerably on the rather terse Latin description "He got the poor creature loose. They spoke, and swore, one after the other, that Reynard's offence had to be paid for with a painful death." (V, 1121-1124). In the adaptation this becomes a longer scene (some 32 lines) in which Ysengrin pulls so hard on Hersent's tail that she is unable to refrain from defecating, presumably in his face (II, 1370-71). This small gem of textual enhancement is probably no more than a transposition, since a similar edifying event occurs in the Latin when the old hag, Aldrada, having cut off Ysengrin's tail which was caught in the ice, falls behind the wolf on bended knee, with the result that: "Stuck in the hollow of his nether hole, her nose begged for mercy." (II, 58)

There seems little doubt then that the earliest of all branches written in the vernacular, Branch II, takes its motivation and most of its procedures from the **Ysengrimus** which was written some twenty to twenty-five years earlier. Even the scene in which Renard, while trying to trick Tibert the wild cat, is himself tricked and is caught in a trap, takes up a number of procedures and incidents from the **Ysengrimus.** In this case, for the third time, wily Renard is unsuccessful despite his best efforts. Throughout the French work, in fact, Tibert is a worthy opponent for the fox. This is natural since the cat's nocturnal habits, his eyes that shine in the dark and his fur coat that gives off sparks when caressed

at night, indicate that his natural bent can, on occasion, be as dangerous and diabolical as that of the red-coated fox. The idea that Renard is quite capable of tricking one or the other of the predators into placing a foot in a trap exists in the **Ysengrimus.** The **goupil,** in point of fact, persuades Ysengrin to swear on "saintly relics" that Carcophas the ass owes him one donkey's hide. The "saintly relics" in question are the parts of an open leg-hold trap. The unsuspecting and slow-thinking wolf, forever greedy and stupid, once caught, has to gnaw off his own foot to free himself. (IV, 514 sqq.) When this incident is transferred to the French, it is Tibert, as crafty as Renard himself, who manages to push the fox with his left arm so that Renard's foot, not his, is caught in the trap. (II, 788-790) Unlike the wolf who is obliged to gnaw off his own foot (VI, 542) in order to free himself (in preparation for his impending death at the hands, or rather at the mouths of the herd of swine, VII, 437), the fox escapes when a peasant, trying to kill him, breaks the trap with his axe. This incident repeats that of the Latin text where Ysengrimus is freed when Aldrada, trying to behead him, cuts off with an axe his tail that is caught in the ice (II, 115-118).

And so, finally, in this oldest branch, the only incident that is not taken from the Latin text is, apparently, the well-known episode where the fox succeeds by flattery in taking a piece of cheese from Tiecelin the crow but is unsuccessful in catching the crow himself (Va, 858-1018). This fable was known in the middle ages through a number of collections derived from Aesop and Phaedrus, the best known of which was the **Romulus** in prose.[10] To a large extent, the whole incident in the **Roman de Renard** is merely a third and final repetition of the original event wherein the fox tries to trick a bird — rooster, titmouse or crow — into coming down from his perch and allowing himself or herself to be caught and eaten. Only the idea of the piece of cheese is added, having been borrowed from either the **Romulus** or from some other **Isopet** collection, but much more is taken from Nivard's work: the integration of the incident in a long series of events, a lively give-and-take of dialogue between the crow and the fox, and a complex personalization of the characters in question. This is very far from the rather wooden, non-named characters of the fable which does little more than illustrate some moral example or human foible. This difference is even more marked when we remember that the fox in the **Renard** is not really interested in the cheese at all: he uses it mostly as bait to lure Tiecelin close enough to be caught himself.

All of the elements of Branch II, then: names, characters, events and, more particularly, the tightly organized sequence of episodes, are drawn from the **Ysengrimus,** first in the form of principles, before being distilled so as to become, in the hand of Pierre de Saint-Cloud, an externally motivated but original work. Ironically, it is the coherent structure of his tale which will, as we show elsewhere, cause the initial disintegration of the cycle.

There seems little doubt that, what later became Branch Va (ed. Martin), was in the beginning the logical and immediate sequence after the rape of Hersent by Renard.[11] Ysengrin, true to character as the original male chauvinist wolf, blames his wife for letting herself be raped by the fox. She cannot deny it, for he claims to have witnessed the event himself:

> bien ai veue toute l'euvre
> bien me sot Renart acupir* *to cuckold
> je le vi sor voz rains croupir,...(VIIb, 6072-74, ms. B)

Ysengrin, beside himself, begins to kick his wife:

> del pié la fiert con s'il fust ivre (Va, 257)

and will not listen until she, unmindful of the consequences, suggests taking the matter before Noble, the lion-king and his court in the hope that it can be settled in a judicial duel (**champeter**, Va, 281).

The idea of having Ysengrimus and Reynard carry their quarrel before Rufus the king had, of course, been extensively developed in the **Ysengrimus.** When the king falls ill, he summons all the powerful princes of the realm to his bedside in a shady valley. The wily Reynard argues to himself that the rich and powerful ought to go, the bear, the boar and the wolf for example, but that the weak and poor would be better advised to look after their own welfare. The wolf, "delighted that Reynard was thumbing his nose at the King" (III, 93) and "thinking that he would take revenge for more torments that he had suffered" (III, 95-96) uncautiously rushes in where the more cautious would fear to tread. Somewhat later, when Gutero the hare goes to fetch Reynard, he says: "You've been accused by the wolf's damaging testimony. You have barely enough time — the king was requested to grant it — to come and explain yourself" (III, 289-90). When he does arrive at court, the fox, besting Ysengrimus at his own game, convinces the king that only a wolf's pelt can cure his illness (III, 413 sqq.), upon which the bear, as though demonstrating the "reading" of a parchment, removes the pelt from the unhappy wolf (III, 951-1016). The court, in a truly macabre scene, and at the instigation of Reynard, forgives the now blood-covered wolf for wearing a "purple tunic" under his ragged coat (III, 1060 sqq.). Nor is this the only incident where Reynard and Ysengrimus are at odds before the king. In a subsequent episode, when the wolf has managed to grow a new coat, Reynard invites Rufus to accompany him to the home of Ysengrimus so they can share a calf. Reynard takes advantage of Ysengrimus' lack of finesse to once more win favor for himself in the eyes of the king while punishing his "uncle" (VI, 133-342), not only for having eaten a ham that he had promised to

share, but also for being a cruel but stupid bully.

The point of view having changed when Renard becomes the centre of attention in Pierre de Saint-Cloud's adaptation, these basic principles are developed rather differently. As in the **Ysengrimus**. the wolf is the instigator of the legal controversy. It is he who asks the king to punish Renard for having raped his wife. The legal arguments are serious and detailed: is it proper that Ysengrin's wife give testimony in the matter since she is not an independent witness? Should the court take into consideration other complaints such as the presumed theft of food from the wolf and the defendant's outrageous behaviour towards the plaintiff's children? ... These complex arguments are not at all unlike the subtle developments of the **Ysengrimus,** where the wolf attempts to convince the king that he himself is above the law, that the ram and sheep should be eaten as a cure to the lion's illness, and above all, in both the French and the Latin text, that Renard (Reynard) is very much in the wrong for not having accepted to attend full council immediately when it was convoked by the king. In both cases a messenger is sent to request that Renard appear in court without delay: the hare in the **Ysengrimus**, the badger in the **Roman de Renard.** The idea that a multitude of stories existed and could be told is clearly suggested by the king's request for

> "an amusing story of some kind: how the wolf had left the cloister, or entered it, and how he was once the roe's guest, and went back again; or something about the adventures that the fox and the wolf were both involved in — the things they said and told each other or why he lied about his age there; and, the king added with a smile, how the cock tricked Reynard himself — he was eager to hear that too" (III, 1180-1186).

We have here, spelled out with remarkable clarity, a recipe for what became in French the Roman de Renard, an invitation to Pierre de Saint-Cloud and to those who came after him, to develop one after another the adventures of the fox and the wolf in their long-standing quarrel. The suggestions did not fall on deaf ears. A remarkable number of the stories in the **Roman de Renard** are indeed lifted directly from the **Ysengrimus:** the wolf and the horse, the animal's pilgrimage, the fishing expedition, Ysengrin as a monk, the theft of the ham, the division of the spoils, Ysengrin as a surveyor, the antagonism of the fox and the rooster (and, from that, of the fox and the rooster's many wives, Pinte, Coupee, Rouse, Noire Blanchete...), or indeed hostility between the fox and the bear.

One scene, naturally, is missing: the death of Ysengrimus. This gory event doubtless inspired the faked death of Renard, but the various French authors, having invented the procedure by which a hero returns day after day, time after time, to the scene (cf. Superman, James Bond, Mister Spock, Luke Skywalker...) cannot have him die, nor allow his principal opponent to be eaten by a herd of swine. Elsewhere, we show how this ingenious tale, adroitly adapted from the complex, learned **Ysengrimus,** was, in the beginning, organized around a central theme, and we begin to show how the various episodes became separated from the original motivation and structure to become, finally, a large group of disconnected events, usually told to children.

[1]**Roman de Thebes,** ed. R. de Lage, CFMA, 1966, v. 12.

[2]F.J.Sypher, introduction to the translation of **Ysengrimus** by F.J.Sypher and Eleanor Sypher, New York, 1980, p. xix. Our English translations from the Latin text will be from this work. Latin quotations are from **Ysengrimus,** herausgegeben and erklärt von Ernst Voigt, Halle, 1884 (Reprinted, Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim - New York, 1974.)

[3]In this study, we shall focus our attention primarily on the two oldest "branches" of the **Renard,** II, and Va, written by Pierre de Saint-Cloud between 1174 and 1177. Medieval French quotations are from the **Roman de Renart,** ed. Jean Dufournet, Garnier-Flammarion, 1970, which in turn is based on Ernest Martin's edition, **Roman de Renart,** Strasbourg & Paris, 1882-1887, 3 vols. See also Mario Roques' edition of the de Cangé manuscript (ms.B), Paris, CFMA, 6 vol. 1955-72, and the important untangling of the Branches by L. Foulet, **Le Roman de Renart,** Paris, 1914.

[4]Pointed out by E. Voigt, p. LXXVI, who quotes from a Latin biblical commentary by Gervasius of Tilbury. See Sypher, note to IV, 7. (p. 222).

[5]See also Sypher, note V 1313 (p. 235) who makes further suggestions. Two, three or more allusions may well be contained in a single name, all of them intended to suggest that there may well be an underlying allegorical intention in the Latin work. (This most pertinent comment was suggested to me by Professor H. Westra, the editor of these papers, at the University of Calgary.)

[6]Again, I am indebted to Professor Westra for this suggestion, and for the idea that these complex names may well indicate that Nivard is concealing an important, involved allegory in his cruel tale.

[7]**Carco,** from the postulated form ***carricare,** from **carrus,** "chariot" or "cart". ***Carricare** becomes **charger** in French. See further suggestions by Sypher (op.cit.) note IV 9, page 222, and in the present volume by J. R. Scheidegger, "Le conflit des langues: écriture et fiction dans l'Ysengrimus," note 33.

[8]Other names may well have topical significance for medieval readers if not for us: "fleet-footed Gutero, leader of the hares" (III, 58), and Bernard, the second ram, for example. The latter name is indeed maintained in the French but refers to a donkey. It is most probable that both the **Ysengrimus** and the **Roman de Renard** contain numerous allusions to real persons of the time, either to members of the cloistered community or perhaps to leaders who could be criticized for their role in events. Saint Bernard, for example, was criticized for preaching the disastrous second crusade. It is not impossible that Nivard harbored some ironic intent in choosing that name for the hard-headed ram (he refers elsewhere to Saint Bernard in what appears to be an unflattering comment VI, 89), and that the **Roman de Renard** does no more than develop the procedure by choosing the same name to refer to a stubborn donkey. Sypher (op.cit.) comments on Saint Bernard (p. 235-236) and also notes that the name, referring to the ram, is from Old High German bero + hart "strong as a bear" II, 499.

[9]This position was defended at length by L. Willems in his **Etude sur l'Ysengrinus,** Gand, 1895, and has been recently re-stated by F.J.Sypher (op.cit.) p. xviii.

[10]See L. Hervieux, **Les Fabulistes latins,** 2e ed., Paris, 1893, 5 vols. For the **Fox and the Crow,** see chapter II, fable No. 14, volume 2. See also "De corvo et vulpe", by Marie de France: **Die Fabeln,** ed. Karl Warnke, Halle: Niemeyer, p. 47.

[11]This point of view has not been contested since L. Foulet (op.cit.) 1914. In the de Cangé manuscript, branches II and Va form a single unit.