THOSE BEASTLY PEOPLE: A STUDY OF HUMAN BEINGS IN ANIMAL EPICS

Sharon Short Robertson—Eastern Michigan University

Emphasis is clearly placed on the animals in the Old French **Roman de Renart (RdR)**, a loose concatenation of tales authored in part by Pierre de Saint-Cloud during the last quarter of the twelfth century, and two later adaptations of the material, the Middle High German **Reinhart Fuchs (RF)** written by the Alsatian Heinrich in the last decade of the twelfth century, and the Middle Dutch **Van den Vos Reinaerde (VdVR)**, dating from the first half of the thirteenth century and composed by a certain Willem. Scholarly attention has justifiably concentrated on the parodistic and satirical elements at the court of the lion king. The human beings who frequently appear and disappear at the periphery of the animal court might easily be written off as mere scenery with vague satirical intent. It would not be unreasonable to expect significant correspondence and even direct translation from the source as regards human figures, given their secondary role, yet each author has maintained considerable individuality in the selection and presentation of details. While there is nothing unusual about the basically antagonistic relationship between man and predators such as the fox, it is apparent from the detailed characterizations and lengthy descriptions of human activities that the authors recognized the added satirical potential of human figures in beast epics. The broad satirical thrusts aimed at the worldly and clerical aristocracy of the animal court are paralleled in the human sphere by the descriptions of the knightly ineptitude of Constant des Granches **(RdR)** and Birtin **(RF)** and of the decidedly venal servants of God in all three epics. The boorishness of the human peasantry not only serves as a foil for the exaggerated courtly foppery of the beasts but also focuses attention on the shortcomings of the lower class, which is not represented at the animal court.

The extensive and unfavorable composite of the lion's retainers is counterbalanced by small portraits of lesser human nobility in the **RdR** and **RF.** While Willem chooses to ignore titled humans, he joins Heinrich and Pierre de Saint-Cloud in appropriating noble titles for his zoological courtiers. The names given to the two human representatives of the nobility, Constant des Granches, described as the wealthy vassal of a vassal, and Birtin, a mere knight, lack the humorous element often found in the names of the peasants, but both suffer ludicrous defeat in a situation in which odds are heavily in their favor. Each happens upon a wolf whose tail is frozen fast in the pond as a result of an ill-advised fishing expedition (**RdR** III, 436-510 and **RF** 780-822).[1] Both release dogs and confront the helpless wolf with swords drawn. Sir Constant takes the added precaution of approaching the wolf from behind and loses any claim to manly prowess when he falls on his sword in his first attempt to slay the wolf. His second effort does little to redeem his wounded honor, since he fails to strike Ysengrin's head but instead severs his tail. The picture of Constant, bleeding from a self-inflicted wound and having deprived himself of a mitigating hunting trophy contrasts ironically with the joyous and noisy preparations for the hunt made by Constant and his retainers in the preceding lines. Heinrich's Birtin is spared the indignity of wounding himself, but he also fails in his efforts to best the defenseless wolf. He is rendered ridiculous by a description of his clumsy progress on the ice:

> er Birtin hatte im gemezzen,
> dez ern vf den rvcke solde troffen han.
> do begone im die buze engan:
> von dem slipfe er nider qvam,
> der val in den swanc nam.
> vmme den val erz nigt enlie,
> an den knien er do wider gie.
> die glete im aber den slag verkerte.
> daz er im den zagel vorserte
> vnde slvgen im gar abe. (**RF** 806-815)
>
> (Herr Birtin had already taken aim and wanted to strike him on the back. His feet began to go from under him, he fell on the slippery ice, the fall took his momentum. He did not stop because of the fall but continued on his knees; however, the ice again spoiled his aim, so that he struck the tail and severed it completely.)[2]

Heinrich adds a final insult by classing Birtin with his mutiliated adversary "si hatten beide groze missehabe," (**RF** 816 — The both knew great disappointment) in much the same way that Walther von Horburg, an actual historical figure, is ridiculed by association with the unfortunate Isingrin after his encounter with the monks at the well:

> hette Ysengrin den zagel nigt verlorn
> noch die blatten geschorn,
> in hette erhenget daz gotes her.
> von Horbvrc her Walther
> zv allen ziten alsvst sprach,
> swaz ime ze leide geschach,
> mit ellenthaftem mvte:
> 'iz kvmet mir als lichte ze gvte,
> so iz mir tvt dehein vngemach.'
> Isengrine alsam geschach (**RF** 1021-1030)

(Had Isengrin not lost his tail and received a tonsure, he would have been killed by the men of God. Herr Walther von Horburg maintained with steadfast courage whatever befell him: "In the end it benefits me if something harms me." The same thing happened to Isengrin.)

Mention of the faithful Hohenstaufen retainer in an obviously unflattering context cannot have been coincidental and adds a strikingly personal dimension to the general mockery of the nobility present in all three epics. Schwab sees the reference to Walther as a significant element of the admonishing fable embedded in **RF**,[3] and coupled with the historical interrelation of place names mentioned (Erstein, Tusculum, Bohemia) and Reinhart's veiled and contextually ironic reference to the courtly accomplishments of Heinrich VI **(RF** 435-439), it confronts the reader with a more sharply articulated political commentary than is found in the **RdR** or in **VdVR.**

Monks and priests receive considerably more attention in all three epics. Even brief references imply a level of wealth inconsistent with the vow of poverty and emphasis on spiritual needs associated with the monastic way of life. The white monks, whose strongly fortified barn Reinhart seeks to plunder, are well supplied with hens and capons **(RdR** IV, 81-83) and careless enough to leave the barn door ajar **(RdR** IV, 96-99). The nuns whose farm Renart would like to visit on his way to Noble's court also have no shortage of worldly goods:

La meson est molt bien garnie
De toz les bienz que terre crie,
De let, de formaches et d'ues,
De berbiz, de vaches, de bues,
D'unes et d'autres norricons **(RdR** I, 1053-1057)

(The house was well supplied with all the goods which the earth produces — with milk, cheese and eggs, sheep, cows, cattle and all manner of young animals.)

Reinaert, too, sees the black nuns' cloister he has often plundered as a welcome diversion on the way to court:

Een prioreit van swarten nonnen,
Daer meneghe gans ende menich hoen,
Meneghe hinne menich cappoen
Plaghen te weedene buten mure.
(VdVR 1695-1699)

(A black nuns' cloister where many geese and many roosters, many hens, many capons scratched for food outside the wall.)

Reinaert leads Ysengrin and his family to an abundantly stocked but poorly guarded monastery cellar for the ill-fated wine-tasting **(RF** 505-541), and himself seeks out a monastery which he knows to have no shortage of tasty hens **(RF** 827-838).

In each epic the wolf is initiated into a monastic order by the fox: Ysengrin becomes a monk in the order of Tyron, a group of Benedictines on the Syrian coast founded by St. Bernard in 1113 **(RdR** III, 237), while Reinhart's steamy baptism of Isengrin gains the wolf entry into the Cistercian order, albeit without the culinary benefits he had visualized **(RF** 685-708). Reinaert confesses that he initiated Isengrin into the religious community at Elmare, a Benedictine monastery located between Aardenburg and Biervliet **(VdVR** 1483). By situating the parody of monastic life within specific walls, each author offers negative comments on the materialistic priorities of extant religious orders.

Renart fears the white monks will hold him hostage after he steals their chickens, "car felons sont a desmesure" **(RdR** IV, 105 — for they are particularly malicious). He expresses a desire to join the Cistercians but speculates that he would soon be forced to leave the order because of the falseness of its monks **(RdR** I, 1013-1016), an insult rendered even stronger because it is voiced by the least trustworthy of beasts. Tibeert expresses similar apprehensions about priests' tricks:

"'Die papen connen vele baraet; Ic besteecse harde noode.'" **(VdVR** 1192-1193)

("Priests know many tricks. I do not like to cross them.")

Monks and priests alike take pleasure in cudgeling the fox's hapless victims. The monks in the **RdR** enthusiastically arm themselves for the confrontation with the wolf at the well:

Li abbes prent une macue
Qui moult estoit grant et cornue,
Et li priours un chandelier.
Il n'i remest moine ou moustier
Qui no portast baston ou pel:
Tuit sont issu de leur hostel.
(RdR IV, 407-412)

(The abbot takes a large studded club and the prior takes a candelabra. Not a single monk came without a pole or stick: all left the house.)

Ysengrin suffers grave injury at the hands of the men of God and narrowly escapes the final indignity of being skinned by the prior thanks to the abbot's momentary lapse into something akin to pity **(RdR** IV 431-441). Heinrich's monks are quick to recognize the wrath of God in the wolf's presence in the well and accordingly bludgeon Isengrin; they alter their convictions with equal celerity in the face of Isengrin's "tonsure" and "circumcision," proof of his status as a penitent, and have no difficulty absolving themselves of blame:

die mvnche sprachen: 'ditz is geschen.
hette wirs e gesehen,
des mochte wir wesen vro.'
dannen giengen si do. (RF 1017-1029)

(The monks said: "What's done is done. If we

had noticed it before we could be happy now."
Thus they left the scene.)

Willem's monks interpret Isengrin's bell-ringing as a manifestation of the devil's presence and lose no time in shortening his stay on earth (**VdVR** 1491-1498).

Incredible stupidity is not the exclusive province of the upper ranks of the monastic hierarchy. Renart has no difficulty convincing the lay brother to keep his hounds leashed instead of adding them to the pack already in pursuit of the fox. The good brother finds nothing unusual in an encounter with an articulate fox and accepts Renart's obviously distorted view of the situation without question:

'Car seins hom estes et hermites.
Si ne devez en nul endroit
A nul home tolir son droit.
S'or estoie ci arestes
Ne par voz chenz point destorbes,
Sor vos en seroit li pecies;
Et j'en seroie corociez,
Car miens en seroit li damages.
Nos corrien ici a gages
Entre moi et ceste cenaille;
Molt a grant cose en la fermaille.'
Cil se porpense qu'il dist bien.
A deu et a seint Julien
Le conmande, si s'en retorne.
(**RdR** II 630-643)

("For you are a holy man and hermit. For that reason you may in no way abridge a person's rights. If I were held captive here and hindered in the least by your dogs, then the sin would be yours. And I would be very angry because I would have the damage from it. These dogs and I are running a race; it is a matter of a large investment." That one thinks to himself that Renart spoke well. He commends him to God and St. Julian and goes his way.)

The monks' worldly brothers are also scrutinized and found lacking. Much attention is given to the figure of the priest in the cat episode, but Willem and the author of the first branch of the **RdR** also list the priest among the tormentors of the bear. The French priest chooses the pitchfork with which he has been spreading manure for his onslaught on the bear (**RdR** I, 670-675), while the Dutch priest expropriates a crosier for use as a cudgel over the protests of the verger (**VdVR** 726-728). Although Willem's priest and verger are intent on shortening Brun's life with the help of weapons borrowed from the Church, the priest is distracted from the task at hand by Julocke's misfortune and demonstrates a not inconsistent disregard for the nature of absolution by offering a year's worth of forgiveness of sins to anyone who would help rescue his wife from the river:

Doe hi sijn wijf sach in die vliet,
Doene luste hem langher niet
Brunn te stekene no te slane.
Hi viep: 'siet, edele prochiane.
Ghindre vloot vrauwe Julocke
Beede met spillen ende met rocke.
No toe, die haer helpen mach!
Ic gheve hem jaer ende dach
Vul pardoen ende vul aflaet
Van alre sonderliker daet.' (**VdVR** 826-836)

(When he saw his wife in the river he no longer wanted to strike and poke Brun. He shouted: "Look, good parishoners, yonder floats dame Julocke with both spindle and distaff. Go on, whoever can help her! I'll give him full pardon and absolution from all misdeeds for the period of a year.")

Reinaert also exposes Isengrin to the riches of the priest of Bolois and draws the priest's attention to the newly obese wolf by stealing the priest's pet capon from his table. The priest reacts by "jousting" with his table knife (**VdVR** 1546-1555), a performance which is neither successful nor otherwise impressive.

The crafty fox entices the unsuspecting cat into a trap intended to avenge his own indiscretions in the henhouse. The French version emphasizes the pitifully impoverished state of the priest:

Car li prestres qui la manoit,
N'avoit ne orge ne aveine.
De ce n'estoit il ja en peine.
Toute la vile le plaignoit
Por une putein qu'il tenoit,
Qui mere estoit Martin d'Orliens,
Si l'avoit gite de granz biens
Que il n'avoit ne buef ne vache
Ne autre beste que je sache
Fors deus gelines et un coc. (**RdR** I, 834-843)

(For the priest who lived there had neither oats nor barley. The entire village pitied him because of the whore whom he endured and who was mother to Martin d'Orliens. She had freed him so thoroughly from possessions that he had neither cattle nor cow nor any other livestock that I know of, save two hens and a rooster.)

When Martin discovers Tybert in the trap he rouses the rest of the family. The concubine springs out of bed, distaff in hand and ready to attack, while the naked priest uses his hand to protect his manly attributes (**RdR** I, 865-869). Both are generous in blows meted out to Tybert, but the cat has its revenge. The priest suffers the actual pain of the loss of a testicle at the claws of the cat, but the concubine's emphasis on her misfortune and her subsequent fainting spell reiterate the carnality of their relationship. Tybert's curse on cuckold, whore and son (**RdR** I, 904-916) adds final insult, coming as it does from the mouth of a would-be thief.

Willem's priest is also guilty of cohabitation, but Julocke, whose name casts aspersions on her virtue,[5] is not the shrewish virago of the **RdR**, and their son

Martinet does not achieve the scoundrel status accorded his French counterpart. The priest and his helpmate confront Tibeert with distaff and candlestick, but the priest, whose nakedness is mentioned three times **VdVR** 1241, 1253, 1258) is no match for the cat's claws. Julocke's lament on the loss of consortium is not punctuated by a fainting spell but defines her loss more specifically:

> '...Siet, lieve neve Martinet,
> Dit was van uwes vader ghewande,
> Siet hier mijn scade ende mijn scande,
> Emmermeer voort in allen stonden.
> Al ghenase hi van der wonden,
> He blivet den soeten spele mat.'
> **(VdVR** 1278-1283)
>
> ("...Look, dear cousin Martinet, this was part of your father's equipment. See here my pain and my shame forever and always. Even if he recovers from the wounds he will be unsuited for the sweet game.")

Like her partner, Julocke expropriates the Church's portion, although merely verbally, in stating that she would gladly have given a year's worth of offerings to avert the disaster which has befallen the priest **(VdVR** 1270-1275). The priest faints and is carried off to bed by Julocke, whom Reinaert gives mocking consolation **(VdVR** 1289-1297).

Heinrich departs significantly from the pattern set for the Dieprecht episode in the **RdR** and loosely followed in **VdVR.** His priest has no son but appears to be keeping both a wife and mistress. The priest inadvertently sets Dieprecht free in the confusion, and thus becomes the object of his wife's violent anger:

> des pfaffen wip darinne
> erhub ein vnminne:
> zv dem oren slvc si in zehant,
> vil schire se ein schit vant,
> da mite zvblov si im den lip,
> vnde were Werenburc, sin kamerwip,
> so het er verlorn sin leben. **(RF** 1717-1723)
>
> (Inside the wife of the priest began an altercation: she boxed his ears and quickly found a plank with which she beat him black and blue. Had it not been for Werenburg, the chambermaid, he would have lost his life.)

The priest moans and begs her goodwill in terms reminiscent of courtly dialogue **(RF** 1726-1728).[6] The loss of testicle is reflected in Isengrin's castration at the hands of Birtin, and the subsequent theatrics become the province of his wife Hersant **(RF** 1057-1060), but Heinrich's priest suffers even greater emasculation from his wife's acid tongue.

Willem mentions a historical Deacon Herman **(VdVR** 2732-2734) in connection with the ban placed on Reinaert because he advised Isengrin to leave the monastery. Stracke identifies a certain Hermannus Diaconus in the bishopric of Terwanen, deacon of the cathedral chapter of the Premonstratensians from 1140 to 1150, as the most likely candidate.[7] Meester Jufroet **(VdVR** 2952), the lion king's theological authority of choice, has been identified by Grimm as the learned theologian Geoffroy d'Angers (1070-1132),[8] but the heretical views on penitential self-help ascribed to him by the lion king are actually taken from the writings of his teacher Wilhelmus according to Stracke.[9] The reason given for Herman's pronouncement of a ban over Reinaert seems paltry by comparison with his other crimes, and the king's effort to convert his chaplain to Jufroet's point of view is obviously constructed with humorous intent. The historical contexts have been rendered obscure by the passage of time; however, it is not unreasonable to assume that both passages elicited greater amusement from the knowledgeable medieval reader. Similarly, the satire on the person of Cardinal Pietro di Pavia in the figure of the camel from Lombardy **(RdR** Va, 444-445)[10] and the possible association of Botsaert, the clerk at Nobel's court **(VdVR** 3375) with Bouchard van Avesnes, cleric and second husband of Margaret of Flanders[11] may have meant more to a medieval audience than modern scholars can hope to discover.

The motley peasants encountered by the animals give each author opportunity to criticize the lower class. Like their spiritual counterparts they are often endowed with tasty possessions, a fact which causes them to be subjected to frequent predations by the fox and his accomplices. Pierre de Saint-Cloud includes an inventory of the riches of Constant des Noes **(RdR** II, 28-43). Heinrich also introduces Langelin as "ein gebvre vil rechte riche" **(RF** 13 — a very well-to-do peasant).

The peasants often lose their possessions to animals due to their own laziness or carelessness. Tibeert the cat steals the sausage claimed by the dog Cortois from a sleeping miller **(VdVR** 120-121), and Constant des Noes is gaming with friends while Renart makes his selection and absconds with the rooster **(RdR** II, 384). The merchants realize they have allowed themselves to be cheated out of countless eels by Renart:

> Li uns des marcheans esgarde,
> A l'autre dist 'mauvaise garde,
> En avons prise, ce me semble.'
> Tuit fierent lor paumes ensemble.
> 'Las' dist li uns, 'con grant damage
> Avons eü par nostre outrage.
> Moult estion fol et musart
> Andui qui creïon Renart.'
> **(RdR** III, 121-128)
>
> (One of the merchants looked after him and said, "We have not guarded him well, it seems to me." Both clapped their hands. "Alas," said the one, "what great damage we have had for our carelessness. We were both very foolish and

stupid to trust Renart.")

Renart mocks them in terse response to their hopes that he will not enjoy his meal (**RdR** III, 136-138), much as Ticelin the raven scolds the old woman who pelts him with words and gravel in protest over the theft of her cheese:

'Vielle' fet il, 's'en en parole,
Ce porroiz dire, jei l'en port,
Ou soit a droit ou soit a tort.
De lui prendre au eü bon leu.
La male garde pest le leu...' (**RdR** III, 878-882)

("Crone," he said, "if it comes to that, you will be able to say, "I am carrying it off, be it right or wrong. I had a good opportunity to take it. The negligent watchman feeds the wolf...")

The calculating peasant who inadvertently frees Reinhart from the trap is able to blame himself for his loss (**RF** 382-384), but not all his fellows are capable of such objectivity. The French counterpart feels himself cruelly tricked and shouts to give vent to his frustration (**RdR** II, 824-825), while the peasant who loses his ham to Reinhart's cunning exhibits childish behavior: "nv viel er nider vf das gras, vil vaste klait er den bachen." (**RF** 482-483 — He sank into the grass and bewailed the loss of his ham).

In their treatment of one another, the peasant couples are hardly more selfless and affectionate than the priest and his chosen companion. In reproaching his wife for the loss of Chantecler, Constant des Noes addresses her as "Pute vielle orde" (**RdR** II, 392 — dirty old whore), hardly a term of endearment. Heinrich reverses the situation by allowing Ruozela to scold her husband:

'alder govch, Lanzelin,
nv han ich der hvener min
von Reinharte zehen verlorn,
daz mvet mich vnde ist mir zorn.'
meister Lanzelin was bescholten,
daz ist noch vnvergolten;
doch er des niht enliez,
er tete, als in habe Ruozela hiez. (**RF** 29-36)

("Old fool, Lanzelin, now I have lost ten hens to Reinhart: that displeases me and makes me furious." Master Lanzelin was greatly mocked by that. It still remains unrewarded. Nevertheless, he began to do that which Ruozela had ordered.)

The diatribe is rendered even more vulgar by its juxtaposition with the courtly tones and titles assumed by Chantecler and Pinte.

The fox and the wolf have various encounters with peasants intent on doing them bodily harm, but it is the captive bear who receives the brunt of the collective wrath. Both Willem and the author of the first branch of the **RdR** take advantage of the crowd scene to list the bear's opponents for humorous effect. The French author identifies many of Brun's tormentors by name and adds relevant details, such as the fact that Tyegier the baker married black Cornille (**RdR** I, 661-662). Willem delights in creating speaking names (**VdVR** 785-804): Otram Lancvoet (Longfoot), vrauwe Vuulmaerte (Dirty Maid), Abelquae (Smooth Talker), wrauwe Bave (from the French, Drool), Hughelijn (a common name often used to connote a cuckold), vrauwe Ogerne (Oh Gladly, an obvious comment on questionable virtue.)[12] Willem also includes physical attributes such as long fingers and crooked legs. He achieves much the same ludicrous effect which Heinrich strove for in describing lowly Lanzelin in the stately tones reserved for heroes in the **Nibelungenlied** (**RF** 13-20) by giving undue attention to the ancestry of one of the villagers (**VdVR** 800-804). Brun's injuries at the hands of the rabble receive extensive coverage in both the **RdR** and **VdVR**, although Brun acquits himself well against dogs and peasants in his own account of the fray (**RdR** Va, 693-748). Willem allows Brun a measure of revenge in the involuntary swim of the old women (**VdVR** 822-823). Heinrich forgoes the facile humor of name-play and blow-by-blow descriptions in favor of a more subtle comment on the credulity of the peasants; the driver who alerts the community to the presence of a bear with his head stuck in a tree trunk sees it as a sign of God's strength (**RF** 1580) much as the monks saw the revenge of God in Isengrin's presence in the well.

The ultimate insult of the peasants is reserved for Lamfreit and carries added vituperative force by virtue of its origin. Although conversations between man and animals are implied in the case of Constant and Renart (**RdR** II, 420-434) and Reinhart and Lanzelin (**RF** 139-140) and actually occur between Renart and the eel merchants (**RdR** III, 22-147), Renart and the lay brother (**RdR** II, 602-645), Ticelin and the woman from whom he steals the cheese (II, 867-894) and between Reinaert and Julocke (**VdVR** 1289-1297), none of the exchanges has the force of Tybert's curse of priest and family (**RdR** I, 904-916), and it in turn is surpassed by the calumnies which Reinaert heaps on Lambreit upon discovering that the peasant has failed to dispatch the bear:

Ende sprac: 'vermalendijt,
Lamfreit, moet dijn herte sijn!
Du best dulre dan een swijn,
Lamfreit, ergher puten sone!
Lettel eeren bestu ghewone.
Hoe es di dese beere ontgaen,
Die di te voren was ghevaen?
Hoe menich morseel leghet deran,
Dat gherne etet menich man.
O wi, Lamfreit, verscroven druut,
Hoe rikelike een beerehuut
Heefstu heden verloren,
Die di ghewonnen was te voren!' (**VdVR** 916-928)

(And he said: "Cursed, Lamfreit, be your heart! You are duller than a swine, Lambreit, filthy

whore's son! You are worthy of little honor. How did this bear escape you, which was captured for you? How many a morsel is there, which many a man would gladly eat. Oh woe, Lamfreit, miserable fellow, what a rich bearskin you lost today which was won for you before!")

The human beings portrayed in animal epics play a secondary role in the larger satire of the conflict between espoused values and the power struggle at a medieval court, yet they too make significant contributions, as is apparent from the differences in emphasis in the three fox epics. Greedy, gullible, and often vicious, the humans add variety to the narrative. Like their animal counterparts who become more or less human to suit the author's purpose, the humans in animal epics fluctuate between a marginally human state and an almost sub-human instinctiveness, so that the boundary separating man from the lower creatures is reduced to a fine, at times invisible line.

[1]Editions of the **Roman de Renart** and **Reinhart Fuchs** used are as follows:

a) **Le Roman de Renart,** tr. and ed. Helga Jauss-Meyer, Klassische Texte des romanischen Mittelalters in zweisprachigen Ausgaben, 5 (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1965).

b) Heinrich der Glîchezâre, **Reinhart Fuchs,** ed. Karl-Heinz Göttert (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1976).

[2]All translations were done by the author.

[3]Ute Schwab, "Walthers von Horburg Spruch. Die Warnfabelstruktur des **RF**," **Zur Datierung und Interpretation des Reinhart Fuchs, Quaderni della Sezione linguistica degli Annali,** Vol. V. (Naples: Cymba, 1967).

[4]**Van den Vos Reinaerde,** ed. D. C. Tinbergen, 20th edition (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1972).

[5]V. Gs Hellinga, "Naamgevingsproblemen in de Reynaert," **Onomastica Neerlandica, Anthroponymica,** Vol. V (Leuven: Instituut voor Naamkunde, 1952).

[6]S. S. Robertson, "Parody and Satire in Heinrich's **Reinhart Fuchs**," **Michigan Academician,** XIV (1982), p. 395.

[7]D. A. Stracke, "Deken Herman uit den **Reinaert**," **Tijdschrift voor nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde,** 13 (1925), 18-32.

[8]Introd., **Van den Vos Reinaerde,** p. 39.

[9]D. A. Stracke, "Meester Jufroet in den **Reinaert**," **Tijdschrift voor nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde,** 43 (1924), 145-160.

[10]Schwab, p. 40.

[11]Introd., **Van den Vos Reinaerde,** p. 40.

[12]K. Heeroma, "De Dorpernamen in de Reinaert," **Nieuwe Taalgids** 44 (1951), 177-179.