RENART RETOLD: THE ORIGINAL *VAN DEN VOS REYNAERDE*

Theresia de Vroom
University of Southern California

The twelfth-century Dutch beast epic, *Van den Vos Reynaerde*, is distinguished from all preceding versions of the tale by a final and original episode concerning a hidden treasure at Kriekenput. The story of the stolen and buried treasure is concocted by the fox to trick the king and Queen of the animal kingdom into pardoning Reynaerde's heinous crimes and releasing him. This story not only contains the original portion of the poem but also describes the attitude of the *Van den Vos Reynaerde* (*VdVR*) toward originality. Like the fox, Willem the poet entices his audience to another tale about Reynaerde by luring them with the treasure of tales buried in the preceding French branches of the *Roman de Renart* (in particular Branche I from which he borrows liberally). At the same time he self-consciously and comically discusses his fox-like foraging for poetic originality which, according to the original adventure at Kriekenput, is no more tangible than an illusory buried treasure. Before examining the relation of the Kriekenput story to the rest of *VdVR*, we turn to the opening of Willem's poem where he first differentiates his tale from those that precede it. An examination of the Dutch prologue in relation to the French prologues reveals that the dilemma of writing an original poem given unoriginal material can be solved in a variety of ways. Willem's solution to this problem, revealed in the Kriekenput episode at the end of the poem, is already evident in his prologue, the latest addition to a rich palimpsest made by the preceding French prologues.

In a forty-line prologue, Willem distinguishes his poem from all other poems about the fox by reworking the tradition of the French prologues that he inherits. In the French branches of the *Renart* which precede the Dutch poem, the mere presence of a prologue signals the inclusion of original material; material not borrowed from the Latin *Ysengrimus* or any of the other preceding branches[1]. Of the seven branches of the *Renart* which predate *VdVR*, II-Va, IV and I have prologues and indeed include original adventures or anecdotes about the fox. Branches XV, V, XIV and III do not have prologues and are simply variations of *Ysengrimus* or the first of the French branches, Branche II-Va.[2] Following the tradition of the French branches, Willem begins *VdVR* with a prologue as a sign that he too intends to write an original poem. What follows Willem's prologue is a poem struggling for originality, a struggle that the evolution of those *Renart* branches that contain original material also provide a precedent for.

The prologues to the three French branches which precede *VdVR* develop into more and more elaborate accounts of their own originality. In the twenty-two line prologue to the first French branche, II-Va, Pierre de Saint-Cloud says that his poem is breaking new ground. He says that the tale of Ysengrimus and Renart is as yet unfamiliar and that his poem will be the first to tell (or retell) this great tale that he says compares in

greatness with the stories of Helen and Paris, Tristan, and Yvain. The poem is in fact modeled on *Ysengrimus*;[3] it claims originality simply because it is the first French poem about the fox. Further, Pierre decides to put the treatment of the "epic" enmity between the fox and the wolf on the same literary level as that of the "serious" genres such as the *roman courtois* and the *épopée*, thereby deflating those genres while at the same time parodically elevating the tale of the fox. In the lengthier thirty-two line prologue to Branche IV, the poet, already aware of his poem as a version, says that he is going to amuse his audience with a "branche" (he uses that word) made up of a single anecdote about a fox.[4] This poet cites a proverb which both Nivardus, the poet of the *Ysengrimus*, and Pierre de Saint-Cloud used before him:

> Mes en cest monde n'a si sage
> Au chef de foiz n'aut a folage.
> (IV, 31-2)[5]

The poet of Branche IV begins his original anecdote about the fox on the foundation of a proverb used by Nivardus and translated by Pierre which says that we are collectively similar only because we can all be foolish. The poet of Branche IV ends his prologue not as Pierre did, with an appeal to the tradition of great stories to which the Renart's adventures belong, but by citing a reference from Pierre's (and Nivardus') poem. That is, he replaces the appeal to a tradition of fixed stories, Helen and Paris etc., with an implicit reference to the individual and original authors of the poems, Pierre and Nivardus. This incipient shift, from literary references to a proverb illustrating the reversal from wisdom to foolishness is significant for the original branches which follow, but first let us examine the continued adventures of the fox in Branche IV.

The "original narrative" of Branche IV is new to the *Renart* even though versions of the same story were popular during the Middle Ages.[6] It begins: one evening after dinner, the fox arrives at a monastery. He is thirsty and comes to a well. The Renart looks in and is deceived by his own reflection, thinking it is his wife, Hermeline. He descends in a bucket only to find himself trapped without his wife and disgusted with his own foolishness. Later that evening, when the wolf Ysengrim passes the well, he too sees his own reflection and thinks it is his wife Hersent in the company of the fox. The wolf quickly becomes jealous but Renart convinces him that Hersent is not with him in the well and with much skillful maneuvering tricks Ysengrim into the empty bucket. While Ysengrim plummets down, the triumphant fox is pulled up.

For our purposes, there are two important components in this story. First, the cunning Renart is deceived by a reflection.[7] From all we know about him, Renart is simply too smart to be deceived by a mere reflection in the water, and yet in this anecdote, he is.[8] Perhaps the fox is so easily outdone because reflection and deceit are virtually the same in the story: the moment the fox sees his reflection, he sees his wife, and he is deceived. In other words, the instant of reflection is the same as the moment of deceit and perhaps even the crafty fox cannot distinguish

them. The second part of the story shows that once fooled, the fox learns from his own deception in a particular way. He learns to use it against his enemy, the wolf, by repeating or reflecting his own deception in order to deceive in turn. With this story, the poet of Branche IV may be writing a commentary on his sources, *Ysengrimus* and Branche II-Va. For this poet, the characters Renart and Ysengrim, like the poets Nivardus and Pierre from the opening proverb, are all figures hanging in the balance between deception and reflection. Beginning with a proverb from both Pierre and Nivardus, that all men have in common their tendency to sometimes be foolish, the poet of Branche IV concretizes this abstraction, thereby creating his original material: the deceit of Renart who in turn deceives Ysengrim, illustrating that foxes as well as wolves can be fooled. At the same time, the poet postulates a theory of what it means to be original by acknowledging that it is nothing more than balancing reflection with deceit.

The prologue to Branche I is the most important for Willem and for the way in which he rewrites his most immediate source. By comparing this prologue to Willem's, we can see that what constitutes the originality of *VdVR* is both the replacement of a traditional story by an individual poet and the balancing of reflection with deceit.

The prologue to Branche I begins:

> Perrot, qui son engin et s'art
> Mis en vers fere le Renart.
> (I, 1-2)[9]

Willem's opening lines clearly reflect his French source:

> Willem, die modocke makede
> Daer hi dicke omme wakede.
> (1-2)[10]

Both poems begin with a name. The name, Perrot, refers to the author of the earliest French Branche, II-Va, Pierre de Saint-Cloud. The name in the Dutch poem, Willem, refers directly to the poem's own author. The line in the French continues by saying that Perrot made his poems about Renart out of his 'intelligence and art'. The line in the Dutch, however, tells us about Willem in the context of another poem he has written called "Madocke". In a sense, the first line of *VdVR* turns the first line of Branche I upside down. The French poem begins with its originator, Willem, (not its ancestor) and continues by naming another work which Willem has written, establishing him further as an acknowledged and expert poet (he already has a poem to his credit, a substantial accomplishment in comparison with the illusory "intelligence and art" of his predecessor). The French poem, like Branche II-Va, locates itself in a tradition with the traditional tools of originality (Engin et s'art) by its side, while Willem replaces that tradition with himself and his other poem, the "Madocke."[11]

The French prologue goes on to say that Perrot wrote about Renart and Ysengrim but that he left out the best part of the story, the judgment at Nobel's court of the rape of Hersent by the fox:

> Lessa le meus de sa matere,
> Car il entroblia le plet
> Et le judgement qui fu fet
> En la cort Noble le lion
> De la grant fornicacion
> Que Renart fist ...
> (I, 4-9)[12]

The French prologue ends; the judgement begins, now narrated by a nameless poet. In a parallel argument, we are told that Willem ws unhappy because many of the fox's adventures were unknown because the poet, Arnout (Perrot), had not bothered to include them in his poem:

> Hem vernoyde so harde
> Dater ene auenture van reynaerde
> In dietsche was onvolmaket bluen
> Die arnout niet hadde bescreuen
> Dat hi die vite dede soeken
> Ende hise uten walschen boeken
> In dietsche heuet begonnen ...
> (3-9)[13]

The prologue of Branche I says that Perrot left out the best part of the story, the trial of the fox. Similarly, the Dutch prologue says that Arnout (Perrot) never told many of the fox's adventures and that this so annoyed Willem that he went to look for these adventures, and indeed that even the French books record that Willem began his poem in Diets. Unlike his predecessor, Willem is portrayed as a passionate and foraging poet, looking for a substantial and new story. He is upset ("Hem vernoyde") that certain tales have not been told and he goes in search of them. In this light, he sounds very much like the foolish lion looking for the fox's treasure at the end of his own poem. Like the lion who goes in search of buried treasure, Willem goes looking for the life of the fox as if it were tangible and not fiction.

The story about the buried treasure at the end of the poem, the story that the fox concocts to escape his death sentence for the rape of Hersent and the murder of Coppe, the hen, is the most original part of *VdVR*. It is the most striking difference between the Dutch poem and its sources; nothing similar to it appears in any of the branches of the *Renart*. In Branch I, Renart simply tells the King that he wishes to atone for his sins by going to the holy land. Nobel's fondness for the fox is rekindled and, forgiven by the King, he sets out. In the Dutch poem, the fox's conviction is followed by the construction of his gallows by his enemies. Reynaerde confesses to the assembled multitude, all of whom he claims to have shamed or done evil to. But suddenly the fox turns the conversation to a more interesting subject: a buried golden treasure at

Kriekenput. The fox says that he is afraid that his death will prevent the treasure from being found; Reynaerde suddenly becomes a storyteller. Both the King and Queen are drawn into the plotting, while the poet steps out of the poem in a now familiar formula of introduction and says:

> Nv hort hoe reynaert sal verdoren
> Den coninc entie coninginne
> (2146-7)

Willem turns the narrative over to the fox by acknowledging his role as *deceiver*: "Now hear how Reynaerde *will deceive* [sal verdoren] the King and the Queen" (my emphasis); and, recalling Branche IV, what this deceiver does is reflect on a tale we have heard before.

The fox begins his discussion of the buried treasure by first accusing his enemies, Brun, Tibert and Ysengrim, as well as his own father, of being conspirators in a murder plot against the king; conveniently, none of the accused is present to defend themselves. Reynaerde tells Nobel and his Queen that his father discovered "King Emeriks'" treasure and then turned against his former friends, Tibert and Brun. Eventually all the accomplices met in Gent in a "parlement" to plot Nobel's overthrow and murder. This parlement of thieves and murderers, the fox wryly adds, was just the opposite of the court assembled before him here.[14] J.W. Muller has shown that the conspiracy and buried treasure motif may not be "original" to *VdVR*, but borrowed from the "ridderverhaal," *Carel ende Elegast*. In that poem, the king, Carel, hatches a plot with the banished knight, Elegast, to become partners as thieves. Over the course of the story, the King realizes how devoted Elegast is to him (Elegast, who does not know that his co-conspirator is the king, nevertheless will not be enticed to steal the king's treasure) and Carel finds out that his brother-in-law, Eggheric van Eggermonde, has conspired to overthrow him.[15] The similarity of *VdVR* to *Carel ende Elegast* - the buried treasure and conspiracy motifs, the thief more loyal than the king's relatives - takes on a parodic twist in *VdVR*. Further, its adoption by Willem reveals a diligent poet who transplants part of another poem or story (not from the branches of the *Renart*) to form the "original" material in his own poem. However, Willem's surgical/poetic skill belongs not only to him but to the fox as well. As we will see, the fox creates his tale for the King and Queen precisely as Willem did; he too steals it from another story.

Reynaerde continues, and his fiction of gold at Kriekenput becomes so enticing to the Queen that she manages to convince Nobel to believe Reynaerde and pardon him in return for the treasure. The fox tells the King and Queen where the treasure is buried, and this deceit is the most ironic and brilliant reflection or retelling of the fox's career. The crime which finally caused the King to condemn the fox was the brutal murder of the hen, Coppe. After the hen's funeral, convinced by her mourners and his courtiers, the lion says he will no longer show any mercy toward the fox. It is ironic, therefore, that the King should not

recognize the fox's description of the buried treasure at Kriekenput, since it sounds just like the inscription on Coppe's tomb. The inscription reads:

> Hier leghet coppe *begrauen*
> Die wel conde *scrauen*
> Die Reynaert de Vos verbeet
> Die haren geslachte was te vreet
> (447-450) my emphasis[16]

Similarly, the fox's description of the buried treasure at Kriekenput reads:

> Die alre naest den putte staet
> Coninc. tot dien berg gaet
> Darliet die scat onder *begrauen*
> Dar suldi deluen ende *scrauen*
> Een luttle mos in deine side
> Dar suldi vinden menich gesminde
> Van goude, rikelic ende scone.
> (2568-74) my emphasis[17]

The similarity of the fox's description to the inscribed tombstone of the murdered chicken, the use of the same words, "begrauen" and "scrauen," likens the royal lion to a chicken scratching for worms because that is the only treasure his adventure in Kriekenput will discover. Coppe's epitaph is concerned with matters of this world, what the hen did in her life and how she met her untimely end. It implies that Coppe was good at uncovering that which now covers her. In a more grotesque light, the worms which she was so good at finding are now finding her. This is perhaps the most accurate metaphor for the attitude of the poem, *Van den Vos Reyanerde*, toward originality. The scratching, whether to uncover worms, discover treasure, or to etch an epitaph in stone, embodies the poem's parodic view. Writing an original poem, like scratching, is a process of discovering something which does not exist or covering something which already exists. In the larger scope of the poem's attitude toward originality, Reynaerde's gold is the treasure of the original which no one can find -- save presumably the fox. That is, it represents the nature of a source or an original as illusory or even non-existent save what stories or fictions are made on its account: what is scratched onto it, what it is covered by. Nobel hunts for a non-existent treasure, thereby trusting Reynaerde, who cannot be trusted. The lion believes in a tangible fiction and not, as the reader does, that the value of the Reynaerde's treasure is that it saves the fox's life and in doing so, reveals his extraordinary wit as a storyteller and a trickster.

At the end of *Van den Vos Reynaerde* a fox emerges who can narrate his own adventure. Herein the shift from a tradition of stories about the fox to certain individual and original poets is completed by the emergence of an independent, self-generating character. No longer a simple fox in a traditional story, or a tool of an individual poet writing an original variation, Reynaerde becomes his own poet. And like Chaucer's pilgrims two hundred years later, he tells his own tale, thus

acknowledging what has been true about the Renart tradition from its beginning: that its perpetuation lies in the extraordinary character of the fox. The originality of *Van den Vos* is its final anecdote, a tale about an illusory buried treasure, a tale told by the fox, representing the whole of Willem's poem, it too perhaps nothing more than Reynaerde's creation.

NOTES

[1] To my knowledge, scholars of the French beast epic have not fully acknowledged this important and additional function of the prologue, namely to account for the presence of original material in the branche. Discussing the forerunner of the genre, A.K. Bate has noted that the *Ecbasis Captivi* is similar to *VdVR* because it too has a lengthy and perhaps unusual prologue: a "... sixty-eight line prologue containing details of the author's life and situation - autobiographical details totally unexpected in a fable, or even an epic." ("Narrative Techniques in the *Ecbasis Captivi*," *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies* Special Issue IV, i (1983):4). Bate goes on to say that the actual content of this prologue may not be too unusual. I would add that with the exception of the epic "in medias res" start of *Ysengrimus*, all the poems which contain original adventures, up through *VdVR*, are preceded by prologues, whose autobiographical or biographical nature provides a transition between the poem that follows and the tradition which preceded it.

[2] By "original material" I do not necessarily mean tales that are entirely new or original. Rather, "original material" refers to tales that are new and original in the context of the written tradition up through *VdVR* and including *Ysengrimus* and the *Renart* branches which precede the Dutch poem. For a complete chronology of the branches see: Lucien Foulet, *Le Roman de Renart* (Paris: Champion, 1914); for a summary of Foulet's argument see: R. Bossuat, "Tableau chronologique des branches du Roman de Renard" in *Le Roman de Renard* (Paris: Hatier-Boivin, 1957) 186-87. For another view see: A. Lodge and K. Varty, "Pierre de Saint Cloud's *Roman de Renart*: Foulet's thesis re-examined," *Proceedings of the Third International Beast Epic, Fable and Fabliau Colloquium*, J. Goossens and T. Sodmann eds. (Cologne and Vienna: Bohlau, 1981) 189-195. For comparative and historical accounts of the Renart versions see: John Flinn, *Le roman de Renart dans la littérature française et dans les littératures étrangères au Moyen Age* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963). For an account of the genre of the beast epic as a whole, see: Hans Robert Jauss, *Untersuchungen zur Tierdichtung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1959).

[3] For a fuller account of Pierre's debt to *Ysengrimus* see for example: L.G. Donovan, "*Ysengrimus* and the Early *Roman de Renart*," *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies*, Special Issue IV, i (1983): 33-38.

[4] "Une branche et un sol gabet," "one branche and a single pleasantry" Branche IV, 19. All quotations are taken from the edition of the *Roman de Renart* by Jean Dufornet, 2 vols. (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1985). All translations are my own.

[5] "But no one on this earth is so wise as not sometimes to be a fool." Similar proverbs are found throughout *Ysengrimus*, especially in Books IV and V. The most exact version of the proverb occurs at the start of Book V, after the Sprontius episode. There Nivardus comments that hardly anyone is always wise:

> Insipiens quandoque rapit sapientis, itemque
> Preuentus sapiens insipiens opus,
> Vix aliquis semper sapienter, et omnia nullus
> Quamlibet insipiens insipienter agit ...
>
> V, 1-4

Ysengrimus, Ernst Voigt, ed. (Halle: Buchhandlung de Waisenhauses, 1884). The proverb is a version of the simpler Latin proverb: "Nemo mortalium omnibus horis sapit," (Pliny VII 40) cited by Voigt, 258. A new English translation from the Latin text of the poem has recently been published: Jill Mann, *Ysengrimus* (Leiden, Brill, 1987). The parallel proverb in Branche II-Va also occurs at the end of the Chantecler/Renart episode. Just as the fox is about to drop his prey, the narrator comments: "N'i a si sage ne foloit", 429.

[6] The story of the fox and the wolf in the well is popular in several versions from the Middle Ages to the present time. In regard to versions that precede Branche IV of the *Roman de Renart*, G.H. McKnight has suggested that the first version of the story came from Rabbi Raschi, born in the eleventh century in Troyes. It was then taken up by Petrus Alfonsus in his *Disciplina Clericalis* and put into more general and widespread circulation. G.H. McKnight, "The Middle English *Vox and Wolf*," *PMLA* 23 (1908): 497-509; see also: Lucien Foulet, *Roman de Renart*, 304-12. This theory of textual transmission agrees with L. Sudre's earlier findings, *Les Sources du Roman de Renart* (Paris, 1893) 266, that the story of the fox and the wolf in the well is not found in Aesopian or Phedrian fable collections. A simpler version of the tale has been preserved in the Biblio. de l'Arsenal *MS. 3334* and has been printed by P. Chabaille in *Le Roman de Renart, Supplément* (Paris: Silvestre, 1835). The popularity of the story and its variations, the reflection on the water not of a vision of paradise or the beloved, but of cheese, is referred to in Branche I: "Gel fis pecher en la fonteine/ Par nuit, quant la lune estoit plene./ De l'ombre de la blance image/ Quida de voir ce fust furmage." 1057-60. For further parallels and analogues see: Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*, vol. 4 (Bloomington: Indiana University Studies, 1934) K651, 350; Antti Aarne, *The Types of Folk-Tale*, trans. Stith Thompson, 2nd ed. (Helsinki: Academia Scientarium Fennica, 1961) 27; and Pack Carnes *Fable Scholarship* (New York: Garland, 1985).

[7] The deceiver deceived is a prominent theme in *Ysengrimus*, especially in the Sprontius episode, Books IV (811-1044) and V (1-316). Ysengrim is absent from this adventure and the fox takes his place as the evil menace who will be outwitted. A forerunner of the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, this episode retells the story of the fox who is deceived by Sprontius, the cock, into letting him go to curse the field hands who mock the fox's catch. The tale has several early parallels, see: Georg Thiele, *Der lateinische Äsop des Romulus* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1970, lxii-lxiii, 110); Leon Herrmann, "Gallus et Vulpes," *Scriptorium* 1 (1946-7): 20-66; and finally, Alcuin's very early (804) Latin version called *Versus de Gallo*. The ending of Branche IV may have been prompted by Nivardus's monastery episode in Book V of *Ysengrimus* in which the wolf is attacked by a group of monks. P. Delarue has observed that many traditional elements in *Ysengrimus* are faithfully retold in Branche IV. P. Delarue and M.L. Teneze, *Le conte populaire français*, 3 vols., (Paris, 1976) 405.

[8] Perhaps one author of Branche IV thought so as well, since in one version of Branche IV, manuscript variant *H*, published by Chabaille, the foolishness of the fox is left out.

[9] "Perrot, with his intelligence and art, put in verse the adventures of the Renart."

[10] "Willem, who wrote the Madocke, over which he labored greatly ..." All quotations are taken from: *Van den Vos Reynaerde* edited by Maurits Gysseling with a parallel modern Dutch translation by Karel Jonckheere (Brussels and Amsterdam: Elsevier Manteau, 1979). The Middle Dutch text is the text called *A* and based on *Van den Vos Reynaerde I*, Teksten, diplomatisch uitgegeven naar de bronnen voor het jaar 1500, W.Gs. Hellinga, ed. (Zwolle: W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, 1952). For an assessment of the poem, see: J.W. Muller, *Van den Vos Reinaerde, Exegetische Commentaar* (Leiden: Brill, 1942).

[11] Whether the Madocke is real or simply an invention to suit Willem's apology, is not known. No poem of that name survives in Dutch, but it is a legitimate title.

[12] "He [Perrot] left out most of his subject matter because he neglected the trial and the judgement which was made in the court of Nobel, the lion, on Renart's great fornication ..."

[13] "It annoyed him so much that many adventures of Reynaerde were left in Diets untold (those which Arnout had not written about) that he [Willem] went to look for the fox's life and, according to French books, began his search in Diets." For a comparison of the complex and ambiguous relationship between the Dutch prologue and the prologue of Branche I see: K. Heeroma, "De eerste Reinaert en zijn voorbeeld," *De Andere Reinaert* (The Hague: Bert Bakker, 1970), 14-18.

[14] There is one other reference to Gent in the poem. It follows the prologue and condludes the wolf's complaint against the fox at the start of the poem:

> Mi heeft reynaert dat felle dijr
> So vele te lede gedaen
> Jc weet dat wel sonder waen
> Ware al dat laken perkement
> Datmen maket tote ghent
> Men screuet niet daer an ... (88-93)

(That Reynaerde, that cruel thing, has done me so much harm, no one doubts; but even if I had all the parchment in Gent I still wouldn't have enough room to write it all down ...) At the beginning of the poem, it is the wolf who complains about the fox. At the end of the poem, the fox recreates this complaint and, as in the narrative of Branche IV, substitutes the wolf for himself as the evildoer in the tale, in order to win his freedom and be avenged. We recall as well that Nivardus lived in Gent and set all the adventures in *Ysengrimus* near Gent. Perhaps as a final commentary, Willem recalls his inheritance in this reference: that poem was the conspiracy that his poem capitalizes on.

[15] For parallels between *Carel ende Elegast* and *VdVR* see: J.W. Muller, "Reinaert-studiën," *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal - en Letterkunde* 52 (1933), 240-52.

[16] "Here lies Coppe buried, who could scratch well, whom Reynaerde the fox bit and slaughtered too cruelly." There are similar burial epitaphs in medieval Dutch literature. In Hendrik van Veldeke's *Eneide* (composed between 1150 and 1174), there are two famous epitaphs that are reminiscent of Coppe's. The epitaph on Dido's grave reads:

> "Hie leget frouwe Dido,
> die mare end die rike,
> die sich so jamerlike
> dorch minne te dode sloech." (2516-2519)

("Here lies the lady Dido, the mother and the queen, who so pitifully slew herself for love.")

Another epitaph from Veldeke, this time from the lavish grave of Pallas, reads:

> ein edel amatiste
> was der stein, de dar op lach.
> dar ane stont, als man wale gesach,
> sin epitafium geskreven
> end wie he dot was beleven
> end wie he hiet end we he was,
> des koninges son Pallas,
> end wie hen Turnus ersloech

des ersten dages, doe he droech
skilt, wapen ende swert. (8330-39)

(A noble amethyst was the stone that lay upon the grave. On it his epitaph was written, so men could see: who survived him, what he was called and who he was, the King's son, Pallas, and how Turnus slew him in the first days, even though he wore a shield, arms and a sword.) All references are from: Hendrik von Veldeke, *Eneide*, ed. Otto Behaghel (Heilbronn: Verlag von Gebr. Henninger, 1882). Another parallel epitaph can be found in Diederic van Assenede's *Floris ende Blancefloer* (1260), on the false grave of Blancefloer:

Daer stont: 'hier leget Blancefloer
In dit graf, op desen vloer,
Die jonchere Floris, dat scone kint,
Met gestandeger herte hadde gemint.'(1033-36)

(There was written: 'Here lies Blancefloer, in this grave, on this floor, whom the Lord Floris, that beautiful child, loved with a brave heart.') From: P. Leendertz, ed., *Floris ende Blancefloer van Diederic van Assende* (Leiden: A.W. Smijthoff, 1912).

17 "At the birch that stands next to the spring is where you will find the treasure buried. Delve and scratch there under the moss on the side [of the stream], there you will find under the sand, gold, relics and riches."