Durham University

Durham E-Theses

A critical and comparative study of Beroul's Tristran

Bromiley, Geoffrey N.

How to cite:

Bromiley, Geoffrey N. (1979) *A critical and comparative study of Beroul's Tristran*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8016/

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
http://etheses.dur.ac.uk

G.N. Bromiley: A CRITICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BÉROUL'S TRISTRAN

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a study of Béroul's version of the Tristan legend. Its aim is a better understanding of the romance through an examination of the work itself and of those versions of the legend with which it is associated.

Part One of the thesis begins with a survey of the manuscript and of the various editions and goes on to suggest the policy that might be adopted when a more reliable text is sought. (The three appendices are also concerned with textual problems.) There then follow, a review of Tristan scholarship and an appraisal of the relationship between the various representatives of the legend. Béroul's romance is seen as an independent derivative of a lost work and as an influence upon the Folie Tristan of Berne.

In Part Two, each of the episodes in Béroul's work is examined. If an episode is also found in other versions, the parallel accounts are scrutinized and emphasis is laid upon those elements which are found to be quite peculiar to our romance. Those episodes in the romance which have no equivalent elsewhere are also examined and suggestions are made as to their possible provenance. At the same time, the structure of the romance is compared with that of other versions. Béroul emerges as a writer who has on occasion re-ordered inherited episodes, in order to present more clearly his own conception of the legend.

In the Conclusion, the significance of the parallel versions is ascertained, before Béroul's own conception of the legend is determined. Béroul consistently presents Tristan and Iseut as guilty sinners, but who are yet never beyond redemption, and he draws on theological support in order to suggest that by the end of the romance they are set on the road to salvation.

A CRITICAL AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BÉROUL'S TRISTRAN

by

Geoffrey N. Bromiley, B.A.

Thesis submitted to the University of Durham
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged

1979

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE: TEXT AND TRADITION

1. Manuscripts, editions, textual criticism 5

2. The component parts of the medieval Tristan tradition 23

PART TWO: THE BÉROUL EPISODES

1. The tryst beneath the tree 40

2. The fleur de farine episode. 61

3. The condemnation of the lovers 78

4. The saut Tristran episode 88

5. The meeting of Governal and Tristan 100

6. The rescue of Iseut from the lepers 108

7. Life in the forest 124

8. The horse's ears episode 134

9. The first meeting with Ogrin 143

10. Tristan the fugitive 154

11. The release and training of Husdent 157

12. The riche baron episode 172

13. The arc qui ne faut episode. 183

14. The separating sword episode 187

15. The cessation of the potion's compulsion 212

16. The return from the forest 227

17. The separation of the lovers 247

18. The machinations of the barons 264

19. Perinis visits Tristan 280

20. Perinis visits Arthur 289

21. Tristan in leper's guise 302

22. The tournament 324

23. The ambiguous oath 344

24. The deaths of Denoalen and Godoïne 365

CONCLUSION 386

APPENDIX I: The damaged portions of the manuscript .. 410

APPENDIX II: Readings disputed by editors within the body of the manuscript 414

APPENDIX III: Notes on the establishment of the text. 419

BIBLIOGRAPHY 527

ABBREVIATIONS

In the text of this thesis, the conventional sigla have been employed for the various versions of the legend (full references are given in the Bibliography).

B	The Romance of 'Tristran by Beroul, edited by Ewert
O	Eilhart von Oberg, edited by Lichtenstein
T	Thomas
G	Gottfried von Strassburg, edited by Ranke
E	Sir Tristrem, edited by Kölbing
S	Tristrams Saga ok Ísondar, edited by Kölbing
T.r.	La tavola ritonda, edited by Polidori
R	The French Prose Romance
Fb	La Folie Tristan de Berne, edited by Hoepffner
Fo	La Folie Tristan d'Oxford, edited by Hoepffner

Other sigla and abbreviations.

BARLLFB	Bulletin de l'académie royale de langue et de littérature françaises de Belgique
BBSIA	Bulletin bibliographique de la société internationale arthurienne
Bédier, Volume I Bédier, Volume II	Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, edited by J. Bédier, Volume I, 1902, Volume II, 1905
BPH	Bulletin philologique et historique
CCM	Cahiers de civilisation médiévale
CFMA	Classiques français du moyen âge
CL	Comparative Literature
CN	Cultura neolatina

Curtis I, Curtis II	Le Roman de Tristan en prose, edited by R. L. Curtis, Volume I, 1963, Volume II, 1976
Esp.	Esprit créateur
Ét. Germ.	Études germaniques
Ewert, Volume I, Ewert, Volume II	The Romance of Tristran by Beroul, edited by A. Ewert, Volume I, 1939, Volume II, 1970
Expl.	Explicator
Fedrick	A. Fedrick, 'A Critical Study of the So-called "Parties anciennes" of the Prose "Tristan"'
FEW	Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch
Fil. preg.	Filološki pregled
FS	French Studies
Godefroy	F. Godefroy, Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française
GRM	Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift
Johnson	F.C. Johnson, La Grant Ystoire de monsignor Tristan 'Li Bret'
Löseth	E. Löseth, Le Roman en prose de Tristan
M^0	Muret's SATF edition of 1903
M^1	Muret's CFMA edition of 1913
M^2	Muret's CFMA edition of 1922
M^3	Muret's CFMA edition of 1928
M^4	Muret's CFMA edition of 1947, revised by 'L.M. Defourques'
MA	Le Moyen âge
Med. aev.	Medium aevum
MLQ	Modern Language Quarterly
MLR	Modern Language Review
MP	Modern Philology
Neophil.	Neophilologus
OED	The Oxford English Dictionary
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

RBPH	Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire
RF	Romanische Forschungen
RJ	Romanistisches Jahrbuch
Rom.	Romania
RP	Romance Philology
SATF	Société des anciens textes français
Stud. franc.	Studi francesi
T.-L.	Tobler-Lommatzsch, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch
Tris.	Tristania
ZDADL	Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur
ZfS	Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur
ZRP	Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie

INTRODUCTION

In the past there have been numerous comparative studies of the various versions of the Tristan legend, in which the poem by Béroul has naturally played a considerable part. The studies of Bédier[1] and Golther,[2] undertaken independently but arriving at roughly similar conclusions, form the basis of much modern criticism.[3] But for both critics a comparative study of the versions had a further goal, the reconstruction of the lost work from which all the extant poems were descended. To achieve this end their studies tended to emphasize features which were common to all versions and to neglect features peculiar to any single one.

There have certainly been critical studies of the individual representatives of the legend. Pierre Le Gentil[4] and Jean Frappier[5] have considerably furthered our knowledge, as has the work of Pierre Jonin[6]. The work of Anthime Fourrier[7] on the relationship of the poem by Thomas to the version commune was of paramount importance and indicated a way in which the other versions might be examined. As far as the poem by Béroul is concerned, Alberto Vàrvaro[8] published the first monograph in 1963. As thorough a work as this is, one feels nonetheless that Frappier's criticism in a review of the book is quite justified:

(Full bibliographical details will be found in the Bibliography. See also the list of abbreviations and sigla.)

1. Bédier, Volume II, pp. 95-319.
2. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen...
3. Whitehead's unpublished thesis on the early versions of the legend must also be mentioned. As Vinaver suggests (FS, XXVI, p. 118), publication of the work is indeed desirable.
4. 'L'Épisode du Morois...', and RP, VII, pp. 111-29.
5. CCM, VI, pp. 255-80, 441-54.
6. Les Personnages féminins....
7. Le Courant réaliste...
8. Il 'Roman de Tristran'...

Qu'on le veuille ou non, l'oeuvre de Béroul s'inscrit malgré ses traits distinctifs dans une tradition, représente un certain état de cette tradition. Il est sûr en effet que Béroul n'a pas inventé tout son récit, il est sûr qu'à peu de chose près il a suivi jusqu'à la fin de l'épisode du Morrois, et un peu au delà, un modèle qui fut aussi celui d'Eilhart, il me paraît sûr aussi que la comparaison avec ce dernier permet de déceler, en même temps que la puissante personnalité du jongleur normand, les accrocs qu'il a faits au canevas commun. Sans doute est-il arrivé à M. Vàrvaro non pas d'ignorer cet aspect du problème (il est au contraire admirablement informé de la matière du Tristan dans son ensemble et des nombreux travaux qu'elle a suscités), mais de trop s'enfermer dans son examen particulier sans jeter un coup d'oeil utile et révélateur sur la version parallèle.[9]

We hope in our study to have combined the two approaches, the comparative and the critical, that Frappier recommends.

A comparative study was the necessary preliminary to the critical examination of the Béroul episodes. Every episode in the fragment was examined and compared with the same episodes if they were recounted in other versions. In this comparison special note was taken, not only of the parallel features which might aid the reconstruction of a roman primitif, but also of the features in each episode which were unique to B.[10] A similar working method was adopted by Ewert who, in his commentary (The Romance of Tristran, Volume II), included a summary of each episode and enclosed features peculiar to B in square brackets. However, he was largely content to record such features and did not draw any substantial conclusions from them. After the comparative study, the critical examination proper of the episodes could begin. In the thesis, all the Béroul episodes will be discussed in turn and information drawn from the comparative study will be incorporated. At the same time, the episodes

---

9. CCM, VII, p. 353. In his Postscript to the English translation of his work, Vàrvaro does in fact recognize the general validity of Frappier's criticism (Beroul's 'Romance of Tristran', p. 198).
10. Michel Huby, in another connection, has stressed the importance of such features: 'En réalité, ce qui importe, ce n'est pas de savoir où Hartmann a pris tel ou tel trait que le texte de Chrétien ne possédait pas, mais de tenter d'expliquer pourquoi il l'a ajouté, de déterminer l'influence de cette addition sur l'aspect général de l'oeuvre' (L'Adaptation des romans courtois..., p.17).

unique to B will naturally be examined and their relationship to the rest of the poem and to the rest of the tradition will be ascertained.

It is hoped that the result of this enquiry will be an appreciation both of Béroul's place within a tradition and of his own individual contribution to the legend. One may also be able to discern the main lines of thought which governed the selection, presentation and invention of material, and to conclude that the poem preserved in MS BN, f. fr. 2171 represents a blend of material, created by one, unifying conception of the legend.

PART ONE

TEXT AND TRADITION

1: MANUSCRIPT, EDITIONS, TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The Tristran of Béroul has been edited on a number of occasions. It first appeared in 1823, in the second volume of F.H. von der Hagen's edition of the works of Gottfried von Strassburg.[1] It was next edited by Francisque Michel in 1835.[2] The modern editing of the poem was undertaken by Ernest Muret, who published the work for the Société des anciens textes français in 1903,[3] then for the Classiques français du moyen âge series in 1913[4] and he produced further editions in that same series in 1922[5] and 1928.[6] In 1939, A. Ewert edited the poem:[7] unless a statement is made to the contrary, all future quotations and line numbers will be taken from the 1958 reprinting of his edition. A companion volume, comprising mainly of a commentary, appeared in 1970. Muret's work was revised in 1947[8] and this revision incorporated many of Ewert's emendations, a number of which would almost certainly not have met with Muret's approval. An edition of little importance was produced by C. Guerrieri Crocetti in 1947, this work being largely a reproduction of Muret's text,[9] and in 1962 Ulrich Mölk[10] published a bilingual edition of the poem, which has on facing pages the Old French text, as established by Professor Ewert with some minor modifications, and a Modern German prose translation. Finally, in 1974, J.C. Payen produced a Modern French prose translation and a rather wayward edition of the work.[11]

---

1. Gottfrieds von Strassburg Werke..., Volume II, pp.243-303.
2. Tristan: Recueil de ce qui reste....
3. Le Roman de Tristan par Béroul et un anonyme, poème du XIIe siècle.
4. Béroul: Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle.
5. Deuxième édition revue, 1922.
6. Troisième édition revue, 1928.
7. The Romance of Tristran by Beroul: A Poem of the Twelfth Century.
8. Béroul: Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, quatrième édition revue par L.M. Defourques. 'L.M. Defourques' apparently conceals the identities of Lucien Foulet and Mario Roques.
9. See L. Thorpe, MLR, XLIII, p. 418.
10. Berol: Tristan und Isolde.
11. Tristan et Iseut: Les 'Tristan' en vers.

For the textual critic a knowledge of all editions of the poem may be thought desirable, for older editors may have had intuitive insights into what the author actually wrote, and although their corrections may be linguistically and paleographically unlikely, the meaning of their corrections can be utilized in the search for more probable readings. On occasion, an emendation in M^0 may strike one as more convincing than a later reading found in the CFMA and Ewert editions. At l. 3166, for example, lenz may be deemed preferable to loinz, and at l. 4408 a tret may be better than atret.

Béroul's poem is preserved in a single manuscript in the fonds français of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, MS BN, f.fr. 2171 (Anc. 7989, Baluze 759).[12] It lacks beginning and end, and numbers thirty-two folios in vellum. These thirty-two folios are made up of four gatherings of eight folios each, and the catchwords for the following gatherings can be seen at the bottom of folios 8d, 16d, 24d and 32d. The final catchword in fact supplies the first line from the lost continuation of the manuscript. Muret first printed this catchword in M^0 as '"Bleciez sui!" Dex! con ferus ...' but M^1 and later editions quite rightly have '"Bleciez sui!" Dex! confession', a reading first proposed by Couderc.[13] The manuscript is written in one hand, a point of obvious importance since a knowledge of this particular scribe's characteristic practice can serve in the correction of the text.

In the manuscript, large red initials are introduced at irregular intervals. They number 131 in all,[14] appear to be slightly less frequent

---

12. For the moment, and without prejudice to hypotheses which may be presented later, I employ the convention of regarding Béroul as the author of the material copied out in 2171.
13. See M^1, p. 148.
14. See M^4, p. 139.

in the second half of the poem, and are unornamented (the only exception being the D of Dinas in folio 28c, l. 3853, which has some rudimentary decoration).

There is some disagreement as to the importance of these capitals. Ewert, in his edition, while stating that they do not correspond to divisions in the narrative,[15] has indicated their presence by indenting the line. Muret relegates the capitals to the foot of the page in M^0, lists them in the notes in M^1, M^2 and M^3 and splits the text into paragraphs unsupported by the manuscript, a purely editorial division continued in M^4. It must be said that Muret's divisions, made on artistic grounds, do in fact coincide in many instances with Ewert's divisions, which alone have manuscript support: ll. 581, 2765 and 4267 are cases in point. Reid has suggested places where the text should be punctuated 'according to the sense of the words and without regard to the initials'[16] and he goes so far as to say that the 'large initials are placed almost at random'.[17] On the other hand, Robson places great store by the rubricated capitals in his attempts to define the process of elaboration to which the basic source-material was subject.[18] His demonstrations are not altogether convincing, but his efforts should inspire a degree of caution and a reluctance to reject any evidence the manuscript may offer which might elucidate a very difficult text. The criteria which governed the placing of the capitals may be almost impossible to determine. If one splits the fragment after the 'prophetic' passage, it will be seen that in the first 2764 lines there are 96 capitals, whilst

---

15. See Ewert, Volume I, p. x.
16. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 266.
17. The 'Tristran'..., p. 15.
18. 'The Technique of Symmetrical Composition...', 'Quatrains and Passages...'.

in the last 1721 lines there are only 35, a significantly smaller proportion. Some capitals may be authorial, others may be purely scribal: their uneven distribution may reflect a flagging interest in the visual effect of the page on the part of the scribe or on the part of the author. So, the reliability of the capitals may indeed be questioned, but it would be foolhardy to reject wholesale such indications as the poet himself may have introduced to mark new developments in his narrative.[19]

It is generally agreed that our poem has suffered greatly in the course of transmission, with the result that MS 2171 is an extremely defective copy of the original work. Before errors can be at all corrected, we must obviously know as exactly as possible what we have in the manuscript, and even this preliminary step is of no small difficulty. The writing of the scribe is cramped and careless. He is negligent in his use of abbreviations,[20] and he fails to differentiate clearly between certain letters, so that n and u, for example, are readily confused by the reader.

Towards an elucidation of the problems posed by a careless scribe, Ewert's edition had a special value. It was based on a very thorough re-examination of the manuscript and he rejected many readings which had appeared in every one of Muret's editions. Mainly because the space at his disposal was limited, Ewert could not publish all his findings in the introduction to his edition. However, this deficiency he made good in his contribution to the volume presented to Professor Pope in 1939,[21] in which (pp. 91-3) he reviewed Muret's reading of the manuscript and

---

19. Henry would seem to support this view, for he writes, when concerned with the capital at l. 2001 in particular: 'Les grandes capitales ne sont pas toujours logiquement distribuées, semble-t-il, dans notre manuscrit, mais il est de fait qu'il y en a une au début de ce vers... et elle est très significative' (Études de syntaxe expressive..., p. 63, note 1).
20. See Ewert, Volume I, p. xi.
21. 'On the Text of...'.

uncovered a considerable number of errors. The result was that when Muret's text was revised after the war the revised edition incorporated many of the results of this aspect of Ewert's work,[22] and a very cursory glance at M^4 would reveal not only a greater conservatism than hitherto in the establishment of the text, but also a general acceptance of Ewert's new readings of the manuscript.

The difficulties of reading MS 2171 are increased considerably in the first two folios by deterioration probably caused by damp. Furthermore, there is a tear in the first column of the first folio. Owing to this damage many lines have been rendered either completely unreadable or their interpretation has become a matter of some doubt.[23] Ewert undertook a re-examination of the damaged portions and managed to read parts of lines which had previously been thought illegible. He was extremely honest in his approach and only reproduced in his text the readings which he himself had clearly seen. In the prefatory note to M^4 there is no mention of a full, independent inquiry into the readings of the manuscript. The approach is more pragmatic: new readings deciphered by Ewert are included, but so are some earlier readings, once deciphered by Meylan and by Roques himself, which Ewert at a later date felt unable to confirm. In the light of this discrepancy between the latest editions, a further examination of the damaged portions was thought advisable. Can Ewert's readings be confirmed? Are the Roques-Meylan readings still visible? Although very few of the doubtful readings can be given complete confirmation, it is hoped that this inquiry will not be considered valueless.[24]

---

22. See M^4, p. XII.
23. The relevant lines are: 8-16, 45-9, 79-84, 112-20, 149-55, 186-9, 221-3, 254-62.
24. A list of points arising from a personal assessment of the damaged parts of the first two folios forms the first appendix of this thesis.

In the main body of the manuscript there is still apparently a small measure of disagreement between Ewert and M^4 regarding the readings of 2171. Clearly these points are mostly of marginal interest, and frequently, where there is disagreement as to the reading, the editors are agreed as to the correction. Certain conflicts concern very small points such as the expansion of an abbreviation. Some letters are extremely difficult to distinguish, c and t for example, and minims regularly cause problems: in many cases, therefore, no clear-cut decision as to the reading of the manuscript can be made.[25]

So far our aim has been a full appreciation of the content of the manuscript. Now the various approaches adopted by editors in their attempts to produce a sound, readable text from a notoriously corrupt manuscript will be considered.

As might be expected, there has been a change in the approach of editors of 2171 which parallels the change in the climate of opinion on textual criticism, which took place in the first half of this century. Muret's first modern edition (M^0) was a fairly freely emended version of the manuscript. His three CFMA editions (M^1, M^2, M^3) present a relatively stable text, but the influence of a growing conservatism in textual criticism induced the restoration of some manuscript readings. In l. 1107, for example, nes vilonast is retained in M^3 in preference to the earlier sis vilonast and ne vilonast. Similarly, at l. 1398, M^3 rejects le Dé jugement and adopts lor delungement, a reading appreciably closer to the lordelugement of the manuscript. In 1939, Ewert produced an edition distinguished by an even greater conservatism, but which inevitably accepted many of Muret's corrections of the text. For the revised edition of Muret's text (M^4), Ewert's work was naturally taken

---

25. A full review of the readings over which the latest editors seem to disagree forms the second appendix of this thesis.

into account, but Muret's corrections were on many occasions preferred to the plain manuscript readings presented by Ewert. However, the revisors did eliminate all the emendations that Muret had introduced simply so that his text would comply with an artificially regular declension system. Admittedly, Muret's text in the SATF edition is on occasion closer to the manuscript than his later suggestions. For example, in l. 755, M^0 retains Deus, which in M^1, M^2, and M^3 was needlessly emended to Deu, and at l. 3088 M^0 retained soz. Nevertheless, it is still true that there has been so far in this century a generally progressive movement towards conservatism in the efforts made to establish the text.

When this has been said, it should also be borne in mind that Reid's recent work on 2171 may mark the inauguration of a new phase characterised by a reaction against extreme conservatism.[26] Disregarding for the moment the wealth of new proposals, one can see that Reid is prepared to accept a number of Muret's emendations in preference to the readings shared by M^4 and Ewert. At ll. 1303, 1343 and 1384, for example, he suggests that the plain MS readings should be discarded and the M^0 emendations restored to favour. Reid's work pertinently reminds us that neither M^4 nor Ewert's edition can be regarded as completely authoritative, even though literary critics may tend to use either edition — or even earlier editions— indifferently, without always realizing the full implications of employing texts which are imperfectly established. Further work is required to establish the text, but it must be said that only a relative success seems guaranteed. Muret's remark in the introduction to his very first edition may prove to have an abiding relevance: 'En maint passage, le texte est si corrompu que l'on désespère d'en tirer jamais un sens satisfaisant.'[27]

---

26. The 'Tristran' of Beroul: A Textual Commentary.
27. M^0, p. II.

But at least one can ask whether the parallel versions of the Tristan legend can offset the difficulties to some extent and be of assistance in the emendation of the text. The dangers of relying to any degree on the parallel works are obvious; the relationship between the versions may never be rigidly established, and our knowledge of Eilhart is largely based on a later reworking-- or, at best, on a number of very late manuscripts -- of the original poem. Commenting on the authorship problem, Ewert expressed doubt as to whether anything of primary value to the text could be drawn from the other versions:

> But whatever view one may take of this much-debated question, the characteristics of Béroul's narrative and its relation to other versions can at most assist us in the elucidation of doubtful passages. Far from furnishing a reliable criterion for textual emendations, they indicate the unwisdom of introducing corrections designed merely to eliminate inconsistencies in the narrative or to accommodate Béroul's account to that of Eilhart and others.[28]

Ewert's caution here is commendable, for the apparent evidence available must always be submitted to a very close examination. At l. 2210, _p'ai trop pris_ has been emended in M^3 and M^4 to _trop me prist_ and the reading of _Fb_ 433, 'Ele mesprist estre son voil' cited in support. But the MS reading of _Fb_ is _me prist_. It may be argued that in both _Fb_ and _B_ the scribe has failed to recognize the form _mesprist_, but it seems hazardous to cite an editorial emendation, however plausible, in one text to support an editorial emendation in another. But with Ewert one can at least admit that the parallel versions can assist us in the search for a satisfactory reading. Frappier has made use of _O_ to justify his interpretation of l. 1909, where he claims that _au chemin fors_ means 'au chemin fourchu, à la bifurcation'.[29] His main methods of justifying the reading were the naming of instances where

---

28. 'On the Text of...', p. 90.
29. _Rom._, LXXXIII, pp. 251-8.

the adjective was uninflected in a situation normally demanding inflexion, and the listing of approximate rhymes, such as occurred in l. 1909. In a note a year later,[30] he pointed out that a passage in O, admittedly a little later in the narrative, presented the same association of a cross and a fork in the road that he had claimed to find in the French text. His conclusion is of some importance:

On doit par conséquent admettre que le détail du 'chemin fourchu' est identique au fond chez Béroul et chez Eilhart, malgré des divergences secondaires dues à l'initiative de l'un ou de l'autre (Croix Rouge et cimetière au milieu de la lande chez le premier, croix, sans épithète, près de la tour devant la ville chez le second) et malgré un défaut de simultanéité dans leur accord. La croix et la fourche des chemins appartenaient déjà au modèle commun que suivaient les deux poètes, du moins pour la partie du texte français appelée Béroul I à tort ou à raison.[31]

Frappier here uses the parallel versions in a rightly cautious manner, for it is significant that the Eilhart passage is employed only as additional support, not as providing justification in itself for his reading of the line. It is probably true that Eilhart and Béroul followed a common source, but the degree of elaboration and of abbreviation practised by both writers prohibits textual emendation on this evidence alone, and a full comparative study of all the parallel versions has provided little information which might directly aid the correction of the Béroul text. Nevertheless, the parallel versions may influence indirectly our reading of the text. From a study of the other versions we may obtain a clearer picture of the aesthetic preoccupations of Béroul, as indicated by the content and the stylistic features unique to his poem. Our enlarged awareness of his aims and practice may combine with other factors in order to supply a more satisfactory reading.

Over thirty years have passed since M[4] appeared and forty since the publication of Ewert's first volume. The work of Defourques was quite correctly seen by critics as a continuation of Muret's editions, but

---

30. Rom., LXXXIV, pp. 77-9. See also Buschinger, Le 'Tristrant'..., I, pp. 475-6.
31. Rom., LXXXIV, pp. 78-9.

one which incorporated certain of Ewert's readings; it aroused, therefore, little critical comment. Ewert's edition was a different matter: the divergences from Muret's text were self-evident. But at the time critics again refrained from a full assessment of the edition because the second volume was announced.[32] The delay in the appearance of this second volume and a gradual movement in the field of textual criticism away from a 'conservative' approach seem to have prompted a revival of interest in the text of Béroul's poem in the last twenty years or so. Several articles have been directly concerned with the elucidation of the text, whilst other work, notably that of Tilander[33] on hunting terms and that of Henry[34] on syntactic devices, have shed indirect light on many problems.

Critics, on the whole, have shown a less submissive attitude towards the readings of 2171, an attitude arising from a new conception of the editor's aim. In 1939, Ewert wrote: 'The prudent editor will therefore confine himself as far as possible to eliminating those errors which, on palaeographical grounds, can be safely attributed to the scribe or which a study of his habits and failings justify one in ascribing to him. For other emendations the editor must be guided by the less reliable criteria indicated above, and they will be correspondingly debatable.'[35] Writing in the same volume, Vinaver asserted: 'In face of these obstacles there is but one possible course open to the critic, and that is to define his task as a partial reconstruction of the lost original; to aim, not at restoring the original work in every particular, but merely at lessening the damage done by the copyists.'[36] But in 1965 Reid maintained that 'the reader is also entitled to know exactly what a competent editor,

---

32. See Wilson, MLR, XXXV, p. 100, and Roques, Rom., LXVII, p. 283.
33. Mélanges d'étymologie cynégétique.
34. Études de syntaxe expressive....
35. 'On the Text of...', p. 98.
36. 'Principles of...', p. 366.

after careful investigation and reflection, thinks the author probably wrote'.[37] Ewert, then, at the time that his first volume appeared, wished to eliminate only the errors of the last scribe and would permit further emendation only with trepidation. Vinaver, like Ewert in effect, sought to produce a text that was neither the work of the last copyist nor of the author, while Reid would seek to tentatively reconstruct what the author actually wrote.

Ewert's second volume appeared with his conception of the textual critic's aim basically unchanged: 'While the editor owes it to his prospective readers to eliminate from the text and record in the Variants all errors which a close study of the copyist's practice shows to be scribal, he should not be concerned to substitute for the reading of the MS what he thinks Beroul said or should have said, having regard to the testimony of other versions of the story and assuming a strict consistency both in the narrative and in the forms the poet employed.'[38] And yet in this same volume, Ewert presents another, possibly conflicting view: 'Of few works can it be said more truly than of Beroul's romance that editing is an art rather than a science: it is to be judged, not by standards of usage and the application of logic, but by the closest possible identification of the critic with the author's personality, his intentions and his preoccupations.'[39] As a theoretical outline of policy, this statement obviously has its good points, but one could easily claim that in practice Ewert frequently fails to take into account his author's personality, intentions and preoccupations.

The cautious approach of Ewert and Vinaver can readily be understood when one recalls the pseudo-scientific methods often employed even after

---

37. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 286.
38. Ewert, Volume II, p. 45.
39. Ewert, Volume II, p. 44.

Bédier's work. Bédier advocated a policy of extreme conservatism, an approach he wittily defended: '"Une telle méthode d'édition, a écrit dom Quentin, risque d'être bien dommageable à la critique textuelle". Peut-être; mais c'est, de toutes les méthodes connues, celle qui risque le moins d'être dommageable aux textes.'[40] But should such a conservatism necessarily be pursued when the sole manuscript surviving has been so mutilated that in many places it certainly does not contain what the author wrote? Just as each textual problem demands its own particular approach, so should each manuscript be individually scrutinized. One is in danger of having too high a regard, in the case of 2171, for what has become a very faulty piece of art. Not that one is advocating a downgrading of the manuscript: the manuscript is our only real possession and forms the basis of our inquiry. (Reid suggests that the manuscript should be published, almost as it stands, in the ideal edition.[41]) Nevertheless, basing our reconstruction squarely on the evidence the manuscript provides, our aim should be the tentative restoration of what we have some reason to think the author actually wrote.

The reconstruction of what the author wrote is a two-part process, consisting firstly in the detection of errors and secondly in the correction of these errors. As far as the detection of errors is concerned, possibly l. 957 of B may offer an example of a case where linguistic knowledge, allied to an appreciation of metre, can be of service. The line, 'Toz a genoz sont en ligliglise', is metrically unsound, and our knowledge of Old French makes us doubt the existence of a word ligliglise or igliglise. As well as linguistic knowledge, an appreciation of the context and the poet's aesthetic aims can serve to detect errors, and in the case of B the parallel versions may shed light on the context. It is not too often that linguistic evidence alone or

---

40. Rom., LIV, p. 356.
41. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 286.

contextual evidence alone can provide sufficient proof that a reading should be rejected: the decision is normally made when evidence from a combination of sources is at one's disposal. Line 485 reads in the manuscript 'De la serpent dont le garistes'. The line appears defective on both linguistic and contextual grounds, and early attracted the attention of editors. On linguistic grounds the line seems dubious: serpent is commonly masculine. On contextual grounds there is reason to doubt the authenticity of the line, for, using our knowledge of the parallel versions of the legend, and noticing the obvious reference back to ll. 50-3, we suppose that Tristan's wound on that occasion originated in a blow from the poisoned weapon of the Morholt, not in an encounter with a dragon. It may be that the copyist has confused in his mind two separate occasions, Tristan's combat with the giant and his slaying of the dragon on his second visit to Ireland, the cause of the confusion being the fact that Tristan is healed by Iseut (or her agent) on both occasions. But one suspects that the error represents above all difficulty in deciphering the model and that the scribe thought that serpent was what the one problematical word in the exemplar actually read. Had the scribe been taking a broader view, reflecting on the subject-matter of the whole poem, he would more probably have rewritten more than one word, producing le serpent as he did at l. 2560. A misapplication of contextual knowledge may not provoke many errors on the part of this scribe, but the critic's subjective belief that a passage is contextual nonsense, that it fails to 'make sense', is almost certainly the prime factor in the detection of errors. If linguistic and metrical knowledge tend to support this subjective belief, so much the better.

In the task of correction the paleographical evidence supplied by our manuscript is of obvious importance. Certain characteristics shared by all scribes, the types of mechanical error to which copyists are prone and the errors which medieval scripts prior to the date of 2171 induce in particular, must certainly be borne in mind. But of far higher value in the work of correction is a knowledge of the idiosyncratic errors of the scribe of 2171. Ewert's article listed idiosyncratic errors of our scribe and Reid added to their number. It may be that the scribe's exemplar was none too clear, or perhaps his own manner of lettering was at odds with that of his predecessor. All the same, one's overall picture is of a scribe who was unremarkable for his intelligence. Indeed, his ignorance, if one may call it that, is perhaps his most endearing characteristic. If more ignorant than a predecessor, he may consequently have been less inclined to 'improve' upon his model and may have confined himself to the reproduction, as best he could, of what he saw there. Even though Ewert's commonly professed aim was not the reconstruction of what the author wrote, but rather the elimination of the errors committed by the last scribe, his evidence of the scribe's practice will, it is hoped, aid the reconstruction of the author's work when it is combined with evidence drawn from other sources. Paleographical evidence is in many ways a 'controller' element; our knowledge of the scribe's practice must increase the likelihood of the proposed correction, or the correction will lack authority. If there is a weakness in Reid's overall approach, it may be in his failure on occasion to suggest how what he believed the author wrote could have given rise, through a misreading or series of misreadings, to the corrupt version in the manuscript. Reid is obviously aware of the problem. In connection with his proposal for l. 1008 he

writes: 'It is not clear why the scribe should have written trop for dex; but some of his other errors are equally inexplicable.'[42] This may be so, but one is obviously more inclined to support an emendation which could reasonably represent a plausible misreading of what was actually in the scribe's exemplar.

A second aid to correction, as it was to detection, is our linguistic knowledge. This may be of a general nature, when one's overall knowledge of Old French suggests a possible correction for a faulty line. Or it may be of a more specific nature, a knowledge of our author's particular practice. It may take the form of an appreciation, following a study of the poet's vocabulary, of the author's specialized insights. It may take the form of recognizing the poet's characteristic rhyme-words: one word at the end of a line may , subconsciously, always call for the same word at the end of the next. Certain rhyme-patterns, pendre: prendre, for example, are common to all poets, but perhaps we may distinguish patterns peculiar to Béroul. More of our linguistic knowledge may come from an examination of the poet's relative adherence to morphological systems: we may find a recurrence of similar instances in the narrative where the poet has no qualms about breaking the 'rules' to comply with the exigences of rhyme and metre.

A third aid in our work of correction is a knowledge of the poet's artistic practice. Scribes may baulk at an author's originality and may introduce more common phrases and less anacoluthonic readings.[43] With only one surviving manuscript such scribal corrections can remain undetected, except where the author's original phrase has been misunderstood and replaced by a simpler word, roughly approximate in form, but

---

42. The 'Tristran'..., p. 40.
43. See Whitehead's discussion of ll. 21-2 and 815-8 on pp. XLVI-XLVII of his edition of La Chastelaine de Vergi.

meaningless in the context. A more specific knowledge of the technique of the author of 2171 would include an appreciation of the poet's most favoured syntactical propensities and more striking constructions. Although it must always be borne in mind that some syntactical features may be the work of the scribe and not of the author,[44] it has rightly been suggested that the poet's syntax did quite clearly cause the scribe difficulty in a number of places.[45] Under this third heading must come a full appreciation of the content of Béroul's poem, an appreciation helped by a comparative study of the parallel versions which will highlight the details either unique to Béroul or which Béroul particularly wishes to emphasize, eliminate or replace. A heightened knowledge of the context, in particular an awareness of the contextual significance of apparently minor things, when combined with other evidence, can be of great assistance in the proposing and in the justifying of corrections.

Paleographical knowledge, linguistic knowledge and a realization of the poet's artistic aims and practice, are therefore aids to correction. But they are more than this, for they are safeguards which ensure that corrections are not proposed which do not comply with the evidence supplied by the manuscript. A correction will be all the more plausible for the support of all three elements.

A return to the examples can illustrate this point. Serrent is deemed incorrect by Muret, not so by Ewert (and M[4]). Had Ewert applied logic and drawn upon his knowledge of normal usage, he also might have been led to discard the manuscript reading. Muret, in all his editions emends serpent to plaie to make a line which largely reproduces, but not quite, l. 51. Paleographically the correction has a little support, p

---

44. It may be that some of the syntactical peculiarities noted by Holden (Rom., LXXXIX, pp. 394-6) are scribal in origin.
45. See Ewert, 'On the Text...', p. 95.

and s being confused elsewhere (e.g. l. 239, sainte for a probable perte). But l. 51 is not an exact parallel: it reads que vos preistes, not dont le garistes. Would peison or poison possibly be a better reading? The word ligliglise in l. 957 appears to be an example of a mechanical scribal error, dittography: Ewert has l'iglise, which is presumably what the scribe intended to write. But this in turn brings doubt, since a word identical in form and meaning now furnishes the rhyme of 957-8. Moreover, a cause of dittography may be hesitancy on the part of a scribe who is unsure that he is copying out exactly what his model says. A further examination of the context might lead one to the correction font en la glise. Tristan's leap from the chapel is now accomplished and he is caught momentarily in quicksand. The scribe's confusion between f and s is a common mistake (in l. 2321, all editors emend saint to faint). Muret's emendation chiet en la glise gives roughly the right sense to the line, but, on paleographical grounds, who would not say that font is a better reading than chiet?[46]

It must of course be said that even when the three forms of knowledge we have support our emendations, they remain hypothetical; certainty cannot be demonstrated, yet our paleographical, linguistic and artistic knowledge can be instrumental in reducing the measure of doubt. This knowledge, then, can help to bring us nearer our avowed goal, the reconstruction of the author's original work. Is this not rather presumptuous? Who are we to claim that our knowledge of Béroul's French is greater than that of the thirteenth-century scribe? But again we must insist that the aim of the textual critic is different from the aim of the copyist. The last copyist of our poem was largely concerned, it would seem, with reproducing his model, as exactly as possible and within

---

46. I am indebted to Mr. R. Anderson for these two proposed corrections.

the limits of his ability, even when he did not understand the meaning of the lines. But we, basing our work firmly upon the information provided by the manuscript and other relevant knowledge, aim at the tentative reconstruction of the author's work and, we hope, at a better rehabilitation of Béroul.

A review of recent attempts to improve the text and a record of the more important places where Ewert and M^4 disagree form the third appendix of this thesis. Also, in Part II, the comparative study of the Béroul episodes, numerous lines will be discussed.

2: THE COMPONENT PARTS OF THE MEDIEVAL TRISTAN TRADITION

What remains of the Tristran of Béroul is not a completely isolable literary creation. Although it has its own high claims on our attention as a literary integer, that claim cannot be properly evaluated without reference to its function as an intrinsic part of the whole Tristan tradition. In our attempt to define the particular qualities of Béroul's poem, we can advantageously begin with an examination of the works which make up that tradition and, more specifically, of the relationship which exists between them. The dangers in pursuing a different line are self-evident; we may draw false conclusions from the apparent parallels between two texts by not recognizing that one text has been directly influenced by the other, or both texts by yet another, and they are accordingly not independent representatives of the tradition. The problem of the exact relationship between the extant works has a long history and it still continues to provoke discussion. Its main lines will be sketched and, as a form of conclusion, tentative results will be presented and a working hypothesis formulated.

The year 1886 was an important year in Tristan scholarship, for it was marked by the appearance in Romania of the first articles inspired by the lectures of Gaston Paris at the École des Hautes Études. Among these articles was one by Joseph Bédier,[1] in which he compared the accounts of the final episode of the legend, the death of the lovers, in the poem of Eilhart von Oberg and in MS BN, f.fr. 103, a manuscript of the French Prose Romance. He established a preliminary stemma:[2] he believed that B, or a compilation very similar to B, and T, were the

1. Rom., XV, pp. 481-510.
2. Rom. XV, p. 483.

major derivatives of what he termed the 'fonds commun de traditions'; O and R 103 would be derived from B or from the very similar compilation.

In the same journal, W. Lutoslawski examined the versions of the Folie Tristan.[3] His most important suggestion for our purpose was that the Folie Tristan de Berne and the Folie Tristan d'Oxford were both derived from a lost episodic lay, 'X'. Gaston Paris contributed a review of the studies largely published under his direction.[4] Like Bédier in his article,[5] Paris reiterated his belief that there were two main groups of poems, Béroul and Eilhart being the main members of one group and Thomas and his derivatives the members of the second.[6] This distinction was generally accepted. In the following year, Ernest Muret published a comparative study,[7] in which he examined the relationship of Eilhart's work to that of Béroul and to the Tristan en prose, representatives of what he termed the 'version arthurienne',[8] as opposed to the version represented by Thomas and his derivatives. Muret's study was yet another of the important articles which Gaston Paris had inspired.

A second important article by Muret was published in 1898,[9] a review of the work of Wilhelm Röttiger.[10] He proposed another and fuller stemma.[11] For Muret, the source of the whole tradition was the work of 'conteurs en prose'. Thomas and his derivatives would represent one line of descent, while a second line of descent would pass through Chrétien de Troyes to the work of Le Chèvre (the form employed by Muret) and to Béroul: Béroul would also have drawn material directly from the prose narratives, whilst Eilhart and the Prose Romance would have had a common source in Le Chèvre's lost work.

---

3. Rom., XV, pp. 511-33.
4. Rom., XV, pp. 597-602.
5. Rom., XV, p. 482.
6. Rom., XV, p. 599.
7. Rom., XVI, pp. 288-363.
8. Rom., XVI, p. 293.
9. Rom., XXVII, pp. 608-19.
10. Der neutige Stand....
11. Rom., XXVII, p. 619.

The initiating influence of Gaston Paris was now producing even more substantial results. In 1891, Eilert Löseth published his summary of the content of R.[12] In 1903 Ernest Muret published his edition of the poem 'par Béroul et un anonyme' for the Société des anciens textes français, another work undertaken indirectly at the instigation of Gaston Paris.[13] But the most important aid to the understanding of the relationship between the various representatives of the Tristan legend was undoubtedly Joseph Bédier's study of Thomas.[14].

In the first volume of his study, Bédier reconstructed T with the aid of its derivatives, S, G, E, Fo and the relevant chapters in T.r.. The second volume comprised firstly a discussion of Thomas's poem, then secondly a discussion of the sources of T and of the relationship of T to the other versions of the Tristan legend. The most important chapter of the second part of this volume is the fifth, for here Bédier presented the reasons why he believed in an archetype, in a single source from which all the known Tristan poems are ultimately derived. Previously critics had generally held that a number of episodic lays were at the head of the tradition (equivalent to Muret's 'conteurs en prose'). Bédier pointed out that the tradition was less rich and varied than had hitherto been thought. He had examined the episodes preserved by O, B, T and R, and he had reached the following conclusion:

A eux quatre, ces romans donnent une soixantaine d'épisodes: vingt environ apparaissent isolément, conservés par un seul texte; les quarante autres se retrouvent dans les quatre versions, ou dans trois, ou dans deux d'entre elles. Ces soixante épisodes, dont quarante se répètent à peu près dans le même ordre d'une version à l'autre, c'est toute la légende de Tristan.[15]

---

12. Le Roman en prose de Tristan....
13. See M°, pp. LXXVII-LXXVIII.
14. Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas.
15. Bédier, Volume II, p. 173.

Taking as his point de départ the lack of diversity presented by the legend, Bédier then supposed that one intelligence must have originally placed the basic data in order, establishing a logical and harmonious structure. He then indicated the main lines of the scenario. To Bédier it was self-evident that this scenario was not created haphazardly, by a process of aggregation, but by a deliberate effort of the will. He then proceeded to indicate how this one creative effort could be perceived.[16] Bédier's conclusion was that at the head of the whole Tristan tradition there existed one single poem, the composition of one man at the beginning of the twelfth century, not a number of episodic lays. Bédier then set out to reconstruct this lost poem, but for the moment our interest lies elsewhere. What concerns us directly is not the content of Bédier's archetype but his opinion as to the relationship between the extant poems:

> Dès lors il y avait indication que les cinq formes primaires (les seules formes, à proprement parler,) de la légende de Tristan: Eilhart-Béroul, Thomas, le roman en prose française, la Folie Tristan de Berne, étaient les dérivés, indépendants entre eux, d'un même poème.[17]

Perhaps the most important point is that Bedier believed all these five versions were independent representatives of the tradition.

Bédier's conclusions were helped on the way towards general acceptance by the work of Wolfgang Golther which appeared in 1907.[18]. Although this was a quite independent enquiry into the origins and development of the Tristan legend, Golther came to roughly the same conclusions as Bédier. He postulated that an archetype had once existed, which was the work of a single writer of genius, and that four derivatives of that archetype were independent one from another.

---

16. In his roman primitif, Bédier considered that 'les situations sont toujours subordonnées aux caractères une fois posés des personnages' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 178), and he suggested that this was an indication that only one creative effort was involved in the poem. But his suggestion has been contested, notably by Vinaver (Études sur..., p. 7) and by Vàrvaro (Rom., LXXXVIII, pp. 31-4).
17. Bédier, Volume II, p. 192. A full stemma appears on p. 309.
18. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen....

The combined effect of the studies of Bédier and Golther led to a wide acceptance of the theory of the archetype, so wide in fact that Bruce could write in his literary history: 'In general, we may say that the existence of a single primitive Tristan romance (Ur-Tristan, as German scholars call it) from which all extant versions are ultimately derived is one of the few matters of Arthurian discussion on which students are definitely agreed.'[19] Bruce was to some extent over-optimistic. Gertrude Schoepperle, for instance, in her study of the legend,[20] considered that R retained traces of a source older than the source of the other major texts. Similarly, Kelemina, in two studies,[21] believed that R could be traced to a different and older source than the common source of the other versions. Bodo Mergell accepted the existence of an Ur-Tristan,[22] but he did not understand by this what other critics, notably Golther, understood by an Ur-Tristan. A surprising prominence in the elaborate stemma manufactured by Mergell was given to the lost work of Chrétien de Troyes, mentioned in the prologue to Cligès, which he boldly termed the estoire: on virtually no evidence at all Chrétien's poem became for him a central and influential work of art. Pauphilet attacked the content of Bédier's reconstructed roman primitif, considering his choice of forty indispensable episodes to be purely arbitrary. He was, in fact, dismissive of the idea of a primitive poem which could be reconstructed in any detail, but acknowledged the fact that all the Tristan stories must have followed the same vague, general pattern.[23] In 1951, Bruno Panvini elaborated a highly complicated theory of transmission, concluding that the three major surviving French works, B, T and R, did not in fact have a common source.[24] On the whole, however, the idea of a primitive

---

19. The Evolution of..., I, p. 155.
20. Tristan and Isolt.
21. Untersuchungen..., Geschichte der....
22. Tristan und Isolde....
23. See Le Lais..., especially p. 111.
24. See La leggenda..., especially p. 122.

poem at the head of the tradition, whether oral or written, vague or detailed, seems to have a continuing vitality.[25]

To return to the main problem, that of the relationship between the extant versions, it will be remembered that Bédier included Fb in his stemma as an independent derivative of the common source of B, O, T and R.[26] In the same volume, the second volume of his edition and examination of Thomas, Bédier largely rejected the stemma proposed by Lutoslawski in 1886, but he still tended to accept the existence of a poem which was the common source of Fb and Fo.[27] In his edition of the two Folies which appeared in 1907 he refused to commit himself on this point: he envisaged the possibility that one of the two poems had imitated the other, or that they were both independent derivatives of a lost poem.[28] He pointed out very plainly, however, that Fb reflected knowledge of the material in B, or a poem very similar to B (Errata, p. 127), while Fo reflected knowledge of T.[29]

The work of Ernest Hoepffner has since defined the relationship of the Folies, and Bédier's first hypothesis, that one poem imitated the other, has gained the day. A study by Hoepffner appearing in 1919[30] was

---

25. Delbouille writes: 'Bédier a prouvé que les diverses versions médiévales du Tristan procèdent toutes, directement ou indirectement, d'un poème narratif français du XIIe siècle dont le texte est perdu. Sa démonstration n'a guère été contestée, même si parfois la critique a voulu évoquer encore une problématique et mystérieuse galaxie de contes oraux plus anciens, si elle a imaginé un roman initial plus court et plus sommaire qui aurait servi de prototype à l'inventeur du seul roman accessible, ou si elle a préféré croire que le premier récit organisé appartenait à une tradition strictement orale' (CCM, V, p. 274). Fedrick similarly writes: 'Without being in any way unjust to those scholars who have opposed it, the existence of a single archetype may fairly be considered nowadays as an acquired fact' (Fedrick, p. 16).
26. See Bédier, Volume II, pp. 188-9.
27. See Bédier, Volume II, pp. 287-96.
28. See Les Deux Poèmes..., p. VI.
29. Les Deux Poèmes..., p. VII.
30. ZRP, XXXIX, pp. 62-82.

in part a refutation of the views of previous critics and also marked a change in his own opinions. He considered that Fb was not an independent representative of the Ur-Tristan, but was made on B. Further, he contended that there was no need to postulate a poem close to B, rather than B itself, as the source. In his editions of the Folies,[31] Hoepffner reiterated these findings, and also claimed that Fb was written first, followed and imitated by Fo, which incorporated material drawn from Thomas. He denied, therefore, that a primitive Folie, as postulated by Bédier and Lutoslawski, had ever existed.[32]

This establishment of the relationship between Fb and B, if it is accepted, is of no small importance: Delbouille has sought to reconstruct lost episodes of Béroul's poem with the aid of Fb and the R 103 interpolations[33] and Fedrick has tried to elucidate Fb by drawing on B.[34] The net result of Hoepffner's work has been a modification of Bédier's stemma, to the effect that the Folie Tristan of Berne is generally no longer looked upon as a possible independent derivative of the roman primitif but as a derivative of B.[35] We should not, therefore, be surprised to find that Béroul and the Berne Folie share distinctive features not encountered elsewhere: such features as are shared by B and Fb need not be taken as indications of Béroul's lack of originality, but can still be regarded as the personal contribution of the author of our poem.

Later critical opinion has also modified that part of Bédier's stemma which represents the relationship between the poems of Béroul and Eilhart. Bédier postulated the existence of an intermediary, which he termed y, as the common source of B and O, and which stood between the

---

31. La Folie Tristan de Berne, La Folie Tristan d'Oxford.
32. See, for example, Fo, p. 2.
33. CCM, V, pp. 276-82. Ewert, while admitting that the evidence of Fb is not conclusive, claims that the text may shed light on the lost portion of B (Ewert, Volume II, p. 59).
34. Med. aev., XXXII, pp. 125-9.
35. But one might note that, in the fragment of the Cambridge manuscript of Fb published by Dean and Kennedy, there may be a suggestion at l. 57 that, as in T, Mark was hunting in the forest before he came to the home of the sleeping lovers (see MA, LXXIX, p. 65 and n. 72).

extant poems and the lost roman primitif. His main reason for postulating the existence of y was his belief that in the original lost romance the love potion's influence never in any way diminished.[36] Bédier's hypothesis has been very strongly contested, by Golther,[37] Schoepperle,[38] Murrell,[39] and Vinaver, among others. Vinaver's view is typical, in that he believes that the account of the love potion contained in the lost source was roughly the same as the account we find in Eilhart and Béroul: 'It would not seem to be correct to base a reconstruction of the love potion motif either on Thomas, or on the French Prose Romance or indeed on the Oxford Folie, and it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the Eilhart-Béroul version represents in this point the primitive romance.'[40] Thus, Bédier's belief in a remanieur y between the roman primitif and OB has generally been rejected. Certainly, on balance, the evidence does indeed suggest that the authors of T and R, whatever the effects of the potion might once have been, modified a version in which the potion's effects were limited in time: having rejected this limitation on the potion's effects, they created somewhat mediocre episodes in order to bring about the lovers' separation by alternative means. But what of La Chèvre and Chrétien de Troyes? Can either of them possibly be the author of an intermediary poem?[41] One feels that Vàrvaro is probably right in regarding speculation along these lines as futile.[42]

A secondary distinction, that between the poems of the version commune and the representatives of the version courtoise, continues to be upheld. The idea of two groups of works was already familiar to Gaston Paris in 1886, and the distinction was accepted by Muret in his first edition of Béroul's poem:

---

36. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 236.
37. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., pp. 100-1.
38. Tristan und Isolt, pp. 75-84.
39. 'Girart de Roussillon'..., pp. 74-5.
40. 'The Love Potion...', pp. 82-3.
41. Delbouille makes La Chèvre the author of the roman primitif (CCM, V, pp. 433-4).
42. Rom., LXXXVIII, p. 27, note 1.

Parmi les plus anciens ouvrages littéraires consacrés aux célèbres amours du preux Tristan et de la reine Iseut, l'on reconnaît aisément deux versions principales. L'une comprend le poème composé dans l'Angleterre normande par un certain Thomas, aux environs de l'an 1170, et les traductions de ce poème, en allemand par Gottfried de Strasbourg (commencement du XIIIe siècle), en norvégien par le moine Robert (1226), en anglais par un anonyme du XIVe siècle. L'autre, qu'on pourrait appeler la version commune, nous est principalement connue par un poème allemand de la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle, le Tristan d'Eilhart d'Oberg.[43]

An important redefinition of the distinction between the two groups was presented by Frappier in 1963.[44] He opposed the blurring of the distinction which he saw as the result of a blurring of terms. He refuted especially the main conclusion contained in the work of Jonin,[45] who declared that Béroul had greater claim to be called 'courtly' than had Thomas. In Frappier's view, Jonin had failed to grasp the difference between a purely social refinement and the fully-fledged ethos which is termed fine amor,[46] a difference Frappier had clearly exposed in a previous article.[47] Notwithstanding Ewert's suggestion that O had possibly been influenced by T,[48] the traditional view, accepting the existence of two separate groups of poems, now obtains.

Fourrier's study, partly on Thomas,[49] has also clearly represented the Anglo-Norman poet as the main representative of the version courtoise. In certain respects, it is true, Fourrier would not altogether agree with Bédier. He asserts the importance of oral tradition and attacks the idea of a purely literary archetype; he argues against the notion that oral tradition lacks coherency and claims that each individual

---

43. M°, pp. II-III.
44. CCM, VI, pp. 255-80, 441-54.
45. Les Personnages féminins....
46. Frappier writes: 'C'est à la notion de courtoisie comprise dans son sens le plus large — social si l'on veut— que se rattachent certains traits courtois qu'on trouve en effet chez Béroul, comme on en trouve aussi chez Eilhart. Mais ni chez l'un ni chez l'autre de ces représentants de la version commune on ne saurait discerner la moindre concession à l'idéal que Thomas prétendait illustrer dans sa version courtoise: la fine amor mise au-dessus de la loi sociale et religieuse, la fine amor justifiée parce qu'elle est la fine amor. A une courtoisie qui n'était rien de plus qu'un vernis ou le goût d'un décor brillant le romancier anglo-normand ajoute ou substitue, plus profondément, la religion de l'amour. Cette différence essentielle a échappé à Jonin' (CCM, VI, p. 263).
47. CCM, II, pp. 135-56.
48. Ewert, Volume II, p. 75.
49. Le Courant réaliste....

oral work is necessarily coherent, having a clear internal structure. With regard to the formation of the Tristan legend, Fourrier retains the idea of a fundamental structure which the poems of the version commune transmit. He would consider, however, that Thomas had at his disposal not merely the general structure but also oral material which would provide a number of variants of the story. But he warns against over-exaggerating the degree of variation this oral material would supply: 'En tout état de cause, ces variantes n'ont pu porter que sur des parties d'importance mineure. La charpente maîtresse, elle, ne varie pas: c'est celle-là même que nous donne la version commune représentée par OBRFb.'[50] Fourrier would see Thomas as adapting to his own purposes the general structure of the legend transmitted by the version commune: 'On voit donc qu'en dehors de Thomas et de ses dérivés, qui nous donnent ce que l'on est convenu d'appeler la "version courtoise", tous les autres témoins que nous possédons fournissent une tradition en somme identique: la "version commune". C'est ce récit que connaît et adapte Thomas.'[51] In this way, Fourrier adopts a position which is fundamentally orthodox and which necessitates no change in the traditional stemma marking the relationship between the extant versions.[52]

The relationship of the French Prose Romance to the other versions of the legend is, by contrast, a problem which has met with no such unanimity of opinion. Many difficulties stem from the complexity of the manuscript tradition, which presents a variety of versions of the work. It is recognized that the work has not survived in its original form:[53] each manuscript constitutes almost a particular version on its own, and

---

50. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 35.
51. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 36.
52. This is pointed out by Delbouille (CCM, V, p. 273, note 2).
53. See Löseth, p. XXVI. Baumgartner speaks of an 'original O du Tristan en prose, rédigé avant 1240, aujourd'hui perdu' (Le'Tristan en prose', p. 86).

the episodes may be disposed in an order peculiar to the manuscript concerned. It has been claimed that the Prose Romance has three major components; firstly, adaptations of romans de chevalerie, secondly, the tradition of the Tristan legend as preserved in the poems, and lastly, the additions of the author:[54] we are concerned mainly with the second element. In the first appendix of the second volume of his study on Thomas, Bédier published what he termed 'les parties anciennes du roman en prose', the traditional and archaic parts of this confused romance, extracted following a suggestion by Rüttiger:

Suivant la suggestion reçue de lui, nous avons essayé de dégager de l'énorme fatras des inventions chevaleresques propres au roman en prose les parties archaïques qu'il recèle, reconnaissables certes dans le livre de M. Löseth, mais réduites par des résumés trop brefs pour qu'on puisse en discerner toujours la valeur vraie. Comment avons-nous opéré ce départ? De la façon la plus simple: chaque fois que nous rencontrions parmi les résumés de M. Löseth un épisode, un trait qui eût quelque analogie avec un épisode de la légende connu par ailleurs, nous le transcrivions in extenso d'après le manuscrit 103 et (pour deux ou trois scènes) d'après le manuscrit 757 du fonds français de la Bibliothèque nationale. Ces épisodes connus par ailleurs forment avec les récits de courtoisie et de chevalerie qui les avoisinent un si violent constrate (sic) que cette méthode d'extraction des éléments archaïques, si sommaire soit-elle, suffit.[55]

To determine the relationship of the Prose Romance to the other versions we must decide whether, even in the parties anciennes, we can detect signs of remodelling by an author who is consciously following a particular derivative, or even a precursor, of the postulated estoire.

In 1897 Rüttiger decided that Thomas's influence could be seen in certain episodes of R,[56] in, for example, the scene relating the last discovery of the lovers(Löseth, §§ 284-6). The influence seems possible,

---

54. See Vinaver, Études sur..., p. 5.
55. Bédier, Volume II, pp. 190-1. Bédier's choice of MS BN, f.fr. 103, a copy influenced by the poetic versions, was doubtless unfortunate, but his transcription can still be of service, if we understand exactly what the 103 modifications are (see Curtis, Tristan Studies, pp. 58-65. Vàrvaro, however, regards Bédier's work as of little value ('L'utilizzazione...', p. 1073, note 62). On 103, see also Baumgartner, Le 'Tristan en prose', pp. 80-3.
56. Der heutige Stand..., pp. 32-3.

one would think, but the episode, the so-called verger episode of T, does not belong to the oldest parts of the tradition, to those episodes shared by versions. Thomas is, in fact, adding an episode of his own, deliberately to bring about the separation of the lovers on which the continuation of his story depends. In 1905, Bédier published the parties anciennes and affirmed that R, in the archaic sections, was an independent derivative of the estoire, as were O, B, T and Fb.[57] A major objection was voiced by Schoepperle in 1913. She believed that the Prose Romance possibly has sources more archaic than the French poem Bédier held to be at the head of the tradition. Accordingly, she limits the term estoire to the source of BOTFb, and writes:

> In the late and hopelessly corrupt redaction in which it has come down to us, the Prose Romance has been strongly influenced by the poems. But it is hazardous to term it a derivative of the estoire. It may even be that in the passages mentioned, the Prose Romance preserves traces of an earlier version than the estoire.[58]

Kelemina also voiced dissatisfaction with Bédier's stemma. He believed that R preserved a version older than the common source of BOT, and that a Prose Romance was at the head of the Tristan tradition.[59] For Kelemina, as for Schoepperle, certain episodes, including the death of the lovers, as recounted in all manuscripts of R except BN, f.fr. 103, probably represented a version of the story older than that preserved in the other texts. These were important statements by Kelemina and Schoepperle, attacking as they did the position of the parties anciennes as an independent derivative of the archetype.

---

57. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 192.
58. Tristan and Isolt, pp. 9-10.
59. In 1923, at the beginning of his second study of the legend (Geschichte der..., p. 1), Kelemina writes: 'Dieser Untersuchung ist der Annahme zugrunde gelegt, dass wir es in RI mit der ältesten französischen Bearbeitung des Liebesromans zu tun haben.'

A partial defence of Bédier came in 1925, when Vinaver published his Études sur le 'Tristan' en prose. Vinaver asserted that R was one of the versions deriving from the common source and explained the main divergences of R from the poetic tradition as the natural refashioning of analagous episodes in the poetic versions:

> Le roman en prose nous paraît donc émaner de la même source que les poèmes de Thomas, de Béroul et d'Eilhart, c'est-à-dire de la source commune à tous les romans anciens de Tristan. Les divergences qui existent entre lui et l'"archétype" fournissent alors l'occasion d'étudier non pas des sources plus anciennes, mais les idées et les goûts littéraires de l'époque où il parut.[60]

But at the foot of the page Vinaver added an important note, for he believed that R drew also upon T. Certain features he mentions in the note are relatively uninteresting: the parallel between the last discovery of the lovers and the verger episode, for example, does not really concern us. But there is a significant exception — 'la mère d'Iseut dénonce Tristan dans la scène du bain'. This feature is found not only in MS BN, f.fr. 103, where it might simply have been regarded as a conscious, late attempt to link up with the poetic versions, but it is also apparently included in the main Prose Romance manuscripts.[61] If we accept Vinaver's view that Thomas has influenced the Prose Romance here, in what are generally considered to be its most archaic parts, we must reject Bédier's argument that R is a completely independent derivative of the original estoire. In 1959, Vinaver reiterated his opinion that R has been subject to the secondary influence of T, for he wrote of the author of the work:

> He seems to have known both the version used by Béroul and Eilhart (l'estoire) and the poem written by Thomas in the seventies or eighties of the twelfth century. His indebtedness to the latter work is evident

---

60. Études sur..., p. 20.
61. See Curtis I, §§ 348-53.

from the way in which he describes the last discovery of the lovers by King Mark and from the episode of the abduction of Iseult by Palamède. Another important link between the two versions is the treatment of the love-potion theme. Whereas in Béroul and Eilhart the separation of the lovers is made possible by the partial abatement of the potion, in Thomas and in the prose romance they are allowed to part in spite of the supposedly unlimited efficacy of the magic drink.[62]

After Vinaver's work, the theory that the Prose Romance may have a source older than the common source of BCT is now generally discredited. Vinaver's second point, that R has been influenced directly by T, has likewise been generally accepted, but there is probably room for doubt.[63] One may doubt the direct influence of Thomas on the scene in the bath because the mother of Iseut does not appear to play the prominent part in T that she does in R. Is this direct employment of Thomas or merely an independent remodelling of the estoire by the author of R? The episode where the lovers are exiled in the Morrois in R, a scene found also in the oldest poems, has lost the atmosphere of deprivation and danger characteristic of the CE version, and it is reminiscent of the more comfortable existence led by the lovers in T. Is there evidence of direct influence, or has the author of R simply accommodated his work to the more refined taste of his time? It is important to point out that if Thomas did exercise a clear influence on the author of R, this influence appears to manifest itself most obviously in the addition of scenes found

---

62. 'The Prose Tristan', pp. 340-1.
63. Vinaver's arguments have been found unconvincing by J. Van Dam (Neophil., XV, p. 189), but Fedrick writes: 'Thomas' influence appears to have been twofold: on the one hand he supplied the direct source of the story of Tristan's "enfances"; and on the other it is possible that he may have influenced the prose author in his long account of Tristan's ancestors. The influence of T can be definitely traced only in the story of Tristan's "enfances", but once it is established that the prose author knew T, then it is always possible that Thomas' poem exerted an influence, however slight, on other episodes' (Fedrick, pp. 200-1). See also Baumgartner, BBSIA, XXIV, p. 196.

only in T, not in the remodelling of scenes shared by the poems of the version commune. Delbouille has suggested that the author of R was influenced by B as well.[64] The possibility of such an influence must obviously be borne in mind and a number of details found only in B and R may easily have originated in B. Equally easily, however, such details may have been omitted by Eilhart, and Delbouille almost certainly exaggerates their number in his eagerness to present the German author as the unswervingly faithful translator of the roman primitif.

This discussion has considerable bearing upon a comparative study of Béroul and the other versions of the legend. Pauphilet granted no value to the Prose Romance for the purposes of a comparative study,[65] but he was speaking of the whole of the romance: our concern is with a small portion of the parties anciennes where the gross distortion revealed by the romance as a whole is considerably less. As a preliminary conclusion regarding the manner of elaboration of basic material, one may say that the author of R has an awareness of the material known to BOT, but that this material is often neglected; perhaps it is half-forgotten and blurred in the author's mind, for data familiar from the poetic versions appear, but the original significance of the data is often lost. Perhaps on other occasions common source material is neglected deliberately, because the author wished to accentuate other features. One may therefore safely regard the Prose Romance as an elaboration of the same material accessible to Béroul, provided one constantly bears in mind the possibility of secondary influence from another version.

---

64. CCM, V, pp. 284-5.
65. See Le Legs..., pp. 137-8.

Following this review, we are now able to formulate a working hypothesis for our comparative study of the extant texts. The poems of Béroul, Eilhart and Thomas will be regarded as independent derivatives of a lost work, or, more judiciously, as independent works which drew on roughly the same basic material. The Folie Tristan of Berne is considered to be the work of a poet who deliberately utilized the material in Béroul's poem. The Prose Romance calls for some caution: it will generally be regarded as an independent derivative of the source of BOT, but secondary influences from these poems and from elsewhere will not be thought unlikely. The Folie Tristan of Oxford will continue to be regarded as a poem which contains material drawn expressly from the work by Thomas. Our knowledge of T will itself be drawn mainly from its major derivatives, from the Middle English Sir Tristrem, from the Norse Saga and from the Middle High German poem of Gottfried von Strassburg.

PART TWO

THE BÉROUL EPISODES

1: THE TRYST BENEATH THE TREE

Full accounts of the tryst episode are to be found in all the other primary versions of the legend,[1] but Béroul's account, since it begins at a point when the episode and the whole of the love story is well under way, has its own peculiar problems of interpretation. To understand our text, we need to decide what was in the first part of the episode, what was in the previous episode in the romance, and to have some notion of what was in the complete poem.

Certainly a number of general deductions regarding the previous, lost portion of the poem can be made. One can fairly confidently assert that Béroul wrote a full account of the legend, for in this first episode Tristan and Iseut frequently allude to previous events in an attempt to improve their position with regard to the king: obviously these allusions must have been recognizable to the audience and their significance realized. In ll. 160-2, for example, we may detect a reference to the arrival of Tristan at Mark's court, as a young boy, without wealth or reputation:[2]

> Tenez moi bien a mon ami;
> Quant je vinc ça a lui par mer,
> Com a seignor i vol torner.'

In all his editions Muret proposed a lacuna after l.161 and M[4] followed this lead. Ewert rejected the lacuna, and, indeed, the rhyme <u>mer</u> : <u>torner</u> strongly suggests that l. 161 and l. 162 belong to the same couplet.

---

1. Texts employed: <u>B</u>, ll. 2-580; <u>O</u>, Altes Gedicht VIII, Altes Gedicht IX, pp. 14-23, and ll. 3081-3791, Bussmann edition, pp. 17-26, Wagner edition, pp. 18-32; <u>S</u>, chapter LIV, p. 69, l. 16 - chapter LV, p. 70, l. 4; <u>E</u>, stanza CXCI - stanza CXCVIII; <u>G</u>, ll. 14583-15046; <u>R</u>, Bedier, Volume II, pp. 347-53, Fedrick, pp. A417-A436, Löseth, §§ 282-3, MS BN, f.fr. 757, 38 v°a - 40 r°a; <u>T.r.</u>, p. 232, l. 10 - p. 235, end of LXIII; <u>Fb</u>, l. 183; <u>Fo</u>, ll. 525-6, ll. 777-816.
2. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 196.

Ewert is probably wrong, however, to claim that Tristan is expressing a desire to return home.[3] In l. 162, i logically refers to King Mark (a lui, l. 161) and Tristan seems rather to be expressing a desire to continue in the service of the lord he once crossed the sea to find. Other references to previous episodes in the story are more certain. The lovers allude in ll. 26-28 and in ll. 135-42 to Tristan's combat with the Morhout, as does Mark later in the episode (ll. 479-80). Allusions to this event are especially telling in this context, for it will be remembered that on that occasion Tristan's present detractors, Mark's barons, emerged with considerable ignominy and he with considerable credit.[4] There are also references to the poisoned wound which Tristan received in the fight and which Iseut healed:

> Molt vos estut mal endurer
> De la plaie que vos preïstes
> En la batalle que feïstes
> O mon oncle. Je vos gari. (ll. 50-3)
>
> Et quant je vos oï retraire
> Le mal q'en mer li estut traire
> De la serpent, dont le garistes,
> Et les grans biens que li feïstes (ll. 483-6)

From these lines it appears that Iseut herself cured Tristan in B.[5] In Fb the author is singularly dogmatic in asserting that Iseut herself cured the wound; perhaps he knew of the other version of the story which he believed to be inaccurate:

> Car de la plaie que ge oi
> Que il me fist parmi l'espaule
> — Si issi je de cestë aule —
> Me randistes et sauf et sain.
> Autres de vos n'i mist la main. (ll. 399-403)

---

3. Ewert, Volume II, pp. 90-1.
4. The chorus of the Cornish people also recalls Tristan's achievement (ll. 848-55).
5. In S, E, G and Fo, Iseut's mother heals the wound: in Fb, R and O, Iseut herself is responsible. In O (ll. 1192-1219) Iseut herself heals the wound without ever seeing Tristan: one suspects that Eilhart has modified his source to avoid what he thought was an improbable feature, namely Iseut's failure to recognize Tristan on the second visit to Ireland.

If Fb is taken as being modelled on Béroul's version this would lend support to the belief that Iseut herself cured the wounded hero in the lost portion of our poem. Lines 22-5 are deliberately ambiguous:

> Mais Dex plevis ma loiauté,
> Qui sor mon cors mete flaele,
> S'onques fors cil qui m'ot pucele
> Out m'amistié encor nul jor!

To Mark they represent a statement of fidelity, but to the audience they refer to the drinking of the potion and its inevitable consequence. Clearly this episode must previously have been recounted to the audience by Béroul if the lines are to have their full and proper impact. A similar veiled allusion to Iseut's loss of virginity is to be found in G (ll. 14760-7), in E (chapter CXCIV, ll. 2133-4) and in T.r. (p. 233, ll. 14-7). The whole episode is very much curtailed in S, where there is no dialogue at all, but one may probably suppose that the allusion was also in T. Muret believed that Eilhart or his source deliberately omitted this ambiguous allusion and the whole ambiguous oath sequence due to a distaste for casuistical argumentation.[6] Lofthouse also believes the allusion was deliberately omitted: 'Il nous semble important de retenir la répugnance d'Eilhart à risquer de mettre ses héros dans une situation où leur faute pourrait s'aggraver d'un sacrilège ou d'un parjure.'[7] It may be, however, that the ambiguity was omitted in O because Eilhart presents Iseut as immediately aware that Tristan knows of Mark's presence: she has accordingly no need to have recourse to verbal hints. A final reference to events previously related by Béroul is to be found in ll. 123-6, where Tristan recalls Mark's marriage:

---

6. Rom., XVI, pp. 314-5.
7. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, p. 110.

Or voi je bien, si con je quit,
Qu'il ne voudroient que o lui
Eüst home de son linage;
Molt m'a pené son mariage.

A certain amount of information regarding the previous episode in Béroul's poem can also be deduced from the extant fragment. We can surely affirm from ll. 103-4 and l. 175 that the activity of slanderers has caused Mark to expel Tristan from court and to refuse him access to Iseut's room; ll. 143-4 are particularly explicit:

Ne deüst pas mis oncles chiers
De moi croire ses losengiers.

The loss of the king's favour has brought him poverty and the necessity of putting his equipment in pledge (l. 204). But the precise reasons for his expulsion from court remain vague, and perhaps the parallel versions of the legend can clarify certain details. It must be said that the French Prose Romance is of limited assistance at this juncture, since there the tryst episode occurs at a much later point in the story and at a time when Tristan is not banished from court.[8] In the poem by Thomas it would appear that Mariadoc, acting upon mere suspicion in collusion with the dwarf, persuaded Mark to expel Tristan from court. The derivatives of T certainly present a degree of confusion, but Bédier was inclined to believe that G preserves the authentic account.[9] In O, the previous episode which has caused Tristan's fall from favour is the so-called Kiss at the Couch episode (ll. 3168-3275). In this episode the traitors approach Mark and claim, with no real evidence at

---

8. In his unpublished thesis (p. 128), Fedrick postulates that the absence of the episode in R at this, the normal point, results from the changed conception of Mark's character. Furthermore, the episode is apparently only found in six of the B.N. manuscripts, as well as being in Chantilly 404 (see Pickford, L'Évolution..., p. 37 and note 10).
9. See Bédier, Volume I, p. 192.

their disposal, that his nephew is having an affair with his wife. The king refuses to believe them, returns to his castle, only to find his wife and Tristan in an embrace. As a result, the king angrily dismisses Tristan from court:

> ir sît ein ungetrûwer man:
> balde rûmet mir den hof
> und sagit ûwerm gote lof
> daz ir behaldit den lîp!' (ll. 3272-5)

This episode in O may not be an authentic part of the old Tristan tradition. The barons, in denouncing Tristan, only make a lucky guess,[10] and it is perhaps surprising that Mark can later reject the fairly damning evidence of the lovers' embrace so easily. It may be that the scene at the couch was invented by the German author to provide what he considered a more convincing reason for Tristan's dismissal from court. In B there is no mention of the guilty kiss; perhaps the lovers were being rightly cautious in not speaking of this compromising action, but Mark himself makes no mention of the incident. Perhaps, as in T, Tristan's fall from favour and his expulsion were caused simply by slanderers who aroused mounting suspicion in Mark. (The text repeatedly mentions the activity of these losengiers.[11]) In this instance, therefore, one is inclined to share Kelemina's view that in B slanderers alone have caused Tristan's expulsion.[12]

The preliminary part of the episode in B can be reconstructed with the aid of later passages, such as ll. 469-74:

> Or dit li rois a la roïne
> Conme le felon nain Frocine
> Out anoncié le parlement
> Et com el pin plus hautement
> Le fist monter por eus voier
> A lor asenblement, le soir.

---

10. 'On ne voit pas clairement de quelle source ils ont appris ce qu'ils viennent répéter au roi' (Muret, Rom., XVI, p. 311).
11. B 56-7, 89-91 etc..
12. See Untersuchungen..., p. 22.

The dwarf, we learn, informed the king of the lovers' impending rendezvous. Mark implies in this passage that he was alone in the pine tree, unaccompanied by the dwarf,[13] and previous events have already shown this to be true. There appears to be little to suggest that Béroul made Mark announce that he would be absent hunting for some time, as we read in Eilhart and Thomas.[14] In l. 390 Iseut feigns surprise at Mark's arrival on his own: in l. 3162, by contrast, her surprise is genuine when Mark returns from the hunt unaccompanied by his knights, after the three barons have roused him to anger by casting suspicion on his wife. Tristan's actions are difficult to reconstruct. Perhaps we can suppose that he summoned Iseut to the rendezvous by the classic method of throwing chips into the stream, but if there is a possible supporting allusion in Fb it is nothing if not ambiguous.[15] But what is clear and what is very important is that Tristan has already noted the presence of Mark in the tree at the beginning of the Béroul fragment. The method of detection is unknown; perhaps, like Iseut, he saw Mark's reflection in the stream (l. 351), but he is certainly aware of the presence of the king before Iseut begins to speak, as ll. 97-8 indicate:

> Quant out oï parler sa drue,
> Sout que s'estoit apercelle.[16]

---

13. Contrast this with O (ll. 3476-9, Bussmann edition, p. 22, Wagner edition, pp. 22-5) and G (ll. 14607-12), where both the king and the dwarf are in the tree. In R (757, 38 v°b), S (chapter LV), E (stanza CXCII) and T.r. (p. 232), Mark is alone in the tree.
14. O, ll. 3424-48, G, ll. 14350-60, E, stanza CLXXXVI, S, chapter LIV.
15. The Berne manuscript reads, at l. 183, 'Et sostenu dolez bastons'. The Cambridge manuscript presented by Kennedy and Dean reads 'Et an fundainne dolé batunz' (MA, LXXIX, p. 64 and p. 70). Since sostenu could indeed represent a misreading of fontaine, it seems likely that the episodic poem does contain an allusion to the incident.
16. Jonin's description of the scene in B is misleading: 'Dans le pin (i.-e. le tilleul d'Eilhart) elle découvre sans aide la présence des espions, elle prend l'initiative de la conversation avec Tristan et par ses reproches habilement plaintifs l'amène à se rendre compte du danger' (Les Personnages féminins..., p. 19). Vàrvaro's account, however, is quite accurate: 'In Béroul i due se ne avvedono ognuno per proprio conto, come risulta dai vv. 3-4 (Yseut si affretta a parlare per prima perché il suo tono avverta Tristran) e dai vv. 97-98 (Tristran si accorge dalle parole di Yseut che anch'ella ha visto il re)' (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 222, note 3).

Now this preliminary knowledge has been acquired the episode can be examined. As we have it now in Béroul's poem the episode has three main phases and three main protagonists.[17] In the first phase (ll. 2-257) all three protagonists are present, Mark hiding in the tree, Tristan and Iseut conversing below the tree. The second phase (ll. 258-384) is marked by the separation of the three: Mark finishes reflecting some time after Tristan has left the scene (l. 285), Iseut recounts what happened to Brengain, and Tristan recounts what happened to Governal. In the third phase (ll. 385-580) Iseut is approached by Mark and his belief in her innocence is confirmed: they are then joined by Tristan. Thus, the three main actors in the drama are re-united and reconciled, at least for a time.

At the beginning of the first phase in the episode Iseut has already become aware of the presence of Mark in the tree, having seen the reflection in the water. There is no certain indication at all, either here or later in the episode, when Iseut tells Brengain what happened, that Tristan's behaviour or even his demeanour warned Iseut that a spy was present.[18] Béroul's text differs, therefore, from the account in Eilhart at this point, for it is Tristan's gesture, his beckoning, which initially alerts Iseut in the German poem:

> dô saz der hêre Tristrant
> und wenkete alliz nindir sich. [19]

---

17. In his second volume, Ewert divides the episode into eleven sections of varying length.
18. Muret holds a similar view: 'Il semble aux termes dont se sert Béroul, que le hasard seul ait rendu Iseut attentive au danger qui la menace' (Rom., XVI, p. 313).
19. O 3514-5. See also Altes Gedicht IX, ll. 95-112, Bussmann edition, p. 23, Wagner edition, pp. 26-9. With Ewert (Volume II, p. 70), one may suspect that Tristan's beckoning in O represents an addition by the German author.

In G, Iseut is surprised at his odd behaviour and then she sees three shadows on the ground (ll. 14679-95). In both cases Tristan plays a part in warning the queen of danger and in both cases Iseut then realizes he is aware of the presence of the spies. Iseut, in Béroul's text, does not know that Tristan has already noted the presence of Mark in the tree, for in ll. 352-69 she claims that had she not set the tone of the conversation the results might have been disastrous. Iseut's intentions are probably two-fold at the beginning of the scene: to warn Tristan of Mark's presence and to make sure, if he does not notice, that the meeting has no unfortunate outcome. In B the point is never explicitly made that Iseut realized that Tristan also knew of Mark's presence in the tree, whereas the Prose Romance leaves us in no doubt. In R there is a similar beginning to the episode. Iseut looks up, sees Mark, believes Tristan is unaware of the king's presence and decides to act in such a way that he learns that Mark is there: 'La royne s'areste .i. petit et pensse qu'elle porra fere, quar volentiers feroit a Tristan tel semblant que il s'aperceust du roi Marc et elle cuidoit tout vraiement qu'il n'en fust encore pas aperceuz.'[20] Later, however, it is expressly mentioned that Iseut realizes that her lover has become aware of the king's presence: 'La roïne est molt liee et molt joieuse quant ele entent ces paroles. Car elle conoist bien a ce que messire Tristanz li vet disant que il c'est aperceüz de ce que li rois est desus l'arbre.'[21]

In our text Iseut seizes the initiative and delivers a long speech before she allows Tristan to speak. We may contrast this with the parallel passage in Eilhart, where Iseut, after recognizing the need to

---

20. MS BN, f. fr. 757, 39 r°a. Ewert believes that the author of R has modified the account in his source (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 74).
21. Bédier, Volume II, p. 350.

dissemble, hands over the initiative by asking Tristan a question:

> der vrawin wîsheit dâ schein,
> daz sie ire ougen nî dar kârte
> und rechte also geôrte,
> als ob sie es nicht en wiste.
> und sprach mit grôzir liste
> 'Tristrant, waz sal ich her zû dir?'[22]

It may be, as Muret thinks,[23] that the episode is much abridged in O, yet the immediate surrender of the initiative may be directly due to the fact that the queen knows that Tristan has probably also seen the spies in the tree, as his unusual gesture revealed. In B, in an effort to warn Tristan, she greets him in a manner which for lovers is highly bizarre and then goes on to include transparent ambiguities in her speech; ll. 20-5 provide an obvious case. She is brusque with Tristan, tells him not to ask her to come again (ll. 16-9) and insists that she must leave soon (l. 64). Iseut also has to bear Mark in mind at this juncture and must make every effort to convey an impression of innocence. She mentions how she cured Tristan of the wound he received in his combat with the Morhout (ll. 50-5) and how it is only proper to love the relatives of one's husband,[24] two ways of justifying her friendship with Mark's nephew. The queen then allows Tristan to speak his first words in the extant romance:

> 'Certes, et il nen.....
> Por qoi seroit tot...li...
> Si home li ont fait acroire
> De nos tel chose qui n'est voire.' (ll. 81-4)

Though the manuscript is unfortunately damaged at this point, Tristan's words must surely bring Iseut confirmation that he also is aware of Mark's

---

22. O 3532-7. See also Bussmann edition, pp. 23-4, Wagner edition, pp. 28-9
23. Rom., XVI, p. 314.
24. B 69-80. The same motif is found in O, ll. 3550-3 (Bussmann edition, p. 24, Wagner edition, pp. 28-31), in R (see Bédier, Volume II, p. 349) and in G, ll. 14781-6.

presence, for the lovers themselves obviously know that the information transmitted to Mark is correct. The succession of ambiguities in the queen's speech has thus had the desired result. From now on, knowing that her lover can participate in the manner she requires, Iseut will seek to draw advantage from an encounter which might have brought about their downfall. In ll. 89-90, she excuses Mark, claiming he is only led astray by others. She is now beginning to induce in the king the sense of guilt which he will eventually seek to alleviate by granting the lovers greater freedom than they have ever enjoyed hitherto.

Reviewing the exchanges in both B and O, Jonin stresses the part played by Iseut in the deceit of Mark in the French romance: 'En revanche, l'Iseut de Béroul tient la première place, prend les initiatives, justifie pleinement sa présence tout en la regrettant.'[25] Frappier similarly considers that in comparison with Iseut Tristan 'est moins prompt à inventer',[26] but there may be a danger in underestimating his contribution. If he does not play an initiating role, he at least is a very competent follower of Iseut's leads.

After the narrator's intervention in ll. 97-100 has confirmed the situation, Tristan's speech beginning at l. 101 continues Iseut's apparently tearful and self-reproachful attitude:

> 'Ahi! Yseut, fille de roi,
> Franche, cortoise, bone foi!
> Par plusors foiz vos ai mandee
> Puis que chanbre me fu vee[e],
> Ne puis ne poi a vos parler.
> Dame, or vos vuel merci crïer
> Qu'il vos menbre de cest chaitif
> Qui a traval et a duel vif.

---

25. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 22. Jonin maintains the same opinion elsewhere (see 'La Ruse d'Iseut...', p. 77).
26. RP, XXVI, p. 218.

If we can rely on the testimony of parallel versions, Tristan is plainly lying in ll. 103-5, in the aim of increasing Mark's unease. Just as in l. 6 Iseut had so speciously reproached Tristan for what he had done to her, so in ll. 109-11 Tristan reproaches King Mark for the injustice the king has supposedly inflicted upon him. Iseut had initiated the theme that Mark was being fooled by the barons, and Tristan carries on the theme.[27] Like Iseut, Tristan mentions the Morhout episode (ll. 135-42), and he declares his innocence in ll. 143-4 just as Iseut had done in ll. 20-5: once more, advantage is taken of the opportunity to point out the king's 'guilt'. Finally, he then has the gall to assume the role of wounded innocent, asking the queen in ll. 159-60 to intercede on his behalf:

> Dame, je vos en cri merci:
> Tenez moi bien a mon ami.

Tristan is deliberately setting up a target for Iseut to attack.

As he anticipated, Iseut turns down his request, but her refusal is tempered by a theme of her first speech, her legitimate affection for Tristan:

> Et si vos dirai une rien,
> Si vuel que vos le saciés bien:
> Se il vos pardounot, beau sire,
> Par Deu, son mautalent et s'ire,
> J'en seroie joiose et lie. (ll. 179-83)

Mischievously, she is openly suggesting the approach that she would like King Mark to adopt!

Tristan then sets up a second target for Iseut to attack. He begs Iseut to redeem his armour which is apparently in pledge: then, he will leave.[28] Relying on the hope that Mark is now close to being convinced

---

27. B 143-4. This is probably also the meaning of the damaged lines, 118-9.
28. B 204-6. In no other version is the nature of Tristan's pledges so closely defined.

of their innocence, he mentions his supposed hatred for him, intending to induce in Mark a spasm of self-reproach (ll. 202-3). Iseut again pretends to be shocked by Tristan's request. Any evidence of sympathy towards him would, so she claims, make Mark convinced of her guilt (ll. 219-32). This is her final word. Tristan now begins a tearful speech of contrived self-pity which is in reality intended to further his case with Mark. In ll. 251-3, in a flattering appeal to the king's affection, he finally lays the blame for his fall from favour and consequent poverty at the door of those who (as distinct from the king) so misconstrued his nature to the point of attributing to him adultery with the queen:

> Beaus oncles, poi me deconnut
> Qui de ta feme me mescrut;
> Onques n'oi talent de tel rage.

In the second phase of the episode (ll. 258-384), Béroul examines the individual reactions of the three main characters, Mark, Iseut and Tristan, to the experience they have all just undergone.

Firstly the focus is on Mark. While still in the tree, he reflects at some length on what he has witnessed, no doubt after Tristan has disappeared. The damaged lines, 255-7, could well have concluded with an indication of Tristan's exit from the scene, and this might be confirmed by l. 285. Mark's first reaction is to weep with pity for the lovers (ll. 261-3). He is angry with Frocin, convinced that the dwarf has seriously misled him and promises for him the same fate Constantine reserved for Segoçon.[29] Clearly the dwarf is not actually with Mark at this moment in B. In O, as we have already observed, the dwarf climbed into the linden-tree with Mark: following Tristan's

---

29. B 265-84. For further information regarding this allusion, see A. Graf, Roma nella memoria..., II, pp.108-10. See also Ewert, Volume II, p. 98.

final lament the dwarf only very narrowly escapes the king's clutches (ll. 3614-25). In R, Andret alone is responsible for persuading the king to climb into the laurel, and he naturally is the target for the hatred reserved in O and B for the dwarf: he only escapes death because he is Mark's nephew and he is careful to leave the court.[30] After Mark has come down from the tree in B the decisions he has made in his monologue are reiterated by the author in a passage which records the king's thoughts (ll. 286-94). The gullibility of Mark is more pointedly portrayed at this juncture and continues to be portrayed in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of amused irony up to the end of the episode. Mark readily takes appearance for reality and wills himself to be convinced of the lovers' innocence. His conclusion is reached via impeccable logic, but because of the falsity of his premisses it is necessarily incorrect.[31] Oscillating as he does between extremes, his previous absolute conviction of the lovers' guilt has been replaced by an equally absolute belief in the lovers' innocence: it is in the logic of his character that he should now grant them liberty to see each other. Does Mark now return to the hunt as happens in O and G?[32] There is no mention of this in B but clearly there is a time-lag before Mark approaches Iseut: it is still night, and Mark is waiting impatiently for morning when he can effect a reconciliation (ll. 315-7).

Attention now turns briefly to the dwarf, whose own behaviour is governed by Mark's reactions to what he has seen and heard from his

---

30. See Bédier, Volume II, pp. 351-2.
31. For a discussion of ll. 295-304, see S.G. Nichols, 'Ethical Criticism...' p. 73 and note 5.
32. O 3626-35, G 14929-31. Ewert is probably right to assume that Béroul had at his disposal an account similar to that in G and O (Ewert, Volume II, p. 110). Perhaps Par matinet in l.315 is a survival of this source material.

vantage point in the pine. Frocin's examination of the stars informs him of the miscarriage of his plans and provokes his flight from the court (ll. 320-36). This is the first physical appearance of Frocin in B, and the first clear mention of his astrological powers. In O his powers were apparently instrumental in informing Mark of Tristan's impending visit to Iseut and his abilities were mentioned at that earlier point (ll. 3389-97, 3449-52). In G, the dwarf's divinatory powers are expressly denied (ll. 14238-51): Gottfried would appear to be inveighing personally against a tradition which Thomas also had rejected.[33] Perhaps Béroul, like Gottfried, did not wish to attribute astrological powers to the dwarf and had Frocin learn of Tristan's rendezvous with Iseut without recourse to such powers. But Béroul also seems to have felt that it was essential to explain the dwarf's flight from King Mark. In G there is no problem: the dwarf is in the tree with Mark (a feature which Béroul eliminated because he felt the dwarf's presence there was incongruous?).But were it not for the powers that in B the author belatedly and reluctantly re-attributes to him the dwarf would have remained ignorant of the threat against his life.[34] In B, the dwarf flees in the direction of Wales, as do the lovers after Mark has come upon them as they lie asleep in the forest. This might be an insignificant coincidence induced by the rhyme-word pales (l. 335, l. 2100). It might be noted that in Fo (p. 134), Hoepffner attributes Tristan's ostëur (l. 875) 'aux besoins de la versification'. In Eilhart, there is an additional episode concerning the dwarf (ll. 3772-91). Tînas comes upon him in the forest and, acting out of kindness, takes him back

---

33. Newstead, however, takes the view that Eilhart did not continue a tradition but was personally responsible for endowing the dwarf with special powers (RP, IX, p. 278).
34. See also Ewert, Volume II, pp. 100-3.

to the court. The account is highly improbable. Why is Tînas convinced by the dwarf's lie? Surely he, the seneschal, should be aware of events at court?[35] In B, Frocin is perhaps surprisingly close at hand (l. 639) when summoned in the next episode, and one must assume that Eilhart was somewhat unconvincingly trying to motivate what he saw as the unexpected re-appearance of the dwarf. Eilhart's episode has the air of a later, somewhat unsuccessful interpolation, inserted in the interests of his kind of logic.[36]

Béroul now turns his attention to Iseut, the second of the three main protagonists. Her conversation with Brengain is found elsewhere only in R. In the Prose Romance, when recounting her experience, Iseut stresses that both she and Tristan became aware of the king's presence in the tree: '-Je vos di(t)," fet la roïne, "que li roi Marc nos vint espier en tel maniere. Et nos avint, la Dieu(s) merci, que nos nos apercelïmes de lui, si chanjames maintenant nostre afere et noz paroles".'[37] In B, the accent placed by Iseut is on the fact that she noticed the presence of Mark and then took the initiative in the conversation that followed (ll. 345-52). She stresses her acting ability, which was so good that the king never noticed anything untoward (ll. 367-8). In ll. 358-9 she acknowledges Tristan's supporting role, but she is surely quite justified in taking the lion's share of credit for the way things turned out.

Line 369, and especially the word tripot, has aroused some discussion.

---

35. Kelemina points this out with some insistance: 'Dinas bring den Zwerg zurück (3772-91). Warum gerade er? Sollte er wirklich nicht über die jüngsten Ereignisse am Hofe unterrichtet sein: 3780 und frâgete in alzuhant waz he in dem walde tête usw! In B erscheint Frocin wieder, ohne das man weiss wie' (Untersuchungen..., p. 26).
36. Bédier confuses the accounts of O and B concerning the dwarf's actions (Bédier, Volume II, p. 246, variantes). Lofthouse claims that 'Eilhart, qui n'aime pas les explications superflues...aime pourtant ne rien laisser dans le vague et craint l'inachevé, se devant de suivre le nain entre ses deux interventions' (unpublished M.A. dissertation, p. 108). In his second volume, p. 101, note 1, Ewert's reference to his account of this incident should be to p. 116 of his work, not p. 156.
37. Bédier, Volume II, p. 351.

Pauphilet has described the term as an expression 'd'une vulgarité frappante'.[38] Vàrvaro, however, would not regard it as the unscrupulous cry of triumph Pauphilet claims it to be, but rather as an expression of disgust with her own actions.[39] One would prefer to take the expression as one of relief after the tension of her dialogue with Tristan, when she knew Mark was hanging on her every word. She was quite overcome by the drama, the tension is still with her when she meets Brengain, and she is glad to tell what happened in order to rid herself of this tension.[40] The situation is rather different in R. Both lovers became aware of Mark's presence and both soon realized they shared this knowledge; as a result the episode turns into a harmless game where the lovers act in playful collusion: 'Sachiez que tote la plus bele aventure qui pieça mès avenist a dame m'est en nuit avenue, et du roi Marc meïsmes.'[41] Reading B, one is always aware that the game is a dangerous one, with serious consequences if played less than expertly.

The interview between Tristan and Governal which follows is only found in Béroul's text (ll. 381-4), and one may feel that it has been deliberately included for the sake of completeness, to round off this phase of the episode with a mention of the third major protagonist in the drama. Ewert quite rightly points out that ll. 385-6 pick up ll. 337-8.[42] Does this suggest that not only the conversation between Tristan and Governal but also that between Iseut and Brengain were

---

38. Le Legs..., p. 129.
39. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 232.
40. This interpretation does not tally with that of Fedrick (RP, XXI, p. 24), who speaks of the cynicism of Iseut's words to Brengain. Frappier, however, speaks of Iseut's 'soupir de soulagement' (RP, XXVI), p. 219).
41. Bédier, Volume II, p. 351.
42. Ewert, Volume II, p. 107. Reid's contention that ert in l. 386 is a future, rather than an imperfect, is surely correct (FS, XXV, p. 54, The 'Tristran'..., p. 23).

additions by Béroul to his source? But one must note that Governal, like Brengain before him in ll. 371-80 (and, indeed, like Iseut herself in l. 352), attributes the lovers' escape to God's intervention:

> Qant conter l'ot, Deu en mercie
> Que plus n'i out fait o s'amie. (ll. 383-4)

This is certainly not fortuitous.

The third phase in the episode is concerned with the reconciliation of Tristan, Iseut and Mark. The morning after the tryst Mark visits Iseut, already convinced of the lovers' innocence. He is resolved to effect a reconciliation with his nephew and also to prevent him from leaving, which he has been led to believe is the course of action Tristan has chosen. At this point he is simply seeking even greater confirmation of the lovers' innocence by interrogating Iseut. Iseut's state of mind is perhaps a little more difficult to ascertain. She is by no means sure of the complete success of her play-acting, for her initial reaction to Mark's entrance is one of fear: 'Iseut le voit, qui molt le crient' (l. 388).

Mark begins the interview by asking her if she has seen his nephew. Iseut seizes the initiative now, as she had done at the beginning of the episode. Her speech has the air of a full confession in which she repeatedly stresses that she is telling the truth (ll. 400-2 , l. 412, l. 447). Line 439 should surely be emended to the reading of the later CFMA editions, 'Sire, de rien ne m'en creirez'. Iseut consistently pretends to hold the view that Mark will never believe her, and in this line she suggests that her initial fears at the beginning of the 'disclosure' are now being justified. Iseut's candour is only superficial, for she merely recalls the evidence which the king himself has seen and which he has been induced to misinterpret. An ambiguity in her speech

beneath the tree is resolved in Mark's favour (l. 424).

In B, Iseut's 'openness' brings her success. In O, there is no such apparent candour on Iseut's part and she in fact claims not to have seen Tristan at all (ll. 3642-9). In G, she similarly does not admit to having seen Tristan and only admits to having heard of his plight through Brengain (ll. 14981-15002). Again in G, Mark never confesses he was present at the tryst, but he does so in O. Gottfried's text is more satisfactory psychologically, with Mark replying with half-truths to Iseut's lies, whereas in O Mark's confession is surprising and not really called for after Iseut's evident lie.[43] Béroul's text is here psychologically perfect. Iseut is apparently being quite open as she relates details which Mark knows to be true, and her feigned candour draws a genuine confession from the king.

Iseut feigns open-eyed wonderment at Mark's confession and poses a question (l. 475) which forces him to admit once more that he had been perched up the pine-tree in a most unregal position. She knows the battle is won and so drives her advantage home (ll. 493-504), asserting that Mark should surely believe what he has seen with his own eyes.

Mark now sends Brengain to fetch Tristan from his lodgings, and she is to say that she is acting on the king's orders (ll. 506-10). Brengain is similarly sent by Mark in O (ll. 3702-5), but in certain other versions it is not made clear who actually goes to Tristan's lodgings.[44] Before she leaves, Brengain claims that she and Tristan have quarrelled, for

---

43. O 3650-60. Ewert refers to 'the comparative ineptness of Eilhart's handling of this scene' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 112). But for a defence of the account in O, see Buschinger, Le'Tristrant'..., I, p. 269.

44. G 15029: 'hie mite wart Tristan besant'. Fedrick's transcription of MS BN, f.fr. 772 reads 'Li rois fet mander pour Tristan' (Fedrick, p. A427). Bédier's transcription of 757 similarly reads 'Li rois fet mander por Tristan' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 352).

she says he is accusing her of causing his estrangement from Mark, and she asks the king to intercede on her behalf and bring about a reconciliation (ll. 511-18). This feigned quarrel seems to be a personal elaboration by Béroul of a suggestion in his source: in O (ll. 3661-3725), Iseut and Brengain first of all claim to be reluctant to effect a reconciliation, and in G (ll. 15017-21) Iseut refuses to give any assistance and claims that Mark's suspicions would only reassert themselves, if she were to play a part herself in restoring amity. Whitteridge thinks that the quarrel between Brengain and Tristan lacks credibility: she claims it is 'a highly improbable tale which does no credit to Marc's intelligence, for how could Brengain have brought Tristan into disfavour with Marc'.[45] But Brengain, who in the lost sections of the romance probably gave the lovers the potion intended for Mark and his bride, is surely therefore responsible for setting Mark and Tristan at variance. Mark, of course, knows nothing of this! Mark thinks he knows that Brengain is not really responsible for his estrangement from Tristan, but, flattered by her claim, he is willing to subscribe to her opinion. On Tristan's return to court, Mark urges him to abandon his quite fictitious antagonism towards Brengain; in return, ironically, he promises to discard his former suspicions which in reality we know to be only too well justified:

> Ton mautalent quite a Brengain,
> Et je te pardorrai le mien.' (ll. 553-4)

The quarrel also gives Tristan further reason to assume the role of wounded innocent, wronged not only by Mark but by Brengain as well.

---

45. 'The Tristan of Béroul', p. 355.

He has the audacity to disarm the king with self-righteous reproach and ensures that the barons' fall from grace is complete and that he and the queen are fully reinstated in his favour.

There is one averred inconsistency in this final part of the episode.[46] Lines 529-30 read:

> Tristran estoit a la paroi,
> Bien les oiet parler au roi.

It would appear that Tristan has heard through the wall all the previous conversation between Mark, Iseut and Brengain (a feature inspired by the spying of Iseut aux Blanches Mains in the final scenes of the legend?), and yet, before informing him as to what pose he should adopt, Brengain tells him exactly what happened all the same. Even though Tristan expects to be reconciled, it is unlikely that he would be in the palace at that moment, and the later remarks of Brengain clearly seem to indicate that she has come to Tristan's lodgings (see l. 536 and l. 541). In R Tristan returns to his lodgings following his nocturnal tryst,[47] while in O (ll. 3739-43) it is expressly mentioned that he is sought by the messenger in town:

> Brangêne muste entwîchen,
> dô si der koning rîche
> alsus innigelîchen bat.
> sie quam geretin in die stat
> zu Tristrandes herbergin.

At the end of the episode the lovers are able to pursue their affair with greater liberty than hitherto, and yet we have a clear intimation that their present happiness is very fragile. The dwarf's participation in an action detrimental to the lovers has been anticipated (ll. 385-6),

---

46. For a discussion of this inconsistency, see Raynaud de Lage, Rom., LXXXIII, pp. 523-4.
47. 'Tristanz se part de la roïne et s'en revient en son ostel' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 351).

even though for the moment we are told he is safely out of the way. The last lines of the episode (ll. 573-80) give an even clearer hint that the difficulties the lovers will encounter in society are insuperable. With regard to ll. 573-80, Ewert erroneously suggests that the 'passage in B has little immediate relevance unless the story continues as in G'.[48] Lines 15038-15046 of Gottfried's poem do bear some similarity to these lines in our poem, but surely the relevance of the passage is felt immediately at the beginning of the next episode in B when fears that the lovers would be discovered are seen to be amply justified.

In conclusion, one would certainly ally oneself with Jonin in repudiating Muret's view that Eilhart and Béroul are in striking agreement in their accounts.[49] On the other hand, it is difficult to subscribe to Robson's view that the first 126 lines of our text should be extensively re-ordered:[50] on account of the fundamental differences in approach of Eilhart and Béroul it would be a desecration to attempt to remodel Béroul's text on the pattern of the German poem. Clearly Béroul is emerging already, not as an author who slavishly reproduces his source, but as one who is always prepared to transform to a considerable extent the material at his disposal.

---

48. Ewert, Volume II, p. 117. F.X. Baron, however, suggests that Béroul's general comments at this stage 'prepare us for a shift in the narrative...If under the pine tree the lovers were able to hide their affair, now it is to be revealed' (MLQ, XXXIII, p. 104).
49. Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 21-2. (See Rom., XVI, p. 332.)
50. 'The Technique of Symmetrical Composition...', p. 66, note 1.

2: THE 'FLEUR DE FARINE' EPISODE

The second episode in Béroul's poem is found in various forms in all the parallel versions of the legend except the Folie Tristan de Berne.[1] But it must be acknowledged that the episode has no exact parallel in the French Prose Romance: much of the material we find in BTO is dispersed in R throughout several episodes. The material is first used in R in the episode which relates Tristan's encounter with the wife of Segurades, the episode which marks in R the real beginning of the animosity between King Mark and his nephew.[2] The parallels between this episode in R and the episode in B have been noticed in the past by Golther and Kelemina,[3] and certain motifs familiar to us from Béroul's poem do appear in the prose version. There is no flour mentioned as part of the trap, but as in B the sheets become stained with blood: the blood originates in a wound inflicted by Mark on Tristan as the hero is on his way to the rendezvous, and it is noticed by Segurades, the husband, on his untimely arrival. The presence of the dwarf is perhaps another sign of the relationship of the episode in R

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 581-826: O, ll. 3792-3979; S, chapter, p. 70, l. 4 - to end of chapter LV; H, stanza CXCIX - stanza CCIII; G, ll. 15407-15307; R, Bédier, Volume II, pp. 354-7, Curtis I, §§ 356-73, Curtis II, §§ 532-543, Fedrick, pp. A120-A140, A353-A356, A364-A367, Johnson, p. 21, pp. 83-91, Löseth, §§ 34, 48, 50-1, 284-6, MS BN, f.fr. 103, 75 r°a - 75 v°b, MS BN, f.fr. 104, 78 v°b - 79 r°b, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 77 v°a - 78 r°b; T.r., LXIV, p. 235 - p. 236, l. 28; Fo, ll. 727-56.
2. See Bédier, Volume II, pp. 354-5, Curtis I, §§ 356-73, Fedrick, pp. A120-A140, Johnson, p. 21, Löseth, § 34.
3. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 117, Geschichte der..., p.178.

to the episode of the other versions. Here, the dwarf is the servant of the lady, but under duress he acts in the interests of Mark, as does Frocin in our poem. Perhaps the influence of the tryst episode as it is recounted in the works in verse can also be perceived in this episode in R. A meeting between the lady and Tristan is suggested at the 'Fontaine del Ping', and she orders the dwarf to bring him to that spot: 'Et tu meïsmes l'amenras la defors a la Fontaine del Ping."'[4]

Material known to us from the fleur de farine episode is also to be found in the faux episode in R.[5] In R, the episode is the first of the series of incidents which leads to the capture of the lovers. The attempt to capture them here proves abortive, but the aim of Tristan's enemies is the same one we find in the fleur de farine episode of the poems, the gaining of proof of the lovers' guilt. A familiar motif reappears, the bloody sheets, stained after Tristan has been wounded in the leg by one of the blades set up by Andret (Sandret in 103):

La nuyt, quant Tristan sceut que Sandret estoit endormy, si se leva coiement, et s'en va au lit la royne et se fiert es faulx, et se fist une grant playe en la jambe. Et commença trop durement a seingnier, si se couche emprès la royne et ne se print garde de ce. La royne, qui sent les draps moulliés, pensa que Tristan estoit bleschié.[6]

In R, the faux episode, or its very close analogue, is to be found almost immediately before the capture of the lovers, even though it does not actually occasion their capture, as does the fleur de farine episode in the poems. It will be remembered that in O the faux episode occurs much later (ll. 5285-5487), after Tristan has surrendered Iseut to Mark and after he has joined Arthur. Is it possible that the author of R

---

4. Curtis I, § 358.
5. For an account of the faux episode, see Bédier, Volume II, pp. 355-6, Curtis II, §§ 532-533, Fedrick, pp. A353-A356, Johnson, pp. 83-84, Löseth, § 48.
6. Bédier, Volume II, p. 355.

deliberately changed the position of the episode? Having already used up much of his material in the account of Tristan's affair with the wife of Segurades, did he take a roughly similar episode from a later point in the legend? This is clearly only a possibility, and we may in fact be dealing with episodes in the legend composed originally at different dates. Lichtenstein and Golther saw the faux and the fleur de farine episodes as the double employment of what was originally one story.[7] Perhaps the faux was modelled on the fleur de farine episode, and in R the offspring has in some measure pushed out its parent?

In R the account of the actual capture of the lovers may still betray traces of the fleur de farine episode. Tristan has penetrated Iseut's quarters, in the company of Brengain and disguised as a maid-servant of the queen. No dwarf figures in the episode, but Basille, a servant of Iseut and in love with Andret, comes across the sleeping Tristan and, like Frocin, she informs Tristan's enemies of his presence. Again, the incident takes place at night and Tristan is captured when in bed.[8]

At the end of the previous episode in Béroul's poem, Mark, Tristan and Iseut had been reconciled. Tristan now had free access to the queen's room and was reinstated to his former position at court. But danger was anticipated, from the dwarf, as indicated in l. 386,[9] and from the lovers, who were likely to betray themselves (ll. 573-80). The introductory passage to the episode (ll. 581-603) shows that what was feared has now indeed happened and that the lovers are in a critical situation.

---

7. Nicht minder scheint mir die List Markes mit der Wolfsfalle bei Artus Besuch nur ein Parallelmotiv zu dem früheren Mehlstreuen des Zwerges zu sein' (Lichtenstein, Eilhart von Oberge, Einleitung, p. CXXVIII). 'Die blutigen Bettücher beim Mehlstreuen und bei der Sensenfalle erscheinen wie zwei Wendungen derselben Geschichte' (Golther, Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 64).
8. For an account of the capture of the lovers in R, see Bédier, Volume II, pp. 356-7, Curtis II, §§ 540-543, Fedrick, pp. A364-A367, Johnson, pp. 89-91, Löseth, §§ 50-1.
9. Varvaro believes the line specifically anticipates the dwarf's machinations in this episode (see Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 48).

This passage opens with the mention of the three wicked barons, who will precipitate a whole sequence of events lasting virtually until l. 3027. This is apparently the first time that these three barons in particular are mentioned in Béroul's poem. Previously, there was reference to slanderers who had caused Tristan to be alienated from his uncle, but no single individual or group of individuals was picked out. Iseut claimed that she did not know who caused Mark to spy on them from the pine-tree: 'Ne sai qui hui nos vout traïr' (l. 348). In Eilhart, by contrast, the same particular individuals as before are involved. The dwarf, to save his own skin, swears that he will prove to Antrêt that the lovers are still meeting (ll. 3792-3807). In G, Marjodo and the dwarf Melot are already known to be particular enemies of Tristan (ll. 15047-15116). In E, Meriadok is acting on his own when he informs the king of the lovers' secret affair and he also has already featured as a particular enemy of the lovers (stanza CXCIX). Perhaps three barons in particular are singled out by Béroul at this point in order to prepare the revenge motif which will later be prominent. The taking of revenge against the whole of Mark's household is patently impossible, but wreaking revenge upon particular enemies is, as it will prove to be, a practical policy. The particular incidents which aroused the animosity of these three barons are listed. They have seen the lovers in a compromising situation in a garden (ll. 589-92), and they have seen them lying in bed together on several occasions when Mark was absent hunting (ll. 593-8). Newstead believes that this reference to Mark's absences supports the view that, in the lost portion of the Tryst beneath the Tree incident, Béroul had an account of the king ostensibly leaving court for a long period in order to go hunting.[10] Kelemina[11] noted the similarity of the lines to

10. RP, IX, pp. 270-1.
11. Geschichte der..., p. 141.

an incident related in R (Löseth,§§ 284-6), while Fourrier indicated that the verger episode in Thomas has a certain similarity to the content of ll. 589-92.[12] Ewert suggests that the closest parallel to ll. 583-634 of B is to be found in ll. 3150-3249 of O and postulates that much of Eilhart's episode was transferred by Béroul to this new position.[13] But are the scenes really so similar that this particular suggestion can be supported? In all probability, it would seem that ll. 581-603 of B do not allude to previous incidents, nor did they have any particular influence on other works: the events described in the passage are not so distinctive that other versions could not have produced episodes similar in content quite independently.[14] The introductory passage is backward-looking in its description of events since the close of the previous episode, but it is also forward-looking in that we learn that the three barons have decided to request Tristan's expulsion from the court: the actual placing of this request before the king will trigger off the new sequence of events.

The next section in the episode runs from l. 604 to l. 638. The three barons now approach the king. They tell him that the love affair is continuing and they threaten to withdraw from court as a prelude to war, if Mark does not yield to their request and exile Tristan. The king is deeply disturbed by their ultimatum, and, in his mercurial way, now turns to them for help in his dilemma. The barons suggest that the dwarf should be summoned to settle the matter. The reader may gain the impression that material is being repeated from the introductory passage.[15] What is happening is that the barons are now acting upon their previous

---

12. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 88.
13. Ewert, Volume II, p. 119.
14. Béroul may simply have been dramatizing conventional courtly terminology. Lazar refers to the phrase of Bertran de Born, en chambra o dintz vergier, as an 'expression-cliché' (Amour courtois..., p. 133).
15. Line 586, for example, is echoed by l. 609 and by l. 624.

decision to request Tristan's exile and they have now directly confronted the king. Material may in part be repeated, but the method of presentation is decidedly different: what was mostly narrative is now being dramatized. Similarly, in the tryst episode, Mark's monologue in the tree following the lovers' departure is largely complemented by the lines of straight narrative, 286-97.[16]

Lines 631-2, where Mark requests that his barons fulfil their feudal obligation as privy counsellors, are reproduced almost exactly in ll. 2529-30, where the king invites advice from his barons after he has received the letter from Tristan. Here, of course, we are none too well disposed towards the barons, for we have been preconditioned from the very outset of the episode to regard the three barons as perpetrators of evil:

> A la cort avoit trois barons,
> Ainz ne veïstes plus felons. (ll. 581-2)

We feel as a result that the barons are being profoundly hypocritical; they are evildoers who have adopted an attitude of outraged innocence. Their actions are in accordance with what feudal law demands, but from this they gain no credit,[17] and certainly further events make it clear that it is not for love of their lord that the barons observe with such punctiliousness the obligations of feudal service.

The barons' approach to the king in ll. 604-38 sets a whole series of events in motion. A similar approach in the passage beginning at l. 3028, again made by the three barons, sets off a second series of

---

16. In his second volume (p. 76), Ewert claims that 'repetition (with or without variations) is one of the characteristic features of the author's narrative technique, and this strengthens the conviction that his work was written to be read in public and not privately'.
17. Vàrvaro holds a similar view: 'Quel che risulta da questi versi è, ancora una volta, l'impostazione giuridica del loro agire, che non vale certo a riscattare la loro natura, ma che come sempre è vista con lucidità e inquadra il loro agire nell'ambito di una precisa società costituita, sempre secondo la più rilevante tendenza del mondo ideale di Béroul' (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 151).

events, and the parallels between the two passages are impressive. There are clear verbal echoes:

> Li roi Marc ont a raison mis. (l. 604)
>
> La sont venu li troi baron,
> Qui le roi mistrent a raison. (ll. 3039-40)
>
> 'Seignor, vos estes mi fael. (l. 627)
>
> Mais nos, qui somes ti feel. (l. 3117)

One parallel in particular may be judged noteworthy; in l. 625 the barons set a problem, whereas in l. 3077 the king leaves the felons with a problem:

> Or t'aron tost cest geu parti. (l. 625)
>
> Ge vos ferai un geu parti. (l. 3077)

One further similarity is that the barons, in the first episode (ll. 623-4), threaten to leave court with their supporters, and in the later episode the barons actually retreat to their castles. Clearly none of these parallels is on its own really remarkable, but their accumulation within the limits of passages which both precipitate a new sequence of events is certainly striking. (Does this support the argument that the poem was the work of one author? Or was a second author responsible for the later passage, drawing on the old material, amplifying and inverting former situations?) The final series of events in the Béroul fragment, from l. 4267, is similarly set in motion by the three barons: they do not approach the king on that occasion, but they have heard of Tristan's continuing presence in the kingdom and, as in this episode, are resolved to engineer his downfall.

The immediate arrival of the dwarf in the next section (ll. 639-78) has been held to be disconcerting: in B he was last reported as fleeing in the general direction of Wales (l. 336). In O, it will be remembered,

the dwarf was brought back to court by Tînas (ll. 3770-91). Both accounts are no doubt contrived: the dwarf must escape the king's wrath in the tryst episode and yet he must be available to play his prominent part here. Béroul tries to explain the dwarf's escape from retribution, Eilhart tries to justify the dwarf's immediate involvement in this episode.

The dwarf's unsympathetic character is re-emphasized at once. The author's dislike, explicitly damning, finds further expression in the disagreeably unctuous intimacy with which one of the felons receives him (ll. 639-48). Frocin unfolds his plan: the king must pretend to send Tristan on an errand to King Arthur at Carduel, and, using his knowledge of human nature and not his divinatory powers — which Béroul, to his regret, was forced to reintroduce — the dwarf anticipates that Tristan will wish to 'speak with' the queen before he leaves (ll. 649-62).[18] The next lines are somewhat confused. Mölk proposes that ll. 663-6 should be emended thus:

> Et s'il i vient, et ge nul sai,
> Se tu nu voiz, si me desfai
> Et tuit ti homẽ, autrement
> Prové seront sanz soirement.[19]

In l. 665 Mölk, like the editors of M^4, would read <u>ti</u> rather than <u>si</u>, the manuscript reading retained by Ewert. M^3 reads at l. 663 'Et s'il n'i vient, et je nul sai'. Muret cites l. 3842 of <u>O</u>, 'sêge he denne nicht die vrawen mîn', in support of this correction, but the lines are not exactly parallel. The dwarf in <u>O</u> is accepting that he should be killed if Tristan does not visit the queen, whilst Frocin's point appears to be more complex: he is not sure Tristan will be there, but if Tristan

---

18. On the similarly euphemistic use of <u>parler</u> in <u>Fo</u>, see Schaefer, <u>Tris.</u>, III, no. 1, p. 11.
19. <u>Tristan und Isolde</u>, pp. 38-9.

does come and he, the dwarf, fails to show this to the king, he should be put to death. The dwarf's acceptance that he should be put to death if his plan goes wrong is understandable,[20] but why should Mark's men (or Tristan's?) necessarily be implicated?

At this point Béroul introduces an element of suspense. In O, the dwarf has already divulged that he will strew flour between the beds (ll. 3836-40), but in B Frocin has not revealed the finer details of how he will convince the king of the lovers' guilt. An intriguing visit to the baker's follows in ll. 673-80, a scene not found in O, and our curiosity is aroused as to the purpose to which the flour bought by the dwarf will be put.[21]

The exposition of the episode is now over: later events in the episode are governed by the result the authors of the various versions are seeking to produce. Béroul and Eilhart are broadly in agreement in that in both poems the king must have general indications of guilt that will justify him in punishing the lovers. In Thomas the case is rather different: no proof of guilt will be presented to the king and he will be left in even greater uncertainty than before.

Events in B take the following course. Tristan has his interview with the king who sends him with a letter to deliver to Arthur. The urgency of the errand is deliberately impressed upon him,[22] and Tristan

---

20. This happens also in O (ll. 3422-3) and the spy in the last episode of our poem offers a similar guarantee (ll. 4288-94).
21. The detail in ll. 675-7 is surely not simply 'a characteristic, picturesque addition', as Ewert would have it (Ewert, Volume II, p. 124).
22. Mark's order in l. 688 that Tristan should only stay one night with King Arthur is also not 'a mere picturesque addition' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 124). Mark pretends to want Tristan to go at once, so that the trap will be effective that very night. By saying Tristan should spend only one night with Arthur, Mark is stressing the apparent urgent need for a reply and the overall urgency of the errand. The detail has surely nothing at all to do with the potion.

naturally panics. The beds are not all that far apart[23] (but for a man with one leg in bandages the leap is obviously no mere formality!) and Tristan is resolved to go and 'speak to' the queen before he leaves. The dwarf strews flour on the floor and Tristan realizes the purpose of this action at the same time we do.[24] At this point the author ominously mentions a wound from a wild boar received the previous day. The dwarf and the king leave. Tristan stands up, jumps, but in the effort the wound opens: his thoughts elsewhere, he fails to notice.[25] The dwarf, from outside, sees the lovers together and tells the king. Tristan leaps back as he hears the king returning, but blood falls from the wound on to the flour.[26] They would not have been held guilty, so the author claims, had Iseut removed the sheets from the bed.

A number of interesting points emerge from Béroul's account. It is clear that Tristan's compulsion to seek gratification with Iseut immediately is given its particular urgency by panic: 'Tristran fu mis en grant esfroi' (l. 693). Eilhart, more explicitly, goes back beyond the confines of the individual episode, makes careful mention of the love potion at this point and attributes to it Tristan's foolhardy behaviour:

> her wolde vor der reise
> zû der koniginne komen,
> doch habe wir wol vornomen
> daz ez von dem tranke quam.

---

23. B 694-6. In G (ll. 15179-80) and in E (stanzas CC, ll. 2199-2200, and CCI, ll. 2205-6), stress is laid on the great length of Tristan's leap. Barbier glosses atenance in l. 696 by 'physical nearness' (FS, I, p. 119), but this meaning hardly fits in with the meaning we must give to fole, the qualifying adjective.
24. B 701-15. In T.r. (p. 236, ll. 9-11), it is the king himself who scatters the flour about.
25. On the strength of ll. 733-4, it is difficult to accept Nichols's claim that we are unsure whether 'the lovers do anything more than talk' (Ethical Criticism...', p. 74).
26. There is surely no suggestion that Tristan has touched the ground in leaping back to his own bed (contrast Ewert, Volume II, p. 130).

he was andirs sô ein wîse man,
her hêtiz wol gelâzin:
die grôzen unmâze
lêrte in des trankes craft.[27]

The German poet ensures that we always know where the main protagonists are in the course of the episode. We learn that the dwarf is below the bed at one point (ll. 3846-9), that the enemies of Tristan are in the room (ll. 3897-9), and we presumably understand that Mark is sleeping in the room as well.[28] Béroul offers rather a series of pictures; his interests lie elsewhere, but he feels it incumbent upon him to indicate the peregrinations of his characters, not by describing their movement from one place to another but by briefly noting their present whereabouts:

Li nains la nuit en la chanbre ert. (l. 701)
Li nains defors est. (l. 736)
Iluec furent li troi felon. (l. 741)
Li troi baron sont en la chanbre. (l. 771)

Eilhart is less fastidious than Béroul at one point in that he gives no indication of the source of Tristan's wound: in fact, he only mentions the wound in l. 3927, when the effort of the leap causes the fateful loss of blood. In B, the blood on the sheets and elsewhere has to be prepared by the mention of the wound on Tristan's leg inflicted by the wild boar: he had no bandage on the wound (ll. 716-20). The detail in B seems an apparent afterthought which aims at lending greater credibility to the scene, and it may well be that O continues the account of the source. In T, the explanatory detail concerning the origin of the wound is more fully

---

27. O 3912-19. One might legitimately regard the content of these lines as a clarification, not altogether indispensable, on the part of the German author. Buschinger, however, feels that this addition by Eilhart 'explicite le sens de la première partie de son oeuvre, fondée sur le thème du philtre et de l'amour irraisonné qu'il allume' (Le 'Tristrant'..., I, p. 311).
28. Ewert expresses his surprise at Eilhart's version (Ewert, Volume II, p. 128). Eilhart may well have continued an account he recognized as improbable but which he was forced to retain because the king in his version must be granted incontrovertible visual evidence.

integrated into the structure of the episode. We are told that Mark, Tristan and Iseut have recently been bled.[29] In E, the bleeding was a deliberate measure proposed by Meriadok to gain evidence of the lovers' guilt (stanza CXCIX). Line 15118 and perhaps ll. 15120-3 of G might appear to support E and the view that the bleeding was deliberate in T. But if the bleeding was deliberate in T, the account is not really satisfactory. In Thomas's version, were the bleeding and the flour connected in the minds of the lovers' enemies as they are in Meriadok's mind in E? Did the enemies really anticipate that Tristan, having become aware of the flour on the ground, would attempt a leap and thereby break open his wound? Certainly in S, when the king returns, no mention is made at all of the state of the flour. But probably in T, and also in G and S, the bleeding of the lovers was unconnected with the plan for the capture: it merely happened to create the general conditions in which the flour ruse could be employed.[30]

More important differences are to be found between the various versions in their accounts of the evidence which Tristan's actions supply. In B, Tristan leaps into the bed where Iseut is lying, and his return leap is also successful: but blood has been spilt on the sheets and blood has fallen on the flour as he leapt back. In Eilhart's version, the first leap of the hero is again successful: but there is blood on Iseut and on his return leap one foot touches the flour:

> wie gerne Tristrant von ir wêre
> gesprungin wedir ûf sîn bette!
> dô mochte he des nicht irreckin,
> daz her mit gûte quême wedir
> und trat mit eime fûze nedir. (ll. 3938-42)

---

29. E, stanza CC, ll. 2190-1, G, ll. 15117-9, S, chapter LV, p. 70, ll. 4-5, Fo, l. 733.
30. 'En T, le roi, la reine et Tristan se sont fait saigner ce jour-là: de là vient l'accident qui tache de sang les draps' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 249, variante c).

In T there is blood on the sheets only and the flour is not touched, neither by blood nor by a footmark.[31]

In O, Mark sees the evidence and decides it is damning.[32] It is probable that O preserves the original version of the story, for the flour, the main motif, still has full prominence and is not yet subordinated to the blood motif. It will be remembered that the original intention of Tristan's enemies in all the versions was that the flour would be disturbed and would betray the hero. In the derivatives of T, Mark draws a different conclusion from the different evidence at his disposal. In G, the king looks down at the flour and sees that it is unmarked. The blood on Iseut's bed disturbs him, however. He hears Iseut's excuse that the blood on the sheets came from the newly-opened vein, and then, 'als ez in schimpfe waere getan' (l. 15220), turns to Tristan's bed. When he sees the blood in Tristan's bed as well, he is naturally even more disturbed. Similarly, in S, there is uncertainty as to the lovers' guilt, for the evidence is again not conclusive (chapter LV, p. 70, ll. 26-36). In E, Mark again has apparently no decisive proof of guilt or innocence on which he may act (stanza CCII). Turning our attention to Béroul's poem, we remember that there the main pieces of evidence had been the blood on Iseut's sheets and the blood which had fallen on the flour as Tristan leapt back to his own bed. The king returns with the dwarf and examines what evidence there is: he sees the blood on the flour where he expected to see a footmark and also the mystifying blood on Iseut's sheets. Tristan is not yet involved, no link has so far been

---

31. See, for example, ll. 15205-8 of G.
32. O 3943-55. Bédier is surely incorrect in claiming that the evidence in O is only very fragile (Bédier, Volume II, pp. 250-1).

discovered to connect him with the blood. But a link is made, almost accidently. The barons seize Tristan, acting, one supposes, on the information supplied by the dwarf who had seen the lovers together (ll. 736-8). And only now, as they seize Tristan, does evidence emerge which links Tristan and Iseut: 'Voient la janbe qui li saine'.[33] At once the blood on the flour and the blood in Iseut's bed can be explained as originating in Tristan's bleeding leg. The king now believes he has proof that the lovers had been together as the dwarf had reported:

> 'Trop par a ci veraie enseigne;
> Provez estes,' ce dist li rois.[34]

The evidence in B is not as ambiguous as Nichols supposes: 'The ambiguity is strengthened by the fact that Tristan has regained his bed by the time the witnesses enter the room, leaving only the circumstantial evidence of the bloody sheets and the blood-flecked flour to mark his movement.'[35] It is important to stress that a closed circle of evidence has now been forged, linking Iseut's bloody sheets, the blood-flecked flour and Tristan's leg. All three elements are necessary to provide any real evidence, and we now understand why the poet in ll. 750-4 regretted that Iseut had not removed the sheets from her bed, an action which would have eliminated a third, decisive item of evidence.[36] It is also very important to point out that apparently only the dwarf has actually seen the lovers together in bed. In the last resort the evidence is only circumstantial, for King Mark has not witnessed the lovers' adultery with his own eyes. He must continue to vacillate between belief in the

---

33. B 777. Perhaps one ought, with M^4, to punctuate the passage with a full stop after 776 in order to highlight 777.
34. B 778-9. Robson believes that l. 778 ought to be attributed not to Mark but to the three barons ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 201). This is certainly possible.
35. 'Ethical Criticism...', p. 75.
36. F. Rigolot stresses the importance of the sheets: 'Le drap devient la pièce à conviction' (CCM, X, p. 447). But we would prefer to consider the blood-stained sheets as only one part of the evidence; as we have seen, blood-stained sheets also figure in T, but there the lovers' guilt is not thought to be proved.

lovers' guilt and belief in their innocence.

At this stage in the other versions the episode is virtually over. In T, Mark is harassed by doubt and ponders on the inconclusive signs of guilt. In O, Mark is convinced of their guilt and anticipates putting them to death (ll. 3956-79). But in B the episode has another forty lines to run. Tristan begs the king to show pity to Iseut and also delivers a plea that he should be allowed to defend himself in judicial combat against his accusers (ll. 783-826). Pauphilet discusses the passage and stresses that Tristan is making a calculated appeal, trusting in his own physical strength: 'Il est vindicatif, à l'occasion cruel; il ne craint pas de s'embusquer pour tuer un ennemi par surprise: nulle trace de point d'honneur chevaleresque dans de pareils combats, mais l'emploi impitoyable de sa force. Il se fie même à cette force pour se disculper, contre toute vérité, lorsqu'il a été, ou peu s'en faut, pris avec Iseut en flagrant délit.'[37] But does this assessment of Tristan's character really help to understand the impression made by the last part of the episode? Jonin has also examined the passage and noted its general similarity to the legal procedure in an apparently comparable case in twelfth-century France. Mark is held by Jonin to have acted according to the law when he is resolved to take vengeance as swiftly as possible, which would no doubt be accurate if the case had been unequivocally presented as one of flagrant délit. Mark's refusal to consider a judicial duel and the binding of the lovers would also be in line with contemporary custom. Jonin finds incongruity only in the punishment proposed, for burning at the stake was not the normal punishment for adultery.[38] M.D. Legge, however, points out that in England the crime of the lovers would

---

37. Le Legs..., p. 126.
38. Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 61-71.

have been one of lèse-majesté, that it would not have been judged according to ecclesiastical law, and that the punishment proposed in the romance would be in perfect accordance with reality.[39]

But neither Jonin's investigation nor Legge's observation sheds any real light on the real function of the passage. A remark of Nichols is perhaps more obviously relevant: 'From the moment the threat arises, the emphasis shifts from the lovers and their indiscretion to the accusers and their behavior.'[40] He surely overstates the case, but certainly a new factor is introduced when the author chooses to underline the cruelty of the barons as they maltreat the lovers (ll. 805-8). Tristan allows himself and Iseut to be tied up, only because he is mistakenly confident at this stage that he will be allowed to enter the lists in order to defend himself (ll. 809-12). He places his trust in God:

> Mais en Deu tant fort se fiot
> Que bien savoit et bien quidoit,
> S'a escondit peüst venir,
> Nus n'en osast armes saisir
> Encontre lui, lever ne prendre;
> Bien se quidoit par champ defendre.
> Por ce ne vout il vers le roi
> Mesfaire soi por nul desroi. (ll. 813-20)

Tristan, it must be noted, does not anticipate that God will be on his side when the judicial duel takes place (God could hardly intervene on behalf of a guilty sinner and thus proclaim his absolute innocence), but only that He will ensure that nobody is prepared to take up arms against him (ll. 813-18). Confident that he will be able to have his escondit and not wishing to antagonize the king in any way, he presents no resistance to the three barons (ll. 819-20). But in ll. 821-4 Béroul makes it plain that had Tristan known that only summary judgement was in store for him he would have killed the three barons on the spot. Then,

---

39. CCM, III, pp. 511-12.
40. 'Ethical Criticism...', p. 75.

in l. 825, the author himself rounds upon the felons, finishing off the process of defamation.

By attacking the three barons in this way, the author has enlisted support for the lovers by emotive means. Tristan may be wrong to expect a judicial duel, but were he right the barons would be too cowardly to provide opposition: his hopes may be unfounded, but the net result of their expression is hatred for the barons and sympathy for their potential victims. Nichols has further pointed out that the lovers are not actually caught in acto and therefore a judicial duel might be possible according to the law.[41] But this legal nicety is not actually mentioned, not even by the chorus who will later, in ll. 885-7, bring up a legal point of a similar delicate nature. To conclude, the author can be seen to be calculating his effects in the closing lines of the episode. While not pretending the lovers are innocent, by denigrating their accusers and by presenting Tristan as confident of an escondit, he makes us aware that there are various gradations of guilt. As a result, the expressions of sympathy and support for the lovers that we encounter in the next episode appear far more plausible.

---

41. 'Ethical Criticism...', p. 76.

3: THE CONDEMNATION OF THE LOVERS

At this point in the story, the only texts available to shed an indirect light on the meaning of Béroul's poem are the representatives of the version commune.[1] Following the fleur de farine episode, the poem by Thomas has taken a different course and now plunges directly into the Ambiguous Oath episode.

As we have seen, one outstanding feature of the last section of the previous episode in Béroul's poem was the systematic denigration of the lovers' enemies, a process which helped the audience to look sympathetically upon the lovers. At the beginning of this next episode, Béroul introduces in ll. 831-59 a long speech by the Cornish people which conveys their distress and their disbelief: no doubt he wishes to insure a comparable reaction in his audience. This speech, delivered in chorus form, records the general reaction to the news that the king has found the lovers together and that he is on the point of ending their lives (ll. 827-30). As in the last section of the previous episode the reputation of the lovers is proportionately enhanced as their enemies are denigrated. In ll. 833-6, Tristan's nobility of character is praised, and, by a deliberate contrast, those who captured him are described as gloton. In ll. 837-43 we find a similar pattern, but this time it is the queen whose unimpeachability is proclaimed, whilst it is judged that the dwarf deserves

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 827-908; O, ll. 3980-4097; R, Bedier, Volume II, pp. 357-8, Curtis II, §§ 544-546, Fedrick, pp. A369-A370, Johnson, pp. 91-2, Löseth, § 51, MS BN, f.fr. 104, 79 r°b - 79 v°b, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 r°b - 78 v°b.

only a quick death. In the next lines, the people of Cornwall firstly lament what to them is the tragedy of Tristan's imminent death: they then go on to recall the Morhout incident, the cowardice of all the barons of Cornwall when the giant delivered his challenge, and, drawing the by now inevitable comparison in ll. 853-7, they recall Tristan's bravery at that time and the suffering that he endured on behalf of them all.[2] The passage then closes with the refusal of the people of Cornwall to look favourably upon the execution of Tristan.

Vàrvaro has discussed at some length the role of what he terms the chorus in Béroul's poem. He considers the 'chorus' to be one element in the co-participation of narrator and public, who are linked together in what he has called a 'circolo di affetti': 'Il coro di Béroul invece esprime sentimenti che sono anche del narratore e degli ascoltatori e mira dunque quasi sempre a creare una più vasta eco all'azione dei protagonisti, ad allargare e concretare il cerchio della solidarietà.'[3] Vàrvaro would appear to assume that the reactions of the audience are automatically identical with those of the 'chorus', but this is surely not the case. The audience has much more information at its disposal than have the people who are simply reacting to the news in the manner of normal, decent human beings. The audience is obviously meant to be touched by their outpouring of emotion, but its greater knowledge must preclude any absolute identification. The king has announced to the people that Tristan and Iseut are to be burnt at the stake[4] and

---

2. In the tryst episode (ll. 135-42), the Morhout incident had been recalled by Tristan himself with a similar end in view, the gaining of credit for himself and the inflicting of disgrace upon the nobles of Cornwall.
3. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 99.
4. In O (ll. 3971-9), the king, on Antrêt's suggestion, is preparing to punish Tristan by breaking him on the wheel and Iseut by burning her at the stake. In the version, probably B, employed by the author of Fb, Iseut was destined to be burnt at the stake: 'Qant a ardoir fustes jugiee' (l. 446).

punishment appears threateningly imminent. The people, now putting the king in the wrong, protest at the rapidity of the execution of sentence and suggest that the lovers must be allowed to submit themselves to the normal processes of the law. This point is amplified later, in ll. 1097-9, when Dinas points out to the king that he is putting himself in the wrong, if he has the queen burnt, because Iseut has not confessed her guilt. Jonin considers that the people and Dinas understood what the law demanded in such a case: 'Même dans cette procédure hâtive qui ne comportait pas le formalisme habituel avec semonces, et n'autorisait pas non plus le duel judiciaire, il fallait encore que la coupable fût jugée au moins sommairement et reconnût son forfait.'[5] But simply discerning that the people and Dinas were aware of what the law of the day demanded does not fully explain the impact of the interventions in this episode.

In truth, Béroul seems to have introduced the speeches at this stage in order to forestall any possible withholding of sympathy on the part of the audience, which, on the evidence available, would not be unjustified. And the people's intervention has a second, attendant result which is ultimately more important: the moral problem, the question of the lovers' guilt, is pushed into the background. The emphasis on the wickedness of the three barons and the dwarf, on the past cowardice of the nobles of Cornwall, succeeds in diverting attention from the main question of the present moment, the adultery of the lovers. This emphasis can be illustrated by the examination of just one couplet, ll. 835-6:

> Qel damage qu'e[n] traïson
> Vos ont fait prendre cil gloton!

Whether one relates <u>en traïson</u> to the actions of the barons and understands

---

5. <u>Les Personnages féminins...</u>, p. 72.

'treacherously', the more likely interpretation, or one relates it to the actions of the lovers and understands 'in an act of treachery', the net result is the same, a further denigration of the barons rather than a recollection of the crime committed by the lovers.[6]

We also find a chorus figuring at this juncture in the Prose Romance, or, more accurately, we find two sets of speeches by two different groups. The first group to intervene is that composed apparently of the nobles of Cornwall.[7] King Mark has decided that Iseut should be burnt at the stake, but the nobles intervene to suggest that they present as an even harsher punishment: 'Ha! sire, de la roine vous voingiez, font cil de Cornuaille, autrement que de feu ardoir. Sire, font il, livrez la es mesiaux. Illuc sera plus tormentee que se ele estoit arse .C. foiz, et avra plus de honte et de mesaise que nule chaitive.'[8] The barons, in proposing this alternative punishment for Iseut, continue a theme already found in the works in verse. In both B and O the handing over of the queen to the lepers occurs because the leader of the band of lepers personally persuades the king that such a course of action will bring him greater credit (B, ll. 1165-79, O, ll. 4261-79). In R, as in B and O, Mark agrees to surrender Iseut to the lepers, but no leader of the lepers, no Yvain, no 'herzoge', actually appears. Perhaps the writer of R, like Thomas, felt the presence of such people to be excessively repugnant, but did not wish to recast the story so drastically at this point. The role of the lepers in R is, in fact, cut down to an absolute

---

6. Nichols has his own view of the significance of the people's intervention: 'Eschewing purely moral values, the people judge only the social and personal worth of the Queen and Tristan, that is, what the two have meant to them. In their eyes, the evil clearly lies with those who would, for whatever reason, attempt to deprive the realm of its vital human resources' ('Ethical Criticism...', p. 84). But it is perhaps preferable to see the speech of the chorus as part of a trend begun in the last episode, where the author deliberately intervened in order to divert the audience's attention away from the moral problem, upon which he will nevertheless come to concentrate in due course of time.
7. MS BN, f.fr. 756: 'cil de Cornoalle'. MS BN, f.fr. 104: 'cil de Cornuaille'. Curtis II,§515: 'cil de Cornoaille'. Bédier, Volume II, p. 357: 'ceulx de Cornouaille'. Johnson, p. 91: 'cil de Cornuaille'.
8. MS BN, f.fr. 104, 79 v°a.

minimum; Governal, when releasing Iseut from the colony, achieves the task easily and swiftly, by contrast with the minor battles which take place in B and O, as if the author of R did not wish to dwell overlong on this matter.[9] Among Mark's nobles there are some who hope for Tristan's escape and similar expressions of support for the lovers are voiced later by the whole of the townspeople, the second group to intervene. Material familiar from Béroul's poem is found here, specifically the recollection of the bravery of Tristan in opposing the Morhout,[10] but there is not the same systematic denigration of the lovers' enemies and the temporary eclipse of the main moral problem that we find in B.

Béroul's intentions become even clearer when we examine the second, much briefer speech of the people of the land:

> Tuit s'escrïent la gent du reigne:
> 'Rois, trop ferïez lai pechié,
> S'il n'estoient primes jugié;
> Puis les destrui; sire, merci!'[11]

Even though the people are wrongly convinced of the lovers' innocence and even though the lovers would presumably have been condemned had the law been allowed to take its normal course, the author contrives to emphasize not the guilt of the lovers, but rather the king's reluctance to follow customary procedures. The final impression conveyed is that the king is in the wrong rather than the lovers; attention has been diverted from the main guilty party by the clever exploitation of another guilty party, just as it was in the first long speech of the chorus.

---

9. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 r°b: 'Et cil dient a Governal qe il monte tost et apertement et s'en voit vers la meson des mesiax ou la roine estoit enclose. Et si entre leenz et la prent q'il ne trove qi contredire li ose.'
10. MS BN, f.fr. 104, 79 v°b: '"Ha! Tristan, font il, se il soveint au roi de l'angoisse que tu aus encontre le Morholt pour la freinchise de Cornuaille, il ne te feïst metre a mort, ainz t'onorast et tenist chier et sire de ton ostel.'
11. B 884-7. The substance of ll. 884-94 is not found in any other version.

Sympathy accrues to the lovers for the last time in the episode when Tristan is led out on his way to the stake:

> Lors l'en ameinent par les mains;
> Par Deu, trop firent que vilains!
> Tant ploroit, mais rien ne li monte,
> Fors l'en ameinent a grant honte.
> Yseut plore, par poi n'enrage.
> 'Tristran,' fait ele, 'quel damage
> Qu'a si grant honte estes liez! [12]

The ignominy of being bound is not a theme unknown in the other versions (see, for example, O, ll. 3952-5), but in B once again a theme is given a slightly different significance. We have been preconditioned by the final section of the previous episode and by what has already occurred in this to feel sympathy for the lovers as a result of the constant attacks upon their enemies. By this stage we are not asking ourselves whether Tristan deserves this ignominy as a result of his actions: the real ignominy, we feel, belongs to those who are responsible for Tristan's being bound, as l. 900 clearly intimates.

We have seen that Béroul is not the only author of a version of the legend who attempts to win the audience's sympathy for the lovers. Already we have seen that the Prose Romance has a chorus which expresses sorrow at the lovers' plight. In Eilhart's poem we have roughly the same thing, but here it is Tînas who intervenes to beg the king for mercy (ll. 3995-4053). It may well be that O preserves the original account and that B and R present remodellings. There is perhaps a hint in B that in Béroul's source an individual intervened at this stage, but this incident has now been suppressed. Lines 863-5 read:

> N'i ot baron tant fort ne fier
> Qui ost le roi mot araisnier
> Qu'i [l] li pardonast cel mesfait.

---

12. B 899-905. The last two lines recall the construction of ll. 835-6, and the author's intention is very similar.

But in Eilhart's version one baron at least dares to make a plea on behalf of the lovers:

> nîman in ichtes betin torste
> wen der eine verste,
> der trugsêze Tînas. (ll. 3995-7)

The sentiments expressed by Tînas are quite similar to those expressed by the people in B. Tînas recalls Tristan's past prowess and he briefly praises Iseut (ll. 4018-29). The king's reactions also are not dissimilar: he insists that the lovers must die that very day, and refuses to countenance the plea of Tînas that they should be allowed to live. Finally, Tînas hesitates to provoke the king's anger further and he leaves the scene. The suspicion that O preserves the authentic version of the episode is reinforced later in B (ll. 1085-1140), when Dinas does finally make a personal intervention on behalf of Iseut alone, for in B the intervention does have a number of peculiar features.[13]

The episode in O does not end when Tînas leaves court. He rides off in sorrow and finally meets the group of men who are taking Tristan to the place of execution. He sees that Tristan's arms are tied behind his back, and as a final gesture of goodwill, using the authority vested in him as seneschal, he cuts through the bonds (ll. 4054-81). It is in the context a gesture of goodwill, but it also has a part to play later in the narrative, for in the next episode the fact that Tristan's hands are free is a factor in ensuring that his escape from his escort is successful.

Perhaps because Béroul concentrates his attention upon the modifications he introduces, we find that he again gives no precise indication as to the location of characters and incidents. Other

---

13. Lofthouse believes that Eilhart modified his source and placed the Tînas intervention in a new position (unpublished M.A. dissertation, p. 120). The same line is taken by Buschinger (Le 'Tristrant'...,I, pp. 361-66).

versions are fairly explicit as to where events are taking place. In R, the site where the lovers are to be burnt is clearly described: 'Et lors conmande qe l'en li face .i. feu grant et planier tres desus la marine. Et quant li feux sera planier soient il andui gité et muerent illeuc.'[14] In O, there are less precise but still adequate indications:

> Des morgens dô ez tagete,
> der koning harte jagete
> ûz der stad zu dem gerichte
> den lûten ze eime angesichte. (ll. 3991-4)

But in B the information given is far less precise. We may surmise that in the source of B, as in R and probably as in O, the site of the proposed fire was on the shore: the chapel is on the cliffs, on the route to the pyre (ll. 915-21), Tristan hears the roaring of the fire as he runs along the shore after his leap from the chapel (ll. 961-2), and the fact that the lepers lead Iseut away over the sand is a further indication.[15] But where is Mark in this episode in B? In O, as we have seen (ll. 3991-4), he leaves the town at this juncture, whilst in R it is expressly mentioned that he remains within the palace.[16] It is not a completely frivolous point, for the precise location of Mark must influence our interpretation of a puzzling line, l. 869, which reads, in Ewert's edition, 'Li rois, tranchanz de main tenant'. Muret, in his 1903 edition, emended the manuscript and produced 'Li rois, de main tenant, tranchanz'. All the CFMA editions, however, have yet another version, 'Li rois, tranchanz, demaintenant'. Ewert glosses tranchanz as 'pruning knife or shears (?)', whilst in L[4] the meaning 'parlant d'un ton coupant et péremptoire' is

---

14. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 v°a.
15. B 1229-30. With reference to these geographical indications (and others), Ewert writes: 'These inconsistencies and loose ends would seem to be due to Beroul's preservation of certain details from his sources and his failure to assimilate them to the more elaborate narrative he has contrived' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 150).
16. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 v°a: 'Et quant li rois en voit aler Tristan, le meillor chevalier du monde, se li samble, et Yselt, tote la plus bele dame q'il oncquez veïst, il se fiert en sa chambre et s'enferme leenz et commence a fere le greignor doel du monde.'

hesitantly put forward. Ewert's tentative interpretation is only really possible if King Mark is already at the site of the pyre, actively contributing to the preparations for the execution, and this in fact does not seem to be the case. He appears rather to be still at court, in the palace, at this stage (see l. 861 and l. 875).

A recognition that Béroul is less than careful in giving precise details of the exact location of events and characters is of real importance only if it reminds us where his true interest lies. He has been engaged throughout the episode in ensuring sympathy for the hero and heroine by attacking their enemies. He is almost aiming at a temporary reversal of roles. The wicked nature of the accusers is so consistently asserted that it comes to dominate at this point the crime of the accused, with the result that at the end of the episode the lovers may appear to be more sinned against than sinning.

Béroul's technique is indeed successful, so successful that Iseut's suggestion that an act of revenge would ensue is not, one would think, questioned by the audience. It should be noticed that this is again a detail found only in B:

> Qui m'occïst, si garisiez,
> Ce fust grant joie, beaus amis;
> Encor en fust vengement pris.' (ll. 906-8)

Tristan, if he escaped, would be seen as the potential righter of a wrong, not as a criminal. This is the logical culmination of the long series of attacks upon the enemies of the lovers which began in the last section of the fleur de farine episode: the three barons have wronged the lovers and therefore deserve punishment.

This is only a secondary issue, but it has been deliberately and consciously placed in the forefront in order to divert attention from the true primary issue, that of the lovers' guilt. The lovers have been

seen together and there is evidence to support the charge of adultery. There may possibly be mitigating circumstances: Eilhart has expressly mentioned the influence of the love potion even if Béroul has not. But does the fact that the lovers are acting under this influence in any way absolve them? Béroul knows he must deal with the matter of the lovers' guilt, but he prefers not to come to grips with it at this stage. Instead, he introduces an issue which is basically secondary but which is made to dominate the whole episode.

4: THE 'SAUT TRISTRAN' EPISODE

In the course of the last two episodes a recurrent phenomenon has been observed: the author has deliberately sought to maintain the audience's sympathy for the lovers at a time when it might reasonably have been refused. In this episode,[1] God Himself shows mercy to one of the lovers, allowing Tristan to survive in order that in the future he may repent.

A striking feature peculiar to Béroul's version is the long, two-fold exposition to the episode, an exposition which runs from l. 909 to l. 926. The first part of this exposition is concentrated around the theme of the pity of God:

> Oez, seignors, de Damledé,
> Conment il est plains de pité;
> Ne vieat pas mort de pecheor:
> Recell out le cri, le plor
> Que faisoient la povre gent
> Por ceus qui eirent a torment. (909-14)

In l. 911, we are plainly told that God does not want a sinner's death. Tristan is thus presented as a sinner who will not enjoy eternal life if he persists in the mortal sin of adultery. But, quite rightly, Jodogne sees in the line a direct allusion to Ezekiel 18. 23 and 32:[2] Tristan will be saved in the hope that eventually 'he should return from his ways, and live'. The next lines, 912-4, are clearly harking back to the previous episode, where the people of Cornwall voiced their sympathy for the lovers' plight. God will now respond to the 'cry' of intercession.

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 909-64; O, ll. 4098-4143, ll. 4203-4221: R, Bedier, Volume II, p. 358, Curtis II, §546, Fedrick, pp. A370-A372, Johnson, p. 92, Löseth, §51, MS BN, f.fr. 104. 79 v°b - 80 r°a, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 v°b - 79 r°a.
2. Fil. preg., I-II. p. 264.

The importance of this first part of the exposition in B emerges when we turn to examine the parallel versions. There is no mention at all of God in the episode in Eilhart's poem. The episode in O begins at the point where Tristan asks to be allowed to enter the chapel in order to pray (ll. 4098-4103). Certainly there is a reference to God in the French Prose Romance, but the mention here is of relatively slight importance: 'Quant Tristan vint devant li yglise il la commençai a regarder, et li est bon avis que se il estoit [de]denz, que Dex li anvoieroit aucun consoil.'[3] (One might perhaps note that the idea of God sending some solution is found elsewhere in R, in the Life in the Forest episode.[4]) It is true that the escape of the lovers and their reunion is later ascribed to the mercy of God, but there is no suggestion from the outset in R that God might be on the point of actively intervening, which is the import of the first part of Béroul's exposition.

In the second part of the exposition Béroul lists the geographical characteristics of the site of Tristan's leap. Eilhart is relatively brief on this point; he mentions the chapel in l. 4099 but does not describe it more closely until ll. 4116-21:

> dese cappelle die enmât
> keine tore wen dese eine
> und die ist alsô cleine,
> daz wir sie wol behûten.
> ouch geit mit vullin vlûten
> jenenthalp der mûren ein sê.

From this description by one of the guards it would seem that the chapel is directly on the edge of the cliff above the sea.[5] In R, we have

---

3. MS BN, f.fr. 104, 79 v°b.
4. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 80 r°b: 'La serions et jor et nuit emsamble, la menrrons nous nostre feste et nostre joie tele come entre nous .ij. ou tant conme il nous plera, adont nous envoira Diex aucun conseill... Et puis q'il est ainssi, ce je vos ai delivre et saine et haitiee, la Diex merci, je veill lesser tretout le monde por vos.'
5. It is surely the sea here and not a lake, as Jonin supposes: 'Les gardes le laissent entrer dans une chapelle d'où il s'échappe en sautant dans un lac' (Les Personnages féminins..., p. 25). With regard to sê, the NHG distinction of meanings through gender is not yet established at this date (see Kluge, Etymologisches Wörterbuch, pp. 554-5).

roughly the same picture. We learn that the church is old and ruined, and it appears once again that it is set at the very edge of the cliff: 'Tant a Tristan alé en tele maniere come je vos cont, q'il vint desus la marine devant une eglise viez et ancienne et descheoite molt durement, et estoit cele eglise en roche nayve et li batoit la mer au pié molt parfonde.'[6]

Turning to Béroul's version we find a much more careful and detailed description of the chapel and its immediate surroundings.[7] In ll. 915-7, we learn that the chapel is to be found on a mound and is set at the corner of a rock. Muret and M[4] emend ȝ sor to est sor in l. 916, while Ewert simply prints 'Une chapele sor un mont'. The next piece of information given is that the chapel is overlooking the sea and faces north, 'Sor mer ert faite, devers bise' (l. 918), but more precise details are about to be supplied. In ll. 919-21 we learn that the chapel is not directly overlooking the sea and is not set at the very edge of the cliff, but that the chancel is set overlooking a moncel:

> La chapelle est asise u coin (coin ou recoin plutôt que faîte?) d'une roche, mais la partie dite chancel est asise sor un moncel; le sanctuaire ou le choeur domine donc un monticule, un mamelon de pierre, un sommet arrondi etc. et la fenêtre absidale donne par conséquent sur cette éminence rocheuse couronnant la falaise et ne donne pas immédiatement sur la paroi et la mer.[8]

Gradually a picture has been built up which has slight but important differences from that presented in R and O. Like l. 916, l. 922 offers editors a textual problem. For the manuscript reading aaise, Muret and M[4] print alise, glossed in M[o] as 'lisse', while Ewert emends to atoise,

---

6. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 v°b.
7. For much of what follows in this chapter I am indebted to the unpublished paper of Mr. R. Anderson, 'Le Saut Tristan: Texte, interprétation, source des particularités de la version de Béroul'.
8. Anderson, 'Le Saut Tristan...', pp. 7-8.

glossed tentatively as 'slate', 'slaty'.[9] Anderson suggests that the dialectal or assimilated form aaise might be accepted as a regular development of adesus-a-um, and would indicate that the cliff had been worn smooth by the elements.[10] The next line, although modern editors agree, has been queried by Anderson. In his view, the form escureus is a copyist's error for escuiers, a reading based partly on the following reasoning:

> Si je comprends bien les vers 923-4, Béroul veut dire que, si un x allait, devait, entreprenait de, se faisait fort de- se lancer du haut de la falaise, il serait certainement tué, ne survivrait point... Mais à la différence d'un x et par l'intervention de la Providence, un Tristan se tirerait d'affaire.[11]

This interpretation may find a form of indirect confirmation in the French Prose Romance. After Tristan's leap the guards remark: 'Assez est de sa vie. Ne nous faut il plus a doubter, car ce tuit cil de Cornoalle i(s)salloient (il) n'en remandroit il mie .i. en vie.'[12] The impossibility of escaping alive from such a leap is stressed at this point, but later in R, when Tristan's companions examine the spot, it is suggested that a man of supreme prowess might escape, the implication of the emendation of escureus to escuiers: 'Se nulz hons qi fust de grant cuer et bien seüst noer sailloit de ci, ja Diex ne m'aist s'il ne poet bien issir tost et eschaper.'[13]

The last detail of the expository section comes in ll. 925-6:

> En la dube out une verrine,
> Que un sainz i fist, porperine.

Ewert glosses dube as 'apse' (Volume I, p. 147), but in his second volume (p. 138) he admits this meaning is conjectural. In M^4 dube is glossed as

---

9. See Ewert, Volume II, pp. 137-8.
10. See 'Le Saut Tristan...', pp. 8-9.
11. 'Le Saut Tristan...', p. 9.
12. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 $r^{o}a$.
13. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 $v^{o}a$.

'abside', and it is suggested that the form l'adube might be possible. Anderson suggests the original reading was conche or cunche, the modern English 'conch', transformed into dube by one or other of two possible misreadings.[14] If cunche is in fact the correct reading, or if dube is retained in the sense of 'tour pyramidale', as De Caluwé argues,[15] the use of a relatively specialized technical term is surely illustrative of the care taken by the author in preparing the action. The first part of his exposition suggests the intervention of God, while the second part carefully presents the physical characteristics of the site which will lend a degree of verisimilitude to Tristan's escape.

At l. 927 the real action begins, and the first stage in the action is concerned with the seeking of permission by Tristan to enter the chapel. He calls to his guards and asks to be allowed to go in and pray:

> 'Seignors, vez ci une chapele;
> Por Deu, quar m'i laisiez entrer.
> Pres est mes termes de finer;
> Preerai Deu qu'il merci ait
> De moi, quar trop li ai forfait. (ll. 928-32)

Is Tristan being wholly sincere? This seems uncertain, for his haste when once he has been freed from his bonds and is in the chapel, out of sight of his captors, seems to indicate that the intention to make a desperate attempt to escape was already present in his mind. Tristan similarly seeks permission to enter the chapel in Eilhart's version, but there are differences, induced by the earlier intervention of Tînas who had freed Tristan from his bonds (ll. 4054-92). This earlier intervention, which may well reproduce the 'authentic' account, had preconditioned the guards

---

14. See 'Le Saut Tristan...', pp. 9-11.
15. 'La Chapelle...', pp. 225-30. De Caluwé's suggestion, that the architectural anachronism of a stained-glass window within a dube is meant as a sign of supernatural intervention, seems a trifle bizarre, but the note that un sainz created the window is somewhat mystifying.

to be merciful towards Tristan, as ll. 4093-7 clearly indicate:

> Die Tristrandes plâgin,
> dô sie den jâmer sâgin
> von dem trogsôzen Tînas,
> do gewunnen sie des ungemach
> unde trûrigen mût.

In the German version, a guard intervenes on Tristan's behalf and presents a series of arguments in favour of agreeing to the request: he should be allowed to confess his sins (ll. 4110-4, ll. 4122-3), he would not be away long (ll. 4105-6), there is only one small door, and there is nothing on the far side of the chapel but the sea (ll. 4116-21). The very same arguments, apart from the final point, are put forward by Tristan himself in B. The hero himself must persuade his guards to be acquiescent, for there has been no intervention by the seneschal to incline them towards leniency. He seeks to confess his sins, he points out that there is only one door, that he must return the same way and that he will not be away long.[16] The guards are won over by Tristan's arguments. But there then follows the perhaps unexpected freeing of Tristan's bonds (l. 941). Clearly Tristan needs his hands free if he is to have a real chance of escaping, as perhaps he does if he is going to pray. But one would have thought that the guards above all would have shown more caution before they untied him: perhaps they are called upon to act because the intervention of the seneschal has so far been suppressed.

In the Prose Romance, Tristan manages to enter the chapel not through force of argument nor through the charity of his guards, but through his own physical strength. He breaks his bonds by force,

---

16. B 928-38. In l. 938, eisinc is glossed by Ewert as 'accordingly'. Anderson (Le Saut Tristan...', pp. 4-5) suggests the meaning 'forthwith', the same as the Latin exhinc. This may be supported by l. 4106 of O, 'ez ist scnîre irgangin'.

seizes a sword and kills one guard before running into the chapel.[17] Kelemina suggests that the chapel is superfluous to the story in R.[18] This is not quite true: Tristan stops in front of the chapel and his decision to break free at that point is because he vaguely hopes, as has been previously indicated, that once within the chapel a God-sent solution might be forthcoming. Moreover, the mention of the chapel in R suggests that it was of supreme importance at an earlier stage in the tradition.

The next stage in the action concerns Tristan's behaviour once he is inside the chapel. In Béroul's poem, the hero swiftly opens the window and throws himself out, preferring to leap rather than be burnt to death.[19] In Eilhart, we learn that Tristan reaches a window and forces himself through (ll. 4131-7). There is a comment in the German poem to the effect that Tristan closes the door behind him, much to the guards' annoyance:

> dô her in die cappellin quam,
> he ted rechte als ein wîser man:
> die tore her innen beslôz.
> die knechte des sêre vordrôz. (ll. 4127-30)

These lines in O certainly have the appearance of being a later addition, inserted to explain the guards' slowness to take action. In R, events take roughly the same course: Tristan reaches a window and we learn that he prefers the cause of his death to be the sea rather than his enemies. There is the added factor that at this point Andret and his men arrive,

---

17. Muret claims that in R Tristan kills two of his guards (Rom., XVI, p. 329). This is not strictly true. Certainly he kills one of the guards before entering the chapel, but it appears that these guards then flee. The second man Tristan kills immediately before his leap appears rather to be one of Andret's men.
18. Geschichte der..., p. 11.
19. B 942-7. Is the fenestre of l. 943 to be associated with the verrine of ll. 925-6?

and before leaping out, Tristan kills one of his enemies.[20]

The next stage in the Prose Romance offers no surprises: 'Et puis se lance en la mer, l'espee ou poing.'[21] The German version is equally straightforward:

> in den sê he dô sprang
> und swam ûz an daz lant. (ll. 4138-9)

But in Béroul's poem there is a surprise, if not to the audience which remembers the details of the chapel's position, almost certainly to Tristan. The audience is told to pay attention to this important point by the call Seignors:

> Seignors, une grant pierre lee
> Out u milieu de cel rochier. (ll. 948-9)

The cliff-face is not immediately outside the window, and it is from a stone, une grant pierre lee, that Tristan leaps in l. 950.[22] This stone at the top of the cliff, overlooking the sea, will later come to be

---

20. The French Prose Romance accounts are somewhat at variance at this point. The term quarante toises is regularly mentioned but variously applied. In 756, Curtis II and Johnson the window is that height above the sea, while in 103 and 104 the term is applied to the depth of the sea. In 756, Curtis II and Johnson, the precise height of the window and the undefined depth of the sea are both mentioned, and this seems to be the correct version. The height above the sea firstly causes all to conclude that no one could survive, but later, when Tristan's friends seek his body, it is pointed out that the depth of the sea could enable someone to emerge unscathed, even from so great a fall.
21. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 r°a.
22. This passage has been variously understood. Loth was half-aware of the meaning of the lines: 'D'après Béroul sur une large pierre au milieu du rocher; mais les vers que je cite semblent indiquer qu'il bondit de la chapelle sur une roche dominant la falaise et de là en bas sur le sable' (Contributions à l'étude..., p. 71, note 1). Panvini, likewise, seems to understand that in Béroul's version Tristan leaps from a high rock (La leggenda..., p. 87). But Bédier (Bédier, Volume II, p. 253, variante b), Frappier (CCM, VI, p. 448) and Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 138) appear to have missed the point. Bédier sees the grant pierre lee as being on the shore, whilst Frappier and Ewert think that it is jutting out, half-way down the cliff. In R, Tristan clings to a rock after plunging into the sea. Fedrick believes that the rock is a survival of a superfluous rock in the archetype and bases this conclusion partly on the erroneous belief that the rock in B is superfluous to the narrative (Fedrick, pp. 135-8). The rock in R may be a survival of a rock which had a role to play in the archetype, if Béroul was broadly continuing the version of his source. But since no rock at all figures in O, it may be that both Béroul and the author of the French Prose Romance independently added rocks which have two different roles to play.

called the saut Tristran.[23] Only after this first initial bound will Tristan launch himself from the cliff-top, and again at this point Béroul adds a variant not found elsewhere:

> Li vens le fiert entre les dras,
> Quil defent qu'il ne chie a tas.[24]

The wind blows in his clothes, which then act as a form of parachute.

The purpose of the long exposition is now gradually emerging. The exact point from which Tristan leapt has been made clear and the significance of an earlier line in the exposition, 'Sor mer ert faite devers bise' (l. 918), is also now apparent. The north wind has checked Tristan's fall, has prevented him falling all of a heap, and by l. 954 the leap is over.

But where in fact has Tristan landed? Is the danger now over? In O and R the position is clear: Tristan lands in the sea and swims to safety. But in Béroul's poem the situation requires careful consideration. In Ewert's edition, ll. 955-60 read:

> La chapele ert plaine de puople.
> Tristran saut sus: l'araine ert moole.
> Toz a genoz sont en l'iglise;
> Cil l'atendent defors l'iglise,
> Mais por noient; Tristran s'en vet,
> Bele merci Dex li a fait!

In Ewert and M^4 the manuscript version of l. 956 is retained, but doubts have been raised as to the authenticity of the reading. In M^4 (p. 142) it is suggested that what one expects, and perhaps what the author in fact wrote, is saut jus. Frappier also feels that the reading sus should be

---

23. B 952-4. In R it is the leap itself, which, so it is suggested, will become known as the Sault Tristan, rather than the starting-point of Tristan's leap (see Bédier, Volume II, p. 358).
24. B 951-2. Rigolot (CCM, X, p. 447) would seem to over-stress the part played by Tristan's clothes alone at this stage. The wind in his clothes is surely the important factor, and it was the wind, not the clothes, which was mentioned in the exposition. He also misquotes l. 951 and seems unsure of the construction of l. 952.

corrected to jus, 'sans hésiter'.[25] But both these versions are based on what appear to be faulty conceptions of the action. The broad stone is not jutting out from the cliff, as Frappier intimates, and at this stage Tristan's leap is definitely over. Saut sus is what is to be expected after a fall, when the person concerned jumps to his feet. But where has Tristan fallen in fact? Line 957 offers the answer, but an answer hidden by a corrupt manuscript. In the manuscript the line reads 'Toz a genoz sont enligliglise'. Critics have taken ligliglise as a mechanical scribal error, as a certain example of dittography.[26] There is an obvious interruption of the scribe's rhythm, but the reading en l'iglise is not the only possible correction. M^4 prints 'Toz a genoz chiet en la glise'. Tristan has in fact landed in or near quicksands, l'ereine est noble. The wind blowing in his clothes has saved Tristan, but there is no respite for him since a new danger instantly appears as he tries to get away: he finds himself sinking to his knees into the treacherous sand.[27] If we accept that en la glise is the correct reading, can we also accept chiet? The manuscript reading, we may recall, was in fact set, and paleographically chiet is far removed from this. We should surely read, with Anderson, 'Toz a genoz font en la glise'.[28]

So, the aftermath of Tristan's leap in Béroul's poem is of considerable importance and merits further attention. The real leap is over by l. 952, or at the latest by l. 954. Tristan is aware firstly that there were people in the church who witnessed his leap, as l. 955 records: this line surely describes Tristan's own reactions, for as he recollects the

---

25. CCH, VI, p. 448, note 141.
26. See Ewert, 'On the Text of...', p. 96, Reid, 'On the Text of the Tristram...', p. 272, Vinaver, 'Principles of...', p. 361.
27. Was the nature of the terrain also a contributory factor to the success of Tristan's leap? It was not mentioned in the exposition, but Ewert considers that Tristan is uninjured because of the soft sand (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 139).
28. See 'Le Saut Tristan...', pp. 4-5.

presence of eye-witnesses he jumps up, recognizing the need to make good his escape. He gets on to his feet, only to discover another danger, the treacherous nature of the terrain. Then another thought strikes him, that his guards are waiting for him, with obvious impatience, outside the chapel, 'Cil l'atendent defors l'iglise' (l. 958). Lines 955 and 958 are clearly not narrative, but betray the panic-stricken thoughts of the hero, afraid lest his success be only short-lived. One might note that the guards waiting for Tristan to return figure also in O, but there they are mentioned in what is certainly a passage of almost entirely straight narrative, long after Tristan has effectively escaped (ll. 4203-21). Then, at l. 959, Béroul finally intervenes himself to offer the audience reassurance, 'Mais por noient; Tristran s'en vet'. But if we are reassured, the hero is still beset by fears and he runs as fast as he can from the scene.

Line 960, 'Bele merci Dex li a fait!', makes explicit the import of the first part of the exposition: a merciful God has now involved Himself and has saved a sinner from death. One might also point to ll. 755-6 where Béroul may seem to anticipate the miracle which has just occurred. Of course, on a different level, a number of material circumstances have combined to make a successful leap possible. Frappier indicates this clearly:

C'est surtout le saut de la chapelle qui nous propose, à côté de l'interprétation par la volonté de Dieu, une explication positive et matérielle. Certes, cet exploit de Tristan, digne des héros irlandais et de leurs sauts prodigieux, parle à l'imagination et acquiert aisément un caractère surnaturel. Pourtant avec quel soin Béroul, dans son récit admirablement concret, circonstancié (v. 915/64), cherche à nous faire comprendre comment Tristan échappe à la mort![29]

---

29. CCM, VI, p. 448.

The two levels, the supernatural level and the level of mise en scène, are not in contradiction but rather co-exist. Béroul has so contrived it that his God appears to work hand-in-hand with the particular circumstances of the leap's geographical location.

In preceding episodes, Béroul had focussed attention upon the wicked nature of the opponents of Tristan and Iseut in order to maintain sympathy for his characters, for he was no doubt conscious that the lovers, caught almost in the very act of adultery, ran the risk of alienating that sympathy. In the saut Tristran episode the author says explicitly that God in no way desires the death of a sinner. The audience consequently feels its sympathy is all the more justified and experiences relief when Tristan does not die but survives to work out his dilemma.

5: THE MEETING OF GOVERNAL AND TRISTAN

At the end of the third episode, Iseut had sought consolation for imminent death in the certainty that, should Tristan survive, her death would not go unrevenged:

> Qui m'oceïst, si garisiez,
> Ce fust grant joie, beaus amis;
> Encor en fust vengement pris.' (ll. 906-8)

Now Tristan has escaped, so that an act of revenge is a clear possibility, with the hero free to assume the role of avenger. Revenge is now accepted as a justified course of action, and it is a discussion of the nature and timing of this revenge which will form much of the substance of this episode.[1]

The beginning of the episode in Béroul's version may appear, on reflection, to be a little surprising. Has Governal already knowledge of Tristan's escape? Is it the fear of being burnt in the place of Tristan which causes him to flee the city?

> Espee çainte, sor cheval
> De la cité s'en ist issuz;
> Bien set, se il fust conseüz,
> Li rois l'arsist por son seignor;
> Fuiant s'en vait por la poor.[2]

What exactly is the meaning of the word por in l. 969? Certainly it would be simplest to understand 'instead of'. The word is not specifically

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 965-1044: C, ll. 4144-4202: R, Bedier, Volume II, pp. 359-61, Curtis II, §§ 547-549, Fedrick, pp. A373-A377, Johnson, pp. 93-5, Löseth, § 51, MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 r°b - 80 v°b, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 r°b - 80 r°a.
2. B 966-70. These same events are recalled in ll. 1354-6.

glossed in Ewert or in M^4, but in M^o (p. 219) Muret cited this particular line and defined por as 'Prep. marquant la substitution'. If we accept the meaning 'instead of', this clearly assumes that Governal is already aware of Tristan's 'miraculous' escape. But another meaning does suggest itself, 'because of his links with', 'because of his love for'. The French Prose Romance offers an interesting semi-parallel which could possibly be taken to support this second meaning. Iseut is handed over to the lepers by Andret in R, and one of her ladies-in-waiting then flees, afraid that she may herself be punished because of her connection: 'Illuc avoit une des damoiseles Yseut, et quant ele voit que l'on avoit sa dame livree as mesiax ele n'ose illuc plus arester, ainz s'an torne fuiant come cele qui grant paour avoit que l'on ne li feïst honte'.[3] It will also be recalled that in ll. 665-6 of B it was suggested that Tristan's men, like Governal on this occasion, would be punished for their lord's crime.

Whatever meaning one cares to place upon por in l. 969, there are indications that Governal acts in anticipation of the facts. It is only later in the poem that Iseut and Mark are informed of the escape, as Kolemina has pointed out: 'Governal verkündet dem Helden, er sei vom König geächtet; dies ist noch zu früh, weil der König, Vers 1065 zufolge, von der Flucht des Neffen noch nicht in Kenntnis gesetzt worden ist.'[4] Certainly one is forced to admit that Béroul's presentation has given rise to some illogicality: his desire to portray above all Governal's instinctively generous im blse, to be at his master's side, has taken precedence over chronological exactitude. But we are not too affronted, for we wholeheartedly approve of Governal's sentiments. All in all,

---

3. MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 r^oa and b. In Curtis II, §547, and in 756, 79 r^oa, she is afraid of being harmed expressly 'por l'amor de sa dame'.
4. Geschichte der..., p. 67.

Governal does appear in this episode as very much the creature of the poet. His generous impulse is based upon a conviction that Tristan will escape, for exactly like the author in l. 911, he seems certain that God does not desire the death of a sinner. Then, since in Béroul's version the line of action Tristan finally adopts is determined by the knowledge the author chooses to lend to the squire, Governal is made to bring about the situation the poet has anticipated.

Turning to Eilhart, we find that there is no suggestion in the German poem that Kurnevâl would be burnt instead of the hero, and in fact we find no threats against his life for any reason at all. In O, Kurnevâl is still unaware of Tristan's escape when he leaves town. His avowed aim is to help Tristan escape if he possibly can:

> 'ach, hêre got vil gûte,
> he mochte wol entrinnen,
> mochte he sîn ros gewinnen
> und sîn swert von geschichte:
> ez hulfe im vil lîchte,
> daz he quême hinnen.'
> daz quam von grôzen minnen
> die her an sîme herzin trûg. (ll. 4156-65)

The sword and horse have thus been brought as potential aids to escape,[5] and, so we learn in ll. 4164-5, his actions stemmed from the deep attachment Kurnevâl felt for his master. In B, the squire already knows of Tristan's escape, but we are told in ll. 971-4 that the sword was brought along as a sign of affection. Perhaps we have in ll. 971-4 a survival of the original motivation of the common source as reproduced in ll. 4164-5 of O, which endures in B in spite of considerable re-casting.

---

5. If O presents differences from B, the Prose Romance is radically altered at this point. Iseut has already been retrieved from the lazar-house where Andret had deposited her. There is a larger number of characters involved, for the companions of Tristan join forces with Governal in the search for the hero's corpse. But then Tristan is seen on a rock where he had taken refuge and a general reunion follows.

The same kind of similarity between B and O is to be found as Governal and Tristan meet each other. In both versions Tristan sees Governal, and they are then reunited amidst expressions of joy.[6] But Tristan's joy is but momentary, for he soon experiences the despair of knowing that, although he is free, Iseut is not: the success of his leap, far from being an occasion for joy, is now seen by Tristan as utterly pointless without Iseut. Payen has characterised Tristan's mentality at this point as almost suicidal,[7] but this is not really the point. He has a keen desire to attempt to free Iseut and he has none of the self-centredness which the term suicide might possibly convey. Even though the attempt is doomed to almost inevitable failure, he is prepared to die in the attempt, so that in the end he and Iseut will share a common fate (l. 988). This same desire to rescue Iseut or to die in the attempt is also a feature of Eilhart's poem:

> 'jâ wil ich den lîp mîn
> nimmer brengin hinnen,
> sal die [edele] koniginne
> werdin nû genarterôt:
> mit ir kore ich eir den tôd,
> adir ich helfe ir dannen. (ll. 4188-93)

But there are differences. In O, Tristan has refused to leave at once, as Kurnevâl had suggested, and he has displayed a controlled anger. He is resolved to take action and calmly plans his next move. It is he who in the German poem initiates the action: he rides to a thicket near the

---

6. B 975-8, O 4174-5. In B, it is not always clear whether it is Tristan or Governal who is the subject of each phrase. Both parts of l. 978 appear to express Tristan's reactions, the first part referring back to l. 975, whilst l. 977 describes Governal. Stone (Tristan et Iseut, p. 38) fails to appreciate that Maistre in l. 979 refers to Governal and he allocates ll. 979-80 to him.
7. 'Tristan s'est échappé, sachant qu'Yseult est encore en péril de mort, et cette pensée le jette au bord du suicide (978 ss.)' (Le Motif..., p. 339).

place where execution should take place and hides there (ll. 4196-4202). A feature of O already noted reappears here, the relative precision as to the exact location of events when compared with the vagueness of B.[8]

The most important difference between B and O, and the one that sets the whole tone for the episode in B, is that, whilst in the German poem Kurnevâl is relatively passive, in the French poem Governal controls the action. He is the restraining figure who repeatedly checks the impetuosity of Tristan, who in his despair is set on immediate action. It is Governal who suggests they hide in the thicket, with the purpose of hearing news of Iseut from the people who might pass that way:

> Veez ci un esplés buisen,
> Clos a fossé tot environ;
> Sire, meton nos la dedenz.
> Par ci trespasse maintes genz;
> Asez orras d'Iseut novele.[9]

Just as Governal seemed to be convinced that Tristan would escape alive, so now he seems sure that all will be well in the case of Iseut (as the author knows it will be!). The possibility that Iseut may be burnt is certainly voiced in l. 996, but following Governal's reassurances in ll. 989-90 the possibility seems remote. Governal swears an oath of support for Tristan which would certainly not be out of place in an epic,[10]

---

8. R is also fairly precise on this point, but in P the companions of Tristan are hiding near the place of execution in order to rescue the hero: 'Et au derrain s'acordent il a ce qu'il s'en iront en unes broces qi sont bien pres a .ij. archiees ou cil sont mené qi sont destruit par jugement. Et ce Tristan est la menez pour destruire il le recorrunt ou il la norrunt' (LS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 r°b).
9. B 991-5. As Hoepffner points out in his edition (p. 122), where this incident is mentioned in Fb (ll. 452-3) Governal is recorded as having played the same initiating role.
10. B 1000-4. Payen writes: 'Governal lui-même jure alors, par un covenant d'esprit tout épique' (Le Motif..., p. 339). Hofer has in fact tentatively postulated a more exact source for this 'epic' oath: 'Ein zweiter Hinweis, der allerdings weniger deutlich hervortritt, zielt auf das verloren gegangene Lied Aimer le Chetif hin. Denn der Schwur Governals... erinnert an das ähnliche Gelobnis Aimers, nie unter einem Dache zu schlafen. Da die Existenz des Aimerliedes durch die Karlsreise bestätigt ist, kann obige Stelle wohl eine Erinnerung aus dem Wilhelmzyklus sein' (ZRP, LXV, pp. 276-7).

but he seems to assume that there is no need to make any attempt to save Iseut and that there will be no need for Tristan to place his own life in jeopardy. Governal does, in truth, emerge as something of a miles gloriosus. Naïvely, but, in the event, correctly, he assumes that Iseut will survive, and his promises of energetic support in an act of revenge against the three barons ring somewhat hollow, since they are accompanied by a belief that his assistance will not be required.

With revenge for what has not happened (and is not likely to happen) uppermost in his mind, Tristan's first thought is that he has no sword. But Governal produces the sword and also a hauberk, and Tristan's attitude changes once more. From despair born of an inability to take action his mood has changed to one of agitation, a desire for immediate action: he wishes to speed at once to the place of execution and to kill Iseut's captors (ll. 1017-22). Certainly the idea of going to the scene of execution in an attempt to save Iseut is present in the German poem, but there the attempt is not seen as necessarily bound to fail. In B, however, these tactics are consistently presented by Governal as destined for failure. Tristan's motive for action is now a desire that he should prevent Iseut from being burned by killing those who detain her. At this point Governal is again the restraining figure. He proposes that Tristan should hold back and await a moment when revenge can be exacted with much less trouble: confident that Iseut will not be killed, Governal sees no virtue in hacking around indiscriminately:[11]

> Tel chose te puet Dex doner
> Que te porras molt mex venger;
> N'i avras pas tel destorbier
> Con tu porroies or avoir. (ll. 1024-7)

---

11. A haphazard form of revenge is the only kind suggested in O (see ll. 4194-5).

Governal now presents a series of arguments in order to persuade Tristan to accept the policy of inaction that he proposes. Any attempt at immediate revenge is bound to fail, because of the king's present antagonism, because of the king's order that Tristan should be captured, and because people would feel forced to hand him over if a hue and cry were to get up.[12]

Finally, Tristan reluctantly yields to his squire's express forbidding and falls in with Governal's proposal:

> Ja, por toz ceus de Tintagol,
> S'en le deüst tot depecier,
> Qu'il n'en tenist piece a sa per,
> Ne laisast il qu'il n'i alast,
> Se son mestre ne li veiast.[13]

The idea of awaiting a suitable moment for revenge, of biding one's time until a favourable opportunity presents itself, is one which remains alive throughout the whole of the extant poem. Certainly the idea of

---

12. See B 1028-38. There is no real indication, in spite of what Tanquerey suggests (Rom., LVI, p. 116), that Governal already knows that a hue and cry has been instigated. Ewert correctly notes: 'Governal merely states as a hypothetical case what might now be expected to happen' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 142).
13. B 1040-4. Line 1042 is not without its problems. One is loath to believe that the image is being continued from l. 1041 and that piece means 'fragment'. But it is apparently in this sense that Raynaud de Lage understands the word (see Rom., LXXXV, p. 527). The line is perhaps describing the course of action Tristan would have taken had he not been dissuaded: he would have sped to the place of execution and joined with Iseut in one last embrace, the idea expressed in ll. 1019-22. Would piece mean 'for a short time' and would sa per be Iseut, Tristan's mistress?

revenge is present in Q, revenge is contemplated later in R,[14] but here in B the notion is fully exploited and possible kinds of revenge are suggested. Revenge will be realized, however, only when the three felons have done all the harm that is required of them.

---

14. 'Or ne vos chaille, dit Tristanz. Si m'eïst Diex, tiex a mon mal porchacié qui encores s'en repentira. Jamés dou Korroiz ne me partira dusques tant que je m'en soie auques vengiez. De ce que vos me prometez vos merci je mout durement' (Curtis II, § 549).

6: THE RESCUE OF ISEUT FROM THE LEPERS

In the previous episode various kinds of revenge were mentioned and revenge will be mentioned again in each of the four major stages of this episode. In the first stage, which runs from l. 1045 to l. 1064, the news of Tristan's escape reaches Iseut. Then follows, in ll. 1065-1154, the intervention of Dinas in a bid to save the life of the queen. The third stage presents the intervention of Yvain and his band of lepers; this runs from l. 1155 to l. 1228. The fourth and final stage in the episode, ll. 1229-1278, tells how Iseut is rescued from the lepers to whom she had been entrusted by King Mark. A preliminary glance at Eilhart's version will show that there is no equivalent to the first stage in the German poem. Also, the second stage, as has already been noted, occurs at an earlier point in O. But the broad lines of the episode do appear in O: in R, however, the corresponding episode is markedly different and the lepers hardly figure at all.[1]

The first stage in the episode, concerning the news of Tristan's escape and Iseut's reaction to the news, is unique to Béroul's version. Why is this incident not found elsewhere? Is it simply included for the sake of completeness? This had been the reason put forward earlier, in the course of the tryst episode, to explain why, in B alone, we have Tristan telling Governal what had happened (ll. 381-4). Perhaps the

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 1045-1278; O, ll. 4222-4367; R, Bédier, Volume II, pp. 358-9, Curtis II, § 547, Fedrick, pp. A372-A373, Johnson, p. 93, Löseth, § 51, MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 r°a - 80 r°b, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 r°a - 79 r°b.

author felt that Iseut must somehow be informed of Tristan's escape and the invention of a vague messenger, un mes (l. 1045), then followed.[2] But the bulk of the first stage of the episode is devoted not to how the news reaches Iseut but to her reaction to the news: she is consoled by the thought that Tristan will now definitely avenge her death. It is true that she is suffering pain (ll. 1053-4), but this personal suffering she thinks she must disregard; she must rather rejoice that her lover has escaped:

> 'Par Deu!' fait el, 'se je mes jor...
> Qant li felon losengeor,
> Qui garder durent mon ami,
> L'ont deperdu, la Deu merci,
> Ne me devroit l'on mes proisier. (ll. 1055-9)

The lacuna generally postulated by editors after l. 1055 has been recently disputed, and with reason. As early as 1903, in the SATF edition (p. 253), Gaston Paris suggested the line should be understood '"Si jamais je [me plains de mon sort] ...'. Reid has accepted that the line means roughly this and considers the clause beginning in l. 1055 to be the protasis to the apodosis in l. 1059: he suggests that the MS reading mes ior should read m'esplor, and that it is not necessary to postulate a lacuna.[3] Blakey supports the sense of Reid's emendation but suggests the reading m'escor, a version paleographically closer to the manuscript reading.[4] Ewert, however, continues to believe, in the face of the evidence, that a lacuna is indicated.[5] Certainly no emendation really convinces. One finds it a little difficult to understand why Iseut should contemplate weeping at this precise moment when she is delighted at the news of her

---

2. In O, we are not informed as to how the news reached Iseut in particular. In R, we must apparently deduce that Iseut was following Tristan on the way to the place of execution, and that she was informed (Johnson), was herself an eye-witness (103, 104, perhaps 756 and Curtis), of Tristan's leap from the church. When Governal releases her from the lazar-house, she is able to tell Tristan's friends of the leap.
3. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 280, The 'Tristran'..., p. 43.
4. FS, XXI, p. 99.
5. Ewert, Volume II, p. 144.

lover's escape. Gaston Paris's suggestion, which obviously inspired the Reid and Blakey proposals, does not really fit the context.

Iseut, with her hands tightly bound, receives our sympathy because it is the three wicked barons who are responsible for her pain (ll. 1051-2), and our sympathy is doubly given as she accepts the hopelessness of her own situation but gains solace from the thought of an avenging Tristan. The consolation to which she had already given expression (ll. 906-8) becomes all the more poignant now. It would be an exaggeration to say, with Jonin, that at this point in the story for Iseut 'l'amour s'efface devant le désir de vengeance',[6] but certainly the consolation of being revenged by love dominates her reaction to the news of Tristan's escape, and the fact that neither O nor R has a similar passage illustrates the importance of the theme to Béroul.

The second stage in the episode, as it occurs in Béroul's version, begins at l. 1065 with a characteristic call upon the audience.[7] It is now, and only now, that Eilhart's version, from l. 4222 onwards, offers any parallel. The news of Tristan's escape reaches King Mark, anger and a sense of grievance follow, which result in his sending for Iseut in order to vent his wrath upon her.[8] Iseut leaves her room, still tightly bound, and the sight arouses the sympathetic indignation of the people of Cornwall. This is not a new phenomenon at all, and the six lines of direct speech in ll. 1077-82 voice the same sentiments as were expressed by the people in the Condemnation of the Lovers episode.[9] The final three

---

6. Neophil., XXXIII, p. 207.
7. Seignor in l. 1065 may be an indication that Béroul is reverting to his source material.
8. This corresponds to a passage in O, ll. 4246-55. Before this point in O, Mark had sent out his knights in a vain and fairly unenthusiastic attempt to capture Tristan.
9. Note the identical lines, 837 and 1077.

lines, ll. 1080-2, echo the sentiments of Iseut in the first stage of the episode, her anticipation of the punishment of the three wicked barons.[10] Certainly this similarity of sentiment must be intentional. Iseut and the Cornish people have an identity of feeling, and, since the people are presented as essentially 'right-thinking' (although obviously uninformed as to the real situation), they reinforce the audience's sympathy for the lovers. There is no similar passage of direct speech in Eilhart.

There is another discrepancy between B and the German version as the episode progresses, for it is at this point in B that Dinas, King Mark's seneschal, intervenes: Dinas falls at the king's feet, just as he had done in ll. 4004-5 of the German poem, at a much earlier point in the story.[11] As has already been indicated, much of the material in the speech of Tînas was recounted by the people of Cornwall in B. Now we have what amounts to a second intercession, the first intercession being on behalf of both lovers, this second on behalf of Iseut alone. The net effect of the intervention of Dinas is very similar to that produced by the speech of the people, a feeling of sympathy for the heroine. After indicating in ll. 1088-96 the services he has rendered in the past, he goes on to present the same argument as was put forward by the people in ll. 884-7: since Iseut does not confess her guilt, the king is acting in an unworthy and potentially tragic manner. Attention is focussed on the injustice of Mark's refusal to let the law take its course.

The second part of Dinas's speech diplomatically exploits a familiar theme, that of revenge (ll. 1101-20). Tristan, he says, is now free, and

---

10. Compare l. 1064 with l. 1082.
11. This is the first appearance of Dinas in the extant fragment, but in the complete poem he presumably appeared long before, as in O and R. Jonin has pointed out that it is historically correct for the holder of the position of seneschal to intervene in judicial affairs (Les Personnages féminins..., p. 72, note 1).

revenge against the barons, though not against Mark (ll. 1104-5), is now inevitable.[12] The target of Tristan's revenge will be the three barons in particular, as ll. 1121-4 ultimately make clear: they had been the object of Governal's, Tristan's and Iseut's utterances to date. Dinas goes on to amplify the revenge theme. He points out the terrible revenge that any person (Qui, l. 1110, Dinas obviously has Tristan in mind) would take, if that person had had an insignificant groom of his killed. Judiciously placing himself, rather than Mark, in the role of perpetrator of the crime,[13] Dinas claims that even if he were himself the ruler of seven kingdoms, the person who had lost a man would sooner put all that territory in jeopardy than not take vengeance. In ll. 1114-18, the seneschal makes it patently clear to Mark that Tristan is obviously likely to do as much if somebody as important to him as Iseut is killed. The final two lines contain a plea by the seneschal that Iseut should be entrusted to him, given his past services.[14]

The result of Dinas's intervention is to be seen firstly in the reaction of the three barons and then in that of Mark. The three barons are reduced to silence and wish to hear no more, for they know they will be the logical targets of Tristan's anger. And their position is not improved by Mark's refusal to be merciful to Iseut and to accede to Dinas's request. His reported reply to Dinas in ll. 1125-8 is very similar to that following the plea of the people in ll. 888-94, containing

---

12. In O, it is Antrêt who expresses his fear of being the object of Tristan's revenge (ll. 4240-2).
13. Iere in l. 1112 is almost certainly a first person imperfect, not a third, as Ewert implies (Ewert, Volume II, p. 147).
14. Robson suggests that the capital at l. 1119 is a mechanical error ('The Technique of Symmetrical Composition...', p. 64). The intrusion of a new paragraph so near to the conclusion of a speech certainly appears to be an unusual phenomenon, but it is no doubt deliberate. After l. 1118 comes a pause during which Dinas allows Mark to realize the full import of his words. Then Dinas, albeit deferentially, feels able to ask for the queen to be handed over to him.

as it does a solemn religious oath, sworn in a mood of anger, to carry out the sentence come what may:

> Li rois prist par la main Dinas,
> Par ire a juré saint Thomas
> Ne laira n'en face justise
> Et qu'en ce fu ne soit la mise.

For his part, Dinas refuses to be present at the execution, and he swears a solemn oath to this effect (l. 1134). He then rides off in sorrow, as he had done at the end of the parallel section in O (ll. 4046-53).

There are sure indications, so much has become apparent, that Béroul has deliberately repositioned the intervention of Dinas. The text has been amplified by a process of duplication, much of the content of the speech of Tînas in O being taken over by the chorus in B, and new, but broadly similar material being found for the later intervention of Dinas. But a desire to expand the text was probably not the only reason for this reallocation and broad repetition of material. Bédier was probably not far from the truth when he wrote with regard to the repositioning: 'Par là, B obtenait que Dinas occupât la scène à l'instant précis où sa prière devait produire son maximum d'effet pathétique.'[15] But the new position also enables the author to emphasize a feature he obviously believes crucial. By inserting in place of the Dinas intervention the speeches of the Cornish people Béroul had ensured that the lovers continued to receive the sympathy of the audience. Now, when he finally comes to introduce the seneschal, he is free to develop the revenge theme that is becoming an important element in the poem. The last lines of this second stage in the episode would further suggest that the intervention of the seneschal has been deliberately repositioned. Line

---

15. Bédier, Volume II, p. 264.

1141 picks up l. 1083, marking the restarting of the action from the point immediately before the seneschal came forward and in l. 1144 the people curse the barons just as they did in ll. 1077-82. A touching description of Iseut in ll. 1145-54 closes this stage, a new development certainly, but one marked by Béroul's characteristic appeal to pity for the heroine and culminating in a final visual evocation of extreme physical pain.[16]

The third stage in the episode begins at l. 1155, and now Béroul's account rejoins that of Eilhart:

> Un malade out en Lancïen
> Par non fu apelé Ivein. (ll. 1155-6)

---

16. Something must be said about Buschinger's claim that it was Eilhart, not Béroul, who repositioned the intervention of the seneschal (see Le Tristan ..., I, pp. 361-6). In the absence of the common source no definite conclusion can be reached, but certain points are worth making. Buschinger underestimates the importance in B of the speech by the people of Cornwall (ll. 833-59), which is a development similar in substance and not much shorter in length to the speech Dinas eventually delivers. She notes that the people's reaction is mentioned in R and that the people are present 'en sourdine' in O (p. 363). It would thus seem possible that Béroul, delaying Dinas's intervention, chose to exploit the possibility of his source and gave the people a much fuller role. Buschinger also correctly remarks that in O the seneschal's meeting with Tristan follows on smoothly from his encounter with Mark and prepares the saut episode (p. 365). Naturally, no scene between Dinas and Tristan is possible at this point in the French poem, but Béroul may have been familiar with the content, for ll. 2935-52, which describe the seneschal's separation from his friend, may represent the relation of temporarily discarded material. Finally, one might reiterate that the similarity of ll. 1083-4 and l. 1141, which precede and follow on from the Dinas intervention in B, does seem to suggest that material has been inserted into the story at this point. If one discounts the description of Iseut in ll. 1142-54, Yvain comes forward immediately after the second mention of the fact that Iseut has been brought to the pyre (l. 1141): these same events are closely associated in ll. 4252-6 of O, which suggests that in Béroul's source Yvain probably intervened after the first and only mention that the queen has been brought out.

dô quam ein herzoge gerant,
der was gar miselsiech. (ll. 4256-7)

The lepers, Yvain the leader and one hundred companions, are described by Béroul in a manner which Jonin has found realistic and historically correct. More importantly, he has tried to elucidate two specific points in the text. The first is centred on the meaning of boçu in l. 1162. The normal meaning, 'hunchbacked', seems inappropriate in this line, and Jonin suggests that boçu refers to the face and is synonymous with bocelé or bociez.[17] This is a distinct possibility which may find some support later, when we encounter Tristan in his disguise as a leper. Unless we take boçuz in l. 3624, 'Il n'ert pas nains, contrez, boçuz', as meaning 'hunchbacked', and boçu in l. 3922, 'Ge sui ladres, boçu, desfait', as having the secondary sense of 'bearing contusions on the face', contradictions may well arise.[18] The second point discussed by Jonin concerns the meaning of the word serie in l. 1164. This was not surprisingly glossed as 'doux' by Muret in the 1903 edition (p. 231), and as 'soft' by Ewert in his edition (Volume I, p. 167), but Jonin's investigation has brought him to a different conclusion: 'Aussi entendons-nous: "d'une voix sourde" ou "d'une voix rauque". Nous pensons donc retrouver dans cette expression une allusion très nette à l'enrouement des lépreux signalé par écrivains ou médecins.'[19] This would again possibly be supported by the later passage where Tristan is himself disguised as a leper, specifically by l. 3747, 'A sa voiz roe crie a paine'. Although Jonin's interpretation is conjectural and does not appear to find any direct support in Godefroy (VII, 389-90) and in T.-L. (IX, 513-9), the

17. Les Personnages féminins.... pp. 109-10.
18. Both l. 1162 and l. 3922 associate boçu and desfait.
19. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 112.

meaning he gives to serie has been deemed roughly correct. In his second volume (p. 152), Ewert accepts that 'soft' is an inappropriate translation and suggests instead 'thin, high-pitched and lacking in resonance'. Short also rejects 'soft' and understands a 'dry, cracked (voice)': his alternative suggestion, where serie is related to serreement and 'loud' is understood, is less convincing.[20] Jonin has also pointed out that in the description of the lepers' equipment the author has again kept close to historical fact, and he has suggested moreover that the lepers who appear in Béroul's poem should be considered as a group drawn from reality, as the inhabitants of a leper-village.[21] But the aim of Béroul's description, however accurate or not it may be, is surely to present to us from the beginning people who are horribly disfigured, so as to make us appreciate the full enormity of the punishment to which Iseut is in danger of being exposed. The German poem is noticeably lacking in such a description, and, in fact, the mass of the lepers is completely unobtrusive until threatened by Tristan and Governal.

From l. 1165 onwards, Yvain prepares the way for his proposal.[22] He points out that punishment by burning will be quickly over. In O, the major characteristic of the punishment the 'herzoge' proposes is the shame it will bring the queen:

> 'sît die koniginne sal irsterbin
> und dû ir gerne oldest erbin
> einen lestirlîchin tôd,
> nû dunket mir des nicht wesin rât,
> ab sie vorbrant wert;
> .....
> einen tôd wil ich dir nennen,
> dâ von sie mêr lasters habete.' (ll. 4261-5, 4270-1)

---

20. RP, XXVI, p. 469.
21. Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 133-4.
22. Cf. Ernst in l. 1164 suggests that the whole group of lepers speaks up, but as the speech develops, it rapidly becomes clear that only Yvain, the leader, is actually involved. And it is to Yvain alone that Mark seems to reply. Do we need to postulate, with Muret and Robson ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 185, note 13), a lacuna after l. 1164?

The position is perhaps less clear in B:

> Tel justice de li ferez;
> Mais, se vos croire me volez...
> Et que voudroit mex mort avoir,
> Qu'ele vivroit, et sanz valoir,
> Et que nus n'en orroit parler
> Qui plus ne t'en tenist por ber. (ll. 1173-8)

The dominant idea would seem to be that such would be the shameful life that Iseut would be forced to lead that she would prefer to die in the manner proposed by Mark than undergo what Yvain has in mind. The position might become clearer if, as Blakey suggests, the order of ll. 1174 and 1173 were reversed and the beginning of l. 1175 were emended to Qu'ele,[23] or if, as Reid suggests, ll. 1175-6 as well as ll. 1173-4 were interverted,[24] but neither set of proposals imposes itself. The final line of the passage quoted is introduced as a sop to Mark's vanity: the punishment Yvain will propose will bring shame to the queen, but, so he claims, honour to Mark.[25]

As in O (l. 4275), King Mark is prepared to be grateful to Yvain if the punishment is suitably ferocious. The leper leader then exposes the details of his proposal: Iseut will be common property,[26] she will find life with them unbearable, and he contrasts the life she has led with Mark with the squalor of the life before her. A similar antithesis between her past life and the proposed

---

23. FS, XXI, p. 100.
24. The 'Tristran'..., pp. 48-9.
25. Presumably the ele of l. 1178 must be taken as an adverb of degree modifying the verbal expression tenir por ber? In Eilhart it is later pointed out that it is the king himself who incurs dishonour for acceding to the request of the 'herzoge' (ll. 4296-4301).
26. B 1193. Fb (ll. 446-51) tells a different story. There, after some quarrelling, it seems to be agreed that Iseut should belong to just one of the lepers.

future life is made twice in R,[27] once by the Cornish people when she is about to be led to the stake and again when the lepers receive her, but with nothing like the wealth of detail concerning everyday existence that we find in B.[28] The final lines of the speech, 1210-6, present again the thought that Iseut would prefer death to that form of life, and that Iseut would find death by burning more acceptable. Iseut is likened to the viper in l. 1214, a creature renowned for its lust, if la guivre is taken as being in apposition to Yseut, as Lejeune suggests: 'L'ardeur sexuelle des lépreux...punira rapidement Iseut, "la guivre", sans lui laisser le temps de contracter la lèpre. Femme adultère aux désirs coupables, elle périra par la lubricité des ladres dès qu'elle leur aura été livrée.'[29] But is death really to result with the swiftness that Lejeune anticipates, and is death really to be the result at all? In O, the position is clear, for ll. 4276-9 and 4286-91 indicate that death will certainly be Iseut's fate. In his comparison of B and O, Muret makes the following point: 'Suivant Eilhart, le lépreux promet de faire mourir Iseut d'une mort plus terrible que le bûcher: suivant Béroul, il propose de la laisser vivre d'une vie plus effroyable que toute mort.'[30] Muret seems to have analysed the situation correctly, while

---

27. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 78 v°a: 'Ele a eu honor el monde et plenté de toz biens, et ore avra plus de deshonor et plus honte qe nule chetive et souffreteuse de toz biens, et ce sera la plus cruele venjance qe oncquez rois preïst de sa mollier.' MS BN, f.fr. 756, 79 r°a: 'Et cil qi male gent estoient et plains de punesie et d'ennuiere, li reçoivent entr'elz et dient que jamés ne lor eschapera, ainz li feront le plus d'ennui q'il porront et de honte qe li rois Marc ne li fist oncquez d'onor. Assez avra des ore mes povreté et honte et lait et avra petit a mengier, c'ele ne porchace son vivre aussi come il feront.'
28. The meaning of solier (l. 1202, MS solaz) has been examined by Legge ('Some Notes...', pp. 221-3).
29. MA, LXVI, p. 150.
30. Rom., XVI, p. 331.

Lejeune is clearly in error and misconstrues ll. 1195-7: Yvain had intervened originally to propose a punishment which would, amongst other things, be of longer duration than death by burning.

Mark has a moment of hesitation before he accepts Yvain's proposal. Iseut panics and begs her husband to kill her on the spot, the same plea she makes to Andret in the French Prose Romance when she is delivered to the lazar-house.[31] But, as in the Prose Romance, her protestations are in vain and she is handed over to Yvain. Jonin has noted that it was not unusual for criminals to be handed over at this period if not to leper-villages at least to leper-colonies.[32] But, once again, a recognition that Béroul may be following the common practice of his time does not really elucidate the text, where the full enormity of Mark's deed must be appreciated. Raynaud de Lage has in fact disputed Jonin's point and he certainly does not fail to comprehend the real import of the passage: 'Il n'y a pas de précédent juridique, et, en un sens, il ne convient pas qu'il y en ait, ce n'est pas un acte de juridiction, c'est une vengeance privée, et d'une horrible invention dramatique.'[33]

Iseut is surrounded by the lepers, and this stage in the episode closes at l. 1228 with a characteristic phrase, 'Qui q'en ait duel, Yvains est liez'. Yvain is now placed apart from the general run of people who sympathize with the lovers and joins their enemies, just as the dwarf by his reaction in ll. 879-80 is set apart from the people who grieve because of the apparently imminent execution of

---

31. MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 r°a: 'Lors dit la roine Yseut a Andret: "Ha! Andret, pour Deu, oci moi! Je te pardoing ma mort! Si ne me livre mie a si vil gent! Ou tu me preste t'espee et je m'ocirra, car plus seroi granz honors pour moi se je m'ocie que se je demore ceanz.'
32. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 137.
33. MA, LXVI, p. 385.

Tristan and Iseut.[34] Yvain has now joined the enemy and therefore is at risk, just as the lovers' revenge on the felons is anticipated. Yvain's punishment will come very swiftly, but Tristan will be surprisingly lenient.

The fourth and final stage in the episode, ll. 1229-78, is concerned with the rescue of Iseut and Yvain's token penalty. The version of Eilhart is on the whole close to that of Béroul, whilst in the Prose Romance Governal simply takes the queen away from the lepers without meeting opposition.

The group of lepers lead Iseut away over the shore, and approach the spot where Tristan is waiting for them:

> Tot droit vont vers l'enbuschement
> Ou ert Tristran, qui les atent. (ll. 1233-4)

Of course, this is not strictly true: Tristan and Governal had taken up their position, not to effect an ambush, but to hear news from passers-by (ll. 991-7). But this minor piece of manipulation barely intrudes on an audience conditioned in advance by ll. 1023-44.[35] Governal is the first to see Iseut coming. Tristan resolves to rescue her; he emerges from the thicket and calls on Yvain to release her, but it is Governal who is directly responsible for freeing Iseut from Yvain's grasp, striking him with a vert jarri.[36]

Eilhart's version of the rescue (ll. 4302-30) presents one major difference from Béroul's version. In the German poem Tristan angrily chops the leader of the lepers in two, and he and Kurnevâl then strike out amongst the lepers so that in the end only one survives to

---

34. See also ll. 4271-2.
35. In R, the companions of Tristan certainly hide in ambush, hoping to rescue the hero. The idea of an ambush is also perhaps to be understood in O (ll. 4196-4202): in O, Tristan is eager to rescue Iseut, and an ambush would be the natural method in the circumstances.
36. The affinity between B and R in the matter of freeing Iseut from the lepers is not as obvious as Delbouille claims (CCM, V, p. 285). It is not true that Tristan plays no role in the rescue of Iseut in B, whilst certainly Governal alone, albeit on the instructions of Tristan's companions, frees Iseut in R.

tell the tale to Mark:[37]

> Ein der sîchin dô genas.
> der quam dâ der lonîng was
> und begunde im jêmerlîchen clagin
> daz sîn hêre wêre irslagin
> und mit im alle sîne man.
> 'daz hât Tristrant getân
> und hât die vrouwe mit im nomen.
> ich bin kûme dannen komen.'
> sô sprach der arme sîche. (ll. 4331-9)

In B, there is no such wholesale slaughter and in fact it is expressly denied that they cause even Yvain's death:

> Li contor d'ient que Yvain
> Firent n'ier, qui sont vilain:
> N'en sevent mie bien l'estoire,
> Berox l'a mex en sen memoire:
> Trop ert Tristran preuz et cortois
> A oirre gent de tes lois.[38]

This account of the incident seems to be supported by Fb (ll. 456-9), where the text implies that Tristan left the struggle to Governal, who nevertheless appears to have killed no one:

> Ainz par moi n'en fu un desdit,
> Mes Gorvenal, cui Deus ait!
> Lor dona teus cous des bastons
> Ou s'apoient des moignons.

Why were the lepers not killed in B as they were in O?

Whitteridge has suggested a reason:

Tristan is not too courtly to kill the lepers because they are lepers,... but because they are his inferiors in rank. In confirmation of this point, it will be remembered that Eilhart makes the

---

37. Lofthouse (unpublished M.A. dissertation, p. 118) sees the additional detail in O, the return of the leper to Mark, as the work of the same author who had Tînas bring back the dwarf to court at the close of the tryst episode.
38. B 1265-70. Hofer has compared this passage with part of the Roman du Mont S. Michel (ZRP, LXV, p. 280), but the texts do not really have the 'sehr überraschende wörtliche Übereinstimmung' that he perceives. N'ier in l. 1266 has generally been accepted in the sense of 'drown', but one may feel there are problems (see M°, p. 208, p. 253, Ewert, Volume II, p. 155).

leader of the lepers a duke, 'ein herzoge', and him Tristan does not hesitate to kill.[39]

But making the leader of the lepers a duke may very easily be a detail invented by Eilhart to make Tristan's action less reprehensible. In the German poem (if not in LS D), Tristan appears to kill many others as well, as ll. 4322-7 indicate. Are all the lepers noble and can therefore be legitimately massacred?[40] This seems rather far-fetched. Is it possible that in B Yvain could be of noble birth? His very name suggests this and l. 1247 may be held to imply that Tristan at least knows him already. Perhaps the right conclusion is the simple one. In the source shared by Béroul and Eilhart, Tristan did indeed put paid to the lepers, or to their leader at least. To avoid any possible ignominy accruing to Tristan, Eilhart may have had the notion of making the leader a duke. In B Tristan does not kill Yvain the leper simply because he is a leper, and the author feels that to kill even one of the lepers is not in keeping with the moral stature of his hero.[41] Certainly it would appear that Béroul is deliberately changing the account of his source at this point and is making a dishonest appeal to an imaginary authority.

---

39. 'The Tristan of Béroul', p. 345.
40. Lejeune writes: 'Eilhart connaît la revendication hardie adressée par les lépreux au roi Marc. Mais l'épisode n'est pas très long (v. 4260-4330) et les lépreux sont nobles (un duc à cheval avec quelques compagnons). C'est le duc qui enlèvera Iseut, c'est lui qui sera tué par Tristan' (RA, LXVI, p. 151).
41. Varvaro holds a similar view: 'Non c'è dubbio che qui il poeta prevarichi conscientemente la tradizione, tenendo fuori Tristano dalla mischia con gli spregevoli lebbrosi proprio per non contaminare l'ideale dell'eroe preuz et cortois' (Rom., LXXXVIII, p. 42). In R, in the Separation of the Lovers episode, Tristan has similar scruples about killing, but there he is simply concerned about the method he should employ to kill a social inferior: 'Car Tristan li sailli de travers et prent le vallet au braz destre, car ferir ne le vouloit pas de l'espee por ce qe chevalier n'estoit' (LS BN, f.fr. 756, 81 v°a and b).

It also appears that Béroul comes into conflict with the logic of his own account. Yvain has been identified as an enemy of the lovers, his punishment is naturally anticipated, but when the time comes Béroul allows the leper to escape virtually scot-free.

Critics have suggested that the escape of Iseut from the lepers, like Tristan's leap from the chapel, is an act of Providence.[42] There are, of course, as in the saut Tristran episode, good, 'non-miraculous' reasons for the success of the rescue attempt: the place where Tristan and his squire hide is well chosen (this detail is even more obvious in O), and the lepers, in spite of their number, are relatively puny opponents.[43] But even though this episode is not clearly 'framed' by references to God's intervention, one may well feel that Governal's plan of action, based on an uncanny anticipation of the course events will take, is ultimately so successful that it must have been divinely inspired.

This episode closes with the retreat of Tristan, Iseut and Governal into the safety of the Forest of Morrois,[44] and it is against the forest background that future events will take place.

---

42. This is the view of Payen, for example: 'Et pourtant, nous sentons qu'une fois de plus, une bienveillante Providence est venue au secours des amants' (Le Motif..., p. 340).
43. This is a feature of Fb: see especially l. 459.
44. In O, the forest is not named (see ll.4328-30). In R the forest is named: 'Et sachiez que cele forest ou il estoient a l'antree estoit apelee la forest del Marois et estoit la greignour forest qui fust en toute Cornuaille' (MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 v°b).

7: LIFE IN THE FOREST

Tristan, Iseut and Governal are now in the Forest of Morrois, and the episode in Béroul's version is dominated by the problems of survival in the wilderness.[1]

An aid towards survival is, we learn, already available: Governal had taken a bow and two arrows off a forester, and these, allied to Tristan's skill as a bowman, will soon be put to good use. In l. 1282 the text refers to a vague forester, un forestier. Is this figure to be identified with any other forester in the romance, more especially with Orri who is first mentioned in l. 2817? Such an identification seems gratuitous, for the detail has all the marks of a secondary accretion, introduced by the author in a bid to rationalize the story. Tristan must have a bow for the sake of survival, but where does he get it from? The question is posed by the author and answered by him for he conveniently invents the figure of a forester. This recourse to the invention of a new, vague character seems to have repercussions elsewhere. Before including ll. 1831-4 in his text the author had clearly wondered what Governal had been doing all the time. He again answers his own question by saying he was with the forester:

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 1279-1305; O, ll. 4502-80; S, chapter LXIV, p. 79 - chapter LXV; E, stanza CCXXIII - stanza CCXXVIII; G, ll. 16621-17274; R, Bédier, Volume II, pp. 361-2, Curtis II, §§550-552, Fedrick, pp. A377-A381, Johnson, pp. 95-7, Löseth, §§51-2, MS BN, f.fr. 104, 80 v°b - 81 r°b, MS BN, f.fr. 756, 80 r°a - 80 v°b; Fb, ll. 460-1; Fo, ll. 857-72.

N'avoit qu(e) eus deus en cel païs;
Quar Governal, ce m'est avis,
S'en ert alez o le destrier
Aval el bois au forestier.

It appears that the author is drawing on his own invention to solve a problem of the same nature as caused the creation of the character in the first place.

There are other ways of ensuring survival. Tristan then builds a crude hut, a bower, and in this operation Iseut plays her part. Governal also has a part to play; he does the cooking:

Tristan s'asist o la roïne.
Governal sot de la cuisine,
De seche busche fait buen feu.
Molt avoient a faire queu!
Il n'avoient ne lait ne sel
A cele foiz a lor ostel. (ll. 1293-8)

Clearly l. 1296 must be taken ironically, as must the description of their crude shelter as an ostel in l. 1298.[2]

The passage then goes on to describe how tired Iseut is as a result of her trials; her wish is to sleep:

Somel li prist, dormir se vot,
Sor son ami dormir se vot. (ll. 1301-2)

The couplet as it stands in the manuscript and in Ewert's text quoted here offers an identical rhyme. Is emendation called for? Perhaps a mistake has arisen owing to the scribe's recognized habit of reading a whole couplet of his model at one time. Muret felt the need to emend the manuscript in all his editions, printing l'estot : se vot in M^0, l'estut : se veut in M^1 and M^2, and l'esteut : se veut in M^3. Ewert, followed by M^4, retains the manuscript reading and comments that on occasion the scribe was evidently content to use

---

2. See Raynaud de Lage, Rom., LXXXV, p. 523. Gaston Paris's proposed emendation (M^0, p. 253), avroient for avoient (l. 1296), is noted in M^4 (p. 144). Mölk is inclined to support the proposal (Tristan und Isolde, p. 69, note 15).

identical rhyme: he suggests that the manuscript reading should be allowed to stand.[3] But it is not only the repetition of dormir se vot in l. 1302 that gives cause for alarm: it is also difficult to decide what Sor son ami means in this context, so the beginning as well as the ending of the line may be in need of correction. It may be that a theme which later becomes prominent, the consolation the lovers find in each other's presence, was originally first introduced here.

Lines 1303-5 present the last stage in the episode.[4] The pattern of the day just described becomes the pattern of a long stay in the wilderness.

Accounts of the lovers' life in the forest are found in the other versions, but with a considerable amount of variation. In Eilhart, for example, the episode comes after the escape of the dog, Ûtant, and begins only at l. 4502. The German poem offers a mixture of the particular and the general, and there are some points which perhaps should be noted. It is Kurnevâl and Tristan who are responsible for the building of the lovers' shelter (ll. 4518-23) and of the three Kurnevâl alone suffers unbearably, not having the consolation of love:

> îdoch was in daz ein kinder spel,
> wen si hâtin dâ bî vroude vel
> von der grôzen minne.
> sô ich mich besinne,
> Kurnevâl leit eine die nôt:
> daz he nicht irlag tôd,
> daz was ein michel wundir. (ll. 4549-55)

---

3. 'On the Text of...', p. 96, Ewert, Volume II, p. 5.
4. Lines 1303-5 belong properly to the next episode, as the rubric and the call Seignors might be held to indicate, but they are included here for the sake of convenience.

O includes the detail that the hero was the inventor of angling (ll. 4530-40), but in spite of Tristan's abilities the author feels a certain disbelief that the lovers and Kurnevâl could survive for so long in the forest. He supposes that his readers and audience would feel a similar disbelief, so he hastens to point out that this is what is contained in his written source and also in the version that people relate:

daz die vrauwe und die degene
nicht zu tôde irvroren
dô sie die cleider gar vorloren,
daz hât mich wundir gar genûg.
îdoch sô sagit uns daz bûch
und ouch die lûte vor wâr,
daz si mêr denne zwei jâr
in dem wilden walde lâgin
und nî dorf noch stad gesûgin. (ll. 4572-80)

Unlike Béroul in the previous episode, he seems to be sincerely reproducing his source, in spite of his own misgivings, rather than claiming adherence to the source and simultaneously producing a much more personal account.

In the Prose Romance, Tristan and Governal bid farewell to the knights who have helped them, and they enter the forest with Governal and a maid: there is the suspicion that Iseut is less willing to leave the world behind than Tristan is.[5] Kelemina has seen a link between a figure in R and the forester in ll. 1281-4 of B: 'Der

---

5. Curtis writes: 'And although she is later described as being very happy in the forest, it is clear that the author here wants to portray a woman who is less willing than her lover to sacrifice the world and its pleasures' (Tristan Studies, p. 53). Iseut's apparent objections may in part be a simple rhetorical device to allow Tristan to voice his own feelings and may not be truly representative of Iseut's emotions (see also Frappier, RP, XXVI, p. 227, note 13). Nevertheless, it does seem that Iseut, when it comes to the point and she is directly faced with exile in the forest, falls in with Tristan's wishes rather than pursue the course she herself would like: 'Bien le veill, fet elle, puis q'il vos plest. Ja contredit ne y metrai"' (756, 80 r°b).

Besuch beim Förster scheint wegen B 1281-4 keine blosse Erfindung von R zu sein.'[6] This is a reference to the fact that before the lovers leave their companions and enter the forest they receive one night's hospitality. But apart from the fact that a hospitable lord is a commonplace of Arthurian romance, it is only in MS BN, f.fr. 103 of the manuscripts examined that the lovers' host is a forester: in 756, 104, Carpentras 404 and the Edinburgh manuscript edited by Johnson, the host is a chevalier.[7] Perhaps Kelemina has hit upon a detail which the author of MS BN, f.fr. 103 drew directly from Béroul? In R, the characteristics of the forest life are rather different from those in B and O. It is a life of ease and luxury, spent in the now abandoned home of the Sage Damoiselle: Tristan must necessarily hunt, but this task is no hardship.

The account of the life in the forest which Thomas presents is certainly closer to R than to B and O. As far as we can judge from the derivatives of T, his account is peculiar in that the lovers' exile in the forest is not all enforced. Mark has seen the love of the hero and heroine, and he allows the lovers to leave the court of their own free will. Thomas, it will be remembered, had caused his version to take a different course from that taken by B, O and R. A period of exile in the forest is not essential to his recast account,

---

6. Untersuchungen..., p. 30.
7. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 360, Curtis II, § 550, Johnson, p. 95. In 756, 80 r°a, we read 'Quant il furent parti du chevalier', and in 104, 80 v°b, 'Quant il urent est [é] chiés le proudonme'. Fedrick strangely writes that the 'lovers take refuge at first in the house of a friendly forester' (Fedrick, p. 140). He supposes, because of Orri in B, that there was a friendly forester in the source of R. But the forester is found only in 103 (see Curtis, Tristan Studies, p. 64): Fedrick's own transcription of 104 (p. A376) refers to the figure as a proudomme and a chevaliers.

but perhaps he was unable to resist the possibilities of the scene. As in R the lovers lead a life of ease:

> in streich diu liebe ir erbepfluoc
> niwan an ieglichem trite
> und ziegelichen stunden mite
> und gab in alles des den rat,
> des man ze wunschlebene hat.[8]

Nor is their home in the least uncomfortable:

> And because it liked them this freedom in the forest, they found a secret place beside a certain water and in a rock that heathen men let hew and adorn in olden time with mickle skill and fair craft, and this was all vaulted and the entrance digged deep into the earth, and there was a secret path far beneath.[9]

So, the characteristics of the lovers' life in B are very much different from those presented in R and T. B also differs from R, T and O in that the text repeats roughly the same material at irregular intervals from now on. In O all the data describing the hard life in the forest are concentrated in the one passage, as Muret has pointed out: 'Le récit de Béroul est bien plus long, singulièrement confus; il y a beaucoup de redites. Au lieu d'être réunis dans un grand tableau, comme chez Eilhart, les détails sur le genre de vie des amants sont épars au cours de la narration.'[10] Let us remind ourselves what the features were of this first day in the forest, as listed in ll. 1279-1302. Hunting was one feature, hunger and deprivation was another, and in ll. 1301-2 Béroul was perhaps hinting that hardship did not preclude happiness. We are told in ll. 1303-5 that this becomes the general pattern of existence, and this is reinforced by the fact that roughly the same material is

---

8. G 16842-6. See also E, stanza CCXXVIII, ll. 2507-8. S, chapter LXIV. Vàrvaro (Rom., LXXVIII, p. 36) sees an allusion in L'Escoufle, l. 8775 (not 8875, as Vàrvaro has it), to the lovers' departure from the court as recounted in T.
9. Loomis, The Romance of Tristram..., p. 177. See also S, chapter LXIV, G, l. 16689 ff., E, stanza CCXXVI, ll. 2478-81. Is there a possible link between the dwelling described here and Orri's cellar?
10. Rom., XVI, p. 334.

repeated in various passages throughout the next few hundred lines.

The major parallel passages with which we are concerned are ll. 1357-66, 1423-30, 1637-55, 1767-73 and perhaps also 1783-92. In these passages the themes of that first day return, new themes emerge with changing circumstances, are consolidated and become regular features of these sequences. The point that the lovers spend a long time in the forest appears in ll. 1303-5, and is later found in ll. 1359, 1648 and 1771. Tristan goes hunting on the first day, and there are similar accounts in ll. 1426-7, 1767-8 and also in ll. 1772-3, where the position has improved following the invention of the arc qui ne faut. The theme of hunger and deprivation returns in l. 1425, ll. 1644-5 and l. 1769. But love is a source of consolation, we are told: this theme may have been suggested in ll. 1301-2, or indeed as early as l. 1274,[11] and it reasserts itself in ll. 1364-6, 1649-50 and 1783-92. Repeatedly we find a stress on the lovers' need to be constantly on the move. Obviously this cannot be a feature of the first day, but it becomes established later and is incorporated into the sequences at ll. 1360-1, 1428-30 and 1640.

Why do we find this repeated data in B? Is the account of the lovers' life in the forest really as 'singulièrement confus' as Muret claimed? So far at least in our study we have been aware of a mind which has carefully calculated its chosen effects, stressing recurrent themes.

Perhaps part of the answer to the problem of why this material is constantly being repeated lies in a comment made already. In Eilhart's version, the single life in the forest sequence is positioned

---

11. See Vinaver, CCM, XI, p. 5.

after the arrival of Ûtant, and, in apparently placing the escape of the dog on the very day of the lovers' escape, Eilhart is probably preserving the 'authentic' account. In B, one has the impression that a longer period of time has elapsed before Husdent is released and because of this the account in B may present certain illogicalities. One may also suspect that, with regard to the two hermit scenes, Eilhart again preserves the logical order; in O, one scene immediately precedes, the other immediately follows, the indication that the four years of the potion's full effectiveness are up. The conclusion presents itself that Béroul has deliberately disposed the episodes in a new order, in which logical succession, one episode following after and dependent on another, has been sacrificed to another design and purpose.

What then is the role of the life in the forest sequences in this new disposition of episodes? Vàrvaro has made an attempt to define this role and his general thesis is that sequences of this nature mark a pause between episodes, the units of the poem:

Il richiamo alla situazione determinatasi nel corso del precedente racconto, se non è affato necessario per la brevità dell'episodio interposto e non serve dunque all'economia del romanzo, riacquista significato se si accetti l'ipotesi di una siffatta pausa, ammettendo una certa autonomia del successivo nucleo narrativo e riflettendo su di esso i versi ora letti, non in funzione di rappel all'interno di un racconto unitario, quanto di introduzione ad un episodio cui concediamo per adesso un margine indeterminato di autonomia.[12]

But Frappier, in reviewing Vàrvaro's monograph, makes the important point that these sequences serve also as a link between episodes:

Remarquons toutefois que les exemples qu'il a choisis, très significatifs, se rapportent presque tous à la vie des amants dans la

---

12. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 32.

forêt, et qu'une analyse un peu plus poussée de ces 'pauses narratives', où l'on dirait que le jongleur se recueille avant un autre élan, conduirait probablement à leur attribuer aussi une valeur de liaison (elliptique il est vrai). Elles sont propres, nous semble-t-il, à suggérer la continuité de l'action entre deux épisodes successifs autant qu'à les séparer.[13]

But what is the real nature of this link? By deliberately re-ordering the episodes would it not seem that Béroul has rejected the kind of link Frappier seems to be describing, where one episode is made to lead on logically to the next? Moreover, certain of the life in the forest sequences, for example, ll. 1364-6 and ll. 1783-92, are to be found not linking episodes but within the body of episodes. Perhaps Payen, in another review of Vàrvaro's book, is nearer the truth:

La relation de Béroul est effectivement plus affective que logique: Mais nous parlerions de composition par séquences (employant à dessein un langage cinématographique). Ce montage refuse l'enchaînement logique et admet tout juste le rappel furtif des conditions dans lesquelles va se dérouler l'action: un vers ou deux y suffisent et là sans doute réside l'explication de beaucoup de 'reprises' ou 'répétitions'.[14]

But Béroul's text offers much more than a 'rappel furtif' of these details! As our analysis has shown, the author carefully and consciously reiterates themes already present and, as the romance progresses, incorporates other themes into his scheme.

Yet Payen's remarks can help us to define our approach to these sequences. The life in the forest sequences form a background characterised by a number of recurrent features and altered slightly by the addition of new themes dictated by changing circumstances. Instead of being in a logical concatenation, the individual, re-

---

13. CCM, VII, p. 354.
14. MA, LXXI, p. 603.

ordered episodes are set in the foreground, against this ever-present background. Not that the order of episodes in B is gratuitous: the first Ogrin episode, for example, is given a new prominence, and this is deliberate. Certainly the order prescribed by logic and probably exemplified by the order in O has been discarded, but a new order, more suited to express the author's conception of the legend, has taken its place.

8: THE HORSE'S EARS EPISODE

The Horse's Ears episode (ll. 1306-50) is exceptional chiefly because it is found only in B. It may also be deemed exceptional because it provides one of the rare glimpses of events at court after the lovers have made their escape to the Morrois. And yet the basic function of the episode is the same as that of other episodes to come, namely the elimination of the various enemies of the lovers once their work is accomplished.

The episode is characteristically presented, 'Oiez du nain com au roi sert'.[1] Another of the life in the forest episodes begins in very much the same way and is concerned with another enemy of the lovers:

> Un de ces trois que Dex maudie,
> Par qui il furent descovert,
> Oiez conment par un jor sert![2]

The bare bones of the story are first presented as a stimulus to our curiosity, for we learn of the consequences suffered by the unfortunate dwarf as a result of his behaviour:

> Un consel sot li nai[n]s du roi,
> Ne sot que il; par grant desroi

---

1. B 1306. At l. 1065, Oiez seemed to mark the point where Béroul reverted to his source material. Here, Oiez would seem to mark the point where he departs from his source.
2. B 1656-8. Note also ll. 701-2.

Le descovri; il fist que beste,
Qar puis en prist li rois la teste.[3]

Béroul could have stopped here, having explained why the dwarf would be absent from the rest of the romance, but he obviously felt there was pleasure and profit to be had from the telling of a full story.

One day the barons approach the dwarf when he happens to be drunk: his state of inebriation explains his imprudence! The barons ask the dwarf the reason for the intimate exchanges which pass between the king and himself, but the dwarf refuses to break faith with Mark. But he offers a plan, whereby, so he claims, he will not divulge the secret to the barons in theory, even if he will do so in practice: he says he will place the three in position by the Gué Aventuros where they will be able to hear him. So these three barons are now described as being three in number (l. 1319). Are these the three barons who have been encountered before, even though they are not identified as the lovers' enemies? Elsewhere, three barons appear again: on this occasion they approach King Mark in order to obtain the release of Husdent (ll. 1473-82) and once more they are not openly described as the felons. It is possible that Béroul simply had a kind of obsession with the figure three, as Vàrvaro has suggested: 'Tanto più è interessante notare che quando Béroul ha per necessità narrative da scegliere nella

---

3. B 1307-10. In his edition (Volume I, p. 145), Ewert glosses desroi, without specifically mentioning l. 1398, as 'disorder, unseemly conduct, rong'. In M4, desroi is glossed as 'folie', which would make the phrase virtually synonymous with il fist que beste in l. 1309. Perhaps the meanings suggested for the phrase par grant desroi in T.-L. (II, 1733), 'im Übermut, ungestüm' are adequate here. The phrase reoccurs in l. 1399. Here Ewert understands 'in great perturbation' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 165), while Reid suggests that desroi should be emended to destroit (MLR, LX, pp. 353-4 and note 1, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 55-6). Holden, however, believes the reading of the manuscript should be preserved (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 391), and this is certainly possible if we can understand a meaning akin to 'with great insistence, with great urgency'.

massa indistinta della corte cornica egli si fermi sempre sul numero tre.'[4] But the roles played by these two sets of barons are not very far removed from the roles played by the three wicked barons.[5] It is true that their actions prove indirectly beneficial to the lovers for in this episode they bring about the elimination of the dwarf and in the Husdent episode they reunite the dog and its master, but in both instances their motives for action appear less than praiseworthy. In the first case, they seem to have caught wind of a possible scandal (ll. 1311-4) which could presumably be harmful to King Mark, and in the second they seem to hope that the dog, when released, will lead them to Tristan. Admittedly, the identification is never clearly made, but it does seem that these two sets of barons are indeed to be associated with the three felons first encountered at l. 581. Béroul would seem to be re-employing characters he created himself. The place where the dwarf is to divulge the secret is the Gué Aventuros and Newstead points out that this is a very familiar location.[6] Probably Béroul chose such a site because of the

---

4. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 151. Murrell has suggested that an author of the Girart de Roussillon poems has an obsession with the number seven. 'It may be added that the number seven has no importance in determining the length of exile in G I; it is a stereotyped figure which the author of L uses, as if a magic phrase, as often as possible. Berte dies seven years before Girart; Mary Magdalene has seven devils; God's anger towards the people for disobeying Girart's wishes as regards burial is shown by an absence of rain for seven years' ('Girart de Roussillon'..., p. 35).
5. For a different view, see M°, p. X.
6. 'The place chosen by the dwarf for his meeting with the barons is "le Gué Aventuros / Et iluec a une aube esmine." A ford by a hawthorn tree was a typical setting for uncanny marvels, as numerous other examples in Celtic and Arthurian tradition prove' (RF, XI, p. 249). See also Loomis, Arthurian Tradition..., p. 130.

particular poetic resonance it had acquired as a result of being commonly utilized in earlier stories. The location is also a familiar one in B: lines identical to l. 1320 are ll. 2677, 2747 and 3436.[7] The dwarf's precise plan, as ll. 1322-4 indicate, is to thrust his head into a hollow beneath the root of the thorn bush, and the three outside will then hear his words.[8]

The next section of the episode tells how the secret is divulged by the dwarf, named Frocine in l. 1328 for the purposes of rhyme.[9] There is a fairly ordinary description of the dwarf, 'Li nains fu cort, la teste et grose' (l. 1329), but perhaps the dimensions of the dwarf's head are important here. The meaning of l. 1330 may well be that there was a need to enlarge the hole to accommodate the head:

---

7. Lines 3876-7 should also be noted in this connection. The 'Croiz Roge' also figures more than once in different contexts in B (l. 1909 and l. 2419).
8. In l. 1326, it is hard to justify the retention of the manuscript reading soi, which Ewert prints. The correction foi seems necessary.
9. From a study of the use of the term Frocine, Hoepffner suggests that the whole passage is the work of a second writer, but his argument is unconvincing (ZRP, XXXIX, p. 69, note 1). Ewert terms ll. 1306-50 'an interpolation made by the poet' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 160). Delboulle has inquired into the origin of the name Frocin and he writes : 'A notre sens, frocin(e) (d'où Frocin-Frocine) pourrait avoir désigné d'abord le petit crapaud ou la petite grenouille..., mais il aurait pris bientôt le sens d'oeufs de crapaud ou de grenouille, sinon celui du têtard. Sans doute, quand Béroul l'employa pour nommer le nain-astrologue du Tristan, ce mot à double genre servait-il déjà aussi bien pour désigner métaphoriquement un nain que pour désigner un petit crapaud. Dans ce cas, Béroul n'aurait pas nommé crûment son nain Crapaud, mais aurait joué de la double signification du mot, son nom propre évoquant d'abord la petite taille du personnage, mais rappelant aussi, derrière ce sens dérivé, le sens premier du mot et la hideur de la bête que la tradition populaire veut aussi méchante que laide' ('Le Nom du nain Frocin(e)', p. 202). In Le Donnei des amants, as presented by Gaston Paris, the dwarf is referred to as li crapouz (Rom., XXV, p. 510, l. 619).

'Delivrement out fait la fosse'. This is the text of Ewert, which reproduces the manuscript reading out. He explains his interpretation: 'According to ll. 1322-3 the hole had already been made and l. 1330 merely recalls the fact that the dwarf had made it. Delivrement might therefore be interpreted "freely", 'at his leisure", "with deliberation(?)".'[10] Before him Muret had read the manuscript as ont and reproduced ont in his editions. The manuscript clearly reads out, a fact acknowledged in M[4], but ont is still printed. The version is defended in this way: 'La fosse existe déjà (v. 1322), mais on l'agrandit pour que le nain puisse y mettre la tête jusqu'aux épaules.'[11] Unless we accept that a hole made by the dwarf is essential to the story, Ewert's interpretation does in fact seem forced. There is no proof that the dwarf himself had made the hole, and there seems no reason for him to have done so unless he was in the habit of divulging secrets in this strange manner: l. 1322 simply records that the hole was in existence. Certainly we are now far into the realm of hypothesis and perhaps the line is in need of more radical emendation than the simple changing of out to ont.[12] From his position in the hole, the dwarf now stammers out his secret, to the bush, his words emerging to begin with, as the text stands, in drunken incoherence. The dwarf's exercise in sophistry, for he claims to be divulging information only to the thorn bush, may well bring the ambiguous oath to mind!

---

10. 'On the Text of...', p. 92. See also Ewert, Volume II, p. 162.
11. M[4], p. 144.
12. Mölk supports in general the interpretation of the action given in M[4], but would accept either out or ont (Tristan und Isolde, p. 69, note 17).

The consequences of the betrayal of the secret are precisely those that the beginning of the episode led us to expect. The king is told by the barons that they know his secret, and perhaps he gives the game away rather too rapidly by confessing at once that he has this disfigurement. His laugh betrays an embarrassment which will soon be relieved by an act of revenge, for Frocin, described in l. 1345 as the cause of the king's peculiarity,[13] is decapitated by the king, and this action gives rise to general rejoicing.

In the past, work on the episode has largely been directed towards an exploration of sources, and only incidentally, to a greater or lesser degree, have the episode itself and its place within the romance been interpreted.[14] Critics have suggested that the origin of the story as told by Béroul is Celtic and especially Breton. This is the theory supported by Foulon, and also by Newstead, who has concluded from a study of the Celtic sources that a Breton story is indeed at the origin of the episode.[15] But is this Breton story the sole source of Béroul's version? Is a direct classical source completely out of the question? Muret writes: 'L'aventure du roi et du nain rappelle vivement la fameuse histoire du barbier de Midas. Mais, qu'il y ait imitation lointaine ou coïncidence fortuite, on ne saurait mettre en doute la provenance celtique de notre récit.'[16] Bédier likewise envisages the possibility that an author might have drawn directly upon a classical source, but again he would reject this theory as

---

13. Ewert assumes that the medieval public would detect in ll. 1343-5 a reference to a partly unsuccessful experiment (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 161). Are we similarly to assume that the public, hearing that the dwarf has made a hole (in Ewert's version of l. 1330), would understand that Frocin had been unburdening himself of the secret on a number of previous occasions?
14. See Bolelli, Due studi irlandesi, especially pp. 57-62, Eisner, The Tristan Legend..., pp. 65-70, Foulon, BBH, 1951-2, pp. 31-40, Giese, ZRP, LXV, pp. 493-506, Krappe, RF, LXV, pp. 95-9, Loomis, CL, II, pp. 289-306, Loth, Contributions à l'étude..., pp. 108-10, Newstead, RP, IX, p. 277, RP, XI, pp. 246-53.
15. See RP, XI, p. 251-2.
16. M°, p. IX.

highly unlikely.[17] By contrast, Giese would stress the influence of Ovid and the Midas story as it appears in the eleventh book of the Metamorphoses, and he would see Béroul as drawing directly upon Ovid.[18] He refines the point slightly when he suggests that, as well as knowing Ovid, Béroul also knew a Breton tale based upon Ovid.[19] Hofer similarly envisages a very close relationship between Béroul and Ovid, and he even seems to suggest the existence of direct textual borrowing.[20] Perhaps, as a general conclusion, we should not underestimate Béroul's ability when we seek to define his exact source for the story: his main source for the story may well have been a Breton tale, but he may have himself noted the equivalence of

---

17. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 156, note 3.
18. 'Die Frage nach der Quelle Bérols ist nicht schwer zu beantworten. Er hat offensichtlich Ovid, Metamorphosen XI benutzt, die Geschichte von dem sagenhaften König Midas' (ZRP, LXXV, p. 495). 'Dem französischen Dichter Bérol hat offenbar der lateinische Text des Ovid oder doch deren altfranzösische Übersetzung vorgelegen' (ZRP, LXXV, p. 502).
19. 'Der aus der französischen Bretagne stammende Dichter muss ausser Ovid eine auf dem Ovid-Text beruhende bretonische Saga gekannt haben' (ZRP, LXXV, p. 502).
20. 'Aus Ovids Metamorphosen stammt die Erzählung von König Midas, der nicht nur in der Gestalt des Königs Marke wiederkehrt, sondern in der Rolle des Zwerges die Begebenheit kopiert, die dort dem Barbier zugewiesen ist. Der Zwerg handelt genau so wie im lat. Gedicht der famulus. Er gräbt eine Grube und spricht in diese sein Geheimnis hinein. Nur hat der Zwerg die Barone zu Zeugen, bei Ovid plaudern die Gräser das Geheimnis aus. Vgl. für diesen Abschnitt des Motivs Ovid, Met. Midas, v. 182ff. mit Tristan v. 1330 Delivrement ont fait la fosse, Jusqu'as espaules l'i ont mis' (ZRP, LXV, pp. 278-9). But l. 1330 is more difficult to interpret than Hofer suspects: it is not certain that the line is not in need of emendation. Even if the line is accepted, there is no exact equivalence between B and the Latin text. The second influence Hofer tentatively suggests for this episode (ZRP, LXV, p. 261), the dwarf in Gaimar's Estoire des Engleis, seems rather remote.

that story with the Midas story as related by Ovid.[21]

The question now arises as to whether the author succeeds in welding this story, whatever its sources, to the rest of the romance. Foulon claims that the episode 'tranche, par son étrangeté, avec le roman d'amour'.[22] But yet he feels that an effort at integration has been made: 'Mais il m'apparaît que dans cet épisode, où la légende celtique a été insérée avec une certaine habileté par Béroul au milieu d'un ensemble qui n'avait pas été fait pour elle, nous avons vu les qualités du dramaturge et du psychologue.'[23] Certainly the killing of the dwarf is an integrating factor, for his death has long been anticipated. In ll. 879-80 he had been set aside from the general run of people who supported the lovers, and now, in ll. 1348-50, we have the same expression of the general will:

> Molt en fu bel a mainte gent
> Que haoient le nain Frocine
> Por Tristran et por la roïne.

The punishment meted out to Yvain had not really been severe, but now Frocin gets his anticipated deserts and one feels his death is inevitable.

---

21. Eisner has also examined the story (The Tristan Legend..., pp. 65-70). He takes the view that the horse's ears story had been loosely linked with the Tristan legend from the very beginning and that similar Irish tales are only derivatives of the story in the legend. He would oppose the contention that the story was attached to Mark, because of his name, when he was already well-established as a leading figure in the Tristan legend.
22. BPH, 1951-2, p. 32.
23. BPH, 1951-2, p. 40. This feeling is shared by Vàrvaro who writes: 'Egualmente palese è lo stacco al v. 1306, quando si lasciano gli amanti nel bosco e con passagio rapido ma netto si racconta l'episodio delle orecchie equine di Marc, chiaramente estraneo alla linea essenziale del racconto' (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 36). But on p. 44 of the same work he writes: 'Si noti che la reintegrazione nella organicità del racconto è sostanziale e non soltanto esteriore.' Ewert writes of the story that 'it is adapted by Beroul as well as such an incident could be to the narrative' (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 161-2).

The episode is therefore in harmony with what one has expected regarding Frocin in particular. Is it also in harmony with the general development of the romance? One minor point, the characteristic beginning to the episode, has previously been noted. Frocin was an enemy of the lovers, acted in association with the three main enemies, the wicked barons, and now he has met his death. So his death certainly illustrates one dominant theme, that the lovers' tribulations are in some measure paid for by their enemies' demise.[24] In this case it is Mark who gets rid of the lovers' enemy,[25] and this fits in with the dwarf's own fears (ll. 329-30) and, more especially, with what the poet reported of the king's state of mind (ll. 292-4). A long time has gone by since the first episode and the dwarf has somehow returned to court and to favour in the meantime, but by revealing Mark's secret the dwarf has surely broken faith with his lord, has rekindled the king's animosity and has provided an excuse for his removal from the scene, now that his work of villainy is done. The dwarf's reinstatement at court remained unexplained by Béroul. By engineering his death now, the poet is ensuring that Frocin does not endanger the logic of his narrative in future.

Also, of course, the episode is something of a relief: after a long period of misfortune something has occured which favours the lovers. Certainly the next episode will point out the lovers' critical situation, and, in particular, their critical spiritual situation.

---

24. In Ovid, it might be noted, it is the king who suffers, as a result of his stupidity.
25. Krappe suggests, following a study of an Irish parallel, that originally Tristan killed the dwarf: 'Die irische Parallele scheint mir ferner auch zu beweisen, dass der Zwerg ursprünglich von Tristan getötet worde, vielleicht wie Polonius im Hamlet' (RF, XLV, p. 99). The allusion in L'Escoufle (l. 616) might also be held to support the existence of a story, but probably a late variant, in which Tristan himself killed the dwarf.

9: THE FIRST MEETING WITH OGRIN

Apart from Béroul's version, the only other full account of this incident is to be found in Eilhart. It is not in R, nor in the texts directly derived from Thomas. There is indeed a period in G, S and E, when the lovers are in the forest, but they lead an idyllic existence in which notions of sin and repentance have no part to play.[1]

The atmosphere of this episode is markedly different from that of the preceding one. For a moment, the lovers and their perilous situation were no longer at the centre of the narrative and the dwarf's death indirectly improved their position. But the lovers' situation is once again of central concern in this episode, which creates the atmosphere that is to prevail during almost the whole of their residence in the Morrois.

In O, the corresponding episode has a different place in the structure of the romance.[2] The first hermit scene occurs a long

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 1351-1430; O, ll. 4702-4723; Fb ll. 462-3.
2. The first hermit episode certainly is in O, in spite of a certain vacillation in the mind of Bédier. In his reconstruction of the postulated lost source he writes: 'OB décrivent en plusieurs épisodes la vie des amants dans la forêt: l'un et l'autre rapportent deux visites à l'ermite Ogrin, qui excite les amants au repentir' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 256, variante e). This is quite correct, apart from the fact that only Tristan visits Ûgrîm in the first scene in O. But then, on p. 264, Bédier adds the comment: 'Faut-il attribuer aussi à Béroul l'invention de la première visite des amants à l'ermitage d'Ogrin? O ne donne pas cette scène; mais c'est peut-être une coupure dont il est responsable.' Delbouille (OCM, V, p. 423) noticed the inaccuracy of Bédier's second remark, but failed to note that it also contradicted a previous statement.

time after the arrival of the lovers in the forest, not at the very beginning of their life there. It occurs after Ûtant has joined them, after Tristan has 'invented' angling, and after Mark has been directed to the spot where the lovers are asleep in the forest. It comes immediately before the effect of the potion changes, in ll. 4724-33, and it is immediately after this that the lovers together seek out Ûgrîm. So, in the German version, the two hermit scenes are placed in deliberate contrast around one central point, the moment of the potion's change in effect. As has been suggested previously, there is every likelihood that Eilhart is preserving the 'authentic' order, relating events in their proper, expected sequence, for in B the Husdent episode does come remarkably late. One would surely expect the dog to join the lovers and Governal in the forest as soon as possible, as is the case in the German version, where Ûtant seems to escape on the very day the lovers themselves reach the forest.[3] Béroul has certainly re-arranged the pattern of events, the pattern he received from his source, and has rejected the logical order in favour of an order which expresses with greater clarity his own design for the story.[4]

Critics have commented on the respective order of events in B and O. Robson describes the first meeting between the lovers and Ogrin in B as 'premature'.[5] Kelemina feels the position of the first Ogrin episode is better in O than in B.[6] Murrell felt that Béroul had committed an error in placing the first hermit scene before the

---

3. It is only after Ûtant has joined them in O that the lovers and Kurnevâl penetrate deeper into the forest, and it is only in ll. 4518-4521 that there is mention of making a shelter for what must be their first night in the forest.
4. The allusions in Fb follow the sequence of events in B, not that in O. The reference to Ugrin comes between the recollection of Iseut's escape from the lepers and the reference to Husdent and his release.
5. 'The Technique of Symmetrical Composition...', p. 63.
6. See Geschichte der..., p. 65.

escape of Husdent, but suggested that the scene ought to come before the discovery of the lovers by the king.[7] Certainly one can regard the episode as premature, but such a judgment is based on a belief that the order of events in O, the logical sequence, is the only order with a raison d'être. Béroul seems clearly to have disregarded the order of his source when he set the first Ogrin episode at this point,[8] but there is every reason to suppose that the episode came at the right time according to his own criteria. Similarly, the order of events in O may only be thought superior to that of B, if the order in O is considered the only acceptable one and if every departure from this norm is an aberration. One can say that the episode ought to come after the Husdent episode, but only if an order with the logic of chronology is thought to be the only possible order. From Béroul's treatment of the life in the forest episodes it would certainly appear that he has a rather different design in mind. Ultimately, the question as to whether Béroul is reproducing the order of episodes in his source or has introduced a new order is irrelevant. The episode is at this point in the romance: the real problem is to define the part played by the episode in the surviving fragment.

The episode is only fully under way at l. 1367: ll. 1351-66 form an introductory passage which makes various points. There is firstly a recapitulatory section which recalls Tristan's leap and Governal's flight from the city. At this juncture, after l. 1356,

---

7. See 'Girart de Roussillon'..., p. 101.
8. For a contrary view, see Buschinger, Le 'Tristrant'..., I, pp. 469-71.

a lacuna has been postulated in the past, unnecessarily one would have thought.[9] There is admittedly a change of content, for now Béroul reminds the audience of the background against which the individual episode must be set:

> Or sont ensemble en la forest,
> Tristran de veneison les pest.
> Longuement sont en cel boschage:
> La ou la nuit ont herberjage,
> Si s'en t[r]estornent au matin. (ll. 1357-61)

The familiar themes of a life in the forest sequence occur: hunting for food, the long time they are together in the forest, the constant movement their exile entails. Then we find that the lovers have arrived at Ogrin's hermitage:

> En l'ermitage frere Ogrin
> Vindrent un jor, par aventure. (ll. 1362-3)

It is not the hero alone who confronts the hermit on this first occasion, as is the case in O, but both the hero and heroine. Also, in O, Tristan has deliberately sought out the hermit, wishing for bûze.

> Eines tages reit Tristrant
> dâ her den gûten man vant
> und wolde zû im bûze nemen. (ll. 4709-11)

In B they come across the hermitage purely by accident: presumably this is the place to which their constant wandering has brought the lovers, if not Governal, on this particular day.

The individual episode now seems under way, but it proves a false start, for once again the general background to the particular event is described:

> Aspre vie meine[n]t et dure:
> Tant s'entraiment de bone amor
> L'un por l'autre ne sent dolor. (ll. 1364-6)

---

9. Muret postulated a lacuna in all his editions, but the lacuna is rejected in Ewert and L[4].

We are reminded that although the lovers lead a life of considerable hardship, their love is such that it renders them immune to physical suffering. So, even within the body of the episode the background to the episode is described. The lovers will explain their behaviour and justify their powerlessness in the face of Ogrin's warnings by referring to the love of which we are reminded right at the beginning. The term bone amor in fact merits further comment. Béroul seems to regard the love of Tristan and Iseut as dual in aspect: it is both reprehensible and 'good', and it is the 'good' aspect of the love which will continue once the potion has abated (see l. 2327).

The hermit recognizes Tristan and takes the initiative in the discussion.[10] He mentions first of all that there is a price on Tristan's head, and that the nobles of the kingdom have solemnly pledged to surrender him, dead or alive. But the hermit is not chiefly concerned with the physical danger to which the hero is exposed, but with his spiritual danger:

> Ogrins li dit molt bonement:
> 'Par foi! Tristran, qui se repent,
> Deu du pechié li fait pardon,
> Par foi et par confession.' (ll. 1377-80)

In all the Muret editions, ll. 1379 and 1380 are interverted, but Ewert and M^4 follow the manuscript. Reid thought that Muret was possibly right in assuming that the scribe had interverted the lines,[11] but Ewert has supported the manuscript version,[12] and, indeed, it may well be best to retain the original order of lines. By way of reply, Tristan seeks to explain his situation:

---

10. The fact that Ogrin recognizes Tristan should not be over-emphasized. It may be a reflection of ll. 4702-5 of O: Ûgrîm is there presented as being a confessor to the king. But the detail in O may equally well be a later accretion and the detail in B a simple tag (see ll. 3713 and 4040).
11. See 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 54-5.
12. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 165

Tristran li dit: 'Sire, par foi,
Que ele m'aime en bone foi,
Vos n'entendez pas la raison:
Q'el m'aime, c'est par la poison.
Ge ne me pus de lié partir,
K'ele de moi, n'en quier mentir.' (ll. 1381-6)

Here, Tristan emphasizes that the potion has caused their love before going on to stress that he and Iseut find it impossible to separate.

In M^4, the text of ll. 1381-6 is identical with that of Ewert, but in the past Muret offered other versions of the first four lines, the most radically different being that of M^0:

Tristran li dit. 'Sire, par foi,
Se ele m'aime (en bone foi,
Vos n'entendez pas la raison),
S'el m'aime, c'est par la poison.

Reid supports the correction of Que ele in l. 1382 to Se ele and of Q'el in l. 1384 to S'el,[13] but the construction Que...c'est seems a perfectly normal one. On the other hand, Muret was almost certainly right to associate en bone foi in l. 1382 with the following line. It is difficult to see what aimer en bone foi might mean, and Tristan seems to be desperately emphasizing the sincerity of his claim. In his interpretation of the lines, Payen surely places too much weight on n'en quier mentir in l. 1386.[14] He sees in ll. 1385-6 an echo of the nature of the love potion as described in ll. 2279-99 of O, which claim that, as a result of drinking the potion, if the lovers were separated for more than a day they would die. N'en quier mentir would rather be an attempt by Tristan to stress that he cannot leave Iseut in these circumstances and would be a phrase of parallel significance to en bone foi in

---

13. The 'Tristran'..., p. 55
14. See Le Motif..., p. 341, note 24.

l. 1382. That the potion in B has in every detail the same nature as the potion in O is a difficult hypothesis to support. The nature of the potion in O is, one may suspect, over-complicated. There remains the problem of the identical rhyme of ll. 1381-2. At l. 1326 Ewert kept the manuscript reading par soi: it may be that there is in fact a need for this reading to be introduced here. Was there originally a contrast between par la raison in l. 1384 and par soi, 'of her own accord', in l. 1381?

Ogrin understands Tristan's position, but since the lovers are willy-nilly in a state of sin he can offer no comfort. For Ogrin, Tristan is an unrepentant sinner to whom he cannot grant absolution. He urges them to repent, quoting from the scriptures:

> Li hermites sovent lor dit
> Les profecies de l'escrit,
> Et molt lor rentoit sovent
> L'ermite lor delu[n]gement. (ll. 1395-8)

Muret had at first emended the manuscript reading lordelugement to le Dé jugement, until he accepted Jeanroy's interpretation for his 1927 edition.[15] Ewert glosses delungement as 'separation',[16] and in M[4], which follows Jeanroy, the word is translated by a paraphrase, 'leur devoir de s'éloigner l'un de l'autre'.[17] Blakey makes the valid point that editors now emend the manuscript and produce an unattested word. He suggests delugement, admitting that it also is a hapax, but goes on to propose delivrement, in the sense of 'deliverance from sin'.[18] Certainly the meaning he proposes is more acceptable than that suggested by editors: Ogrin is not merely requesting that the lovers should physically separate. But one

---

15. 'Il suffit, pour avoir un sens meilleur, de pourvoir l'u de son titulus et de lire lor delungement (c.-a.-d. deslongement). L'ermite rappelle aux amants que leur devoir est de se séparer l'un de l'autre' (Jeanroy, 'Quelques corrections...', p. 228).
16. Ewert, Volume I, p. 144. See also Ewert, Volume II, p. 165.
17. M[4], p. 161.
18. FS, XXX, pp. 133-4.

wonders if these are the only possible interpretations. Is there not the possibility that delungement might mean something akin to 'alienation from a state of grace','estrangement from God'? Under deloignier, T.-L. (II, 1346), following Godefroy (II, 608a), cites an example of the word in a religious context, 'vos estes mot deloigné par vostre péché de paradis'.[19]

All that Tristan can do is to re-affirm his love for Iseut, which is a compulsive thing about which he can do nothing and which makes material blessings quite irrelevant. His last words echo part of his first statement to Ogrin, 'Ge ne me pus de lié partir', but this decision is now couched in even more irrevocable and final terms:

> De lié laisier parler ne puis,
> Certes, quar faire ne le puis.' (ll. 1407-8)

How should this series of speeches between Tristan and Ogrin be regarded? Payen feels that the passage contains an 'étrange dialogue de sourds',[20] and Vinaver similarly sees an absence of genuine communication: 'Si leurs voix se parlent ainsi sans se répondre, c'est qu'il ne s'agit guère d'un échange de répliques, mais d'un texte à plusieurs voix qui évoluent simultanément, d'un ensemble sonore qui supplée à l'absence du dialogue proprement dit.'[21] But this point of view fails to convince. What is surely important is that the fact of the potion has reduced both Tristan and Ogrin not to non-communication but to total impotence. Tristan stresses his powerlessness: the hermit takes his point but can offer no comfort and must repeat his admonition. Tristan then can

---

19. 'Sermons écrits en dialecte poitevin', in Le Dialecte poitevin au XIIIe siècle, 1873.
20. Le motif..., p. 342.
21. CCM, XI, p. 6.

only reiterate his inability to act in any way differently.

Thus, while Tristan stresses his inability to leave Iseut, Ogrin emphasizes that his remaining with Iseut means that he is living in a state of sin. What attitude will Iseut herself present? Iseut, it will be remembered, does not appear at all in the corresponding scene in O. It may be that O offers an abbreviated version at this point: it does appear that a rather long conversation has been transformed into a much shorter passage of indirect speech, but there is no indication that the queen participated in the conversation, if it existed, in the source of O. So Iseut, perhaps to be regarded as an addition by Béroul to the scene, now presents her own plea.

She weeps at the hermit's feet, in a highly emotional state, begging for forgiveness and stressing the root cause of the situation; it is the potion which caused the love:

> 'Sire, por Deu omnipotent,
> Il ne m'ame pas, ne je lui,
> Fors par un herbé dont je bui,
> Et il en but; ce fu pechiez.
> Por ce nos a li rois chaciez.' (ll. 1412-16)

The passage merits careful consideration. What must we understand by pechiez, for example? Payen insists that the word means at this point 'malheur, dommage',[22] but Ewert is less confident: he glosses pechiez as 'sin' or 'misfortune' and adds a cautionary question mark.[23] In Payen's interpretation, the drinking of the potion would not be much more than an unfortunate mistake. But is the meaning 'sin' necessarily to be ruled out? Might not Iseut be claiming that drinking the potion resulted automatically in sin, that sin was its

---

22. Le Motif..., p. 342.
23. Ewert, Volume II, p. 165. Vinaver is similarly circumspect. In The Rise of Romance (p. 48), he writes that pechiez 'can mean either sin or misfortune, or possibly both'.

ineluctable consequence, with pechié having the sense it had when the hermit employed it? Frappier sees Iseut, in this confrontation with the hermit, as unexpectedly revealing the degree of anguish she is feeling.[24] Perhaps his surprise is unwarranted: her outburst follows hard upon the frank exchanges between Tristan and Ogrin in an episode which is intended above all to clarify the lovers' situation.

Iseut's plea is predictably unsuccessful. She can only elicit from the hermit the same uncompromising answer, even though kindly couched, that the only resort he can see is that God may somehow help them to repent:

> Li hermites tost li respont:
> 'Diva! cil Dex qui fist le mont,
> Il vos donst voire repentance!'
> Et saciez de voir, sanz dotance,
> Cele nuit jurent chiés l'ermite:
> Por eus esforça molt sa vite. (ll. 1417-22)

The tost of l. 1417 indicates that the tenor of the hermit's reply is inevitable. Adopting the only attitude that a confessor can take, Ogrin has to reiterate what has been stated rather more severely to Tristan. He is able to offer the lovers hospitality for one night, but seems to practise on their behalf some form of intensified self-mortification.[25]

The final passage, ll. 1423-30, marks the return to the basic situation, the movement away from the individual episode in the

---

24. RP, XXVI, pp. 220-1.
25. The meaning of l. 1422 may not be immediately clear. Ewert interprets the passage thus. '"He did violence to his way of living for their sake", i.e. "He put himself out for them"' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 165). Ewert does not define the nature of the hermit's sacrifice on the lovers' behalf but Payen writes: 'Mais Ogrin ne se contente pas de prier. Il va faire pénitence et redoubler d'austérité pour attirer sur les proscrits cette céleste clémence que leur méritera son propre martyre' (Le Motif..., p. 343). One could argue (as Ewert implies?) that granting an adulterous couple hospitality for one night is a violent enough disturbance in the life of any hermit, but Payen's interpretation is surely the correct one.

foreground to those features which form a permanent background for the lovers' existence in the Morrois. The same themes return, hunting, the avoidance of open territory, hunger and the necessity for constant movement. These are the constant physical constraints which the lovers must endure and which are becoming familiar. But, as a result of this episode, we are aware that the lovers are subject to another kind of pressure.

Ogrin has indicated to the lovers the dangerous spiritual situation in which they find themselves. Tristan has pointed to the potion as the cause of their situation, as has Iseut in an emotional outburst which reflected her extreme distress. But Ogrin can do nothing to help, and the lovers are powerless to help themselves for they are under the control of the philtre. The question of the lovers' guilt, perhaps deliberately kept in the background in previous episodes, is now fully explored, in an episode which was almost certainly advanced by Béroul to the key position it now holds. The lovers will spend their time in the Morrois, so we now know, aware that they have been urged to abandon sin, desirous to repent but unable to do so, and constantly afraid of discovery, death and eternal damnation.

10: TRISTAN THE FUGITIVE

The next incident in the romance hardly qualifies for consideration as a full episode, but it is convenient to treat it as such. We are concerned with ll. 1431-6:

> Seignors, oiez con por Tristran
> Out fait li rois crïer son ban-
> En Cornoualle n'a parroise
> Ou la novele n'en angoise-
> Que, qui porroit Tristran trover,
> Qu'il en feïst le cri lever.

King Mark has issued a proclamation against the fugitive Tristan and the news arouses extreme consternation throughout the whole of Cornwall, for the people are now obviously beset by conflicting loyalties.[1] This is not the first pronouncement of this nature. In an attempt to deter Tristan from setting off on an immediate, desperate bid to save Iseut, Governal had told him that Mark had issued an order to the people of the city: he had instructed them to take the hero captive, if the opportunity arose, and had threatened punishment for those who failed to comply (ll. 1030-8). The same theme returned in ll. 1370-6, where the hermit told Tristan that an oath had been sworn to the king by barons in the whole of Cornwall, and they had promised to surrender Tristan: a

---

1. As in the Muret editions, the passage is punctuated differently in M^4:

> Seignors, oiez con por Tristran
> Out fait li rois crïer son ban!
> En Cornoualle n'a parroise
> Ou la novelle (sic) n'an angoise
> Que, qui porroit Tristran trover,
> Qu'il en feïst le cri lever.

It is certainly possible that que in l. 1435 explains novele rather than ban.

reward had also been offered. Even though in this second instance the scope of the order has been extended, perhaps we can accept that in B both Governal and Ogrin were referring to the same pronouncement by King Mark. This second passage has affinities with ll. 4340-9 of O, where after the rescue of Iseut from the lepers the king issues a number of orders:

> wie der koning dô gesprêche,
> daz mag ûch allin habin wundir.
> her bat sie abir alle besundir
> man unde mâge
> daz sie im woldin lâgen:
> 'swer in nû begriffe
> daz ich an ime reche
> daz grôze leit daz her mir tût,
> mit deme wil ich al mîn gût
> î mêre teilen.' 2

On its third appearance in B, the theme is expressed in roughly the same terms as before. The proclamation covers the whole of Cornwall and all are told to raise a hue and cry, a point mentioned by Governal in the first passage. But this is certainly the only passage to record the general dismay that follows upon the proclamation, and, furthermore, it is Béroul who has intervened personally on this occasion and who has told or reminded his audience that Tristan is a fugitive from justice. (Must it be understood that Iseut also is included in the proclamation, even though she is not expressly mentioned and it is possible that Mark has no knowledge of her escape from the lepers?) The author's intervention does not provide crucial new information, necessary for the understanding of what follows, but do we need to join Ewert in seeing the passage as

---

2. In R, Mark later retrieves Iseut from the forest after four shepherds have innocently betrayed her whereabouts to the king. Mark then issues a formal proclamation, promising a reward to anyone who would rid the land of Tristan (see Bédier, Volume II, p. 363-4, Curtis II, § 554-5, Fedrick, p. A384, Johnson, pp. 98-9, Lüseth, § 53). On the text of O 4340-1, see Buschinger, Eilhart von Oberg, Tristrant, pp. 341-3.

a possible interpolation?[3] It is true that the passage might be dispensed with, but before disregarding it altogether one must first try to assess the role played by the passage at this stage in the romance.

We know already that the lovers are living in fear of capture, for their constant movement to avoid detection is a recurrent theme of the life in the forest passages, and this restatement of their situation increases our awareness of the pressures under which the lovers must henceforth attempt to survive. We know now that the lovers (if we include Iseut) are fugitives from the law and that it is the duty of all those living within the law, wherever their personal sympathies may lie, to aid in their capture.

This reiteration of the danger to which the lovers are constantly exposed is surely effectively placed, for it comes immediately before the Husdent episode. In the next episode, the fear expressed by the lovers is precisely that the dog will lead their enemies to their hiding-place and that detection and capture will result. This same fear of detection nearly persuades Tristan to eliminate the dog soon after its arrival in the forest. But, while colouring our reaction to events in the next episode, this passage also reinforces the effect of the previous episode. The lovers, so the hermit told them, are transgressors of the law of God. Through the king's proclamation, we come to realize fully the danger the lovers run of discovery before they are able to repent.

---

3. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 166.

11: THE RELEASE AND TRAINING OF HUSDENT

We have treated ll. 1431-6 as an independent episode. These lines might well have been included in this episode; the apostrophe Seignors, that we find in l. 1431, is an important rubric to more than one of the ensuing episodes. In ll. 1437-9, however, there is another call upon the audience, of a more particularized nature, so our division of the text can in part be justified.[1] In truth, the question of the division of the text is not a problem: what must be emphasized is that the content of ll. 1431-6, the reminder that Tristan is a fugitive from the law, is at once the reason for the release of the dog and for his retraining.[2]

Another matter which has been mentioned before, the position of the episode in B, must now be discussed at greater length. It would appear that Béroul deliberately changed the order of episodes that he found in his source, a conclusion suggested primarily by a study of the position of this particular episode.

At what moment in time is this taking place in B? One must have the initial impression that a quite lengthy period has elapsed since the day that the lovers escaped. This impression is induced above all by the life in the forest passages, which describe the

---

1. A similar pattern for the beginning of an episode may be discerned in the passage beginning at l. 1637. There is a call on the audience, Seignors, in l. 1637, and then a later call, Oiez, in l. 1658.
2. Texts employed: B, ll. 1437-1636: O, ll. 4368-4501; S, chapter LXIV; E, stanza CCCXXV; G, ll. 17242-60; R, Bédier, Volume II, p. 362, Curtis II, § 553, Fedrick, pp. A381-A382, Johnson, pp. 97-8, Löseth, § 52, LS BN, f.fr. 104, 81 r°b - 81 v°a, LS BN, f. fr. 756, 80 v°b - 81 r°a; Fb, ll. 484-92; Fc, ll. 873-6.

normal, regular pattern of the lovers' existence, the background against which the episodes of the foreground must be set. The passage of time is surely indicated by lines such as 1305, 'Longuement sont en cel desert', and 1430, 'Sol une nuit sont en un leu'. It is true that such lines do not necessarily refer to a past which has already elapsed, for they may embrace as well a future which is marked by the same general features. But the passages describe a regular, but not unchanging background, since the individual episodes of the foreground modify their content as the romance develops. The outlawing of the lovers and their increased fear of discovery becomes a constant feature of their lives, and so the substance of ll. 1431-6 is incorporated into a later background passage (ll. 1639-43). The foreground episodes themselves convey the impression that a fair length of time has elapsed; at the beginning of the hermit scene we read:

> En l'ermitage frere Ogrin
> Vindrent un jor, par aventure. (ll. 1362-3)

Un jor, one day among many of a regular pattern, this is surely the impression given to the audience.

But one's growing conviction that a fair amount of time has elapsed from the moment of the escape of the lovers to the moment of the escape of Husdent is somewhat shaken when the Husdent episode itself is read, for the text implies that a much shorter time has gone by. It is indeed a necessary prerequisite for the action that a short time only should have elapsed, since Tristan's scent must still be relatively fresh, indeed hot, if the dog is to follow it. In Fb, there is an indication that the dog is tied up for three days:

Queles! (qu'est) Husdent devenu?
Qant cil l'orent trois jorz tenu,
Ainz ne vost boivre ne mangier;
Por moi se voloit enragier.
Donc abatirent au brechet
Lo bel lïen o tot l'uisset. (ll. 486-91)

Even if we must accept that Fb was written under the direct influence of B, by the time the reader comes upon the Husdent episode he may easily have formed the assumption that rather longer than three days have gone by since the lovers' escape. Bédier claimed that the Husdent episode is set in B 'quelques jours après le départ de Tristan',[3] but the text itself gives no such indication.[4]

In the parallel episode in O, evidence points to the fact that the dog escapes the very same day that the lovers flee together into the forest. The episode occurs after the one surviving leper has informed the king of the successful ambush by Tristan and after the knights have sought in vain to capture him. Tristan's favourite hunting-dog is tied up and through its barking arouses the attention of the king. On being told that the dog belonged to Tristan, Mark orders the dog to be killed. But the squire disobeys Mark, and -- quite rightly, so the author tells us -- lets the dog run free:

he gedâchte daz he wolde
sich des landes eir getrôstin
eir wen he den hunt irlôste
sînes lîbes: um die scholt,
wen he was Tristrande holt.
den bracken he dô loufin lîz.
daz in der koning tûn hîz,
daz wart von im nicht getân;
he tet rechte wol dar an
daz her den bracken liez leben. (ll. 4390-99)

Ôtant follows the route taken by Tristan into the dark forest, where

---

3. Bédier, Volume II, p. 255, variante d.
4. Hoepffner also wondered what was the source of Bédier's claim (ZRP, XXXIX, p. 65, note 1). Nevertheless, Hoepffner accepts that the Husdent episode in B takes place a few days after the lovers' escape, and in support he quotes the three-day interval in Fb.

eventually Tristan hears him. The hero's immediate reaction is to presume that the dog is being used to track them down and he prepares to sell his life dear. Kurnevâl proposes a different course of action: he alone will stay and face those who are presumed to be following them, and he is prepared to kill the dog and surrender his life in order to save Tristan and the queen:

> sînen hêren her dô bat
> daz her balde hin weg rete
> und die vrauwen vûrte mete
> daz sie behielten daz leben.
> "ich wil alhie ûf geben
> mînen lîp mit êren." (ll. 4442-7)

So Kurnevâl is left to wait for the enemy, but he is soon overjoyed to find the dog is alone, and with the dog he follows after the couple. The now silent dog renders a service almost immediately, for Kurnevâl has to use Ûtant to pick up the track of the lovers: soon he has rejoined them.

There are no major episodes intervening in O between the rescue of the queen from the lepers and the escape of the dog. The first Ogrin scene comes much later and the Horse's Ears episode is unique to B. It does seem that in O the dog has joined the lovers on the very first day of their flight: they only seem to pause for the night at l. 4515, after spending the day riding deeper into the forest.[5]

Thus, on the evidence of the minor contradictions which emerge from a study of B itself and on the evidence supplied by O, one is led to reiterate the conclusion that Béroul has rearranged the order of episodes he found in his source and that the Husdent episode has been held over. It has been held over deliberately, in order that

---

5. The day of l. 4506, 'und retin allen den tach', can only be the very first day. Bédier rightly claims that in O 'l'épisode du chien Husdent se place le jour même de la fuite de Tristan' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 255, variante d).

the first Ogrin episode could be placed at the head of the Morrois episodes, where its position reflects the importance, in Béroul's thinking, of its theme. As we have seen, the nature of the lovers' answerability to God, their non-responsibility notwithstanding, was made clear by Ogrin: while they live together in the forest, they are not only in danger of physical death, but also in danger of spiritual death. The first Ogrin episode was so crucial to Béroul's conception of the story that he re-ordered the episodes and relegated the telling of the Husdent story to a later, if chronologically less plausible stage in the romance.

The Husdent episode in B falls into two parts. In the first part, ll. 1437-1548, interest is centred on the dog's attachment to Tristan, his consequent release and success in promptly finding his master. The second part runs from l. 1549 to l. 1639. The dog is overjoyed at being reunited with his master, but such joy is tempered with apprehension on the part of the lovers: the presence of the dog could betray their whereabouts to their enemies. But such danger is precluded when the dog has been trained to hunt without giving tongue, an accomplishment which turns out to be a handsome boon.[6]

At the beginning of the first part, the author invites the audience to listen to his story. He will talk about a dog named Husdent whose exceptional keenness is described in ll. 1440-4, lines

---

6. In R, Governal is sent by Tristan to retrieve his horse, Passebroil, and his dog, Hudene, from Mark: Mark calmly agrees to his request. In G (ll. 16646-50), the dog Hudain has come with the lovers when they are first exiled. In E (stanza CCXXV), both Hodain and Petitcrowe are with the lovers, but this may well be an error. S does not name the dog at this point (chapter LXIV). Only in P and, to a lesser extent, in O, do we have an account of the release of the dog and his search for his master.

which contain a large amount of repetition. It may be that Béroul recast lines from his source rather carelessly at this point, as Ewert suggests,[7] or perhaps a series of scribal corruptions has led to the present state of the manuscript. The dog is in a keep, tied up en un landon,[8] and in the absence of his master he is agitated and refuses to eat. People are generally sympathetic towards the dog; in certain details the speech in ll. 1454-66 echoes the previous descriptive passage.[9] Everyone urges the king to free the dog, and Mark inwardly agrees that the dog has good cause to grieve as it does for such a master as Tristan.

It is three barons who finally persuade Mark to release the dog. Are these three barons the three wicked barons even though, exactly as we saw with the three barons in the Horse's Ears episode, no precise identification is made? After the people have together expressed their pity for the dog and urged his release for fear he goes mad (l. 1456), three particular barons address the king and secure the dog's freedom. They present their motives for having the dog released as pity once again and a degree of intellectual curiosity:

> 'Sire, quar deslïez Husdant!
> Si verron bien certainement
> Se il meine ceste dolor
> Por la pitié de son seignor;
> Quar ja si tost n'ert deslïez
> Q'il ne morde, s'est enragiez,
> Ou autre rien ou beste ou gent:
> S'avra la langue overte au vent.' (ll. 1475-82)

---

7. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 168.
8. Landon (l. 1445) is described by Ewert as 'a clog, or stick fastened across the neck of an animal to prevent it from straying' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 168). As in Fb (l. 491), the form of check upon the dog is described as a lïen in l. 1508. Landon appears also in ll. 1455 and 1466, and again at l. 2724, but this last line may be in need of emendation. The meaning of landon has been discussed by Tobler (ZRP, XXX, p. 742).
9. Note, for example, the parallels between ll. 1464 and 1449, 1458 and 1442.

But probably those three barons have perceived what other normal, kindly people have not perceived: if Husdent is in fact not mad, he may well furnish decisive proof that he is pining for his master by eventually leading them to him; this is surely implied in ll. 1476-8. The dog's release is thus envisaged by them as a potential threat to Tristan. These three barons are, therefore, best looked upon as the lovers' enemies.

Certainly, most of those who are watching the dog do not have malice and the possibility of catching Tristan in mind when Husdent evinces no sign of madness and goes straight to his master's lodgings:

> De la sale s'en ist par l'us,
> Vint a l'ostel ou il soloit
> Trover Tristran; li rois le voit,
> Et li autre qui a ŕés vont.
> Li chiens escrie, sovent gront,
> Molt par demeine grant dolor.
> Encontré a de son seignor:
> Onques Tristran ne fist un pas,
> Qant il fu pris, qu'il dut estre ars,
> Que li bracnez nen aut agrés;
> Et dit chascun de venir mes.
> Husdant en la chambre est mis
> O Tristran fu traît et (a)pris. (ll. 1492-1504)

Husdent is disappointed not to find his master and momentarily begins to pine once more for Tristan (ll. 1496-7). There is no question so far of the dog following his master's scent: he has simply gone to where he expects to find him.[10] As the text stands, l. 1498 must mean that the dog has found the scent, but the line itself must be regarded as dubious.[11] If, in fact, the dog has

---

10. Ewert's summary is almost certainly wrong: 'He runs to Tristran's lodging,] following his master's steps' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 166).
11. Muret showed dissatisfaction with the line in his first CFMA edition where he printed 'En queste va de son seignor'. Perhaps he was aware that it was out of place for the dog to catch the scent at this point?

found the scent, his grief makes no sense. The next lines, 1499-1501, may well describe what those following the dog said to themselves when they came to this apparent dead end.[12] The dog is then put in the royal bedchamber where Tristan was captured; as l. 1503 indicates, the dog does not follow a scent which leads to the room, he has to be placed in the room. It is only after this that the dog apparently picks up the scent and noisily follows Tristan's progress, to the chapel, down the cliff and then to the forest. As the dog sets off into the forest (l. 1521), the pity of the people in general is recorded. We then read:

> Au roi diënt li chevalier:
> 'Laison a seurre cest tra(a)llier:
> En tel leu nos porroit mener
> D[o]nt griés seroit le retorner.'[13]

Li chevalier are surely once again the three felons, those who have the ear of the king (see ll. 1473-4). Although it would seem that everyone falls in with the recommendation not to go any further, the craven reason for giving up the search, the difficulty of return, only makes proper sense if it is put forward by the three barons.[14] The logic of Béroul's narrative might be queried. Béroul has sought to engineer the reunion of the lovers and the dog. With this end in view, he has had Husdent's release brought about by the three barons who hope that the dog will lead them to his master. But, when their goal is almost in sight, the three felons then turn tail: fearing

---

12. Ewert discusses l. 1994 and refers to it as 'being in form a reflection of the poet's, but by implication attributed to the king as the consideration which stayed his arm' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 43). It may be that in ll. 1499-1501 we have a somewhat similar instance, ostensibly a reflection of the poet's, but in reality the expression of the spoken or unspoken thoughts of the people.
13. B 1523-6. Ewert discusses the word tra(a)llier in his second volume (pp. 169-70), corrects his text to traallier and suggests the meaning 'hound'.
14. For a refusal to identify the three barons mentioned here with the three wicked barons, see Buschinger, Le 'Tristrant'..., I, p. 375, and Varvaro, Il 'roman de Tristran'..., pp. 150-1.

for their own lives if they do encounter Tristan face-to-face, they now see the release of the dog not as a threat to the hero but as a threat to themselves.

In this connection it might be noted that a certain squire appears only once in the episode:

> Li rois apele un escuier
> Por Husdan faire deslier. (ll. 1483-4)

It will be remembered that in O a squire plays a much larger role, inwardly expressing sympathy for the dog, defying the king's orders and letting Ûtant run free. There is, therefore, the possibility that the escuier of l. 1483 is a pale reflection of a rather more substantial figure in the source of B, which the three barons have partly replaced.[15]

Abandoned by the knights, the dog continues on its way alone, barking as it goes. Tristan, with the queen and Governal, realizes it is Husdent that is approaching: they are all overcome by fear, believing that the king is using the dog to track them down.[16] Their reaction is perfectly understandable: a price has been placed on their heads, so Ogrin informed them, and naturally their fear of discovery is uppermost in their minds. We can understand their reaction all the more readily since the fact that they are fugitives from the law has been deliberately reiterated by the author just before the episode got under way. But their fear is unwarranted: although it is not expressly stated, they are led to understand

---

15. In Fb, ll. 490-1, the allusion to this episode does not say exactly who released the dog.
16. Lines 4408-11 of O describe a similar reaction:

> 'hôre, waz moge wir nû tûn?
> nû mûze wir schiere tôd sîn,
> wen ich hôre den brackin mîn.
> dâ mit sport man uns nâ.

that there is no immediate danger and the dog manifests his joy to all and sundry.

The second part of the episode runs from l. 1549 to l. 1636, and its main substance is the training of Husdent to hunt silently. At first it seems unlikely that this will happen, for Tristan feels that he must put the dog to death lest he betray them through his barking:

> Asez est mex qu'il soit ocis
> Que nos soion par son cri pris. (ll. 1563-4)

When Iseut's advice is sought, she suggests with characteristic resourcefulness that perhaps Tristan could attempt to train the dog to hunt without barking, following the example of a certain Welsh forester. Tristan agrees to try:

> Pesera moi se je l'oci,
> Et je criem molt du chien le cri;
> Quar je porroie en tel leu estre,
> O vos ou Governal mon mestre,
> Se il criout, feroit nos prendre.
> Or vuel peine metre et entendre
> A beste prendre sanz crier.' (ll. 1599-1605)

Tristan then begins to train the dog and succeeds within the month.

The major problems of this second part of the episode are textual, for on occasion the syntax appears to be more than usually tortuous and there are a number of technical terms which require elucidation.[17] A problem of a different kind presents itself when we examine the other versions of the story. Do other texts tell us that the dog is trained to hunt silently? Why is the dog so trained in the other versions?

---

17. See Ebert, Volume II, pp. 171-2 and Appendix III of this thesis.

In the French Prose Romance, circumstances are rather different. The dog is not released by a squire, nor does he have to track the lovers down, for Governal is sent to Mark in Norholt in order to bring back the horse and dog. Mark grants the request at once, for it is Mark who is afraid of Tristan at this stage in R: 'Il a doutance et paor qe Tristan ne li porchace mal de tout son poer.'[18] Yet Tristan apparently trains the dog to hunt silently, afraid lest Mark should surprise them once the dog had betrayed their whereabouts:

Tristan prent de la venoison tant com il puet, et por ce qe il ne voloit pas qe li rois Marc li seüst, q'il ne le feüst agaitier et sorprendre par aucune traison, aprist il et duit Hudene son brachet, qi chacoit sa beste sanz glaitir et l'amenoit jusquez a prise qe ja ne sera oïz.[19]

A mutual fear could exist between Mark and Tristan, the fugitive in the forest, but one might suggest that material drawn straight from the source of R seems out of place in the changed circumstances.

Similar problems emerge from a study of the derivatives of T. In both S and E the dog is certainly trained to hunt, but there is no claim that the dog is trained to hunt silently. In G (ll. 17254-60), however, the dog does acquire the same skill as in B, and Fo (ll. 873-4) likewise mentions his ability to catch his prey without yielding to the temptation to bark. Certainly there is no desperate necessity in T for the dog to hunt without betraying the location of the lovers: they have accepted their exile and they are not in constant fear of recapture. But presumably the ability to hunt in silence does increase the overall efficiency of the dog, as it did in B for the dog of the Welsh forester, and it may be that G and Fo

---

18. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 80 v°b.
19. MS BN, f.fr. 756, 81 r°a. In 104 (81 v°a), no explicit mention of silent hunting is made: 'Tristan prit Hudent, si l'aprit a chacier pour ce qu'il ne fust gaitiez en aucune menire del roi Marht.'

reproduce the version of T and that S and E have misunderstood or truncated their source.

In the final analysis, however, it may well be wrong to seek a logical explanation as to why the dog is trained to hunt silently in R and in G (and in T). We may have to accept that hunting silently is unnecessary and out of place in R and G, but that the writers have either felt forced to reproduce an obviously well-known feature or have been themselves reluctant to altogether abandon such an appealing story.[20]

Bédier suggests, and then refutes his own suggestion, that G was following the version of Eilhart.[21] In fact, a study of O reveals no clear intimation that the dog was taught to hunt without barking,[22] but there are certain signs which indicate that the author knew of the story and eliminated it. Once Ûtant has found Kurnevâl, the dog becomes silent before he tracks down the lovers who have gone on ahead:

> den vorswêgetin hunt
> Kurnevâl dar nedir lîz:
> al sîgende ner in îsen hîz,
> wâ sîn hêre hin wêre. (ll. 4484-7)

---

20. In a review of Grüdinger's book, Hiudan und Petitcreiu, Buschinger expresses the view that Gottfried was simply following his source and that the silent hunting represents a 'blindes Motiv' (CCM, XIV, p. 378). If, as seems likely, the motif was already in T, it is the Anglo-Norman poet who first preserved the 'superfluous' detail.
21. 'G est seul à dire que Tristan l'avait dressé à chasser à la muette, et il est possible qu'il ait pris ce récit à Eilhart: il est plus probable pourtant que Thomas avait conservé cette donnée, qui aura été mal comprise par le poète anglais et par frère Robert, peu expert aux choses de la chasse' (Bédier, Volume I, p. 238, note 2).
22. 'Si dans les deux cas son arrivée imprévue et bruyante provoque la crainte des fugitifs, du moins c'est seulement chez Eilhart que le chien est emmené sans que se pose le problème des abois' (Jonin, Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 26-7). This may not be quite true, but Bédier's summary of events in O is much less accurate: 'Husdent les rejoint, Tristan veut le tuer: mais il se décide à essayer de lui apprendre à chasser sans aboyer' (Bédier, Volume II, p. 255, variante d).

Then, in ll. 4541-5, the author claims that Tristan was the first man to teach dogs to hunt wild animals:[23]

> ouch hôrte ich sagen mêre,
> daz he der êrste wêre
> der daz erdêchte,
> wie man bracken brêchte
> ûf wildes verte.

So it may be that O has abbreviated the story.[24] Finally, the allusion in L'Escoufle suggests the existence of a story in which the dog hunted silently, even if it does not confirm that the dog was trained by Tristan to hunt silently:

> Defors, entor, sor le noiel,
> Estoit entaillés a esmaus
> Tristans et maistre Govrenaus
> Et Yseus et ses chiens Hudains,
> Comment il les prendoit les daims
> Et les cers sans noise et sans cris. (ll. 568-93)

To return to B, there is no doubt whatsoever that the second part of the Husdent episode concentrates upon the training of the dog to hunt silently. But what is the importance of the episode taken as a hole? One must obviously mention first of all that in the episode the author skilfully tells an interesting story. Bik describes the episode as a 'sorte d'anecdote où Béroul déploie toute sa verve de conteur'.[25] But does the use of the term anecdote and conteur imply that the episode, whatever its individual merits, is hardly integrated into the rest of the romance? In the same article, Bik confirms one's suspicions for she claims that the episode 'fait l'impression d'avoir été introduit un peu au hasard

---

23. But Muret correctly points out, following Knieschek, that there is no equivalent to ll. 4541-5 in the Czech translation (see Rom., XVI, pp. 336-7 and ZDaDL, XVI, p. 318).
24. Whitehead thinks Eilhart knew a story where Tristan trained the dog to hunt silently ('The Early Tristan Poems', p. 139, note 1) and Buschinger suggests that the German author omitted the feature (CC, XIV, p. 380, note 2).
25. Neophil., LVI, p. 32. Frappier refers to 'l'histoire du chien fidèle, Husdent, si bien contée par Béroul' (CCM, VI, p. 260, note 47).

dans cette partie de l'histoire'.[26] Admittedly, Béroul's probable distortion of the order of episodes in his source rules any kind of complete integration, such as we get in C, quite out of the question: the 'careless' positioning of the Husdent episode has its source in the careful repositioning of the Ogrin scene. But this is not to say that the episode has no effect at all on the basic situation of the lovers in the forest. At the beginning of the episode we know they are on the run, beyond the pale of normal society. In their encounter with Ogrin they were told, moreover, that they were in extreme spiritual danger as well. The arrival of Husdent increased the danger of detection and capture, for a dog which barks is of no help to outlaws.

> Chien qi en bois ne se tient mu
> N'a mestier a home banni. (ll. 1552-3)

But Iseut persuades Tristan to train the dog and so Husdent no longer constitutes a threat. In deliberate contrast to ll. 1552-3, the poet then writes:

> Or lor a grant mestier li chiens
> A mervelles lor fait grans biens. (ll. 1627-8)

The dog will not only not betray the lovers now but will also contribute positively to their survival. But of course the danger of being discovered and of all that such discovery would entail remains, hence the timely reminder in ll. 1637-48, part of the

---

26. Neophil., LVI, p. 36. Gnädinger considers that as a result of the amplification of basic material 'die Husdent-Episode innerhalb des béroulschen Erzählganzen zwar nicht zusammenhanglos, aber beinahe isoliert wird' (Hiudan und Isoldereiu, p. 73).

introduction to the next episode. This is not to say that there is nothing of lasting significance to be extracted from the episode. Ewert quite rightly points out that what excites the poet's admiration is the dog's noble nature,[27] and, as we have seen, Mark is made to acknowledge in ll. 1467-72 that, in pining for the absent Tristan, Husdent's nobility finds its correct expression. The nobility of the dog and his loyalty to his master remind us of Tristan's essential nobility of character.[28]

---

27. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 171.
28. See the interesting note by Frappier, CCM, VI, p. 269, note 50.

12: THE 'RICH' BARON' EPISODE

The next episode, which runs from l. 1637 to l. 1750, describes the killing by Governal of one of the lovers' enemies, and it has only very distant analogues in other versions of the Tristan story.

The episode begins characteristically enough with another evocation of the hard life the lovers lead in the forest. We are led to appreciate that if the training of Husdent to hunt silently has brought some small improvement in the lovers' circumstances, their basic situation is unchanged. They suffer physical deprivation, they are forced to be constantly on the move and to live entirely on the wild game they manage to kill. New to these life in the forest passages, but a detail which is completely expected, is the terse judgement by Tristan that a proclamation has gone out for his arrest. Then, at l. 1649, a new section of the introductory passage begins, as we hear more of the lovers' attitudes during their hard period of exile in the forest. It is accepted now that the end of l. 1650 should read ne sent mal, in accordance with the manuscript, and that the general meaning of ll. 1649-50 is that although they must endure hardship they yet feel no unhappiness. But the link between ll. 1649-50 and what follows, the meaning or acceptability of ber in l. 1650, and the meaning of ll. 1651-55 are points about which critics are very much divided (the main arguments are revised in the third appendix).

At l. 1656 the episode begins to get under way. Appearances are that we are concerned with one of the three barons who caused the lovers to be unmasked. Then there is a brief statement in ll. 1661-7

to the effect that the people of Cornwall are afraid of entering the forest in case they are caught by Tristan. Such brief summaries of the general situation within the body of an episode are not unknown elsewhere in Béroul's text. These particular lines are clearly meant to indicate that the fate of one foolhardy hunter amply confirms the wisdom of avoiding the Morrois. The baron's future assassin, Governal, is then presented: he is somewhere in the forest with his horse, whilst the lovers are presented as being asleep together in the bower (ll. 1673-7). In the Separating Sword episode the action will be centred upon the sleeping lovers, whilst Governal will be absent and will only learn later what has happened (ll. 1831-4). Here, by contrast, it is Governal who is at the centre of the action and who will be able to inform the lovers that one of their enemies has been eliminated.

The main action of the episode starts at l. 1679. Governal hears dogs and then sees his lord's enemy coming alone. The enemy is frantically urging on his horse, so much so that the horse stumbles. In the manuscript l. 1693 has <u>soz .i. arbre</u>. Although all editors correct to <u>sor un marbre</u>, this is not altogether happy, for would one really expect to find a block of marble in such surroundings as these? Meanwhile, Governal leans against a tree, presumably relaxed and anticipating the confrontation with no small pleasure. At the right moment, he leaps from his hiding-place and decapitates the enemy baron, to the immediate consternation of the huntsmen and to the later consternation of all the men of Cornwall, who from that time on fight shy of hunting in the Morrois for fear of encountering Tristan. The narrative switches to the bower at l. 1729. Governal has returned and has hung up the head. Presumably his return has disturbed Tristan,

for the hero now wakes up, only to start in fright when he sees the head. However, in response to Tristan's cry, Covernal is soon able to reassure him. The episode closes with a brief reiteration of the point made in ll. 1719-28, that the people are now so afraid of entering the forest that the lovers have it all to themselves.

The episode is to be found only in Béroul's version of the legend. This is not the first episode to be encountered which is unique to Béroul, for the Horse's Ears episode similarly had no direct analogues. Attempts had frequently been made to deduce the origins of that episode and critics have likewise tried to ascertain the possible sources and possible influences of this one. This time the enquiry involves not an excursion into folklore but speculation as to how the material of the extant versions may have developed.

In 1897, Wilhelm Rüttiger suggested that the riche baron episode in B was a recasting of the story of Husdent's escape as related in O:

> So gewinnt es fast den Anschein, als sei diese Episode eine Umformung der ursprünglichen Husdentepisode, wie sie uns Eilhart erzählt. Dass diese Umformung, wie überhaupt die von Eilharts Überlieferung des Waldlebens, Berols Werk sind, scheint auch daraus hervorzugehen, dass die andern Versionen diese Episoden in der Berol eigentümlichen Form nicht kennen.[1]

Furthermore, Rüttiger pointed out that in R there is an incident similar to that recounted in the episode in B: 'Zunächst haben wir eine Vorwegnahme des Waldlebens Tristans -- ein beliebtes Motiv in R. -- Tristan tötet einen Ritter von Cornwall, wie Guvernal bei B. den jagenden Feind Tristans erschlägt.'[2]

Muret was the first to react to Rüttiger's suggestions. In the introduction to the SATF edition (pp. X-XII), he reviews the theory

---

1. Der heutige Stand..., p. 23.
2. Der heutige Stand..., p. 31. There are versions of the episode in R in Curtis II, §§515-517, Johnson, pp. 70-2 and in Löseth, §46.

that the situation related by Eilhart could easily have given rise to the invention of the murder of the enemy. Muret acknowledges the parallels between the passages in O and B, but he refuses to believe that the episode was a relatively recent invention because of its barbarous nature. He thinks that the episode, on account of the parallels in the final episode of the Béroul fragment, was a commonplace of the older versions of the Tristan legend. But barbarity is not automatically a sign of the age of the episode: authors can deliberately seek to create an archaic atmosphere.[3] In 1907, Golther similarly noted the parallel with Eilhart which Rüttiger has indicated: he also noted the parallel with events in the last episode of the fragment.[4] Bédier also had his say on the subject, and he shows at this point rather greater subtlety than elsewhere in envisaging the way in which the roman primitif might be reconstructed; he accepts it as a possibility that three of the main versions independently decided to suppress the episode and that the episode might have been in the common source of B, O, R, T, and Fb.[5]

Rüttiger put forward two suggestions, one regarding the source of the episode in B, the other regarding the influence of the episode in B upon R. The second suggestion, the possible influence upon R, can be examined first. There are certainly similarities: in both episodes Tristan is in the forest and an enemy is decapitated. Consequently, in B the people are afraid to enter the forest and in R the king and his supporters are afraid to leave the city. One hesitates to be

---

3. Ewert wisely remarks: 'But it is not safe to assume that because the episode is contrary to the spirit and tastes of courtly society, it is necessarily a survival from Celtic sources or primitive' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 175).
4. See Tristan und Isolde in der Dichtungen..., p. 108.
5. See Bédier, Volume II, p. 312, note 2.

dogmatic: it may well be that the episode in B is the direct inspiration for the incident in R, but it would be wrong in that case to regard the author of R as a simple plagiarist. If the episode in B is in fact the source, it has been much modified. There are two enemies, two brothers, and one survives long enough to tell what happened to Mark. Moreover, it is Tristan who is said to be the murderer, not Governal. Iseut, for her part, is in Mark's custody all the time, not with her lover in the forest.

Röttiger suggested also that the episode in B was inspired by the escape of the dog as related in O, and the evidence in this case is rather more convincing. A number of parallels may be listed. In O (ll. 4405-28), the barking of the dog Ûtant causes the lovers and Kurnevâl to anticipate the arrival of an enemy, just as Governal is made alert to possible danger by the barking of hounds in B (ll. 1678-9). In O (ll. 4429-51), Kurnevâl faces the enemy alone whilst the lovers go on ahead. In B, similarly, Governal is alone and Tristan and Isaut, so we learn from ll. 1673-7, are asleep in the bower. In the German version, Kurnevâl hides against a tree:

> kurnevâl der gûte,
> in vil zornigîchem mûte
> hîlt he bî einem boume
> und nam vil rechte gâme,
> wâ he den brûchin hôrte.

To these lines, 4457-61, ll. 1694-6 of B offer a close correspondance. The idea of revenge is met with in ll. 1702-3 of B and in the German version ll. 4424-8 express a similar notion:

> er wirt sîn lîchte irbolgin
> swer sô zu vorderôst jaget,
> swen he kumt ûf her gedribit:
> den habe ich schîre in gerant'
> sprach der kûne vîgant.

No single parallel is in itself decisive, but the accumulation of

parallels has inspired tentative conclusions. Whitehead, for example, believes it possible that Eilhart knew our episode: 'The verbal similarity between Eilhart's vss. 4457-65 and Béroul's vss. 1694-6 suggests that Eilhart knew the "riche baron" episode.'[6] Do we infer from Whitehead that in the source of O the dog was pursued by an enemy in actual fact and that this enemy was killed by Tristan's squire? Are we to understand that the episode is curtailed in O and that Béroul split the original episode into two parts? But in O, as it stands, the episode appears to hold together quite well; it appears to be in the correct position in the sequence of events and there is no real hint of drastic modification by the author.

A rather different conclusion from that of Whitehead can be presented, if we accept that Eilhart reproduced the basic elements of the original version of Husdent's escape. Béroul took over from his source, which related the same story that we find in O, the false belief that the dog is being followed, but as in his source no enemy materializes. When Béroul comes to invent the riche baron episode he picks up some of the material from the Husdent episode of his source, the barking dog, the anticipation of an enemy, but this time he reaches the climax only postulated in O. An enemy does materialize in the episode and he is put to death by Tristan's squire. Naturally, this is a purely hypothetical conclusion and probably depends too much on the assumption that Eilhart was faithfully reproducing his source and that the version in the surviving manuscripts is substantially close to the original.

Certainly the possibility that it was Béroul who invented the episode is reinforced by other evidence, for it does seem that for the episode he drew on data found elsewhere in the romance, material

---

6. 'The Early Tristan Poems', p. 139, note 1. See also Buschinger, Le Tristrant'.., I. pp. 409-10.

largely of his own invention.

Features appear to have been taken from the Separating Sword incident. There we shall encounter the lovers asleep together in the bower, in ll. 1620-1, just as in ll. 1673-6 of this episode. There is a reference to the heat of the day in l. 1794 which corresponds to l. 1730 of the earlier episode. The heat of the day seems a more integral part of the Separating Sword episode, for it partly induces the sleep which even Mark's presence will not immediately disturb. It is true that Iseut will eventually start up in terror in reaction to her dream in ll. 2073-4 and her cry causes Tristan to leap to his feet. In the earlier episode (ll. 1739-40), Tristan similarly leaps to his feet in fright when he sees the head brought back by Governal. While the lovers are asleep in the bower in both episodes, Governal is absent elsewhere. But whereas in the earlier episode the action is concentrated upon him, in the Separating Sword episode the lovers, discovered by Mark, are in the centre of the stage. It may well be that Béroul, in his creation of the riche baron episode, was aware that he was reversing the order of importance of his characters.

The most striking similarities to the riche baron episode are, however, to be found in the final episode in the fragment, in the account of the deaths of Denoalen and Godoïne. Obviously it is Tristan and not Governal who is the main protagonist, but this may again be a case of a deliberate reversal of roles, for the number of parallels is quite remarkable. In both episodes, in ll. 1678-84 and in ll. 4371-2, the enemy is hunting with dogs. In both cases the would-be assassin, after seeing the enemy in the distance (ll. 1685-9, 4369-71), hides against a tree (ll. 1694, 1700 and 4373). The notion that the enemy's death is inevitable is encountered in both episodes, in

l. 1697 and l. 4386. When death comes, it comes with an equal swiftness in both places, l. 1708 finding a parallel of a kind in l. 4383. Decapitation follows in both cases, but while Governal takes back the whole head as a trophy Tristan contents himself with a simple scalp. One must conclude that fundamentally the same material has been employed in both these episodes, and that there is the possibility that Béroul was so pleased with his own invention, the riche baron episode, that he employed the same material, with minor modifications, in order to eliminate another enemy of the lovers.

Perhaps now a general conclusion may be drawn which will indicate the source of certain episodes in Béroul's romance and show how episodes may have accumulated. In order to create the riche baron episode the author drew on material in his source which told of the escape of Husdent. Drawing on hints which suggested a different climax to the Husdent episode, namely the killing of an enemy, for his episode Béroul allowed an enemy to materialize, who meets his death at the hands of Tristan's squire. As Ewert has intimated, the poet may also have been stimulated by a detail in his own romance, l. 1124.[7] To develop the episode, he borrows details from an episode which is to follow, the Separating Sword incident. The material which the author has thus created is employed in turn in the creation of another episode, the final episode of the fragment. An episode, itself largely formed from pre-existent material, is roughly duplicated. The episodes concerned here, the riche baron episode, the Separating Sword incident and the account of the deaths of Denoalen and Godoïne, may not be the work of one single author, but multiple authorship does not necessarily mean that the episodes are not related in the

---

7. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 175.

manner which has been proposed.

In examining the text, critics have also pointed out--assuming, perhaps wrongly, that all work on the episode had been concluded--that the inclusion of the episode in the romance creates a number of contradictions and inconsistencies. This unnamed baron is apparently one of those who, in company with Frocin, caused the initial downfall of Tristan and Iseut. The author seems to make this identification not only once, but on four separate occasions, in ll. 1656-8, 1681-3, 1709 and 1720-1: not every identification is certain, but the impression conveyed is that the riche baron is surely one of the three who participated in the fleur de farine episode. He is killed by Governal and yet he seems to be alive later, notably in the episode which begins at l. 3028 (compare ll. 3026-30 and ll. 1720-1). Muret writes: 'L'exploit de Governal, qui tue l'un de ces trois ennemis de Tristan, nous apparaît en contradiction manifeste avec la suite du récit, où nous les retrouverons tous trois, à partir du vers 2757, bien vivants et plus acharnés que jamais à la perte des amants.'[8] We find later that Muret does not regard the episode as an interpolation: he would explain away the contradictions created by the episode by suggesting that the whole sequence is a variant which could be omitted by the jongleur in the course of recitation.[9] Both Mergell and Ewert minimize the contradictions, one by claiming that the resuscitation of the dead is not unknown in the French epics, the other by suggesting that the medieval audience was less offended by illogicalities

---

8. M°, pp. X-XI.
9. 'Ces vers pouvaient sans inconvénient subsister dans le manuscrit original, pourvu que le jongleur eût soin de les passer sous silence en récitant le poème' (M°, p. LXXII).

than the modern audience.[10] These theories fail to convince.

However much one tries to explain away the presence of the illogicalities in the text, the illogicalities nonetheless remain. Yet, when this has been said, on another level, the riche baron episode is in harmony with the rest of the fragment. The episode is carefully set against a now familiar background, as we have seen from the introduction to the episode. Moreover, within the body of the episode, in ll. 1717-8, there is a reference to events earlier in the romance, to the announcement that Tristan should be apprehended, and the main content of the episode, a just act of revenge, is certainly in harmony with what has gone before. The Horse's Ears story was likewise unique to Béroul, it also took place while the lovers were in the forest and its context was not dissimilar. Although there was no specific act of revenge, the net result of that passage was the elimination of an enemy of the lovers, and this met with general approval. Now, another enemy of the lovers is removed from the scene by an act of revenge:

> Dit mes veut estre mis au vent
> Que il de lui n'ait la vengance;
> Car par lui et par sa faisance
> Durent il estre tuit destruit.[11]

---

10. 'Les détails l'ile zu Geist und Stil der Chanson de geste erklärt eben ferner, dass einer der drei Verräter, der im Walde von Morois durch Governal glücklich zur Strecke gebracht war (1650-1728), später wieder --wie es in den Heldengesängen gelegentlich geschieht-- unter den lebenden Gegnern Tristans erscheint, um übermaligen Todes zu sterben' (Hergell, Tristan und Isolde..., p. 85). 'Le public médiéval n'est pas choqué par des illogismes, parce qu'il sent intuitivement qu'une même histoire peut avoir plusieurs développements qui ne coïncident pas. Qu'un traître meure, et qu'on le retrouve ensuite bien vivant n'est pas nécessairement à ses yeux une erreur du romancier, mais peut lui apparaître comme une nouvelle modalité de l'action romanesque en cours' (Lecoy, Mél., LXXI, pp. 603-4).

11. B 1702-5. This passage may have been influenced by ll. 1954-6 of the Sworn Tring Swordsmen episode. K Lehmann noted the parallel with the death of Frocin and went so far as to postulate that the baron murdered by Governal was Frocin's colleague, Andret (Untersuchungen..., pp. 18-19).

Also, the episode does seem to indicate that it is Béroul's intention to have the lovers left in peace once they have fled society. Without any further encounters in the forest their spiritual situation presents them with problems enough already, and it may be that, since the lovers are in the Morrois for three years, Béroul felt it incumbent upon him to explain the almost complete absence of contact with outsiders. Certainly we know that the people of Corn all have been already extremely reluctant to enter the forest, but it does appear from ll. 1747-50 that the slaying of the baron has increased their reluctance further and that the lovers are now in less immediate fear of discovery. It is, of course, true that the episode could be removed from the romance and certain inconsistencies would simultaneously vanish. But it does seem that the author has made an effort to harmonize the material in the episode with material elsewhere and that it was no part of his intention to have it omitted, even temporarily for the period of a jongleur's performance.

13: THE 'ARC QUI NE FAUT' EPISODE

The death of the anonymous baron has eliminated, for the lovers, the probability, if not altogether the possibility, of interference from outside, for the people of Cornwall are now considerably more afraid of entering the forest lest they should meet with a similar fate. In this next episode (ll. 1751-73), we learn of something else which alleviates in some degree the hardship of the lovers' existence.

Tristan devises a kind of weapon:

> La ou il ere[n]t en cel gaut,
> Trova Tristran l'arc Qui ne faut. (ll. 1751-2)

By printing in his edition l'arc Qui ne faut at this point and later at l. 1781,[1] Ewert seemed to look upon the invention as a particular bow, unique of its kind, with a special, personal name. In his second volume, Ewert refers to the device as the 'arc qui ne faut' (p. 177) and as l'arc qui ne faut (p. 178), and he still seems to regard the device as one particular, unique object. Professor Legge studied the various instances where an instrument of this kind was mentioned,[2] and she came to the conclusion that the bow in question is a kind of trap, what she terms a spring-bow.[3] She claims that in this episode Tristan is being presented as the inventor of the spring-bow, and that 'li ars qui ne faut' is a generic name, the name of a class of objects. One can accept her first claim, but the text

---

1. Muret consistently printed l'arc qui ne faut: M^4 reproduces this version. Francisque Michel printed l'arc Qui-ne-faut.
2. Med. aev., XXV, pp. 79-83.
3. 'To sum up, it looks as though someone had once the happy idea of describing the spring-bow as "li ars qui ne faut", in which case Foulo-Lomnatsch ought to have accorded it a separate rubric' (Med. aev., XXV, p. 82).

surely indicates that the bow was not merely Tristan's invention but was aptly named by him. Certainly 'li ars qui ne faut' may already have been, or was to become, a generic name, but this is not really relevant here.

In ll. 1753-60, Béroul describes the main virtue of the bow: it is an automatic weapon which strikes down any creature which makes contact with it or touches the branches in which it is set. The author then goes on to tell us that it was Tristan who gave this bow the name by which it is known:

> Tristran, par droit et par raison,
> Oant et fait l'arc, li mist cel non;
> Molt a buen non l'arc, qui ne faut
> Riens qui l'en fire, bas ne haut. (ll. 1761-4)

In his SATF edition, Muret printed the first half of l. 1764 as Riens qu'il en fire, while all the later CFMA editions read Riens qu'il ne fire. The manuscript reads quil (abbreviated) enfire.[4] Ewert interprets the line in the following manner. 'The bow is well named, which does not miss any thing which may strike (make contact with) it, high or low.'[5] Reid rightly objects that it is doubtful whether faut from falir can be taken transitively in the sense of 'miss', and yet his own proposed solutions are definitely contrived.[6] It may be that the qui of l. 1763 is dative (= cui), that in l. 1764 we should read Riens qui le fire (with the n of en perhaps originating in the careless stroking of the following f), and that we should understand 'which is never found wanting whatever may strike it'.

The passage continues with a note of how useful the device proved to be to the lovers, and then the author draws the passage to a close by moving from the particular to the general, reminding the audience

---

4. For his CFMA editions, Muret incorrectly read ensire. M[4], like Ewert, has enfire.
5. Ewert, Volume II, p. 178.
6. The 'Tristrant'..., pp. 66-7. Mölk prints 'Riens qu'il en fire, bas ne haut'. He then translates the whole section thus: 'Einen sehr guten Namen hat der Bogen, der nichts verfehlt, worauf er mit ihm schiesst, oben oder unten' (Tristan und Isolde, pp. 89 and 91). This interpretation lends a far more active role to Tristan than one expects; the automatic functioning of the bow is its major characteristic and this Mölk's version tends to obscure.

of the habitual tenor of the lovers' existence, their need to hunt for food and to keep within the precincts of the forest during this long period of exile. One might note in passing that the singular fu of l. 1771, after the references to both lovers in the previous lines, is decidedly odd.

The invention by Tristan of the 'arc qui ne faut' is found only in B. There is an analogue of a very distant kind in O, for just as Tristan is presented as the inventor of the spring-bow in B, in O Eilhart passes on the story that Tristan was the first to indulge in angling:

> vor wâr mir man daz sagete,
> Tristrant wêre der êrste man
> der daz angelin î began.[7]

As if to compensate for the lack of analogues in the Tristan material itself, critics have regularly pointed out that a similar weapon is described in Gaimar's Estoire des Engleis.[8] Inevitably one is made to wonder what relationship may exist between Béroul and Gaimar. Is Béroul drawing in this passage on Gaimar? There are some textual reminiscences, and it may be that Béroul was adapting to his own purposes the Anglo-Norman account. But the alternative possibility must be entertained, namely that Béroul and Gaimar were employing a common source which may have had nothing to do with the Tristan legend.[9]

---

7. O 4538-40. Buschinger links the 'arc qui ne faut' with the crossbow in G (l. 17246) which makes for rather unorthodox hunting (CCL, XIV, p. 377).
8. Lines 4403-23. Critics who have referred to this passage include Hofer (ZRP, LXV, p. 267), Loth (Contributions à l'étude..., p. 92), Muret (L°, p. IX) and Schoepperle (Tristan and Isolt, pp. 316-7).
9. In his edition (p. 257), Bell takes the view that both authors were making independent references to a kind of object in relatively common use. He is thus repudiating an earlier opinion expressed in 1925 (Le Lai d'Haveloc, pp. 46-9) In his article (ZRP, LXV, pp. 257-88), Hofer tries on three occasions to link Gaimar with B or the estoire, but is not altogether successful. On p. 267 he suggests that B knew Gaimar because of the 'arc qui ne faut': but it is possible that the references in B and Gaimar were made independently one of the other. On p. 268, he suggests that

Perhaps we can postulate that Béroul's claim that Tristan was the inventor of the spring-bow arose naturally from the circumstances of the romance. We know already from l. 1279, 'En Tristran out molt buen archier', of the hero's skill with the bow, a necessary skill if the lovers are to survive, and his invention of the spring-bow would be another indication of his competence in hunting matters. So, although the episode is unique to B, it does not clash with received material elsewhere in the romance. There are other ways in which the episode is integrated with other material. The 'arc qui ne faut' proves, so we are told in l. 1765, to be of great service to the lovers: 'Li molt lor out pus grant mestier.' Husdent, when trained to hunt without barking, had proved of similar value: 'Ce lor a grant mestier li chiens.'[10] Furthermore, as if to dispel any feeling that the episode is extraneous and could feasibly be omitted without loss, the bow is mentioned in the first lines of the next episode, at l. 1781. Béroul is aware of his responsibilities as an artist, conscious that his individual innovations must be made to harmonize with the rest of the story.

---

ll. 4053-4 of B represent a direct borrowing of ll. 5649-50 of the Estoire des Engleis: however, the content of the lines is not sufficiently distinctive to prove that a direct borrowing has taken place and to eliminate the possibility that both authors independently created the admittedly similar, but not unusual phrases. The third claim made by Lofer, on p. 261, that the death of Frocin in B may have been influenced by a similar story in Gaimar, seems quite without justification: contrary to Lofer's contention, in ll. 3961-4032 of the Estoire des Engleis it is king Edward who loses his life, not the dwarf, Alstinet.

10. B 1627. Professor Legge also links the bow and the hunting-dog: 'A bow of this kind and a hound trained to run mute fit naturally into the forest episode' (Med. Rev., XXV, p. 80).

14: THE SEPARATING SWORD INCIDENT

Lines 1774-2132 will be treated here as one complete episode. There is one major central event, the visit of Mark to the lovers' bower, and the rest of the episode describes events which lead up to the visit and events which follow upon it.[1] A subdivision of the episode is formed by ll. 1774-1834: this passage establishes the scene which Mark will come upon when he arrives at the bower. Admittedly, l. 1774, 'Seignor, ce fu un jor d'esté', is the second line of a rhyming couplet, but this does not appreciably diminish the feeling that a new departure is taking place. In the line we have a call on the audience as if to prepare them for a new development. The line also marks the moment of transition from the general background to the foreground of the individual episode: un jor d'esté contrasts with the general indication of time, Longuement, in l. 1771.[2] A second subdivision in the episode is contained in ll. 1835-1942 (this is a division approved by Ewert). In l. 1835 there is a second appeal to the audience, for attention now turns from the lovers, who dominated the first section of the episode, to the foresters who will betray them to the king. The central event in the episode is described in ll. 1943-2062 and all the main characters of the episode are involved, King Mark, guided to the bower by the

---

1. Ewert treats the episode as four separate scenes, a division which suits admirably his own purposes but which may conceal the essential unity of ll. 1774-2132 (see Ewert, Volume II, pp. 178-92).
2. We find a similar movement from the general to the particular in ll. 1359-63.

forester, and the lovers, asleep in the bower. Lines 2063-2152 describe the consequences of Mark's visit. The beginning of this fourth and final section is again indicated by a call on the audience, 'Nun ir oiez des endormiz', and the author once more focusses attention upon the lovers.

Other versions of the same episode are to be found in T and C and a very much altered version in R.[3] O's version is closest to that of B, although differently placed: in the German romance, the Separating Sword incident comes between an account of the lovers' way of life in the wilderness and the first hermit episode. In B, the Separating Sword incident comes immediately before the waning of the potion. In O, the first hermit episode comes before the change in the potion's effect and straightway after this the second hermit episode occurs. So, in the German romance, there are two contrasting episodes centred around the change in the potion's effect: in the first hermit scene, Tristan refuses to leave Iseut, but in the second hermit scene he plans to part from her and restore her to her husband. It seems that Béroul has adopted an order of episodes different from that of his source, but he may well have preserved certain elements of the structure, especially the placing of contrasting episodes around the all-important moment when the potion abruptly ceases.

The first part of the episode, up to l. 1834, evokes with considerable attention to significant detail the scene which Mark will eventually encounter. But to begin there is a movement between the particular and the general. On the day in question, Tristan

---

3. Texts employed: B, ll. 1773-2152: O, ll. 4581-4701: D, chapter LXV - chapter LXVI: T, strophes CCCXXIX - strophes CCCXXXIII, G, ll. 17275-17658; R, Bédier, Volume II, pp. 362-5, Curtis II, §§ 554-9, Fedrick, pp. 382-389, Johnson, pp. 98-101, Löseth, §§ 53-4, S BN, f.fr. 104, 81 v°a - 82 v°b, LS BN, f.fr. 756, 81 r°a - 82 r°b; Fb, ll. 194-207; Fc, ll. 877-94.

inspects the 'arc que ne faut' before going off to hunt. The normal, everyday tribulations and compensations of the lovers' life in the forest are thrice presented, in ll. 1783-92, as being uniquely intense:

> Ainz qu'il venist, fu en tel maine:
> Fu ainz nuls gent tant c'ust paine?
> Mais l'un por l'autre ne le sent,
> Bien orent lor aaisement.
> Ainz, puis le tens que el bois furent,
> Deus gent itant de tel ne burent;
> Ne, si comme l'estoire dit,
> L[a]ou Beroz le vit escrit,
> Nule gent tant ne s'entremerent
> Ne si grement nu compererent.

Line 1783 is difficult. Ewert understands 'before he came back (from hunting)' and alludes to ll. 1798-1800.[4] The line would thus mark the point of transition between the particular and the general. Certainly, there is no need to see a lacuna after 1783 as was suggested by Muret in all his editions.[5] Hölk suggests a question mark should be placed after the line and he translates: 'Hatte er, bevor er (in den Wald) gekommen war, je solche Not gelitten?'[6] Even if the question mark is desirable, Hölk is probably right to understand 'came to the forest' by venist. Béroul seems to be suggesting that before Tristan came to the forest and consequently suffered nobody ever suffered quite so much, but the identical rhyme of ll 1789-1 does suggest that elevation is required. Raynaud de Lage believes that the image in l. 1788, though apparently banal, gains a new resonance if we are led to think of the love maître,[7] but

---

4. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 180.
5. [illegible] has a comma at the end of the line, but as in Ewert the lacuna is rejected. Ewert's text, quoted above in the 1950 edition, has a misprint at l. 1784. The line should have mais, as it had in the 1939 edition, not mais, as in the 1946 and 1963 reprintings. In his glossary (p. 137), Ewert correctly prints mais.
6. Tristan und Isolde, pp. 90-1.
7. See Rom., LXXV, p. 92.

this was hardly the author's intention: indeed, emendation may again be required for de tel hardly makes sense. Ewert supposes that Béroul invoked the estoire in l. 1789 in order to justify the dogmatic 'never'.[8] It is interesting to note that there is a mention of a bûch in O at almost the same point, at l. 4576, 'îdoch sô sagit uns daz bûch'. In truth, the allusion occurs in the previous episode in O, the description of the lovers' life in the forest, but it does come immediately before Eilhart describes Tristan's habit of placing the sword between himself and Iseut before going to sleep. The whole of this passage in B is used to make a general comment upon the particular material of the episode. This is not unknown elsewhere: within the first hermit episode, at ll. 1364-6, there is a similar general reflection upon a life of great hardship and great love.

At l. 1793 the narrative returns to the particular. Tristan returns weary from the hunt and preparations for sleep are described. Significant detail is carefully presented. The day has been hot and exhausting for both Tristan and Iseut (l. 1794), and, of course, Tristan has had a tiring day's hunting.[9] Tristan places his sword between himself and Iseut:

> Tristran se couche et trait s'espee,
> Entre les deus chars l'a posee. (ll. 1805-6)

No reason is given as to why Tristan should do this, and none seems really necessary: the sword is surely drawn so as to be more accessible if a sudden attack should occur. At the same time, Béroul is introducing one element of the scene that Mark will come to misinterpret. Certainly other authors have given precise reasons for

---

8. See Ewert, Volume II, p. 181.
9. See also Fb, l. 200, 'Chaut faisoit con el tans de mai'.

the placing of the sword in its particular position. For Eilhart it was simply a habit which Tristan had adopted, a strange habit which yet proved to have a fortunate result:

> daz was ein vromder manres sin
> und quam im doch zu heile sît. (ll. 4592-3)

In G, the sword is deliberately placed between the lovers, perhaps in order to allay any suspicion that an intruder might entertain. Tristan had heard the horns of Mark's huntsmen and the baying of hounds, and he had hit upon the idea of lying far apart. He had also placed the sword between them (ll. 17402-16). It may be that Gottfried was trying to motivate an action relatively unexplained in his source.[10] It has been suggested by Wind that the presence of the sword in the legend may only be fully explained if we see in it a relic of Celtic lore: 'Signalons à ce propos que l'épisode de l'épée, signe de chasteté, qui sépare les amants et qui dans les versions françaises est un témoignage menteur, n'est logiquement fondé que dans la tradition celtique où Tristan est envisagé malgré lui.'[11] But in B the sword is not by itself an indication, albeit misleading, that the lovers are leading a chaste existence: only when it combines with other elements does the sword contribute to the conclusion which Mark will reach. It is to Béroul's credit that he discards any residue of symbolic significance the separating sword may have borne and justifies its presence only in the terms of his own narrative. Lazar's description of the episode is therefore disappointing: 'Béroul est très elliptique; il n'explique guère la raison d'être

---

10. Buschinger writes: 'Le bruit des trompes et les aboiements des chiens laissent présumer que le roi se trouve dans les parages, et c'est pour couper court à tout éventuel sur la nature de ses relations avec la reine que Tristan organise cette véritable mise en scène' (CC, XIV, p. 370).
11. RP, XIV, p. 3.

de cette épée entre les amants. Qu'elle ait été placée là pour faire croire à Marc qu'ils ont vécu chastement dans la forêt, est évident. Béroul nous dit que le roi chassait dans la forêt. L'on voit bien que les amants viennent de procéder à toute une mise en scène spectaculaire.'[12] That the sword has been placed there to make Mark believe that they are living chastely cannot be true, or the lovers would have later expressed great joy when they realized Mark had been there and they would have been smugly satisfied by the success of their ruse. And where does it say precisely that Mark was hunting or was accustomed to hunt in the forest? Finally, it is not the lovers who embark upon the 'mise en scène' but the poet, who carefully manipulates the details which, together, will create a misleading picture of innocence.

The fact that the lovers are clothed is mentioned next, in ll. 1807-10. Again, there is no suggestion that they have purposefully kept their clothes on, for the poet indicates that Iseut might just as easily have been naked, in which case the consequences could have been disastrous for them. Iseut has a ring on her finger, and not just any ring but her gold wedding ring. There is no mention of a ring in O: it is an element introduced by Béroul, which, when the time comes, will reinforce the impression of fidelity that Mark will have gained. The position of the lovers is then described with the utmost care. They lie in an embrace, and yet Béroul points out that their mouths are not in contact:

> Les bouches furent tres aprises,
> Et nequeqant sui ot devises
> Que n'acoeiblerent pas ensemble.[13]

---

12. Amour courtois..., pp. 153-4.
13. B 1815-9. Baron is surely misinterpreting the text when he claims that in ll. 1816-20 'we see the two figures in King love' (RLC, XXXIII, p. 108).

The air is still, and a sunbeam falls upon the face of Iseut, but they sleep on, not at all anticipating any sort of mishap. In Fb (l. 198), Tristan claims that he was only pretending to be asleep at this point, but, of course, it is essential to Fb that Tristan be awake in order to be able to tell the tale later.[14]

The setting of the scene is not quite over:

> N'avoit qu(e) eus deus en cel païs;
> Quar Governal, ce m'est avis,
> S'en ert alez o le destrier
> Avel ci bois au forestier. (ll. 1831-4)

In ll. 1281-4, Béroul invented a forester in order to explain why the lovers came to have the necessary equipment for survival in the forest. Now he draws on his own invention to justify Governal's absence from the bower. This is a last indication of the care with which Béroul has set the scene: the cumulative effect of such neatly planted circumstantial evidence will be to mislead King Mark. To realize fully the skill and application employed by Béroul it is only necessary to glance at Eilhart: the German version offers no such careful mise en scène before the arrival of the huntsman at the bower, but mentions only Tristan's general habit of placing a sword between himself and Iseut.[15]

The second section, containing once again material which prepares the central event in the episode, runs from l. 1835 to l. 1942, and immediately we are made aware of a threat to the peaceful scene just described.

> Oez, seignors, quel aventure!
> Tant lor dut estre posme et dure![16]

---

14. See also Le Roman de la poire, especially ll. 149-52, where it is supposed that Tristan and Iseut were feigning sleep.
15. See Q, ll. 4561-91. Muret condemns Eilhart's account for its mediocrity (see Rom., XVI, p. 337).
16. D 1839-40. Line 4351 is identical to l. 1835. Both lines anticipate what [illegible] outcome of a chance encounter.

and so it is with a sense of foreboding that we learn of the forester's approach:

> Par le bois vint uns forestiers,
> Qui avoit trové lor fulliers
> Ou il orent el bois gëu;
> Tant a par le fuellier seü
> Qu'il fu venuz a la ramee
> Ou Tristran out fait s'aünee. (ll. 1837-42)

The passage offers certain difficulties of vocabulary. In his second volume (pp. 181-2), Ewert suggests that fulliers in l. 1838, and the apparent variant fuellier of l. 1840, should be translated by 'dense wood' or 'thicket', rather than by 'bower', which was his interpretation in the glossary of his first volume (p. 152). Unless two distinct words are involved, fulliers to be associated with fullare and fuellier with folia, it seems that the meaning Reid gives to fu(e)llier, 'trampled grass', 'trace(s)', should be accepted.[17] Ewert continues to be uncertain as to the meaning of aünee in l. 1842. With reservations, he translates it by 'gathering-place', 'rendezvous', 'abode' in his second volume (p. 182), thus supporting the translation 'abode' which he had proposed in his first volume (p. 138). One might postulate that aünee is of similar meaning to asenplee of l. 2010, and both terms refer to the position in which the lovers are lying.

The forester's immediate reaction to his discovery is to take to his heels for fear. For a moment, in ll. 1851-2, the author tarries to comment on the lovers as they sleep peacefully on, blissfully ignorant of their near escape, but this provides but momentary

---

17. See The 'Tristran'..., p. 69.

consolation, for it is all too clear where the forester is heading and for what reward. There is no change of surroundings in the other versions. In O, it is not clear where the weidewan meets up with King Mark. In the derivatives of T Mark is already hunting in the forest: the lovers are discovered by huntsmen in E, by the chief huntsman, Kanves, in S, and by the chief but unnamed huntsman in G, but in all cases Mark is already in the vicinity.

In Béroul's version, Mark greets his forester and has him divulge the information. Mark learns that the forester has found his wife with his nephew.[18] [illegible] meant to assume that Mark still believed that Iseut was with the lepers, condemned to a lingering death? In C, one leper had survived the attack upon his band by Tristan and his squire and had reported Iseut's rescue to King Mark (ll. 4331-5). Mark's reaction to the news in l. 1895, 'Li rois l'entent, boufe et sospire', is very close to his reaction in l. 610, 'Li rois l'entens, fist un sospir'. At that point in the story the king had learned of his wife's alleged adultery with his nephew at a time when he thought that their innocence had been conclusively proved, following the evidence of his own eyes. Perhaps up to this moment also Mark had thought that the activity of his wife no longer posed a problem.[19] The forester is forced to divulge further information as to the exact location of the sleeping couple, to Mark and to Mark alone. Silence is forced upon the forester—a step

---

18. Ewert is surely right to keep *gel* and not emend to *nel* in l. 1889 (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 182). The forester may be afraid because he did not try to kill or capture Tristan, but has simply informed the king of his discovery.
19. It might be remembered, for what it is worth, that in the report of the hue and cry Tristan alone was mentioned (ll. 1431-6).

which seems to baffle Eilhart[20] — and a rendezvous is arranged, 'A la Croiz Roge, au chemin fors' (l. 1909). To the consternation of his men, the king tells them he is leaving alone,[21] and he proffers the excuse that a maiden wishes to 'speak with him'. Certainly, as Ewert suggests,[22] the pucele of l. 1932 may be the stock 'damoisele' of romance, but we must, of course, realize that the king presents his engagement as an essentially private one in order to warn off any would-be companions.[23] The fact that Mark insists on going alone may have influenced Béroul's presentation of the riche baron episode: the baron is similarly alone and ll. 1889-90 offer the (admittedly common) rhyme words, destriez : escuier, that we find in ll. 1935-6.

Forthrightness of the forester, as he is presented here, may also have influenced the riche baron episode. In ll. 1846-51 the forester hastens from the scene, afraid of being killed, the fate which actually befalls the baron in the earlier episode. We are left in no doubt that death is his rightful due, for this is no kindly Orri, nor a forester created for purposes of convenience, but a figure who identifies himself with those who wish to punish the lovers (l. 1902). In ll. 1916-20 he receives the accolade of

---

20. Lines 4614-6 read:

wes her dô mit gedêchte,
daz mag ûch grôz wunder hân,
wan ich ez ûch niht wegen kan.

Lachtenstein, in his edition (p. CXX), interprets 4614-6 as Eilhart's way of discarding any scruples he may have felt over the lack of motivation of his character's actions. It is, of course, Mark's unwillingness to make public details of his shame which induces him to force silence upon the forester.

21. This does not seem to be the case in U:

der koninc bevie lengir nît
sîne lîve hîz be der rosse plegin. (ll. 4622-3)

22. Ewert, Volume II, pp. 183-4.

23. See also Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 71.

a curse from the author who at the same time announces his future death.[24]

The central event of the episode, the visit of Mark to the bower, runs from l. 1943 to l. 2062. In a section which creates suspense, for it delays the crucial encounter and also justifies in part Mark's later reactions, Béroul portrays the king's state of mind: and so at l. 1945 the text must register the king's disapproval of the wrong which Mark believes Tristan has committed and *cuvertise* (or, better, *covertise*?) is an adequate replacement for the social *contrefaire*. This is not an objective assessment of Tristan's actions, but part of a record of Mark's feelings which continues in ll. 1951-6:

> Molt est li rois acoragiez
> De destruire: c'les[t] prez [illegible] seniez.
> De la cité s'en est [illegible]
> Et dist ke vent entre [illegible]
> Qu'il ne vienne de ceus vengance
> Que li ont fait tel avilance.

The king's state of mind naturally changes once the scene in the bower has made its impact.

At l. 1957, the action begins in earnest. The king meets up with the forester at the prearranged rendezvous and promises the spy his reward. The word *forfet* in l. 1971 has caused problems. Ewert suggests that *forfet* here means 'forfeit', 'bargain', and in particular the place where the bargain would be fulfilled.[25] Ewert's earlier suggestion, 'to (the scene of) his misdeed',[26] meaning the place of the forester's treachery, would presumably be deemed more correct by Blakey, but the misdeed in question, in Blakey's view, is the forester's failure to kill Tristan in accordance with the

---

24. In C, ll. 4606-9, the *laid man* is similarly attacked, but in rather less forceful terms:
> tôt ne m'ait destruit [illegible]
> [illegible] gote
> [illegible] hahete
> [illegible] ne ber sie vent?

25. Ewert, Volume II, pp. 135-6.
26. Ewert, Volume I, p. 152.

terms of the royal proclamation.[27] Line 1971 forms part of the reported speech of Mark, and it is certainly unlikely that the king would look upon the forester's betrayal of the lovers as treachery. But the sequence of thought is awkward. Is the forester still going to receive a kind of reward even after committing his crime? Thus, it is quite possible that forfet refers to Tristan's crime, as Müllk suggests,[28] and that it is in the possession of the king (son), because the crime was committed against him. The forester and the king reach the vicinity of the bower, the king dismounts and together they reach the shelter. This is a summary of the action up to l. 1980, but there is also a continuing account of Tristan's frame of mind:

> Li rois le sieut, qui bien s'i fie,
> En l'espee que il a çainte,
> Dont a doné celee mainte.
> Si fait il trop que serguidez:
> Quar, se Tristran fust esveillez,
> Li nués o l'oncle se meslast,
> Li uns morust, ainz ne finast. (ll. 1962-8)

The author speculates as to the possible outcome of the encounter, were Tristan in fact so able, and he thus contributes further to the atmosphere of drama. It may be noted that at the equivalent point in G there is no attempt at psychological analysis, no speculation as to the possible outcome of events.[29]

---

27. MB, XXX, pp. 136-7.
28. 'Dem Förster sagte der König Mark, er würde ihm 5 Mark Silber geben, wenn er ihn schnell an (den Ort) seines (Tristans) Vergehens führte' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 99). Müllk's translation may in fact be a misinterpretation of L Ort's loss.
29. The corresponding lines in G, ll. 4017-25 read:

> Zu hant des morgenes vrû
> der weidemen reit balde dô
> als in der koning wîste bît
> und uffente in recht an die stad
> da he vant die helfelôsin dît.
> der koning beite lengir nît
> sîne lûte hêz he der rosse ele an.
> he ging alleine after wegin
> dô Tristrant der holt lach.

From l. 1981 onwards, attention is concentrated on the bower. The king presents an image of nobility: we are not meant to see him as a figure acting from churlish motives, for the revenge he contemplates in ll. 1985-6 is justified by the sense of outraged honour suggested before. With drawn sword, he enters the bower and prepares to strike:

> Li rois en haut le cop levi,
> Iré le fait, si se tresvi:
> Ja descendist li cop sor eus:
> Ses occist, ce fust grant dous.
> Qant vit qu'ele avoit sa chemise
> Et q'entre eus deus avoit devise,
> La bouche o l'autre n'ert jostee,
> Et qant il vit la nue espee
> Qui entre eus deus les desevret,
> Vit les braies que Tristran out:
> 'Dex!' dist li rois, 'ce que puet estre?'
> (ll. 1991-2001)

In Ewert's words, 'this passage has attracted the attention of a number of critics who have shown a singular reluctance to take the text as it stands'.[30] This is undoubtedly true and the suggestions put forward by critics will be reviewed in the third appendix. Whatever the authentic text may have read, it will be already clear by the end of this passage that in the first part of the episode the descriptive details included by the poet have been deliberately chosen. The features mentioned there now return: Iseut and Tristan are clothed, their mouths are not together and the drawn sword lies between them.

In what is turning out to be almost a humorous scene, we find that the gullible Mark notices the details of the picture before him and stays his hand. Then, in a monologue beginning at l. 2001, Mark will analyse the scene further, examining the constituent elements

---

30. Ewert, Volume II, p. 186.

which have been mentioned in the preceding narrative passage and generally rationalizing after the event.[31] He deduces from their clothes, the sword and their position[32] that they are not involved in adultery, 'De fole amor corage n'ont' (l. 2013). In this same first part of the monologue, we have also a deliberate recollection of Mark's intentions as he left the city, before his arrival at the bower. Line 2011 recalls his postulated intention to kill the lovers in ll. 1951-2, while line 2016 echoes the second half of l. 1952: killing the lovers would indeed have been a grievous error.

Before analysing further Béroul's text, it is interesting to note the king's reaction in the other accounts. In S, Mark is brought to the scene by Kanves. He sees the sword lying between the lovers and decides they are not lusting after each other (chapter LXVI). In E there is a similar account: the presence of the sword denotes an absence of love (stanza CCXXXII). G offers a more complex account of Mark's reaction, where the king passes through a series of psychological states. He feels pleasure, believing them innocent, pain, because he is suspicious. He alternates between doubt and a refusal to see guilt, until Love convinces him of their innocence:

> der ander sin smerze,
> daz wort, daz ungenaeme ja
> dazn sach Marke niender da;
> daz was mitalle him getan,
> dan was zwivel noch wan. (ll. 17546-50)

C offers a very disappointing account, for in ll. 4626-9 there is no real attempt to explain Mark's later gesture. By contrast,

---

31. Just as the speech of the people in ll. 1454-66 picked up details of the descriptive passage, ll. 1442-53.
32. Presumably Ewert quotes l. 2009 of M[4] (Ewert, Volume II, p. 187) to show that the latest CFMA edition has accepted his version?

Béroul's account is highly effective: the time spent in exposition has been put to positive advantage.

Mark now plans his next move:

> Je lor ferai tel demonstrance
> Ançois que il s'esvelleront,
> Certainement savoir porront
> Qu'il furent endormi trove
> Et q'en a eü d'eus pité,
> Que je nes vuel noient ocire,
> Ne moi ne gent de mon enpire. (ll. 2020-6)

Mark now wishes to leave the lovers with proofs of his compassion, the same emotion he had felt on another important occasion, in the course of the tryst episode (ll. 261,481 and 491), but whereas in the first episode of the fragment he had been deliberately misled by appearances, here he is accidentally taken in. He goes on to mention the objects which figured in the first part of the episode, the ring, the sunbeam and the sword. He intends to replace the ring by one the queen gave him, to cover the sunbeam with gloves[33] she brought from Ireland and to substitute his sword for that of Tristan. His speech thus prepares the narrative which is to follow.

As his first action, Mark covers up the sunbeam with his gloves, but where exactly does he place them?

> Le rai qui sor Ysout decent
> Covre des ganz molt bonement. (ll. 2041-2)

In C, one glove is placed upon the queen herself.[34] In Fb (l. 204), Tristan claims that the gloves were placed in a hole in the fabric of the bower. In S (chapter LXVI) and E (stanza CCXXXII), the glove is placed on the queen's face, as it is in Fo (ll. 884-8). In G

---

33. It is a pair of gloves at l. 2032 (as uns seüs in l. 1576?). Ewert admits that the version of L[3] and L[4], 'Uns ganz de vair rai je o moi', may well be authentic (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 187).
34. O 4638-41. In spite of Bédier's claim (Bédier, Volume II, pp. 256-7), there is no mention at all in O of the sunbeam.

(ll. 17613-4), the king does not penetrate the lovers' home but simply blocks up the window through which the sunbeam strikes Iseut. In Le Roman de la poire (ll. 141-60), the general circumstances of Mark's visit seem close to those in the derivatives of T, and the king places the glove in a hole in the foliage, while in the representation of the story described in L'Escoufle a single glove is placed beside the queen, lés l'oreille (l. 605). In B, the use of the verb covrir at l. 2042 suggests that the sunbeam was blocked by the placing of gloves in the foliage: there is no indication at all that they were placed on the face.[35] Mark then removes the ring from Iseut's finger and substitutes one which once belonged to her. It is his wedding ring he removes, and for Mark the fact that she has continued to wear it is a sign of her enduring loyalty. The ring slips easily from her finger.[36] Mark's final action is to remove the sword from between the couple and to substitute his own (ll. 2049-50), an action which also takes place in O:

> daz swert he selbe legin sach
> zwischin in, des nam he were
> und greif harte lîse dare,
> ven sie wârin entslâfin.
> dô nam ne Tristrandes râfin
> den tûrlîchen beiden
> und zoug daz sîne ûz der scheide.
> Tristrandes stackte ne wedir în
> und legete dî daz swert sîn
> dâ jenez hâte vor gelegin. (ll. 4626-35)

But what is the significance of the king's actions in B? In an oft-quoted article, Marx claims that the king has performed a

---

35. Critics disagree on this point. Murrell, for example, claims that the glove (sic) is indeed placed on Iseut's face ('Girart de Roussillon'..., p. 103), whilst Vinaver states that the gloves are placed in the surrounding foliage (OCm, XI, p.8, DENLTB, XXXIX, p. 209).
36. There is no mention of a ring in O or in the derivatives of T. The pathetic touch may be Béroul's own invention. At l. 2044, there may be even less case than at l. 1655 for emending the scribe's al to el (but see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 77-8).

triple investiture, per quantum, per annulum, per ensem: 'La succession des trois marques de l'autorité du roi atteste sa volonté de replacer les amants fugitifs sous le lien féodal.'[37] One wonders if the pattern of symbols is quite as clear as Marx thinks. The gloves, placed in the way of the sunbeam, do not appear to be on the same level of significance as the sword and the ring, but are purely utilitarian, shielding Iseut from the sun. And when the lovers awake they completely disregard the gloves, which have served only as the instruments which disturb Iseut's dream. They note that the sword and ring have been exchanged, but of the gloves there is no mention.[38]

Vinaver rejects in part Marx's interpretation and also another possible explanation for the gloves, namely that they may represent a kind of feudal reward. He then adds: 'Si plausible que puisse paraître cette explication, elle ne me semble pas être dans la logique du conte.'[39] It is indeed within the strict confines of the text that we must seek to explain the presence of the gloves, ring and sword. The exchange of rings and swords, so the text tells us, is meant to demonstrate that the king found them asleep, that he felt pity for them and that neither he nor his men wish to kill them. When he covers the sunbeam with the gloves he is surely motivated by a similar feeling of pity. It may be that at the basis of the gloves, sword and ring is a threefold investiture, but the text must surely be explained without recourse to external evidence of this kind.[40] The sword may well be a 'relic of Celtic tradition',[41] but its meaning here must not be defined by reference to that tradition:

---

37. 'Observations sur un émaux...', p. 271.
38. See ll. 2079-86, 2107-10. It is true that the glove is mentioned in O (ll. 4647-51).
39. OC., XI, p. 8, note 28.
40. See also Vàrvaro, Il 'Roman de Tristan'..., p. 165. 'Non è in effetti da escludere che nella tradizione ci sia stata una certa tendenza a dare valore giuridico agli atti de fiducia, ma non ci sembra che tale valore sia essenziale nel testo di Béroul.'
41. Ewert, Volume II, p. 189.

in Béroul's text it is simply a sword which separates the lovers. Mark sees the sword and from this and other factors he wrongly concludes that the lovers are innocent of adultery but the sword is not itself a sword of chastity in Béroul's text.

Mark has carried out an act of mercy, of pity, of benevolence, and the instruments of his act have sentimental, rather than feudal significance.[42] From the queen's finger Mark slips his wedding ring and he slips on a ring which once was hers. Likewise, the sword he removes from between the lovers is a sword which has played a major part in their lives, being the sword with which Tristan killed Iseut's uncle and relieved his own uncle of the burden of a tribute. The gloves also have sentimental significance, having come from Ireland with Iseut. The three sets of objects incidentally remind us of how closely their lives are intertwined, but Mark has not chosen them at all in order to remind the lovers of this fact.

After a brief account of the return of Mark to his stronghold, the final stage of the episode begins, a description of the lovers' reaction to what has happened. In S, E and G, the lovers awake naturally from their sleep. In both S (chapter LXVI) and E (stanza CCCXXXIII), the lovers find the glove and recognize it as that of the king, and they are overjoyed since they can be accused of no wrong. In G (ll. 17646-58), the lovers' reaction is one of fear. They are frightened because they have been discovered, but they hope that the intruder noticed that they were lying well apart. In all the derivatives of T the lovers are summoned back to court following

---

42. See once again Vinaver, Il 'roman de Tristram'..., pp. 166-7. See also Van Coolput, RR, LXXIV, pp. 36-40, especially pp. 44-5.

this incident. In C (ll. 4669-69), the lovers likewise enter naturally, see the glove and Mark's sword, but they think they are in grave danger. Mark, they believe, has only stayed his hand through hopischeit, refusing to kill them while they are still asleep. They believe he is in hiding nearby and they flee at once deeper into the forest.

In B, similarly, the lovers' reaction is one of fear and they also flee from the scene:

> Morrois tresbusent, si s'en vont,
> Grans jornees par peur font,
> Droit vers Galles s'en sont alé. (ll. 2127-9)

But Béroul introduces developments and complexities unknown to Eilhart. Lines 2065-72 describe a dream: Iseut dreams that she is in a wood, within a tent, beset by two lions, each of which seeks to devour her.[43] Frappier suggests that the two lions represent Mark and Tristan and notes that Iseut's subconscious, by representing her lover as a second ravenous lion, does seem to place Tristan on the same level as Mark, as an obstacle to true peace of mind: 'Comprenons qu'au-delà de son amour s'est exprimé soudain le besoin le plus profond et le plus irréalisable d'Iseut: celui d'une paix qu'elle ne connaîtra jamais, ni avec l'époux, ni avec l'amant.' The dream, Frappier argues, 'traduit chez l'amante une sourde résistance à l'amour qui fait d'elle une victime, une serve'.[44] Iseut, however, perturbed by what he feels would be a false representation of the relationship between Mark and Tristan,

---

43. Jonin's interpretation of the dream (A, LXIV, pp. 103-13) has been justifiably criticized by Ménard (Rom., LXXXI, p. 557), by Vàrvaro (Il 'Roman de Tristan'..., p. 167, note 67) and by Frappier (CC, VII, p. 357, note 10 and RP, XVI, p. 222, note 8). See also A. Bell, Ed. Rev., XXIII, p. 204, for an earlier, similar dream in Gaimar.
44. RP, XVI, p. 222.

refuses to identify the lions with the king and his nephew. For him, the lions symbolize the danger to which the lovers are exposed, 'la grave menace qui sème sur le bonheur du couple'.[45] But there is another possibility: we could see the two lions as representing Mark and Arthur, and Iseut's dream may foreshadow the oath the queen must eventually swear in the presence of the two kings. In connection with l. 2072, 'chascun le prenoit par la main', ll. 4183-5 might usefully be read.

> Tuit s'asistient par mé les rens,
> Fors les deus rois; c'est a grant sens:
> Yseut fu entre eus deus as mains.

The dream comes to a sudden end when the gloves fall upon Iseut:[46] our supposition that they had been placed over an opening in the fabric of the hut or in the surrounding foliage now seems confirmed. The cry of Iseut then wakes Tristan, who leaps up in fright and reaches for his sword.[47] The simple reason for the drawing of the sword is now seen to be also the correct one: the sword was placed between the lovers as a precautionary measure, for ease of access in case of the kind of crisis which has now arisen. At this point, Tristan realizes that his sword has gone and that Mark's sword is in its place, and Iseut, for her part, sees that her ring has been replaced by another.[48] In this section we surely see Béroul's narrative art at its best: in a smooth movement we pass from the gloves which fall upon Iseut to the cry which awakens Tristan, to his seizing his sword and to the realization that his sword and Iseut's ring have been removed. For the poet will

---

45. 'Les amants dans la forêt', p. 9.
46. Ewert is almost certainly right to see l. 2076 as a 'descriptive' line rather than a 'narrative' line, and to see that the gloves, falling from the mitaines (Eu, l. 20[illegible]), are what interrupt Iseut's dream (see Ewert, Tristan II, p. 100).
47. Line 2078, 'Ele l'a trové avant vermeile', is not immediately comprehensible, but it is perhaps an indication of Tristan's agitation (but see Eu, l. 688).
48. Béroul does not in fact describe how Mark places his own ring on Iseut's finger.

describe at greater length the lovers' reaction to what they believe has happened.

The lovers attempt no objective reconstruction of what has happened, but assume immediately that they must flee before Mark returns to harm them:

> Ele crie: 'Sire, merci!
> Li rois nos a troves ici.'
> Il li respont: 'Dame, c'est voirs.
> Or nos covient gerpir forrois,
> Car molt li par somes mesfait.
> M'espee a, la soue me lait;
> Bien nos peust avoir occis.' (ll. 2087-93)

They assume at once that Mark wishes to harm them because they are aware of their own guilt, because they have harmed Mark, 'Car molt li par somes mesfait'.[49] This awareness of guilt colours their whole reaction and they cannot imagine that Mark has shown benevolence or pity towards them. This is indeed a false deduction on the lovers' part, but it is a logical deduction given their state of mind, and it explains perfectly their decision to seek an even more remote place of exile.[50] The lovers cannot accept the straightforward explanation, that Mark has shown pity; they see this as a possible, superficial explanation for the substitution of the sword and the ring, but they conclude that Mark is trying to fool them, to lull them into a false sense of security:

> Par cest change peon parçoivre,
> Mestre, que il nos veut decevre:
> Quar il ert ceus, si nos trova,
> Icor si tost, si s'en torna.
> Por peut s'en est alé arriere,
> Dont il a troi et baude et fiere;
> Ses aherra, destruire veut
> Et moi et la roïne Yseut.[51]

---

49. See also ll. 2773-4.
50. But Bédier claims that 'the inadequacy of Tristan's religious is startling' (Ed. cit., XXIII, p. 127). See also Vinaver, OC, XII, p. 9, note 31.
51. B 2111-18. Decevre in l. 2112 may mean 'take by surprise' rather than 'deceive': but either rendering conveys the duplicity the lovers see in Mark's gesture.

Mark has not gone for men, and he had tried to indicate that neither he nor his men bore the lovers any malice (ll. 2023-6). But the lovers interpret the signs left by Mark in a manner diametrically opposed to that intended by the king. Thinking that the lovers are innocent, the king makes a gesture of pity and benevolence, but the lovers, knowing themselves to be guilty, interpret the gesture as an act of malicious deceit.[52]

Varvaro contrasts the reaction of the lovers in B with their reaction in G: 'Più di tutto sembra sorprendente la reazione degli amanti a quello che vorrebbe e dovrebbe chiaramente essere un segno della benevolenza del re, e che come tale è giustamente inteso in Thomas.'[53] But this is because notions of guilt, sin and repentance, so central to an understanding of Béroul's poem, are quite foreign to the country version. In B the lovers recognize their guilt, recognize they have sinned twice, even if they have sinned against their will, under the power of the potion, and at this stage, because the potion still dominates them, they correctly possibly atone for their guilt. Only after the potion ceases to have any effect will they be able to assess the burden of that guilt.

The account in the French prose Romance has so far not been mentioned, and understandably so, for events at the corresponding stage in F are rather different. The first part of the action primarily concerns Iseut. Mark is hunting with his men in the forest and comes upon four young shepherds who innocently betray the hiding-place of the lovers. We learn that Tristan and Governal

---

52. Fedrick again disagrees: 'Not only does the reader know that this was not Mark's intention, but Tristan's theory clearly fails to explain why Mark should let the lovers know that he has seen them' (ed. rev., LXXII, p. 126).
53. Il 'Roman de Tristan'..., p. 164.

are absent at that time, and Mark captures Iseut and takes her back to Tintagel. After a brief passage in which Tristan is formally outlawed, attention then turns to the hero. He has been hunting, in the company of Governal, but by this point he has left his squire behind. Tristan is asleep when a youth finds him: we learn that the youth's father had been murdered by Tristan. Tristan is woken by a shout and struck by a poisoned arrow before he succeeds in killing the boy.

The author of R was obviously engineering the separation of the lovers in this episode. Iseut is now back with Mark and we learn that Tristan must go to Brittany, to Iseut of the White Hands, in order to seek treatment for the wound. Yet it may be that material from the Separating Sword incident, as related in the poetic versions, found its way into the prose account. In B we heard tales of a possible quarrel in which either Mark or Tristan would be killed (ll. 1966-8, 2017-9). This did not happen in B or in C, but the fight which might have happened in the poetic versions does in fact occur in R: one of the two protagonists does meet his death. Moreover, in B and C, after first staying his arm, Mark seemed to develop scruples about striking a sleeping victim:[54] the youth in R echoes this idea. 'Mes se je en dormant l'ocioie ce seroit le greignor mauvestié du monde et la greignor traïson.'[55]

The author of R creates his account, perhaps partly from the resources of the poetic versions, in order to engineer the separation of the lovers, for there is no abatement of the potion which can help

---

54. See B, ll. 2014-6 and especially ll. 4669-72 of C, where we find the clearest expression of the concept:
> wir haben den tôd al gereit,
> wir gemîner den sîner hôbischeit,
> der her uns ellînde vert
> und uns niht tête zu nît.

55. MS R, f.fr. 755, fol. [illegible]. Curtis II, §556, has a similar version: 'Mes se je en dormant l'ocis, ce sera la greignor mauvestié à monde et la greignor traïson.'

to motivate their parting. In T, where again the potion never changes or loses its power, a similar engineering of the separation of the lovers is necessary. Thomas creates the verger episode, another episode which may well incorporate material which was originally the property of the Separating Sword incident.

The situation is basically the same. Mark, led by the dwarf, sees the lovers asleep together. In T, he then goes off to seek his men:

> En cel palais la sus iral,
> De mes barons i amerrai.
> Verrent con les avon trovez. (ll. 10-12)[56]

In B (ll. 2113-6), Tristan believes that this may have happened, but his hypothesis, as we know, is quite wrong. In T, in the verger episode, Tristan is seemingly awake and this time his supposition is correct:

> Li rois a veü quanque avon fait,
> Au palais a ses omes vait. (ll. 20-1)

What is potential in B does in fact occur in a different episode of a different version, a hypothesis which is false in B becomes accurate also here. It is interesting to note that in Fo Tristan claims that the dwarf was with the king in the Separating Sword incident.

> Li reis meïs nus trovat
> E li nains ki l'i amenat(?). (ll. 879-80)

Hoepffner, on p. 9 of the introduction to his edition, refers to this detail as resulting from confusion, but he suggests later (p. 38) that the author of Fo may have deliberately corrected T:

---

56. Quotations from T are taken from the 1950 Hand edition.

Dans ces conditions on pourrait voir dans le récit de Fo comme une correction apportée au récit de Thomas. Le nain, inutile dans la scène du Verger, est transféré dans l'épisode parallèle de la Forêt. Le nain traditionnel des amants y prend la place du personnage inconnu du forestier.

If we accept that the verger episode is a parallel to the Separating Sword incident in the specific sense that it was partially inspired by it, the confusion or correction of Fo becomes all the more understandable.

The Separating Sword incident is the last of a series of episodes in Béroul's version. Lines 2130-2 form the last, brief life in the forest sequence:

> Molt les avra amors penés:
> Trois anz plainniers sofrirent peine,
> Lor char pali et devint vaine.

It will be remembered that the first of the Morrois scenes in which the lovers played an active part was the Ogrin episode, and that episode offers certain resemblances in form and theme to this, the last of the characteristic Morrois episodes. In both episodes, when the action appears to be already under way, it is interrupted by a mention of the love which binds Tristan and Iseut. Line 1365, 'Tant s'entremeent de bone amor', corresponds to l. 1791, 'Mule gent tant ne s'entramerent'. In the earlier episode, in spite of the hermit's admonitions, Tristan and Iseut refused to separate because their love, induced by the potion, would not allow it. In this later scene, this same love again prevents them from separating, and now the lovers only acknowledge that their actions have harmed King Mark. Under the power of the potion they cannot lessen the burden of guilt and they decide to flee yet further. Soon, however, their situation will undergo a dramatic transformation.

15: THE CESSATION OF THE POTION'S COMPULSION

The only other version which describes the loss of the potion's power is that of Eilhart:

> Îsaldîn he nicht vorneit
> von der minne gedrange
> und was sint alsô lange
> in deme walde mit der vrauwin
> (des mogit ir getrûwen)
> biz des trankis craft vorgî.
> daz wârin dô, alsô sprechin die
> die ez in dem bûche hân gelesin
> (daz mag wol ungelogin wesin),
> vîr jâr daz sie in trunkin.
> do begunde sie beide dunken,
> sie mochtin sich wol scheidîn
> und begunde in harte leidin
> in dem walde dez ungemach:
> sie enmochten einen einigen tach
> die arbeit nicht vîr lîden.
> sie mochten kûme vortrîben
> die nacht, und dô der tag quam,
> Tristrant dô die vrauwe nam.
> zu Ûgrîme he dâ mede reit
> unde sprach.... (ll. 4724-44)

The passage in G contains a number of points of information. First of all, Tristan is in the forest with the queen until the potion runs its course (ll. 4726-9). Next, once the potion has ceased to have effect they feel they should separate and they cannot endure the suffering any longer (ll. 4730-9). Finally, on the next day, Tristan takes his lady to the hermit (ll. 4240-4). As is often the case, it is Tristan who is the initiator of events in G: he alone has seen the hermit Ûgrîm before and it is he who now takes the queen with him to the hermit. Béroul will offer a different version. It is obvious that Eilhart's account is much shorter than that of B,

where the episode covers ll. 2133-2268 (if this division of the text is accepted), but the consequences of the relative brevity of C must also be ascertained. By limiting to a strict minimum the length of the passage which tells of the crucial cessation of the potion's compulsion, the two episodes which stand on either side of the passage, namely the two hermit scenes, are thrown into greater relief. In the first hermit scene, Tristan refuses to leave Isout:

> dô stunt dem gûten knechte
> dennoch die rede nicht sô hô,
> daz her ez wolde tûn.
> âne bûze he dannen reit. (ll. 4720-3)

But in the second hermit scene, Tristan expresses his willingness to do what Ûgrîn had previously suggested:

> unde sprach, im wêre leit
> daz he nicht getân habete
> swes he in irmanete;
> und sprach, he woldez gerne tûn
> und die vrauwe ouch dar zû. (ll. 4744-8)

The German version thus presents two contrasting episodes, on either side of the passage in which we learn of the end of the potion's effect, and it may well be that the structure of its source is being reproduced.

Does Béroul's romance present a similar structure? This would seem at first glance to be ruled out, for different episodes from those of C are involved. The first hermit episode in B is the first of the episodes in which the lovers actively participate to be set against the forest background, and the episode immediately before the potion wears off is the Separating Sword incident. But the event itself is of such great importance that a form of antithetical structure must suggest itself to any author almost automatically: once the time-limit is reached things can never be the same again,

the lovers' life immediately after the potion has ceased to have effect must be different from their life immediately before. An examination of the lovers' reactions to events, in both the Separating Sword incident and in this episode, will certainly show that in B the episodes are closely related.

For much of the time the lovers played a passive role in the Separating Sword incident, but after they woke up they realized that Mark had been in the bower. Their reaction to this knowledge must be explained in terms of the recognition of their own guilt, of the realization that they had wronged the king. Because of their sense of guilt, they misconstrued Mark's gestures and, because the potion still ruled them, they could not attempt to make amends by separating. In this, the next episode, the lovers' reaction to events is dominated by a similar awareness of guilt, by the same awareness of the wrong they have done to Mark.

The major event to which the lovers react is, of course, the sudden cessation of the potion's influence. Tristan is hunting:

> La ou il cort aprés la beste,
> L'ore revient, et il s'areste,
> Qu'il ot bel le lovendrant. (ll. 2157-9)

In the speech which follows, Tristan again confesses that he has harmed his uncle:

> Dex! tant m'amast mes oncle(r)s chiers,
> Se tant ne fuse a lui mesfez! (ll. 2170-1)

Payen would minimize the importance of these lines and suggests that Tristan may not be expressing genuine remorse at all.[1] But the lines

---

1. 'Encore faudrait-il que dans les v. 2169-70 (sic)..., Tristan exprimât autre chose que le seul regret de n'avoir pu profiter des faveurs dont l'eût comblé s'il ne l'avait trahi. Nous ne pouvons donc même pas affirmer que ces deux vers impliquent chez le héros un véritable remords!' (Le motif..., p. 347, note 29).

surely gain importance because a similar consideration, a similar awareness of the harm that he has done to Mark has governed his reactions to events in the previous episode.[2] After Tristan's speech is over, the author will sum up the hero's reactions and will concentrate on this very same point:

> Tristran s'apuie sor son arc,
> Sovent regrete le roi Marc,
> Son oncle, qui a fait tel tort,
> Sa feme mise a tel descort. (ll. 2195-8)

It may be that certain similarities of presentation in the two episodes are meant to provoke a comparison. In both episodes there is an indication of the time of year. Line 2147, 'L'endemain de la saint Jehan', corresponds to the earlier lines, 1774-6. In the earlier episode Tristan grows weary in pursuit of a stag, and he similarly hunts a stag in this episode:

> Tristran, sachiez, une doitre
> A un cerf trouve, qu'il out wisé,
> Par les flans l'a outre rsé,
> Fuit s'en li cerf, Tristran l'ageut;
> Que soirs fu plains tant le porseut. (ll. 2152-6)

These details surely point further to the conclusion that we have two episodes in which the lovers' reactions are ruled by the same, basic consideration, an awareness of wrong done, of pain inflicted. But whereas in the first episode the lovers could only flee, now, in this episode, liberated from the power of the potion, they can take steps to reduce their burden of guilt and will seek out the hermit for advice.

Vinaver sees a link between the Separating Sword incident and this episode, but he prefers to stress the complementary rather than

---

2. Payen admits that he does not concentrate to any degree upon the separating sword incident (Le motif..., p. 345, note 27).

the contrasting nature of the link:

La scène du brusque réveil des amants fait corps avec celle de leur découverte par le roi Marc, et ces deux scènes à leur tour n'ont de sens que parce qu'elles préparent un autre réveil, plus brusque encore, celui de Tristan au moment où il s'arrête comme pour entendre sonner l'heure à laquelle, il y a trois ans, il a bu le philtre.[3]

He writes elsewhere:

L'investiture par le gant, l'anneau et l'épée rappelle Iseut auprès de Marc, au poste dès lors de placer ce revirement sous l'égide du merveilleux, de le transposer dans le langage du conte.[4]

It may well be that the 'triple investiture' of Mark had an effect in that it caused the lovers to acknowledge their guilt with regard to Mark. It is this acknowledged sense of guilt which causes them to wrongly interpret the signs he left them and this sense of guilt naturally continues into the next episode. What the next episode describes is therefore not the awakening of a sense of responsibility towards Mark, but the liberation of the lovers from the potion. Now they can do something about their sense of guilt, they can seek to fulfil obligations towards Mark of which they are already well aware.

So far the individual reactions of Tristan and Iseut to the taking of the potion have been treated as identical, but there are certain differences of emphasis which emerge from an analysis of their monologues.

Tristan's monologue runs from l. 2161 to l. 2194. He describes first of all his present situation: he is not at court, he has neglected chivalry. At l. 2173 we have a new departure, for Tristan

---

3. CCN, XI, p. 12.
4. BARTEB, XXIX, p. 210.

goes on to describe what he ought to be doing at that time. Tristan does not only regret the pleasures of life at court, he is also aware that he has failed to carry out certain duties which his rightful position would have brought.

> Or deüse estre a cort a roi,
> Et cent danzeaus avoques moi,
> Qui servisent por armes prendre
> Et a moi lor service rendre.
> Aler deüse en autre(s) terre(s)
> Soudoier et soudees querre(s). (ll. 2173-8)

Certainly the accomplishment of these duties would have brought some honour to Tristan, but nevertheless it does seem that Tristan regrets not only his lost privileges but also his unfulfilled obligations. This lack of egocentricity in his reaction appears again when he expresses sympathy for the situation of the queen; she, similarly, has lost the comforts which her rightful situation would have brought her, and for this Tristan assumes the blame: 'Por moi a reine male voie' (l. 2184).

The present situation they share is the effect of a precise cause, their adulterous relationship and the harm they have inflicted upon Mark. Death was to be their punishment, but this they escaped and they endure instead exile in the forest. What Tristan hopes to do now is to return Iseut to Mark, and he prays for the will-power which would enable him to leave the queen alone:

> A Deu, qui est sire du mont,
> Cri je merci, que il me donst
> Itel corage que je lais
> A mon oncle sa feme en pais. (ll. 2185-8)

By returning his uncle's wife, Tristan hopes to eliminate the cause of the present situation, his adultery with Iseut which Mark has sought to punish. The descort (l. 2198) in which Iseut finds

herself is the effect of this same cause, the adulterous relationship through which he has so wronged his uncle, 'Son oncle, qui a fait tel tort' (l. 2197). Payen writes of Tristan's reaction in this passage. 'Qu'Yseut soit devenue pécheresse est moins à ses yeux que le fait de l'avoir réduite au pire dénuement.'[5] But Tristan has not really judged one facet of their relationship as less serious than another. Rather there is a chain of cause and effect: adultery is the result of the potion, Mark proposes punishment as a result of adultery and the attendant wrong done to him, and the lovers' present situation is the result of their escape from punishment. Adultery was unavoidable after the drinking of the potion, but the potion has ceased to have any effect and adultery is no longer believed to be unavoidable. What must be done is to limit the results of that adultery, so Tristan now proposes that Iseut should be returned to Mark. The potion, the initial begetter of the chain of cause and effect, has eliminated itself: now Tristan must come to terms with the new situation.

In the speech which begins at l. 2201, Iseut stresses, like Tristan, the situation in which she finds herself:

> En bois estes com autre serve,
> Petit trovez qui ci vos serve. (ll. 2203-4)

Like Tristan again, she misses the honours which would be bestowed upon her at court, but she also seems to be aware that her rightful position would bring certain obligations:

> Les damoiseles des anors,
> Les filles as frans vavasors,
> Deüse ensemble o moi tenir
> En mes chambres, por moi servir,
> Et les deüse marier
> Et as seignors por bien doner.

---

5. Le Motif..., p. 347.

These lines, 2211-6, echo Tristan's regrets and sense of obligation in ll. 2173-8, a similar six-line passage. But while Tristan referred back only to the adultery and the pain inflicted upon Mark as the cause of their present situation, Iseut goes back to the beginning of the chain, to the potion and to the person who gave them the potion:

> Je sui roïne, mais le non
> En ai perdu par ma poison
> Que nos beümes en la mer.
> Ce fist Brengain, qu'i dut garder. (ll. 2205-8)

Iseut is not thrusting blame on to Brengain,[6] but simply recalling the nature of the accident which lies behind their present plight.

Before examining further developments in the episode, the love philtre and its nature ought to be discussed. Tristan is now hoping to return Iseut to Mark, and this decision is only possible because the potion has lost its power. The potion and its effects are described in ll. 2133-46:

> Seignors, du vin de qoi il burent
> Avez oï, por qoi il furent
> En si grant paine longtens mis;
> Mais ne savez, ce m'est avis
> A conbien fu determinez
> Li lovendrins, li vin herbez:
> La mere Yseut, qui le bolli,
> A trois anz d'amistié le fist.
> Por Marc le fist et por sa fille:
> Autre en bruvi, qui s'en essille.

---

6. Brengain seems to have had the duty of looking after the potion in B, but it is not absolutely certain that it was she who gave the lovers the potion to drink. In O, a female servant appears to hand over the potion:

> do sprach ein hobisch juncfrauwelîn
> 'ich wene, hêre, hie steit wîn.' (ll. 2343-4)

In R, both Brengain and Governal present the drink to the lovers (see Curtis II, § 445). The version of R is probably a later development which helps to motivate the scene in which Brengain is called upon to act as substitute for Iseut in Mark's bed (see Bogdanow, 'Quelques remarques...', p. 977). The Edinburgh manuscript (Johnson, p. 31) gives a slightly different account: there it is not clear whether Brengain and Governal themselves gave the lovers the drink or not. In L'Escoufle (ll. 6356-7), it is assumed that Brengain personally handed over the potion. For a review of the whole problem, see Buschinger, Le 'Tristrant'..., II, pp. 928-30.

Tant con durerent li trois ans,
Out li vins si sourris Tristran
Et la roïne ensemble o lui
Que chacun disoit : 'Los m'en fui.'

From this passage it would appear that Béroul had deliberately held back information up to this moment and had not told his audience of the time-limit imposed upon the potion. In B this is three years, in O four years (ll. 2283 and 2288). It is possible to see a contradiction of a kind in B, if one considers the trois anz plainiers of l. 2131 to be the time the lovers spent in the forest.[7] But if we understand s'en esaile in l. 2142 to have the meaning, 'suffering exile', the line summarizes Tristan's progress so far, with all the intermediate stages eliminated: drinking the potion has led to his exile in the forest. Line 2146, as it appears in Ewert's edition, is really far from satisfactory, but Muret's Las n'en sui is hardly a convincing alternative; indeed, it may suggest exactly the opposite of what is intended.

At this stage in the romance, the three years of the potion's efficacy have come to an end:

L'endemain de la Saint Jehan
Acompli furent li trois an
Que cil vin fu determinez. (ll. 2147-9)

From this bare statement and from the information given in ll. 2133-46, it would appear that the potion itself no longer has any power over the lovers. But many critics are reluctant to accept that this is so. Frappier, for example, has written:

---

7. See Frappier, CCL, VI, p. 269, note 53. But Curtis remarks that Béroul 'may just be summing up the lovers' fate: ever since they loved each other (i.e. three years), they suffered pain' (Tristan Studies, p. 32). It certainly seems quite fanciful to relate the three years of the potion's effects to 'la durée de la vie publique du Christ' (Bartoli, Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut, p. 136, note 15).

Le philtre de la version commune offre enfin une particularité bien curieuse: sa pleine efficacité est limitée dans le temps. Comme le précise Eilhart 'le boire d'amour' avait tant de force durant les quatre premières années que les amants ne pouvaient rester séparés plus d'un jour sans tomber malades, ni plus d'une semaine sans mourir. Mais au bout de quatre ans sa violence diminuait assez pour qu'il leur fût permis de vivre éloignés l'un de l'autre. Iseut et Tristan n'en devaient pas moins s'aimer toute leur vie de tout leur être: rien ne pourrait jamais les affranchir du charme fatal.

C'est à coup sûr Eilhart qui demeure ici fidèle à l'archétype, alors que Béroul a faussé la donnée initiale en disant que la mère d'Iseut avait fait bouillir le philtre 'à trois ans d'amitié'.[8]

This call upon Eilhart to fill out the information which Béroul supplies is common amongst critics,[9] but reliance upon the German version is a rather desperate resort at such an important juncture.

The account of the potion's nature in O, to which Frappier has referred, comes early in the poem, before the philtre is handed over to the lovers on board ship, and the passage ought perhaps to be quoted in full:

> Der trank der was sô getân:
> swelch îp pres man
> des getrunkin beide,
> die entrochten sich mit muote sorgeiden
> innewendig vîr jâren.
> swie gerne sie es verbârin,
> sie musten sich minnen
> mit allen irn sinnen
> die êle daz sie lebtin.
> vîr jâr sie abir phlegetin
> sô grôzir liebe beide,
> daz sie sich nicht gescheidin
> mochtin einen halben tag.
> swedir daz ander nicht en sach
> alle tage, daz wart siechen.
> von den tranke hâten sie sich lîp.
> ab sie dêrin eine wochen
> von ein ander ungesprochen,
> sie musten beide wesin tôt. (ll. 2279-97)

This account surely strikes one as too complete, too much in accordance with what follows. It also seems premature. One must

---

8. CCL, VI, p. 203.
9. See Delboeille, CCL, V, p. 424, Ebert, Volume II, p. 194, Frappier, Le Courant réaliste..., p. 70. Curtis's claim, that 'all critics seem to agree in considering Eilhart's reading a later development' (sic) (Martin Studer, p. 32, note 12), seems a trifle optimistic.

consider it unlikely that Béroul also could have told of a partial diminution of the potion's influence at such an early stage in his romance: the loss of the potion's power is meant to be a completely unexpected occurrence which gives the promise of a solution after the impasse of the Separating Sword incident. One might add that the text of the German poem is not perfectly established. Kelemina queried the authenticity of ll. 2206-7, and he may well be right in doing so, even though his actual arguments are unconvincing.[10] Moreover, it seems from Lunischer's translation that there is no equivalent to ll. 2206-7 in the Czech version.[11]

Critics have alluded to Eilhart's account only because they felt that Béroul's version lacked completeness.[12] But is this really so? We can surely see in Béroul's romance an interpretation which is at once complete and non-contradictory. It is wrong to suppose that the end of the potion's effect means that the love between Tristan and Iseut also comes to an end.[13] What could have happened if the right people had drunk the potion? Iseut's mother, so we know from ll. 2139-41, brewed the potion for her daughter and for King Marc. It was surely not her intention that all love between them should come to an end after the three years which she herself had decided was to be the period of the potion's effect! Iseut's mother meant the potion to be a kind of compulsive aphrodisiac which

---

10. Untersuchungen..., p. 15.
11. Zeitschrift, XVI, p. 296.
12. Frappier, for example, writes: 'Si l'on prenait cette affirmation à la lettre, il faudrait en tirer la conclusion que, passé le délai de trois ou quatre ans, l'amour de Tristan et d'Iseut a cessé d'exister' (Romania, VI, p. 269). Le Gentil, in contrast, writes 'Il ne faut pas, en effet, s'y tromper. La passion a cessé de tout commander, mais l'amour subsiste' ('L'épisode du Morois...', p. 272).
13. Curtis has a clear understanding of the problem. See Tristan Studies, pp. 20-35.

would counter my reluctance to consummate the arranged marriage. Had the right people taken the potion, they would have continued to love each other after the three years, after the philtre lost its influence. But 'Autre en prova, qui s'en essaille'. The wrong people took the aphrodisiac, their love continues after its effect ceases, but because they are the wrong people they cannot stay together. They are now able to contemplate separation, to make redress to the person who ought to have drunk the potion.[14]

At l. 2221 Tristan begins to consider the problem of separation,[15] and it is a problem with two associated aspects. There is firstly the question of the relationship between Iseut and himself, which might be termed the personal, private side. If they are to be spiritually rehabilitated it is essential for them to separate, and this they are able to do now that the potion no longer rules them. The second aspect of the problem concerns their joint relationship to King Mark and to society as a whole. How are they to bring about the return of Iseut to Mark, the reconciliation with the wronged king? This aspect could be termed the public side of the problem and it is the side which first of all dominates Tristan's speech. He longs for someone to find a way whereby he could make his peace with the king and at the same time persuade Mark to allow him to enter the lists in order to defend himself against any accusation. As in the <u>Fier de ferine</u> episode, Tristan would like to be in a

---

14. For a not dissimilar view of the potion's nature, see J. Gallais, <u>Genèse du roman occidental</u>, pp. 121-2.
15. It is more than surprising to find at l. 2217 that Tristan has returned to the cover and that Iseut is addressing him. The transition is certainly abrupt, as Meyer has pointed out (<u>Le motif...</u>, p. 348). Perhaps we have another case here of Béroul's lack of interest in the precise geographical location of his characters.

position to offer combat against anyone who might accuse him of adultery.

> Ne chevalier en son royaume,
> Ne de Lidan tresque en Duresme,
> S'il volsit dire ore ainsi
> Eüse o vos por desnonor,
> Ne m'en trovast en champ, armé.[16]

This is a theme which returns frequently, in various forms, in the next scenes. In ll. 2366-70, Ogrin contemplates a return to court for Tristan, on which occasion nobody would be believed if he brought an accusation of adultery and on which occasion the king could have Tristan hanged if he were unable to sustain his contention in a 'wager of battle'. In ll. 2368-80, in the letter sent to Mark, the theme of the 'wager of battle' is fully developed and associated with a 'wager in law'. Finally, in the speech beginning at l. 2831, made on the day Isolt is restored to Mark, Tristan concerns himself with this same matter.

Tristan then considers his own future, after Isolt has somehow been returned to King Mark. He proposes two alternatives, and, like the combat theme, these same two alternatives will recur in the following scenes. One possibility is that he will serve Mark, an idea first expressed in ll. 2236-42 and repeated to Ogrin in ll. 2311-3, and which then forms part of the projected letter in ll. 2404-6 before being included, at ll. 2604-6, in the letter which is read to Mark. The second possibility envisaged by Tristan is that Mark will ask him to leave and he will then seek service elsewhere. The substance of ll. 2243-8 in this episode will be echoed

---

16. E 2231-5. See also ll. 7[illegible]-803.

> 'Car il n'i aroie en ta meson,
> Se disoit cette traison
> Que pris d'ese d'ëuvre
> O la roïne par folie,
> Ne m'en trovast en champ, armé.

in other episodes, by ll. 2305-10, 2407-9 and 2608-12. His exact destination, if he does have to leave the country, is left open, but the same names reoccur, Frise (2246, 2408, 2610), Bretaigne (2247, 2310); Leonois is a possibility (2268 and, with the emendation, 2310), and the barons suggest Gavoie (2631, and perhaps 2925). Although these considerations concern Tristan's own future, they still form part of the public side of the problem, for they depend on what marriage will allow Tristan to do.

Then, at l. 2249, Tristan turns to consider his personal relationship with Iseut. Everything points to the fact that the love continues:

> Roine franche, ou que je soie,
> Vostre tes jorz ie clameroie. (ll. 2249-50)

Separation does not mean rejection, but is rather a sign of continued concern on Tristan's part. Now that the potion, the root cause of their present situation, has lost its power and they are able to part, in the interests of her spiritual salvation Iseut ought once more to assume her rightful place in society.

Iseut responds with enthusiasm to Tristan's words. She proposes at once that they should go together to the hermit and get his solution, thanks to which they will be able to contemplate the possibility of joy eternal:

> De ce soi ioie franchemere:
> Conseil nos donroit honorable,
> Par qoi a joie pardurable
> Porron encore cien venir.' (ll. 2274-7)

Just as Tristan prayed to God in ll. 2185-8 for strength to do at last what was right, so Iseut is hoping that a solution to their

spiritual problems may somehow be forthcoming, and that joie perdurable may yet be theirs. Of course, this means that reinstatement in society must be achieved, however painful this reinstatement may be. With this in view, Tristan goes on to envisage the sending of a letter with the help of Ogrin, a suggestion which Iseut once again wholeheartedly approves.[17]

---

17. Payen writes: 'Il y a d'ailleurs un singulier malentendu dans ce dialogue. Yseut a parlé de joie perdurable (sic), et Tristan répond en évoquant la lettre (le "bref") par lequel Ogrin pourrait obtenir le pardon de Marc' (Le Motif..., p. 349). This is surely an erroneous view. There is no hope of the lovers' gaining eternal life if their separation and their social rehabilitation do not come about: the letter is the means whereby these ends will be achieved.

16: THE RETURN FROM THE FOREST

The next episode, in our division of the text, runs from l. 2289-2764.[1] This certainly makes for a long episode and represents a division of the text not accepted by Ewert, who splits roughly the same lines into four separate sections. Since the first meeting with Ogrin was treated as a full episode, should not the second meeting be treated in the same way? But there is probably better justification for treating the lines as one, continuous sequence. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Tristan has already formulated his plans. He wishes to return Iseut to Mark, to bring about a reconciliation and to offer combat against any accusation of misconduct: once Iseut has been accepted back, he will stay and serve his king, if Mark so wishes, or alternatively, he will leave and enter the service of a foreign king. Tristan will not modify such an objective to any important degree in all the scenes described in this long episode. Ogrin's role in the episode is essentially to tell the lovers how best to achieve that objective. Reconciliation is the aim (ll. 2223-5): how reconciliation may be achieved is the problem which Ogrin will help to solve (ll. 2265-2277). But Tristan himself already has a clear idea as to how reconciliation might be effected; a letter will be necessary:

> Encor enuit ou le matin,
> O le consel de maistre Ogrin,
> Manderon a nostre talent
> Par briés sanz autre mandement.'[2]

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 2289-2764; C, ll. 4743-4909.
2. Lines 2281-4. The comma which Ewert prints at l. 2284 is surely a misprint, but it is uncorrected in his second volume, unlike the similar misprint at l. 1605.

The episode will, therefore, tell how Tristan's plans are brought close to fruition, and there is an almost unbroken line of progress up to l. 2764 (the events of the actual day of restitution will be discussed in the next chapter). Ogrin will hear of Tristan's plans, will offer no objections and will tender his advice. Very much as Tristan had predicted, he proposes that a letter should be sent and the contents of the letter are suggested. The letter is transmitted to Mark, he sends a reply, and the lovers then reflect upon their future. Events follow one of the courses Tristan had anticipated.

The lovers seek the advice of Ogrin, the first step in the progress towards reconciliation. Almost inevitably, this second interview with the hermit follows quite closely the pattern of the first. There is the exhortation of Ogrin to the lovers, Tristan's speech follows and then comes Iseut's.[3] Ogrin then gives his response. Eilhart's version of the scene (ll. 4743-63) is notable for the very minor role that is assigned to Iseut. Whereas in B it is Iseut who suggests that they should seek Ogrin's advice, in O she is simply taken along by Tristan and does not participate in the conversation: it will be remembered that she was not present at all in the first hermit scene in O.

Ogrin's exhortation to the lovers runs from l. 2295 to l. 2299. The hermit lays stress upon what he takes to be their present situation, upon their present way of life. They have become gent dechacie by reason of their love, and he entreats with them to repent, to leave their state of sin. Tristan replies in ll. 2300-18. This time there is the possibility of progress in Tristan's dealings with the hermit, a possibility that was precluded in the first scene. He claims that the life described by the hermit is now at an end:

---

3. For a further similarity between the episodes, note l. 1409 and ll. 2319-20.

Si longuement l'avon menee,
Itel fu nostre destinee;
Trois anz a bien, si que n'i falle,
Onques ne nos falli travalle.[4]

He goes on to say that he seeks a means of effecting a reconciliation with Mark, and that he will either leave or stay and serve his uncle. Tristan consequently concentrates upon the practicalities of how best to achieve the reconciliation of Iseut with the king. He does not aim at reconciliation with the king for himself, only for Iseut, nor is he concerned with his own spiritual situation. It is also clear from ll. 2300-4 that the life with which Ogrin reproaches the lovers is now quite over. Now, in their new state, they need the hermit's help and advice.

Iseut's response to the hermit is to plead with him with all her heart to aid them in their search for reconciliation. She, quite explicitly, declares that henceforth the physical love she shared with Tristan is at an end:

Ge ne di pas, a vostre entente,
Que de Tristran jor me repente
Que je ne l'aim de bone amor
Et com amis, sanz desanor;
De la comune de mon cors
Et je du suen somes tuit fors.' (ll. 2325-30)

There is no such declaration in G. Iseut, as has been stated, plays only a very small part in the scene in the German version, but similar sentiments are not voiced by the hero. How should we look upon Iseut's statement? She emphasizes that she will remain in love, but her love will be a 'good' love, platonic in the sense of non-physical, and the kind of love she ought quite reasonably to bestow upon Tristan.

---

4. B 2301-4. These lines obviously resemble ll. 2161-4.

Ogrin's delight, upon hearing Iseut's words, is manifest. He gives thanks to God for letting him live to see the day when the couple came to consult him as to how best to proceed in view of their previous sinning. Although the hermit will soon follow up his general statement about absolution with practical advice on what can be done in the lovers' particular situation, he puts their case in universal terms first of all:

> Qant home et feme font pechié,
> S'anz se sont pris et sont quitié
> Et s'aus vienent a penitence
> Et aient bone repentance,
> Dex lor pardone lor mesfait,
> Tant ne seroit criable et lait. (ll. 2345-50)

In O, the question of repentance is attacked much more directly:

> Ûgrîm der gûte man
> Tristrande vrâgin began,
> ab he des hête rûwe
> swaz he mit der vrauwen
> hête getân obiles,
> 'und wiltû dene koninge
> sie denne wedir gebin?'
> "jâ ich" sprach der edole degin.
> daz was Ûgrîme lîp. (ll. 4755-63)

In the German version, the hermit straightway seems to accept the claim of repentance, the restitution of the queen being consequent upon it. In B, so Le Gentil has suggested, the situation is the reverse; the restitution of Iseut and the separation of the lovers would be an aid to true repentance. Concerning the hermit's role he then writes:

Mais comment ne les encouragerait-il pas à persévérer dans la voie où ils semblent vouloir désormais s'engager, puisque cette voie peut les conduire au salut? Une réconciliation avec Marc constitue la première et indispensable étape qu'il faut les aider à franchir, parce qu'elle en prépare d'autres plus importantes, plus décisives.[5]

---

5. 'L'Épisode du Morois...', p. 273.

But the text does not really confirm the view that the separation of the lovers and the restitution of the queen must be looked upon quite in this light.[6] Rather the separation of the lovers is on a different plane from the problem of sin and repentance. We have moved away now from the private plane, from the personal situation of the lovers, to the public plane, the need for reconciliation with the third party they know they have wronged.

Line 2351, with the new call upon the hero and heroine, marks the transition to this new plane:

> Tristran, roïne, or escoutez
> Un petitet, si m'entendez:
> Por honte oster et mal covrir
> Doit on un poi par bel mentir. (ll. 2351-4)

These lines have persuaded critics to accuse the hermit of a number of vices. Evert, for example, writes: 'It is significant for our understanding of Beroul that he presents Ogrin as combining the orthodoxy of a court preacher (1377-80, 1387-98) with a casuistry which verges on the cynical (2353-4) and a readiness to advise the lovers to pursue a course of action of more than doubtful morality.'[7] Jonin is even harsher in his condemnation of Ogrin: 'Mais Frère Ogrin est si peu choqué par le mensonge qu'après l'avoir conseillé, il fonde sur lui tout un plan d'action.'[8] But the hermit finds a supporter in Nichols: 'Ogrin is clearly somewhat less than orthodox as a cleric, but it would be overhasty to term him cynical, nor could his conduct be said to compromise the Church. Looking forward to the positive gains, he arranges for the return of a wife to her

---

6. Vàrvaro also criticizes Le Gentil's view (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 121, note 21).
7. Evert, Volume II, pp. 164-5.
8. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 351.

husband, a queen to her realm, and a discordant land to a harmonious state.'[9] Nichols is surely right to refute a potential charge of cynicism. By now the hermit is no longer directly concerned with the lovers' sin and their movement towards true repentance, but with burying the past.

Ogrin decides to write a letter and starts to outline its possible contents. The machinery necessary to bring about the restitution of Iseut is thus beginning to move. What the hermit suggests should be in the letter is close to what Tristan himself had proposed, firstly in discussion with Iseut and then with Ogrin himself. If Mark desires a reconciliation, Tristan would engage any accuser in combat at court. The accusation would be directed against Tristan, but would naturally involve Iseut (nostre escondit, l. 2227); indeed, if the innocence of Iseut were not indirectly proved, shame would always be attached to her, and, by implication, to Mark. The whole sequence, ll. 2361-70, is obviously close to what Tristan had suggested in ll. 2223-35, but not so close that we can accept fort in l. 2366: the construction of ll. 2231-5 is not being reproduced in ll. 2366-70.[10] Ogrin goes on to say that nobody would dare to oppose Tristan:

> Tristran, por ce t'os bien loer,
> Que ja n'i troveras ton per
> Qui gage doinst encontre toi;
> Icest consel te doin par foi. (ll. 2371-4)

Certainly the hermit is displaying a degree of calculation not quite

---

9. 'Ethical Criticism...', p. 81.
10. Ewert accepts fort (Ewert, Volume II, p. 203), but Reid has legitimate reservations ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 277, The 'Tristan'..., p. 87).

in accordance with his position as spiritual leader,[11] but he is no longer acting in a purely religious capacity; what he is now seeking to achieve is the restitution of Iseut to Mark.[12]

Ogrin advises Tristan to appeal to past events and marshals a series of arguments to explain the lovers' present situation. Like the author in the earlier episode, he counsels putting the king in the wrong, exploiting the instance of divine intervention on his behalf and reminding him that what he had done he had done because of Mark's failure. He goes on to propose a formal defence by Tristan as a result of which the king may well feel disposed to have his wife back:

> S'il veut prendre vostre escondit,
> Si qel verront grant et petit,
> Vos li offrez a sa cort feire.
> Et se lui venoit a viaire,
> Qant vos serez de lui loiaus
> Au loement de vos vasaus,
> Preïst sa feme la cortoise.[13]

This defence is presumably the same as that anticipated in ll. 2223-35 and ll. 2361-70. The final point Ogrin would wish to include in the letter would be Tristan's willingness to serve the king, if Mark so desires, or, if not, to depart the realm and serve elsewhere.

That Ogrin is fulfilling Tristan's hopes, even repeating the possible alternatives that the hero had himself anticipated, must now be abundantly clear. The overall impression conveyed is that the hermit is not playing an initiating role, but, having taken his cue

---

11. Frappier points out that Ogrin's reasoning at this point is virtually identical to that of Tristan in ll. 813-8 (CCM, VI, p. 445).
12. Hunt makes a similar remark: 'It therefore appears likely that in Béroul's poem Ogrin recognizes the lovers' desire to amend their life and judiciously expedites the reconciliation with the king in the interests of Mark and also in order to consolidate the lovers' acceptance of a new situation' (Rom., XCVIII, p. 534).
13. B 2397-2405. Vos in l. 2402 is almost certainly a scribal error for ses, but other problems remain. As in Muret's editions and M4, l. 2402 should probably be associated with l. 2403, but l. 2401 may then appear faulty (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 87-8).

from Tristan, devising as plausible a case as can be made.[14] By contrast, in the German version, it is Ûgrîm who decides what measures should be taken. A letter is mentioned first at l. 4764, 'zu hant dô schreib he einen brîf', when Ûgrîm in fact writes the document; there is no long discussion of its possible contents and Tristan is not called upon to give his approval, as he is in B (l. 2410). Nor do we find in the German romance a passage equivalent to ll. 2411-27 of B. Tristan has no trust in Mark now that there is a price on his head. He proposes that Mark should write another letter which should be hung at the Croiz Roge,[15] for he is afraid to reveal his whereabouts to Mark. Again Tristan is in B the proposer of plans, the initiator of a course of action.

The next stage in the progress towards the restitution of Iseut is the writing and transmission of the letter, described in ll. 2428-2509. The narrative develops in a similar fashion in B and O (ll. 4764-4838). In both versions, it is Tristan who conveys the letter written by the hermit. In B his destination is Lancïen (l. 2453), in O Tintanjôl (l. 4775). He is accompanied by Governal in B, but in O the hero goes alone. There is a conversation between Tristan and his uncle, with a stray element of comedy in the German version:

> he gîng dâ der koning lach.
> dorch die want he im zû sprach
> und vrâgete in, ab ze slîfe.
> 'jâ ich, ab man mich lîze'
> sprach der koning rîche. (ll. 4785-9)

---

14. Jonin undoubtedly over-stresses the initiating role of the hermit in B (Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 351-2).
15. B 2419. The Croiz Roge has already been mentioned in l. 1909. In O, ll. 4819-21, on the hermit's instructions, Tristan will tell Mark to leave his letter:

> an daz crûze daz bîr steit,
> dâ die stâze enzwei geit
> bî dem torme vor der stad.

In both romances the king begs his nephew to stay a while, but Tristan rides off at once.

The major differences between B and O are not unexpected. In O, Ûgrîm has an important role to play. In the letter Ûgrîm urges compliance with what he has proposed:

> deme koninge reit he bî gote
> daz he mit willen tête
> swes her in dem brîfe bête. (ll. 4768-70)

Ûgrîm is, therefore, not simply the scribe who writes a letter for Tristan in accordance with what Tristan wants. Indeed, in O it is a letter from Ûgrîm which Tristan transmits to the king, not a personal letter of his own:

> und sprach "dîn bîchteger Ûgrîm
> sendit dir desin brîf. (ll. 4804-5)

It is Ûgrîm who through Tristan tells Mark to write a letter in reply and who tells the king where to place the letter. In comparison, Tristan plays a self-effacing role: he does not reveal his identity at once to Mark and it is only when Tristan has finished speaking that the king recognizes the voice of his nephew.[16] In B, it is Ogrin who plays a basically passive role. He is merely the agent of Tristan's wishes and it is never revealed to Mark that he is the deviser of Tristan's letter. Accordingly, there is no mention in B of the kind of theological blackmail in which Ûgrîm indulges in ll. 4806-14:

> und entbût dir, ab he dir sî lîf
> zu einem bîchtegêre,
> daz dû vernimest dese mêre,
> swaz dar ane geschrîben sî,
> und entbût dir dâ bî
> daz he dir wol helfen gunde:
> vor alle dîne sunde
> wil he dir zu bûze gebin
> sô mochtestû daz gerne nemen.

---

16. O 4824-5. Contrast ll. 2465-6 of B.

It seems a feature of the whole of Béroul's romance when it is compared with O, that the queen has a significantly more prominent part to play. In O, Iseut is not mentioned in this particular scene, but it is no surprise to find that in ll. 2489-95 of the French romance we have a record of Iseut's reaction to Tristan's absence. Another characteristic feature of B appears at the very beginning of the scene. Before leaving with Governal, Tristan outlines what he intends to do and when he eventually puts his plan into action events follow the course one has been led to expect.[17] A similar development was seen in the Separating Sword incident, in ll. 2020-50, where Mark planned the substitution in a monologue, before he proceeded to act.

The next scene in B, ll. 2510-2650, describes the reading of the letter, firstly to Mark and then to the assembled barons. Mark summons his chaplain first of all, who informs the king of the contents of the letter. The barons then assemble[18] and, after an intervention by Dinas, the chaplain reads the letter to them. The barons propose that the queen should be accepted back but say that Tristan cannot be allowed to stay. The king orders the chaplain to write a letter to this effect and the letter is hung up at the Croiz Roge.

The main difference in the account of O is that Ûgrîm is once more presented as playing a dominant role. It is Ûgrîm, not Tristan, who is appealing to Mark in the letter:

> dorch gotes liebe bite ich dich,
> Ûgrîm der meistir dîn,
> daz dû ez willest gût lân sîn
> dorch got und mîner bete willen.' (ll. 4858-61)

---

17. Vàrvaro discusses instances of repetition, as encountered in this passage, under the heading 'Le riprese dinamiche' (Il Roman de Tristan ..., pp. 200-3)
18. Does the king summon his court soon after he has received the letter in B? In O the king waits until day (ll. 4839-41).

Mark then tells in O of his experience when he found Tristan and Iseut lying together in the forest and of how he was convinced that no misconduct had occurred (ll. 4863-71). At this point Béroul makes no mention of the Separating Sword incident, but obviously the events of that day have contributed to the king's spontaneous reactions (ll. 2518-20, 2642-4) to the news that Tristan is willing to return Iseut. In O the letter is read out only once and it is not clear who actually reads it (ll. 4841-2, 4862, 4864). It may be that a mention of the individual concerned has been deliberately omitted from the reworked text, since the Czech translation states that a chaplain was responsible.[19]

The contents of the letter which the chaplain reads out in B are very much as anticipated. Firstly, at l. 2552, Tristan greets the king and his court, as Ogrin had proposed at l. 2358. The letter reminds the king that it was through Tristan's efforts that Iseut was brought to Cornwall: ll. 2556-64 thus pick up Ogrin's words in ll. 2391-4. Tristan then offers combat, specifically against those who would accuse Iseut. Previously, Tristan proposed to defend himself against those who would accuse him, but the lines here make it plain that Iseut would necessarily have been implicated.[20] From l. 2581 to l. 2603 there is a brief summary of the events which led up to their present situation, their exile in the Morrois. The same details encountered in ll. 2375-96, in the account of Ogrin, are listed here: the punishment which the lovers escaped, the leap from

---

19. See Muret, Rom., XVI, p. 344, note 2, Kniescbek, ZDADL, XVI, p. 323 and Ruckhäger, Le 'Tristrant'..., I, pp. 554-5.
20. Lines 2565-80 present a number of textual problems which are discussed in the third appendix. Suffice it to say at this point that Tristan is offering the kind of combat which has long been anticipated and that to derive fui in l. 2577 from faidir seems somewhat audacious.

the chapel, the freeing of Iseut from the lepers and their flight into the forest. Tristan's reluctance to fail Iseut is reaffirmed in ll. 2595-6. The letter then goes on to discuss Tristan's future. If Iseut is accepted back, he will serve the king or go and serve the roi de Frise: the alternatives are familiar.[21] At the close of the letter, however, an ultimatum is presented: if Mark refuses a reconciliation, Tristan will take Iseut to Ireland. If the problem cannot be harmoniously resolved in a manner agreeable to Mark, Tristan will seek a solution without Mark.

One wonders whether the episode so far is a complete success. Without foreknowledge, Ogrin does seem to reproduce Tristan's intentions with an uncanny precision. The terms in which the hermit foresaw a combat echo Tristan's own words in surprising detail. Once one enters on this line of thought certain other questions may arise. For example, how does Mark know where to hang the letter? The Croiz Rogo was not mentioned, neither by Tristan when he brought the letter nor in the letter itself: Tristan merely suggested to the hermit that the king's reply should be placed there, but somehow his instructions were followed. This may serve to remind us that it was Tristan who planned the whole of a campaign which has turned out to be extremely successful. What he sought to achieve almost immediately after the potion lost its power has in fact been achieved, for the decision given by the barons in ll. 2625-38 corresponds to one possible outcome that he had long since anticipated: Mark is to accept back Iseut and he must leave for Gavoie, to serve another king,

---

21. In O, it is only in the king's letter of reply that the idea first occurs that Tristan may have to leave (ll. 4872-83). The letter is reporting the council's decision.

at least for a time. The final section of the episode will describe the lovers' apprehension in face of the future which they have created for themselves.

Tristan retrieves Mark's letter from the Croiz Roge and hands it to the hermit.[22] The element of repetition which is characteristic of the episode as a whole reasserts itself on a minor scale here.[23] The hermit then reads the letter:

> Li hermite la chartre a prise,
> Lut les letres, vit la franchise
> Du roi, qui pardonne a Yseut
> Son mautalent, et qu'il veut
> Repenre la tant bonement. (ll. 2657-61)

It is only pardon for Iseut that the letter makes explicit. This is not really surprising, for Tristan had not sought to be rehabilitated in the same way as Iseut. He is prepared to undertake at court a formal defence of himself and, by the same token, of Iseut, and to engage in combat anyone who wishes to accuse him.[24] The queen will be received back at court and one alternative which Tristan proposed for himself has also been approved, so he learns from Ogrin. We see once more that it is Tristan who is about to realize his own hopes and that the hermit has merely acted as counsel and amanuensis:

> 'Tristran, quel joie t'est creüe!
> Ta parole est tost entendue. (ll. 2665-6)

The time and place which are proposed for the restitution of Iseut are typically Beroulian:

---

22. B 2651-6. Lines 4896-8 of O tell the same story:
> Tristrant des dô nicht en lîz,
> her holte in in der nachte;
> sînem meister her in brâchte.

23. Compare l. 2655 with ll. 2438 and 2452.

24. Tristan's position is not, in truth, very clear. Jonin discusses the question and makes reference to contemporary custom (Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 77-8).

D'ui en tierz jor, sanz nul decoivre,
Est li rois prest de lié reçoivre.
Devant le Gué Aventuros
Est li plez mis de vos et d'eus. (ll. 2675-8)

Iseut will return to her husband three days later in B, in O she will return in four days.[25] Béroul's predilection for three, as opposed to Eilhart's four, is once more in evidence. The site where the restitution will take place in P is already familiar (in O the site is not named), and l. 2677 is the same as l.1320 and l. 3436.

At this point in the episode, at l. 2681, Béroul returns to Tristan and Iseut's personal relationship in the new circumstances of restitution. Lines 2681-5 of Tristan's speech hark back to ll. 2251-5, and he then goes on to propose an exchange of tokens, indicating that he will keep in touch, come what may. Iseut then suggests the specific forms the tokens should take. Tristan is to leave her the incomparable Husdent, as a source of pleasure after pain. For her part, she entreats Tristan to wear her ring and to send it to her with any message: provided any request is unexceptionable, it will be honoured absolutely. The transfer of the ring then takes place:

De son doi l'oste, met a son.
Tristran en bese la roïne,
Et ele lui, per la saisine. (ll. 2730-2)

The terms por l'amor de moi (l. 2709) and par fine amor (l. 2722) could be regarded as purely conventional, but in this context they should surely be seen as indications that Tristan and Iseut continue to love each other but that now their love is of a non-physical nature. The terms should thus be associated with ll. 2323-30, and

---

25. The parallel lines in O read:
dô lîz he schrîben einen brîv,
her wolde die vrauwen wedir nemen,
ab oz Tristrande wolde gezemen,
dar mîn obir vîr tage. (ll. 4872-5)

particularly with the expression de bone amor of l. 2327.[26]

This scene is only the first of two separation scenes in B, for the exchange of tokens is confirmed in ll. 2778-2804. In Eilhart's version Tristan similarly presents Iseut with the dog, but it is not said that he receives a ring in return, and, moreover, he hands over the dog on the very day of restitution.[27] In Fb also, Tristan seems to indicate that the ring was given to him only on the day of the parlement:

> Encor ai l'anel pres de moi
> Que me donastes au partir
> Del parlemant que doi haïr. (ll. 221-3)

Jonin has reservations regarding the account in O: 'Pourtant il faut noter, malgré ces points communs, que la scène des adieux, où d'ailleurs Tristan parle seul, se situe dans Eilhart après l'arrivée auprès de Marc, quoiqu'il soit peu naturel que ce genre d'épanchements se produise devant le roi.'[28] It is not clear that the final leave-taking does in fact occur with the king looking on, but if the presence of the king is embarrassing in O the presence of the hermit might be deemed equally so in B. It may well be that Béroul has introduced an extra separation scene at an earlier point in his romance: if the exchange of gifts is accomplished in this new scene and need only be confirmed in the second, this leaves the

---

26. Frappier, likewise, seems to accept the presence of genuine sentiment beneath the formal phraseology: 'Ainsi Tristan et Iseut se garantissent entre eux la possession de leur amour en adoptant les rites de la fin'amor. Non que le Tristan de Béroul s'accorde véritablement avec les conceptions des troubadours. Mais l'éloignement auquel se trouvent contraints les amants coïncide avec une situation "classique" de la fin'amor et entraîne en conséquence l'emploi de sa terminologie' (CCI, II, p. 143).
27. O 4984-94. The dog in O is never named as Ût ant, but simply referred to as the hundelîn (4992). See Ewert's second volume (pp. 208-9) for a discussion of the possible influence of Petit-Crû. Ewert also discusses there the later possession by Tristan of a ring in ll. 6356-9 of O.
28. Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 32-3.

way open for the author to introduce new material.[29]

In O, after reading the letter, Ûgrîm has concerned himself at once with the acquisition of clothes:

> die cleider wârin im tûre,
> Ûgrîm gap im zu stûre
> vil armer lîn wâte
> swaz he selbe ob im hâte
> und swes her entbern mochte:
> daz im doch wênig tochte,
> daz dûchte Tristranden gût. (ll. 4903-9)

One important difference from the account in B is that the hermit gives poor but adequate clothes to Tristan, not to Iseut. A second point is that there is no account of a journey to St Michael's Mount, such as we read of in ll. 2733-44 in B, but Ewert points out that at a later stage in O, in the passage beginning at l. 7370, Pâloise makes a journey to what appears to be the Mont Saint Michel.[30] At l. 2733, in spite of the differences from the account in O, the account in B does seem to be rejoining the shared tradition, after the intrusion of the first separation scene. Ogrin, we are told, buys expensive clothes and even a horse for Iseut. Once more there is a concentration on the public aspect of the imminent separation: Ogrin is seeking to guarantee the final success of the operation whereby Iseut will be returned to Mark. It is a queen who is returning to her rightful position, not a ragged exile who would be a potential source of shame to Mark.[31]

---

29. However, Buschinger suggests that Eilhart combined the two separation scenes he found in his source and then set his new episode in a new position (see Le 'Tristrant'..., I, pp. 506-12).
30. Ewert, Volume II, p. 209, note 1. See also Buschinger, Le 'Tristrant'..., II, pp. 738-41, Schoepperle, Tristan and Isolt, p. 274.
31. Le Gentil stresses the importance of dress at this stage: 'En une telle circonstance, le costume n'est pas indifférent. Parée, la reine se sentira plus sûre d'elle et sa beauté, mieux mise en valeur, suscitera l'admiration, imposera le respect, ranimera l'estime et l'affection' ('L'Épisode du Morois...', p. 274).

The formal announcement of the coming restitution is followed by the controversial 'prophetic passage':

> Tuit quatre [en orent] tel[s] soudees:
> Li dui en furent mort d'espees,
> Li tierz d'une secte ocis,
> A duel morurent el païs;
> Li forestier qui(e)s encusa
> Mort crüele n'en refusa;
> Quer Ferinis, li franc, li blois,
> L'ocist puis d'un gibet el bois.
> Dex les venga de tez ces quatre,
> Qui vout le fier orguel abatre. (ll. 2755-64)

The major inconsistency in this passage seems to be that the forester will meet a different death from that predicted here: in ll. 4045-54 the forester is slain by Governal at the tournament. This inconsistency only emerges later. There is a second point: one of the four felons has already met his death, killed by Governal in the riche baron episode. The quatre of the manuscript can be retained, for the forester has joined the company of the lovers' enemies (for a rather lesser crime?) and he has received the customary curse (ll. 1916-7). But even though, according to the manuscript evidence, one of the lovers' enemies is already dead, can the author be accused of contradicting himself at this point in the text? The tense is past, but the implication is future or rather future perfect.[32] The author seems to be saying that by the end of the romance the four will have encountered the fates he describes. One baron has already died by the sword and another, Denoalen, will die in a very similar fashion in the final episode. As with the forester, the contradiction only really emerges later, at l. 2890 or perhaps not until l. 3028, when it is clear that the three wicked barons are still very much alive.

---

32. Bik comments on the use of tenses in certain of the author's interventions: 'Ce annonces au futur se rapportent à ce qui va suivre immédiatement. Par contre, quand il s'agit d'un événement qui aura lieu à un moment plus avancé du récit, le verbe se trouve au parfait' (Recueil., LVI, p. 38).

Certainly there are other passages where there are similar imprecations and where the fates of the lovers' enemies are foretold, but this passage does have a rather special nature. It represents a statement by the poet himself, not just wishful thinking by the lovers couched in an optimistic future tense, as in ll. 2822-4. Certainly the poet himself regularly curses the barons, but nowhere else, not in ll. 1656, 2754, 2891 or 3788, does the poet himself pronounce upon the kinds of death they will suffer. The passage is remarkable also for the precision with which the death of the forester is described: such precision is not found elsewhere, neither in the words of the poet himself nor in the words of his characters. Lines 2822-4, 3199, 3331-2 and 3337 are vague, commonplace phrases which anticipate the barons' deaths. A similar vagueness is found in l. 1919 which refers to the forester's fate. Ewert comments that 'it would certainly seem that our author is more concerned with the meting out of condign punishment to the enemies of Tristran than with the precise fulfilment of a prognostication'.[33] Yet one must inevitably wonder why the author has, at this point, given such a precise prognostication of the forester's death. Or are we erroneously identifying the <u>forestier</u> of l. 2759 with the wrong figure? Ménage makes the suggestion that the man to be killed by Perinis is in fact the figure referred to as an <u>espie</u> in the final episode (l. 4273, l. 4336).[34] The argument is persuasive: since the forester who comes upon the lovers in the forest is referred to as an <u>espie</u> (l. 1930, l. 1961, l. 1975), is the <u>espie</u> of the final episode to be understood to be a forester? The 'prophetic passage', Ménage goes on to argue, is not alluding to vague events in the future but is describing what happens in the final, unfinished episode of the

---

33. Ewert, Volume II, p. 211.
34. <u>Rom.</u>, XCV, pp. 148-50.

romance: two felons are killed in the surviving fragment, the third, Guenelon, is surely soon to follow them and it is surely possible that Perinis, mentioned in l. 4347, eliminated their informant.

One must also seek an answer as to why the passage should be placed at this moment in the action. Béroul may quite simply be wishing to create a mood of nervous expectation in his audience after a series of scenes in which things have gone rather too closely to plan, but he may also be wishing to suggest a contrast between the behaviour of the barons and the behaviour of Tristan. In the introduction to the passage, the barons and the forester are presented as exceptions to the general rule:

> La roïne ont molt desirree:
> Amee estoit de tote gent,
> Fors des felons que Dex cravent! (ll. 2752-4)

A similar development is found in ll. 879-80 where the dwarf, another enemy of the lovers, has feelings which clash with those of the great majority of the people. If one compares the barons' general aims with the aim of Tristan in the whole of this episode one can see a similar clash. Tristan's aim has been the reconciliation of Iseut and Mark, the day is now set for the restitution and his aim is close to being achieved. He had announced his hopes long ago, soon after the potion had abated, and he had called upon God to help him in his efforts (ll. 2185-8). God is also mentioned at the close of the 'prophetic passage', this time not as anyone's potential ally but as an avenger, the destroyer of the lovers' enemies. If we can accept that Tristan is basically seeking harmony, the restoration of the rightful social order, the barons, in contrast,

are the past and future disrupters of harmony.[35] In the next episode, Iseut will be returned to Mark and order will be achieved. But in the episode after that, those who are bent on the destruction of harmony will reassert themselves once more.

---

35. Si ne vos tendron nule pez. (l. 622)
O vos ne puis plus avoir pes. (l. 3075)
Que po t ce estre? Quel merveille
Qu'il ne me lesent an pes eure! (ll. 3230-1)
Mais, qui q'ait pais, li troi felon
Sont en esgart de traïson. (ll. 4271-2)

17: THE SEPARATION OF THE LOVERS

The episode in ll. 2763-3027, which relates the return of Iseut to Mark and the separation of the lovers, is the last episode in a long sequence. This sequence, beginning at l. 581, described the discovery of the lovers, their capture and their eventual escape into the forest; but now Iseut at least is returning to her former position in society. Moreover, this is the last episode in B to have a direct parallel in C, for after this episode the two romances will take divergent courses.

The parallel episode in O runs from l. 4910 to l. 4997, but before examining the passage in detail a negative point might once more be made. Up to this moment in O, no discussion has taken place between Tristan and Iseut about the impending separation, nor has there been any exchange of tokens. Both these features have previously been encountered in B.

In O, after the reading of Mark's letter and the giving of clothes to Tristan, there is a sudden transition to the day of restitution. We find no description of the surroundings, no development of a sense of occasion, simply the exchanges between Mark and Tristan which will run from l. 4916 to l. 4977. The matter of Iseut's future is swiftly settled: it had already been decided and only needed confirmation here. Then the discussion centres upon Tristan's future and Mark straightway refuses him permission to remain:

dô her sie dare brâchte,
dô sprach der koning al zuhant
'wie nû, hêre Tristrant',
wolt ir mir nû die vrawe gebin?'
"gerne, hêre" sprach der degin
"sal ich daz lant mite habin?"
'nein, daz wil ich wedirs gin.'
"war umme? waz habe ich ûch getân?"
'harte vele, des ich lastir hân.' (ll. 4914-22)

Mark's refusal to allow Tristan to remain in the land (if this is in fact what Eilhart wrote)[1] arises mainly from a sense of wounded honour which governs his response to all Tristan's proposals. Tristan seems prepared to make more and more concessions, but Mark is unyielding. He refuses to pardon Tristan's misdeed, even going so far as to say that so great is his hatred that he cannot envisage the possibility of ever looking favourably upon him in the future. Tristan is prepared to serve Mark and earn the king's favour once more; he hopes that Mark will at least let him remain in the country, but Mark remains as obdurate as he was at the beginning, invoking in l. 4942 in defence of his attitude the same <u>lastir</u> he had mentioned in l. 4922:

"alsô vele ich ûch noch dîren sol,
daz ich ûch wedir werde lîp."
'Ûwers dînstes begere ich nît.'
"war umme, hêre?" 'daz wil ich sagin.
dâ habe ich lastir unde schadin
vil von ûch gewonnen.'
"wolt ir mir nicht gonnen
daz ich in ûwerm lande sî?"
'nein, ir wêret mir zu nâne bî.
ir mûzet ûch erwegen haben:
ich wil ûch wol vorclagen.' (ll. 4938-48)

The second stage in the dialogue, ll. 4949-77, describes Tristan's reaction to the string of related refusals by Mark. He declares that he will never again seek the king's favour and that it is with a heavy heart that he is surrendering his lady.

---

1. See Buschinger, <u>Eilhart von Oberg, Tristrant</u>, pp. 386-7.

Reluctantly, he prepares to leave:

> und ich mit grôzin rûwin
> leider mûz von ir varn." (ll. 4976-7)

Then Mark rides forward to receive back his wife.

It is at this point in O that the dog is entrusted to the queen:

> Tristrant beval dô sînen hunt
> der edelin koninginne
> und bat sie doch rechte minne
> daz sie sîn mit vlîze phlêge
> und in alle tage sêge
> und sîn gedêhte dar bî.
> "ab ich ûch iehe lîp sî,
> daz tût an dem brackin schîn!" (ll. 4984-91)

The dog is the only token of affection actually exchanged in O, even though Tristan will later be in possession of a ring. To close the episode Tristan rides off to the king of Gânôje.[2]

> Dô reit der togenthafte man
> vâ he sich muchte begân
> zu dem koninge von Gânôje. (ll. 4995-7)

In the episode Iseut is returned to Mark and the lovers eventually separate, but the episode seems to concentrate not on these events but on the conflict between Tristan and his uncle. Mark's outraged sense of honour will not allow Tristan to be reinstated at court and Tristan warns his uncle as to his future behaviour.[3] By no stretch of the imagination could the restitution

---

2. Legge sees the journey to Gânôje as a feature introduced by Eilhart: 'Le fait que Tristan ne parte pas pour Gavoie, chez Béroul, est probablement authentique: ce serait plutôt Eilhart qui aurait introduit le voyage, car personne ne revenait des bornes de ce pays, ce que les félons et Tristan ne savaient que trop' (CCM, III, p. 511)
3. Fermante correctly writes: 'One has the feeling that Marke's love is only barely suppressed by his offended honor, but it is the hurt that wins out until Tristrant is finally offended in turn and vows never again to look for Marke's favor' (The Conflict..., p. 132).

of Iseut in O be termed a reconciliation between the warring parties. When we turn to examine the episode in B, reconciliation is not exactly the issue, for all that the king is clearly well disposed towards Tristan. By the end of the episode Iseut is certainly restored to Mark, but Tristan has not assumed his former position at court: he must leave for a while to prevent people suggesting complicity on the king's part in what will inevitably be implied and in order for Iseut to prove her faithfulness. There is no animosity between Mark and Tristan when the hero gives back the queen: Mark himself is inclined to keep Tristan at court, until the three wicked barons intervene.

In B, the scene which corresponds closest to the account in O begins at l. 2843. The two groups draw close and Tristan addresses the king in a long speech. Certainly the restitution of Iseut is for the moment given as scant attention as in O: Tristan refers to it only briefly in ll. 2851-2 before going on to the question of his own future. There is no conflict with the king. Tristan simply proceeds to a request for an escondit (l. 2227, l. 2397), a judicial defence against the charge of adultery. A successful defence would aid his own rehabilitation, but it would also help Iseut and would even be of benefit to Mark, for were Iseut to be indirectly deemed innocent, through Tristan's initiative, any shame felt by Mark would be minimized:[4]

> Ci voi les homes de ta terre
> Et, oiant eus, te vuel requerre
> Que te sueffres a esligier
> Et en ta cort roi derainier
> C'onques o lié n'ai druerie,
> Ne ele o moi, jor de ma vie.

---

4. The request for an escondit is a recurrent feature in B, but unknown in O. For a discussion of the significance of this, see Frappier, CCL, VI, p. 446, note 129.

Acroire t'a l'en fait mençonge;
Mais, se Dex joie et bien me donge,
Onques ne firent jugement,
Conbatre a pié ou autrement,
Dedenz ta cort, se je t'en sueffre;
Si sui dannez, si m'art en soffre.
Et, se je m'en pus faire saus,
Qu'il n'i ait chevelu ne chaus...
Si me retien ovocques toi,
O m'en irai en Loenoi.' (ll. 2853-68)

The passage has a certain familiarity: the escondit argument has long been exploited and details already encountered reoccur here. That the defence should take place at court in the presence of witnesses was suggested by Ogrin (ll. 2397-99) and duly appeared in the letter (l. 2576). Tristan is offering to defend himself against a charge of adultery: this same theme, with the allied theme that he would be defending Iseut, appeared in ll. 2573-7. Mark has been persuaded to believe lies, so Tristan claims, thereby repeating a claim made in the letter at ll. 2565-7. The proposed nature of the contest, described here in l. 2862, has already been suggested in the letter at ll. 2571-2. In ll. 2863-4 Tristan uses in the interests of conviction the punishment argument, as Ogrin had done in ll. 2369-70. He then goes on to state, as if it were a matter of indifference to him, that he will gladly stay at court or alternatively depart the realm. At least this appears to be the meaning of ll. 2865-8. A lacuna is postulated by all editors after l. 2866, and Ewert has suggested that one or more couplets have been omitted.[5] However, Ewert is prepared to entertain another suggestion: 'Lacuna; or is it possible to interpret this as an elliptical exclamation, the sentence remaining uncompleted?'[6] Ewert's proposal seems very dubious.

---

5. Ewert, Volume II, p. 6
6. Ewert, Volume II, p. 216.

Nevertheless, it may well be that the lines can be interpreted in a manner which eliminates the postulated lacuna.

At this juncture one might note that Frappier makes the point that there is a difference between an escondit accepted by those present and an actual judicial duel: 'Pourtant il subsiste une faille entre un duel judiciaire, où l'accusé démontre effectivement son innocence en l'emportant les armes à la main, et un escondit où sa justification garde un caractère à demi négatif, n'aboutit pas au signe positif du combat victorieux.'[7] Of course, Tristan's escondit proves nothing and he is indeed guilty. But if he has made a profession of innocence which has not been challenged by the assembled knights of Cornwall, even though Iseut herself has not made a similar claim, an argument has been used which would imply her innocence and it is with the implied approval of society that Mark can accept back his wife.

The first reaction to Tristan's proposal comes from a certain 'Andrez, qui fu nez de Nicole' (l. 2870). The argument has convinced Andret who proposes that it will be in the king's interest if Tristan stays:

> Li rois a son nevo parole.
> Andrez, qui fu nez de Nicole,
> Li a dit: 'Rois, quar le retiens,
> Plus en seras doutez et criens.'
> Molt en faut poi que ne l'otroie,
> Le cuer forment l'en asouploie. (ll. 2869-74)

Elsewhere in the romance, in ll. 4267-8, fear of the king is associated with peace in the land. It is the three barons who, so we learn in ll. 4271-2, will seek to destroy that peace. So Andret's proposal that Tristan should be allowed to remain at court, without

---

7. CCM, VI, 447.

an intervening period abroad, aims directly at ensuring the security of the throne. Mark, for a moment, is inclined to support Andret's suggestion, the very proposal to which he was so vehemently opposed in O.

This is the first time that a figure named Andret (MS Audrez) appears in the extant fragment and certain observations need to be made about him. One is surely not justified in immediately identifying the character in l. 2870 with Mark's hostile nephew, a figure familiar to us from O and R. Unlike the character in O and R, Andret is not acting against the lovers' interests at all. He is proposing a full restoration of the previous state of affairs: staying at court was one possibility that Tristan, with apparent indifference, had said he was willing to entertain. There is thus no reason to suppose that Andret is one of the lovers' enemies, and his birthplace Lincoln does not have the significance that Legge ascribes to it.[8] Moreover, at another point in the romance (l. 3877), Andret is associated with Dinas, unquestionably an ally of the lovers.

When the king draws Andret aside, does Dinas take over from Andret the duty of escorting Iseut (a role which Andret has at l. 3783, if the emendation is accepted)? Dinas eases the cloak from the queen's shoulders,[9] a gesture which leads on to a description of Iseut. At this point the author shows a tendency to be more expansive than usual: 'De son mantel que vos diroie?'[10] Such rhetorical

---

8. 'A reference to Lincoln, l. 2874, might seem to be gratuitous, but it is the home of one of the felon barons, and was appropriate since it was one of the principal scenes of struggle in the Civil War between Stephen and Matilda, 1140-41' (Med. aev., XXVIII, p. 171).
9. Rigolot surely reads too much into a simple gesture when he suggests that Iseut, 'dans sa splendeur royale fraîchement dévoilée', is going to influence the decision regarding Tristan's future (CCM, X, p. 452). Nevertheless, the chivalrous action by Dinas, implying his own acceptance of the queen, obviously serves to antagonize the three barons.
10. B 2884. See also l. 3991 and l. 4093.

questions are, of course, the stock-in-trade of all twelfth-century romance writers. Perhaps one might make the most general of general statements and say that from this point onwards Béroul employs a larger number of common descriptive terms than hitherto. This is not to say that he is drawing on specific sources, but that more familiar material, the court replaces the forest as the regular background, necessitates the employment of concepts common in all romances.[11]

Tristan has proposed as one alternative that he should be allowed to remain, Andret has supported this suggestion and the king seems likely to concur. But at this point the three barons intervene to the accompaniment of a curse from Béroul, lest one should feel that they are unduly maligned. Béroul makes it clear that base motives lie behind their intervention, for all that what they propose has already been agreed upon by the whole council:

> Lai de ta cort partir Tristran,
> Et, quant vendra jusqu'a un an,
> Que tu seras aseürez
> Qu(e) Yseut te tienge loiauez,
> Mande Tristran qu'il vienge a toi.
> Ce te loons par bone foi.' [12]

The three barons are in direct opposition to what Andret, acting without guile and in the king's interests, had just proposed. Mark accepts their advice, but the effective result of the intervention of the three barons is to present them, and not King Mark, as the enemies of the lovers (a result similar to that procured in the

---

11. Hofer's comment, for example, surely lacks real justification: 'Auch in Béroul's Gedicht lässt sich zumindest eine Anlehnung an "Eneas" nachweisen, wenn es von Isolde heisst: Les eulz ot vers, les cheveus sors (v. 2892): Die Stelle ist der Beschreibung Camilles entnommen, En. 400): Cheveus ot sors, lons jusqu'as piez' (ZRP, LXV, p. 271).
12. B 2901-6. Do we assume from l. 2904 that the barons in l. 2636 were concerned about Iseut's future behaviour rather than about Tristan's?

fleur de farine episode). It is surely significant that they cannot wait to let the king announce the decision himself but pass on the news themselves with disagreeable speed. One can again point to the contrasting situation in Q, where it is Mark's animosity which causes Tristan to go into exile.

In B there is no such animosity between Tristan and his uncle at the actual moment of separation. Tristan first takes his leave of Iseut and her reaction is recorded:

> La roïne fu coloree,
> Vergoigne avoit por l'esenblee.[13]

Jonin is right to see an analogy, but nothing more, in a passage in the Roman de Thèbes,[14] for Béroul is using the normal terms to describe the queen's modesty and confusion. In striking contrast to Q, Mark then offers gifts which Tristan refuses.

> Tristran dist: 'Rois de Cornouille,
> Ja n'en prendrai une maille:
> A qant que puis vois a grant joie.
> Au roi riene que l'en gerroie.'[15]

In l. 2925, 'A qant que puis', must mean 'as quickly as I can'. Ewert's interpretation of the line, 'I go with the greatest possible joy', seems untenable for it would surely impute to Tristan emotions quite unworthy of him.[16] Almost certainly the correction of a grant joie to en Gevoie, as advocated most recently by Reid[17] is required here.

Tristan then sets out in the direction of the sea,[18] escorted initially by the barons and King Mark. Clearly there are similarities

---

13. B 2915-6. In Fb 224, the gathering is similarly termed an asamblee.
14. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 167.
15. B 2923-6. It may be noted that at the beginning of the fragment, when Tristan was ostensibly planning to leave, he had claimed, or pretended to claim, that it was undesirable for a knight to leave in poverty (ll. 238-42).
16. Ewert, Volume II, p. 219.
17. The 'Thistrim'..., p. 103.
18. In accordance with his declared intention in the letter (l. 2612) and with the decision of the royal council (l. 2630)?

with the later escorting of Perinis by King Arthur: ll. 3535-6 recall ll. 2927-8 and l. 3531 recalls l. 2934. But one could find parallels in many romances for these lines, as one could for ll. 2930-2. Ewert refers to the Roman d'Eneas,[19] but one could call on the Chastelaine de Vergi as well, a later text which illustrates the persistence of the common motif:

> La chevaliers en tel maniere
> s'en part, et la dame l'uis clot;
> mes tant come veoir le pot,
> le convoia a ses biaus ieus,
> quant ele ne pot fere mieus.[20]

The familiarity of the motif does not necessarily mean it is any less evocative: the motif's presence in other romances and particularly in the work of lyric poets may even contribute to its effectiveness here. If anything does mar the poignancy of the moment, it is an awareness that Tristan is not to leave at once but is to remain in the vicinity, at least for a while. Nevertheless, this is the moment of separation for the lovers, if not the real beginning of Tristan's exile overseas.

It will be recalled that Béroul delayed the intervention of Dinas until after the capture of the lovers. The parting of Tristan and Tinas we read of in O, ll. 4049-92, is naturally not at the later point in B, for Tristan has by that time escaped, but Béroul appears to pick up that temporarily discarded material now. The friends separate, but not before Tristan has extracted a promise that Dinas will comply with any message transmitted by Governal. One may indulge in speculation, if one so wishes, as to the possible development of the romance after the end of the fragment. Is a specific message later transmitted to Dinas? Certainly Dinas is in active collusion

---

19. Ewert, Volume II, p. 219.
20. La Chastelaine de Vergi, ll. 472-6.

with the lovers even in the surviving fragment. The last lines of this scene, ll. 2945-52, are not altogether straightforward:

> Dinas li prie ge nel doit,
> Die son buen: il fera tot.
> Dit molt a bele desevree.
> Mais, sor sa foi asëuree,
> La retendra ensemble o soi;
> Non feroit, certes, por le roi.
> Ilueec Tristran de lui s'en torne;
> Au departir andui sont morne.

Lines 2945-6 can safely be regarded as the reported speech of Dinas. But is it Tristan's speech that is reported in ll. 2947-50? Line 2947 is open to a number of interpretations. In Ewert's view, bele is an adjective qualifying the noun desevree: 'He declares that this is a noble leave-taking' is the translation he offers.[21] Pedrick, however, gives the lines to Tristan and produces a markedly different translation: 'Tristan said that he had parted from a lovely woman and swore that he would one day have her with him again, although the king would not allow this.'[22] But this must be wrong, for ll. 2947 and 2950 surely cannot be interpreted in this manner. Fairly clearly, ll. 2947-50 represent the continuation of the speech of Dinas. Do we not expect Dinas to be saying that he would like to keep Tristan around, but will not do so, because he would be going against the king's decision? If this is so, la retendra in l. 2949, at the very least, is in need of correction.

After these lines, the triumphal return of Iseut is described. Iseut is firstly welcomed by the people in the streets on her way to the church of Saint Sason. In the church she lays a gift of fine

---

21. Ewert, Volume II, p. 219.
22. The Romance of Tristan..., p. 113.

cloth upon the altar. Celebrations in the palace then follow.

The passage is hardly outstanding for its originality. Jonin points to the scene in Érec et Énide which describes the arrival of the hero and heroine at Carnant, at the court of King Lac:

Or les deux jeunes gens bénéficient des démonstrations, des honneurs témoignés à Iseut, et qui plus est, ceux-ci se présentent dans le même ordre. On reconnaît le cortège du roi et de sa suite venant à leur rencontre, l'exaltation joyeuse du peuple, les cloches qui sonnent à toute volée, les rues pavoisées, encourtinées, jonchées de fleurs, la rituelle visite au moûtier, et dernière étape, le retour au palais où la fête se prolonge.[23]

There are indeed many striking similarities between the passages. In B, a paile is placed upon the altar and is made in due course of time into a chasuble. In Érec (ll. 2353-76), a paisle and a chasuble are placed upon the altar, but the chasuble, so we learn, had been transformed from a simple riche vestement by Guinevere: the value of Iseut's gift, cent mars d'argent, is exactly that of the chasuble presented by Énide. Even so, one cannot automatically suppose a direct connection between the two romances.[24] Jonin refers to the celebration in B as 'la fête courtoise type'[25] and certainly the passage is typical of the whole body of courtly literature. For example, the knighting of the squires in celebration of a homecoming, described in ll. 3008-9, brings to mind a similar event in Perceval (ll. 9167-88). Our author tells us also that the chasuble is still at the church of St. Sanson, according to eye-witness account:

> Encore est ele a Saint Sanson;
> Ce dïent cil qui l'ont veïe. (ll. 2994-5)

---

23. Les personnages féminins..., p. 216.
24. But mention should be made of the remarks of Wilmotte in a review of Ewert's first volume (MA, L, p. 62): he wonders whether the presence in B of the minor character Garflet was inspired by his appearance in Érec and Perceval. Gallais also suggests a direct link with Érec (Genèse du roman occidental, p. 59).
25. Les personnages féminins..., p. 216.

The poet is surely simply exploiting a convention in order to give some semblance of authenticity to his account (as in ll. 953-4).

Whatever literary reminiscing the passage may inspire, in the context of the romance the melancholy of Tristan's parting from Danas contrasts with the joyous reception given to Iseut:

> Molt l'ont le jor tuit honoree;
> Ainz le jor que fu esposee
> Ne li fist hom si grant honor
> Con l'on li a fait icel jor. (ll. 3003-6)

If we bear in mind ll. 2189-94 and particularly ll. 2192-4, the reference to Iseut's wedding-day in l. 3004 takes on fuller significance and emphasizes a sense of momentous occasion. By contrast, but in accordance with what he had expressly envisaged, if not with his secret wishes, Tristan will now have to make his own future.

There remains to be settled, however, the question of the relationship between the lovers, between Tristan and Iseut, as opposed to their individual relationships with Mark. The future of this 'private' relationship has also to be decided and the problem dominates the beginning and end of the episode.

The episode begins at l. 2765 with a conventional description of the scene on the way of the <u>parlement</u>. Tristan has not come unprotected:

> Tristran chevauche et voit le merc.
> Souz son bliaut et son hauberc:
> Quar grant poor avoit de soi,
> Por ce qu'il out mesfait au roi. (ll. 2771-4)

How do we explain this hauberk hidden beneath Tristan's tunic?[26] Schoepperle relates the lovers' return from the forest to the story

---

26. Ewert points out the unusual nature of Tristan's garb (Ewert, Volume II, p. 214).

of Deirdre and Naisi, pointing out that Naisi is slain when Deirdre is restored to Conor: 'In the Old Irish romance the tragic conclusion immediately follows. What Tristan merely feared that day when he put on his hauberk to meet Mark at the Gué Aventuros, here comes to pass.'[27] It may be that later writers deferred a conflict between Tristan and Mark, remodelling their sources to do so. But the fact that Tristan wears the hauberk can surely be explained within the terms of the romance. Tristan is afraid for his life because he has wronged Mark, a conviction which has been the mainspring for many of his recent actions. Tristan has already expressed his fear of Mark because of the ban in l. 2413 and, later in the romance, at ll. 3575-6, he will conceal a sword beneath his garments, for fear of being unmasked and found to be in contravention of the king's orders. From l. 2777 to l. 2804 the material is generally familiar, for the lovers are confirming the exchange of tokens which has already taken place. Tristan urges his lady to keep Husdent, made over to her in ll. 2725-6, and asks Iseut to comply with any request he might make in the future.[28] Iseut replies to the familiar words in the expected way. The ring, placed on Tristan's finger in the previous scene, must be the recognition signal,[29] and she will carry out whatever he requests. But she makes the important proviso that she will not act in a manner she considers dishonourable or disloyal: with the potion no longer ruling her, her days of adultery are over. The passage closes with an embrace; it should be

---

27. Tristan and Iseult, p. 444.
28. Ewert's version of l. 2780 is possible and could be retained, in spite of ll. 4990-1 of O. But one does expect n'a partes and l'amasta could easily have been induced by l'amez. At l. 2785, M4 has vois, an obvious misprint for voi.
29. In the introduction to his edition of Fb (p. 14), Hoepffner points to the similarity between ll. 219-20 of Fb and ll. 2798-9 of B. One hesitates to conclude that the author of Fb borrowed the phrase directly from B.

noted that, in the earlier scene, at ll. 2731-2, the kiss was qualified as being a token of 'possession'.

But from l. 2805 there is an unexpected rush of new material, the novelty of which is enhanced because it follows so suddenly after familiar data. It is Iseut who for reasons of self-interest wishes to put off the inevitable. (Barteau claims that it is now that the queen seizes the initiative from Tristan and begins to suggest the course of their activities.[30]) Iseut entreats Tristan to stay in the country until the king's reaction to her return is known. She requests him to remain with the forester, Orri, at whose house, so she claims, they have already spent many nights. This is unexpected information, to say the least, for it paints in retrospect a rather different picture of the life the lovers led in the Morrois. Iseut goes on to curse the three barons and to forecast their unhappy ends, but she mentions that at this time her fear of them is very considerable (l. 2827). Finally, Iseut tells Tristan that through Perinis he will remain in constant touch with her. Tristan, in a brief but energetic reply, makes it clear that he will be more than glad to stay wherever the queen suggests[31] and to be at hand in case she is the object of any reproach. The queen reacts with gratitude and joyful relief:

> 'Sire,' dist Yseut, 'grant merci!
> Or sui je molt bonëuree;
> A grant fin m'avez asenee.' (ll. 2840-2)

There is no scene of this nature in O. The only 'private' feature of the restitution of Iseut in the German version is the handing over of the hundelîn to the queen. In B, Iseut's entreaty

---

30. Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut, p. 163 (see also pp. 203-5).
31. Reid rightly considers the reply postulated at l. 2836 to be doubtful and considers that in l. 2839 Tristan is reacting to Iseut's hope in l. 2833 ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 267, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 99-100).

represents a delaying action which reveals her legitimate fears for the immediate future, and it is surely to misunderstand the whole tone of the passage to describe the queen, as Jonin does, as 'une femme assoiffée de vengeance'.[32] It is true that at ll. 2822-4 the queen expresses her conviction that evil will be destroyed and that certain outstanding scores will be settled, but undoubtedly her utterance has to be explained not only in psychological terms but also in literary terms. The author, in short, is preparing the rest of his romance. Iseut fears the barons and it is, through no coincidence whatsoever, the three barons who set a new series of events in motion. Perinis (l. 2330) will be the messenger who will inform Tristan of the queen's reaction following the barons' new approach to the king, and Tristan will indeed move into action after the three barons have brought up the matter of Iseut's <u>folie</u> (l. 2338).

The final scene of the episode centres upon Tristan who begins to fulfil the terms of this personal agreement with Iseut. He leaves the main path (l. 3012) and reaches the home of the forester, Orri. Delbouille suggests that the name and role of Orri were partly inspired by Ogrin and points specifically to the hospitality given to the lovers by the hermit, as recorded in ll. 1421-2.[33] But perhaps Muret is nearer to the mark when he alludes to the forester of l. 1834. 'Ce deuxième forestier, dont il est parlé comme d'un personnage connu, doit-il être identifié avec le quatrième, avec cet Orri qui donne l'hospitalité à Tristan après la réconciliation du roi et de la reine et qui, si nous en croyions les vers 2822-3, l'aurait déjà hébergé auparavant en compagnie d'Iseut?'[34] Perhaps

---

32. <u>Romphil.</u>, XXXIII, p. 203.
33. <u>CCT</u>, V, p. 423, note 25.
34. <u>Id.</u>, p. XIII.

we can see a progress in the romance: a forester in l. 1282 becomes the forester in l. 1834 and he is now named at this point. The three wicked barons undergo a similar progress: they are singled out from the other knights of the court and are eventually named in ll. 3138-9.[35] Alternatively, one might simply regard Orri as an example of the generous host, as drawn from the common fund of romance material. The celier of l. 2828 and l. 3017 appears to be a motif of similar provenance, even though attempts have been made to trace a specific source.[36]

By l. 3027 a whole sequence of events has come to a close and a new sequence of events will have to be inaugurated. But already there are indications of the form that the new developments will take, for in their final conversation the lovers expressed their fears and hopes for the future. How will Mark behave? Will the wicked barons accuse Iseut? Tristan has promised action if this comes about.

---

35. Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 215) and Delbouille (CCM, V, p. 205) seek to relate Orri to an hospitable forester in R who shelters the lovers on their first night in the forest. One must point out once again that only in 103 does a forestier (Bédier, Volume II, p. 360) receive the lovers (see Curtis, Tristan Studies, p. 64). Without making any cross-reference, Baumgartner at one point suggests that the hospitable vavasour in R was perhaps inspired by Orri, at another point perhaps by Ogrin (Le 'Tristan en prose', p. 110, note 41, p. 235, note 19).
36. Muret (M°, p. XVIII) and Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 214-5) point to the grotte merveilleuse of Thomas. Hofer sees the influence of Wace on B or on its model (ZRL, LXV, p. 267), but he certainly exaggerates the verbal similarities between Le Roman de Brut, ll. 1385-90, and B: the word celier will almost inevitably provoke the word soutterrin (l. 3025, soterrin, l. 3351). (See, for example, Aucassin et Nicolette, VI, 6.)

18: THE MACHINATIONS OF THE BARONS

The long sequence of episodes which began at l. 581 has come to an end. The new sequence of episodes beginning at l. 3028 is rather shorter, but it is represented by over twelve hundred lines of the romance for it finishes at l. 4266. The return of King Arthur to his own kingdom whilst King Mark remains in Cornwall, noted at ll. 4262-6, indicates not only the end of one individual episode but the end of a whole movement.

The first episode in the sequence runs in our division from l. 3028 to l. 3282.[1] Ewert splits the text slightly differently, treating ll. 3148-3282 as a separate unit. One must immediately concede that to the episode as established by our division there are two parts, linked by the role of King Mark: he first encounters the barons and then he returns to his stronghold to speak with Iseut.[2]

The first part is set in motion by the barons:

> Oiez des trois, que Dex maudie:
> Par cus fu molt li rois malez,
> Qui o Tristran estoit mesiez.
> Ne targa pas un mois entier
> Que li rois n'en ala chacier,
> Et avoc lui li traïtor.
> Or escoutez que font cel jor. (ll. 3028-34)

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 3028-3282; S, chapter LVI - chapter LVII; E, stanza CCIII, l. 2225 - stanza CCIV, l. 2237; G, ll. 15306-15533 T.r., p. 236, l. 29 - p. 239, l. 19.
2. Ewert argues that a series of episodes runs up to l. 4266, but he would place the beginning of the series earlier, at l. 3010 (Ewert, Volume II, p. 220).

Whether ll. 3029-30 refer to past events or represent the author's retrospective judgment on the events which are to follow, there seems no doubt that the three barons involved here are the three wicked barons already encountered, and yet one is already dead, killed by Governal in the forest. At l. 2890, the reappearance of the three barons apparently introduced a contradiction into the text, the existence of which is confirmed in this episode.[3] One might point out certain similarities in presentation between the Nicole Bacon episode and the present one. The expression que Dex maudie is at the very beginning of both episodes and ll. 1682-3 are not unlike ll. 3029-30. In both instances dogs are heard, in the first by Governal (l. 1679), in the second by the King (l. 3038), the first mention being an integral part of the narrative, the second seemingly a gratuitous background detail.

The barons approach King Mark and place before him a request based on what they present to be a feeling common to all the nobles of the land. It is necessary, so they suggest, for Iseut to clear herself of the suspicions that she has committed adultery with Tristan. Moreover, as l. 3044 indicates, it is felt that Iseut's failure to clear herself brings shame to Mark.[4] If Iseut, once the matter is broached, refuses to clear herself, she should be made to leave the land. The barons seem to present themselves in this passage as transmitters of the general will, representatives of the barons at large, a small faction within the general body. At the close of their interview with King Mark, in ll. 3137-9, they will in fact be

---

3. Suggesting that 'L'auteur ici annonce la reconstitution d'un clan' (Rom., XCV, p. 149), Méraugis denies the existence of any contradiction, but his argument is not really convincing.
4. Line 3044 is reminiscent of ll. 2897-9, where the barons seem to suggest that if Tristan were allowed to stay it would be felt that King Mark was condoning the lovers' adultery.

named for the first time. The naming of the barons seems almost an afterthought, coming as it does in a brief summary of what has happened. But the purpose of this afterthought, if it can be so termed, has been clearly perceived by Ewert:

It is not until l. 581 that they are presented as three in number and, with a minor exception at l. 641 (where one of the barons is described as embracing the dwarf Frocin) and the 'interpolated' killing of one of the faction by Governal (1656-1746) and the prophecy (2756-7), they act and are treated as a group: but in anticipation of their more individualized role (3457 ff.), the poet felt constrained to provide each of them with an appropriate name.[5]

One has no quarrel with this judgment, but one might perhaps point again to a not dissimilar development in the role of Orri: from being un forestier in l. 1282 he becomes Orri le forestier in l. 2817, probably because he is about to play a larger, if not a more individualized role.

Mark's reaction to the barons' request is recorded in ll. 3055-86, and the nature of this reaction is so unexpected by the barons that it causes their withdrawal. Mark contests the sincerity of the barons' request that Iseut should clear herself, for he perceives that their real desire is for his wife to leave the country and return to Ireland. It will be remembered that Tristan had envisaged that he might go to Ireland with Iseut, if no reconciliation had taken place; this possibility was mentioned only in the letter read by the chaplain to the assembled barons, at ll. 2615-8. The removal of Iseut certainly seems central to the barons' intentions, even if it is difficult to see what this will really achieve for their cause. The isolation of Mark has been achieved by Tristan's exile, temporary

---

5. Ewert, Volume II, p. 223.

though it is, and Iseut's departure would bring little real advantage. Of course, now that the barons have introduced the notion of an escondit, Iseut will be able to demand that the escondit take place, precisely in order to put an end to their innuendoes.

Mark puts the barons' sincerity in question, reminding them that they had had their chance in the past to prove their point:

> N'offri Tristran li a defendre?
> Ainz n'en osastes armes prendre.
> Par vos est il hors au païs. (ll. 3063-5)

The lines would refer to the escondit which Tristan himself had offered when he returned Iseut to Mark.[6] Further, Mark considers that the barons were responsible for the imposition of a period of exile upon his nephew, which is perfectly true. In the previous scene Andret had pleaded in favour of Tristan's retention at court, but the three barons had intervened and had carried the day. At that time Mark had succumbed to pressure on the grounds that he must abide by 'loyal' advice, but there is no such concession now. In place of mild acquiescence he announces his intention to recall Tristan at once:

> Par saint Tresmor de Caharés,
> Ge vos feraï en gai martiz
> Ainz ne verroiz passé marsdi-
> Hui est lundi- si le verrez.'[7]

Mark reiterates his threat in ll. 3085-6 and the barons withdraw in classic disarray.

---

6. Newstead believes that ll. 3064-7 refer to a much earlier event, not the restitution of Iseut. 'Thus Mark's allusions at the beginning of the oath episode to Tristan's earlier demand for a judicial combat (vss. 3063 f.) clearly link the two and indicate that the bloodstained bed was the traditional introduction to both versions' ('The Equivocal Oath...', pp. 1082-3).
7. B 3076-9. It has been noted that Carhaix is elsewhere the home of the father of Iseut aux blanches mains (see Luquet, Ron., XVI, p. 298 and Bédier, Volume II, p. 123).

The three barons then decide to adopt another tactic. They note that, by recalling Tristan, Mark reveals a tendency to go back on his word:

> Bien tost mandera son nevou,
> Ja n'i tendra ne fer ne veu. (ll. 3093-4)

If the barons are referring to a specific promise made them in the past by Mark, this must be the pledge he made to them at ll. 2907-8, to the effect that he would support their suggestion that Tristan should go temporarily into exile. Fearing for their lives, the barons now wish to pacify the king.

They then seem to return to Mark:

> Enmié l'essart li rois s'estot;
> La sont venu; tost les destot,
> De lor parole n'a mes cure. (ll. 3101-3)

In the manuscript, l. 3102 reads 'Vit son nevo tost les destot' and this has been unanimously rejected by editors. In M^2, Muret printed 'Que sont venu mout li desplot', but in the CFMA editions he was to leave the line blank. Ewert printed 'La sont venu; tost les destot', and this new version was accepted in M^4.[8] To support this correction, in a footnote on p. 93 of his first volume, Ewert referred back to an earlier line, 3039, 'La sont venu li troi baron'. Even though the whole passage is in many ways a repetition of what has gone before, Vit is an unlikely misreading of La, and in his glossary (p. 145), Ewert has to concede that the meaning he grants to destot is purely conjectural.

What is clear is that the barons' new policy proves unsuccessful, for Mark exhibits an intransigence which is new in the romance. He is in the same place as before (essart, l. 3101, essart, l. 3036),

---

8. Ewert records that his version was accepted in M^4, but he prints sunt instead of sont (Ewert, Volume II, p. 222).

but the barons, in their second approach, have a different end in view. They attempt to calm Mark, claiming that in advising him they were merely carrying out their duty as loyal subjects,[9] and they promise silence in the future. Before the barons began to speak, Mark had recognised that he was unable at that time to take the three barons into custody:

> S'il eüst or la force o soi,
> La fusent pris, ce dit, tuit troi. (ll. 3107-8)

Drawing on these lines, Stone has stressed Mark's impotence in the scene: 'Béroul first recounts how the three felons accuse the queen again before Mark, who is furious, but alone at a hunt he is also powerless to arrest them.'[10] This is surely inaccurate. Line 3107 refers to the fact that he is alone and has no potential arresting officers with him: it is not a king's job to personally lay hands upon malefactors! Certainly Mark cannot be said at all to show any lack of decision. He recalls for a second time the barons' reluctance to oppose Tristan when they were given every opportunity and then takes the decisive step of banishing the three from his land, before reiterating the sentiments which he had expressed when rejecting the barons' first request:

> Par saint André, que l'en vet querre
> Outre la mer, jusque en Escoce,
> Mis m'en avez el cuer la boce,
> Qui n'en istra jusqu'a un an:
> G'en ai jor vos chacié Tristran.'[11]

---

9. B 3112-18. Line 3117 recalls l. 627, but there it was King Mark who described the barons in these terms, not the barons themselves. Ewert suggests that in ll. 3114-6 there may be an oblique reference to Tristan, but this seems unlikely (Ewert, Volume II, p. 222).
10. Esn., V, 223.
11. B 3152-6. Par saint André would correspond to Par saint Estiene le martir (l. 3078), an invocation to a saint before an account of the pain the barons have inflicted. Both identified this reference to the town of St. Andrews (Contribution à l'étude..., p. 75) and Professor Legge has insisted that the sea in question is the Firth of Forth (Med. aev., XXXIV, p. 56, Med. aev., XXVIII, p. 173).

Thus the barons fail to pacify King Mark and repair to their strongholds in open conflict with their lord.

The second part of the episode begins at l. 3148. Mark, for his part, returns at once to his stronghold at Tintagol.[12] Iseut at once notices her husband's agitated state and realises he has returned alone:

> Aperçut soi qu'il ert mariz;
> Venuz s'en est desconfiz. (ll. 3161-2)

Line 3162 is clearly not straight narrative, but indicates the apprehension in Iseut's mind which contributes to her panic and to her eventual loss of consciousness. But she regains her composure when she recovers and hears Mark's words of consolation. Although she now realizes that she and her lover are not immediately in danger, she naturally wants to know the reason for Mark's evident annoyance. When she addresses him in ll. 3181-3, she assumes that a hunting dispute has caused his agitation. Her husband is amused by her supposition and prepares to inform Iseut of the true source of his displeasure.

Béroul at first only allows Mark to divulge a certain amount of information. He tells Iseut of the three barons, of the fact that they were responsible for Tristan's exile and of his present intention to recall his nephew in order to rid himself of them. A change of heart has come over Mark:

> Il m'ont asez adesentu,
> Et je lor ai trop consentu:
> N'i a mais rien del covertir. (ll. 3191-3)

Line 3193 appears to mean that Mark is no longer going to vacillate, no longer going to be diverted from his purpose by the barons' words.

---

12. Ewert has a note on Tintagel on p. 142 of his second volume. His conclusion that Tintagel is simply an alternative residence for Lancien is not that of Warwick (ll 'Roman de Tristan'..., p. 18), who sees Lancien as the town where the fortress of Tintagel is to be found. See also E.W.R. Ditmas, Tristan and Iseult in Cornwall. p. 68.

If the line refers to a specific policy, Mark is resolved not to waver in his intention to drive the barons from his land and in his allied intention to recall Tristan.[13]

There is no real rapport established between Mark and Iseut, for it is the whispered thoughts of ll. 3203-7, for her ears only, which reveal her true state of mind. She discerns that her situation must have been at the centre of Mark's discussion with the barons and asks for more information, but not without flattering Mark by describing to him the role of her sole protector in l.3212. With characteristic cleverness, in l. 3213 Iseut presents herself as the object of a campaign of persecution on the part of the barons, against which Mark himself has fulminated in l. 3083. Unconscious of echoing his sentiments, Iseut thus elicits further information which culminates in the disclosure that the barons have requested an escondit. Iseut announces her willingness to clear herself and suffers only a minor set-back when Mark suggests that the escondit should take place immediately.

From l. 3228, Iseut is in full possession of the facts and therefore able to contrive future events. If Tristan contrived events following the loss of the potion's effect, it is now Iseut who will engineer the future she already seems to have envisaged.[14]

---

13. In M[4], Coventir is translated by 'gagner à son opinion', which is misleading. Mölk's translation is even more questionable: 'Es bleibt mir nur eines übrig, meine Gesinnung zu ändern' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 157).

14. Payen writes: 'C'est alors que, très habilement, Yseut propose d'elle-même cet escondit, devant Arthur et ses chevaliers. Elle a compris que le meilleur moyen d'écarter définitivement tout soupçon était de prendre les devants. Songe-t-elle déjà au serment public? Nous le pensons, car son premier soin est de faire prévenir Tristan et de lui indiquer le stratagème qu'elle a conçu, qu'il se rende au lieu qu'elle lui indique, déguisé en lépreux' (Le Motif..., pp. 352-3). Jonin also stresses Iseut's control over events: 'Dans le Tristan de Béroul, Iseut, mise en accusation et en péril de mort, reste constamment maîtresse de la situation' (Rom., XCIV, p. 200).

In a long speech, ll. 3228-76, she reveals that part of her plans which Mark is entitled to know. The corner-stone of her plans is that she will carry out an escondit of her own devising. A defence carried out merely at Mark's court, in the presence of Mark's barons alone, would be an unsatisfactory half-measure; Arthur and his knights must be present as witnesses and guarantors. The immediate defence which Mark has called for and which would prevent Iseut from secretly seeking the assistance of Tristan is no longer possible under these circumstances:

> A terme avrai en mié la place
> Li roi Artus et sa mesnie;
> Se devant lui sui alegie,
> Qui me voudroit après sordire,
> Cil me voudroient escondire,
> Qui avront veü ma deraisne,
> Vers un Cornot ou vers un Saisne.
> Por ce m'est bel que cil i soient
> Et mon deresne a lor eulz voient. (ll. 3248-56)

Following Jonin, Ebert points out in a note that the barons, in requesting that Iseut should clear herself, and Iseut, in requesting that the oath should be of her own formulation and that Arthur and his knights should be present, are acting in accordance with the law of Béroul's own time.[15] But rather than merely praise our author's knowledge of the legal procedures of his day, perhaps we should above all pay tribute to his skill in smoothly harmonizing the fact of contemporary custom law with the fiction of his narrative.

The characters refer to past events and past attitudes to justify their present actions and attitudes. Mark, first of all, claims in l. 3065 and elsewhere that it was the three barons who caused him to exile Tristan. In this episode he is breaking a promise made in the previous episode, deliberately reversing a previous

---

15. Ebert, Volume II, p. 226.

decision. The barons similarly refer to a past event to justify in part their overtures to the king in this episode: they point out in ll. 3041-54 that Tristan alone has offered to defend his position. In this episode it is clear that Iseut's forebodings about a future move by the barons, expressed in l. 2827, were fully justified. One might note as well that at l. 3206 Iseut expresses her hope that her enemies will eventually suffer punishment, just as she had done at l. 2826.[16]

This does not mean that the result of the episode is in complete accordance with what the characters anticipated, for Mark undergoes a change of heart and offers resistance to the barons' demands. He is, however, surely pleased that Iseut offers to undertake the escondit, for he has no wish to be permanently estranged from nobles who are held in high esteem (proisiez, l. 3219). One would certainly have presumed, on the pattern of previous developments in the romance, that Mark would simply have yielded to the barons' request. This happened, as we have seen, in the previous episode and, more significantly, in the fleur de farine episode. It will be recalled that the similarities between that episode and the present episode are quite striking. The fleur de farine episode introduced the three barons as a faction apart from the rest of the court. They initiated a long series of events, and in this episode the barons again set a course of events in motion. But other, more detailed similarities come to light. In ll. 604-5 and in ll. 3039-40 the barons ensure the king is alone before broaching the matter uppermost

---

16. At l. 2824, Iseut predicts the future fate of the barons, while at l. 3098 the barons themselves anticipate what will happen to them if Tristan is recalled. The similarity of construction might be noticed. Line 2824: 'Li cors giront el bois, sovin.' Line 3098: 'Le sanc n'en traie du cors, frois.'

in their minds. In ll. 669-70 they suggest to Mark that he should speak to Tristan *a l'ore du coucher* and in l. 3052 Mark is advised to reveal their request to Iseut at a similar time, *a lon couchier*. If l. 625 and l. 3077 are compared, we see a reversal of roles: in the first instance it is the barons who set the problem, who impose a choice from two alternatives, whilst in the second case Mark presents a similar problem to the barons. A final parallel between the scenes can be observed in ll. 583-8 (also ll. 623-4) and ll. 3143-7. In the first episode the barons threaten to withdraw to their strongholds, a step which never becomes necessary owing to Mark's submissive attitude. But in this episode, due to the king's resistance, they find themselves impelled to leave court. There thus seems little doubt that for the second episode pre-existing material has been employed, but any more far-reaching conclusion may be hazardous. It is not necessary to assume, with Buschinger, for example,[17] that the same author was responsible for both episodes, for a second author may quite easily have drawn upon the material and then introduced the elements of variation we can perceive.

At the close of the episode, the barons have, perhaps unexpectedly, achieved their avowed aim, for Iseut's *escondit* is announced:

> Atant est li termes bariz
> A quinze jorz par le païs.
> Li rois le mande a trois naïs
> Que por mal sont parti de cort:
> Molt en sont lié, a que qu'il tort.[18]

For her part, Iseut has succeeded in gaining control of events. She will carry out in the near future an *escondit* of her own devising,

---

17. *Le 'Tristrant'...*, I, p. 247, note 30.
18. B 3276-82. The *trois naïs* of l. 3280 certainly seem to be the three barons. The manuscript appears to read *nais*, rather than *naif* (see Ewert, Volume I, p. 98, note).

and the next episodes will describe the steps she will take to ensure that her defence achieves the desired result. The visits of Perinis to Tristan and to Arthur, the antics of the disguised Tristan at the Mal Pas are all essential preparation, organized by Iseut, for the swearing of the ambiguous oath.

A parallel sequence of episodes is, of course, found also here, in G, S and E, the major derivatives of T.[19] In both T and B the queen agrees to undertake an act in order to clear herself. A message is borne to Tristan who duly appears in disguise on the appointed day, and, after a successful piece of play-acting, the ambiguous oath is sworn. The more salient differences between the versions might also be mentioned here. In T, the sequence of events follows immediately upon the fleur de farine episode. Secondly, the oath in T is followed by an ordeal. In the version courtoise the fleur de farine episode had ended inconclusively. Mark had seen the blood and suspicion had been sown in his mind, but neither the lovers' guilt nor the lovers' innocence had been established. It is to settle this question and to free himself from uncertainty that Mark summons his barons and councillors.[20] A characteristic shared with B by all the derivatives of T is the mention of rumours regarding Iseut's behaviour,[21] but in none of the three derivatives do specific enemies of the queen appear, counterparts of the three wicked barons. It is agreed that Iseut's trial and ordeal should

---

19. The equivalent passages to ll. 3028-4265 of B are S, chapter LVI - chapter LX, E, stanza CCIII, l. 2225 - stanza CCIX, l. 2292, G, ll. 15308-15764. See also T.R., p. 236, l. 28 - p. 241, end of LXIV.
20. In G there are two councils, a preliminary meeting of Mark's nobles and the main assembly attended by clergy and laymen, ll. 15280-15311 and ll. 15312-15333. Characteristically, G is much more developed at this point than S and E. A, indeed, offers an extremely brief account.
21. B 3042-4, G 15283-6, E, stanza CCIII, l. 2227, S, chapter LVI.

take place at Carlisle (G, l. 15531), Korbínberg (S, chapter LVII, but Korbínberg may well be a misinterpretation of the source), or Westminster (E, stanza, CCIV, l. 2235). Clearly the council episode in T is quite different from the episode in ll. 3028-3282 of B, but its purpose is the same, for it also prepares the Ambiguous Oath episode.

The Ambiguous Oath episode is thus to be found in B and T, but not in O. What conclusion regarding the provenance of the episode can we draw from this evidence? Was the Ambiguous Oath or derrisne episode in the estoire? What position did the episode hold in the estoire if it was indeed to be found there? With regard to Eilhart, Schoepperle suggests that the episode might have been in the estoire but was omitted by the German author.[22] Ferrante, likewise, seems to accept that Eilhart deliberately omitted the episode.[23] But no such unanimity can be found if the whole field of criticism is surveyed: certain critics emphasize the comparative novelty of the episode in T and B, others its early incorporation in the main body of Tristan material.

A first school of thought was established by Bédier. In his reconstruction of the poème primitif he dismisses the episode in a few lines: 'Cet épisode manque en R, en F, en O. Thomas mis à part, il n'est donné que par le continuateur de Béroul, dont nous ignorons les sources. Il est possible que ce récit soit une des végétations

---

22. 'It is possible that the episode was in the estoire, and was omitted by Eilhart' (Tristan and Isolt, p. 225).
23. 'The absence of God is an indication of Eilhart's antipathy for the love; he alone, of the poets, has no desire to show God's sympathy to the lovers in any way. For the same reason, his is the only version in which there is no formal justification by ordeal. For Eilhart, the love is an evil which prevents his hero from discharging his proper responsibilities towards his uncle, his friends, and the world (The Conflict..., p. 51). Ferrante's arguments are somewhat dubious.

parasites qui se sont développés autour de l'estoire.'[24] In 1929, Golther, like Bédier, saw the episode as a later development: he referred to it as 'ein später Einschub' which was not in the estoire as he conceived it.[25] Van Dam would also see the episode as a secondary accretion, absent from the Archetypus.[26]

But a second school of thought would stress on the whole that the episode belonged to the common fund of available material, would stress the age of the episode rather than its novelty. Fourrier offers a brief review of critical opinion regarding the provenance of the episode: he believes that the episode was in the model of Thomas and that Thomas was responsible for changing its position. The matter of the ultimate source of the episode is rather outside Fourrier's scope, but he offers a tentative conclusion:

Quant à la question de savoir si, à l'origine, l'épisode était rapporté par un scène à part, il nous est difficile d'en décider, mais ce qui paraît certain, c'est que très tôt cette scène fut incorporée à la légende ou du moins à un roman complet de la version commune antérieur à celui de Thomas.[27]

Whitehead believes that the ambiguous Oath episode is correctly placed in B, and has the place it may have had in the original: 'In Béroul, it seems to come at the right place - before Tristan has left Cornwall but after he has given Isolt back to Mark. It may therefore have occurred in the original at this point.'[28] Whitteridge also believes that Béroul is reproducing the estoire in placing the trial scene at the point he does.[29]

There is a final school of thought which believes that Thomas and Béroul did not treat the same episode independently, whether it

---

24. Bédier, Volume II, p. 265.
25. Tristan und Isolde in der französischen und deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Gegenwart, p. 33. Golther's opinion differs here from the view he expressed in 1907 (Tristan und Isolde in der Dichtung..., pp. 59-62, p. 103).
26. Leonhard, XV, p. 105.
27. Le Roman réaliste..., pp. 78-9.
28. 'The Early Tristan Poems', p. 141.
29. 'The Trial of Béroul', pp. [illegible]-4.

was a secondary accretion or part of a common source, but that one influenced the other. Mergell is right to see a connection between the Ambiguous Oath episode and the flour de farine episode, but his conclusions that Béroul was following Thomas and that the Ambiguous Oath episode was a substitute for the faux episode are difficult to accept.[30] On the other hand, Delbouille suggests that the episode was not in the common source of B and T, but was originally an independent story first taken up by Béroul: he further suggests that Thomas drew the idea for an ordeal from ll. 3244-7 and 4215-6 of B.[31]

These divergent opinions surely indicate that no really definitive conclusion as to the origin of the episode will be found. Instead, perhaps attention could usefully be focussed on the extent to which the early stages of the Ambiguous Oath episode in B, ll. 3028-3282, are integrated into the romance. Delbouille finds the whole episode an embarrassment: 'Rien ne prouve donc que le "serment ambigu" ait figuré dans le roman avant Béroul dont l'interpolation est aussi évidente que maladroite.'[32] The Ambiguous Oath episode may just possibly be an interpolation by Béroul but one would hesitate to term it clumsy. Those details of the previous scene in which Béroul's account differed markedly from that of Eilhart can be seen as preparing this episode. The escondit which Tristan offered to undertake will before long be balanced by Iseut's escondit. Iseut has been afraid, not merely of possible animosity from Mark,

---

30. Tristan und Isolde..., p. 82. Fourrier (Le Courant réaliste..., p. 78) dismisses Mergell's conclusions.
31. CCM, V, pp. 420-3.
32. CCM, V, p. 422, note 23.

but of interference from the three barons: she had accordingly arranged with Tristan that he should stay close at hand, in the house of the forester Orri, and that Perinis should inform her of any developments. Now Iseut's fears are seen to be amply justified. After already persuading Mark to reject Andret's proposal, the barons have interfered once more, and in the next episode Iseut will inform Tristan of this through Perinis. Iseut is now going to take a number of steps in order to safeguard her position.

19: PERINIS VISITS TRISTAN

The general purpose of this episode, ll. 3283-3364,[1] is to relate how Tristan is briefed for the role he is to play, when the courts of King Mark and King Arthur foregather in order to judge Iseut. It is one of a number of preparatory scenes and follows on directly from the previous episode: the queen is using Perinis to implement the plan she has evidently conceived.

Iseut appeals to Tristan's sense of obligation to her:

> Yseut ne s'ert mie atargie;
> Par Perinis warde Tristran
> Tote la paine et tot l'ahan
> Qu'el a por lui oum ele.
> Or l'en soit la bonté rendue!
> Metre la puet, s'il veut, en pes. (ll. 3285-93)

It had been arranged on the day of the parlement, immediately before the queen was restored to King Marc, that Perinis should be the intermediary between Iseut and Tristan (ll. 2830-1 and 2835-6). One might note that the journey planned for Perinis has apparently not been the first which the queen's squire had undertaken:

> Par Perinis, li franc meschin,
> Soit Tristran novos de s'amie. (ll. 3026-7)

At first sight, Iseut's presentation of past events in ll. 3290-1 might be considered unusual. Previously, the poet has stressed Tristan's suffering or at least has suggested that the lovers suffered equally. But almost certainly in these lines Iseut is referring to events that have taken place since her restoration to Marc. For her own peace of mind, the queen had asked Tristan to

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 3283-3364: S, chapter LVIII: E, stanza CCIV: C, ll. 15556-15559; T.r., p. 238, l. 15 - l. 32.

linger in the vicinity until she had ascertained how the king was going to behave (ll. 2811-21), and this her lover had agreed to do. Although Mark's behaviour has caused the queen no problem, the three felons have produced a situation in which Iseut feels bound to defend herself in an escondit in order to have her enemies dealt with once and for all. She now indicates to Tristan that he has it in his power to bring her lasting peace of mind.

From l. 3294 onwards, we have, in direct speech, the instructions that Perinis must pass on to Tristan. Most of these are self-explanatory, but Iseut's final request is less clear:

> Gart moi l'argent, tant que le voie
> Priveement, en chambre coie.' (ll. 3312-2)

Critics are hardly agreed as to the significance of Iseut's request. Muret, for example, writes: 'L'argent qu'il reçoit de toutes mains est destiné à la reine Iseut, pour l'amour de laquelle il a pris ce déguisement.'[2] But why should Iseut receive the money eventually? Joulin interprets her instruction differently: 'En exprimant ce désir la reine semble vouloir éviter à son amant un mouvement de générosité ou de gente inconsidéré qui le trahirait. En effet, en règle générale, le lépreux devait conserver intégralement les sommes reçues afin de les remettre au chef de la communauté.'[3] The historical observation of his second sentence is not really helpful, but Joulin is no doubt nearer when he points out Iseut's insistence that Tristan must play the role of leper correctly.[4] It is not only Tristan's safety that is at stake: any error which would lead to his detection would also render her unable to swear the oath she has formulated. But

---

2. M°, p. LXVIII.
3. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 119.
4. Joulin expresses the same sentiments elsewhere: 'Sans doute craindrait-elle d'un seigneur tel que lui un geste désinvolte ou dédaigneux qui le trahirait' ('La Ruse d'Iseut...', p. 82).

the question still arises: why should Tristan keep the money for her in particular? This is the aspect which Jodogne stresses:

Et voici encore que, sans commentaire, elle oblige Tristan à lui remettre l'argent qu'il aura récolté en mendiant (3311). En fait, c'est à des détails mesquins qu'Iseut s'abaissera lorsqu'elle fera semblant de brutaliser le pseudo-lépreux qui lui sert de monture (3929-80), à la grande joie des assistants. Celui dont elle se moque, c'est tout de même Tristan, même si personne ne l'a reconnu.[5]

While Jodogne sees a desire to humiliate Tristan in Iseut's character, Ewert detects a mercenary trait.[6] None of these explanations is really satisfactory. Is not Iseut telling Tristan that he should keep the money as his role of leper demands and that he should then pass on the money to her so that she, in accordance with her position as queen, may then distribute it to the poor and needy?

The other instructions which Perceis has to pass on are relatively straightforward. Tristan must station himself in the vicinity of the Lande Blanche (l. 3298): the familiar Blanche Lande has been reversed for the sake of the rhyme.[7] Iseut then gives precise details of the disguise which her lover must adopt: his dress and equipment are to conform in every authentic way to those of the leper.[8]

But ll. 3294-6 do offer a problem:

> 'Di li qu(e) il set bien [un] marchés,
> Au chief des planches, au mal Pas;
> G'i solló ja un poi mes dras.

---

5. Fol. pres., I-II, p. 270.
6. Ewert, Volume II, p. 94 and p. 229. One might note that in the Folie episode in O, Tristan retains the cheese given him on his voyage to Tintagel, but it is later used in the narrative (see especially ll. 8750-7). Of course, the Folie episode and the disguised leper episode in b do have several points in common.
7. Note ll. 3921-2 of B:
   > Color rosine, fresche et blanche.
   > Ensi s'haresce vers la planche.
8. Compare ll. 3299-3300 of B with ll. 511-2 of the Douce fragment.
   > Tut se d'ereille cum fust lazre,
   > E puis prent un hanap de mazre.
   Ewert is uncertain of the exact meaning of dedesoz in l. 3301 (Ewert, Volume II, p. 229). Line 3691 hardly suggests that the botele (or bocele) is hidden beneath Tristan's cloak.

Kelemanis raises the cry, with reference to l. 3296, 'Auf welchen Anlass bezieht sich das?'.[9] Iseut appears to be alluding here to a past event, but not one which Béroul has recounted. What may come to mind, of course, is the eau hardie episode,[10] but it is a fairly pointless quest. In the romance there are other indeterminate allusions to past events. Already, at l. 3276, Iseut has alluded to Arthur's disposition: 'Son corage sai des piça.' One might feel that she had in mind a particular event which gave her this knowledge. At ll. 3591-2 Tristan, when addressing Governal, makes a similar allusion:

> Vos savez bien le buen passage,
> Tiegl'a que vos en estes sage.

Is Tristan alluding to the same incident as that referred to by Iseut in l. 3296? Do ll. 3546-8 describe the event which gave rise to the opinion voiced by Iseut in l. 3276?

A number of different conclusions might be reached. Firstly, one might suppose that the romance is alluding to events which appear in other, now lost, versions of the Tristan story,[11] but there is no firm evidence for this. Or do the allusions to previous events represent an attempt to create a seemingly authentic pedigree for a particular and divergent account of the legend? Tickford is inclined towards this kind of conclusion with regard to passages in LS DN, f.fr. 112:

> L'auteur de ce récit tente de le relier aux autres branches du roman en se référant à d'autres aventures de Gauvain. Mais nous rechercherions en vain dans le cycle l'épisode où Sagramable doit la vie à Gauvain et où celui-ci tue le fils de Fergus. Cependant, ces renvois donnent un air d'authenticité à l'interpolation. C'est là un procédé qui est cher à Béroul, quand il renvoie aux aventures, inconnues ailleurs de Godwin.[12]

It is not, of course, Galoine's adventures which are recalled in

---

9. Geschichte des..., p. 56.
10. G 6143-6204, T, Turin[1], ll. 184-256.
11. This is one conclusion Sudre arrives at after examining the allusion to the dwarf's death at the hand of Tristan in L'Escoufle (Rom., XV, pp. 541-2).
12. L'Interpolation..., p. 27.

l. 3546 to which Pickford refers, but certainly he is right to suggest that allusions of this nature do create a general past with which present and future events harmonize. Payen suggests much the same in his review of Vàrvaro's monograph.[13] But the allusion to past events does not always correspond to what has happened before in the romance. We can easily accept that Tristan and Iseut know a particular location of old, for it contradicts nothing even if this is the first mention. But Iseut's reference to Orri, in ll. 2815-21, an allusion belonging to the same category, seemed to present a different picture of the lovers' life in the forest from the one we in fact encountered. One may conclude that allusions such as those in l. 3276, ll. 3294-6, ll. 3546-8, ll. 3591-2 and elsewhere, although they refer to the past, are basically preparatory in function. The poet seemed to consider the past life of his characters, as already described in the romance, to be inadequate preparation, and he therefore created a second, occasionally contradictory past to supplement it.

Turning for a moment to examine the derivatives of T, we discover at once that E offers no direct parallel to this episode in T; in stanza CCIV there is no intimation at all that Iseut ever

---

13. 'Les allusions à ce qu'on croit être des épisodes perdus ne se réfèrent peut-être pas à des histoires précédemment racontées: point n'est en effet besoin de les tirer au clair pour suivre l'action. Ces allusions sont-elles pour autant gratuites et superflues? Non, dans la mesure où elles feignent de faire confiance à l'auditeur, qui est censé connaître les faits qu'elles rappellent. A ce niveau c'est un nouveau moyen de participation. Cette hypothèse est séduisante, mais fragile. Elle se justifie pourtant, pensons-nous, lorsque Béroul évoque en quelques mots, de manière obscure, une ancienne complicité entre Arthur et Iseut, ou une vieille inimitié entre Gauvain et Ganelon. L'événement prend aussitôt une dimension nouvelle, celle du temps. L'intervention d'Arthur lors de l'escondit s'inscrit dès lors dans le cadre d'une ligne de conduite et cesse d'être plus ou moins accidentelle' (Ma, LXXI, p. 602).

contacted Tristan. A look at G is more rewarding. In the German poem, Iseut certainly lacks the resolve, the confidence that she displays in B, for the poet rather stresses her anxiety and concern until, after an appeal to Christ, she hits on a ruse:

> in disen dingen haete Isot
> einen list ir herzen vür geleit
> vil verre uf gotes hülfecheit·
> si schreip unde sande
> einen brief Tristande
> und enbot im, daz er kaeme,
> swe er die vuoge naeme,
> ze Carliun des ê ges vrîe,
> so si da solte stozen zuo,
> und naeme er an dem stade war. (ll. 15550-9)

As in B, Iseut finally takes control of events, albeit after lengthy uncertainty. It is through a letter that she contacts Tristan and her instructions are kept to a minimum. Not so in S (chapter LVIII). In the Saga a message is sent to Tristan, the manner of the message's transmission not being revealed. But in the details of the message S is more precise. Iseut tells Tristan that he must carry her from the boat and during this operation she would pass on further instructions. Perhaps S is being too precise in making Tristan know in advance what was expected of him and perhaps S was to some extent departing from the source on this point. None of the major derivatives really makes it clear where Tristan is supposed to be at this moment. Bédier presumes that Tristan left the court after the flour de farine events.[14] Only in T.r. is Tristan's apparent absence during the oath and ordeal properly explained. There, he is granted permission by Marc to visit the duca Bramondo.[15] And not only is Tristan's 'absence' motivated, but the Petitorû episode is also

---

14. Bédier, Volume I, p. 208, note 3.
15. T.r., p. 238, ll. 23-7.

prepared, for the duke is the owner of le Pilletto Aravluto. As far as the mechanics of preparation are concerned, one may deduce that T differed from B in a number of respects. There were perhaps no details of dress and behaviour transmitted to Tristan, nothing to compare with the instructions in ll. 3299-3312 of B. In short, Thomas did not show us an Iseut who had to invent a course of action and get Tristan to implement it.

Nevertheless, in T as in B, there was probably a Tristan who played a much more passive role than that played by Iseut. In B, Perinis finds Tristan in Orri's cellar and passes on the queen's message. Tristan accepts her instructions and adds only a minor proposal of his own:

> Bien le verra li rois Artus
> Soiez au chief ser le hal ras,
> Mais il ne me conoistra pas;
> S'atapine avrai, se l'en plus traire.[16]

Tristan will take care that not even King Arthur will recognize him when he is 'atapiné comme tafurs',[17] and the idea of begging for alms is an extension of Iseut's instructions in ll. 3308-12. Thus, Tristan is not called upon to show any more initiative than is necessary to implement convincingly Iseut's plan.

However, ll. 3340-1 would then appear to offer a problem:

> Di li que tot ai bien trové
> A sauver soi du soirement.

Ewert translates these lines thus: 'Tell her that I have contrived everything to save her from [the predicament of] the oath.'[18] But if Ewert's interpretation is correct, this would seem to mean that

---

16. B 3346-9. The elliptical phrase au chief in l. 3346 is explained by l. 3295, Ao chief des aleches.
17. B 3349. See also Fr, l. 571. 'Ains ert tafur, ren escient'.
18. Ewert, Volume II, p. 229. Fedrick interprets the lines similarly: 'Tell her that I have thought of a good way of saving her from the oath' (The Romance of Tristan..., p. 122).

Tristan is controlling the whole sequence of events and not merely complying with Iseut's instructions. Not only past, but future events would contradict this. Also, Iseut is not in any way to be saved from the oath. Following up the reference Ewert gives to l. 3565, one can see that he believes sauver soi in l. 3341 to be a rare use of the infinitive with a pronoun subject. Holden describes soi as a 'pronom régime d'un infinitif, régi lui-même par un autre verbe'.[19] The very rarity of this construction, with soi for lié, has been a cause of concern in the past and has led to the emendation of the lines. In his editions Muret printed 'Di li que tot ait bien trové',[20] and the emendation of ai to ait or a is indeed tempting.[21] But perhaps the manuscript reading ai could be retained, if the lines were interpreted roughly in the manner proposed by Müll: 'Sag ihr, dass ich die Art, wie sie sich, was den Eid angeht, zu helfen weiss, ganz und gar gutheisse.'[22] Müll's interpretation of bien trove as 'approve' may well be correct,[23] but tot is probably the direct object of the verb rather than an adverb. Should we understand 'Tell her I have approved all she proposes for saving herself in the matter of the oath'?

Even though Tristan is playing a primarily passive role, it is through Tristan that the theme of revenge is openly re-introduced:

> Tristran vers terre un poi encline
> Et jure quant que puet ataindre:
> Mar l'ont pensé, ne puet remaindre,

---

19. Rom., LXXIX, p. 395.
20. M4 follows Ewert and has 'Di li que tot ai bien trové'. Nevertheless, the MS reading ai continues to be reproduced in the notes (p. 148).
21. See Lecoy, Rom., XCIII, p. 575, Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 113.
22. Tristan und Isolde, p. 163.
23. See the examples of trover in the sense of 'erfinden als' in T.-L., X, 698.

> Il en verdront encor les testes
> Et as forches pendront, as festes.[24]

The theme has not exactly been dormant, for Mark had told Iseut in ll. 3197-9 that Tristan would take revenge upon the barons on his behalf and in ll. 3203-6 the queen had moved for their disgrace. Tristan insists upon this desire to take revenge upon the barons in ll. 3336-9:

> Ja n'avrai mais bain d'eve chaude
> Tant qu'a m'espee ale vengance
> De ceus qui li ont fait pesance;
> Il sont traïtre fel prové.

One might possibly be surprised that Tristan gives so much emphasis here to his animosity towards the barons when his major concern ought to be the guaranteeing of Iseut's safety. But a stress upon revenge, a feature peculiar to B and one which has been encountered before, will give Iseut the kind of reassurance she obviously needs at this juncture (neither of the derivatives of T, G and S, which tell of the message from Iseut to Tristan, records the reaction of the hero at all). The revenge theme is encountered again in the very next episode, especially in the words of Gauvain, Girflet and Ivain (ll. 3466-70, 3476-81 and 3488-94), and, in the near future, the theme will be a source of inspiration for whole scenes unique to B, such as the tournament scene and perhaps the account of the barons' disastrous attempt to cross the ford.

---

24. B 3328-32. As Ewert indicates (Ewert, Volume II, p. 229), the meaning of l. 3329 is not altogether clear (see M[4], p. 140), but his translation shows he has understood the basic construction correctly: 'He swears by whatever is within his reach (power).' (See also Reid, The 'Tristan'..., p. 113.) In l. 3352, 'Ous fist fere si bel, errin', there is another minor problem of interpretation which is considered by Ewert. Who is deemed responsible for having the cellar built? Orri or the queen? Ewert refers back to ll. 2820-1, as if to indicate that Orri is responsible (Ewert, Volume II, p. 229), but the immediate context suggests it was the queen.

20: PERINIS VISITS ARTHUR

In the next episode, ll. 3365-3562, the visit of Perinis to the court of King Arthur is recounted. Obviously it is very much a continuation of the previous episode, having Perinis as the lurking figure: in ll. 3559-61, the squire will tell Iseut about both parts of his mission. But certain differences between the two parts must be indicated. The meeting with Tristan was essentially a clandestine one, naturally unknown to Mark, but this part of the squire's journey is closer to an official embassy, known and approved by the king. In l. 3248 ff., Iseut had expressed the wish that Arthur and his knights should be her guarantors on the occasion of her escondit. It is Mark's duty to summon all his nobles to the escondit, but it seems to be Iseut's responsibility, and certainly it is in her own interests, to ensure that Arthur is informed.[1] Perinis is thus a quasi-official messenger to Arthur, but a secret messenger to Tristan: the hero will be an uninvited guest at the assembly.

For convenience, the episode could be divided into three sections. The first section runs from l. 3365 to l. 3410 and describes the journey of Perinis to Arthur's court and his reception at that court. The second, ll. 3411-3519, includes the speech of Perinis and the reaction of Arthur's knights. And finally, ll. 3520-3562

---

1. See ll. 3273-6:

> Et li mien cors est tos seürs,
> Des que verra li rois Artus
> Mon esgrego, qu'il vendra ça.

tell of the departure of Perinis from Isneldone and of his return home. This is not altogether an arbitrary division, for it seems that the poet himself has introduced a balance into the episode, as we shall see later.

At the beginning of the first section, Perinis leaves Tristan and journeys first to Cuerlion (l. 3368). Arthur is not there, but further enquiries confirm that he is at Isneldone. Of course, as Ewert suggests, other romances show Arthur and his household changing residence frequently, and one may, if one wishes, relate the movement of the fictional king to those of the Plantagenets.[2] But in our particular romance Béroul is above all seeking to create a sense of occasion: arriving at a king's court is hardly eventful, but arriving at Arthur's court is a different experience altogether.[3] Perinis once again seeks information:

> A un pastor qui chaloiele
> A demandé. 'Ou est li rois?'
> 'Sire,' fait il, 'il sit au dais;
> Je verrois la Table Reonde,
> Qui tornoie comme le monde;
> Sa mesnie sit environ.' (ll. 3376-81)

The news that Arthur is sitting au dais is hardly surprising: the temptation to rayme rois and dais and their respective variants is so strong that few writers ever overcome it. Dais can be fairly flexible in meaning; it often denotes a table,[4] but here it seems

---

2. 'The romances show Arthur changing residence with a frequency not unlike that which characterized the Plantagenet kings. It is not surprising, therefore, that Perinis should seek him in vain at Cuerlion and be directed to Isneldone' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 231).
3. One might compare ll. 1863-5, the arrival of the forester at Mark's court, with the elaboration in ll. 3385-96.
4. See T.-L., II, 1989-90, and the two further examples which follow. Fo, ll. 261-2:

> Sengle s'en aporceut li rois,
> Ln ou il sist al restre dais.

Le Roman de Brut, ll. 8367-8:

> Al mangier est asis li rois
> Au chief de la sale, a un dais.

to have a meaning closer to 'dais', the estage of l. 3395.[5]

The Table Ronde is, of course, associated only with Arthur. Ewert refers to an article by Weston to support his gloss of tornoie, 'turns', 'rotates',[6] an article in which Weston quotes the lines in B and claims that they provide a clinching argument: 'This appears to me definitely to settle the question; to certain of the early romance writers, Layamon and Béroul among them, Arthur's Round Table was a Turning Table.'[7] Frappier, however, is unconvinced:

Faut-il comprendre que la Table Ronde était une table tournante? Certains commentateurs n'ont pas hésité à admettre cette interprétation; elle est pourtant bien peu vraisemblable, et il vaut mieux donner à tornoie le sens d''avoir une forme circulaire', sens plus rare que celui de 'se mouvoir en rond', mais suffisamment attesté. La forme ronde de la table symboliserait la sphéricité de l'univers, rien plus; son origine remonterait alors à un vieux mythe que rien n'empêche, si l'on veut, d'être celtique.[8]

It is certainly the static roundness of the Table rather than its movement which is emphasized in Malory.[9] This is obviously not a vital point of interpretation, and whatever the exact nature of the Table it is obviously unusual and heightens the sense of occasion noticed before.

Having been greeted by Ferinis in Iseut's name, Arthur returns the salutation with considerable gallantry. He pays homage to Iseut and tells Ferinis he will be knighted because of his connection with the queen:

> Vaslet, voiant cest don tu me,
> Otroi a la qeut que requiers.

---

5. This is the meaning dais presents in the transcription of part of Add. MS 10292 printed by Stafford (L'Évolution..., p. 178): 'Et li rendus qui venoit de la terre de Loheye entra laiens, et vint a grans pas parmi la sale contreval jusques devant le haut dais ou estoit li rois Artus, et maint haut baron i seoient.'
6. Ewert, Volume II, p. 231.
7. 'A Hitherto Unconsidered Aspect...', p. 888.
8. Le Roman breton..., p. 69.
9. 'Also Merlyon made the Rounde Table in tokenyng of rowndnes of the worlde, for men sholde by the Rounde Table undirstonde the rowndnes signyfyed by myght (The Works of Sir Thomas Malory, II, p. 906).

> Toi tiens sorus fet chevaliers,
> Por le nesce a la plus bele
> Qui soit de ci jusq'en Tudele.' (ll. 3406-10)

Arthur's reaction, his spontaneous approval of whatever Iseut might request, had been anticipated by the queen in ll. 3273-6.

The second part of the episode comprises the speech by Perinis and the reaction to it. The squire begins by seeking the attention of Arthur and his knights, and of Gauvain in particular:

> 'Sire,' fait il, 'vostre merci!
> Oiez por qoi sui venu ci:
> Et si entendent cil baron,
> Et mes sires Gauvain par non. (ll. 3411-4)

The importance of Arthur's nephew will be confirmed as the romance goes on:[10] he will be, in this scene, the first of the individual barons to respond to Perinis's plea and he is prominent in the tournament scene (l. 4010, l. 4060).

In ll. 3415-25 Perinis substantially repeats the gist of the arguments with which Mark rebuffed the barons on their first approach (l. 3056 ff.). Compare, for example, l. 3419 with l. 3063, and l. 3423 with l. 3064. In ll. 3426-47, in the second part of his speech, Perinis is again repeating familiar material; in this case this is to be expected, for he is passing on Iseut's instructions. Again, one might compare Iseut's words in l. 3239, part of her conversation with King Mark, with the words of her squire in ll. 3426-7, and ll. 3260-64, especially l. 3250, with ll. 3443-6. The proposed site for Iseut's exculpation, 'Devant le Gué Aventuros'

---

10. Reid has drawn on this passage to support his interpretation of ll. 4202-5: 'The allusion to the king's nephew becomes less unexpected than it may at first sight appear if we observe that wherever in this episode the escondit is referred to, Gauvain is always the first and sometimes the only member of Arthur's household to be mentioned by name, so in the opening words of the appeal addressed by Yseut's emissary Perinis to Arthur and his court' (op. cit., LXXXV, p. 367).

(l. 3436), is a familiar one: it was, in fact, the place where Tristan offered to undergo his own ecorcdit. But ll. 3428-33 bring quite new material:

> Ce on dire que souef nage
> Cil qui on soutient le menton.
> Rois, se nos ja de ce menton,
> Si me tenes a lose ger.
> Li rois n'a pas corage entier,
> Sempres est ci et sempres la.

Other examples of the proverb in ll. 3428-9 are given by Muret (M°, p. 207) and Mölk (Tristan und Isolde, p. 167) refers to Morawski's collection. In ll. 3432-3 Perinis assesses Mark's character and Ewert praises the squire's judgment: 'These lines sum up with admirable brevity the cardinal weakness of Mark as a man and as a king.'[11] But this kind of analysis of character can be misleading. Béroul saw clearly that with a gullible and vacillating Mark he could conveniently engineer new situations. One might also remember that the lines form part of Perinis's appeal to Arthur. His presence at the judgment is flatteringly presented as indispensable: unlike Mark, Le will not prevaricate.

The reaction of Arthur's whole company of knights is recorded in ll. 3448-51. It has already been noted that the beginning of Perinis's appeal was reminiscent of Mark's reaction to the three wicked barons, when they made their initial request for Iseut to clear herself. Now Arthur's knights as a body, when they hear of the barons' demands, respond in much the same way that Mark did.[12] After this collective reaction, in ll. 3457-94 the author describes the reaction of three individuals, Gauvain, Girflet and Ewain, who

---

11. Ewert, Volume II, p. 233. See also Tuaquerey, Med. aev., VI, p. 14.
12. Compare ll. 3151-3 and ll. 3062-5.

emerge from the whole body of knights much as the three felons emerged from Mark's retinue. This section of the episode closes at l. 3519, after Perinis's reply to Arthur and the king's instructions to his knights.

The third and final section of the episode begins at l. 3520 in a familiar manner, 'Ciez du franc de bone main'. Arthur and his knights escort Perinis as he departs from the court, and one may recall the occasion on which Mark had escorted Tristan when he was seemingly on the point of entering into exile.[13] But one becomes aware above all of the balance the author seeks to create with the first section of the episode. Arthur is lavish in his praise of Iseut as this point as he was in ll. 3409-10, at the time of Perinis's first appearance:

> Tant li conte sens de la bele,
> Qu'il retrait lance par astele.[14]

Again, Arthur then offers to knight Perinis, just as he had promised at the beginning (l. 3408, ll. 3528-9). The squire then takes leave of his escort but the parallels with the first section continue. The author praises Perinis's devotion to duty as he had in ll. 3369-70:

> Cil s'en vient; son mesage a fait
> Perinis qui tant mal a trait
> Por le servise a la reïne. (ll. 3533-5)

---

13. The rhyme <u>convoi</u> : <u>roi</u> is perhaps another that romance writers find difficult to resist: compare ll. 3535-6 and ll. 2927-8.
14. B 3525-6. Line 3526 offers difficulty. Muret consistently printed 'Qui retrait lance par astele'. Henry decided that the manuscript version, reproduced by Ewert, was 'difficile, sinon impossible à conserver' (<u>R.P.</u>, XVII, p. 256). Ewert seemed to change his view. In his second volume (p. 235), he wrote: '<u>Qui</u>, if adopted, might be interpreted as yet another example of Beroul's bold use of generic <u>qui</u>, loosely connected with what precedes: "All their talk is of the fair one [and of] whoever will splinter a lance [sc. "in her honour"]".'

A last parallel is found in ll. 3556-8, where the speed of Perinis's return is matched only by that of his outward journey (ll. 3365-8).

The final destination of Perinis would appear to be Lidan (l. 3562). Is Lidan to be associated with Dinas and with the Lîtîn of Eilhart?[15] Lidan appears elsewhere in B only at l. 2232, without any particular significance, and perhaps it is wisest to place no particular significance upon the use of the place-name here: Béroul is concluding an episode in a characteristic manner,[16] using a convenient place-name he has employed before (which perhaps belonged to the common stock of material), and Lidan is a convenient variant for Dinan as a rhyme for Tristran.[17]

As well as the attempt to balance the beginning and end of the episode, one may see another manifestation of the author's artistic concern in the speeches of Arthur's knights, in ll. 3457-3494. Each of the three speeches expresses roughly the same sentiments and each of them is constructed on the same pattern.[18] One may for a moment recall part of Tristan's reaction to Iseut's instructions in ll. 3336-9.

> Ja n'avrai mais bain d'eve chaude
> Tant qu'a m'espee aie vengance
> De ceus qui li ont fait nosance;
> Il sont traître fol prové.

The three knights will react in a similar manner to the plea of Perinis. It is obvious that the embassy of Perinis follows on from his visit to Tristan, and the knights' speeches provide another, more oblique indication of continuity.

---

15. The point is discussed at some length by Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 146-7 and n. 236). In the introduction to his edition (p. CXLVII), Lichtenstein notes: 'Tînîs der Truchsess in Markes Hofhalt heisst bei B. Dinas, sein Stammsitz Dinan 1085. 1135. u. ö. Eilhart hat dafür Lîtîn, welches sich aber auch in dem Berneschen Gedicht findet: Perinis von seinem Botschaftsritt zu König Artus und Tristran zurückgekehrt trifft Isolden: 3527 cele nuit firent a Lidin. Allerdings weicht Eilhart gerade von diesem letzten Teil der Berneschen Erzählung vollständig ab.'
16. See ll. 1276 and 1421.
17. See ll. 1085-6 and 2047-8.
18. Hénry suggests that here Béroul is consciously imitating the epic laisse (op. cit., XCV, p. 170).

The parallels between the knights' speeches begin with the way in which the speeches are introduced. Gauvain is the first to prepare to speak:

> Gauvains s'en est levé en piez,
> Karla et dist come afaitiez. (ll. 3457-8)

Girflet and Evain are briefly introduced in a similar manner before they speak, in ll. 3471-2 and in l. 3483. Each of the knights selects one felon as his particular enemy: Gauvain expresses his animosity towards Guenelon, Girflet is opposed to Godoïne and Evain to Denoalen. All three of the knights have encountered the three felons in the past or at least are aware of their evil natures. Gauvain has jousted with Guenelon before (ll. 3462-5), Girflet knows of the felons' longstanding opposition to Iseut (ll. 3473-5) and Evain recalls Denoalen's manipulation of the king and his own previous encounter with him (ll. 3484-9). All three of the knights swear that they will take revenge on their own particular foe and they call on various authorities to witness their oaths in l. 3466, l. 3476 and l. 3490. Each of the knights, moreover, has a particular idea of the form that revenge will take, indicated by Gauvain in ll. 3468-70, by Girflet in ll. 3477-9 and by Evain in l. 3492.

The obvious similarities in content presented by the three speeches are supplemented by similarities in syntax. Lines 3476-81 read:

> Ja ne me tienge Dex en sens,
> Se vois a contre Godoïne,
> Se de ma grant lance fresine
> Ne passent outre li coutel,
> Ja n'en enbraz soz le mantel
> Bele dame devoz coutire.'

After the optative clause in l. 3476, two conditional clauses follow in ll. 3477-9, the second one dependent on the first: ll. 3480-1 then present another optative. The speech of Evain in ll. 3488-92

offers a similar construction.

> Se je l'encontre ennié ma voie,
> Con je fis ja une autre foiz,
> Ja ne m'en tienge lois ne fois,
> S'il ne se puet de moi defendre,
> S'a mes deus mains ne le fais rendre.

The pattern of presentation has been modified, but the same structural elements have been exploited. Whatever form the speeches of the knights may take, the sentiments expressed are those already voiced by Tristan in the previous episode. As well as ll. 3336-9, which have already been noted, one might notice ll. 3330-2, here Tristan anticipates punishment for the felons as the three knights do here.

The three knights, Gauvain, Girflet and Evain all refer to a past encounter with one of the three felons. Certainly these references do not contradict anything which has gone before, for this is the first episode in which the knights participate. The references create a past history for their relationship with the barons and, almost paradoxically, prepare future events.

In this same episode, Arthur himself makes reference to an event in the past:

> Menbre li de l'espié lancier,
> Qui fu en l'estache feru;
> Ele savra bien ou ce fu. (ll. 3546-8)

The meaning of l. 3546 is not altogether certain. Ebert treats lancier as an infinitive form and translates accordingly: 'Remind her of the hurling of the hunting-spear which was embedded in the post.'[19] This is perhaps the correct interpretation.[20]

Even if some general agreement can be reached regarding meaning, the problem of the significance of the allusion remains.

---

19. Ebert, Volume II, p. 255.
20. Muret emended lancier to d'acier in L^0. Fedrick would appear to see lancier as an adjective qualifying espie (The Romance of Tristan..., p. 127).

is Arthur referring to an incident found elsewhere in Tristan material? Golther, for example, sees in the lines an allusion to the faux or Blades at the Bed episode, the incident recounted in ll. 5280-5487 of O.[21] Likewise, Kelemina[22] and Delbouille[23] link the lines with the faux episode. But this identification is rejected by Bédier,[24] and the kind of contest which Ewert believes the lines allude to has none of the essential characteristics of the faux.[25] The purpose of the allusion, whether it refers to an event known elsewhere or not, is also problematical. Convinced that Béroul is alluding to the faux, Golther sees the reference as quite incomprehensible because Béroul omits the episode: 'Man ersieht hieraus wieder seine sorglose Darstellungsweise, die, ganz im Augenblick befangen, das Vorhergehende oder Nachfolgende völlig vergisst.'[26] But if the lines, like ll. 3294-6 of the previous episode, allude to no incident ever found in the Tristan material, the reference may fulfil a different purpose. Through Arthur's words, a past is perhaps being created for the relationship between the king and Iseut: the queen's assertion in l. 3276 that Arthur is convinced of her innocence, 'Son corage sai des piça', in some way thus gains corroboration. As we found in examining the claims of Gauvain, Girflet and Evain to have prior knowledge of the felons, a past may again have been created to serve as essential exposition, to justify

---

21. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 51, p. 63, p. 109. Golther expressed the same view in 1929 (Tristan und Isolde in der französischen und deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit, p. 32).
22. Geschichte der..., p. 36, p. 74.
23. CCM, V, p. 420.
24. Bédier, Volume II, p. 312.
25. He writes: 'It is possible that Beroul had in mind the type of competition described, for example, in Cléomadès, according to which four targets were erected on tall posts (sor tres hauts sapins) which knights and squires on horseback sought to hit with their javelos (l. 15981)' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 236).
26. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 110.

future events and attitudes.[27]

One last comment could be made in connection with this analysis of the knights' speeches. Lines 3480-1, already cited, could not be more conventional.[28] But in other parts of the knights' promises an element of bombast, appearing as an exaggeration of already exaggerated attitudes, might be detected. Line 3492, 'S'a mes deus mains ne le fais pendre', could well form part of a boastful gab. If we are meant to see Gauvain and his friends as minor braggarts, the falsity of their claims will be publicly exposed at the tournament, for none of Arthur's knights will dare to engage Tristan and Governal in combat.

Arthur and his knights do not, of course, appear in the derivatives of T, even though they include the escondit sequence in their accounts.[29] One must probably suppose that Thomas found Arthur in his source account, but adapted the story to suit his own purposes. Fourrier writes:

Désirant faire de Marke un roi comparable en magnificence et en prestige au roi Arthur des romans courtois, il veut l'élever à un rang égal en dignité à celui de son modèle: Arthur était roi d'Angleterre, Markele sera donc aussi, ce qui permettra au poète d'entonner au seuil de son oeuvre, l'éloge de sa patrie et, par ricochet, de rendre ainsi hommage au roi d'Angleterre de son temps, le puissant Henri II Plantegenêt.

---

27. Looking at the legend as a whole, the relationship between the faux, the fleur de farine and the escondit is extremely difficult to determine. Because of their many similarities, the faux has been seen as a doublet of the fleur de farine episode (see Lichtenstein, Eilhart von Oberge, p. CXXVIII, Golther, Tristan und Isolde in der Dichtungen..., p. 64). Arthur is mentioned, albeit fleetingly, in the fleur de farine episode in B and O, and he plays a part in the episodes which follow soon after the separation of the lovers, the escondit sequence in B, the faux in C. The author of O himself seems aware of the repetitive nature of the faux episode (see ll. 5280-4 and ll. 3909-11). In R, the fleur de farine episode is absent, and before the capture of the lovers, although it does not occasion the capture of the lovers, we find the faux episode.
28. See, for example, ll. 227-9 of Fb.
29. In the derivatives of T, the only vague parallel is the reference to Caerleon in l. 15531 of C: Caerleon was the first town visited by Perinis in B in his search for Arthur.

Mais du même coup Thomas s'interdit de se conformer à la tradition qui fait de Marke et d'Arthur des contemporains. Le premier devra forcément occuper le trône d'Angleterre à une autre époque que le second et celui-ci, par conséquent, disparaître du récit.[30]

Mölk proposes another reason for the change. He agrees with Fourrier that Arthur was in Thomas's source, but he believes that Thomas presented a different historical perspective, not simply to praise his country and Henry II, but also for literary reasons. Arthur, so Mölk claims, was placed in the past so that Thomas could put forward a critique of the courtly ideal:

So ist es verständlich, dass Thomas einen solchen Artus, der sich für die Liebenden einsetzt und in dieser Weise ebenfalls im Erec charakterisiert ist, aus seinem Roman ausklammert, da er an dem Beispiel seiner liebenden Helden, Tristans und Isoldens, sein Publikum auf die Fragwürdigkeit des höfischen Ideals weist und ihm zeigt, dass die höfische Einheit der Liebe und der Ritterschaft im Grunde nicht mehr besteht, nicht mehr gesellschaftliche Wahrheit ist, was freilich nicht ausschliesst, dass sie es einmal war.[31]

What remains is to gauge the effect so far of the inclusion of Arthur in Béroul's version. Arthur has been mentioned before this scene. The letter which Mark ostensibly wished Tristan to transmit in the fleur de farine episode was destined for Arthur (in both O and B), and Arthur is briefly mentioned during the Morrois sequence in B when Iseut seeks to persuade Tristan to train Husdent to hunt silently (l. 1578). In this scene, however, Arthur makes his first appearance. Certainly King Arthur would not be deprived in B of the charisma that he has in other romances,[32] but naturally he plays a particular role here. As we have seen, three of Arthur's knights echoed the sentiments of Tristan in their resolve to punish the three felons. Now King Arthur blushes with pleasure at Perinis's flattery

---

30. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 43-4.
31. GRM, XII, p. 100.
32. See Jonin, Les Personnages féminins..., p. 239.

and sends the squire away, with the assurance that the vindication of Iseut will receive prompt attention:

> Li rois fu liez, un poi rougi:
> 'Sire vaslez, alez mangier;
> Cist penseront de lui vengier.' (ll. 3504-6)

Convinced that Iseut is innocent and willing to enter the lists if the need to defend her arises, Arthur and his knights thus reinforce the notion that the three felons are the real villains of the piece.

The preparations for the assembly are now concluded, if not all the preparations for the oath itself. Iseut's proposal that Arthur and his knights should be present was accepted by King Mark and now Arthur has promised to be there. Iseut is in control of events. In the same way that Tristan's aims were achieved in the sequence of events that began at l. 2133, Iseut's preparations are now bearing fruit. The queen has already informed Tristan what mode of disguise he should adopt and now Arthur tells his knights that he requires an impressive and immaculate turn-out. In the next episode we shall see that the instructions of Iseut and Arthur have been carried out.

21: TRISTAN IN LEPER'S GUISE

The climax to the sequence of episodes which begins at l. 3028 is the swearing of the oath by Iseut, ll. 4197-4216 of Béroul's poem. The derivatives of Thomas also have, of course, the swearing of an oath by the queen.[1] In Gottfried's poem Iseut excludes from her oath King Mark and the pilgrim; only they ever lay with her:

> daz mines libes nie kein man
> dekeine künde nie gewan
> noch mir ze keinen zîten
> weder zarme noch ze sîten
> ane îuch nie lebende man gelac
> wan der, vür den ich niene mac
> gebieten ûf noch lâgen,
> den ir mit îwern ougen
> îr sahet an dem arme,
> der wallaere der arme. (ll. 15707-15716)

In S, Iseut similarly excludes from her oath the king and the pilgrim, as the only men who had ever approached her: the pilgrim, so she claims, carried her from the boat and fell upon her (chapter LIX). In H, Iseut's oath is only very slightly different: she refers to the man who carried her to the ship and says that he alone had ever come as near to her as had King Mark (stanza CCVII, ll. 2271-7). In T.r., Iseut must exclude in her oath two figures, a pilgrim and a fool, apart from King Mark, for it is in two different guises that Tristan embraces her.[2] In all the derivatives of T an ordeal then follows.

The nature of the oath in all the versions is determined by what happens in the preceding episodes, by the nature of the plan that Iseut

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 3563-3984; S, chapter LVIII - L, stanza CCIV, l. 2238 - stanza CCVII, l. 2267, G, ll. 15560-15633; T.r., p. 238 - p. 240; Fo, ll. 817-30.
2. T.r., p. 240, ll. 15-21. Only in a vague allusion in L'Escoufle (ll. 3132-3) do we glimpse the existence of another version in which Tristan donned more than one disguise:
   > Il fu par conseil fou lonc tans,
   > Et mesiaus et faus pelerins.

executes, by the nature of the incident that she deliberately provokes. In Béroul's poem, the central part of Iseut's oath appears as follows:

> Si m'ait Dex et saint Ylaire,
> Ces reliques, cest saintuaire,
> Totes celes qui ci ne sont
> Et tuit icil de par le mont,
> Q'entre mes cuisses n'entra home,
> Fors le ladre qui fist soi some,
> Qui me porta outre les guez,
> Et li rois Marc mes esposez. (ll. 4201-8)

The events which are recounted in ll. 3865-3984 make it possible for Iseut to swear an oath in these terms.

Iseut is already in control of events, working behind the scenes, stage-managing the operation. Already she has given precise instructions to Tristan regarding the role that he must play. Now she must herself step forward and take over the leading role from Tristan. Dinas also has a part to play, as we see from the initial stages of the scene.[3] He has arrived at the Mal Pas with the queen and he is aware that the leper is really Tristan in disguise (l. 3855). Dinas interrogates the queen in ll. 3868-72, but not for his own information. The problem ostensibly before the queen is how to cross the ford with rather more success than the three felons, but we must understand from ll. 3873-5 that Dinas knows that Iseut already has an answer:

> Yseut rist, qui n'ert pas coarde,
> De l'uel li guigne, si l'esgarde;
> Le penser sout a la roïne.

---

3. Jonin stresses the essentially theatrical nature of the proceedings ('La Ruse d'Iseut...', pp. 81-3), as does Nichols: 'Tristan is present at the ceremony and during the events preceding the oath. He is not there in his own raiment, but on the command of Iseut, disguised as a leper. Only Iseut and Dinas recognize him. The scene is reminiscent of the very first one because, once again, only the lovers have the key to the roles being played, while everyone else takes the illusion for the reality. The lovers themselves play their roles zestfully, fully aware of the humorous aspects of the double entendre they are acting out' ('Ethical Criticism...', p. 82).

Dinas is thus playing a role for the benefit of all, and especially those who have struggled across already to the other side. Just as the oath will be essentially public, witnessed by guarantors and open to objections, so the preparations for the oath are carried out in full view of the world at large. Indeed, the apparent authenticity of the oath is dependent on the public performance which is now beginning and the public interest in Iseut's actions is repeatedly stressed:

> La roïne out molt grant esgart
> De ceus qui sont de l'autre part.
> Li roi prisié s'en esbahirent,
> Et tuit li autre qui le virent. (ll. 3899-3902)

At a crucial moment, when the queen settles herself upon the leper's back, the narrative is interrupted to emphasize the close attention which everyone is paying: 'Tuit les gardent, et roi et conte.'[4] After his conversation with the queen, Dinas crosses over, Iseut is left alone, and at the very beginning of the scene the fact that she is being watched, and that she knows she is being watched, is given prominence:

> De l'autre part fu Yseut sole.
> Devant le gué fu grant la fole
> Des deus rois et de lor barnage.
> Oiez d'Yseut com el fu sage!
> Bien savoit que cil l'esgardoient
> Qui outre le Mal Pas estoient.[5]

Iseut's first step is to send the horse across alone, an action which the spectators find more than a little surprising. They see Iseut now stranded without a horse on the wrong side of the ford. In ll. 3903-11 there follows a description of Iseut which is closely

---

4. B 3934. As Ewert suspects, it is very possible that the scribe made the wrong word-division at l. 3934 and that the text should read not les gardent, but l'esgardent (Ewert, Volume II, p. 244), which is in fact what Muret printed in M°.
5. B 3879-84. I fail to see the point of Ewert's query regarding l. 3879: 'Sole, ... apart from Tristran (and Dinas?)' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 244). Dinas has already left Iseut and has crossed by a ford with Arquit (ll. 3876-8), if we accept that lui in l. 3877, replacing the [illegible] of the manuscript, refers to him. (See also [illegible], The 'Tristran'..., p. 127)

linked with what has gone before: the spectators are disconcerted because the queen has such fine clothes which seem in danger of suffering damage in the crossing which now faces her. Dinas had been presented as being concerned about the queen's clothes in ll. 3868-72, a general concern regarding the crossing Iseut must undertake had been voiced in ll. 3785-7 and in l. 3917 the queen herself will express a desire to avoid getting her clothes soiled.[6]

The derivatives of T present a different account of events before the disguised Tristan gets involved. In S, the queen is being ferried across the river: she beckons and calls out to Tristan, telling him to carry her from the boat (chapter LVIII). In T.r., similarly, Iseut is carried by the pellegrino to the shore (p. 239, ll. 4-10). The account by Gottfried is characteristically more complex. Iseut claims that she has no wish to be carried by a knight from the gangway of the ship to the harbour. Accordingly, she has those present call upon the pilgrim to perform the task. In the German account the number of protagonists is larger, for it is not the queen herself who calls the pilgrim over (ll. 15565-15581). In E, we find yet another version of the story. Tristan is summoned, apparently by the queen, in order to carry her from the shore to the ship, not from ship to shore.[7] This variant is consistent with the words in the oath in ll. 2271-2. The allusion in Fo, however, accords on this point with the versions of G, S and T.r.:

---

6. Rigolot refers to the description of Iseut as a 'miniature de circonstance' and neglects its immediate purpose in the narrative: 'Enfin, dans l'épisode de Mal Pas, neuf vers (3903/11), sorte de miniature de circonstance, tracent le portrait de cette femme d'apparence frêle et délicate qui va réussir à se jouer de barons occupés à exercer leur vengeance, comme d'un mari colérique et par trop naïf' (CCM, X, p. 492).
7. E, stanza CCV, ll. 2245-8. Bédier does not mention this variant in his reconstruction of Thomas (Bédier, Volume I, p. 208, p. 211). It is not a major variant, but the account of the incident given by Bédier does imply a greater agreement between the derivatives than actually exists.

> Quant vus eisistes de la nef,
> Entre mes bras vus tinc stef. (ll. 819-20)

There is, therefore, certainly variation in the accounts of the derivatives of T, but the derivatives of T are much closer to each other than any of them are to B. Perhaps one may draw a conclusion from this, namely that the episodic story known to D and T, which may have been their joint source, was not defined in every detail. One may at least express doubts as to the suggestions that B was following T, the line adopted by Bergell, or that T was following B, the proposal of Delbouille. Surely the accounts are too dissimilar to support the contention that one was based directly on the other?

It is from l. 3912 that Iseut and Tristan together dominate events. Obviously their dialogue, and each phase of their dialogue, serves a dual purpose. Iseut informs the leper that he must carry her across the plank-bridge. This is clearly meant to be heard by the spectators and to increase their interest in the situation, but at the same time Iseut is informing Tristan of the precise role that he must play. The apparently rational plea in ll. 3920-22,[8] Tristan's mock protestations in fact, lead up to Iseut's confident reply in ll. 3923-5. What seems to the public Iseut's singular assurance is also a private joke, enjoyed only by the leading actor and actress:

> 'Cuite,' fait ele, 'un poi t'arenge.
> Quides tu que ton mal me prenge?
> N'en aies doute, non iera.'

In ll. 3929-32 Iseut gives her final instructions to the pseudo-leper:

---

8. Ewert interprets bocu in l. 3922, and in l. 1162, as meaning 'covered with scrofulous tumours or swellings' (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 151-2). On this point, Ewert would agree with Jonin (Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 109-10). Certainly bocu must relate in this line to a particular effect of leprosy.

'Diva! malades, molt es gros!
Tor la ton vis et ça ton dos;
Ge monteral comme vaslet.'
Et lors s'en sormist li degot.

For the spectators, Iseut's words bear the promise of an amusing spectacle, but for Tristan they bring a full comprehension of the role he must play. Does the smile of l. 3932 indicate that Tristan has at last realized the nature of Iseut's grand design? The meaning of l. 3931 is quite clear: Iseut is proposing to ride not side-saddle, but with one leg on each side (see also l. 3940). But Roques attacks the use of the expression comme vaslet by due cause: '"Come vaslet" peut signifier "à la manière des enfants" qui jouent au cheval, et non à la manière d'un jeune homme, écuyer ou futur chevalier. Pourquoi Iseut n'aurait-elle pas dit "comme baron" ce qui aurait mieux convenu à sa dignité de reine?'[9] But perhaps the playful idea which Roques finds inapposite is really very much a part of the scene. Iseut is staging an amusing spectacle for those watching on the other side. Certainly the scene has a serious purpose for Iseut in being preparation for the oath, but the more lightheartedness Iseut can inject into the proceedings at this point the less likelihood there is of that serious purpose being detected.

Tristan's progress across the plank-bridge is described twice. Firstly we have six lines of straight narrative, ll. 3935-40, and then we have in ll. 3941-48 the comments of those who are watching the leper's painful progress. This double description is surely quite deliberate. In the first section we are made aware that Tristan is involved in a pretence:

Savent fait senblant de choier,
Grant chere fait de soi doloir.[10]

---

9. 'Sur l'équitation féminine...', p. 222, note 2.
10. B 3937-8. In M4, l. 3938 reads 'Grant chere fai de soi doloir'. Fai must be an unacknowledged misprint.

In the second set of lines, the comments of the spectators tell us that the play-acting is successful and that they believe that the 'leper' is indeed in grave danger of falling. Yet in spite of these two perspectives, it is not absolutely clear where Tristan has placed the crutch. In l. 3946, editors have emended the de soz of the manuscript and have printed desor (as soz in l. 3935 has been corrected to sor), and editors, if not all commentators, would presume that Tristan has placed his crutch somewhere in the lumbar region.[11] In whatever manner the journey is accomplished Iseut does eventually reach the other side and slips gently to the ground. In the derivatives of T Iseut falls to the ground, but the fact that versions differ should not really surprise us. The main purpose of this scene is to make an ambiguous oath possible: this is achieved in one way in the derivatives of T, in another way in B.[12] One might, however, usefully reiterate the point that the source story of T and B, if in fact they were employing the same one, was far from fixed in every detail.

In the final part of the episode, ll. 3956-84, Iseut refuses the leper's request for a reward, in spite of Arthur's plea in ll. 3959-60. The reason she puts forward is that the leper, so she claims, has received sufficient reward already from others:

> Hui a suff bone pasture,
> Trové a gent a sa mesure. (ll. 3977-8)

Is Iseut referring to herself in l. 3978, as Ewert suggests? He translates the line thus: 'He has found someone who is a match for him.'[13] Certainly the implication that Iseut at least can recognize the leper for what he is would be in harmony with much of the scene,

---

11. For a discussion of the problem, see Ewert, Volume II, pp. 241-5.
12. Kolerman's view that Béroul omitted the fall by the beggar and the queen must surely be rejected (Geschichte der..., p. 95).
13. Ewert, Volume II, p. 246.

but this is not the only possible interpretation. Fedrick, for example, offers this translation of the lines: 'He has taken a rich crop here today from the kind of people he likes.'[14] However, what the queen may really be saying is that so far the leper has found people who have taken him at his own assessment of himself, at face value, and who have therefore been something of a 'soft touch'.[15]

The queen's lack of generosity is part of a deliberate policy. When Iseut points out that the leper is strong in body and that he has found plenty of food already and yet still continues to beg, her discredit of the leper produces laughter. But, as Stone indicates, this laughter has a serious purpose: 'When Iseut asks help of the leper, he feigns fear for her health, and when afterward he asks her for food, she refuses brutally, much to the pleasure of the kings. The lovers cleverly do everything to remove suspicion of collusion in their act.'[16] By pouring scorn on the leper, Iseut emphasizes the apparent lack of common ground between the leper and herself.

It is true that, in the derivatives of T, Iseut does show kindness to her disguised lover, but only after he has done her an apparent disservice by falling to the ground with her. In S (chapter LVIII), the pilgrim is threatened with a beating as a result of the fall, but Iseut steps in and restrains her men. In C, similarly, Iseut intervenes to save the pilgrim:

> des gesindes kam ein michel schar
> mit staben und mit stecken dar
> und wolten den wallaere
> bereiten übeler maere.
> 'nein nein, lat stan!' sprach aber Isot
> 'ez tet dem wallaere not:
> er ist amehtic unde cranc
> und viel ane sinen danc.' (ll. 15599-15606)

---

14. The Romance of Tristan..., p. 137.
15. T.-L. translates trouver a. a sa mesure by 'seinesgleichen finden' and cites this passage in B (V, 1714).
16. Eum., V, p. 225.

In E (stanza CCVI), Iseut's men are bent on drowning the poor man but the queen again intervenes and gives him the gold she refuses him in B. The net result of Iseut's kindness in the derivatives of T is not the raising of suspicion, but rather the recognition by all and sundry of the queen's magnanimity.

In all the versions of the story Iseut's oath is dependent for its success upon the playlet enacted here. But the success of the playlet is in turn dependent on Tristan's cooperation. In Béroul's poem in particular, Tristan must persuade all those who see him that he really is a leper. He must direct attention upon himself so that he can be called to mind and be mentioned without incongruity in Iseut's oath, and yet he must contrive to remain unrecognized; this he achieves in the scenes which begin at l. 3563. In the derivatives of T we find only a very brief mention of what happens before the queen arrives. In every one of the derivatives we learn that Tristan disguises himself, but the amount of detail in the accounts varies considerably. In B, events and scenes have multiplied. The scene in which the leper accosts the people in general, his encounters with King Arthur and with King Mark, his skirmish with the three wicked barons, all these scenes -- and the later tournament scene-- are found only in Béroul's version.

Lines 3563-3614 largely concern the preparations that Tristan must make even before he assumes the role. In accordance with Iseut's instructions (l. 3299) he dresses up as a leper. Also, he takes one elementary precautionary measure:

> Affublez se fu forment bien,
> Malade senble plus que rien;
> Et requeden si ot s'espee
> Entor ses flans ostroit noee. (ll. 3573-6)

One is reminded that Tristan was wearing a hauberk when he surrendered Iseut to Mark.[17] Governal adds his own word of caution:

> 'Sire Tristran, ne soiez bric;
> Pronez garde de la roïne,
> Qu'el n'en fera semblant et signe.[18]

Ewert interprets the last two lines in the following way: 'Observe the queen, for she will give no sign or token [of being aware of your identity?].'[19] This is certainly a possible reading, but others come to mind. Perhaps Governal is encouraging Tristan to watch the queen closely for she will not openly reveal her intentions. Tristan cannot yet be certain of the exact role he may have to play in a situation fraught with uncertainties, so naturally he must observe the queen and take his cue from what she does.[20]

Tristan certainly acts under instruction from Iseut, but only up to a point. It will be remembered that at ll. 3346-9 Tristan had proposed King Artur for alms: he is soon to act on this proposal. Now, in the speech which begins at l. 3583, Tristan instructs Governal to be in hiding near his appointed station, a very sensible precaution, one would have thought. But precautions give way to plans and to singularly audacious ones at that. He tells Governal to have his horse ready for a rather dangerous coup:

> La ert Artus atot sa gent,
> Et li rois Marc tot ensement.
> Cil chevalier d'estrange terre
> Bohorderont por les aquerre;
> Et, por l'amor Yseut m'amie,
> I ferai tost une eshaudie.

---

17. B 2772. Contrast this with l. 117 of Fb, where Tristan prepares to visit Iseut in disguise, but takes no such precautions: 'Il ne prinst ne hauberc ne hiaume.'
18. B 3580-2. In M4, l. 3582 appears as 'Qu'el n'en fera semblant et signe'. Semblant is in all probability an unacknowledged misprint. Other CFMA editions read senblant, and senblant is the form, appearing at l. 2, for example, when the word is written in full in the manuscript. M4 accepts the MS reading n'en returned by Ewert and rejects the earlier ne.
19. Ewert, Volume II, p. 238.
20. In M9 (p. 254), Muret noted Gaston Paris's proposal, 'Qu'el vos f. s. et s.'. In his first volume (p. 152), Ewert glosses prendre garde in l. 3787 as 'take care', 'beware', but perhaps the more [illegible] in l. 3581 is closer to 'observe'.

Sus la lance soit le penon
Dont la bele me fist le don. (ll. 3597-3604)

The chevalier d'estrange terre are almost certainly the knights of King Arthur. But what is the meaning of esbaudie in l. 3602? The CFMA editions translate esbaudie by 'joute', but this surely indicates the form which the esbaudie will take. Viewing esbaudie as a variant of the usual form esbaudise, Ewert translates it by 'reckless act (?)'[21] and his interpretation meets with Reid's approval.[22] 'Reckless act' is certainly a plausible translation, but esbaudie, related as it is to baut and to esbaudir, must surely convey as well notions of exultation, arrogance, defiance and provocation.[23] The pennon will be a recognition signal for Iseut at the tournament to come. In l. 3604 we have once more an allusion to a vague, past event, an allusion which in reality serves as preparation for events to come.[24]

One cannot help but be concerned by the apparent contradiction between Tristan's precautions and his audacious plans. One has perhaps to suppose that caution is considered essential only for the scene at the ford when Tristan must play the leper and make the ambiguous oath possible. Tristan's bold design will be executed after this, after the disguise has fulfilled its purpose. Governal will aid Tristan in both his roles: he will guard Tristan while he is at the Mal Pas, but he will also prepare Tristan's foray on to the Blanche Lande and will indeed be an active participant when it actually comes about. But once Governal leaves Tristan, no mention is made of Tristan's second planned course of action:

---

21. Ewert, Volume I, p. 149, Volume II, pp. 238-9.
22. The 'Tristran'..., pp. 121-2.
23. See T.-L., I, 690, III, 798.
24. Varvaro's question (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 248), which seeks the specific occasion when Iseut gave Tristan the pennon, is fundamentally irrelevant.

> Governal vint a son ostel,
> Son herneis orist, ainz ne fist el;
> Puis se mist tost a la voie.
> Il n'a cure que nus le voie;
> Tant a erré qu(e) enbuschiez s'est
> Pres de Tristran, qui au Pas est. (ll. 3609-14)

We certainly expect Tristan's squire to take up his position by the ford. But must ainz ne fist el be taken literally, or is it simply a tag? If it has a real meaning, it surely indicates that Governal has failed to prepare Tristan's second course of action.

With all preparations over, Tristan must now contemplate playing the role assigned to him. In accordance with Iseut's instructions he takes up his position:

> Sor la mote, au chief de la mare,
> S'asist Tristran sanz autre afaire.[25]

Tristan does not assume the role immediately, but only when he hears the crowd approaching. The fact that he is not deformed in any way but powerfully built will severely test Tristan's acting abilities, his talent for persuading all those who see him that he really is a leper.[26] His major apparent physical defect would be the contusions on his face, 'Molt ot bien bocelé son vis'.[27] There is no doubt that Tristan is a success in the role. He certainly takes elementary precautions to avoid detection (l. 3640) and he receives the alms which would be due to the genuine beggar:

---

25. B 3615-6. One may recall l. 3305, 'Au terme ert sor la mote assis', and l. 3295, 'Au chief des planches, au Mal Pas'.
26. Perhaps Evert's note to l. 3624 misses the point: 'Tristran, in spite of his disguise as a leper, is, the poet tells us, neither a dwarf nor a hunchback, car il est (sic) gros et corporus' (Evert, Volume II, p. 239).
27. B 3626. See also Thomas, Douce, ll. 506-8:
> Par un'herbe tut les deceit,
> Sun vis em fait tut eslever,
> Cum se malade fust, emfler.

Tristran lor fait des borses trove,
Que il fait tant, chascun li done;
Il les reçoit, que nus n'en sone.[28]

Tristan's success is further indicated at l. 3642 and at ll. 3653-5 and he even provokes tears of sympathy in ll. 3659-62, sure signs that Tristan is achieving his aims:

Tuit cil qui l'oient si parler
De pitié prenent a plorer;
Ne tant ne quant pas nu mescroient
Qu'il ne soit ladres, cil quil voient.

In his role as leper Tristan is thrown into contact with a number of different social groups. He meets the lowest members of society in the passage which begins at l. 3637. They are certainly those who are least generous to the leper and he is forced to persuade them to continue on their way. But others, 'Li franc vaslet de bone orine' of l. 3653, show more deference. After the quality of his disguise has apparently been confirmed and after a brief note about the preparations in hand, Tristan lastly encounters the chevalier (l. 3669). He indulges in a slightly wider range of activities; he misdirects the knights who are floundering in the bog and he shakes his rattle when they find themselves in even greater difficulties. Quite inappropriately, he also asks the knights to give him some of their clothes (l. 3690). The purpose of these activities is revealed in ll. 3691-6: they are purely for Iseut's amusement.[29]

By describing Tristan's dealings with various groups of people, the author is establishing a pattern of behaviour. Later events at

---

28. B 3632-4. Muret and M^4 print at l. 3634, 'Il les reçoit, que mot ne sone'. In M^4, l. 3645 is cited in support of the emendation, but perhaps wrongly so. In l. 3645 Tristan does not verbally retaliate against those who insult him, but this does not mean he keeps silent when people do give him alms. Ewert's retention of the manuscript reading is therefore to be endorsed. Line 3634 would mean that no one voices a suspicion that the leper is other than he appears to be.
29. Lines 3601-2 had shown a roughly similar concern by Tristan.

the ford, before the arrival of Queen Iseut, will present Tristan in contact with particular individuals, but his behaviour towards them will have the same general features as his behaviour so far. He has so far pleaded for alms from all and sundry and has misdirected the knights into the bog. In the next scene, he will plead for alms from the two kings and in the following scene it will be the three wicked barons whom he will send into the muddiest parts of the ford. Even the final scene in the episode, Iseut's refusal to give a reward to her leper-porter, partly follows the pattern which has been set. The most lowly members of the courts have been ungenerous to the leper and have insulted him:

> Li covert gars, li desfie
> Mignon, herlot l'ont apelé.[30]

Iseut will describe her mount in the same way: 'Li est herlot, si que jel sai.'[31] The high-born queen will thus act more like the uncouth messengers than the young squires of ll. 3653-5:

> De moi n'en portera qui valle
> Un sol ferlinc n'une maille.' (ll. 3979-80)

Clearly the queen's behaviour, quite out of harmony with her own status, is a source of comedy at the end of the episode.

The next stage in the episode begins with a preliminary description of Arthur's knights in ll. 3706-12. Their horses, shields and clothes are exactly as King Arthur wanted, and they joust by the ford, as the king had anticipated. It is Arthur himself that Tristan accosts in the passage beginning at l. 3713. He begs him for alms: from the knights wallowing in the mud Tristan had asked for clothes, and now (ll. 3725-30) he asks the king for his gaiters.[32] Arthur's

---

30. B 3643-4. See also l. 3649, 'Truant le claiment et herlot'.
31. B 3976. See also l. 3963, 'F(r)erz truanz est, asez en a'.
32. Varvaro suggests that the reference to Regensburg in l. 3722 may be of assistance in dating the romance (ll 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 251, note 50).

reaction is identical with that of one section of the passers-by, for the author remarks that 'li nobles rois en ot pitié' (l. 3731).

Another victim soon presents himself, none other than King Mark. The king accompanies Iseut elsewhere, in Gottfried (l. 15565), but, apart from a brief exchange after the ordeal in T.r. (pp. 240-1), in no other version does the king directly encounter the disguised Tristan. The scene has frequently been compared to the Folie poems and episodes, and it is by reference to the Folies that Vàrvaro attempts to characterize the scene: 'Scena di costume? Quadro realistico? La situazione doveva certo essere non infrequente, ma si noti che il dialogo con Marc si risolve subito in schermaglia di vero e falso, di allusioni coperte ed apparentemente sol a senso come appunto nelle Folies.'[33] Pauphilet even suggests that the scene in B inspired the Folie Tristan poems:

Contraste d'un héros misérablement déguisé, supercherie, paroles bouffonnes, allusions que Marc ne peut pas comprendre, ne sont-ce pas déjà les procédés de la Folie Tristan?...On notera que dans ce passage de Béroul s'annonce aussi bien le motif de Tristan lépreux que celui de Tristan Fou: ce qui semble bien confirmer que le beau conte des retours déguisés de Tristan est sorti de là. Il n'est nullement improbable que Béroul lui-même l'en ait tiré, développant ainsi ses propres ébauches.[34]

Be that as it may, Tristan's behaviour initially follows a familiar pattern. He requests alms from the king and exuberantly shakes his rattle:

> Tristran l'aqeut a essaier
> S'il porra rien avoir du suen;
> Son flavel sonê a haut suen.[35]

Like Arthur, Mark parts with some of his clothing, but then at l. 3767 a comic question and answer sequence begins, which has no

---

33. Il 'Roman de Tristan'..., p. 244.
34. Le Roman..., p. 120.
35. B 3741-6. See also Thomas, Douce, ll. 531-4.

parallel in Tristan's previous encounter with the other king. Bédier has tried to define the source of the comedy:

Tristan, déguisé en lépreux, demande l'aumône au roi Marc et à Iseut. Iseut l'a reconnu sous son déguisement, mais non pas le roi, qui l'interroge; et tout le piquant de la scène est en ceci qu'à chaque question le lépreux fait une réponse véridique; à chacune, il risque de se faire reconnaître.[36]

Certainly a basic source of the comedy is that Mark fails to recognize Tristan and fails to associate, therefore, the relationship the leper is describing with that existing between Iseut, Tristan and himself. But are Tristan's replies all true?[37] The first reply of all seems to fall outside the pattern:

> 'Dom est tu, ladres? fait li rois.
> De Carloon, filz d'un Galois.' [38]

Bédier claims to detect a 'jeu de mots' in the leper's reply:

Quel est, en effet, le point de départ de l'invention qui fait de Tristan un Gallois de de (sic) Carloon? C'est un jeu de mots sur Carloon, Loonois. Chacun, dans l'Angleterre normande du XIIe siècle (voyez le Brut de Wace ou un chroniqueur anglo-normand quelconque), savait que caer signifie ville.[39]

Bédier would thus claim that Tristan was, albeit obliquely, giving a truthful answer to Mark's question. Other critics have used the lines to reflect on the origins of the legend as a whole. Loth recalls the Chevrefoil of Marie de France:[40]

> En sa cuntree en est alez;
> En Subtwales, u il fu nez. [41]

---

36. Bédier, Volume II, p. 121.
37. The sequence in Fo, commencing at l. 155, contains answers far removed from any kind of truth (see also Fo, ll. 271-84).
38. B 3757-8. In Fo, ll. 269-70, Mark's first question similarly concerns the fool's origins.
39. Bédier, Volume II, p. 121.
40. Contributions à l'étude..., p. 90. Loth adds a note on p. 126: 'Il est important de remarquer que sous le nom de Galles, les Anglo-Saxons comprenaient les habitants de Cornwall aussi bien que ceux de Galles. Subtwales a très bien pu désigner le Cornwall. Il a pu y avoir, de ce fait, confusion, chez les auteurs français, entre le pays de Galles et le Cornwall.' Would Tristan in B be playing on an ambiguity of this nature? It seems unlikely.
41. Marie de France, Lais, p. 123.

Fourrier would see the reference to Caerleon as marking just one localisation of the legend.

Cela n'empêcherait d'ailleurs pas de penser qu'antérieurement ou parallèlement, la légende ait localisé la patrie du héros dans le Lothian écossais si, avec F. Lot, on voit en Tristan le pictе Drostan, ou dans le pays de Carleon-upon-Usk, si, avec J. Loth, on préfère lui attribuer, conformément aux dires de Marie de France, une origine gallicise.[42]

But is Tristan necessarily telling a kind of truth in these lines, as Loth and Fourrier would seem to imply? Tristan may be, at least to begin with, astutely concealing his real origins, and only after the initial deception has averted suspicion would the comedy of ambiguity begin.[43]

In the sent exchanges Tristan certainly draws on Mark's failure to recognise him. The three years that Mark understands the leper to have been away from society are, on the second level, the three years of life in the wilderness.[44] Again, the <u>cortoise amie</u> that Tristan introduces at l. 3762 is not identified by Mark with his wife Iseut. It is true, on a level unperceived by Mark, that Iseut has caused Tristan to don that particular disguise: he can say, quite justifiably, that 'Por lié ai je ces boces lees' (l. 3763). Direct mockery of Mark now begins:

> Li rois li dit: 'Ne celez mie:
> Comment ce te donna t'amie?'
> 'Dans rois, ses sires ert meseaus,
> O lié faisoie mes jeiaus,
> Cist maus me prist de la comune;
> Mais plus bele ne fu que une.
> 'Qui est ele?' 'La bele Yseut;
> Einsi ce vest con cele seut.'
> Li rois l'entent, riant s'en part. (ll. 3769-77)

---

42. <u>Le Cycle breton réaliste....</u> p. 47.
43. Brugger would support this point of view. He considers it virtually certain that Tristan is telling a lie in l. 3758 (MP, XXII, pp. 169-76). The rhyme <u>rois</u> : <u>Galois</u> is also found at ll. 1577-8, which may or may not be significant.
44. Ewert has a note on this point (Ewert, Volume II, p. 241). Surely the <u>trois ans</u> of l. 3760 is only an approximation, which does not contradict the idea that the potion was brewed to last for three years precisely?

Tanquerey found ll. 3773-6 unsatisfactory and suggested emendations.[45] But the text printed by Muret and accepted by Ewert may not be as impossible as Tanquerey supposed. The manuscript reading covine for comune may be a characteristic case of minim confusion. Moreover, ll. 3774-6 surely make sense; Tristan's cortoise amie would not be more beautiful than Queen Iseut because she is Queen Iseut. In l. 3775, Mark is perhaps requesting the identity of this supreme beauty, not the identity of the cortoise amie. And Tristan's reply is effective because it applies to both: his cortoise amie is the bele Yseut. But if, in l. 3775, Mark is asking for the name of the cortoise amie, Tristan's reply must take him quite aback. Only when l. 3776 brings some kind of clarification does relief come to the king and he bursts into laughter. Of course, the king's laughter is also that of the dupe:[46] Mark believes that he knows the truth, but he is being ridiculed for his failure to penetrate to the real truth, for he does not see the similarity between the situation of the third person in the leper's eternal triangle, the disease-ridden cuckold, and his own situation. Perhaps one can see a certain similarity between Tristan's reply here and Iseut's ambiguous oath. Tristan, in disguise, makes Mark believe that he is speaking of a certain anonymous woman, not of the queen. Similarly, when Iseut swears her oath and refers to a leper, nobody identifies that leper with Tristan.

In ll. 3778-87 we have a brief transitional passage. Both Mark and Arthur are concerned as to how Iseut will cross the Mal Pas. Public interest in Iseut's crossing is thus developing and will be

---

45. Rom., LVI, pp. 119-20.
46. As in l. 527. See also Fo, l. 285 and l. 295.

increased by the misfortunes which befall the three barons. We have just seen Tristan successful in seeking alms from particular individuals, from Arthur and Mark, and now Tristan will seize the opportunity to misdirect his three particular enemies.

Events follow the pattern laid down in the passage beginning at l. 3674. Once the three are in the thick of it, Tristan urges them to spur on the horses, the same unhelpful advice he dispensed to the knights in l. 3677. And when their predicament becomes even more serious he asks them for alms:

> 'Alez, seignor! Par saint apostre,
> Si me done chascun du vostre!' [47]

The three felons, like the knights before them, sink deeper into the mud:

> Li cheval fonde[n]t el taier;
> Cil se prenent a esmaier
> Car ne trovent rive ne fonz.[48]

The leper, characteristically, then shakes his rattle. Tristan's aim, that of bringing amusement to his lady on her arrival by misleading the knights, has been attained. Moreover, it is not merely any knights who are floundering in the mud but Iseut's three particular enemies:

> Atant es vos Yseut la bele
> El taier vit les ornemis,
> Sor la mote sist ses amis;
> Joie en a grant, rit et envoise,
> A pié decent sor la faloise. (ll. 3824-8)

The public nature of the barons' discomfiture is emphasized by the poet in ll. 3810-11 and in ll. 3829-32. Iseut's crossing, for the purposes of her oath, must be a public event and Tristan's fooling,

---

47. B 3805-6. See also ll. 3688-90.
48. B 3807-9. See also ll. 3671-2 and l. 3681.

perhaps accidentally, guarantees that it will be.[49]

Of the three barons at Jaudalen who is singled out for special humiliation. After releasing the staff with which he was ostensibly trying to help the baron, Tristan presents his excuse:

> Fait li malades: 'N'en poi mes:
> J'ai endorm jantes et nerf,
> Les mains gourdes por le mal d'Acre,
> Les piez enflez por le poacre:
> Li maus a enpirez ma force ,
> Ses sont ra brus com une escorce.' (ll. 3847-52)

The reference to the mal d'Acre has frequently been employed to set a terminus a quo, at least for the second half of the poem. Muret claimed, firstly in a review of Rüttiger's work, that the fragment dated from after 1190-1[50] and Golther supported the view.[51] But Whitteridge contested this frequently professed belief. She pointed out a perhaps neglected fact, that the manuscript reads, in ll. 3848 and 3849, le mal dagres and le poacres. Mainly on the medical evidence, she then claimed there was no allusion at all in the poem to the siege of Acre.[52] But in his second volume, Ebert expresses no eagerness to change his text. He points out that the fact that Tristan's disease does not tally exactly with the medical details of the real mal d'Acre is not an obstacle to accepting the emendation:

---

49. However, Vàrvaro writes: 'È evidente che l'attenzione con cui tutti i presenti osservano la scena al cui centro è Tristran travestito mal convive appunto con la fisicità verosimigliarza del travestimento, già di per sé --come vedremo-- inadeguato alla struttura fisica dell'eroe e che dunque non sarebbe prudente tradire richiamando così l'attenzione' (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 246). But there is no doubt that Tristan's disguise has proved eminently successful.

50. 'Contrairement aux idées courantes, mais d'accord avec W. Förster (p. 20), H.R. pense que Béroul est un poète moins ancien que Thomas (p. 38). Il ne s'est pas douté que son opinion est confirmée, au moins en ce qui concerne la seconde partie du fragment, par une allusion fort précise à l'épidémie qui ravagea l'armée des croisés pendant le siège d'Acre (1190-91)' (Rom., XXVII, p. 617).

51. Tristan und Isolt in den französischen und deutschen Dichtungen des Mittelalters und unserer Zeit, p. 3?.

52. Med. aev., XXVIII, pp. 167-71. See also her article, 'The Tristan of Béroul', pp. 349-50 and Short, RP, XXVI, p 467.

It is true that, as already pointed out, the chronicles make no mention of numbness of the hands, but one can hardly expect a rigid adherence to the symptoms associated with the Acre epidemic in Tristran's 'explanation' of why he was forced to release his hold on the staff, thus causing Denoalen to fall back into the mire.[53] One may have more than a little sympathy for Ewert's point of view: the term mal d'Acre could well have been used generically, to describe a number of diseases not dissimilar to that suffered by the crusaders. A parallel term, le mal de Naples, surely covers a multitude of sins!

This stage of the episode is surely basically amusing. If the encounter between the disguised Tristan and King Mark offers a relatively subtle form of comedy, the plight of the unfortunate Denoalen, almost completely submerged in the mud, appeals to a more robust sense of humour. And one might say that the whole series of incidents is superficially light-hearted. When Tristan misdirects the three barons into the bog he does not do so primarily to have revenge —which has been a major motive for action in the past— but to give pleasure to Iseut. He certainly succeeds, as we learn from l. 3827. Indeed, l. 3837 tells us that the people in general are amused by the discomfort suffered by the lovers' enemies: 'Por en i a joie n'en ait.' Later, Iseut's refusal to reward the leper will be another cause of merriment, at the very end of the episode:

> Grant joie en menent li dui roi.
> Amené ont son palefroi,
> Montee l'ont; d'iluec tornerent.
> Qui ont armes, lors ooborderent.[54]

Certainly the parallel episode in T does not have this air of frivolity. It lacks, to begin with, the scenes in which Mark is

---

53. Ewert, Volume II, p. 35, note 2. See also Vàrvaro, Il'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 231, note 50.
54. B 3901-4. Ewert points out that his text incorrectly reads lor at l. 3904 (Ewert, Volume II, p. 263).

mocked by Tristan and in which the barons wallow in the mud. And the serious motive behind the events organised by Iseut positively intrudes at the end of the episode, for the queen claims that she will be forced to modify her oath now that she has been in contact with someone other than King Mark.[55] But even in B the comedy serves a serious purpose. By carrying Iseut over the marsh, the leper has obviously now made it possible for the queen to undertake the serious business of the oath. But his comic antics incidentally provide an effective bar to reflection on the scene. Viewing this performance, who could possibly imagine that the leper is conspiring with the queen in order to control the course of justice?

---

55. G, ll. 15622-15629, S, chapter LVIII, E (stanza CCVII) shows signs of abbreviation at this point.

22: THE TOURNAMENT

This episode in B, ll. 3985-4074, has no equivalent at all in any of the derivatives of T. It would appear that in Thomas's poem, after the disguised Tristan has carried Iseut from the ship, the oath episode immediately followed.[1] The episode is not only absent from T, but seems to have no real equivalent in any other of the Tristan stories. Mersart de La Villemarqué tries to link the episode with an encounter between Tristan and 'Gwalhmaï' in the Welsh tradition, but the points of similarity he detects are not very distinctive.[2] Ewert, on p. 247 of his second volume, cites passages in the Tristan Ménestrel[3] but he admits that the parallel is only a loose one. Schoepperle refers briefly to the Tristan Ménestrel tale and notes certain similarities between that story and events immediately before the Blades at the Bed episode in O.[4] One might add the logical conclusion that the tournament episode in B has certain similarities with those same events in O, ll. 5059-98, in which Tristan unhorses a certain knight:

> dô quam dere wîgante
> Tristrant an den velde zû
> und stach in von dem rosse dô
> als he nî d r ûf en quême.
> ab he daz ros iemt nême?
> jâ, he vûrtez dannen sân.[5]

---

1. In S, a new chapter, LIX, marks the new scene, which follows the pilgrim episode. In G (l. 15634), the oath episode follows smoothly on, but in E (stanza CCVIII, l. 226), the transition to the oath is quite brutal.
2. Les Romans de la Table Ronde..., pp. 69-75.
3. This story is presented and edited by Weston and Bédier in the 1906 volume of Romania (XXXV, pp. 497-530), not the 1907 volume as Ewert indicates (Ewert, Volume II, p. 48).
4. Tristan and Isolt, pp. 239-40.
5. O 5080-85. The knight is apparently named Delekors in the text, but Schoepperle adds a note. 'I have taken Lilhart's Delekors scheveliier (O(5061) to be a translation of chevalier de la cour in his original' (Tristan and Isolt, p. 36, note 1).

Even though this parallel is a loose one, one is again reminded that there does seem to exist a close relationship between the faux and the escondit episodes in the Tristan legend. As a final, even looser parallel, one could refer to the incident in the Douce manuscript of T, in which Kaherdin and Tristan in disguise kill two barons:[6] Kaherdin's victim is named as Kariado.

The absence of conclusive parallels elsewhere would seem to indicate that the episode is a late addition to the story. But if so, when was the episode added? Muret is not quite certain that the episode even fits in with the rest of the escondit sequence in B, which is, one suspects, already a much modified version. He expresses his misgivings in the introduction to his SATF edition: 'Les vers 3987-4074, qui racontent les combats singuliers livrés par Tristan et par Governal à Audret et au forestier, ont un caractère moins archaïque, plus chevaleresque et plus banal que le reste de l'épisode du jugement de Dieu...Néanmoins, il est si malaisé de les séparer du contexte qu'on hésite à les croire interpolés.'[7] Muret's misgivings, the reasons for which will be examined in more detail later, are shared to some extent by Ewert. He makes the following comment: 'The passage extending from l. 3985 to l. 4113 offers a striking contrast with Beroul's normal manner and preoccupations. The introduction of Arthur may be held to have invited this concession to the taste of the courtly society of the time for scenes of jousting and courtesy.'[8] Ewert, it will have been noted, does not go so far as

---

6. Thomas, Douce, ll. 777-834.
7. M°, p. XXII.
8. Ewert, Volume II, p. 247.

to suggest that the lines represent a later interpolation, but at least he does raise the question as to what extent the lines are integrated into the rest of the romance. To what extent do ll. 3985-4074 harmonize with the rest? Do they clash so much that we must indeed regard the episode as an interpolation?

The events of the episode have to some extent been anticipated. We have seen that in a line of action controlled essentially by Iseut, Tristan has had to exercise a degree of personal initiative. He has, for example, already carried out the plan, announced in ll. 3346-9, for begging alms from Arthur. And in ll. 3593-3606 he gave instructions to Governal with a view to undertaking another action not directly sanctioned by the queen: he had told his squire to disguise his horse, for he intended to perform an <u>esbaudie</u> for love of Iseut.

It appears that Tristan's instructions have been carried out, with reasonable accuracy if not to the letter. Tristan meets up with Governal, who has brought <u>two</u> disguised horses. Governal is described in ll. 3992-6, and, in truth, Tristan's squire is a somewhat unexpected participant in the tournament for his active involvement in Tristan's <u>esbaudie</u> had not been foreseen. In ll. 3997-4004 Tristan is described:

> Tristran rot le Bel Joër,
> Ne puet on pas trover mellor.
> Coste, sille, destrier et targe
> Out covert d'une noire sarge;
> Son vis out covert d'un noir voil,
> Tot ot covert et chief et roil;
> A sa lance ot l'enseigne mise
> Que la bele li ot tramise.[9]

---

9. In Muret's editions and in M^4, l. 3999 appears as 'Coste, sele, destrier et targe'. Lines 3997-8 are vaguely reminiscent of ll. 811-2 of the Douce manuscript:
> Dous chevals lur duna de pris,
> Ken averit melliurs el pays.

As previously anticipated, his horse is disguised. It has been given a name, Bel Joër, just as Arthur's horse had been named Passelande in l. 3522: it seems that both these names are found only in Béroul's poem among contemporary texts.[10] The pennon, referred to here as l'enseigne, is in its expected place on Tristan's lance. Together, the two figures then come on to the Blanche Lande.

The reaction of Arthur's knights to their arrival is described in the passage beginning at l. 4010. Characteristically, Gauvain is named first (as in ll. 3258 and 3457), and, again characteristically, Girflet is the second of Arthur's knights to intervene. He makes a rather surprising assertion in response to Gauvain's question as to the identity of the two knights:

> 'Ges connois bien,' Girflet respont,
> Noir cheval a et noire enseigne,
> Ce est li Noirs de la Montaigne.
> L'autre connois as armes vaires,
> Qar en cest païs n'en a gaires.
> Il so[n]t faé, bel sai sanz dote.'[11]

How can Girflet possibly recognize the knights? Is he displaying the same element of bravura one may detect in ll. 3457-94?[12] His claim that the knights are enchanted may well be an excuse to justify his personal reluctance to engage the knights in combat. Lines 4017-8, Girflet's appraisal of Governal, are somewhat peculiar as well. Like Ewert,[13] Vàrvaro indicates the existence in other romances of knights in similar garb,[14] and from the whole tone of Vàrvaro's description of events here it would seem that he would agree with Muret that

---

10. See West, An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances, p. 15 and p. 129, Pluttre, Table des noms propres..., p. 27 and p. 152.
11. B 4014-19. See also Tristan Ménestrel, l. 321: 'Par ses armes le reconnois.' One might also note that in R a giant called Taulas de la Montagne is killed by Tristan (Loseth, § 103), and that a 'géant de la Montagne noire' is also mentioned (Loseth, § 441).
12. Bartelu seems an explanation in earlier texts for Girflet's apparent knowledge. In Celtic tradition, she claims, 'Girflet est donc celui qui en sait plus que les autres' (Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut, p. 291).
13. Ewert, Volume II, p. 247.
14. Il 'roman de Tristran'..., pp. 248-9 and notes 47 and 48.

compared with much of the escondit sequence this section is 'moins archaïque, plus chevaleresque et plus banal'. In contrast to Gauvain and Girflet, Iseut is well aware of the true identity of the knights: 'La roïne bien les connut.'[15] The existence of a closed circle of people who have the key to real identities is a feature already noticed in previous episodes (see ll. 3853-5). Falling similarly into a pre-existing pattern is the fact that the two knights are being watched by the public, just as Iseut held the attention in the previous episode.[16]

At l. 4035 the main substance of the episode begins, the encounter of Tristan and Andret and the clash between Governal and the forester. This is not the first time that a figure by the name of Andret has appeared in the fragment and this seems the moment to discuss the character at some length.

A character named Andret appears in the text at l. 2870, 'Andrez, qui fu nez de Nicole'. Ewert describes the part he plays in the romance:

> A certain Audrez (perhaps to be regarded as the scribe's imperfect rendering of Andrez), a native of Lincoln, advises the king to retain Tristran's services, contrary (be it noted) to the advice tendered by the three hostile barons (2890-2906). It is reasonable also to identify this personage with the Andrez mentioned in l. 3877 (who in company with Dinas attends upon the queen), and, if we accept the emendation, with the Andret of l. 3783.[17]

But Ewert goes on to point out that 'in ll. 4035-44 a personage of the same name meets his death at the hands of Tristran in circumstances which suggest that he was a sworn enemy'.[18] Before, Andret was seemingly on the side of Tristan, but now he is killed by Tristan.

---

15. B 4033.
16. Compare l. 4030 with ll. 3899-3900 and ll. 3883-4.
17. Ewert, Volume II, p. 216.
18. Ewert, Volume II, p. 216.

Ewert seeks to explain this contradiction by reference to the role played by Antrêt in O: in the German poem Antrêt is the leader of the hostile nobles but at the same time he is the constant guardian of Iseut. Ewert suggests that from a single character in his source Béroul created two characters:

It is possible, then, that Beroul, baffled by the apparent contradictions in the role of Andret (Antrêt or Antrêd in O), created two characters, one who is well disposed to the lovers and whom he finds it necessary to distinguish by describing him as 'nez de Nicole', the other an enemy, although not a leader or even a member of a faction.[19]

But Ewert's interpretation of the character is hardly shared by all. Professor Legge, far from seeing the Andret of l. 2870 as a character sympathetic towards the lovers, seems to look upon him as their enemy.[20] In the last CFMA edition (p. 153), the revisers reproduce the note of Muret's editions, which states, after referring to O and R, that there are two figures named Andret in the text and that the Lincoln Andret must not be identified with the Andret who engages Tristan in combat. But, unlike Ewert, Muret does not identify the Lincoln Andret with the figure at l. 3783 and l. 3877: the references at l. 3783, l. 3877 and l. 4035 in his estimation all concern the same figure. But is Andret killed by Tristan as Ewert claims? Commentators differ: Pauphilet,[21] Panvini,[22] Tanquerey[23] and Barteau,[24] believe that Andret does indeed meet his death, while others, Golther,[25] Fedrick,[26] Noble,[27] West[28] and Ménage[29] among them, suggest that Andret is only unhorsed. Given this degree of disagreement among critics, the need for a re-examination of the relevant passages is obvious.

---

19. Ewert, Volume II, p. 217.
20. Med. aev., XXXVIII, p. 171.
21. Le Roman..., p. 140.
22. La leggenda..., p. 89.
23. Med. aev., VI, p. 16.
24. Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut, p. 242, note 30.
25. Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 107.
26. The Romance of Tristan..., p. 168.
27. MA, LXXV, p. 474.
28. An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances, p. 8.
29. Rom., XCV, pp. 147-8.

The character who appears at l. 2870 is clearly named Audrez in the manuscript, as opposed to the Andrez of l. 3877 and l. 4035. Given the confusion elsewhere of n and u, we can surely regard the form Audrez as an acceptable variant for Andrez.[30] Lines 2869-78 read, in Ewert's edition:

> Li rois a son novo parole.
> Andrez, qui fu nez de Nicole,
> Li a dit: 'Rois, quar le retiens,
> Plus en seras doutez et criens.'
> Molt en faut poi que ne l'otroie,
> Le cuer forment l'en asouplaie.
> A une part li rois le trait·
> La roïne avoc Dinas let,
> Qui molt par ert voirs et loiaus
> Et d'amor faire communaix.

One must probably assume, with most commentators, that the nephew in l. 2869 is Tristan.[31] Andret of Lincoln is suggesting that Tristan should be allowed to remain at court, claiming that this would be in the king's best interests. The king is momentarily attracted to the idea and draws Andret aside, leaving the queen with Dinas. Can one possibly infer from l. 2876 that someone else, perhaps Andret, escorted the queen on occasion? It would perhaps be audacious to suggest that Andret is a conscious ally of the lovers: he may indeed be considering only what would be advantageous to the king, not realizing that his proposal is pleasing to the lovers as well. But certainly he is not allied to the three barons who now step forward and oppose Andret's proposal.

A figure named Andret appears also at l. 3783 of the printed text:

---

30. The question has been raised as to whether either of the forms is acceptable. Golther suggested that Audrez was a scribal error for Dinas (Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 105, note) and Kelemina was in agreement (Geschichte der..., p. 70). In his SATF edition (p. XIX), Muret expressed agreement with Golther and Kelemina to the extent that he believed the name Andret was wrongly given to this character, but he did not suggest that Dinas was a natural replacement.
31. The new division in the manuscript at l. 2869 is somewhat surprising. Does l. 2869 sum up immediately preceding events —even though it is Tristan who has been talking to Mark!—

> Artus enquist de la roïne.
> 'El vient,' fait Marc, 'par la gaudine,
> Dan roi, ele vient o Andret;
> De lié conduire s'entremet.' (ll. 3781-4)

But the manuscript reads at l. 3783 not o Andret but orendroit. Muret emended this either to Audret or Andret and justified his correction in the following way: 'En restituant son nom (d'après le vers 3831) au vers 3787, j'avais présent à la mémoire l'Antrêt d'Eilhart, tel qu'il nous apparaît dans deux épisodes, à cheval dans le cortège d'Iseut et la surveillant d'un oeil jaloux.'[32] Certainly the emendation is a commendable one, but if we accept the correction we do so, not after reference to Eilhart's version, which does not justify the change, but because Andret is now fulfilling a role which has already been suggested by l. 2876 of our text, 'La roïne ovoc Dinas let'.

Andret appears next not simply as an editorial substitution but with the full support of the manuscript:

> Un poi aval, lez une espine,
> Torne a un gué lui et Andrez,
> Ou trepasserent auques nez.
> De l'autre part fu Yseut sole. (ll. 3876-9)

A picture of Andret is gradually emerging from his two, possibly three, appearances. In the first passage, a certain Andret, appearing in the manuscript as Audrez, advocates a course of action which the three recognized enemies of the lovers will immediately oppose. He may be seen as an associate of Dinas here, if one accepts that the seneschal takes over from Andret the task of escorting Iseut. If one can accept the textual emendation, it is in the course of

---

as does l. 3701? In spite of the suspicions of Gallais (Genèse du roman occidental, p. 119, note 6), Andret is unlikely to be the nepeu referred to in l. 2869.

32. M°, p. XIX. The Audret form is found only in M° and subsequent editions have Andret. M³ reads 'Dan roi, ele vient ou Andret'.

escorting the queen that we see him on a second occasion. He is then associated with Dinas once more at l. 3877. Nothing indicates so far that Andret is Tristan's enemy. Why then is he killed, as Ewert believes, when he appears for a last time in this episode? Or is this the appearance of another character of the same name?

Lines 4035-44 read:

> Et Andrez vint
> Sor son destrier, ses armes tint;
> Lance levee, l'escu pris,
> A Tristran saut en mié le vis.
> Nu connoisoit de nule rien,
> Et Tristran le connoisoit bien;
> Fiert l'en l'escu, en mié la voie
> L'abat et le bras li peçoie.
> Devant les piez a la reïne
> Cil put sanz lever sus l'escaire.

We have been told that there was a marked reluctance to engage the two mysterious knights in combat, but now Andret appears, ready for battle, and directs himself at Tristan. It is not Tristan who picks out Andret as his opponent, but Andret who takes the apparently courageous step of matching himself against one of the two enchanted knights. Tristan is not recognized by Andret, but Tristan, so we are told, knows Andret well.[33] Does Andret's failure to recognize Tristan indicate that he is an enemy of the lovers? Dinas had certainly recognized Tristan in his disguise at the ford (ll. 3653-5), but only Iseut in this episode is said to know that one of the mysterious knights is Tristan; the pennon on the lance would reveal his identity. Perhaps, therefore, the fact that Andret fails to recognize Tristan, but Tristan recognizes him, does not make him into an enemy. What is striking in the passage is the sudden speed of

---

33. See also B 3713-4.

Andret's arrival, accentuated by the way the incident begins half-way through l. 4035 and by the expression saut en mié le vis in l. 4038.[34] Even though Tristan recognizes Andret —as an ally?— he has no time to avoid his onrush, but must retaliate in the interests of self-defence.

Tristan is thus forced to join combat. From ll. 4041-2 we gather that Tristan strikes Andret on the shield, unhorses him and breaks his arm. There seems to be no positive indication that in the course of this brief encounter Andret has been mortally wounded. Had this happened the indication that his arm had been broken would perhaps be superfluous, but the whole situation is far from clear. Does abat in l. 4042 mean that Andret is simply unhorsed or that he is killed? Is abat only elliptical for abat mort?[35] Line 4044 also warns against any dogmatic pronouncement. The manuscript has here been corrected by the scribe, perhaps an indication that his model was none too explicit and that the surviving version of the line represents a misguided attempt at clarification. Does sans lever mean not getting up at all, or simply not getting up at that particular moment?[36] What is the exact syntactical function of sus

---

34. On saut en mié le vis, see Blakey, FS, XXX, p. 138.
35. Else here, abattre can mean 'to unhorse' and nothing more. Tristan Ménestrel, ll. 224-30:

De soz la coutine tot droit
L'a ens el ventre un poi navré.
A cel cop l'eüst mort jetté,
Que mais sa bouche ne parlast,
Se sa lance ne pechoiast:
Mais si l'enpaint qu'envers tot plat
Ganbes leveés jus l'abat.

La Queste del Saint Graal, p. 48, ll. 8-10: 'Et tant que cil qui furent abatu sont rencontré; et lors recomence la meslee grandre que devant.'

36. Tristan Ménestrel is more explicit on a similar occasion:

Du bon cheval sor cel il sist
Est Lancelos a terre jus
Issi trés durement cheüs
Que por un poi qu'il ne creva:
En grant piece ne se leva. (ll. 174-8)

in the line?

This clash with Andret appears to be something of a surprise to Tristan. Certainly Andret is deposited at the feet of the queen, which might indicate that the action was committed por l'amor Ysent m'amie (l. 3601), but probably he conceived the esbaudie in more general terms, anticipating participation in the tournament and contests against any opponents who presented themselves.

If Tristan's clash with Andret is unexpected, the involvement of Governal in the tournament is doubly so. Governal's encounter with the forester is of a rather different nature but it may indirectly illumine what has gone on immediately before:

> Governal vit le forestier
> Venir des tro[s] sor un destrier,
> Qui vout Tristran livrer a mort
> En sa forest, ou dormoit fort. (ll. 4045-8)

The forester who had denounced the lovers such a long time ago has now reappeared, but one is reminded of an episode even earlier than the Separating Sword incident, namely the riche baron episode. Governal sees the enemy coming, as before, and in this passage, as in the earlier account, the potential opponent is clearly described as an enemy of the lovers (see ll. 1685-8). Andret was not described at all. Another major difference from the Andret encounter is that it is Governal who seizes the initiative and attacks the forester:

> Gran[t] aleüre a lui s'adrece,
> Ja ert de mort en grant destrece.
> Le fer trenchant li mist el cors,
> O l'acier bote le cuir fors.
> Cil chaï mort, si c'onques prestre
> N'i vint a tens ne n'i pot estre. (ll. 4049-54)

The forester's death is anticipated in l. 4050 (as was that of the baron in l. 1696 and as will be that of Denoalen in ll. 4378-80), and when death comes it strikes with a remarkable swiftness (ll. 4053-4) which is equalled only in the last episode of the romance (l. 4339,

ll. 4484-5). Neither of these features was found in the Andret-Tristan encounter.[37] Moreover, the nature of the blow struck by Governal differs markedly from that struck by Tristan. Instead of the lance striking the shield, the blade of the lance penetrates the forester's body.[38] Iseut greets the death of her enemy with the same approval she bestowed on the discomfiture of the three wicked barons (ll. 4054-6, ll. 3825-8).

To return to the figure of Andret, the notion that in B we have two characters named Andret, one amiably disposed towards the lovers, the other a sworn enemy, seemed to emanate from the presence of a wicked nephew of Mark in O and B, and, therefore, also in the source of B. However, can we be certain that in the lost portions of Béroul's poem itself a similar figure appeared? For a figure named Andret is absent from the extant fragment at a point where he might reasonably have been included, in the episode which begins at l. 581. In the Béroul fragment the enemies of the lovers are individualized as three barons, whilst in O, at this same point, Antrêt figures as the leader of the hostile faction. In O, Antrêt figures also in the so-called Kiss at the Couch episode (ll. 3150-3249), but Ewert suggests that this episode may well not have been in B.[39] One can go on to suggest that the name Andret is given to only one character in B and that this character plays a consistent role. A native of Lincoln, Andret first appears as the advocate of a course of action which the three felons will oppose. If we accept the editorial emendation at l. 3783, Andret next appears as an escort for Iseut,

---

37. Hofer sees a parallel to ll. 4053-4 in ll. 5649-50 of the Estoire des Engleis (ZRP, LXV, p. 268).
38. B 4051-2. For a note on these lines and particularly on cuir in l. 4052, see Reid, The 'Tristan'..., p. 131.
39. Ewert, Volume II, p. 119.

a role which may have vaguely been suggested on his first appearance. On his third appearance Andret is in the company of Dinas, the major ally of the lovers. On his final appearance, Andret is unhorsed by Tristan, who has been forced to defend himself. It is possible that Béroul did find a character like the Antrêt of O in his source and that he did indeed see a certain inconsistency in the role. If this was the case, he solved the problem, not by creating two characters, each of which would have one half of Andret's original role, but by creating one single character with a single, consistent role.[40] If this is indeed a valid assessment of the role of Andret in B, this would argue in favour of treating ll. 3985-4074 as an integral part of the text.

The scene closes with the reaction of Arthur's knights to the two clashes, and thus a balance is created with the beginning of the scene, where the immediate reaction of the knights to the arrival of the two mysterious horsemen was described. One must presume that the compaignons of l. 4059 are Andret and the forester, who suffered disgrace, to say the very least. Gauvain is the first to speak out, as he was at the beginning:

> 'Seignors,' fait Gaugains, 'que ferons?
> Li forestier gist la baé.
> Saciez que cil dui sont faé:
> Ne tant ne quant nes connoison[s];
> Or nos tienent il por briccons.
> Brochons a eus, alon les prendre.'
> 'Qui(e)s nos porra,' fait li rois, 'rendre,
> Molt nos avra servi a gré.' (ll. 4060-7)

It is interesting to note that Gauvain refers only to the forester. Is this because the forester alone has gone to his death? Gauvain

---

40. Ménage also sees Andret as a single coherent character, 'un allié des amants, défenseur de Tristan, symboliquement éclaboussé par la boue en compagnie de Dinas dans l'épisode du "bourbier"' (Rom., XCV, p. 148).

seeks volunteers to ride with him against these unknown horsemen who have made fools of the knights of the Round Table: King Arthur himself supports the project. But the knights do not respond to Gauvain's suggestion, and Tristan and Governal are able to ride away unmolested. The scene ends typically enough with a mention of jousting (as in l. 3984), but the activity has lost its attraction and now the knights are eager only to seek security in their own camp, after their contact with the forces of evil. Thus, they never come to know the true identity of the two mysterious knights (which is not the case in the first part of the Tristan Ménestrel).[41] This is a point which Varvaro chooses to emphasize: 'Il torneo si trasforma così in scontro e inseguimento e la chiave dell'apparizione dei due non verrà mai data, essi rimarranno per sempre "fantosmes" (vv. 4062 e 4072).'[42]

The purpose of the whole scene has yet to be discussed. Ewert has his theory as to why the passage was included:

> Beroul's predilection for the more robust, not to say primitive and barbarous, and for the matter and style of the chanson de geste is betrayed by the casual manner which characterizes this passage. It provides him with the opportunity of unceremoniously eliminating Andret from the narrative and dispatching the forester, somewhat incongruously introduced as a companion of Arthur's knights (4059) and spared the ignominious death prophesied for him (2759-62). He also introduces two unattested Arthurian knights, Cinglor and Coris.[43]

It is certainly true to say that Governal eliminates an enemy from the narrative when he kills the forester, but the clash between

---

41. Tristan Ménestrel, ll. 337-42:

    Quant li rois Artus che oï
    Molt durement s'en esjoï:
    "Oez, seignor," dist il, "oez:
    C'est Tristrans, qui tant est loez,
    Que veoir poez la aval
    Conbatre a loi d'ome vassal.

42. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 249. Why the singular in l. 4072? Varvaro prints fantosmes, but the line reads fantosme soit.
43. Ewert, Volume II, p. 247.

Andret and Tristan comes into a different category.[44] According to Ewert, the passage provides the author with an opportunity of getting rid of Andret, but this may only have come to mind because of an awareness that in other versions a person of the same name plays the role of the recognized opponent of the lovers. The Andret of this passage is not identified with the Andret who has appeared already in the fragment, but with the nephew of King Mark familiar from other versions, a man whose elimination is desirable. But Béroul's romance itself provides ample motivation for the scene. Tristan is participating in the tournament, his anticipated esbaudie, for love of his lady. Only Andret is prepared to engage Tristan in combat, and he acts as an unconscious ally in that he gives Tristan an opportunity to display his prowess. And he is not killed, so it would seem, but simply unhorsed. Even if Andret is in fact killed in the episode, the purpose of the episode is still not his elimination: his death is but one incident in the esbaudie.

Both these interpretations of the purpose of the episode tend to assume that the episode is as much an integral part of the romance as any other. But it was noted at the beginning of the chapter that objections have been voiced to the effect that this may not in fact be the case. These objections, especially those formulated by Muret, will be examined now.

Perhaps one can detect an element of contradiction even within the episode. In ll. 4014-19 Girflet claims to know exactly who the two knights are, but in l. 4063 Gauvain appears to reject this view and says that they do not know them at all. It may be that Gauvain

---

44. For the purposes of his article, Noble distinguishes between the two combats in the scene: 'Il faut ajouter que Governal tue le forestier qui est l'ennemi déclaré des amants mais cette tuerie est sans rapport avec le problème de la courtoisie des amants' (MA, LXXV, p. 475).

is rebuking Girflet for pretending to air his knowledge, and yet he would agree that the two knights are indeed faé (l. 4019, l. 4062). Girflet's comment that they were enchanted might be regarded simply as an excuse for inaction, the plea of the miles gloriosus , but Gauvain agrees with this part at least of his colleague's identification. Surely he is not urging action against the two knights while at the same time presenting an excuse for inaction! But if the two knights are totally unknown, even more enigmatic than Girflet claimed, inaction might seem proportionately more excusable.[45]

In the introduction to his SATF edition, Muret indicated certain peculiarities in the passage. He noted on p. XXII that among the knights 'il y en a trois, Cinglor, Tolas et Coris (4059-60), qui n'ont pas été nommés auparavant, et deux, Cinglor et Coris, qui, si je ne me trompe, sont inconnus dans les autres romans du cycle breton'. Certainly, according to West and Flutre, neither Coris nor Cinglor is found elsewhere as the name of an Arthurian knight.[46] Without giving any further details at that juncture, Muret declared, on p. XXII again, that the passage contained a number of peculiar linguistic features. One of the linguistic features he has in mind comes to light on p. LVIII: 'La désinence de la première personne du pluriel est ordinairement notée dans notre manuscrit par -on. A la rime nous trouvons quatre fois -on (614, 2262, 3386, 3434), et deux fois -ons (4062, 4065) dans un passage suspect.'[47] Another

---

45. In the case of Baruc li Noirs, the Noir Chevalier or Chevalier Faé, who figures in the Livre d'Artus, the term Faé could indicate his apparent invincibility (see West, An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Prose Romances, p. 234).
46. An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances, p. 41 and p. 44, Index des noms propres..., p. 48 and p. 53. As we have seen, Ebert makes this same point, that Cinglor and Coris are 'unattested' (Ebert, Volume II, p. 247).
47. The line numbers refer to M°. At l. 4065 Ebert prints alon not alons: alon appears to be a misprint. The manuscript reads pernons, not prenons, as printed by Muret in M° (p. 126, variant). Röttiger proposed 'Brochons à eus, ses poons prendre' (Der heutige Stand..., p. 21).

possible linguistic peculiarity has been noted by Reid:

> For instance, though both parts use as chevilles certain adverbs and locutions properly meaning 'certainly, without doubt', the commonest of these, certes, occurs seventeen times in I but only three times in II; of the others, certainement and sanz doutance are used only in I (ll. 494, 1476, 2022: 449, 1420, 1904), a certain and sanz dote only in II (ll. 3861: 4019).[48]

Muret appears to have reservations about the 'authenticity' of the passage for other reasons, for he writes: 'Ces vers, à tout le moins suspects, contrastent vivement avec la fin du poème, avec les vers 4269-4487, dans lesquels est racontée d'une façon si brève et si dramatique la mort de Dencalen et de Godoïne.'[49] This viewpoint is a development of Muret's impression that the lines in question seem less archaic than the rest of the escondit sequence. And what of the forester who reappears in this episode after a singularly long absence?[50] Even if we accept Ménage's contention that the forestier of l. 2759 is not King Mark's appointee in the Morrois but the espie of the final episode and that the forester's death in no way contradicts a previous forecast,[51] Evert is surely justified in his claim that the forester is 'somewhat incongruously introduced as a companion of Arthur's knights (4059)'. Muret goes further and suggests that conpaignon is a term equally unsuitable for Andret.[52] One must agree that the term seems strange, unless one can believe that Gauvain regards Andret and the forester as their comrades-in-arms in their struggle against the unknown. This is not the only aspect of Andret's role which gives pause for thought. Certainly the text does not indicate that Andret was deliberately picked out by Tristan as a fitting object for disgrace, but Andret

---

48. MLR, LX, p. 352, note 3.
49. Mº, pp. XXII-XXIII.
50. Muret makes this ancillary point: 'Excepté les vers 4047-63, qui racontent la mort du forestier, tué par Governal, rien ne rappelle les événements survenus depuis le mariage d'Iseut jusqu'à sa réconciliation avec son mari' (Mº, p. XX).
51. Rom., XCV, p. 149.
52. Mº, p. XXII.

does nevertheless suffer at least disgrace in the end. One can hardly say that on the strength of his previous appearances in the romance he deserves such a fate. Do we, then, ultimately have to suppose with Ewert that the Andret in this episode is a different figure from the Andret of Lincoln in ll. 2870, 3783 and 3877? Perhaps, if this is indeed the case, one can see a pattern emerging. Tristan sought to amuse his lady by misdirecting the general body of knights when they tried to cross the bog, but he achieved an outstanding success when the three wicked barons presented themselves as his unexpected victims. Similarly, Tristan is already in the process of carrying out his esbaudie by being present at the tournament at all, but he receives an unexpected bonus when Andret —an enemy, like the three barons?— takes it into his head to engage him in combat. If this is the right interpretation and there are two figures in the fragment named Andret, this may well indicate, when allied to other factors already noted, that the passage in question is indeed a later addition to the romance, an interpolation.

But if the passage is a later addition, it is well to point out that it does not establish new lines of development, but rather extends old, pre-existing ones. Muret has described the character of the passage as 'moins archaïque, plus chevaleresque et plus banal que le reste de l'épisode du jugement de Dieu'. But one must contend that a great deal in this second half of the romance, from the restitution of Iseut onwards, could be characterized in the same way. The welcome of Iseut by the people in the passage beginning at l. 2957 is surely a case in point: the parallels with an episode in Érec et Énide have already been noted. When Perinis reaches Isneldone,

there is a classic description of Arthur and his knights. Tristan's horse is almost inevitably given a name in this passage, but so was Arthur's at l. 3522. In this episode, as in the previous episode, disguise is all-important, but Tristan's pose as a leper was obviously an element in the central story, in the progress towards Iseut's successful oath. One can quite easily imagine that the putative interpolator was induced by the pre-existing disguise scene to add a second, non-essential but characteristically Artaurian one. Tristan's arrival on the Blanche Lande has been anticipated since ll. 3599-3604. But the esbaudie itself may well be a development of a pre-established pattern. Does an author draw on the idea in ll. 3513-4 and slightly transpose it to justify Tristan's appearance at the tournament? If ll. 3599-3604 are indeed a later addition, this might well explain the apparent slip from precautionary measures to audacious projects that we find in Tristan's instructions to Governal. One might briefly add that the revenge-killing of the forester continues a very familiar theme.

One suspects that if more than one author were indeed involved in the second part of the romance, one would have to postulate a theory of evolution rather more complex than the simple interpolation of ll. 3985-4074. As the lines stand in the fragment they offer a diversion before the serious matter of the oath is taken up once more, and in spite of the killing of the forester one must concede that the lines form an hors d'oeuvre. It may be that the author is seeking to achieve a variation in tone in his romance; if so, this is not an unworthy aim, but it is a pity that the episode itself is not free from contradictions. Perhaps the whole of the escondit sequence is dominated by a concern to strike a balance. Events in the long sequence beginning at l. 2132 lead up to Tristan's request

that he should be allowed to prove his innocence, and perhaps, in l. 3022 ff., the original source story was consciously amplified to produce a sequence of similar length. The original story probably already had the figure of Arthur, who was excised by Thomas for reasons which have already been suggested. The basic account was expanded by more than one author, or at least there was more than one attempt to extend the sequence, for one can discern a pattern of 'repetitive creation'. Tristan begs for alms from Arthur, a course of action anticipated in ll. 3346-9. But then --and this is not anticipated-- the theme is repeated, for Tristan seeks alms from Mark. Moreover, we find the comic dialogue between the leper and the unsuspecting dupe, which may be regarded as a further embellishment to the basic story. If we accept that ll. 3599-3604 are authentic, Tristan plans his esbaudie. But surprisingly, when the time comes, we find Governal involved as well and his clash with the forester certainly creates a contradiction within the scope of the extant fragment. Is the fact that Governal is a late addition to the story a reason for the singular fantosme soit in l. 4072? Vàrvaro detects a number of different tonalities in the sequence: 'Con la stessa facilità di trapasso ecco ora Tristran tornato con Governal a sembianze cortesi; ma sembra proprio che la forzatura che la narrazione ha avuto in un senso autorizzi ora anche la sottolineatura del tono opposto.'[53] It is possible that Vàrvaro has detected not merely different tonalities, but also different stages of composition, in the romance which survives.

---

53. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 248.

23: THE AMBIGUOUS OATH

As presented here, this episode runs from l. 4075 to l. 4266. Ewert, it is true, divides this same number of lines into two scenes, the first running from l. 4075 to l. 4182, the second from l. 4183 to l. 4266. But certainly there is no disagreement over the fact that at l. 4266 a whole section of the romance comes to an end; for Ewert, the line concludes the fifth division of the romance. In the derivatives of T, the end of the parallel episode similarly brings a whole section of the story to an end, although the components of that section are different. The fleur de farine episode, it will be remembered, is followed almost immediately in T by the proposal for a trial. But both versions have the swearing of the oath as a climax, and in both versions a mystery is explained, for the purpose of Iseut's bizarre actions is now revealed to the reader.[1]

Lines 4075 to 4113 form the first part of the episode in B. It would seem that Ewert would approve of this division, for, as noted before, he sees the whole passage which runs from l. 3985 to l. 4113 as offering 'a striking contrast with Beroul's normal manner and preoccupations'.[2] The scene has no direct equivalent in the derivatives of T. It would appear that in T the swearing of the oath followed soon after Iseut's encounter with Tristan: there was no tournament and no night intervened.

---

1. Texts employed: B, ll. 4075-4266; S, chapter LIX - chapter LX; E, stanza CCVII - stanza CCVIII; G, ll. 15634-15764; T.r., p. 240, l. 13 - p. 240, l. 28.
2. Ewert, Volume II, p. 247.

The camp has now been set up. Lines 4080-84 recall ll. 3663-9, but the new scene is felt above all to follow on from the close of events at the ford. At that point, after Iseut had crossed over the ford on Tristan's back, it had seemed that the company was moving on:

> Grant joie en meinent li dui roi.
> Amené ont son palefroi,
> Montee l'ont; d'illuec tornerent.
> Qui ont armes, lors bohorderent. (ll. 3981-4)

Line 4075 appears to follow on quite logically from this and may strengthen a suspicion that the tournament episode represents a later addition to the story. A number of descriptive details follow which together form a picture of the scene. Knights are there with their ladies, there is the hunting of stags[3] and the kings hold court. One incident is described at rather greater length, the visit of Arthur and his court to Mark, and this development is indicated by the new rubric at l. 4093. The splendour of the two courts is shown particularly through a description of the clothes on view, introduced in classic fashion, 'Des vestëures que diroie?'[4] But the author pertinently writes in ll. 4104-8:

> Es pavellons ont joie fait:
> La nuit devisent lor afaire,
> Comment la franche debonere
> Se doit deraisnier de l'outrage
> Voiant les rois et lor barnage.[5]

If, as Ewert suggests, the passage up to l. 4113 represents a departure for the poet from his normal manner, he still concentrates

---

3. Ewert has a note on l. 4088, more particularly on the word menee (Ewert, Volume II, p. 249). Tilander also has a note on the word (Mélanges d'étymologie cynégétique, pp. 309-10). Ewert's contention that ot is part of oïr may gain support from l. 4113, for the construction of ll. 4087-8 has evident similarities with that of ll. 4111-13.
4. B 4098. See also ll. 2884 and 3991.
5. Iseut is characterized in l. 4106 in what appears to be the normal manner for this part of the romance: see also ll. 3914 and 4150.

upon the important matter to come. The splendour of the scene that has been described is an indication of the importance of the occasion, for soon Iseut must defend herself against the accusation made by the three barons.

And so the first part of the episode in B creates an air of expectancy. There is nothing directly equivalent to this part in the derivatives of T, but certainly roughly similar effects are sought. Indeed, considerably more suspense is generated in T; the issue is very open and Iseut's opponents are still active, not already humiliated as are the three barons in Béroul's version. Gottfried almost inevitably offers the fullest account. Lines 15643-50 of the German version tell us that the queen has already rid herself of some of her possessions. After her arrival at the minster, she hears mass, dressed in a hair-shirt and an unusually short robe; she is a figure who arouses pity:

> manec herze und ouge nar ir war
> swarę unde erbermecliche. (ll. 15664-5)

That the issue is very much in doubt is reflected by the quarrel, recorded in ll. 15681-15696, between her opponents and supporters, a quarrel which seems to centre on the form of the oath that Iseut should swear. The account in E is characteristically brief. There is no wrangling of any kind nor any descriptive detail and Iseut swears her oath immediately (stanza CCVII). The account of S does seem to confirm that G is largely reproducing T and that E is abbreviating. We hear of the sternness of the king and of Iseut's giving of alms. She is described as being without shoes and as wearing coarse clothes, a description identical in spirit to that of Gottfried. Again, as in Gottfried's account, she arouses pity amongst those present and a quarrel takes place (chapter LIX).

Schoepperle noticed the probable difference between the account of T and that of B. She writes of the queen in T: 'Isolt's appearance and behaviour are calculated to inspire pity for her miserable state, rather than admiration for her beauty and courage.'[6] Newstead would agree that this is indeed the intention of Thomas, for she notes that 'Thomas seeks to evoke sympathy for the queen's wretched plight'.[7] The reader of T probably does lend his sympathy to Iseut at this point, for he must be somewhat apprehensive about the outcome of the whole situation. He is unaware of the purpose of the queen's encounter with the disguised Tristan, uncertain as to whether Iseut will succeed in formulating an acceptable oath and anxious about the result of the ordeal which he knows to lie ahead. The reader is certainly not lulled into believing that the issue is decided in advance and in Iseut's favour, which might be held to be the case in B. The queen in B has shown an assurance unknown in T. Moreover, there is no ordeal to be undergone and we know already that Iseut has claimed the right to decide the form of the escondit, if not the precise form of the oath. Béroul's account never really arouses our pity and, indeed, it is not meant to: our interest lies mainly in the mechanics of the process through which Iseut will extricate herself.

The next part of the episode, ll. 4114-82, begins with the dawning of the actual day on which the trial is to take place. A familiar element in the overall picture is described again, the knights are present with their ladies. But their presence now has

---

6. Tristan and Isolt, p. 225.
7. 'The Equivocal Oath...', p. 1081.

a specific purpose, for they have come together to bear witness to the oath. In ll. 4125-36 the reliquaries and the cloth on which they are set are described. Similar reliquaries are mentioned in S, and also in G:

> hie mite was ouch daz heiltuom komen,
> uf dem si sweren solde. (ll. 15668-9)

There is no such mention in E, perhaps another indication that the author seems to have abbreviated the account of his source. But even in G and S (chapter LIX), the relics are not subjected to the kind of detailed description that one finds in ll. 4125-36 of B. Béroul's presentation of the marvellous relics combines with his earlier description of the splendour of the courts to bring out the importance of the event. If the derivatives of T emphasize the gravity of the situation, B lays stress upon the brilliance of the occasion.

At l. 4137 the poet concentrates upon the two kings, and in ll. 4141-69 we have Arthur's long address to King Mark. He expresses disbelief in the validity of the accusations of Iseut's enemies, he is angry with Mark's advisers and reproaches the king for his gullibility:

> 'Rois Marc, fait il, 'qui te conselle
> Tel outrage si fait merveille;
> Certes,' fait il, 'sil se desloie.
> Tu es legier a metre en voie,
> Ne doiz croire parole fause. (ll. 4141-5)

As in the earlier episode, when Perinis first outlined the matter to Arthur, it is Mark who is blamed for having paid heed to unworthy advisers (see ll. 3451-2). The question of Iseut's innocence is never really examined, rather her innocence and her accusers' guilt are automatically presumed. Arthur goes on to indicate to Mark the

course of action Iseut should adopt:

> Or oiez, roi: qui ara tort,
> La roïne vendra avant,
> Si qel verront petit et grant,
> Et si jurra o sa main destre,
> Sor les corsainz, au roi celestre
> Qu'el onques n'ot amor conmune
> A ton nevo, ne deus ne une,
> Que l'en tornast a vilanie,
> N'amor ne prist par puterie.[8]

Mark accepts Arthur's criticism of his character and, in his reply, gives evidence of the mercurial aspect of his nature: he now promises short shrift to any future accusers, once Iseut has completed her formal defence. Like Arthur, if Mark does not make any open declaration of belief in Iseut's innocence, he acknowledges the folly of believing her enemies and envisages a future in which a terrible reckoning awaits any new detractors.

At this point, the reader may well be wondering how Iseut will be able to swear an oath which will conform to Arthur's indications in ll. 4158-66. Moreover, he has yet to discover the purpose behind the crossing of the ford. Nevertheless, even though his curiosity has no doubt been deftly stimulated, he can hardly be anticipating anything other than a happy outcome.

The actual swearing of the oath is introduced by Arthur with the following words:

> 'Entendez moi, Yseut la bele,
> Oiez de qoi on vos apele:
> Que Tristran n'ot vers vos amor
> De putee ne de folor
> Fors cele que devoit porter
> Envers son oncle et vers sa per.' (ll. 4191-6)

---

8. B 4158-66. In l. 4158 the interpretation of qui ara tort is somewhat problematical (see Ewert, Volume II, pp. 250-1, Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 135-6). Qui ara tort may well be the object of oiez (see also l. 4192) and we should perhaps understand: 'Hear....who will be (proved) wrong.' Lines 4159-66 then describe the process whereby the innocent party will identify herself. One might note that in L. Muret printed: 'Or oiez, roi, qui ara tort:'.

Lines 4193-6 are not an indication of the charge which has been laid against Iseut, as l. 4192 would have us understand if apeler were to be taken in its common sense of 'accuse'. For apeler, the CFMA editions give the meaning 'exiger une déclaration formelle',[9] but one can go further. Iseut is in fact being called upon in law to meet an appeal by direct negation.[10] In ll. 4193-6 Arthur indicates what her negation should contain and Iseut adopts the framework the king's words have suggested in the formal denial she delivers in ll. 4201-16:

> Si m'aït Dex et saint Ylaire,
> Ces reliques, cest saintuaire,
> Totes celes qi ci ne sont
> Et tuit icil de par le mont,
> Q'entre mes cuisses n'entra home,
> Fors le ladre qui fist soi some,
> Qui me porta outre les guez,
> Et li rois Marc mes esposez;
> Ces deus ost de mon soirement.
> Ge n'en ost plus de tote gent;
> De deus ne me puis escondire:
> Du ladre, du roi Marc, mon sire.
> Li ladres fu entre mes janbes
> .....
> Qui voudra que je plus en face,
> Tote en sui preste en ceste place.'

In all versions the nature of the oath which Iseut swears is necessarily dependent upon previous events, upon the events which she herself has engineered. In B, the major qualification introduced by the queen comes in l. 4206, 'Fors le ladre qui fist soi some'.[11] Like Jonin[12] and Blakey,[13] one is led to recall ll. 22-5 in the opening episode of the romance. In G, inevitably, it is the pilgrim

---

9. Reid supports the CFMA interpretation (The 'Tristran'..., p. 137). It is perhaps worth recording that Mussafia postulated that the term might mean 'chiedere una dichiarazione formale' (Rom., XXXIV, pp. 306-7). T.-L. glosses apeler as 'zu einer Erklärung vor Gericht auffordern' (I, 437) and cites l. 4192.
10. See Francis, 'The Trial in Lanval', especially pp. 116-7.
11. Reid proposes the retention of the manuscript's sor some and suggests the correction qui fis sorsome (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 138-9).
12. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 366.
13. 'Truth and Falsehood...', p. 25.

that the queen must exempt. She notes (ll. 15706-16) that only he, apart from King Mark, ever lay with her. The oath in S (chapter LIX) has its own predictable form with the variation in the oath induced by variation in preceding events. She claims that no one, apart from Mark and the pilgrim who bore her from the boat and fell with her to the ground, had ever come near her.[14] In E (stanza CCVII), the account is brief and imprecise. The person who carried her to the ship is again designated simply as a man, not as a leper or pilgrim. As in S, Iseut stresses that apart from Mark no one had ever enjoyed such proximity.

Concentrating on B, one finds that it is the scrupulous attention to detail, the apparent thoroughness of the oath, that is acknowledged by those present:

> Tuit cil qui l'ont oï jurer
> Ne püent pas plus endurer.
> 'Dex!' fait chascuns, 'si fiere en jure!
> Tant en a fait aprés droiture!
> Plus i a mis que ne disoient
> Ne que li fel le requeroient:
> Ne li covient plus escondit
> Q'avez oï, grant et petit,
> Fors du roi et de son nevo. (ll. 4217-25)

Line 4219 has been interpreted in a number of different ways. Ewert accepts the word-division of the manuscript, regards jure as a verb form and sees fiere as having adverbial force.[15] In M[4] en jure is restored (replacing Muret's a jure), but jure is still, perhaps inadvertently, glossed as a noun (p. 165). Reid, however, takes en jure as one word and interprets the expression as meaning 'so

---

14. Like Bédier (Bédier, Volume I, p. 210, note 1), Ewert picks out a phrase apparently unique to S (Ewert, p. 252, note 2). He translates the phrase thus: 'Never did I incur guilt or sin through any other man; this I vow to God and all his saints.' It may well be that B was reproducing the source on this occasion, even though it is not in G (but G 15717-20 are in a similar spirit). (In note 1 of p. 252, Ewert's reference should presumably be to chapter LXIV of S, not chapter LIV.)
15. Ewert, Volume II, p. 253.

cruel a wrong',[16] which seems an inappropriate statement at a time when those present have been impressed above all by the queen's conscientiousness. It is, therefore, Ewert's interpretation which carries most conviction. But the interpretation of l. 4219 is of relatively minor importance when compared to that of l. 4225. Christmann claims that fors in that line has an adversative use and can be translated by 'mais seulement'. He writes: 'La phrase signifie donc: "Elle n'est tenue à aucune autre justification que celle que vous venez d'entendre, mais [elle est] seulement [tenue à se justifier] en ce qui concerne le roi et son neveu".'[17] Ewert supports the general line held by Christmann but cannot accept his interpretation of fors: 'But I take fors by itself to mean "except" and du as signifying "concerning", "in respect of".'[18] The measure of disagreement here between Ewert and Christmann fades into insignificance in face of their joint disagreement with an interpretation suggested by Reid. He writes:

> All commentators seem to have assumed (perhaps under the influence of Muret's emended text) that the words 'du roi et de son nevo' must necessarily refer to Mark and his nephew Tristan. But might they not rather refer to Arthur and his nephew Gauvain? In that case, both fors and de could have their most usual senses, and the passage would mean: 'She needs no other exculpation than you have all heard except that of the king (Arthur) and his nephew'.[19]

We are concentrating on a minor detail, but it is a detail which is all-important for an understanding of the passage. Are Christmann and Ewert justified in so forthrightly repudiating Reid's suggestion

---

16. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 265-7, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 139-40.
17. Rom., LXXX, p. 86. Christmann has forcefully reiterated his conclusion (ZfS, LXXVI, pp. 243-5).
18. Ewert, Volume II, p. 253.
19. Rom., LXXXV, pp. 366-7. Muret's editions had read:

    Ne li covient plus escondit.
    Q'avez oï, grant et petit,
    Du roi Marc et de son nevo?

that the nevo is Gauvain? For a characteristic of Iseut's oath is that there is no mention of Tristan at all, and this contrasts with the speech of Arthur in ll. 4192-6 which introduced the oath.[20] Iseut avoids any overt mention of Tristan and concentrates on a seemingly quite different person, the leper who bore her across the ford. By including the leper in her oath due to an apparent excess of scruple, Iseut is trying to suggest to those present that her general probity cannot be doubted. Jonin observes:

> D'abord par sa formule d'une précision crue, Iseut prouve qu'elle est si à l'aise dans l'innocence qu'elle peut aller dans le détail bien au-delà de ce qu'on lui demande. Ensuite elle accroît singulièrement le caractère persuasif du serment en l'actualisant. Chacun a pu voir, il y a un instant la reine sur le dos du lépreux: dans ces conditions il est quasi impossible de ne pas accorder foi à l'ensemble d'une affirmation quant on vient précisément d'en constater la justesse pour la plus grande partie.[21]

Because Iseut expressly avoids a mention of Tristan, even though he is, of course, le ladre qui fist soi some, can one claim, therefore, that the spectators also disregard Tristan and that the nevo is indeed Gauvain? If we must accept Reid's emendation, li niés, in l. 4232,[22] his view of l. 4225 gains some support. There is, however, a more likely interpretation. Iseut's attempt at obfuscation succeeds, for the spectators assume that Iseut has exempted Tristan in l. 4210 and they assume that she has responded directly to Arthur's words in ll. 4191-6. As they were meant to, they accept what Iseut has actually said as meaning exactly what they anticipated she would say after Arthur's brief introduction. The roi and the nevo in l. 4225 would refer, then, to Mark and

---

20. Newstead points out the difference between the oath sworn by Iseut and Arthur's introductory remarks ('The Equivocal Oath...', pp. 1080-1).
21. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 366. See also 'La Ruse d'Iseut...', p. 83.
22. See Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 142.

Tristan, the more obvious interpretation. The spectators, in ll. 4226-30, then build upon their confusion, ignorant of the fact that the meseaus and the nevo are one and the same person.

The reference to St Hilary (l. 4201) is found only in Béroul's version of the oath.[23] Is this a significant reference even though it is found at the rhyme? Lejeune thinks so:

Saint Hilaire, guérisseur de la lèpre devait frapper les imaginations... On ne s'étonnera donc point de voir l'auteur juxtaposer le nom de saint Hilaire à celui de Dieu dans un serment qui met en cause non seulement Iseut et son mari, mais le prétendu lépreux qui l'a portée sur ses épaules. L'allusion était transparente pour des esprits médiévaux.[24]

But there is almost certainly far more to it than this. In his treatise on the psalms, St Hilary of Poitiers had recognized that there may be very exceptional circumstances in which lying is allowed. Hilary, like the hermit Ogrin, approves the telling of lies when the consequences of telling the truth would be quite disastrous:

Sed artum hoc et per saeculi nequitiae ac uitia difficile est. est enim necessarium plerumque mendacium, et nonnumquam falsitas utilis est, cum aut percussori de latente mentitur, aut testimonium pro periclitante frustramur, aut fallimus de difficultate curationis aegrotum ; et oportet secundum apostoli doctrinam sermonem nostrum sale esse conditum.[25]

Before passing on to discuss further the results of Iseut's oath, a side-issue might perhaps be explored here. It seems it was W.A. Tregenza who first made the link between Iseut's oath and the Roman de Renart.[26] He claimed that an affinity exists between B and branches II and Va. Admitting that Renart, not Hersent, takes the oath, he pointed out that nevertheless a number of similarities exist. Arthur and Noble play similar roles, for both aim at

---

23. Even though, of course, she swears by God and the saints in S (chapter LIX) and in G (ll. 15717-20), if not in E.
24. MA, LXVI, pp. 157-8. See also Jonin, Les Personnages féminins..., pp. 343-8.
25. S. Hilarii episcopi pictaviensis tractatus super psalmos, p. 91.
26. MLN, XIX, pp. 301-5.

impartiality and yet betray their sympathy for the accused. Tregenza also noted similarities in the style of the poets, even instances of verbal agreement, but many of these affinities seem fortuitous, representing current descriptive clichés and turns of phrase. He came to the following conclusion: 'The only possible explanation appears to be that Beroul himself, at least when writing the "Ambiguous Oath" episode, drew from the source which Pierre de Saint-Cloud imitated and parodied, and that that source was none other than the "Tristan dont La Chievre fist" mentioned in the prologue of II and Va.'[27] Van Dam recorded Tregenza's conclusion,[28] and Fourrier also has a word to say: 'L'escondit de Renart dans la branche la plus ancienne du Roman de Renart est une parodie du serment d'Iseut, de même d'ailleurs que l'escondit d'Hersent dans la branche I.'[29] Fourrier is not claiming that II and Va were parodying B but an earlier version of the Tristan story: in this he would agree fundamentally with Tregenza. Jonin, like Fourrier, refers to the oath of Hersent in the Renart, but he cites it only as an example of an ambiguous oath and does not assert the existence of any direct link with B.[30] But certain broad conclusions have been reached regarding the similarities between the two accounts in the Renart and the oath in B. Delbouille, following up the comments of Tregenza and Fourrier, sees the opportunity for setting a date for the episodic tale which Thomas and Béroul may have independently drawn upon for the escondit scenes. He writes: 'Quand aurait été

---

27. MLR, XIX, p. 305.
28. Neophil., XV, p. 104.
29. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 79.
30. Les Personnages féminins..., p. 102.

écrit ce récit marginal? Son âge doit être estimé à partir du fait que l'épisode, connu de Béroul aussi bien que de Thomas, a été parodié dans les plus anciennes branches du Roman de Renart, c'est-à-dire dès 1175/80.'[31] Lejeune meditates specifically upon the first branch of the Renart and wonders what conclusion might be drawn: 'La date de ce texte —vers 1180— aurait peut-être mérité un commentaire.'[32] Is she suggesting the possibility that B was being directly parodied in the Roman de Renart?

Returning to the text, one finds that Iseut's oath has met with general approval: no further action is deemed necessary. Then King Arthur, or perhaps his nephew Gauvain (compare ll. 3457 and 4232), attacks the three barons:

> Or esgardent li troi felon,
> Donoalent et Guenelon,
> Et Goudoïne li mauvés,
> Qu(e) il ne parolent sol jamés.[33]

And it is certainly Arthur who condemns the barons at a later point, in a speech addressed to Iseut:

> Mal le penserent li felon.
> Ge prié le roi vostre seignor,
> Et feelment, molt par amor,
> Que mais felon de vos ne croie.' (ll. 4256-9)

A vague parallel to this condemnation is found in E, where there is a general repudiation of Meriadoc.[34] But certainly events following the taking of the oath in T are radically different from events in B in one crucial feature.

In B, Iseut concludes her oath in the following manner:

> Qui voudra que je plus en face,
> Tote en sui preste en ceste place.' (ll. 4215-6)

---

31. CCM, V, p. 421. In note 22 of the same page the reference to the volume in which Tregenza's article appeared should read XIX, not IX.
32. MA, LXVI, p. 149.
33. B 4237-40. Mölk translates sol jamés by 'jemals allein' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 205), which is almost certainly wrong.
34. E, stanza CCVIII, ll. 2287-8. No enemy is specifically condemned at this point in S (chapter LX, p. 74, ll. 19-28), nor in G (ll. 15745-15764).

Whereas in B Iseut offers to do more, in T Iseut concludes her oath by offering to say more:

> han ich es niht genuoc geseit,
> herre, ich bezzer iu den eit,
> als ir mir saget, sus oder so.'[35]

Mark, in reply, expresses his satisfaction with the terms of the oath:

> 'Vrouwe' sprach der künic do,
> 'es dunket mich genuoc hier an,
> alse ich michs versinnen kan.[36]

It had long been envisaged in T that Iseut's defence would comprise an oath followed by an ordeal. At this point Iseut has said enough, but she must do more, for in all the derivatives of T the ordeal is presented as the indispensable adjunct to the oath.

In S, Iseut is asked by the king to take hold of the hot iron, and it seems that approval by men must be followed by the approval of God:

Bear now this hot iron, and may God so purge thee as thou hast deserved and as thou hast sworn."
"I will well," said she. And she set her hands upon the iron and bare it so briefly that no man perceived cowardice nor dread in her. And God in his fair mercy granted her clean purgation and reconcilement and accord with the King, her lord and proper husband, with entire love and honor and great worship.[37]

In G, a similar tale is told. King Mark asks her to take hold of the hot iron, calling upon God's help. Again Iseut escapes injury:

> nu nemet daz isen uf die hant;
> und alse ir uns habt vor benant,
> als helfe iu got ze dirre not!'
> 'amen! sprach diu schoene Isot.
> in gotes namen greif siz an
> und truogez, daz si niht verbran. (ll. 15727-32)

---

35. G 15721-3. See also S, chapter LIX, p. 74, ll. 7-8.
36. G 15724-6. See also S, chapter LIX, p. 74, ll. 10-11.
37. Loomis, The Romance of Tristram..., p. 168.

In E, after the oath, we are told the hot iron is ready. The barons pray for her and Iseut carries the iron unscathed (stanza CCVIII). One might note the strong religious element associated with the oath and ordeal in T, as far as one can judge from the derivatives. G offers perhaps the fullest example, for there we have the appeal to God by Iseut in the oath, the appeal to God by Mark before Iseut takes the hot iron and, as we have seen, Iseut lays hold of the iron in gotes namen. The presence of the religious element is confirmed by S and to a lesser extent by E, and almost certainly it was an integral part of the original. It is obviously true that the oath and ordeal are basically religious ceremonies in any case. But is the religious element deliberately exaggerated? Are the references to God simply part of the regular terminology?

The situation, or rather the problem, is now established. A major difference between B and T exists; in B there is an oath, in T an oath and an ordeal. Did Béroul cut out the ordeal? Did Thomas add the ordeal? One can easily find supporters for both points of view. For example, Ewert writes: 'In other versions Iseut asks whether the oath is comprehensive enough and Mark answers in the affirmative. Kelemina's suggestion that l. 4215 implies the existence in Beroul's source of the ordeal by the red-hot iron is hardly justified.' Delbouille presents a view diametrically opposed to that of Kelemina but which does not correspond to that of Ewert. He makes the tentative claim: 'Et n'est-ce pas aussi des vers 3244

---

38. Ewert, Volume II, p. 253. Ewert alludes to the following statement by Kelemina: 'Isolde fragt, ob man noch eine andere Probe von ihr verlangt oder ob der Schwur allein genügt: in Betracht käme (3250) die Probe mit dem glühenden Eisen, allein die Versammlung entscheidet, dass durch den Eid Isoldens der Gerechtigkeit Genüge getan sei. Man kann aus diesen Bemerkungen schliessen, dass in der Quelle des Fortsetzers wie in Thomas auch die Eisenprobe vorkam und dass der Erzähler sie fortliess' (Geschichte der..., p. 96).

et s., 4215 et s. de Béroul...que Thomas tiendrait l'idée de soumettre Iseut à l'épreuve du fer rouge?'[39] Frappier would agree with Delbouille and Ewert in claiming that the ordeal was an addition by Thomas, but does not at all imply that Thomas drew directly on B. He writes: 'Contrairement à ce qu'on a pu quelquefois supposer, ce n'est pas Béroul qui a tronqué l'épreuve d'Iseut en supprimant l'ordalie, c'est Thomas qui a voulu compléter le serment par l'ordalie.'[40] Newstead takes a far wider view of the problem. She does not seem, unlike Kelemina, to have a common source for B and T in mind, but believes rather that the absence of an ordeal springs from the fusion of two traditions. Her claim is this:

> Béroul's episode preserves the distinctive features of the Welsh Trystan tradition —Arthur's role as judge and the verbal equivocation that saves Essylt for her lover. When this Celtic tradition reached the Continent, it may have been the latter feature that drew the Oriental story of the ambiguous oath into the Tristan legend. In any case, the Oriental tale is modified to fit the Celtic framework, since the ordeal that confirms the ambiguous oath is omitted to enable Arthur to play his traditional role.[41]

Newstead immediately goes on to mention the second major difference between T and B, that is the presence of Arthur in B and his absence in T, and she links the two major differences: 'In Thomas's romance, Arthur is a king who lived at an earlier time than the protagonists of the Tristan story; hence, since he does not appear as a character, the episode of the oath ends with the customary climax of the successful ordeal.'[42] Newstead implies an equivalence between Arthur and the ordeal, but one must point out that in the courtly version a figure similar to Arthur appears, namely the Bishop of the Thames.[43] This is how Mölk describes the

---

39. CCM, V, p. 423.
40. CCM, VI, p. 452.
41. 'The Equivocal Oath...', p. 1084.
42. 'The Equivocal Oath...', p. 1084.
43. Blakey also contests Newstead's interpretation of Arthur's role in B ('Truth and Falsehood...', p. 24, note 13).

Bishop's role: 'Auf der Ratsversammlung, die vor dem Gerichtstag stattfindet, hält der "bischof von Thamise" (Gottfried V. 15348) eine respektheischende Rede, die, wie wir sofort merken, dieselbe Aufgabe hat wie die Rüge Artus' bei Berol, nämlich Marks Isolde gegenüber zu tadeln.'[44] And certainly, as we see from ll. 15424-68 of G, the bishop supports Iseut and attacks King Mark. In E, an unnamed bishop figures, but he does not have the role of the bishop in G.[45] But in S (chapter LVI), the bishop, although unnamed once again, has many attributes comparable to those of Gottfried's bischof von Thamise.

If tentative conclusions may be offered following this study of the major differences between T and B, one may start by pointing out that the absence of Arthur is inevitable in T, but that one hesitates to suggest that the bishop is meant to replace him. Nor is the ordeal really a replacement for Arthur, for it seems suspiciously like an addition to the story. But, addition or not, the ordeal is in T and obviously its inclusion gives a different complexion to events in T than does the presence of Arthur, the guarantor of the oath, to events in B. If we take ll. 4215-6 at their face-value, an ordeal is certainly one of the possibilities one might envisage in B. At the close of her oath, Iseut offers to do something more, presumably to submit herself to an ordeal. But those present, believing that Iseut has already gone far beyond the minimum required of her, decide that she need take no further action.

---

44. GRM, XII, pp. 100-1.
45. E, stanza CCIII, ll. 2228-31. For an interpretation of the bishop's role in E, see York, Exrl. XXV, 76.

This is surely the response that the queen's apparent offer of an ordeal was calculated to elicit. The superficial result of events in both versions is the same: Iseut is cleared and Mark is convinced of her innocence. But the meaning of the versions, one with an ordeal, one without, presents no such similarity.

Disregarding the outward forms of ecclesiastical justice, one must ask the basic question: what is the role of God in B? Frappier has sought to describe the effects of Iseut's oath:

> Son serment permet deux fois une double lecture, et par son ambiguïté, et suivant qu'il s'adresse à la terre ou au Ciel. Il n'est frauduleux, sans être inexact, qu'à l'intention des hommes. Cela dit, il est bien évident que le serment purgatoire implique aussi le silence de Dieu. La sentence du Ciel demeure une inconnue.[46]

Certainly Iseut has deliberately striven after ambiguity, but Frappier resolutely refuses, just as he had done in connection with other scenes, to charge the queen with insincerity:

> En raison du philtre et de sa fatalité, n'est-elle pas convaincue que Dieu la jugera selon une justice impossible ici-bas et que déjà il l'a miraculeusement protégée? Il faut opter pour cette sincérité d'Iseut, sans quoi il manque une clé de voûte à la structure de la version commune dès lors menacée de s'effondrer dérisoirement.[47]

Frappier's arguments are on the whole persuasive, but one needs to suggest that God's silence may not mean that his verdict 'demeure une inconnue'. By remaining silent God has accepted Hilary's case for the necessity of lying and has above all allowed Iseut's innocence to be publicly established, when, had he so desired, he could have intervened and produced exactly the opposite result. But what Frappier's statements quite rightly indicate is that Béroul has

---

46. CCM, VI, pp. 450-1.
47. CCM, VI, p. 450.

tried to come to terms with a sophisticated religious problem.[48]

Turning to T, one finds a rather different picture. It will be remembered that, following the oath, Iseut takes up the hot iron and emerges unscathed. Whereas in B Iseut's 'innocence' is merely implied, in T God does not remain silent, for the queen's success is tantamount to an open pronouncement in her favour. What is Thomas's intention? Once again Frappier makes a powerful point:

> Cette raison n'est autre à coup sûr que la volonté de magnifier la fine amor. Dieu lui-même est compromis: il prend parti pour les amants...Iseut a porté sans trembler le fer brûlant, parce qu'elle portait avec lui son amour. Et Dieu, par delà le bien et le mal, a proclamé l'innocence d'Iseut, comme s'il ratifiait la religion de l'amour.[49]

At this point in the story Gottfried von Strassburg intervenes and makes his own comment on events.[50] Frappier sees Gottfried as finally realizing that the story he was adapting was basically immoral and wishing to absolve himself from all responsibility: 'La célèbre protestation de Gottfried signifie éloquemment qu'il entend laisser à son modèle anglo-normand la responsabilité du blasphème.'[51] But perhaps the outburst is not so serious as all that. Hatto sees the passage more as an aside than as a self-righteous protest:

> There is no compelling reason to regard this passage in its context as blasphemous, or heretical or demoniac, or indeed as anything more sensational than the utterance of an intelligent and alert man who was indifferent enough in religious matters to be critical of pious excess among the ignorant.[52]

Certainly one would have thought that Gottfried was being essentially ironical, making it clear that he saw the serious implications of Thomas's account and pointing them out.

---

48. Not all critics would agree that this is so. Jonin, mistakenly one feels, fails to see any mature view of religion in the poem: 'La religion que nous trouvons dans Béroul est toute superficielle et ne permet pas de parler de foi. Elle n'inspire aucune action, n'enrichit aucun épisode de valeur symbolique assurée' (Les Personnages féminins..., p. 372).
49. CCM, VI, p. 453.
50. G 15733-55. Gottfried's commentary is discussed by Combridge in Das Recht im 'Tristan'..., pp. 100-13.
51. CCM, VI, p. 453.
52. Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan, p. 20. See also Combridge, Das Recht im 'Tristan'..., p. 112.

A whole series of events is now at an end. From l. 3028 Iseut has been largely directing the events which have led up to her escondit, just as, from l. 2133 onwards, Tristan controlled the events which led up to his offer of an escondit. These two sequences do in fact contain a number of textual similarities. Arthur's words in ll. 4175-8 bear some resemblance to the speech in ll. 2223-35, and in l. 3436 the site for Iseut's trial is named as the Gué Aventuros, the place where Tristan returned the queen to Mark and where he pronounced his own declaration of innocence (see especially ll. 2677 and 2747).

Tristan's offer of an escondit is found only in B, Iseut's escondit is not found in O, but only in B and T. It is possible that Iseut's escondit was drawn from an episodic poem and incorporated at an early date into other material.[53] Was the sequence which contains Tristan's offer of an escondit, from l. 2133 onwards, refashioned by Béroul so that it became a parallel development to the sequence in ll. 3028-4266? Delbouille seems inclined to believe that an episodic poem was simply inserted by Béroul and that this extraneous material has now been exhausted:

> Si, d'autre part, les v. 4267/70 du ms. 2171 reprennent bien le modèle français des v. 4981/82 d'Eilhart, fort semblables, il faudrait penser que Béroul abandonnait là la matière du poème épisodique...Aussitôt après commencerait donc, chez Béroul, un développement nouveau destiné à dire le châtiment des traîtres remis en cause par le début du'serment ambigu'.[54]

The source of Iseut's escondit may well have been an episodic poem, but it seems important to insist that the inclusion of this material

---

53. Of course, the possibility that Eilhart cut out the scenes of Tristan's escondit certainly ought to be borne in mind. Frappier discusses the problem at some length (CCM, VI, p. 446 and note 129).
54. CCM, V, p. 421.

has apparently been accompanied by some refashioning of the content of earlier, inherited scenes. Eilhart's poem has neither Tristan's request for an escondit nor Iseut's escondit, Thomas's has Iseut's escondit, only Béroul's poem has both. The balance which is achieved must surely be deliberate.

24: THE DEATHS OF DENOALEN AND GODOINE

This, the final episode in the fragment, runs from l. 4267 to l. 4485. Ewert sees this new series of events as the beginning of the sixth section of the romance to which he gives the title 'Revenge'.[1] The idea of revenge has certainly been encountered before in other episodes of Béroul's version and so its atmosphere has a certain familiarity, but the episode itself is one which has no exact parallels elsewhere in any other of the Tristan stories. All the derivatives of T agree in following the ordeal of Iseut with the Petitcrû scenes:[2] Béroul continues his romance in a very different way.

Ewert splits the episode into three parts. The first part would run up to l. 4344, the second from l. 4345 to l. 4409[3] and the third from l. 4410 to the end.

In the first part of the episode the three barons are once more involved in a new crisis which appears to threaten Tristan and Iseut. This time the felons do not provoke the crisis directly, for the figure of a spy intervenes:

> Mais, qui q'ait pais, li troi felon
> Sont en esgart de traison.
> A eus fu venue une espie,
> Qui va querant changier sa vie. (ll. 4271-4)

---

1. Ewert, Volume II, p. 254.
2. See S, chapter LXI, p. 74 - chapter LXIV, p. 79, E, stanza CCIX, l. 2293 - stanza CCXXII, l. 2435, G, ll. 15765-16402, T.r., pp. 241-4 and Fo, ll. 757-62.
3. Ewert's second part ends at l. 4410 (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 256-7).

The spy promises, naturally in return for a reward, to show Tristan on his way to visit Iseut:

> De moi faciez en un feu cendre,
> Se vos alez a la fenestre
> De la chanbre, dorier' a destre,
> Se n'i veez Tristran venir,
> S'espee çainte, un arc tenir,
> Deus seetes en l'autre main;
> Enuit verrez venir, par main.'[4]

After the spy's initial pronouncement, there follows dialogue between the spy and the three barons, presented in broken lines, ll. 4295-4312. The spy has his eye on a possible reward and is, therefore, less than eager to reveal too much information, fearing that once the three barons possess the information they will consider him superfluous. In l. 4284, the spy was careful not to divulge the hiding-place of Tristan and he gives nothing away at l. 4301 in answer to the barons' eager question as to whether Dinas is harbouring Tristan and Governal.[5] Of course, ll. 4300-1 may not necessarily refer to Tristan and Governal, but to Tristan and Iseut, the true centres of interest for the three barons.[6] The spy is intent upon a reward, as ll. 4306-10 show, but the whole of this part of the dialogue is again not altogether clear. The attribution of ll. 4309-10 is doubtful. In Ewert and M[4], both the lines are attributed to the barons, but Tanquerey holds that l. 4309, and probably l. 4310 as well, form part of the spy's reply.[7] Tanquerey's view corresponds in fact to that held by Muret in his earliest editions. A later correction by

---

4. B 4288-94. Line 4293 vaguely recalls l. 1283, 'Et deus seetes enpeno[c]s'.
5. As first suggested by Muret in his SATF edition (p. 133, note), demas is a possible reading of the last word of l. 4301. But the apparent abbreviation mark on the d is almost certainly a misplaced accent, intended to distinguish the i from the following n.
6. But Ewert claims that 'the further questions of the barons (4300-3) can hardly apply to anyone but Tristran and Governal' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 254).
7. Med. aev., X, p. 115.

Muret, retained in M^4, was the emendation nos for the vos of the manuscript in l. 4310.[8] As if to confirm the problematical nature of the lines by introducing yet another possibility, Reid suggests that ll. 4309-10 may have been interverted by the scribe.[9] However, interversion would not seem to solve a great deal. If l. 4309 were attributed to the spy and ll. 4310-12 to the barons, the correction nos could certainly be justified. This much is certain: whilst the spy is keen to gain a reward, the three barons are intent on obtaining information, eager for their suspicions to be confirmed. This is perhaps why the name of Dinas is introduced. As an ally of the lovers, he is the barons' logical enemy, but the spy is once again careful not to give anything away.[10] Despite the editorial problems involved, Ewert's judgment on ll. 4298-4303, 'little more than irrelevant embellishment',[11] is somewhat unappreciative: in these rapid exchanges Béroul puts on the stage a nice interplay of mistrust and self-interested curiosity.

It is only when he is promised his price and more that the spy reveals the queen's whereabouts and briefs the felons as to the lie of the land (ll. 4313-33). He gives them directions concerning how best to approach the queen's room and draw back the curtain. The barons confirm their promise to the spy, and this part of the episode closes on a note of common accord: Godoïne is to go and reconnoitre at the earliest possible moment.

---

8. 'C'est en général celui qui promet, menace, ou annonce une intention qui demande à Dieu de ne pas l'aider dans le cas où il serait défaillant' (M^4, p. 150).
9. 'On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., p. 145.
10. When Muret firmly asserts that Tristan is now hidden with Dinas (M^0, p. XXIII), he is surely going beyond what the text actually says.
11. Ewert, Volume II, p. 254.

The central part of the episode runs from l. 4345 to l. 4409, and, although relatively straightforward, it still contains a number of peculiarities. The queen, so we learn, has summoned Tristan 'Par Perinis, un suen prochain'. In this line, 4347, it seems rather strange to find the queen's squire, a familiar figure carrying out a familiar role, designated as 'un suen prochain'. Mark will be absent, so it is said, at Saint Lubin. Perhaps one should avoid laying too much importance on this place-name, found at the rhyme, in any attempt to establish the provenance of the text.[12]

In the events that follow, Tristan, on his way to the queen, sees Godoïne coming. Line 4357, 'Et s'en venoit de son recet', is tacked on rather awkwardly. It could refer to Godoïne but almost certainly it is Tristan who is coming from his hiding-place: the line sums up his general activity at this point before concentrating on the particular. He prepares to strike, but Godoïne takes a different path. Tristan is naturally disappointed, but not for long, for Denoalen now puts in a rather unexpected appearance. Surely we have the impression so far that events are taking place somewhere in the vicinity of the queen's chamber and one must be surprised to see Denoalen here as well! Or, alternatively, if this is a false impression, the encounter with Denoalen and Godoïne, so far from the

---

12. In M° (p. 199), Muret points to the frequency of the name in the diocese of Chartres. But Saint Lubin may be the kind of word described by West: 'It should be remembered, however, that the appearance in a text of a name is no certain guarantee that this name has any relevance to the story. This is especially true of place names: a poet striving to give emphasis to a turn of phrase, or to create an effective expression, will suddenly introduce a particular name, the selection of which seems to have been determined largely by the demands of rhyme' (An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances, p. xiii). Rhyme may well have been the factor which determined the description of Perinis in l. 4347 (see ll. 4189-90). Nevertheless, with St Hilary still in mind, it is worth recalling that Lubin, who became bishop of Chartres, was reputedly born near Poitiers!

main seat of action, is highly coincidental. The poet, in fact, stresses the swiftness of events; Denoalen appears almost as Godoïne disappears.[13] Of course, Denoalen is not around for too long either, for he is swiftly decapitated by Tristan, an act described by Muret as 'peu chevaleresque'.[14] One might, indeed, quite reasonably entertain the notion that Tristan's killing of an enemy in such a brutal fashion is not quite proper. Tristan briefly expresses disappointment at Godoïne's sudden disappearance, covers up the body and reaches Iseut's room.

Godoïne, in fact, is already in position: he has followed the spy's instructions and has drawn back the curtain. As was previously the case with regard to Perinis, one may feel that Brengain is rather strangely described in l. 4417, for a very familiar figure is referred to as la damoisele. Perhaps, once again, rhyme has dictated a description. Line 4419, furthermore, seems a singularly desperate line. Tristan's appearance is portrayed almost exactly as anticipated in the spy's report in ll. 4292-3: only the scalp is unexpected. Iseut rises to greet Tristan and, in doing so, she sees the hazy outline of Godoïne's head. When Tristan shows the queen the scalp, she pretends indifference (contrast ll. 1745-6), her mind now upon quite other things. She thinks aloud:

> 'Sire,' fait ele, 'ge q'en puis?
> Mes prié vos que cest arc tendez,
> Et verron com il est bendez.' (ll. 4438-40)

---

13. The subject of l. 4370 is presumably Denoalen. Mölk either understands the line differently or neatly side-steps the problem: 'Tristan schaute in die Ferne, da sah er —es dauerte nicht lange—, wie Denoalen herbeiritt mit zwei erstaunlich grossen Jagdhunden' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 211).
14. M°, p. LXVIII.

Tristan is obviously aware that something is wrong and ll. 4441-2 note his perplexity:

> Tristran l'estent, si s'apensa,
> Oiez! en son penser tensa.

At l. 4441, the Muret editions and M^4 modify the MS reading sestent and print s'esteut. Ewert defends his version: 'Against Muret's s'esteut, one might object that the MS reads sestent and that nowhere else does the form esteut occur. Tristran tests the bow by stretching it, temporizes (in order not to alarm Godoïne), and then stretches the bow again (4443).'[15] This is not the only possibility. Perhaps the scribe's copy read l'entent: he began to write s'esteut or, more probably, s'estut, realized his mistake and finished the word correctly, but failed to emend the beginning. At l. 4441, Tristan does not seem to be temporizing in the manner Ewert suggests, for he is surely not yet aware of the cause of Iseut's evident concern. The lacuna at l. 4446 probably introduced Iseut's unspoken thoughts, amplified in ll. 4447-51. Iseut then returns to her plea of ll. 4439-40, adding that he should fit an arrow. Only in l. 4455 does Tristan become certain that she has actually seen something and only in l. 4462 does he locate the specific source of her distress, when he himself sees the head of Godoïne outlined against the light.[16] Whilst Iseut does not identify the owner of the profile, Tristan presumes correctly in l. 4466 that it is Godoïne, whom he has encountered already, who is outside. In the early stages of the action, Tristan appears to be automatically following Iseut's instructions. He

---

15. Ewert, Volume II, p. 259. (See also 'On the Text of ...', p. 92)
16. There should surely be a full stop after l. 4460: this is apparently omitted in some later printings of Ewert's edition.

certainly bends his bow in l. 4443, but, one suspects, not before and consequently one hesitates to accept Ewert's emendation at l. 4441. The fragment closes with the swift, but rather gruesome death of Godoïne whose eye is pierced by the arrow finally released from Tristan's bow.[17] It has been argued by Bennett that Béroul may have been inspired by a detail in Aelred's Vita Sancti Edwardi Regis et Confessoris to inflict this particular kind of death upon Godoïne.[18] It will also be recalled that Ménage suggested that the 'prophetic passage' was in fact directly predicting events in this episode;[19] certainly with the deaths of Godoïne and Denoalen at least a part of the 'prophetic passage' has been proved correct:

> Li dui en furent mort d'espees,
> Li tierz d'une seete ocis,
> A duel morurent el païs.[20]

From this summary of events a point made at the beginning may have become clearer. This sequence of events has no direct parallel in any other version and yet a number of details in the episode are reminiscent of incidents elsewhere in the romance. It has already been suggested when the riche baron episode was being discussed that this final episode in B is partly a repetition of the earlier episode. It is obviously not unknown for material primarily associated with one episode to crop up in another, the classic case being, of course, the verger scene of Thomas. The Anglo-Norman poet needed to achieve the separation of the lovers and the way in which he attained his aim has been described by Fourrier:

---

17. Frappier plausibly suggests that at l. 4473, as at ll. 3928, 2701 and perhaps 612, sovent means, if we retain it 'beaucoup, fortement, longuement' (Rom., LXXXIII, p. 257, note 2). From Ewert's note to l. 4441, it would not appear that he shares this view but prefers the meaning 'often' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 259).
18. Med. Rev., XLII, pp. 133-40.
19. Rom., LXV, pp. 148-50.
20. B 2756-8. In connection with the death of Denoalen, one might also consider l. 2824 and ll. 3096-8.

Il invente la scène du Verger. Ce n'est pas un chef-d'oeuvre, c'est un 'doublet' qui ramène l'intrigue au point où, dans la version commune, elle se trouve au moment de la Fleur de Farine, mais sans la vigoureuse progression dramatique à laquelle elle y donne naissance. Il faut toutefois reconnaître que, de cet imbroglio où il s'est volontairement embarrassé, notre auteur a su se tirer aussi bien qu'il pouvait. Son récit est manifestement une combinaison d'éléments empruntés à divers épisodes du modèle.[21]

Can a similar process of creation be detected in the case of this episode in B?

Certain features of the episode may have been inspired by the Tryst under the Tree episode. Iseut's problem in the closing lines of B is to make Tristan aware of the presence of an intruder, the same problem with which she thought she was faced in the first lines of the fragment. As in the opening scene (l. 351), it is an outline shape which gives the intruder away:

> Par sa fenestre vit la nue
> De la teste de Gondoïne. (ll. 4428-9)

The site of Iseut's room in this final episode also seems vaguely familiar:

> 'Et un petit pertus overt
> Endroit la chambre la roïne:
> Par dedevant vet la cortine.
> Triés la chambre est grant la doiz
> Et bien esgesse li jagloiz.[22]

Ewert dismisses a possible further link between the first and the last episodes of the fragment when he writes: 'The doiz can hardly be the stream down which Tristran sent the chips.'[23] If doiz is the correct reading (and the textual problems of the next line indicate the need for caution), the stream is certainly not flowing through

---

21. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 88. For a different view as to the provenance of the verger episode, see Ranke, 'Isoldes Gottesurteil', pp. 89-91.
22. B 4314-8. Because of the rhyme, the lacuna after l. 4313 postulated by Ewert and Muret seems dubious and l. 4314 may certainly be in need of correction. Reid would print espés li jagloiz in l. 4318 ('The 'Tristrand'...', pp. 146-7). In view of the problems of interpretation presented by esgesse, emendation seems preferable.
23. Ewert, Volume II, p. 256.

the room, as is the case in C,[24] and other details of the geographical setting of the first scene are not reproduced here. But one hesitates to reject altogether the possibility that the stream in the Tryst under the Tree episode inspired the inclusion of a stream here.

There is no doubt, however, that one is on surer ground when one suggests the possible influence of the fleur de farine episode upon this final scene. The last scene in B, after the close of the trial scene, introduces a new sequence of events and, looking at the fragment, one can see other new beginnings, at l. 581 and at l. 3028. The final episode shares one major feature with both these previous departures, for the three felons are once more actively involved.[25] But, overall, the final episode would seem to be rather closer to the fleur de farine story.

In ll. 494-8 of the fleur de farine episode, it is reported that the lovers meet when the king goes off to hunt. In the final episode (ll. 4285-7), the spy makes a similar claim:

> Tristran set molt de Malportis:
> Qant li rois vait a ses deduis,
> En la chanbre vet congié prendre.

Leaving aside the question of whether ll. 4285-6 were really interverted by the scribe, one is somewhat surprised by the term congié prendre in l. 4287. Is it simply a delicate euphemism? In M[4] (p. 150), as in the Muret editions, it is tentatively suggested that congié should

---

24. See ll. 3343 and 3354.
25. Vàrvaro notes a certain stylistic similarity between ll. 3024-34 and ll. 4262-73 (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., pp. 39-40).

be corrected to son gré and Reid proposes son sez or ses sez.[26] Is it at all possible that the influence of the fleur de farine episode can be detected here? In that episode Tristan certainly wishes to take his leave of Iseut before travelling to Carlisle. With regard to the spy in this final scene, he shares at least one attribute with the dwarf. The spy professes a willingness to be punished if proved wrong (l. 4288, l. 4332), as did Frocin in ll. 661-4. Certain other textual similarities between the two episodes may be significant, ll. 4343 and 672 being a case in point, and Vàrvaro has drawn attention to the use of l'autrier in both l. 4277 and l. 590.[27] Obviously there are differences between the two episodes. In the earlier scene the barons, through their own initiative, came to know of the lovers' meeting, while in the later scene the spy approaches the barons and passes on the information. Again, in the final scene, the barons do not approach the king at once but seek confirmation first of all: their estrangement from Mark as a result of the escondit sequence may partly justify this. Yet, in spite of these differences, one must conclude that events are set in train by a roughly similar process. Indeed, a proportion of the differences may be deliberate: the poet draws on a previous episode and purposely introduces variation. The degree of variation could well confirm the influence of the fleur de farine episode upon the final episode rather than disprove it.

The Separating Sword incident seems to be another episode which has contributed material to these closing scenes. The forester is

---

26. The 'Tristran'..., pp. 143-4.
27. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., pp. 60-1.

referred to as an espie in ll. 1930, 1961 and 1975. He tells King Mark of the lovers' whereabouts just as the spy passes on information to the barons, and his desire for gain (ll. 1856-62) is matched by the spy's evident greed (l. 4274, ll. 4306-12). Vàrvaro sees a further similarity between these two episodes in ll. 1835-9 and ll. 4348-56: 'Il verso "Oez, seignors, quel aventure!" ritorna ancora una seconda volta, identico e in situazione simile, nell'ultimo episodio, di cui già lo svolgimento è avanzato ma solo ora comincia la parte decisiva.'[28]

But obviously it is the central part of the final episode, the killing of Denoalen, which has the most evident similarity with events elsewhere, namely with the death of the riche baron. Critics have widely acknowledged this similarity. Schoepperle, for example, discusses the incident in which Governal decapitates the baron and goes on to write:

> In the continuation of Béroul there is an incident very similar to the one we have just discussed. The similarity is especially striking from the fact that the continuator is apparently oblivious of the fact that the personage whose death he is relating has already been beheaded in the earlier portion of the romance.[29]

Ewert has also briefly noted the similarity between incidents.[30]

The details found in both episodes may be usefully listed again. At l. 4369 Tristan sees the enemy coming from afar, just as Governal espies his enemy in the distance in ll. 1685-9.[31] In both cases the enemy is hunting with dogs (l. 1679 and l. 4372). In the first episode the anonymous baron is pursuing a stag, in the second Denoalen's dogs are about to start a wild boar. In both episodes, at

---

28. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 80.
29. Tristan and Isolt, pp. 318-9.
30. Ewert, Volume II, p. 257.
31. Note also l. 1686, En une lande, and l. 4404, Enmié la lande.

l. 1694 and l. 4373, the assassin hides behind a tree, and in both episodes the death of the enemy is anticipated:

> Governal s'acoste a un arbre,
> Enbuschiez est, celui atent
> Qui trop vient tost et fuira lent. (ll. 1694-6)
>
> Ainz qu'il le puisen[t] desangler,
> Avra lor mestre tel colee
> Que ja par mire n'ert sanee. (ll. 4378-80)

Both victims are decapitated (l. 1711 and l. 4388): Tristan's modus operandi is more refined only in that he is content with bearing off the tresses, while Governal prefers to have the whole head as a trophy. It is thus easy to agree with Vàrvaro's claim that the deaths in ll. 1708-11 and ll. 4381-90, and also the death of Godoïne in ll. 4474-85, have a definite similarity.[32] Obviously the final episode offers a degree of variation. One expects, first of all, not the death of Denoalen, but the death of Godoïne. But this degree of variation, the contrived anti-climax, may once more be instrumental in confirming the influence of an earlier episode rather than in casting doubt upon it.

It has also been suggested that certain details in the final episode are parallelled in episodes not in E but in other versions of the story. Some details relevant to the site of the queen's chamber and to the means of access have provoked comment, especially the detail in l. 4320, 'Par la fraite du nuef jardin'.[33] A similar, if far from identical feature, a loose or broken board, appears in the Mariadoc episode which is found only in T. The accounts in S (chapter LI) and E (stanza CLXXVI, ll. 1933-4) have the detail, even

---

32. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., pp. 179-80.
33. See Muret, Rom., XVI, p. 312, M°, p. XXIII, Kelemina, Geschichte der..., p. 97.

if it is absent from the account in G (ll. 13451-13673). If we accept the existence of a parallel, even though the feature in B seems something of a commonplace,[34] what conclusion may we draw from the appearance of this feature in both the final episode in B and in the Mariadoc episode in T? The feature in l. 4320 of B, associated as it is with the doiz of l. 4317, must bring to mind the Tryst under the Tree episode of B, even though there are no direct parallels in the surviving fragment. When Thomas created the Mariadoc episode, in describing the environs of the queen's bedchamber, he may have drawn on material normally associated with the tryst episode, even though none of the surviving derivative accounts of the tryst mention the loose board. Béroul, in creating the final episode of the fragment, may similarly have drawn on material normally associated with the tryst and introduced both the stream and the opening in the enclosure. We must surely resist the attractively simple conclusion that B drew directly on T.

Mergell has ingeniously found other parallels in other versions. He writes: 'So selbständig die letzte Szene des französischen Bruchstücks innerhalb der Tristanüberlieferung sich ausnimmt: auch sie beruht auf der Estoire, die, nach Eilhards Zeugnis, die Liebenden bei ihrem letzten Zusammensein durch zwei kemmerêre (Eilh. 8945) entdeckt werden lässt.'[35] But Mergell is surely exaggerating the degree of similarity between the scene in B and this and the following incidents in O. He has to admit in due course: 'Mit dieser durch Eilhard für die Estoire bezeugten Episode hat Béroul die Szene von

---

34. See T.-L., III, 2194-5.
35. Tristan und Isolde..., p. 86.

Tristans kunstvollem Schiessen auf eigentümliche Weise verschmolzen.'[36] But he goes on to find another source for the last episode in B, in the Douce fragment of T, for he believes that ll. 777-834, the killing by Tristan and Kaherdin of two knights, influenced the passage in B.[37] Again, it seems a trifle over-ambitious to attempt to link these episodes. It has also been claimed that one incident portrayed on the cup in L'Escoufle (ll. 610-16), the death of the dwarf at the hand of Tristan, is related to events here. Kelemina suggested that Béroul was telling a story about Godoïne which was originally, perhaps even in the estoire, told about the dwarf.[38] There are elements of similarity, one must admit, but perhaps a more plausible conclusion is that Jean Renart was alluding to a now lost Tristan story, if he was in fact drawing upon one particular source at all.

The final episode in B has also been linked with the ending of the story in R.[39] Schoepperle expresses her views thus: 'In some earlier version of Tristan, this incident in the continuation of Béroul may have been a prelude to the tragic ending preserved, with characteristic modifications, in the late and courtly version of the Prose Romance.'[40] There are some similarities, of course, for events in R do take place en chanbrez la roine.[41] But in B, is the whole episode about to change its nature? Are the lovers to enjoy their

---

36. Tristan und Isolde..., p. 86. Mergell is surely wrong to assume, as he does on p. 87, that events are taking place in Dinas's castle.
37. Tristan und Isolde..., p. 113 and note 7. It will be remembered that this passage in T was mentioned, with far less enthusiasm than is mustered here by Mergell, as possibly related to the tournament scene in B.
38. Geschichte der..., p. 164. See also Sudre, Rom., XV, p. 541.
39. See Löseth, § 546. Line 4301 has inspired Ewert to suggest another parallel between R and B (Ewert, Volume II, p. 255), but, from the account given by Löseth on p. 205, it appears that while Tristan certainly meets Iseut in Dinas's castle, he has not actually found refuge there. The detail might easily be termed a commonplace of R. One might add that the events recounted by Löseth, before the initial discovery of the lovers and before the beginning of the enchennes parties proper (§ 49, pp. 40-1), bear some similarity to the story in B.
40. Tristan and Isolt, p. 441.
41. See Murrell, PMLA, XLIII, p. 370.

revenge for such a short time?

The last episode in the romance certainly bears some resemblance to a number of incidents related in other versions, but from this review we can surely see that the most similar incidents are to be found in B itself, in the riche baron episode and in the other episodes already mentioned. In any attempt to suggest how the final episode arose, it seems that one must ultimately concentrate on B itself. One may suggest that the final episode is made up of elements from earlier parts of the romance, particularly the riche baron episode, but that a degree of variation has been deliberately introduced. Perhaps, after the riche baron episode had been inspired by a story similar to that told in the Husdent episode in O, the death of Denoalen was created by drawing on the riche baron events and the rest of the episode partially created by adding elements from elsewhere. One hesitates to see Denoalen's demise simply as a second version of the riche baron episode, as Schoepperle would seem to claim in a passage already quoted, even though Muret takes a similar view: 'En revanche, les circonstances de la mort de Denoalen (4353-4412) et du baron tué par Governal en Morrois sont si semblables qu'on est tenté d'y reconnaître des variantes d'un même récit primitif.'[42] It would be tempting to see the death of Denoalen in B as a variant story which could replace the earlier episode, but there are grounds for rejecting this easy answer. So close are the similarities that it does appear that use has been directly made of the riche baron episode rather than of the source story as told in O. If one accepts the order of episodes in the romance as representing

---

42. M°, p. XXIV.

the order of composition, in the central part of the final episode —the actual killing of Denoalen— the poet has drawn far more heavily on a pre-existing episode than he has in other parts; his debt to the tryst, fleur de farine and Separating Sword episodes is far less apparent. As part of his general theory regarding the development of the Tristan legend, Bédier had seen many 'independent' episodes as reworkings of the archetype or as developments which had their 'point d'attache' in a story of the archetype:

> Or, si l'on considère l'un après l'autre chacun des épisodes relatés par une seule version, et rejetés de ce chef dans nos tables de divergences, il apparaît que chacun d'eux n'est rien qu'un remaniement du récit de l'archétype, ou bien une invention tardive qui prend son point d'attache dans un récit de l'archétype.[43]

Perhaps one may extend Bédier's theory to justify the theory of provenance already formulated. Is it possible that the central part of the final episode in B represents a reworking of an episode not in the archetype but in B itself and that other parts have their 'point d'attache' elsewhere in the romance?

No one would claim that the final episode in the fragment is a complete success. Several unsatisfactory details have already been mentioned, including the unexpected appearance of Denoalen at l. 4371: once Godoïne had been chosen one surely presumed that the others would be eclipsed. The barons express little surprise when the spy informs them that Tristan is lurking in the area, at a time when he is generally believed to be in exile, and Perinis, it has already been noted, is described in a rather surprising manner at l. 4347. Ewert,

---

43. Bédier, Volume II, p. 312.

for his part, points out at some length that the poet fails to distinguish consistently between fenestre, pertus and pertuset.[44] If the emendation at l. 4314 is accepted, the scribe would seem to have shared some of the modern critic's confusion!

Compiling a list of the defects in an episode is not altogether a fruitless exercise if it serves to remind one of where the author's interest really lay. Thomas's verger episode, an episode perhaps created in the manner of the last episode in B, also has its obvious defects. Why does Tristan flee and not stay to help Iseut? What happens to the dwarf? But the lapses in the scene serve to indicate the author's purpose. Tristan must abandon Iseut in the verger episode, however improbable this may seem, because the scene is expressly designed to bring about the separation of the lovers. The final episode in B has as its central theme the idea of revenge, obviously a theme regularly encountered already. Whole episodes such as the Horse's Ears episode and the riche baron episode, Tristan's esbaudie and perhaps the scene in which the barons wallowed in the mud, seemed motivated by a desire to show the lovers triumphing over their enemies. In this episode, the theme is once more prominent:

> 'Se Dex me gart,' fait il, au suen,
> Vez les trecos Denoalen;
> Ge t'ai de lui pris la venjance,
> Jamais par lui escu ne lance
> N'iert achatez ne mis en pris.' (ll. 4433-7)
>
> Dex, qui le tuen saintisme cors
> Por le pueple mes a mort,
> Lai moi venjance avoir du tort
> Que cil felon muevent vers moi!' (ll. 4468-71)

---

44. Ewert, Volume II, pp. 254-5. See also M[4], p. 150.

Denoalen's appearance, immediately after Godoïne has unconsciously avoided Tristan, may be surprising. But when Tristan kills him, one realizes that it is the gaining of revenge through the elimination of the felons which is the real raison d'être of the episode.

The final episode represents a new departure, but there is still a precise connection made, in ll. 4277-9, with previous events and Vàrvaro, for one, feels there is a strong link between the trial scene and Tristan's revenge:

> Ragioni passionali e ragioni giuridiche coincidono e ciò, mentre esclude una ulteriore possibilità di azione dei tre, che divengono così inutili al racconto, li condanna alla punizione da gran tempo attesa. Subito dopo infatti sapranno di nuovo di aver ragione ma la vendetta di Tristran li abatterà uno dopo l'altro, certamente anche Guenelon, prima di poter riprendere la loro azione.[45]

Perhaps, because the barons are transgressing the command of Arthur in ll. 4237-40, punishment is felt to be even more justified? Vàrvaro is surely right to assume that Guenelon also would soon meet his death. Perhaps he is as the worst saved till the last: in l. 3462 he was called li plus coverz.

How did the complete work continue? It is possible that the exchange of tokens when Iseut was returned to Mark indicates that Béroul's complete romance had the series of returns to Cornwall familiar from O. Does the text that survives provide evidence for a second Iseut? Ewert tentatively suggests that it does: 'Note that in l. 1546 she is described as a la crine bloie: as this designation is used to distinguish the first from the second Iseut (aux blanches mains), it might seem to support the view that Iseut

---

45. Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 157.

of the White Hands figured in the lost conclusion of Beroul's romance.'[46] One might point out that at l. 4426 Iseut is referred to as la bele o les crins sors. In both cases, rhyme, rather than the resonance of the epithet, seems to have determined the choice of words.

Some critics, Ferrante, for example,[47] believe that in B we find a shift of emphasis to the idea of vengeance and that it is unlikely, therefore, that Béroul told the whole story. But can we be sure that the shift of emphasis was a permanent phenomenon? We are concerned with a fragment only, and in the extant fragment the theme may have a prominence it did not have in the complete work. But Curtis also sees Béroul as taking an independent line and suggests that the complete romance may not have had the Liebestod,[48] and Barteau believes that 'le texte de Béroul nous paraît tourné vers la vie et toutes les formes d'espoir'.[49] Other critics appear to believe that the story continued in a manner akin to that of other versions. Pauphilet seems to believe that Tristan would soon be leaving Cornwall but only to return[50] and Loomis claims that a casket in the Hermitage may represent a scene from the lost part of Béroul's romance.[51] But another group of critics, remembering the death of the lovers in R, suggests that the end is not far off. This seems

---

46. Ewert, Volume II, p. 86. Lofthouse holds a similar view: 'Eilhart ne distingue pas les deux Iseut par les épithètes "aux Blanches Mains" et "la Blonde". Béroul semble avoir connu au moins la dernière, cf. v. 1546' (unpublished M.A. dissertation, p. 146, note 1).
47. The Conflict..., pp. 60-61.
48. 'There is no suggestion at all in Béroul's text that death was the lovers' destiny; and although one must stress that the fragment is concerned only with a comparatively early part of the relationship, and that therefore it would be wrong to make a final judgment, one cannot help feeling that if the concept of love's bond with death had meant anything to Béroul, he would have had ample opportunity to make this apparent' (Tristan Studies, p. 38).
49. Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut, p. 206.
50. Le Legs..., p. 111.
51. Arthurian Legends in Medieval Art, p. 56.

to be the conclusion drawn by Adams and Hemming[52] and Mergell feels that Tristan may well receive his mortal wound soon after the impending death of Guenelon:

Wenn die letzte der erhaltenen Szenen des Béroulfragments auf diese Weise weit vorausgreift auf das Ende des französischen Tristanromans, so berechtigt dies zur Annahme, dass Béroul die Tristanhandlung nicht im Sinne der von Chrestien durchgeführten Verwicklungen (Isolde Weisshand, Kaherdin, Gargeolain) hätte entwickeln, sondern mehr oder minder schnell dem Ziel des Liebestodes hätte entgegenführen wollen, nachdem auch der letzte der Gegner Tristans, Guenelon, den Tod gefunden und Tristan --vermutlich in der gleichen Kampfepisode-- die tödliche Verwundung erhalten hätte.[53]

Ewert suggests that Tristan may well have died at the hands of Mark, but he does not imply that his death is necessarily imminent.[54] The notion that B had the same ending as R obviously gains support if the version of the death in R is deemed older than the version of O and T. Schoepperle suggests this may be so: 'The Prose Romance, for all its modifications and interpolations, seems to us to preserve in this ending a tradition, if not older than that of the poems, at least independent of them. It is difficult to believe that it was written by a poet who was acquainted with the versions of the poems.'[55] One body of critical opinion, however, sees the episode in R as late rather than early; and this view certainly merits support.[56]

We are concerned, however, not with the death itself in R, but with the incident which introduces it. Is there a real equivalent in R to the events at the end of B which will cause us to assume that the death scene in B is about to begin? The account in R is excessively brief, a good deal happens in a short time:

---

52. MA, LXXIX, pp. 449-68. This view is approved by Gallais (Genèse du roman occidental, p. 239, note 3).
53. Tristan und Isolde..., p. 87.
54. Ewert, Volume II, pp. 260-1. See also Hunt, Rom., XCVIII, p. 537.
55. Tristan and Isolt, pp. 439-40. Van Dam is very much inclined to believe that the death of the lovers in R comes from an early stage in the development of the legend (Neophil., XV, p. 94). See also Ranke, Tristan und Isolde, p. 237.
56. See Lisner, The Tristan Legend..., p. 155, Vinaver, Études sur..., pp. 17-20 and 'The Prose Tristan', pp. 341-2.

Un jor estoit Monseignor Tristan entrez en chanbrez la roine, arpoit et disoit un lai q'il avoit fait. Audret l'entent; si le vait conter au roi Marc, et li rois Marc s'en treveille tant puis q'il feri Tristan d'un glaive enveniné que Morgain li avoit baillié. Tristan estoit desarmés si que li rois li feri mortelmont parmi l'echeine.[57]

Like Thomas's verger episode this seems to be an independent creation by one author, not a survival of an old, shared tradition. When the time comes for Tristan to die, he must necessarily receive a mortal wound and this comes, as in other versions, through the convenient agency of a poisoned weapon. A surprise wound as the introduction to a new series of events is not new to R. It will be remembered that after Iseut was seized by Mark in the forest, the author had to contrive Tristan's removal to Brittany for the events involving the second Iseut. The youth who stumbled across Tristan had not only a convenient animosity for the hero, who had murdered the boy's father, but also a poisoned arrow ready to hand. This scene in R is surely a late invention, and one suspects that the incident which introduces the death in R is also a late creation, similarly induced by expediency.[58]

It thus seems extremely difficult to reach any firm conclusion as to the substance of the lost portions of B. Indeed, given Béroul's habitual independence of mind, any speculation as to how the story went on is fraught with hazard.

---

57. Murrell, PMLA, XLIII, p. 370.
58. Golther suggests that the author of R drew on features from the death of the lovers in order to effect the transition to the marriage with the second Iseut (Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen..., p. 120). Even if there is a direct influence, other episodes as well of the legend seem to have contributed to the separation scene in R. On a point of detail, Golther believes that Governal is the messenger in the separation scene in R, but this is not really so.

CONCLUSION

Writing within a tradition, Béroul used received material for his version of the romance. Pre-existent material obviously relieves a poet of the main burden of invention, but puts him, at the same time, under some constraint: tempting as innovation may have been, the creative mind cannot always risk breaking with consecrated tradition or disappointing public expectation. In order to assess Béroul's attitude to his source material, one could usefully review the standpoints taken by other Tristan poets, since all the indications are that Béroul, Thomas, the author of the French Prose Romance and Eilhart were familiar with the same primary material.

The exact nature of this primary matter gives rise to continuing conjecture. Bédier rejected the notion that there were episodic lays at the head of the tradition and proposed, instead, that there was one single poem, a 'poème régulier',[1] his 'roman primitif', which he then proceeded to reconstruct. While critics have accepted the probability of a common source for B, T, R and O, they have been less eager to accept that the source could be reconstructed in anything like the detail claimed by Bédier. Frappier speaks of a 'certaine structure',[2] a 'canevas commun'[3] and a 'scénario pré-existant'.[4] Pauphilet greeted with scornful scepticism the presumption of attempting to reconstruct the postulated first Tristan poem,

---

1. Bédier, Volume II, p. 186.
2. CCM, VI, p. 258.
3. CCM, VII, p. 353.
4. CCM, VI, p. 261.

but he nevertheless acknowledged that the main versions of the legend conformed to a common 'schéma général',[5] and even Gallais, with his radically different view of the ultimate provenance of the material, has recourse to the notion of a 'structure essentielle'.[6] Fourrier, in the same general tradition, envisaged a 'charpente maîtresse',[7] but also held that a story which may well have been written down at one point does not necessarily get handed on in a definite form, being subject to the hasards of oral dissemination and written transmission, with all the variants and accretions which such activity may imply.[8] Vàrvaro has expressed a similar belief in a continuing creative process even after a story is enshrined in a literary form: although a poet may have decided to adopt a particular version, he may well introduce a variant from elsewhere, with which he was already familiar.[9] Ewert's final view, as expressed in his second volume, no doubt reflects a concession to what he took to be the general climate of opinion. Stressing both a relative absence of detail in the inherited material and the importance of oral tradition, he is 'led to ask whether the so-called Estoire was not in fact an unwritten form of the story orally transmitted, a sort of vulgate form, enjoying a considerable measure of authority but tolerating very substantial variants and a certain amount of transposition and changes in the order of incidents'.[10]

But even if the common source of B, T, R and O were exclusively oral and lacked the detail Bédier attributed to it, this does not

---

5. Le Legs..., p. 111.
6. Genèse du roman occidental, pp. 34-5.
7. Le Courant réaliste..., p. 35.
8. See Le Courant réaliste..., p. 35.
9. See Rom., LXXVIII, pp. 13-58, especially p. 57.
10. Ewert, Volume II, p. 42. In employing the term 'vulgate', Ewert is clearly drawing on Fourrier (Le Courant réaliste..., p. 35).

mean at all that there was no consistent approach to the material. It may be that at one stage the Tristan story grew out of an amorphous mass of disconnected stories, but, by the time that we can speak of a common source for all the extant versions, these stories have been organized into a relatively ordered sequence. And as they are organized into one structure, schéma or charpente, they gain a certain uniform tenor.[11] Oral or written material which remained outside the accepted scenario might not contradict this general tenor but could rather tend to confirm or complement it.

The belief expressed by Fourrier, Vàrvaro and Frappier in the existence of variant versions of certain incidents in the general scenario is based in part on the claim made by Thomas in one of the surviving fragments of his work:

> Seignurs, ceste cunte est mult divers,
> E pur ço l'uni par mes vers
> E di en tant cum est mester
> E le surplus voil relesser.
> Ne vol pas trop en uni dire:
> Ici diverse la matyre.[12]

Even if Thomas is not following Breri, as he appears to imply immediately after this, and even if there were in fact no divergent accounts of this particular incident, there seems little reason to doubt that there existed divergent accounts of a number of incidents. Thomas could hardly have covered up a personal invention by claiming he was selecting from a whole mass of variants if these variants were not known to exist. But perhaps the problem of selection loomed largest when the incident involved was relatively secondary. It

---

11. Frappier writes: 'Au fond, il conviendrait d'employer le terme d'"archétype" uniquement pour désigner cette structure, fondée sur une conception définie du sujet, en rapport étroit avec la civilisation française et féodale du XIIe siècle' (CCM, VI, p. 258). Rather too boldly, Le Gentil asserts: 'La sombre histoire des amants de Cornouailles, en effet, n'a qu'un sens' (RP, VII, p. 119).
12. Douce, ll. 835-40. There is a similar comment in O, ll. 9452-7.

would seem that for the major episodes of his romance Thomas was able to follow a coherent account, the same one that was known to Béroul, Eilhart and the author of the Prose Romance. Not that this account met with Thomas's full approval! A very cursory glance at the derivatives reveals that he has eliminated many of the episodes in his source which follow the fleur de farine episode. The saut Tristran, Iseut's escape from the lepers, the encounters with the hermit and the rehabilitation of the queen have found no place in his version. On the other hand, it would seem that Thomas added the ordeal to Iseut's escondit and the escondit itself may easily represent an addition to the account found in the source Thomas shared with the other Tristan writers. The verger episode is almost certainly an addition by Thomas, one forced upon him by a modification elsewhere: in his version, the love potion never loses its power and the separation of the lovers must be engineered by means other than by the sudden cessation of its effect.

Given, then, that Thomas selected at times between variant accounts, excised a number of episodes, added other episodes and modified an important donnée of his source, one must ask to what ends he did so. It would seem that in writing his romance Thomas's primary aim was the exaltation of fine amor. Because this kind of love is held to stem from the free choice of the lovers, the potion is no longer the material cause of love but its symbol. As a symbol of an eternal, unchanging love the potion cannot cease to act and thereby facilitate the lovers' separation, and because this kind of love bows to no other principle, Ogrin's reprimands are obviously out of place and God himself, by allowing Iseut to emerge unscathed

from the ordeal, must be held to have been somewhat clumsily compromised. Obviously, other considerations, the better motivation of episodes, greater realism, the playing down of the marvellous and the elimination of the more brutal aspects of the tale, lie behind some of the modifications Thomas has made, but the most important changes stem from his attempt to impose a new interpretation upon the material he inherited. Whether Thomas completely succeeded in his attempt is another matter: the consensus of opinion would seem to be that the inherited material offered just too much resistance.[13]

Because we are forced to rely for much of our knowledge of Thomas upon the work of his derivatives, we need to consider as well the approaches adopted by the authors of S, E and G. When Bédier came to define the role of the author of the Saga, he had recourse to the term 'traducteur': 'En outre, il se trouve que l'auteur de la saga, frère Robert, est moins un remanieur qu'un traducteur: ce qu'il conserve de l'original, il le rend souvent mot pour mot.'[14] There is general agreement that a fair amount of abridgement, particularly of dialogue, has taken place,[15] but nowhere has Brother Robert excised a complete series of episodes. His personal additions are few in

---

13. Fourrier writes, for example: 'Est-ce à dire que l'oeuvre soit sans défaut? Certes non. Beaucoup préféreront l'âpreté tragique de la version commune. Mais il faut reconnaître la profondeur et la délicatesse du poète anglo-normand' (Le Courant réaliste..., p. 107). Paupailet holds a similar view: 'Thomas a adapté aux goûts de son temps une légende dont les violences, les disparates et les reflets mythiques ne se comprenaient déjà plus. Les défauts, et aussi les mérites, de son poème tiennent dans ce contraste de sa matière et de sa manière' (Le Lais..., p. 137). Whitehead similarly writes: 'The task which he attempted, to fit together the old plot and his new conception, called for more drastic procedures than he could or would adopt' ('The Early Tristan Poems', p. 143).
14. Bédier, Volume I, pp. V-VI. Bédier's most sustained assessment of S is on pp. 64-75 of the second volume.
15. See Mitchell, 'Scandinavian Literature', p. 465, Piquet, L'Originalité..., pp. 11-37. Bédier lists the main omissions on p. 73 of his second volume.

number and of secondary importance,[16] but, among the derivatives of T, in S alone do we find a mention of the trees which grow from the tombs of the lovers.[17] Bédier was far from impressed by the quality of S, but he reserved wholesale condemnation for Sir Tristrem. He termed the author a 'remanieur',[18] for many of the weaknesses of E appear to stem not from an unthinking adherence by the author to his source but from a desire to refashion his material. In defence of the author, Pickford points out that he does, with some justification, cut down the passages of psychological reflection and seems to aim his work quite legitimately at a different public, one 'concerned with cleverness of form, and which delighted in simple everyday occurrences'.[19] What the working method of the author was remains in some doubt. It may be that he was working from memory,[20] but if so he at least managed to include every incident of note. It would appear, then, that the writers of S and E abbreviated their source in varying degrees, but did not cut out whole sequences of episodes. A measure of inventiveness was shown by both authors, but neither seems to have created any new episodes.

Even Gottfried, whose work is generally acknowledged as being vastly superior, did not create a single, completely new episode of his own. There are, one must concede, passages in G which have been termed inventions, the Minnegrotte being the obvious case in point. But even the Minnegrotte is a development of something which was probably already in T, for Thomas had already substituted a comfortable cave for the crude dwelling of the common source. In

---

16. See Schach, The Saga of..., p. xvi.
17. S, chapter C, p. 112. The detail is not in the surviving conclusion of T (but see Bédier, Volume I, p. 416, Volume II, p. 301). For a discussion of the motif, see Varvaro, 'L'utilizzazione...', pp. 1060-3.
18. Bédier, Volume II, p. 87.
19. 'Sir Tristrem...', p. 228.
20. Bédier rejected this notion (Bédier, Volume II, p. 87), but Ackermann considers it plausible ('English Rimed...', p. 515).

Gottfried's version material may have been developed almost beyond all recognition, but this material existed already, if only in unelaborated form. Perhaps we need to adopt for Gottfried the term adaptateur, a term mentioned by Piquet in his conclusion,[21] and re-introduced and re-defined by Huby.[22] Huby's thesis has not escaped criticism,[23] but his claim that Gottfried was an adapter setting about his task in much the same way as Heinrich von Veldeke or Hartmann von Aue deserves consideration as a useful corrective.[24] This is how Huby understands the task of the adaptateur:

> Le problème général de l'adaptateur n'est pas de donner une interprétation nouvelle d'une fable ou bien de s'en servir simplement comme point de départ destiné à faire découvrir une nouvelle conception du monde...Un seul domaine semble lui réserver la liberté qu'il voulait vraiment posséder: le domaine de la forme, de la mise en pages, de la mise en oeuvre.[25]

This does not mean that the adaptateur will not extend the meaning of individual scenes, but that the overall significance of the work will be fundamentally the one bequeathed him by his source.

The French Prose Romance was composed in the first half of the thirteenth century, perhaps some fifty years after Thomas completed his work. Naturally, the tradition was by then much less of a constraint upon the potential author. The old Tristan material certainly appears in the Prose Romance, but it is frequently modified and swamped by the vast mass of new material. If Thomas sought to impose a new meaning upon his material, the author of R (or, more correctly, authors?)[26] was largely concerned, like the authors of the

---

21. L'Originalité..., p. 375.
22. In L'Adaptation des romans courtois....
23. Notably from Jackson, SC., XIII, pp. 382-4.
24. Huby writes: 'Gottfried a les mêmes réactions que tous les adaptateurs et sans doute la floraison de recherches portant sur l'originalité de Gottfried, sur ses conceptions personnelles n'est-elle due qu'au simple fait que nous ne possédons qu'une infime partie du roman de Thomas qui corresponde à l'oeuvre de Gottfried' (L'Adaptation des romans courtois..., p. 451).
25. L'Adaptation des romans courtois..., p. 462.
26. See Curtis, Rom., LXIX, pp. 314-38.

other prose romances, with the development of the material itself. Vinaver has described the attitude of these later authors:

> Leur intérêt n'est plus dans les idées qu'ils illustrent; il réside dans les intrigues et les événements qu'ils racontent. Ce que le lecteur réclame et ce que l'auteur lui fournit, ce n'est plus le 'sens', mais la matière pure et simple, la matière autonome, seule raison d'être de la narration.[27]

This is not to say, of course, that the author of R added material without considering the overall structure of his work.[28] Moreover, to realize that the story in R is far removed from the Tristan story as preserved in the poetic versions does not mean that one must automatically condemn the Prose Romance as inferior. The difference in the attitudes adopted by the author of R and by his predecessors has been noted, not the relative merits of their productions.

Turning to the work of Eilhart von Oberg, we are faced with a preliminary problem. To what extent is the complete story, as preserved in the later manuscripts a reworking, to what extent a reproduction of the original? There does seem, in fact, to be a case for considering that these manuscripts represent the culmination of a manuscript tradition rather than a separate, more modern adaptation.[29] Few, if any, episodes were omitted by Eilhart. He may have dropped the harpe et rote story, but the queen's escondit was probably not in his source, even though it may soon have become very closely associated with the common material.[30] At times, Eilhart appears to have added explanatory passages. In the Tryst under the Tree episode, Tristan's beckoning to Iseut, which reveals his knowledge of Mark's presence, may have been a personal invention.

---

27. Études sur..., p. 13.
28. On this point, see Bogdanow, 'Quelques remarques...'.
29. See Buschinger, Et. Germ., XXVI, pp. 221-8.
30. See Fourrier, Le Courant réaliste..., pp. 78-9.

The mention of the potion in the fleur de farine episode (ll. 3912-19) may be a misguided attempt at clarification and the details of the potion's peculiar characteristics in ll. 2279-2300 almost certainly represent an unhappy addition. In O, Ôgrîm is Mark's confessor (ll. 4704-5), a detail which may well be another personal invention by the German poet. Many of these additions stem from a desire for greater plausibility, and, at times, at ll. 4572-80 and ll. 4610-6 for example, Eilhart seems to regret his inability to produce what would be to him a more rational account. Perhaps his attempt to explain the lie of the second Iseut (ll. 9278 ff.) is another example of an unsatisfactory addition to the content of his source.

Other passages, though unattested elsewhere in written form, may have belonged to the general mass of material associated with the main story. The brief passage where Tristan is presented as the inventor of angling (ll. 4534-40) may fall into this category and some of Tristan's return visits to Cornwall from Brittany may originally have been episodic tales which grew up naturally once the main outline story had told of one return to Cornwall. Eilhart may not have invented them but merely introduced them, with minor additions of his own, into the written tradition. Similarly, the Kiss at the Couch episode (ll. 3150-3283) may not have belonged to the source Eilhart shared with B, T and R, but it may not have been his own invention either. Eilhart probably added the consummation of the marriage to the second Iseut (ll. 7070-81) and the Germanic veneer that one finds on occasion in his work.[31] As well as perhaps omitting episodes and adding other passages, Eilhart certainly seems to have

---

31. See Muret, Rom., XVI, p. 290. For other innovations, mostly concerning style and structure, see Buschinger, CCM, XIV, pp. 379-81, CCM, XVI, pp. 287-94 and Le 'Tristrant'..., II, pp. 1030-40.

abridged his source on occasion, for while Thomas is at pains to develop the analysis of his characters Eilhart is at his weakest in those passages which depend for their effect on psychological credibility.[32] But although Eilhart may not have reproduced all his source, his personal embellishments are relatively few and he is generally regarded as a faithful recorder of the shared story.[33] Vàrvaro even suggests that apparently personal remarks may have been taken straight from his source, with Eilhart merely substituting his name for another.[34] Overall, Eilhart has added comparatively little of importance to the material he inherited, and he has not, in all probability, sought to re-interpret his material to any significant degree.[35]

Far more than Eilhart, Béroul was very clearly able and prepared to modify his material as he thought fit. As far as omissions are concerned, in the absence of his source and, indeed, in the absence

---

32. As cases in point, Whitehead refers to the passages which concern the first visit to the hermit and Tristan's marriage ('The Early Tristan Poems', p. 138, note 5).
33. Delbouille takes an extreme view: 'Ainsi, rien, à aucun moment, ne rend la version allemande suspecte pour quelque élément important de la narration. Tout semble montrer, au contraire, une fois encore, que le traducteur a reproduit fidèlement un modèle français dans lequel il y a lieu de reconnaître la forme la plus archaïque du roman' (CCM, V, p. 430). Schoepperle also has faith in O: 'We are disposed to believe that the poem of Eilhart von Oberge represents more accurately than any reconstruction that has been made, and more faithfully than any other version (except perhaps the fragment of Béroul) the French poem to which the Folie of the Berne manuscript alludes, and which Thomas remodelled according to his personal taste' (Tristan and Isolt, p. 8). Legge writes, however: 'Qu'Eilhart représente le dérivé le plus fidèle de la tradition est une hypothèse impossible à prouver' (CCM, III, p. 511).
34. See Rom., LXXVIII, p. 48.
35. Buschinger sees Eilhart as a writer who essentially brings out the meaning of his source: 'Bref, par le choix d'une structure symétrique bien proportionnée et très élaborée, Eilhart a su mettre en valeur des qualités que l'original français ne laissait pas clairement apparaître, faire ressortir ce qui, dans la structure du modèle n'était que latent, ou du moins non entièrement réalisé, en un mot, la composition numérique donne du relief au sens de l'oeuvre française' (CCM, XVI, p. 294).

of the complete romance, it is obviously very difficult to gauge exactly how much Béroul has left out and all one can do is review possible cases. He claims in ll. 1265-70 to be telling the estoire accurately, but of course his claim may simply seek to preclude objections to a personal innovation or the fact that he has replaced the account of Yvain's murder, that he found in his source, with an already existing variant version: in either case a form of excision has taken place. In the lost portions of his romance it may be that Béroul omitted the Kiss at the Couch episode and that ll. 583-634 are the transposed remnants of that scene, but it is equally possible that the episode was an addition by Eilhart to the source material he shared with Béroul. Béroul has also been accused of omitting to mention, in the lost portions of the romance or in the passage beginning at l. 2133, the peculiar properties of the potion. Again we may be discussing an addition peculiar to Eilhart rather than an omission by Béroul.

The additions made by Béroul vary considerably in scope. A number of complete episodes have been added, for example, the Horse's Ears episode, probably a story taken from outside the Tristan material, and the riche baron episode, a story which seems to have its origins within the Tristan material itself. One might also mention the arc qui ne faut episode and the final episode in the fragment, which relates the deaths of Denoalen and Godoïne. The account of the cessation of the potion's influence in ll. 2133-2288 is such a long development, by contrast with the curt indication in O, that it also can surely be termed a new episode, as can the separation scene of ll. 2765-3027 which contains a vast amount of material not found elsewhere. The escondit sequence in ll. 3028-4266 is again not Béroul's invention, since the basic outline of

events is the same as in T, but Béroul would appear to have greatly expanded his material. Within the sequence, there are developments unique to B: for example, Perinis's journey to Tristan in ll. 3283-3364 must be regarded as a new episode. Béroul has added a number of briefer passages as well. The end of the fleur de farine passage, ll. 783-826, has no equivalent elsewhere, nor have the life in the forest passages (ll. 1357-66, 1423-30, 1637-55 and 1767-73) that recall the general background against which the Morrois episodes are set. Iseut's dream in ll. 2065-72 and, of course, the 'prophetic' passage of ll. 2755-64 are further developments unique to B. Perhaps we need to mention that Béroul has seemingly added a number of rationalizing or simply picturesque details. In the fleur de farine episode, for example, at ll. 716-20 we are told that Tristan received his wound from a wild boar and at ll. 673-8 we are expressly, if unsurprisingly, informed that the dwarf gets his flour from a baker. Later in the text, in ll. 1281-4, Béroul invents un forestier to explain how Tristan obtained his indispensable bow and arrows and the same figure, now presented as an established character, seemingly appears in another explanatory passage, ll. 1831-4. Returning to the fleur de farine episode, the description of Tristan snoring in his bed (ll. 759-61) borders on the comic.

It has been suggested that certain features of the kind just described are not simply additions to the schéma général, but interpolations by a writer other than Béroul (if we take Béroul to be the remanieur of the common source).[36] The Horse's Ears episode and

---

36. It seems advisable, in this particular context, to understand by an interpolation not an addition by the remanieur to the common source but an addition by yet another author to the remaniement.

the riche baron episode have both been regarded as interpolations, but the tournament episode of ll. 3985-4074 is the most likely possibility. If there are interpolated episodes in B, it might usefully be borne in mind that such episodes do not normally endanger the general meaning of the remaniement. The remanieur may impose a new meaning upon his material, the interpolator will consolidate the meaning of the remaniement.

As well as omitting and adding material, Béroul does seem to have re-ordered material on occasion. The indication of the dwarf's astrological powers in ll. 320-27 and the intervention of Dinas in ll. 1085-1140 may well have come, as in O, at earlier points in the common source. And the episode telling of the lovers' first meeting with Ogrin (ll. 1351-1430) may certainly have been advanced by Béroul while Eilhart preserved the order of episodes he found in his source.

This brief survey of some of the modifications introduced by Béroul confirms an observation made by Le Gentil. He realized that the authors of the extant Tristan versions, in common with other medieval writers, were restricted by the weight of the old tradition and yet they had sufficient freedom to introduce new material: 'Autant de versions, autant de mutations brusques qui, chaque fois, modifient de façon plus ou moins sensible la physionomie du mythe, et en suggèrent avec plus ou moins de bonheur une interprétation différente, dans un style nouveau.'[37] If we accept, as common sense indeed dictates, the notion suggested by Le Gentil that every version has a different meaning, obviously the degree of change imposed upon the meaning of the source is not always the same. Thomas, for example,

---

37. CN, XX, p. 137.

attempts to introduce a totally new interpretation, one that is continued in S, E and G. The author of R, however, is concerned above all with telling a story and evinces comparatively little interest in imposing a new meaning or even in continuing the meaning of his source. But Eilhart seems to continue, by and large, the same general meaning of his source; a relative absence of innovation implies a relatively close adherence to the meaning he receives. Béroul presumably found in the material he inherited this same general meaning. His modifications, though demonstrably more extensive than those of Eilhart, are not as considerable as those introduced by Thomas, and his interprétation différente would not seem to be as radical as that of the Anglo-Norman writer.

But how best may this interprétation différente be determined? Ewert suggested that, in any attempt to ascertain the meaning of the poem by Béroul, particular attention should be directed 'to the elucidation and appreciation of those passages (single lines or whole divisions of the narrative) in which he differs from all other versions'.[38] The policy Ewert proposes (which he did not fully adopt for his commentary) seems an admirable one.

Let us consider, then, first of all, the complete episodes which Béroul has inserted and which correspond to what Ewert calls the 'whole divisions of the narrative'. Of the episodes already identified as additions, the arc qui ne faut episode stands somewhat apart from the rest, thematically at least. When the lovers and Governal first took refuge in the forest, we were told of Tristan's skill with a bow (l. 1279): in the new, invented episode, his competence as a huntsman is confirmed. But other episodes introduced by Béroul do seem to share a common theme, namely the elimination of

---

38. Ewert, Volume II, p. 42.

the lovers' enemies. At the close of the Horse's Ears incident, Béroul makes it plain that it is an enemy of the lovers who has been despatched:

> Molt en fu bel a mainte gent,
> Que haoient le nain Frocine
> Por Tristran et por la roïne. (ll. 1348-50)

Similarly, in the riche baron episode, it is a man identified from the outset as an enemy of the lovers (ll. 1656-8) who meets his death at the hands of Governal. At a much later point in the story, in the course of the tournament episode (ll. 3985-4074), Governal kills another enemy, a forester, identified as the one who betrayed the lovers' whereabouts to King Mark (ll. 4045-8). Then, finally, in the last episode in the fragment, Tristan kills two of the three felons, Denoalen and Godoïne, and in the case of Denoalen at least it is made abundantly clear that one of the lovers' enemies has been removed from the scene (ll. 4382-8). It is worth pointing out again that although these new episodes are inserted into a pre-existing scenario, Béroul is careful to prepare them in advance. Just as the arc qui ne faut episode apparently builds on an earlier allusion, the death of the dwarf is hoped for in ll. 840-3 (see also ll. 292-4 and ll. 328-30) and the deaths of all the lovers' enemies are anticipated in the 'prophetic' passage.

To what extent is the theme of these new episodes really central to the romance? The arc qui ne faut episode apart, the episodes seem to have been expressly devised to get rid of the lovers' enemies once they had outlived their usefulness, and, by the end of the fragment, with almost every opponent dead, the theme has almost certainly run its course. It must be said as well that these episodes do not really give us much information about Tristan and Iseut.

Admittedly, what happens helps the lovers to remain alive: but the episodes tell us little about the lovers' spiritual dilemma and fail to indicate why, in their particular circumstances, survival is so precious to them.

Béroul has introduced other passages which deal with the enemies of Tristan and Iseut and with the three felons in particular. Although none of these can be held to comprise a full, independent episode, they nonetheless reveal rather more about the situation of the lovers. In the fleur de farine episode, once the felons and the dwarf have achieved the capture of Tristan and Iseut, the episode, in other versions, is as good as over. Béroul, however, introduces a new series of developments (ll. 783-826), in which, by emphasizing in particular the barons' cruelty (ll. 805-8), he induces sympathy for the lovers and enmity for their opponents. He continues this denigration of the lovers' enemies in the very next episode. As a consequence of the two speeches by the people of Cornwall (ll. 853-59, 884-7), which contain original departures from the tradition, the barons, the dwarf and, to a certain extent, King Mark emerge as the main guilty parties while the guilt of Tristan and Iseut is temporarily forgotten. Béroul is certainly not trying to absolve his main characters, but he is intimating that the lovers, unlike the barons and the dwarf, should not be condemned out of hand.

Since the lovers' enemies are so obviously motivated by malice, it is only right that in due course of time revenge should be exacted. Béroul accordingly inserts a number of passages which anticipate the punishment of the felons. In ll. 904-8, in a detail found only in B, Iseut expresses the conviction that, if Tristan were to escape, an act of revenge would surely follow. When Iseut is eventually informed that her lover has in fact managed to escape, in a passage

again unknown elsewhere (ll. 1045-64), she takes consolation from the certainty that her death will be avenged. Later on in the narrative, in ll. 2822-7, part of another passage unique to Béroul, Iseut predicts that the three felons will eventually suffer ignoble deaths. And the queen is not the only character to voice such sentiments. When Governal meets up again with Tristan after the latter's leap from the chapel, he promises his support in any act of revenge against the three barons but manages to persuade his master that the time for revenge has not yet come (ll. 1023-38). The seneschal, Dinas, speaks of the possibility, indeed the inevitability, of revenge. It will be recalled that some of the content of his speech (ll. 1088-1120), delivered when Iseut is led out to be burnt at the stake, is not new. But Béroul has certainly invented the second half of the seneschal's speech (ll. 1101-20), in which Dinas forecasts that Tristan will take his revenge upon the three barons. But for the moment Béroul feels that revenge can wait: he will have the felons eliminated only when they have fully acted out their roles. So, they disappear from the scene and will re-emerge only when they are needed to make the case for Iseut's <u>escondit</u>.

When Iseut announces, in an episode unknown elsewhere, her willingness to submit herself to the request for an <u>escondit</u> (ll. 3228-76), she wishes to quash for ever malicious gossip. But an <u>escondit</u> suits Mark no less, for the swearing of the oath will lead to a strengthening of his position (see ll. 4267-8). By contrast, when the three felons re-appear, they are felt by Mark to be actively working against his interests and to be intent upon causing him further humiliation (ll. 3082-3): similarly, at the

beginning of the final episode in the fragment, it is suggested that the felons are eager to destroy whatever peace of mind Iseut's escondit has brought the king (ll. 4271-2). Therefore, when Tristan kills Godoïne, he is not merely carrying out an act of personal revenge but also ensuring that no conflict between Mark and Iseut develops:

> S'il en peüst vis eschaper
> Du roi Marc et d'Iseut sa per
> Referoit sordre mortel gerre.
> Cil, qui Dex doinst anor conquerre,
> L'engardera de l'eschaper. (ll. 4447-51)

Now, and perhaps only now, are we coming close to the heart of the matter, the lovers' spiritual state and Béroul's attitude towards it. Frappier quite rightly considers that the crucial features in the story are the love potion and, indissolubly bound up with the potion, the question of the lovers' relationship to God. He believes that these two dominant themes 'posent immédiatement le problème fondamental: Tristan ou (sic) Iseut sont-ils des coupables ou des innocents?'[39] To this problem Béroul gives an answer which is at the centre of his interprétation différente.

In the extent fragment, we have to wait until the first of the lovers' meetings with Ogrin before we come upon a statement about the potion and its effects. When they encounter the hermit, Tristan and Iseut present the philtre as the cause of their adulterous love, claim that sin was the inescapable consequence of absorbing the philtre and plead powerlessness in the situation that has resulted. Ogrin sympathizes, but all he can do is to pray that God may help to bring about repentance. Thus, when the potion is mentioned for

---

39. CCM, VI, p. 265.

the first time in the fragment, we are made fully aware of the spiritual consequences of sinful love. By advancing the first Ogrin episode to the position it now enjoys, Béroul makes it plain that, throughout the period of their stay in the Morrois, the lovers, quite unable to repent, run the risk of eternal damnation.

So the short answer to Frappier's question, 'sont-ils des coupables ou des innocents?', is that Tristan and Iseut are indeed guilty of sin. Ogrin has pointed this out clearly enough: if the lovers are in need of absolution it must be because they are living in a state of mortal sin. But desperate though the lovers' situation may be, it is never presented as hopeless. Ogrin points out also that God pardons repentant sinners (ll. 1378-80) and he expresses the fervent wish that God will eventually see fit to pardon them (ll. 1418-9). For the moment, the lovers may be unable to act upon the hermit's advice, but we are given more than one hint that they may yet be able to repent and so avoid perdition.

Tristan and Iseut themselves are confident that God participates actively in their survival through all their many trials and tribulations, notwithstanding their sin. In the very first episode, Iseut attributes her escape to God (l. 352) and Brengain goes on to assert that God has performed a great miracle on the lovers' behalf (l. 377). When Tristan tells Governal what happened, in a brief passage to which there is no equivalent elsewhere (ll. 381-4), his squire thanks God for ensuring that no indiscretion was committed. After the lovers have been captured, Tristan asks, in the course of another development found only in B, to be allowed to defend himself in judicial combat against those who have accused him. Certain that he will be allowed to enter the lists, he firmly believes that when

this comes about God will make sure that nobody will be so bold as to take up arms against him:[40]

> Mais en Deu tant fort se fiot
> Que bien savoit et bien quidoit,
> S'a escondit peüst venir,
> Nus n'en osast armes saisir
> Encontre lui, lever ne prendre;
> Bien se quidoit par chanp defendre. (ll. 813-8)

Thus far the lovers have acted in the sure confidence that God is preserving them from what should ordinarily have meant their death, and nowhere is this more explicitly stated than in the saut Tristran episode. Invoking the authority of Ezekiel at the beginning of the scene (ll. 909-11), Béroul asserts that Tristan is about to be saved from death and, after his hero's leap, he tells us that 'Bele merci Dex li a fait!' (l. 960). God does not desire the death of a sinner and he has miraculously intervened to keep this particular transgressor safe and sound. Can one regard Iseut's rescue from the lepers a little later on as a companion miracle which guarantees the survival of Tristan's partner? Governal's plan of campaign ultimately proves so successful in saving Iseut from certain death that indeed we may well feel behind it the guiding hand of Providence. After their escape, the lovers live in the forest, still in a state of sin but still hoping for redemption. God has acted on their behalf and, since He desireth not the death of a sinner, has brought them out of society to a place of relative security. While they are in the Morrois, the deaths of the dwarf and the riche baron, the flight of Husdent and the acquisition of the arc qui ne faut will all contribute to their

---

40. See also Hunt, Rom., XCVIII, p. 529: 'Such is Tristran's confidence, his faith in God, that he knows that no-one will challenge him in judicial combat.'

survival against the time that they can truly repent.

After three years the potion's compulsion comes to an end and Tristan repents at once (ll. 2157-60). The lovers are now released from the immediate power of the potion and, fully conscious of the harm they have caused others, can take positive steps to make amends. What Tristan now hopes to do is to return Iseut to Mark and he prays that God may grant him the will to leave the queen in peace in future (ll. 2185-8). Iseut is quick to endorse Tristan's reactions. She suggests that they should go back to the hermit and seek from him a solution which, guilty sinners though they are, will give them the chance of eternal life:

> De ce sui tote fianciere:
> Consel nos doroit honorable
> Par qoi a joie pardurable
> Porron ancore bien venir.' (ll. 2274-7)

All this takes place in an episode of which the most significant constituents are Béroul's, for although the potion's power also ceases in O this is mentioned very briefly (ll. 4724-44) and does not give rise to the extended developments we find in the French poem.

Ogrin does not disappoint the lovers. He is delighted by the statements he receives from the two repentant sinners, for he knows full well from Ezekiel 18. 27 that 'when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive'. The lovers need to be rehabilitated socially and the best way for this to be achieved, in the hermit's view, is for a discreet veil to be drawn over what has happened in the past (ll. 2353-4). As a man fully conversant with the profecies de l'escrit (l. 1396) and the loi escrite (l. 2266), Ogrin will have been aware that his policy gains

ample support from the close of the epistle of St James: 'Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins.' We may, at some risk of misrepresenting both Abelard and Béroul, have recourse to the writings of Abelard to justify the tactics the hermit employs.[41] What is certain is that the lovers have abandoned mortal sin and are now set on the road to redemption.

To facilitate their social rehabilitation, Tristan is the first to moot the usefulness of offering to exculpate himself publicly. The hermit readily accedes, confident that nobody will dare to accept Tristan's challenge (ll. 2371-4). On the day Tristan returns Iseut to Mark, he requests a judicial defence against the charge of adultery (ll. 2853-68) and, exactly as predicted, no opponent is prepared to come forward. Tristan has, of course, committed adultery and he is indeed guilty. But because no judicial duel has any chance of taking place, God will not be directly involved and will be in no way compromised. The escondit argument, unknown elsewhere, has been exploited in order to induce in those on whom it is used the erroneous conviction that Tristan and Iseut are innocent, none of which will preclude the lovers from at least entertaining the hope of salvation.

Before long, the three barons approach the king and demand that Iseut should clear herself of all suspicion of adultery. The queen agrees to perform an escondit, swears her oath on the appointed day and even offers to do more, presumably to follow up her oath with an ordeal. Exactly as in the case of Tristan's offer of an

---

41. See Hunt, Rom., XCVIII, pp. 532-4.

escondit, she thereby induces, with her specious oath, the erroneous conviction that she is innocent, but with one important difference; she actually swears an oath, God is in fact necessarily implicated and tacitly lets her statement pass. Béroul is careful to supply what theological justification he can by making Iseut invoke Hilary of Poitiers in the same breath as she invokes God: Hilary had made a case for some lying in certain circumstances. When God does not intervene —as He quite clearly could!— He must be deemed to have accepted as valid for Iseut the case Hilary had made. Iseut prefaced her acceptance of an escondit with the words 'Se Damledeu mon cors seceure' (l. 3232): God has more important designs for the sinner and allows her to remain alive.

But what of the final episode? Though the lovers continue to meet, the felons alone impute adultery to their meetings and, in the text, there is no real evidence to suggest that the lovers have resumed any sort of physical relationship. Certainly the lovers' faith in God, already amply confirmed, has not wavered. When Tristan prepares to despatch Godoïne, he is led to seek God's help in what he considers to be eminently justifiable revenge:

> 'Ha! Dex, vrai roi, tant riche trait
> Ai d'arc et de seete fait;
> Consentez moi que cest ne falle!
> Un des trois felis de Cornoualle
> Voi, a grant tort, par la defors.
> Dex, qui le tuen saintisme cors
> Por le pueple mes a mort,
> Lai moi vengance avoir du tort
> Que cil felon muevent vers moi!' (ll. 4463-71)

All the indications are that Tristan and Iseut will continue to resist sin, but will love each other till death with what the author has termed a bone amor (l. 2327). Their death will be tragic, and yet at the same time there will be cause for hope in the thought

that they may come to enjoy the *joie pardurable* of which Iseut has spoken. Payen notes that Thomas's hero and heroine, even in death, 'pas un instant...ne pensent à leur salut éternel'.[42] In Béroul's romance, by contrast, the lovers are beset by the fear of damnation and then inspired by the hope of salvation. Another contrasting feature deserves special mention. In his concluding epilogue, Thomas has a message for all lovers, 'A tuz amanz saluz i dit'. Much more pertinently than Thomas, Béroul addresses himself to the *purvers* and offers a message of solace to the repentant *purvers*.

---

42. 'Lancelot contre Tristan', p. 621.

APPENDIX I

The damaged portions of the manuscript

Lines 8-16 (fol. 1a).

9. I would prefer to read mie, Ewert's reading, rather than u roi, which was first suggested by Michel and included by Muret in all his editions. On p. 141 of M^4, where, amidst other lines, the damaged sections are reviewed, Ewert's reading is recorded; the reading is also incorporated into the text.

10-12. I cannot confirm the words deciphered by Ewert and included in M^4.

16. The last four letters are clearly a mer. The suggestion in M^4 that the manuscript should be read e mer cannot be supported. Ewert would confirm Muret's conjectural reading fist et la (Ewert, Volume I, p. xv), but it is by no means clear.

Lines 45-9 (fol. 1b).

48. Roques and Meylan read the words aise and parole, and these were included in M^3 and M^4. But, like Ewert, I find the words indecipherable.

49. The beginning of the line has been variously interpreted. In M^o, Muret printed simply nos. In M^1, M^2 and M^3, he printed a blank letter, then a nos: this is the reading adopted in M^4. Ewert, however, reads . amor. I would prefer to read the fifth letter of the line as s rather than r. Does this make .a nos the more likely reading? The shadow of an upright can be seen before the a (which is very possible), and this upright seems

to be part of the column containing the larger, initial letters of lines.

Lines 79-84 (fol. 1c).

82. M^1, M^2, M^3 and M^4 read: Porqoi seroit tot suen li.... Ewert reads: Por qoi seroit tot...li..., and confesses inability to read suen. The word after tot appears to be sue, with the abbreviation for -us over the e. The following word appears to be le rather than li, and the final letter of the line could well be r.

Lines 112-20 (fol. 1d).

112. M^3 and M^4 read: Fort m'est a cuer que je. The words a cuer were deciphered by Roques and Meylan. But in M^4 there is an acknowledgment that cuer is a doubtful reading, and Ewert agrees. Only the c of cuer seems clear in fact. The letters -re are clear at the end of the line and they appear to be preceded by a sequence of minims.

115. The first letter of the line is a Q, accompanied by an abbreviation giving the reading Qui.

116. I failed to read Ewert's words ne fai at the end of the line. The second letter of the line appears to be the abbreviation for con, but this is far from certain.

119. Like Ewert, I could not distinguish the reading n'en. The initial letter of the line would again appear to be Q, with an abbreviation mark, probably to be interpreted as Qui.

120. In M^4 the claim is made: 'Entre Moi et or on ne peut rien lire; la lecture de Ewert confirme la conjecture de Muret.' In fact, desor, printed by Ewert, is quite legible.

Lines 149-55 (fol. 2a).

149. In M^4 the reading ore is termed 'incertain'. Ewert describes ore (Ewert, Volume I, p. 5) as 'not clear'. The reading quar seems preferable: quar is abbreviated in a similar fashion at l. 595. The final word of the line seems to read itant or atant, rather than errant.

150. The latest editors are agreed as to the reading of the line, but I suggest that the manuscript should be transcribed thus: Qu'il face faire .i. ré ardant.

Lines 186-9 (fol. 2b).

186. M^4: Tristran, n'avreie contre mort

Ewert: Tristran, n'avroit contre la mort

Editors agree that only the letters nav of the second word are clear, and their conflicting texts spring from different interpretations of the meaning of the line. But the last two words are clearly la mort, although in M^4 the line is presented as: 'nau...(espace de quatre ou cinq lettres illisibles) el mort'.

187. Ewert fails to read imais, the third word in the line, which is described in M^4 as a 'mot incertain'. However, when the manuscript is held up to the light, the reading imais clearly emerges.

Lines 221-3 (fol. 2c).

223. Of mescreance only me and the final e seem clear.

Lines 254-62 (fol. 2d).

254. In M^4, the first three letters of the word sarroit are

considered unclear. Ewert reads savroit and records no difficulty in reading the word. It now seems impossible to decipher any of the word.

255. All editors leave this line blank. Perhaps the last three letters read sol or sot?

257. The initial letter of the line is M, unrecorded in the editions.

258. In Ewert and M^4, en l'arbr is considered illegible. The editorial addition seems to supply the right sense, and the letters -br, which can just be detected, support the suggestion.

The net gain from this study has been minimal, and it has been impossible to confirm some of the readings offered by the latest editors. Even the letters which are newly deciphered are frequently in isolation, imposing no change at all upon the meaning of the text. One could pursue the policy apparently pursued in M^4 and include in one's text any reading which had been offered by any source, but perhaps a form of integrity demands that the editor should only include in his final version readings he has actually seen, while being careful to note the contributions of others.

APPENDIX II

Readings disputed by editors within the body of the manuscript

504 (fol. 4c, l. 12). Both Ewert and M^4 support the reading creissiez. In M^4 creïsiez was printed, but the error was acknowledged (Rom., LXX, p. 98). Ewert suggests the manuscript could be read as creusiez (Ewert, Volume II, p. 113). Muret consistently printed creusiez in his editions. It does seem that creusiez is the more likely reading

521 (fol. 4c, l. 30). In all probability the second s of esscient is expuncted by the scribe, as Ewert suggests (Ewert, Volume II, p. 114).

547 (fol. 4d, l. 19). Ewert: beise.
M^4: beise or besse.

The correct reading of the manuscript would appear to be beise.

591 (fol. 5a, l. 28). Ewert: tel or cel.
M^4: tel.

The manuscript appears to read cel, but differentiation is extremely difficult.

645 (fol. 5c, l. 12). The manuscript reads Frociz: in M^4 only the correction Frocin is printed and Frociz is not recorded. In M^3, however, the manuscript reading was recorded.

728. (fol. 6a, l. 26). The reading fist, printed by Ewert, is a very possible alternative to the reading fut, preferred in M4.

1128 (fol. 9a, l. 4). Ewert: sont.
M^4: sout.

The reading of the manuscript as sont seems preferable.

1503 (fol. 11c, l. 29). The scribe seems to have written ama, rather than anla.

1509 (fol. 11c, l. 35). Ewert: moutier.
M^4: montier.

The text of M^o had moutier, but M^1, M^2 and M^3 had montier. Perhaps the manuscript reads moutier rather than montier. Moutier is the form preferred by Andrieu in the supplement to the Concordancier.

1601 (fol. 12b, l. 22). Ewert: tel or cel (?).
M^4: tel.

Again, as at l. 591, differentiation is extremely difficult, although the text should obviously read tel.

1691 (fol. 13a, l. 9). Whatever the correct interpretation of the line may be, the final word is certainly estache, not escache. Ewert acknowledges this in his second volume (p. 176): there is no such acknowledgment in M^4.

1790 (fol. 13d, l. 3). The manuscript appears to read lon, rather than lou, which M^4 supports (p. 145) and which Ewert sees as a possible alternative reading (Ewert, Volume II, p. 181).

2038 (fol. 15c, l. 9). Ewert: blos with l written over r or e.
M^4: vbos or lbos.

One would think that l was written over r (as at l. 2034), so that the word now reads blos, as Ewert suggests.

2839 (fol. 21b, l. 5). Ewert: 7 (for 9?).

The sign would appear to be the familiar abbreviation for et as suggested in M^4.

2877 (fol. 21c, l. 8). M^3: vairs et ioiaus.

Ewert: vairs et ioiaus.

M^4: vains et ioiaus.

The manuscript reads vairs: presumably there is an unacknowledged misprint in M^4.

3011 (fol. 22c, l. 2). Ewert: cente or tente.

M^4: cente.

Cente appears to be the reading of the manuscript.

3246 (fol. 24a, l. 29). Ewert: mıte (or iuice or mice?)

M^4: iuice.

An example of the confusion caused by minims and of the difficulty in differentiating between c and t. Perhaps the best reading is iuice.

3280 (fol. 24b, l. 28). The manuscript reads nais, rather than naif (see Ewert, Volume I, p. 98).

3300 (fol. 24c, l. 13). M^4: osai.

In his text, as in M^4, Ewert prints o soı, but makes no mention of the reading in the manuscript, which is almost certainly osai.

3544 (fol. 26b, l. 10). Ewert: ue or uc.

M^4: lie.

Even though the correction lié is probably the right one, the manuscript seems to have an ill-made ue rather than lie.

3643(fol. 27a, l. 4). Perhaps Ewert's first suggestion, cunter,

is better than cuvert. M^4 is content to print cuvert. The abbreviation is squarely over the t, not before it.

3723 (fol. 27c, l. 14). Ewert would read the manuscript as rentiene rather than renciene, the M^4 reading. The manuscript appears closer to rentiene.

3843 (fol. 28b, l. 29). Ewert: tegrez (or regrez).
M^4: degrez.
The reading regrez appears most probable.

4017 (fol. 29c, l. 26). It is suggested in M^4 that the manuscript might be read as noires or voires. Ewert suggests only voires, the more likely reading, so it would seem.

4087 (fol. 30a, l. 25). Ewert: prelaee, with la expuncted.
M^4: place corrected to preee.
The penultimate letter certainly appears to be an e rather than a c.

4232 (fol. 31a, l. 29). Ewert: li mes.
M^4: lunes or limes or liuies.
Li mes would appear to be the manuscript reading, but there is clearly room for doubt.

4407 (fol. 32b, l. 29). In M^4, the last two syllables are read as soi met, whereas Ewert reads sei met or sennet ('On the Text of...', p. 92, Ewert, Volume II, p. 258). Perhaps the M^4 reading is a misprint, but it was not recorded in the

list of corrections. In M^1, M^2 and M^3 Muret read sennet, which he corrected to se met. Seimet seems the most likely reading of the manuscript.

4413 (fol. 32b, l. 35). Ewert admits that ot is not clear ('On the Text of...', p. 93). He suggests er as an alternative reading of the manuscript, while et or er are suggested in M^4. The most probable reading is et. The line closes, in the manuscript, with percie (or parcie?) rather than with partie (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 259).

4422 (fol. 32c, l. 9). It is suggested in M^4 that the manuscript reads either aucer or ancer. Ewert reads ancer ('On the Text of...', p. 92, Ewert, Volume II, p. 10, note 1).

4441 (fol. 32c, l. 28). The manuscript reads sestent, as Ewert points out ('On the Text of...', p. 92, Ewert, Volume II, p. 259). In M^4, as in Muret's editions, the manuscript reading is apparently taken to be sesteut.

APPENDIX III

Notes on the establishment of the text

41-3. Reid suggests ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 279-80, The 'Tristran'..., p. 10) that the lines should read:

> Sire, molt dist voir Salemon:
> Qui de forches raient larron,
> Ja pus nel amera nul jor.

This new reading certainly deserves support: the scribe appears to have introduced a more familiar word, traient, for raient, misled by the form in which the verb appeared. Ewert had criticized the scribe for showing an unintelligent appreciation of the text in writing nel rather than nes ('On the Text of...', p. 94), but in his second volume (pp. 82-3), he expressed the view that Reid had proposed a much more satisfactory reading. Mölk (Tristan und Isolde, p. 9, note 1) knew Morawski 1048, which Reid cites in support of his version.

58-9. Tanquerey (Rom., LXVI, p. 122) believed that 58 contained not an exclamation but a concessive subjunctive and interpreted the lines thus: 'Mourraient-ils, ils ne seraient pas admis à voir la face de Dieu.' He accordingly suggested the text should read:

> Si voient il Deu et son reigne,
> Ja nul verroient en la face.

But Tanquerey's version falls singularly flat. At 58 M^4 and Ewert both print Si voient il Deu et son reigne! However, they

understand the line rather differently. M^4 (Glossary, Deu, p. 154) sees the line as an asseverative formula which is virtually contradicted by 59. Ewert sees 58 as exclamatory and translates (Ewert, Volume II, p. 83): 'Let them come into the presence of God and his kingdom! Never would they look upon his face!' Ewert alludes (p. 84) to Lancelot 6611 (Roques 6591): one might also mention Perceval 6282. Reid prefers the interpretation of M^4, but he suggests that improvement can still be made (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 10-11). Suggesting that a comma should replace the full stop after 57, he believes, that 58 could be 'put into the mouths of the hostile barons'.

67-8. Reid thinks ('On the Text of the Tristran...' p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., p. 11) that these two lines have been interverted. As the lines stand, 67, like 441, does indeed appear to be a form of conclusion, giving judgment on the whole sequence of events Iseut has imagined would happen, were the king to learn of their meeting. Ewert records Reid's proposal (Ewert, Volume II, p.84), but offers no comment.

70. The MS reads Que por lui pas vos ameit. Ewert and M^4 emend pas, obviously inappropriate here, to par. Reid queries this (The 'Tristran'..., p. 12), pointing out that par is only rarely found in isolation without another intensive adverb. Reid may be right in supposing that the pas of the MS was induced by por, but the scribe may also have misunderstood the general context.

75-6. In 75 Ewert alone corrects ja to la. Muret and M^4 retain ja in 76 and thus have ja repeated in the same clause.

Reid points to the repeated *ja* in ll. 2323-4 in the manuscript version (*The 'Tristran'...*, pp. 12-13). The absence of any compelling reason for emending 75 and the presence of the parallel passage suggest that *ja* ought to be retained.

89-90. Ewert: Mais l'en puet home desveier,
Faire le mal et bien laisier;

M^4: Mais l'en puet home desveier,
Faire mal faire et bien laisier:

Ewert reproduces the reading of the manuscript, as did Muret in M^o. The correction in M^4, found in fact in all the CFMA editions, was first suggested by Tobler (*ZRP*, XXX, p. 743). Ewert defends his version in his second volume (p. 85) and argues that, even if the emended version presents the author's thought more clearly, this is not sufficient reason for modifying the manuscript reading. A more persuasive defence of the MS reading is presented by Reid (*The 'Tristran'...*, pp. 13-14). He suggests that here, as elsewhere in the text, *faire* is being put to the factitive use and that *faire le mal* is equivalent to (*lui) faire faire le mal*.

93-100. Hunt is prepared to re-order lines in the first part of this first episode (*Tris.*, I, pp. 31-4). He prefers to allocate 81-4 to Iseut, and, as Robson before him ('The Technique of Symmetrical Composition...', p. 66, note 1), to invert 93-6 and 97-100. Certainly 93-6 are then better integrated into the text. Iseut's speech is still a long one, but this should not really cause concern: clearly her loquacity is due in this instance to an overwhelming desire to prevent Tristan from intervening and, so she fears, from betraying them.

102. Ewert: Franche, cortoise, bone foi!

M^4: Franche, cortoise, en bone foi

Once more Ewert retains the reading of the manuscript and once more he has the support of M^o. It was Acher (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 720) who first proposed the reading en bone foi, associating the adverbial phrase with vos ai mandee in the next line. Ewert is reluctant to adopt Acher's version and points to epithets similar to bone foi in 2261 and 1238 (Ewert, Volume II, p. 86). On the other hand, reference ought to be made to the use of en bone foi in 1382.

105. M^4 follows Ewert in retaining the manuscript reading puis, thereby rejecting a previous emendation, plus, printed in M^3. It might be noted, however, that in a similar case, at 1728, M^4 has plus and the manuscript reading pus, originally accepted by Ewert, is rejected.

137. Tobler suggested the line should read Onc nen i out un sol d'eus tous (ZRP, XXX, p. 743). Ewert is surely right to reject this suggestion (Ewert, Volume II, p. 89), as Muret had himself done in M^1 (p. 140). With Ewert, one finds it difficult to comprehend Tanquerey's point that sous may come from soldre (Rom., LVI, p. 118, note 1).

146-50. The authority of the large red initials in the manuscript is in some doubt. Reid would punctuate these lines according to the sense of the passage ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 266, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 15-16). He would place a full stop at the end of 147 and a comma after 148, not

the comma and full stop adopted by Ewert. He would, therefore, agree with the interpretation of the passage proposed in M^4. Ewert finds Reid's proposal unjustified and pleads that there is no compelling reason for breaking the couplet (Ewert, Volume II, p. 89). But, as Reid points out, our author frequently breaks the couplet elsewhere.

156. All editors correct the MS reading obatalle to a batalle, but Reid expresses dissatisfaction (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 16-17). Certainly if s'en tort were to be taken in its normal sense it would suggest the notion of escaping from combat rather than going forth to combat, which is what Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 89-90) and M^4 (p. 170) understand. Simply correcting o to de would produce a line quite inappropriate in the context, so Reid suggests Qui de (or a) batalle o moi s'atort. The scribe's confusion at l. 4472 of torner and atorner, as pointed out by Reid, suggests that his emendation deserves support.

160-2. After 161, all the CFMA editions suppose a lacuna. Ewert, however, prints a comma and challenges the need to assume the lacuna (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 90-1). Mer and torner rhyme and unless we envisage a rhyming quatrain we would have to accept, if we accept the lacuna, that at least four lines have been omitted. One must agree with Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 17) that it is difficult to see how so long a development could be inserted.

But after the lacuna has been rejected, how are the lines to be interpreted? Ewert thinks the lines mean: 'I wish to return there (i.e. across the sea to his native land) in lordly

fashion as when I crossed hither (i.e. to take service with Mark)'. There are a number of objections to this interpretation. In the context it would seem that Tristan is wanting, not to return home, but to stay with Mark, and Ewert's interpretation unexpectedly introduces, at the very end of a speech, a radically new idea. Furthermore, it is difficult, as Reid points out, to take com with the very clause in which it does not occur. Finally Ewert's decision to take a seignor as an adverbial clause is not supported by the other lines he cites (2308 and 2670), which present a rather different construction. Reid sees i as meaning 'to him', considers vol as a preterite and is prepared to translate the couplet quite literally: 'When I came here across the sea to him, I wished to come to him as my lord' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 18). But one feels unhappy that Tristran's speech should close so lamely with little relevance to the central notion of his reconciliation with Mark. The translation offered by Ménage is more convincing: 'Puisque c'est vers lui que je vins en ce pays en traversant la mer, comme vers un seigneur, c'est vers lui que je veux me tourner' (Rom., XCIII, p. 112). Like Reid, Ménage understands i as 'to him', but takes qant as causal, as in fact Ewert did when he composed his glossary. In this proposal the reconciliation notion is central: Tristan is prepared, so he affirms, to make a fresh start, to let bygones be bygones and to serve once more the lord he sought and found. Hunt agrees basically with Ménage's reading of the lines (Tris., I, pp. 34-6), but wonders whether 161 and 162 might originally have had Com at the head of both lines or Com in 161 and Si in 162.

207-10. In 208 Ewert retains the MS reading fol adoise

but he is far from satisfied (Ewert, Volume II, p. 92). Reid considers the line obscure in sense and construction (MLR, LX, p. 357), while M^{o} and all the CFMA editions emend fol to sol. In 1897, Rüttiger had suggested the bolder correction, and one which is not really apt in the context, Par tote terre que fuse a l'aise (Der heutige Stand..., p. 18, note 5). The obvious difficulties experienced by translators testify to the line's continuing obscurity. Stone judiciously omits both 207 and 208 (Tristan et Iseut, p. 19), while Mölk omits 208 alone (Tristan und Isolde, p. 17 and note 3). Fedrick feels obliged to supply material (The Romance of Tristan..., p. 51), and Caulkins and Mermier produce the only certain impossible translation (Tristan et Iseult, p. 15). Ewert suggests, as one possibility only, that there may be a lacuna of several lines after 208 (Ewert, Volume I, p. 7, Volume II, p. 92). Reid is certainly prepared to accept that this may be so (The 'Tristran'..., p. 19). However, if a satisfactory version were to be found for 208, the need to postulate a lacuna might easily disappear.

219-20. Ewert prints an exclamation mark after 220, while the CFMA editions all have a full stop. Reid finds neither version satisfactory and suggests either emending Qui to Que or punctuating the whole passage differently (The 'Tristran'..., p. 20). His version would read Par Deu, Tristran, molt me mervel! Qui me donez itel consel, Vos m'alez porchaçant mon mal. And yet the Muret and Ewert version, where Qui is a relative vaguely dependent upon Tristran, should by no means be ruled out.

224. The manuscript reads soit avoir or possibly soit aveir, which Muret after M^0 consistently emended to soit savoir: the editors of M^4 followed suit. Ewert defends his version, soit a voir, in his commentary (Ewert, Volume II, p. 94), but as Reid claims (The 'Tristran'..., p. 20) his argument lacks any firm foundation unless parallel examples of the expression estre a voir are produced.

230-1. In l. 230 there is no reason to doubt that the emendation je ne for se je in the MS is correct, but l. 231 has given rise to comment by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 20-1). The MS reads Que ce vos di por averté, which in M^2, M^3, M^4 and Ewert is corrected to Ne ce vos di por averté. Reid considers the use of ne, in the sense of 'hor', without a negation, to be unlikely at this time. Of the readings he suggests a return to that of M^0 and M^1 is tempting. Placing a full stop after 230, Muret then printed Ne le vos di. At 230, M^4 reads Certes, je ne suis pas si osse. Suis is surely an unacknowledged error.

235-6. Hunt wishes to emend s'apuie to sospire in l. 236, claiming that one expects ce m'est vis to be attached to a 'rather more psychological action than leaning on a slab of stone' (Tris., I, pp. 36-7). But ce m'est vis (as distinct from ce m'est avis), on the only other occasion it appears in the text, at 1818, is associated with a physical, rather than a psychological, movement. The linking of 234 and 235 also seems a trifle forced.

272. The form of the line itself offers no problem, but

the interpretation of de certainly does. Beyerle pointed out (RJ, XVII, p. 56) that Mölk mistranslated the line. Since the same mistranslation occurs in the translations by Fedrick (p. 53), by Caulkins and Mermier (p. 18) and by Stone (p. 21), it might be advisable to quote Beyerle in his support of Ewert's gloss (Ewert, Volume I, p. 144): 'Das De am Anfang von Vers 272 muss Präposition zu ma mollier sein und kann nur den Urheber der Handlung bezeichnen...Die Verleumdungen des Zwerges haben den König erzürnt und haben bewirkt, dass er den Hass seiner Frau auf sich zog. Daran denkt der König, und nicht an seinen eigenen Groll, dem er längst abgeschworen hat' (RJ, XVII, pp. 56-7).

304-5. As at l. 148, Reid disputes the punctuation suggested by Ewert because of the presence of the large red initial ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 266, The 'Tristran'..., p. 22). He suggests that there should be a comma, not a full stop, at 304. As was the case at 148, Ewert dismisses Reid's suggestion (Ewert, Volume II, p. 99) and the editors of M^4 dispute the initial and print the text as Reid suggests.

329-30. The latest editors agree in correcting the scribal ceus to cel. But Ewert goes on to speculate that the form is a relic of an earlier version (Ewert, Volume II, p. 103). He suggests that the lines in an earlier version might have read Mout se penout de ceus deçoivre Qui de l'ame le feront soivre, which is in fact how the lines read in M^o. But speculation of this kind is dangerous. By alluding to O, Ewert might seem to be acting counter to his dictum, that the editor 'should not be concerned to substitute for the reading of the MS what

he thinks Beroul said or should have said, having regard to the testimony of other versions of the story' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 45).

331-2. Hunt wishes to eliminate the simple assonance which links the lines (Tris., I, pp. 37-8).

He proposes:

As estoiles choisist l'asent,
Rogist et enfle de mautalent.

Certainly assent is far more common than assente (see T.-L., 579-81), but is not 332 in Hunt's version hypermetric?

350. All modern editors print estait for the scribal estoit, but Ewert once again indulges in speculation (Ewert, Volume II, p. 106). He suggests that estoit may be simply a graphy for estait. But he repeats his earlier suggestion that the scribe let his eye wander to the previous line ('On the Text of...', p. 96).

382-3. Ewert: A Governal com out ouvré;
Qant conter l'ot, Deu en mercie

M^4: A son mestre com out ouvré.
Qant conter l'ot, Deu en mercie

At 382, the manuscript reads a son oncle and, at 383, Qant Got', presumably for Goter or Gotier. The M^4 reading at 382, continuing the Muret version, seems to lack paleographical support, and appears simply to be an attempt to reproduce the right general sense. Ewert's Governal is a little closer to the manuscript form and might just about have been misread as son oncle.

386. Reid claims that ert is a future (FS, XXV, p. 54, The 'Tristran'..., p. 23), while Ewert regards it as either

future or imperfect (Ewert, Volume II, p. 108). The imperfect would appear to be unlikely here: if a past tense were employed in this context, one would certainly expect the preterite rather than the imperfect (see also Bik, Neophil., LVI, p. 38).

412-14. Reid, justifiably interpreting si in 412 as meaning 'if', prefers the comma printed by the Muret and M^4 editors at the end of 413 to the full stop offered by Ewert (The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 23-4). In his review of Ewert's first volume, Tanquerey remarked that fole et are not the only words which could be supplied to fit the context (Med. aev., X, p. 114). This is obviously true, but as Ewert notes (Ewert, Volume II, p. 110), it is not unlikely that the form of parole induced the omission. This would explain the absence of fole, if not of the abbreviation for et.

418-19. At 419 the manuscript reads Anor faire trop fraine. All editors insert a non between faire and trop. Ewert, attributing the fault to a misunderstanding of the context or to the scribe's carelessness ('On the Text of...', p. 97), interprets the lines as if Iseut were repeating Tristan's words and translates: 'He said nothing but that I should pay him honour of a not too niggardly kind' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 110). Reid, strangely, does not consider the second half of 419, but he quite correctly takes mais in its normal sense and translates: 'He said nothing to me (about his reason for wishing to speak to me), but I felt bound to pay him honour' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 24). Yet Reid's interpretation is not altogether convincing either. It may well

be that 11. 418-20 represent Iseut's own account of events. She may well be ostensibly regretting her brusqueness and be apologizing for not showing to Tristan the respect due to him as her husband's nephew. Tristan, however, acted impeccably and did not even rebuke her (Ne me dist rien). One might, therefore, speculate that not non but par should be supplied (see 133, 229, 1152). Thus, the line might read Anor faire trop par frarine and the passage might be translated: 'He said nothing to me, but I had to show him far too little respect.'

430. The scribe writes doige. In all the CFMA editions the absence of a titulus or n is supposed and doinge is printed. Ewert would seem to suppose the absence of a minim and prints donge, the version of M^{o}. The form donge is found, in a similar expression, at 2860.

439. While Ewert retains ne mentirez, followed by an exclamation mark, Muret first printed ne m'en crerrez and then ne m'en creirez, the form reproduced in M^{4}. Mölk, in his text (Tristan und Isolde, p. 28), although generally following Ewert, here prints ne men creirez (men presumably being an error for m'en). Henry considers that the MS reading is impossible (RBPH, XXII, p. 256), and Ewert concedes (Ewert, Volume II, p. 111) that his interpretation involves an extension of the attested meanings of mentir, but the extension is surely greater than he is prepared to admit (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 24). Given the similar scribal error at 468, ne m'en creirez is surely the better reading. Iseut is anticipating, and thereby rendering unlikely, a possible reaction by Mark, the correct reaction were he in full possession of the facts. The same approach has been

adopted before (39, 401).

483-5. Two manuscript forms, li in 483 and serpent in 485, have proved disconcerting. In an attempt to provide consistency with events earlier in the fragment and in the lost episodes, corrections have been proposed. Editors emend li to vos, considering that in the line there is a reference back to the words of Iseut in 49-53. Because two incidents seem to have been confused, serpent was emended by Muret to plaie (but it is difficult to see quite how plaie was misread by the scribe as serpent); Ewert and M^4, however, retain the manuscript form. Acher was prepared to accept li but assumed a lacuna after 484 (ZRP, XXXIII, pp. 720-1). Certainly, as Ewert points out (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 112-3), a comma after 484 and the omission of a comma after serpent (as in M^4) would produce a better reading, but the treatment of serpent as feminine (contrast 2560) is still unexpected. Or do we simply have to assume that Mark, delighted by the apparent exhibition of innocence he has witnessed, presents a garbled account? Ought we in that case to retain li and serpent?

491. Certainly the MS reading preserved by Ewert, a l'arbre, is unexpected, particularly in view of 349 where we have en l'arbre. In M^o, Muret printed en l'arbre but his subsequent editions and M^4 have an, which Henry supports (RBPH, XXII, p. 256). This is not the only case of this kind: Reid lists other examples and suggests that in 'the great majority of all these lines it seems probable that the original had

en' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 25). In the latest editions, Ewert and M^4, Ewert has a in the following lines while M^4 has an: 491, 765, 772, 805, 1111, 1447, 1729, 2260, 3464, 4089, 4339, 4359. In almost all of these cases it is certainly difficult to accept the bald MS reading presented by Ewert. (See also Ewert, Volume II, p. 99, note on 317.)

492. Hunt is ready to emend Souef m'en ris to M'en soufris (Tris., I, pp. 38-9). But it is possible that Mark's laugh is quite understandably one of embarrassment, directed at himself (as at 1343?).

500. For his CFMA editions, Muret adopted the correction me preïst proposed by Gaston Paris. But the MS reading mespreïst, as printed by Ewert, is surely quite acceptable. In M^4, Paris's correction seems to be accepted (p. 142), but the MS reading is reproduced.

506. While Ewert mildly queries the form donst (Ewert, Volume II, p. 18), Reid proposed a more radical emendation, se for the manuscript's que (The 'Tristran'..., p. 26). But although there is no compelling reason for Mark to invoke a blessing on Brengain, his words might be inspired by his overall pleasure at the apparent outcome of events. Blakey concurs (FS, XXX, pp. 129-30).

558-60. Reid has proposed ('On the Text of the Tristran ..., p. 267, The 'Tristran'..., p. 27) that a full stop should replace the comma at 558, and 559 would then stand, without a

verb, as an exclamatory construction. Ewert would see this proposal as obscuring a characteristic stylistic feature (Ewert, Volume II, p. 116). An alternative correction, interversion of 559 and 560, was tentatively suggested by Tanquerey (Rom., LVI, p. 122). An apparent error by Muret at 559 --grand for grant-- was noted by Ewert ('On the Text of...', p. 93, note). On the evidence of other editions, this appears to be a printing error rather than a misreading of the manuscript.

576. In his second volume (p. 117), Ewert suggests that cline may be a variant of cligne, meaning 'winks', rather than 'bows', the interpretation in his glossary. With common sense surely on his side, Reid would tend to support the meaning 'bows' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 28). One might point out that in the editions dated 1958, 1963 and 1967 (if not that dated 1939), cline in this line is already given the meaning 'winks'.

599. On a point of vocabulary, it might be noted that Orr speculates as to whether 599 might not mean 'Nous lui dirons notre façon de parler' (Three Studies..., pp. 52-3).

620. Tanquerey points out that Ewert's addition of il is not the only solution to the problem posed by the missing syllable (Med. aev., X, p. 114). But Ewert's version is as probable as that of the CFMA editions, which have Si que jamais nen i retort.

639-40. M^4: Et il i est mot tost venuz
(Dehez ait il!) conme boçuz.

Ewert: Et il i est molt tost venuz;
Dehez ait il conme boçuz!

Mölk: Et il i est molt tost venuz
--Dehez ait il-- conme boçuz!

The similar interpretations offered by Mölk and M^4 (which continues the reading of the previous CFMA editions) would seem to have their source in a proposal of Tobler (ZRP, XXX, p. 743). Ewert defends his version (Ewert, Volume II, p. 121), and rightly so, for his reading, which does not assume that hunchbacks are necessarily lacking in speed, is surely superior.

644. Ewert makes no comment on the reading con faite (as opposed to his own confaite), which appeared in the SATF edition and in all the CFMA editions and which met with the support of Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 256). In the manuscript, for what it is worth, it is possible to read the symbols as one word.

646-8. Gaston Paris's emendation porpensast was not retained in M^3 or M^4, although with porpensa in 647 the lines do not really make a great deal of sense. Reid proposes to emend porpensa to porpensent and to repunctuate as follows (The 'Tristran'..., p. 29): Dehé aient tuit cil devin Qui porpensent tel felonie Con fist cist nain, qui Dex maudie! It is not too hard to accept that the scribe, under the influence of fist and obsessed with the actions of one particular dwarf, might have written a past, singular form in place of porpensent.

651. Reid considers the version Muret first printed in his SATF edition, Covient qu'il alle par matin, to be superior to that of the later CFMA and Ewert editions (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 29-30). The reason Reid puts forward for the scribe's error, an awareness of the alternative possibility Di ton nevo qu'il

alle a Carduel, seems very plausible. But there is surely no reason to suspect, as Reid does, that par matin is possibly corrupt. Ainz que la nuit ait fin in 692 is an embellishment added by Mark to emphasize the apparent urgency of the embassy and is not in absolute contradiction with par matin in 691. Blakey, perhaps a trifle laboriously, has come to recognize this (FS, XXX, p. 131). Reid also apparently presumes that at 651 M^1 followed M^0: in fact its reading is that adopted in M^2, M^3, M^4 and Ewert.

658. In this particular context the MS reading Por Deu, reproduced by Ewert, does not really make sense. Reid supports emendation (The 'Tristran'..., p. 30), but prefers por ce to por ceu, the correction introduced by Muret in all his editions and in M^4. If the form Deu is felt to arise from a misreading of a similar form by the scribe one will select ceu, but if parallel expressions elsewhere in the MS are considered all-important one will support Reid's ce.

663-6. M^3 printed 663 thus: Et s'il n'i vient, et je nul sai. Although Robson has supported this version ('Quatrains and Passages...', pp. 193 and 201), it is far from convincing and the parallel in O (l. 3842) cited by Muret, is not really close. Ewert places a semi-colon after 664 and at 665 he prints the plain MS reading Et tuit si home autrement. In his second volume (pp. 123-4), Ewert voices dissatisfaction with this version, but he cannot accept the version adopted by Muret and the M^4 editors, originally a proposal by Gaston Paris, Et tuit ti home outreement. Mölk suggests the lines should

read (Tristan und Isolde, p. 38 and p. 39, note 7):

> Et s'il i vient, et ge nul sai,
> Se tu nu voiz, si me desfai,
> Et tuit ti homẽ, autrement
> Prové seront sanz soirement.

If, in Ewert's version, Tristan's men are somewhat surprisingly involved, here the dwarf is somewhat unfairly suggesting that the king's men should be punished, presumably for failure to detect the presence of Tristan. Surely it is not within the dwarf's province to recommend their punishment? One wonders whether 665 ought not to be dissociated altogether from the preceding line. Has Et been added by a scribe to supply a syllable to a deficient line, as at 3483? If the lines are to be linked, might 665 not once have begun Voiant ti homẽ?

669. Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 124) and Reid (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 30-1) are rather harsh on Tanquerey (Rom., LVI, p.122 and note 1). Tanquerey does not actually propose the emendation of se to si. Ewert's reference to Aucassin et Nicolete (sic) should be to p. XVIII, as Tanquerey correctly has it.

696. Ewert glosses atenance as 'intent' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 138), while M^4 suggests 'disposition d'âme', 'dessein' (Glossary, p. 159). Payen (Le Motif..., p. 335, note 13) translates fole atenance by 'le dessein insensé', stressing that fole means simply 'insensée', not 'démesurée'. But Barbier glosses atenance as 'physical nearness' (FS, I, p. 119). His proposal has perhaps not met with the consideration it deserves.

697-8. Reid suggests ('On the Text of the Tristran...',

p. 275, The 'Tristran'..., p. 31) that the lines in the scribe's source might easily have read En son cuer dist que s'il pooit A la roîne parleroit. Ewert, for his part, suggests as one possibility that originally there may have been two couplets made on the same rhyme and that one line was omitted by the scribe (Volume II, p. 128). This seems unlikely: as Ewert suggests elsewhere (Ewert, Volume II, p. 6), the scribe appears to have produced two imperfect versions of 698. Reid refers to the editor's decision as to what to include in his text as 'somewhat arbitrary' ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 275). This is obviously true, but the editor will include in his text the form of words which, in his view, is most likely to have induced the pattern of errors behind the manuscript version.

711-4. Editors regard trace in l. 712 as the object of veer in l. 713, but Reid has suggested that a comma should be placed after trace and that veer should be associated with se l'un a l'autre iroit (The 'Tristran'..., p. 31). Vinaver supports the general view that trace is the direct object to veer, but he builds on Reid's observation that in the conditional clause in 713 one would expect either an imperfect indicative or an imperfect subjunctive ('Remarques sur...', pp. 341-3). He suggests that iroit is an error, occasioned by the presence in the following line of the conditionals ending in -roit. In Vinaver's view, the scribe's model read aloit. If this kind of contamination has taken place, it is not unlike the kind that may have occurred in ll. 820 and 2366, where errors may have been induced within the line by the rhyme-words to come. But Henry also has attacked the problem ('Sur les vers...').

He agrees with Reid that the sense of bien tost is 'perhaps', but considers that Tristan is here posing himself a question and that se in l. 713 has the sense of savoir se. Accordingly, he would print:

> Puis (sic) dist: 'Bientost (sic) a ceste place
> Espandroit flor por nostre trace
> Veer, se l'un a l'autre iroit?

725-8. It has normally been accepted that in these lines we have two consecutive couplets made on the same rhyme. But Reid, whose general tendency is to reduce the number of rhyming quatrains (see, for example, the note in his commentary on 2702-6), suggests that 725-6 originally rhymed in -é (The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 31-2). His proposal that Cirge ne lanpe should be reversed to read Lanpe ne cirge does not seem to serve any real purpose.

755. With M^o and M^4 Ewert accepts the reading of the manuscript, Deus. But if Deus is a nominative, as Ewert claims (Ewert, Volume II, p. 129), one must agree with Reid (The 'Tristran' ..., p. 32) that it is difficult to accept that out is the equivalent of fist.

770. Rather than emend to Du sanc as in M^o, the MS reading Du saut should be retained. Robson's repunctuation of the line, following a comma after 669, produces the version Du saut li rois Tristran menace, which he translates by 'The king threatens Tristran because of his leap' ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 196 and p. 201). Admittedly, in the CFMA and Ewert versions, en in 769 might be regarded as redundant, but the word-order in Robson's version seems unhappy. La trace du saut, obviously

meaning the blood which fell to the ground in the course of the leap, holds together well.

771-4. While a lacuna after 771 is supposed in the Muret editions, none is supposed in M^4 or Ewert. The M^4 version reads Li troi baron sont en la chanbre, Tristran par ire an son lit prenent (Cuelli l'orent cil en haïne, Por sa prooise), et la roïne. Roïne is certainly not governed by por, but it is more likely to be the direct object of the verb in 773 than of the earlier prenent (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 130, Hunt, Rom., XCVIII, p. 521, note 1). Like Reid, (The 'Tristran'..., p. 32), the revisors of M^4 accept the rhyme in 771-2. Ewert, however, suggests a correction, Tristran pensent a son lit prendre (Ewert, Volume I, p. 24, note, Volume II, p. 130), and this is supported by Robson ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 196 and p. 201). Yet the rhyme thus produced is not markedly more 'correct' than the chanbre : prenent rhyme. Certainly, the evidence of 331-2 and 2627-8, for example, suggest that the rhyme can be accepted and that there is little need to assume a lacuna.

784. All the Muret editions and M^4 have a comma after soufri, while Ewert prints a semi-colon. Certainly, as Reid intimates (The 'Tristran'..., p. 33), the comma serves the sense better.

788. All the Muret editions and M^4 emend mon to mau, but Ewert defends the manuscript reading (Ewert, Volume II, p. 131). With Raynaud de Lage (Rom., LXXXV, p. 523, note), one would not think the reading mon saut to be authentic. The

reading may well be scribal, for the copyist, perhaps inspired by 755-6, seems to be blatantly anticipating Tristan's leap from the chapel. Mau saut might be the author's more oblique anticipation of the leap. Nobody would deny the existence of expressions such as faire le saut, but to support his retention of mon saut Ewert surely needs to present examples where the expression is personalized, as it is here. Henry's suggestion (RBPH, XXII, p. 256), that the comma after sai should be suppressed, has much to commend it.

789. Ewert maintains the word-division in the MS and prints acorocier. But the scribe's word-divisions are hardly sacrosanct. Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 33) and Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 256) prefer a corocier, which from a study of T.-L. (I, 24, II, 897-8) would seem more likely.

810. Nul has been variously interpreted. Foulet sees the form as representing ne li (Petite syntaxe..., § 221), while Ewert wavers between ne li and ne le (Ewert, Volume II, p. 27, p. 132). Acher suggested the correction to nu (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 721), interpreting nul as ne le. With logic on his side, Reid believes that nul = ne le and regards le as the personal direct object of leüst and not that of escondire (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 33-4), as Ewert believes (Ewert, Volume II, p. 132).

819-20. MS: Por ce nesevout vers le roi
Mesfaire soi por nul desroi

Ewert: Por ce ne vout il vers le roi
Mesfaire soi por nul desroi;

M^4: Por ce ne vout envers le roi
Mesfaire soi por nul desroi;

Reid points out that se accompanying the finite verb is normal Old French syntax, while soi with the infinitive is not ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 277, The 'Tristran'..., p. 34). Reid suggests that soi is faulty and was induced by the scribe's appreciation of the rhyme to come. Ewert, however, sees se as redundant, unless soi could be interpreted as ç'oi (Ewert, Volume II, p. 132): this is ingenious, but ultimately unconvincing for the reason Reid puts forward, that one hardly expects to find ç'oi on its own. Holden, without declaring se consequently redundant, sees soi in 820 as the author's characteristic preference for the strong form of the pronoun after the verb (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 395).

822. Muret suggested that qui in 822 might be interpreted as qu'i or que (M^{o}, p. 224, p. 253). Ewert is prepared to consider only qu'i as a possibility (Ewert, Volume II, p. 132). But is it really difficult to accept qui as the nominative relative pronoun?

853. Henry would disregard the MS form and print en preïstes, rather than enpreïstes (RBPH, XXII, p. 256). Both enprendre bataille and prendre bataille are of course attested (T.-L., III, 132, I, 868-70).

867-70. It is difficult to imagine King Mark taking an active part in the preparations for the burning of the lovers and there has been no mention of his move to the place of execution. In 869, therefore, tranchanz surely cannot mean 'pruning knife or shears' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 171), unless,

as Ewert suggests (Ewert, Volume II, p. 135), a scribe added a detail familiar to him from another story such as the Dolopathos. We do read, in the Dolopathos: 'Cum igitur paruenissent ad locum, rex propria manu ignem lignis supposuit' (Historia septem sapientium, II, edited by A. Hilka, pp. 43-4). M^4 follows Muret in tentatively suggesting the meaning 'Parlant d'un ton coupant et péremptoire' (Glossary, p. 170), but this seems equally inadequate. Ewert supposes again, as at ll. 207-10, that two alternative variant readings from the scribe's model may have been incorporated into the scribe's text, but Reid once more regards this as unlikely (The 'Tristran'..., p.36 and p. 19). There are certainly other possibilities. One must feel that at one time tranchanz and sarmenz were much more closely linked together. Perhaps the second halves of 869-70 have at one time somehow been interverted?

878. It may be wisest to retain the manuscript reading tibois and to look upon it as a scribal variant rather than as an error. All the CFMA editions correct tibois to tabois, while Ewert preserves the MS form. Tobler (ZRP, XXX, p. 743) and Robson ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 198) also support tabois. Ewert wrongly claims that it is Tanquerey, not Tobler, who cites examples of tabois (Ewert, Volume II, p. 136).

892-4. The sense of these lines is not very clear. In M^4 (p. 142) there is the suggestion that 892 and 893 should be linked, with a comma after 892 and a full stop at the end of 893. The source of this suggestion may well be Tanquerey

(Med. aev., X, p. 115). Ewert is prepared to take 893 as 'exclamatory, i.e. postulating a condition with an implied threat, the same thought being repeated imperatively in 894' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 136). Neither suggestion is by any means convincing. Braet has recently revived the notion that in 892 the MS reading nel (continued as ne l' in M^0, M^1 and M^2) should be retained (ZfS, LXXXVII, p. 50).

916. Where Muret and M^4 print Une chapele est sor, Ewert prints Une chapele sor. In the manuscript the abbreviation for et comes between chapele and sor. Muret and M^4 may have the correct reading, for the scribe may easily have introduced the abbreviation for et in error for est or its abbreviated form. Or perhaps et was introduced to supply what the scribe saw as a missing syllable (as may have been the case at 4314).

921-2. In the MS the rhyme-words are faloise and aaise. M^0 and the CFMA editions emend to falise and alise, which is glossed as 'lisse' in M^0 (p. 147). This is the version accepted by Robson ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 199 and p. 201). Ewert also corrected aaise, printing atoise and glossing the word as 'slate' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 138), but he admitted in his second volume (pp. 137-8) that this was only a tentative interpretation. De Caluwé has also concerned himself with the lines ('La Chapelle...', pp. 224-5). He sees plain in l. 922 as the product of planus and proposes:

> Outre n'out rien fors la faloise.
> Cil mont est plain, de pierre adoise.

The re-interpretation of plain seems reasonable, but it may

be prudent to retain aaise. (See also Frappier, CCM, VI, p. 448, note 141). However, Paquette has recently joined those who are unhappy with aaise and has proposed the correction aoise, which he interprets as a participle made on adaugere (Tris., II, p. 33). For pierre aoise he suggests the translation 'pierre proéminente'.

938. Ewert and M^4 retain A vos eisinc, the manuscript reading. Previously, Muret had printed A vo seisine in M^o, which Acher opposed (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 721), and A vos ici in his CFMA editions. In M^4 (p. 142) an audacious emendation is also suggested, En es l'ore a vos revendrai.

955-8. The MS reading ligliglise in 957 has caused critics to be uncertain as to the meaning of these lines. Ewert sought the form closest to the MS, l'iglise, and was prepared to disregard the identical rhyme he thus produced. Muret and M^4 emend 957 to Toz a genoz chiet en la glise, a version favoured by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 37-8), as is the correction jus for sus in 956, which had been tentatively put forward in M^4 (p. 142). The identical rhyme, in spite of Ewert's explanation (Ewert, Volume II, p. 139), is difficult to support. The scribe almost certainly found l'iglise in his copy at l. 957, but he himself hesitated to write it down and eventually produced a botched version. The narrative may be disjointed, as Ewert and Reid insist, but the author is surely describing all the time either Tristan's actions or, as in 955 and 957-8, the thoughts which pass through his mind after his successful leap. Lines 953-4 are surely a form of conclusion, introduced once the event is over. Ewert's punctuation obscures this, of course. Vinaver, in defending Ewert's reading, Toz a genoz sont en l'iglise,

considers that by l. 957 the leap is not yet over ('Remarques sur...', pp. 343-5). He accepts saut sus in 956, but his interpretation of events at this point is unconvincing. He writes that 'il s'agit justement d'un saut en hauteur: quittant le rocher, Tristan saute en l'air et retombe sur le sable' (p. 345, note 5). Why should Tristan leap up into the air and perhaps increase the danger? Vinaver quite rightly stresses that chiet could hardly have been misread by the scribe as sot. But font, according to this criterion, as Blakey acknowledges (FS, XXX, pp. 131-2), must surely be regarded as an excellent reading. It thus seems essential to retain sus in 956, to eliminate the identical rhyme in 957 and 958 and to print Toz a genoz font en la glise (see also the first chapter of Part One of this thesis).

982-5. Now that M^4 has restored the manuscript reading le at 983, this version differs from that of Ewert only in its punctuation. Ewert comments on the disjointed nature of the narrative (Ewert, Volume II, p. 140): by linking 983 to 982 his version is, in fact, less disjointed than that of M^4. Reid's only reservation with regard to Ewert's version (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 38-9), that this interpretation breaks the couplet, is a relatively minor one, particularly in view of his own comments on 147-50 (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 15-6).

994. Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 141) suggests the correction trespassent, and Reid supports him (The 'Tristran'..., p. 39). But the text does not seem to present any complete consistency in related cases (see, for example, 913).

998. Muret regularly corrected the MS reading enpres (which he read in M^0 as apres) to aspre. M^4 and Ewert print enprés. Reid queries enprés (The 'Tristran'..., p. 39) and suggests the emendation senpres, but does not allude to a parallel example for support.

1006. The full stop at the end of the line in M^3 and M^4 seems to be an unacknowledged misprint.

1008. Anoie has caused comment, but has been universally accepted by editors. Muret, while not altogether accepting the text, saw anoie as a remodelled form (M^0, p. XXXVIII, p. LXII, note 1). Ewert accepts the form and sees anoie as the weak form of the radical by analogy (Ewert, Volume II, p. 12) but Reid shares Muret's uneasiness and proposes emendation (The 'Tristran'..., p. 40). He suggests that the author might have written Dex vos an oie! and argues that in the MS Tristan's reaction to Governal's words in 1005-7 is not really logical. Certainly, as Reid admits, it is difficult to see why the scribe should have written trop for dex, and on this account one should give a rather guarded reception to the proposal.

1030. MS: Avoc sont tuit li borjois

Ewert: Avoé sont tuit li borjois

M^4: Avocques sont tuit li borjois

The M^4 reading stems from a suggestion of Acher (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 721) which was adopted by Muret. Ewert's correction, involving a minimal alteration of the MS, comes from Tanquerey

(Rom., LVI, p. 115), but, as Wilson pointed out (MLR, XXXV, p. 100), he interprets avoé in a rather different manner. Avoé, for Ewert, seemed to be at first the past participle of avoer, which he glossed as 'avow', 'acknowledge as vassal' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 139), but in his second volume (p. 141), he seems to regard it as a noun meaning 'retainers'. Tanquerey, on the other hand, interprets the word as a form of aveiier and to him the line would mean 'Les bourgeois et les gens de la ville ont été prévenus, le roi leur a commandé...'. M^4 would interpret avocques in a very loose sense: 'Il a avec lui, c'est-à-dire à sa disposition (quels que soient leurs sentiments réels), tous les bourgeois et tous ceux de la ville' (p. 143). Reid accepts the form avoé, but he sees it as the past participle of soi avoer, 'acknowledge oneself as vassal' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 41). Reid seems to have the correct sense, but doubts may well remain, mainly because Governal is not relating a factual truth but promoting a hypothesis in order to deter Tristan from going.

1035-6. Ewert: Chascun aime mex soi que toi:
Se l'en levout sor toi le hui,

M^4: Chascun aime mex soi qu'autrui:
Se l'en levout sor toi le hui,

M^4 is following Muret and Michel in emending in 1035 the toi of the MS to autrui, thus producing much the better reading. Tanquerey suggested a different correction, Chascun aime mex soi que toi· Se loi levout sor toi le roi (Rom., LVI, p. 116). Tanquerey's point, that Governal already knows that the hue and cry has been raised and that 1036 is therefore faulty, cannot really be given support. As at 1030, Governal is formulating

a hypothesis to keep Tristan in relative safety. Can the scribe's appreciation of rhyme have induced an error at l. 1035? Has he written toi, and not the correct autrui, under the influence of the preceding soi? Normally, it is true, the process works the other way round: the word within the line is altered under the influence of the rhyme to come. Ewert admits that Muret's emendation is 'eminently reasonable' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 31, note 3).

1053. In M^0 and M^1 Muret had emended out to ont, a correction which Reid quite reasonably now proposes to revive (The 'Tristran'..., p. 42).

1055. Reid ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 280, The 'Tristran'..., p. 43) considers the lacuna postulated by all editors at 1055 to be a doubtful one. He sees 1055 as the protasis to the apodosis in 1059 and suggests the reading m'esplor. Blakey (FS, XXI, p. 99) accepts the sense of Reid's emendation but suggests the reading m'escor, which is, indeed, paleographically more likely. Ewert, however, is unconvinced and writes that the 'context, and particularly l. 1059, indicates a lacuna at this point' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 144). But the main evidence, the rhyme jor : losengeor and the obvious possibility that 1059 is the apodosis of a conditional clause, would seem to argue against the existence of a lacuna. Ewert also points out that in 1059 mes proisier ought perhaps to be printed mesproisier, which is in fact what the scribe wrote. Of course, mesproisier would make both m'esplor and m'escor somewhat unlikely. Indeed, it is a trifle difficult to imagine

why Iseut should be thinking of weeping, even over her own fate, when she is so clearly delighted by the news of her lover's escape. In ll. 1048-50, she has just expressed absolute indifference as to her own future.

1105-8. Reid suggests ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp.264-5, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 44-5), that l. 1107 might be a rhetorical question. In his version the whole passage would read thus: A vos ne mesferoit il mie; Mais vos barons, en sa ballie S'il les trouvout, nes vilonast? Encor en ert ta terre en gast. Ewert notes the proposal (Ewert, Volume II, p. 147), but that is all. Certainly Reid's proposal would eliminate the difficulty noted in M^4 (p. 143), namely that nes, formed from ne (from nec) + les, represents an unusual enclisis. Muret printed sis vilonast in M^o and ne vilonast in M^1 and M^2. Blakey also is perturbed by the unusual enclisis, but unhappy over the sense Reid attributes to encor. He interprets vilonast as concessive and translates: 'To you he would do no harm. But if he found your barons in his power, even if he did not ill-treat them, yet will your land be ravaged' (FS, XXX, p. 133). But still it is more plausible for l. 1008 to be concerned, as Ewert hints, with a dearth of nobles in the land rather than with the laying waste of territory (see T.-L., IV, 203, and the example from the Roland, 1985-6).

1151. Reid considers that 1151 might be regarded as an independent exclamatory clause (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 46-7), but the text as printed by all editors is far from impossible.

1161. It is surely unnecessary to contemplate, as Ewert does (Ewert, Volume II, p. 151), a correction to laits : desfaits (or rather to laiz : desfaiz?).

1173-8. All editors postulate a lacuna between 1174 and 1175. Blakey, however, believes emendation is required (FS, XXI, pp. 99-100). He would intervert 1173-4, adjust Et que (for the Et qui of the MS) to Qu'ele in 1175, a line dependent, as 1177, on Tel justise in 1173. Line 1176, interpreted by Blakey as an explanation of 1175, still perhaps offers difficulty. One solution is offered by Reid, following a suggestion by Barnett, namely the interversion not only of 1173-4 but also of 1175-6 (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 48-9). His version runs: Mais, se vos croire me volez, Tel justise de li ferez Qu'ele vivroit, et sanz valoir, Et que voudroit mex mort avoir, Et que nus n'en orroit parler.... There seems to be no other case in the MS where the scribe has interverted two succesive couplets, but certainly there appears to be no obvious reason why he should not have done so. Braet favours the proposal (ZfS, LXXXVII, p. 50). However, the order in which the ideas are expressed in the new version does seem a trifle odd.

1194. The MS text is certainly not impossible, but obviously mais une could quite easily represent a misreading of nesune (via an intermediate mes une?), as Reid suggests (The 'Tristran'..., p. 49).

1205. Reid queries, amongst other things, the meaning 'perceive' that Ewert gives to eslire (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 50-1).

But there are a number of examples given in T.-L (III, 1096) which suggest that 'perceive' is in fact a possible translation.

1212. Muret corrected verrez to verra and si to son, while M^4 and Ewert correct only verrez to verra. The sense of si is far from clear, as the varying interpretations of Ewert and M^4 bear witness (Ewert, Volume II, p. 153, M^4, Glossary, p. 169). Reid would tend to support son, but retain verrez, as Braet would (ZfS, LXXXVII, p. 51). However, Reid is inclined towards the notion that the whole passage might be corrupt (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 50-1). The large amount of repetition in 1211-4 is certainly disconcerting.

1220. Ewert wonders whether prist may not be a scribal error for pris (Ewert, Volume II, p. 153), but the overall construction, with the elided weak form of the pronoun object coming after the verb, is surely quite normal.

1239-40. Quite rightly, Reid defends Ewert's interpretation of 1239-40 and sees con as introducing an exclamatory clause (The 'Tristran'..., p. 51). The CFMA editions all had a comma after 1240 and con is interpreted as 'aussi vrai que' (M^4, Glossary, p. 160).

1265-6. Ewert: Li contor dïent que Yvain
Firent nïer, qui sont vilain;
M^4: Li conteor dïent qu'Yvain
Firent nïer, qui sont vilain;

Ewert believes the poet treated contor, for older contëor, as trisyllabic and elided que (Ewert, Volume II, p. 28, p. 155).

Reid, however, finds no evidence for the reduced form at this time and supports the M^4 version (The 'Tristran'..., p. 52). Certainly, if Ewert believes that the poet elided que, as he most probably did, the edited text ought to have the elided form. Nïer is, to say the least, a surprising word to find. Its meaning surely ought to be 'to drown' at this time (see T.-L., VI, 710-3). Perhaps, following the suggestion of Gaston Paris (M^o, p. 253) which Ewert is prepared to support (Ewert, Volume II, p. 155), we should print tuer instead?

1301-2. Muret regularly emended dormir se vot in 1301, to dormir l'estot in M^o, to dormir l'estut and to dormir l'estuet in later editions. M^4, like Ewert, retains the MS form and Ewert has consistently advocated the retention of the identical rhyme ('On the Text of...', p. 96, Ewert, Volume II, p. 5). Ménage also accepts the lines as they stand, claiming that they 'diffusent, à notre sens, le charme d'une sensualité délicate' (Rom., XCV, p. 196). Reid, however, believes that the repetition of dormir se vot was not the author's work and he supports emendation (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 52-3). Since a sequence comes to an end with these lines, one might argue that the author could have repeated dormir se vot in order to emphasize the pause in his narrative. But, on the whole, emendation seems to be required. One might also query the beginning of the line, for it seems difficult to find a plausible interpretation here for Sor son ami.

1303. Muret corrected font to sont, but Ewert and M^4 retain the MS reading. Faire is surely unexpected in this context (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 53) and given the scribe's habit of writing f for s the correction sont almost

imposes itself.

1325-6. Ewert: Ce que dirai, c'ert du segroi
Dont je sui vers le roi par soi.'

M^4: Ce que dirai, c'ert du segroi
Dont je sui vers le roi par foi."

At 1326 Ewert reproduces the reading of the manuscript, soi. He defends his version at some length (Ewert, Volume II, p. 45 and p. 162), but one must entertain doubts. If the examples he quotes are relevant should not the text read at least par moi? As reason dictates, Acher accepts the correction par foi (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 722) and Henry and Lecoy believe that Ewert's version must be emended (RBPH, XXII, p. 256, Rom., XCIII, p. 575). Reid ('On the Text of the Tristran....', p. 273, The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 53-4) would likewise reject the Ewert reading and support the correction first suggested by Gaston Paris, adopted by Muret and reproduced in M^4. In 1325 Reid suggests that de [1] ought to be printed rather than du, the form commonly adopted for the de of the MS. There is surely no indication that Ewert ever hesitated to emend de, which is what Reid seems to imply.

1330. Ewert reproduces the manuscript and prints Delivrement out fait la fosse. M^4, however, like M^o and the other CFMA editions, prints ont. In defence of his reading, Ewert points out that the hole existed already and that the author insists here that the hole had been made previously by the dwarf ('On the Text of....', p. 92, Ewert, Volume II, p. 162). In M^4 it is suggested that in this line the hole is enlarged to accommodate the dwarf's head (p. 144). One might well wonder why, following Ewert's interpretation, the dwarf had made the

hole before. Had he felt the need to unburden himself of his secret before, in private? The Midas story obviously comes to mind with this possibility. Delivrement offers difficulties. In M^4 the word is glossed as 'promptement' (p. 161), while Ewert suggests 'freely', 'at leisure', 'with deliberation'. It is possible that the note in M^4 conveys what is meant to be happening at this point, but the actual text does not really express this. Perhaps the beginning of the line is in need of correction.

1336. M^4 follows Muret in adopting Paris's correction S'avint. Ewert prints S'en vint, the manuscript reading, which he interprets as 'And it happened' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 163). Reid challenges the meaning Ewert gives to the form (The 'Tristran' ..., p. 54) and it certainly seems probable that a scribe simply misread the a in his exemplar as an e with a titulus above.

1341-4. Reid proposes that Muret's s'iraist in l. 1343 ought to be considered once more as a replacement for s'en rist, the MS reading reproduced in Ewert and M^4 (The 'Tristran'..., p. 54). Vinaver considers that Muret was right to intervert ll. 1343-4 in M^2, but believes that, if the lines are interverted and Que j'ai orelles de cheval treated as a question posed by the king no further emendation is necessary ('Remarques sur...', pp. 345-6). But Vinaver surely exaggerates the degree of ambiguity in the episode. In 1307 the author states the king has a secret known only the dwarf, which in the context can only be the existence of his peculiar ears. We are surely not meant to understand that the dwarf invented the whole story. It seems best to retain the text basically as printed in the

latest editions and to regard the laugh in 1343 as one of embarrassment.

1379-80. In all his editions, Muret assumed that the scribe interverted these lines, but in Ewert and M^4 the MS order is retained. Reid is inclined to reverse this decision and to follow Muret ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 54-5). Even though it is certainly somewhat difficult to accept Ewert's interpretation of par in 1380 as 'in virtue of' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 165), it seems preferable to keep to the order in the manuscript.

1382-4. Ewert and M^4 now have the same version of these lines, but in the past Muret in M^o and M^1 had emended Que ele in 1382 to Se ele and Q'el in 1384 to S'el. Reid now argues in favour of the restoration of these corrections (The 'Tristran' ..., p.55), but there is nothing at all unorthodox about the Que...c'est construction and this part of the Muret proposals ought to be discarded. However, Muret was almost certainly right in M^o to associate en bone foi, not with Que ele m'aime, but with Vos n'entendez pas la raison. The sense of aimer en bone foi would be far from clear, and what Tristan seems to be frantically trying to do is to insist upon the truth of his almost incredible claim. Vàrvaro noted the M^o version, and, although rejecting it, considered that it ought to be borne in mind (Il 'Roman de Tristran'..., p. 115, note 14).

1399. Ewert glosses desroi as 'distress' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 145) and in his second volume he translates par grant desroi by 'in great perturbation' (p. 165). Reid is reluctant to

accept the manuscript's authority and he suggests that desroi could be emended to destroit (MLR, LX, p. 354 and note 1, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 55-6). In M^4 the word is glossed as 'vivacité' (Glossary, p. 161), while Mölk offeres 'in heftigem Zorn' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 73). In M^0 Muret glossed the word as 'impétuosité' and 'violence' (p. 254). Holden believes the manuscript reading can be preserved(Rom., LXXXIX, p. 391), and this is certainly possible if we can understand a meaning akin to 'with great insistence, with great urgency' (see T.-L., II, 1733).

1451. M^4 prints Grignout, following Muret, but Ewert retains the manuscript reading, guignout. Grignout, the imperfect indicative of grignier or greignier, is a more familiar word (greignoient, 3362), but it hardly fits the context, as Ewert points out (Ewert, Volume II, p. 168). Certainly a meaning 'whine' or 'whinge' seems necessary, and this represents only a relatively slight extension of the normal meaning of guignier.

1455-6. Ewert accepts the rhyme fors : deus (Ewert, Volume II, p. 11, pp. 15-16). Other critics are, with reason, less confident. Tanquerey proposed fors : torz (Rom., LVI, p. 120), while Holden suggests 1456 originally read c'ert dolors (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 390). Reid postulates that a diphthongized form of fors, fuers or feurs, may have been used here, but he otherwise refuses to commit himself (The 'Tristran'..., p. 57)

1467. Ewert is uncertain as to the meaning of a son corage (Ewert, Volume II, p. 169), which Tobler in fact proposed to

emend to a son barnage (ZRP, XXX, p. 744). Ewert seems prepared to correct a to an (en) here, and one must agree with Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 58) that this seems the correct decision.

1505-6. Ewert's suggestion that the lines were interverted by the scribe is accepted in M^4. But this does not solve every problem. If 1506 has been uniformly printed by editors, this has not been the case with 1505. In M^0 Muret emended the manuscript reading Li part to Si part (the reading of Ewert and M^4) and then to La part in M^2 and M^3. It may well be, however, that the verb parfaire is involved and that Li parfait is what the author originally wrote. Clarele, glossed tentatively by Ewert as 'clear, resonant' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 142, Volume II, p. 169), is unattested elsewhere. In M^2 and M^3, Muret printed et voiz, cha rele, but in M^1 he had a voiz harele, which may be closer to the original.

1524. Ewert reviews the discussion which leads him to the conclusion that the line should close with the word traallier (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 169-70). For the sake of completeness, one might refer also to the comments of Livingston (Skein-Winding Reels, pp. 138-41) and to those of Tanquerey (Rom., LVI, p. 121).

1544. Ewert and M^4 offer identical versions of the line, but Ewert believes that the author may easily have written conme des ieus se molle (Ewert. Volume II, p. 170), a version close to that proposed by Acher (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 722). But is this not felt to be too human a reaction on the part of the dog? Ewert draws on the concluding scenes of Fb to suggest that the scribe truncated and mutilated the passage. This manner of using

a derivative version seems a trifle cavalier.

1556. The form quere, as printed in Ewert and in M^0 and M^2, represents a more logical expansion of the abbreviation than querre.

1570. Reid, noting that 'the mood in the que-clause depending on an expression of emotion is normally the indic.', suggests the scribe's model read Que je li doi doner la mort (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 59-60). There certainly seem to be, as Reid claims, parallel instances where the scribe, perhaps after an initial misreading, has arbitrarily added to the line in order to make up the syllable count. Hackett, however, suggests that doie is less unlikely than Reid claims (Med. aev., XLIII, p. 277).

1576. Ewert retains the manuscript reading uns seüs, which in all the Muret editions and in M^4 is emended to un seüs Even if uns seüs indicates a single hound rather than a brace (as Ewert tentatively suggests on p. 171 of his second volume), it seems advisable to retain the manuscript reading.

1578. Reid queries Puis que, arguing that one rather expects the opposite expression, Ainz que or Ançois qu' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 60). Puis que is surely not impossible.

1582-6. Ewert's analysis of the syntax of these lines in his second volume (p. 171) has been criticized by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 60-1). There is almost universal agreement as to the text itself, except in 1584. Where Ewert

prints Por crier n'en tornast le faut, thereby retaining the manuscript reading, M^4 has Por crier n'estonast le gaut. The M^4 reading, found in all the CFMA editions in fact, represents a modification of Muret's proposal in M^o, Por crier ne sonast le gaut, but it hardly fits the context. Ewert admits that faut, if it does denote a break in the line of scent, combines uneasily with tornast (Ewert, Volume II, p. 172). An obvious objection to Ewert's overall interpretation of the line is voiced by Reid, who points out that the dog is not supposed to bark at all. Perhaps faut should be associated not with English fault, but with fewte, feaute, feute (OED, IV, p. 180). In his discussion of the lines, Blakey sees saut as scribal for sanc, a correction which though eminently plausible in itself needs a degree of support from the following line (FS, XXX, pp. 134-6). But Blakey, perhaps over-hastily, suggests that 'it seems probable that 1584 cannot be satisfactorily reconstructed'. His interpretation of 1585 as a concessive must be right. One might note that Fedrick has a similar interpretation, 'however close to its prey the dog was' (The Romance of Tristan..., p. 83).

1648-55. These lines are certainly not without their problems. In 1961, Vinaver attempted an explanation and centred his attention on 1650 ('Pour le Commentaire...'). Soffre paine in 1649, he declared, refers to the lovers' tolerance of the physical hardships to which they are jointly exposed and ne sent mal in 1650, a line which basically repeats the sentiments of 1649, emphasizes the lovers' indifference to these physical hardships. Vinaver would thus

restore, and quite rightly so, the manuscript reading ne sent mal, which Muret, against the advice of Gaston Paris, had modified to resent. Qar in 1650 Vinaver proposed to interpret as 'si bien que' or donc'. In 1968, Vinaver repeated his interpretation of the lines, insisting upon the necessity of a full stop at the end of 1650 (CCM, XI, pp. 7-8, see also A la recherche..., pp. 84-92, 'Remarques sur...', pp. 346-9). Payen finds Vinaver's interpretation of the lines only moderately satisfactory (Le Motif..., p. 344), takes Qar as causal (p. 344, note 26), but offers no new emendation of the text. Reid, however, has an original point of view ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 280-2, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 62-4). He suggests, first of all, that Qar in 1650, the sense of which he feels it is difficult to define adequately, should be replaced by mais, and the contrast he notices between 1649-50 and what follows, should, so he believes, be marked by a full stop at the end of 1650. Vinaver has welcomed Reid's support for the full stop, but he has again argued that Qar is being used as a consecutive ('Remarques sur...', pp. 348-9, especially p. 348, note 10, where the reference to l. 2964 should read 2967). But it was ll. 1653-5 which received the bulk of Reid's attention. Where Muret assumed a lacuna after 1654 and Ewert and M^4 read Qu'el in 1655 rather than the Qu'il of the manuscript (see 3582), Reid suggests the passage should read Et Tristran repoise si fort (or Et a Tristran poise si fort) Que Yseut a por lui descort Qu'il se repent de la folie. He then explains the meaning of his correction: 'The two sentences, so far from being the expression of corresponding and reciprocal fears on the part of the two

lovers, are both concerned exclusively with Tristan's (sic) reactions: Yseut is afraid that Tristran will repent for her sake, and in fact he, on his side, is so distressed by her situation that he does repent' ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 282).

Reid's emendations have received little support, even though the reading he proposed could feasibly have provoked in the scribe a series of errors leading to the MS version. But had Tristan in fact fully repented at this point, the author would surely have concentrated for some time on this crucial development. Vinaver is surely right to point out that the context above all argues against acceptance of Reid's proposals ('Remarques sur...', pp. 349-50). Ewert considers Reid's emendations 'uncalled for' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 174), but he is almost certainly wrong to include the full stop at l. 1650 in this category. There is surely a contrast between an indifference to physical hardship and the degree of mental suffering to which Tristan especially is subject. This contrast, which does not mean the complete absence of a connection, is best conveyed by a full stop. Ziltener is similarly unconvinced by Reid's proposal (ZRP, LXXXV, p. 591). Hunt has also reviewed the question (Tris., I, pp. 41-4). He accepts Vinaver's interpretation of 1649-50, but prefers modal Que to Qar in 1650. Hunt's main attention is directed, however, at 1651-5. He emends thus:

> Grant poor a Yseut la gente
> Tristran por lié ne se repente
> Qu'a Tristran ne repoise fort,
> Que Yseut a por lui descort,
> Qu'il ne repente de folie.

For Hunt, ne repoise and ne repente are both subjunctives dependent on 1651. But the sentence produced is then surely

excessively clumsy, with 1655 very awkwardly tacked on. This final line still appears to be some kind of consecutive clause. The rejection of Et at 1653 is inadequately justified and one would expect the pronoun ele rather than a repetition of Yseut in 1654.

1660. With Ewert, one hesitates to reject the par of the manuscript. Muret and M^4 emend to por.

1661-2. Reid terms both the Ewert and M^4 interpretations of the lines 'distinctly forced' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 64). Ewert associates du païs with de Cornoualle and translates 'Those of the land of Cornwall' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 175), while in M^4 du païs is associated with eschis and translated 'De [toutes les parties de la] Cornouaille on évitait avec tant de soin le pays de M. que...' (p. 144). Reid believes the original might well be Muret's version De Cornoualle li naïf De Morrois erent si eschif. Reid refers to 3280 for support (not 2380 as Ewert has it), but in that line the scribe has managed to reproduce naïs correctly.

1678. In the glossary of his SATF edition, Muret described esquoi as a 'mot inconnu ou mauvaise leçon' and his uncertainty has been widely shared. The word has been associated, first of all, with quietum. Tanquerey, for example, suggested the reading Governal esteit entrues quoi (Rom., LVI, pp. 116-7). One may entertain doubts about this version: does Governal necessarily have to be quiet himself in order to hear the dogs of the barons? But Roques proposes a sim-

ilar reading (Rom., LXIX, pp. 534-40), ert enunes quoi. Enunes could be related, in the view of Roques, to enaines or eneines. The manuscript, it must be pointed out, reads en .i., not en un. The Roques proposal is mentioned in M^4 (pp. 144-5), but it was not introduced into the text. Suchier, in his Altfranzösische Grammatik, had also linked the form with quietum (see M^o, p. XL): he proposed recoi, which finds favour with Holden (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 392). Reid (MLR, LX, p. 355, note 5, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 64-5) casts doubt upon the authenticity of the rhyme amedoi : esquoi. He notes that andui is the usual masculine nominative form in the text, and that no contextually appropriate noun esquoi is known. Röttiger was also affronted by the rhyme and suggested the author wrote en un estui (Der heutige Stand..., p. 22, note 1). Ewert is inclined to retain the manuscript reading. After glossing the word in his first volume (p. 150) as 'hiding-place', without adding a question mark incidentally, he defends the reading in his second volume (p. 176). He would regard esquoi as a 'mot inconnu' rather than a 'mauvaise leçon'. Like guignout in 1451, esquoi would be a Norman term of limited currency. As for the rhyme, Ewert deems it possible to retain the form (Ewert, Volume II, p, 12). Henry refuses to commit himself with regard to esquoi (Études de lexicologie.., pp. 157-8), and, on the present evidence, it does seem safest to retain the manuscript reading, including the word-division of the scribe On a point of detail, the agait of 1708 is surely different from the esquoi in this line, in spite of Ewert's assertion to the contrary.

1690-2. Almost certainly the final word in 1691 reads estache in the MS rather than escache. Muret first of all

printed que il l'en cache, while Acher suggested que il l'escache (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 722). M^4 and Ewert have que il escache, but Holden suggests that Acher's proposal should be accepted (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 392). Reid, however, points out that a form made on excoaticat does not really make sense in the context (Rom., XC, pp. 385-6, The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 65-6). Perhaps the action in 1693 should be dissociated from 1690-2 and not be seen at all as a direct consequence. Ewert punctuates with a semi-colon at 1692, while Muret printed, more correctly one feels, a full stop (the absence of puctuation in M^4 seems an unacknowledged printing error). Would a form made on excorticare supply the right sense in 1691 (see FEW, III, 281-2)?

1724-8. Ewert and M^4 offer basically the same text, although it is suggested that at 1724 the N'ont originally printed in M^4 is possible (Rom.,LXX, p. 98). Tanquerey had suggested a different interpretation (Rom., LVI, pp. 117-8) :

> Des cel'ore qu'eu bois entroit,
> Fust purchacié chascuns dotoit;
> Que Tristran li preuz l'encontrast
> Crient fu u plain et plus u gast.

The interpretation is ingenious, but l' in 1727 is somewhat disconcerting in this version, if crient fu is to be taken impersonally. Almost certainly, as Ewert eventually admits (Ewert, Volume II, p. 177), the pus of the manuscript at 1728 should read plus.

1731. Reid suggests that est, a present tense standing in isolation, should be replaced by ert (The 'Tristran'...,

p. 66). The parallel case he cites, at 1767, does provide impressive support.

1737. Ewert follows the manuscript and prints A la forche de sa ramee. The Muret editions and M^4 emend sa to la, a correction supported by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 66). In a similar instance at 2206, M^4 prints la where Ewert retains ma, but at 3170 M^4 follows Ewert in retaining sa. In none of these three cases is the MS version absolutely impossible.

1763-4. In the main attention has been directed on to the form 1764 should take. The MS reads quil enfire (rather than quil ensire). In M^o, following a colon after 1763, a lacuna was assumed after 1764 which was printed thus: Riens qu'il en fire, bas ne haut.... All the CFMA editions do not punctuate after 1763, reject the lacuna and print in 1764 Riens qu'il ne fire, bas ne haut. Ewert prints Riens qui l'en fire, Mölk Riens qu'il en fire. Reid rightly wonders whether faut can be taken in the transitive sense of 'miss' (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 66-7), which is perhaps the reason why Muret assumed a lacuna (see also Acher, ZRP, XXXIII, p. 722). Reid's objection is legitimate, but his proposed solutions are unconvincing. He finally supports the placing of a colon after 1763 as in M^o and sees 1764 as an independent verbless sentence, '[there is] nothing that it does not strike'. However, as Reid admits, the use of rien is unexpected and the line he refers to, 1754, hardly has the same construction. Given the nature of the 'arc qui ne faut', a kind of trap, it seems impossible to include in the line an il referring to Tristan. Qui in l. 1763 may in fact be a dative, in l. 1764

we should read Riens qui le fire (le being the trap), on the assumption that a titulus was originally included as the result of an over-casual stroking of the following f, and we should understand by the whole phrase 'which is never found wanting whatever may strike it'.

1783-4. In all his editions, Muret postulated a lacuna after 1783, naturally basing his decision largely on the repetition of the rhyme-word. Ewert has a semi-colon after 1783, M^4 has a comma and both reject the lacuna. In spite of the identical rhyme, perhaps on this occasion we have no need to suppose the existence of a lacuna. What the author seems to be saying is that before Tristan came into the forest and suffered, no one ever suffered so much. But, as Reid indicates (The 'Tristran'..., p. 68), 1783 (or, more probably, 1784?) may well be corrupt. Mölk probably understands the sense of venist correctly, but his question mark seems unnecessary: 'Hatte er, bevor er (in den Wald) gekommen war, je solche Not gelitten?' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 91). Ménage uncritically accepts the M^4 text and somewhat extravagantly claims that 'il n'est pas possible d'imaginer une cheville qui remplace la fin du premier vers sans détruire la beauté du couplet' (Rom., XCV, p. 196).

1834-5. Reid suggests that the original might have read Aval el bois au forestier En ot mené le bon destrier ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 275, The 'Tristran' ..., p. 69). Ewert envisages the possibility that the line he omits, En ot mené le bon destrier, may be an alternative

reading for 1833 (Ewert, Volume II, p. 181), but this is surely rather unlikely (see also his comments on 207-10). At 1631-2 it is the third line which the scribe himself has expuncted. This being so, Reid's claim that 'the decision which line to omit is arbitrary' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 69) is not quite true, especially when one considers his own general emphasis on parallel passages.

1862. In the MS the line is hypermetric. Ewert prints Por ce acort (il) a tel esploit, but Reid argues effectively in favour of the Muret and M^4 version, Por c'acort il a tel esploit (The 'Tristran'..., p. 69).

1877. The best version of this line does seem to be that of Muret, Tu senbles home qu'ait besoin, with senbler being taken transitively and the elided form of que being used here as the nominative form of the relative pronoun (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 70). It may be that the existence of this line persuaded the editors of M^3 and M^4 to print que, rather than the qui of the manuscript, in 1874.

1881. Reid alone questions vos (The 'Tristran'..., p. 70). Of the two suggestions Reid puts forward, perhaps the better is dechacié: vos may well have been introduced by a scribe simply in order to restore the syllable-count.

1889. The manuscript reads gel, emended in M^o and the CFMA editions to nel: in these editions the line reads Se nel t'ensein, dorras moi mort. Ewert, however, retains the MS form and prints Se gel t'ensein, dorras moi mort? Ewert's

version is appealing, though perhaps for a slightly different reason from the one he himself proposes (Ewert, Volume II, p. 182). The forester has failed to capture Tristan, but at least he has come to tell the king of his whereabouts. He may well be afraid that Mark will be angry with him for not actually capturing him. Or is the forester obliquely alluding to the reward he believes Mark has offered (1859-60)?

1892. The MS reads Gel vi poie ensenble o lui, which Ewert corrects to Gel vi, poi a, si con je quit. He claims elsewhere ('On the Text of...', p. 96) that here we have an instance of homoeoteleuton, the scribe's eye having wandered to the previous line. Reid has pointed out in another context that the use of the term homoeoteleuton is misleading (The 'Tristran'..., p. 38), but he would seem to accept the emendation (MLR, LX, p. 353). In M^4 (p. 145), however, the line is seen as a case of deliberate repetition. Ewert recants in his second volume (p. 182) and deems it more prudent to accept the manuscript reading ensenble o lui. If the line is in need of correction, Ewert's original proposal is less dramatic but perhaps closer to what the author wrote, than Muret's proposal, la ou andui.

1909-10. Frappier has suggested that au chemin fors should be interpreted as meaning 'au chemin fourchu, à l'endroit où le chemin se bifurque' (Rom., LXXXIII, pp. 251-6, Rom., LXXXIV, pp. 77-9). Reid accepts that Frappier interprets fors correctly, but he is probably right to go on to suggest that, because of the dubious nature of the examples of the nominative

singular used in oblique function, the original probably read as chemin fors, meaning 'crossroads' (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 70-1).

1985. Ewert retains the reading of the manuscript, Iriez s'en torne, which in the CFMA editions is emended to Iriez s'atorne. Ewert insists that the manuscript makes satisfactory sense (Ewert, Volume II, p. 186), but, as at 156, the scribe's error at 4472 must give pause for thought.

1988. Reid suggests that entre is a scribal error, induced by the rhyme word ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 277, The 'Tristran'..., p. 73). He claims the line should read Li forestiers (or Le forestier) en vet (or en vait) soventre, since it does not appear, in his view, that the forester actually enters the bower. Blakey agrees with Reid that entre is an error but suggests the reading s'entret, a part of s'entraire (FS, XXX, pp. 137-8). Reid's en vet is surely unsatisfactory, since the line would then seem to be describing the consequences of 1989-90.

1991-2001. Since the last editions of the text, this passage has attracted a good deal of comment.
A. Henry has offered three contributions to the argument(Rom., LXXIII, pp. 392-407, Études de syntaxe expressive..., pp. 62-6, Chrestomathie de la littérature en ancien français, II, p. 31). To begin with, Henry sees the first word of 1992, iré not as a variant of the adjective irié, but as the substantive ire. He points out that everywhere else in B the adjective appears

as irié. Ewert accepts that ire is a plausible reading (Ewert, Volume II, p. 187), but one must agree with him that the absence elsewhere of a form in é proves relatively little. Reid seems to support Ire le fait, if taken as equivalent to ire li fait faire (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 73-4).

The second half of 1992 is then discussed by Henry. Ewert glosses the verb tresaler as 'faint' (Volume I, p. 171), while in M^4 (p. 170) tresaler is glossed by 'défaillir'. Ewert gives his interpretation of the line on p. 186 (and on p. 43) of his second volume: 'The poet here tells us, in his usual vivid manner, how Mark raised his unsheathed sword in anger, but how his strength fails him (se tresva).' Is this a satisfactory interpretation of se tresva? Henry hesitates and suggests two meanings. Firstly, he translates 'la colère le lui fait faire, et puis elle passe', but he feels the dramatic movement of the passage is broken if this is the sense of tresaler. He then suggests the meaning 'aller trop loin, dépasser les bornes', or, if the king is the subject, 'sortir de ses gonds, se déchaîner, perdre tout contrôle'. Blakey points out (FS, XXI, pp. 100-1) that the reason for Henry's second proposal is that Mark's anger appears to persist until he is convinced of the lovers' innocence by what he sees. But the second meaning of tresaler which Henry proposes is nowhere attested. Accordingly, Blakey suggests the last half of the line should read sis tresua, rather than se tresva. Reid accepts the general sense of Blakey's proposal, but suggests the original ran si tressua (The 'Tristran'..., p. 74). Blakey's suggestion has been welcomed by Merrilees (Speculum, XLVII, p. 746),

and the pedigree of the suggestion had been traced by Vinaver ('Remarques sur...', pp. 350-2). A number of possibilities, therefore, present themselves. Firstly, we can accept Ewert's interpretation of tresaler, where the king loses his strength at the crucial moment. But Reid points out that nowhere else in the text do we find the 3rd person sing. pres. indic. of aler appearing as va. In Ewert's version, the anger of the king does not come to an end at 1992. Secondly, we may accept Henry's second meaning for tresaler, taking either ire or the king as the subject, but for full acceptance we surely need more evidence in support of this meaning. The third possibility, and perhaps the most likely one, is that se tresva is corrupt. Vinaver argues convincingly that a scribe misread tresua as tresva and, seeing the line as hypometric, added se. The best reading of the second half of the line would thus appear to be si tresua.

Turning to 1993-5, we find that Henry proposes to repunctuate the passage (Études de syntaxe expressive..., pp. 62-6). He would print:

Ja decendist li cop sor eus
--Ses oceïst, ce fust grant deus--
Qant vit qu'ele avoit sa chemise

Line 1993, in his view, would then present a 'subjonctif d'imminence contrecarrée'. Hackett, while not judging Henry's interpretation as such, states that Henry's punctuation would make of 1994 a parenthesis within a complex sentence and that other examples of this construction are to be found elsewhere in the Tristran and also in Girart ('Syntactical Features...', p. 163). Ewert defends his interpretation (Ewert, Volume II, p. 186). He prefers to term decendist a 'subjonctif d'imminence suspendue' or a 'phrase conditionnelle à condition sous-entendue'. He understands: 'The blow all but descended upon the lovers

(= 'le coup descendait déjà sur eux'); had he killed them, it would have been a grievous thing. When [having recovered himself] he saw that they were clothed...'. But, as Reid rightly points out (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 74-6), in this paraphrase Ewert now seems to accept the general sense of Henry's interpretation. Reid also supports Henry's interpretation of Ses in 1994 as Si les, but suggests that only the second hemistich need be understood parenthetically; Ses oceist (ce fust grant deus!).

2021. Ewert established that the manuscript read s'esvelleront, which Muret had consistently printed after reading s'esvellont. In Muret's texts, the line read Que, puis que il s'esvelleront, while in M^4 the manuscript version, with qu'il for que il, is printed, Que, ançois qu'il s'esvelleront. One sympathizes with Ewert who finds that the M^4 version does not make sense (Ewert, Volume II, p. 187). Ewert's solution is to eliminate Que and print Ançois qu'il s'esvelleront, but Reid finds this version unconvincing and grammatically unlikely (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 76-7). He is inclined to think, with Muret, that the scribe has written ançois que for its opposite (compare Reid's proposal for 1578), but suggests that the original read des que rather than puis que .

2029. Muret consistently emended Or to Que, but Ewert and M^4 restore the MS reading. Reid challenges this decision and goes so far as to say that 'Muret's correction seems indispensable' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 77). The Muret version does, in truth, seem infinitely superior.

2032. The manuscript reads Uns granz de voirre ai je o moi. It would seem that the scribe was quite overcome by the thought of Mark's ring and wrongly added the r in granz. A pair of gloves is clearly what the context demands. Did the thought of the ring also induce the writing of voirre by the scribe? Mussafia proposed vair (Rom., XXXIV, p. 305), and Ewert sensibly concedes (Volume II, p. 187) that M^3 and M^4 have the right version, Uns ganz de vair rai je o moi.

2038. In his text, Ewert reproduced the manuscript and printed Dont au Morhot fu le chief blos. In his second volume (p. 188), however, he suggests Dont le Morholt (sic) fu del chief blos was what was in the scribe's model. This is what appeared in M^4, with the correct Morhot, probably inspired by the proposal in Ewert's glossary (Ewert, Volume I, p. 140). The obvious objection arises: the sword did not cause, as far as we can tell from the other versions, the Morholt's decapitation. In B itself there are no details as to the precise manner of the Morholt's death (28, 855), but to insist upon a line completely consonant with other versions is probably unnecessary. One might also err if one were to take del chief blos too literally. The line has provoked a number of proposals. Jeanroy ('Quelques corrections...', p. 229), bearing the actual combat in mind, ventured the reading Dont el chief Morhout fu (ou mest) uns tros. Support for tros might come from the manuscript itself, where an l does seem to be written over an r. Tanquerey (Rom., LVI, p. 119) likewise recalled the actual episode, but suggested the reading Dont au Morhot fu treü sous. (For sous, see

274.) In M^2, Muret suggested Dont au Morhot fu el chief dors and in M^3 Dont au Morhot fu el chief tros.

2044. Ewert dismisses, in his second volume (p. 188), the suggestion in M^4 that il ought to be corrected to el (p. 145), but Reid defends the proposal (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 77-8). Although elsewhere in the text the scribe may have confused personal pronouns, the case for emendation here is perhaps not very strong. Reid is obviously right when he says that il in 2045 and 2047 and le in 2044 can only refer to the ring, but if, with Ewert, we take il in 2044 as referring to doi, it is by no means as isolated as Reid would have us believe, for i in 2045 and en in 2048 refer back to the finger as well.

2058. As Ewert suggests (Ewert, Volume II, p. 189), out could be a scribal error for ont. Reid, however, feels out is the more likely form (The 'Tristran'..., p. 78). The very next line begins, almost certainly, with On in fact and not with Ou, a point which editors have neglected to record.

2091. The M^4 version, agreeing fundamentally with Ewert, has Qar mot li par somes mesfait, but it is suggested in the notes (p. 145) that Qar mot li parsomes mesfait might be a better reading. The word order, molt li par, does seem unusual. In M^0 and M^1, Muret printed mout par li and mot par li.

2100. It certainly seems possible, as Hunt suggests (Tris., I, p.39), that by 2100 Tristan's speech is over and that

the line is straight narrative. Hunt accordingly proposes the line should read (see also 1844): Li sanc li fuit, tot devient pales.

2122. Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 256) is very much inclined to reject the manuscript reading demorer. Muret consistently printed sejorner. There seems a case for accepting the evidence of the manuscript, for, perhaps like 1892, this may well be an instance of deliberate repetition. But Reid questions whether 2122 really makes sense with either sejorner or demorer (The 'Tristran'..., p. 79). His demonstration does suggest that the scribe's eye has wandered to the previous line when writing 2122 and that the original had a rather different verb.

2146. Ewert concludes the line with Los m'en fui: M^4, following Muret, has Las n'en sui. In his edition, Ewert glosses los as 'wretched' and cites Aiol in support (Ewert, Volume I, p. 156). But one might note that the editors of Aiol, Normand and Raynaud, have reservations about their interpretation of lous (p. 335). Vinaver opposes Ewert's reading, on contextual and syntactical grounds (CCM, XI, p. 12, note 41), and Payen apparently accepts the M^4 version (Le Motif..., p. 345). In his second volume (p. 196), Ewert rejects his own version and accepts that of Muret as plausible, but one must feel that at least the general sense of his original suggestion was nearer the mark. There are other factors to be considered. What importance must one place on the fact that before the los in the manuscript a p or b has apparently been effaced? Did the author write, perhaps,

blos nen sui? Can 3628 be a guide? It reads in Ewert's version: En plaignant disoit: 'Mar i fui' (Muret in his CFMA editions emended fui to sui).

2152. Raynaud de Lage (Rom., LXXXIII, p. 522) does not accept Ewert's tentative gloss of doitie,'arrow', 'shaft' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 146, Volume II, p. 196). He suggests that doitie means 'une piste, une "coulée" de gibier', and that une doitie forms 'un complément circonstanciel de lieu sans préposition'. Obviously, doitie is not necessarily the object of traist· in 1286, for example, traire is used intransitively. But Henry (RBPH, XXII, pp. 256-7) is inclined to accept the meaning 'arrow', which he quite justifiably believes the context demands. (Would not the kind of construction Raynaud de Lage perceives be found more frequently with a verb of movement?) Reid also rejects Raynaud de Lage's interpretation, but suggests that the original might have had boitie(e) , a hypothetical form which might mean a '(crossbow) bolt' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 79).

2168. M^4 has failli, which would appear to be an unacknowledged misprint.

2210. Where Ewert prints the manuscript version, quar j'ai trop pris, M^3 and M^4 follow Jeanroy ('Quelques corrections ...', pp. 229-30) in printing quar trop mesprist. The meaning proposed by Jeanroy, 'pécher par étourderie, par malice', was also accepted in M^3 and M^4. The rhyme fist : pris in Ewert's version is admittedly imperfect, but not sufficiently so as to

impose correction. Ewert, moreover, defends the sense of his version (Ewert, Volume II, p. 197), claiming, with some justification, that it fits the immediate context better. Reid disagrees and suggests El n'en pout mais se trop mesprist (The 'Tristran'..., p. 80), alluding, like other critics, to Fb 433. In his edition of Fb (p. 119), Hoepffner sees 433 as a direct echo of B forgetting that the reading of 2210 was itself partly established by reference to this line. Hunt favours correction to El n'en pout mais, se autre en prist (Tris., I, pp. 39-40).

2237. Reid's suggestion that avriez is a scribal error for avroie is very persuasive (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 81-2). It is quite true that what ought to be envisaged at this time is that Tristan should clear Iseut, which in fact is what he does, albeit indirectly, by declaring his own innocence on the day of separation.

2242. M^4 has Muret's emendation servist, rather than the manuscript reading soufrist, which Ewert retains. Ewert suggests (Ewert, Volume II, p. 198) that we may here have an extension of the meaning of soufrir from 'bear with' to 'serve', but the extension in meaning does seem singularly large, as Reid would agree (The 'Tristran'..., p. 82).

2244. Ewert's edition, like the CFMA editions, preserves the word-division of the manuscript and prints de gerpir. Reid, however, suggests degerpir should be printed ('On the Text of the Tristran..., p. 266, The 'Tristran'..., p. 82). The scribe's

word-division is not sacrosanct, the change of preposition before the infinitive is more unexpected than its omission, so Reid's correction may well be advisable.

2251-4. Reid considers it possible that 2251 and 2252 have been interverted (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 82-3). But, all in all, the M^4 interpretation (p. 146), in which Ne fust is a parallel clause to S'estre peüst, seems eminently reasonable.

2255. The CFMA editions correct to Tanz dis, while M^o and Ewert reproduce the reading of the manuscript, Toz dis. In spite of the existence of toz tens in 2594, it may be that what the author wrote was Tanz. Perhaps the a was first written without the nasal abbreviation and then misread as an o?

2283. Ewert, characteristically, prints the version of the manuscript, Manderon a nostre talent, while M^4 continues Muret's emended version Mandon au roi nostre talent. Reid, questioning the absolute use of mander, supports the Muret and M^4 version (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 83-4). It may well be that Manderon a is in need of correction, but it is difficult to see how it evolved from Mandon au roi, unless at one stage au roi was omitted and a later scribe, to supply the missing syllables, introduced a and the future of the verb form.

2303-4. All editors have falle and travalle as their rhyme words, but Reid questions the mood of the verb in the first line, claiming that if the force of si que is modal,

meaning 'in such circumstances that', the indicative form, fal, is what one expects (The 'Tristran'..., p. 84). The fact that travalle does not appear elsewhere in the text is perhaps not too important, but it certainly may have been introduced as a result of an erroneous subjunctive form in the previous line.

2313-8. In this sequence there are three lines rhyming in -ez. In M^{o}, Muret at first considered that there was a supernumerary line included (2318 in Ewert), but he soon changed his mind and his CFMA editions assumed there was a lacuna after the third line in -ez. The M^{4} version lacks logic, for a lacuna is posited after 2313: almost certainly this is a printing error, as the note on p. 146 suggests, where the lacuna is deemed to come, following Ewert's example, after 2314. But if we accept in 2314 the correction of Gaston Paris (M^{o}, p. 254), Si con mon oncle et riche roi, which appeared in all Muret's CFMA editions, one suspects that the lacuna, if any, should come later, since the scribe would hardly have omitted the first of four rhyming lines (see Reid, The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 84-5). On the whole, it does seem a trifle unlikely that the author produced a rhyming quatrain, unless he wished to finish off Tristan's speech with a flourish. If we revert to Muret's original suggestion and assume the presence of a supernumerary line, 2317 (rather than 2318) seems the right line to omit.

2321-4. Reid is dissatisfied with the version printed by editors ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 269, The 'Tristran'..., p. 85). He suggests 2321-2 should read De lui proier point ne se faint; Qu'il les acort au roi se plaint.

The se of the manuscript in 2322 could be retained and Qar in 2323 could have its normal causal sense. The unusual meaning of se plaindre, 'implore', which Reid proposes, does cause hesitation (see T.-L., VII, 1034-9). It is suggested in M^4 (p. 146) that in 2324 ja might be retained. Reid seems prepared to lend his support (The 'Tristran'..., p. 12).

2335-5. The Muret and M^4 editions have laisié : pechié, while Ewert retains the manuscript version, laisiez : pechiez. One suspects that a scribal error in 2335, laisiez for laisié, inspired the form pechiez in 2336.

2340. The form averez has attracted the attention of Holden (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 397) and of Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 86). Holden, comparing the 'two' parts of the text, saw averez as one of the 'formes aberrantes, attestées dans une seule partie, mais qui s'opposent à la pratique des deux auteurs'. Reid is prepared to reject the form, plausibly suggesting that Buen consel en avrez was the version in the original. Once again an incorrect form would seem to have been introduced to restore the syllable-count after a word was omitted.

2346. The manuscript reads Sanz, which Ewert retains as S'anz, but which in M^3 and M^4 is emended to S'aus as Gaston Paris had suggested (M^o, p. 254). If Ewert's reading is correct, this would seem to be the only time that anz, rather than ainz, appears in the text. But his reading gains Reid's support, who cites further cases of where the scribe has written -an for -ain ('On the Text of the Tristran...',

pp. 283-4. The 'Tristran'..., p. 86). Reid suggests that if the scribe's Sanz is not corrected to S'aus 'the case for taking his saus in 2347 as s'aus = s'eus is very much weakened': he believes that the author might have written puis (pus). It is possible that Et in 2347, which is repeated in 2348, is suspect as well.

2366. Editors print N'i avroit fort, sage ne lort, but Reid argues that fort makes little sense and was probably induced by the rhyme-word lort ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 277, The 'Tristran'..., p. 87). If fort is in fact a scribal error, which is by no means certain, a suitable correction might be foi. This would involve closing 2368 with a full stop. It may be that the scribe was misled by similar constructions elsewhere, such as that of 2231-5.

2400-3. In his second volume (p. 204), Ewert admits that vos in 2402 is probably a scribal error for ses (the scribe writes moi for lui in 2413), but Reid insists that the passage still remains obscure (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 87-8). Certainly 2402 ought to be taken with 2403, as it was in the Muret editions and in M^4, but the connection between 2400 and 2401 then becomes unclear. Reid suggests correcting 2401 to Que vos fussiez (or seiez) a lui loiaus. Que for Qant produces a much better reading, but is the second emendation, a lui for de lui, altogether essential?

2449. Editors correct Qanuit to Anuit. Reid is surely right to propose La nuit ('On the Text of Tristran...', p. 283,

The 'Tristran'..., pp. 88-9), both from a contextual and a logical point of view. If Q is an error of the rubricator, perhaps misled by Qant in 2450, it was obviously written in mistake for another letter.

2495-6. While all editors assume the existence of a lacuna, Rüttiger suggested that pas pole should be emended to pas polie (Der heutige Stand..., p. 21). But the basic constructions of 2495 and 2496 seem correct and one feels ultimately bound to admit that the scribe has omitted at least two lines. To return to 2496, parole, the correction of Muret continued in Ewert and M^4, seems quite illogical. Reid suggests fole (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 89-90), but the lacuna effectively renders any real conclusion impossible.

2512. The scribe wrote qui, which Ewert thinks (Ewert, Volume II, p. 205) could be interpreted as the first person of quidier (see 1854 and 2847). One doubts whether qui was what the author wrote.

2565-80. Blakey has expressed his general dissatisfaction with these lines (FS, XXI, pp. 101-2). He finds the infinitive alegier of 2570 difficult to connect with the construction of 2568 and he lacks confidence in the versions of 2577-9 found in Ewert and M^4. His remedies are a transposition of couplets and the emendation of N'i a in 2579 to N'i ait. His revised version reads therefore:

N'eüs gaires o li esté
Quant losengier en ton reigné
Te firent acroire mençonge:
Ge sui tot prest que gage en donge.
Qui li voudroit blasme lever,

Lié alegier contre mon per,
Beau sire, a pié ou a cheval--
Chascuns ait armes et cheval--
Adonc me fai devant ton ost;
N'i a baron que je t'en ost.
Se je ne l'en puis alegier
Et en ta cort moi deraisnier
Qu'onques amor nen out vers moi
Ne je vers lui, par nul desroi,
N'i a[it] baron, por moi laisier,
Ne me face ardre, ou jugier.

Alegier is governed, in Blakey's version, by the rather distant fai, the imperative of faire, not of faidir as Ewert suggests (Ewert, Volume I, p. 150). Certainly, as Reid points out (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 90-1), Ewert's interpretation of fai does indeed raise difficulties (see Godefroy, III, 697-8, T.-L., III, 1557). Ewert accepts that Blakey produces a smoother rendering, but he claims that he has altered 'what may well be a characteristic specimen of Beroulian syntax and style' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 206). Blakey's version may be far from perfect: he admits that no such exchange of couplets appears elsewhere (although couplets are, of course, displaced or repeated). Ewert's attitude, on the other hand, may quite easily allow a multitude of scribal errors to pass uncorrected.

The repeated rhyme-word at 2572, in the versions of Ewert and M^4, still ought to provoke suspicion. Muret consistently printed (Chascuns ait armes par egal). Ewert himself admits that 2578-80 are still suspect. In M^4, 2578 continues to read Jugier: n'i a qui je t'en ost, which eliminates the other awkward repetition, N'i a baron. In 2579, laisier is apparently accepted by T.-L (V, 333), but Acher suggested that it should be corrected to plaissier (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 723) and the CFMA editions all have plaisier. Ewert, however, retains the manuscript reading, taking laisier in the sense of 'injure, endanger, encroach upon one's rights' (Ewert, Volume I,

p. 155). It was Tanquerey who suggested this interpretation (Rom., LVI, p. 121), but as Reid points out, there is little genuine support for it. Finally, in 2580, one hesitates to accept that the meaning of ou jugier is 'au jugement' (M^4, Glossary, p. 165), and probably another infinitive ought to be sought (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 91).

2611-2. Reid believes the scribe may well have interverted these lines ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., p. 92). If his suggestion were accepted, the order of ideas would certainly be more logical, but the manuscript version is obviously quite possible.

2658-61. Reid suggests that it might just be possible to accept Repenra, the MS version in 2661, if que il veut is seen as the object of vit in 2658 (The 'Tristran'..., p.93). But his version seems somewhat forced: que il veut is rather a long way from vit, a feature which his paraphrase tends to obscure. Foulet accepts the edited version and regards the placing of the pronoun la as a peculiarity of Béroul (Petite syntaxe..., §192).

2664. Ewert reproduces the manuscript when he prints Et con li rois qui a Deu croit. In M^4, as in all Muret's editions, rois is emended to hon, but a is retained. M^1, M^2 and M^3 read an. The parallel drawn between the hermit and Mark in Ewert's text is unexpected to say the least. In his second volume (p. 207) Ewert admits as much and accepts the emendation hon, but considers that a is still permissible.

2684. The scribe writes fors trete, which Muret, M^4 and Ewert all emend to fort trete. Tanquerey, however, saw in the line a form of forstraire (Rom., LVI, p. 121). With Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 208), one finds Tanquerey's argument unconvincing. Are retirer and subir as close in meaning as Tanquerey suggests?

2698. The most recent editions have N'ert gardé e a tel honor. Word-division, although admittedly an uncertain guide, would indicate that the scribe wrote the feminine form of the past participle, not the masculine form and the conjunction e. As Reid rightly points out ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 278, The 'Tristran'..., p. 94), the conjunction et is never elsewhere written e within the line. Starting from the linguistic point that ainz in the sense of 'ever' is always employed in the preterite in the text, Reid finds one source of error in the scribe's consciousness of the octosyllabic metre. He very plausibly suggests the scribe's model reads Ne fu, for which he wrote N'ert, and he then restored the metre by writing the feminine form of the past participle. One might care to note that Fedrick's translation anticipated Reid's emendation, or at least did not take ert as the future the scribe presumably thought he was writing. Fedrick's version reads 'No hunter ever looked after his dog with such care as I shall, my fair friend' (The Romance of Tristan..., p. 107).

2703-6. The MS has here, as at 725-8, two successive couplets on the same rhyme. Reid questions the authenticity of the second set of rhymes and suggests the second couplet

might originally have read Ne fu brachez si herbergiez Ne en si riche lit couchiez (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 94-5). Robson, however, believes that the author has indeed written a rhyming quatrain ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 181). Is it significant that in the manuscript a new section begins at once, as is the case after 2315-8, which may just possibly have once formed a rhyming quatrain?

2708. M^3 and M^4 have a un seel. M^o, M^1, M^2 and Ewert print a u seel. The manuscript has et (abbreviated) .i. Seel. The Ewert and early Muret version, one feels, makes better sense (see also Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 95).

2719. Ewert and M^4 reproduce the manuscript and print con. Henry, however, believes with Muret that çou is more plausible (RBPH, XXII, p. 256). Acher suggested c'onques (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 723), which influenced the reading found only in M^1, Ne face çou c'onqu'il dira. If accepted here, çou would appear nowhere else in the text. (It is not simply a problem of distinguishing between minims for the manuscript reads co, with a titulus over the o.) It therefore seems wiser to support Reid who suggests the text should read ce que (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 95-6).

2721. The word-division of the manuscript for what it is worth, would support the Porce of the CFMA editions, rather than Ewert's Por ce.

2735. As Ewert admits (Ewert, Volume II, p, 210), one certainly expects Assés. Even though he points to the use of aprés at 2463 in support of its retention here, one cannot readily concede that aprés was what the poet wrote. Reid goes further, questions the use of aprés in 2463 and suggests that adés might be what the author wrote there and adés or senpres what he wrote here (The 'Tristran'..., p. 89 and p. 96). Senpres is found elsewhere in the text (2160, 3433), if adés is not. One might even go on to argue that the scribe's apparent unfamiliarity with adés led him to write aprés instead.

2749. The MS has avez, Muret and M^4 have en ont, Ewert an ont. Since it is the letter after the a which seems to have induced the scribe's mistake, it appears probable that what was in the scribe's exemplar at least was an, not en.

2759. If we preserve traallier (1524) as the form in our scribe's model, perhaps we should also here preserve quies (and at 756 and 4066). Similarly, we should preserve enn at 732 and 2589.

2780. Ewert and M^4 retain l'amastes, while Muret printed m'amastes. The MS version obviously makes a kind of sense (see Ewert, Volume II, p. 214), but Reid terms the Muret correction 'indispensable' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 96). One does indeed expect m'amastes, and a scribe could quite easily have written the wrong pronoun, especially under the influence of l'amez. M'amastes is preferred by Adams and Hemming (MA, LXXIX, p. 459, note 15).

2807. M^4 has fait. This is surely an unacknowledged misprint (see also 3050). The revisors correct the same misprint at 3119 (Rom., LXX, p. 98).

2813-4. At 2814, Ewert reproduces the version of the manuscript, Sera vers moi, iriez ou lois. M^4, however, has the correction which appeared in the 1922 and 1928 editions, Sera vers moi, iriez ou voirs. In M^0 and M^1 Muret printed iriez ou cois. Although the lines have attracted considerable attention, no new suggestions have emerged. Reid tends to support Ewert's retention of lois, a form derived from luscus (MLR, LX, p. 356, The 'Tristran'..., p. 97). He accepts the meanings, 'ambiguous, uncertain', which Ewert tentatively offered in his glossary (p. 156), and suggests another, 'untrustworthy'. Holden, however, is inclined to go back to Muret's first suggestion (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 393). He suggests the lines should rhyme le roi : ou coi. In his second volume (p. 215), Ewert defends lois. Adopting a similar argument to the one he presented for 224, he makes the obvious point that the alternatives in 2814 do not have to be mutually exclusive or antithetic. It seems, at this point in time, advisable to retain lois.

2821. All editors print fist, the subject of which must be Orri. But, as Reid points out (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 97-8), this might contradict 3350-2 where Iseut is presented as the person who had the cellar constructed: in the interests of consistency Reid suggests that fist should be emended to fis. But is there as complete a contradication

as Reid supposes? Cannot the maker of nostre lit (2821) be different from the maker of the sozterrin (3351)?

2822-37. In his SATF edition, Muret radically reorganized these lines. He printed 2822-7 after 2836: accordingly, 2838 followed 2821, with a lacuna intervening. Ewert records Muret's proposal and suggests that, indeed, 2822-7 'may well have been displaced from their original context' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 215). Certainly the lines interrupt the flow of the narrative, but there may here be a case of deliberate interpolation rather than a simple displacement of lines. Reid is prepared to accept the MS order (The 'Tristran'..., p. 98), as reproduced, with some misgivings, in Ewert and M^4 (see p. 147).

At 2822, M^4 prints qui nos quierent moleste, following Muret, while Ewert supposes the author wrote qui erent de: the scribe wrote qui ert demoleste. Nos quierent moleste has something to commend it. The scribe may easily have omitted nos, then added de to supply the missing syllable. But Reid points out that neither querre moleste or estre de moleste are attested (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 98-9). He suggests the correction demalaire, which, besides being apposite in meaning, would have the additional advantage of eliminating the need to accept a lacuna after 2821. Reid believed in the past that Muret was perhaps right in assuming the scribe interverted 2825-6 ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276), but he has now changed his mind (The 'Tristran'..., p. 99). The lines surely read better in the order of the manuscript: Iseut is going to say that she fears the barons quar il sont molt felon, but interrupts herself to curse them. In both

versions, however, et in 2825 seems a little awkward. Neither M^4 nor Ewert supposes a lacuna after 2827, but both do so after 2836. Ewert believes that one or more couplets have been omitted, but Reid contests this point of view ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 267, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 99-100): he sees 2837 as Tristan's reply to Iseut's request at 2833. This seems eminently reasonable. As in 506, Reid insists that que should be corrected to se in 2832 and the exclamation mark eliminated, but we may be on safer ground with Blakey (FS, XXX, pp. 129-30), who advocates the retention of que and the repunctuation of 2832-3: Li miens amis --que Dex t'enort!--Ne t'ennuit pas la herbergier!

2861. Ewert: Onques ne firent jugement,
Conbatre a pié ou autrement,
Dedenz ta cort, se ge t'en sueffre;
Se sui dannez, si m'art en soffre.

M^4: Onques ne firent jugement.
Conbatre a pié ou autrement
Dedenz ta cort, sire, m'en soffre.
Se sui dannez, si m'art en soffre.

Ewert reproduces the manuscript version. In his second volume (pp. 215-6) he rightly concedes that there is good reason for having a heavy stop after cort, or even after autrement in 2862. Mölk anticipated Ewert's change of heart. He places a colon after cort and translates the whole passage thus: 'Aber, so wahr mir Gott Freude und Glück schenke, niemals haben sie an deinem Hof Gericht gehalten, einen Kampf zu Fuss angesetzt oder in anderer Weise; wenn ich dir hierhin willfahre, dann verbrenne mich, falls ich verurteilt werde, mit Schwefel '(Tristan und Isolde, p. 141). Reid, however, finds Ewert's version still unsatisfactory and believes that Muret's punctuation and corrections, as reproduced in M^4, may

well be necessary (The 'Tristran'..., p.100).

2866. Editors suppose a lacuna after this line, although Ewert does express hesitation in his second volume (p. 216). He suggests that 2866 may be an elliptical exclamation with the sentence remaining uncompleted: Reid is unconvinced (The 'Tristran'..., p. 101). It is true that ne chevelu ne chaus is a regular periphrasis for 'no one' (see, for example, The First Continuation of the Perceval, Volume III, part 1, 7526, Horn, 4353). But here, if we reject the idea of a lacuna, Qu' could be taken consecutively and 2866 could just possibly be interpreted as meaning 'so that there is no strife or disagreement'.

2925. In M^0 Muret printed vois en Ganoie (but understand Gavoie) and in M^1 he printed vois an Gavoie. Recently, vois en Gavoie has met with a certain amount of critical support (see Reid, MLR, LX, p. 356, note 1, The 'Tristran'..., p. 103, Holden, Rom., LXXXIX, p. 393). Ewert retains the manuscript version vois a grant joie and translates the line by 'I go with the greatest possible joy' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 219), but this may be quite the wrong sense and according to Reid other examples of (a) quant que puis do not support this interpretation. However, it is difficult to see why, if vois en Gavoie is preferred, Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 103) takes exception to the translations offered in M^0 and M^4 for A qant que puis, 'aussi vite que je peux' (M^0, p. 222) and 'aussi vite que je puis' (M^4, p. 168). These translations surely represent a logical and only slight extension of the basic meaning Reid gives to the phrase, namely 'with all my might'. Lines 2631-2

obviously ought to be considered, but they do not automatically clinch the argument in favour of emendation.

2945-50. The Muret editions and M^4 suppose a lacuna after 2947, thereby indicating the fundamental obscurity of the whole passage. Reid has made a few hesitant suggestions (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 103-4), but he has not really managed to make the passage any clearer.

3012. Reid's argument that the scribe was unlikely to have written lez in error twice has some force (The 'Tristran' ..., p. 104). His proposal, Lez le chemin prent (or vet) une sente, is not altogether convincing. Is the path actually beside the main track?

3029-30. The manuscript reads, at 3030 in Ewert's edition, Qui o Tristran avoit alez. All editors emend. M^4 follows Muret in printing Par qui Tristran an est alez, but Ewert proposes a more radical change, for he alone assumes that the scribe interverted the lines. He prints Par eus fu molt li rois malez, Qui o Tristran estoit meslez. Ewert, for once, has proved less cautious than other critics and it may well be that his suggestion is too audacious. Reid considers Ewert's proposal unnecessary (The 'Tristran'..., p. 105), and one must concur: in Muret's emended version there is a logical sequence of ideas and more drastic correction seems superfluous.

3048. The manuscript reads Que on. Ewert sees in on a graphy for onc and points out that the preposition always appears as o, never as ou ('On the Text of...', p. 92). M^4

has Qu'o (after Muret printed Qu'ou) and refers to 130 for support (p. 147). But, as Ewert and Reid rightly indicate (Ewert, Volume II, p. 221, The 'Tristran'..., p. 105), 130 does not present an exact parallel. At 130, the manuscript clearly reads O and cannot support the notion that the scribe has written on for o.

3049. Reid queries the use of escondire with a following affirmative clause (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 105-6). The evidence of T.-L (III, 955-7) does suggest that a verb 'of more positive meaning' may be required (escrier?).

3084. Reid suggests the original read not Por noient, but A noient (The 'Tristran'..., p. 106). It is not unlikely that the scribe's familiarity with the expression por noient induced error.

3088. M^4 retains the manuscript reading soz un larri, as Muret had done in M^o, M^1, M^2, M^3 and Ewert follow Acher (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 724) and correct soz to sor. The scribe has elsewhere written soz for a probable sor (e.g., 1693), so there is certainly the possibility of an error at this point. There is no reason why the poet should not have used a pair of roughly synonymous terms to indicate the barons' position (the examples in T.-L, V, 194-6, suggest that larriz is fairly elastic in meaning), but the odds may be against it. Muret long ago suggested that larri might be an error for jarri (M^o, p. LVI, note 3, p. 196), and Reid believes jarri may in fact be what the author wrote (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 106-7).

3113. Editors correct Consentir to Consellier (Conseillier, M^{o}, a misprint), but Ewert suggests it might possibly be retained with the sense 'bear with, humour' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 222). But once again, as was the case at 2242, Ewert may be extending the meaning of a word rather too much (see T.-L., II, 734 and Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 107).

3114-8. The M^{4} edition agrees with Ewert in taking 3115 as a form of parenthesis, but Reid believes that Muret may have been right to intervert the lines of the couplet ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 107-8). Tanquerey seems to accept interversion, but proposes two alternative forms for the scribe's Ja mar o toi s'en marrira (Rom., LVI p. 119). The minimum correction would be to emend o to a, forms the scribe might easily have confused.

3140. Where the manuscript reads Li troi ont, Ewert suggests Li troi l'ont, the Muret editions Le roi ont and M^{4} Li roi ont. Ewert believes that the scribe, misunderstanding the context, omitted a single letter, l ('On the Text of ...', p. 97). However, it may be that the sense of the Muret and M^{4} editions is preferable: the scribe thinks he is still concerned with the three barons he has just named and 604, 3040 and even 3180 might possibly support the Muret and M^{4} interpretation. Reid accepts Muret's Le roi (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 108-9). Li roi, though 'ungrammatical', is obviously possible.

3151-2. In Ewert, M^{4} and Robson's article ('Quatrains and Passages...', p. 175) the rhyme is accepted, but Reid

expresses his concern ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 287, note 19, The 'Tristran'..., p. 109). Questioning also the appropriateness in the context of estre, he prefers the correction which appeared in M^o, Nus nel suit ne ne vait soentre, and the correction which appeared in M^2 and M^3, Nus ne sut ne ne voit soventre. He suggests, however, that the author was more likely to have written Nus ne[l] se[u]t ne n'e[n] voit soventre. In M^o and M^1, Muret had already emended ne to nel. The sense of Reid's version is supported by aeschariz (3162).

3166. Ewert retains loinz, but mentions in his second volume (p. 225) that Tanquerey proposed lenz (Rom., LVI, pp. 120-1), which is in fact what appeared in M^o. Lenz finds favour with other critics: Reid (MLR, LX, p. 357, note 1) and Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 256) are inclined to support the correction. The rhyme denz : loinz, as Ewert has shown (Ewert, Volume II, p. 15), is quite possible, but on balance lenz seems preferable.

3169-71. Reid notes that editors assume a lacuna after 3170, but he envisages the possibility that 3169-70 have been interverted by the scribe, the accidental result of reading a couplet at a time. He suggests we should read Pasme soi, sa color a perse; Devant le roi choï enverse, Q'entre ses braz l'en a levee ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 275-6). Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 225) would support Reid's proposal rather than that of Acher (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 724), who suggested that Q'entre should read Entre. The order of events seems certainly more logical in Reid's version, but, strangely, he apparently felt unable to repeat his suggestion in his full-length commentary.

3177-8. In 3177 the MS reads si l'aseüre, which is universally corrected to qui l'aseüre, but the problem of the identical rhyme remains. Muret, at 3178, printed si rest seüre in M^0 and si s'aseüre in M^1, but M^2, M^3, M^4 and Ewert all have si aseüre. In his second volume (p. 5), Ewert accepted the identical rhyme, but in a footnote in his first volume (p. 95) he had suggested that 3178 might be corrected to si est seüre, a version which Reid is half-heartedly prepared to consider (The 'Tristran'..., p. 109). In truth, none of the proposed emendations convinces.

3227. Muret consistently emended met to mez, a correction now supported by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 110-11). Certainly, if Ancor ancui in 3226 is to be associated with Qant le feras, the correction seems almost indispensable.

3240. Ewert retains the manuscript reading destraignement, while in M^4, as in the Muret editions, the text reads desraignement, a synonym according to the glossary of deraisne. Certainly one would agree with Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 226-7) that there is no real case for emendation (see T.-L., II, 1792). The normal meanings of destraignement, 'distress', 'embarrassment', difficulties', seem perfectly adequate.

3278. It may well be that in 3277-8 we have, not an inexact rhyme, but a rhyme in t: we should read banit for baniz (see Holden, Rom., LXXXIX, p. 391, Robson, 'Quatrains and Passage...', p. 176). The poet seems to have made a deliberate declension 'mistake', for the purposes of rhyme,

which the scribe has then corrected.

3280. It is tempting to correct a trois to as trois, as Muret did in M^0 and as Ewert contemplates doing in his second volume (p. 228). Muret's correction, as trois eschis, which appeared in M^1 and M^2, seems unnecessary. Hunt feels naïs is difficult as well: he suggests as trois haïs (Tris., I, p. 40), which, because of 4248, may well be the correct reading.

3301. Reid believes that the scribe's botele, here and at 3691, is an error for bocele (MLR, LX, p. 355, note 1, The 'Tristran'..., p. 112): he suggests the meaning '(small) keg or leather bottle'. The scribe could easily have misread bocele as a form of the more familiar boteille.

3313. As at 1326, Ewert retains the reading par soi, which other editors emend to par foi. The same critics, Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 256) and Reid ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 273, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 112-3), with good cause find par soi as indefensible here as it was on the previous occasion. Mölk, on both occasions, prints par foi (Tristan und Isolde, p. 68, p. 162).

3340. While Muret printed tot ait, Ewert and M^4 retain the reading of the manuscript tot ai, though M^4 records in the notes (p. 148) the MS reading which is preserved. Foulet accepted Muret's version (Petite syntaxe..., §183). If the manuscript reading is preserved, one would certainly expect lié, not soi, in 3341 (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 113-4).

It is tempting to correct ai to ait or to a (see Lecoy, Rom., XCIII, p. 575), for throughout the whole sequence of episodes which begins at 3028 it is Iseut who is controlling events. But ai can be retained if we accept the meaning Mölk give to bien trové, 'gutheisse', 'approve' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 163, see also T.-L., X, 698). However, tot is probably not the adverb Mölk's translation suggests it is, but the direct object of the verb. We should perhaps understand: 'Tell her I have approved all she proposes for saving herself in the matter of the oath.'

3354. The MS reading boces is corrected in all editions after M^{o} to botons, with moi interpreted ingeniously as 'rameau feuillé au commencement de mai, arbre de mai' (M^{4}, Glossary, p. 166) and as 'may-tree, branch of may' (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 229-30). But Reid now queries the accepted interpretation (The 'Tristran'..., p. 114) and suggests that it may be possible to retain boces, as bocés, which would mean presumably 'small pimples'. Tristan might just be alluding to the disfigurement of his face that Iseut has decreed (3306), but one must feel that the line is then somewhat incongruous. It still seems likely that boces is a scribal error, but not necessarily for botons.

3396. Ewert sees tuit li barnage as a nominative plural correctly reproduced by the scribe (Ewert, Volume II, p. 232). Seoient toz li barnage, Muret's version, seems much more likely. As Reid surmises (The 'Tristran'..., p. 115), the scribe may have been induced by s[e]oient to write tuit and failed to go back and correct his work. The nominative singular noun

associated with a verb in the plural creates no problem. Vinaver mentions 3396 in connection with his defence of Ewert's version of 957 ('Remarques sur...', p. 345). His argument is perhaps unclear. Just because, in his view, the scribe employs the plural form tuit as a singular in 3396, are we to suppose that the scribe would necessarily feel able to employ the form toz as a plural elsewhere (even though toz was probably meant by the scribe to be a nominative plural in 957)?

3422. Mainly because of the identical rhyme, one presumes, Muret always printed Ainz nus de trestot le barné. The analogical feminine tele has also provoked comment (Reid, MLR, LX, p. 357, Holden, Rom., LXXXIX, p. 397). Ewert defends his version (and that of M^4) in his second volume (p. 232). If tele can be accepted (analogical forms of the feminine occur also at 2760, 3726 and 4076), the repetition of loiauté is still a cause for concern.

3426. François for MS francier, continuing Muret's first version, Franceis, certainly seems suspect. Ewert proposes Cornot (Ewert, Volume II, p. 232). Line 3254 suggests that Cornot is more likely to be what the author wrote than Ireis, the alternative proposal mentioned by Ewert.

3440-3. Reid suggests that once more the scribe has interverted the lines of a couplet, an error arising from his practice of reading a whole couplet at a time ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., p. 116). He suggests the passage should read as follows:

Cent i aiez de vos amis,
Vostre mesnie natural;
Vostre cort set a tant loial,
Dedevant vos iert alegiee.

Soit in 3027 and 4458 is presumably scribal for the imperfect sot and it is obviously inappropriate here: Reid, with Muret, justifiably corrects to set. It does indeed appear, as Reid and the M^4 revisors claim (p. 148), that l.3443 in the editions is a consecutive clause depending on 3441. Even if the lines are to remain in the scribe's order, a comma at 3442, rather than a semi-colon, seems advisable. The note in M^4 on natural is potentially misleading (Glossary, p. 166): it is surely Arthur's knights who are involved here, not King Mark's.

3454. The MS reads Ja ne voist il sanz paradis. Muret, obviously unhappy with the line, corrected to Ja ne voist il en paradis in his early editions (M^o, M^1, M^2). Ewert, however, prints Ja ne voist il s'anz paradis, the reading in M^3 and M^4. Reid shares Muret's initial dissatisfaction ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 283-4, The 'Tristran'..., p. 117). He believes the line is corrupt because this would be the only place in the text where enz (anz) is used as a preposition, because the reflexive pronoun is in a most exceptional position and because pronominal aler is hardly ever found without the adverb an. In defence of his version, Ewert suggests that s' is not the reflexive, but an elided form of se for si (Ewert, Volume II, p. 233). If this is so, it is difficult to see what particular sense s' might have. Reid's third objection, the absence of an (or en), would be countered if we assume that the scribe omitted the titulus, as in fact happened in Reid's version of 3152. But the problem of anz remains and Reid's suggested reading, Ja ne voie il saint

paradis, has a great deal to commend it.

3470. Et lui pendre is felt by Reid to be suspect (The 'Tristran'..., p. 118). Its link with the preceding clause is less than clear, a point illustrated by the fact that Ewert presents what seem to be two alternative interpretations of the phrase (Ewert, Volume II, p. 234). Et at the beginning of the line may well be suspect, inserted simply to restore the syllable-count. Reid suggests Com de lui pendre as a possible version.

3480. Ewert and M^4 have Ja n'en, M^o had Ja mais, M'jamais, M^2 and M^3 Ja n'en. Reid supports Ja nen (The 'Tristran'..., p. 118), which certainly does seem the best reading, for in Ewert and M^4 the sense of en remains obscure.

3482. In certain printings at least, Ewert has oit, apparently in error for MS ot.

3487. Ewert reproduces the manuscript when he prints Tant li dirai que il me croie. Muret and M^4, however, have Tant li dira que il le croie and Mölk also has his doubts over Ewert's version (Tristan und Isolde, p. 171, note 41). Elsewhere, the scribe appears to confuse the second and third persons in a passage of direct speech. Although this is obviously not an exact parallel, at 2402 the scribe writes vos in place of ses and Ewert accepts the correction (Ewert, Volume II, p. 204). It may well be that the Muret and M^4 version is the better reading of the two. Reid, however, sees 3487 as the introduction to Evain's threats against

Denoalen (The 'Tristran'..., p. 119). After presumably closing 3486 with a full stop, he would print Tant li dirai (que il me croie!): Se je l'encontre.... Reid's proposal is not altogether convincing. The parenthetical que il me croie is awkward, and neither Gauvain nor Girflet make a similar preliminary remark.

3525-7. At 3526, Ewert retains Qu'il, while M^4, following the Muret editions, prints Qui. Similarly, at 3527, Ewert prints de parlemenz (MS de parlomenz), which is emended by Muret and M^4 to li parlemenz. To take 3527 first, de parlemenz seems unlikely and the Muret and M^4 reading should probably be retained, as Reid requests (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 119-20). In M^o and M^4 3527 is linked with 3526, but this seems difficult to support. One would tend to identify parlemenz more with the conversation of Arthur and Perinis than with the forthcoming scenes at the Blanche Lande. Ewert seems hesitant over his version of 3526 which Henry considered virtually impossible (RBPH, XXII, p. 256) and now seems inclined to accept the correction of the line to Qui metra lance par astele (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 234-5), if qui can be the 'generic' qui, to be translated by 'whoever'. If Qu'il is the correct version, which Ewert does not completely dismiss, it is difficult to identify the il of 3526 with Arthur. Raynaud de Lage would seem to accept the Muret and M^4 interpretation of 3525-6 (Rom., LXXXV, p. 526) and, as Reid says, this is probably the better version of the lines.

3538. Quite reasonably, Ewert preferred to retain the manuscript reading, Beaus amis, rather than introduce the

emendation of Muret, Bel ami. M^4 has Beaux amis, presumably an unacknowledged misprint. At 3537, Ewert prints departiz, Muret departi.

3544-5. The MS reads at 3544 Por ue (rather than uc) serai des alentez, which editors emend to Por lié serai entalentez. Reid believes the construction with entalentez to be unusual and suggests two versions, both of which require rather less correction of the manuscript than the approved version, Poroc ne serai alentez and Poi en serai destalentez (The 'Tristran'..., p. 120). The scribe may well have started to write destalentez, but may have checked himself (hence the space), re-examined his exemplar and may have written the correct alentez without bothering to excise des. Reid also questions the agreed version of 3545 and favours the proposal of Gaston Paris, Ele me pot ja molt avancier (M^o, p. 254). Certainly the incident alluded to in 3546-8 may have resulted in a debt of gratitude which Arthur is now eager to pay, but it is a deliberately vague allusion.

3560. Reid rightly points out (The 'Tristran'..., p. 121) that in printing the MS reading celui, M^4 shows greater consistency than Ewert who emends to celi with Muret.

3582. M^4 has semblant, which seems to be another unacknowledged misprint, for where the full form is found the scribe writes senblant (e.g., 2). In the MS the line reads Quil nen fera senblant et signe. Muret printed Qu'el ne fera senblant ne signe. Ewert, followed in principle by M^4,

has Qu'el n'en fera senblant et signe. Lecoy, however, believes semblant (sic) et signe to be impossible in a negative clause (Rom., XCIII, p. 576), and neither the Muret version nor the Ewert version meets with Reid's approval (The 'Tristran'..., p. 121). He specifically queries Ewert's interpretation in his second volume (p. 238), 'for she will give no sign or token [of being aware of your identity?]'. Certainly one expects Governal to be warning Tristan to pay attention just in case Iseut gives some kind of signal. Reid again tends to support Paris's emendation, Qu'el vos fera senblant et signe (M^{o}, p. 254), which seems at least to have the right sense.

3634. With Ewert, one prefers to retain que nus n'en sone (Ewert, Volume II, p. 239). Muret and M^{4} have que mot ne sone. Line 3645, to which M^{4} alludes (p. 149), is not a direct parallel. Here, no one is suspicious that the leper is other than he appears to be, while at the later line it is Tristan's refusal to retaliate verbally which is described. It is true, as Reid points out (The 'Tristran'..., p. 122), that Ewert's interpretation 'does not correspond to any attested use of soner'. But Ewert's interpretation is hardly more forced than that of Reid who claims that the meaning of mot ne sone is 'without comment'.

3637. Ewert, like T.-L. (II, 868), would seem to recognize in corlain an acceptable variant for corlieu (Ewert, Volume II, p. 239). M^{4}, likewise, prints corlain. But Henry (RBPH, XXII, p. 257) prefers corlieu, which Muret printed. Has the scribe's eye slipped momentarily to mains in the next line?

3647. Muret emended corbel to corlieu, while Ewert and M^4 retain corbel. Henry suggested that corbel can be retained with the meaning 'paysan' (RBPH, XXII, p. 257): Ewert glosses the word as 'crow (used pejoratively of persons)' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 143, see also Ewert, Volume II, pp. 239-40), but there is very little support for this particular meaning in T.-L. (II, 848).

3651. M^4 has saigner, which appears to be an unacknowledged error. At 3709, M^4 reads entreseigné, but this is corrected to entreseignié (Rom., LXX, p. 98).

3663-6. The MS reading of 3664, Quil se hast de nus alegier, has been generally held to be corrupt. Gaston Paris apparently suggested Qu'il se hastent de soi logier and this is what all modern editors print. But Reid believes that not only 3664 but also 3663 is corrupt ('On the Text of the Tristran ...', p. 284, The 'Tristran'..., p. 123). He believes the scribe printed Pensent in error for Passent, and he believes that alegier in 3664 is authentic. He suggests the original had Passent vaslet et escuier Qui se hastent d'eus alegier. Reid's objections to Paris's version seem valid enough. It does seem strange that the squires should think first of finding lodgings for themselves and the construction with penser is somewhat abnormal. Ewert dismisses Reid's proposal by simply referring to it as a 'bold emendation' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 240), but in fact the proposal is surely less 'bold' than that of Paris and contextually it is rather more satisfying.

3680. The MS reads Qant il pensent estre essaier. M^4 follows Muret in printing Qant il le pensent essaier, another reading attributed to Gaston Paris. From his SATF edition, where he has printed Qant il le cuident essaier, it would seem that Muret at that time misread pensent as cuident. But certainly preferable to the Muret and M^4 reading is that of Ewert, Qant il pensent outre essaier. This offers the advantage of providing a satisfactory reading with the minimum of change.

3701. The manuscript reads Cil qui les passe n'est seuez, which Reid is tempted to retain, with seuez corrected to seüz (The 'Tristran'..., p. 124). Editors print Cil qui la passe n'est seürs (or seür). Reid translates Cil qui les passe by 'he who sets them across', but this is not precisely Tristan's role, and it may be difficult to take seüz in the sense Reid suggests, 'known, recognized' (but see T.-L., IX, 255-6).

3702-4. Reid suggests that 3703 and 3704 have been interverted by the scribe (The 'Tristran'..., p. 124). His proposed version reads Atant es vos le roi Artus, O lui de ses barons plusors; Esgarder vient les passeors. The scribe has certainly interverted the lines of couplets on other occasions and it is hard to accept that passeor should have a meaning in 3703 which is different from its meaning almost immediately before in 3698.

3738. In the manuscript the line begins Fait dras. In M^o, Muret printed Mais dras, but suggested Fins dras as a possible correction (p. 254), and it is Fins dras which appears in the CFMA editions and in Ewert. But critics have been less satisfied with Muret's suggestion. Acher proposed Frois dras (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 724), while Tanquerey proposed to retain Fait (as Faiz), understanding '(des vêtement (sic)) convenables' (Rom., LVI, pp. 121-2). In his second volume (p. 241), Ewert contemplates whether Fait might be possible, if one can understand Fait que by it: the line is then translated as 'He contrives to obtain raiment in great quantity...'. Reid can find no support for the particular meaning Ewert wishes to give to this construction with faire (The 'Tristran' ..., p. 125). At the moment, Fins appears to be the best reading.

3794. Because the normally feminine torbe is here apparently masculine and because of the repetition of cel, Gaston Paris and Reid have suggested corrections. In M^o (p. 254), la grant torbe is suggested, while Reid sees the line as a question, Veez la torbe aprés cel fanc? (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 125-6). Reid's version is clearly preferable: misreading veez as vez, the scribe has characteristically sought to restore the correct syllable-count by introducing the gratuitous cel.

3814. M^4 has biens, almost certainly an unacknowledged error.

3835. In his edition, Ewert retains aresnement, while Muret and M^4 have desresnement. Ewert understands 'explanation,

justification' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 138), which seems somewhat forced: T.-L. (I, 489) suggests only 'Anrede'. The Muret emendation, as Ewert concedes (Ewert, Volume II, p. 242), may well be preferable.

3849. Editors question por le mal d'agres, assume that the scribe has misread or altered a proper name (see Ewert, 'On the Text of...', p. 96) and print por le mal d'Acre. But Whitteridge (Med. aev., XXVIII, pp. 167-71) has contested this widely-held view that here we have a reference to the epidemic which swept through the crusaders at the siege of Acre in 1191. She believes that the reading of the manuscript is difficult but not impossible. Rejecting the ideas that mal d'agres is 'the disease of the catching pains' or a form of anthrax, she suggests that what may be meant here is 'the disease of the extremities'. She admits that there is no conclusive proof, and she would accept for the moment that le mal d'agres is the name of an unknown disease. Ewert makes a defence of the version he shares with other editors (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 34-6, especially p. 36, note 2), and one must have every sympathy with the line he takes: Whitteridge's supposition that the 'leper' is alluding to a precise medical complaint rather than to a general condition is surely unfounded.

3872. The manuscript reads posenadoise. Muret reproduced this reading in M^{o}, printing pose n'adoise, but the CFMA editions have point en adoise, as Tobler recommended (ZRP, XXX, p. 744). Ewert prints poi en adoise, assuming that the scribe misread poi as pos ('On the Text of...', p. 94), but it seems more likely, as he suggests on p. 244 of his second

volume, that the scribe misread poī as pos. Certainly poin (or point) makes better sense. Reid terms point an indispensable correction (The 'Tristran'..., p. 127).

3910. Reid may be right to query the use of Qui as the direct object of a verb referring to a concrete object (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 127-8). He suggests that Qui empare might be corrected to Qui l'empare.

3922. In his CFMA editions Muret corrected boçu to bociez, but M^4 follows Ewert in retaining the manuscript reading. Here, and at 1162, Ewert interprets boçu as meaning 'covered with scrofulous tumours or swellings' (Volume II, p. 151). Godefroy (I, 670) and T.-L (I, 1022) confirm the existence of this meaning, but one wonders whether it is absolutely necessary to adopt it here. It might be possible to accept the meaning 'hunchbacked', if we realize that Tristan is now playing a role, very successfully it would seem. Although by nature he has none of the physical attributes of the leper (3622-4), he has imitated them and fooled passers-by. Having fooled all, Tristan can now claim openly to be boçu, in the most common meaning of the word.

3934. It is very possible, as Ewert suspects (Ewert, Volume II, p. 244), that the scribe once more made the wrong word-division and that we should read l'esgardent, not les gardent. Muret in fact printed l'esgardent in M^o. Reid supports l'esgardent (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 128-9).

3938. M^4 has fai, an obvious error for fait.

3944. Ewert prints the manuscript reading set, but M^4, following Muret, has seut. It is easy to see how seut might have given rise to set; seut was misread as sent, which was then written without the titulus. However, Ewert defends set (Ewert, Volume II, p. 245), but even with the meaning 'know how to', which Reid challenges (The 'Tristran'..., p. 129), set makes much less sense than seut.

3947-50. Once more we find three successive lines in the MS which have the same rhyme, in -el. In M^o, Muret saw 3949 as supernumerary and discarded it, but in the CFMA editions the line is included and a lacuna assumed. Ewert suggests either that the scribe has omitted a line or incorporated a variant (Ewert, Volume II, p. 4, p. 7). Reid is inclined to dispense with 3949, though he correctly observes that the line is not really a variant of either 3947 or 3948 (The 'Tristran'..., p. 129). But the line strangely anticipates the general substance of 3952 and might even be regarded as contradicting that line.

3957. Muret and M^4 print il, while Ewert retains li. Il does not seem to produce a better sense by any means (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 129-30).

3974. Ewert and M^4 both print Achat bien lit, si soit pastor, but earlier editions show no such unanimity. In M^o, Muret printed Achat bun lit; ce soit en tor, and later he suggests Achat bun lit et covertor. In the meantime Acher had put forward two possibilities, Achat bun lit, si soit passor

and Achat bun lit, soit passeor (ZRP, XXXIII, p. 725). Reid proposes a more radical change ('On the Text of the Tristran ...', pp. 284-5, The 'Tristran'..., p. 130). He sees Muret's concern over the declension irregularity of pastor as unwarranted, considers lit to be unexpected and bien unjustified and suggests Achat berbiz, si soit pastor. Certainly a leper is more qualified to perform the isolated task of a shepherd than that of a ferry-man. Lit, moreover, is indeed surprising. Acher translates by 'une bonne litière', which is ingenious but unconvincing. Reid has put forward a quite plausible correction, but it is possible that other features in 3973-5 are corrupt.

3999. In his text Ewert retains coste and silie, which Muret and M^4 emend to cote and sele. But Ewert's glossary (Ewert, Volume I, p. 143) suggests that he intended to print co(s)te and the existence of sele in 3988 puts silie in some doubt.

4015-6. Reid suggests that these lines might have been interverted by the scribe (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 130-1). Is this really likely? 4016 is the logical deduction made from the evidence observed by Girflet in 4015.

4021. Pres is difficult, unless we see in it a variant of prez. But Ewert's tentative proposal, pris (Ewert, Volume II, p. 248), may well be what the author wrote.

4052. Cuir, if it is to be taken in the sense of 'skin' (Ewert, Volume I, p. 144, M^4, Glossary, p. 161), strikes one as somewhat odd. Reid suggests that cuir might refer to the

camois or chamois, but also suggests that cuir might be an error for fust (The 'Tristran'..., p. 131). Is the scribe still thinking of the body of the victim (cors, 4051) and writes cuir in error for a word similar in form?

4065. In some printings at least, Ewert prints alon, not alons, an apparent error (at 4245 we have allons).

4071. Ewert retains estroit, which in Muret and M^4 is emended to destroit. Ewert gives the meaning 'grip (with fear)' for the verb estreindre and sees estroit as its past participle (Ewert, Volume I, p. 150). This extension of meaning seems a trifle audacious and no precise parallel with this particular figurative meaning is offered in T.-L (III, 1469-70).

4081. The CFMA editions and Mölk have cordel, a correction first suggested by Muret in M^o (p. 254). Ewert alone retains in his text the corbel of the manuscript. But in his commentary (Ewert, Volume II, p. 249), Ewert is prepared to adopt the more likely cordel. Corbel appeared at 3647 and the scribe may unconsciously have harked back to that line.

4088. Reid has a note on the meaning of menee (The 'Tristran'..., p. 132). If 4088 is followed by a full-stop (as in Muret and M^4) and dissociated from 4089, the context does not necessarily demand that menee should signify 'the sounding of the horn to signify the return from a successful hunt'. (See also Tilander, Mélanges d'étymologie cyné-

gétique, pp. 309-10).

4096-4100. The text of these lines, even though Ewert and M^4 agree, still seems corrupt. It seems essential to correct De to Se in 4099, following M^o, and a full-stop after 4097 seems advisable, if we understand the meaning of dras to be 'fabrics' rather than 'clothes'. Only in 4098 does the author concern himself with one particular group of dras.

4103. Reid suggests that the first nen and possibly the second should be corrected to n'en (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 132-3). There are obviously occasions when nen could be read as n'en (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., p. 13). Here, certainly, the first nen, and probably only the first nen, should be printed n'en.

4107-8. As Ewert indicates (Ewert, Volume II, p. 250), it may be better to retain enseigne in the sense of 'charge, incriminating evidence' and to emend barnage in 4108 to conpaigne.

4112. Ewert retains fu. Obviously the most usual construction would have fust, the correction introduced by Muret, continued in M^4 and supported by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 133). Probably, fust should be printed.

4114-5. The lines are variously punctuated and interpreted. Ewert runs together 4114 and 4115 and places a comma after fermeté, while M^4 follows Muret in placing as well a colon after toner. Editors agree, however, over the meaning of A fermeté, for Ewert understands 'assuredly, doubtless' (Ewert, Volume I,

p. 151), Muret and M^4 'assurément, sans doute' (M^4, Glossary, p. 163). But Reid points to Paris's reservations (M^o, p. 254) and the lack of corroborative evidence in T.-L. and suggests that fermeté in 4115 means 'guarantee' ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 265, The 'Tristran'..., p. 133). He understands 'It was by way of a guarantee of (later) heat'. Contextually, this would make admirable sense.

4125. Ewert retains the manuscript reading and prints Un drap de soie a paile bis. In the text of his SATF edition, Muret had likewise retained the manuscript version, but in his list of corrections (p. 254) he substituted the reading reproduced in the CFMA editions, Un drap de soie, un paile bis. If a is retained, it would seem to mean 'made out of', rather than simply 'bordered or lined' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 250).

4130-5. Line 4135 is clearly dependent on 4130, as Reid points out (The 'Tristran'.., p. 134), and he suggests that one would expect nes eussent mises, rather than les orent mises. Ewert defends the MS version that he reproduces (Ewert, Volume II, p. 250), claiming the construction is a loose one. But one suspects that it was the scribe, rather than the author, who lost track of the original construction. In 4132, all editors correct ceres (rather than teres, M^o) to bieres, but Reid proposes serres, in spite of the rhyme, feeling that the attested meaning of bieres is quite inappropriate here (see T.-L., I, 971-2). Reid gives to serres the meaning 'lock-ups, safe places' and cites Yvain, 4633(Roques, 4627): there is now some rather more convincing evidence in T.-L. (IX, 545-6)

to support his interpretation.

4141-3. Reid queries the accepted version of these lines, because of the necessity to take a form of merveille as masculine (The 'Tristran'..., p. 135). He offers two versions of 4142, Sifait outrage, tel mervelle and Tel outrage, si grant mervelle. His second suggestion seems more acceptable, for the scribe's eye may easily have slipped to 4141 or to 4143 and caused him to write yet another fait. Blakey, however, voiced his unhappiness with Reid's interpretation in a review (FS, XXVII, p. 316) and proceeded elsewhere to defend the manuscript version. For him, the construction involved would be a qui-clause followed by two parallel si-clauses (FS, XXX, pp. 138-9). There is surely no need to emend sil (= cil) to cil, a proposal which Reid seems to put forward .

4149. In M° qui is emended to quel, but in other editions the MS form is retained. Mussafia criticized quel and interpreted qui, quite correctly, as a relative pronoun with li as its antecedent: he cited 1916-7 as a parallel and suggested that qui[l] should perhaps be printed (Rom., XXXIV, p. 306). Reid, apparently unaware of Mussafia's suggestion, now makes the same proposal (The 'Tristran'..., p. 135).

4158-9. The interpretation of qui ara tort is difficult. Ewert follows the CFMA editions and prints Or oiez, roi: qui ara tort, La roîne vendra avant. He offers two explanations, neither of which is fully convincing (Ewert, Volume II, pp. 250-1). Reid reviews the question but does not formulate any firm conclusion (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 135-6). In M°

Muret printed: Or oiez, roi, qui ara tort· La roîne vendra avant. Mölk reproduces Ewert's text, but his translation implies a different punctuation, akin to that of the SATF edition. He translates thus: 'Nun hört, König, wer Unrecht haben wird!' (Tristan und Isolde, p. 201). Certainly qui ara tort may well be the object of oiez as Mölk suggests and as Muret originally thought. We should perhaps understand: 'Hear...who will be (proved) wrong'.

4180. With good reason, Reid adopts the suggestion made in M^4 (p. 150) that C'a should be printed Ç'a, meaning S'a not Q'a (The 'Tristran'..., p. 136).

4199-4205. All editors correct tuit celes in 4204. In M^o, Muret printed Et totes celes par le mont, while all the CFMA editions and Ewert have Et tuit icil de par le mont. Presumably tuit icil refers to saintuaire and is meant as part of the subject of aŦt: Muret corrected cest to cist in 4202, obviously to give the 'correct' nominative form. But the whole passage is somewhat confused. Reid argues that 4201 might be parenthetical and that 4202, 4203 and 4204 are all the object of jure, representing the objects by which Iseut is to swear (The 'Tristran'..., p. 138). If 4201 is indeed parenthetical, the passage still remains somewhat obscure. All that seems certain is that the initial Q' in 4205 introduces a noun clause dependent on jure which is the primary object of the verb.

4206. After Mussafia (Rom., XXXIV, p. 307), all editors have corrected fist sor some to fist soi some. But Reid now suggests that the basic error lies not in sor but in fist. He

believes that the original probably read qui (= cui) fis sorsome, 'for whom I made a very heavy load' (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 138-9). This makes good sense and would dispose of soi, the linguistic abnormality which partly led to Reid's emendation.

4219. M^4 restores si fiere en jure, closing the line with a colon, not Ewert's exclamation mark, and, perhaps inadvertently, sees jure as a substantive and not as a verb (Glossary, p. 165). Muret consistently printed si fiere a jure!. Reid approves adherence to the manuscript, but once more suggests that the word-division need not be respected. He suggests that si fiere enjure! should be printed, meaning 'so cruel a wrong!' ('On the Text of the Tristran...', pp. 266-7, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 139-40). There is some support for Reid's interpretation of fiere in T.-L (III, 1823), but the sentiments his version conveys do not really strike one as very appropriate at this juncture. On balance, Ewert's interpretation seems most likely and we should understand 'so proud she swears!'.

4225. The interpretation of fors has stimulated much critical comment. Christmann (Rom., LXXX, pp. 85-7) opposes the conclusion presented in M^4 (p. 150): 'Elle n'est tenue à aucun autre serment que celui que vous venez d'entendre, qui met hors de cause la question du roi et de son neveu.' Christmann proposes a different meaning for fors: 'Je crois plutôt qu'il s'agit de l'emploi adversatif de fors (emploi assez fréquent en ancien français), et qu'il convient de le rendre par "mais seulement" (cf. l'allemand: "sondern nur"). La phrase signifie donc: "Elle n'est tenue à aucune autre justification que celle que vous venez d'entendre, mais [elle est] seulement [tenue à se justifier] en ce qui concerne le roi et son neveu".' Ewert,

by and large, supports Christmann, but would take fors to mean 'except' and du 'concerning, in respect of' (Ewert, Volume II, p. 253). Reid has questioned the interpretation Christmann and Ewert offer (Rom., LXXXV, pp. 366-7, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 140-1). He believes that 4255 may easily refer to Arthur and Gauvain, not to Mark and Tristan. He writes: 'In that case, both fors and de could have their most usual senses, and the passage would mean: "She needs no other exculpation than you have heard except that of the king (Arthur) and his nephew" ' (Rom., LXXXV, pp. 366-7). It is certainly true, as Reid suggests, that very often the identity of the king referred to can only be deduced from the immediate context: 4126 may be a further case in point.

Christmann has taken up the argument once more (ZfS, LXXVI, pp. 243-5). Mentioning Frappier's apparent support for his interpretation (Rom., LXXXIII, p. 252), the doubts of Cigada (Stud. franc., III, p. 463) and Mölk's interpretation in his translation, he gives the reasons for finding Reid's conclusions untenable. After the speech of those present, he points out, a 'guarantee' by Arthur, not by Gauvain, is discussed. Further, Christmann goes on, there is no reason to suppose that Gauvain and Arthur are the only 'guarantors', and he denies that the term escondit could have the two separate meanings Reid mentioned in his note. Christmann's interpretation has gained the support of Ménage (Rom., XCV, p. 169, note 1). But as Reid points out in his commentary, 3252 and 4176 seem to suggest that escondit does have a rather wider field of meaning than Christmann is prepared to admit. Moreover, if one accepts that the king and nephew are indeed Arthur and Gauvain, this does not mean that they are the sole 'guarantors', as Christmann suggests:

Arthur and his nephew may simply be the figures whose importance warrants an individual mention.

Nevertheless, the more obvious interpretation, namely that the roi and the nevo of 4225 refer to Mark and Tristan, seems likely to be the correct one. The spectators assume that in 4210 the queen has exempted Tristan (who is clearly very much in their minds at the time) and assume that she has responded directly to Arthur's words in 4191-6. Difficult though it may be to take fors in the sense of 'except', this may well be its meaning here.

4232. Certainly Reid's interpretation of 4225 gains a measure of support, if, as he claims (The 'Tristran'..., p. 142), the scribe intended here to write li niés. The beginning of the line has been variously interpreted, but Ewert does see Linies as a perfectly valid reading (Ewert, Volume II, p. 253). To support this particular reading, one might point to an earlier passage with a similar development. Perinis's speech at Arthur's court provokes an immediate corporate reaction (chascun, 3451), but Gauvain is the first individual to stand up and speak (3457). If we accept li niés in 4232, Gauvain is again the first individual to be heard after the reaction of all those present (chascuns, 4219). Adams and Hemming seem to support Reid (MA, LXXIX, p. 467, note 21), but wrongly refer to 4139, and Hackett is also impressed by Reid's interpretation (Med. aev., XLIII, p. 277).

4241-6. Seront in 4241 must surely be an error. Reid suggests seroie as the correct conditional form and also tends to believe that allasse should replace allons in 4245 (The

'Tristran'..., p. 142). But seront might easily have been written for serons, a form which allons, if retained, would support. In 4235 the first person plural is employed by Arthur (or Gauvain?).

4285-7. Ewert interverts 4285-6 and prints Tristran set molt de Malpertis; Qant li rois vait a ses deduis, En la chanbre vet congié prendre. In the Muret editions and M^4 the order of lines in the MS is retained. In Ewert's 4286, the scribe finally wrote son deduis· in M^o the word was read as deduit and the form reproduced, in M^1, M^2 and M^3 the word was read as a probable deduiz and corrected in M^1 to deduit; in M^2 and M^3 deduiz was retained. Following Gaston Paris (M^o, p. 254), M^1, M^2 and M^3 assume a lacuna between their 4285 and 4286, but M^4 retains the order of lines in the MS without assuming a lacuna. If we accept the scribe's order of lines, reject the lacuna and understand Tristran set molt de Malpertis (Malpertuis, M^1, M^2, M^3, M^4) parenthetically, this may aid comprehension. Certainly in Ewert's version the change of subject in 4287 from Mark to Tristan is a trifle surprising. As Reid suggests (The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 143-4), congié may be an error, for the scribe thought he was still writing about Mark: he proposes son sez or ses sez, suggestions deemed weak by Blakey (FS, XXVII, p. 316). But is it possible that vet congié prendre is a euphemistic expression, like venir a parlement in 662? One expects Mark to take his leave; is it suggested here that Tristan is performing a rather more intimate task on Mark's behalf? Payen also sees the phrase as having something other than a literal meaning (Tristan et Yseut, p. 341).

4294. Muret consistently printed Enuit l'i verrez ou par main, while Ewert and M^4 retain Enuit verrez venir, par main. Reid supports the Muret version (The 'Tristran'..., p. 144). The omission of the object pronoun is disconcerting and certainly venir may have been introduced under the influence of 4291.

4307. The MS reads quant leuratin. Muret first printed quant en ratent in M^0, then quant le ratent in M^1, before printing in M^2 and M^3 quant l'en ratent, the version appearing also in Ewert and M^4. Rüttiger suggested quant le vos rent, taking rendre to mean 'faire connaître' (Der heutige Stand..., p. 21). Reid would seem to feel that the meaning offered by Rüttiger is closer to the original than that of editors, for he quite reasonably suggests the author might have written quant ert (r)ataint, 'when he is caught' (The 'Tristran'..., p. 144).

4309-4312. Ewert prints the manuscript reading Si vos at 4310, but M^4 corrects vos to nos. The correction is doubtful, particularly if 4309-10 form part of the spy's reply (see Tanquerey, Med. aev., X, p. 115). Reid suggests that the scribe may once again have interverted the lines ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 276, The 'Tristran'..., p. 145), but interversion would not seem to solve very much. If 4309 can be attributed to the spy, 4310-12 might be attributed to the barons. If 4310 can be seen as a solemn promise on the barons' part, the correction of vos to nos might then be justified.

4313-4. The rhyme between cuvert and overt makes the

lacuna supposed by Muret and Ewert somewhat dubious. In M^4 the lacuna is rejected and it is suggested (p. 150) that 4314 ought possibly to read Est un petit pertus overt. Reid supports the rejection of the lacuna (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 145-6), proposes Un petit pertus a overt or Uns petiz pertus est overz (rhyming with cuverz). Elsewhere (916, 3470, 4357?) there is the suspicion that et has been included to supply a missing syllable and this may certainly have happened here.

4318. Reid has devoted a good deal of attention to this line. In one article ('On the Text of the Tristran...', p. 278) he suggests that jagloiz is an error for jagloloiz, 'iris-bed, plantation of sword-lilies or sweet sedge'. He writes: 'The scribe has transformed jagloloiz, by haplology, into jagloiz, and has restored the measure by arbitrarily giving the feminine form to the adjective espés.' In a second note (MLR, LX, p. 356 and note 2), Reid amplifies the linguistic reasons for his emendation. The word jagloiz would be connected with the forms glajol, jaglol, jagluel etc., corresponding to gladiolum. It has no final palatal l which would justify the z in the nominative singular, and its tonic vowel, when undiphthongized, is an open o, not the closed o the rhyme with doiz would appear to demand.

Ewert, however, believes the syntax of the line is misinterpreted by Reid. For Ewert (Ewert, Volume II, p. 256), espesse is a verb-form, part of espesser, 'be or become thick or dense'. He also defends his form jagloiz. But Reid continues to support his reading Et bien espés li jagloloiz (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 146-7). He challenges Ewert's interpretation of espesse and certainly there is little support for the meaning

Ewert wishes to give to espessier (see T.-L., III, 1235-7). Bearing in mind the scribe's well-known habit of restoring the measure by various means, one may well feel that Reid's interpretation is superior. It has the support of Holden (Rom., LXXXIX, p. 393).

4322. Muret printed Fors la fenestre n'i a plus, but Ewert and M^4 retain Fors la fenestre n'i aut nus. In the Muret version there is a problem over fors, but, as Reid points out (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 147-8), there is little evidence to support Ewert's translation 'outside'. The evidence of 2468, where senestrier is corrected to fenestrier, is certainly suggestive and indicates that here the scribe might have done almost exactly the reverse and read fenestre for senestre. Reid believes the line should read Fors a senestre n'i aut nus.

4324. The revisors of M^4, like Muret, feel impelled to accept Gaston Paris's suggestion, that agucete should be corrected to aguete. T.-L. refers to this line under the rubric aguet (I, 216), but Ewert retains agucete. Reid feels that agucete must be discarded (The 'Tristran'..., p. 148) and the weight of the evidence is surely on his side.

4328. All editors retain c'on ne l'estache, which Muret and M^4 place in parentheses. Reid, however, sensibly argues that a form from estachier (= atachier) lacks plausibility (The 'Tristran'..., p. 148). He believes the text might read c'on ne le sache, 'in such a way that they do not know it, without anyone's knowing'. The rhyme with sache (sachier) in 4327 causes no problem.

4368. While Reid associates poine with poena (MLR, LX, p. 356, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 149-50), Ewert sees the form as scribal for poigne, to be associated with pugna (Ewert, Volume II, p. 257). This was also Muret's interpretation, but poine is conveniently omitted from the M^4 glossary. It may be noted that in his first volume Ewert glossed poine under peine, and the evidence assembled by Reid suggests that his initial decision was the correct one.

4372. M^1 alone printed mervelles granz, referring to the levriers, while all other editions retain grant, which is then presumably meant to describe Denoalen. Reid supports M^1 (The 'Tristran'..., p. 150), which certainly seems to offer the better version.

4397-8. Muret consistently printed in 4398 Est li passez par la tantost?, but Ewert and M^4 repunctuate and retain the MS version Est il passez? Ala tantost? Neither version is very convincing: the problem over the meaning of tantost and the rhyme with si tost do indeed suggest that the lines are in need of some fairly radical emendation (see Reid, The 'Tristran'..., pp. 150-1).

4407. Ewert retains the manuscript reading sei met, which emends, like Muret, to se met. (The note in M^4 (p. 150) to the effect that soi met is the manuscript reading is perhaps a printing error). Reid prefers se met (The 'Tristran'..., p. 151), which is clearly the 'safer' version.

4408. Ewert suggests one might read a tret (Ewert, Volume II, p. 258), which is, in fact, what Muret printed in M^o and which is probably a better reading than atret.

4413. The manuscript itself appears to read percie, rather than partie. Nevertheless, partie may be a desirable correction, as Reid intimates (MLR, LX, p. 355, Rom., XC, p. 388, The 'Tristran' ..., pp. 151-2).

4422. Ewert corrects the manuscript reading ancer to anter. The CFMA editions read Li ber. Anter may satisfy the sense, if only just, and the ie : e rhyme is acceptable. But elsewhere (452, 3031, 3432, 3967), the form entier is used. Was the source of Muret's proposal the Charroi de Nîmes? Lines 21-2 read Quatre saietes ot li bers ou costé; Son arc d'aubor raportoit de berser.

4441. The MS reads s'estent rather than s'esteut. Muret and M^4 print s'esteut, but Ewert prints l'estent. The problem with l'estent is that roughly the same action would be repeated in 4443, in spite of Ewert's protestations to the contrary (Ewert, Volume II, p. 259). S'esteut also presents a problem: in 4457, as at 1591, the text has s'estut. Reid tends to feel that this is not a major objection at all (The 'Tristran'..., pp. 152-3). But the MS reads at 4441 not s'esteut, but s'estent. Can the scribe possibly have begun to write s'esteut, realized he should be be writing l'entent and completed the word correctly without rewriting the beginning of the word? One might consider also 2278, Tristran l'entent, fist un sospir, and 3184, Li rois l'entent, rist, si l'enbrace.

4465. Ewert retains que cest, but Muret and M^4 emend to qu'a cest. One hesitates to discard the MS version.

4473. There is indeed the possibility, mentioned by Reid (The 'Tristran'..., p. 153), that Sovent is a scribal error. One might note that at 2507-8 the lines close in the MS with romenz and ent: editors correct to ro Marc and arc. Normally romenz and ent are regarded as examples of the scribe's erroneously carrying on the rhymes of a previous couplet, but there is also the possiblility that the scribe simply misread Marc as menz and arc as ent. If this is so, Sovent in 4473 might easily be the result of a misreading of Son arc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is selective in so far as it lists only those works which have been of direct use and interest in the preparation of the final draft of this thesis.

I MANUSCRIPTS

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, 103

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, 104

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, 756-7

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français, 2171

II EDITIONS

a) Béroul

Hagen, F.H. von der, ed., Gottfrieds von Strassburg Werke, aus den bessten Handschriften mit Einleitung und Wörterbuch 2 vols (Breslau, 1823), II, 243-303

Michel, F., ed., Tristan: Recueil de ce qui reste des poëmes relatifs à ses aventures composés en françois, en anglo-normand et en grec dans les XII et XIII siècles, 3 vols (London, 1835-1839), I, 1-212

Muret, E., ed., Le Roman de Tristan par Béroul et un anonyme, poème du XIIe siècle, Société des anciens textes français (Paris, 1903)

- Béroul: Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, Classiques français du moyen âge, 12, first edition (Paris, 1913)

- Béroul: Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, second revised edition (Paris, 1922)

- Béroul. Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, third revised edition (Paris, 1928)

- Béroul: Le Roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, fourth edition revised by L.M. Defourques (Paris, 1947)

Ewert, A., ed., The Romance of Tristran by Beroul: A Poem of the Twelfth Century, Volume I, Introduction, Text, Glossary, Index (Oxford, 1939), Volume II, Introduction, Commentary (Oxford, 1970)

Mölk, U., ed., Berol: Tristan und Isolde (Munich, 1962)

Mettmann, W., ed., Beroul/Thomas: Der Tristanroman, Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte, 45, second edition (Tübingen, 1968)

Payen, J.C., ed., Tristan et Yseut: Les 'Tristan' en vers, 'Tristan' de Béroul. 'Tristan' de Thomas, 'Folie Tristan' de Berne, 'Folie Tristan' d'Oxford, 'Chèvrefeuille' de Marie de France (Paris, 1974)

b) Eilhart

Lichtenstein, F., ed., Eilhart von Oberge, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, 19 (Strassburg, 1877)

Wagner, K., ed., Eilhart von Oberg, Tristrant, I, Die alten Bruchstücke, Rheinische Beiträge und Hülfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie und Volkskunde, 5 (Bonn and Leipzig, 1924)

Bussmann, H., ed., Eilhart von Oberg: Tristrant (Tübingen, 1969)

Buschinger, D., ed., Eilhart von Oberg, Tristrant, Göppinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik, 202 (Göppingen, 1976)

c) The French Prose Romance

Löseth, E., ed., Le Roman en prose de Tristan, le roman de Palamède et la compilation de Rusticien de Pise (Paris, 1891)

Johnson, F.C., ed., La Grant Ystoire de monsignor Tristan 'Li Bret' (Edinburgh, 1942)

Curtis, R.L., ed., Le Roman de Tristan en prose, Volume I (Munich, 1963), Volume II (Leiden, 1976)

d) Thomas

Bédier, J. ed., Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, poème du XIIe siècle, Sociéte des anciens textes français, Volume I, Texte (Paris, 1902), Volume II, Introduction (Paris, 1905)

Wind, B.H., ed., Les Fragments du roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle par Thomas (Leiden, 1950)

- Thomas: Les Fragments du roman de Tristan, poème du XIIe siècle, Textes littéraires français, 92 (Geneva and Paris, 1960)

e) Derivatives of Thomas

Polidori, F.-L., ed., La tavola ritonda, o l'istoria di Tristano,

2 vols (Bologna, 1864-5)

Kölbing, E., ed., Die nordische und die englische Version der Tristan-sage (Heilbronn, 1883)

Long, C.E., Jr, ed., ' "Sir Tristrem", Edited from Photostats of the MS, Collated with Previous Editions and Provided with Introduction and Notes' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1963)

Closs, A., ed., Tristan und Îsolt: A Poem by Gottfried von Strassburg (Oxford, reprinted 1965)

Ranke, F., ed., Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan und Isold, tenth edition (Berlin, Zurich and Dublin, 1966)

f) Folies

Bédier, J., ed., Les Deux Poèmes de la Folie Tristan, Société des anciens textes français (Paris, 1907)

Hoepffner, E., ed., La Folie Tristan de Berne, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Textes d'étude, 3, second edition (Paris, 1949)

- La Folie Tristan d'Oxford, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Textes d'étude, 8 (Paris, reprinted 1963)

g) Other editions

Arnold, I., ed., Le Roman de Brut de Wace, Société des anciens textes français, 2 vols (Paris, 1938-40)

Bamborschke, U., ed., Das altčechische Tristan-Epos, Volume I, Einleitung (Wiesbaden, 1969), Volume II, Texte (Wiesbaden, 1968)

Bell, A., ed., Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode (Manchester, 1925)

- L'Estoire des Engleis, by Geffrei Gaimar, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 14-16 (Oxford, 1960)

Ewert, A., ed., Marie de France, Lais (Oxford, reprinted 1965)

Hilka, A., ed., Historia septem sapientium, II, Johannis de Alta Silva Dolopathos sive De rege et septem sapientibus (Heidelberg, 1913)

Normand, J., and G. Raynaud, ed., Aiol, Société des anciens textes français (Paris, 1877)

Pauphilet, A., ed., La Queste del saint graal, Classiques français du moyen âge, 33 (Paris, reprinted 1965)

Perrier, J.-L., ed., Le Charroi de Nîmes, Classiques français du moyen âge, 66 (Paris, 1931)

Pope, M.K., ed., The Romance of Horn by Thomas, Anglo-Norman Text Society, 9-10, 12-13, 2 vols (Oxford, 1955-64)

Roach, W., ed., The Continuations of the Old French 'Perceval' of Chrétien de Troyes, 5 vols (Philadelphia, 1949-71)

Roques, M., ed., Le Roman de Renart, première branche, Classiques français du moyen âge, 78 (Paris, 1948)

- Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, I, Érec et Énide, Classiques français du moyen âge, 80 (Paris, 1952)

- Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes, IV, Le Chevalier au Lion (Yvain), Classiques français du moyen âge 89 (Paris, 1960)

- Aucassin et Nicolette, Classiques français du moyen âge, 41, second edition (Paris, reprinted 1965)

Stehlich, F., ed., Messire Thibaut, Li Romanz de la poire: Erotisch-allegorisches Gedicht aus dem XIII. Jahrhundert (Halle, 1881)

Sweetser, F., ed., Jean Renart, L'Escoufle, Textes littéraires français, 211 (Geneva, 1974)

Vinaver, E., ed., The Works of Sir Thomas Malory, 3 vols (Oxford, 1947)

Whitehead, F., ed., La Chastelaine de Vergi (Manchester, reprinted 1961)

Zingerle, A.R., ed., S. Hilarii episcopi pictaviensis tractatus super psalmos, Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, 22 (Milan, 1891)

III REFERENCE WORKS

Andrieu, G., J. Piolle and M. Plouzeau, Le Roman de Tristan de Béroul: Concordancier complet des formes graphiques occurrentes (Aix, 1974)

Flutre, L.-F., Table des noms propres avec toutes leurs variantes figurant dans les romans du moyen âge écrits en français ou en provençal et actuellement publiés ou analysés (Poitiers, 1962)

Foulet, L., Petite syntaxe de l'ancien français, Classiques français du moyen âge, 21, third revised edition (Paris, 1961)

Godefroy, F., Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du 9e au 15e siècle, 10 vols (Paris, 1881-1902)

Kluge, F., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, eleventh edition (Berlin, 1934)

The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford, reprinted 1933)

Tobler, A., and E. Lommatzsch, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch (Berlin, 1925-43, Wiesbaden, 1954-)

Wartburg, W. von, Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Basel, 1922-)

West, G.D., An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Verse Romances, 1150-1300, University of Toronto Romance Series, 15 (Toronto, 1969)

- An Index of Proper Names in French Arthurian Prose Romances, University of Toronto Romance Series, 35 (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1978)

IV STUDIES

Acher, J., 'Corrections au "Roman de Tristan par Béroul et un anonyme" publié par M. E. Muret', Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXIII (1909), pp. 720-25

Ackermann, R. W., 'English Rimed and Prose Romances', in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, edited by R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 480-519

Adams, A., and T.D. Hemming, 'La Fin du "Tristan" de Béroul', Le Moyen âge, LXXIX (1973), pp. 449-68

Anderson, R., 'Le Saut Tristan: Texte, interprétation, source des particularités de la version de Béroul' (unpublished paper)

Augier, M., 'Le Rire et les larmes dans le Tristan de Béroul', in Mélanges d'histoire littéraire, de linguistique et de philologie romanes offerts à Charles Rostaing par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis, 2 vols (Liège, 1974), I, pp. 41-8

Bar, F., 'Le Premier Serment ambigu d'Iseut dans le poème de Béroul', Bulletin bibliographique de la société internationale arthurienne, XXIX (1977), pp. 181-4

Barbier, P., 'Lexicographical Notes on French Words', French Studies, I (1947), pp. 115-28

Baron, F.X., 'Visual Presentation in Béroul's Tristan', Modern Language Quarterly, XXXIII (1972), pp. 99-112

Barteau, F., Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut: Introduction à une lecture plurielle (Paris, 1972)

Baumgartner, E., 'L'Influence de Thomas sur le Tristan en prose', Bulletin bibliographique de la société internationale arthurienne, XXIV (1972), p. 196

- Le 'Tristan en prose': Essai d'interprétation d'un roman médiéval (Geneva, 1975)

Bédier, J., 'La Mort de Tristan et d'Iseut, d'après le manuscrit fr. 103 de la Bibliothèque Nationale comparé au poème allemand d'Eilhart d'Oberg', Romania, XV (1886), pp. 481-510

- 'La Tradition manuscrite du Lai de l'Ombre: Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes', Romania, LIV (1928), pp. 161-96, 321-56

Bell, A., 'A Note on Iseult's Dream', Medium aevum, XLIII (1974) p. 264

Bennett, P.E., 'The Literary Source of Béroul's Godoïne', Medium aevum, XLII (1973), pp. 133-40

Beyerle, D., 'Zu König Markes Monolog - Béroul, V. 271-72', Romanistisches Jahrbuch, XVII (1966), pp. 55-7

Bik, E.J., 'Les Interventions d'auteur dans le Tristan de Béroul', Neophilologus, LVI (1972), pp. 31-42

Blakey, B., 'On the Text of Béroul's Tristran', French Studies, XXI (1967), pp. 99-103

- 'Truth and Falsehood in the Tristran of Béroul', in History and Structure of French: Essays in the Honour of Professor T.B.W. Reid (Oxford, 1972), pp. 19-29

- French Studies, XXVII (1973), pp. 316-7 (review of Reid, The 'Tristran' of Beroul)

- 'Further Comments on the Text of Beroul's Tristran', French Studies, XXX (1976), pp. 129-39

Bloch, R.H., 'Tristan, the Myth of the State and the Language of the Self', in Approaches to Medieval Romance, Yale French Studies, 51 (1974), pp. 61-81

Bogdanow, F., 'Quelques remarques sur la composition du roman en prose de Tristan', in Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune, 2 vols (Gembloux, 1969), II, pp. 971-81

Bolelli, T., Due studi irlandesi (Pisa, 1950)

Braet, H., 'Les Amants dans la forêt: A propos d'un passage du Tristran de Béroul', in Mélanges de langue et de littérature du moyen âge offerts à Teruo Sato, special number of Cahiers d'études médiévales (Nagoya, 1973), part I, pp. 1-7

- 'Remarques sur le texte de Béroul', Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, LXXXVII (1977), pp. 49-52

Bruce, J.D., The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300, 2 vols, second edition (Göttingen and Baltimore, 1928)

Brugger, E., 'Loenois as Tristan's Home', Modern Philology, XXII (1924-5), pp. 159-91

Buschinger, D., 'Une Nouvelle Contribution à l'étude d'Eilhart von Oberg', Études germaniques, XXVI (1971), pp. 221-8

- Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, XIV (1971), pp, 376-82 (review of Gnadinger, Hiudan und Petitcreiu)

- 'La Composition numérique du Tristrant d'Eilhart von Oberg', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, XVI (1973), pp. 287-94

- Le 'Tristrant' d'Eilhart von Oberg, 2 vols (Lille, 1974)

Caulkins, J.H., and G.R. Mermier, Béroul: Tristan and Iseult (Paris, 1967)

Caulkins, J.H., 'The Meaning of "Pechié" in the Romance of Tristran by Béroul', Romance Notes, XIII (1971-2), pp. 545-9

- 'Le Jeu du surnaturel et du féodal dans le Tristan de Béroul', in Mélanges d'histoire littéraire, de linguistique et de philologie romanes offerts à Charles Rostaing par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis, 2 vols (Liège, 1974), I, pp. 131-40

Cézard, P., Romania, LXXXI (1960), p. 557 (review of Jonin, MA, LXIV, pp. 103-13)

Christmann, H.H., 'Sur un passage du Tristan de Béroul', Romania, LXXX (1959), pp. 85-7

- 'Nochmals zu Berols Tristan V. 4223-5', Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, LXXVI (1966), pp. 243-5

Cigada, S., Studi francesi, III (1959), p. 463 (review of Christmann, Rom., LXXX, pp. 85-7)

Combarieu, M. de, 'Le Jour et la nuit dans le Roman de Tristan de Béroul (poème de XIIe siècle)', Tristania, II, no. 1 (November 1976), pp. 12-31

Combridge, R.N., Das Recht im 'Tristan' Gottfrieds von Strassburg, Philologische Studien und Quellen, 15 (Berlin, 1964)

Cormier, R.J., 'Tristan and the Noble Lie', Studies in the Humanities, IV (1974), pp. 10-14

Curtis, R.L., 'The Problems of the Authorship of the Prose Tristan', Romania, LXXIX (1958), pp. 314-38

- 'Les Deux Versions du Tristan en prose: Examen de la théorie de Löseth', Romania, LXXXIV (1963), pp. 390-8

- Tristan Studies (Munich, 1969)

- 'Le Philtre mal préparé: Le Thème de la réciprocité dans l'amour de Tristan et Iseut', in Mélanges de langue et de littérature du moyen âge et de la renaissance offerts à Jean Frappier, 2 vols (Geneva, 1970), I, pp. 195-206

- 'The Humble and the Cruel Tristan: A New Look at the Two Poems of the Folie Tristan', Tristania, II, no. 1 (November 1976), pp. 3-11

Dean, R.J., and E. Kennedy,' Un Fragment anglo-normand de la Folie Tristan de Berne', Le Moyen âge, LXXIX (1973), pp. 57-72

De Caluwé, J., 'La Chapelle du "saut Tristan"', Marche Romane, (numéro spécial), Hommage au professeur Maurice Delbouille (Liège, 1973), pp. 223-30

Defourques, L.M., Romania, LXX (1948-9), p. 98 (corrections to M^4)

Delbouille, M., 'Le Nom du nain Frocin(e)', in Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes à la mémoire d'István Frank offerts par ses anciens maîtres, ses amis et ses collègues de France et de l'étranger, Annales Universitatis Saraviensis, 6 (Saarbrucken,1957) pp. 191-203

- 'Le Premier Roman de Tristan', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, V (1962), pp. 273-86, 419-35

- 'Le Nom et le personnage d'Equitan', Le Moyen âge,LXIX (1963), pp. 315-23

- 'Les Hanches du Roi-Pêcheur et la genèse du Conte del Graal', in Festschrift Walter von Wartburg zum 80. Geburtstag (Tübingen, 1968), pp. 357-79

Ditmas, E.M.R., Tristan and Iseult in Cornwall (Gloucester, 1970)

Dufournet, J., 'Notes à propos d'une lecture plurielle des romans de Tristan et Iseut', Revue des langues romanes,LXXX (1973), pp. 415-31 (review of Barteau, Les Romans de Tristan et Iseut)

Eisner, S., The Tristan Legend: A Study in Sources (Evanston, 1969)

Ewert, A., 'On the Text of Béroul's Tristran', in Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature Presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope (Manchester, 1939), pp. 89-98

Fedrick, A. 'A Note on the Folie Tristan de Berne', Medium aevum, XXXII (1963), pp. 125-9

- 'A Critical Study of the So-called "Parties anciennes" of the Prose "Tristan", Together with an Edition of the "Parties anciennes" from MS B.N. fonds français 104' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1965)

- 'The Love Potion in the French Prose Tristan', Romance Philology, XXI (1967-8). pp. 23-34

- The Romance of Tristan by Beroul and the Tale of Tristan's Madness (Harmondsworth, 1970)

Ferrante, J.M., The Conflict of Love and Honor: The Medieval Tristan Legend in France, Germany and Italy, De proprietatibus litterarum, Series practica, 78 (The Hague and Paris, 1973)

Foulon, C., 'Le Conte des oreilles du roi Marc'h dans le Tristan de Béroul', Bulletin philologique et historique, 1951-2, pp. 31-40

Fourrier, A., Le Courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen-âge, I, Les Débuts (XIIe siècle), (Paris, 1960)

Francis, E.A., 'The Trial in Lanval', in Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature Presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope (Manchester, 1939), pp. 115-24

Frappier, J., Le Roman breton, les origines de la légende arthurienne, Chrétien de Troyes: Introduction, des origines à Chrétien de Troyes (Paris, 1951-2)

- 'Vues sur les conceptions courtoises dans les littératures d'oc et d'oïl au XIIe siècle', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, II (1959), pp. 135-56

- 'Sur deux passages du Tristan de Béroul: I, v. 1909-1911; II, v. 3928-3954', Romania, LXXXIII (1962), pp. 251-8

- 'Note complémentaire sur l'expression "au chemin fors" dans le Tristan de Béroul (v. 1909)', Romania, LXXXIV (1963), pp. 77-9

- 'Structure et sens du Tristan: Version commune, version courtoise', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, VI (1963), pp. 255-80, 441-54

- Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, VII (1964), pp. 353-9 (review of Vàrvaro, Il 'Roman de Tristran' di Béroul)

- 'La Reine Iseut dans le Tristan de Béroul', Romance Philology, XXVI (1972-3), pp. 215-28

Gallais, P., 'Recherches sur la mentalité des romanciers français du moyen âge', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, VII (1964), pp. 479-93, XIII (1970), pp. 333-47

- Genèse du roman occidental: Essais sur Tristan et Iseut et son modèle persan (Paris, 1974)

Giese, W., 'König Markes Pferdeohren', Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LXXV (1959), pp. 493-506

Gnädinger, L., Hiudan und Petitcreiu: Gestalt und Figur des Hundes in der mittelalterlichen Tristandichtung (Zurich and Freiburg i. Br., 1971)

Golther, W., Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit (Leipzig, 1907)

- Tristan und Isolde in der französischen und deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit, Stoff- und Motivgeschichte der deutschen Literatur, 2 (Berlin and Leipzig, 1929)

Graf, A., Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del medio evo, 2 vols (Turin, 1882-83)

Hackett, W.M., 'Syntactical Features Common to Girart de Roussillon and Beroul's Tristan', in Medieval Miscellany presented to Eugène Vinaver by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends (Manchester, 1965), pp. 157-66

- Medium aevum, XLIII (1974), pp. 275-8 (review of Reid, The 'Tristran' of Beroul)

Hanoset, M., 'Unité ou dualité du Tristan de Béroul?', Le Moyen âge, LXVII (1961), pp. 503-33

Hatto, A.T., Gottfried von Strassburg, Tristan (Harmondsworth, 1960)

Henry, A., Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire, XXII (1943), pp. 255-7 (review of Ewert, Volume I)

- 'Du subjonctif d'imminence contrecarrée à un passage du Tristan de Béroul', Romania, LXXIII (1952), pp. 392-407

- Chrestomathie de la littérature en ancien français (Berne, 1953)

- Études de lexicologie française et gallo-romane, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, XVIII (Paris, 1960)

- Études de syntaxe expressive: Ancien français et français moderne, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, XIX (Paris, 1960)

- 'Sur les vers 711-713 du "Tristan" de Béroul', in Mélanges de langues et de littératures romanes offerts à Carl Theodor Gossen, 2 vols (Berne and Liège, 1976), I, pp.359-61

Hersart de La Villemarqué, T.C.H., Les Romans de la table ronde et les contes des anciens Bretons, third edition (Paris, 1860)

Hoepffner, E., 'Das Verhältnis der Berner Folie Tristan zu Berols Tristandichtung', Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXIX (1919), pp. 62-82

Hofer, S., 'Streitfragen zur altfranzösischen Literatur, I, Die Komposition des Tristanromans', Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LXV (1949), pp. 257-88

Holden, A., 'Note sur la langue de Béroul', Romania, LXXXIX (1968), pp. 387-99

Huby, M., L'Adaptation des romans courtois en Allemagne au XIIe et au XIIIe siècle (Paris, 1968)

Hunt, T., 'Textual Notes on Béroul and Thomas: Some Problems of Interpretation and Emendation', Tristania, I, no. 1 (November 1975), pp. 29-59

- 'Abelardian Ethics and Béroul's Tristran', Romania, XCVIII (1977), pp. 501-40

Jackson, W.T.H., The Anatomy of Love: The Tristan of Gottfried von Strassburg (New York and London, 1971)

- Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, XIII (1970), pp. 382-4 (review of Huby, L'Adaptation des romans courtois en Allemagne)

Jeanroy, A., 'Quelques corrections au texte du Tristan de Béroul', in Mélanges de philologie et d'histoire offerts à M. Antoine Thomas par ses élèves et ses amis (Paris, 1927), pp. 227-30

Jodogne, O., 'La Légende de Tristan et d'Iseut interprétée par Béroul', Filološki pregled, I-II (1964), pp. 261-70

- 'Comment Thomas d'Angleterre a compris l'amour de Tristan et d'Iseut', Lettres Romanes, XIX (1965), pp. 103-19

Jonin, P., 'La Vengeance chez l'Iseut de Béroul et chez l'Iseut de Thomas', Neophilologus, XXXIII (1949), pp. 207-9

- Les Personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan au XIIe siècle. Étude des influences contemporaines, Publications des annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Aix-en-Provence, nouvelle série, 22 (Gap, 1958)

- 'Le Songe d'Iseut dans la forêt du Morois', Le Moyen âge, LXIV (1958), pp. 103-13

- 'La Ruse d'Iseut dans le "Tristan" de Béroul', in Hommage au doyen Etienne Gros (Gap, 1959), pp. 77-84

- 'Un Phénomène de concordance: Un passage du Tristan de Béroul et un conte yoruba', Romania, XCIV (1973), pp. 196-210

Jordan, L., Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XXXVI (1915), pp. 16-7 (review of M[1])

Kelemina, J., Untersuchungen zur Tristansage, Teutonia, Arbeiten zur germanischen Philologie, 16 (Leipzig, 1910)

- Geschichte der Tristansage nach den Dichtungen des Mittelalters (Vienna, 1923)

Knieschek, J., 'Der čechische Tristram', Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur, Neue Folge, XVI (1884), pp. 261-358

Krappe, A.H., 'Der Zwerg im Tristan', Romanische Forschungen, XLV (1931), pp. 95-9

Lazar, M., Amour courtois et 'fin'amors' dans la littérature du XIIe siècle (Paris, 1964)

Leclanche, J.-L., 'Ne...el quel: A propos du vers 2636 du Tristan de Béroul', Romania, XCVII (1976), pp. 99-100

Lecoy, F., 'Sur les vers 1461-1462 du Tristan de Beroul', Romania, LXXX (1959), pp. 82-5

- 'L'Épisode du harpeur d'Irlande et la date des Tristan de Béroul et de Thomas', Romania, LXXXVI (1965), pp. 538-45

- Romania, XCIII (1972), pp. 575-6 (review of Reid, The 'Tristran' of Beroul)

Le Gentil, P., 'La Légende de Tristan vue par Béroul et Thomas: Essai d'interprétation', Romance Philology, VII (1953-4), pp. 111 -29

- 'L'Épisode du Morois et la signification du Tristan de Béroul', in Studia philologica et litteraria in honorem L. Spitzer (Berne, 1958), pp. 267-74

- 'Réflexions sur la création littéraire au moyen âge', Cultura neolatina, XX (1960), pp. 129-40

Legge, M.D., 'The Unerring Bow', Medium aevum, XXV (1956), pp. 79-83

- Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, III (1960), pp. 510-12 (review of Jonin, Les Personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan)

- 'Some Notes on Anglo-Norman Vocabulary', in Studies in Medieval French Presented to Alfred Ewert in Honour of His Seventieth Birthday (Oxford, 1961), pp. 214-31

- Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background (Oxford, 1963)

- Medium aevum, XXXIV (1965), pp. 55-8 (review of Vàrvaro, Il 'Roman de Tristran' di Béroul)

- 'Place-Names and the Date of Beroul', Medium aevum, XXXVIII (1969), pp. 171-4

Lejeune-Dehousse, R., L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart: Contribution à l'étude du genre romanesque au moyen âge, Bibliothèque de de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 61 (Liège and Paris, 1935)

Lejeune, R., 'Les "Influences contemporaines" dans les romans français de Tristan au XIIe siècle: A propos d'un livre récent', Le Moyen âge, LXVI (1960), pp. 143-62

Livingston, C.H., Skein-Winding Reels: Studies in Word History and Etymology (Ann Arbor, 1957)

Lofthouse, A., 'Le Tristan d'Eilhart d'Oberg' (unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1939)

Loomis. R.S., and L.H. Loomis, Arthurian Legends in Medieval Art (New York, 1938)

Loomis, R.S., Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes (New York and London, 1949)

- 'Breton Folklore and Arthurian Romance', Comparative Literature, II, (1950), pp. 289-306

- The Romance of Tristram and Ysolt by Thomas of Britain, new, revised edition (New York, 1951)

Loth, J., Contributions à l'étude des romans de la table ronde (Paris, 1912)

Lutoslawski, W., 'Les Folies de Tristan', Romania, XV (1886), pp. 511-33

Marx, J., 'Observations sur un épisode de la légende de Tristan' in Recueil de travaux offert à M. Clovis Brunel, 2 vols (Paris, 1955), II, pp. 265-73

- 'La Naissance de l'amour de Tristan et Iseut dans les formes les plus anciennes de la légende', Romance Philology, IX (1955-6), pp. 167-73

Ménage, R., 'Sur les vers 161 et 162 du Tristan de Béroul', Romania, XCIII (1972), pp. 108-13

- 'L'Atelier Béroul ou Béroul artiste', Romania, XCV (1974), pp. 145-98

Mergell, B., Tristan und Isolde: Ursprung und Entwicklung der Tristansage des Mittelalters (Mainz, 1949)

Merrilees, B., Speculum, XLVII (1972), pp. 744-7 (review of Ewert, Volumes I and II)

Mitchell, P.M., 'Scandinavian Literature', in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, edited by R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 462-71

Moignet, G., 'Remarques sur le pronom personnel régime dans la syntaxe du "Tristan" de Béroul', in Mélanges de langue et de littérature médiévales offerts à Pierre Le Gentil par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis (Paris, 1973), pp. 561-8

Mölk, U., 'Die Figur des Königs Artus in Thomas' Tristanroman', Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift, XII (1962), pp. 96-101

Muret, E., 'Eilhart d'Oberg et sa source française', Romania, XVI (1887), pp. 288-363

- Romania, XXVII (1898), pp. 608-19 (review of Röttiger, Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung)

Murrell, E.S., 'Girart de Roussillon' and the 'Tristan' Poems (Chesterfield, 1926)

- 'The Death of Tristan, from Douce MS 189', Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XLIII (1928), pp. 343-83

Mussafia, A., 'Per il Tristano di Béroul, ed. Muret', Romania, XXXIV (1905), pp. 304-7

Newstead,, H., 'The Tryst beneath the Tree: An Episode in the Tristan Legend', Romance Philology, IX (1955-6), pp. 269-84

- 'King Mark of Cornwall', Romance Philology, XI (1957-8), pp. 240-53

- 'The Equivocal Oath in the Tristan Legend', in Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune, 2 vols (Gembloux, 1969), II, pp. 1077-85

Nichols, S.G., Jr.,'Ethical Criticism and Medieval Literature: Le Roman de Tristan', in Medieval Secular Literature: Four Essays Edited by William Matthews (London, 1966), pp. 68-89

Noble, P., 'L'Influence de la courtoisie sur le Tristan de Béroul', Le Moyen âge, LXXV (1969), pp. 467-77

Novati, F., 'Un nuovo ed un vecchio frammento del Tristran di Tommaso', Studj di filologia romanza, II (1887), pp. 369-515

Orr, J., Three Studies on Homonymics, Edinburgh University Publications, Language and Literature Texts, 6 (Edinburgh, 1962)

Panvini, B., La leggenda di Tristano e Isotta: Studio critico (Florence, 1951)

Paquette, J.-M., 'Notes sur quelque vers du Tristan de Béroul', Tristania, II, no. 1 (November 1976), pp. 32-8

Paris, G., 'Note sur les romans relatifs à Tristan', Romania, XV (1886), pp. 597-602

- 'Le Donnei des Amants', Romania, XXV (1896), pp. 497-541

Pauphilet, A., Le Legs du moyen âge (Melun, 1950)

Payen, J.C., Le Moyen âge, LXXI (1965), pp. 600-7 (review of Vàrvaro, Il 'Roman de Tristran' di Béroul)

- Le Motif du repentir dans la littérature française médiévale (Des origines à 1230), Publications romanes et françaises, 98 (Geneva, 1967)

- 'Lancelot contre Tristan: La Conjuration d'un mythe subversif (réflexions sur l'idéologie romanesque au moyen âge)', in Mélanges de langue et de littérature médiévales offerts à Pierre Le Gentil par ses collègues, ses élèves et ses amis (Paris, 1973), pp. 617-32

Pickford, C.E., L'Évolution du roman arthurien en prose vers la fin du moyen âge, d'après le manuscrit 112 du fonds français de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1960)

- 'Sir Tristrem, Sir Walter Scott and Thomas', in Studies in Medieval Literature and Languages: In Memory of Frederick Whitehead (Manchester, 1973), pp. 219-28

Piquet, F., L'Originalité de Gottfried de Strasbourg, dans son poème de 'Tristan et Isolde': Étude de littérature comparée (Lille, 1905)

Pope, M.K., 'A Note on the Dialect of Beroul's "Tristan" and a Conjecture', Modern Language Review, VIII (1913), pp. 189-92

Ranke, F., Tristan und Isolde, Bücher des Mittelalters, 3 (Munich, 1925)

- 'Isoldes Gottesurteil', in Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis (New York and Paris, 1927), pp. 87-94

Raynaud de Lage, G., 'Faut-il attribuer à Béroul tout le Tristan?', Le Moyen âge, LXIV (1958), pp. 249-70

- Le Moyen âge, LXVI (1960), pp. 383-5 (review of Jonin, Les Personnages féminins dans les romans français de Tristan)

- 'Post-scriptum à une étude sur le Tristan de Béroul', Le Moyen âge, LXVII (1961), pp. 167-8

- 'Trois notes sur le Tristan de Béroul', Romania, LXXXIII (1962), pp. 522-6

- 'Du style de Béroul', Romania, LXXXV (1964), pp. 518-30

- 'Faut-il attribuer à Béroul tout le Tristan? (suite et fin)', Le Moyen âge, LXX (1964), pp. 33-8

Reid, T.B.W., 'On the Interpretation of Béroul, Tristan 4223-5', Romania, LXXXV (1964), pp. 366-7

- 'On the Text of the Tristran of Béroul', in Medieval Miscellany Presented to Eugène Vinaver by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends (Manchester, 1965), pp. 263-88

- 'The Tristran of Beroul: One Author or Two?', Modern Language Review, LX (1965), pp. 352-8

- 'A Further Note on the Language of Beroul', Romania, XC (1969), pp. 382-90

- French Studies, XXV (1971), pp. 53-5)review of Ewert, Volume II)

- The 'Tristran' of Beroul: A Textual Commentary (Oxford, 1972)

Rigolot, F., 'Valeur figurative du vêtement dans le Tristan de Béroul', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, X (1967), pp. 447-53

Robson, C.A., 'The Technique of Symmetrical Composition in Medieval Narrative Poetry', in Studies in Medieval French Presented to Alfred Ewert in Honour of His Seventieth Birthday (Oxford, 1961), pp. 26-75

- 'Quatrains and Passages of Eight Lines in Beroul: Some Stylistic and Linguistic Aspects', in History and Structure of French: Essays in the Honour of Professor T.B.W. Reid (Oxford, 1972), pp. 171-201

Röttiger, W., Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Wilhelm-Gymnasiums zu Hamburg, Ostern 1897 (Hamburg, 1897)

Roques, M., Romania, XXXIX (1910), p. 409 (review of Acher, ZRP, XXXIII (1909), pp. 720-5)

- Romania, LXVII (1942-3), pp. 283-4 (review of Ewert, Volume I)

- 'L'Ancien français enaines et le v. 1678 du Tristan de Béroul', Romania, LXIX (1946-7), pp. 534-40

- 'Sur l'équitation féminine au moyen âge: A propos d'un épisode du Tristan de Thomas', in Mélanges de linguistique française offerts à M. Charles Bruneau (Geneva, 1954), pp. 219-25

Schach, P., The Saga of Tristram and Ísönd (Lincoln, 1973)

Schaefer, J.T., 'Tristan's Folly: Feigned or Real?', Tristania, III, no. 1 (November 1977), pp. 3-16

Schindele, G., Tristan: Metamorphose und Tradition, Studien zur Poetik und Geschichte der Literatur, 12 (Stuttgart, 1971)

Schoepperle, G., Tristan and Isolt: A Study of the Sources of the Romance (Frankfurt and London, 1913)

Short, I., Romance Philology, XXVI (1972-3), pp. 466-70 (review of Ewert, Volume II)

Stone, D., Jr., 'Realism and the Real Béroul', Esprit créateur, V (1965), pp. 219-27

- Tristan and Iseut: Modern French Edition by Donald Stone, Jr. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966)

Subrenat, J., 'Sur le climat social, moral, religieux du Tristan de Béroul', Le Moyen âge, LXXXII (1976), pp. 219-61

Sudre, L., 'Les Allusions à la légende de Tristan dans la littérature du moyen âge', Romania, XV (1887), pp. 534-57

Tanquerey, F.J., 'Notes sur le texte du Roman de Tristan de Béroul', Romania, LVI (1930), pp. 114-22

- 'Giraut de Barri et le Roman de Tristan', Medium aevum, VI (1937), pp. 1-20

- Medium aevum, X (1941), pp. 113-6 (review of Ewert, Volume I)

Thorpe, L., Modern Language Review, XLIII (1948), p. 418 (review of C.Guerrieri Crocetti, Le Roman de Tristran (Genoa, 1947))

Tilander, G., Mélanges d'étymologie cynégétique, Cynegetica, 5 (Lund, 1958)

Tobler, A., 'Zu Murets Ausgabe von Berouls Tristan', Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXX (1906), pp. 741-5

Tregenza, W.A., 'The Relation of the Oldest Branch of the "Roman de Renart" to the Tristan Poems', Modern Language Review, XIX (1924), pp. 301-5

Van Coolput, C.-A., 'Le Roi Marc dans le Tristan de Béroul', Le Moyen âge, LXXXIV (1978), pp. 35-51

Van Dam, J., 'Tristanprobleme', Neophilologus, XV (1929-30), pp. 18-34, 88-105, 183-201

Vàrvaro, A., Il 'Roman de Tristran' di Béroul (Turin, 1963)

- 'La teoria dell'archetipo tristaniano', Romania, LXXXVIII (1967), pp. 13-58

- 'L'utilizzazione letteraria di motivi della narrativa popolare nei romanzi di Tristano', in Mélanges de langue et de littérature du moyen âge et de la renaissance offerts à Jean Frappier, 2 vols (Geneva, 1970), II, pp. 1057-75

- Beroul's 'Romance of Tristran' (Manchester, 1972)

Vinaver, E., Études sur le 'Tristan' en prose, les sources, les manuscrits, bibliographie critique (Paris, 1925)

- 'The Love Potion in the Primitive Tristan Romance', in Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis (New York and Paris, 1927), pp. 75-86

- 'Principles of Textual Emendation', in Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature Presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope (Manchester, 1939), pp. 351-69

- 'The Prose Tristan', in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, edited by R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 339-47

- 'Pour le commentaire du vers 1650 du Tristan de Béroul', in Studies in Medieval French Presented to Alfred Ewert in Honour of His Seventieth Birthday (Oxford, 1961), pp. 90-5

- Bulletin de l'académie royale de langue et de littérature françaises de Belgique, XXXIX (1961), pp. 199-212 (discours de M. Eugène Vinaver)

- 'La Forêt de Morois', Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, XI (1968), pp. 1-13

- A la recherche d'une poétique médiévale (Paris, 1970)

- The Rise of Romance (Oxford, 1971)

- French Studies, XXVI (1972), pp. 118-9 (obituary of F. Whitehead)

- 'Remarques sur quelques vers de Béroul', in Studies in Medieval Literature and Languages: In Memory of Frederick Whitehead (Manchester, 1973), pp. 341-52

Weston, J.L., and J. Bédier, 'Tristan ménestrel: Extrait de la continuation de Perceval par Gerbert', Romania, XXXV (1906), pp. 497-530

Weston, J. L., 'A Hitherto Unconsidered Aspect of the Round Table', in Mélanges de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offerts à M. Maurice Wilmotte, 2 vols (Paris, 1910), II, pp. 883-94

Whitehead, F., 'The Early Tristan Poems', in Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages, edited by R.S. Loomis (Oxford, 1959), pp. 134-44

Whitteridge, G., 'The Date of the Tristan of Beroul', Medium aevum, XXVIII (1959), pp. 167-71

- 'The Tristan of Béroul', in Medieval Miscellany Presented to Eugène Vinaver by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends (Manchester, 1965), pp. 337-56

Wilmotte, M., Le Moyen âge, L (1940), pp. 60-2 (review of Ewert, Volume I)

Wilson, C.I., Modern Language Review, XXXV (1940) p. 100 (review of Ewert, Volume I)

Wind, B.H., 'Éléments courtois dans Béroul et dans Thomas', Romance Philology, XIV (1960-1), pp. 1-13

- 'Les Versions françaises du Tristan et les influences contemporaines: A propos d'un livre récent', Neophilologus, XLV (1961), pp. 278-86

Woledge, B., 'A Rare Word in Beroul: Traallier "hunting dog"', French Studies, X (1956), pp. 154-9

York , E.C., 'Sir Tristrem, 2225-2233', Explicator, XXV (1966-7), 76

Ziltener, W., Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LXXXV (1969), p. 591 (review of Reid, 'On the Text of the Tristran...')