The Saga af Tristram ok Ís°nd, also known as Tristrams saga ok Ís°ndar, occupies an important position in the history of medieval literature. In part this is because it provides the only complete, though condensed, account of the twelfth-century Roman de Tristan by Thomas (of Britain, or d’Angleterre), which now exists otherwise only in fragments, but which formed the basis for Gottfried von Strassburg’s unfinished masterpiece, Tristan und Isold. From the nineteenth century to the present day the saga has therefore been a major source for the study of the Tristan legend. And the legend itself continues to fascinate now, as it did in the Middle Ages, because it is the quintessential tale of a compulsive love that transcends all other loyalties.

The importance of this saga specifically for Old Norse–Icelandic studies is that it was probably the first of the large-scale works to be translated from French at the behest of Hákon Hákonarson, king of Norway 1217–63. As such it helped to create an enthusiasm in the north for stories of the romance type — which show a concern for love as well as fighting, for the fantastic, for emotions quite freely expressed, for beauty and other sensory delights, for elegant manners, for costly display, and not least for accomplishments such as the knowledge of languages and music. The romance translations made for King Hákon, which embody these characteristics, make up a significant corpus in their own right. They would still do so, assuming that they had survived, even if they had not exerted influence beyond Norway; but in fact they soon arrived in Iceland, where themes and concerns from them were drawn into the Sagas of Icelanders, and where native imitations started to be written and to develop a character of their own. Eventually the romantic sagas, generally known today as riddarasögur (Sagas of Knights), came to be one of the dominant genres of Old Icelandic literature.

As regards the saga’s origin, the main piece of evidence is the prologue found in the seventeenth-century Icelandic manuscript AM 543 4to, which contains the earliest complete version of the work now extant. This states that the translation was made at Hákon’s command in 1226 by a certain Brother Robert. Such attributions always leave room for scepticism, but in this case there is wide agreement that the statements of the prologue are highly plausible, for in most of its parts the saga bears a strong stylistic likeness to
other romance translations made for King Hákon that are preserved in Iceland, and also — most significantly — to Strengleikar, a collection of short pieces based on Breton lais, which has survived in a Norwegian manuscript from c.1270 and is probably close to its original form. It is apparent, nevertheless, that the Saga af Tristram ok Ísýnd as we have it is by no means identical to Brother Robert’s version and that it has been modified, as one would expect, during the centuries of its transmission in Iceland. It was probably Robert himself who pushed the material in the direction of native sagas by concentrating on the story and omitting the many long passages of reflection that may be said to adorn, or alternatively to clog, the French text; but the very few leaves of the saga surviving from medieval manuscripts, which are themselves Icelandic and no earlier than the mid-fifteenth century, render Thomas’s words at somewhat greater length than is the case with the later manuscripts, and thus show that the saga has undergone at least one further round of shortening. There are signs too of material being added from sources other than Thomas. The consequence is that the work contains many discontinuities and inconsistencies, some of which are mentioned in the notes to the extract given here; but often enough, when Thomas or Gottfried seem bent on maximum elaboration, the saga strikes to the heart of the matter in a way that is astute, honest and humane (see note 11 below, for example).

One of the most noticeable features of the Saga af Tristram ok Ísýnd is the style in which many of its parts are written. It is not unlikely that this so-called ‘court style’, which is common to the Hákonian romances, was established by Brother Robert, or perhaps developed for the very first time, in this particular saga. The most obvious characteristics are the following: the frequent use of constructions based on present participles, which is regarded as unidiomatic in classical Old Norse; a good deal of alliteration, whether in formal pairs or in longer ad hoc strings; the habitual use of synonymous doublets, with or without alliteration; and repetitions of an underlying lexical item in varied forms. There is also the occasional recourse to rhyme and other forms of wordplay. These mannerisms derive from medieval Latin prose and can also be observed, in different concentrations, in the ‘learned style’ translations of Latin texts and in the ‘florid style’ of later religious works; but in the court romances they are integrated with the relatively plain manner displayed by native
Icelandic sagas, eschewing simile and working for the most part in sentences that are not especially complex. No doubt the purpose of the verbal decorations was to dignify the prose in general, and in particular to indicate the importance of passages where such decorations are in high density.

All the stylistic features just mentioned, except rhyme, are well represented in the extract given here, which comes from the last third of the saga when Tristram and Ísönd have been forced to part, Tristram to live in Brittany and Ísönd to remain with her husband in Cornwall. The description of the Hall of Statues is not extant in the fragments of Thomas’s work (nor did Gottfried reach so far in the story), but the episode must originally have been present in the poem because one of the fragments (lines 941–1196) begins with Tristan recalling his love and kissing his beloved’s image, corresponding to a point in ch. 81 of the saga. Grotesque though the episode may seem to modern taste, it clearly caught the Icelandic imagination, as shown by the fact that it is echoed in several native romances (cf. Schach 1968), notably in Rémundar saga keisarasonar ch. 7.

The passage has been transcribed from the manuscript mentioned above, AM 543 4to. Norwegianisms of the types listed on page 59 above do not occur in the manuscript orthography of the extract except for the occasional appearance of y in place of i; this feature has been retained here only for the name Bryngvet, which is consistently spelled thus. In general the spelling of the manuscript is post-medieval but has been normalised in line with the usage of ÍF, and the following substitutions have been made: konungr for kóngur, inn for hinn etc., lifanda for the Norwegian neuter form lifandi and eigi for ei.
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XII: SAGA AF TRISTRAM OK ÍSÑD

Chapter 80

Nú lætr Tristram skunda smíðinni þat er hann má, ok líkar honum þar vel undir fjallinu. Smiða þar trésmiðir ok gullsmiðir, ok var nú allt kompásat ok búit saman at fella. Tristram lofaði þá smiðunum heim at fara, ok fylgði þeim til þess «er» þeir váru ör eynni komnir ok síðan h(eim) til síns fóstérlands. Nú hefir Tristram óngvan félagu þar hjá sér nema þjótumnin;³ ok báru þeir nú allt starf smiðanna ok felldu saman hválhúsit, svá sem efti var aðr af smiðunum til búit, allt steint ok gylt með inum bezta hagleik.² Ok mátti þá berliga sjá smíðina fullgørva, svá at enginn kunní betr eðska.

Undir miðju hválfinu reistu þeir upp líknesku eina, svá hagliga at líkams vesti ok andliti at enginn ásjaandi maðr kunní annat at ætla en kvikt varri í öllum limunum, ok svá frítt ok vel górt at í öllum heiminum mátti eigi fegri líknesku finna.³ Ok ór munnum stöð svá gódri ilmri at allt húsit fjöllu af, svá sem òl jurtakyn varri þar inn-i, þau sem dýrust eru. En þessi inn gódri ilmri kom með þeirri list öf líkneskjunní, at Tristram háði górt undir geirvörtunni þafnsítt hjartanu eina boru á brjóstini, ok setti þar einn bauk fullan af gullmólnum grósunum, þeim settstum er í váru öllum heiminum. Ór þessum bauk stóðu tvær 18 reyrstafir af brenndu gulli, ok annarr þessara skaut ilm út undan hnakkanum þar sem mettisk hárit ok holdit, en annarr með sama haetti horði til munnsins. Þessi líkneskja var, at skópun, fegði ok 21 mikilleik, svá lík Ísñð dróttningu svá sem hon varri þar sjálf standandi, ok svá kvíklig sem lifandi væri. Þessi líkneskja var svá hagliga skorin ok svá tignarliga klædd sem sömiinni tignustu dróttningu. Hon háði 24 á þofði sér kórunu af brenndu gulli, górra með alls konar hagleik — ok sett með inum dýrustum gísmsteinum ok öllum lítum.³ En í því laufinu sem framan var í ennínu stóð eimn stórr smaragdus, at aldri 27 bar konungur eðr dróttning jafngóðan. Í hegni hendi líkneskjunnar stóð eirvöndr eðr valdsmeki, í inum efra endanum með flúrum górt, innar haglígustu smiðar: leggr viðarins var allr klæddr af gulli ok setti með 30 fínggullsteinum; guillaufin váru it bezta Arabíagull; en á inu efra laufi vandarins var skorinn fugl með fjóðrum ok alls konar lítum fjóðranna ok fullgórt at vængjum, blakandi sem hann væri kvikr ok 33

18 bauk] bauðk. 32 lífum, but corrected in the manuscript.
lifandi. Þessi líkneskjua var klaðd inum beþta purpura með hvítum skinnum; en þar fyrir var hon klaðd purpurapelli, at purpurinn merkir harm, hryggð, válk ok vesölð er Ísónd þöldi fyrir ástar sakir við Tristram.

Í høgrí hendi helt hon fínggulli sínu, ok þar var á ritat orð þau er Ísónd dróttningja með í skilað þeirra: ‘Tristram,’ kvað hon, ‘tak þetta fínggull í minning ástar okkar, ok gleym eigi þómi okkar, válk ok vesölðum, er þú hefir þolat fyrir mínar sakir ok fyrir þínar.’

Undir fótim hennar var einn fóktistill steypt af kopar í líking þess vánda dvergs er þau hafði neðst fyrir konungsínun ok hrópat; líkneskján stóð á þrójóti honum því líkast sem hon skipaði honum undir feðir sér, en hann la opinn undir fótim hennar því líkt sem hann væri gráttandi. Hjá líkneskjunnri var gó þar af brenndu gulli lítil skemtan, rakki hennar, høfuð sítt skakandi ok bjóllu sinni hringjandi, gört með miklum hagleik.7 En þóru megin dvergsín stóð ein líkneskjía lítil, eptir Bryngvet, fylgismey dróttningar; hon var vel skopuð eptir fegrð sinni ok vel skryði inum beþta búnaði, ok hælt sér í hendi keri með loki, bjóðandi Ísónd dróttningu með blóðu andlíti. Umbergis kerir váru þau orð er hon mælti: ‘Ísónd dróttning, tak drykk þennan, er görr var á Írlandi Markis konungi.’8 En þóru megin í herberginu, sem inn var gengit, hafði hann gört einna mikla líknesku í líking jóturnsins, svá sem hann stoði þar sjálfir einfaþtr ok reiddi báðum hóndum járnstaf sinn yfir því sér at verja líkneskjuva; en hann var klaðd stóru bukkskinni ok lóðnu — ok tók kyr tillinn honum skammt ofán, ok var hann nakinn nið frá nafla — ok gnísti þomnum, grimmr í augum, sem hann vildi berja alla þá er inn gengu.9 En þóru megin dyranna stóð eitt mikilt león steypft af kopar ok svá hagliga gört at enginn hugði annat en lífanda væri, þeir er þat seii. Þat stóð á fjórum fótim ok bæði hala sínum um eina líknesku, er gó þar eptir ráðismanni þeim er hrópaði ok reðgi Tristram fyrir Markis konungi.10

Enginn kann at tjá nê telja þann hagleik er þar var á þeim líkneskjum er Tristram lét þar gora í hválfinu. Ok hefir hann nû allt gört þat er hann vill at sinni, ok fær nú í vald jóturnsins ok bauð honum, sem þæli sínum ok þjónustumanni, þetta svá vel at varðveita at ekki skyldi þar nærri koma; en hann sjálfir bar lyklena bæði at hválhúsinu ok líkneskjum. En þóturnninn hafði allt fé sitt frjálst annat. Ok líkaði þetta Tristram vel, er hann hefir sliku á leið komit.
Chapter 81

Sem Tristram hafði lokit starfi sínu, þá reið hann heim til kastala síns sem hann var vanr, etr ok drekkr ok sefr hjá Ísodd, konu sinni, ok var kærr með félogum sínum. En eigi er honum hugr at eiga likamslosta við konu sína, en þó fór hann leynt með, því engi maðr mátti ætlan hans né athöf fi finna, því allir hugðu at hann byggði hjónskapliga sem hann skyldi með henni. En Ísodd er ok svá lunduð at hon leyndi fyrir hverjum manni svá tryggiliga at hon birti hvárki fyrir fremdum sínum né vinum. En þá er hann var i burtu ok góði líkneshjá þessar, þá þóti henni mjökk kynligt, hvar hann var eda hvat hann góði.

Svá reið hann heim ok heiman um einn leynistíg at enginn varð varr við hann, ok kom svá til hválthússins. Ók jafnan sem hann kom inn til líkneshjú Ísňendar, þá kyssti hann hana svá opt sem hann kom, ok lagði hana í fang sér ok hendr um háls sem hon væri lifandi, ok reðdi til hennar morgum ástamlegum orðum um ástarþokka þeira ok harma. Svá góði hann við líkneshjú Bryngvetar, ok minntrisk á òll orð þau er hann var vanr at mæla við þær. Hann minntrisk ok á alla þá huggan, skemtan, gleði ok yndi er hann fekk af Ísňand, ok kyssti hvert sinn líkneshit, er hann íhuga huggan þeira; en þá var hann hrygg ok reiðr, er hann minntrisk á harm þeira, vás ok vesaldir, er hann þólði fyrir sakir þeira er þau hrópuðu, ok kennir þat nú líkneshjú hins vánna ræðismanns.
Notes

1 The giant, Moldagog, is introduced in ch. 73 as the owner and defender of the land. Tristram defeats him in single combat by chopping off one of his legs, at which point the giant swears loyalty to Tristram and surrenders his treasures along with his territory; in return Tristram fashions a wooden leg for his new vassal (ch. 76).

2 Ch. 78 says that the main structure of the vaulted building had been made by an earlier giant who abducted the daughter of a certain Duke Orsl; and brought her to the place, where he inadvertently killed her because of his size and weight (sakir mikilleik; hans ok þunga) while trying to have sex. The fragments of Thomas’s poem do not contain this story, but versions of it are told by Wace and Geoffrey of Monmouth.

3 Kvikt and subsequent words modifying líkneskja have the neuter form, perhaps by attraction to annat. But fullgort in line 33 (modifying fugl) and gort in line 46 (modifying skemtan or rakki) are also neuter where one would expect masculine or feminine forms, and it is probably to be explained as the use of ‘natural’ gender (or rather referring to animals and statues as neuter, as often in English) and the tendency to looseness in grammar that is common in seventeenth-century manuscripts and was reversed by nineteenth-century purists. In all three cases the adjective is separated from its noun. Cf. Gr 3.9.8.2.

4 The words kórónan var are to be understood in front of sett.

5 The full account of the parting is in ch. 67.

6 In the Norwegian original there would have been perfect alliteration on rœgt and hrópat (røpat; the initial breathing in such words is early lost in Norwegian, see p. 59 above); likewise on the phrase hryggr ok reiðr in the final sentence of the extract. The dwarf, who appears for the first time in ch. 54, tries to gather evidence against the lovers by sprinkling flour between their beds so that King Markis will see Tristram’s footprints (ch. 55). He is with the king when the lovers are discovered embracing in an orchard — the event that brings about their separation (ch. 67). There is no indication in the rest of the saga that he is ever punished for his enmity towards Tristram and Ísþnd, or that he regrets it at all; nevertheless his tears, as depicted in the sculpture, are to be understood primarily as signifying remorse, though with
overtones of cowardice. In much Old Norse literature it is shameful for males to weep except when mourning a person of rank, but in the romances it is common even for heroes to weep at moments of strong emotion, as Tristram himself does when he parts from Ísñ (ch. 68).

7 Ísñ’s dog, a gift from Tristram, came originally from Elfland (Álfheimar, ch. 61). In the saga he is portrayed as a large animal that hunts wild boar and deer when Tristram and Ísñ are living together in the woods (chs 63 and 64); but Gottfried (line 16,659) specifies two separate animals and represents the one of elvish origin as a small lapdog (line 15,805). Ch. 61 of the saga lays much emphasis on the delights of sensory perception, commenting on the silkiness and wonderful colours of the dog’s coat, and saying that the sound of his bell transported Tristram ‘so that he hardly knew whether he was the same man or another one’ (svá at hann kenndi varla hvárt hann var inn sami eða annarr).

8 Ísñ’s mother prepares a wine-like love potion and tells Bryngvet to serve it to Ísñ and King Markis on their wedding-night; but before Bryngvet can do so another servant finds it and unwittingly gives some to Ísñ and Tristram, thus causing all the pain that ensues from their love (ch. 46). Bryngvet perseveres with her instructions and serves more of the potion to Markis and his bride; on the evidence of the statue it appears that she hoped to rectify the situation by allowing Ísñ to fall in love with Markis, but ch. 46 says only that she gave the potion to the king without his knowledge, and that Ísñ did not drink it on that occasion.

9 The giant’s trouserless condition is not mentioned elsewhere. Possibly it is meant to recall what was said of the chamber’s previous owner and his size (note 2 above); but in any case its message is clearly ‘Keep out, or else’.

10 Mariadókk, the steward referred to, is introduced as Tristram’s friend and bed-partner, and as the man who first discovered the adulterous affair: he woke up in the night, noticed that Tristram was missing, went out in search of him and heard him talking with Ísñ (ch. 51). In the same chapter the saga states that it was not until a long time after this event that ‘malicious persons’ (ofundarmenn) told Markis
what was going on, and Maríadókk is not actually named as one of the tell-tales. Gottfried, however, states in his poem that the corresponding character, Marjodoc, quickly went to the king and pretended to have heard rumours (lines 13, 637–51). The end-on approach of the lion, which appears only in this passage, no doubt involves maximum disgrace for the steward.

11 After parting with Ísand, Tristram marries Ísodd, daughter of the duke of Brittany. The saga states bluntly that he does so either in the hope that new love will drive out old or because he wants a wife ‘for benefit and pleasure’ (til gagns ok gamans, ch. 69), this and the next sentence standing in place of much logic-chopping in Thomas (lines 235–420). On his wedding night, however, Tristram decides not to consummate the marriage because thoughts of Ísand intrude, and he pretends to be ill (ch. 70). The assertion that his sickness was nothing else than pining for the other Ísand (ekki var ðnnur sótt Tristrongs en um aðra Ísand, ch. 70) confirms that in the saga, as in the poems of Thomas and Gottfried, the two women originally had the same name.

12 Ísodd has promised Tristram not to tell anyone that they do not have sex (ch. 70). Ch. 96 suggests that at one point she thinks he wants to become a priest or monk — possibly a joke. Eventually a chance event forces her to tell her brother Kardín, who then construes Tristram’s behaviour as an insult to the family (chs 82 and 83); but Kardín abandons any thought of a feud with Tristram when he sees the statue of Bryngvet, which he initially mistakes for a real woman, and falls in love (ch. 86). This, in fact, is the only narrative function fulfilled by the episode of the statues.