THE STRUGGLE FOR CONTROL of York in the early tenth century, between rival Scandinavian Kings and the English, is one of the most exciting and yet obscure periods of northern English history. It is so obscure, in fact, that the chronology of the last Scandinavian Kings of York can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Alex Woolf and Peter Sawyer have recently published articles which have radically challenged pre-existing views on this topic and drawn a wider range of source materials into the debate.¹

In this paper I shall review their arguments and put forward some different ideas based on a range of contemporary evidence. Partly this will constitute a defence of the chronology presented in the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for these years. This text survives in a single manuscript from the mid eleventh century, continued to 1079, and with one further annal (for 1130) added in the twelfth century.² It combines elements from version C of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (or an antecedent) and from an antecedent (known as ‘the Northern Recension’) of version E. The history of this ‘Northern Recension’ has not yet been satisfactorily expounded.³ (In addition, it contains an eleventh-century Northern English and Scottish element oddly distributed between versions D and E.)⁴ The D-text is indisputably a major guide to the period. However, there has been a tendency to reject the dates presented in it and re-jig them, either in favour of a later source or to suit a particular argument.⁵ While none of the texts of the Anglo-Saxon
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Chronicle provides an entirely reliable chronology of events, this attitude towards ‘D’ seems in some respects to be misguided, and I hope to demonstrate why.

When was the first reign of Eirikr?

First, I shall discuss Alex Woolf’s article published in 1998. There he questioned the received view of the history of the kingdom of York from 937 to 947, which was established by Murray Beaven in 1918. Before Woolf’s article, Beaven’s chronology for these years had received widespread acceptance, being cited for example by F. M. Stenton in his *Anglo-Saxon England*, and followed by others, including Dorothy Whitelock, Alfred Smyth, and Simon Keynes. Sawyer’s article published in 1995 was similarly iconoclastic for the years 947–954, and this may have provided some inspiration for Woolf. I hope to demonstrate that there are some debatable issues in Woolf’s article, and I shall then provide a tentative chronology for the years to which his article was devoted.

Woolf put forward a case that Eirikr of York first ruled at some point between 937 and 941. This contrasts with the view of most other commentators who have given a date of 947/8 for the beginning of Eirikr’s first reign. To support this argument Woolf used evidence from the Life of St Cathroe, Icelandic sagas, contemporary charters, and negative assertion from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. I hope to show from the study of these texts that Woolf’s thesis can be challenged. Perhaps the most significant item in his case is the Life of St Cathroe. This is a somewhat neglected source, to which Woolf has drawn greater attention.

This Life concerns a Gaelic *peregrinus* who, its author asserted, visited the Court of Eirikr at York. Woolf has argued that the Life shows this visit to have taken place before 943. In other words, Eirikr’s power had been established well before 947/8 when his reign is conventionally said to have begun. The Life is attributed to the 980s, that is, within a few years of the saint’s death, and it was probably composed at Metz, where Cathroe had held the abbacy of the monastery of St Felix. Thus it has good reason to be considered seriously as a historical source.

As Woolf has pointed out, few historians have used this text. Alan Orr Anderson partially translated it into English in 1922 (and arrived at a conclusion...
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6 Beaven, *EHR*, xxxiii.
8 Woolf, *NH*, xxxiv, 189.
9 Elsewhere I have argued that the identification of Eirikr with Eirikr Blöðöx, King of Norway, is mistaken. C. Downham, ‘Eric Bloodaxe - Axed? The Mystery of the Last Viking King of York’, *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, xiv (2003), forthcoming.
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similar to Woolf's regarding the date of Eirikr's first reign). W. G. Collingwood considered the reference to Eirikr in the Life to be spurious, and Alfred Smyth also expressed reservations on this matter. It seems that students of Northumbrian history have long felt some reluctance to employ this seemingly near-contemporary Life because of the difficulties of reconciling it with the established chronology of events. More recently, David Dumville has discussed the Life of St Cathroe in the context of tenth-century political contacts and has drawn together some information on the origins of this text.

Part of the Life's potential for the historian lies in Cathroe's social connections. Dates can be assigned to his travels from the names of famous people whom he met en route from North Britain to the Continent. Cathroe is said to have encountered Eirikr on what Dumville has called a 'veritable court-crawl' beginning with Constantine of Alba and ending with Edmund I of England. Woolf has dated Cathroe's visit to York 'if this account ... is accurate ... sometime between 939 (the accession of Edmund) and 943 (the abdication of Constantine)'. The problem with this dating is that it rests on the assumption that Cathroe completed the whole journey within a year. That is, his last host is used to provide the earliest possible date for the beginning of his travels, and the abdication of his first host provides the last possible date for the end. Moreover, we know from the Life that Cathroe's stay with his kinsman, Domnaldus, King of the Cumbri (that is, the Strathclyders) was prolonged. Thus Woolf's dating may be based on a false premise. Rather, the beginning of Cathroe's travels should be dated sometime before the abdication of Constantine, which cannot be dated more specifically than 940-943. Cathroe arrived in London before May 946 (Edmund's death), but after 941. 941 was the beginning of the pontificate of Oda of Canterbury, and it was Archbishop Oda who accompanied Cathroe on the last leg of his journey in England.

The next group of sources used by Woolf was the Norse sagas concerning Eirikr Blóðóx. Woolf has pointed out that these indicate that Eirikr Blóðóx ruled when Æthelstan was King of England (927–939). On that basis, Eirikr's reign at York

16 Dumville, in Carey et al., Studies, p. 176.
17 Woolf, NH, xxxiv, 190. The date 943 for Constantine's abdication is not secure.
20 Dumville, in Carey et al., Studies, p. 170 and 177, n. 42. A charter recording a grant of land to Cathroe for a religious house at Saint-Michel-en-Thiérache can be dated before February 945, which could suggest that he completed his travels by this date. Nevertheless, serious doubts have been expressed regarding the authenticity of the thirteenth-century unique copy of this grant: ibid., p. 180, n. 62, and p. 183.
would have commenced before the autumn of 939. Nevertheless the unreliability of
Norse sagas as historical sources is widely acknowledged, as Woolf has admitted.22
In general, they provide an imaginative and deceptively detailed account of the
past, invented to fit with earlier legends and skaldic poetry. Much of the poetry
concerning Eiríkr Blöðóx in Icelandic literature is attributed to the tenth-century
poet Egill Skallagrímsson (but not without reservation).23 The link between
Æthelstan and Eiríkr in Egils saga, which Woolf has used to support his argument,
may have developed from an earlier poem about Æthelstan enshrined in the text of
this thirteenth-century saga.24 If this poem was Egill’s, and if it could be linked
with the rest of the poems in Egils saga, it would provide good evidence for
Woolf’s case. However, both the poem’s association with the other compositions
in Egils saga and Egill’s authorship have been questioned.25 This casts into doubt
the evidence which links Æthelstan’s reign with the rule of Eiríkr at York. It
should also be kept in mind that Æthelstan enjoyed something of a cult in the
Middle Ages as a King who united England and made far-reaching political
alliances.26 It may thus have seemed appropriate to the author of Egils saga to link
him with Egill and Eiríkr, even though this now seems not to be historically
accurate.

The next type of information used by Woolf was contemporary English royal
diplomas. Woolf has pointed out that Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (931–
952/956), did not witness any royal charters in 936–941. This absence is all the
more notable because Wulfstan appeared (regularly) before 936, and (less
regularly) after 941.27 Woolf has therefore suggested that Wulfstan’s absence from
the English Court may be linked to Eiríkr’s power at York. This view is
encouraged by the fact that Wulfstan supported Eiríkr in the years after 947. This
is a persuasive line of reasoning, but there could be other reasons why Wulfstan
was not witnessing royal charters from 936 to 941.

Simon Keynes has suggested that Wulfstan may have been absent as a witness
from 936 to 941 because of his support for another Scandinavian King, Óláfr
Guðrøðsson.28 Óláfr was of the line of Kings of the dynasty of Ívarr who ruled

22 Woolf, NH, xxxiv, 189; J. Harris, ‘Saga as a Historical Novel’, in Structure and Meaning in Old Norse
Literature: New Approaches to Textual Analysis and Literary Criticism, ed. J. Lindow et al. (Odense, 1986),
pp. 187–219; Sawyer, NH, xxxi, 42.
Skálalagrímssonar’, Scripta Islandica, XLVI (1995), 29; R. G. Poole, Viking Poems on War and Peace: A Study in
24 Egils saga Skálalagrímssonar, ed. S. Nordal (Reykjavik, 1933), pp. 146–47; Scudder, in Attwood et al.,
Sagas, p. 91.
History in the Viking Age: A Select Bibliography (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 35–36; Poole, Viking Poems, p. 177.
This does not compromise the theory that this poem was composed by a Scandinavian at Æthelstan’s court.
27 Woolf, NH, xxxiv, 192.
York intermittently from 867 to 927. Following their expulsion from York in 927, members of this family remained in Ireland where they dominated the viking settlements of Dublin and Waterford. Wulfstan, on the other hand, was raised to his archbishopric in 931, when all Northumbria was in the hands of King Æthelstan. Wulfstan was, in all likelihood, promoted with Æthelstan's support. It may seem surprising, then, that the Bishop was a staunch supporter of Scandinavian rule in York throughout his career, or at least whenever he felt it safe to be so. Some hints of this are provided in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (D). This shows that Wulfstan accompanied a Scandinavian King called Óláfr on a raid into Mercia. Wulfstan later swore allegiance to Eadred, King of England (946–55), but he broke his oath soon after and endured temporary imprisonment by the same King in the 950s. Wulfstan thus appears as a power-broker and leading figure in Northumbria at this time. But he was also someone who took political risks with varying success. His frequent but irregular presence at the English Court serves to illustrate this further.

It may be that Wulfstan was drawn out of the orbit of the English Court at the time when Óláfr Guðrøðsson was preparing his campaign to seize power at York in 937. Óláfr was already allied with the kingdom of Alba and thus had a strong chance of attaining his goal. This may have encouraged Wulfstan to risk English royal displeasure and give Óláfr his support. This venture however ended at Brunanburh where ‘the people of the Scots and pirates fell doomed’ (‘Scotta leode 7 scipflotan fæge feollon’), and Óláfr withdrew to Dublin. Wulfstan (not surprisingly) stayed away from the English Court until the death of Óláfr Guðrøðsson in 941.

Furthermore, there is evidence in the charter-styles employed by English Kings against Woolf’s thesis that Eiríkr came to power during the final years of Æthelstan’s reign. This has been deemed a credible way of assessing changes in royal authority. In each of the charters surviving from the years 937 to 939, Æthelstan claimed to be ruler of all Britain. For example, in 937 his diplomas described him as ‘rex Anglorum et aeque totius Britanniae orbis curagulus preelectus’. In 938 he was ‘totius rex Britannie’, and equally ambitious statements were put forward in 939. By way of comparison, Æthelstan’s successor, King Edmund I, did not claim to be King of all Britain (‘rex totiusque Albionis’) until Northumbria was firmly in his grasp in 945. In other words, there is no
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evidence of decline in Æthelstan’s power which could suggest that a rival King was ruling at York. The force of this diplomatic evidence may partly be mitigated by Woolf’s assertion that Eiríkr was ‘installed’ by Æthelstan. This idea seems to be derived from Egils saga, which is not a trustworthy source. It seems unlikely that Æthelstan would have been willing to delegate power over all or part of Northumbria to an ambitious foreign ruler at this time.

Woolf has suggested that, following the death of Æthelstan, there was a length of time before Óláfr Guðrøðsson took hold of York. If so, this would permit the meeting of St Cuthroe and King Eiríkr to have taken place between late October 939 and the spring of 940. Woolf has argued that such a delay would have resulted from the time taken for news of the King’s death to travel back to Ireland, and the lateness of the season for a military campaign. However, news of the English King’s death need not have taken so long to travel across the Irish Sea (particularly in the context of frequent trade between the two islands, which in favourable conditions were merely a day’s sailing apart). Furthermore, the Annals of the Four Masters report Óláfr’s departure from Dublin in an annal definable from its context as that for 939. This suggests that he took ship soon after Æthelstan’s death. In addition, as Alfred Smyth has shown, winter campaigns were a speciality of vikings in Ireland. There is accordingly every reason to think that Óláfr hurried to England soon after news of the potential power vacuum in Northumbria reached his Court.

The final body of evidence used by Woolf is provided by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. There is no reference to a reign of Eiríkr between 937 and 941 in any of the versions. However, Woolf has remarked that the record is incomplete: no events are recorded for the two-year period between the battle of Brunanburh and the death of Æthelstan (October 939). He has suggested that a relatively late insertion of the poem on Brunanburh into the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at 937 could have overlain (and therefore caused the loss of) entries for the next two years. Thus, if Eiríkr came to power at this time, record of his accession would be lost. This raises two issues.

The first concerns the textual integrity of annals 924–46 as held in common by versions ABC of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. These provide no evidence to support a theory of textual dislocation around annal 937 (whose sole content is the Brunanburh poem). That the poem (and that on the ‘Five Boroughs’ in annal 942) was part of this block of annals 924–46 by the end of the 950s is clear from the
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43 Woolf, NH, xxxiv, 191.
44 Dumville, Wessex, p. 64.
evidence of version A.\textsuperscript{45} That the poem was composed for the Chronicle is indicated by its opening word \textit{(Her)} whose originality is metrically guaranteed.\textsuperscript{46}

The second issue concerns the Chronicle’s account of events in the reign of Æthelstan. The thinness of its record of such an important King has long been remarked.\textsuperscript{47} It is worth stressing the Chronicler’s extreme selectivity. The sequence of annals begins with Æthelstan’s succession to Edward in 924. (Nothing is said of the intervening King, Ælfweard, or of the other complexities of the succession.) In versions ABC, no notice is given of Æthelstan’s relations with Scandinavian Northumbria (or other northern powers), leading to the creation of the kingdom of England in 927: the next annal after 924 is for 934, recording Æthelstan’s invasion of Scotland. Furthermore, nothing is said of Æthelstan’s Continental activities — his military campaigns in Brittany and France — or of the death of his brother Edwin (mentioned in version E).\textsuperscript{48} The next annal after 934 is 937, the poem on the battle of \textit{Brunanburh}. This is followed immediately by record of Æthelstan’s death in annal 940 (referring back to the death of King Alfred, forty years earlier). These annals are hardly to be reckoned a contemporary record of events. They are carefully selected and show a political amnesia born of a new situation. The Chronicle record acquires some sort of continuity from 942, when King Edmund was fighting for control of the ‘Five Boroughs’, Northumbria, and Strathclyde.\textsuperscript{49} From the Chronicle as represented by version A or the common source of BC a reader would scarcely deduce that Edmund’s campaigns of conquest were other than a continuation of those of Edward the Elder. When annal 944 announces Edmund’s conquest of Northumbria, the reader has not been told of Æthelstan’s conquest of it in 927 and Edmund’s loss of it in 939/40. We should therefore consider annals 924–46 in versions ABC of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as creations of Edmund’s reign. The silence of the Chronicle concerning many of the years in which Æthelstan held power appears to be political, and not transmissional, in origin.

In summary, there are several reasons to doubt Woolf’s case that Eiríkr began his first reign before 943. On the arguments presented here, the dates suggested by Woolf for Cathroe’s visit to King Eiríkr should be broadened from 939±943 to 939±946. In addition, the prose narratives of Icelandic sagas should not be regarded as reliable witnesses, and the poetry within them needs more thorough analysis. It seems in particular that the poems attributed to Egill Skallagrímsson do not support the argument that Eiríkr ruled at York in 937±941. When considered independently, the poems do not explicitly link Eiríkr to Æthelstan or Edmund.\textsuperscript{50} No positive evidence for Woolf’s argument is to be found in English royal diplomas or the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, while Irish chronicles imply that Óláfr Guðrøðsson and not Eiríkr was ruling at York from the end of 939.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 62.
\textsuperscript{47} Dumville, \textit{Wessex}, pp. 142–43 and notes.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., pp. 149–50.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., pp. 173–84.
By advocating the Life of St Cathroe as a source for Northumbrian history, Alex Woolf has posed an interesting and significant challenge to historians, which I cannot satisfactorily answer. In order to match this source with other evidence, I tentatively suggest that Eirikr ruled briefly in 946, nearer the time when he is recorded as active in Northumbria. This would encompass the final months of Edmund’s reign when a plot to kill the King may have been afoot in England. All versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle agree that Eadred subdued Northumbria immediately after his accession. This would have put an end to any such reign of Eirikr. Woolf’s article is significant because it has provided a fresh look at some of the primary sources and raised an interesting question regarding the date of Eirikr’s first reign. For that reason, I decided to discuss it first, before going on to discuss other aspects of Northumbrian chronology from 937 to 947.

Northumbrian chronology AD 937–947 and the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

From 937 to 940, the chronology appears to be fairly simple in Insular chronicles. The escape of Óláfr Guðrøðsson from Brunanburh is recorded in the Annals of Ulster and Annals of the Four Masters in relation to the year 937, and this matches the account in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. By the end of 939 or early in 940 Óláfr appears to have been ruling in Northumbria.

Problems can be seen to begin in 940. This is where received scholarship has diverged from the dating presented in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (D), perhaps without good reason. It should be said at the outset that all versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle suffer from inconsistencies in dating. From 891 to 934, the D-text in particular has a sequence of irregularities. These are introduced into the text by blank annals or clumsy interpolations from the so-called ‘Mercian Register’ whose entries run from 902 to 924. In addition the annal for 911 confusingly telescopes several years into one. These irregularities may have led scholars to mistrust the chronology of this text in following years.

However, I suggest that for the sequence of years from 934 to the 950s the D-text provides a largely accurate chronological record. There are various points where the chronology of the D-text can be proved correct by cross-reference to other texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. For the years 937 to 947, there is information recorded for the correct years in D at 937, 940, 942, 944, 945, 946, and 947. However, scholarly mistrust has persisted in relation to those events which cannot be cross-referenced with other versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.
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The trail begins with Charles Plummer's proficient but slightly damning analysis of D, published in 1899. He stated, 'The junction of the southern chronicle with the Gesta Northanhymbrorum is, on the whole, not unskilfully done: but in some cases the work of compilation is performed very clumsily ... D is from first to last very inaccurately and carelessly written'. Plummer's views were used by Murray Beaven to cast doubt on the chronology of the additional material in this text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Beaven concluded that 'The incorrect dating of D, which supplies us with more detail than the other manuscripts of the Chronicle, has largely contributed to confuse the chronology of Edmund’s reign'.

It seems, in consequence of such scholarly reservations about the D-text’s dating in the 930s and 940s, that some have been quick to conclude that things which cannot be easily explained in the chronology of the D-text for these years, or which do not suit a particular argument, can be rejected as error. However, this seems a rather misguided approach. I propose to re-open the question of the reliability of the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the chronology of Edmund’s reign. The dates which it provides can, to some extent, be cross-referenced with other Insular chronicles and charter evidence as well as with other texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. This suggests to me that D may be rather more useful for the years from 937 to 947 than Beaven allowed (see Appendix 1).

At 940, D (with texts A, B and C of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle) reports the death of Æthelstan on 27 October. This occurred in 939 and the reckoning may show that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle began its year on 24 September at this date, as Dorothy Whitelock suggested. In the following annal, dated 941, D records the Northumbrians’ treachery in electing Óláfr from Ireland as their King. The D-text’s dating of this event was dismissed by Beaven and others. He suggested that this was a misplaced reference to the promotion of Óláfr Guðrødsson to kingship at York at the end of 939 or beginning of 940. However, rejection of D’s chronology at this point is not necessary.

We can trace the sequence of events from the corrected dates of Irish chronicles: the Annals of the Four Masters report the departure of Óláfr Guðrødsson from Dublin in 939. In 940 he was joined by a kinsman, Óláfr Cuarán (alias Sigtryggsson), whose departure for York is recorded in the Annals of the Four Masters and the Annals of Clonmacnoise. This is followed in 941 by the death of
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56 Ibid., n. lxxxi. Plummer went on to say that D is ‘full of errors and omissions’. The sum total of ‘important errors’ is in fact small: ibid., p. lxii, n. 3; lxxxi, n. 4. Minor variations from other Chronicle texts for the years 937 and 945 have been discussed by Cubbin, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, pp. civ–cxiv, 42–44. They do not undermine D’s importance as a source. On the title ‘Gesta Veterum Northanhymbrorum’ see Plummer, Two of the Saxon Chronicles, ii, lxix, n.1.
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Óláfr Guðrøðsson, recorded in the Annals of Clonmacnoise and *Chronicum Scotorum*. The report in 941 (D) then follows appropriately, ‘the Northumbrians were false to their pledges and chose Óláfr from Ireland as their King’ (‘Norðhymbra alugon hira getreowað 7 Anlaf of Yrlande him to cinge gecuron’). If we accept D’s dating, we can identify him as Óláfr Cuarán who ruled Northumbria from 941 to 944, following the death of Óláfr Guðrøðsson. This also fits with the date and identification given in Part I of the twelfth-century compilation attributed to Symeon of Durham, *Historia Regum Anglorum*.

Pressing on with D, we see that the annal for 942 records Edmund’s triumphant recapture of the ‘Five Boroughs’. This record is also found in versions A, B, and C. So significant was this event that a poem was written to commemorate it. As with the *Brunanburh* poem mentioned above, this is thought to have been a near-contemporary composition. The poem claimed that the territory had been ‘for a long time in bonds of captivity to the heathens’ (‘on hreoenra hrefteclommum lange þragse’). This is followed in D by the annal for 943 which contains information not found in other texts of the Chronicle.

The date provided by D for annal 943 must be partially incorrect as it appears to cover the events of two separate years. The challenge is how to accurately date this information. The first part describes a raid on Tamworth by the Northumbrian King, Óláfr. After this report, the word Her (translated as ‘in this year’) appears. This should indicate the beginning of another annal, although the information which follows is still dated as 943 in the D-text. It reports that Óláfr was besieged with Archbishop Wulfstan, at Leicester, by Edmund. The two were forced to flee the town under cover of darkness. Afterwards (in the same annal) D records that Óláfr secured friendship with Edmund. This reconciliation of the Kings is attributed in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, to the mediation of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. Óláfr was then baptised and his relative, Røgnvaldr Guðrøðsson, was confirmed with the sponsorship of the English King.

The date of Óláfr’s baptism and Røgnvaldr’s confirmation given in D can be compared with other versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. These events are dated to 942 in version A (although two or three words appears to be missing between the end of the poem on the ‘Five Boroughs’ and the beginning of this record, which could have incorporated an annal marker). In the B-text, these
events can be construed as belonging to an annal for 943.\textsuperscript{70} In C it is recorded within annal 942, but (as in B) the report is preceded directly by the word *Her* which suggests that the beginning of a new annal was intended. Version D, as already mentioned, records the event in its annal 943. On balance, Whitelock dated the baptism of Óláfr and Rōgnvaldr’s confirmation to the year 943, and I am inclined to support her conclusion.\textsuperscript{71}

What we appear to have in the record for 943 in version D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is the sandwiching of information unique to this text (from a northern source) between the record of Edmund’s recapture of the ‘Five Boroughs’ in 942 and the baptism of Óláfr in 943. This unique information in D appears to cover two years because of the repetition of the word *Her* after the record of Óláfr’s activities at Tamworth and before the description of his being besieged at Leicester. These reports may therefore be dated by their context in D to the years 942 and 943 respectively.

Nevertheless, the received date for this campaign in the East Midlands is 940, despite the layout of information in the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. This date was established by Beaven and followed by (nearly all) subsequent historians.\textsuperscript{72} The reason given by Beaven for his dismissal of D’s evidence was that the Tamworth–Leicester campaign is recorded under the year 939 in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I (Beaven argued that this should be ‘corrected’ to 940).\textsuperscript{73} Furthermore, he argued that

The entire Danelaw south of the Northumbrian frontier had been reduced by Edward the Elder in the great campaigns of 911–920 ... Hence, if the Chronicle is accurate in stating that Edmund recovered the Five Boroughs in 942 ... it is plain that he must have previously lost them; and the occasion of their cession can only have been, as Symeon says it was, the East Midland campaign of the 940s.\textsuperscript{74}

There are reasons to doubt this argument. Moreover, while the chronological difference between the date 939 provided by *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, and the date 942 suggested by the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is slight, it has significant bearing on the interpretation of events. It determines whether one regards the campaigns at Tamworth and Leicester as having been undertaken by Óláfr Guðrōðsson or his successor Óláfr Cuarán. Edmund may be portrayed as either defender or aggressor in his seizure of the ‘Five Boroughs’ according to this sequence of events. Furthermore, debate of this issue can highlight the relative merits of *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, and version D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as chronological guides to the events of these years.

\textsuperscript{70} Taylor, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{71} Whitelock, *EHD*, p. 72, n. 6.
\textsuperscript{73} Beaven, *EHR*, xxxiii, 3, n. 9.
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., p. 4.
The Leicester campaign is recorded under the year 940 in the *Flores Historiarum* of Roger of Wendover. This might have encouraged Beaven. However, the chronology of this early-thirteenth-century compilation is demonstrably floundering at this stage. For example, the entry for 941 combines events from 941 and 944 (the death of Óláfr Guðrøðarson with the expulsion of Óláfr Cuarán and Rognvaldr from Northumbria). If annal 941 incorporates events from 944, is it not possible that the record for 940 includes events from 943? At any rate, Roger of Wendover should not be regarded as a reliable chronological guide at this point. Furthermore, Roger’s *Flores Historiarum* is the only source supposedly dependent on near contemporary records which places the events at Leicester and the subsequent peace treaty before the recovery of the ‘Five Boroughs’.

Part of Beaven’s argument therefore turns on whether *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I (and Beaven’s interpretation of its annal 939), is a more reliable guide to the sequence of events at this point than the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. A brief comparison of these texts’ origins and chronology therefore needs to be made. The *Historia* was compiled sometime between 1129 (the last annal) and 1164 (the year indicated by the opening rubric and the probable date of the unique manuscript).

Peter Hunter Blair suggested that the text only reached its final form at the end of this period, when the rubrics identifying Symeon of Durham as the author were added (indeed, Symeon may have only been responsible for the last section of Part II of the work, which runs from 1119 to 1129). Hunter Blair, in his ground-breaking article on the *Historia*, divided the compilation into sections, which has facilitated detailed analysis of the text.

Sections one to five of Part I were compiled at the end of the tenth century (perhaps by Byrhtferth of Ramsey).

Section six comprises the small chronicle which is the focus of present concern. This covers the years from 888 to 957. It is independent in style, outlook and character from what goes before and what follows (and could have been added in Northumbria after Byrhtferth’s work was received there). It concludes Part I. Part
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75 Rogeri de Wendover Chronica, sive Flores historiarum, ed. H. O. Coxe, 4 vols (1841–42), i, 394–95 (s.a. 940); Roger of Wendover’s Flowers of History, comprising the History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235, trans. J. A. Giles, 2 vols (1849), i, 251.

76 Coxe, Rogeri de Wendover, i, 395; Giles, Roger, i, 251–52; Cubbin, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, p. 43 (s.a. 941); CS, p. 202 (s.a. [940] (= 941)); AClon, p. 152 (s.a. 934 (= 941)); Thorpe, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1, 212–13 (A–F, s.a. 944); Whitelock, EHD, pp. 222, 224.

77 Arnold, Symeonis Monachi Opera, ii, 93, 125; Stevenson, Church Historians, iii, pt 2, pp. 68, 89; Chronicon Æthelweardi: The Chronicle of Æthelweard, ed. and trans. A. Campbell (Edinburgh, 1962), pp. 53–54 (iv.6). Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (D) of course places the Tamworth raid after Edward’s recovery: it is the only version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to record both events. Cubbin, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, p. 43; Whitelock, EHD, p. 221.


80 Hunter Blair, in Chadwick, *Celt*, p. 117.

II begins with a chronicle which runs from 848 to 1118 (section seven), based on the Chronicle of John of Worcester. The final section (eight) is an addition to this chronicle, running from 1119 to 1129, which has been attributed to Symeon by Peter Hunter Blair.

It is the small chronicle identified as Part I, section six, of the Historia, which provides the date 939 for the raid on Tamworth. This laconic set of annals contains information drawn from a northern source, akin to that represented in the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. These northern annals seem to have a tenth-century element preserved within them. They are therefore potentially of great significance in reconstructing events in Viking Age Northumbria.

However, the chronology of this short chronicle in Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, is not without its difficulties. It has a complicated textual history. The chronicle for 888–957 is a combination of at least three different texts, and there appear to be some later interpolations. A terminus post quem for this chronicle's reaching its present form is the year 1042. This is provided by the last annal, for the year 957, which mentions the reign of Edward the Confessor. A terminus ante quem may be provided by the rubric to Historia Regum Anglorum which is datable to 1164. The D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle may have reached its final form no later than Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I. First Ker and then Cubbin suggested that D was originally put together in the 1050s, and later information (to the year 1079) was added on the end. There is no reason, at any rate on the grounds of textual history, for the chronology of Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, to be given precedence over that of version D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

Analysis of their contents shows that while the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section six, both derive information from a set of northern annals (which in its original form is now lost), their authors assigned different dates to the information which they preserved. Cubbin listed all the material from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which is unique to D, which can also be found in Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section six. This is thought to derive from the northern annals. I tabulate this information below with the dates provided by each text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ASC (D)</th>
<th>HRA (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>941 ASC (D) = 941 HRA (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>943 ASC (D) = 939 HRA (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
<td>947 ASC (D) = 938 HRA (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>948 ASC (D) = 950 HRA (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>957 ASC (D) = 956 HRA (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that there is no consistent difference in dating between the unique information in the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and that found in the
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83 Ibid., p. liv; Rollason et al., *Sources*, p. 27.
85 Hunter Blair, in Chadwick, *Celt*, p. 106. Annals 952(?)–7 appear to be work of the late eleventh or twelfth century.
87 Ibid., p. xxxviii. It should be kept in mind that the information recorded *s.a.* 956 in Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, comes from a section of this chronicle dated to the late eleventh and twelfth century.
short chronicle in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I. The problem cannot simply be resolved by shifting all the northern information in one of these sources a few years one way or the other.

One matter which counts against the dates given in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, section six, is that its chronology is often at fault. This was noticed by Hunter Blair. He showed that three out of the six obits of English Kings, recorded in this text, were out of place.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRA (I)</th>
<th>correct date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadwig</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W. S. Angus also demonstrated that events recorded under the years 910, 912, and 914 were misdated.89 Information reported in annals 943 and 945 can also be correctly dated to 944.90 Therefore where chronology can be tested, it is often at fault. There is accordingly little reason to prefer the dating of section six of *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, over that of the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the record of events unique to both texts.

Rather, there are positive reasons why D’s attribution of the Leicester campaign to 943 may be deemed more reliable than the date 939 provided by *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, section 6. As Lesley Abrams has demonstrated, the record for the year 939 in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, section 6, assigns Archbishop Oda a significant role in reconciling Kings Edmund and Óláfr. However, we know from other sources that Oda’s pontificate at Canterbury did not begin until 941.91 Although Beaven found a charter witnessed by Oda as Archbishop for the year 940,92 this evidence has since been rejected on good grounds by Mary Anne O’Donovan. She demonstrated that Oda’s predecessor at Canterbury, Wulfhelm, was witnessing charters until 941, and she assigned Wulfhelm’s death to that year.93 Therefore, 942 or 943 may be more probable dates for the peace agreement.

In the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Óláfr’s baptism under the sponsorship of Edmund (which may be dated to 943) is said to have taken place in the same year as the treaty. Several historians, writing before Beaven, regarded Óláfr’s baptism as a condition of this royal treaty.94 Indeed, it would not be surprising if the two events were linked. The confirmation of a treaty between a

88 Hunter Blair, in Chadwick, *Celt*, p. 105. Deaths of Kings Alfred (899), Æthelstan (939) and Eadred (955) are recorded under the correct years.

89 Angus, *Durham University Journal*, xxxii. The years are corrected as follows: 910 [= 910-04], 912 [= 918], 914 [= 919].

90 The expulsion of Óláfr Cuarán, which is recorded in annals 943 and 945 in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, section 6, is recorded in all versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year 944. Thorpe, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, i, 212–23 (A–F, s.a. 944); Whitelock, *EHD*, p. 222.


92 Beaven, *EHR*, XXXIII, 3, n. 11.


Christian and a heathen through the latter’s conversion is a recurrent historical theme in the Viking Age. A parallel may be found in the agreement between Alfred and Guthrum (878x890), and a similar arrangement may have been reached between Æthelstan and Sigtryggr in 926.\(^95\) There are also Continental examples.\(^96\) As Abrams has commented, ‘Frankish rulers regularly encouraged Viking leaders to accept Christianity, often in return for grants’.\(^97\) The date 939 given in *Historia Regum Anglorum*, Part I, does not allow for a connection between these events (this is because the Óláfr who ruled York in 940 died in 941).

There is, however, another element of Beaven’s argument to consider. As Beaven stated, if West Saxon Kings had ruled the ‘Five Boroughs’ from 920 to 940, there would be cause to date Óláfr’s raid on the East Midlands to 940 in order to explain the reclamation of the ‘Five Boroughs’ in 942. This is a sensible argument, but there are some issues within it which may be questioned.

The first point of difficulty in Beaven’s argument is that the record of the re-seizure of the ‘Five Boroughs’ in 942 asserts that they were previously subject to ‘Northmen’ for a long time (‘lange þræge’).\(^98\) Two years would hardly be long enough to warrant such a claim. Allen Mawer dismissed it as a meaningless cliché added for effect.\(^99\) However, the statement may have had some truth, not least because it can be argued that West Saxon Kings did not hold unchallenged authority over the ‘Five Boroughs’ from 920 to 940.

Beaven did not have access to the numismatic evidence used in the 1970s by Alfred Smyth, which might have altered his argument. Smyth used this evidence to show that Northumbrian Kings exercised intermittent control over part of the ‘Five Boroughs’ in the 920s. During the reign of Sigtryggr grandson of Ívarr (Sitric ua Imair) in Northumbria (920–27), coins were minted in his name at Lincoln.\(^100\) Smyth suggested that the Northumbrian kingdom may have embraced parts of Lindsey, south of the Humber estuary.\(^101\) Smyth also identified further evidence for Northumbrian influence over the ‘Five Boroughs’ in the St Martin’s coinage produced in Lincoln around this time. This coinage is linked by design and dye-cutting technique to the St Peter’s coinage at York.\(^102\) It may be significant that both coinages bore a sword design during Sigtryggr’s reign; this symbol has been linked elsewhere to the power of the dynasty of Ívarr (Ui Imair).\(^103\) The coins thus suggest a strong link between Scandinavian Northumbria and one of the ‘Five Boroughs’ until 927.


\(^98\) Allen Mawer identified ‘Northmen’ as referring to those vikings from Ireland who ruled Northumbria and who, he thought, were of Norwegian descent. *EHR*, xxxviii, 552.

\(^99\) Ibid., p. 556.


\(^102\) Ibid., n, 6–7.

\(^103\) Ibid., n, 104–07; Blackburn, in Graham-Campbell et al., *Vikings*, p. 135.
But what of the time when Æthelstan dominated Northumbria (927–39)? It is possible that the area of the ‘Five Boroughs’ was still subject to an established élite of ‘Northumbrian’ landholders and officials who retained their status under Æthelstan’s suzerainty. These may be the ‘Northmen’ or ‘heathens’ who are mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s poem on Edmund’s recovery of the ‘Five Boroughs’, who are said to have oppressed the Danish majority.

If there was such a Northumbrian élite persisting in the region of the ‘Five Boroughs’ until 942 (and it is not unlikely), its members may have seemed a threat to Edmund’s control. They were perhaps inclined to be sympathetic to any designs on the area of the ‘Five Boroughs’ which Óláf Ímaír might have entertained. Some may have also held lands in Northumbria, which was again ruled by Óláf Ímaír from 940. Indeed by 942 the power of Óláfr Cuarán may have effectively spread southwards without any great military campaign. In these circumstances, Edmund’s action in 942 might be regarded as a conquest intended to disfranchise much of the remaining ‘Northumbrian’ élite in the region. It may have been a defensive reaction to the re-seizure of York in 939/40 by Óláf Ímaír and the penetration of their influence farther south. This theory may further be linked to Dorothy Whitelock’s comment that ‘there were by the end of the tenth century thegns in English areas who possessed also large estates in the districts settled by Danes. Their lands may have been got together by purchase and inheritance, but one wonders whether Æthelstan and his successors encouraged such infiltration into the Danish areas’. Could some of these large estates represent the fruits of Edmund’s conquest shared out to loyal English thegns?

The last part of my argument has involved some guesswork, but it was intended to show that a scenario different from that envisaged by Beaven and his successors is possible. A case can be put that Óláfr’s activities in Tamworth and Leicester took place in 942 and 943 as the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle implies, not in 940 as is often stated. The sequence of events presented in version D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is worth considering because the text on which Beaven based his argument (Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section 6) seems to be an unreliable guide to the chronology of these years.

My argument must also take account of a recent article by Andrew Breeze concerning the composition of Armes Prydein Vawr, ‘The Great Prophecy of Britain’. Breeze has argued that this Welsh prophetic poem, which calls for Britons, Gaels, and vikings to unite against the English, was written in response to Óláfr’s raid on the ‘Five Boroughs’. Breeze has offered evidence for dating the prophecy before 941. He has also identified the place-names Lego and Arlego in

104 Allen Mawer suggested that the scatter of Normanton and Normanby place-names found across north-east England could represent settlements owned by a powerful minority of Norwegians who had followed Óláf Ímaír from Ireland (but there is no certainty that Óláf Ímaír were Norwegians): EHR, xxxviii, 556. I have so far been unable to find more recent comment on the value of this evidence.

105 Ibid.; Thorpe, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, i, 208–11 (A–D, s.a. 942); Whitelock, EHD, p. 221.

106 Whitelock, in Clemoes, Anglo-Saxons, p. 81.

107 Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters, nos 479, 484, and 495 record grants of lands in the region of the ‘Five Boroughs’ in 942. The recipients were Wulfsige the Black and Ælfric, Bishop of Ramsbury.

108 Beaven, EHR, xxxiii.

109 A. Breeze, Études celtiques, xxxiii.
that text with the Leicester region (basing his argument on an emendation of an Old English river-name form posited by Eilert Ekwall). Breeze has suggested that the reference to Leicester is related to its seizure, with other boroughs, by Óláfr in 940. Nevertheless, no explicit reference to Óláfr’s campaign is made in the Prophecy. Nor should Leicester’s significance in the poem (if Breeze’s identification be accepted) be dependent on Óláfr’s campaign. As the most southwesterly of the ‘Five Boroughs’, it would be a natural base for a viking attack on the English kingdom. It is this scenario which the poet may have hoped for when he wrote Dybi o Lego lyghes rewyd (‘from Lego there will come rapacious sea-rovers’).110 Óláfr’s campaign (which I date to 943) further serves to illustrate this region’s significance. Breeze may be correct in arguing that 940 would be a crucial time for the composition of Armes Prydein Vawr, as the re-establishment of viking power at York at the end of 939 might have nurtured hopes for independence from English oppression in both Wales and the ‘Five Boroughs’. Breeze’s argument cannot be taken as evidence that Óláfr’s raid on Leicester took place before 941.111

The sequence of events which I envisage is based on the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In 942 Edmund seized effective control of the ‘Five Boroughs’.112 In the same year (although the exact chronology of events is hard to determine) Óláfr stormed Tamworth. This raid was highly successful. In 943, as D states, Óláfr proceeded to Leicester, and, after his narrow escape from King Edmund, the two parties made peace. This treaty, according to Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I (s.a. 939), and Roger’s Flores Historiarum (s.a. 940), established a boundary between the lands of the two Kings at Watling Street, which would have represented a substantial gain for Óláfr.113 In the same year Óláfr was baptised under Edmund’s patronage, and Rögnvaldr was confirmed.114 This may have been a condition of Óláfr’s treaty with Edmund. However, Óláfr’s and Rögnvaldr’s hold over English territories was soon lost, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records their expulsion in annal 944.115 Northumbria was taken back into Edmund’s control. It may be because of the temporary nature of Óláfr’s success that the A, B, and C texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle do not record his raid on Tamworth. Indeed they rather seem to focus on Edmund’s victories in these years.116 From the aftermath of the Tamworth-Leicester operation until 946, the chronology is rather clearer. Irish chronicle evidence reports that, following the

112 Thorpe, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, i, 208–11 (A–D, s.a. 942); Whitelock, EHD, p. 221.
113 Coxe, Roger de Wendover Chronica, i, 395; Giles, Roger, i, 251; Arnold, Symeonis Monachi Opera, ii, 93; Stevenson, Church Historians, iii, pt 2, p. 68.
114 Thorpe, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, i, 210–11 (A–D, s.a. 943); Whitelock, EHD, p. 221.
115 Both Æthelweard and Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, state that it was the Northumbrians and not Edmund who drove out the two Scandinavian Kings. Æthelweard also credited Wulfstan with facilitating their expulsion. Campbell, Chronicon Æthelwardi, p. 54 (iv.6); Arnold, Symeonis Monachi Opera, ii, 94; Stevenson, Church Historians, iii, pt 2, p. 69.
116 Binns, in Small, Fourth Viking Congress, pp. 185–86.
expulsion of the viking Kings from York, Óláfr returned to Dublin in 945;\footnote{AU, pp. 392–93 (s.a. 944 [= 945]); AClon, p. 154 (s.a. 937 [= 945]).} and in the same year another (but unnamed) viking ruler died at York.\footnote{AU, pp. 392–93 (s.a. 944 [= 945]); AClon, p. 154 (s.a. 937 [= 945]).} This was presumably Rögnvaldr Guðrødsson, who may have died while trying to regain power. He is not mentioned again in the chronicle records of Ireland or Britain.

In 945, Edmund raided Strathclyde. The event is mentioned briefly in Welsh chronicles.\footnote{Annales Cambria, ed. J. Williams (Ab Ithel), Rolls Series (1860), p. 18 (s.a. 946 [= 945]); Brut y Tywysogion, Peniarth MS [Version], ed. and trans. T. Jones, 2nd edn (Cardiff, 1973), pp. 12–13 (s.a. 945).} The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reports that the territory was then granted to Mael Coluim I, King of Alba, in recognition of his submission to Edmund.\footnote{Thorpe, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, i, 212–13 (A–F, s.a. 945); Whitelock, EHD, p. 222.} This sequence of events might have been, as Alfred Smyth has suggested, an attempt to prevent an attack on Northumbria by vikings from Ireland, using the Forth-Clyde route across Britain.\footnote{Ibid.} Smyth has also argued that the treaty with King Mael Coluim was intended to break any residual friendship between Dublin and Alba which may have persisted after Brunanburh.\footnote{Ibid., p. 211; AFM, ii, 642 (s.a. 939 [= 941]).}

Unfortunately for Edmund, he did not live long to enjoy his succession of victories. He was stabbed to death in May 946 by one Leofa, and the King’s brother, Eadred, came to the throne.\footnote{D. Ó Corráin, ‘Muirchertach Mac Lochlainn and the Circuit of Ireland’, in Seanchas: Studies in Early and Medieval Irish Archaeology, History and Literature in Honour of Francis J. Byrne, ed. A. P. Smyth (Dublin, 2000), p. 243.}

One final issue, which has not yet been resolved in this consideration of events from 937 to 946, is the identity of a certain King Sigtryggr. He is mentioned on a single coin of York but not known in English historical record. Blunt, Lyon, and Stewart linked this coin stylistically to those produced for Óláfr Sigtryggsson and Rögnvaldr Guðrødsson before 944. The implication is that Sigtryggr ruled jointly with Óláfr before Rögnvaldr’s appearance in the historical and numismatic record around 943.\footnote{Ibid., p. 242; Smyth, Scandinavian York, ii, 124.}

The same authors suggested that Sigtryggr may be identified with the King of that name mentioned in the Annals of the Four Masters for the year 941.\footnote{Ibid., p. 242; Smyth, Scandinavian York, ii, 124.} Since their publication, some doubt has been cast upon the reliability of that specific chronicle entry by Donnchadh Ó Corráin. Ó Corráin has argued that the report of King Sigtryggr’s seizure by Muirchertach mac Néill in 941 is based on a twelfth-century poem, whose details were incorporated into the Annals of the Four Masters. He has argued that this evidence ‘has no independent value’.\footnote{Ibid., p. 242; Smyth, Scandinavian York, ii, 124.} On this argument, the Sigtryggr mentioned in the Annals of the Four Masters is a poetic invention rather than a historical King.\footnote{Ibid., p. 242; Smyth, Scandinavian York, ii, 124.}
The Irish chronicle record does present us with another possibility. There is a Sigtryggr son of Óláfr, recorded as ‘king of the Foreigners’, who plundered the church of Kells in 969.\(^{128}\) He can possibly be linked to Sigtryggr ‘Cam’, who is recorded as raiding the Irish coast seven years earlier.\(^{129}\) This association is suggested by a reference in the Annals of Ulster to Cammán son of Óláfr son of Guðrøðr, for the year 960.\(^{130}\) Cammán can be taken as a diminutive of the epithet ‘Cam’ (‘the crooked’), and we may be dealing with the same person.\(^{131}\) Cammán was a son of that Óláfr who ruled York 939/40–41 and the nephew of that Rögnvaldr who ruled at York in 943×944. These three names (Sigtryggr Óláfsson, Sigtryggr ‘Cam’, and Cammán Óláfsson) are otherwise unattested in the chronicle record. It is of course, tempting to link them all and posit a connection with York. This would solve several problems; however it can be no more than a tentative suggestion in the absence of more convincing evidence.

The decade after Brunanburh saw the return of viking kings to Northumbria after a gap of more than ten years. In the political struggles which ensued, the chronology is sometimes unclear. Indeed, Murray Beaven called ‘the period 939 to 946, one of the obscurest in our national annals’.\(^{132}\) For this period I have already sought to defend the chronology presented to us by the D-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. I have suggested that it is more reliable than section six of Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, for the years under discussion. In particular, D’s evidence for the date of Óláfr’s activities at Tamworth and Leicester should be seriously considered. Earlier I also argued against the theory put forward by Alex Woolf regarding Eirikr’s first reign. Like other commentators, I have had difficulty trying to fit the Life of St Cathroe with the record for these years. If the reference to Eirikr is authentic, he may have ruled Northumbria briefly in 946, but his power must have been lost before the Northumbrian nobility submitted to King Eadred at Tanshelf in 947.

**Chronology AD 947–54**

I shall now go on to discuss the years from the submission at Tanshelf to the end of viking rule in Northumbria. Peter Sawyer argued in 1995 for a fundamental revision of the received dating of the Kings of York in these years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received dating(^ {133})</th>
<th>Sawyer’s dating(^ {134})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eadred 946–47/48</td>
<td>Eadred 946–47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eirikr 947/48–48</td>
<td>Óláfr Sigtryggsson 947–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óláfr Sigtryggsson 949/50–52</td>
<td>Eirikr 950–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eirikr 952–54</td>
<td>Eadred 952–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadred 954–55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{128}\) AFM, II, 692–93 (s.a. 967 [= 969]).

\(^{129}\) AFM, II, 682–83 (s.a. 960 [= 962]).

\(^{130}\) AU, pp. 402–03 (s.a. 959 [= 960]).


\(^{132}\) Beaven, EHR, xxxiii, 1.

\(^{133}\) Rollason et al., Sources, pp. 68–69; Sawyer, NH, xxxi, 39.

\(^{134}\) Sawyer, NH, xxxi, 40–42; Woolf, NH, xxxiv, 189.
Sawyer hypothesised that Eirikr ruled Northumbria from 950 to 952, and not on any other occasion. This differed from the received opinion, which had assigned Eirikr two periods of rule, in 948 and 952–54. Sawyer’s argument was partly based on royal diplomas which showed that Eirikr’s ally, Archbishop Wulfstan, was not present at the English Court from 950 to 952. Sawyer suggested that this was because Eirikr was ruling Northumbria at that time. Sawyer also suggested that the northern information found in versions D and E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle had been misdated. He re-dated the relevant entries as follows:

- ASC (D) 948 = 950 (plus two years: date of event in Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section 6)
- ASC (E) 948 = 946 (minus two years: correct date of event in versions A–D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle)
- ASC (E) 949 = 947 (minus two years)
- ASC (E) 952 = 950 (minus two years)
- ASC (D) 952 = 950 (minus two years)
- ASC (E) 954 = 952 (minus two years)
- ASC (D) 954 = 952 (minus two years)

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s annal 948 (D) he re-dated to 950. That is the date given for corresponding material in Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section six. The other northern entries of D and E from 949 to 954 he deemed to be two years too late. This he supported with the fact that there is a misdated annal 948 in the E-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which should read 946. By moving D’s and E’s dates 949-54 back two years, he made them fit the evidence of Wulfstan’s absence from the English Court. There are also enough blank annals in D and E at this point to accommodate such changes. The rest of Sawyer’s dating, tabulated above, results from these adjustments.

Sawyer’s case is admirable, but some of the reasons for this revision are debatable. I suggest that the received chronology should be partly or completely reinstated. First, I shall deal with the chronicle evidence. Appendix 2 shows the evidence of versions D and E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the critical years from 948 to 954. The D-text’s annal 948 was re-dated by Sawyer to fit the record of Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section six. I have already presented some arguments about the relative merits of the chronologies of these two texts. I have generally favoured the dating given in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Historia Regum Anglorum, Part I, section six, has chronological problems for the years currently under discussion. The entries immediately before and after 950 in that text appear to be dated too late. The death of Edmund I (946) is recorded in annal 948, along with events of 947, while the death of King Hywel Dda (950) is recorded under the year 951. It is the dates of Historia Regum Anglorum which are in need of revision here, and not necessarily those of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle D-text. The
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The dates provided by the *Historia* cannot be trusted. D may therefore be correct in stating that Eirikr first lost the kingship of York in 948.

The next issue is the dates given in version E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the reign of Óláfr Sigtryggsson. E indicates that he ruled from 949 to 952. Sawyer has moved the dates back two years to suggest that Óláfr’s reign extended from 947 to 950. This alteration was based on an error in version E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for the year 948, which records the death of King Edmund and a raid on Northumbria by King Eadred. Both of these events in fact happened in 946.\(^{138}\) E is clearly in error at this point. A possible reason for the displacement of this information is that a second attack on Northumbria by Eadred took place in 948.\(^{139}\) Perhaps the compiler of the E-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (or, more probably, an antecedent redactor) considered the records of two raids to be duplication. Whether deliberately or not, the record of 946 seems to have been projected forward two years to replace the record of the second raid, which took place in 948. However, this error did not affect subsequent entries; the chronology of the following events in E is correct.

This argument is strengthened by evidence from Irish chronicles. They can tell us when Uí Ímair rulers were in Ireland. Sometimes these Kings’ departure for Northumbria is explicitly stated. Sometimes their absence can be inferred from their non-appearance in the Irish chronicle record (although this is inevitably a less reliable method). The number of Irish chronicles recording information from the central Middle Ages (for the years 947 to 954 there are eight chronicles)\(^{140}\) and the number of separate events recorded in each annal facilitate the provision of correct dates through multiple cross-referencing.\(^{141}\) For these reasons, the Irish chronicles provide a useful yardstick for Northumbrian chronology in these years.

Óláfr Sigtryggsson is not recorded on campaign in Ireland from 948 to 953. His absence from the Irish record in these years fits Sawyer’s view that Óláfr ruled York from (late) 947 to 950. It can also, as Sawyer noted, match the received chronology for his reign (from 949 to 952) taken from version E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.\(^{142}\) Nevertheless, a challenge is posed to Sawyer’s chronology by an entry in the Annals of Clonmacnoise for the year 951 (recorded as 946: the chronicle is five years out of synchrony at this point). It states that Óláfr (Sigtryggsson) was King of York for another year (‘Awley was king of Yorck for a year after’).\(^{143}\) This would bring the end of Óláfr’s reign to the year 952, in line with the received dating.

This raises the question of the reliability of the Annals of Clonmacnoise. It is a translation into English made by Conell Mageoghagan in 1627.\(^{144}\) The exemplar was an ‘oulde Booke’ (perhaps of the fifteenth century) and severely damaged. It
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should be noted that most of the Irish chronicles are preserved in late-sixteenth- or early-seventeenth-century copies.\textsuperscript{145} Some material which can be distinguished by style and context was inserted by the translator into the early sections of this chronicle. The text also suffers from some great chronological blunders.\textsuperscript{146} However, in defence of the Annals of Clonmacnoise, one can say that its contents are for the most part correctly ordered, although the dating of each year's account needs to be checked against other chronicles. All other events in its annal 946 can be securely dated to 951 by reference to other chronicles.\textsuperscript{147} The evidence therefore seems worth considering.

One comment which may be made about the record of Ólavr in the Annals of Clonmacnoise is that it is an odd statement. ‘Awley was king of Yorck for a year after’ is a retrospective record. It could be a late addition to the Annals of Clonmacnoise. Alternatively, it may imply that Ólavr went back to Ireland for a short time about 951, before returning to his kingdom of Northumbria. Such a trip could have been in response to the political crisis among Úi Ímair from 950 to 951, which led to a short interregnum at Dublin. In 950, Guðrðr Sigtryggsson, brother of Ólavr and King of Dublin, had been defeated in battle, at Muine Brócain in Mide, by the over-king of Mide, Congalach mac Maelmíthig. At least two thousand on the Dublin side are said to have fallen in this encounter, and, even if the number is not credible, it implies a heavy defeat.\textsuperscript{148} Guðrðr fled the scene of battle and seems to have temporarily lost control of Dublin.\textsuperscript{149} He re-took the town in 951 and proceeded to sack the churches of Mide in revenge for his rout in the previous year.\textsuperscript{150} It is in this context that the Annals of Clonmacnoise mention the rule of Ólavr Sigtryggsson at York until 952. It could indicate that Ólavr visited Ireland to secure his personal or familial interests. Furthermore, if we accept the evidence of the Annals of Clonmacnoise, Eirikr must have begun his second reign in 952. The E-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle informs us that Eirikr took power at the moment of Ólavr’s demise.\textsuperscript{151}

The second part of Sawyer’s case was based on the evidence of royal diplomas. Unfortunately, a decline in the number of surviving charters for the relevant years restricts some of the conclusions which may be drawn. We have one charter from 950, five from 951, no reliable ones from 952, three in 953, and none from 954, but there are eight from 955.\textsuperscript{152} As Sawyer has demonstrated, Wulfstan, Archbishop of
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York, witnessed charters regularly until 950, but he did not witness any surviving charters of 951. He appears to have been back at the English Court in 953, as he witnessed a charter of that year. He witnessed charters again in 955. Wulfstan’s presence at the English Court from 947 to 950 and in 953 clashes with the received dating of the reigns of Óláfr Sigtryggsson and Eiríkr at York. As Wulfstan appears to have been a supporter of both these Scandinavian Kings of York, these discrepancies require some explanation.

Wulfstan’s attendance at the English Court in 947 and 948 may be explained if the Archbishop acted in obedience to the English for part of each year, albeit under duress. In 947, Wulfstan was among the Northumbrian counsellors who pledged themselves to Eadred at Tanshelf. Wulfstan however broke his pledge afterwards. When an irate King Eadred brutally ravaged Eiríkr’s kingdom in 948 and threatened to return, the witan of the Northumbrians (probably including Wulfstan) deserted King Eiríkr and paid compensation to Eadred. It is therefore possible to envisage Wulfstan’s presence at the English Court in 947 and 948, except, however, for the time after he broke his oath to Eadred and before Eadred plundered the kingdom. According to Simon Keynes, ‘Wulfstan was apparently absent from meetings of King Eadred’s counsellors for what may have been an extended period in 947–8’. This is also the time when Eiríkr is likely to have ruled, perhaps for a second time, at York.

In the following year, 949, Wulfstan witnessed more royal charters. His name also appears on a charter of 950, but the witness-list of this document may not be authentic. According to the received chronology, Óláfr Sigtryggsson was King at York 949/50–952. Sawyer has seen no conflict in Wulfstan’s attendance at the English Court during Óláfr’s reign. He argued that ‘Wulfstan had similarly attended Edmund’s Court during Óláfr Sigtryggsson’s first reign in York’. It is possible, as Sawyer has suggested, that Óláfr and Eadred had reached a modus vivendi, which made Óláfr more acceptable to Eadred as a King of Northumbria than was Eiríkr. During Óláfr’s reign, Wulfstan may have been acting as an ambassador for Northumbrian affairs at Eadred’s Court. Nevertheless, we may perceive in Óláfr Sigtryggsson’s reign growing mistrust between the English King and Wulfstan. The exact circumstances are hard to determine: perhaps Wulfstan supported Eiríkr’s claim to the kingdom of York over that of Óláfr. This would
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have threatened political stability in the North. If so, news of Wulfstan's sympathies may have spread in 951, causing him to be away from the English Court in that year. In 952, Óláfr was driven out by Northumbrians in favour of Eiríkr. It was also in 952 that Wulfstan was imprisoned at Iudanbrugh, on Eadred's orders. Historians have tended to link these two events and have perceived Wulfstan as a supporter of Eiríkr's coup, which in turn caused the rift with Eadred.

Under these circumstances, it is hard to account for Wulfstan's presence at the English Court in 953, which is attested by a royal charter for that year. The received dating suggests that Eiríkr was still on the Northumbrian throne at this time. However, Wulfstan may, as on previous occasions, have backed away from supporting Eiríkr, under English royal pressure, and tendered his allegiance once more to Eadred. Alternatively, as Sawyer has suggested, the date in version D of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, placing the end of Eiríkr's reign in 954, may be mistaken; if so, I suggest that it would be one year rather than two years too late. However, as the exact nature of the circumstances is uncertain, perhaps we should hesitate before rejecting the date 954.

In sum, the received dating of the last Northumbrian Kings, from 947 to 952, appears to withstand the challenge posed by Sawyer. However, it remains uncertain whether Eiríkr completed his second reign in 953 or 954. Generally the dates in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle appear to provide a reliable guide to events. The D and E texts' date of 954, therefore, should not be rejected without stronger evidence to contradict it. Apart from this uncertainty, there is another matter bearing on Northumbrian chronology which has not yet been resolved. This is the identification of Eltangerht whose name appears on the obverses of coins minted at York around this time and whose identity is not evident in the historical record. These difficulties serve to highlight both the complexity of the period under discussion and the rather incomplete nature of the textual sources.

The work of Peter Sawyer and Alex Woolf has served to underline some of the ambiguities in Northumbrian chronology in the second quarter of the tenth century. Their arguments favour radical departures from the received scholarship.
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They have drawn attention to a broader range of source material than was used by Murray Beaven and his contemporaries when some of the milestones of Northumbrian history were being marked out early in the last century. Woolf has emphasised the significance of the Life of St Cathroe, and Sawyer has done much to further research into contemporary royal diplomas. Their work therefore has the potential to stimulate further debate in this field. However, in this paper I have focused rather on the sources available to Beaven and his contemporaries, namely the Insular chronicles. For the most part, I have argued in favour of the received chronology of Northumbrian history, but at times I have departed from it (as with Óláfr Cuarán’s raid on Tamworth and Leicester). I conclude that near contemporary Insular chronicles still provide the most reliable guide to the events of these years, even though the chronology in each text needs to be checked against, and used with, the other available evidence.

I provide, in conclusion, a tabular representation of the chronology of events concerning Northumbria from 937 to 954. It is to be kept in mind that the sequence of events within each year is not always certain.

APPENDIX 1

The D-Text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 939–947

(Translation taken directly from English Historical Documents, trans. Whitelock, pp. 220–22. References to dates given in other text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle given in brackets.)

940 D (941 A, 940 B, 940 C)

In this year King Athelstan died on 27 October, 40 years except for one day after King Alfred died; and the atheling Edmund succeeded to the kingdom, and he was then 18 years old. And King Athelstan had reigned for 14 years and 10 weeks.
941 D
In this year the Northumbrians were false to their pledges, and chose Olaf from Ireland as their king.

942 D (942 A–C)
In this year King Edmund, lord of the English, protector of men, the beloved performer of mighty deeds, overran Mercia, as bounded by Dore, Whitwell gate, and the broad stream, the River Humber; and five boroughs, Leicester and Lincoln, Nottingham and likewise Stamford, and also Derby. The Danes were previously subjected by force under the Norsemen, for a long time in bonds of captivity to the heathens, until the defender of warriors, the son of Edward, King Edmund, redeemed them, to his glory.

943 D
In this year Olaf took Tamworth by storm, and the losses were heavy on both sides, and the Danes were victorious and took away much booty with them, Wulfrun was taken captive in that raid.

In this year King Edmund besieged King Olaf and Archbishop Wulfstan in Leicester, and he could have subdued them if they had not escaped by night from the borough. And after that Olaf secured King Edmund’s friendship and (942 A, 943 B, 943 C) King Edmund stood sponsor to King Olaf at baptism, and the same year, after a fairly big interval, he stood sponsor to King Ragnald at his confirmation.

944 D (944 A–C and E–F)
In this year King Edmund reduced all Northumbria under his rule, and drove out two kings, Olaf, Sihtric’s son, and Ragnald, Guthfrith’s son.

945 D (945 A–C and E–F)
In this year King Edmund ravaged all Cumberland, and granted it all to Malcolm, king of the Scots, on condition that he should be his ally both on sea and on land.

946 D (946 A–C, 948 E)
In this year King Edmund died on St Augustine’s day. It was widely known how he ended his life, that Leofa stabbed him at Pucklechurch. And Æthelflæd of Damerham, Ealdorman Ælfgar’s daughter, was then his queen. And he had held the kingdom six years and a half years. And then atheling Eadred, his brother, succeeded to the kingdom and reduced all Northumbria under his rule. And the Scots gave oaths to him that they would agree to all he wanted.

947 D
In this year King Eadred came to Tanshelf, and there Archbishop Wulfstan and all the councillors of the Northumbrians pledged themselves to the king, and within a short space they were false to it all, both pledge and oaths as well.

APPENDIX 2

Entries from the D and E texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 948–954

(Translation taken directly from English Historical Documents, trans. Whitelock, pp. 222–23)
948 D
In this year King Eadred ravaged all Northumbria, because they had accepted Eric as their king; and in that ravaging the glorious minister at Ripon, which St Wilfrid had built, was burnt down. And when the king was on his way home, the army [which] was in York overtook the king's army at Castleford, and they made a great slaughter there. Then the king became so angry that he wished to march back into the land and destroy it utterly. When the councillors of the Northumbrians understood that, they deserted Eric and paid to King Eadred compensation for their act.

949 E
In this year Olaf Cwiran came into Northumbria.

952 D
In this year King Eadred ordered Archbishop Wulfstan to be taken into the fortress of Iudanbyrig, because accusations had often been made to the king against him. And in this year also the king ordered a great slaughter to be made in the borough of Thetford in vengeance for the abbot Eadhelm, whom they had slain.

952 E
In this year the Northumbrians drove out King Olaf, and received Eric, Harald's son.

954 D
In this year the Northumbrians drove out Eric and Eadred succeeded to the kingdom of the Northumbrians. In this year Archbishop Wulfstan received a bishopric again in Dorchester.

954 E
In this year the Northumbrians drove out Eric and Eadred succeeded to the kingdom of the Northumbrians.