

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Volume 100

Summer, 2003

Number 3

## The Legend of Havelok the Dane and the Historiography of East Anglia

*by Scott Kleinman*

### THE STORY AND ITS SOURCES

THE story of Havelok the Dane appears to have been well known in eastern England from the twelfth century to the end of the Middle Ages. The earliest Anglo-Norman version occurs in Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis*.<sup>1</sup> The plot can be summarized as follows:

During the reign of Arthur's nephew Constantine, the Danish king Adelbriht, who has conquered Norfolk and the land from Colchester to Holland in Lincolnshire, marries Orwain, the sister of King Edelsi, a Briton, who rules Lincoln and Lindsey and the land from Humber to Rutland. Their daughter Argentille becomes the ward of her uncle after the death of her parents, and Edelsi marries her off to a scullion called Cuaran in an attempt to disinherit her. This Cuaran turns out to be Haveloc, the son of Gunter, the hereditary king of Denmark who was slain by King Arthur for withholding tribute. Haveloc discovers his lineage, returns to Denmark, and takes back the throne from one Odulf, who has occupied it illegitimately. He then invades England and forces Edelsi to surrender Argentille's heritage. When Edelsi dies soon afterwards, Haveloc and Argentille rule his kingdom for twenty years.

<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey Gaimar, *L'Estoire des Engleis*, ed. Alexander Bell, Anglo-Norman Text Society 14-16 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960), ll. 1-816. Translations from this and other non-English texts are my own.

The story is best known today from the fourteenth-century Middle English poem *Havelok the Dane*.<sup>2</sup> The poem differs from Gaimar's account in the names of its characters and many details of plot, as the following summary shows:

King Athelwold of England dies, leaving his daughter Goldeburgh in the hands of Earl Godrich of Cornwall. Meanwhile, King Birkabeyn of Denmark dies, leaving Havelok in the hands of his seneschal Godard, who orders the fisherman Grim to kill the young prince. Instead, Grim sails to England and raises Havelok in Grimsby. Havelok eventually takes a job in the kitchens at Lincoln Castle, where Godrich, thinking Havelok is a commoner, marries him to Goldeburgh in order to disinherit her. When Havelok's royal heritage is revealed, he goes to Denmark, defeats Godard, and then returns to England and defeats Godrich to become king in both countries.

There are also a number of shorter versions of the story or references to Havelok in a variety of sources, which will be surveyed below. It was once thought that some or all the extant texts derived from a common source, probably an earlier poem in Anglo-Norman French, but this view has been convincingly disproved by Alexander Bell.<sup>3</sup> Today these variations are usually treated as corruptions or confusions of accounts similar to one of the two main versions or as variants that developed in folk tradition. It is also generally assumed that the Havelok legend has its origins in historical events before the Norman Conquest, but that it has been so modified by centuries of retelling that only a few details of the original story remain in the extant versions. The strongest evidence for a pre-Conquest origin to the story is the name *Havelok* itself, along with the nickname *Cuaran* used by Gaimar. This nickname was also applied to the tenth-century Norse king Ólafr Sigtryggson, and since Ólafr is frequently rendered *Abloyc* in Welsh sources, many have concluded that the Havelok story ultimately goes back to a tale about Ólafr Sigtryggson that passed at some point through a Celtic-speaking area of Britain, probably Cumbria. That said, there is little other resemblance between the life of the historical Ólafr and the legendary Havelok, so the story as we have it is clearly a great deal removed from any historical account of the Norse king.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Havelok the Dane*, ed. G. V. Smithers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

<sup>3</sup> *Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode*, ed. Alexander Bell, Publications of the University of Manchester, French Series 4 (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1925), 29–79. For the belief that there was a common French original for all known versions, see the critique by E. K. Putnam, "The Lambeth Version of Havelok," *PMLA* 15 (1900): 1–19.

<sup>4</sup> For the relationship between the names of Havelok and Ólafr Sigtryggson, see Smith-

Some commentators have attempted to connect other characters in the story with historical figures and the plot with various historical scenarios before the Norman Conquest. The most recent and elaborate of such theories is by Max Deutschbein, who sees Ólafr Sigtryggson as the focal point for stories about several historical scenarios having to do with Scandinavian activity in England and concludes that this was a story about the struggles between the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavians for control of the north of England and Mercia.<sup>5</sup> However, such attempts to trace the extant versions of the story back to historical episodes have met with some skepticism. This is in part because no scenario has emerged as more convincing than the others, and in part because the names of the characters in the story are not always related to the historical figures with whom they have been connected. Hence, when Kenneth Sisam considered the various theories of Deutschbein and others in his revision of W. W. Skeat's edition of *Havelok the Dane*, he concluded that "if these divergent views point to any result, it is that the *Havelok* story corresponds to no history at all. Popular romances must not be taken too seriously, even when they contain historical names."<sup>6</sup>

Sisam's comment recognizes the prevalent assumption today that *Havelok the Dane* is more popular romance than history.<sup>7</sup> This perspective is heavily influenced by comments by Robert Mannyng in the 1330s.

---

ers, *Havelok*, lv. There is extensive discussion of Ólafr Sigtryggson's history in Alfred P. Smyth, *Scandinavian York and Dublin*, 2 vols. (Dublin: Templekieran Press, 1979), vol. 2, ch. 6. It seems unlikely that Gaimar associated the name *Haveloc* with Ólafr Sigtryggson since he does not mention Haveloc when he encounters Anlaf Cwiran in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It is true that in connection with the Danish invasions of the 870s he mentions a "geune Sidroc / qui fud le parent Haveloc" (ll. 2981–82), but the reference is to Earl Sidroc (Sigtryggr) the Young, who died in battle in 871, not to the father of Ólafr Sigtryggson. On the possible reasons for Gaimar's mention of Haveloc here, see Bell, *L'Estoire*, n. to l. 2982: "Whether, as Gross suggests, Gaimar, in need of a rime to *Sidroc* (line 2981), recalled the name of the Danish king whose story he had told at length much earlier or whether the name refers to some other person is an unsolved puzzle."

<sup>5</sup>Max Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte Englands* (Cöthen: O. Schulze, 1906). For earlier discussions, see *The Ancient English Romance of Havelok the Dane*, ed. Frederick Madden for the Roxburghe Club (London, 1828) and Harald E. Heyman, *Studies on the Havelok-Tale* (Upsala: Wretmans Tryckeri, 1903). A more recent discussion by Hans Matter in *Englische Gründungssagen von Geoffrey of Monmouth bis zur Renaissance*, *Anglistische Forschungen* 58 (1922): v–685 (at 241–80), has little to add.

<sup>6</sup>*The Lay of Havelok*, ed. W. W. Skeat, 2d ed., rev. Kenneth Sisam (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915; reprint with corrections, 1956), xxvi. Smithers provides little discussion of the issue in his more recent edition.

<sup>7</sup>Recently, Nancy Mason Bradbury has argued influentially that the story itself has its origins in oral tradition. See Bradbury, "The Traditional Origins of *Havelok the Dane*," *Studies in Philology* 90 (1993): 115–42.

Coming across a reference to Havelok in his source, Langtoft's *Chronicle*, he remarks:

Bot I haf grete ferly þat I fynd no man  
 þat has writen in story how Hauelok þis lond wan  
 . . . . .  
 Bot þat þise lowed men vpon English tellis,  
 right story can me not ken, þe certeynte what spellis.  
 Men sais in Lyncoln castelle ligges ʒit a stone  
 þat Hauelok kast wele forbi euerilkone,  
 & ʒit þe chapelle standes þer he weddid his wife,  
 Goldeburgh þe kynges douhter, þat saw is ʒit rife,  
 & of Gryme, a fisshere, men redes ʒit in ryme  
 þat he bigged Grymesby, Gryme þat ilk tyme.  
 (2.519–20, 527–34)<sup>8</sup>

Mannyng's implication that Havelok was well known through local landmarks and the tales of "lowed men" has encouraged the view that Havelok's "right story" had already been so modified through oral transmission and folk tradition as to now be untraceable.<sup>9</sup> The view that *Havelok the Dane* was a popular tale has also prompted critics to resist the presence of topical references from the reigns of Edward I and Edward II in the story. Thus Thorlac Turville-Petre dismisses the possibility that some names in the English poem contain topical references from the reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Instead, he suggests that the names and titles that may appear topical are merely intended to sound old and authentic. He points out that they are "familiar in English history and reasonably ancient," so that they "help to build up an impression of an England of geographical range and familiar institutions."<sup>10</sup> So, too, Ananya J. Kabir has argued recently that the poet takes pains to ground his authority in popular tradition by "forging" an oral style that is intended to go undetected.<sup>11</sup> Hence, as Caroline D. Eckhardt

<sup>8</sup> Robert Mannyng of Brunne, *The Chronicle*, ed. Idelle Sullens (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> It is unclear whether the "ryme" Mannyng refers to in l. 533 is a poem that originally existed in writing, as the word "redes" may imply. Likewise, it is possible that he is referring to a story that existed independently of the story of Havelok and Goldeburgh, although Mannyng is clearly aware of a connection between the two.

<sup>10</sup> Thorlac Turville-Petre, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 149; see also the discussion on 151–55. For suggested references to post-Conquest history, see Smithers, *Havelok*, nn. to ll. 178, 1179–80, and 2608.

<sup>11</sup> For the argument that the "oral style" of *Havelok the Dane* is itself fabricated, see

puts it, "It is possible that the tale's resemblance to historical events is fortuitous or retrospectively fabricated."<sup>12</sup>

My purpose here is to examine the nature of such fabrication by suggesting that many of the names associated with the Havelok legend in its various forms do in fact suggest if not a historical origin, then a historiographical one. I will trace the names of some of the characters in historiographical traditions about East Anglia and examine the context in which they appeared in Gaimar's version of the Havelok tale. Next, I will examine the historiographical roots for the name changes that are found in *Havelok the Dane* and suggest that they imply a literary context for the transformation of the tale over time. I will argue that the names of the characters in the various versions of the tale, both early and late, are the result neither of a corrupted popular version of forgotten history nor of a crafted illusion of history by later poets. Rather, they grew out of the chronicle tradition of the twelfth through fourteenth centuries in which writers were engaged in a process of East Anglian history-building, a learned and literate enterprise that attempted to establish an identity for the region. In short, at least certain aspects of the legend that has come down to us have as much to do with historiography as with popular romance.<sup>13</sup>

In exploring these issues, I will avoid making some of the assumptions that have characterized past treatments of the legend. Following Bell, I do not assume that the extant versions derive from a lost poem in Anglo-Norman French, nor do I assume that the later versions of the story derive from the Middle English poem.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, unless otherwise stated, I do not treat any of the extant versions of the story as indebted to any other one since the same or similar names and motifs may appear in multiple texts without direct borrowing from one to the other. Rather, I see all the extant versions as participants in a textual community—a body of historiographical materials, many of which were in written

Ananya J. Kabir, "Forging an Oral Style? *Havelok* and the Fiction of Orality," *Studies in Philology* 98 (2001): 18–48.

<sup>12</sup> Caroline D. Eckhardt, "Havelok the Dane in *Castleford's Chronicle*," *Studies in Philology* 98 (2001): 7.

<sup>13</sup> In this I agree with Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, 152–53, who sees the tale as an Anglo-Danish attempt to counter anti-Danish sentiment in the chronicles of the Middle Ages. However, I derive the influence of historiography on retellers of the Havelok legend through the choice of character names from a stock of names that were associated with a newly constructed or developing regional history.

<sup>14</sup> For discussion of Smithers's treatment of Rauf de Bohun's *Petit Bruit* as a derivative of *Havelok the Dane*, see Eckhardt, "Havelok the Dane in *Castleford's Chronicle*," 15 n. 29.

form—in which the Havelok story circulated. This view does not imply that the Havelok story was limited solely to this community or that it entered this community with all its major elements already present; nor does it imply that the story never circulated orally, either within the community or without. The written versions that have come down to us are simply evidence that elements in the tale were exposed to, examined by, and sometimes reproduced or modified by those whose concerns were with the writing of history.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to survey briefly the extant versions of the story.<sup>15</sup> Sometime between 1190 and 1220, Gaimar's version was transformed into a courtly poem known as the *Lai d'Haveloc*, and accounts similar to Gaimar's are also to be found in a Latin chronicle of around 1300 as well as the so-called Lambeth Interpolation in one copy of Robert Mannyng's *Chronicle*.<sup>16</sup> A short summary in the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, written between 1272 and 1300, is also similar to Gaimar's version of the story, but the names *Argentille* and *Gunter* are replaced in some manuscripts with *Goldeburgh* and *Birkebayn*.<sup>17</sup> Further variations occur in shorter forms in the fourteenth century. Mannyng's text is primarily a translation of *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, written about 1307, which equates Havelok's father *Gunter* with Guthrum, the Danish king of East Anglia.<sup>18</sup> However, Mannyng's comments suggest that he knows the tale in a form much like the Middle English *Havelok the Dane*. There are also two closely related summaries of the legend preserved in Rauf de Bohun's *Petit Bruit*, written about 1310, and Henry Knighton's *Chronicle*, written in the late fourteenth century; these also

<sup>15</sup> Smithers, *Havelok*, xvi–lvi, provides extensive discussion of the different versions written up to about 1310.

<sup>16</sup> The *Lai d'Haveloc* is edited in Bell, *Lai d'Haveloc*. Bell surveys earlier discussion on the relationship between the two texts and concludes that the *Lai* derives ultimately from Gaimar. I assume that the *Lai* is a courtly transformation of Gaimar's account in which all details relevant to my discussion are essentially the same. For the Latin chronicle in MS Cotton Domitian ii, see Smithers, *Havelok*, xxii–xxvii. The Lambeth Interpolation occurs in a fifteenth-century manuscript based on a revision of Mannyng's text by someone in the Southwest Midlands sometime earlier; see Mannyng, *The Chronicle*, ed. Sullens, pp. 45–51. The Interpolation is printed by Sullens beside ll. 519–38 of Mannyng's text.

<sup>17</sup> There is no published edition of the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, but the slightly later Middle English translation, which follows the original closely, has been published as *The Brut, or the Chronicle of England*, ed. F. Brie, EETS o.s. 131 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1906), names in ll. 22–23. The section of the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* relating to Havelok is printed by Smithers, albeit from a later manuscript, MS Rawlinson D.329, which corrects errors in the earlier manuscripts. For discussion of the manuscript variations, see Smithers, *Havelok*, xxiv–xxvi.

<sup>18</sup> *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, ed. Thomas Wright, 2 vols., Rolls Series 47 (London, 1887; reprint, Kraus, 1964), 1:249.

bear some resemblances to the Middle English poem, particularly in the choice of names.<sup>19</sup> The name *Havelok*—from a French source, judging by the spellings (*Haueloc*, *Auelot*)—has also been inserted in accounts of major Danish incursions in manuscripts of the *Anonymous Short Metrical Chronicle* dating to around the first quarter of the fourteenth century.<sup>20</sup> Finally, Eckhardt has recently identified a passage in *Castleford's Chronicle*, written around 1330, that appears to preserve features of the Havelok story, especially the name *Birkebane*.<sup>21</sup>

THE NAMES IN GAIMAR'S *ESTOIRE DES ENGLEIS*

It is normally assumed that Gaimar encountered the Havelok story after he moved from Hampshire to Lincolnshire and then inserted it retrospectively at the beginning of his *Estoire*.<sup>22</sup> But although Gaimar cites *la veire estoire* (ironically echoed in Mannyng's "right story") as his authority for Haveloc's coronation feast (ll. 755–56), it should be not be assumed that he was working with a single source containing the complete plot line. His version has clearly been modified extensively under the influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia*, and, because this text had only recently become available, these modifications are almost certainly Gaimar's. When introducing Adelbriht and Edelsi, Gaimar states:

Se ço est veir que Gilde dit  
En la geste trovai escrit  
Que dous reis ot ja en Bretaine,  
Quant Costentins ert chevetaine.  
(39–42)

[If that which Gildas says is true, I have found written in the history that there were two kings in Britain when Constantine was chieftain.]

The first line is immensely problematic since Gaimar does not actually use Gildas, about whom he seems to have some skepticism. Indeed, if

<sup>19</sup> See Rauf de Bohun, *Le Petit Bruit*, ed. Diana B. Tyson, Plain Texts Series 4 (London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 1987), and *The Chronicle of Henry Knighton*, in *Chronicon Henrici Knighton vel Cnihtthon Monachi Leycestrencis*, ed. Joseph Rawson Lumby, 2 vols., Rolls Series 92 (London: Public Record Office, 1889 and 1885), 1:18–19, 27.

<sup>20</sup> *An Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle*, ed. Ewald Zettl, EETS o.s. 196 (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), ll. 430, 729.

<sup>21</sup> *Castleford's Chronicle or the Boke of Brut*, ed. Caroline D. Eckhardt, EETS o.s. 305–6, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), ll. 28608–33. See also Eckhardt, "Havelok the Dane in *Castleford's Chronicle*," 1–17.

<sup>22</sup> See Bell, *Lai d'Haveloc*, 18–19, 71.

the characters in the story derive in any way from historical figures later than the sixth century, they could not have come from Gildas at all.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, Gaimar does specify that his two kings are found in writing, whatever the precise source. By contrast, Gaimar locates the source of his information on Argentille's upbringing in the stories of his older contemporaries:

E Argentille fud nurrie  
A Nincole e a Lindesie.  
Si cum dient l'antive gent,  
Ele n'ot nul chevel parent  
De part sun pere des Daneis.  
(91–95)

[And Argentille was raised at Lincoln and at Lindsey. And as the ancient folk say, she had no noble kin on her father's side amongst the Danes.]<sup>24</sup>

Here Gaimar's source appears to be oral, suggesting that in all likelihood he created his Havelok episode by combining both oral and written traditions, probably drawing Argentille from the former and Adelbriht and Edelsi from the latter.<sup>25</sup> Bell wonders whether a difference in spelling is evidence for a third source later in the *Estoire*, when the Danes invading during the reign of the West Saxon king Beorhtric (786–802) cite *Ailbrith* and *Haveloc* as precedents for their rule in Britain.<sup>26</sup> Thus the general impression conveyed by this evidence is that Gaimar's form of the Havelok story is pieced together from different materials that were not necessarily originally related.

Gaimar's source for the name *Adelbriht* is difficult to trace. The name comes from Old English *Æthelberht*, but the frequency with which this (and other character names in the legend) occurs in early England makes it nearly impossible to identify Adelbriht with any historical figure with much certainty. Even if we restrict our search to historical

<sup>23</sup> On the textual problems and the use of the first person singular *trovai*, see Bell, *Estoire des Engleis*, n. to ll. 39–40.

<sup>24</sup> *L'antive gent* may also be translated as "the ancient people," but it is translated "old folks" in the Rolls Series edition of Gaimar; see *L'Estoire des Engleis Solum la Translacion Maistre Geffrei Gaimar*, ed. Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy and Charles Trice Martin, 2 vols., Rolls Series 91 (London, 1888; reprint, Kraus, 1966), 1:95. This interpretation is also used by Bradbury, "Traditional Origins," 124.

<sup>25</sup> Bell, *Lai d'Haveloc*, 60–71, comes to the same conclusion, but largely on the basis of analogy with interpolations elsewhere in the *Estoire*.

<sup>26</sup> Whether or not *Ailbrith* comes from another source, it seems clear that Gaimar intends him to be the same as the *Adelbriht* of his earlier Havelok episode. See Bell, *Estoire des Engleis*, n. to l. 2081.



kings, we are still left with a choice of Æthelberhts. The most prominent, for instance, is Æthelberht of Kent, whose reputation for saintliness would certainly justify his use as the basis for a legend. There was also an Æthelberht of East Anglia, who was killed by Offa of Mercia in 794 and who was afterwards venerated in the region.<sup>27</sup> His local significance makes him an obvious candidate for the prototype of Gaimar's Adelbriht of East Anglia. Finally, there is an Æthelberht of Wessex, a brother of King Alfred, who reigned during the Danish invasions of the mid-ninth century. Given the Anglo-Danish context of the story, he too might be a possibility. However, to connect any one of these figures with the character in the Havelok story is to assume that in the course of time his name became independent of his deeds. This assumption is necessary to account for the considerable discrepancies between historical events and the plot of the story, and most of all for King Adelbriht's Danish, rather than English, ethnicity.

The cultural ties between East Anglia and Scandinavia did, however, create a milieu in which such ethnic jumping was possible. Evidence from the historiography both of England and Scandinavia suggests that the tradition of a King Adelbriht developed gradually in chronicles and other historical texts from the eleventh century onwards. The evolution of this King Adelbriht took place against the backdrop of attempts to define the impoverished genealogy of the East Anglian kings, particularly St. Edmund.<sup>28</sup> Traditions about a King Adelbriht who was related to St. Edmund crossed the North Sea and are preserved in the early fourteenth-century *Þáttr af Ragnars sonum*:<sup>29</sup>

Þa varu allir Loðbrokar synir dauðir. Eftir Ivar tok konung dom i Englandi Aðalmundr. Hann var broðor sun Itamundr ens helga ok kristnaði hann við England. Hann tok konungdom sun hans er Adalbrigt het. Hann var goðr konungr ok varð gamall. Ofarliga a hans dogum kom Dana her til Englandz ok varu formen hersins Knutr ok Haralldr synir Gorms konungs. Þeir logðu undir sig mikið ríki i Norðhumru landi þat er Ivar hafði att. Adalbrigt konungr for moti þeim ok borduz þeir fyri nordan Kliflond ok fell þar mart af Donum ok nockyru si þar gengu Danir ypp við Skarða borg ok þeir þa ecki ad ser.

<sup>27</sup> See F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 210.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 236.

<sup>29</sup> See *Ragnarssonar þáttr*, in *Hauksbók*, ed. Eiríkur Jónsson and Finnur Jónsson (Copenhagen, 1892–96), 464–65; *Flateyjarbók*, ed. Guðbrandr Vigfusson, 3 vols. (Christiania, 1860–68), 1:114. The passage was later integrated into *Óláfs saga Tryggvasonar en mesta* from which it was disseminated more widely. The passage and its history are analyzed extensively by Smyth, *Scandinavian York and Dublin*, 1:47–52. For another interpretation of the passage, see Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte*, 94–95.

[Then all the sons of Loðbrok were dead. After Ivarr, Aðalmund succeeded to the kingdom in England. He was the nephew of St. Edmund and he converted England far and wide. His son succeeded to the kingdom, who was called Adalbrigt. He was a good king and grew old. In the latter part of his days a Danish army came to England and the leaders of the army were Cnut and Harald, the sons of King Gorm. They conquered a great kingdom in Northumberland which Ivarr had formerly possessed. King Adalbrigt went to meet them and they fought each other there just north of Cleveland and many of the Danes died there, and sometime later the Danes went up to Scarborough and laid siege there.]

The passage describes how King Adalbrigt, son of Aðalmund, is driven out of Northumbria by an invading Dane called Cnut around the year 900, but no king of that name fits this scenario or date. Smyth identifies *Adalbrigt* with a West Saxon prince, Æthelwold son of King Æthelred and nephew of King Alfred. On the death of his uncle, Æthelwold contested the succession with King Edward and was forced to flee from Wessex. Then, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, he “sought out the raiding-army in Northumbria, and they received him as king and submitted to him.”<sup>30</sup> In 903 the people of Essex submitted to Æthelwold, and in the following year he and the Danish king Eohric of East Anglia were slain in an invasion of Mercia. Æthelwold’s acceptance by the Danes of York and his association with the Danes of East Anglia make him a good candidate for the Adalbrigt of the Scandinavian tradition.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, although the *Páttr af Ragnars sonum* seems to intend Adalbrigt to be English, its statement that his father succeeds the Danish king Ivarr the Boneless portrays his ethnicity in decidedly ambiguous terms.<sup>32</sup> To a later writer like Gaimar, these ambiguities might well have suggested a king who *was* Danish.

However, the name *Adalbrigt* and the East Anglian genealogy applied to the king driven out of Northumbria clearly reflect a tradition that originally circulated independently of the historical figure to whom it refers in the Old Norse *páttr*. The genealogy apparently derives from

<sup>30</sup> MS C, vol. 5 of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, gen. ed. David Dumville and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983–), s.a. 901. The assertion that Æthelwold was accepted as king by the Danes does not occur in MS A; therefore, it either developed outside a West Saxon context, or it developed in the eleventh century.

<sup>31</sup> Æthelwold is described in the *Annals of St. Neots* as *rex Danorum* (s.a. 903) and *rex paganorum* (s.a. 904). See the *Annals of St. Neots*, vol. 17 of *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, gen. ed. Dumville and Lapidge, s.aa. 903, 904.

<sup>32</sup> Whether the characterization of Adalbrigt as a good king who lived to an old age can be connected with the portrayal of Athelwold in *Havelok the Dane* is open to speculation.

an English source similar to the lost *Chronica Regum Angliae* at Bury St. Edmund's which was consulted by Florentius, abbot of Egmond, in the Netherlands in 1296. According to Florentius, that source described St. Adalbert (*Adalbrigt*), son of *Adalmund*, as the brother of St. Edmund of East Anglia (rather than his grand-nephew), who ruled for thirty-seven years before him.<sup>33</sup> Dorothy Whitelock suggests that this Bury St. Edmund's tradition about Adalbert and his father Adalmund arose out of a confusion with the West Saxon King Egberht (802–39) and his father Alcmund. Logically, this confusion would be with Egberht's contemporary Æthelberht of East Anglia, who was slain by Offa.<sup>34</sup> Hence the Adalbrigt in the *Báttr af Ragnars sonum* would appear to go back, at least in name, to Æthelberht of East Anglia. This association of the two names must have grown out of attempts to provide a genealogy for St. Edmund. As early as the middle of the twelfth century, Edmund is recorded as having had a brother called St. *Eduuoldus* (1125–44) or *Edwaldus* (1155–75), who was buried at Cernel.<sup>35</sup> It seems logical to conclude that St. Eduuoldus was conflated with St. Æthelberht and that shortly afterwards the name Æthelberht was confused with that of Egberht.<sup>36</sup>

But the replacement of Egberht's father Alcmund with *Adalmundr* suggests the operation of yet another tradition. The name probably derives from the eleventh-century *Life of St. Botulf*, which mentions that an earlier King Æthelwold of East Anglia (655–64) was a kinsman of one Æthelmund.<sup>37</sup> If, when the fictional "St Eduuoldus" appeared in the twelfth century, he was confused with Æthelwold, then

<sup>33</sup> *Memorials of St. Edmund*, ed. Thomas Arnold, 2 vols. (London, 1890), 1:xviii–xix. See also Dorothy Whitelock, "Fact and Fiction in the Legend of St. Edmund," *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* 31 (1969): 230–31, and "The Pre-Viking Age Church in East Anglia," *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 10–12.

<sup>34</sup> There must have then been a further confusion, so far as Florentius was concerned, between the venerated Æthelberht of East Anglia and the St. Adalbert to whom his abbey was dedicated.

<sup>35</sup> See William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series 52 (London: Longman and Trübner, 1870), 2.84 (p. 185), and *The Peterborough Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*, ed. William Thomas Mellows, trans. Charles Mellows (Peterborough: Peterborough Natural History, Scientific and Archaeological Society, 1941). This is a translation only based on a transcription of the original text by George Davenport in 1652 (MS CUL Dd.14.28.6): the relevant portion reads, "et in Cernelo S: Edwaldus frater S: Edmundi regis" (f. 13r).

<sup>36</sup> The confusion between Egberht and Æthelberht occurs in most manuscripts of Gaimar's *Estoire* (see Bell, *Estoire des Engleis*, l. 2081 and n.) and continues later, as can be seen in the fourteenth-century *Castleford's Chronicle*, where the West Saxon king is called Æthelberht and Egberht is made to be his brother (l. 28528).

<sup>37</sup> Whitelock, "Fact and Fiction," 230.

the name Æthelmund could have easily entered the genealogy from the same source. Hence, in the mid-thirteenth century, the compiler of *John Wallingford's Chronicle* (who uses the *Life of St. Botulf*) points out that he finds not only *Alcmund* but also *Æthelmund* recorded for the father of both Egberht and Edmund.<sup>38</sup> The process effectively collapsed the genealogy by constructing a brother for Edmund who was derived at once from the seventh-century King Æthelwold and the eighth-century Æthelberht. *John Wallingford's Chronicle* shows that the collapsing was even more extensive. It gives as Edmund's predecessor one *Eatheluuold* (Æthelwold), brother of *Aldulf* (the father of St. Ethelburgh), without indicating the time gap of more than two hundred years between them. This Æthelwold is himself a product of further conflation. The historical king Æthelwold was succeeded by Ealdulf (664–713) and Ælfwald (713–49), and it appears that he has simply replaced the latter in this genealogy. Hence there were two very similar traditions existing simultaneously: one naming Edmund's predecessor and brother as either *Adelbert* or *Eduuoldus* and another naming Edmund's predecessor as *Eatheluuold*, brother of *Aldulf*.

It is not possible to say whether the development of one of these fraternal relationships influenced the development of the other, but their appearance in such close proximity in twelfth- and thirteenth-century historiography may have created for later writers an association between the names *Æthelberht* and *Æthelwold* or encouraged their confusion. This may have ultimately contributed to the adoption of the name *Athelwold* for Gaimar's *Adelbriht* in later versions of the Havelok legend. However, it seems unlikely that the name *Athelwold* would filter into popular versions of the tale from such sources, since it was not directly connected with the story of Havelok. Instead, if the appearance of the name *Athelwold* in the Havelok story relates in any way to the presence of the name in historical literature, it must be because writers of the late thirteenth century turned back to earlier written documents and dug it up. Such writers may even have assumed that the two names referred to the same figure, which would help explain the transference of the name *Adelbriht* to the historical Æthelwold of Wessex in the *Báttir af Ragnars sonum*.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *The Chronicle Attributed to John Wallingford*, ed. Richard Vaughan, Camden Miscellany 21 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1958), 23.

<sup>39</sup> In Knighton's *Chronicle* the name *Argentille* is written in the margin across from *Goldeburgh*, suggesting that it was possible for later writers to equate different forms of the character names.

If both the names *Adelbriht* and *Athelwold* entered the Havelok story through these complex developments, the same may be true of other characters. The most likely candidate is Gaimar's Odulf, whose name is similar to that of Aldulf in *John Wallingford's Chronicle*. Deutschbein argues that the name *Odulf* derives from that of Ealdorman Eadulf of Bamborough, and the story from his struggle for control of Northumbria against Ragnall I (919–21), who by the twelfth century was thought to be the son of Guthfrith I (880–95).<sup>40</sup> However, Gaimar's Odulf is Danish, the brother of King Arthur's ally Aschis, whom Gaimar has lifted from Geoffrey of Monmouth.<sup>41</sup> Hence, if Deutschbein's view is to be accepted, we must explain why a historically Anglo-Saxon figure would have become Danish, just as we must for Adelbriht. According to Deutschbein, the historical conflict between Alfred's appointed governor and the son of Guthfrith maps onto Gaimar's conflict between Odulf, brother of Arthur's appointed governor, and the son of Gunter (Haveloc). This necessitates an adjustment in the characters' ethnicities. Alfred, the West Saxon ("English") king, is equated with the British king Arthur. Gaimar preserves the relationship of Eadulf to Arthur by making him the brother of Arthur's vassal Aschis; but since Aschis is king of Denmark in Geoffrey of Monmouth, Odulf is by extension also Danish.

One difficulty with this theory is that the equation of the name *Gunter* with Guthfrith I of Northumbria does not account for the Continental form of the name. Writers such as William of Malmesbury equated Guthfrith I with Guthrum (also called Gurmund) of East Anglia, and Deutschbein suggests that Langtoft's reference to Guthrum as *Gunter*, the father of Haveloc, may derive from this tradition.<sup>42</sup> However, I know of no reference to either Guthfrith or Guthrum as *Gunter* before the fourteenth century. Gaimar certainly drew on Continental sources at the point where he encountered Guthrum in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 879. Here Gaimar introduces material from an unknown source related to, but at some remove from, the French *Gormont et Isembart*:<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte*, 111–15. The tradition, found in writers such as Adam of Bremen and William of Malmesbury, gives Guthfrith I as the head of a dynasty of Scandinavian rulers of York including Ragnall II and Ólafr Sigtryggson, whom Deutschbein considers to be prototypes for Havelok.

<sup>41</sup> Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966), 9.12, 10.6, 10.10, 11.2.

<sup>42</sup> Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte*, 112.

<sup>43</sup> *Gormont et Isembart* contains a character called *Guntier*, a squire to Gormont, which may explain why the *Havelok* poet has demoted King Gunter to an earl who is a mere

Dunc ot des la Nativited  
 Oit cenz anz li siecle durez  
 E dis e nof anz de surplus,  
 Si cum es livres est espuns  
 Dunt li prodom unt la memoire  
 Qui parsivent la dreite istoire,  
 En icel an, ço dit mis mestre,  
 Vint reis Gurmund a Cirecestre.

(3229–35)

[Then eight hundred years since the Nativity had passed, with nineteen years more, as it is stated in the books of which worthy men who seek true history have memory—in this year, so says my master, King Gurmund came to Cirencester.]

Gaimar partially conflates Guthrum (*Gudron*) with Gurmund, a Dane who ravaged Normandy in the 880s, only separating them when he turns back to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 892 to record Guthrum's death.<sup>44</sup> If he was not actively seeking an alternative authority to that of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, he appears to have had one that he respected in the form of the mysterious *mestre*. Gaimar may refer here to a teacher of Continental origin, in which case his source may have been oral—a plausible explanation for why he might have elsewhere encountered the name *Guthfrith* or *Guthrum* in a Continental form.<sup>45</sup> However, although Gaimar may have identified Guthrum with the mythical Gurmund character as he knew him from a Continental source, there remains no evidence that the name *Gunter* was ever used for either the historical Guthrum or the mythical Gurmund.

A second problem with the view that *Gunter* derives from Guthfrith (conflated with Guthrum) is that he appears in Gaimar's *Estoire* as king of Denmark. While it is common for the distinction between "Danish king" or "king of the Danes" and "king of Denmark" to be a fuzzy one, it is a much further step to develop an elaborate subplot set in Denmark. This aspect of the Havelok story is better attributed to the influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth from whom Gaimar combines details of the

vassal of Godrich. See *Gormont et Isembart*, ed. Alphonse Bayot, 2d ed., *Classiques français du moyen âge* 14 (Paris: H. Champion, 1921), ll. 327, 548.

<sup>44</sup> Bell, *Estoire des Engleis*, n. to ll. 3391–405.

<sup>45</sup> Bell briefly discusses Gaimar's Continental connections on pp. x–xi, and there is also new evidence that his patrons, the FitzGilberts, had strong family connections in Ghent; see Elisabeth van Houts, "Hereward and Flanders," *Anglo-Saxon England* 28 (1999): 201–23.

Arthurian invasion of Denmark with the earlier invasion by Gurgut Barbtruc for his own plot.<sup>46</sup>

While Gaimar may have adapted an episode in English history to fit the plot of the Arthurian conquest of Denmark, it is equally possible that he adopted an episode from Danish history that he felt appropriate to the details of Geoffrey's account. Looking for historical names that fit the Danish context, Gaimar may have turned to some Continental account of Danish history, and his eye (or ear) may have been drawn to the names he eventually used in his story. No such text survives, but there is some evidence that the fraternal formula from which he derived his "Danish" king Adelbriht may have influenced his choices. For instance, the *Flateyjarbók* entry for 860 contains a formula, *Aðalbrikt, bróðir Aðalúlfs*, that is very similar to the formula in East Anglian genealogies (which we have seen may have influenced Gaimar):

Aðalbrikt, bróðir Aðalúlfs, fimm ár ríkti hann í Englandi. Orrosta Guthorms ok Háreks Jótakonungs. Þar féll allt konunga kyn nema sveinn einn, er Hárekr hét.

[Adalbrikt, Adalulf's brother ruled in England for five years. Battle of Guthorm and Horik king of the Jutes. There all the king's kin died except one boy, who was called Horik.]

The *Adalbrikt* here refers to Æthelberht of Wessex (860–65), and the "brother" is in fact Æthelberht's father Æthelwulf, who has been conflated with his elder son Æthelbald, perhaps because the two reigned concurrently for a time and because Æthelbald later married his father's widow.<sup>47</sup> The formula "Adelbriht, brother of Athulf" appears to have been transmitted widely in Scandinavia, occurring as *Adelbrictus frater Adevulfi* in the Icelandic annals and even making an appearance in a compressed summary of the reigns of eight kings of Wessex up to Æthelstan at the end of *Breta sögur*, the Old Norse translation of Geoffrey of Monmouth.<sup>48</sup>

What is particularly intriguing about the *Flateyjarbók* entry is its preservation of an account of events in Britain and on the Continent that mentions the names *Æthelberht* and *Guthrum* in tandem. The passage refers to the death of King Horik, the son of the Danish king Godfrey (Guthfrith), at the hands of his nephew Guthrum in 854.<sup>49</sup> There is ad-

<sup>46</sup> Alexander Bell, "Gaimar's Early 'Danish' Kings," *PMLA* 65 (1950): 617–19. See also Smithers, *Havelok*, xvii.

<sup>47</sup> Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 245.

<sup>48</sup> *Islandske Annaler*, ed. Gustav Storm, 10 vols. (Christiania, 1888), vol. 4, s.a. 850. For the reference in *Breta sögur*, see Jónsson and Jónsson, *Hauksbók*, 301–2.

<sup>49</sup> Saxo Grammaticus tells in books 8–9 of his *Gesta Danorum* of a Danish king Gotrik,

mittedly no direct evidence to relate the material in this passage to Gaimar's *Gunter*; however, if *Gunter* does come from a conflation of the names *Guthfrith* and *Guthrum*, this material seems a much likelier source than that posited by Deutschbein. In part this is because the material concerns a king of Denmark, and in part it is because Gaimar's source for the name *Gunter* is more likely to have been Continental. Furthermore, if he had access to a similar version of the passage, he may have been drawn to it because it gave a king of Denmark in the same breath as a formula from which he had already derived his king Adelbriht. Of course, in this case, he would not have associated this king with Æthelberht of Wessex, an easy mistake to make if his source, like the *Flateyjárbok* entry, specified only that *Adalbrikt* ruled in England. If a passage like this was indeed the source of Gaimar's Odulf, he was clearly willing to change the role of his character, making him the brother of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Aschis rather than of his own Adelbriht. Since, as suggested above, Gaimar was starting out with Geoffrey of Monmouth's scenario and was willing to make history fit his story, rather than the other way around, it would be a small step for him to replace a name like *Adalbrikt* with *Aschis* as part of his attempt to situate the story after the death of Arthur. However, he does preserve the fraternal formula from which he ultimately derived the names. We can conclude that Gaimar is likely to have drawn his character names as he felt appropriate from historical sources at his disposal, but that the names were generally related not by historical events but by their close proximity in those sources or by their resemblance to a few well-remembered patterns that occurred in East Anglian or Anglo-Scandinavian traditions.

Apart from the lack of an English documentary tradition for the names *Gunter* and *Odulf*, the origins of these characters are further clouded by the obvious parallelism in Gaimar's *Estoire* between Odulf and the villainous Briton Edelsi. For Deutschbein, the Edelsi subplot reflects an eleventh-century tradition that Ragnall I attempted to marry Ælfwynn, daughter of Æthelred and Æthelflæd of the Mercia. According to this tradition, Edward the Elder, who had no wish to see an alliance between Mercia and Scandinavian York, disinherited Ælfwynn in 919. Deutschbein suggests that these events were later transferred onto the names of Ragnall's nephew Ólafr Sigtryggson and Edward's

---

or Godfrey, who was cruelly assassinated and then avenged by his son Ólafr, although the latter detail is unique to Saxo's account. Frankish sources state that he is succeeded by his son Horik. See Saxo Grammaticus, *The History of the Danes: Books I–IX*, ed. Hilda Ellis Davidson and Peter Fisher, 2 vols. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), 2:150 n. 1.



son Æthelstan respectively. He then reconstructs the following equivalences between the Havelok legend and history:

Edelsi	= Æthelstan (= Edward)
Adelbriht	= Æthelred
Orwain	= Æthelflæd
Argentille	= Ælfwynn
Haveloc	= Ólafr (= Ragnall) <sup>50</sup>

Just as the West Saxon King Alfred corresponds to the British King Arthur for Deutschbein, so King Edward corresponds to the Briton Edelsi and the disinherited Ælfwynn to Argentille.

One problem with this scenario is that Edward prevents a marriage between Ragnall and Ælfwynn, whereas Edelsi enforces one between Haveloc and Argentille. It is hard to believe that this would allow for the development of such a complete reversal of the historical events in the eventual plot of the Havelok story.<sup>51</sup> But a greater problem is that regardless of whether or not the story of Ælfwynn's disinheritance influenced the plot of the Havelok legend, the names of many its characters resemble those of this historical episode so little that they are clearly not derived from a source that told of these events. Without such a connection, the resemblances between these historical events and the plot of the Havelok story could be no more than coincidental.

Given that Gaimar appears to have transformed an Anglo-Saxon name into the Danish Odulf to place it within the context of Geoffrey of Monmouth's story about the Arthurian conquest of Denmark, we may consider Odulf's ethnicity to be inherently unstable. Odulf is made the brother of Aschis, who is present at Arthur's Plenary Court, leads a legion of Arthur's forces into the Battle of Saussy, and dies fighting for Arthur at Camblam. Although Geoffrey calls Aschis king of Denmark, he is an important member of Arthur's court and fights on behalf of the Britons. Thus the writer of the Lambeth Interpolation in one copy of Mannyng's *Chronicle* (printed beginning on p. 500 of Sullens's edition) seems to have struggled with the ethnicities of the characters. He opens his account with an apparent invasion of Denmark by Gunter:

<sup>50</sup> The traditions regarding the fate of Ælfwynn and their relevance to the Havelok story are discussed by Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagengeschichte*, 106–10.

<sup>51</sup> Deutschbein (*ibid.*, 109) considers this difference superficial since the same political end is achieved. An additional problem is that Deutschbein's parallel between Alfred and Edward on the one hand and Arthur and Edelsi on the other is also somewhat strained here, since Arthur's successor was in fact Constantine, not Edelsi.

Forþ wente Gounter & his folk al in to Denemark  
 Sone fel þer hym upon a werre styth & stark  
 þurgh a Breton kyng, þat out of Ingelond cam  
 & asked tribut of Denmark, þat Arthur whylom nam.  
 (Interpolation ll. 1–4)

Gunter is attacked by a “Breton kyng” who can only be Arthur, Aschis, or Odulf. The term “whyлом” implies that Arthur had once taken tribute from Denmark and that Arthur’s invasion had occurred prior to Gunter’s arrival in Denmark. This would make the “Breton kyng” Aschis or Odulf, perhaps the latter since Aschis dies at the same time as Arthur. Putnam attached no significance to this, arguing that the interpolator created these lines as a bridge from Mannyng’s reference to Gunter in the ninth century to the account based on Gaimar’s post-Arthurian scenario without considering the backward leap in time.<sup>52</sup> But the Lambeth interpolator may have been building on an ambiguity already present in Gaimar, such as when he specifies that the usurper “mult fud haiz de ses Daneis” [“was much hated by the Danes”] (l. 526).

This ambiguity between Danish and British ethnicity augments the parallelism between Odulf and Edelsi. The two characters were closely associated by later writers in the English traditions; for instance, Gaimar’s *Edelsi* is spelled *Edelfi* in some manuscripts of the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* (and in the Middle English translation), where Odulf disappears as a character. Whether a miswriting or a deliberate modification, the spelling is likely to relate to the similarity of the two characters, and this similarity was actively pursued by those who replaced them with the similar names of Godard and Godrich. According to Bell, Gaimar introduced the name *Edelsi* based on the Old English *Æthelsige*, but no figure of note with that name has survived.<sup>53</sup> Although nothing similar is to be found in the East Anglian historiographical tradition discussed above, Gaimar seems to imply that the name *Edelsi* comes from the same source as *Adelbriht*. Hence, it appears that Gaimar’s character names—regardless of their precise origins—derive from largely written sources, or, if oral, then learned ones, rather than from folk tradition. Gaimar appears to have begun, at least for the political background to the Havelok tale, with Geoffrey of Monmouth’s account of Arthur’s subjection of Denmark and then adopted names from East Anglian and Continental sources such as fit the general outline of the story. His working methodology seems to have consisted primarily of

<sup>52</sup> Putnam, “Lambeth Version,” 12.

<sup>53</sup> Bell, *Lai d’Haveloc*, 262–63 (see *Edelsi* in the Index of Names).

name association, particularly where he recalled seeing fraternal relationships containing the names *Adelbriht* or something like *Athulf*.

Gaimar could not fail to be interested in Geoffrey of Monmouth's story, writing as he was in East Anglia with its sizable Scandinavian-derived population. The former Danelaw areas of England had different social and legal structures from those of the South and West, and the region boasted a far higher population of freemen than anywhere else in England. Trade between East Anglia and Scandinavia continued to flourish into the twelfth century, which no doubt reinforced cultural links and led to the transmission of texts across the North Sea.<sup>54</sup> Gaimar's *Estoire* shows a concern for this sub-culture by drawing attention to the precedents for Danish rule in England prior to the Anglo-Saxon conquest.<sup>55</sup> Hence, when the Danes invade during the reign of King Beorhtric, they cite the earlier rules of Ailbrith and Haveloc, and later, Cnut justifies his claim to the throne of England based on past Danish rulers (ll. 4307–18), although he does not name Haveloc.

Nevertheless, Gaimar's interest in Danish rights is somewhat surprising, given that there had been no serious Danish claimant to the English throne since Cnut III's failed invasion plans of 1075 and 1086, some sixty or seventy years earlier.<sup>56</sup> The claim was certainly still alive in people's minds as late as the 1170s when Richard FitzNigel, discussing the recent abolishment of the danegeld in his *Dialogue of the Exchequer*, noted that the Danes had invaded England during the Anglo-Saxon period not only for plunder but because they claimed an ancient legal right to the kingdom, "as the history of Britain tells more fully."<sup>57</sup> However, promoting the claims of the Danish monarchy could not have had any direct benefit for this population. Rather, the strong tendency to do so in the region seems to betray concerns about threats to their cultural identity. As twelfth-century baronial politics gained momentum,

<sup>54</sup> An account of the character of Danelaw England, including much information about the period after the Norman Conquest, is given by F. M. Stenton, *The Danes in England*, Proceedings of the British Academy 12 (London: Oxford University Press, 1927). For further references, see Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, 151.

<sup>55</sup> Bell, "Gaimar's Early 'Danish' Kings," 637–40.

<sup>56</sup> See Palle Lauring, *A History of the Kingdom of Denmark*, trans. David Hohnen (Copenhagen: Høst & Søn, 1960), 64–65.

<sup>57</sup> See John Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity, and Political Values* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), 119. Gillingham even suggests that the history to which FitzNigel refers is Gaimar's lost *Estoire des Bretons*. There was also a failed attack on England by Erik III during the 1140s, but this was probably no more than a Viking raid since Denmark was undergoing a period of implosion and was itself under attack from the Slavic Wends from the southern Baltic. See Lauring, *History of Denmark*, 70.

there must have been concern in the Anglo-Scandinavian community for their special status.<sup>58</sup> It is also possible that people from the rest of England could have resented the privileges of their eastern compatriots, so that the reasons for those privileges had to be asserted. Geoffrey of Monmouth's story appears to undermine those claims deliberately by creating precedents for British suzerainty over Denmark. In this he may reflect the views of his Anglo-Norman patrons. But Gaimar, too, was commissioned to write his history by an Anglo-Norman lady, so some further explanation is required for his interest in Danish sovereignty in England.

Here we may draw on Odulf's ethnic ambiguity, since he is the only evil Danish figure in Gaimar's account. By connecting Odulf with Arthur—and with the Britons—Gaimar makes Odulf's failure to secure his claim to the Danish throne symbolic of a *translatio imperii* from Briton to Dane: precisely the theme he addresses elsewhere in the *Estoire*. On the other side of the North Sea, where Haveloc secures the Danish right to rule in Britain from the British king Edelsi, the same point is made. The similarity between the two characters is more than that they play similar roles as usurpers and disinheritors of Haveloc and Argentille. They also represent the *ancien régime* whose rights will be won by the Danes. Hence Geoffrey of Monmouth's story of British sovereignty over Denmark is reversed, and by implication, the Anglo-Normans are the heirs of Danish rights. Such a transformation of the story may well have appealed to an Anglo-Norman audience trying to establish hereditary rights in an East Anglian regional context.

Given that Gaimar appears to have created the story by dipping into history for figures with whom he could construct a rival version of England's relationship with Denmark, the story as it appears in his *Estoire* must be substantially one of his own construction, combined as it is from diverse elements. One consequence of the conclusion that Gaimar created the Havelok story from several sources is that the figure (or at least the name) of *Haveloc* need not be seen as coming from the same sources as the other characters. Gaimar may have drawn it from another story, one which was in fact of Cumbrian rather than Anglo-Danish origin, and then integrated it with his other material. In other words, there is no need to see the entire story as a legend with its ori-

<sup>58</sup> Evidence for the extent of Danish integration is somewhat lacking, and texts from the time can be contradictory. For instance, Robert of Gloucester implies that the Danes had not yet fully merged with the English, whereas his source implies that a distinctly Danish population had died out. See Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, 149.

gins among the Cumbrians. Instead, Havelok entered East Anglian local history through Gaimar and was popularized as a hero only later as a result of his historical efforts.

#### THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE STORY

Most likely the popularity of the tale of Havelok in East Anglia came from Gaimar's choice to attach his story to that of Grim, whom local legend probably already held to be the founder of Grimsby. The princess Argentille to whom Havelok is married may also have been local in origin, to go by Gaimar's own reference to *l'antive gent* (l. 93) as the source of his knowledge about her upbringing. If the character originated in East Anglia, her name is unlikely to come from the same Celtic source as Havelok's.<sup>59</sup> Indeed, Argentille's name may be no older than the Conquest since it appears to be French and has connotations of wealth which coincide nicely with Gaimar's specification that her father is rich (l. 57). However, even if the name was older in origin, it seems likely that it would be interpreted as French after Gaimar's time. In all probability, the French-named Argentille appears in the Havelok story because she has been grafted onto it from an originally separate local legend. Furthermore, there is no reason to suspect that the name *Goldeburgh*, which first appears in the late thirteenth century in the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*, was the original name of the character, since Gaimar would have no motivation to change it. But there is a plausible motive for later writers to have changed the name of Gaimar's Argentille since she (along with Gunter, perhaps) is the only major character in Gaimar's account whose name does not look pre-Conquest in origin.

The new name *Goldeburgh* is found in a Latin confirmation (c. 1160–65) of the will of one *Goldburga* granting 12d to Southwark Priory, and to this we may add literary usages of *Goldburga* in the *Latin Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich* (c. 1172–73) and *Goldeburc* in the *Anglo-Norman Romance of Horn* (c. 1170).<sup>60</sup> The *Havelok* poet appears to have drawn four other female character names from these sources: *Leuiua*, *Gunnilda*, and *Leua* from the *Life*, and *Swanburc* from the romance. Smithers does not seem inclined to believe that the name *Goldeburgh* entered the Havelok legend from either of these sources; instead, he suggests that "if the name *Goldeburgh* was already in the form of the story that was received

<sup>59</sup> For suggestions that the name is Celtic in origin, see Deutschbein, *Studien zur Sagen-geschichte*, 101, and Bell, *Lai d'Haveloc*, 260.

<sup>60</sup> The extant forms of the name are discussed by Smithers, *Havelok*, lxix–lxx.

by the author of the extant *Hav.*, he may have been responsible for bringing the other three names into his own version as a result of finding all four in the *Life*. Similarly, he may well have taken over *Swanborw* from the AN *Horn* because it occurred there along with *Goldeburc* and in the same specific context (of the hero's close female kin).<sup>61</sup> I am inclined to agree with Smithers and dismiss the possibility that *Goldeburgh* was adopted directly from either of these sources, although they may have contributed to its familiarity. The name probably entered the legend because its meaning was appropriate as an English-sounding equivalent of *Argentille*. The choice of the name may have also been influenced by the frequent occurrence of the ending *-burh* among names of women before the Norman Conquest in the East Anglian royal genealogies.<sup>62</sup>

Furthermore, anyone who looked back at the reference to *Ailbrith* and *Aveloc* in Gaimar's account of the eighth-century Danish invasion (l. 2081) would have found several similar-sounding names in the in close proximity. The name *Guereburc* occurs slightly earlier (l. 2035), and *Brectric* (Beorhtric) marries *Edburc*, the daughter of King Offa of Mercia, immediately before the arrival of the invading Danes (ll. 2059–63). A few lines later, the arm of St. "Oswald" (Ælfwald in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) is brought to *Coledesburc el sud* (l. 2113), which, Bell argues convincingly, probably indicates Peterborough, elsewhere referred to as *Goldborch*, *Gyldeneburh*.<sup>63</sup> Thus the name *Goldeburgh* may have been chosen by someone deliberately looking back at the *Estoire* for evidence of a more authentic name for the character than the French-sounding *Argentille*. If the name was originally derived from a by-name of Peterborough, it may have served to strengthen further the East Anglian credentials of the story. More than likely, Gaimar's integration of the *Havelok* story with the foundation myth of Grimsby, and its subsequent popularization, prompted East Anglians in the thirteenth century to turn to available historiography in order to enhance still further the characters' place in local history. Hence it is probably around this time that the Grimsby Seal was designed, portraying *Grim*, *Havelok*, and *Goldeburgh* with the later form of the character's name, rather than the earlier *Argentille*.<sup>64</sup> Chronicle accounts continued to follow Gaimar but

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, lxx.

<sup>62</sup> See William George Searle, *Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings, and Nobles: The Succession of the Bishops and the Pedigrees of the Kings and Nobles* (Cambridge, 1899), 282–83. The ending is also frequently found in women's names in the genealogies of the other kingdoms.

<sup>63</sup> See Bell, *Estoire des Engleis*, n. to ll. 2091–118.

<sup>64</sup> Smithers, *Havelok*, 166, concludes that the features of the Grimsby Seal are compat-

gradually began to adopt the new name. Thus different manuscripts of the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* use either one name or the other, and the *Argentille* written in the margin of Knighton's *Chronicle* opposite *Goldeburgh* in the text suggests that the two names were still connected in the later fourteenth century.

If the name *Argentille* were replaced because it did not look sufficiently pre-Conquest or "English," the same might be true of *Gunter*, which is replaced with *Birkebeyn* in some manuscripts of the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut*. Langtoft's identification of Gunter with Guthrum was certainly problematic for later writers. The Lambeth Interpolation to Mannyng's translation shows the interpolator's struggle to make Gaimar's king of Denmark fit with the ninth-century king of East Anglia by having him immigrate to Denmark, where he is attacked by a "Breton kyng." The leap from Arthurian Britain to the ninth century is smoothed over by the omission of any relationship of Odulf (*Edulf*, as it is spelled in the Lambeth Interpolation) to the Arthurian Aschis. In fact, the only reference to Arthur is to his invasion in the past. Thus, while Gaimar was the ultimate authority for the version of the story in the Lambeth Interpolation, his chronological placement of the story has been subtly removed.

However, Mannyng's comments, particularly his use of the names *Goldeburgh* and *Athelwold*, suggest that versions of the story that departed more significantly from Gaimar were circulating after 1300. It is unclear whether he knew the name *Birkebayn*, since his comments are prompted by Langtoft's reference to Haveloc as the son of *Gunter*, but its occurrence in the *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* and the version of the Havelok story embedded in *Castleford's Chronicle* suggests that its use was widespread from the late thirteenth century on. The *Anglo-Norman Prose Brut* simply replaces *Gunter* with *Birkebein*, but *Castleford's Chronicle* demonstrates a more radical transformation of the tale, eliminating the Arthurian scenario by stating that "Birkebaine's son" (which I assume refers to Havelok) actually invades England during the reign of Beorhtric. As with Gaimar, the compiler of *Castleford's Chronicle* identifies this period with the beginning of the Scandinavian invasions of Britain based on the famous entry for 787 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. However, he appears to attach later Scandinavian incursions to the same period, including, for instance, the invasions by the "Kinges of Hir-

---

ible with a date in the "later 13th century." For extensive discussion, see his Appendix B (160-67).

lande," presumably the Vikings of Dublin (ll. 28614–17).<sup>65</sup> The invocation of the Havelok legend at this point seems to show the influence of Gaimar, whose reference to *Aveloc* as a past precedent for Danish rights in Britain comes at precisely this point in his *Estoire*. Perhaps the compiler of *Castleford's Chronicle* drew on a source that had garbled Gaimar's reference to Havelok, or perhaps the compiler himself was responsible for the change; but regardless, it reflects the perception that this historical period was an appropriate context for the Havelok story.<sup>66</sup> The placement of the story in this period is incompatible with Langtoft's identification of Gunter with the Guthrum who lived a century later, but as in Langtoft, the account reflects an attempt to locate Gunter's character in history. There is nothing in Gaimar to suggest a replacement name, but the revisers of the legend seem to have adopted a new name, *Birkebayn*, which was known locally and perceived to be linguistically appropriate to the ethnicity of the character, just as they did for *Argentille*.<sup>67</sup> This similarity of procedure suggests more than popular corruption of Gaimar's tale; rather, it suggests deliberate changes based on conscious reflection on the story's place in the historical past.

Fourteenth-century chroniclers also seem to have fixed on another feature of the Havelok legend with its roots in Gaimar: the motif of the seneschal. This motif appears both in accounts of the Danish invasion of England and of the Havelok story itself. For instance, Langtoft gives the Danes a leader named Duke *Ebric*, demonstrably a version of the *Adelbriht* figure used by Gaimar: the form in MS D is *Kebrith* (Mannyng's *Kebriht*), which shows the same changes found in the spell-

<sup>65</sup> The confusion may follow on from an earlier passage (ll. 27506–18), where the compiler foreshadows all the later Scandinavian invasions; alternatively, he may have confused the Dublin Norse with the Norwegians, since some versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* claim the Viking raiders of 787 were Norsemen, while others claim they were from *Hörthaland* in Norway.

<sup>66</sup> If, as Bell suggests, the spelling *Ailbrith* in Gaimar's account of the Danish attack is evidence of a different source from that which supplied his more extended version of the story, it is unlikely that the passage in *Castleford's Chronicle* is connected with such an alternative account. Even if Gaimar had not yet encountered (or composed) the story in its form at the beginning of the *Estoire*, he was clearly thinking of the two Danish kings as having lived at some point substantially in the past. *Castleford's Chronicle* more likely reflects a later change to the story.

<sup>67</sup> The name was applied to Sverre Sigurdsson, who became king of Norway in 1184; see Skeat, *The Lay of Havelok*, xxvi, and Eckhardt, "Havelok the Dane in *Castleford's Chronicle*," 5 n. 8. *Birkebayn* was also a family name in England by the late thirteenth century, so it may have been familiar to East Anglians. See Jan Jönsjö, *Studies in Middle English Nicknames: I. Compounds*, Lund Studies in English 55 (Lund: Gleerup, 1979), who also lists a similar name *Birkebarch* occurring as early as 1226 or 1227.



ing *Achebrit* in the *Lai d'Haveloc*.<sup>68</sup> According to Langtoft, Beorhtric has a seneschal called *Herman* who is slain by the duke of Denmark. While *Herman* does not appear to derive directly from Gaimar's *Sigar*, seneschal of Gunter, it is notable that good seneschals appear with a variety of names and roles in *Havelok the Dane* (*Ubbe*, seneschal of Denmark), Rauf de Bohun's *Petit Bruit* (*Godard*, seneschal of England), and Henry Knighton's *Chronicle* (*Godard*, seneschal of Denmark and England). It is difficult to explain the diversity of names, but it is likely that they result from separate attempts to incorporate the motif from the Havelok legend into separate historical scenarios.

The appearance of the name *Ebric* in Langtoft's (and hence Mannyng's) *Chronicle* may shed further light on the appearance of the character *Godrich*. In later versions of the story *Godrich* replaces *Edelsi*, who becomes an earl rather than a king. In part, this reflects the promotion (and ethnic jump) of Gaimar's *Adelbriht*, Danish king of East Anglia, to the status of *Athelwold*, king of England. However, the old name was not abandoned; instead, it was reinterpreted and preserved as *Ebric*, duke of Denmark. The effect was to remove the equivalency between the East Anglian king *Adelbriht* in Gaimar's Havelok episode and the *Ailbrith* referred to in connection with the Danish invasion. But the latter tradition continued to interact with the Havelok story. The version of the Danish invasion given by *Castleford's Chronicle* states that "Birkebaine's son" landed on the coast of Lindsey, claimed that land by right of marriage, and then drove the dukes of Cornwall out of Mercia (ll. 26618–29). The reference to Mercia is unique to this text. It may reflect a tendency in northern and eastern chronicles to equate Lindsey and Mercia, a tendency also found in the *Chronicle* of Robert Mannyng, who regularly changes Mercia to Lindsey when he encounters it in this section of Langtoft's *Chronicle*.<sup>69</sup> If such an association between the two regions existed, then Gaimar's treacherous *Edelsi*, king of Lindsey, could be equated by revisers of the tale with a treacherous Mercian lord. Such a figure was known from history in the form of Eadric Streona, ealdorman of Mercia, who, after betraying Edmund Ironside and aiding Cnut, was killed in

<sup>68</sup> Wright, *Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, 1:294. The name also occurs as *Rebrut* (MS B), *Kylryk* (MS C), and *Kebrike* or *Kebrith* (MS D). Langtoft incorrectly gives the name of Egbert's father as *Ailric*, which is probably of the same origin, since *Ebric* is once spelled *Helric*. *Castleford's Chronicle*, which states that Egbert and Athelberht are brothers (l. 28528), also shows the tendency to bring the two figures into a family relationship.

<sup>69</sup> Hence Offa is "kyng of Lyndsay" (pt. 2, l. 187) and the Britons flee "to Lynday" to gain succour from Bernewolf (pt. 2, ll. 234–35). Mannyng also specifies that Bernewolf is a Briton (pt. 2, l. 235).

1017.<sup>70</sup> The use of Eadric as a model for the character may have been further encouraged by the existence of the similar name *Ebric* in connection with the Danish presence in England. The second element in the name *Godrich* may thus have been adopted by revisers who found either or both the names *Ebric* and *Eadric* associated in historical literature with the Danish acquisition of power in England. Ironically, the name of the traitor *Godrich* could be partially from the very name which had earlier given rise to *Gaimar's Adelbriht*. The title Earl of Cornwall is probably a secondary development created to dissociate the character from East Anglia, although it does preserve *Edelsi's* British heritage. It is also possible that the title came from a topical reference to *Richard*, the brother of *Henry III*, who was made earl of Cornwall in 1225.<sup>71</sup> The version in *Castleford's Chronicle* apparently postdates this development, since it makes the "Dukes of Cornewaile" the enemies of "Birkebaine's son." Regardless, it also seems to preserve some notion of the character's connection with *Mercia*, and with *Lindsey*, if the two were equated.

The influence of *Eadric Streona* on the *Havelok* legend is also apparent in the accounts given by *Rauf de Bohun* and *Henry Knighton*, who connect the story with the reign of *King Cnut*. These authors state that *Havelok* had four sons: *Gormund*, *Cnut*, *Godard*, and *Thorald*. These names were apparently selected from history in order to boost Scandinavian claims in England, and particularly the historical rule of *King Cnut* (as *Knighton* states explicitly).<sup>72</sup> Assuming that *Gormund* is to be equated with *Guthrum*, the first two are famous Danes from early English history.<sup>73</sup> *Thorald* may be a memory of *Thorkell the Tall*, who was made ealdorman of East Anglia by *Cnut* and later acted as *Cnut's* re-

<sup>70</sup> *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, s.aa. 1007, 1017. *Turville-Petre* also connects *Godrich* with the historical *Eadric*, though he treats their relation, along with that of *Athelwold* to *Edmund* and *Havelok* to *Cnut*, as a loose allegory (*England the Nation*, 152).

<sup>71</sup> *Smithers, Havelok*, n. to l. 178, argues that the title Earl of Cornwall is a reference to the historical *Richard*, earl of Cornwall (1209–72), pointing out that the second elements of the names *Godrich* and *Godard* add up to *Richard*. However, this need not imply that both names were originally chosen for the purpose of creating a cryptic reference to the historical *Richard*. Even if such a reference were intended, the name *Godard* may have been selected to replace *Odulf* only because the name *Godrich* was already in the legend. *Turville-Petre* does not accept the reference to *Richard*, arguing that the title was selected because it was far from East Anglia (*England the Nation*, 149).

<sup>72</sup> *Lumby, Chronicon Henrici Knighton*: "Inter cætera videamus quam ob causam et qua ratione Canutus venit in Angliam et misit clamium in regno Angliæ" ["Among these things we may see how and for what reason *Cnut* came to England and made a claim for the English throne"] (18).

<sup>73</sup> The direct identification of *Gormund* with *Guthrum* is uncertain; *Bohun* and *Knighton* claim that he breaks his neck falling off a horse.

gent in Denmark.<sup>74</sup> The *Petit Bruit* goes to extraordinary lengths to place these Scandinavian figures within the West Saxon, and by implication English, genealogy by giving their mother Goldeburgh as the daughter of Athelwold, the great-great-grandson of Alfred, who in turn is the grandson of Arthur. This makes Cnut not only the heir of Havelok but also heir by lineage to the English throne.<sup>75</sup> The attempt by these writers or their sources to locate Havelok and Cnut in close historical proximity may then have been prompted in part by the development of a villain associated with Eadric Streona. Alternatively, the reverse may have happened: the relocation of the Havelok story to the time of Cnut may have encouraged the use of Eadric as a model for the transformation of Edelsi into Godrich.

Havelok's third son *Godard* presents other difficulties. *Godard* may be no more than an invented name, modeled on *Godrich* and designed to replace *Odulf* as his Danish parallel. But this necessitates some explanation of how *Godard* came to be regarded by Bohun as seneschal in England and Havelok's son, a surprising fate if he was drawn from a version of the story where he is a villainous character, as in *Havelok the Dane*. Knighton says *Godard* was seneschal both in Denmark and in England, and this may have represented the original formulation if both come from an earlier common source.<sup>76</sup> Knighton's version seems also to be partially derived from Gaimar, not only because of the marginal notation equating *Goldeburgh* with *Argentille*, but also because it states that Birkabeyn is king of the Danes of Lincoln, rather than of Denmark, as in Bohun's account. These elements could preserve features of the original story or they could represent later modifications by someone familiar with Gaimar's account. Regardless, both Bohun's and Knighton's versions agree in their interest in the office of seneschal. For instance, Bohun makes a point of stating that the seneschalship *Godard* receives

<sup>74</sup> See Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 398–401. Bohun tells us that Thorald's marriage to a countess of *Hertonwe* (Smithers's *Hertouwe*) in Norway was responsible for the traditional alliance between the Danes and the Norwegians. *Hertonwe* may refer to *Hörthaland* in western Norway.

<sup>75</sup> The genealogy is summarized by Diana B. Tyson, "Problem People in the *Petit Bruit* by Rauf de Boun," *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990): 355–58.

<sup>76</sup> Bohun gives *Gondwich* for *Godrich*, but the significance of this form is unclear because Smithers's transcription, published independently in the same year as Tyson's, gives *Goudrich* (*Havelok*, xviii). Likewise, Smithers gives *Thorand* for Tyson's *Thoraud*. Knighton's *Thoraldus* suggests that Tyson's transcription is more accurate, at least for this name. Smithers and Tyson also disagree over the date of the manuscript, with Smithers giving the later fifteenth century and Tyson the second half of the sixteenth century. I have not had the opportunity to consult the manuscript myself.

“n'avout tant come ore fait ly quart” [“made up a quarter of what it is now”]. Knighton’s version of this is to say that Godard was invested “in senescaria Daciæ et in mercimoniatu Angliæ, quæ non se extendebant ad tantum valorem quam nunc” [“in the seneschalship of Denmark and the chancellorship of England, which did not carry so much power as now”]. The interest in the office of seneschal thus appears to relate to the extent of power that the king’s magnates could exercise. The poet of *Havelok the Dane* shows a similar concern for the constitutional implications of the social and legal practices in the story, as Turville-Petre shows, calling attention to Godrich’s oath to Athelwold (185–209), his appointment of local officials (263–67), the frequent references to *man-rede* (“homage”), and the formality of Godrich’s execution sentence.<sup>77</sup>

There are several historical scenarios in the thirteenth century that could have provoked interest in the power of the king’s magnates, the most notable of which is the regency of Richard, earl of Cornwall, whose title, it has been suggested, was applied to Godrich. The characterization of his counterpart Godard in *Havelok the Dane* probably developed in tandem, so it seems pointless to try to connect the name *Godard* with any single historical figure. The importance of Bohun’s and Knighton’s comments about the limits of the seneschalship in Havelok’s time is that they show why Godard may have been moved away from the position of usurper. The reviser of the legend appears to think Danish rulership in the distant past provided a more ideal form of government. The presence of Godard in a position to usurp the throne would certainly have gainsaid that view of history; hence Bohun states ambiguously that Havelok is in England because he was “chasé de Denmarche” [“driven from Denmark”], and Knighton fails to offer any explanation at all. Instead, they change the parallel between Godrich and Godard to a contrast, with the latter’s power restricted by comparison with the former.

An interest in history, then, was a motivating factor in the transformation of the Havelok legend, and many of the changes of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries relate to attempts to adapt the story to various historical contexts. The widespread interest in the seneschal motif may reflect a growing concern on the part of the revisers of the tale with the implications of these historical contexts. This may explain the abandonment of Gaimar’s Arthurian milieu. Instead, chroniclers appear to have been turning back to earlier chronicles for their inspiration, finding new names where they could or adapting names

<sup>77</sup> Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, 145.

suitable for the new scenarios in which they located the tale. These attempts may reflect regional biases. For instance, Langtoft recounts how King Egbert, upon his return from France after the death of Beorhtric, begins to persecute the Britons, who seek aid from Bernewolf of Mercia. Egbert defeats Bernewolf and seizes eastern England between Dover and Grimsby. Bernewolf's son Wiglaf submits to Egbert and is granted the kingdom of Lindsey in addition to his kingdom of Mercia. Then King Fritheald of the North arrives to say that he has been exiled by the pagan Danes. Battle ensues and goes badly for the English, until Egbert's sons Ethelwolf and Ethelstan (corrected to Ethelbert in most manuscripts and in Mannyng) arrive to save the day. Mannyng reproduces this fairly accurately, except that he makes Bernewolf and Wiglaf Britons and kings of Lindsey only. These modifications only serve to clarify the meaning of the story. The addition of the British subplot here demonstrates the English king's legal sovereignty in East Anglia. The land has been granted to English or British kings, taking away the rights of future Danish invaders like Guthrum. Likewise, the Danes in the north displace the rightful king. That Egbert takes up arms on his behalf suggests that he is Fritheald's feudal overlord. Whether this amounts to a refutation of Danish rights in East Anglia or not probably requires a broader study of Langtoft's *Chronicle*, but it is notable that *Castleford's Chronicle*, the other northern exemplar of the Havelok legend, likewise accuses "Birkebaine's son" of dwelling in Mercia and Lindsey illegally.

The Lambeth Interpolation, despite its dependence on Gaimar's version of the story, also seems to undermine Havelok's right to rule in England. Gunter's status as the hereditary king of Denmark is undermined by the suggestion that he is an immigrant, that he refused to pay tribute to Arthur, and that he was defeated by the Britons. Indeed, if the "Breton kyng" is Odulf, the implication of the Lambeth Interpolation is somewhat closer to Geoffrey of Monmouth's original design in creating precedents for British sovereignty over Denmark. The shift is slight, since Havelok still wins back his kingdom, but the subtle change of emphasis may reflect the Southwest Midlands origins of the passage.<sup>78</sup> On the other hand, Rauf de Bohun had a patron from Lincolnshire and clearly works to support Cnut's claim to the throne, along with the rights of the other Danes who become his siblings.<sup>79</sup> But these

<sup>78</sup> See n. 16 above.

<sup>79</sup> Rauf de Bohun's patron was Henry de Lacy, third earl of Lincoln. See Tyson, *Petit Bruit*, 1, 5. If the immediate genealogy is not original to Bohun's *Petit Bruit*, as seems plausible given the discussion above and the fact that it is found in Knighton's *Chronicle* un-

details also place the sons of Havelok in the direct line of English kings (through Goldeburgh), thus diminishing any sense of them as foreigners. If Bohun or his source encountered a form of the story that placed an unacceptable emphasis on Danish rule in England, then this is a neat compromise. *Havelok the Dane* seems to perform this compromise in another way, by stressing the legality of the process by which he becomes king.<sup>80</sup>

Thus the different treatments of the intertwined stories of Havelok the Dane and the origins and settlement of the Danelaw appear to have been the subject of much interpretation and reinterpretation during the twelfth, thirteenth, and early fourteenth centuries. The motivation for this enterprise was certainly not because people thought that a return to power of the kings of Denmark was likely. The Danish claim to the throne may have briefly entered the English political agenda in 1193, when Philip Augustus married Ingeborg, the sister of Cnut VI of Denmark. Philip demanded as dowry—so William of Newburgh tells us—the “antiquum ius regis Dacorum in regno Anglorum” [“the ancient right of the king of the Danes in the English kingdom”], which he did not receive; and he repudiated his marriage almost as soon as the ceremony was over (although he was never able to secure an abolition).<sup>81</sup> He brought Ingeborg out of prison again in 1213, when Innocent III declared King John unfit to rule in England, but does not seem to have pushed her claims explicitly. If the episode had any impact on the English Havelok tradition, it would have been to encourage the adoption of a name ending in *-burgh* for the heroine. But that would make the story’s resonance not so much pro-Danish as pro-French.<sup>82</sup>

Turville-Petre suggests that the story is an answer by the Anglo-Scandinavian population of East Anglia to the overwhelmingly negative representation of the Danes in the Anglo-Norman chronicle tradi-

---

attached to the surrounding details in Bohun’s text, then it may still be argued that the genealogy has an East Midlands origin.

<sup>80</sup> I interpret Havelok’s reluctance to take the throne of England in ll. 2778–87 as showing a concern that he conform to due process of law rather than a concern over his status as a foreigner. See Smithers, *Havelok*, n. to l. 2782.

<sup>81</sup> Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century*, 119.

<sup>82</sup> Such a position might just have had an audience during the invasion of Philip’s son Louis at the request of the rebel barons in 1215, but most of the developments we are looking at date to the second half of the thirteenth century or later, and there is no clear evidence that they were made in response to the events of 1215–17. For the Capetian invasion of England and Louis’s progress in East Anglia, see John Gillingham, *The Angevin Empire*, 2d ed. (London: Arnold Publishers, 2001), 107–8.

tion.<sup>83</sup> Such an explanation seems slightly at odds with the popularity of the legend in the fourteenth century, when the Scandinavian identity of the region had probably ceased to confer any legal distinction or privileges on its population and when writers in the heavily Scandinavian north, such as Langtoft and the compiler of *Castleford's Chronicle*, employed aspects of the Havelok legend to condemn Danish settlement in England. But in eastern England, writers such as Bohun and the *Havelok* poet seem more concerned with integrating the Danish population into a larger English picture. For these texts, Turville-Petre is right to point out the importance of the intermarriage between the Danish and the English characters at the end of the poem, making the Danes part of the "English national stock."<sup>84</sup> Just as Bohun's genealogy ignores historical distinctions of ethnicity, so the *Havelok* poet dispenses with historical political divisions, instead affecting a folksiness intended to convey the impression that his story is an old English tale but which at the same time divorces it from any historical scenario that implies Danish independence of English rule in East Anglia. Although he keeps the names of characters like *Goldeburgh* and *Godrich*, which may have their origins in the wider historiographical treatment of the Havelok legend, he dips into the English tradition of secular romances, particularly the Anglo-Norman *Romance of Horn*, for the names of many of the other characters.<sup>85</sup> This too transforms the story from the style of chronicle to the style of oral presentation, further divorcing it from historiographical attempts to identify precedents for Danish rights in England.

*Havelok the Dane* in fact participates in a wider process of re-examining the importance of Danish ethnicity in East Anglia and in England as whole. Langtoft uses elements of the Havelok story to assert the English king's right to rule in East Anglia. He does this by removing earlier precedents for Danish rule first through Egbert's defeat of Ebric and the grant of the land to Wiglaf, and second through his identification

<sup>83</sup> Turville-Petre, *England the Nation*, 152–53.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>85</sup> It is to be noted that the Middle English *King Horn* contains characters named *Athulf* and *Athelbrus* (= *Æthelbriht*); the one is Horn's blood-brother, and the other is the steward of Horn's future father-in-law. That the Horn tradition contains the steward motif as well as the resemblance of names suggests that the two stories were once more closely related than is suggested by the influence of the Anglo-Norman romance on the adoption of female names. The relationship between the Havelok and Horn stories deserves to be explored further, since it may have implications for our understanding of the dating of the different versions as well as broader implications for our understanding of the context in which the earliest English romances arose.

of Havelok's father as Guthrum, who is baptized by Alfred. Mannyng does not try to pursue the possibly weaker implications of Langtoft's equation of Gunter with Guthrum, preferring instead the account given locally. But he does clarify the former story, placing greater emphasis on Egbert's sovereignty over Lindsey. *Castleford's Chronicle* shows a similar line of reasoning to that of Langtoft: a Danish invader arrives and illegally occupies Lindsey and Mercia, driving off the rightful rulers. The effect in both cases is to suggest that sovereignty rests ultimately with the king and that the denizens of East Anglia cannot claim rights from any other source. Bohun's and Knighton's versions make the Danish rulers heirs to this English royal authority, partially by de-emphasizing their ethnicity. Indeed, the focus of the story is somewhat shifted away from the historical legitimacy of Danish rule in England and onto the placement of the Danish rulers within its institutional power structures and social hierarchy. In other words, the historical anglicization of the Anglo-Danes prompted reflection on their historical place in England. Both the passing of the Havelok story from chronicle into local legend and the continued manipulation of the tale by chroniclers narrating the origins of England reflect this absorption of the Anglo-Danes into English society.

#### CONCLUSION

It is hoped that these findings contribute to an understanding of the context in which Gaimar, the *Havelok* poet, and the other tellers of the Havelok story reproduced and modified its form, as well as the relation of the Havelok story to historical literature about East Anglia and the methods of its historiographers. My discussion is not intended to imply that the Havelok story did not receive widespread popular transmission, but that certain elements of the tale as we have it were invented by Gaimar based on elements in historical literature about East Anglia rather than on the folk traditions of the region. Because of the Anglo-Scandinavian culture of East Anglia, these elements can sometimes be traced in Scandinavian sources. It is likely that the sources for the names *Haveloc*, *Argentille*, and *Adelbriht* and *Edelsi* were separate, and that Gaimar's combination of them was instrumental in the adoption of Havelok as a local legend. Later writers were then anxious to fit this legend into a recognized historical context, and they turned sometimes back to Gaimar and sometimes to sources similar to those he had used for inspiration. Although it is difficult to quantify how much of



a Scandinavian cultural identity East Anglia may have retained by the turn of the fourteenth century, the Anglo-Norman need to justify foreign rule must clearly have diminished. Whereas Gaimar tried to create precedents for Danish (and by implication foreign) rule in East Anglia, later writers were more interested in the nature of its contribution to the formation of the English nation. Hence the Havelok story gradually underwent changes to enhance its credentials as local history, and the revisers inevitably turned to the historiographical materials available to them when they could. The revision of the Havelok story developed in tandem with, and interacted with, changes in the treatment of historical Danish invasions in narratives of the history of England. This suggests that the various extant references to Havelok are not merely garbled interpolations based on a popular local legend which in form resembled the poem *Havelok the Dane*, but different attempts to understand anew the historical significance of a legend essentially created by Gaimar.

Gaimar's earlier construction of the tale adopted a model of multiculturalism similar to our "tossed salad" notion by asserting the rights of ethnic groups, Danish and Anglo-Norman, within their individual province. Later writers seem to have turned towards more of a "melting pot" approach, one which argues for the contribution of different ethnicities to, but also absorption within, the whole. Hence the main interest of the revisers of the tale was to provide a new historical context for the Havelok story that went beyond justifying the Danish presence in East Anglia. Instead, they drew attention to its greater implications by using it to show how Danish rule in East Anglia participated in and was a part of the development of English social and legal institutions. The English poet of *Havelok the Dane*, in exchanging historical genre for the unspecified timelessness of romance, sacrifices the historical perspective of the other writers of his period but skillfully weaves these interests into a more popular form. Perhaps his work, like Gaimar's, provides one model of the way the ideas of the learned historiographers of the Middle Ages reached and influenced a much broader audience.

*California State University, Northridge*

