In the popular opinion, Haraldr hardradi’s death in the battle of Stamford Bridge in 1066 is often perceived as a symbolic end of the Viking Age. However, this moment should perhaps be postponed to 24th August 1103, when, following his ten-year reign as king of Norway, his grandson Magnus fell in combat, after having been caught in an ambush in Ulster. Some of the Old Norse accounts of his reign tend to compare the two rulers by depicting Magnus as a true and dedicated follower of his grandfather. Unsurprisingly, the circumstances of Magnus’s last stand are frequently seen as the best illustration of this image, in terms of both its positive and negative connotations. This naturally provokes one to ask whether this particular image of Magnus should be considered only as a highly imaginative construct of later medieval Scandinavian historiography or, rather, as a reflection of the genuine policy of Magnus to see himself as the heir and follower of his famous grandfather. The present article is an attempt to find an answer to this question.

Textual evidence in the contemporary skaldic poetry dedicated to Magnus appears to make such an option at least plausible. Magnus, the only son of the Norwegian king Olaf kyrri, was born around 1073. Twenty years later, he succeeded his father on the throne. Having crashed the opposition of his cousin Hákon Magnusson and his supporters, Magnus was able to make his name known also outside Norway by turning his attention to the political

---

developments in the British Isles. Magnus’s activity there evinces itself in the two expeditions he led there. The first one, undertaken in 1097—1098, resulted in the instalment of his son Sigurðr as a new jarl of the Orkney Islands as well as the submission of the Hebrides and taking over the Isle of Man. The latter would become his residence and a very convenient location when it comes both to the control of the main trading route between the British Isles and Scandinavia, and to his ensuing military activity in the area. The achievements of the Norwegian king could not have gone unnoticed by the local powers, in particular, Edgar the Valiant, king of Scotland, and Muirchertach Ua Brian, the ruler of Munster and Dublin. Magnus probably found both rulers powerful enough to be his allies, although the contacts between the three sides were quite regularly plagued by distrust and caution in trying to keep the previous positions.

The first expedition of Magnus in the West ended with his raid of Wales in the summer of 1098, resulting in the rather accidental strife with the Norman forces at Anglesey, led by the earls Hugh of Chester and Hugh of Montgomery. As a result, the latter of the two leaders was killed — perhaps by Magnus himself — which is the fact that came to be widely echoed in the Norse and Anglo-Norman accounts. Some scholars see these events as an attempt to conquer England — a remarkable feat by means of which he would appear to try to emulate his grandfather Harald. Such interpretations should, however, be regarded with great caution or even dismissed. Shortly after the battle of Anglesey, Magnus returned to Norway.

The second expedition in the West started in either 1101 or 1102, culminating with Magnus’s death in Ulster in the August of 1103. This time, the king strove to strengthen the “insular kingdom” of his son Sigurðr and further pursue his own interests in Dublin, still the most important trading centre in north-western Europe at that time. The expedition once again brought Magnus to the Isle of Man and resulted in his strong military presence in Ireland. This made Muirchertach very cautious, and so, in order to ensure peace between the two monarchs, the king of Munster and Dublin decided to marry his daughter Bjadmynja to Sigurðr Magnusson. The move appears to have been highly profitable to both sides, with Magnus becoming allied to the most powerful ruler in the region (thus opening Dublin to the Norwegian

---


It may be quite safely assumed that, notwithstanding the alliance, the king of Muster and Dublin would count on the weakening of the Norse influence in the region and that, in the end, “the insular kingdom” of Sigurðr would not last long. Muirchertach knew very well that to achieve this goal, he would have to take any opportunity to weaken the condition of Magnus and to make his political and military activities as problematic as possible. Such an opportunity did indeed occur before long, when the king of Norway decided to return north. Muirchertach was expected to supply the Norwegians with necessary provisions, but as the Irish support was delayed, Magnus — impatient and angry — decided to supply his forces with the basic necessities on his own account. Thus the Norwegian fleet appeared in Ulster, where the king commanded to obtain the provisions by any possible means. The local people decided to defend their properties, and so attacked the aggressors. The Norwegian troops were not prepared to withstand the attack and on 24th August, trapped in an ambush, came to be completely obliterated, with Magnus himself ultimately fallen in combat.\footnote{Heimskringla III... pp. 235—237. See also R. Power: Magnus Barelegs’ Expeditions... pp. 124—128.}

The abrupt end of Magnus’s expedition plunged the contemporaries into shock, perhaps similar to the one that came about as a result of the defeat of the Norwegian army of Harald hardradi at Stamford Bridge in 1066.\footnote{See J. Morawiec: Między poezją a polityką. Rozgrywki polityczne w Skandynawii XI wieku w świetle poezji ówczesnych skaldów. Katowice 2016, pp. 591—593.} Both kings found their death under rather negative circumstances, when their prudence, carefulness, and self-awareness came to be completely overshadowed by unnecessary bravado and overconfidence. In each case, it was also the king’s attitude that led to the ultimate disaster of his army. Both defeats — at Stamford Bridge and in Ulster — were seen as evidence that both Harald and Magnus were very much alike, sharing similar worldviews and political philosophies. This view appears to be dominant in medieval Scandinavian historiography. And so, according to the anonymous author of the \textit{Ágrip af Nöregkonungasögum}:

King Magnús ruled alone and uncontested, kept his land in peace and rid the country of all vikings and outlaws. He was a warlike man, doughty and industrious, and in disposition he was in every respect more like his grandfather Haraldr than like his father. They were all tall and handsome men [...]
He won a part of it straight away and as a result grew bolder and then became more unwary, because all went well for him in the beginning, just as it had for his grandfather Haraldr, when he fell in England. And the same treachery drew him to his death.9

A similar opinion concerning the circumstances of Magnus’s death is provided by the monk Theodoricus, the author of the *Historia de Antiquitate regum Norwagiensium*:

[…] after winning control over part of the island, hoping that the rest might be conquered with ease, he began to lead his army with less caution, and fell into the same trap as his grandfather Haraldr in England.10

These opinions find an intriguing follow-up in the *Morkinskinna*. The saga describes Magnus’s second expedition in the West during which the king was planning to besiege Dublin. Sigurðr Sigurðarson, one of his lendir menn, is reported to have made a speech in which he warned Magnus against following too close in the footsteps of his grandfather:

Sire, everyone is prepared to promote your honor, but we are somewhat apprehensive about what honor is to be had in this country. It is a populous region and the people are treacherous. We are not certain how well we can guard ourselves against them. Your kinsman King Haraldr had the experience that people in England at first surrendered to him wherever he went, but it ended with his death. Your friends would have deemed it best if you had remained quietly in your realm, considering the advantages that you have.11

All these excerpts point to a relatively uniform image of Magnus Barefoot in the Old Norse accounts, an image that all too often focuses on his military activity and omits other significant spheres (e.g. economic) of his reign.12 As has been noted, a situation like this may be found in Scandinavian medieval historiography, provoking the question whether such a depiction of Magnus is...

---

not in fact a later development, or whether it should be linked with the actual policy and means of poetic propaganda at the court of the Norwegian king. A potential answer to this question could be found in the skaldic verses dedicated to Magnus composed during and around the time of his reign and, in all likelihood, connected with his court and retinue.

According to Skáldatal, there were five poets known to have regularly composed strophes on King Magnus. These were: Þorkell hamarskáld, Bjǫrn krepphendi, Gísl Illugason, Ívarr Ingimundarson, and Bardr svarti. Unfortunately, no poetic works of the last of them have survived until our time. Similarly, in the case of Ívarr, we are only in possession of a single poem dedicated to Sigurðr slembidjákn, the supposed son of Magnus Barefoot and short-term king of Norway (1135—1139). This means that the following analysis must be limited to the three Magnúsdrápur attributed to Bjǫrn krepphendi, Þorkell hamarskáld, and Gísl Illugason. The first of these three poems was composed during Magnus’s lifetime, the other two belong to the period shortly after 24th August 1103.

To varying degrees, each of the three poems recapitulates the events of Magnus’s lifetime. Bjǫrn krepphendi’s drápa, for instance, relates the king’s military exploits during the early stage of his reign and his first expedition in the West. The poems of Þorkell and Gísl have a more retrospective character, providing account of some of the most important endeavours of the Norwegian monarch, both in Scandinavia and beyond. In the Magnúsdrápur, the depiction of Magnus’s encounters possesses a number of features which could be seen as an attempt to create a direct link between the praised hero and his royal grandfather.

First of all, what is worth noting are the instances of the poets’ direct references to Haraldr hardradi. Gísl does it twice, as Kari Ellen Gade correctly observes, first in stanza 11 and then in stanza 20, each time calling Magnus “Harald’s kinsman” (frændr Haralds). Further inspection also reveals other, more subtle hints of comparison between both monarchs. Those skalds who outlined the encounters at Fulford Gate and Stamford Bridge are quite unanimous in underlining Harald’s bravery, which was pushed to such an extreme that one may well take it to mean unreasonable recklessness. This can be noted, for instance, in some of the stanzas in Arnórr Þórðarson’s Haraldsdrápa, in which Arnór, as the only poet, relates the circumstances of Harald’s final battle:

16 SPMA II, pp. 424, 430.
Hafðit brjóst, né bifðisk
bōðsnart konungs hjarta,
i hjalmþrimu hilmir
hlītstyggr fyr sér lítt;
þars til þengils hersa
þat sá herr, at skatna
blōðugr hjǫrr ins barra
beit dǫglinga hneitis.16

The prince, shunning mediocrity, had no small courage in himself, and the battle-
swift heart of the king did not tremble in the helmet-din, where the army saw,
watching the lord of hersar, that the bloody sword of the zealous subduer of prin-
ces bit men.

Olli ofrausn stillis,
ormalátrs þats máttit
stáls í ströngu éli
striðir elli bíða;
sás aldrigi aldins
ótams lítuðr hramma
viggs í vápna glyggvi
Varðrúnar sik sparði.17

The excess of heroism in the ruler caused [this] in the stern blizzard of steel, that
the foe of the reptiles’ lair could not live to see old age, the stainer of the claws
of the old, untamed steed of Varðrún who never spared himself in the wind-storm
of weapons.

Following the suggestions of Diana Whaley,19 one can find in these stanzas
certain elements of criticism towards Harald’s mindset, his flawed attitude that
led both him and his army into their final disaster. The criticism touches on the
king’s excessive bravery and overconfidence, both of which could have easily
turned into his egocentric pride and the feeling of superiority above others. In
stanza 12, Arnórr clearly refers to Harald’s heroism as the foremost cause
of his death. Here, the skald uses the word ofrausn, which could be translated
as “excessive heroism.” According to Whaley, this term could have also been
used in connection with Harald’s exceptional bravery and inclination to risk-
taking, which, together with his self-confidence and disrespect for the enemy,
could only have resulted in his death in combat with the overwhelming forces
of a well-disciplined enemy.20 This tendency of Arnórr can also be seen in
the other part of the poem. In stanza 11, the skald calls Haraldr hlītstyggr, an
ambiguous term which could be interpreted as the poet’s willingness to
highlight the king’s zeal and fervour to outshine others in battle in the way in
which no one could question Harald’s outstanding military qualities. Likewise,
Steinn Herðisarson, in the drápa dedicated to Olaf kyrri, refers to the king’s
father as a “protection-shy” leader who, during the battle of Fulford Gate, did
not hesitate to risk his own life (hliftraudr konungr hetti lifi).21

17 SPMA II, pp. 272—273.
18 SPMA II, pp. 273—274.
20 SPMA II, p. 275.
21 SPMA II, p. 369.
The poetic utterances of both Þorkell hamarskáld and Gísl Illugason seem to be quite similar in tone. The former reveals it in the first helming of stanza 5 of his Magnúsdrápa:

Uppgǫngu réð yngvi
ír með helming lítinn,
áraði hykk áðan,
Eysteins fóður treystask.\(^{22}\)

The splendid king advanced ashore with a small unit, I believe Eystein’s father earlier put faith in his courage.

The crux of this half-stanza is practically analogous to that of the poem dedicated to Harald hardradi. It relates the account of a small number of warriors who accompanied the king and, on the one hand, serves to rationalise his failure and death, but, on the other, subtly criticises Magnus for his nonchalance and lack of foresight. The king — Þorkell is in fact particularly explicit about that — is too self-confident, relying too heavily on his previous successes.

Magnus’s courage and bravery, as decisive factors in his triumph over Lǫgmaðr of the Hebrides and Earl Hugh of Montgomery, are also recalled by Gísl:

Tók á Skíði, en Skotar flýðu,
joðra œgir Ívistar gram;
hafði fylkir, sás frami těði,
Lǫgmann konung í liði sínu.\(^{23}\)

The terrifier of princes captured the lord of North Uist in Skye, and the Scots fled; the leader, whom courage aided, kept King Lǫgmaðr in his company.

Họðum hildi með Haralds frændu
Ǫnguls við ey innanverða,
þars af reiði ríkisvendir
konungr ok jarlar kapp sitt brutu.\(^{24}\)

We waged war with Harald’s kinsman on the inner side of Anglesey, where the royal spectres, the king and the earls, tested their courage with rage.

This tendency to juxtapose the deeds of Magnus Barefoot with those of his grandfather Harald may be seen in other elements as well. Bjǫrn krepp-hendi describes Magnus, in stanza 3 of his drápa, as being “shy of protection”
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\(^{22}\) SPMA II, p. 413.

\(^{23}\) SPMA II, p. 422.

\(^{24}\) SPMA II, p. 424.
(styggr hlífar), the very same phrase also being used by Steinn Herdisarson in the fourth stanza of his poem to reflect the warlike attitude of Haraldr. Also in the third stanza, Björn labels Magnus the “troop-Baldr” (her-Baldr). A very similar phrase, lið-Baldr, is used by Þjóðólfr Írúnarson in stanza 2 of his leidangr vísur. In stanza 17 of his poem, Gísl calls Magnus a ruler of the Oppland people (Upplanda gramr). Although an identical phrase is used by Þjóðólfr ör Hvini in his poem dedicated to Harald Fairhair and, in fact, appears to be its closest analogy, Gísl could have also been inspired by the words in stanza 15 of Sextefja, in which Þjóðólfr names Haraldr hardradi the king of Oppland (upplenzkr hilmir). The latter appellation seems to be the more accurate of the two, as both Gísl and Þjóðólfr refer to Harald’s sovereignty over the people of Oppland in the context of his military exploits on the Norwegian-Danish border.

There is another set of stanzas in Gísl’s drápa which may well have been inspired by Þjóðólfr’s poetry:

Vágr þrúnaði, en vefi keyrði
steinóðr á stagi storðar galli;
braut dýrr dreki und Dana skelfi
hrygg í hverri hafs glymbruði.32

The sea swelled, and the raging destruction of the sapling drove the sails against the stays; the precious dragon beneath the terrifier of the Danes broke the back in every roaring-bride of the ocean.

Blár ægir skaut búnú svíra,
gjalfr hljóp í gin gollnu hofði;
skein af hausum sem himins eisa
döglinga drauka djúps valfasti.33

The dark ocean struck against the adorned neck, the surge leaped into the jaws of the golden head; the corpse-flame of the deep shone like the cinder of heaven from the skulls of the ruler’s dragon.

Some of the closest analogies seem to be provided in the stanzas attributed to Þjóðólfr Leiðangr:
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Skeið sák framm at fleði, orms glóa fax of farmi
fagrt sprund, ór þrunar; fráns, sízt ýtt vas þóttum
kennd hvar liggr fyr landi — þóru búnir svírar
lóng síð dreka ins prúða; brunnit goll — af hlunni.34

I saw the warship beautiful lady, propelled out of the river onto the ocean, look
where the long side-planking of the splendid dragon-ship lies offshore; the gleam-
ing manes of the serpent shine out above the cargo, since it was launched from the
rollers, the decorated necks bore burnished gold.

Slyngr laugardag lóngu vestr réð ór Nið næsta
lið-Baldr af sér tjaldi, nýri skeið at stýra
út þars ekkjur líta ungr, en árar drengja,
orms síð ór bæ prúðar; allvaldr, í sæk falla.35

The troop-Baldr throws, on a Saturday, the long awning off, where fine women
gaze at the side-planking of the serpent out from the town; the youthful overlord
set about steering the brand new longship west out of Nidelven, and the oars of the
warriors plunge into the sea.

Like his grandfather, Magnus Barefoot — as he is depicted by Þjóðólfr
Árnórsson — appears to be the owner of an excellently equipped and richly
decorated fleet. In his poem, Gísl uses precisely the same elements: the
sea-faring quality of the royal drakkar that can easily cope with the wrath
of the sea, the shining gold of the dragon heads that adorn both the prows
and the sterns of all the ships, and the terror that the sight of his fleet arises
in the hearts of Magnus’s enemies, acting as a foreboding of his successful
military achievements. The stylistic analogies seem to be by no means acci-
dental. On the one hand, they point to some distinct artistic influence of
the skalds working for Haraldr on those who are known to be working at
the court of Magnus Barefoot. On the other, though, such similarities may
be interpreted as a poetic response to the particular expectations articula-
ted by Magnus and his retinue. The latter group also presumably included
the sons of the Norwegian king. Both Þorkell and Gísl call Magnus the
father of both Eysteinn (Eysteins fóður) and Sigurðr (Sigurðar feðr).36 The
two brothers were undoubtedly among the original audience of the poems
dedicated to their father and, later, actively participated in the process of
preserving the memory of Magnus Barefoot as a true follower of Haraldr
hardradi.

The process in question presumably included another element, namely
the tradition of the king as a poet, which may be exemplified by the

34 SPMA II, p. 150.
35 SPMA II, pp. 150—151.
sequence of three stanzas preserved in the *Morkinskinna* which are attributed to Magnus:

Sú’s ein es mér meinar
Maktildr ok vekr hildi
(mór drekkr suðr ór schörum
sveita) leik ok teiti;

så kennir mér svanni,
síð lónd es verr röndu
(sverð bitu Högnar hurðir)
hvítjarpr sofa liðit.

There is one Matilda, who denies me fun and pleasure and stirs up strife, in the south the seagull of gore drinks from wounds; that lady with the light-brown hair, who defends her lands with the shield, teaches me to sleep but little, swords bit the doors of Högni.

Hvat’s í heimi betra,
hyggr skald af þró sjaldan
(mjók’s langr sás dvelr drengi
dagr) an víf en foğru;

Þungan berk af þingi
þann harm, es skalk svanna
(skreytask menn at móti)
minn aldrigi finna.

What’s better in this world than fair women? The poet seldom forgets his yearning, the day which delays men is very long; I carry that heavy care from the assembly, that I shall never meet my woman; men dress up at the meeting.

Jørp mun eigi verpa
arm-Hlín á glæ sínum,
orð spyrk golhrrings Gerðar
góð of skald i hljóði;

annk, þótt eigi finnak
opt, goðvefjar ðoptu;
viti menn at hykk hennar
hála rökðarmölum.

The brown-haired Hlín of the arm will not throw away her [words] to no avail, I hear in secret the kind words of the Gerðr of the gold ring about the skald; I love the thwart of precious cloth, although I don’t often meet [her]; let men know that I think very highly of her caring comments.

The authorship of the above stanzas is far from certain. Moreover, even the author of the saga himself appears to have raised some air of doubt, as he wove these pieces into his own narrative (*þessi vísa er kennd Magnúsi konungi*). The stanzas are dedicated to a woman named Matilda (*Maktildr*), and their content suggests that the skald’s attempts to win her favour ultimately failed, as she, denying him fun and pleasure (*leik ok teiti*), in a sense defended her land with a shield (*verr lónd sin röndu*). Despite this, the skald expresses his unshaken affection towards her and fears that he will not see her again. His praise is capped by a rhetorical coda, a question through which he asks whether there is anything better in this world than a beautiful woman (*hvats betra i heimi*

---


38 *Morkinskinna* 1…, p. 60.
an ín fǫgru víf). The skald hopes, though, that he will soon be able to share further moments of tenderness with his beloved, as, according to him, Matilda has secretly admitted her fondness for him.

The stanzas in question may be classified as rather conventional love poetry (mansǫngr), displaying some of the most characteristic features of the sub-genre: frequent erotic allusions, the poet’s inability to fulfil his desires, his longing for the beloved woman articulated in the course of a long and distant military campaign. Much attention so far has also been paid to the identification of this mysterious Maktildr. It is quite a complicated matter, though, as, according to the Morkinskinna, she was dóttur keisarans. The potential candidates include Matilda, daughter of Malcolm III of Scotland, later married to Henry I of England, and Margret, great-granddaughter of Edmund Ironside. Given Magnus’s relations with Scotland and his supposed matrimonial plans, the former seems to be the most probable candidate. This short list may, however, be extended to include another Matilda, daughter of the aforementioned Henry I and Matilda of Scotland (1102—1167), who, in 1114, married the Emperor Henry V and, following his death, became the wife of Geoffrey V Plantagenet, the Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy. It must be noted, though, that this identification is very problematic, as she was never considered to be the potential beloved of Magnus. Moreover, no emperor’s daughter (in this case, it would have to be the daughter of Henry IV) is known to be called Matilda during the reign of Magnus Barefoot. Hence, it seems that the identification may lead only to a person who, as a dóttur keisarans, was considered by the author of the Morkinskinna. The Empress Matilda was famous not only for her exceptional beauty, but she was also known as a charismatic woman, one whose exceptional qualities came to full expression as she was fighting for her rights to the throne of England. One cannot exclude the possibility that her fame was also known in the North and, in this way, inspired the saga authors. Yet another problem is the authenticity and reliability of the attribution of these stanzas to Magnus Barefoot. According to Russell Poole, the saga authors were consciously modifying the contexts in which love poetry, often attributed to particular rulers, could find its place. It seems possible, then, that in the case of Magnus, one deals with another example of the poets’ stylistic attempts to align the king

---
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with his famous grandfather,\textsuperscript{44} himself an active skald, also known for some love stanzas (Gamanvísur). The latter poem shares certain similarities with the stanzas on Matilda. Its attribution to Harald is at least uncertain and the poem might in fact be of a later date.\textsuperscript{45} Although the skald’s main concerns appear to be his personal achievements confirming his prowess and ability to display a wide range of skills (átta íþróttir in stanza 4), it is the erotic and/or love context which is confirmed in the concluding remark that appears in five of the poem’s six stanzas (þó lætr Gerðr gollhrings í Gǫrðum skolla við mér: “yet the Gerðr goddess of the gold ring in Russia ridicules me”).\textsuperscript{46}

Again, the poet’s desire for the beloved woman is juxtaposed with her indifference to his advances and ultimate rejection. The similarities that both sets of stanzas share suggest that the motif of Magnus’s love turbulences and his unfulfilled desire for the mysterious Matilda serve as a supplement to the more general comparison between the two rulers, a supplement, it ought to be stressed, with quite unique, and thus significant, features.

Despite the fact that the thematic scope of the poems dedicated to Magnus Barefoot is relatively limited, it allows one to draw some conclusions with regard to the above-examined issues. The king of Norway appears to be very much interested in presenting his reign as a direct continuation of the days of Harald hardradi, his grandfather. This trend is reflected not only in connection with his general policy, but also in the accompanying sphere of royal propaganda, the latter of which was the domain of those skalds who composed their verses with the monarch in mind.

This tendency to depict the king as a follower of his famous predecessor surely served to strengthen Magnus’s position in Norway and to justify his military actions both in Scandinavia and in the British Isles. This poetic comparison with Harald was an occasion to accentuate the royal virtues of Magnus and to distinguish the king from among his contemporaries. That is why the skalds who are known to have made their living at his court were so willing to imitate the poets composing for Harald, especially Þjóðólfr Árnórsson, whose works were perceived as a good model to emulate, reflecting the spirit of the time. Then, it should come as no surprise that analogous criteria would be welcomed by Magnus in his recruitment of the skalds, whose task was to support and strengthen his royal actions by means of their poetic skills.


\textsuperscript{45} SPMA II, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{46} SPMA II, pp. 35—41.
Magnus Barefoot — the Last Viking King of Norway?
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Streszczenie

W powszechnej opinii, śmierć Haralda Srogiego w bitwie pod Stamford Bridge w 1066 roku postrzegana jest często jako symboliczny koniec epoki wikingów. Jednakże, moment ten można przesunąć w czasie do 24 sierpnia 1103 roku, gdy, po dziesięcioletnim panowaniu w Norwegii, wnuk Haralda Magnus poległ w starciu w wyniku zasadzki, do jakiej doszło w Ulster. Niektóre ze staroskandynawskich przekazów, które opisują panowanie Magnusa, dokonują swoistego porównania obu władców, ukazując Magnusa jako prawdziwego i zadeklarowanego naśladowcę swojego dziada. Nie dziwi więc, że okoliczności, w jakich Magnus poległ, często przedstawiane są jako najpełniejszy przejaw tego wizerunku, zarówno w pozytywnym jak i negatywnym znaczeniu.

Król Norwegii jawi się jako osoba niezwykle zainteresowana tym, aby jego rządy były postrzegane jako bezpośrednia kontynuacja czasów Haralda Srogiego. Tendencja ta dotyczy nie tylko jego działań politycznych w ogólności, ale także sfery propagandowej. Ta ostatnia był zaś dominowana przez skaldów komponujących na rzecz króla.

Słowa klucze: epoka wikingów, poezja skaldów, Magnus Bosy

Jakub Morawiec

Magnus Bosy — ostatni wikiński król Norwegii?

Zusammenfassung

Herrschern her und zeigen Magnus als einen echten und überzeugten Nachahmer seines Großvaters. Es ist daher nicht verwunderlich, dass die Umstände, unter denen Magnus fiel, oft als der vollste Ausdruck dieses Bildes, im sowohl positiven als auch negativen Sinne, dargestellt werden.


Schlüsselwörter: Wikingerzeit, Skaldenpoesie, Magnus Barfuß