

trading-ship. In 684 Ecgfrith of Northumbria sent his army, under Berhtred, to Ireland, and ravaged Magh-breg, and in 685 Adamnan sailed to England to buy back the captives. In 728 the *Four Masters* mention a "marine fleet" of Dalriada which attacked Inisowen in Ulster. The English and Irish were already showing the example of the very deeds they lamented with such bitterness a little later. Is it to be supposed that no word of such events reached Scandinavia, when the chief sea-traders of the age were the Frisians, near neighbours of Denmark? Why, one may ask, did not the Viking raids begin sooner?

As a matter of fact, they did; but we have no record stating that they reached Britain. About 515 King Chochilaicus, as Gregory of Tours calls him, or Huggleik, led a fleet from the Baltic to the mouth of the Meuse or the Rhine, and was overcome and slain by Theodebert, son of the Frankish king Theodoric. This is *Beowulf's* Hygelác, king of Goths; and the existence of *Beowulf* shows that there was early connection, other than hostile, between Scandinavia and England. But the invasion of Huggleik, like the Anglo-Saxon settlement, was a part of the great "folk-wandering" movement, not a Viking raid of a few pirates adventuring for slaves and gold. Professor Alexander Bugge, in his recent works *Vikingerne*, i., 1904, and *Vesterlandenes Inflydelse paa Nordboernes i Vikingetiden*, 1905, points out that the period of Huggleik was full of such enterprises. Fifty years later (565) the Danes made a