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One result of the Viking raids was the taking of captives who later became slaves. There is no agreement among scholars on the social and economic importance of this phenomenon, and some offer that it is not significant to the state. The problem is illustrated by the story by random selections from the annals, twelfth-century sagas and laws. It is, however, often assumed that the taking of slaves reached its peak in the ninth and tenth centuries and that the advent of Christianity made the institution of slavery morally unacceptable.

The only modern monograph on Scandinavian slavery is N. Neves, Fræjem og schoterfærem, Danmark og Storbritannia (Copenhagen 1975). It is not necessary from a historical point of view. Opinions and presumptions on the role of the church are expressed by P. Poole and R. N. Neves in Early Medieval Slavery (Copenhagen 1977). In a different view, G. Andersen emphasizes the acceptance by the medieval church of ethnic slavery. Slavery and the concept of music (Townsend 1987).
The Slav Trade of Dublin

In this study I propose to analyse the information supplied by the Irish annals on Viking and Irish practices in regard to slavery. I shall argue that the taking of slaves was a marginal aspect of the Viking raiding pattern, which centered on the taking of portable wealth. Slaving-raiding became an integral part of the warfare of the Dublin kings of the late tenth and early tenth centuries, first and foremost as a means of retaliation and of displaying the military capacities of the king of his would-be successor. The economic importance of the trade was not, however, directly dependent on the political circumstances of the Viking kingdom, and the taking of slaves was not a primary motive for warfare. I shall further argue that the boom of the Dublin trade is to be dated in the late tenth and eleventh centuries as a result of the work of freebooters, and especially of the struggles of Irish kings for supremacy. Thus the market expanded in response to the profound changes of internal Irish warfare and to the changing role of Dublin in the Irish power struggle. The declining importance of slavery in the twelfth century was probably caused by the emergence of links with Scandinavia, the rise of Boyne in Irish sea trade, and the establishment of territorial kingdoms with defined boundaries.

In all, 75 annals for years between 781 and 1085 record the taking of prisoners on raids which I take to indicate deliberate action by the Vikings to exact a demand for slaves. Clearly related to this was the taking of prominent nobles or ecclesiastics apparently with the object of obtaining ransom money; this is attested at least eight instances. Whereas cosmopolitanism is recorded from all over Ireland, slave-taking is only known from the eastern parts of Ireland (except for one Echthriac raid on the Aran Islands in 1013). Even though slave-taking probably also took place in the west and in southern counties, there is little doubt that the areas most strongly affected by the raids from Dublin westwards are Kildare and north to Armagh. These were the areas where the Viking attacks occurred again and again in the two centuries and it was in these areas bordering on Leinster and the Uí Néill territories that Dublin's political interests encountered the continuing power-struggles of contending Irish kingdoms.

The area to the north was the border area of the Northern and Southern Uí Néill, Leinster and Meath and to the west, the border between Leinster and Westmeath.

Outrage, and Meath. Opportunities alliances on one or other kingdom enabled Dublin to survive and reap the fruits of war. In the 880s and 890s the Vikings primarily adhered to hit-and-run tactics in which the taking of slaves was a fairly regular occurrence, though probably not on a large scale. Taking of prisoners was intended for the years 881 on Howth, first and foremost as a means of retaliation and of displaying the military capacities of the king of his would-be successor. The economic importance of the trade was not, however, directly dependent on the political circumstances of the Viking kingdom, and the taking of slaves was not a primary motive for warfare. I shall further argue that the boom of the Dublin trade is to be dated in the late tenth and eleventh centuries as a result of the work of freebooters, and especially of the struggles of Irish kings for supremacy. Thus the market expanded in response to the profound changes of internal Irish warfare and to the changing role of Dublin in the Irish power struggle. The declining importance of slavery in the twelfth century was probably caused by the emergence of links with Scandinavia, the rise of Boyne in Irish sea trade, and the establishment of territorial kingdoms with defined boundaries.

I

In all, 75 annals for years between 781 and 1085 record the taking of prisoners on raids which I take to indicate deliberate action by the Vikings to exact a demand for slaves. Clearly related to this was the taking of prominent nobles or ecclesiastics apparently with the object of obtaining ransom money; this is attested at least eight instances. Whereas cosmopolitanism is recorded from all over Ireland, slave-taking is only known from the eastern parts of Ireland (except for one Echthriac raid on the Aran Islands in 1013). Even though slave-taking probably also took place in the west and in southern counties, there is little doubt that the areas most strongly affected by the raids from Dublin westwards are Kildare and north to Armagh. These were the areas where the Viking attacks occurred again and again in the two centuries and it was in these areas bordering on Leinster and the Uí Néill territories that Dublin's political interests encountered the continuing power-struggles of contending Irish kingdoms. The area to the north was the border area of the Northern and Southern Uí Néill, Leinster and Meath and to the west, the border between Leinster and Westmeath.
would have been an appropriate act of defiance. Dublin now allied with the kingdom of Osraige, and for the next decade the fate of Dublin was still connected with Irish need and willingness to pay for their services. Using the Dublin forces as mercenaries and assassins in the early days, the Northern Ul Néill finally secured a hegemony over Osraige and a momentary peace. From 865 to 868 the annals of the city do not record one Irish war. Perhaps, however, the Vikings went on to take their toll on the Irish. The Dublin annals of the early 9th century are absent. What really needs to be discerned is the military activity based on the necessity to secure the presence of the soldiers. If this military activity was not based on the necessity to secure the soldiers, the presence of such a military activity is not in evidence. The presence of such a military activity is not in evidence for this period. For the next century, the Dublin annals of the 9th century are absent. In the same year, other followed Joint planning and Co-operation to take up a new round of old-time liberties. The nearer the tide, the more urgent the need. That first took revenge in 869 by plundering and burning Armagh and, according to the annals, killing or taking prisoner c. 1,000 persons (A.D. 895). Our fairly detailed knowledge of events before Olaf's death (see Table 1) suggests that a large-scale slave raiding was an interesting insight into the mechanisms behind raids. Olaf was on a mission of war in 895 and had taken severe blows. To keep up his prestige as king-warrior he had to do the spectacular. Rather than being the Armagh attack of 895 as merely a continuation of the attacks of the 880s, we should recognize that the taking of slaves was now part of Olaf's revenge on Armagh and a political necessity for his own survival as undisputed leader of Dublin warriors. These were probably the real motives behind this first major supply to the postulated slave market of Dublin. Olaf's resumption of interest in the other side of the Irish Sea may reflect this view. In 879 he made a surprising return to Dublin with 300 ships and a large number of captives, 11. The taking of this enormous number of captives, Northern Ul Néill finally secured a hegemony over Osraige and a momentary peace. From 865 to 868 the annals of the city do not record one Irish war. Perhaps, however, the Vikings went on to take their toll on the Irish. The Dublin annals of the early 9th century are absent. What really needs to be discerned is the military activity based on the necessity to secure the presence of the soldiers. If this military activity was not based on the necessity to secure the soldiers, the presence of such a military activity is not in evidence. The presence of such a military activity is not in evidence for this period. For the next century, the Dublin annals of the 9th century are absent. In the same year, other followed Joint planning and Co-operation to take up a new round of old-time liberties. The nearer the tide, the more urgent the need. That first took revenge in 869 by plundering and burning Armagh and, according to the annals, killing or taking prisoner c. 1,000 persons (A.D. 895). Our fairly detailed knowledge of events before Olaf's death (see Table 1) suggests that a large-scale slave raiding was an interesting insight into the mechanisms behind raids. Olaf was on a mission of war in 895 and had taken severe blows. To keep up his prestige as king-warrior he had to do the spectacular. Rather than being the Armagh attack of 895 as merely a continuation of the attacks of the 880s, we should recognize that the taking of slaves was now part of Olaf's revenge on Armagh and a political necessity for his own survival as undisputed leader of Dublin warriors. These were probably the real motives behind this first major supply to the postulated slave market of Dublin. Olaf's resumption of interest in the other side of the Irish Sea may reflect this view. In 879 he made a surprising return to Dublin with 300 ships and a large number of captives, 11. The taking of this enormous number of captives, Northern Ul Néill finally secured a hegemony over Osraige and a momentary peace. From 865 to 868 the annals of the city do not record one Irish war. Perhaps, however, the Vikings went on to take their toll on the Irish. The Dublin annals of the early 9th century are absent. What really needs to be discerned is the military activity based on the necessity to secure the presence of the soldiers. If this military activity was not based on the necessity to secure the soldiers, the presence of such a military activity is not in evidence. The presence of such a military activity is not in evidence for this period. For the next century, the Dublin annals of the 9th century are absent. In the same year, other followed Joint planning and Co-operation to take up a new round of old-time liberties. The nearer the tide, the more urgent the need. That first took revenge in 869 by plundering and burning Armagh and, according to the annals, killing or taking prisoner c. 1,000 persons (A.D. 895). Our fairly detailed knowledge of events before Olaf's death (see Table 1) suggests that a large-scale slave raiding was an interesting insight into the mechanisms behind raids. Olaf was on a mission of war in 895 and had taken severe blows. To keep up his prestige as king-warrior he had to do the spectacular. Rather than being the Armagh attack of 895 as merely a continuation of the attacks of the 880s, we should recognize that the taking of slaves was now part of Olaf's revenge on Armagh and a political necessity for his own survival as undisputed leader of Dublin warriors. These were probably the real motives behind this first major supply to the postulated slave market of Dublin.
attack may indeed have occurred on their way to Dublin, as they wished to fortify the territory and establish control. The lack of direct evidence in the form of inscriptions, art or written records makes it difficult to establish the exact date of this event. However, the presence of Norse ships in the area suggests a Norse settlement, possibly as early as the 9th century.

The city of Dublin was established by the Vikings, who may have arrived as early as the 9th century AD. The city became a center of trade and culture, and the Viking influence is still visible today in the city's architecture and language.

Dublin was a major hub for trade and commerce, and its location on the coast made it an ideal place for merchants to trade with other Norse settlements.

The city's rich history and cultural heritage continue to attract tourists from around the world, making it one of the most popular destinations in Ireland.
marriage alliances and other political necessities but some of it was prob-
ably traded. Unfortunately, we do not know what the commodities may
have been, but in this state of complete darkness it is conceivable that the luxury
items have been Irish women and children and skilled craftsmen.

In this stretch of entry into slavery I have found myself only once in
agreement with the theory of Alfred E. Smyth. He does point to the
occupation on Arran as an accessory in the activities of Dublin, but he seems
to surmise that this change should be as the aggressive heresy of Franks and
Old Irish. I cannot find any indication that the conflict between paganism and
Christianity should be the driving motive for the slave trade of the
Vikings. Only late hydraulic marijuana crops attest to this conduct from
the eighth to the twelfth of the attackers, and I would prefer the simpler explanation of
revenge and injustice. More interesting in its own notion of a very active
trade between Dublin and the Spanish Gulf, Smyth argues that had
Scandinavia and Ireland could have had a market to absorb the output of
Western European slave trade and thus find himself forced to look for other
possible markets. Unfortunately, he is badly served by his reference to
Brandwein's work on the Vikings, first published in 1936, since Brandwein's theory
that overpopulation was the cause of the Viking emigration must now be finally rejected. It is now evident that such medieval evidence as Dómid of let-
nor and the Norwegian that was initially central to the emigration of
such phenomena as the migrations of the
Goths and the Neurans.

I would rather find part of the explanation of
the Viking trade in the old references in the land legends of Harald Härfagre which forced aristocratic Norwegian to find
other lands abroad if they would not inherit allegiance to the king. This explana-
tion certainly indicates the cause of the matter; the social upheavals in Scandi-
navia is connection with the rising demands of the national kingdoms. Thus, we
should be concerned with the social and political factors in the
emigration of aristocracy, and their warbands. Under any circumstances, free
will may be a partial to this in the migration of the Norwegians in the
ninth century, so as to take the low left by Danish and Norwegian emigrants in America.

Smyth's actual indications of trade between Dublin and Spisa are few

Pie Seven Viking C veins (Dublin 1936) 77-72.

3 Smyth, Some Norse kings (151-156) A thorough review of Smyth's work is given by D. W. O'Don-
rain, 'Some kings of Arran' (1985), 268-280. Changes (1985) 7-27. Smyth is con-
not receive the standard study of the original belief of the Vikings which even if a crucial
matter; only such studies must be based on contemporaneous sources.


5 FROM THE SLAVE TRADE OF DUKE
was prohibited. Churches probably tried to make the Vikings comply with that condition. We always tried to accept that the Vikings left an acceptable role in society as long as they treated heathen slaves and maybe even foreign Christians. In this respect, they may have been more tolerant and respectful.

The problems with the Vikings was that they practiced slavery — every self-respecting ancestor did that — but that they did not follow the laws of society and that they had the farmers’ assistance to carve a piece of land for themselves.

II

While Ireland must have been somewhat of a backwater in the late-sixth century when great battles were fought by British in Britain and France, the stabilisation of Viking territories in the Danube and Normandy in the second decade of the tenth century seems a plausible background for renewed interest among some warriors in independent adventuring in Ireland. Raiding again reached the peaks of 853 and 854, but now it is clear that the grandsons of Ivar had control of the areas that began paying in an attempt to control their wealth from the sea. In the new decade, Stringfellow built up a system of control that was based on coastal strongholds. Waterford in the south-east, Carlingford and Strangford Lough and Antrim in the north-west. The River Barrow was effectively under their control and linked Waterford to Dublin. The northern forces seem, on the other hand, to have been unable to open up the hinterland, except for sudden summer campaigns. From 930 independent Vikings under the leadership of Thorold Helethson operated from Limerick and brought for the first time the extensive Shannon river system under the control of Norse forces. During this Viking build-up, we hear occasional reports of the taking of prisoners from the Irish, evidently for ransom.

The competition between the Dublin and Limerick leaderships was to be the underlying motive for most Viking actions for five years, eventually directed against the Irish. At first, Dublin’s response to the threat from the Shannon was to secure its northern bases which were on Uisneach land. In 930, the forces of Stringfellow in Antrim succeeded in destroying the precarious settlement at Kells.

15  In 935, the king of Conchob was taken to Limerick and later released (ADF 3.941:032).  Two years later, the king of Leinster represented the same (ADF 4.918:040-41).
At this time, the taking of slaves seems to have become a regular feature of Dublin warfare. As the camp was again under heavy pressure and spectacular success was expected by the commander, Ola's misfortune in York had been immediately vindicated by the king of Meath and Cúchulainn took over Dublin and ravaged its hinterland (AU s. 347). In 958, Ola took revenge on the Cenél Eógain and had their king ransomed at what we may imagine to be a shattering price (AU s. 986). The same year, he beat the first united Viking-Irish alliance in the taking of prisoners when Cúchulain of Cnóch with the Norse of Waterford plundered Meath and took many captives, among whom the abbots of Clonmacnoise and Killaloe (A.F. s. 337). One of the abbots was evidently sold to Dublin to keep prisoner at the Dalkey Island; he drowned when trying to escape the next year (A.F. s. 338). His fate gives us a sudden glimpse of the practical circumstances of slavery. He may have been sold off to Dublin when there was no prospect of obtaining ransom money, and were waited on Dalkey for the slave market. The tale of the abbots sold off the coast as a prisoner is a parallel to the account of St. Finburet of Vich, mentioned above.

The question of the Irish involvement in the taking of slaves is intriguing. Slavery was certainly practiced in Ireland before the advent of the Vikings, and yet the annals of the tenth century do not attest to any instances of the taking of prisoners en masse by the Irish. In 953, the Annals of Ulster record for the first time that the taking of prisoners (regarded as distinct from the regular practice of the taking of hostages (gaitl) (AU s. 924). Only in 953 do we again hear of captives of war when the Cenél Eógain king plundered an assigning party led by the Ogleth and Dubhghach kings by taking captives (A.F. s. 924). Apart from the unspecified incidents of 953, we must observe that the taking of captives by Irish kings seems exclusively restricted to the tenth century to menacing expeditions against the Vikings. In 957, when Dublin was again losing strength, Conchlaerc, king of Lérim, drove the Dubliners back and took many women, treasures and lands (AU s. 942), we may reasonably regard the great ship of Hansewore does not, as it is now apparent, the present meaning seems to be 'enemy captives'. The Annals of the Four Masters turn the tense annal of AU into dramatic prose for the year 954:

'The destruction brought upon us was thus tuff that, i.e., its houses, dominions, ships and all other structures, were burned; its women, boys, and common folk were carried into bondage. It was utterly destroyed, from four cause: man, by lightning, drowning, burning and captivity, excepting a small remnant, which fled in a few ships and reached Dalkey (A.F. s. 942). If we read A.F. there is no doubt as to the vengeance of Conchlaerc, but we are cautioned by the style which is very much like that of twelfth-century writers for the keenest seeking of Dublin cow breath: Somnadium York and Dublin, 1544-958.'
full of the great house of St Brigit, and the full of the oratory, is what Niall ranagumed of them with his own money. The entry must be read quite literally, i.e. that most of the clerics were bereft, whereas the rest, including the many kernmen likely to be around the monastic house, were led away. Incidentally, the pious Niall may have been so keen an admirer of his grandfather's name Erlikh is perhaps Norse. [Annot.]

During the first halfof the tenth century, slaves were still a by-product of a particular kind of war, namely retaliatory actions and military adventures designed to exact the capabilities of the would-be assailer. The object of most ordinary attacks was probably portable wealth, mostly cattle, hence with cattle and slaves demanded a higher organisation of the attack and were not so easily turned into money. Even though the taking of slaves occurred, probably by the use of war captives, and they were an important source of slavery in Dublin was probably much slighter, and we may imagine that most slaves would be useful for household purposes as servants, workmen or perhaps as armed workers. An unknown proportion of slaves were bought by serfdom slave-dealers or brought home to the new settlements of the north Atlantic. The mention of the large boat-owners, the sons of Olaf in one earlier suggestion is that of enterprise wars in the Gulf.

Some Irish kings seem to have learnt the practice of slave-taking from the Vikings. They turned this humiliating expedient against the Norse, but a near parallel can be found in the monastic areas to suggest that the Irish slaves in the Irish households was perhaps spreading. General social development seems to have degraded some peasants to a social status near that of the slaves, and some might well feel their children 'grasp' with debts incurred in a harsh winter. [Annot.]

[Annot.]


[Annot.]
also that of these freebooters. Rossneverty was attacked in 1659, and Brian Boru later ransomed the imprisoned leader on security stipulated (AL 2478), -the fate of the monks, and Breton that may have been caught in the same action is unknown. The Dublin arms in England in these years eventually have distracted the attention of these freebooting gangs from the Irish Sea.

Within Ireland, on the other hand, the Dublin arms seem not to have taken slaves in any significant degree. Our sparse information suggests nothing but the occasional capture of an Irish king to obtain political concessions and ransom money. After the battle of Trim in 1171, the king of Meath is reputed to have freed all the Irish slaves of Dublin, on 111 of the occasion of a heavy tribute of 20,000 marks. It was noted, moreover, that Sechnamh proclaimed "let every one of the Irish kings as in the territory of the orlainghe, the satellite and hereditary depart thereof to his own territory with peace and happiness," C.S. a. 631. Like the entry for 1171, this looks much like a late interpolation. The pirate alliance to a vellam Meath Sechnamh reveals, however, is genuine and it seems quite plausible that he freed the Irish slaves - not every slave of foreign extraction. Hundred Dublin 10th century and any significant number of slaves at this time, they must have been supplied to some degree, from sources other than Dublin's own military actions. All this must remain for conjecture as all we know from this period is the name of those slave-owning masters, the king of Dublin, Sechnamh, allegodly whilst drunk, he had been given the Norse name Sechnam (AS a. 471)

The freeing operations were reported by Brian Boru's Meath Sechnamh, an action on Dublin after the victory over Leinster and the suppression of Dublin in 1171. The vector proceeded from the battle-field to Dublin where they remained for some weeks and carried off all its gold and silver and prisoners (AL 2478). The prisoners may have been vikings except for Niall and some Breton allies.

After the battle of Clontarf, Máel Mórada, king Sechnamh of Dublin had to surrender his hostages to Brian, and for the next years Dublin acted as the front trooper for Brian's campaign of an all-Ireland sovereignty. We may presume that the outside action of the Ulaid in 1171 to Sechnamh was a result of successful secedation to save his own authority and perhaps to serve Brian's purposes by defending the other monastic territories. At any rate, this was the occasion for the

- in Chester's history of the Vikings (Iubilat in ibid. 16);
- in a note by John's (1173, 16).
- O.F.S. 67 (1173), for the taking of Donald, Donn, who was only ejected from Dublin in 1176, after AP. 4, 676.
s. a. 1051: Sigtryg launched Dublin's last offensive the next year against the Angles, when he was alleged to have been killed or captured (AFM s. a. 1051).

The Indian summer of Dublin was well over by now, however, Sigtryg's operations in the 1050s were only made possible because of the sudden collapse of the Dal-Clit supremacy in 1044. Sigtryg's machinations were months in the making and his 700 soldiers sided (along with a minor political faction) with Sigtryg and his brother (HR). In this, 1049, the three men were under

The new Swedish fleet, which was assembled in the north, was a formidable force. With this new fleet, the Swedes launched a massive attack on Dublin. The Swedes sailed up the River Liffey and landed their army at the mouth of the river. The Swedes then marched on the city, demanding its surrender.

The Dubliners refused to surrender and the Swedes laid siege to the city. The siege lasted for several months, with both sides suffering heavy casualties. Finally, in the spring of 1052, the Swedes abandoned the siege and retreated back to their ships. The Dubliners were victorious and their city was saved.

The victory over the Swedes was a significant moment in Dublin's history. It marked the end of the threat of Swedish invasion and allowed the city to continue to grow and prosper. It also strengthened the Dubliners' resolve to resist any future attacks on their city.

The victory over the Swedes was a significant moment in Dublin's history. It marked the end of the threat of Swedish invasion and allowed the city to continue to grow and prosper. It also strengthened the Dubliners' resolve to resist any future attacks on their city.
the UI Muiredach raided Fir Chulh and took many prisoners (AFM s.a. 1035). But the leading place of the UI Chernaingt was well attested by the spoils of Drumannack. In 1035, he took many prisoners from several UI Muiredach churches in Killmore and Carlow (AFM s.a. 1035). And the next year he was in the burning of Ferns and the murder of his brethren by an attack on Killamore, where 200 were said to be killed and 200 captured (AU s.a. 1035). In 1048 he took captives and fire from the Deirs (AFM s.a. 1048). In the same source, a second edition took a fourth revenge upon the Ailpillia for the violences of the Bell of Patrick. In 1050, 2000 cows and a great many prisoners from the UI Mollich and Coolagles, and many cows and prisoners from the Muiredach (AU s.a. 1044). In 1055, the Dál Cais and Meath kings made a desperate move to crush Drumannack. In 1050, they took the hostages of Drumannack and the wife of the lord of Oiveage, and many prisoners from the church of Killmore. Drumannack immediately avenged this attack by burning and plundering the churches of Meath and taking captives and great spoil. The fugitives of Drumannack’s action crowded into Gridelle’s territory where they were attacked again by the north by the Ailealla who seem to have spotted easy prey; many cows and prisoners were led away, in spite of the efforts of Lord of Gridelle (AFM, NA s.a. 1055). The Ailealla attack was evidently one of the very many plagues that were not part of some larger political scheme that were personal treatment manifestations of the brutality of the period. This newly established custom was called reedh, a prey of cattle for cattle. By now, the taking of captives also became part of these heroic. In 1069, the king of Connacht led the men of Meath in a battle in the new area of West Meath and took a large force of cattle. But the weakness of Meath was perhaps the reason why the overwhelming average the attack that diverted his attention to the UI Buídh and the Gulf. It was taken in the following year (AU s.a. 1069). In 1069 a war was led by the Ul and the UI Ferga in Connacht, where they took captives in the church and new a great amount of livestock. The Debuna pursued the assailants, however, and prevented them to capture the last night and the day. But the taking of captives was not the only thing that was happening. In Connacht, there was a twelfth-century territory that was called a cairn. In the Viking attack of 997, they took their jewels and 100 prisoners (AFM s.a. 1069). The rising power of the Dál Cais was marked in the assaults by heavy expeditions on north-western kingdoms. In 1095 the UI Mollich took a great prey of cattle from the Ulster kingdom of Dál Artair and killed or
pont to the very striking functional similarities between the warfare of Dublin and Irish kings. Simple features of the humiliating function of slavery to the point that one could perhaps put it to its own advantage. Thus, it is clearly comprehensible that the Vikings were imprisoned by their own demands and their eyes. The erroneous belief that some Irishwomen were at the service of Cogadh Gaedhil-Gaidheala. After the account of Béarn's victory of Limerick in 698, it is stated quite likely that every one of them, when she was killed, and every one that was made a slave was enslaved. The other main sources of the narrative tradition of the Viking Age, does not contain the same stories. However, it may be thought of as an extension, the place names certainly hint at the antiquity of the early twelfth-century text - not towards the contemporary inhabitants of Limerick, but towards an imaginary former site of the Vikings that had slowly changed into Irish attitudes to their own neighbors.

Further, we know that the great strengths of the east kings for supremacy were on a large degree decided by the use of naval forces. These were rather indirectly controlled by the overlordship in consequence of their control of Norse cities or they were hired from Norse warriors in Ireland or the Scottish Isles. On the contrary, Irish kings gradually came to control the main-power under their own direct control, but the Dublin fleet was in demand even on the eve of the Norman conquest. The Cogadh Gaedheal and the Scandinavian emigration and these were more dependent on Norse forces for hire. From the twelfth century we know that the Dublin fleet was hired for the services of castles that were driven in the city in payment. We know nothing of an earlier arrangement, but it is conceivable that in addition to payments in cattle there were also hired services. The prince of the government sold at the seaports and cutting high-seas in the service of captive, such as a, was evidenced in the east of Cogadh Gaedheal and it achieved the overlordship of Dublin for his son in 1014. On the Cogadh Gaedheal and 1022 the kings and the Cogadh Gaedheal, a new phase in the political and military history of the city might also be due to the need of the kings for foreign luxury items that were largely obtained only from the Norse cities, luxuries such as silk.

\[12\] Linn, Irish Norse Trade in the Irish of Dublin.

\[13\] The importance of trade in the economic and military potential of the Vikings is seen in the work of J. Linn, in G. and High Age (London 1937).

\[14\] In 1024, Mac Lochlainn's fleet Dublin a regular of 1,200 tons, and a harvest of 6,000 tons is marked in 628 (AF).
because it had formed part of their habit to purchase Englishmen indiscriminately from merchants as well as from robbers and traitors, and to make slaves of them. The word decayed that throughout the whole Englishmen should be tried from the hands of slaves and restored to their former freedom. The decree clearly seems to have been dictated by the Normans as the explanation clause reveals: 'For the Englishmen, in the days when the government of England was in their hands, to use their children for sale ... and would sell their own sons and relations into Ireland rather than endure any want or hunger. So there are good grounds for believing that just as forcibly those who sold the slaves, so now also those who bought them, have, by committing such a monstrous crime, deserved the yoke of slavery.' This reference to the days before Irish law contains some truth. There was indeed a slave trade between Bristol and Dublin, all the way back to the eleventh century. The persistent stand against the selling of christians abroad had been reiterated in all Anglo-Saxon law codes from the tenth to the twelfth century. But William the Conqueror seems to have had some success in enforcing the law. He prohibited the slave-trade of Bristol and, in 1102, finally, the Westminster Council declared a general prohibition against all trade in slaves in England. Although some slave trade probably continued, the dear reference of the word of Armagh to these regulations does indicate that the slave trade of Anglo-Irish slave trade was well for a time. And, the liberated Englishmen may well have been born in Ireland of English parents. Hermann the monk wrote in 1120 that Irish traders in Bristol were notorious for their invitation of foreigners aboard their ships when they would suddenly set sail and sell their captives in Ireland. This slave-trading practice, if anything, rather suggests that the organised slave trade of Bristol had come to an end.

Irish evidence points to the eleventh century as the grand day of the Irish Sea slave-trade. By way of conclusion, I shall present some further indications:
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taunted close contacts with Denmark in the first half of the century. 28 This closely timed event must have been worth considering a further analysis. The most manifest evidence of continued contacts is the attempt of Magnus Bardeus in 1701-1702 to claim Norwegian rule over Norse settlements around the Irish Sea. His failure was accompanied by the build-up of Norwegian control over the Scottish Isles. Even though Dublin maintained continued relations with the Norse of Orkney and the Hebrides, it probably lost direct and direct economic tie after Magnus's death.

On the basis of this evidence we must consider ourselves with possibilities. It is most likely that the supply of slaves for the market slumped somewhat in the early twelfth century, and that the usual circumstances had already been already for some time neglected the attention of both the Norwegian and Dublin rulers away from each other. In a Scandinavian context, it is of some interest to state the probability that after the thirteenth century Norway and other countries received no Irish slaves.

The re-direction of Dublin interest was partly due to the fact that it found other and richer markets as well as the late tenth and eleventh centuries. The poem of Garmur of Rogan c 1210 relates the story of an Irish poet who was initially caught in Ireland, sold at the market of Carlingford in the north of England, and the latter's name, only to wind up in Rogar in Normandy where he redeemed his wife from her owner. 34 The economic geography of this otherwise particularly untruthworthy poem has a ring of truth.

We know that Dublin built up trade relations with Chester in the late tenth century on the road to Carlingford, and it is likely that Rogar was an important slave market well into the middle of the eleventh century. The initials of foremen of this period in Ireland are two Norman names (one on Dublin Island which attests some relationship with Normandy) from whose wine was imported. 35 Excavations in Dublin have shown that the contacts of the city came to concentrate heavily on Normandy and the Welsh area from the late eleventh century. 36 Initially markets for slaves, these cities grew in
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