



Ascough, P. L., Church, M. J., Cook, G. T., Einarsson, Á., McGovern, T. H., Dugmore, A. J., and Edwards, K. J. (2014) Stable isotopic ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) characterization of key faunal resources 1 from Norse period 2 settlements in North Iceland. *Journal of the North Atlantic*, 7(7). pp. 25-42.

Copyright © 2014 Eagle Hill Publications

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

Content must not be changed in any way or reproduced in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder(s)

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details must be given

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/95036>

Deposited on: 20 February 2015

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

1 **Stable isotopic ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) characterization of key faunal resources from Norse period**  
2 **settlements in North Iceland**

3  
4 Philippa L. Ascough<sup>1,\*</sup>, Mike J. Church<sup>2</sup>, Gordon T. Cook<sup>1</sup>, Árni Einarsson<sup>3</sup>, Thomas H.  
5 McGovern<sup>4</sup>, Andrew J. Dugmore<sup>5</sup>, Kevin J. Edwards<sup>6,7</sup>.

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>SUERC, Scottish Enterprise Technology Park, Rankine Avenue, East Kilbride G75 0QF, UK

8 <sup>2</sup>Department of Archaeology, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK.

9 <sup>3</sup>Mývatn Research Station, Skútustaðir, Iceland and Institute of Biology and Environmental Sciences, University of  
10 Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland.

11 <sup>4</sup>Hunter Bioarchaeology Laboratory, Hunter College CUNY, NYC 10021, USA

12 <sup>5</sup>Institute of Geography, School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Drummond Street, Edinburgh EH9 8XP, UK

13 <sup>6</sup>Departments of Geography & Environment and Archaeology, University of Aberdeen, Elphinstone Road, Aberdeen  
14 AB24 3UF, UK

15 <sup>7</sup>St Catherine's College, University of Oxford, Manor Road, Oxford OX1 3UJ, UK

16 \*corresponding author email: [Philippa.ascough@gla.ac.uk](mailto:Philippa.ascough@gla.ac.uk)

17  
18 **Abstract:**

19 During the Viking Age, Norse peoples established settlements across the North Atlantic, colonizing  
20 the pristine and near-pristine landscapes of the Faroe Islands, Iceland, Greenland and the short-lived  
21 Vinland settlement in Newfoundland. Current North Atlantic archaeological research themes  
22 include efforts to understand human adaptation and impact in these environments. For example,  
23 early Icelandic settlements persisted despite substantial environmental impacts and climatic change,  
24 while the Greenlandic settlements were abandoned ca. AD 1450 in the face of similar  
25 environmental degradation. The Norse settlers utilized both imported domestic livestock and natural  
26 fauna, including wild birds and aquatic resources. The stable isotope ratios of carbon and nitrogen  
27 (expressed as  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) in archaeofaunal bones provide a powerful tool for the reconstruction  
28 of Norse economy and diet. Here we assess the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of faunal and floral samples  
29 from sites in North Iceland within the context of Norse economic strategies. These strategies had a  
30 dramatic effect upon the ecology and environment of the North Atlantic islands, with impacts  
31 enduring to the present day.

32  
33 **Keywords:** Stable isotopes, Iceland, North Atlantic, zooarchaeology, diet reconstruction

34

## 1        **Introduction**

2        The Viking settlement of the North Atlantic commenced around AD 800, and was characterized  
3 by rapid expansion of the Norse over a wide geographical area, including Scotland, the Faroe  
4 Islands, Iceland, and Greenland (e.g. Sharples and Parker Pearson 1999, Vésteinsson et al. 2002,  
5 Arge et al. 2005, Dugmore et al. 2005). In a relatively short time, settlements were established in a  
6 broad set of ecological and climatic zones, and agriculture was established in many previously  
7 pristine environments (Vésteinsson 1998, Dugmore et al. 2005, McGovern et al. 2007). Macro-scale  
8 settlement outcomes varied markedly, from long-term sustainability in the Faroes and Iceland, to  
9 abandonment of Greenlandic settlements in the mid 15<sup>th</sup> century AD (Dugmore et al. 2007a, 2012).  
10 This variation is also evident on smaller geographical scales; in Iceland the overall continuity of  
11 settlement is overlain by differences in the history and longevity of individual farm sites (Dugmore  
12 et al. 2007b). Understanding the mechanisms for this variation is a key component in the  
13 reconstruction of Viking histories in the North Atlantic, but this aim is frequently confounded by  
14 the complexity of social, economic and environmental interactions that influenced the behaviour of  
15 inhabitants at a site.

16        One recurring and crucial research question is: what economic strategy was in place at a  
17 particular settlement? Understanding economic practices, particularly in terms of diet and animal  
18 husbandry, is essential to the reconstruction of human-environment interactions. Over recent years,  
19 the utility of stable isotope analysis in this regard has become increasingly apparent (e.g. Ambrose  
20 1986, Schwarcz and Schoeninger 1991, Arneborg et al. 1999, Richards and Hedges 1999, Barrett  
21 and Richards 2007, Richards et al. 2006, Ascough et al. 2012; Arneborg et al., 2012). In this study,  
22 we investigate the use of stable isotope ratios of carbon and nitrogen, expressed as  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ , as  
23 a tool to reconstruct economic practice at early Viking period sites within the region of  
24 Mývatnssveit, northern Iceland (Fig. 8.1).

25        Norse North Atlantic communities used both agricultural and wild resources to build a broad-  
26 spectrum, effective and flexible subsistence system that was initially based on traditional economic  
27 knowledge from the Norse homelands and then adapted to local settings (Dugmore et al. 2005,  
28 2012). The agricultural component involved cows, sheep, goats, pigs, horses and dogs, plus, where  
29 possible, arable agriculture. The wild component varied but could include freshwater and marine  
30 fish, birds, and marine mammals. Individual farms generally operated as part of a multi-farm  
31 cooperative system, involving exchange of materials and products with communal management of  
32 practices, such as upland grazing. The economic system was not static but responded to changing  
33 environmental conditions and social pressures.

1 Measurements of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  are a valuable tool in archaeological palaeodietary  
2 reconstruction. These measurements represent an integration of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  isotope values in  
3 food consumed over the time a tissue (e.g. bone collagen) was formed (Tieszen 1978, Hobson and  
4 Clark 1992, Hedges et al. 2007). There is also a diet-tissue offset, meaning that  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$   
5 increase within an organism with each trophic level up a food chain by typically  $\sim 1\text{-}2\text{‰}$  for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ,  
6 and  $3\text{-}5\text{‰}$  for  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . An increase in trophic level has also been observed in the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of neonatal and  
7 suckling animals relative to the tissues of the mother in both modern and archaeological populations  
8 (e.g. Fuller et al. 2006, Ascough et al. 2012). Although the typical source-consumer  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  offset is  
9 minimal, it should be noted that the bone collagen diet-tissue  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  offset appears to show species  
10 and diet-dependant variations (e.g. Hare et al., 1991), with a recent survey suggesting an offset of  
11  $+3.6\text{‰}$  for mammalian collagen (Szpak et al. 2012b). If the isotopic values of possible dietary  
12 components are sufficiently different, then the proportion of each component that was consumed by  
13 an organism can be assessed by analysis of its body tissues.  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  measurements of  
14 archaeological samples are usually made using bone collagen and have proved particularly useful in  
15 discriminating between terrestrial and marine components in the diet of human populations, as there  
16 is a large and consistent difference between both carbon and nitrogen isotope values in marine and  
17 terrestrial organisms (Arneborg et al. 1999, Richards et al. 2006, Sveinbjörnsdóttir et al. 2010).  
18 Commonly, this involves modelling the proportion of different theoretical dietary components. The  
19 accuracy of such isotope-based diet reconstruction depends heavily on how accurately the source  
20 isotopic compositions for each resource group represent the resources actually consumed. This  
21 means that the selection of appropriate end-member values for such a model is critical (Dewar and  
22 Pfeiffer 2010). Importantly, both the resources included in the economic strategy of the inhabitants  
23 of the archaeological site and the isotope values of these resources, must be known.

24 Values of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  show wide geographical variation, meaning that the values for a  
25 species in one region cannot necessarily be used in palaeodietary reconstruction for another region.  
26 Geographic variations occur due to a range of environmental and anthropogenic variables,  
27 summarised in Rubenstein and Hobson (2004). Terrestrial  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  decreases with increasing latitude  
28 and increases with altitude due to temperature effects, while in  $\text{C}_3$  plant-based ecosystems, dry  
29 habitats are enriched in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  compared to wet habitats due to differences in water use efficiency  
30 (Lajtha and Marshall 1994). In marine environments,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  decreases with latitude, leading to  
31 northern oceans being enriched in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  compared to southern oceans and benthic systems are  
32 enriched in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  compared to pelagic systems. These effects are ascribed to temperature  
33 differences, surface-water  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration offsets and differences in plankton biosynthesis or  
34 metabolism (Kelly 2000). Terrestrial plant tissue  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  varies according to the method of nitrogen

1 fixation, the influence of anthropogenically and naturally added fertilizers, land-use practices  
2 resulting in differential loss of  $^{14}\text{N}$  and the enrichment of wet habitats in  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  relative to dry  
3 habitats (Kelly 2000). Marine  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  geographic patterns are less well understood, although  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  in  
4 northern oceans appears more enriched compared to southern oceans (Kelly 2000). In addition to  
5 the above variables, the isotope values of any resource (e.g., cattle) at a single location will show  
6 considerable variability due to factors such as individual feeding preferences, age, sex or illness  
7 (Hobson and Schwartz 1986, Hobson 1999, Bocherens and Drucker 2003).

8 This paper compiles stable isotope ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) values for a range of resources available to  
9 early Norse settlements in northern Iceland, within the region of Mývatnssveit, surrounding Lake  
10 Mývatn (Figure 8.1). This includes both domestic animals and wild resources, from four  
11 archaeological sites: Undir Sandmúla (McGovern 2005), Sveigakot (Vésteinsson 2002), Hofstaðir  
12 (Lucas 2010) and Hrísheimar (Edvardsson and McGovern 2007). The region has been the focus of  
13 an international research effort to investigate human-environment interaction over the past twenty  
14 years (McGovern et al. 2007). The dataset presented here includes the first investigation of  
15 archaeological bird bone  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  for the study region. This is significant, given the extensive  
16 evidence for exploitation of bird populations surrounding Mývatn by the Norse inhabitants of  
17 Mývatnssveit (McGovern et al. 2007). In addition, analysis of bird remains from archaeological and  
18 paleontological contexts have contributed significantly to better understanding of the ecology of a  
19 number of bird species (e.g. Chamberlain et al. 2005, Fox-Dobbs et al. 2006, Emslie et al. 2007),  
20 meaning the results may have value beyond archaeological investigations.

21 The aim of the research is firstly to compile a new and more comprehensive assessment of the  
22 isotope values and their ranges for resources used in the Norse economy of the study area.  
23 Secondly, it aims to investigate the potential for using isotope analysis of archaeofaunal remains in  
24 informing researchers about animal husbandry practices in the study area. Animal husbandry is a  
25 key component within North Atlantic archaeology but little research has addressed the direct  
26 reconstruction of animal diet through stable isotope analysis. This paper therefore assesses the  
27 isotopic values of archaeofauna from sites in Mývatnssveit to determine whether it is possible to use  
28 these data to detect differences in husbandry practices in differing environments and between sites  
29 of differing status or function. In omnivores, such as pigs, both  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  can vary significantly  
30 between animals obtaining nutrients through free-range pannage, versus those that are stalled and  
31 fed upon domestic waste including animal protein. This is particularly evident if the domestic waste  
32 includes marine or freshwater resources. In herbivores,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values tend to show less variability in  
33 areas where plant communities are dominated by  $\text{C}_3$  vegetation (as in Iceland). However, plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$   
34 values can vary widely, depending upon local environment. Of particular interest to the current

1 study is that long-term intensive use of animal manure distinctly raises plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values relative to  
2 unmanured areas (Bol et al. 2005, Commisso and Nelson 2006, 2007, Bogaard et al. 2007, Fraser  
3 et al. 2011, Kanstrup et al. 2011, 2012). This elevation is considerable and has been shown to be as  
4 high as 10‰ in cereal grains (Kanstrup et al. 2012). High  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in domestic animals may  
5 therefore indicate enhancement of production via manuring practices or feeding of stalled animals  
6 over winter. It is important to note that natural variation in plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values can also be  
7 considerable and baseline values are required. The data presented here also include values of  
8 modern vegetation from zones unaffected by modern agriculture in Mývatnssveit.

## 1 **1. Methods**

### 2 **1.1. Sample material**

#### 3 *Modern sample material*

4 Stable isotope values used in this study represent the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of both modern and  
5 archaeological biota from Mývatnssveit. These values include a range of new analyses and  
6 previously published measurements. Modern vegetation was obtained from four locations close to  
7 Mývatn (Haganes, Kálfaströnd, Framengjar and Hróteyjarnes) and from two locations ca. 5 km  
8 from the lake in the vicinity of the archaeological site of Sveigakot (Sveigakot and Seljahjallagil –  
9 see Figure 8.1). At Framengjar and Hróteyjarnes, multiple vegetation samples were collected along  
10 a short transect to assess isotope variability in terrestrial plants at these locations in more detail.  
11 Leaves were sampled from living vegetation, air-dried at 30 °C, followed by freeze-drying. Samples  
12 were stored in pre-cleaned glass vials or plastic bags prior to subsequent analysis. Living biota from  
13 within and around Mývatn, including freshwater fish, were obtained as described in Ascough et al.  
14 (2010). Wildfowl were procured from local gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*) nests, or from gillnets in  
15 Lake Mývatn. Some were collected as roadkill adjacent to Mývatn as soon as practical after death.  
16 Full sample details are given in Tables 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.

17

#### 18 *Archaeofaunal sample material*

19 The dataset of Norse period archaeofauna included in this study were obtained from four  
20 sites of varying status in the Mývatnssveit region. Broadly, Hofstaðir is interpreted as a high-status  
21 farm, while specialist activities, such as industry, appear to have taken place at the farms of  
22 Hrísheimar and Undir Sandmúla. Finally, Sveigakot represents a lower-status farm site. The  
23 holdings at Hofstaðir, Hrísheimar and Sveigakot are located at 250-350 meters above sea level,  
24 while the territory of Undir Sandmúla is located slightly higher, at ~ 400 m a.s.l. All samples  
25 retrieved date to the 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> centuries AD. The age of samples obtained was established through a  
26 combination of tephrochronology and radiocarbon ( $^{14}\text{C}$ ) dating. Archaeofaunal samples included in  
27 the dataset are the bones of domesticated mammals (cow, sheep, goat, pig, horse and dog) and wild  
28 species (birds and freshwater fish). These materials were obtained during excavations for two main  
29 projects: the Leverhulme Trust-funded “Landscapes circum-*landnám*” (Edwards et al. 2004), and  
30 the NSF-funded “Long Term Human Ecodynamics in the Norse North Atlantic: cases of  
31 sustainability, survival, and collapse” (McGovern 2011). Full sample details are given in Tables 8.1  
32 and 8.2.

33

### 34 **1.2. Laboratory methods**

1 Pretreatment of dried vegetation involved homogenization of each sample by grinding using an  
2 agate mortar and pestle. A sub-sample (c. 2-3 mg) of the ground material was then taken for  
3 analysis. Bone samples of modern organisms were de-fatted prior to collagen extraction by  
4 extraction with 2:1 (v/v) chloroform/methanol solution, followed by sonication for 60 minutes. The  
5 extraction was repeated until the solvent remained clear. Collagen was extracted from bone samples  
6 according to a modified Longin (1971) method. The sample surface was cleaned by abrasion with a  
7 Dremmel® tool, after which the bone was crushed and placed in 1M HCl at room temperature  
8 (~20°C). The bone was left in the HCl for up to 96 hours, after which dissolution of the bone  
9 mineral component was complete. The solution was then decanted and the collagen washed in  
10 reverse osmosis water. The collagen was placed in reverse osmosis water and the solution pH  
11 adjusted to 3.0 by addition of 0.5 M HCl. The collagen was solubilized by gentle heating at ~80°C.  
12 After cooling, the resulting solution was filtered through Whatman GF/A glass fibre paper and then  
13 freeze-dried to recover the collagen. A sub-sample (c. 0.5-1 mg) of the dried collagen was  
14 transferred into tin capsules for measurement of elemental abundance and stable isotope ratios.

15 Sample elemental abundances of %C and %N, to calculate CN ratios, were measured using a  
16 Costech elemental analyser (EA) (Milan, Italy) and fitted with a zero-blank auto-sampler.  
17 Vegetation samples were measured at the University of St. Andrews Facility for Earth and  
18 Environmental Analysis and bone collagen samples were measured at the Scottish Universities  
19 Environmental Research Centre. The sample CN ratio was used to screen collagen samples for  
20 purity; samples with ratios of 2.9-3.6 were included in the dataset (c.f. DeNiro 1985). Following  
21 combustion in the EA, the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of vegetation samples was measured using a  
22 ThermoFinnegan Delta<sup>plus</sup> XL and the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of collagen was measured using a Thermo  
23 Fisher Scientific Delta V Advantage isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS) (Thermo  
24 FisherScientific Inc. GmbH, Bremen, FRG). The EA and IRMS were linked via a ConFlo III  
25 (Werner et al. 1999). Isotope values thus obtained are reported as per mil (‰) deviations from the  
26 VPDB and AIR international standards for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . Samples were measured with a mix of  
27 appropriate laboratory standards and blanks, from which measurement precision ( $1\sigma$ ) for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  was  
28 determined to be better than  $\pm 0.2\text{‰}$  and measurement precision ( $1\sigma$ ) for  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  was better than  $\pm$   
29  $0.3\text{‰}$ . Statistical differences in isotope values between archaeological sites for each archaeofaunal  
30 species were assessed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post hoc Tukey tests.

31

## 32 **2. Results and Interpretations**

33

### 34 **2.1. Modern vegetation and biota from Mývatnssveit**

### 2.1.1. Modern terrestrial vegetation

The raw  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of modern terrestrial vegetation were adjusted by +1.57‰ (Feng and Epstein 1995, McCarroll and Loader 2004, McCarroll et al. 2009) to account for the decrease in atmospheric  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  since c. AD 1880 due to human burning of fossil fuels (the Suess effect (Keeling, 1979; Keeling et al., 1979)). The corrected  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values ranged from -30.0 to -25.3‰ and the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values ranged from -9.0 to +6.5‰ (Table 8.2; Fig. 8.2). These values accord with previous measurements by Wang and Wooller (2006) and Gratton et al. (2008) of plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values for a range of locations in Iceland. The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of all sites falls within the same broad range. In contrast, the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of samples from Haganes, Kálfaströnd and Hróteyjarnes (+0.4 to +6.5‰; average: +2.9‰) is higher than that of samples from Framengjar, Sveigakot and Seljahjallagil (-9.0 to +1.1‰; average: -3.7‰). The sampling sites of Hróteyjarnes and Framengjar in particular were selected due to the lack of modern grazing animals at these locations, meaning that the elevated  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values at Hróteyjarnes are unlikely to be due to the effect of manuring via these species. An alternative explanation for higher plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values at Haganes, Kálfaströnd and Hróteyjarnes is higher  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of bioavailable soil nitrogen (as  $\text{NH}_4^+$  or  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) at these sites. One potential source of this is the transportation of nitrogen from the lake to the shore in the bodies of chironomids (non-biting midges). Gratton et al. (2008) estimated that, on average, 17 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> (kilograms of nitrogen per hectare, per day) were transported from Lake Mývatn to the terrestrial environment in this way and that midge abundances decreased logarithmically with distance from shore. In contrast to our results, Gratton et al. (2008) did not find elevated  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in plants close to Mývatn. A further potential source of elevated plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values close to the lake is that of guano from nesting bird populations. Bird guano has been shown to elevate plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values considerably in experimental studies (Szpak et al. 2012a).

The results of stable isotope measurements on modern vegetation show that there is a wide range in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in plants in the Mývatn area. While  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  is variable at all sites,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values appear to differ significantly between locations. The expected  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of modern herbivores consuming plants exclusively from Framengjar, Sveigakot and Seljahjallagil would therefore be ~0-2‰, whereas the expected  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of animals consuming plants at Haganes, Kálfaströnd and Hróteyjarnes would be ~6-8‰. These values are based on the average  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of plants at these locations, meaning that the actual range in animal  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values at any location is likely to be larger than the values quoted above. Despite this, the overall  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of a population at Hróteyjarnes, for example, would be expected to be higher than an equivalent population at Framengjar.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 2.2. Modern freshwater biota and birds

The range in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values within modern freshwater biota in Mývatn, with respect to internal spatial lake variability, is discussed in detail in Ascough et al. (2011). However, the overall  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of lake biota also have relevance for the isotope values of wild resources (freshwater fish and birds) that were exploited by the Norse inhabitants of Mývatnssveit. The range in isotope values for individual species fits the established food web of Mývatn presented in Einarsson et al. 2004, where the trophic pathways from detritus up to waterfowl and fish are illustrated. The overall  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  value of modern freshwater biota is higher than that of terrestrial plants, meaning that the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of fish and birds obtaining carbon from the lake will generally be higher than that of terrestrial herbivores (cf. Ascough et al. 2012). In contrast, the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of aquatic plants and invertebrates are within the range of that represented in terrestrial vegetation samples. Excluding an extreme  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of  $-16\text{‰}$  (discussed in Ascough et al. 2011), the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value range is  $-4.3$  to  $+6.1\text{‰}$ . This means that the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of organisms consuming freshwater resources will overlap with that of organisms consuming terrestrial plants in Mývatnssveit (Ascough et al. 2012). An important point concerning the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of modern freshwater biota is that values for both these isotopes show large variability within the lake. This variation may therefore be reflected in the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of organisms consuming lake biota.

The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of modern bird bones from around Mývatn ranged from  $-23.2$  to  $-7.9\text{‰}$  and the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values for these samples ranged from  $+1.3$  to  $+16.4\text{‰}$  (Table 8.2, Fig. 8.6). The very wide range in these values reflects the broad diet of the sampled birds. While some species have a diet of terrestrial material (e.g., the whimbrel), the majority of other species incorporate freshwater and marine resources in their diets. The broad range in freshwater biota  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values discussed above is hence represented in the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of bird tissues. In addition, some birds represented in the sample group are piscivorous (Slavonian grebe), hence will be at higher trophic levels than other species. In addition, most are migratory, spending part of the year in marine environments. This means that the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of their tissues represent an integration of many different dietary resources from a variety of locations. One important point here regards differences in tissue turnover rates; the isotopic values of tissues with rapid turnover (e.g. muscle) reflect recent diet, whereas tissues with slower turnover (e.g. bone collagen) reflect longer-term dietary averages (Hobson and Clark 1992). Therefore, the bone collagen  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of migratory birds measured in this study may not exactly reflect the values of the tissues consumed by humans exploiting these birds as a dietary resource, a factor that should be considered before applying these data within the context of a palaeodietary baseline.

## 2.3. Archaeological biota from Mývatnssveit

### 2.3.1. Cows: inter-site comparison

The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of archaeofaunal cow samples ranged from  $-22.1$  to  $-20.3\text{‰}$  (Table 8.3; Fig. 8.3). Excluding neonatal cattle, there is a barely significant difference between cattle  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values at the four sites ( $P = 0.4659$ , ANOVA). Although values from Undir Sandmúla appear slightly lower than the other sites the significance of this offset is difficult to assess owing to the small sample size at Undir Sandmúla (2 animals) relative to other locations. Although the majority of the vegetation-cow bone offsets are reasonably explained by a trophic effect, it should be borne in mind in future work that some higher cow  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values could indicate the deliberate feeding of cattle with fish bones, a practice that is documented in Icelandic historical records.

The  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of neonatal cattle were not higher than that of adult animals, with the exception of SUERC-3429 ( $\delta^{15}\text{N} = +5.9$ ); this is in contrast to the effective trophic level increase observed in neonates and suckling animals relative to the adult mother in previous studies (e.g. Fuller et al. 2006, Ascough et al. 2012). There is no statistically significant difference in the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of non-neonatal cattle between the four sites ( $P = 0.52737$ , ANOVA). However the range of  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of cows at Sveigakot, Undir Sandmúla and Hrísheimar ( $2.5\text{‰}$ ,  $2.0\text{‰}$  and  $3.5\text{‰}$ , respectively) is lower than that of cows at Hofstaðir ( $4\text{‰}$ ). The farm holdings of Hofstaðir and Sveigakot (Thomson and Simpson 2007) are shown on Fig. 8.1. It is possible that the larger range in  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values at Hofstaðir may reflect the larger size of the potential area available for grazing of animals at this site, incorporating zones with more varied vegetation  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values.

### 2.3.2. Ovicaprines: inter-site comparison

In some instances, it was possible to identify samples within the ovicaprine group to species (*Ovis aries* or *Capra hircus*) on an archaeozoological basis. Where further identification was possible, there was no apparent difference between the isotope values of these species and the larger group of indeterminate ovicaprines. The range of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in ovicaprine samples was  $-22.0$  to  $-20.8\text{‰}$  (Table 8.3; Fig. 8.4). This is not different from the range of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in cattle samples, and there is no significant difference in ovicaprine  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values between sites ( $P = 0.73311$ , ANOVA). The  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of the ovicaprine sample group ranged from  $-1.5$  to  $+4.0\text{‰}$ . The two highest values belonged to two identified neonatal animals (GU-15267 and GU-15268), resulting from the trophic offset between neonates and mothers discussed above. Exclusion of these values from the dataset gives a maximum  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of  $+1.8\text{‰}$ . The average  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of the

1 archaeofaunal ovicaprine bones is hence lower than that of the cattle bones. If neonatal animals are  
2 excluded, the average cattle  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value is +1.0‰, versus an average of +0.4‰ for ovicaprines. This  
3 could be the result of a physiological difference between cattle and ovicaprines, although we are not  
4 aware of any studies that demonstrate that such a difference results in a  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  offset between the two  
5 groups of the kind observed here. An alternative explanation is that there was a variation in the  
6 average  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  value of material consumed by cattle versus that of ovicaprines. This would result  
7 from a dietary difference between the two groups and could be the result of food selection by the  
8 organisms directly, or a difference in the type of food to which ovicaprines and cattle had access as  
9 a result of human control. The findings may therefore be suggestive of different husbandry practices  
10 between species, such as grazing of cattle and ovicaprines in different areas of the region.  
11 Specialisation in husbandry practices between species has also been used to explain similar dietary  
12 differences between domestic animal species expressed in isotopic values in previous archaeofaunal  
13 studies (e.g. Fuller et al. 2012). The range of ovicaprine  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values shows these animals did not  
14 frequently consume plants with the high  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values observed at Haganes, Kálfaströnd and  
15 Hróteyjarnes. This argues against grazing of ovicaprines in intensively-manured areas or zones of  
16 high natural plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values.

17 The  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of non-neonatal ovicaprines from Undir Sandmúla are significantly lower than  
18 animals from Hofstaðir ( $P = 0.0003$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc), Hrísheimar ( $P = 0.0079$ , ANOVA,  
19 Tukey posthoc) and Sveigakot ( $P = 0.0152$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc). Values from Sveigakot are  
20 significantly lower than values from Hofstaðir ( $P = 0.3489$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc). It seems  
21 likely this is a function of the rangeland areas of sheep and goats at Undir Sandmúla, where plant  
22  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values are low in modern vegetation samples. This also appears to impact animals from  
23 Sveigakot to a smaller extent. As observed in the cattle bones, the range in  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values at Hofstaðir  
24 is larger than at other sites, even when neonatal animals are excluded. This is potentially a function  
25 of site status, with greater access to herds grazing in a variety of different vegetation catchments or  
26 a wider range of fodder sources procured by the inhabitants of the site

27

### 28 **2.3.3. Pigs: inter-site comparison**

29 The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of pig bone samples from the archaeofaunal sites ranged from  $-22.5$  to  $-16.9$ ‰,  
30 and the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of these samples covers a range of  $-1.2$  to  $+8.7$ ‰ (Table 8.3, Fig. 8.5). There  
31 are significant differences between sites for non-neonatal animals for both  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  ( $P = 0.29374$ ,  
32 ANOVA) and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  ( $P = 0.03839$  ANOVA). The broad range in isotope values at all three sites  
33 (Sveigakot, Hrísheimar and Hofstaðir) from which pig bones were obtained, is likely to reflect a  
34 mixed and variable range of husbandry practices. These clearly included a variety of resources, not

1 restricted to terrestrial material. The most distinctive difference between the sites is between the  
2 samples from Hrísheimar and those from Sveigakot and Hofstaðir. At Hrísheimar, the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  
3  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in the majority of sampled pig bones falls within a narrow range that is characteristic of  
4 animals existing on a diet of terrestrial vegetation. This means that the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of pigs at Hrísheimar is  
5 significantly lower than those at Sveigakot ( $P = 0.4425$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc) and Hofstaðir ( $P$   
6  $=0.3067$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc), while there is no difference in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  between pigs from  
7 Sveigakot and Hofstaðir ( $P = 0.9842$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc). Similarly, the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of pigs at  
8 Hrísheimar is significantly lower than those at Sveigakot ( $P = 0.058$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc) and  
9 Hofstaðir ( $P = 0.0716$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc), while there is no difference in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  between pigs  
10 from Sveigakot and Hofstaðir ( $P = 0.957$ , ANOVA, Tukey posthoc). These results suggest that  
11 animal protein or non-terrestrial resources did not feature significantly in the diet of pigs from  
12 Hrísheimar, which have isotope values consistent with free-range pannage of plant material with  
13 low  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values (such as in the modern vegetation sampled at Framengjar, Sveigakot and  
14 Seljahjallagil). This could be a function of the early *landnám* date of the Hrísheimar midden layers,  
15 as previous research has suggested the use of free-range pannage pig husbandry as a means of  
16 clearing woodland (Dugmore et al. 2005, McGovern et al. 2006, 2007). In contrast, pig bone  
17 samples at Sveigakot and Hofstaðir show significantly higher  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values that covers a  
18 wider range between animals. Clearly, non-plant material featured more heavily in the diet of pigs  
19 at these sites. Further, this included a mix of terrestrial, freshwater and (potentially) marine  
20 material. Animals with  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values characteristic of terrestrial herbivores but with high  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values,  
21 could represent free-range pannage on vegetation that had high  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values. Alternatively, these  
22 values could represent the inclusion of terrestrial animal protein in the diet of these pigs.  
23 Unfortunately, these two possibilities are not readily discriminated with bulk  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values,  
24 although the isotopic values of amino acids may provide the route to this information (e.g. Choy et  
25 al. 2010) and could be a possible focus for future work. However, where pig bone collagen  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$   
26 values are also elevated, this suggests inclusion of freshwater or marine protein in the diet. Potential  
27 sources of this material include fish processing waste, fish bones and bird eggs. The presence of  
28 freshwater protein in the diet of pigs from Mývatnssveit is also evidenced in  $^{14}\text{C}$  dating, which has  
29 revealed a freshwater  $^{14}\text{C}$  reservoir effect in the bones of pig samples from these sites (Ascough et  
30 al. 2010, 2012). The range of pig husbandry practices represented at Sveigakot and Hofstaðir is  
31 therefore characteristic of a varied strategy, including some animals that were fed upon domestic  
32 waste, potentially while styed.

33

34

#### 2.3.4. Wild species

1           The isotope values of archaeofaunal freshwater fish ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  from -12.2 to -16.0‰,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  from  
2 5.6 to 6.8‰) are within the range of modern fish from Mývatn ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  from -13.4 to -14.0‰,  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$   
3 from +5.4 to +5.8‰), although there is some variation within the group (Ascough et al. 2007,  
4 2010). The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  range for freshwater fish overlaps with that of previous values for archaeofaunal  
5 marine fish bone collagen (Atlantic cod from Norse and medieval period sites in northern Scotland,  
6 Russell et al. 2011), but the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  is several per mill lower than average cod bone values from  
7 Russell et al. (2011) and other studies (e.g. Barrett et al. 2011). The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of fish  
8 from freshwater systems show great site-specific variation on geographic scales; for example, Fuller  
9 et al. (2012) found  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of -20.3 to -28.2‰ for freshwater fish in Belgium, while Grupe et al.  
10 (2009)  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of -11.7 to -27.4‰ for non-marine species in a brackish fjord in northern  
11 Germany. In these studies, the average  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  of freshwater fish bone collagen was several per mill  
12 higher than that of modern or archaeofaunal fish from Mývatn.

13           The  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of archaeofaunal bird bone samples from sites in Mývatnssveit were -23.6 to  
14 -9.7‰ (Table 8.3, Fig. 8.6). This is approximately equivalent to the sample of modern bird bones,  
15 and similarly reflects the range in diet of the species represented. The lowest  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values indicate a  
16 diet containing more terrestrial resources, while higher values denote increasing amounts of  
17 freshwater and/or marine material in the diet. This is also reflected in the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of the  
18 samples, which range from -4.9 to +15.2‰. If the resources consumed by the birds were simply  
19 terrestrial and marine in origin, a positive linear correlation between  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in the  
20 sample group would be expected. This is not the case, due to the confounding influence of  
21 freshwater resources in the diet of the birds. As discussed above, the isotope values for freshwater  
22 resources in the lake are highly variable. The isotope values of waterfowl in the region therefore  
23 incorporate varying proportions of terrestrial, marine and freshwater food, whereas the isotope  
24 values for freshwater resources cover a very large range. This is apparent in both archaeological and  
25 modern bird samples. This variability has implications for palaeodietary reconstructions of  
26 omnivorous organisms such as humans. Along with consumption of waterfowl themselves,  
27 exploitation of waterfowl populations by Norse populations around Mývatnssveit involved the  
28 collection of large quantities of waterfowl eggs (McGovern et al. 2006, 2007). Egg production by a  
29 bird uses nutrients obtained in the diet and it is likely that the large variation in isotope values  
30 reflected in the bone collagen of samples analysed in this study would be reflected in the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  
31  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of eggs consumed by human populations.

32

### 33 **3. Conclusions**

1 The research presented here compiles isotope values for Norse economic resources in  
2 Mývatnssveit, representing the most comprehensive suite of archaeofaunal  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$   
3 measurements for sites in the region and anywhere in Iceland. The analyses emphasize the wide  
4 range in isotope values of resources used by the Norse settlers of Mývatnssveit. As previously  
5 noted, there is separation between the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of terrestrial and freshwater resources but  
6 considerable overlap between the  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values of these groups (Ascough et al. 2012). This means  
7 that paleodietary reconstruction of individuals in the region based solely on  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values  
8 will always be problematic.

9 The results provide information that is useful to reconstructing animal husbandry practices  
10 in the study area. While herbivore bone  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  are unlikely to reveal subtle husbandry  
11 differences (e.g. small-scale differences in grazing areas or in the duration of over-winter stalling),  
12 it is clear that with sufficiently large datasets, differences and similarities between isotope values  
13 at individual sites begin to emerge. In particular,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  measurements of pig bone enable  
14 detailed investigation of husbandry in the region as these animals are omnivores and consume a  
15 potential range of resources with large separation in terms of isotope values (e.g. terrestrial versus  
16 marine material). Within the dataset represented here, quite marked differences in pig husbandry  
17 are apparent between a relatively small number of sites.

18 Finally, the work highlights methodological ‘best practice’ in the application of stable  
19 isotope analysis for archaeological research. Variation in animal management practices, rather  
20 than animals having unrestricted access to a landscape, means that particular isotopic patterns at a  
21 site could arise from a range of practices. Therefore, careful research design is required and the  
22 results places within a secure archaeological, chronological and palaeoenvironmental framework.

## 23 24 **Acknowledgements**

25 This research was supported by funding from the Leverhulme Trust (‘Landscape circum-*landnám*’  
26 Programme Award: grant number F/00 152/F), US National Science Foundation (grant number  
27 0732327 ‘IPY: Long Term Human Ecodynamics in the Norse North Atlantic: cases of  
28 sustainability, survival, and collapse’ awarded by the Office of Polar Programs Arctic Social  
29 Sciences International Polar Year program 2007-2010), the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of  
30 Scotland and the Royal Scottish Geographical Society. Thanks are due to Olafur K. Nielsen,  
31 Institute of Natural History, Iceland, for providing some of the bird samples from the Lake Mývatn  
32 area. We would also like to thank Ian Lawson and Katy Roucoux for help gathering the modern  
33 vegetation samples, Kerry Sayle, Helen Hastie and Elaine Dunbar for stable isotope support at

1 SUERC, and to three reviewers of the original submission for their helpful and constructive  
2 comments.

#### 4 **References**

5 Ambrose, S.H. 1986. Stable carbon and nitrogen isotope analysis of human and animal diet in  
6 Africa. *Journal of Human Evolution* 15:707-731.

7  
8 Arge, S.V., G. Sveinbjarnardóttir, K.J. Edwards, and P.C. Buckland. 2005. Viking and Medieval  
9 settlement in the Faroes: People, place and environment. *Human Ecology* 33:597-620.

10  
11 Arneborg, J., J. Heinemeier, N. Lynnerup, H.L. Nielsen, N. Rud, and Á.E. Sveinbjörnsdóttir. 1999.  
12 Change of diet of the Greenland Vikings determined from stable carbon isotope analysis and <sup>14</sup>C  
13 dating of their bones. *Radiocarbon* 41:157-168.

14  
15 Arneborg, J., N. Lynnerup, J. Heinemeier. 2012. Human Diet and Subsistence Patterns in Norse  
16 Greenland AD c.980–AD c.1450: Archaeological Interpretations. *Journal of the North Atlantic*,  
17 Special Volume 3: 94–133.

18  
19 Ascough, P.L., G.T. Cook, M.J. Church, A.J. Dugmore, T.H. McGovern, E. Dunbar, Á. Einarsson,  
20 A. Friðriksson, and H. Gestsdóttir. 2007. Reservoirs and radiocarbon: <sup>14</sup>C dating problems in  
21 Mývatnsveit, northern Iceland. *Radiocarbon* 49:947-961.

22  
23 Ascough, P.L., G.T. Cook, M.J. Church, E. Dunbar, Á. Einarsson, T.H. McGovern, A.J. Dugmore,  
24 S. Perdikaris, H. Hastie, A. Friðriksson, and H. Gestsdóttir. 2010. Temporal and spatial variations in  
25 freshwater <sup>14</sup>C reservoir effects, Lake Mývatn, northern Iceland. *Radiocarbon* 52:1098-1112.

26  
27 Ascough, P.L., G.T. Cook, H. Hastie, E. Dunbar, M.J. Church, Á. Einarsson, T.H. McGovern, and  
28 A.J. Dugmore. 2011. An Icelandic freshwater radiocarbon reservoir effect: implications for  
29 lacustrine <sup>14</sup>C chronologies. *The Holocene* 21:1073-1080.

30  
31 Ascough, P.L., M.J. Church, G.T. Cook, E. Dunbar, H. Gestsdóttir, T.H. McGovern, A.J. Dugmore,  
32 A. Friðriksson, and K.J. Edwards. 2012. Radiocarbon reservoir effects in human bone collagen  
33 from northern Iceland. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39:2261-2271.

34  
35 Barrett, J.H., D. Orton, C. Johnstone, J. Harland, W. Van Neer, A. Ervynck, C. Roberts, A. Locker,  
36 C. Amundsen, I.B. Enghoff, S. Hamilton-Dryer, D. Heinrich, A.K. Hufthammer, A.K.G. Jones, L.  
37 Jonsson, D. Makowiecki, P. Pope, T.C. O'Connell, T. de Roo, and M.P. Richards. 2011.  
38 Interpreting the expansion of sea fishing in medieval Europe using stable isotope analysis of  
39 archaeological cod bones. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38:1516–1524.

40  
41 Barrett, J.H., and M.P. Richards. 2007. Identity, gender, religion and economy: New isotope and  
42 radiocarbon evidence for marine resource intensification in early historic Orkney, Scotland, UK.  
43 *European Journal of Archaeology* 7:249-271.

44  
45 Bocherens, H., and D. Drucker. 2003. Trophic level isotopic enrichment of carbon and nitrogen in  
46 bone collagen: case studies from recent and ancient terrestrial ecosystems. *International Journal of*  
47 *Osteoarchaeology* 13:1099-1212.

48

- 1 Bogaard, A., T.H.E. Heaton, P. Poulton, and I. Merbach. 2007. The impact of manuring on nitrogen  
2 isotope ratios in cereals: archaeological implications for reconstruction of diet and crop  
3 management practices. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34:335-343.  
4
- 5 Bol, R., J. Eriksen, P. Smith, M.H. Garnett, K. Coleman, and B.T. Christensen. 2005. The natural  
6 abundance of  $^{13}\text{C}$ ,  $^{15}\text{N}$ ,  $^{34}\text{S}$  and  $^{14}\text{C}$  in archived (1923-2000) plant and soil samples from the Askov  
7 long-term experiments on animal manure and mineral fertilizer. *Rapid Communications in Mass  
8 Spectrometry* 19:3216-3226.  
9
- 10 Chamberlain, C.P., J.R. Waldbauer, K. Fox-Dobbs, S.D. Newsome, P.L. Koch, D.R. Smith, M.E.  
11 Church, S.D. Chamberlain, K.J. Sorenson, and R. Risebrough. 2005. Pleistocene to recent dietary  
12 shifts in California Condors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States  
13 of America* 102:16707-16711.  
14
- 15 Choy, K., C.I. Smith, B.T. Fuller, and M.P. Richards. 2010. Investigation of amino acid  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$   
16 signatures in bone collagen to reconstruct human palaeodiets using liquid chromatography isotope  
17 ratio mass spectrometry. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 74:6093-6111  
18
- 19 Commisso, R.G., and D.E. Nelson. 2006. Modern plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values reflect ancient human activity.  
20 *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33:1167-1176.  
21
- 22 Commisso, R.G., and D.E. Nelson. 2007. Patterns of plant  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values on a Greenland Norse farm.  
23 *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34:440-450.  
24
- 25 Dewar, G., and S. Pfeiffer. 2010. Approaches to estimating marine protein in human collagen for  
26 radiocarbon date calibration. *Radiocarbon* 52:1611-1625.  
27
- 28 DeNiro, M.J. 1985. Post-mortem preservation and alteration of in vivo bone collagen isotope ratios  
29 in relation to paleodietary reconstruction. *Nature* 317:806-809.  
30
- 31 Dugmore, A.J., M.J. Church, P.C. Buckland, K.J. Edwards, I.T. Lawson, T.H. McGovern, E.  
32 Panagiotakopulu, I.A. Simpson, P. Skidmore, and G. Sveinbjarnardóttir. 2005. The Norse *landnám*  
33 on the north Atlantic islands: An environmental impact assessment. *Polar Record* 41:21-37.  
34
- 35 Dugmore, A.J., M.J. Church, K-A. Mairs, T.H. McGovern, S. Perdikaris, and O. Vésteinsson.  
36 2007b. Abandoned farms, volcanic impacts, and woodland management: Revisiting Þjórsárdalur,  
37 the "Pompeii of Iceland". *Arctic Anthropology* 44:1-11.  
38
- 39 Dugmore, A.J., C. Keller, and T.H. McGovern. 2007a. Norse Greenland settlement: Reflections on  
40 climate change, trade, and the contrasting fates of human settlements in the north Atlantic islands.  
41 *Arctic Anthropology* 44:12-36.  
42
- 43 Dugmore, A.J., T.H. McGovern, O. Vésteinsson, J. Arneborg, R. Streeter, and C. Keller. 2012.  
44 Cultural adaptation, compounding vulnerabilities and conjunctures in Norse Greenland.  
45 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:3658-3663.  
46
- 47 Edvardsson, R., and T.H. McGovern. 2007. Hrísheimar 2006: Interim report. Unpublished North  
48 Atlantic Biocultural Organisation field report (Available for download from  
49 <http://www.nabohome.org/publications/fieldreports/fieldreports.html>).  
50


- 1 Edwards, K.J., P.C. Buckland, A.J. Dugmore, T.H. McGovern, I.A. Simpson, and G.  
2 Sveinbjarnardóttir. 2004. Landscapes circum-*Landnám*: Viking settlement in the North Atlantic and  
3 its human and ecological consequences - a major new research programme. Pp. 260-271, *In* R.  
4 Housley and G.M. Coles (Eds.). *Atlantic Connections and Adaptations: Economies, Environments*  
5 *and Subsistence in Lands Bordering the North Atlantic*. Oxbow, Oxford, UK. 271 pp.  
6
- 7 Einarsson, Á., G. Stefánsdóttir, H. Jóhannesson, J.S. Ólafsson, G.M. Gíslason, I. Wakana, G.  
8 Gudbergsson, and A. Gardarsson. 2004. The ecology of Lake Mývatn and the River Laxá: variation  
9 in space and time. *Aquatic Ecology* 38:317-348.  
10
- 11 Emslie, S.D., and W.P. Patterson. 2007. Abrupt recent shift in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values in Adélie  
12 penguin eggshell in Antarctica. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104:11666-  
13 11669.  
14
- 15 Feng, X., and S. Epstein. 1995. Carbon isotopes of trees from arid environments and implications  
16 for reconstructing atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 59:2599-  
17 2608.  
18
- 19 Fox-Dobbs, K., T.A. Stidham, G.J. Bowen, S.D. Emslie, and P.L. Koch. 2006. Dietary controls on  
20 extinction versus survival among avian megafauna in the late Pleistocene. *Geology* 34:685-688.  
21
- 22 Fraser, R.A., A. Bogaard, T. Heaton, M. Charles, G. Jones, B.T. Christensen, P.H.I. Merbach, P.R.  
23 Poulton, D. Sparkes, and A.K. Styring. 2011. Manuring and stable nitrogen isotope ratios in cereals  
24 and pulses: Towards a new archaeobotanical approach to the inference of land use and dietary  
25 practices. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38:2790-2804.  
26
- 27 Fuller, B.T., J.L. Fuller, D.A. Harris, and R.E.M. Hedges. 2006. Detection of breastfeeding and  
28 weaning in modern human infants with carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios. *American Journal*  
29 *of Physical Anthropology* 129:279-293.  
30
- 31 Fuller, B.T., B. De Cupere, E. Marinova, W. van Neer, M. Waelkens, and M.P. Richards. 2012.  
32 Isotopic reconstruction of human diet and animal husbandry practices during the Classical-  
33 Hellenistic, Imperial and Byzantine Periods at Sagalassos, Turkey. *American Journal of Physical*  
34 *Anthropology* 149:157-171.  
35
- 36 Fuller, B.T., G. Müldner, W. van Neer, A. Ervynck, and M.P. Richards. 2012. Carbon and nitrogen  
37 stable isotope ratio analysis of freshwater, brackish, and marine fish from Belgian, archaeological  
38 sites (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium AD). *Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry* 27: 807-820.  
39
- 40 Gratton, C., J. Donaldson, and M.J. van der Zanden. 2008. Ecosystem linkages between lakes and  
41 the surrounding terrestrial landscape in northeast Iceland. *Ecosystems* 11:764-774.  
42
- 43 Grupe, G., D. Heinrich, and J. Peters. 2009. A brackish water aquatic foodweb: trophic levels and  
44 salinity gradients in the schlei fjord, Northern Germany, in Viking and medieval times. *Journal of*  
45 *Archaeological Science* 36:2125-2144.  
46
- 47 Hare, P.E., M.L. Fogel, T.W. Stafford Jr., A.D. Mitchell, and T.C. Hoering. 1991. The isotopic  
48 composition of carbon and nitrogen in individual amino acids isolated from modern and fossil  
49 proteins. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 18:277-292.  
50

- 1 Hedges, R.E.M., J.G. Clement, C.D.L. Thomas, and T.C. O'Connell. 2007. Collagen turnover in the  
2 adult femoral mid-shaft: modeled from anthropogenic radiocarbon tracer measurements. *American*  
3 *Journal of Physical Anthropology* 133:808–816.  
4
- 5 Hobson, K.A., and R.G. Clark. 1992. Assessing avian diets using stable isotopes I: Turnover of  $^{13}\text{C}$   
6 in tissues. *The Condor* 94:181-188.  
7
- 8 Hobson, K.A. 1999. Stable carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios of songbird feathers grown in two  
9 terrestrial biomes: Implications for evaluating trophic relationships and breeding origins. *The*  
10 *Condor* 101:799-805.  
11
- 12 Hobson, K.A., and H.P. Schwarcz. 1986. The variation in  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in bone collagen for two wild  
13 herbivore populations: Implications for palaeodiet studies. *Journal of Archaeological Science*  
14 13:101-106.  
15
- 16 Kanstrup, M., I. K. Thomsen, A.J. Andersen, A. Bogaard, and B.T. Christensen. 2011. Abundance  
17 of  $^{13}\text{C}$  and  $^{15}\text{N}$  in emmer, spelt and naked barley grown on differently manured soils: Towards a  
18 method for identifying past manuring practice. *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*  
19 25:2879-2887.  
20
- 21 Kanstrup, M., I.K. Thomsen, P.H. Mikkelsen, and Christensen. 2012. Impact of charring on cereal  
22 grain characteristics: Linking prehistoric manuring practice to  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  signatures in archaeobotanical  
23 material. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39:2533-2540.  
24
- 25 Keeling, C.D. 1979. The Suess effect:  $^{13}\text{C}$ - $^{14}\text{C}$  interrelations. *Environment International*  
26 2:229-300.  
27
- 28 Keeling, C.D., W.G. Mook, and P.P. Tans. 1979. Recent trends in the  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  ratio of atmospheric  
29 carbon dioxide. *Nature* 277:121-123.  
30
- 31 Kelly, J.F. 2000. Stable isotopes of carbon and nitrogen in the study of avian and mammalian  
32 trophic ecology. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 78:1-27.  
33
- 34 Lajtha, K., and J.D. Marshall. 1994. Sources of variation in the stable isotopic composition of  
35 plants. Pp. 1-21, *In* K. Lajtha, and R.H. Michener (Eds.). *Stable Isotopes in Ecology and*  
36 *Environmental Science*. Blackwell Scientific Publications, New York. 336 pp.  
37
- 38 Longin, R. 1971. New method of collagen extraction for radiocarbon dating. *Nature* 230:241-242.  
39
- 40 Lucas, G. (Ed.) 2010. Hofstaðir: Excavations of a Viking age Feasting Hall in North-Eastern  
41 Iceland. *Icelandic Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series No. 1*, Reykjavík, Iceland. 440 pp.  
42
- 43 McCarroll, D., and N.J. Loader. 2004. Stable isotopes in tree rings. *Quaternary Science Reviews*  
44 23:771-801.  
45
- 46 McCarroll, D., M. Gagen, N.J. Loader, I. Robertson, K.J. Anchukaitis, S. Los, R. Jalkanen, A.  
47 Kirchhefer, and J.S. Waterhouse. 2009. Correction of tree ring stable carbon isotope chronologies  
48 for changes in the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*  
49 73:1539-1547.  
50

- 1 McGovern, T.H., S.P. Perdikaris, Á. Einarsson, and J. Sidell. 2006. Coastal connections, local  
2 fishing, and sustainable egg harvesting: Patterns of Viking age inland wild resource use in Mývatn  
3 district, northern Iceland. *Environmental Archaeology* 11:187-206.  
4
- 5 McGovern, T.H., O. Vésteinsson, A. Friðriksson, M.J. Church, I.T. Lawson,  
6 I.A. Simpson, Á Einarsson, A.J. Dugmore, G.T. Cook, S. Perdikaris, K.J. Edwards, A.M. Thomson,  
7 P.W. Adderly, A.J. Newton, G. Lucas, Edvardsson, R., O. Aldred, and E. Dunbar. 2007.  
8 Landscapes of settlement in northern Iceland: Historical ecology of human impact and climate  
9 fluctuation on the millennial scale. *American Anthropologist* 109:27-51.  
10
- 11 McGovern, T.H. 2005. Report of Midden Investigations at Undir Sandmúla, Bardadalur, Northern  
12 Iceland. Unpublished North Atlantic Biocultural Organisation field report (Available for download  
13 from <http://www.nabohome.org/publications/fieldreports/fieldreports.html>).  
14
- 15 McGovern, T.H. 2011. Vikings in the International Polar Year 2007-09: still bloodthirsty, but also  
16 ecodynamical and educational. Pp 290-309, *In* S. Sigmundsson, A. Holt, G Sigurðsson, Ólafsson,  
17 and O. Vésteinsson (Eds.). *Viking settlements and Viking society*. Hið íslenska fornleifafélag and  
18 University of Iceland Press, Reykjavík, Iceland. 511 pp.  
19
- 20 Richards, M.P., and R.E.M. Hedges. 1999. Stable isotope evidence for similarities in the types of  
21 marine foods used by late Mesolithic humans at sites along the Atlantic coast of Europe. *Journal of*  
22 *Archaeological Science* 26:717-722.  
23
- 24 Richards, M.P., B.T. Fuller, and T.I. Molleson. 2006. Stable isotope palaeodietary study of humans  
25 and fauna from the multi-period (Iron Age, Viking and late Medieval) site of Newark Bay, Orkney.  
26 *Journal of Archaeological Science* 33:122–131.  
27
- 28 Rubenstein, D.R., and K.A. Hobson. 2004. From birds to butterflies: animal movement patterns and  
29 stable isotopes. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19:256-263.  
30
- 31 Russell N., G.T. Cook, P.L. Ascough, J.H. Barrett, and A.J. Dugmore. 2011. Species specific  
32 Marine Radiocarbon Reservoir Effect: A comparison of  $\Delta R$  values between *Patella vulgata* (limpet)  
33 shell carbonate and *Gadus morhua* (Atlantic cod) bone collagen. *Journal of Archaeological Science*  
34 38:1008-1015.  
35
- 36 Schwarcz, H.P., and M.J. Schoeninger. 1991. Stable isotope analyses in human nutritional ecology.  
37 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 34:283-321.  
38
- 39 Sharples, N., and M. Parker Pearson. 1999. Norse settlement in the Outer Hebrides. *Norwegian*  
40 *Archaeological Review* 32:41-62.  
41
- 42 Sveinbjörnsdóttir, A., J. Heinemeier, J. Arneborg, N. Lynnerup, G. Olafsson, and G. Zoëga. 2010.  
43 Dietary reconstruction and reservoir correction of  $^{14}\text{C}$  dates on bones from pagan and early  
44 Christian graves in Iceland. *Radiocarbon* 52:682-696.  
45
- 46 Szpak, P., F.J. Longstaffe, J-F. Millaire, and C.D. White. 2012a. Stable isotope biogeochemistry of  
47 seabird guano fertilization: Results from growth chamber studies with maize (*Zea Mays*). *PLoS*  
48 *ONE* 7(3):doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0033741  
49

- 1 Szpak, P., T.J. Orchard, I. McKechnie, and D.R. Gröcke. 2012b. Historical ecology of late  
2 Holocene sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*) from northern British Columbia: isotopic and  
3 zooarchaeological perspectives. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39:1553-1571.  
4
- 5 Thomson, A.M., and I.A. Simpson. 2007. Modeling historic rangeland management and grazing  
6 pressures in landscapes of settlement. *Human Ecology* 35:151-168.  
7
- 8 Tieszen, L.L. 1978. Carbon isotope fractionation in biological material. *Nature* 276:97-98.  
9
- 10 Vésteinsson, O., T.H. McGovern, and C. Keller. 2002. Enduring impacts: Social and environmental  
11 aspects of Viking age settlement in Iceland and Greenland. *Archaeologia Islandica* 2:98-136.  
12
- 13 Vésteinsson, O. 1998. Patterns of settlement in Iceland: A study in prehistory. *Saga Book* 28:1–29.  
14
- 15 Vésteinsson, O. 2002. Archaeological Investigations at Sveigakot, 2001. Unpublished  
16 Fornleifastofnun Íslands field report (Available for download from  
17 [http://www.nabohome.org/cgi\\_bin/fsi\\_reports.pl](http://www.nabohome.org/cgi_bin/fsi_reports.pl)).  
18
- 19 Wang, Y., and M.J. Wooller. 2006. The stable isotopic (C and N) composition of modern plants and  
20 lichens from northern Iceland: with paleoenvironmental implications. *Jökull* 56:27-37.  
21
- 22 Werner, R.A., B.A. Bruch, and W.A. Brand. 1999. ConFlo III- an interface for high precision <sup>13</sup>C  
23 and <sup>15</sup>N analysis with an extended dynamic range. *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*  
24 13:1237–1241.  
25  
26


1 **Figures:**



2


3 Figure 8.1: Location map of sites mentioned in the text

4




1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

Figure 8.2: Modern vegetation samples from Mývatnssveit. Bars represent 1σ measurement precision (i.e. ± 0.2‰ for δ<sup>13</sup>C and ± 0.3‰ for δ<sup>15</sup>N). δ<sup>13</sup>C values are given corrected for the Suess effect (i.e. -1.57‰; Keeling 1979, Keeling et al. 1979, Feng and Epstein 1995, McCarroll and Loader 2004, McCarroll et al. 2009).




8  
9  
10

Figure 8.3: *Bos taurus* (cow) bone collagen isotope values for archaeofaunal samples from Mývatnssveit. Bars represent 1σ measurement precision (i.e. ± 0.2‰ for δ<sup>13</sup>C and ± 0.3‰ for δ<sup>15</sup>N).



1  
2  
3  
4

Figure 8.4: Ovicaprine (sheep/goat) bone collagen isotope values for archaeofaunal samples from Mývatnssveit. Bars represent 1σ measurement precision (i.e. ± 0.2‰ for δ<sup>13</sup>C and ± 0.3‰ for δ<sup>15</sup>N).



5  
6  
7

Fig. 8.5: *Sus scrofa* (pig) bone collagen isotope values for archaeofaunal samples from Mývatnssveit. Bars represent 1σ measurement precision (i.e. ± 0.2‰ for δ<sup>13</sup>C and ± 0.3‰ for δ<sup>15</sup>N).



1 Table 8.1: Site descriptions from which material was obtained for analysis in this study  
2

Site	Description
Mývatn	A highland lake basin in the interior of North Iceland
Haganes	Area adjacent to the Mývatn shoreline
Kálfaströnd	Area adjacent to the Mývatn shoreline
Seljahjallagil	Gorge located ~5 km south east of Mývatn
Framengjar	A large wetland area directly to the south of Mývatn
Hrúteyjarnes	An island within Mývatn
Undir Sandmúla	Archaeological site. Indeterminate status Norse period farmstead
Sveigakot	Archaeological site. Low-status Norse period farmstead
Hofstaðir	Archaeological site. High-status Norse period farmstead
Hrísheimar	Archaeological site. Indeterminate status Norse period farmstead

3  
4  
5 Table 8.2: Stable isotope measurements of modern samples from Mývatnssveit. (Previously  
6 published measurements: \* Ascough et al. 2010, \*\* Ascough et al. 2011). Modern terrestrial  
7 vegetation  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values are also given corrected for the Suess effect (i.e. -1.57‰; Keeling 1979,  
8 Keeling et al. 1979, Feng and Epstein 1995, McCarroll and Loader 2004, McCarroll et al. 2009).  
9

Measurement ID	Sample location	Latin name	Common name	Habitat; dietary preference	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	Suess-corrected $\delta^{13}\text{C}$	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	C/N
SUER C-19798*	Haganes	<i>Poa</i> sp.	Grass	Temperate grassland	-28.3	-26.7	1.3	37
SUER C-19799*	Kálfaströnd	<i>Poa</i> sp.	Grass	Temperate grassland	-29.1	-27.5	2.6	23
StA-1	Sveigakot	<i>Poa</i> sp.	Grass	Temperate grassland	-28.2	-26.6	-6.3	33
StA-2*	Seljahjallagil	<i>Poa</i> sp.	Grass	Temperate grassland	-28.5	-26.9	-9.1	25
StA-3*	Seljahjallagil	<i>Equisetum arvense</i>	Field horsetail	Meadow	-26.9	-25.3	-2.6	19
StA-4	Kálfaströnd	<i>Equisetum arvense</i>	Field horsetail	Meadow	-29.2	-27.6	1.4	17
StA-5	Framengjar	<i>Carex rostrata</i>	Bottle sedge	Wet meadows, Carr	-27.8	-26.2	-0.9	24
StA-6	Framengjar	<i>Vaccinium uliginosum</i>	Bog bilberry	Heaths, blanket bog	-30.1	-28.5	-5.5	29
StA-7	Framengjar	<i>Carex lyngbyei</i>	Lyngbye's sedge	Wetlands, brackish water	-27.8	-26.2	-0.9	26
StA-8	Framengjar	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp/freshwater zones	-29.0	-27.4	-4.3	28
StA-9	Framengjar	<i>Betula nana</i>	Dwarf birch	Heaths, bogs	-29.4	-27.8	-4.9	22
StA-10	Framengjar	<i>Potentilla palustris</i>	Marsh cinquefoil	Marsh, stream/lake banks	-27.5	-25.9	1.1	21
StA-11	Framengjar	<i>Salix lanata</i>	Woolly willow	Meadow, streamside	-28.4	-26.8	-4.1	26
StA-12	Framengjar	<i>Empetrum nigrum</i>	Crowberry	Heathland	-28.9	-27.3	-6.2	77
StA-13	Framengjar	<i>Bartsia alpina</i>	Alpine bartsia	Pastures and flushes	-29.4	-27.8	-3.6	25
StA-14	Framengjar	<i>Galium verum</i>	Lady's bedstraw	Meadows and pastures	-27.0	-25.4	-0.8	18

StA-15	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geranium	Meadows, woodlands	-30.2	-28.6	0.4	16
StA-16	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geum rivale</i>	Water avens	Wet meadow, bog, riparian zones	-29.0	-27.4	1.7	19
StA-17	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp/freshwater zones	-28.0	-26.4	2.3	17
StA-18	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Erysimum hieraciifolium</i>	Wallflower	Open damp grasslands	-30.6	-29.0	1.8	9
StA-19	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Angelica archangelica</i>	Angelica	Stream/lake shorelines	-30.9	-29.3	2.1	11
StA-20	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geranium	Meadows, woodlands	-28.8	-27.2	4.0	12
StA-21	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geum rivale</i>	Water avens	Wet meadow, bog, riparian zones	-30.9	-29.3	1.5	14
StA-22	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Angelica archangelica</i>	Angelica	Stream/lake shorelines	-29.3	-27.7	3.9	8
StA-23	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-27.1	-25.5	3.9	15
StA-24	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geum rivale</i>	Water avens	Wet meadow, bog, riparian zones	-31.6	-30.0	1.9	16
StA-25	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-29.1	-27.5	3.4	18
StA-26	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geranium	Meadows, woodlands	-26.9	-25.3	2.1	14
StA-27	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Angelica archangelica</i>	Angelica	Stream and lake shorelines	-29.5	-27.9	3.7	12
StA-28	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geum rivale</i>	Water avens	Wet meadow, bog, riparian zones	-29.1	-27.5	1.7	16
StA-29	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-28.7	-27.1	4.8	20
StA-30	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geranium	Meadows, woodlands	-28.8	-27.2	3.6	13
StA-31	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geum rivale</i>	Water avens	Wet meadow, bog, riparian zones	-30.9	-29.3	2.6	16
StA-32	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-30.5	-28.9	5.0	16
StA-33	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-30.5	-28.9	6.5	17
StA-34	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-30.8	-29.2	4.1	17
StA-35	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	Tea-leaved willow	Damp and freshwater zones	-31.3	-29.7	4.6	17
StA-36	Hrúteyjarnes	<i>Geranium</i> sp.	Geranium	Meadows, woodlands	-30.6	-29.0	3.0	12
SUER C-19788*	Mývatn	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	Fresh and/or marine waters; insectivore/piscivore	-14.0	-	5.8	7.0
SUER C-19789*	Mývatn	<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>	Three-spined stickleback	Fresh and/or marine waters; benthic	-13.4	-	5.4	4.6

				insectivore				
SUER C- 19791*	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d midge	Freshwater	-14.4	-	0.5	-
SUER C- 19792*	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-11.8	-	-1.7	-
SUER C- 19793*	Mývatn	-	Bulk zooplankto n	Freshwater pelagic; heterotrophic	-17.7	-	1.5	-
SUER C- 27076**	Mývatn	<i>Daphnia longispina</i>	Zooplankto n	Freshwater pelagic ; algae and organic detritus	-17.0	-	1.2	7.2
SUER C- 27072**	Mývatn	<i>Apatania zonella</i>	Caddisfly larvae	Freshwater benthic; algae and detritus	-19.0	-	-0.9	6.6
SUER C- 27062**	Mývatn	<i>Simulium vittatum</i>	Blackfly larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-15.4	-	1.2	5.1
SUER C- 27070**	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-15.8	-	6.1	5.1
SUER C- 27071**	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-19.3	-	0.7	-
SUER C- 27068**	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-16.1	-	0.4	5.2
SUER C- 27069**	Mývatn	<i>Tanytarsus gracilentus</i>	Chironomi d larvae	Freshwater, benthic detritivore	-13.7	-	1.7	5.1
SUER C- 27082**	Mývatn	<i>Radix peregra</i>	Mollusc	Freshwater benthic; algae and detritus	-22.6	-	5.5	5.6
SUER C- 27086**	Mývatn	<i>Radix peregra</i>	Mollusc	Freshwater benthic; algae and detritus	-15.7	-	3.6	5.0
SUER C- 27081**	Mývatn	<i>Radix peregra</i>	Mollusc	Freshwater benthic; algae and detritus	-13.4	-	0.5	6.7
SUER C- 19797*	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-16.4	-	-0.5	-
SUER C- 27059**	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-17.5	-	-1.9	-
SUER C- 27056**	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-18.3	-	-0.4	-
SUER C- 27057**	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-17.7	-	-3.1	6.6
SUER C- 27058**	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-16.5	-	-2	-
SUER C- 27060**	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic detritus	-19.2	-	6.3	-
SUER	Mývatn	-	Detritus	Lake benthic	-17.4	-	-2.1	-

C-27061**				detritus				
SUER C-27067**	Mývatn	<i>Cladophora</i> spp.	Green algae	Freshwater aquatic plant	-14.8	-	-1.3	8.7
SUER C-27066**	Mývatn	<i>Cladophora</i> spp.	Green algae	Freshwater aquatic plant	-10.1	-	3.4	16.7
SUER C-19800*	Mývatn	<i>Myriophyllum alterniflorum</i>	Alternate water-milfoil	Freshwater aquatic plant	-10.2	-	-1.3	-
SUER C-19801*	Mývatn	<i>Potamogeton perfoliatus</i>	Perfoliate pondweed	Freshwater aquatic plant	-12.5	-	0.8	-
SUER C-27079**	Mývatn	<i>Potamogeton filiformis</i>	Slender-leaved pondweed	Freshwater aquatic plant	-16.9	-	2	26.6
SUER C-27080**	Mývatn	<i>Potamogeton filiformis</i>	Slender-leaved pondweed	Freshwater aquatic plant	-12.1	-	-16	17.1
SUER C-27077**	Mývatn	<i>Potamogeton filiformis</i>	Slender-leaved pondweed	Freshwater aquatic plant	-13.1	-	-4.3	17.8
SUER C-27078**	Mývatn	<i>Potamogeton filiformis</i>	Slender-leaved pondweed	Freshwater aquatic plant	-11.9	-	-2.5	25.2
StA-37	Mývatn	<i>Melanitta nigra</i>	Common scoter	Inland/coastal waters; aquatic invertebrates, fish, vegetation	-7.9	-	5.4	3.4
StA-38	Mývatn	<i>Anas penelope</i>	Wigeon	Freshwater/coastal wetlands; herbivorous	-11.0	-	1.3	3.2
StA-39	Mývatn	<i>Numenius phaeopus</i>	Whimbrel	Freshwater/coastal wetlands; invertebrates, fish	-12.6	-	9.8	3.5
StA-41	Mývatn	<i>Sterna paradisaea</i>	Arctic tern	Coastal zone (may breed on inland water); piscivorous	-17.1	-	11.1	2.9
StA-42	Mývatn	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	Inland/coastal waters; fish and invertebrates	-10.6	-	8.0	3.2
StA-44	Mývatn	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	Inland/coastal waters; fish and invertebrates	-12.2	-	7.7	3.3
StA-45	Mývatn	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	Inland/coastal waters; fish and invertebrates	-13.1	-	10.5	3.1
StA-46	Mývatn	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	Inland/coastal waters; fish and invertebrates	-9.8	-	8.0	3.3
StA-47	Mývatn	<i>Aythya fuligula</i>	Tufted duck	Lakes, rivers, estuaries: Omnivorous	-23.2	-	16.4	3.5
StA-49	Mývatn	<i>Anas crecca</i>	Teal	Lake, marsh and river systems;	-20.6	-	5.4	3.5
StA-51	Mývatn	<i>Bucephala islandica</i>	Barrow's goldeneye	Inland/coastal waters; aquatic	-13.4	-	5.2	2.9

				insects, crustaceans and vegetation				
StA-52	Mývatn	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	Inland/coastal waters; fish and invertebrates	-14.6	-	10.4	3.0

1  
2  
3

Table 8.3: Stable isotope measurements of archaeological samples from Mývatnssveit. †Ascough et al. 2007, \*Ascough et al. 2010, §Ascough et al. 2012. <sup>x</sup>Neonatal animal.

Measurement ID	Sample location	Context No.	Latin name	Common name	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	C/N
StA-133	Hofstaðir	4	Aythiinae	Diving duck	-12.6	6.1	3.0
StA-134	Hofstaðir	8	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Mallard	-11.9	5.1	3.3
StA-135	Hofstaðir	4	<i>Anas platyrhynchos</i>	Mallard	-11.6	7.0	2.9
StA-136	Hofstaðir	1144	Aythiinae	Diving duck	-9.7	5.8	3.0
StA-138	Hofstaðir	6h	<i>Cephus</i> sp.	Guillemot	-15.9	8.7	3.3
StA-139	Hofstaðir	4a	Laridae (family)	Gull	-16.6	7.1	3.1
StA-140	Hofstaðir	4a	<i>Lagopus</i> sp.	Ptarmigan	-20.0	-4.9	3.4
StA-141	Hofstaðir	4a	<i>Phalacrocorax carbo</i>	Cormorant	-12.0	5.4	3.3
StA-142	Hofstaðir	5a	<i>Alle alle</i>	Little Auk	-21.0	5.2	2.9
StA-143	Hofstaðir	16	Aythiinae sp.	Diving duck	-15.0	13.9	2.9
StA-144	Hofstaðir	4	Aythiinae sp.	Diving duck	-13.1	4.8	2.9
SUERC-3429 <sup>*x</sup>	Hofstaðir	7a	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.0	5.9	3.1
SUERC-3431 <sup>*x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6d	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.3	1.6	3.1
SUERC-3433 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	6g	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.9	3.8	3.3
SUERC-6393 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	62	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.2	-0.1	3.2
SUERC-6397 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	159	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.3	-0.1	3.2
SUERC-6398 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	159	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.4	0.6	3.1
SUERC-6399 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	159	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.4	-0.2	3.2
SUERC-8618 <sup>†</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.2	1.4	3.2
SUERC-8619 <sup>†x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.0	2.6	3.3
SUERC-8623 <sup>†</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.2	0.1	3.1
SUERC-8624 <sup>†</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.4	-0.2	3.3
GU-14804 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	1495	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.5	0.2	3.5
SUERC-8353 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	233	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.7	0.7	3.4
SUERC-8354 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	254	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	1.1	3.2
SUERC-8360 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	170	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.4	1.3	3.2
SUERC-11541 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	760	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	0.4	3.6
SUERC-11547 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	170	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.4	1.8	3.4
GU-15267 <sup>§x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	4.0	3.1
GU-15268 <sup>§x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.5	2.5	3.1
GU-15269 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.0	0.5	3.1
GU-15270 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-20.9	1.6	3.1
GU-15271 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-20.8	1.2	3.1
GU-15272 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6M	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.0	0.2	3.1
SUERC-8356 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	254	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.8	0.1	3.3
SUERC-11542 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	4480	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-20.9	0.6	3.4
SUERC-11546 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	1480	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.0	1.1	3.3
GU-14805 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	1166	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.5	1.4	3.3
SUERC-11540 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	219/470	<i>Salmo trutta</i>	Brown trout	-12.2	6.8	3.5
SUERC-11539 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	219/470	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	-12.5	5.7	3.4
SUERC-3430 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	7a	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.0	4.6	3.4
SUERC-3432 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	6d	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.5	0.5	3.5
SUERC-3438 <sup>*</sup>	Hofstaðir	6g	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-19.8	3.7	3.2
SUERC-8355 <sup>†</sup>	Hofstaðir	254	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-16.9	7.4	3.2
GU-15273 <sup>§x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.7	4.4	3.3
GU-15274 <sup>§x</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.2	0.9	3.3
GU-15275 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	1.8	3.3

GU-15276 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-18.9	6.6	3.4
GU-15277 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.5	0.3	3.1
GU-15278 <sup>§</sup>	Hofstaðir	6N	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	3.1	3.3
StA-150	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Anas crecca</i>	Teal	-23.6	3.6	3.4
StA-154	Hrísheimar	384	<i>Anser</i> sp.	Goose	-10.4	4.9	3.0
SUERC-3445 <sup>§x</sup>	Hrísheimar	60	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.9	1.5	3.2
SUERC-3446 <sup>*x</sup>	Hrísheimar	2	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.4	1.0	3.1
SUERC-6431 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.7	-0.4	3.2
SUERC-6432 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.6	1.5	3.2
SUERC-6433 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.8	0.0	3.2
SUERC-6437 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.9	1.8	3.2
GU-14807 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	429	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.4	3.1	3.4
GU-14808 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	429	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.6	2.3	3.3
GU-14809 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	429	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.0	1.6	3.4
GU-15286 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.2	-0.5	3.3
GU-15287 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.0	0.9	3.3
GU-15288 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.3	0.6	3.4
GU-15289 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.1	1.6	3.2
GU-15290 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-22.0	1.7	3.6
GU-15291 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.2	-0.2	3.3
GU-15292 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.2	0.6	3.2
GU-15293 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.3	-1.5	3.3
GU-15294 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.6	0.3	3.4
SUERC-9045 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	-15.9	6.0	3.1
SUERC-9049 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	-16.0	5.7	3.3
SUERC-9050 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	-15.5	5.6	3.2
SUERC-9051 <sup>†</sup>	Hrísheimar	45	<i>Salvelinus alpinus</i>	Arctic char	-15.9	5.8	3.2
SUERC-3440 <sup>*</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	0.1	3.1
SUERC-3442 <sup>*</sup>	Hrísheimar	2	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-20.1	1.3	3.1
GU-14806 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	429	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-20.6	3.9	3.5
GU-15279 <sup>§x</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-22.5	-1.2	3.4
GU-15280 <sup>§x</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-22.2	-0.7	3.5
GU-15281 <sup>§x</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.8	0.0	3.3
GU-15282 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-22.2	-0.4	3.5
GU-15283 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-22.0	-0.5	3.3
GU-15284 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	0.1	3.2
GU-15285 <sup>§</sup>	Hrísheimar	3	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.9	-0.6	3.3
StA-155	Sveigakot	27	Aythiinae	Diving duck	-20.5	-2.7	2.9
StA-156	Sveigakot	58	<i>Gavia immer</i>	Great Northern diver	-14.5	14.2	3.4
StA-158	Sveigakot	55	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	-17.0	11.3	3.1
StA-159	Sveigakot	4	<i>Podiceps auritus</i>	Slavonian grebe	-11.9	11.1	3.0
StA-160	Sveigakot	2	<i>Anser</i> sp.	Goose	-13.5	14.1	2.9
StA-161	Sveigakot	54	Anatidae	Ducks, geese, swans (family)	-13.8	8.6	2.9
StA-162	Sveigakot	2	Aythiinae	Diving duck	-12.2	4.2	2.9
StA-163	Sveigakot	1437	Laridae (family)	Gull	-15.6	15.0	3.1
StA-164	Sveigakot	55	<i>Gavia stellata</i>	Red throated diver	-13.6	12.6	3.1
GUsi-1312	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.5	2.7	3.3
GU-15461 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.5	1.2	3.2
GU-15462 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.3	0.2	3.3
GU-15463 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-22.1	0.3	3.3
GU-15464 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.3	0.9	3.3
GU-15465 <sup>§x</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-20.9	2.3	3.4
GU-15466 <sup>§x</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.2	2.1	3.5
GU-15467 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprines	Sheep/Goat	-21.1	0.0	3.3
GU-15468 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprines	Sheep/Goat	-21.1	-0.6	3.4

GU-15469 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.1	0.3	3.3
GU-15470 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.5	0.4	3.6
GU-15471 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	0.0	3.3
GU-15472 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.1	-0.3	3.3
GUsi-1316	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.8	0.5	3.4
GUsi-1317	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.2	1.2	3.2
GUsi-1318	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.9	1.4	3.6
GUsi-1319	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Ovis aries</i>	Sheep	-21.3	1.2	3.3
GUsi-1314	Sveigakot	2859	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.6	5.0	3.6
GU-15473 <sup>§</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-19.8	3.0	3.5
GU-15474	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	0.2	3.3
GU-15475	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-17.8	8.7	3.4
GU-15476 <sup>x</sup>	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.3	2.0	3.5
GU-15477	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-20.4	3.3	3.4
GU-15478	Sveigakot	55	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	Domestic pig	-21.5	3.0	3.3
SUERC-11548	Undir Sandmúla	2	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.6	2.1	3.4
SUERC-11549	Undir Sandmúla	2	<i>Bos taurus</i>	Cow	-21.6	0.1	3.6
GU-14803 <sup>§</sup>	Undir Sandmúla	2	<i>Capra hircus</i>	Goat	-21.4	-1.0	3.3
GU-14799 <sup>§</sup>	Undir Sandmúla	2	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	-1.3	3.3
GU-14800 <sup>§</sup>	Undir Sandmúla	2	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.4	-0.2	3.5
GU-14801 <sup>§</sup>	Undir Sandmúla	2	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.3	-0.8	3.5
GU-14802 <sup>§</sup>	Undir Sandmúla	2	Ovicaprine	Sheep/Goat	-21.5	-1.0	3.6