

**LANDSCAPES OF LIFE AND DEATH: SOCIAL DIMENSIONS OF A
PERCEIVED LANDSCAPE IN VIKING AGE ICELAND**

by

Ruth Ann Maher

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Anthropology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2009

Chapter 6. Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

Upon reflection, the title of this dissertation is not only dramatic, but functional. In practice archaeology is many times divided into two spheres. The first looks at the archaeology of settlement, or production or even the impact that proliferation of a group has on a particular landscape – in other words, studies of life. The second focuses on forms of burial, burial ritual, burial monuments and the deceased – in other words, studies of death. The lines are flexible and one is often representative of the other, either directly or indirectly. However, this study intended to consider not only the politics and economics imbedded within each burial to understand the social roles assigned to age and gender, but to go beyond social relationships and place the sites within a cosmology by illuminating conceptual relationships to space. The value of this approach is in its ability to draw out the conscious and unconscious behaviors derived from thought as well as social interactions among the pre-Christian Icelanders.

This study however, does not ignore social dimensions or social infrastructure. Burial evidence combined with other archaeological evidence was examined with the use of GIS in order to appreciate the cognitive aspects of the various spaces and places that made up the Viking Age landscapes in Iceland. Mostly, this study compiled the many lists of data created during the last century, integrated those lists with data collected for this project and by thoroughly analyzing all the data, derived a social context from the by using anthropological methods.

Some might claim that there is enough written information about the subject and that such a study cannot possibly contribute any more than the writings and current

archaeological evidence already tells us; or, further, that it is impossible to understand the cognitive processes behind certain types of material remains, such as those associated with ritual and spatial perceptions. Societies are much more complicated than their material remains. A general description may be presented regarding any group, but when one looks deeper, it is revealed that there are individual thinkers, people who do not ascribe to the same beliefs, groups who are ostracized or enslaved or oppressed and class and gender divisions which are not included in a normative description of a society. For this reason, it is worth delving deeper into the many possibilities for information that the material remains can offer in the hope of expanding our knowledge of a subject.

The roughly 130-year pre-historic period in Iceland, when the pre-Christian group was settling into a new land and striving not only to understand their new surroundings but also to acquire a connection to the land so that its features became part of their social memory and identity, provided an opportunity to follow the progress of a growing population. The emerging society did not materialize out of thin air. They had arrived with a common cosmology, religion and ideology. For whatever reasons they sought to immigrate to Iceland, at least the new settlers had shared origins. Creating a new community and establishing new political and social networks in this community would mean integrating their previous ideals and this new situation, and to make it work, lines between the public and private spheres would have to be crossed.

6.2 Results of the Study

I approached this study with the expectations that using the catalogues of material data already on record, would allow the project to answer questions of gender roles, differences associated with age and cognition within an anthropological context; and

doing so would generate a more comprehensive understanding of the pre-Christian burial practices and ritual performances which directly reflect the ideology of the society. By striving to understand the cognition of spaces and places and how that affected the Viking period burials, a more realistic image of how the Icelandic settlers perceived their landscape emerged. I further argued that that GIS would be quite useful in such a study since it could reveal not only geography but perceptions.

This study showed that there were indeed differences in Icelandic burial practices from other parts of the Scandinavian world, their assumed place of origin. The most notable differences can be seen in the lack of cremation burials, high-status ship or boat burials, and special practices for a warrior class.

6.2.1 Burial Location

Marked differences were also revealed in burial location and placement. For instance, in Norway, burials tended to be much closer to the farm complex than is seen in the Icelandic corpus – averaging almost one-third of the distance. (Gjerland and Keller 2009 (in press)) In Iceland, burials were farther from the farm complex, probably because land was more readily available. Even if the actual mounds were not clearly visible, these burials were placed within sight of the farm house, and *vice versa*, so as to maintain a connection between the living and the dead. In so doing, lines of descent were forged indicating ownership and ancestry as well as creating a social attachment to one's surroundings. Despite the absence of a past in this new land, the settlers were creating one for future generations.

6.2.2 Social Status

The contents of the burials suggested the social status that was realized by the deceased and aspired to by the family. Thus, social position was projected from the

deceased onto the family and re-projected from the family to the deceased and back again. This cyclical process ensured that for better or for worse, the status of the deceased in the family and community was transferred to the household and thus to the legitimate heir.

It is not possible to know how representative the burial sample is with respect to the society under study because we can only be certain of wealth when a grave included many artifacts. Unfortunately, we cannot know if those without or with very few grave goods represent the poor, a different culture or a different religion. However, similar to other research in this area, the understanding of wealth in this study was based solely on the quantity and quality of grave goods associated with each grave, assuming it to be representative of the entire culture under study. In so doing, elevated social status was indicated by more than the usual prestige items collected in long-range trade. Items for leisure activities, excess amounts of any category of item – for instance adornment and weaponry, items of trade and specific craft items signaled the elevated status of an individual. Artifacts relating to specific tasks or toolkits are quite rare in the corpus and the results of the analyses indicate that such items more than likely show that the individual or family excelled at a particular task. In at least one situation, the inclusion of weaving artifacts, points toward a surplus-creating venture enhancing the position of the family and family members.

Diversity of grave goods was also an indication of enhanced social position in the pre-Christian Icelandic burials. When the artifacts were organized into categories based on function and purpose, some individuals had artifacts from as many as six categories while others had them from only one or two. Male graves could contain up to six

categories and female graves might have up to four. This clearly showed unequal access between the sexes. Age differences in grave goods was also noted, indicating the social positions of childhood, the arbitrary age group divisions created by this society and the manner in which maturity and development attributed to an individual's achievements and overall success.

Variation occurs among individuals in the number of artifact categories included within each grave. By considering animal inclusions as a significant category and relying on the number of categories included in burials with animals as strong indicators of social status, it seems a small group represented the highest social position (11.8%), the middle level accounts for 31.6% and the lowest level individuals with significant standing, 56.6%.

From the analyses of the data, it is seen that once the Icelandic corpus was separated from the other Norse communities, the image of the Icelanders changed. By allowing these data to be weighed on their own merits, the image suggested by so many in the past, of a group of relatively poor, egalitarian chieftains, changes. Now, it is clear from the diversity of their grave goods that they were actually a socially stratified community some of whom could afford to bury a variety of prestige goods, albeit on a lesser scale than found in some of the more magnificent burials from their neighboring Scandinavian communities. (Binford 1971; Crumlin-Pedersen and Thye 1995; Earle 1997; Kobylinski 1995; O'Gorman 2001; Schjødt 1995; Sjøvold 1954, 1985; Sørensen 1997)

6.2.3 Status Revealed in Graveyards

From the cemeteries, it appears that people of all social positions were commonly buried in graveyards in Iceland and that cemeteries further develop the image set forth in

6.2.2 by presenting the social levels of family-groups. There are obvious differences between those of the families of possible higher-ranking chieftains, or trading or specialized communities and the rest of society. In the higher-ranking graveyards more than one individual was interred with fine grave goods, full weaponry and jewelry of high quality and in some cases in considerable quantities. Graveyards for trading groups or families contained more than a few graves with artifacts of commerce, while those for more specialized groups contained those few specialized artifacts in the record. All the burials in these two groups contained a fair amount of artifacts, even a few prestigious artifacts. However, they included neither the quantity nor quality of those higher-ranking groups, with limited grave goods, some of high quality but most indicative of successful activities such as trading. Not all of the graves in these graveyards contained high status grave goods, but overall contained enough to show moderate status. The rest of the cemeteries had individuals with very few artifact inclusions. The meaning behind this difference is, at this point, unclear. Such graveyards could have been for low status free farmers or could be burial grounds for serfs or even indicate a different cultural group only containing the bare minimum of inclusions to meet the ritual needs for the next stage in life. In all cases, graves may have been subjected to robbery or events of borrowing where artifacts were removed to establish the continuity of power and to justify the continued authority derived from that powerful individual now deceased.

There is still the possibility that the very poor, either tenants or serfs, did not have proper burial grounds, suggesting they had no rights to any land after death. Maybe this explains some of the isolated individuals without artifacts or animal inclusions, though it

is possible that some may have been outlaws. These are questions that the data may never answer.

The Icelandic pre-Christian graveyards, like the individual graves, once taken out of the broader Scandinavian picture and measured against their own cultural group, clearly show social stratification among the Icelanders.

6.2.4 The Gendered Perspective

The lines between the genders were crossed inside and outside the grave. The sex of the individual had a strong influence on the position of the grave. Males tended to be on elevated ground and females were usually placed in association with a waterway. Although such a difference could be based solely on perceived status between the sexes and gender roles, the data suggest that such placements were chosen based on Icelandic cosmology. Males who died under certain circumstances would automatically travel to Valhalla in the afterlife, thus their trip was planned. Possibly, females, those males who did not die a warrior or those too young to have earned any such status, needed guidance towards the route to their own afterlives. Thus, they were placed near a waterway. In both cases, a view of the ocean may have some significance as being the liminal zone between the worlds.

There are gender differences in the dataset and inequality based on age and sex is evident. Not all individuals in a household were equal, and social roles were not completely binary. Women's and men's roles often crossed in this evolving economic and political system, as can be seen by the fact that there are hardly any artifact categories that could be attributed solely to either sex. Thus, in such uncertain times the public sphere has a direct impact on the private sphere and changes to the private affected the outcome of the public. Each household member had to do his or her part toward the

household's survival or success. It was also evident that there was both ascribed and achieved status in this culture. This is indicated by the increase in quantity and quality of grave goods with age and by the sparsity of younger individuals with prestigious burials in comparison, as well as by the inclusion of the artifacts of trade and craft production in mid to upper level assemblages.

Women were definitely outnumbered during the settlement period, but, the archaeological data does not necessarily support the almost 6:1 ratio suggested by some scholars using the Book of Settlements as a guide. For the most part, the ratios in most of the analyses usually ranged between 2.5-3.0:1 throughout the dataset. Whether this unbalanced ratio directly affected the position of women in this group is not certain. However, it is certain that in death, although there are notable inequalities, women were not necessarily subordinate to men. In fact, it seems they were revered because they contributed greatly to the success and wealth of the household through their management of the day-to-day as well as their involvement in surplus-creating activities, most notably, the production of homespun. The graves with artifacts of prestige and leisure as well as the graves that have an abundance of artifacts from diverse categories, suggest that in death, both sexes established social position and solidified social and political alliances, though more male graves than female graves exhibited higher social position through greater diversity in artifact function.

The incorporation of gender into this study clarified many of the differences based on sex. Social status based on sex is revealed but the situation is not as black and white as was once believed. This study showed that there are classes of women and that not all women are subordinate to all men. Also evidenced by this study is the social

stratification within the sexes and a possible means of perceiving how those strata were reached. Another aspect of gender differentiation was revealed by the incorporation of the burial landscape and GIS played a significant role in illuminating the gendered cosmology of the pre-Christian Icelanders.

6.2.5 Perceptions of Childhood

By incorporating an archaeology of childhood, the project was able to focus a portion of the analyses on the invisible. Despite the small sample, by doing so, it came to light that children were not insignificant. Care was shown for the very young who were buried in graveyards with the adults, presumably of their families, but without grave goods. It could be seen that adulthood was reached at a much younger age than in contemporary society, seemingly sometime during the 13-18 age category used in the skeletal analysis. During this time, it appears it was possible for an individual to have earned this particular rite of burial, but within this category, there are already differences in social status, indicating both ascribed and achieved social status in the community. This trend continues into the next age category, up to the age of 25 years of age. During this time there are more individuals in the dataset and they show that social status is not only being projected by grave goods, but also by burial placement. One possibility being entertained here is that males, in particular those who had not earned a particular status were placed in accordance with a general burial practice where placement near a waterway helped to guide them to their afterlife. Those males who had achieved or had begun to achieve a certain status were more likely to be placed in an elevated area – similar to the remainder of the dataset.

Such variations in placement also applied to the age groups, at least when it pertained to those more than likely considered too young to have had a chance to earn

such status. We find that in the earlier years of adulthood the majority were placed near waterways regardless of their gender associations. The very young, however, were placed with adults.

This study brought to light a perceptible difference in the measurement of childhood between contemporary thought and that of the pre-Christian Icelanders. It is proposed here that childhood was for the very young and once an individual was able to meet the requirements of adulthood either by skill or intelligence, it was then up to the individual to excel in life in order to earn a particular burial style or placement. Once again GIS contributed greatly to revealing this difference in burial placement based on age and cosmology.

6.2.6 Horses: Prestige, Transportation or Cosmology?

Since Iceland's landscape was very unlike the rest of the Viking homelands in that land transportation was more common than travel by sea, as discussed further below, horses were a fundamental component of travel and communication among trade networks from this time to well into the 20th century. It seems likely that the horse represented a substantial and prestigious contribution to the burial ceremony and projected the power and social standing of the individual onto his or her descendants during the period of hierarchical formation in the new land. (Brunwasser 2007; Cool 2005)

The Horse inclusions were not simply a sign of status, but represented the functional nature of the beast – both in life and in death a horse could provide transportation. Obviously, in the Icelandic context, the horse was part of daily life, providing transportation between farms, for trade and even more importantly to and from the annual assembly meetings. Essential cross-country travel was provided for by horses.

It would seem that such an important component of life would be as important in death as one would need transportation to the final destination. With almost half of the burials on record containing horse inclusions, it seems that they were not simply included because they were abundant, but they held a symbolic position in the burial ritual as well.

6.2.7 The Burial Landscape

In furtherance of Eldjárn's description, there are qualities in the placement of the burials such as the surrounding environment and the associated features which shed light on the decision-making process of choosing the burial location. As already established elsewhere (McGovern 1988; McGovern, et al. 2007) these farmers needed land suitable for maintaining, and particularly over-wintering, animals such as cows and sheep. The use-value of grasslands was clearly reflected in the choice of burial location as there were only a handful of burials placed in this type of environment, while the majority of burials were placed in or near areas of birch forest and water. Even with forested areas having been cleared pretty early during the settlement period, it appears that placing burials at the edge of birch forests near to water was the preferred location.

Burial in or near to birch was obviously sound economy, as the agricultural value is less than that of grasslands. Placement near water sources can also be thought of that way too but it had symbolic value as well. Cognitively, there may be a connection with networks, similar to Friðriksson's idea of placement by roads and tracks (Friðriksson 2005) with water being another type of track in the travel network. However, it appears that the Berufjord burial site (BR No. 50) is placed overlooking the deepest part of a fjord which today is not a particularly good landing place for boats and, more than likely, was not suitable during the Viking period either. (Gjerland and Keller 2009 (in press); Keller 2008, pers. comm.) It appears that there could have been a symbolic connection to

the travel and communication networks and possibly a connection to a cosmological network, as well. This would mean that water functioned as part of their regular network. Also, as was argued above, within their belief-system a visual connection to the path leading to the next stage of existence was implied by placement near water.

The strong connection between the living and the dead may have placed restrictions on burial placement. Although Iceland was uninhabited when the settlers arrived, it was shown that burials tended to be placed close to their associated farmhouses. This suggested that even though there was an empty landscape in which to place farms, burial locations were restricted by ideology. The majority of burial sites in this study were within an arbitrary 500-meter radius from the likely farmhouse position which suggests that the Icelandic settlers were indeed creating an obvious line of descent and staking claims based on lineage. This validated the right of the decedents to own and control the land on which their ancestors were interred. The social position of the deceased was reflected by the inclusions within the graves and projected onto the subsequent owners, thereby transferring any acquired status to descendants. The burial sites within this range were more than likely placed just outside of the home field, but still within the individual farm boundaries. This relative lack of distance between the likely farmhouse location and the burial site was one of the first indications that burials supported ownership rights by kinship and possibly indicated the longevity of a lineage on a particular farm.

Two-thirds of the burials were placed on prominent features. However, their overall unobtrusive appearance tempered the implications of such a position and for the most part supports Eldjárn's idea of the wealth of the Icelandic pre-Christian society. All

of the burial sites could be seen as claims to land, especially those along some sort of boundary, whether natural or man-made. The elevated burial sites, however, appear to serve this purpose quite well as they overlooked their property, another indication that they represented ownership and land tenure. This concept is supported by the contents of the Book of Settlement, as well as the manner in which line of descent is re-enforced in every saga and the fact that inhumation burials were a well-established ritual for marking land.

The landscape visible from each burial was also studied and it was found that the majority of the burial sites were located in areas without a vast view of the landscape, and though from my own surveys most views were generally pleasing to the eye, the measure here was of the overall range of visibility. For the majority, it proved to be limited. This seems to indicate that a view of one's own land was more important than a panoramic vista.

Ultimately, what the burial landscape brought to this study was a way to understand how these Norse individuals became Icelanders and how they created not only a physically demarcated landscape with boundaries and limitations, but a social memory for their descendants.

6.2.8 The Boat Burials and Cosmology

At present, there are nine possible boat burials known in Iceland. One is a burial mound in the shape of a very large boat to represent a boat grave, containing cremated remains. (Byock, et al. 2005) Another is particularly circumstantial with only wood fragments and boat nails remaining. Eldjárn thought it could possibly be a boat. (Friðriksson 2000:222-223) Also, according to Crumlin-Pedersen, even a partial boat is considered a boat burial. (Crumlin-Pedersen 1995; Müller-Wille 1995) These boat

burials were clearly following a Norse burial rite. In a land where materials were scarce, they denoted prestige and power as well as ritual symbolism and transport.

Iceland is quite a large island and during the Viking period was traversed by many land routes as well as by sea. In fact, compared to their contemporaries in other parts of Scandinavia, they relied heavily on land routes. Thus, placing a burial near a land route conveyed many of the various messages being sent via the seaside burials: ownership, protection and ancestry. However, when considering the perceived landscape, one possible interpretation of placement is that there was a strong cognitive connection to the sea, possibly representing a connection with the afterlife. Even with the strong connection to water seen in the various analyses, there were obviously other determining factors contributing to the placement of the burial sites and it would appear from the data that being located on a water feature was less important than being near to water or within view of water. Although being placed close to water sources does happen, what comes to light here is that most burial sites could not be described as being on a river or at the sea – the view was more important. By utilizing a cognitive GIS to ask questions about burial site placement and further explore the landscape, it was possible to bring to light the specific Cosmological connection: the dead were shown the way to the watery path to their afterlife.

As my thesis stated, it is quite clear that both the internal and external parts of each grave shed light on the culture; on both the living and the dead, and their various relationships. The study has shown that funerary ritual was a form of intentional communication, not only through the artifacts, but also in the placement of the burials. As such it was a key force in creating, displaying, strengthening and perpetuating social

and political aspects of this culture. The material remains also provide a possible interpretation of their cosmology and ideology. Finally, this study has shown that there is meaning in the patterns of visual imagery and that GIS can be employed not only to determine quantitative data, but qualitative information, as well, to venture into the cognitive world; Cognitive GIS can help us understand not only how spaces and places are built, but how they are perceived.

6.3 The Future of the Research

There are still questions regarding placement, such as why some burials are located above the farm locations, and what the meanings are behind the few outliers. There are questions concerning what further cognitive implications can be drawn from the data, especially in engendering the pre-Christian burials of Iceland where a wealth of information is yet to be revealed.

There are a few immediate points raised in this project that I intend to pursue further. The first is a continuation of the research of childhood, particularly to find out more definitively, what the Icelanders did with their young. Differences can already be seen even in the small dataset on those under 18, but since retrieving more data on the subject from the Icelandic context is not necessarily an option, this project would benefit from a more comparative approach, both expanding the dataset to include the rest of the Viking period graves and incorporating similar studies on other regions and cultures.

The second point raised in this project that I intend to pursue further is to delve deeper into the cosmology and other cognitive avenues of the burial rituals of Iceland. Thus, research incorporating the animal inclusions, particularly the horses, can be more complete. This may reveal how similar the symbolism is to other areas of the Norse

world where it is possible that in the Scandinavian context, since the horse was not as 'abundant' they used imagery and in the Icelandic context they were able to include the actual animal. The concept of traveling to the otherworld, in particular, the role of horses and other animals present in the burial ritual will show that the horse was not insignificant in the Icelandic corpus as it represented not only the change in lifestyle from their places of origin where travel by land was less readily accessible and even costlier, but also reflects the reliance this community had on the horse. The numbers of horses in the burial rites show clear differences between the Icelanders and other Norse communities.

Third third point raised is that the cognitive research from cosmology to religion, and beyond, needs to be looked at further. Just as the connection between placement and cosmology was revealed, religion and placement may be brought to light by further analyzing the symbolic meanings of the artifact inclusions and then bringing back into the landscape.

Finally, the focus on the boat burials in this project only scratches the surface. There are countless arguments that have been floating around whether or not the boats are functional, represent networks or have a symbolic meaning. Although I, along with many others, believe that they represent all three; there is still very little solid evidence in support of this – primarily due to the fact that the solution is based on a cognitive viewpoint. This project has shown that by incorporating processual, postprocessual and cognitive theoretical frameworks into a GIS and using GIS as more than a tool, images of the abstract processes embedded within the archaeology were brought to the surface and made visible. It was shown that water is as important as the physical boat and that

physical boats come in all shapes and sizes. It was also shown that 'saltwater people' have a strong connection to the sea and thus it is not surprising that water and boats would play a significant role in their cosmology. The next step is to attempt to shed light on the meanings of the boats in the burials, understand them within the religious context and develop a more detailed analysis that will reveal what social role the boat had in the burial ritual.

There is still much to be explored as questions still remain regarding some of the relationships. For example we still do not know who was selected for burial and if the poor are indeed represented. Such a project might focus on those seeming outliers – possibly outlaws or outcasts – or a more extensive survey to see if those above were associated with the farms considered here or possibly with undiscovered farms above the elevation of the anomalous graves.

Another question left open by this project is that although based on quantity and quality it would seem we have a range of rich to poor, those burials without or with very few grave goods may in fact be those people of a different cultural identity, with differing burial practices, or may not be poor, just of a slightly lower-class, as the poor may not have had an opportunity to be buried in this manner at all.

Not only has this project shed light on the gendered world of the pre-Christian Icelanders, but also the cognitive world. What this project has shown is that research needs to focus beyond creating lists – even beyond what the data are telling us. It is in this way that the data are able to finally be explained in their cultural context.

With the growing corpus of burial sites and new research methods being employed, it is believed that the early Icelandic society will finally be understood as a unique culture rather than a poor imitation of their superior contemporaries.

TABLES

Individual Graves In the Three-Variable Analysis as discussed in Chapter 4.5				
Grave No.	Sex	Age	Artifact Count	Animal
260	U	MA	75	Dog
189	U	A+?	53	Horse/Dog
135	F	U	46	Horse/Dog
265	F	OMA	43	Horse
286	M	OMA	34	Horse
250	M?	MA	31	Horse/Dog
157	F?	OMA	30	Horse
26	M	MA	23	Horse
196	F?	YMA	23	Dog
8	U	OSA	17	Horse
70	M	OMA	17	Horse/Dog
213	M	OMA	17	Horse
187	M	MA	13	Horse
44	U	U	11	Horse/Dog
197	M	YA	11	Horse
190	F?	OMA	8	Horse
154	M?	MA	6	Horse/Dog
221	U	U	6	Horse
27	M?	U	5	Horse
170	U	U	5	Horse
276	U	U	5	Horse
140	M	OMA	4	Horse
144	U	U	4	Horse
161	U	U	4	Horse
164	U	U	4	Horse
200	M?	OMA	4	Horse
262	M	MA	4	Horse
41	U	OMA	3	Horse
159	M?	OMA	3	Horse
251	M?	U	3	Dog
288	M	OMA	3	Dog
24	U	U	2	Horse

Tab. 4.5 Graves included in this portion of the dataset with sex, age and animal inclusion. (continued)

Individual Graves In the Three-Variable Analysis as discussed in Chapter 4.5				
Grave No.	Sex	Age	Artifact Count	Animal
50	U	U	2	Horse
146	M	YMA	2	Horse
162	U	U	2	Horse
248	M	OMA	2	Dog
43	U	U	1	Horse
73	M	MA	1	Dog
201	U	U	1	Horse

Tab. 4.5 Graves included in this portion of the dataset with sex, age and animal inclusion listed in descending order of artifact count by grave. Beads and boat nails are the two most likely artifacts drawing the artifact counts upward.

Pre-Christian Icelandic Boat Burials As Discussed in Chapter 5.14.4					
Burial Site No.	No. of Humans	Site Name	Size & Place of Boat	Artifacts Associated with Boat	Notes
37	2	Kaldárhöfði	“small boat” On small island in lake.	Silver wire, textile, strap end, buckle, 85 boat nails, ignitor, knife, ignitor, hook, hook, sinker, fragment, axe, arrow head, arrow head, shield boss, spear head, axe, sword, spear head, shield boss,	Adult and child in one small boat.
54	7	Vatnsdalur	6 m At deep end of fjord at shore.	Bronze finger ring, bronze arm ring, 30 beads, pin, chain, pendant, silver Thor’s hammer pendant, pin, bell, coin, weight, comb, comb, knife, whetstone, comb case, pebble, fragment, fragment, bone, decorated object,	
88	1	Dalvík (Böggsvisstaðir)	6.45 m Set back from water, but in view of water	124 nails and rivets, wood and iron fragments	

Tab. 5.5 Boat burials recorded in the Icelandic pre-Christian burial record. (continued)

<p style="text-align: center;">Pre-Christian Icelandic Boat Burials As Discussed in Chapter 5.14.4</p>					
89	1	Dalvík	7 m At landing area on water	Oval brooch, 15 beads, 52 rivets, 11 lead weights, 3 nails, steatite vessel, 2 whetstones, 2 knives, 3 buckles, wood, bone charcoal and iron fragments, 19 bone gaming pieces, 2 spear heads	
120	1	Glaumbær	5.5 m No view of sea, but water	25 rivets, 1 bridle bit, 3 buckles, 3 loops, 1 hook, 3 nails, 3 plated bosses, wood and iron fragments, 1 spear head	
134	1	Straumur	Placed very near to the glacial river	30 rivets, 1 lead weight, 1 knife, 2 pebbles, 1 axe	Thought to be a boat-burial, or at least a partial
163	3	Litlu-Nupar	6.5 m Overlooking river and view of the sea	1 bead, 1 bronze bell, 223 rivets and nails	Two males and one female
164	1	Hringsdalur	Between the road and the shoreline, very close to sea	400 boat nails, 10 rivets, 1 axe, 1 spear head, 1 shield boss, 1 sword, and iron fragments	Analyses not complete

Tab. 5.5 Boat burials recorded in the Icelandic pre-Christian burial record. (continued)

<p style="text-align: center;">Pre-Christian Icelandic Boat Burials As Discussed in Chapter 5.14.4</p>					
169	1	Huldahóll, Mosfellsbær	On a very prominent natural feature pointing toward the sea and landing place	Iron sheets with rivets, worked bronze sheet, iron fragments	Natural and man-made mound in shape of large boat, facing sea

Tab. 5.5 Boat burials recorded in the Icelandic pre-Christian burial record as of April 2009.