Title: Mobility, Mortality, and the Middle Ages: Identification of Migrant Individuals in a

14th Century Black Death Cemetery Population

Authors: E. J. Kendall, 1* J. Montgomery, 1 J. A. Evans, 2 C. Stantis, 1 and V. Mueller3

1Department of Archaeology, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK 2NERC Isotope Geosciences Laboratory, British Geological Survey, Keyworth, Nottingham

NG12 5GG, UK

3Department of Archaeological Sciences, University of Bradford, Bradford BD7 1DP, UK

Mobility and migration patterns of groups and individuals have long been a topic of

interest to archaeologists, used for broad explanatory models of cultural change as well as

illustrations of historical particularism. The $14_{\rm th}$ century was a tumultuous period of history in

Britain, with severely erratic weather patterns, the Great Famine of 1315-1322, the Scottish

Wars of Independence, and the Hundred Years' War providing additional migration pressures

to the ordinary economic issues drawing individuals to their capital under more stable

conditions. East Smithfield Black Death Cemetery (Royal Mint) had a documented use

period of only two years (AD 1348-1350), providing a precise historical context (~50 years)

for data.

Adults (n=30) from the East Smithfield site were sampled for strontium and oxygen

stable isotope analysis of tooth enamel. Five individuals were demonstrated to be statistical

outliers through the combined strontium and oxygen isotope data. Potential origins for

migrants ranged from London's surrounding hinterlands to distant portions of northern and

western Britain. Historic food sourcing practices for London were found to be an important

factor for consideration in a broader than expected 87Sr/86Sr range reflected in a comparison of

enamel samples from three London datasets. The pooled dataset demonstrated a high level of

consistency between site data, divergent from the geologically-predicted range. We argue

that this supports the premise that isotope data in human populations must be approached as a

complex interaction between behaviour and environment, and thus should be interpreted $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

cautiously with the aid of alternate lines of evidence.