Author’s response to reviewer 1

We sincerely thank reviewer 1, Antoon Kuijpers, for his useful and insightful comments and an advice on highly relevant references, which we missed to include. Below we respond to the comments point by point:

Comment 1:
Comment/ discuss general results in context of (non-cited) highly relevant reference Luterbacher et al. 2016 Env.Res.Lett. 11.

Response:
We first had troubles tracking down the suggested reference, until we have found out that it must be a paper by Orth et al (2016), including Luterbacher as a co-author, since it appears to be the only paper in Env.Res.Lett. 11, which, indeed, turned out to be highly relevant for our discussion. Now we included this into the discussion and added the following section under the “LIA milder episode”:

«Indeed, several studies report an exceptional multi-month drought and long-lasting warm conditions in Europe associated with year 1540 (Casty et al., 2005; Pauling et al., 2006; Wetter et al, 2014), which given our age model uncertainty for the time interval 1538-1664 BCE (±40 yr, see Table 2) may well fall within the warm period identified for the LIA from our BWT record. A warming around 1540 is also seen in winter temperature reconstruction for Stockholm ports and harbours based on historical records of sea ice (Leijonhufvud et al., 2009). The model-based reconstruction by Orth et al (2016) suggests that the European temperatures of 1540 exceeded those of the summer 2003, which was likely the warmest for centuries (e.g. Luterbacher et al, 2016). This is, however, difficult to deduce based on our data, since the fjord BWT record only stretches until ~1996.»

Comment 2:
Start of LIA : refer to Stuiver et al. 1995, Quat Res 44

Response:
The reference has been included.

Comment 3:
Multi-decadal variability lacking reference to possible link to Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO). Within this context interesting to discuss results shown in Fig. 7 with peaking BWT values prior to 1920 coinciding with cold AMO / low N Atlantic sea surface salinities (Reverdin et al. 1994 Progr.Ocean. 33; Reverdin 2010, Journ Clim 23; during warm AMO), after which again peaking (e.g. at time of ‘Great Salinity Anomaly’, early 1970’s).

Response:
We added a reference to AMO (Enfield et al, 2001) and its link to the multidecadal climate variability (through AMOC) into the introduction. We also added a discussion around high fjord BWT at times of cold AMO and reduced salinities in the North Atlantic:

“Our record also shows higher BWT prior to the 1920s (Fig. 8), which coincides with the cold AMO (low SSTs) and low sea surface salinities in the North Atlantic and Subpolar Gyre (Reverdin et al. 1994; Reverdin, 2010), while in the following period until ~1960, the reconstructed BWT remains at a lower level (during the warm AMO, i.e. high North Atlantic SSTs), after which it peaks again at time of “Great Salinity Anomaly” during the late 1970s and late 1980s (Dickson et al., 1988; Belkin et al., 1998). It remains intriguing, though, that at both occasions (prior to the 1920s and during the 1970s/1980s) of the reduced salinities and low SSTs in the North Atlantic, our record is characterized by high temperatures of the fjord deep water, which is consistent with increasing air temperatures in instrumental datasets from Stockholm and Central England (Fig. 8). The low surface salinities of the Great Salinity Anomaly were likely driven by an increased freshwater/sea ice export from the Arctic via Fram Strait and Canadian Archipelago (Belkin et al., 1998). The increased freshwater flux into the subpolar North Atlantic, in turn, is suggested to increase salinity of the North Atlantic Current, which may reduce its predicted weakening due to enhanced freshwater fluxes and will help to restart a stronger AMOC (Hátún et al., 2005; Thoralley et al., 2009). A stronger North Atlantic Current would in turn result in an increased heat transport during winter to the Eastern North Atlantic and together with other external forcing factors (e.g. changes in NAO, volcanism, and solar activity) would contribute to the warming observed in the fjord BWT record during the early 20th century. One of those factors, the positive NAO mode, which prevailed since the 1970s/1980s (Hurrell, 1995;...
http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/pna/season.JFM.nao.gif), extracts heat from the subpolar North Atlantic through increased westerlies over that region, decreases SSTs, enhances convection, increases ocean density (Delworth et al., 2016; Delworth and Zeng, 2016) and results in milder winter conditions over the north-western Europe, thus counteracting effects of the AMOC weakening, which has been suggested for the 20th century based on modeling data and proxy records (Caesar et al., 2018; Thornalley et al., 2018). Also, located within a coastal region, the Gullmar Fjord is more susceptible to wind-forced temperature changes, which follow the variability of the NAO index and drive coastal upwelling and downwelling in the fjord (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). According to Jansen et al. (2007), the late 20th century warming as demonstrated by many proxy records from the NE Atlantic (see discussion above), is unlikely to be explained by the external forcing factors and is probably linked to the anthropogenic drivers such as greenhouse gas emissions and aerosols (Booth et al, 2012), which both significantly increased since ~1970s (Masson-Delmotte, 2013).”

Comment 4:
Fig. 8: Discuss Dalton Minimum (AD 1790 -1820) with general low T, both Tair and BWT coinciding with Gulf Stream warming (see previous remark!), ref Van der Schrier and Barkmeijer 2005, Clim Dyn. 24

Response:
We agree with the reviewer and have added a following section into the LIA-discussion:

“Another interesting feature of the LIA climate variability is associated with consistently low fjord BWT as well as reduced air temperatures during 1790 – 1820 CE as indicated by Stockholm and Central England instrumental time series (Fig. 8). Despite this time period is known to coincide with the Dalton minimum in solar activity (Grove, 1988), it is likely that solar activity played much less role than volcanic activity associated with eruptions of 1809 and 1815 (Wagner and Zorita, 2005). The role of AMOC strength in shaping the LIA cold periods is also somewhat controversial based on marine geological evidence: though the AMOC weakening was proposed as a trigger for the LIA cooling (Bianchi and McCave, 1999), it was argued against (Keigwin and Boyle, 2000) and was not statistically significant in paleoclimate modelling (Van der Schrier and Barkmeijer, 2005). It has even been suggested that Gulf Stream may have experienced warming during this period (e.g. Keigwin and Pickart, 1999), which certainly does not explain low BWT temperatures in our record, as well as low air temperatures over Stockholm and Central England during 1790 – 1820 CE. An explanation for this phenomenon has been proposed by Bjerknes (1965), who postulated, “a decrease in western European winter surface air temperatures to be related almost completely to an anomalous southward advection of cold polar air”, a hypothesis later verified by a model study of Van der Schrier and Barkmeijer (2005).”
Author’s response to reviewer 2

We sincerely thank anonymous reviewer 2 for insightful comments and valuable suggestions on how to improve the manuscript. Below we respond to each of the comments.

Major comment 1:
Relevance: The authors need to explain better why the study is important. It is mentioned in the introduction that only few high-resolution records of late Holocene conditions exist from the eastern North Atlantic region. But records also exist from other regions, both Iceland and the western North Atlantic and the Labrador Sea region. Why is the Eastern North Atlantic region important? Please add a short explanation, what is special/different about this region compared to other areas. How can this study improve our general understanding of the late Holocene climate of the North Atlantic and which mechanisms control climate and ocean variability?

Response:
We are aware of the existing records from other regions, such as Iceland, the W North Atlantic and the Labrador Sea (among many others Jiang et al., 2005; Andresen et al, 2012; Seidenkrantz et al., 2012; Perner et al., 2011, 2013, Sicre et al., 2008, 2014 etc). However, in this paper we merely wanted to stay focused on available fjord records from the NE Atlantic, which all share high temporal resolution (i.e. annual to subdecadal) and similar fjordic hydrography allowing calm sedimentation and continuous sediment accumulation with minor dilution by glaciomarine and/or terrigenous component. One of the reasons for a specific focus on the NE Atlantic is due to a geographical location of the majority of the NH temperate silled fjords, which are simply less frequent on the western side of the Atlantic. In addition, we believe that since the North Atlantic Current (NAC), and it’s northward extension in a form of the Norwegian Atlantic Current, is one of the branches carrying a major part of the volume flux (and hence heat and salt) into the Nordic Seas (Hansen and Østerhus, 2000) and its ameliorating effect on NW European climate, more high-resolving records from sites influenced by the NAC and having long-term instrumental observations are needed. This is especially important in view that future predictions warn about NAC weakening (through AMOC) due to greenhouse forcing and, also, given the AMOC close connection to other mechanisms and phenomena controlling climate and ocean variability not only locally (for NW Europe) but also regionally and through teleconnections (e.g. NAO, AMO, ENSO).

We added the following section into the introduction following the reviewer’s suggestion:
“The North Atlantic region plays in this respect a paramount role for climate variability and global carbon budget by modulating the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) (e.g. Eiriksson et al., 2006; Lund et al., 2006; Park and Latif, 2008; Trouet et al., 2009). The upper northern limb of the AMOC, the North Atlantic Current, delivers heat, salt and nutrients from tropics to the mid- and high latitudes and carries a major part of the volume flux into the Nordic Seas (Hansen and Østerhus, 2000). The AMOC is thought to be linked to the sea surface temperature variability of the Atlantic multidecadal oscillation (AMO; Enfield et al., 2001) and is connected to decadal variability of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), where the NAO index is defined as the normalized sea level pressure difference between the Icelandic Low and the Azores High (Hurrel et al., 1995). The AMOC also contributes to a multidecadal modulation of El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Ortega et al., 2012 and references therein). Finally, variability of ocean temperature in high latitude North Atlantic and Nordic Seas are reflected in NW European climate and in winter Arctic sea ice extent (Årthun et al., 2017). Model projections predict AMOC slowdown in response to future warming and enhanced Arctic freshwater fluxes (e.g. Schmittner et al., 2005; Ortega et al., 2012) with potential detrimental impacts on the climate, the ecosystems and the economy of many European countries (e.g. Kuhlbrodt et al., 2009; Jackson et al., 2015). Hence, high-resolution paleoceanographic records, which preferably overlap with instrumental observations and historical data, are needed from the eastern North Atlantic region in order to document climate variability related to physical properties of the North Atlantic Current and AMOC strength.”
Major comment 2:

**Bottom Water Temperatures:** Page 3, line 28-31. It is stated that the water exchange only occurs during winter. Does any change in salinity or temperature conditions of the bottom waters occur during spring/summer? Explain more clearly whether the Bottom Water Temperatures actually represent winter conditions (mention this also in the abstract). As this is a central part of the work, it needs to be explained very clearly.

Seasons used in the bottom-water temperature reconstruction (p9): Traditionally the winter season is described through the months DJF, but here the period JFM is used. Why? Is there a local environmental reason for this, purely due to available data, or... Similarly an explanation should be given for the use of May-August as the summer period, but this is normally JJA. It is not directly stated in paragraph 4.3 that these periods correspond to “winter” (JFM) and “summer (MJJA) but in the following discussion (paragraph 5) winter temperatures are mentioned, so I assume that this is the case? However, it needs to be stated clearly and explained properly.

**Response:**

We tried to be more specific and to clarify the “winter temperature signal” by modifying the corresponding Study area section accordingly:

"The deep water temperatures vary between the years depending on the temperature of the inflowing water mass but remain stable seasonally (Fig. 2D). The deep-water salinities seasonally do not vary much from the average value of 34.5 (Fig. 2B). The stratification of the water column is strengthened during the summer by the development of a strong thermocline, which impedes deep-water exchange. The deep-water exchange of the fjord basin water takes place once a year during winter, mostly between January and March, based on long-term instrumental observations performed in the fjord (Arneborg et al., 2004). Due to a presence of a sill isolating the fjord deep-water mass from the adjacent seas and the large basin volume, the winter temperature and salinity of the inflowing North Sea/Skagerrak water, are “annually preserved” in the fjord basin until the next deep-water turnover, which does not occur until the winter of the year to come (Arneborg et al., 2004). This results in a bottom water environment characterised by the winter temperatures. The benthic foraminifers reproduce and grow in the fjord during the spring and summer (Gustafsson and Nordberg 2001), thus incorporating this annually preserved winter temperature signal of the ambient deep-water into their shells. This results in a stable oxygen isotope signal mainly reflecting winter temperatures of the North Sea surface water and the Skagerrak intermediate water."

As regarding the choice of JFM for winter months instead of the most commonly used DJF, this is due the deep-water turnover timing (Jan-March) described above. For example this can be seen clearly in Fig. 2 (C-E), where the bottom water exchange occurred in March 1993 (green rectangle). In addition, March is a month included in calculation of the winter NAO index (Hurrell, 1995), which has a documented effect on the deep-water exchange in the fjord (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). In contrast, it is very unlikely for bottom water renewal to occur in December, based on instrumental time series available for the fjord deep basin.

Similarly, May-August, are the months associated with foraminiferal growth in the fjord (Gustafsson & Nordberg, 2001), and hence we use those months when plotting instrumental observations for “summer season”, instead of commonly used JJA. We added this information in section 4.3.

Major comment 3:

**General interpretation and potential link to the NAO:**

3a) The section on the influence of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) on the Gullmar Fjord (p 11, lines 1.6) should be moved to the introduction, with reference also to modern data from NE Europe/NE Atlantic. No reference to NAO during past climate periods should be mentioned as fact before this is discussed in the following paragraphs.

3b) The potential role of the NAO is discussed for the MCA and LIA. But what about the RWP and the DACP? Several studies have indicated that climate during these periods may also be linked to the NAO, and the manuscript would benefit form a more in-depth discussion – and reference to a
wider range of previously published studies. It is also noteworthy that the authors only refer to work that shows comparable conditions as seen in Gullmar Fjord, omitting any other studies. The authors should also look towards studies on the Late Holocene from further afield, e.g. Portugal, East Greenland, the Labrador Sea.

Response:
3a) This has been done. We added the general info regarding the NAO into the introduction (see response to major comment 1) and also inserted the following text into the Study area section:

“The deep-water exchange in the fjord is driven by wind forcing, and largely depends on wind direction and wind strength (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). The latter two properties, in turn, are governed by the NAO, which is the dominant mode of climate variability in the region during the winter. In Gullmar fjord, the higher frequency and duration of NE winds, common during the negative NAO index periods, result in Ekman transport of surface water from the coast and facilitate coastal upwelling, which causes the deep-water exchange (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). In contrast, a positive NAO index causes stronger westerly winds, which prevent the deep-water renewals to occur. From the late 1970s the NAO has been in its prolonged positive phase and is believed to trigger severe seasonal hypoxia in the deep fjord basin (Nordberg et al., 2000; Björk and Nordberg, 2003; Filipsson and Nordberg, 2004).”

3b) We added the potential role of the NAO for the RWP and DACP in the discussion:

For RWP: “Other studies report an increased contribution of the Atlantic water to the East Greenland shelf, a reduced sea ice concentration and an increased export of fresh water from the Arctic with the East Greenland Current during the RWP, which are thought to be linked to a shift from negative to positive NAO after ~500 BCE/0 CE and changes in the AMO regime (e.g. Perner et al., 2015 and references therein; Kolling et al., 2017).”

For DACP we also added references to a negative NAO mode as suggested by e.g. Orme et al, 2015 and Helama et al 2017.

Major comment 4:

Hypoxia:
4a) On P. 7, line 5 and again Page 10, line 17-18 it is mentioned that C. laevigata has become a rare species in the Gullmar Fjord since 1990. One page 7 no explanation is given, page 10 the phenomenon is explained through hypoxia. However on page 15 a discussion is raised, whether it is due to hypoxia and if yes, why. The discussion is certainly relevant but the fact that first a statement is made and later a discussion is raised, makes it confusing and somewhat messy. I would suggest just to refer to “see†discussion” instead of jumping the gun on p7 and 10. Also the discussion on p 15 does not really fit well to the remaining text, and a solution may be to move this hypoxia discussion to its own, separate paragraph.

4b) With respect to this discussion, the authors basically explain the hypoxia as due to climate change. However, what about the increased nutrient supply seen due to more intensified farming seen in the general region, may this also play a role? Please discuss.

Response:
4a) We referred to discussion on p.7 and 10 regarding mentioning hypoxia and absence of C. laevigata, following reviewer’s suggestion. We also added a separated subsection “Environmental conditions explaining absence or rare occurrence of C. lavigata in the record” to separate the discussion about hypoxia.

4b) We added the following sentence into the discussion: “To a large extent, the oxygen status of fjords and estuaries on the Swedish west coast, is controlled by climate (e.g. Nordberg et al., 2000; Filipsson and Nordberg 2004a, b), but the late Holocene changes in land use and organic enrichment in the fjord are also suggested to play a role (Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010).”
Major comment 5:

Conclusions:
The paragraph should be expanded with a synopsis on the discussion on the processes driving the climate change.

Response:
We included the following sentences into the section:
"Those warming (cooling) intervals during the last 2500 years were likely caused by the strengthening (weakening) of the AMOC linked to changes in atmospheric and oceanic forcing, such as the NAO, the AMO and, also perhaps, the ENSO, as suggested by other studies. In addition, changes in solar activity, volcanic forcing and, more recently, the anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and aerosols have also been important drivers of the observed climate variability during the late Holocene."

Minor comments:
"Foraminiferal species: add author name to the species name the first time a species is mentioned: i.e., Cassidulina laevigata d’Orbigny, 1826; Adercotryma glomerata (Brady, 1878); Hyalinea balthica (Schröter in Gmelin, 1791)." - This has been corrected and the author’s names have been added.

"P5, line 14; reservoir correction: How many bivalve shells and from how many sites in the Gullmar Fjord is this reservoir correction based on?" – The shells were taken at four sites in a fjord deep basin (>100 m) and in total 14 samples were analysed for 14C reservoir effect. Four replicates were taken from each of 3 stations, while 1 station had only 2 replicates. The average reservoir age based on those 14 analysed samples is 497±30yr (Nordberg & Possnert, unpubl. data).

"P.9, line 24: add reference for timing of the foraminiferal growth season." – The reference has been added.

"P10, line 22-25: add references for the mentioned climatic intervals." – All references are present in the text above, just before the climate intervals are mentioned, however we also added some new references as suggested by reviewer 1.

"Page 15: Could the stronger recent warming of the Marlangen Fjord region be due to a more direct link to the northward flow of Atlantic water compared to Gullmar Fjord, which is not in direct contact with the core of the Atlantic water?" – It is true and we added this argument into discussion.

Figures and figure captions:
"All terms and abbreviations should be explained."– This has been corrected.

"Fig 1: explain abbreviations for current names" – This has been done.

"Fig 1a: land masses are shown in a very pale gray – it would be easier to see, if landmasses were shown in a slightly darker colour." – The figure was changed accordingly.

"Fig. 2: BWT needs to be explained either in the figures or the figure captions, as it should be possible to understand the figures without reading the main text." – This has been done.

"Fig 3A: I cannot distinguish between the upper and lower symbol; please make them more different." – The symbols have been changed.

"Fig. 5: explain BWT, RWP, DA, LIA etc in the figure caption. Mark the present BWT range on the figure." – This has been done.

"Fig. 6: explain the pink and blue intervals." – Has been done, as well.

"Fig. 7: Here “bottom water temperature” is written in full (not giving the abbreviation) – be
consistent.” – This has been corrected.

“Some additional comments are provided as comments in pdf file of the manuscript (only relevant pages).” – Those changes were applied to the text accordingly.
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Abstract. We present 2500 years of reconstructed bottom water temperatures (BWT) by using a fjord sediment archive from the NE Atlantic region. The BWT represent winter conditions due to the fjord hydrography and associated timing and frequency of bottom-water renewals. The study is based on a ca. 8-m long sediment core from Gullmar Fjord (Sweden), dated by $^{210}$Pb and AMS $^1$C and analysed for stable oxygen isotopes ($^1$H$_2$O) measured on shallow infaunal benthic foraminiferal species Cassidulina laevigata. The BWT, calculated by using the palaeotemperature equation of McCorkle et al (1997), range between 2.7 - 7.8°C and are within the annual temperature variability, instrumentally recorded in the deep fjord basin since the 1890s. The record demonstrates a warming during the Roman Warm Period (~350 BCE – 450 CE), variable BWT during the Dark Ages (~450 – 850 CE), positive BWT anomalies during the Viking Age/Medieval Climate Anomaly (~850 – 1350 CE) and a long-term cooling with distinct multidecadal variability during the Little Ice Age (~1350 – 1850 CE). The fjord BWT record also picks up the contemporary warming of the 20th century (presented here until 1996), which does not stand out in the 2500-year perspective and is of the same magnitude as the Roman Warm Period and the Medieval Climate Anomaly.

1 Introduction

The climate variability over last two millennia has been widely recognized as crucial for the understanding of the present and future climate responses to anthropogenic forcing (e.g. Cunningeham et al., 2013; Pagés et al., 2013; McGregor et al., 2015; Abram et al., 2016). To evaluate how significant regional climate changes are or if observed temperature anomalies are unprecedented in view of long-term climate evolution, there is a need for long historical instrumental climate records. A major challenge for the reconstructions of past climate changes, both by using proxy data and paleoclimate modelling, is often a lack of such long instrumental records, which if available seldom reach beyond the 20th century. The North Atlantic region plays in this respect a paramount role for climate variability and global carbon budget by modulating the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) (e.g. Ehrtsky et al., 2006; Lund et al., 2006; Park and Latif, 2008; Trouet et al., 2009). The upper northern limb of the AMOC, the North Atlantic Current (Fig. 1A), delivers heat, salt, and nutrients from the tropics to mid- and high latitudes and carries major parts of the volume flux into the Nordic Seas (Hansen and Østerhus, 2000), The AMOC is thought to be linked to the Atlantic multidecadal oscillation (AMO; Enfield et al., 2001), through sea surface temperature variability and it is connected to decadal variability of the North Atlantic Oscillation, (NAO; Curry and McCartney, 2001), where the NAO index is defined as the normalized sea level pressure difference between the Icelandic Low and the Azores High (Hurrel et al., 1995). The variability of AMOC also contributes to a multidecadal modulation of El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Ortega et al., 2012 and references therein). In addition, the North Atlantic Current passes between the subpolar and subtropical gyres (Fig. 1A), from which it draws water and, hence, depends on variability occurring within both gyres (Hansen and Østerhus, 2000). Variability of ocean temperature in high latitude North Atlantic and Nordic Seas are reflected in NW European climate and in winter Arctic sea ice extent (Árthun et
Historical data are needed from the eastern North Atlantic region in order to document climate variability related to physical properties of the North Atlantic Current and AMOC strength. At the same time many of the marine records available from the region to date tend to have low temporal resolution due to their location in the deep sea or within the open shelf areas.

Meanwhile, crucial knowledge has been gained from temperature proxy datasets available from the North Atlantic and northern hemisphere in general, which represent either composite records of different climate characteristics with various temporal resolution or are a combination of historical and proxy data; with generated data sets mostly reflecting summer conditions at higher latitudes (e.g. Moberg et al. 2005; Gunnarsson et al., 2011; Butler et al., 2013; Cunningham et al., 2013; PAGES2K, 2013, 2017; Sicre et al., 2014; Linderholm et al., 2015). In contrast, based on instrumental records, increased winter temperatures have been suggested as an important driver of the most recent warming (Cage and Austin, 2010) and, hence, climate proxies incorporating winter signal are needed. Sediment archives of temperate fjord inlets located within the region to date tend to have low temporal resolution due to their location in the deep sea or within the open shelf areas.

Herein, we present a high-resolution winter temperature proxy record from the Gullmar Fjord, on the west coast of Sweden, which illustrates the climatic development in NW Europe in annual to sub-decadal resolution over the last ~2500 years. The reconstructed temperatures are based on stable oxygen isotopes (δ18O) measured in shells (tests) of a shallow infaunal foraminifler Cassidulina laevigata d’Orbigny 1826 and reflect the deep water temperatures in the fjord basin. The fjord has a >100 yr-long record of instrumental observations from the deepest basin, performed since 1869 (Fig. 2A-C); furthermore, >100-yr long time series of air temperature observations are also available for Stockholm, Sweden and central England. These instrumental observations of bottom water and air temperatures are used to evaluate the accuracy of the reconstructed climate variability for the last century provided by the fjord sediment archive.

2 Study area

Gullmar Fjord is a Skagerrak fjord inlet, which is 28 km long and 1-2 km wide and oriented south-west to north-east (Fig. 1). The maximum basin depth is 118.6 m. The fjord is located at critical latitude picking up fluctuations between cold and temperate climates and has almost no tidal activity. The adjacent Skagerrak largely determines the local hydrography so that
the deep (basin) water, which is typically exchanged in the fjord during the winter, originates from the North Sea surface water flowing into the Skagerrak with the present-day current circulation system (Svensson, 1975; Nordberg, 1991). The 42-m deep sill at the fjord entrance restricts the water exchange and results in water column stratification due to salinity differences (Fig. 1C). At the surface (<1 m) there is a thin layer of river water from the Örekilsälven (Fig. 1), which does not significantly impact the fjord hydrography (SMHI, 1994; Arneborg, 2004). Below, at 1-15 m water depth, there is a brackish water mass (S=24-27), primarily derived from the brackish Baltic current flowing northward along the Swedish west coast. The brackish water mass has a residence time of 20-38 days in Gullmar Fjord (Arneborg et al., 2004). A more saline water mass (S=32-33) at ~15-50 m is derived from the Skagerrak and has mean residence time of 29-62 days (Arneborg et al., 2004). The last and deepest layer (>50 m), referred herein as deep water or basin water, is more stagnant, with little seasonal and inter-annual changes in salinity ranging between 34 and 35 and inter-annual temperature variability of 4 - 8°C (Fig. 2A, B). The deep water temperatures vary between the years depending on the temperature of the inflowing water mass but remain stable seasonally (Fig. 2D). The deep-water salinities seasonally do not vary much from the average value of 34.5 (Fig. 2B). The stratification of the water column is further strengthened during the summer by the development of a strong thermocline, which impedes deep-water exchange. The deep-water exchange of the fjord basin water takes place once a year during winter, mostly between January and March, determined using long-term instrumental records from the fjord (Arneborg et al., 2004). Due to a presence of a sill isolating the fjord deep-water mass from the adjacent sea and the comparably large basin volume, the winter temperature and salinity of the inflowing North Sea/Skagerrak water, are “annually preserved” in the fjord basin until the next deep-water turnover the following year (Arneborg et al., 2004). This results in a deep-water environment characterised by winter temperatures. The benthic foraminifers reproduce and grow in the fjord during the spring and summer (Gustafsson and Nordberg 2001), thus incorporating this annually preserved winter temperature signal of the ambient deep-water into their shells. This results in a stable oxygen isotope signal mainly reflecting winter temperatures of the North Sea surface water and the Skagerrak intermediate water. The deep-water exchange in the fjord is driven by wind forcing, and largely depends on wind direction and wind strength (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). The latter two properties, in turn, are governed by the NAO, which is the dominant mode of climate variability in the region during the winter (ref). In Gullmar Fjord, the higher frequency and duration of NE winds, common during the negative NAO index periods, result in Ekman transport of surface water from the coast and facilitate coastal upwelling, which causes the deep-water exchange (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). In contrast, a positive NAO index causes stronger westerly winds, which prevent the deep-water renewals to occur. From the late 1970s the NAO has been in its prolonged positive phase and is believed to be one of the triggers of seasonal hypoxia (<2 ml O₂ l⁻¹) in the deep fjord basin (Nordberg et al., 2000; Björk and Nordberg, 2003; Filipsson and Nordberg, 2004).

After an extensive deep-water exchange event in the fjord the oxygen level starts to decline in June, and the lowest oxygen levels normally develop between November and January, indicating hypoxic conditions, but so far anoxia has not been recorded (Fig. 2F). The first ever documented severe hypoxic event was noted in February 1890 by Pettersson and Ekman (1891). In the following, severe hypoxic events (≤1 ml O₂ l⁻¹) were measured in 1906, 1961/62, and 1973/74 (Fig. 2F).
but due to the low observation frequency and duration of these events are not well documented. Since 1979, multiple episodes of more frequent severe hypoxia lasting for at least 3 months have been observed. These events occurred in 1979/80, 1983/84, 1987/88, 1990/91, 1994/95, 1996–1998, 2008, 2014/2015, 2016 (e.g. Filipsson and Nordberg 2004a; Polovodova Asteman and Nordberg 2013; SMHI SHARK-database, 2017; Nordberg, unpubl. data).

The severe hypoxia makes the fjord basin hostile for large burrowing organisms but allows benthic meiofaunas to thrive. This lowers sediment bioturbation and results in well-preserved environmental sediment archive. The fjord basin has high sediment accumulation rates, which provide a high temporal resolution corresponding to 1-6 years per 1-cm thick sediment sample. Finally, the fjord sediment archive is characterized by the diverse and abundant foraminiferal faunas and dinoflagellate cysts, which have already provided some insights in climate evolution and associated environmental changes on the Swedish west coast during the last two millennia (Filipsson & Nordberg, 2004a; Harland et al., 2006; Nordberg et al. 2009; Filipsson and Nordberg 2010; Polovodova et al., 2011; Harland et al., 2013; Polovodova Asteman & Nordberg, 2013; Polovodova Asteman et al., 2013).

3 Material and Methods

This study is based on a composite record of two sediment cores: GA113-2Aa and 9004, which were both collected at 116 m water depth at the same site in the deepest Gullmar Fjord basin (58°17.570’ N, 11°23.060’ E) (Fig. 1), for which the long-term hydrographic observations are available (Fig. 2A-C). The core 9004 (731-cm long) was taken with a gravity corer (Ø=7.6 cm) onboard R/V Svenic in July 1990. The core GA113-2Aa (60-cm long) with an intact sediment-bottom water interface was recovered by using a Gemini corer (Ø=8 cm) in June 1999 from the R/V Skagerak. In the laboratory both cores were split in two halves and sectioned in 1-cm intervals. One half was used for bulk sediment geochemistry (TC, TN and C/N ratio), stable oxygen and carbon isotopes, dinoflagellate cysts- and benthic foraminiferal faunal analyses. Another half was stored as an archive at the Department of Geosciences, University of Gothenburg. The TC and stable carbon isotope data from both cores are published in Filipsson and Nordberg (2010), dinoflagellate cysts data are discussed in Harland et al. (2006, 2013), while C/N and foraminiferal assemblage data are presented in Filipsson & Nordberg (2004a), Polovodova et al. (2011) and Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013). We also present data from the gravity core G113-091, collected at the same location as GA113-2Aa & 9004 onboard R/V Skagerak in September 2009, and used herein only (similar to our previous study) to create a composite age model for the cores GA113-2Aa and 9004 (Polovodova Asteman et al., 2013; see below).

In addition to the above-mentioned cores, we also use six surface samples (0-1-cm) collected at five stations in the Skagerrak (OS4, OS6, OS14, 9202 and 9205) and one station in the Gullmar Fjord (G113-091a: the same location as for GA113-2Aa & 9004) in 1992-93 and 2009, respectively (Fig. 1B, C; Table 1). All surface samples were stained by rose Bengal to distinguish individuals presumably living at the moment of sampling from the empty foraminiferal shells.
3.1 Sediment core dating and age model

The age model for the composite GA113-2Aa & 9004 record has been previously published in Filipsson and Nordberg (2010) with further revisions by Polovodova et al. (2011) and Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013). Eleven intact marine bivalve shells were recovered in life position from the core 9004 and were subject to the AMS $^{14}$C analysis (Fig. 3A; Table 2). All $^{14}$C dates were obtained through analysis at the Ångström Laboratory (Uppsala University, Sweden) and originally were calibrated using the marine calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2004; Bronk Ramsey, 2005). Ages were normalized to $\delta^{13}$C of −25‰ according to Stuiver and Polach (1977), and a correction corresponding to $\delta^{13}$C= 0‰ (not measured) versus PDB has been applied. Herein we present ages recalibrated by using Calib Radiocarbon Calibration software v. 7.1 (Stuiver et al., 2017: http://calib.org/calib/), the most recent marine calibration curve (Reimer et al., 2013) and a reservoir age of 500 yr ($^{210}$Pb) by using a constant rate of supply (CRS) model (Appleby and Oldfield, 1978), which suggested that the core material was deposited between ca. 1915 and 1999 (Fig. 3A). For details regarding GA113-2Aa age model see Filipsson and Nordberg (2004a).

The composite record of GA113-2Aa & 9004 spans from approximately 350 BCE to 1999 CE (Table 2, Fig. 3A), and includes the late Holocene climate events such as the Roman Warm Period (RWP: ~350 BCE – 450 CE), the Dark Ages Cold Period (DA: ~450 – 850 CE), the Viking Age/Medieval Climate Anomaly (VA/MCA: ~850 – 1350 CE), the Little Ice Age (LIA: ~1350 – 1850 CE) and the contemporary warming from 1850 CE to present (Lamb, 1995; Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010; Harland et al., 2013; Polovodova Asteman et al., 2013; Helama et al., 2017). We add the Viking Age to the Medieval Climate Anomaly following the approach of Filipsson and Nordberg (2010), based on historical evidence that warming in Northern Europe began earlier than 1000 CE, which allowed Vikings to reach the NE coast of England and loot the monastery of Lindisfame in 793 CE (Morris, 1985). For further details on chronology of the cores GA113-2Aa and 9004 see Filipsson and Nordberg (2004a), Polovodova et al., 2011; and Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013).

Combining the long gravity core with the 60 cm long Gemini core, which includes the sediment-bottom water interface and, hence, the intact core top, resulted in a high-resolution temporal record of almost 1-year cm$^{-1}$ sample for the upper part of the record and <10 years cm$^{-1}$ sample for the deepest part of the record. Calculations from the $^{210}$Pb analyses and the AMS-$^{14}$C dates suggest sediment accumulation rates of ~9 mm year$^{-1}$ in the most recent sediments and approximately ~2.8
mm year\(^{-1}\) in the compacted deepest part of the gravity core (Fig. 2). Hence, due to high accumulation rates the upper 60 cm of the record can be directly compared to instrumental hydrographic and meteorological data (Figs 6, 7).

### 3.2 Stable oxygen isotopes

We measured \(\delta^{18}O\) on tests of shallow infaunal foraminifer *Cassidulina laevigata* from the core top samples and from the ca. 8-m long G113-2Aa-9004 record (Fig.1B). Between 12 and 20 specimens of *Cassidulina laevigata* were picked from each sample for the analysis. In total 6 and 425 samples were analysed for stable oxygen isotopic composition for the surface sediments and composite G113-2Aa-9004 record, respectively. All samples were measured at the Department of Geosciences, University of Bremen, Germany, using a Finnigan Mat 251 mass spectrometer equipped with an automatic carbonate preparation device. Isotope composition is given in the usual \(\delta\)-notation and is calibrated to Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (V-PDB) standard. The analytical standard deviation is \(<0.07\%\) for \(\delta^{18}O\) based on the long-term standard deviation of an internal standard (Solnhofen limestone).

The temperature was reconstructed using the salinity: \(\delta^{18}O\) relationship established by Fröhlich et al. (1988) (eq. 1), which is representative for this region (Filipsson, unpubl. data). An average salinity value of 34.4 (range 33-35) was used in equation 1, based on instrumental measurements between 1896 and 1999 for the fjord deep-water (station Alsbäck). The salinity (S) was assumed to be constant over the investigated time period.

\[
\delta^{18}O_w = 0.272 \times S - 8.91
\]

To calculate temperatures the paleotemperature equation by McCorkle et al. (1997) was applied (eq. 2). This equation is more appropriate to the temperature range observed in temperate fjord basin than the more commonly used linear equation by Shackleton (1974), which produces unrealistically high temperatures in our study (see results section). The bottom water temperature in degrees Kelvin (\(T^oK\)) was calculated as follows:

\[
T^oK = \frac{2.78 \times 10^3 \delta^18O + 2.89 \times 10^3}{\sqrt{2.78 \times 10^3 \delta^18O + 2.89 \times 10^3}}
\]

Here, \(\delta^18O\) stands for stable oxygen isotopic ratio \(^{18}O/^16\)O measured in calcite tests of *C. laevigata*, while \(\delta^18O_w\) is the isotopic composition of water calculated from equation 1 and converted from SMOW to V-PDB by subtracting 0.27\% (Bemis et al., 1998)

Finally, to convert reconstructed temperatures to degrees Celsius, equation 3 was used:

\[
T^oC = T^oK - 273.15
\]
Since 1990 *C. laevigata* has become a rare species in the Gullmar Fjord deep basin (Fig. 6), which resulted in short gap in the most recent part of the record (see discussion). Similar gaps in $\delta^{18}O$ and, hence, bottom water temperature data are also seen for the earlier part of the record and are due to absence or very low abundances of *C. laevigata* (Fig. 6).

### 3.3 Hydrographical and meteorological instrumental data

Long-term hydrographical instrumental data for temperature, salinity and dissolved oxygen concentration [O$_2$] for the fjord basin (average for 110-118 m w.d.) were extracted from the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI) SHARK database (https://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/oceangraf/havsmljodata/marina-miljoovervakningsdata). Some of the Gullmar instrumental data is also available from the Water Quality Association of the Bohus Coast (BVVF) (http://www.bwvf.se/), while the data prior to 1958 come from Engström (1970). The Skagerrak hydography data for the stations adjacent to OS4-6, 9202, 9205 and OS14 were obtained from the International Council for the Exploration of the Seas (ICES: http://www.ices.dk/marine-data/). Meteorological observations of air temperature were also obtained for Stockholm (https://www.smhi.se/klimatdata) and the Central England (http://www.metoffice.gov.uk), which both have the longest historical meteorological records going as far back as the 18th century.

### 4 Results

#### 4.1 Core tops

To obtain an error estimate and to facilitate the choice of the paleotemperature equation we used living (stained) tests of *Cassidulina laevigata* from the core top samples collected in the Gullmar Fjord and the adjacent Skagerrak. Calculated bottom water temperatures based on the $\delta^{18}O$ values from the living (stained) *C. laevigata* were compared to ICES and SMHI hydography data from the adjacent stations (Fig. 4A). Also the $\delta^{18}O$, values predicted from the chosen equation (see below) were used to estimate the reliability of our temperature reconstruction (Fig. 4B). *Cassidulina laevigata* has been previously suggested to calcify 0.19‰ lower than equilibrium (Poole et al., 1994). Our $\delta^{18}O$, data from the core tops demonstrate an offset, ranging between 0.01‰ and 0.27‰ (mean 0.15‰), compared with $\delta^{18}O$, predicted using the paleotemperature equation from McCorkle et al (1997) (Fig. 4B). Applying the mean correction of +0.15‰ to the Gullmar $\delta^{18}O$, record results in bottom water temperatures -0.5-1°C higher than those recorded by instrumental observations in the fjord (Fig. 2A), while uncorrected $\delta^{18}O$, values produce temperatures close to observations. Taking the latter into the account and because, based on available data, it is difficult to estimate how large the correction should be, we further report the uncorrected $\delta^{18}O$, values both for the core tops and for the sediment cores. Instead, we use a median value (0.7°C) of the range in produced temperature offset (Fig. 4A) as an error margin for our paleotemperature reconstructions (Figs 5-6).
Instrumental temperature data from ICES and SMHI were used to calculate $\delta^{18}O_c - \delta^{18}O_w$ for the core top samples to facilitate the choice of a paleotemperature equation. Plotting $\delta^{18}O_c - \delta^{18}O_w$ versus observed temperature data for different paleotemperature equations (Fig. 4C) allows estimating which of the equations gives the best possible agreement with the core top data and, hence, is the most appropriate for temperature reconstructions. Figure 4C shows that $\delta^{18}O$ values from the NW Skagerrak (OS4 and OS6) are clearly in better agreement with equations by Hays and Grossman (1991) and McCorkle et al. (1997), while the central Skagerrak samples (9202 and 9205) plot close to the linear equation by Shackleton (1974). The samples from Gullmar Fjord (G113-091) and the OS14 station, collected just outside the fjord, occupy a space in between the Shackleton equation and those by Hays and Grossman (1991) and McCorkle et al. (1997). This suggests that applying the Shackleton equation for Gullmar Fjord and Skagerrak will result in temperatures higher than observations, which has been also observed for Cibicidoides and Planulina from Florida Straits (Marchitto et al., 2014). Indeed, when testing the Shackleton equation on our dataset, the temperatures are warmer than the ICES hydrographic observation data by 1.5-2°C. In contrast, the equation by Bemis et al. (1998) applied to the core top $\delta^{18}O_c$ data produces the coldest temperatures, which are 0.9-1.5°C colder than observations. In turn, it appears that by using Hays and Grossman (1991) or McCorkle et al. (1997) equations, the corresponding calculated temperatures come closer to observations. Both equations are nearly identical for the temperature range 5-8°C (Fig. 4C) observed between 1890 and 2001 (Fig. 2) and by exercising both equations on Gullmar Fjord $\delta^{18}O$ record the almost identical paleotemperature curves are produced. This is rather curious since the equation of Hays and Grossman (1991) is based on meteoric calcite of non-biogenic origin. In the current paper we apply the McCorkle et al (1997) equation for the paleotemperature reconstructions.

4.2 Composite record of G113-2Aa and 9004 sediment cores

The $\delta^{18}O$ record from the Gullmar Fjord shows both decadal and centennial variability for the last 2500 yr (Fig. 5) and can be divided into five major isotopic intervals: 1) For the lower part of the record at 802-592 cm, corresponding to ~350 BCE – 450 CE, the $\delta^{18}O_c$ values are generally lower (~2.4‰) than the long-term average of 2.7‰. 2) Between 598 and 475 cm (~425 – 900 CE) the $\delta^{18}O$ record demonstrates a considerable variability (Fig. 5), starting with higher $\delta^{18}O_c$ (2.8-3‰) at 598–574 cm (~425 – 525 CE), which then become lower (~2.4‰) at 574–529 cm (~525 – 700 CE) and increase again (~3.0‰) between 529 and 497 cm (~700 – 825 CE). 3) The 475–302 cm interval (~900 – 1350 CE) displays again lower $\delta^{18}O_c$ (~2.4-2.5‰), which are below the long-term average. 4) From 302 to 53.5 cm (~1350 – 1900 CE) the stable oxygen isotope record increases again with the majority of the $\delta^{18}O_c$ values being ~3.1-3.2‰ and exceeding the long-term average. Within this interval the highest $\delta^{18}O_c$ values of >3.2‰ are found between 300 and 170 cm (~1350CE – 1580 CE). 5) Finally, the $\delta^{18}O$ record becomes lower again (~2.4‰) between 53.5 and 5 cm (~1900 and 1996 CE). We did not find enough specimens of Cassidulina laevigata to perform isotopic analyses for samples between 5 and 0 cm (1996-1999).
Shifts of ~0.25% in δ¹⁸O occur throughout the Gullmar Fjord δ¹⁸O record, which according to the equation of McCorkle et al. (1997) may potentially indicate a temperature variability of ~1°C. A corresponding salinity change is rather small (0.02), calculated using the mixing line by Fröhlich et al. (1988) and by applying the δ¹⁸O range of 2.6-2.85 and a corresponding temperature range of 4.9-5.9°C. Such salinity changes are well within the amplitude of inter-annual variability (1-1.5), recorded by instrumental salinity observations since the 1890 (Fig. 2). Foraminifera precipitate their tests during several months (e.g. Filipsson et al., 2004) and thus integrate the inter-monthly salinity signal, which together with annual variability is minimal according to the instrumental data. For the upper part of the record 1-cm sediment slice integrates one or possibly two growing seasons of C. laevigata and, hence, records a potentially higher variability of both salinity and temperature. In the deepest part of the record, however, a single 1-cm sample may correspond to ~7-10 years and, thus, more likely averages inter-annual salinity and temperature variability providing “a more smoothed” signal.

Stable carbon isotopes (δ¹³C) data from the composite G113-2Aa – 9004 record (Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010) were plotted against the oxygen isotope data presented herein, to investigate the potential relationship between the two e.g. due to different water masses (Suppl. Fig. 1). No such relationship was found (Suppl. Fig. 1), which indicates that our δ¹⁸O record mainly reflects fjord deep-water temperatures.

### 4.3 Reconstructed bottom water temperatures (BWT)

The resulting calculated bottom water temperature record is plotted both as absolute temperature values (Fig. 5B) and as anomaly from the mean value (5.4°C), based on the instrumental temperatures observed between 1961 and 1999 (Fig. 6). With very few outliers, the reconstructed temperature range (2.7 - 7.8°C) is within the present-day annual variability, documented from instrumental temperature measurements in the fjord deepest basin since 1890 (Fig. 2A,C,Fig. 5C). To further prove that our record represents a winter signal rather than summer conditions (as most of biological proxies) we compare the obtained BWT record to instrumental temperatures recorded in the fjord deep water during summer and winter.

When performing such a comparison, instead of the commonly used June-August (JJA) temperatures for designation of meteorological summer, one has to consider the observations during May-August), when the foraminifera precipitate their calcite (Gustafsson and Nordberg, 2001; Filipsson et al., 2004), which is used herein for stable isotope analysis and BWT reconstruction. Likewise instead of months used for definition of meteorological winter (December-February: DJF), when comparing reconstructed BWT to instrumental observations we use January-March, which define hydrographic winter in the fjord and are associated with months when deep-water exchanges occur (see Study area).

Observed annual temperatures registered between 1890 and 1996 (which corresponds to the uppermost part of the composite G113-2Aa – 9004 record) vary between 3.0 and 8.3°C, which gives an amplitude of 5.3°C. Corresponding instrumental 1890-1996 temperatures for foraminiferal growth season in the fjord (May-August, see above) show a 4.1 - 7.2°C range with an amplitude of 5.4°C. When studying the reconstructed temperatures over the last 2500 years the corresponding amplitude, i.e. the difference between the maximum (7.8°C) and the minimum (2.7°C) temperatures is 5.1°C (Fig. 5).
plotting the reconstructed bottom water temperatures for the period 1890–1996 versus corresponding instrumental bottom water temperatures as annual average and means for May-August (Fig. 7B) and January-March (Fig. 7C), the calculated bottom water temperatures and hydrographic data agree with each other rather well in terms of amplitude. An increased agreement, however, is reached when comparing the reconstructed data to the hydrographic winter (Jan-March) temperature (Fig. 7C), which is not surprising considering the fjord hydrography and a season when deep-water exchanges typically occur (see Study Area section). Hence, Gullmar Fjord δ¹⁸O-based temperature record reflects the winter temperature variability of surface water in the North Sea.

From the reconstructed Gullmar Fjord temperature record five bottom water temperature intervals can be recognized (Figs 5-6), in parallel to the isotopic intervals mentioned above. 1) From ~350 BCE to 450 CE the fjord bottom water temperatures are consistently above 5.4°C, the 1961-1990 mean. 2) Between 450 CE and 850 CE the record fluctuates between positive temperature anomalies (~450–650 CE) and negative anomalies (~650 – 850 CE) reaching minimum value at ~750 CE. 3) At ~850–1300 CE the bottom water temperatures are again above the average with a short negative anomaly around 1200-1250CE. 4) The period between ~1300 CE and 1850 CE in the Gullmar Fjord record is unprecedentedly cold for the last ~2500 years with the majority of temperature anomalies being negative and reaching the minimum value around ~1350 CE (Fig. 6). 5) Finally, from ~1850 CE towards present day the record is characterised by consistently positive bottom water temperature anomalies, which is comparable in the amplitude to the high anomalies found at ~350 BCE – 450 CE.

4.4 Gaps in the record due to absent/rare *Cassidulina laevigata*

Some intervals in the G113-2Aa - 9004 record were barren of *C. laevigata* tests and hence for those intervals δ¹⁸O values and the corresponding reconstructed bottom water temperature data are missing. Those intervals are: ~130–120 BCE, ~725–740 CE, ~1260–1265 CE, ~1273–1277 CE, ~1340 CE and ~1996–1999 (Fig. 6). The most recent period of absent/rare *C. laevigata* in the Gullmar Fjord coincides with higher bottom water temperatures and frequently occurring severe hypoxia (see introduction and discussion), as registered by the instrumental measurements in the deepest basin (Fig. 2C).

5 Discussion

The Gullmar Fjord winter bottom water temperature record shows both centennial and multidecadal variability and has a striking resemblance with climate periods (see below) historically known in the northern Europe over the last 2500 years (e.g. Lamb 1995; Stuiver et al., 1995; Moberg et al., 2005; Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010; Helama et al., 2017). The record demonstrates periods of temperature variability, which correspond to the Roman Warm Period (~350 BCE – 450 CE), the Dark Ages cold period (~450 – 850 CE), the warm Viking Age/Medieval Climate Anomaly (~850 – 1350 CE), the colder
Little Ice Age (~1350 – 1850 CE) as well as the warmer conditions during the 20th century (~1850 CE – present). There is an overall cooling trend in the Gullmar Fjord temperature record for the last 2500 years, which is consistent with other climate proxy records for this period (e.g. Lebreiro et al., 2006; Eiriksson et al., 2006; Hald et al., 2011; McGregor et al., 2015). Among forcing mechanisms for the late Holocene climate variability in the North Atlantic region changes in temperature and influx of the Atlantic Water to the region (e.g. Nordberg, 1991; Hass, 1996; Kitgaard-Kristensen et al., 2004; Eiriksson et al., 2006; Lund et al., 2006), radiative forcing (Jiang et al., 2005; Hald et al., 2007), volcanic activity (Otterå et al., 2010; McGregor et al., 2015) and land-use changes and increased greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. Abram et al., 2016) are suggested. In addition, there is a strong coupling between atmospheric and ocean circulation linked to the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) variability. The NAO influences strength and frequency of moist westerly winds, bringing precipitation to the Northern Europe and has even been suggested to induce multidecadal-scale changes in the AMOC (Dickson et al., 1996), which on centennial scales is linked to the late Holocene major climate extremes (Bianchi and McCave, 1999).

5.1 The Roman Warm Period (prior to ~450 CE)

The fjord record shows consistently positive bottom water temperature anomalies during the Roman Warm Period (RWP) when compared to 5.4°C, the annual mean for 1961-1999 (Fig. 6). The RWP is often associated with increasingly warm and dry summers both on the British Isles and in the central Europe and is linked to the expansion of the Roman Empire (Lamb, 1995; Wang et al., 2012). The RWP warming coincided with a more vigorous flow of the Iceland Scotland Overflow Water, which is an important component of the AMOC modulating the European climate (Bianchi and McCave, 1999). Other studies report an increased contribution of the Atlantic Water to the East Greenland shelf, a reduced sea ice concentration and an increased export of fresh water from the Arctic with the East Greenland Current (Fig. 1A), which all are thought to be linked to a shift from the negative to a positive NAO after ~500 BCE/0 CE and changes in the AMO regime (e.g. Perner et al., 2015 and references therein; Kolling et al., 2017). Harland et al (2013) analysed dinoflagellate cysts from the same composite core as presented herein and, based on observed changes in species composition, suggested that sea surface temperatures (SSTs) in the fjord were >10°C during the RWP, as compared to the present-day SSTs of ~9°C (SMHI, 2017). Other studies suggest SSTs of 6-10°C for the waters off N Iceland (Sicre et al., 2011), 10.7-12.6°C for the Voring Plateau, Norwegian Sea (Risebrobakken et al., 2011), >13°C for off the NW Scotland (Wang et al., 2012) and >15°C for the Rockall Trough, NE Atlantic (Richter et al., 2009) during this period. Also for the coastal NW Atlantic (Chesapeake Bay) the SSTs as high as 12-15°C were reported (Cronin et al., 2003). For the adjacent Skagerrak an increase in both intermediate and bottom water temperatures is reported based on Mg/Ca data on benthic foraminiferal species Melonis barleeanus by Butruille et al. (2017). The authors demonstrate a ~2°C temperature increase and report a temperature range of ~6-8°C during the RWP. In a 2000-yr long temperature record from
the Malangen Fjord, NW Norway (Hald et al., 2011), the RWP is characterized as “a warm period with stable bottom water temperatures”. The Malangen fjord record is based on δ¹⁸O measured on *Cassidulina neo*teretis and documents a bottom water temperature range of 5.5-7.5°C (Hald et al., 2011). Both Skagerrak and Malangen Fjord studies agree well with our dataset, which demonstrates a temperature increase of ~2.5°C, resulting in a 5.4-7.9°C temperature range during the RWP for the Gullmar Fjord deep water (Fig. 5). The somewhat higher upper range limit of the RWP bottom water temperatures in the Skagerrak and Malangen Fjord, compared to our data, may be explained by a more direct influence of the more temperate Atlantic water at those sites, which is less obvious for our study area as it is more land-locked and with a stronger continental influence.

When comparing our data to the major temperature synthesis efforts done for the last two millennia, it becomes evident that our RWP reconstruction seem to disagree with the northern hemisphere temperature record of Moberg et al (2005), which is mostly characterized by the negative RWP temperature anomalies (Fig. 6). On the other hand, the warming seen in the Gullmar Fjord dataset is consistent with the PAGES2k temperature synthesis for the continental Europe (Fig. 6), which also reports a distinct warming corresponding to ~2-3°C temperature increase during the RWP (PAGES2k, 2013).

### 5.2 The Dark Ages Cold Period (~450 – 850 CE)

Our record displays variable bottom water temperatures in the fjord during the Dark Ages (Figs 5-6), which is initiated with a short-lived negative anomaly at ~400-450 CE, then switches to positive values (~450-650 CE) and then becomes negative again at ~650-850 CE. The Dark Ages Cold Period (DACP) is commonly linked to a large-scale human migration in the central Europe (Lamb, 1995; Büntgen et al., 2011). The DACP was contemporaneous with a reduced flow of the Iceland Scotland Overflow Water (Bianchi and McCave, 1999), low solar activity, low pollen influx (Desprat et al., 2003), glacier advance (Lamb, 1995) and a negative mode of the NAO (Orme et al., 2015; Helama et al., 2017). Summer temperatures <10°C in French Alps (Millet et al., 2009), increased humidity in the northern Europe (Barber et al., 2004) as well as a widespread abandonment of arable lands and cultivation in the SW Norway (Salvesen, 1979) were also documented for this period.

There is also some cooling during the DACP indicated for the intermediate and deep water in the adjacent Skagerrak (Butruille et al., 2017) but different temporal resolution makes it difficult to directly compare the Skagerrak record with ours. In contrast, variable SSTs during the Dark Ages are reported by some North Atlantic records (Sicre et al., 2011; Risebrobakken et al., 2011), with timing similar to the variability of the Gullmar temperatures (see above). Variable bottom water temperatures are also reported for the Malangen Fjord with a range (5.5-7.5°C) relatively close to our results (~4-8°C). There is also some fluctuation between cooling and warming with a ~3-4°C amplitude in a Mg/Ca-based SST record from the Chesapeake Bay (Cronin et al., 2003), as well as in the DACP temperatures reconstructed for the continental Europe (PAGES2k, 2013).
5.3 The Viking Age / Medieval Climate Anomaly (~850 – 1350 CE)

After the Dark Ages the bottom water temperature anomalies in Gullmar Fjord become positive between ~850 CE and 1350 CE, which fits well with the onset of the warming during the VA/MCA. The warm MCA is believed to be associated with a positive NAO index (e.g. Trouet et al., 2009; Faust et al., 2016), which likely have strengthened the AMOC (Bianchi & McCave, 1999) and resulted in an increased transport of heat and moisture to the higher latitudes. The MCA also coincided with Grand Solar Maximum at 1100–1250 CE (Zicheng and Ito, 2000) and its temperature optimum occurred between 1000 CE and 1300 CE when there was a sharp temperature maximum in most of Europe (Lamb, 1995).

The mean annual northern hemispheric and continental Europe temperature records (Moberg et al., 2005; PAGES2k, 2013) show the onset of warming as early as between ~850 and 950 CE, with distinct warmth peaks reached around 1000 CE and 1100 CE and the MCA termination around 1300 CE, which all agrees with our data rather well (Fig. 6). The Malangen Fjord record also shows the warming already before 800 CE, which terminates around 1250 CE (Hald et al., 2011), a century earlier than in the Gullmar Fjord record. Despite such inconsistency in timing, which likely results from dating uncertainties (which may be the case for both studies), the two fjord records agree with each other rather well in terms of reconstructed bottom water temperature ranges for this period: 5.4-7.6°C for the Gullmar Fjord and 5.5-7.1°C for the Malangen Fjord. In the adjacent Skagerrak both intermediate and deep-water temperatures are reported to increase from ~6 to 8°C (Butruille et al., 2017) but sampling resolution of the former is too low for the MCA period. In turn, bottom water temperatures in the Scottish Loch Sunart also increased by ~1.2°C during the MCA (Cage and Austin, 2010), which is also within the abovementioned ranges. An increase of similar magnitude during the MCA is also reported for the sea surface temperatures in the North Atlantic (Cunningham et al., 2013).

An interesting feature in the Gullmar Fjord record of the VA/MCA is a presence of a short-lived cooling centred at ~1250 CE before the final peak of warmth at 1250-1350 CE (Fig. 6; see blue box). Such short cooling during the MCA is also documented for both eastern and western Atlantic coasts (Chesapeake Bay: Cronin et al., 2003; Loch Sunart: Cage and Austin, 2010) but with a slightly different timing, either due to dating uncertainties or application of different temperature proxies (Mg/Ca vs $\delta^{18}O$).

5.4 The Little Ice Age (~1350 – 1850 CE)

From ~1350 CE to ~1850 CE our record shows winter bottom water temperatures 2-3°C lower than the instrumental annual mean for 1961-1999 (Fig. 6). Many other proxy records report cooling of similar magnitude or even stronger in the North Atlantic during the LIA (e.g. Stuiver et al., 1995; Cronin et al., 2003; Klimgaard Kristensen et al., 2004; Eiriksson et al., 2006; Hald et al., 2011; Sicre et al., 2011). The PAGES2k synthesis of marine palaeoclimate records spanning the past 2000 years also identified a robust global surface ocean cooling with the coldest conditions from 1400 to 1800 CE (McGregor et al., 2015). The Little Ice Age is commonly associated with glacier advances in the Arctic and alpine regions (Porter, 1986;
Miller et al., 2012) in response to reduced solar activity (Mauquoy et al., 2002) and summer insolation (Wanner et al., 2011), increased volcanism (Miller et al., 2012), negative North Atlantic Oscillation (e.g. Trouet et al., 2009; Faust et al., 2016) and reduced strength of the AMOC (e.g. Bianchi & McCave, 1999; Klitgaard Kristensen et al., 2004; Lund et al., 2006). There is also a growing evidence for a stronger Siberian High prevailing from 1450 CE to 1900 CE based on increased Na$^{2+}$ content in the GISP2 record from Greenland (Mayewski et al., 1997; Meeker and Mayewski, 2002).

The onset of the LIA (~1350 CE) on the Swedish west coast also coincided in time with an outbreak of Black Death, which decreased the population by 50-60% and resulted in large-scale farm abandonment with negative implications for land use (Harrison, 2000).

For the Gullmar Fjord a general cooling during the LIA has been previously suggested based on increased abundances of cryophilic dinocysts (Harland et al., 2013) and benthic foraminifer Adercotryma glomerata, which prefers bottom water temperatures < 4°C (Polovodova Asteman et al., 2013). This agrees rather well with the data presented herein, which show temperatures as low as ~3.4 – 4.4°C around 1350 CE, 1500 CE, 1550 CE and 1700-1850 CE with a general temperature range of 2.9-6.6°C for the whole LIA period (Fig. 5). Based on foraminiferal faunal and δ18O data Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013) divided the LIA into two distinct phases in the Gullmar Fjord: 1) 1350 –1650 CE and 2) 1650 –1850 CE separated by a short-lived warming centred at ~1650 CE. The reconstructed temperatures show as well a short milder episode based on positive anomalies between ~1570 and 1700 CE (Fig. 6: see pink box). Similar warm, but slightly displaced in time, event is visible in other climate records (Fig. 6) from the North Atlantic and northern hemisphere (Cronin et al., 2003; Moberg et al., 2005; Cage and Austin, 2010; Hald et al., 2011) suggesting that this short-lived warming was a larger-scale phenomenon possibly linked to a strengthening of the winter NAO, which might have enhanced the AMOC (Cage and Austin, 2010).

Indeed, several studies report a long-lasting warm conditions in Europe associated with year 1540 (Casty et al., 2005; Pauling et al., 2006; Wetter et al., 2014), which given our age model uncertainty (±40 yr, see Table 2) for the time interval 1538-1664 CE, may fall within the warm period identified for the LIA from our BWT record. A warming around 1540 is also seen in winter temperature reconstruction for Stockholm ports and harbours based on historical records (Leijonhufvud et al., 2009). The model-based reconstruction by Orth et al (2016) suggests that the European temperatures of 1540 exceeded those of the summer 2003, which was likely the warmest for centuries (e.g. Luterbacher et al., 2016). This is, however, difficult to deduce based on data presented herein, since i) the fjord BWT represent winter temperatures and ii) the record stretches only as far as ~1996.

The climax or the coldest part of the LIA is often linked to the Maunder minimum in solar activity, which occurred at ~1645–1715 CE (Mauquoy et al., 2002). Our record shows a distinct cooling at around 1750 CE with temperatures ~1°C below the 1961-1999 mean, which given a calibrated 14C age range for this particular date (1675-1813 CE ±25 years: see Table 2), may well represent the Maunder minimum in our record. At the same time, a 500-yr long reconstruction of Stockholm winter temperatures based on sea ice records from local ports and harbours does not show the coldest temperatures during the LIA climax demonstrating instead that the coldest decade for the last 500 years occurred during 1592-1601 CE with average negative temperature anomalies of ~4°C (Leijonhufvud et al., 2009).
It appears rather intriguing that the coldest bottom water temperatures for the last 2500 years in the Gullmar Fjord are associated with the onset of the LIA (1350 CE, ~2°C colder than the 1961-1999 mean) rather than with its climax (Figs 5-6). This agrees well with the LIA temperature evolution reported for Loch Sunart (Cage and Austin, 2010) and Chesapeake Bay (Cronin et al., 2003), which both show 2-4°C cooling of the bottom waters at the MCA-LIA transition (Fig. 6), attributed to a switch from the positive winter NAO mode dominating during the medieval times (e.g. Tronet et al., 2009; Faust et al., 2016) to the negative NAO prevailing during the major part of the Little Ice Age. Such a switch in the NAO has been linked to a relaxation of the persistent La Niña-like conditions in the equatorial Pacific dominating the MCA (Tronet et al., 2009). The MCA-LIA transition has been dated to 1250 CE (Cunningham et al., 2013), 1400 CE (McGregor et al., 2015) and 1450 CE (Cage and Austin, 2010), in contrast to our study (1350 CE), which may again be a result of 14C dating uncertainties valid for all of the above-mentioned marine records. At the same time the Chesapeake Bay study places MCA-LIA transition in between 1300 and 1400 CE (Cronin et al., 2003), which agrees with our data.

Another interesting feature of the LIA climate variability is associated with consistently low fjord BWT as well as reduced air temperatures during 1790–1820 CE as indicated by Stockholm and Central England instrumental time series (Fig. 8). Despite this time period is known to coincide with the Dalton minimum in solar activity (Grove, 1988), it is likely that volcanic activity played much more important role in climate cooling (e.g. Wagner and Zorita, 2005, McGregor et al., 2015). The role of AMOC strength in shaping the LIA cold periods is also somewhat controversial based on marine geological evidence: though the AMOC weakening was proposed as a trigger for the LIA cooling (Bianchi and McCave, 1999), it was argued against (Keigwin and Boyle, 2000) and was not statistically significant in paleoclimate modelling (Van der Schrier and Barkmeijer, 2005). It has even been suggested that Gulf Stream may have experienced warming during this period (e.g. Keigwin and Pickart, 1999), which certainly does not explain low BWT temperatures in our record, as well as low air temperatures over Stockholm and Central England during 1790–1820 CE. An explanation for this phenomenon has been proposed by Bjerknes (1965), who postulated, “a decrease in western European winter surface air temperatures during 1790–1820 CE to be related almost completely to an anomalous southward advection of cold polar air”, a hypothesis later verified by a model study of Van der Schrier and Barkmeijer (2005).

5.5 The Contemporary Warm Period (~1850 CE – present)

Most of the proxy records in the North Atlantic indicate a clear warming trend for the last 100-200 years (Hald et al., 2011 and references therein) similar to our data picking up the warm 1930s and the 1990s (Fig. 8). The 500-yr long reconstruction of Stockholm winter temperatures also demonstrates that the 20th century has experienced four out of five warmest decades over the last 500 years: 1905-1914, 1930-1939, 1989-1998 and 1999-2008 (Leijonhufvud et al., 2009). Gullmar Fjord temperature record shows that when considering a 3-point running mean temperature variability, the most recent warming (note: presented herein only until 1996) does not stand out in comparison to the RWP and the MCA, similar to the Scottish loch data (Cage and Austin, 2010) and the North Atlantic SST composite (Cunningham et al., 2013) but in contrast to the
Malangen Fjord record (Hald et al., 2011), according to which the last 100 years are the warmest in the last two millennia. This may reflect the so-called polar amplification, as suggested by the authors, since Malangen Fjord is located much more to the north than Loch Sunart and Gullmar Fjord, both comparably temperate fjord inlets. On the other hand, the stronger recent warming of the Norwegian fjord record can also perhaps be explained by a more direct link to the northward flow of the Atlantic water as compared to Gullmar Fjord, which is not located within the core of the North Atlantic Current (Fig.1). At the same time the spring SST reconstruction from the Chesapeake Bay (Cronin et al., 2003, Fig. 6 herein) shows that the 20th century warming clearly exceeds temperatures observed during the prior 2500 years. The shallow Chesapeake Bay displays large seasonal temperature and salinity variability (Cronin et al., 2003) in contrast to Gullmar Fjord, Malangen Fjord and Loch Sunart, which all have slightly less variable bottom water conditions during the year and similar “fjordic” circulation with annual or less frequent basin water exchanges. Also the SST record from the Chesapeake Bay is the shallowest temperature reconstruction (12-25 m w. d.) among the temperature records considered herein (Loch Sunart: 56 m; Gullmar Fjord: 120 m and Malangen Fjord: 218 m w. d.), Shallow water areas are known to generally warm up faster, (especially given the facilitating atmospheric warming of the 20th century due to increase of greenhouse gas emissions, e.g. Masson-Delmotte et al., 2013), which also may explain why the recent SST increase in the Chesapeake Bay record is unprecedented in a 2500-year perspective.

Studying the instrumental hydrographic time series from the fjord plotted versus reconstructed temperatures (Fig. 7) makes it clear that our record captures the most recent warm period with the bottom water temperatures, which increased by ~1.5°C since the 1960s. Similar increase has been documented for Loch Sunart (Cage and Austin, 2010) and Ranafjorden, NW coast of Norway (Klitgaard-Kristensen et al., 2004). Instrumental meteorological time series for air temperatures since 1960s from Stockholm and the Central England also demonstrate a winter temperature increase by 3-3.5°C, which is higher than the reconstructed range of Gullmar Fjord bottom water temperatures for this period (Fig. 8). Overall, the variability in reconstructed fjord temperatures corresponds well with both meteorological datasets from 1750 to 1990, by an exception of individual wiggle mismatch between 1930 and 1990 (Fig. 8). In general it appears that for 1930-1990 period both air temperatures records lead the observed variability while bottom water temperatures are lagging behind (Fig. 8). Our record also shows higher BWT prior to the 1920s (Fig. 8), which coincides with the cold AMO (low SSTs) and low sea surface salinities in the North Atlantic and Subpolar Gyre (Reverdin et al., 1994; Reverdin, 2010), while in the following period until ~1960, the reconstructed BWT remains at a lower level (during the warm AMO, i.e. high North Atlantic SSTs), after which it peaks again at time of “Great Salinity Anomaly” during the late 1970s and late 1980s (Dickson et al., 1988; Belkin et al., 1998). It remains intriguing, though, that at both occasions (prior to the 1920s and during the 1970s/1980s) of the reduced salinities and low SSTs in the North Atlantic, our record is characterized by high temperatures of the fjord deep water, which is consistent with increasing air temperatures in instrumental datasets from Stockholm and Central England (Fig. 8). The low surface salinities of the Great Salinity Anomaly were likely driven by an increased freshwater/sea ice export from the Arctic via Fram Strait and Canadian Archipelago (Belkin et al., 1998).
subpolar North Atlantic, in turn, is suggested to increase salinity of the North Atlantic Current, which may reduce its predicted weakening due to enhanced freshwater fluxes and will help to restart a stronger AMOC (Hátún et al., 2005; Thoram et al., 2009). A stronger North Atlantic Current would in turn result in an increased heat transport during winter to the Eastern North Atlantic and together with other external forcing factors (e.g., changes in NAO, volcanism, and solar activity) would contribute to the warming observed in the fjord BWT record during the early 20th century. One of those factors, the positive NAO mode, which prevailed since the 1970s/1980s (Hurrell, 1995; http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov/products/precip/CWlink/pna/season/JFM.nao.gif), extracts heat from the subpolar North Atlantic through increased westerlies over that region, decreases SSTs, enhances convection, increases ocean density (Delworth et al., 2016; Delworth and Zeng, 2016) and results in milder winter conditions over the north-western Europe, thus counteracting effects of the AMOC weakening, which has been suggested for the 20th century based on modeling data and proxy records (Caesar et al., 2018; Thornalley et al., 2018). Also, located within a coastal region, the Gullmar Fjord is more susceptible to wind-forced temperature changes, which follow the variability of the NAO index and drive coastal upwelling and downwelling in the fjord (Björk and Nordberg, 2003). According to Jansen et al. (2007), the late 20th century warming as demonstrated by many proxy records from the NE Atlantic (see discussion above), is unlikely to be explained by the external forcing factors and is probably linked to the anthropogenic drivers such as greenhouse gas emissions and aerosols (Booth et al., 2012), which both significantly increased since ~1970s (Masson-Delmotte, 2013).

5.6 Environmental conditions explaining absence or rare occurrence of Cassidulina laevigata in the record.

Since 1990, Cassidulina laevigata has dramatically decreased in abundances in the Gullmar Fjord deep basin (Fig. 6). A similar pattern, with short disappearances of C. laevigata, is seen during the Roman and Medieval warm periods (Fig. 6). This effect may be either due to the increased temperatures and/or, more likely, due to periods of severe hypoxia as C. laevigata is documented to be sensitive to oxygen concentrations below 1 ml/l (e.g. Gustafsson & Nordberg 2001; Nardelli et al., 2014). To a large extent, the oxygen status of fjords and estuaries on the Swedish west coast, is controlled by climate (e.g. Nordberg et al., 2000; Filipsson and Nordberg 2004a, b), but the late Holocene changes in land use and organic enrichment in the fjord are also suggested to play a role (Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010). Thus, the short extinctions of C. laevigata during warmer periods further back in time may be equivalent to the present-day pattern of severe hypoxia following positive North Atlantic Oscillation with mild and humid winters, limited basin water exchange and high organic matter flux increasing oxygen demand (Nordberg et al. 2000, 2001; Filipsson & Nordberg 2004a). Indeed, when comparing our record to the reconstructed NAO index from the Trondheim Fjord, W Norway (Faust et al., 2016) it appears that core intervals with absent C. laevigata (at ~75 CE, 450 CE, 1000 CE and post-1990) correlate rather well with the positive NAO index (Fig. 6).
6 Conclusions

To conclude, from the available paleotemperature equations, the equation by McCorkle et al. (1997) produced most realistic reconstructed deep water temperature range of 2.7 - 7.8°C, which falls within the annual variability instrumentally recorded in the deep fjord basin since 1890. This suggests that the Gullmar Fjord δ18O record mainly reflects variability of the winter bottom water temperatures with a minor salinity influence. Comparison with instrumental winter air temperature observations from Central England and Stockholm shows that the fjord record picks up the contemporary warming of the 20th century. The relationship between the evolution of the fjord’s bottom water temperatures over the last two millennia and other late Holocene climate records reveals synchronous North Atlantic-wide centennial and multidecadal climate variability despite age model uncertainties, different proxy type, time resolution, annual versus seasonal signal and different hydrographic characteristics.

The record shows a substantial and long-term warming during the Roman Warm Period (~350 BCE – 450 CE), followed by variable bottom water temperatures during the Dark Ages (~450 – 850 CE). The Viking Age/Medieval Climate Anomaly (~850 – 1350 CE) is also indicated by positive bottom water temperature anomalies, while the Little Ice Age (~1350 – 1850 CE) is characterized by a long-term cooling with distinct multidecadal variability. When studying the Gullmar Fjord bottom water temperature record for the last 2500 years, it is interesting to note that the most recent warming of the 20th century (presented herein until 1996) does not stand out but appears to be comparable to both the Roman Warm Period and the MCA. Those warming (cooling) intervals during the last 2500 years were likely associated with strengthening (weakening) of the AMOC linked to changes in atmospheric and oceanic forcing, such as the NAO, the AMO and, also perhaps, the ENSO, as suggested by other studies. In addition, changes in solar activity, volcanic forcing and the anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are important drivers of the observed climate variability during the late Holocene.
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Figure captions

15 Figure 1: Map of the study area including location of Gullmar Fjord (GF) and sampling site of Gal13-2Aa & 9004 record (star) within North Atlantic (A) and North Sea – Skagerrak region (B). Locations of other discussed proxy records are shown by white circles, while some of major ocean circulation characteristics mentioned in the text are indicated as: EGC – East Greenland Current, NAC – North Atlantic Current, SPG – Subpolar Gyre, and STG – Subtropical Gyre (A). B: the major regional water masses and currents are shown as follows: AW – Atlantic Water, SJC – South Jutland Current, NCC – Norwegian Coastal Current, BC – Baltic Current, BWT – bottom water temperature (a), salinity (b) and dissolved oxygen (c). A snapshot of hydrographic changes in BWT (d), salinity (e) and oxygen (f) associated with basin water exchanges between 1992 and 1993 showing annual variability of these parameters.

20 Locations of other relevant proxy records, discussed in the text, are shown by white circles.

25 Borttaget: temperature
Figure 3: Age model of the studied G113-2Aa & 9004 record (A) and comparison of foraminiferal and isotopic data with core G113-091, taken at the same location in 2009, to prove the absence of a gap between GA113-2Aa and 9004 (B), according to Polovodova Asteman et al (2013).

Figure 4: Comparison of reconstructed temperatures and δ¹⁸O values measured in stained C. laevigata from the core tops collected in Gullmar Fjord (G113-091) and the Skagerrak (OS4, OS6, OS14, 9202, 9205) to hydrographic temperature data (A) and to δ¹⁸O predicted from palaeotemperature equation (B) by McCorkle et al (1997). C: Temperature vs. δ¹⁸Oc − δ¹⁸Ow, together with the palaeotemperature equations from Shackleton (1974), Hays and Grossman (1991), Kim and O’Neil (1997), McCorkle et al. (1997), and Bemis et al. (1998).

Figure 5: A 2500-year long δ¹⁸O record (A) and reconstructed winter bottom water temperatures, BWT (B) from Gullmar Fjord. Thick lines show 3-point running mean for both curves, and dashed lines indicate A) a long-term average of 2.4‰ for δ¹⁸O record and B) 5.4°C - a mean for instrumental bottom water temperatures registered between 1961 and 1990. Grey shaded areas in BWT indicate a median offset (0.7°C) in instrumental versus reconstructed temperatures obtained for rose Bengal stained C. laevigata from the core tops (see Fig. 4A), used herein as an error margin. C: Box and whisker plot showing a range for instrumental BWT observations performed during 1890 – 1999 and measured at more regular intervals from the 1960s, the data is from water depths ≥110 m in the fjord deepest basin (Alsbäck Deep). The middle, the upper and the lower horizontal lines in the box indicate the median, 75 and 25 percentiles, respectively. Abbreviations are as follows: RWP – the Roman Warm Period, DA – the Dark Ages, VA/MCA – the Viking Age/Medieval Climate Anomaly and LIA – the Little Ice Age.  

Figure 6: Reconstructed bottom water temperatures (BWT) shown as anomaly against the 1961-1990 instrumental mean of 5.4°C from Gullmar Fjord compared against other temperature proxy records: annual northern hemisphere temperatures (Moberg et al., 2005), bottom water temperatures from Malangen Fjord in NW Norway (Hald et al., 2011) and Loch Sunart in Scotland (Cage and Austin, 2010), spring sea surface temperatures from Chesapeake Bay, E North Atlantic Ocean (Cronin et al., 2003), annual temperatures reconstructed for continental Europe (Pages2K, 2013) and the reconstructed NAO record from Trondheim Fjord, W Norway (Faus et al., 2016). Also are shown relative abundances of foraminifer Cassidulina laevigata in the fjord with abundance minima and respective gaps in temperature reconstruction linked to the positive NAO index (arrows). For location of these proxy records see Fig. 1A and for abbreviations see text to Fig. 5. Grey shaded areas in Gullmar Fjord BWT anomalies indicate a median offset (0.7°C) in instrumental versus reconstructed temperatures (see Fig. 4A) obtained for rose Bengal stained C. laevigata from the core tops, used herein as an error margin. Blue and pink boxes depict a short-lived cooling at ~1250 CE and a warm interval between ~1570 and 1700 CE, both of which are discussed in the text.
Figure 7: Comparison of the winter bottom water temperatures (BWT) reconstructed from Gullmar Fjord record to instrumental basin water temperatures measured in the deepest fjord basin: the annual mean (a), mean for May-August (b) and mean for January-March (c).

Figure 8: Comparison of reconstructed winter bottom water temperatures (BWT) from Gullmar Fjord to meteorological observations of winter air temperatures recorded for Stockholm (stippled line) and the Central England (solid line without symbols).

Supplementary Figure 1: Scatter plot of stable carbon isotopes ($\delta^{13}$C) data from the composite G113-2Aa – 9004 record (Filipsson and Nordberg, 2010) plotted against the oxygen isotope data presented herein. Note absence of correlation between the two, ruling out the possibility that the changes in $\delta^{18}$O are due to changes in water masses.

Table captions:

Table 1: Stations with collected sediment core tops and $\delta^{18}$O analyzed on living (rose Bengal stained) Cassidulina laevigata.

Table 2. AMS $^{14}$C dates obtained for the gravity core 9004 and calibrated calendar ages. All dates presented in Filipsson and Nordberg (2010) and Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013) were re-calibrated using Calib 7.10 (Stuiver et al. 2017), the Marine13 calibration dataset (Reimer et al, 2013), and $\Delta R = 100 \pm 50$. Asterisks (*) show dates not used in the final age model due to age reversals.
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Graph A: BWT (°C) reconstr. and BWT (°C) instrum. annual 10-p r.m.

Graph B: BWT (°C) reconstr. and BWT (°C) instrum. May-Aug 10-p r.m.

Graph C: BWT (°C) reconstr. and BWT (°C) instrum. Jan-March 10-p r.m.
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Supplementary Fig. 1

The figure shows a scatter plot with data points distributed across a range of δ13C (‰) and δ18O (‰) values. The data points are scattered across the graph, indicating a correlation between the two isotopic values. The axes are labeled with the isotopic ratios, and the graph includes a grid for easier visualization of the data points' distribution.
Table 1: Stations with collected sediment core tops and $\delta^{18}$O analyzed on living (rose Bengal stained) Cassidulina laevigata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Water depth, m</th>
<th>Sampling date</th>
<th>$\delta^{18}$O, ‰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9202</td>
<td>57°56.2'</td>
<td>9°27.3'</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1992-08-04</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9202</td>
<td>57°56.2'</td>
<td>9°27.3'</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1992-08-04</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9205</td>
<td>57°58.4'</td>
<td>9°24.0'</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1992-08-06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS14</td>
<td>58°06.06'</td>
<td>10°58.27'</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1993-05-06</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS4</td>
<td>58°18.54'</td>
<td>8°54.99'</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1993-05-09</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS6</td>
<td>58°21.58'</td>
<td>8°51.01'</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1992-08-04</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G113-091</td>
<td>58°17.570'</td>
<td>11°23.060'</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2009-09-01</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. AMS $^{14}$C dates obtained for the gravity core 9004 and calibrated calendar ages. All dates presented in Filipsson and Nordberg (2010) and Polovodova Asteman et al. (2013) were re-calibrated using Calib 7.10 (Stuiver et al. 2017), the Marine13 calibration dataset (Reimer et al. 2013), and $\Delta R = 100 \pm 50$. Asterisks (*) show dates not used in the final age model due to age reversals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Core depth (cm)</th>
<th>Lab. ID</th>
<th>Dated bivalve species</th>
<th>$^{14}$C age (years BP)</th>
<th>Error (±)</th>
<th>Calibrated age range, ±1σ, $\Delta R$=100±50 (years CE/BCE)</th>
<th>Relative probability</th>
<th>Calibrated age, median probability (years CE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Ua-24043</td>
<td>Nuculana minuta</td>
<td>710*</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>1645-1806*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1702*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Ua-35966</td>
<td>Nuculana pernula</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1675-1813</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Ua-23075</td>
<td>Yoldiella lenticula</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1538-1664</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Ua-35967</td>
<td>Nucula sp.</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1356-1372/1383-1465</td>
<td>0.106/0.894</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Ua-35968</td>
<td>Clamys septemradiatus</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1295-1389</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>Ua-23000</td>
<td>Abra nitida</td>
<td>1305*</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>1138-1276*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Ua-35969</td>
<td>Nucula tenuis</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1208-1303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>Ua-23001</td>
<td>Abra nitida</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>776-938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>Ua-23002</td>
<td>Nuculana minuta</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>517-658</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>Ua-23003</td>
<td>Thyasira flexuosa</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>246-410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9004</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>Ua-23004</td>
<td>Thyasira flexuosa</td>
<td>2415</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68 BCE-102 CE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>