



university of
 groningen



Shipwrecking Probability in Mediterranean Territorial Waters

A Cultural Approach to Archaeological Predictive Modelling

PhD thesis

to obtain the degree of PhD at the
University of Groningen
on the authority of the
Rector Magnificus Prof. C. Wijmenga
and in accordance with
the decision by the College of Deans

and

to obtain the degree of PhD at
IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca
on the authority of the
Director R. De Nicola
and in the accordance with
the decision by the Scientific Board.

Double PhD degree

This thesis will be defended in public on

Thursday 16 June 2022 at 11.00 hours

by

Manuela Ritondale

born on 22 June 1982
in Torre del Greco, Italy

Supervisors

Prof. P.J. Attema
Prof. M.L. Catoni

Co-supervisors

Dr. P.M. van Leusen
Dr. R. Scopigno

Assessment Committee

Prof. P. Arnaud
Prof. M. Gillings
Prof. O.M. van Nijf
Prof. L. Casini

SUMMARY

This thesis presents a formal approach and a GIS-based methodology for the assessment of the shipwrecking probability in Mediterranean territorial waters, thus addressing the underdevelopment of archaeological predictive models in the maritime domain, particularly in the Mediterranean region. As archaeological predictive models are often criticized for oversimplifying complex historical phenomena to produce quantifiable outcomes, this study focuses on two different scales of analysis to meet the need for both a general tool applicable to spatial planning and a more detailed one providing insights for historical and archaeological research. First, a regional-scale model is developed, which focuses on navigation dynamics in the area between Cap Bon (present Tunisia) and Alexandria (present Egypt) in Roman times. Then, this model is extended to all Mediterranean territorial waters in a simplified version and without chronological limitations. At both scales, the criteria for selecting the input factors are formalized.

In order to identify areas with higher shipwrecking probability than others, two sub-questions are addressed that correspond to separate model components: 1. Where would ships be more likely to transit? 2. Where would ships have a higher risk of sinking? Grounding the theory-building on a systematic screening of accounts by primary sources, the first model component derives transit probabilities by considering multiple, oftentimes competing, criteria that trigger and affect mariners' movements, including in particular the effects of risk perception - thus rejecting the idea that sailors would necessarily choose the optimal or most efficient route. The second model component includes environmental hazards objectively increasing the risk of sinking.

Given the many elements of uncertainty and subjective reasoning behind the model building - a problem often unheeded in archaeological computational modelling - an entire chapter is devoted to a sensitivity analysis of the model and the exploration of diverse model scenarios. The overall methodology attempts to overcome some of the main pitfalls of current modelling approaches to seafaring and to shipwreck locations, namely, the inductive use of shipwreck data without a formal exploration of data biases, and the predominant reliance on environmental and economic input variables to the detriment of cultural and cognitive factors.

This study suggests that by explicitly differentiating between actual and perceived risks, and accounting for the effects this difference produces in terms of variations from the optimal navigation corridors, the predictive ability of the model increases. While constituting a valuable tool for optimizing maritime spatial planning and archaeological investigations, this model also offers insights into the biases in current shipwreck data. The model furthermore provides an adaptable toolkit applicable to other geographical contexts and chronological periods, and a suitable basis for expansion with a future component by modelling post-depositional dynamics that affect the preservation and detectability of wrecks at local scales.

SAMENVATTING

In dit proefschrift wordt een formele benaderingswijze en GIS-methodologie gepresenteerd waarmee de waarschijnlijkheid vastgesteld kan worden dat schepen schipbreuk lijden in territoriale wateren in de Middellandse zee. Hiermee wordt een lacune gedicht in de ontwikkeling van archeologische verwachtingsmodellen in maritieme context, specifiek voor het Mediterrane gebied. Omdat archeologische verwachtingsmodellen vaak worden bekritiseerd vanwege hun neiging om complexe historische fenomenen te over-vereenvoudigen om tot toetsbare resultaten te kunnen komen, wordt de analyse op twee schaalniveaus uitgevoerd. Daarmee wordt zowel voorzien in de behoefte aan een globaal en algemeen toepasbaar model voor ruimtelijke ordening, als in die aan een meer gedetailleerd model voor historisch en archeologisch onderzoek. Dit laatste wordt als eerste gepresenteerd aan de hand van een regionale *case study* die zich richt op de navigatiedynamiek in het gebied tussen Cap Bon (huidig Tunesië) en Alexandrië (huidig Egypte) in de Romeinse tijd. Vervolgens wordt dit model, in een vereenvoudigde vorm en zonder chronologische beperkingen, geëxtrapoleerd naar alle territoriale wateren in de Middellandse zee. Op beide schaalniveaus zijn de criteria voor het selecteren van de inputfactoren geformaliseerd.

Om te kunnen vaststellen welke gebieden een hogere kans op schipbreuk hebben in vergelijking met andere zijn twee deelvragen gesteld die overeenkomen met de twee hoofdcomponenten van ieder model: waar is het het meest waarschijnlijk dat de schepen gevaren hebben? En: waar hadden schepen een grotere kans om schipbreuk te lijden? Het hier ontwikkelde eerste modelcomponent is gebaseerd op een systematische analyse van primaire bronnen die informatie bieden over de vele, vaak tegenstrijdige, criteria die aan de navigatiebeslissingen van zeelieden ten grondslag kunnen liggen. Hierbij is specifiek rekening gehouden met het effect van de perceptie van gevaar, waarmee het idee verworpen wordt dat zeelieden in het verleden één enkele optimale route kozen, uitsluitend gebaseerd op het minimaliseren van de objectieve risico's. De tweede component van het model draait om de vraag of en hoe gevaren als gevolg van omgevingsfactoren de kans op schipbreuk objectief gezien vergroten.

Omdat er noodzakelijkerwijs vele onzekerheden en subjectieve afwegingen aan de basis liggen van het model – een probleem dat vaak genegeerd wordt in archeologische voorspellingsmodellen – wordt een heel hoofdstuk gewijd aan *sensitivity analysis*: het toetsen van hoe het model reageert op veranderingen in de berekening en weging van de inputfactoren. Hiermee wordt geprobeerd te ontsnappen aan de twee grootste nadelen van de huidige wijze van modelleren van historische navigatieroutes en van archeologische risicoanalyse; namelijk dat gegevens over scheepswrakken inductief worden gebruikt zonder dat een formele verkenning heeft plaatsgevonden naar de mate van vertekening van deze gegevens, en het overheersende gebruik van omgevingsfactoren en economische factoren ten koste van culturele en cognitieve factoren.

Op basis van de uitkomsten van dit onderzoek blijkt dat het voorspellend vermogen van het model toeneemt wanneer er expliciet gedifferentieerd wordt tussen de werkelijke en de gepercipieerde risico's én als de gevolgen van dit onderscheid, namelijk keuzes die afwijken van de optimale navigatiecorridors, in acht worden genomen. Hiermee levert het model niet alleen een bruikbaar gereedschap voor de ruimtelijke ordening van de maritieme omgeving en voor maritiem archeologisch onderzoek, maar het verschaft ook inzicht in de bestaande vertekeningen in scheepswrakgegevens. Het model biedt bovendien een flexibele *GIS-toolkit* die toegepast kan worden op andere geografische contexten en periodes, en kan in de toekomst uitgebreid worden met een component die ook de post-depositionele processen modelleert die op lokale schaal de bewaringstoestand en detecteerbaarheid van scheepswrakken mede bepalen.

SOMMARIO

In questa tesi viene presentato un modello predittivo, sviluppato utilizzando sistemi informativi geografici (GIS), il cui scopo è di stimare la probabilità di naufragio nelle acque territoriali del Mediterraneo. L'obiettivo è quello di compensare lo scarso sviluppo ed utilizzo di modelli predittivi in ambito archeologico subacqueo -soprattutto nel bacino Mediterraneo- il cui uso ottimizzerebbe invece le indagini archeologiche marine. Dal momento che i modelli predittivi vengono spesso criticati poiché per produrre risultati quantificabili tendono a semplificare e generalizzare fenomeni storici complessi, questo studio si focalizza su due distinte scale di analisi. Una più generale per venire incontro alla necessità di fornire un modello complessivo, applicabile nelle pratiche di archeologia preventiva, e una di dettaglio per supportare studi e analisi storico-archeologiche. Un primo modello viene quindi sviluppato su scala regionale, focalizzandosi sulle dinamiche di navigazione in età romana nell'area compresa tra Cap Bon (attuale Tunisia) e Alessandria (attuale Egitto). Successivamente tale modello viene esteso alle acque territoriali del Mar Mediterraneo, in forma semplificata e senza limitazioni cronologiche. Propedeutica allo sviluppo di entrambi i modelli è la formalizzazione dei criteri seguiti per la selezione dei fattori di input.

Per poter stabilire quali aree presentino una maggiore probabilità di incidenza di naufragi, vengono poste e affrontate due domande di ricerca che sottendono lo sviluppo di due distinte componenti del modello: dove è maggiormente probabile che le imbarcazioni transitassero, e dove è più probabile che naufragassero. Per quanto attiene alle probabilità di transito, queste sono state desunte attraverso un sistematico scrutinio delle fonti storiche, considerando molteplici fattori che possono aver determinato la scelta di destinazioni e rotte, inclusa la percezione del rischio. In tal modo si è anche rifiutata l'ipotesi che le imbarcazioni seguissero necessariamente rotte ottimali, solitamente alla base delle simulazioni di navigazione antica. Per quanto attiene alle probabilità di naufragio, si sono considerati quei parametri, ambientali, oceanografici e meteorologici, che oggettivamente costituiscono un rischio per le imbarcazioni. Visti i molteplici fattori di incertezza nel modello -un problema spesso non formalmente affrontato negli approcci computazionali in ambito archeologico- un intero capitolo è dedicato all'analisi di sensitività e all'esplorazione dei diversi scenari prodotti alterando il modello. L'intero approccio metodologico mira a superare alcune delle maggiori limitazioni degli attuali modelli sviluppati per simulare le antiche rotte di navigazione o predire la localizzazione di relitti. Tali limiti riguardano da un lato l'inferenza induttiva basata sull'osservazione dei siti noti, effettuata senza una adeguata valutazione e compensazione delle distorsioni che pregiudicano l'attendibilità e rappresentatività del campione di dati usati; dall'altro l'utilizzo predominante di fattori ambientali e socio-economici a scapito di quelli culturali e cognitivi.

Le evidenze prodotte da questa ricerca suggeriscono invece che, distinguendo formalmente il rischio reale da quello percepito e identificando così rotte di navigazione non necessariamente ottimali, la prestazione del modello migliora. Le aree indicate come a maggiore probabilità di incidenza di naufragi corrispondono infatti a quelle dove si rileva effettivamente un maggior numero di siti noti. Tale modello, a oggi unico nel suo genere, oltre a fornire un valido strumento per ottimizzare la pianificazione delle indagini archeologiche in mare, costituisce un *toolkit* adattabile e applicabile su diverse scale spazio-temporali e può essere utilizzato come base di partenza per implementare e valutare l'impatto delle dinamiche post-deposizionali per la preservazione dei siti subacquei.

“No book can ever be finished. While working on it we learn just enough to find it
immature the moment we turn away from it”

Karl Popper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	I
Samenvatting.....	II
Sommario.....	III
Acknowledgements	5
List of Figures	7
List of Tables	12
Abbreviations	14
1 INTRODUCTION	18
1.1 Archaeological prediction in maritime contexts: challenges and opportunities	19
1.2 Objectives and research questions	20
1.3 Rationale and scope.....	22
1.3.1 Challenges and pitfalls of a global theory: tuning temporal and geographical scales	22
1.3.2 Why focus on shipwrecking probability.....	23
1.3.3 Why focus on territorial waters.....	24
1.4 Outputs and methodology	25
1.5 Thesis outline.....	26
2 STATE OF THE ART IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PREDICTIVE MODELLING	28
2.1 Review of theories and methods of archaeological predictive modelling	28
2.1.1 History and theoretical background	28
2.1.2 Definitions: main distinctions in methodological approaches	32
2.1.3 Main criticisms.....	34
2.2 Review of predictive models for shipwreck locations	37
2.2.1 Paucity of predictive models in the maritime context: whys and wherefores	37
2.2.2 Theoretical underpinnings.....	41
2.2.3 Predictive models for shipwreck locations in the Mediterranean basin.....	46
2.2.4 Predictive models for shipwreck locations outside the Mediterranean.....	49
2.2.5 Models predicting past seaborne movement	51
2.2.6 Main limitations of current models	56
2.3 From limitations to suitable modelling trajectories.....	61
2.4 Summary	62
3 A DIVE INTO SHIPWRECK DATA BIASES: EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS.....	63
3.1 Building an integrated relational shipwreck database and geodatabase to support EDA..	64

3.2	Shipwreck records: the meaning of absence	71
3.3	Quality assessment: testing locational uncertainty and differences between sources....	81
3.4	Conclusions.....	83
3.5	Summary	84
4	THEORY DEVELOPMENT: A NEW TAKE ON MARITIME PREDICTION.....	85
4.1	Coastal navigation: shortcomings and ambiguities in theories and practices	85
4.2	Coastal proximity in scholarship.....	88
4.2.1	A land of opportunities or a mortal hug: dangers and benefits of coast approaching.	88
4.2.2	“You who mistrust both land and sea”: subjective perceptions.....	89
4.2.3	Do I want to see what I see? Implications of mutual visibility	91
4.3	A review of accounts in primary sources.....	96
4.3.1	Shelters providing conditional refuge.....	99
4.3.2	More or less secure anchorages	105
4.3.3	Clear, sweet fresh waters.....	105
4.3.4	Unfavourable landmarks.....	106
4.3.5	Scent of a shore: creatures of the sea and further indicators of coastal proximity	107
4.3.6	Seamanship and risk management	111
4.4	Conclusions: insights gained and implications for modelling approaches.....	114
4.5	Summary	116
5	A FORMAL MODEL TO ASSESS SHIPWRECKING PROBABILITY IN TERRITORIAL WATERS.....	117
5.1	Theoretical model underpinnings: dealing with a logic conundrum	118
5.2	Criteria for factor selection.....	120
5.3	First component: transit probability	130
5.3.1	Landing places and anchorages	133
5.3.2	Port attractiveness.....	134
5.3.3	Inland network.....	137
5.3.4	Implications of mutual visibility: assault probability and wayfinding	138
5.3.5	Other indicators of coastal proximity	140
5.4	Second component: navigational hazards.....	142
5.4.1	Geomorphological hazards.....	142
5.4.2	Severe meteorological and oceanographic conditions.....	143
5.4.3	Past climatic variations	146
5.5	Brief historical introduction to the regional perspective	148

5.5.1	Reasons for choosing the north-eastern African coast as a case-study	149
5.5.2	The <i>Stadiasmus</i> as a source for implementing port attractiveness.....	151
5.6	A global perspective: designing a simplified Mediterranean-scale model.....	153
5.7	Summary	154
6	GIS IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FORMAL MODEL	155
6.1	Methodology.....	155
6.2	Transit-probability. Regional scale	158
6.2.1	Landing sites	161
6.2.2	Port attractiveness.....	163
6.2.3	Inland network: proximity to roads and water sources	168
6.2.4	Assault probability and orientation potential	172
6.3	Navigational hazards	180
6.3.1	Geomorphological hazards.....	180
6.3.2	Severe meteorological and oceanographic conditions.....	181
6.4	Establishing a base model and a preferred model	189
6.4.1	Factor weights evaluation through Saaty's Analytic Hierarchy Process.....	190
6.4.2	Factor weights calculation.....	193
6.5	Comparing actual and perceived optimal routes	196
6.6	From regional to global: implementing a simplified Mediterranean-scale model	198
6.6.1	A simplified Transit-probability model.....	201
6.6.2	Factor weights assignment and generation of a Base and Preferred Global scales models	204
6.7	Conclusions.....	207
6.8	Summary	209
7	QUALITY ASSESSMENT	210
7.1	Methodology assessment.....	211
7.2	Sensitivity assessment: To which factor is the model more sensitive?	216
7.3	Robustness assessment	220
7.3.1	Number of classes and classification method	221
7.3.2	Testing risk classes against shipwreck locations.....	226
7.4	Testing the global and regional scale models on an area low in shipwreck density	234
7.5	Summary and reflections on model performance.....	237
8	GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	239
8.1	A research summary: assessing shipwrecking probabilities in territorial waters.....	239
8.2	Improvements to current models.....	242

8.3	Answering the research questions.....	244
8.3.1	Comparing actual and perceived risk scenarios.....	246
8.3.2	The implications of absence: what information the model can provide.....	251
8.4	Constraints and potential for improvements	253
8.5	Future work	253
8.6	Conclusion	255
	Bibliography	256
	Appendices and supplementary documents	290
	Appendix 1 – Primary Sources	290
	Appendix 2 – Port Attractiveness.....	336
	Appendix 3 – Model Scripts	348

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the result of a journey -in my eyes, more like an Odyssey- during which every single encounter, exchange and contribution impossible to record in these few lines played a crucial role in helping me set the course, enjoy the process, and persist in patience when winds were unfavourable, or even absent.

It is not only because of convention that I start by thanking my reading committee for their comments, which will help me improve this work in the future, and all my promotors and advisors for the aid they could provide in different moments of this PhD. Particularly, I want to emphasize my gratitude to Maria Luisa Catoni, who first recognised the merit of my research proposal and contributed to its final shape with precious and insightful discussions, and to Peter¹ for betting on and trusting my project when I first arrived in Groningen as an Erasmus Plus student, supporting my double doctorate application. I thank prof André van Holk for opening up to different maritime landscape perspectives and for not making me feel the burden of some administrative choices that were beyond my will; I thank Roberto for being always the first to answer my emails no matter the level of involvement in that specific stage of the research process. Last but not least, I am grateful to my daily advisor Martijn, because thanks to his support and confidence in my *pilotage*, even when our perspectives were not necessarily aligned, I could grow as a researcher and always count on his honest feedback, insights, and cheerful attitude.

Besides my formal advisors, a very special thank and tons of gratitude go to Frits Steenhuisen, for his invaluable support with GIS, coding and all my related struggles, and to a number of people that offered their technical help -e.g. Daniella Vos and Mark Verlaat at the Geodienst- or support in different stages of my research: a special thank goes to Linda Bertelli for being always available to chat in difficult moments, and to Marco Callieri and Matteo Dellepiane (whose memory is always vivid) at the CNR ISTI in Pisa, for understanding and supporting my research focus shift. A special thank also to Francesco De Giosa and the ENSU Environmental Survey crew for being like the Phial of Galadriel holding the light of Eärendil's star, i.e. illuminating the first steps into the modelling of waves and winds at the moment I felt most lost. A special thank also to the many people, scholars and Institutions providing data, images, reading material or contributing with insightful discussions to specific parts of my thesis: among these, Prof. Piero Lionello, Prof. dr. Judy Shamoun-Baranes, Philip Verhagen, Iza Romanowska, Tom Brughmans (whom I wish to thank for inviting me joining an inspiring MERCURY workshop at All Souls College in Oxford), Peter Campbell, Christina Williamson, Federico Ponchio, Giampaolo Coro, Martino Tumbarello, Maarten Loonen, Luca Alessandri, Wouter Waldus, Martijn Manders.

I am not sure whether to group Xavi R-C. and Luce P. among the invaluable supporters, sparring partners or dearest friends made during the journey; this blurred category includes several other names that made my research Odyssey more insightful, fun and overall less heavy to sustain in all its challenging phases: the great Barcelona group I met from the EPNet ERC Advanced Grant, particularly Ignacio, Maria C., Simon, Albert and Cozzo (I thank prof Guido Caldarelli for putting me in contact with them in 2015); my IMT mates across different cycles, which I can't entirely list, among which Mauro, Daria, Vincenzo, Vasilis, Van Tien, Rita, Chiara, Lisa, Selma, Sara, Srdjan,

¹ As for the inconsistent use of surnames in these acknowledgements, I beg for the indulgence of the readers. Consistency is oftentimes misleading since -barring the need for clarity- it prevents accounting for cultural differences and approaches, which in no way reflect different degrees of familiarity, reverence, or esteem.

Ilkay, Mika, Vitaly, Yehia, Laura, Caterina; the friends I made in Pisa, Massa and Lucca, particularly Justine, Barbara, Francesco, Adele, Sonia, Lucia, Giulia, Beppe e Marica. Moreover, the friends and mates I made in the foreign northern countries who made my stay undoubtedly warmer: e.g. Karen, Safoora, Angelique, Martina, Pinar, Rachel, Francesca I., Merita, Marco, Theun, Chris, Nike, Mailis, Gerrit, Bianca, Allard, Ernesto & Ronald, James & Claudia, Dafne & Theo...and all the other dear friends I met at the GIA and during my Groningen life among whom Agostino, Remco, Rocco, Dimitris, Liz, Willemien, Pir (please forgive me if your name is not among these, it does not mean that your friendship is not carried in my heart's gratitude).

I am grateful for the financial support of the IMT School for Advanced Studies, the University of Groningen and the Catharina van Tussenbroek funds. Given the many logistic and administrative challenges connected to my double-doctorate, I want to thank the IMT and UG PhD offices, particularly Daniela Giorgetti, Serena Argentieri, Sara Olson, Marijke Wubbolts, for their assistance, support and patience during the writing and approval of the convention, and Paola Ciregia, for the final stages of the thesis submission. Last but not least, Flip, for his logistic and motivational support and his very much appreciated sense of humour that lighten our life at GIA.

I also have a debt of gratitude toward the teachers of my past who, although not directly involved in this research, did contribute to my professional and scientific formation: my advisors in the Bachelor and Master thesis (P.A.G. and B. S. A. particularly); Timmy G., Annalisa Z., Tatá, Roberto M., Norbert H. for including me in exciting scientific projects. Antonella G., Maria Chiara L. and the Cineca Visit Lab for first showing me cultural digital wonders. I can't omit mentioning also the companions that contributed to my growth as a maritime archaeologist and diver, or shared with me significant professional adventures on or close to the sea: Luana and my unforgettable Crinciu; Marianna, Silvana, Elena & Salvatore S.C. in Ventotene; the Sicilian crew and particularly Nazareno, Salvo, Carlo; lastly, Francesca Pede and my former engineers mates dealing with underwater pipelines: it is while working with them that I could acknowledge the different perspectives at stake in archaeological risk assessment and mature this research-project idea.

I close these acknowledgements by thanking the companions of my life, who have been sailing with me in the last twenty to thirty years: particularly Vincenzo, Anna, Andrea (Andrew), Puzzone Ross, Alessia and my ship-mate, the self-declared 'lieutenant', Erwin (and his sweet family). I hope the latter will recognise himself despite the formal and never employed official name: without his love, constant support and, more importantly, the ability to make me laugh about my anxieties, I don't know in what state I would have reached this stage. Similarly, I am grateful for the love and support of my family, my sister, Eros, and particularly my parents, who have never stopped believing in and sustaining my journey even though it brought me far from the familiar shores. To them, I dedicate, with love, this work.