Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Multianalytical approach to the exceptional Late Roman shipwreck of Ses Fontanelles (Mallorca, Balearic Islands)

M. Á. Cau-Ontiveros

macau@ub.edu

ICREA

D. Bernal-Casasola

Universidad de Cádiz (UCA), Universidad de Cádiz

A. Pecci

Equip de Recerca Arqueològica i Arqueomètrica de la Universitat de Barcelona (ERAAUB), Institut d'Arqueologia de la Universitat de Barcelona (IAUB), Universitat de Barcelona (UB)

L. Fantuzzi

Equip de Recerca Arqueològica i Arqueomètrica de la Universitat de Barcelona (ERAAUB), Institut d'Arqueologia de la Universitat de Barcelona (IAUB), Universitat de Barcelona (UB)

Ll. Picornell-Gelabert

ARQUEOUIB, Universitat de les Illes Balears (UIB)

A. Valenzuela

Equip de Recerca Arqueològica i Arqueomètrica de la Universitat de Barcelona (ERAAUB), Institut d'Arqueologia de la Universitat de Barcelona (IAUB), Universitat de Barcelona (UB)

J. A. Retamosa

Universidad de Cádiz (UCA), Universidad de Cádiz

J. L. Portillo

Universidad de Cádiz (UCA), Universidad de Cádiz

J. Cardell

Universitat de les Illes Balears (UIB)

S. Munar Llabrés

Equip de Recerca Arqueològica i Arqueomètrica de la Universitat de Barcelona (ERAAUB), Institut d'Arqueologia de la Universitat de Barcelona (IAUB), Universitat de Barcelona (UB)

C. Juan Fuertes

Institute of Nautical Archaeology

E. García Riaza

Universitat de les Illes Balears (UIB)

Research Article

Keywords: petrographic analysis, residue analysis, archaeozoology, amphora content, wood, shipbuilding, maritime archaeology, analysis, Late Antiquity

Posted Date: June 2nd, 2023

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2990165/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences on March 21st, 2024. See the published version at https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-024-01952-3.

Abstract

The paper presents the results of an interim analytical approach to the Late Roman shipwreck of Ses Fontanelles recently found in the island of Mallorca (Balearic Islands, Spain). The excellent state of preservation of the hull and the cargo, including amphorae with painted inscriptions (*tituli picti*), and its location in shallow waters offshore of one of the main touristic beaches of the island makes this a unique finding in the Mediterranean.

A first season of excavations and study of the cargo triggered an analytical approach to solve some of the problems pose by archaeological research, mainly related to the possible origin of the vessel. The analytical strategy combines petrographic analysis for the study of the provenance of the amphorae, archaeozoology and residue analysis to identify their content, and analysis of the wood and plant remains to understand the use of vegetal resources in shipbuilding and in the stow of the cargo.

The results of the combination of the petrographic analysis, the study of the ichthyofauna and the organic residue analysis suggest that the boat probably departed from the area of Cartagena in the southeastern part of the Iberian Peninsula, carrying a cargo of fish sauce (*liquaminis flos*), oil, and probably olives preserved in wine derivatives, transported in three main types of amphorae. The analysis of the wood shows, as known in Roman shipbuilding, a clear selection of forest resources. The shipbuilders used pine for longitudinal parts of the hull, while for the small pieces related to the assemblage system (pegged, mortise and tenons) and subjected to a great stress they selected harder woods mainly Cupressaceae, *Olea europaea*, and *Laurus nobilis*. In addition, the study reveals that mainly branches of *Vitis vinifera*, but also other herbaceous plants were used as dunnage protecting the cargo during the journey. The results help to shed some light into different aspects of this unique vessel sunk in Mallorcan waters and contributes to show the benefit of applying archaeological sciences in maritime archaeology.

1. Introduction

The Balearic Islands lay not far from the eastern coast of the Iberian Peninsula placed in a strategic position within the navigation and trade routes of the western Mediterranean in Antiquity (e.g., Mascaró 1971; Ruiz de Arbulo 1990; Izquierdo 1996; Moreno 2005; Guerrero 2006). The islands as steppingstones in these navigation routes were points of scale. Often, the boats experienced problems and sunk. This was the case of the shipwreck known as Ses Fontanelles. It was accidentally found in 2019 in one of the main touristic beaches not far from the city of Palma, the current capital of Mallorca, the largest island of the archipelago (Fig. 1). This prompted the authorities to undertake a rescue excavation in summer 2019 (Munar et al. 2021). Soon they realized of the exceptional state of preservation of the cargo and of the hull of the vessel. After a first evaluation and the excavation of a section of the shipwreck, that corresponding to the bow, the rest of the remains were left *in situ* and covered again. After the rescue excavation, an interinstitutional project (ARQUEOMALLORNAUTA) to study the materials already recovered, and to ensure the continuity of the excavation and the full study of the shipwreck.

The ship transported a relevant cargo of products packaged in amphorae around the 4th century of our era, a time when commercial activities in the Western Mediterranean are still little known. This, together with the preservation of an impressive quantity of inscriptions depicted on the amphorae (*tituli picti*), makes this site a unique example in the Mediterranean and an excellent case for the study of commercial dynamics in Late Antiquity.

A first campaign of study of the materials recovered in the 2019 excavation helped to classify the ceramic findings and opened some major questions. To solve some of the main problems raised by the wreck and its cargo, an interim multi-proxy analytical targeted approach was designed based in a combination of methods and analytical techniques. The main aim was to use analytical techniques to help defining the cargo, and the vegetal resources that could help to better understand the origin of this ancient vessel sunk in Mallorcan waters in Late Antiquity. To understand the provenance of the different types of amphorae a selection was subjected to petrographic analysis. To identify the products contained in the amphorae, some of them (including some that were still sealed) were micro-excavated and the content studied with an archaeozoological approach and organic residue analysis. Finally, a first set of wood remains from the hull, plants found between the cargo, and

bark used as stoppers to seal the amphorae were also studied to understand the use of vegetal resources and to shed light into the species used in shipbuilding.

Overall, this contribution presents the first multianalytical results obtained from this important shipwreck and aims to contribute to the beneficial relationship between inorganic and organic analysis, and between maritime archaeology and archaeological sciences. Certainly, over the last decades the application of archaeological sciences to the study of shipwrecks have largely contributed to maritime archaeology worldwide for a wide range of chronologies and geographical areas. Apart from the studies of conservation science, it is worth mentioning the advance in the use of geophysics and in general remote sensing techniques in the detection and monitoring of shipwrecks with spectacular results (e.g., Caratori et al. 2006; Bates et al. 2011; Gron et al. 2015; Odegard et al. 2016; Pachecho-Ruiz et al. 2019; Ward and Ballard, 2004). Archaeobotany in general has been essential for the study of the wood used in shipbuilding and providing important information on provenance and chronology (e.g., Colombini et al. 2003, 2007; Beltrame and Gaddi 2007; Capretti et al. 2008; Allevato et al. 2009; Domínguez-Delmás et al. 2013; Liphschitz 2015, 2019; Traoré et al. 2016; 2018) with important contributions from radiocarbon dating (e.g., Lorentzen et al. 2014). These approaches have been combined, of course, with the analytical study of the myriad of materials that formed part of the cargoes or of the crew's belongings on board, notably including inorganic materials such ceramics, glass, metals, stones, but also different organic materials and other substances (Colombini et al. 2003; Muller 2004; Lempiäinen et al. 2022). Also, archaeozoological studies have been contributing enormously in the study of shipwrecks, including full studies of the faunal remains oriented to dietary reconstruction (e.g., Hamilton-Dyer 1995), the identification of the content of the cargoes (e.g., Auriemma 2000; Barkai et al. 2013), or to singular applications like, for instance, the study of a mandibula of a mice found in the Late Bronze Age Uluburun shipwreck that allow to determine that Ugarit was probably one of the steps of the boat in its last journey (Cucchi 2008). All these studies and many others are excellent examples of the benefits of the application of archaeological sciences in maritime archaeology.

Our interim multianalytical approach to the shipwreck found in Mallorca aims to modestly contribute combining organic and inorganic analysis and generalizing the analytical studies, even in cases when the resources, and therefore the number of samples, are limited. This is just a first targeted step to solve archaeological questions waiting for a full excavation and a more developed strategy of application of archaeological sciences to this exceptional shipwreck.

2. The shipwreck and its cargo

The shipwreck lays just 65 m off the coast and just two meters depth in a very busy area of the coast, covering an area of approximately 12 m long by 5 m wide. The excellent state of preservation helps to reconstruct the composition and disposition of the cargo (Fig. 2). The hull was divided into horizontal sections by vertical bulkheads, which were used to organize the cargo inside the hold. It is also important to emphasize that the hull is very well preserved from bow to stern (approximate height of 1.5 m). The interim examination of the shipbuilding confirmed that the vessel belongs to shell first with mortise and tenons assemblage tradition, being a typical example of western Roman imperial naval architectural type (Pomey et al. 2012; Munar et al. 2021).

The typological study of the amphorae recovered in the first season of excavations has allowed to classify 249 pieces with diagnostic attributes that fit into four main types (or groups of types) (Fig. 3) (Bernal et al. 2020). From a typological point of view, the Almagro 51c type amphorae are especially abundant, many of them exhibiting painted inscriptions (*tituli picti*) formed by a line with the names *Ausonius* et *Alumni*, and a second line allusive to the content: *Liq Flos*, restorable as *Liquaminis Flos* (*liquamen* flower), a liquid fish sauce appreciated in the Roman period (Soler et al., 2021) (Fig. 2C, and Fig. 3). The shipwreck is a unique example since is one of the few cases around the Mediterranean where, thanks to an exceptional state of preservation, is possible to relate the information of the painted inscriptions with the paleocontent. The second group identified is represented by a new type of amphora that we have named Ses Fontanelles I, but that could be probably considered as an imitation of the oil amphorae type Dressel 23, commonly manufactured in the *Baetica* (southern Spain). A third group of containers are the flat-bottomed amphorae related to containers manufactured in the 3rd and 4th centuries, especially in the eastern part of *Baetica*, where some workshops have been excavated (Bernal-Casasola 2019). These

containers have been traditionally considered as for transporting wine based in their typology and in their prototype the "Gaulish" amphorae produced in the *Narbonensis*. However, in our case some of these amphorae contained solid residues including what it seems olives pits. The amphorae repertoire is completed by type Keay XIX, but so far only two examples have been uncovered. This might indicate that this type maybe was more related to the crew than to the commercial cargo. The cargo was organized at least in two tiers that covered the whole length and width of the ship. The amphorae were vertically arranged to maximize the limited space available (Munar et al. 2021). Ses Fontanelles I type amphorae, which were larger and heavier, occupied the bottom tier of the center and the stern area (sectors 2 and 3). Smaller containers were mostly found near the bow (Sector 1) and the sides (Fig. 2). The amphorae were stooped with numerous quantities of what in the excavation seemed branches of vine shots, but also other plants, as dunnage to protect the cargo during the journey.

3. Methods and materials

3.1. Petrographic characterization of ceramics

All amphorae and sherds recovered in the first archaeological campaign were macroscopically examined. Of these materials, 25 complete or nearly complete amphorae were further examined with the help of a Dino-Lite digital microscope. In addition, ten selected samples were examined in the laboratory using an Olympus SZH stereoscopic microscope equipped with a continuous zoom between 7.5X and 64X, with 1X and 2X oculars, working between 7.5 and 128 magnifications. Systematic photographs were taken at 10X and 30X in both polished and fresh fractured sections.

The ten selected samples were also analyzed by Optical Microscopy (MO) using thin sections, for petrographic and mineralogical characterization (Table 1). Preparations were made from a fragment of ceramic included in resin, downgraded with a Struers Discoplan TS cutter-rectifier, and manually polished using a powder abrasive to a thickness of 30μm, in which the quartz shows a grey-white first order interference color. The fabric observations were made with an Olympus BX41 microscope, equipped with 2x, 4x, 10x and 20x lenses and 10x eyepieces, working between 20 and 200 magnifications. The petrographic descriptions of the fabrics were made following the system proposed by Whitbread (1989, 1995) and Quinn (2013). Grain sizes for inclusions in petrographic descriptions were defined using the American Geophysical Union (Udden-Wentworth scale) system. The following abbreviations are used in the description of the inclusions of each fabric or petrographic group: eq = equidimensional; el = elongated; a = angular; sa = subangular; r = rounded; sr = subrounded. All photographs, both in binocular and under the microscope, were taken with a computer-controlled Olympus DP70 digital camera.

Table 1
Samples for the petrographic analysis

Sample	Typology	Observations
DSF002	Ses Fontanelles I	
DSF003	Ses Fontanelles I	
DSF183	Almagro 51c	With *titulus pictus*
DSF185	Almagro 51c	With *titulus pictus*
DSF186	Almagro 51c	With *titulus pictus*
DSF195	Almagro 51c	With *titulus pictus*
DSF263	Almagro 51c	
DSF266	Flat-bottomed amphora	
DSF270	Flat-bottomed amphora	
DSF277	Keay XIX	

3.2. Archaeozoological approach: the study of the ichthyofauna in amphorae

Some of the sealed amphorae were selected to sample their contents. The materials recovered from the microexcavation of these amphorae were wet sieved through a series of sieves of progressively smaller mesh size (*i.e.*, 4 mm, 2 mm, 500 µm, 250 µm, 125 µm, 63 µm) and then air-dried. The only exception was the broken amphora DSF-231 that retained several bones embedded in the inner walls and its toe (Fig. 8.3). Most of the identifiable fish bones were sorted through 500 µm mesh sieve, using a Dino-Lite digital microscope for its triage. Four of the six samples from Almagro 51c amphorae provided ichthyofauna remains: DSF-220, DSF-231, DSF-235 and DSF-257. The two samples from flat-bottomed amphorae (DSF-266 and DSF-272) were sterile in terms of fish remains (Table 2). To estimate the body size (total length - LT) of the fishes we followed the osteometric procedure indicated by Assis and Amaro (2006) for sardines. For the anchovies we built our own model from an extant reference population (n = 9) based on the length of the dentary (LD, Fig. 8.2 A) as this was the predominant element. The following linear regression formula was used: LT = 8.95*LD- 0.18 (r^2 0.882). Only left-sided dentaries were used to avoid the repetition of individuals. The measurements were done with a Dino-Lite Edge digital microscope and using DinoCapture 2.0 software.

Table 2
Description of the samples for the archaeozoological study

Sample	Typology	Volume	Comments	Diagnose
DSF-220	Almagro 51c	15 ml	Dark sediment with sandy inclusions and multiple ichthyological inclusions	Fertile
DSF-226	Almagro 51c	1200 ml	Sandy, but with ichthyological remains	Sterile
DSF-231	Almagro 51c	-	Toe of amphorae presenting several ichthyological remains attached both on the inner walls and in its basal part	Fertile
DSF-235	Almagro 51c	212 ml	Composed mainly of ichthyological remains and a little sand. Coming from the toe of the amphora	Fertile
DSF-256	Almagro 51c	171 ml	Sample composed exclusively of sand	Sterile
DSF-257	Almagro 51c	15 ml	Coming from the internal bottom next to the toe with pivots	Fertile
DSF-266	Flat-base amphora	114 ml	Composed exclusively of sand and fragmented and rolled shells, with fibers of *P. oceanica.* Post-depositional intrusions	Sterile
DSF-272	Flat-base amphora	5 ml	Small resinous sample with sand remains	Sterile

3.3. Organic residue analysis of some amphorae

Porous materials absorb liquid and semi-liquid substances that enter in contact with them. Almost 50 years of research have shown that through chemical analysis it is possible to try to determine the original content of ceramic containers and especially amphorae (Condamin et al., 1976; Garnier 2007; Garnier and Pecci 2022; Garnier et al. 2011; Guasch-Jané et al. 2004; Pecci et al. 2017, 2021). For a first approach to the content, five samples were selected: one from an Almagro 51c amphora (DSF220) for which the *tituli picti* informed of the content being *liquaminis flos* (a liquid fish sauce), one from Ses Fontanelles I type (DSF002), and three from flat-bottomed amphorae (DSF267, DSF274, and DSF272) (Table 3).

Each ceramic sample was cleaned mechanically, and then it was sub-sampled in the laboratory. The specimens were ground, and the powders were extracted by using three different extraction methods:

1. The alkaline extraction proposed by Pecci et al. (2013b, 2020) was carried out on approximately 1g of sample to identify wine and fermentation biomarkers. Before extraction, 50 µl of internal standard (*n*-hexatriacontane) were added.
2. The lipid extract was carried out following Chartres et al. 1993, modified by Pecci et al. (2013a). Before extraction, we added 20 µl of internal standard (*n*-hexatriacontane).
3. A further extraction with KOH and chloroform (Pecci et al. 2013a) was carried out on the powder already extracted by extraction ii.

All the extracts were trimethylsilylated with 30µl of N,O-bis(trimethylsilyl)trifluoroacetamide (BSTFA, Sigma-Aldrich) heating at 70°C. 75 µl of hexane were added and the extracts analysed with gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (GC-MS) using a chromatographer Thermo Scientific TS GC ultra, with a silica capillary column and a mass spectrometer Thermo Scientific ITQ 900 operated in electronic ionization (70 eV). The mass range is *m/z* 40–650. A blank sample was analysed using the same solvents employed for the analysis of the archaeological samples.

Table 3
Details of the ceramic sherds analysed with Gas-Chromatrography.

LAB n.	SAMPLE ID.	Old sample n.	Typology
1	DSF002	52	Ses Fontanelles I (similar to Dr23)
2	DSF267	67	Flat-base amphora
3	DSF274		Flat-base amphora
4	DSF220	60	Almagro 51C
5	DSF272	76	Flat-base amphora

3.4. Analysis of wood and plant remains

After the first excavation season and awaiting the full excavation of the shipwreck for an extensive sampling, 20 interim samples of wooden elements from various components of the hull were selected. The rest of samples up to a total of 101 specimens (Table 4), were selected from branches and herbaceous plants used as packaging placed between the amphorae to prevent their movement and breakage during the journey, and from bark used to seal the amphorae. A pinecone found within the cargo was also included.

The study of the cell structure of the wood was based on the observation of its three anatomical planes (transverse, longitudinal radial and longitudinal transverse) using a reflected light microscope Olympus BX60, with 50x, 100x, 200x and 500x magnifications. In addition, a MEB HITACHI S-3400N scanning electron microscope (MEB) has been used to obtain detail images at further magnifications. The taxonomic identification of wood remains is based on comparative analysis of the cellular anatomy of the woods of the different species. Wood anatomy atlases of European woods (Schweingruber 1990) and the reference collection of wood and coal of the ArqueoUIB Research Group (Universitat de les Illes Balears) has been used as comparative materials. The degree of accuracy of the taxonomic identification has varied in each case depending on the conservation of the wood and/or the difficulty of obtaining thin sections from the different anatomical planes.

Several bunches of herbaceous plants were also analyzed. In this case, as these are non-woody plant remains, their taxonomic identification is not based on the analysis of the type of cells and cell structures typical of woody tissue. A first approach to these materials has been carried out to characterize them both macroscopically and microscopically to provide a first insight, awaiting further analyses. A test was carried out with one of these samples ("T.A. 2"). The contents of the sample were dissed in water to identify the various elements (Fig. 9). Two of the herbaceous plant elements present were selected to be observed in the optical microscope with transmitted light without any treatment or preparation (stains, etc.). Different elements of his anatomy could be observed in this way.

Table 4
Synthesis of the wood and plant remains studied

Material/Type of element	Number of samples
Mineral concretion	**2**
Concretion on stopper	2
Bark	**12**
Material inside amphora	1
Stopper of amphorae	11
Wood	**20**
Peg 1	1
Peg 2	1
Peg 3	1
Peg 4	1
Peg 5	1
Unknown fragment	3
Tenon 1	1
Tenon 2	1
Stanchion	1
Stringer	1
Pin 1	1
Pin 2	1
Pin 3	1
Pin 4	1
Pin 5	1
Pin 6	1
Rib 105	1
Wood	1
Herbaceous (dunnage)	**2**
Herbaceous	2
Pinecone	**1**
Pinecone	1
Vine's shoots (dunnage)	**62**
Vine's shoots	62
Branch	**2**
Branch attached to stopper	2

Material/Type of element	Number of samples
Mineral concretion	2
Total	101

4. Results

4.1. Petrographic characterization: approaching the provenance of the amphorae

From a macroscopic point of view, although ceramics certainly share similarities, especially in the abundant micaceous content, the fabrics are not entirely homogeneous, with a diversity of colors and textures that could perhaps indicate a multiplicity of products. Thin-section petrographic analysis on the selected amphorae enabled the identification of two fabric groups. A full petrographic description of these groups is available in the Supplementary materials, and the discussion here is orientated towards the provenance issue.

Petrographic Group 1 (Fig. 4) includes almost all the samples analyzed (nine out of 10), including the five samples of Almagro 51c amphorae, the two flat-bottomed amphorae, and the two amphorae of the type Ses Fontanelles I (Table 1). The strong similarities in fabric between these nine samples provides evidence of a provenance, most likely, in the same area for all of them. The percentage of coarse inclusions is variable, although never very high, and, in any case, there is a continuous variability between samples with very little coarse fraction and others where it is more common. Similarly, the relative frequencies of the different types of inclusions vary between individuals, although again gradually and always repeating the same range of main inclusions, especially micas (mainly muscovite), monocrystalline and polycrystalline quartz/quartzite, and fragments of metamorphic rocks likely derived from mica-schist, along with other components in minor amounts (Fig. 4).

The typology of the amphorae —especially in the case of Almagro 51c— points to a provenance either in southern Spain or in Portugal. Comparison with regional geology helps to suggest various possible provenance areas in which there is an important contribution of metamorphic materials, such as the Mediterranean coast of southern Spain (particularly from Málaga to Cartagena), or the Guadalquivir Valley (Aldaya et al. 1972, 1980; Fontboté 1983; Junta de Andalucía 1998; Martín-Algarra 2004). Other areas such as the Atlantic coast of *Baetica* (e.g., Cadiz Bay), the bay of Algeciras, or southern and western Lusitania could instead be ruled out. In the latter area, corresponding to the lower valleys of the Sado and Tagus, although some rather micaceous fabrics of Late Roman amphorae have been reported (e.g., Mayet et al.1996; Fantuzzi et al. 2015), the comparison with the samples from the wreck of Ses Fontanelles indicates that these are clearly different products, both in terms of clay matrix and texture and composition of the inclusions.

In the case of areas with contribution of metamorphic rocks, it is mainly through comparison with reference materials and previously known fabrics that it is possible to obtain a first insight into the possible provenance based on the compositional compatibility. Thus, the fabrics observed in Petrographic Group 1 are clearly different from those defined in previous studies for the Guadalquivir valley (e.g., Grubessi 1999; Grubessi and Conti 1999; Fantuzzi and Cau 2017, 2019), the coast of present-day Málaga province (e.g., Fantuzzi and Cau 2017; Bernal-Casasola et al. 2020; Fantuzzi et al. 2020), or the coast of Granada (e.g., Vigil de la Villa et al. 1998). Conversely, in the easternmost part of the southern Iberian Peninsula, particularly in the western zone of Cartagena, comparison with previously published studies reveals similarities between our Petrographic Group 1 and the fabrics described for El Mojón workshop (Berrocal 2012: 256–257), where a fine fabric containing predominant inclusions of quartz, muscovite, and fragments of metamorphic rocks rich in quartz and muscovite, as well as iron oxides, has been recorded. It should be noted that we have compared the samples of Petrographic Group 1 with thin sections of four amphorae from the workshops of El Mojón and Mazarrón in Cartagena, and while clear similarities are observed in both the main types of inclusions and textural parameters, some differences are also noticed, especially in the relative frequency of inclusions. In this regard, we should also mention that the samples used as comparison elements are mostly *spatheia*, with fabrics possibly more refined than in other amphora types. In addition, the frequencies of the different components in the

amphorae from El Mojón are very variable (Berrocal 2012: 257), especially in the case of calcite, which might suggest the use of raw materials from various outcrops to produce the amphorae. For all the above, the relationship of the Petrographic Group 1 of Ses Fontanelles with the productions of El Mojón or, at least, of the Cartagena area is a very likely hypothesis, especially when comparing with the information previously published by other authors (Berrocal 2012). It is worth mentioning that the workshops in Cartagena (particularly El Mojón) and Granada (sites of Los Matagallares and Los Barreros, in Salobreña) are the only areas known to date in the Mediterranean coast of Spain with well-documented production of both Almagro 51c amphorae and flat-bottomed amphorae (Bernal-Casasola 1998, 2001; Berrocal 2007, 2012); in the case of Málaga, production of Almagro 51c amphorae is well documented, but not of flat-bottomed amphorae (Bernal-Casasola 1997; Serrano 2004).

On the other hand, in the case of Petrographic Group 2 (Fig. 5), which includes only one of the samples analyzed (DSF277), corresponding to a Keay XIX amphora, the fabric observed in thin section indicates a provenance in an area with a dominant metamorphic contribution, but different from the production area of Petrographic Group 1. The nature of the metamorphic rocks present in this fabric could be compatible with different areas with low to very low grade metamorphism associated with phyllite outcrops, as is the case —especially— of the bay of Málaga, in relation to the outcrops of the Maláguide Complex (Aldaya et al. 1980; Fontboté 1983; Junta de Andalucía 1998; Martin-Algarra 2004; Serrano and Guerra 2004), and also from other more eastern areas of the southern part of Iberia related to the Alpujárride Complex, where phyllite outcrops can also be found, although in many cases along with other rocks related to a higher degree of metamorphism (Fontboté 1983; Junta de Andalucía 1998; Martin-Algarra 2004).

Comparison with the petrographic reference collection at ERAAUB, as well as with comparative materials found in different publications, shows partial similarities with amphorae fabrics between the Punic and Late Roman periods in the Málaga region, including amphorae of the same type Keay XIX (Fantuzzi and Cau 2017; Fantuzzi et al. 2020). It should be noted that the Málaga coast was, based on the archaeological evidence known to date, the main production area of Baetican Keay XIX amphorae –in addition to the important production centers known in Lusitanian– with various documented workshops (Bernal-Casasola 1997, 2001; Serrano 2004; García Vargas and Bernal-Casasola 2008). There are, however, some differences with the most typical fabrics of coastal Málaga, especially the lower frequency of sedimentary rock fragments (argillites, sandstones, and limestone) in sample DSF277, as well as the absence of some inclusions (serpentinite and pyroxene) that are sometimes –but not always– found in accessory quantities in the products of Málaga due to the proximity of the ultra-mafic complex of the Ronda mountain range (Fantuzzi and Cau 2017; Fantuzzi et al. 2020). However, the characteristics of the metamorphic rocks found in the DSF277 fabric, as well as the other types of inclusions observed –e.g., the fragments of igneous rocks present in an accessory quantity, identical to those documented in other Málaga products (Fantuzzi et al. 2020)– suggest that the fabric of sample DSF277 could correspond to a different variant within the products of the Málaga coast. It is important, in this sense, to note that the amphora DSF277 corresponds to an atypical morphological variant of the Keay XIX type, different from that analyzed in previous petrographic studies (Fantuzzi and Cau 2017). For this formal variant we do not know possible workshops and there is no information concerning the chronological and geographical relationship with respect to the best-known variants of this type. The presence of a particular fabric could respond to various factors: a variant of Keay XIX produced in another pottery workshop in the same region?, use of different clay sources at different chronological times of Keay XIX production?

In any case, it should also be noted that the comparison with reference materials and the geology of other production areas for Keay XIX amphorae —like the cases of western and southern *Lusitania*, as well as the Baetican coast between Huelva and the bay of Algeciras, and the coast of Granada— suggests that none of them could be proposed as provenance area for sample DSF277. Something similar happens in El Mojón wokshop in Mazarrón Bay, in the Cartagena area, where amphorae like Keay XIX have also been attested (Berrocal 2007, 2012); in this case, the fabric of sample DSF277 could be compatible from a strictly geological point of view, considering the presence of outcrops of phyllites and quartzites a few kilometers from the site (Espinosa et al. 1974). However, the products of this and other well-known workshops in the area are very different in terms of fabric both macroscopically and petrographically from the amphora DSF277. In summary, the integration of the existing archaeological information on the manufacture of Keay XIX amphorae together with the analytical evidence obtained from this study (and in combination with previous studies), suggest as a most likely hypothesis a provenance around the

Málaga coast for the amphora DSF277 recovered at Ses Fontanelles shipwreck. In any case, both the lack of known workshops producing the morphological variant of Keay XIX to which this amphora is related to, and the differences mentioned above with respect to the most typical petrographic fabrics in Málaga amphorae, do not allow us for the moment to provide further details concerning its provenance.

4.2. The study of the ichthyofauna: which fish sauce?

All faunal remains recovered from the amphorae containing fish sauce reveals that the substance was derived almost exclusively from a single species: the European anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*). The only exception was a hiomandibular bone of sardine (*Sardine pilchardus*) identified in the sample DSF-231 (Fig. 6). A selection of anatomical elements was used to estimate the minimum number of individuals (NMI) of each sample (Table 5). The anatomical representation of the anchovy is quite similar in all samples. The dentaries and other elements of the cranial region are predominant, with the rest of the appendicular skeleton appearing underrepresented, to a greater or lesser extent. Considering the dentaries as a reference for the minimum number of individuals (NMI), the percentage of representation of the vertebrae has been calculated by dividing the number of vertebrae observed by the expected number of vertebrae (e.g., the anchovy has 46–47 vertebrae, if 65 are observed, the estimated NMI will be equal to 2). The average percentage is 19%, ranging from a maximum of 33.3% (DSF-235) to a minimum of 7.1% (DSF-220). On the other hand, the number of vertebrae appears to be correlated to the estimated number of scales, since in those samples where there are with fewer vertebrae there are also fewer scales.

Table 5
Results of the ichthyofauna analysis, number of remains of anchovies identified. The sample marked with * only counts for the remains recovered at the bottom of the toe of the amphora (fig. X), and those bones attached to the walls of the amphora container have not been considered.

Element	DSF-220	DSF-231*	DSF-235	DSF-257
Dental (right)	12	12	3	9
Dental (left)	14	15	3	8
Articular	2	2	0	2
Neurocranium	7	11	2	8
Maxillary	18	19	5	15
Cleitro	14	14	3	9
Hiomandibular	12	18	3	5
Vertebra	9	65	10	51
Scales	Few (< 25)	Present (c. 50–100)	Abundant (> 250)	Present (c. 50–100)

Although it is tempting to suggest that the content of the Almagro 51c amphorae was composed almost exclusively of anchovies' heads, the embedded content in the resin of the inner walls of the amphora DSF-231 showed various articulated skeletons of anchovy (Fig. 7D, and Table 5), with their ribs and vertebrae still in anatomical position. The cranial parts of these specimens were recovered at the lower wall and toe of the amphora probably because of the detachment of the heads during the micronization process. For this reason, we suggest that, despite the observed partial anatomical representation in most of the samples, the fish sauce was made of whole anchovies.

The sardine found in sample DSF-231 had a total length of 11.4 cm based on the dorsal length of the hiomandibular bone (CRD, Fig. 8) and using the following linear regression: LT = 32.89*CRD + 8.43 (r^2 0.931); where LT was the total length and r^2 was the coefficient of determination (Assis and Amaro, 2006). In the case of the anchovies, the size range is between 7 and 12.5 cm (n = 36; x = 8.7; CV = 13.5), although the vast majority were individuals with sizes between 8 and 10 cm. Although

there are no significant differences in the size of the individuals present in the four samples, the occurrence of some larger fishes is observed in the DSF-235 sample (Fig. 8, small box).

4.3. Organic residue analysis: further investigating the content of the amphorae

Almagro 51c

The amphorae DSF220 (sample 4), Almagro 51c type, displays a painted inscription (*titulus pictus*) *Alunnii et Ausonii NN() liq(uaminis) f < l(o)s* informing of its content *liquaminis flos* (flower of *liquamen*, a fish sauce). Extract i displays abundant dehydroabietic acid followed by abietic acid, and methylabietate. Extracts ii and iii display very abundant dehydroabietic acid, abietic acid, methyldehydroabietate, 7-oxodehydroabietic acid, and retene is also present. These are markers of Pinaceae products, specifically of pitch obtained burning the wood of Pinaceae trees (Colombini et al. 2005). Retene is the marker of heating. The abundance of abietic acid, which are quite uncommon in archaeological samples, suggests that the pitch could derive from *Abies* sp or alternatively that the residue is very well-preserved and giving a strong signal, not normally observed in archaeological cases.

The abundance of Pinaceae products makes more difficut to identify other compounds. Nevertheless, extract i displays traces of tartaric and succinic acids, that, considering the context and period studied, indicate that the amphora contained wine or its derivatives (Garnier and Valamoti 2016; McGovern et al. 2017; Pecci et al. 2013, 2020). In extracts i, ii, and iii, palmitic and stearic acid are present, being stearic acid the most abundant. Cholesterol is also present in the sample, while β-sitosterol is absent. Although sterols could derive from post-depositional contamination (Hamman et al. 2018), this could also suggest an animal origin of the content of the amphora. In extract ii also $C_{20:0}$ and $C_{22:0}$ are present. These compounds are present in fish but are not exclusive markers of this product. The data indicate an animal origin of the content probably mixed with wine, vinegar, or other wine derivative.

Ses Fontanelles I amphora type

Amphorae DSF002S Fontanelles I type (sample 1), display abundant residues. The oleic acid ($C_{18:1}$) is the most abundant fatty acid in extracts i and ii, followed by palmitic acid ($C_{16:0}$). In extracts i and iii there are also short chain fatty acids, being the $C_{9:0}$ the most abundant and dicarboxylic acids, among which azelaic acid is the most abundant. β- sitosterol is present only in traces in extract i. In general, the profile of the three extracts suggests a plant oil content for the amphora, compatible with olive oil. However, the analyses performed do not allow for the identification of TAGs, therefore we cannot fully confirm the presence of olive oil. Sample 1 is the only sample, among the five analyzed, in which tartaric acid is not identified. This datum reinforces the idea that this type of amphora was carrying a plant oil. Differently from the other analyzed amphorae, where resin/pitch biomarkers are abundant, dehydroabietic acid is present only in traces and there are no markers of the production process of the resin/pitch (i.e., heating or extracting it directly from the wood).

The flat-bottomed amphorae

Three samples were recovered and analyzed from flat-bottomed amphorae. Olives were preserved in amphora DSF267.

The samples from amphora DSF267 (sample 2), DSF274 (sample 3) and DSF272 (sample 5), display abundant dehydroabietic acid followed by abietic acid. Methyldehydroabietate and 7- oxodehydroabietic acid are also present. These are markers of Pinaceae products (pitch) obtained burning the wood of Pinaceae trees. The abundance of abietic acid suggests that the pitch could derive from *Abies* sp. In sample DSF272 pitch is very abundant, even to the necked eye.

Possibly due to the abundance of Pinaceae products, or because we mechanically cleaned the samples in the laboratory (removing the pitch coating layer that possibly had absorbed most of the residues), it is difficult to identify other compounds in the lipid extracts.

Stearic acid ($C_{18:0}$), palmitic acid ($C_{16:0}$), and oleic acid ($C_{18:1}$) are present in extract ii of DSF267 (sample 2) and DSF274 (sample 3), being $C_{18:1}$ (oleic acid) the is relatively most abundant among them. However, none of these acids is abundant. β-sitosterol is present in traces in extract i. These data are compatible with a plant oil. However, lipids are not abundant in the two amphorae. This is surprising mainly for DSF267, because olives were recovered in the bottom of the amphora. These data indicate that likely, if olives were preserved in a wine/vinegar medium (see later), they did not release abundant fats or that fatty acids possibly degraded and that possibly the abundance of pitch did not allow the abortion of residues in the pottery matrix. In DSF274, no solid residue was preserved, therefore we do not know if it contained olives.

Extracts i of the three amphorae displayed tartaric and succinic acids. Although tartaric acid is present also in other fruits (i.e., tamarind) (Barnard et al. 2011), it is possible to interpret it as a marker of grape derivatives for the context and period studied (Garnier and Valamoti 2016; McGovern et al. 2017; Pecci et al. 2013; Pecci et al. 2020). The presence of tartaric and succinic acids VEDERE MALICO, CITRICO confirms that the analysed amphorae also contained wine, vinegar, or OTHER derivatives, although it is not possible to differentiate among them. Extract i of samples DSF267 (sample 2), DSF274 also displayed syringic acid. This acid is related to the presence of red wine, however further analyses should be performed to confirm this hypothesis, as syringic acid could also derive from contamination. In general, the data could be compatible with the presence of olives in vinegar/other wine derivative, or with a first wine content of the amphorae and a re-use of at least DSF267 for olives.

Sulfur is present in extracts i and iii of the three amphorae.

4.4. Wood and macroplant remains

Elements of the hull of the vessel

The results of the taxonomic identification of the 20 wood elements analyzed are expressed in Table 5. In short, four different taxa have been identified, three corresponding to conifers, Cupressaceae (cypress and juniper family), *Pinus* (indeterminate pine) and *Pinus t. pinea (Stone pine* type); and two to angiosperms, *Olea europaea* (olive tree) and *Laurus nobilis* (laurel) (Table 5).

Among the larger elements that make up the hull of the boat only a single genus, *Pinus* sp, has been documented (Table 5). In two cases, it has been possible to differentiate that these corresponds to stone pine type *(Pinus* t. *pinea*) (Fig. 10). In two other cases only the genus, *Pinus* sp, has been determined. On the other hand, for the small parts of the hull three different taxonomic categories have been identified: Cupressaceae, *Olea europaea*, and *Laurus nobilis* (Table 5). In the case of fragments belonging to the family Cupressaceae (Fig. 10) anatomical elements have not been clearly observed to differentiate the genus *Cupressus* (cypress) and *Juniperus* (juniper). Similarly, in other cases it has not been possible to clearly differentiate between the two species of angiosperms identified, *Olea europaea* and *Laurus nobilis* (Fig. 10).

Table 5
Result of taxonomic identification of recovered wood objects (excluding branches)

Element identified	Conifer indet.	Cupressaceae	Indeterminable	*Laurus nobilis*	*Laurus/Olea*	*Olea europaea*	*Pinus* sp.	*Pinus t. pinea*	Total
Peg 1		1							1
Peg 2		1							1
Peg 3	1								1
Peg 4	1								1
Peg 5		1							1
Unknown fragment			3						3
Tenon 1					1				1
Tenon 2					1				1
Stanchion							1		1
Stringer								1	1
Pin 1				1					1
Pin 2				1					1
Pin 3					1				1
Pin 4			1						1
Pin 5						1			1
Pin 6				1					1
Rib 105								1	1
Wood							1		1
Total	**2**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**2**	**2**	**20**

The analysis of the wooden elements of the hull of the boat shows in any case a clear distinction in the woods used for large parts and for those of smaller sizes that formed part of the hull assembly system (pegged, mortise, and tenons).

Other plant remains

Several bunches of herbaceous plants interwoven with twigs, together with branches, were found between the amphorae as dunnage to protect the cargo during the journey. All branches were analyzed, together with some samples of the bunches of herbaceous plants and twigs and three fragments of wood of indeterminate shape and origin also found among the cargo (Table 6).

Table 6
Results of the taxonomical identification of branches and unclassified wooden fragments

Element	Indeterminable	Lamiaceae	*Vitis vinifera*	Total
Branch (dunnage)		1	61	62
Indeterminate woody fragment	3			3
Branch attached to stopper	1			1
Total	**4**	**1**	**61**	**66**

Most of the branches (n = 61) were fragments of common grape vine (*Vitis vinifera*, Fig. 11) placed between the amphorae transported by the boat to prevent its movement and collision. One of the small branches was of a different species (DSF 40 sample), a plant in the Lamiaceae family. Two other herbaceous plants reveal the presence of paracytic stomata, in parallel to the axis of the leaf (Fig. 12), long cell structures and short cells could be observed, some of the long ones, with anticlinal walls profusely undulated (Fig. 11). The presence of tomentum was also observed (Fig. 12). This consisted of trichomes of various sizes, apparently single-celled, and especially associated with cells of the nerviations, where they concentrate very densely. Some images show structures that are possibly silica (phytoliths). Thus, the observed material has a diversity of well-preserved cellular elements that could in principle be related to plants in the grass family (*Poaceae*), but a confirmation using phytolith analysis is already planned.

In addition, tree bark stoppers used to seal the mouths of the amphorae were analyzed. In all cases, the different elements of the cell structure of tree bark could be observed (Fig. 12). However, taxonomic identification beyond the determination of bark (cork) was not possible because of the taxonomic undefinition of this part of woody plants and by the conservation of the samples analyzed. However, due to the size of some of them, both in diameter and thickness, the cork pieces probably come from a tree species with a great development of this organ protecting the trunk. The most plausible hypothesis is that the cork oak *(Quercus suber)*, a tree especially appreciated for its large cork production, was used to prepare the stoppers to seal the amphorae.

Finally, among the materials found on the boat a pinecone was identified according to the size and morphology of its components, mainly the peduncle (element that joins the pineapple to the branch) and the sheaths (Fig. 11). In this case, the morphological elements indicate that it is an Aleppo pine pinecone (*Pinus halepensis*). It presents a patent peduncle, elongated, and curved, typical of this species. The seminiferous scales have slightly convex apphysis. Finally, the measurements of this pinecone (7.1 x 4 cm) fit quite well within the range of the pinecones of this pine species (6–12 x 3.5–4.5 cm) (Amaral Franco 1989).

5. Discussion

The multi-proxy approach to Ses Fontanelles shipwreck helps to a better archaeological interpretation of the boat and its cargo.

For the provenance of the amphorae cargo, the petrographic analysis provides additional and complementary evidence to the typological and macroscopic information. All amphorae of the Almagro 51c, Ses Fontanelles I, and flat-bottomed amphorae are very similar to each other in terms of the petrographic fabric (Petrographic Group 1), indicating broadly the same provenance for all of them. The petrographic characteristics, in combination with the available archaeological evidence, point to the Cartagena area, in southeastern Iberian Peninsula, as a likely area of manufacture. On the other hand, for the only specimen of a variant of Keay XIX amphora a provenance in the current coast of Málaga may be proposed as the most likely hypothesis. Overall, it seems that the boat transported a cargo of products packaged in amphorae produced around Cartagena in southeastern Iberian Peninsula.

The archeozoological study reveals that the fish sauce transported in the Almagro 51c amphorae labeled as *liquaminis flos* was prepared using primarily small-medium-sized anchovies *(Engraulis encrasicolus*), despite the occasional presence of sardines. The documented taxonomic selection and homogeneity of sizes between 7 and 12.5 cm is in line with that observed in other areas of the western Mediterranean (García-Vargas et al. 2018), highlighting that these small pelagic species were the subject of an intense and widespread fishing for the preparation of salting products. From a historical and archaeological point of view, this practice can be contextualized in the renaissance of the production of fish salting during the Constantinian period with the generalization of new products based on small fish, such as sardine, wing, blotched picarel, or the same anchovy (Bernal-Casasola 2001; Bernal-Casasola et al. 2016, 2020; García-Vargas et al. 2018). At the same time, the samples studied here represents one of the few cases in the Balearic Islands where the fish remains were preserved in primary position (paleocontent in amphorae).

The results of the organic residue analysis provide further information about the content of the amphorae. The Almagro 51c amphora analyzed (DSF220), which displays a painted inscription (*titulus pictus*) informing of its content *liquaminis flos*, displays residues that indicate the presence of animal fats, but cannot be surely attributed to fish at this stage of analysis. The results are however interesting because they indicate abundant residues of resin or pitch used as a coating of the vessel and the presence of tartaric and succinic acids, indicating a wine/vinegar/*defrutum* content, which could have been used as a condiment to the fish sauce or the result of a re-use of the vessel. A combination of products was likely also preserved in the flat-bottomed amphorae. In fact, in one of them, olives were preserved, and residues are compatible with a plant oil. It has been suggested that sterols can be indicative of the content of the amphorae coming from waterlogged contexts (Garnier et al. 2011). However, we also know that sterols could derive from post-depositional contamination (Hamman et al. 2018). In any case, in this regard, it is interesting that we could identify cholesterol in the Almagro 51c type sample, and β-sitosterol in the other samples, which agrees with animal products in the first case and plant oil/olives in the second. In general, it is interesting that from the data obtained it is possible to suggest that substances that are identified as solid residues were stored in *wine/vinegar/defrutum*. An alternatively explanation could be the reuse of the amphorae, a practice that is more common than previously thought. If this would be the case, then wine/vinegar/defrutum or other wine derivatives would have been absorbed during a first use of amphorae and then these would have been re-coated with pitch and used for a different content (olives, fish products). All these amphorae were coated with pitch, from Pinaceae, possibly from *Abies* sp., which was mostly visible also to the necked eye and could have been used as a waterproofing and/or preserving agent for the content of the amphorae. In some cases, it is possible to identify the production process of pitch extraction, which was heated and/or extracted by burning the wood. Sulfur, which is also present in all of them, could derive from contamination or could have been mixed to the pitch to waterproof the amphorae and/or preserve the content. Finally, Ses Fontanelles I amphora type DSF 002 (sample 1), only displayed residues compatible with a plant oil content. Differently from the other amphorae, only traces of resin (and not abundant pitch), and no sulfur were identified in tis amphora.

The study of the wood used in the shipbuilding has identified five different taxonomic categories: Cupressaceae, *Olea europaea*, *Laurus nobilis, Pinus* t. pinea, and *Pinus* sp. (Table 4). A selection of timber resources is clearly observed. For the construction of the large elements of the hull pine was used (Table 4), taking advantage of the wood of this tree that develops large trunks of straight growth, which, despite offering a wood of medium hardness and density, is especially optimal for the manufacture of these large elements which absorb water and expand transversely optimally for pegged, mortise, and tenon joints tightness'. In contrast, for the smaller elements of the hull assembly system (P, M & T) *Cupresaceae*, *Laurus nobilis* and *Olea europaea* woods were used (Table 4). The latter two species offer woods with a high density and fine grain, especially appreciated in cabinetry to make small elements and complex shapes. In the case of elements made of *Cupresaceae* wood, the genus or species used has not been more accurately determined. Considering the forest formations in which the identified taxa are developed, they could be Phoenician juniper (*Juniperus phoenicea*), a tree developing in coastal sand dune formation. However, we have not been able to be confirm this properly from the observation of the anatomy of the wood. In any case, the various species of the genus *Juniperus* also offer dense and fine grain woods specially indicated for the manufacture of this type of small objects. Furthermore, an association between taxon and object type is also documented considering the small elements of the assembly system (Table 4). For the manufacture of the pegs, only *Cupresaceae* wood has been documented, while only woods of *Laurus nobilis* and *Olea europaea* have been used for the tenons and treenails. The used of different

woods is normal and has been widely attested in other ships similar chronology (e.g., Giacchi et al. 2003, 2017; Beltrame and Gaddi 2006; Allevato et al. 2009). The identified species correspond to thermo- or meso- Mediterranean vegetation, without documenting, for example, taxa of broad-leaved formations (e.g., oaks, deciduous *Quercus*, or beech, *Fagus sylvatica)* or alpine (such as fir, *Abies alba*, mountain pine, *Pinus mugo*, or Scots pine, *Pinus sylvestris).* Among the angiosperms identified, Olea *europaea* develops very extensively in all the low and middle lands of the circum-Mediterranean region, being in many cases the main tree component of open maquia formations or forming part of the undergrowth of other forest formations. *Laurus nobilis* (laurel) is also a taxon of clear development in the Mediterranean basin, although in this case the populations are more restricted to shady places and with greater humidity. As for conifers, pine woods have been identified, which in when type was possible to differentiate, they correspond to Stone pine type *(Pinus* t. *pinea)*, so also discarding taxa typical of high mountain areas. Stone pine *(Pinus pinea)* is a species of lowlands and, although it grows in continental territories, develops significantly in coastal areas throughout the Mediterranean basin, also in sandy dunes. Among the 62 branches of woody plants analyzed used to secure the cargo (Table 3) most of them correspond to fragments of grape vine (*Vitis vinifera*), except for one corresponding to the *Lamiaceae* family. They were interwoven with herbaceous plants, and the analysis of few of them suggests that could be of the *Poaceae* family. They could be leaves and/or stems of common reed *(Phragmites* sp.), also a common coastal plant in the Mediterranean basin that was used in this case also to protect some of the amphorae during the journey. The use of vine shoots and other plants to secure the cargo was a common practice in ancient Mediterranean navigation, as witnessed in several shipwrecks such as Port Vendres (Liou, 1974), Cap del Vol (Spain) (Nieto and Foerster 1980), Madrague de Giens, Dramont E (Santamaria 1995), Gran Ribaud F (Long et al. 2006), Ma'agan Mikhael B (Israel) (Civkel 2020), or several of the shipwrecks found in Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer (SM2, SM24, SM9) (e.g., Marlier 2018), just to cite a few examples. These plants were interpreted as for protecting the hull from the cargo but also to protect the cargo, as clearly demonstrated in the Madrague de Giens (Tchernia et al. 1978) and in Ses Fontanelles. Amphorae, sensible to friction and mechanical breakage, needed at least sometimes a proper a packaging. Finally, the pinecone analyzed has been identified as *Pinus halepensis*, a taxon that develops in large areas of the Mediterranean basin and it is also especially present in coastal areas. In the Iberian Peninsula, it is one of the main coastal forest formations south of the Llobregat River, which does not contradict the main hypothesis of the origin. The presence of pinecones in shipwrecks is not rare. Sometimes it has been interpreted as dunnage, as in the case of Madrague de Giens or more recently in the Ma'agan Mikhael B shipwreck in Israel (Cohen and Civkel 2018), but also as related to the sealing system of the amphorae.

6. Concluding remarks and future perspectives

Considering all the information obtained through the application of a multi-proxy approach to the exceptional shipwreck of Ses Fontanelles a few conclusions concerning its origin can be proposed.

All the analytical data suggest that *Alumnius et Ausonius* prepared a trade enterprise fleeting a merchant ship with a cargo composed mainly of fish sauce (*Liquaminis flos*), in Almagro 51c amphora, oil transported in Ses Fontanelles I amphorae (probably an imitation of Dressel 23 type), and vine derivates or fruits preserved in those substances in flat-bottomed amphorae. The analysis of the ichthyofauna has contributed to understand that this fish sauce was basically prepared with small *engraulidae* particularly anchovies but with presence of sardine. It is possible that also a, so far, invisible cargo occupied part of the space in the galley (Munar et al., 2022). These products were carefully stowed in the hold of the merchant ship using vine shots and herbaceous plants as dunnage for protection. Petrographic analysis of the amphorae suggests an origin for the cargo in southeastern Iberian Peninsula, and particularly in Cartagena or its surroundings. The study of the wood of the elements of the hull and branches and herbaceous plants recovered suggest species of a temperate region, mainly in coastal areas and in lowlands ruling out the use of species of mountainous vegetation, compatible with the area of southeastern Iberian Peninsula.

On the light of this first analytical approach, it is very likely that the vessel departed from some port of the area, perhaps from the main city of *Carthago Nova* or *Carthago Spartaria* (current Cartagena) in Late Antiquity. The boat probably departed from the city itself or a nearby port and sunk for reasons that we still do not know in the large bay of Palma in Mallorcan waters.

On a more methodological basis, we hope that this interim study shows that even in cases where the resources, and therefore the sampling, are limited, a well-defined initial archaeological question and a precise selection of samples can help to obtain analytical results that help in the archaeological and historical interpretation of the Roman and late antique Mediterranean. Future perspectives include a major multidisciplinary an interinstitutional project to finish the excavation of the shipwreck, the full study of its cargo and the naval architecture, and the evaluation of the possibilities of the extraction of the hull for future display. All these will count with an integrated and extensive multianalytical approach that could serve to confirm or refute some of the initial hypothesis proposed here and certainly to shed light into this exceptional shipwreck found in Mallorca waters.

Declarations

Supplementary Information. The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/xxxxxxxxxxxx.

Acknowledgements. The samples for residue analysis were analyzed using the infrastructure of the *Departament d'Història i Arqueologia* and the Centres Científics i Tecnològics (CCiTUB), Unidad de cromatrografía de gases, of the Universitat de Barcelona. The identification of ichthyological remains was made using the reference osteological collections in the vertebrate laboratory of the *Instituto Mediterráneo de Estudios Avanzados* (UIB-CSIC). The study of the wood and plant remains has been made using the reference collection of wood and coal of the ArqueoUIB Research Group and the SEM observations at the Serveis Cientifico-Tècnics of the Universitat de les Illes Balears. The work of Llorenç Picornell-Gelabert has been financed by a Ramón y Cajal Fellowship (RYC2020-030621-I / AEI / 10.13039/501100011033) financed by the Agencia Estatal de Investigación, the European Social Fund and the Universitat de les Illes Balears.

Author contributions. MACO:Funding, project director, archaeological excavation director, paper conceptualization, compilation, petrographic analysis, writing, manuscript revision, and approval.

DBC: Funding, project director, archaeological excavations director, paper conceptualization, writing, manuscript revision, and approval. AP: Organic residue analysis, writing, and manuscript revision. LF: Petrographic analysis of ceramics, writing, and manuscript revision. LLP: Wood analysis, writing, and manuscript revision. AV: Study of faunal remains, writing, and manuscript revision. JAR: Processing of archaeological materials, writing, and manuscript revision. JLP: Processing of archaeological materials, writing, and manuscript revision. JC: Funding, project director, writing, manuscript revision, and approval. SML: Archaeological excavation director, writing, and manuscript revision. CJF: Archaeological excavation director, writing, and manuscript revision. EGR: Funding, project director, writing, manuscript revision, and approval. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding. The work presented here is part of the activities of the project ARQUEOMALLORNAUTA, funded by Consell de Mallorca and Ports IB, and lead by Miguel Ángel Cau Ontiveros (ICREA and ERAAUB, Institute of Archaeology of the University of Barcelona), Darío Bernal-Casasola (University of Cádiz), Enrique García Riaza (University of the Balearic Islands), and Jaume Cardell Perelló (Consell de Mallorca). This is part of the activities of the research group ERAAUB of the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Barcelona (IAUB), Consolidated Group (2021 SGR 00696), thanks to the support of the Comissionat per a Universitats i Recerca del DIUE de la Generalitat de Catalunya. Some of the activities have been possible thanks to the synergies created with the project “Arqueología y Arqueometría aplicadas al estudio de la cerámica y el poblamiento de la ciudad romana de *Pollentia* y su hinterland (Mallorca, islas Baleares)” (ARQCERPOL) (PID2021-123223NB-I00) (ARQCERPOL) (PID2021-123223NB-I00) (IP: Miguel Ángel Cau Ontiveros and Catalina Mas-Florit), funded by MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”, GARVM III (PID2019-108948RB-I00/AEI/10.13039/501100011033), Gobierno de España/FEDEAR; ARQUEOSTRA (FEDER-UCA18-104415) Programa Operativo FEDER 2014-2020 and Consejería de Transformación Económica, Industria, Conocimiento y Universidades, Junta de Andalucía; and ARQUEOFISH (P18-FR-1483) Programa de Ayudas a la I+D+I, Plan Andaluz de Investigación, Desarrollo e Innovación (PAIDI 2020). The residue analysis study is also part of the activities of the project RACAMed (PID2020-113409GB-I00), funded by MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033.

Data availability. The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Ethics approval. Not applicable.

Consent to participate. Not applicable.

Consent for publication. Not applicable.

Competing interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Allevato E, Ermolli ER, Pasquale GD (2009) Woodland exploitation and Roman shipbuilding. Preliminary data from the shipwreck Napoli C (Naples, Italy) Données préliminaires de l'épave C (Naples, Italie). Méditerranée. Revue géographique des pays méditerranéens/Journal of Mediterranean geography 112: 33–42.
2. Amaral Franco J (1989) Pinus L. En S. Castroviejo et al. (eds.) Flora Iberica. Vol 1: 168–174. Real Jardín Botánico, C.S.I.C., Madrid.
3. Assis C, Amaro C (2006), Estudo dos restos de peixe de dois sítios fabris de Olisipo". Setúbal Arqueológica 13: 123–144.
4. Auriemma R (2000) Le anfore del relitto di Grado e il loro contenuto. Mélanges de l'école française de Rome, 112(1): 27–51.
5. Barkai O, Lernau O, Kahanov Y (2013) Analysis of fish bones from the Tantura F shipwreck, Israel. Archaeofauna, 22(1): 189–199
6. Barnard H, Dooley AN, Areshian G, Gasparyan B, Faull KF (2011) Chemical evidence for wine production around 4000 BCE in the Late Chalcolithic Near Eastern highlands. Journal of Archaeological Science 38: 977–984
7. Beltrame C, Gaddi D (2007) Preliminary Analysis of the Hull of the Roman Ship from Grado, Gorizia, Italy. International Journal of Nautical Archaeology 36(1): 138–147.
8. Bernal-Casasola D (2001) La producción de ánforas en la Bética en el s. III d.C. y durante el Bajo Imperio, Congreso Internacional Ex Baetica Amphorae. Conservas, aceite y vino de la Bética en el Imperio romano (Écija y Sevilla 1998), Écija, 239–372.
9. Bernal-Casasola D, Cau Ontiveros MA (coord.) (2020) Estudio preliminar del cargamento del pecio tardorromano de Ses Fontanelles (Palma de Mallorca): inventario, catalogación y primeras analíticas, Memoria inédita depositada en el Consell de Mallorca.
10. Bernal-Casasola D, Gabriel S, Hernández-Tórtoles A, Lavado-Florido ML (2020) Una nueva cetaria en Rota y el garum de sardinas en época altoimperial. Anejos a Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología 4, 221–234.
11. Bernal-Casasola D, Marlasca R, Rodríguez-Santana CG, Ruiz-Zapata B, Gil-García MJ, Alba M (2016) Garum de sardinas en Augusta Emerita. Caracterización arqueológica, epigráfica, ictiológica y palinológica del contenido de un ánfora Beltrán IIB. Rei Cretariæ Romanæ Favtorvm Acta 44: 737–749.
12. Capretti C, Macchioni N, Pizzo B, Galotta G, Giachi G, Giampaola D (2008) The characterization of waterlogged archaeological wood: the three Roman ships found in Naples (Italy). Archaeometry 50(5): 855–876.
13. Carrión Y (2003) Afinidades y diferencias de las secuencias antracológicas en las vertientes mediterránea y atlántica de la península Ibérica. Tesis Doctoral, Universitat de València.
14. Charters S, Evershed RP, Goad LG, Leyden A, Blinkhorn PW, Denham V (1993) Quantification and Distribution of lipids in archaeological ceramics: implications for sampling potsherds for organic residue analysis and the classification of vessel use. Archaeometry 35(2): 211–233.
15. Cohen M, Cvikel D (2019) Ma agan Mikhael B, Israel: a preliminary report of a Late Byzantine–Early Islamic period shipwreck. International Journal of Nautical Archaeology 48(1): 189–207.

16. Colombini MP, Giachi G, Modugno F, Pallecchi P, Ribechini E (2003) The characterization of paints and waterproofing materials from the shipwrecks found at the archaeological site of the Etruscan and Roman harbour of Pisa (Italy). Archaeometry 45(4): 659–674.
17. Colombini MP, Modugno F, Ribechini E (2005) Direct exposure electron ionization mass spectrometry and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry techniques to study organic coatings on archaeological amphorae. Mass Spectrometry 40: 675–687.
18. Colombini MP, Orlandi M, Modugno F, Tolppa EL, Sardelli M, Zoia L, Crestini C (2007), Archaeological wood characterisation by PY/GC/MS, GC/MS, NMR and GPC techniques. Microchemical Journal 85(1): 164–173.
19. Condamin J, Formenti F, Metais MO, Michel M, Bond P (1976), The application of Gas Chromatography to the tracing of oil in ancient amphorae. Archaeometry, 18(2): 195–201.
20. Cucchi T (2008) Uluburun shipwreck stowaway house mouse: molar shape analysis and indirect clues about the vessel's last journey. Journal of Archaeological Science 35(11): 2953–2959.
21. Cvikel D (2020) The Late-Antique Ma'agan Mikhael B Shipwreck, Israel. Near Eastern Archaeology, 83(1): 30–37.
22. Deforce K, Allemeersch L, Stieperaere H, Haneca K (2014) Tracking ancient ship routes through the analysis of caulking material from shipwrecks? The case study of two 14th century cogs from Doel (northern Belgium). Journal of Archaeological Science 43: 299–314.
23. Domínguez-Delmás M, Nayling N, Ważny T, Loureiro V, Lavier C (2013) Dendrochronological dating and provenancing of timbers from the Arade 1 Shipwreck, Portugal. International Journal of Nautical Archaeology 42(1): 118–136.
24. Evershed R (1993) Biomolecular archaeology and lipids. World Archaeology 25 (1): 74–93.
25. Evershed R (2008), Organic residues in archaeology: the archaeological biomarker revolution. Archaeometry 50(6): 895–924.
26. Frost, H (2011) Don't forget the dunnage: targeting plants on ships. IJNA41(1): 194–198.
27. García-Vargas E, Roselló E, Bernal-Casasola D, Morales A (2018) Salazones y salsas de pescado en la Antigüedad. Un primer acercamiento a las evidencias de paleocontenidos y depósitos primarios en el ámbito europeo-mediterráneo. Las cetariae de Ivulia Tradvcta. Resultados de las excavaciones arqueológicas en la calle San Nicolás de Algeciras (2001–2006). Editorial UCA, Cádiz, 287–312
28. Garnier N (2007) Analyse de résidus organiques conservés dans des amphores: un état de la question. In Bonifay M, Tréglia JC, LRCW2 Late Roman Coarse Wares. Archaeology and Archaeometry, BAR Int Series, 39–49.
29. Garnier N, Valamoti S (2016) Prehistoric wine making at Dikili Tash (northern Greece): integrating residue analysis and archaeobotany. Journal of Archaeological Science 76: 195–206.
30. Garnier N, Silvino T, Bernal Casasola D (2011) The identification of the content of amphorae: oils, salsamenta and pitch. In French Society for the Study of Archaeological Ceramics from Gallia, Proceedings of the Congress SFECAG: 397–416. SFECAG. Arles.
31. Giachi G, Lazzeri S, Lippi MM, Macchioni N, Paci S (2003) The wood of "C" and "F" Roman ships found in the ancient harbour of Pisa (Tuscany, Italy): the utilisation of different timbers and the probable geographical area which supplied them. Journal of Cultural Heritage, 4(4): 269–283.
32. Giachi G, Capretti C, Lazzeri S, Sozzi L, Paci S, Lippi MM., Macchioni N (2017) Identification of wood from Roman ships found in the docking site of Pisa (Italy). Journal of Cultural Heritage, 23: 176–184.
33. Grøn O, Boldreel LO, Cvikel D, Kahanov Y, Galili E, Hermand J-P, Nævestad D, Reitan M (2015) Detection and mapping of shipwrecks embedded in sea-floor sediments. Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports 4: 242–251.
34. Guasch-Jané MR, Iberno Gómez M, Andrés-Lacueva C, Jáuregui O, Lamuela-Raventós RM (2004) Liquid chromatography with mass spectrometry in tandem mode applied for the identification of wine markers in residues from ancient Egyptian vessels. Analytical Chemistry 76: 1672–1677.
35. Guerrero Ayuso VM (2006) Nautas baleáricos durante la Prehistoria (parte I). Condiciones meteomarinas y navegación de cabotaje. Pyrenae 37: 87–129.

36. Hamilton-Dyer S (1995) Fish in Tudor naval diet-with reference to the Mary Rose. Archaeofauna 4:27–32.
37. Hammann S, Cramp LJE, Whittle M, Evershed RP (2018) Cholesterol degradation in archaeological pottery mediated by fired clay and fatty acid pro-oxidants. Tetrahedron Letters 59: 4401–4404.
38. Izquierdo i Tugas P (1996) Los condicionantes de la navegación en la Antigüedad: una aproximación al caso de la provincia Hispania Citerior mediterránea. In Achútegui, J.J. (ed.) I Simposio de Historia de las técnicas. La construcción naval y la navegación, Santander (1995), 299–306.
39. Lempiäinen-Avci M, Timonen T, Harju P, Alvik R (2021) Underwater archaeobotany: plant and wood analyses from the Vrouw Maria, a 1771 shipwreck in the Finnish Baltic Sea. Vegetation History and Archaeobotany 31: 97–106.
40. Liou B (1974) L'épave romaine de l'anse Gerbal à Port-Vendres, Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, juillet-octobre, 414–433.
41. Liphschitz N (2015) Cupressus sempervirens (Cypress) as hull construction timber of sunken shipwrecks in the East Mediterranean. Shipwrecks Around the World: Revelations of the Past, 604–623.
42. Liphschitz N (2019) Dendroarchaeology of shipwrecks and ships in the eastern Mediterranean. Current Science 117(10): 1617–1622.
43. Long L, Rival M, Gantè LF (2006) L'épave Grand Ribaud F: un chargement de produits étrusques du début du Ve siècle avant J.-C. L'épave Grand Ribaud F, 1000–1041.
44. Lorentzen B, Manning SW, Kahanov Y (2014) The 1st millennium AD Mediterranean shipbuilding transition at Dor/Tantura Lagoon, Israel: dating the Dor 2001/1 shipwreck. Radiocarbon 56(2): 667–678.
45. Mascaró J (1971) El tráfico marítimo en la Antigüedad Clásica. II Congreso Internacional de Arqueología Submarina, 69–86.
46. Marlier S (2018) Navires et navigations dans le delta du Rhône à l'époque romaine.Archaeonautica. L'archéologie maritime et navale de la préhistoire à l'époque contemporaine, 20: 103–140.
47. Mc Govern P, Jalabadze M, Batiuk S, Callahan MP, Smith K, Hall G, Kvavadze E, Maghradze D, Rusishvili N, Bouby L, Failla O, Cola L, Mariani L, Boaretto E, Bacilieri R, This P, Wales N, Lordkipanidze L (2017) Early Neolithic wine of Georgia in the South Caucasus. PNAS, doi/10.1073/pnas.1714728114.
48. Moreno Torres S (2005) Rutas de navegación en el Mediterráneo occidental: condicionantes atmosféricos y aspectos técnicos de la navegación en la antigüedad. Mayurqa 30(2): 781–799.
49. Muller SD (2004) Palynological study of Antique shipwrecks from the western Mediterranean Sea, France. Journal of Archaeological Science 31(3): 343–349.
50. Munar Llabrés S, Cardell J, de Juan C, Cau Ontiveros MÁ, Bernal-Casasola D, Picornell Ll, García Riaza E (2022) Ses Fontanelles Shipwreck (Mallorca, Balearic Islands): An Exceptional Late Roman Vessel and Its Cargo. J Mari Arch 17: 487–505.
51. Nieto FJ, Foerster F (1980) El pecio romano del Cap del Vol (Campañas de 1978 y 1979). Cypsela III: 163–177.
52. Pecci A, Borgna E, Mileto S, Dalla Longa E, Bosi G, Florenzano A, Mercuri AM, Corazza S, Marchesini M, Vidale M. (2020). Wine consumption in Bronze Age Italy: combining organic residue analysis, botanical data and ceramic variability. Journal of Archaeological Science 123: 105256-1-12.
53. Pecci A, Cau MA, Valdambrini C, Inserra F (2013a). Understanding residues of oil production: chemical analyses of floors in traditional mills. Journal of Archaeological Science 40: 883–893.
54. Pecci A, Giorgi G, Salvini L, Cau MA (2013b) Identifying wine markers in ceramics and plasters with gas chromatography - mass spectrometry. Experimental, ethnoarchaeological and archaeological materials. Journal of Archaeological Science 40: 109–115.
55. Pecci A, Clarke J, Thomas M, Muslin J, van der Graaff I, Toniolo L, Miriello D, Crisci GM, Buonincontri M, Di Pasquale G (2017). Use and reuse of amphorae. Wine residues in Dressel 2–4 amphorae from Oplontis Villa B (Torre Annunziata, Italy). Journal of Archaeological Science: Reports 12: 515–521.

56. Pecci A, Reynolds P, Mileto S, Vargas Girón JM, Bernal-Casasola D (2021). Production and transport of goods in the Roman period: Residue analysis and wine derivatives in late Republican Baetican ovoid amphorae, Environmental Archaeology: 1–13. doi: 10.1080/14614103.2020.1867291.
57. Pomey P, Kahanov Y, Rieth E (2012) Transition from Shell to Skeleton in Ancient Mediterranean Ship-Construction: analysis, problems, and future research. The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology 41(2): 235–314.
58. Regert M (2011) Analytical strategies for discriminating archeological fatty substances from animal origin. Mass Spectrometry Reviews 30: 177–220.
59. Ruiz de Arbulo J. (1990) Rutas marítimas y colonizaciones en la Península Ibérica: una aproximación náutica a algunos problemas. Italica 18: 79–116.
60. Pacheco-Ruiz R, Adams J, Pedrotti F, Grant M, Holmlund J, Bailey C (2019) Deep sea archaeological survey in the Black Sea–Robotic documentation of 2,500 years of human seafaring. Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers 152: 103087.
61. Santamaria C (1995) L'épave Dramont «E» à Saint-Raphaël (Ve siècle ap. J.-C.). Archaeonautica 13(1): 5–198.
62. Schweingruber F (1990) Anatomie europäischer Hölzer ein Atlas zur Bestimmung europäis- cher Baum-, Strauch- und Zwergstrauchhölzer Anatomy of European woods an atlas for the identification of European trees shrubs and dwarf shrubs. Stuttgart: Verlag Paul Haupt.
63. Soler i Nicolau A, Font Jaume A, Berni Millet P, García Riaza E, Bernal-Casasola D, Cau Ontiveros MÁ, Cardell Perelló J, Munar Llabrés S (2021) El singular conjunto de tituli picti del pecio de Ses Fontanelles (Mallorca, islas Baleares) y su contribución a la epigrafía anfórica tardorromana hispánica. Cuadernos de Arqueología y Prehistoria de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (CUPAUAM) 47(1): 287–317.
64. Tchernia A, Pomey P, Hesnard A (1978) L'épave romaine de la Madrague de Giens (Var), XXXIVe suppl. à Gallia, Paris.
65. Traoré M, Kaal J, Martínez Cortizas A (2016) Application of FTIR spectroscopy to the characterization of archeological wood. Spectrochimica Acta Part A: Molecular and Biomolecular Spectroscopy 153: 63–70.
66. Traoré, M, Kaal J, Martínez Cortizas A (2018) Chemometric tools for identification of wood from different oak species and their potential for provenancing of Iberian shipwrecks (16th-18th centuries AD). Journal of Archaeological Science 100: 62–73.
67. Ward, C., Ballard, R. D., 2004. Deep-water archaeological survey in the Black Sea: 2000 season. International Journal of Nautical Archaeology, 33(1): 2–13.

Figures



Figure 1

Situation of Ses Fontanelles shipwreck in the context of Mallorca



Figure 2

The shipwreck and its cargo during the excavation process





Figure 3

Main types of amphorae documented at Ses Fontanelles shipwreck



a) Amphora DSF002 (Ses Fontanelles I)
b) Amphora DSF003 (Ses Fontanelles I)
c) Amphora DSF183 (Almagro 51c)
d) Amphora DSF185 (Almagro 51c)
e) Amphora DSF263 (Almagro 51c)
f) Amphora DSF270 (Flat-bottomed amphora)

Figure 4

Photomicrographs of the petrofabric Group 1




Figure 5

Photomicrographs of the petrofabric Group 2




Figure 6

Selection of osteological remains selected for taxonomic identification and quantification. A1) current left dentary of anchovy and joint bone in anatomical connection, A2; B) specimen of anchovy of Ses Fontanelles; C) neurocraneum of anchovy, dorsal and lateral view; D) anchovy maxillar; E) cleitro; F) sardine hiomandibular (DSF-231) and measurement used for size inference (CRD); G) anchovy's Hyomandibular; H) anchovy's vertebra.




Figure 7

Fish remains attached to the inner walls of the toe of an Almagro 51c amphora (DSF-231). A) container typology and sampled section; B) view of the toe of the amphorae; C) several skeletons of anchovies attached to the walls and still in anatomical connection; D) detail of the basal area of the toe where the sample studied was collected from




Figure 8

Sizes of the anchovies identified in the samples. The small box at the top left separates cases by sample




Figure 9

A) Partial chromatogram of extract i of sample 1. B) Partial chromatogram of extract i in sample 2; C) Partial chromatogram of extract ii in sample 4




Figure 10

MEB images of the transverse plane (upper left) and longitudinal radial (upper right) of a wooden fragment of Cupressaceae. MEB images of the transverse plane (mid left) and tangential longitudinal (mid right) of a fragment of *Olea europaea* wood. MEB images of the transverse plane (lower left) and longitudinal radial (lower right) of a *Pinus t. pinea* wood fragment.




Figure 11

Fragment of Lamiaceae branch: a) longitudinal tangential plane seen under the optical microscope; b and c) view of the transverse plane on the SEM; d) and e) images of the optical microscope of the longitudinal tangential plane of a *Vitis vinifera* fragment; f) pinecone of *Pinus halepensis*: overview and detail of the curved peduncle.




Figure 12

a) paracytic stomata (red arrows) from one of the samples analyzed in "T.A. 2"; b) trichomes (red arrows) and phytoliths from one of the samples analyzed in “T.A. 2.”; c) to f) photographs of the cell structure of the bark observed in the transmitted light optical microscope.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- Supplementarymaterial1.docx