

## OVEN HILL (Di-15), A REFUSE SITE IN THE SUWANNEE RIVER

Stephen J. Gluckman and Christopher S. Peebles

In 1960, John M. Goggin defined four major types of underwater sites: "(1) refuse sites; (2) submerged sites of former human occupation; (3) shrines or places of offerings and interment; (4) shipwrecks" (Goggin 1960:351). The following year Donald Jewell (1961:441) defined two broad categories of sites: "those in which cultural materials have been introduced into existing bodies of water, and those in which cultural sites have been inundated by submergence or damming." Two years later Stephan de Borhegyi followed Goggin's classification and also described four major types of subsurface sites (Holmquist and Wheeler 1964:2). Frederic Dumas (1962), in Deep-Water Archaeology recognized only one type of site, the shipwreck. In Marine Archaeology, edited by Joan du Plat Taylor (1965), none of the articles specify a classification of underwater sites but the book is divided into sections which indicate a recognition of such a classification. The same can be said of George Bass's (1966) Archaeology Under Water.

This rather truncated listing of authors who have offered classifications of underwater sites is meant to serve a dual purpose: first, to show that a variety of underwater sites has been recognized in print for over ten years; and second, to introduce the point that definitive studies (if that term can be applied to any underwater work) have been attempted only for shipwrecks. To corroborate this last statement, one needs only to check quickly through the literature. A bibliography which has been compiled by one of us over the last few years (Gluckman 1967 ms) shows over two-thirds of the citations to be concerned in part or completely with shipwrecks.

In this paper we shall make an attempt to redress this imbalance by defining and describing a very common type of underwater site which has received little attention in the literature. We also hope to show, by using Oven Hill as a specific example, that this typical Florida refuse site is representative, generally, of all refuse sites, and that lessons learned at Oven Hill allow the formation of work methods and of theoretical concepts which are applicable to all sites of this type.

#### The Refuse Site: A Definition

The refuse site as defined by Goggin (1960:351) refers to any archeological site formed either by the deliberate deposition of cultural refuse into a body of water or by the unintentional deposition of such materials through loss as at a watering place, anchorage, or landing. Goggin recognized three

sels which are from a "pure" or single component site), have vastly increased the known range of variability of Seminole ceramics.

Seminole brused ware in the past has been divided into two types on the basis of whether the vessel was limestone or sand tempered (Goggin 1958). At Oven Hill both "types" are present, and with the single exception of tempering material, both are identical. The microstylistic elements of decoration and manufacturing techniques are such that the conclusion that the pots are made by the same or closely related persons is inescapable. Possibly, in this context, preference for crushed limestone or sand as temper may be a personal matter.

European ceramics, which constitute less than 5 per cent of the ceramic assemblage, consists of two small "Lambeth Delft" bowls and one small red paste lead glazed bowl. The land portion of the site yielded some of the remaining pieces of these vessels plus one small sherd of Ksang Hsi blue-on-white porcelain. Other than pottery the only other material recovered from the river was one trigger guard, one well rusted stirup and one rifle grenade.

The Land Portion supplied gun parts representing at least four weapons. Although these parts are not interchangeable they are identical in form. Axes, razors, and knives, like the guns, present an amazing degree of internal homogeneity. Also recovered from the site was a pair of spurs, and a snaffle bridle. Other items recovered were worked brass wire segments, buckles, gift trunk hinges, and several buttons. These buttons have been analyzed for us by Dr. Lewis Binford, who has done part of the analysis of the Fort Michilimackinac (Canada) material. One large button is a British military legging button and the others are military coat buttons. These buttons had an official life span among the British military in America from 1764-1768. There were also numerous items of personal adornment: silver cones, a silver maltese cross, ear rings, and a "stone ring". Also represented on the site are large numbers of both black and white barleycorn beads and the Oven Hill Chevron Bead. A few pipe fragments were recovered from Oven Hill. Again, through the good offices of Lewis Binford, these pipes have been compared to the Fort Michilimackinac material. With the exception of one bowl whose mark can not be clearly read, all of the pipes are marked "T D". However, there are many different forms of "T D" markings. Of those examined, one, according to Binford, dates immediately post-1765, which ties in nicely with the buttons.

In addition to specific dating of single artifacts, the Oven Hill assemblage has been compared to the earliest gift lists kept by the British relative to the Seminoles in Florida (Gage papers, Stuart to Gage 7-19-1764, and Covington 1960). There is an amazing correspondence between the types and descriptions of goods contained in these lists and the material recovered at Oven Hill. The homogeneity of various artifact classes at Oven Hill is absent from