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I. Introduction

This report details a cooperative investigation of selected Civil War battlefields on U.S.D.A. Forest Service lands in northwestern Georgia. The battlefields under study are associated with Major General William Tecumseh Sherman’s March to Atlanta Campaign in May, 1864 and events following the capture of Atlanta in October, 1864. The military engagements surrounding Ringgold, Dalton, and Resaca were the beginnings of what was to be a protracted trek across the entire state of Georgia by a large Union force. The outmanned Confederates, commanded by Major General Joseph P. Johnston, were forced into a strategy of defend and retreat, as the best that they could hope for was to slow the movement of Sherman’s forces and desire for their retreat. As the Union troops neared Atlanta, Confederate President Jefferson Davis ordered a change in command, replacing General Johnston with Major General John Bell Hood. Hoping to lure Sherman to Tennessee, Major General John Bell Hood took a large portion of the Confederate troops and moved north into Tennessee. That move by the Confederates proved disastrous for the Confederates as they suffered defeat after defeat. A Union retreat never came and Sherman’s army conquered Atlanta and the rest of the State of Georgia. By Christmas of 1864, General Sherman telegraphed President Lincoln announcing the capture of Savannah. Meanwhile, interior Georgia was even less well defended by the Confederates with General Hood’s absence.

During the winter of 2011 archaeologists, historians and volunteers braved freezing conditions to follow in the footsteps of Sherman’s army. The battlefield archaeology study described in this report investigates three locations that were part of the 1864 military action in northwestern Georgia. This study helps to establish a benchmark for the beginning of Sherman’s March through Georgia. The three sites chosen for study were Dug Gap (9WD5), Chestnut Mountain entrenchments (9GO326), and Ships Gap (also known as Maddox Gap) (9WA201) (Figure 1). A fourth site, suspected cannon emplacements at Snake Creek Gap (9WA335) was selected for potential study, but time and resources were exhausted and no fieldwork was conducted there. The collaboration was comprised by U.S. Forest Service archaeologists, The LAMAR Institute, Inc., a North Georgia College and State University graduate student and U.S.F.S. intern (Jonathan Harton), and 14 volunteer participants in the U.S.F.S.’s Passport in Time program. The LAMAR Institute was retained by the U.S.F.S. to direct the project under Challenge Cost Share Agreement Number 10-CS-11080300-017.

The report is organized in the following manner. Chapter 2 provides background information on the three study sites. Chapter 3 details the methods employed in the research project, including the historical research, fieldwork, laboratory analysis, reporting and collection curation. Chapter 4 contains a discussion of the previous archaeological research in the project vicinity. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the Dug Gap battlefield and the wider action on Rocky Face Ridge. Chapter 6 presents a short discussion of military resources at Snake Creek Gap. Chapter 7 presents a discussion of the military resources at Chestnut Mountain entrenchments. Chapter 9 presents a discussion of the military resources at Ship’s Gap battlefield. Chapter 10 contains a series of GIS distribution maps of battlefield resources at Dug Gap. Chapter 11 contains an interpretation of the military engagements in the study areas. It also includes a discussion of the eligibility of these cultural resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
(NRHP). This is followed by a complete bibliography of references cited or consulted for the project. Appendix 1 contains a complete artifact inventory.
Figure 1. Project Area (NPS 2011).
II. Background

The original study area included four locations on the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service Chattahoochee National Forest in Gordon, Walker and Whitfield counties, Georgia (U.S. Geological Survey 1981a-b, 1982a-b, 1983a-b, 1985). These were: Ship’s Gap (9WA201), Dug Gap (9WD5), Snake Creek Gap (9WA335), and an entrenchment on the western, lower slopes of Chestnut Mountain (9GO326). All four study sites were reconnoitered in January, 2010 by members of the project team. Three of the sites were examined as part of the 2011 Passport in Time (PIT) project. Surface features thought to be related to Civil War defenses were observed on the ground surface at all four study sites. Prior to the field study, U.S. Forest Archaeologist James Wettstaed (2010) prepared a research design for the management of Civil War resources on the U.S.D.A. Forest Service land holdings in Georgia. His document contains a summary of previous professional study of Civil War sites on the National Forest lands, which has been minimal. Wettstaed’s research design served to establish the groundwork for the present study.

Project resources did not allow for a complete battlefield study of all four study sites. Energy was focused on the battle of Dug Gap on Rocky Face Ridge with lesser treatment of the Chestnut Mountain entrenchment and Ship’s Gap. No additional study was conducted at Snake Creek Gap, other than historical research and recordation of the archaeological remains that were observed in the January 2010 reconnaissance.

A. PROJECT ENVIRONMENT

The study sites are located within the Valley and Ridge physiographic province of northwestern Georgia (Wharton 1978; Hodler and Schretter 1986). This province is characterized by well defined parallel ridges and valleys that trend northeast-southwest. Topographic relief in many areas is abrupt with steep cliffs and rocky slopes that make travel difficult. Emerson (1905:109-121) noted the role that the Valley and Ridge geology played in Major General Sherman’s campaign through Georgia. He notes that the Confederate’s choice of Dalton for a defensive stance was well chosen. The ridge and valley topography, well represented by Rocky Face Ridge, offered excellent strategic opportunities for Confederate defensive positions and made it difficult for the Union troops to conquer. The sheer bluffs of Rocky Face Ridge allowed for only a few points of access from the west and these were well defended by the Confederates. The under-defended passage at Snake Creek Gap proved to be a weak link in Major General Johnston’s plan and General Sherman found and took advantage of that vulnerability. Eventually General Sherman’s army bypassed Dalton and continued south into the Georgia piedmont region, where other difficulties with the terrain challenged both armies.

Early 20th century soil survey maps for Gordon and Walker counties reveal the rural character of the PIT study areas (Veatch 1914; McLendon 1911). Portions of these maps displaying relevant battlefield areas are reproduced in Figures 2 and 3.

Other environmental and cultural background information concerning the study area and the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest is summarized in Wettstaed’s research design and in Wynn’s cultural resource overview (Wettstaed 2010; Wynn 1982; Wynn et al. 1992).
Figure 2. Portion of Early 20th Century Soil Map of Walker County, Georgia Showing Maddox [Ship's] Gap Locale (McClendon 1911) (North is to left of page).
Figure 3. Portion of Early 20th Century Soil Map of Gordon County, Georgia Showing Snake Creek Gap and Chestnut Mountain Locales (Veatch 1914) (North is to left of page).
B. **SHIP’S GAP (MADDOX GAP)-9WA201**

Ship’s Gap, also known as Maddow, Maddox, or Mattock Gap, is a mountain pass through Taylor Ridge in Walker County. The Ship’s Gap study area is located west of the Villanow-Lafayette Road. The area investigated was a steep side slope of a wooded knoll where a low rock wall was previously identified. This rock wall occupies a superior vantage point for defending against an army approaching along the road from the east. This area is heavily wooded except where the paved state highway crosses the gap. Wettstaed (2011:13-14) provides this preliminary summary of the battle of Ship’s Gap (9WA201):

> Although the Union forces under McPherson traveled through Ship’s (Maddox) Gap on their way to flank Johnston in Dalton by way of Snake Creek Gap, the features present at this site are believed to date to a later episode. In the fall of 1864, Confederate forces raided throughout northwest Georgia in an attempt to disrupt Union supply lines. Ship’s (Maddox) Gap was the site of a limited battle in the fall of 1864, when the 24th South Carolina Infantry took position to delay the advancing 1st Division of the Federal XV Corps, on 16 October 1864. The Confederate regiment had two of its companies captured here. Features present at the site consist of a 200 foot long rock wall on the south slope of the gap, at a point where there was excellent visibility down at the road approaching uphill from the east. No formal investigations have occurred at this site.

C. **DUG GAP-9WD5**

Dug Gap, also known as Babb’s Gap, is a mountain pass across Rocky Face Ridge in Whitfield County, Georgia. The Dug Gap study area is located on the eastern and western slopes and summit of Rocky Face Ridge and Dug Mountain. Mill Creek is located at the base of Rocky Face Ridge, west of the study tract. The northern and western end of the Dug Gap study tract was defined by Dug Gap Road. Exploration to the east and south continued until all evidence of battle debris and fortifications were terminated. A gravel road runs north-south through the study tract to near the summit of Dug Mountain. The crest of Dug Mountain contains a large utility tower and the area surrounding the tower complex has been graded. Figures 4 and 5 show two views of the Dug Gap battlefield.

Wettstaed (2010:13) provides this preliminary summary of the battle of Dug Gap (Site 9WD5):

> The battle at Dug Gap occurred on May 8, 1864, when Confederate forces held Dug Gap and repulsed an assault by Federal troops...This position was held on May 8, and then improved over the following days by building fortifications within the gap, but the Confederates abandoned the position on May 13, 1864. The site consists of a linear feature of native stone forming a wall 1,350 feet long along the top of Dug Mountain. The wall ranges from two to four feet high and 10-15 feet wide (Fearrington 1984; Meier and Dittmar 1979). Part of the site (on the north side of the gap) has been donated to the Whitfield-Murray Historical Society for a park, but part of the site is still present on National Forest land (Wynn et al 1994: B-9). The Update to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields identifies the location of this site as one of the core areas of the battle (DOI, NPS, ABPP 2010:108)
Figure 4. Current View Upslope to East at Dug Creek Gap.

Figure 5. Segment of Rock Wall on Western Slope of Rocky Face Ridge at Dug Gap.
Snake Creek Gap is a mountain pass in eastern Walker County, Georgia. The gap is located along Snake Creek, on the western slopes of Mill Creek Mountain and just southeast of the northern end of Horn Mountain. Georgia Highway 136, also known as the Resaca-Lafayette Road, is situated approximately 40 m west of the site. The Snake Creek Gap study area lies just east of Snake Creek Road and northeast of Horn Mountain. The gap at the northern end of Horn Mountain lies within cannon range of the study tract.

Wettstaed (2011:13-14) provides this preliminary summary of Civil War resources on Forest Service lands at Snake Creek Gap: “This is a possible site at the mouth of Snake Creek Gap. Possible earthworks are situated on a low ridge facing down the road to the west at the point at which the valley narrows considerably. This would have been a good location for Confederate forces to have defended the gap, and a letter in the Forest land acquisition files from 1969 reports that “old civil war gun emplacements” are present on this property. However, a later farmstead is located immediately north of this feature and it is possible that the possible earthwork is associated with that occupation.”

The archaeological site (9WA335) was reconnoitered on January 20, 2010. It lies on USFS property, east of Snake Gap Road and just south of the intersection with the Villanow Road. It consists of a series of possible cannon emplacements that would have guarded the road intersection. The engagement at Snake Creek Gap followed soon after the battle of Dug Gap. It was fought by advance forces of Major General James McPherson’s 15th Corps and Confederate troops commanded by Major General Joseph Johnston.

No formal archaeological investigations have occurred at this site and no archaeological sites are presently recorded in the vicinity. A brief reconnaissance to the site by Wettstaed, Elliott, Harton, Crawford and others, comprised of a surface walkover, confirmed the likely presence of several cannon emplacements. Sadly, the site was later used as a dump site and a robust early 20th century trash deposit covers the site’s surface. This trash deposit would severely hamper any attempts at a systematic metal detector survey of the vicinity. Unfortunately, time and manpower resources did not permit any further investigation of this potential site by the 2011 PIT crew. The site was recorded in the Georgia Archaeological Site File based on the reconnaissance level examination.

The suspected artillery position represented by archaeological site 9WA335 is in a strategic military location and are almost certainly the remains associated with the American Civil War. What is not known, however, is whether it represents a Confederate or Union artillery battery. Our suspicion is that it was manned by Confederate artillerymen guarding against the advancing Union troops in May, 1864. Alternatively, it may represent a position held by Major General Hood’s rear guard in October, 1864. The few contemporary descriptions of the combat at Snake Creek Gap, however, make no mention of artillery fire. Similarly, the Civil War atlas maps show no artillery or trench positions at Snake Creek Gap.
E. CHESTNUT MOUNTAIN ENTRENCHMENT- 9GO326

The western, lower slopes of Chestnut Mountain include a series of Civil War trenches in Gordon County, Georgia. The segment examined in the present study occupies a narrow ridge on the lower southwestern slopes of Chestnut Mountain Georgia (USGS 1981b). The Chestnut Mountain Encampment study area is located in a wooded tract, accessed by a trail off of a U.S. Forest Service road. The southern end of the study tract was defined by a private property boundary. The northern, eastern and western extent of the study area was defined by the topographic formation of the ridge and its side slopes. This site, recorded in the GASF as site 9GO326, is marked by a long, linear entrenchment flanked on its west side by scatters of machine cut square nails and one small lead ball. It may represent the May, 1864 headquarters complex of Major General James B. McPherson, who commanded General Sherman’s 15th Army Corps. Several battlefield maps and maps published in the Civil War Atlas shows extensive U.S. Army fortifications in this vicinity (Blakeslee 1864; U.S. Army Dept. of the Cumberland Topographical Engineers 1864; Cowles 1895: Plate 57, Map 2; Plate 58, Map 3; Plate 63, Map 4). Major General McPherson was killed in the battle of Atlanta in July, 1864, so he provided no post-battled account of his actions at Snake Creek Gap.

Several other sites in the vicinity may be related to site 9GO326. The archaeological vestiges at 9GO170 also may represent a U.S. Army encampment from October, 1864, when Union troops once again guarded the passage at Snake Creek Gap. The site was recorded in 1993 during a U.S.F.S. intensive survey of blizzard damage timber stands (Evans-Shumate et al. 1993). The study site selected for the PIT project was not identified by previous archaeological survey. It is situated south of 9GO170, although the two sites are likely related. Other possibly related nearby sites with entrenchments include 9GO122, 9GO123, and 9GO124. These three sites were located by Panamerican Consultants, Inc. during a contract survey for the U.S. Forest Service (Walling 1992; Moore 1992a-c).

Wettstaed (2010:12-13) provides this preliminary summary of the Chestnut Mountain Encampment (Site 9GO170):

This site is reported to be the location at which McPherson's Corp camped prior to the attack on Resaca. During the feint at Rocky Face, McPherson advanced down Snake Creek Gap and reached Resaca on May 9, 1864, but fearing the Confederate position was too strong, he pulled back, reportedly to this location. The Battle of Resaca was begun by the Union on May 13, 1864 and it is possible that a substantial portion of McPherson’s Corps was camped at or near this location from May 9 to 13. In addition, the engagement at the south end of Snake Creek Gap on October 14, 1864, could potentially have take place in this location, as it would have been easier for the Union forces to reoccupy previously prepared positions than to build new ones. A trench is located at this location that would have served a defensive function during the encampment, and this area is reportedly a favorite of local relic collectors. During a wildfire in 2006, a dozer line was constructed through the site and numerous holes left by artifact collectors were reported to be visible in the burned area. No formal investigations have occurred at this site.
III. Research Methods

A. RESEARCH DESIGN

Wettstaed (2011:20-22) offers a series of research design questions to be applied to the Civil War sites in Georgia’s national forests, which are applicable to the sites in this study. The research by the LAMAR Institute was approached with these questions in mind. Wettstaed’s basic questions posed for every potential Civil War site include:

- Is the site associated with the Civil War?
- What type of site is it (encampment, fortification or battlefield)?
- To what action(s) is the site associated?
- What is the larger association for the site?
- Does that part of the site on Forest Service land represent an isolated section of a much larger site, or is the entirety of the associated action located on FS land?
- What threats are there to the long-term preservation of the site?
- Could the site be interpreted without endangering the preservation of the site?
- What is the physical extent of each site?
- What level of disturbance has occurred at each site?

B. HISTORICAL RESEARCH METHODS

Research by The LAMAR Institute supplemented the historical context for these encampment and battle sites. Elliott explored historical resources available on the internet and in other published sources. This included a review of contemporary newspaper and magazine accounts *(Harper’s Weekly* 1864; *Illustrated New Age* 1864a:2, 1864b:1; 1864c:1; *Lowell Daily Citizen News* 1864:2; *Macon Telegraph* 1864a:2, 1864b:1, 1864c:1, 1865:1; *Memphis Appeal* 1864a-I; *Milwaukee Sentinel* 1864a:2, 1864b:2; *New York Herald Tribune* 1864:1; *Plain Dealer* 1864a:2, 1864b:2, 1864c:3). LAMAR Institute researchers reviewed the official records (ehistory.com 2011; U.S. War Department [OR] 1880-1891; Cowles 1895; U.S. Surgeon General’s Office 1870), regimental histories and reminiscences by battle participants, and early historical accounts of the military action in northwestern Georgia (Anders 1968; Austin 1899; Bates 1871; Boyle 1905; Breckenridge 1888a-b; Brown 1890; Brown 1980; Chappel 1874; Coffin 1889; *Confederate Veteran* 1911; Dacus 1972; Davis 1990; Dodge 1866; Dunkleman and Winey 1981; Fitch 1905; Foster 1868; Gerdes 2011a-d; Goodspeed 1887, 1891; Jennings 1915; Johnson and Buell 1888; Johnston 1864; Jones 2006; Kell 1894; Kentucky Historical Society 1977; Knap’s Independent Battery ‘E’ 2011; Lane 1892; Learning 1864; Lindsley 1886; Mann 1909; Mansfield 1899; New York State Military Museum and Veterans Research Center 2011; Ohio Roster Commission 1887; Phisterer 1912; Ridley 1906; Rowland 1896; SeCheverell 1883; Shaw 1912; Shaw 1884; Sifakis 2005, 2007a-c, 2009a-b; Sprott et al. 1999; Strayer and Baumgartner 2004; Thomas 1866; Van Horn 1875; U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service 2011; Walker and Curren 1997; Watkins 1997; Waud 1864a-e; Wilks 2000; Willis 1998; Wilson 1907; Yates 1902).

Researchers scoured the internet for information on relic finds in the study vicinity (Columbus Daily Enquirer 1897; Conley 2001; Cwartifax.com 2011; Mike Kent & Associates, LLC 2011; Horsesoldier.com 2011; South Carolina Treasure and Artifact Association 2011). The internet has proven to be an invaluable resource for Civil War research on a variety of fronts. It not only provides the researcher access to vast libraries of books, manuscripts, maps and other useful data, but it also provides many links to the Civil War enthusiasts and the general public. Information collected from the internet often contains errors and misinformation, so its use requires a discerning researcher’s eye.

C. FIELD METHODS

Methods employed in the field survey included systematic use of metal detectors to inventory the battlefield resources. Metal detector finds were plotted with handheld GPS receivers. The goal of this inventory is to identify general artifact distributions and recover a representative sample of artifacts. Sketch maps were prepared for each site and photographs were taken of all sites and relevant features. Representative artifact illustrations are provided in this report. Features were recorded in detail. Such recording will involve the preparation of profiles and plan views. Cross-sections were prepared of representative sections of the Chestnut Mountain entrenchments. More precise GPS locations for selected battlefield features at Dug Gap were collected with a Trimble backpack GPS unit. A small portion of the Chestnut Mountain study area was mapped using a total station laser transit. A plan for the potential discovery of human remains was anticipated but was not needed, as no human remains were discovered by the project.

The LAMAR Institute herein offers recommendations for eligibility of each study property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). These properties were evaluated according to four NRHP criteria. The LAMAR Institute also provides recommendations for responsible management of these resources.

The Civil War study sites were reconnoitered by Becky Bruce-Vaughters, Charlie Crawford, Daniel Elliott, Jonathan Harton, James Wettstaed, and others on January 20, 2010. PIT project fieldwork commenced on February 7 and continued through February 11, 2011. Fieldwork was completed by a 19 person crew directed by LAMAR Institute archaeologist, Daniel T. Elliott. Mr. Elliott was assisted by LAMAR Institute archaeologist, P.T. Ashlock, II. The U.S.F.S. crew
included James Wettstaed, Becky Bruce-Vaughters, and Stacy Lundgren. Historian Jonathan Harton provided important historical background information about the project and Mr. Harton also assisted with data recordation during the field survey (Harton 2011a-b).

The PIT project participants included Craig Anderson, Gregory Beavers, Candice Cravins, Larry Glass, Edwin Goad, Drew Hester, Skip Johnson, David Jopling, Gil Kane, James King, Brenda McKaig, Frank Perry, Dave Port, and Shirley Rivera. The PIT crew members were selected from a generous pool of 61 applicants who were solicited via the Passport in Time’s website and other outreach publications, whose extent was nationwide. Most of those who were selected had previous experience on PIT projects or extensive expertise in using metal detectors or survey equipment. Several were selected for their expertise in Civil War history or because of their prior anthropological training. Several potentially useful volunteers had to be turned down because of the overwhelming response and limited slots available on the crew. Two of the participants, Anderson and Beavers, had previously surveyed with Mr. Elliott on other battlefields in the Georgia piedmont. David Jopling, a professional surveyor, provided total station expertise in mapping the entrenchments at Chestnut Mountain.

The surveyors were divided into four teams, which were designated A-D. Team A was headed by Anderson, Team B by P.T. Ashlock, Team C by Stacy Lundgren, and Team D by Dan Elliott. Each metal detector find was identified by its team designation and by its numerical GPS waypoint. For example, the 10th item recorded by Team B was identified in the artifact catalogue as B-10. GPS waypoints also were recorded at landmark features and other non-artifact landscape features.

Most of the field effort was spent investigating the archaeological remains at Dug Gap. One field day was spent by the entire crew at the Chestnut Mountain entrenchments. One partial field day was expended by one crew at Ship Gap. The possible artillery position at Snake Creek Gap, which was reconnoitered in January, was not investigated by the Passport in Time team owning to lack of time.

The brands of metal detectors used by the survey crew varied considerably. Receiver units included Fisher 1270, Minelab Sovereign, and Tesoro Silver Max, Nautilus DMC II, Nautilus 2 BA, Garrett Crossfire II, Viking 5 Series 2, and a Tejon Tesoro 141950 models. Ideally, the survey would have been undertaken with similar equipment but this was not feasible given that it was largely a volunteer effort and volunteers supplied their own metal detecting equipment. Every attempt was made to pair up the team members to maximize the varying skill levels and surveying equipment capabilities for the benefit of the project. Some machines, for example, were better suited for deep probing, whereas others worked better in trashy areas. Fortunately, metallic trash was not a major problem over most of the sampled tracts. A veneer of modern tin cans, shotgun shells and other trash over the entire National Forest was expected and confirmed by the survey. Most of these clearly modern items were not recorded or collected. One small trash dump obscured metal items in the northern end of the Dug Gap study tract.

In the case of the Dug Gap battlefield the terrain was steep and rocky. Consequently, it was not feasible to maintain close interval transects on portions of this tract. Safety concerns limited survey in some of the steep cliffs. A fresh snowfall blanket provided an added environmental
challenge to the survey at Dug Gap and Ship Gap. Surprisingly, the metal detectors and their operators performed well in meeting this challenge (Figure 6).

Some artifacts were identified in the field and left in place. These included objects that post-dated the Civil War period and those objects, primarily machine cut square nails that were easily identified in the field.

Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) was attempted at the Chestnut Mountain entrenchments. A MALA RAMAC X3M ground penetrating radar unit, mounted on a cart with a 500 Mhz shielded antenna, was employed for this purpose. The equipment was used to survey a cross-section across the entrenchment in the vicinity of the firebreak and main site datum. This effort met with poor results, however. The vegetative cover over the National Forest tract precluded any systematic grid block survey with the GPR equipment. If the Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment site was properly cleared of vegetation, GPR of the level ground may prove more fruitful. It provided little useful information on the trenches.

Figure 6. Intrepid PIT Survey Member on Western Slope Above Dug Gap.

D. LABORATORY METHODS

Laboratory analysis was conducted from February 23 through March 11, 2011. Reporting on the project was completed in May, 2012. Artifacts were returned to the LAMAR Institute laboratory
in Rincon, Georgia for cleaning, processing, analyses and data entry. Laboratory analysis was accomplished by P.T. Ashlock, II, Dawn Chapman, and Daniel Elliott. Artifacts were grouped into functional categories, following South (1977). These categories were: Architecture, Arms, Clothing, Furniture, Kitchen, Miscellaneous, Personal, Tobacco, and Activities. Military-related items were in the arms and clothing group. Possible military-related artifacts cross-over to other categories, including personal and activities. An extensive list of published sources was consulted for artifact identification (Albaugh 1993a-b; Albert 1976; Bilby 2005; Coates and Thomas 1990; Crouch 1995; Flayderman 1980; Harris 1987; Lord 1965; McAulay 1997; McKee et al. 1980; Morrow 1989; Ripley 1984; Thomas 1985, 1997, 2002, 2003, 2010; Tice 1997; Wycoff 1984).
IV. Previous Research

A. EARLY INTEREST

Guidebooks to battlefields of Sherman’s campaign against Atlanta (Luvaas and Nelson (2008:62-64) include a description of the Dug Gap battlefield. Other important studies of Civil War activity in the general study vicinity were published by Scaife (1993) and Secrist (2010) (Figure 7). Non-professional exploration of the Civil War battlefields that are addressed by this study has been extensive. A few examples were gleaned from a search of the internet.

Metal detector technology has existed since 1881, when the “Hughes Induction Balance” was by Alexander Graham Bell employed to detect bullets during operations on President James Garfield (The History of the Year 1883:363). Jesse F. Kester received U.S. Patent 412924 for an electrical metal detector in 1889. Kester claimed his device, “relates to a metal-finder for detecting the presence of metal—such as gold, silver, copper, &c.—and which can be used either for exploring the bottom of streams or for searching the earth, either at the surface or several feet below the same” (U.S. Patent Office 1893). Inventors promoted Watkins’ Electrical Bullet Probe and Metal Detector in 1892 (Snow 1892:267).

In 1925 Gerard Fischer invented a portable metal detector and by the 1930s Fischer’s metal detectors were commercially available and were being used to search for buried treasure. Popular Mechanics Magazine provided schematic diagrams and encouraged collectors to build their own metal detecting machines (Popular Mechanics Magazine 1930:824-826; 1937:161-163). Fischer established the Fisher Research Laboratory, which continued to produce detectors for decades and Fisher-brand detectors remain very popular among relic collectors. By the mid-1930s, metal detectors were used to recover relics from Civil War battlefields (Popular Mechanics Magazine 1935:423, 480; 1939:102). A 1940 magazine provided instructions for making your own “Chilton-type” detector (Fore 1940:133a, 136-137). Metal detectors came into popular use by Civil War relic collectors in the United States following World War II. War surplus mine sweepers were adapted to search for battlefield relics (Fore 1946:214-215). The number of persons who pursued the hobby in the period prior to the 1960s was limited to a few enterprising collectors. Metal detectors reached a wider audience by the late 1940s as more brands entered the market and the prices for detectors became more affordable. A 1947 advertisement in Popular Mechanics magazine touted the new “Goldak Locators”, for discovering buried treasure (The Goldak Co. 1947:276). Subsequent popular brands of detectors included Garrett (introduced in 1964), which offered various technological improvements and refinements over earlier models. By 1967 more than 35 companies were manufacturing metal detectors for consumers, including: Detectron, Fisher, Garrett, Geo-Finder, Goldak, Metrotech, Raytron, and White (Popular Mechanics 1961:52). These transistorized models were smaller and more tailored for treasure hunting than the earlier tube-type models. Goldak claimed its model could locate a silver or gold ring at three inches, medium sized gold or silver coins at eight inches, and “an iron kettle filled with coins or other metal objects at four feet” (Oertle 1963:101).

Garrett developed a Transmitter-Receiver (TR) metal detectors by the early 1970s and Very Low Frequency (VLF) detectors were developed in the late 1970s (Garrett.com 2012). New
generations of improved detectors continued to enter the relic collector market in the 1980s and 1990s with brands, including Nautilus, Minelab and Tesoro joined the market place (Johnson 2008). These newer, high-end models delved deeper and possessed more discrimination features. These new technological features provided relic collectors with enhanced capabilities for discovering deeper artifacts than before, as well as discriminating faint or mixed signals. Battlefields that had been “worked over” previously by relic collectors were once again fertile grounds.

Relic collecting exploded in popularity since the 1960s and the relic collecting community has developed an extensive body of literature, local, state and national clubs and societies, ethical codes of conduct, and diverse opinions on the use of metal detectors in locating historical metal objects on archaeological sites. Various catalogues, price guides, identification guides, books and journals are published in the United States to serve this community. Examples include, Civil War Relic Collector, Warman’s Civil War Collectibles, Civil War Times Illustrated, Blue and Gray Journal, North South Trader’s Civil War, and American Digger. Interest in the Civil War dominates the (metal) relic collector market in America (Fahs and Waugh 2004; Sylvia and O’Donnell 1978; Graff 2006; Lewis 2010; North South-Trader 2010).

By the 1980s archaeologists recognized the need to cooperate with relic collectors as part of an anthropologically-based archaeological approach to battlefields. A landmark study on the subject took place at the Little Bighorn battlefield (Scott and Fox 1987; Scott et al. 1989). In that study, the skills of the veteran metal detectorists wrangled by the archaeologists, carefully mapped each find, interpreted the artifacts patterning, and re-wrote the events in the battle using the controlled archaeological data. The Little Bighorn experiment was perceived by archaeologists as successful and that research model has been emulated on several battlefields in eastern North American over the past few decades, including several projects conducted by the LAMAR Institute (Wood and Wood 1990; Elliott and Dean 2007; Powis 2007; Balicki and Espenshade 2010; Powis et al. 2007, 2011).

Civil War interest in northern Georgia in the 1950s-1970s was dominated by the relic collectors and not by professional archaeologists. Unfortunately, the early history of metal detecting on historic sites in Georgia is poorly documented. Thomas S. Dickey, Sr., was an avid Civil War relic collector active in northern Georgia in the 1950s and 1970s. Dickey and several of his friends, including Beverly DuBose, Jr., Syd Kerksis, and others, were pioneers in the use of metal detectors for finding relics on Georgia’s Civil War battlefields. Dickey collected artillery artifacts at Dug Gap among other places (Dickey’s #51-Dug Gap) (Meier and Dittmar 1979; Civilwarartillery.com 2011; Dickey and George 1993). The exact location of Dickey’s finds at Dug Gap remains undetermined. A portion of Dickey’s collection is housed in the Atlanta History Center, where it may be researched.

Many modern-day Civil War relic collectors use the internet for communicating with other collectors and for sharing their discoveries. The internet is an important source for this unique information, although it varies greatly in its documentation, thoroughness, precision and veracity.
Figure 7. Scaife’s Interpretive Map of the Battle of Rocky Face Ridge and Dug Gap, May 7-12, 1864 (Scaife1993:27, Figure 6).
Relic hunter Bruce Conley wrote of his metal detecting activity circa 2001 at Rocky Face Ridge, “I began detecting beside a ravine and got a loud signal close to a sapling…Confederate North Carolina ‘sunburst’ coat button.” Conley also provided poor quality photographs of three artifacts that he dug from the Rocky Face Ridge area, including two minie balls that had fused in midair, a North Carolina coat button, and a Confederate cast “I” button (South Carolina Treasure and Artifact Association 2010). In 2007 Chris Phillips posted on the same blog, a small collection of bullets and percussion caps that he, “dug in northwest Georgia at the place of the battle of Rocky Face Ridge and the surrounding area.” An online blog for the Antiques Roadshow ACW Finds (2011) includes one contribution from a relic collector in Georgia, who wrote in 2004: “My dad lives on Rocky Face Ridge…..there are still some earthworks behind his house & if you carry a metal detector & sniff around for a bit, you can usually find something interesting. Buttons, bullets, & buckles are the usual fare.” Several excavated relics, attributed to Snake Creek Gap were recently offered for sale, including a State of New York oval belt plate, a gun tool, and uniform insignia (Relicman.com 2011). Examples of collector finds are reproduced in Figures 8 and 9.

Figure 8. Various Artifacts Attributed to Rocky Face Ridge (A. North Carolina Button; B. Union Minie Ball in Wood; C. Artifacts Attributed to Rocky Face Ridge and Surrounding Area (Bruce Conley ca. 2001; mytreasurespot.com 2008; Chris Phillips ca. 2007).

An anonymous relic hunter from Resaca, Georgia, posted this entry in 2010 online at the Hello American Civil War Forum:

I've been recognized several times in American Digger for recovering some really rare relics. Mostly my relic hunting is done here in Resaca GA. but sometimes I find myself around Buzzards Roost, Missionary ridge, Dug Gap, Snake Creek Gap etc. I hunt with a Whites MXT which is mainly used in large fields and when I'm hunting old house sites or campsites I use my Tesoro Silver Sabre Umax. I guess one of my greatest hunts was here in Resaca GA. under an old house place and when I say old I mean old. I bellied around for several hours, with no more space than
one foot between me and the floor of the house. Some of my findings where as followed, a jackknife, change purse, jew's harp, hinged matched safe and several other items (AmericanCivilWarForum.com 2010).

From another online blog, Georgia Outdoor News Forum, Metal Detecting (2010), a relic hunter named Jason from Calhoun, Georgia laments the state of metal detecting affairs on December 30, 2010:

That is [t]he trouble with detecting this day - very few places to go. Back in the mid 70's I was out all the time and had hundreds of acres to detect on in Resaca and Rocky Face, you could get on any school [sic, school] yard or public park and being in Law Enforcement I could get on church playgrounds and stadiums. I still have two drawers and several boxes of stuff I found in the 7 years I did it. One guy I knew crept under the fence at night in the local fairgrounds that had been such since the 30's - man he dug the silver dollars and other silver coins up by the pounds….Now half of the areas I dug civil war stuff in are subdivisions, and those not the owners have died and new owners won't let a soul on it. One of the major reasons people have been restricted it they don't fill up their holes. On some Bowater land in Resaca when I was doing it the ground was so pocked marked by holes it looked like the battle had just been fought.

A legendary gold hoard in a cave on Rocky Face ridge has been alleged but this myth is now debunked. The basis for the legend may be found in Columbus, Georgia newspaper article, which reported on the story on page 2 of its July 31, 1897 edition (Columbus Daily Enquirer 1897:2). The article, entitled, “Rich Find is Reported” stated that the alleged gold was discovered by an African-American named Pete Gilbert, who was opossum hunting on Will Waterhouse’s property near Keith, Georgia. The same story was published in a Chattanooga newspaper on August 8, 1890, although this version has not been researched. From the review of the article it does not appear that the alleged find was in the vicinity of Rocky Face Ridge. Nevertheless, this story continues to fascinate and lure treasure seekers and relic collectors to Rocky Face.

Despite the debunking of the legend, as pertains to Rocky Face Ridge, the story continues to attract treasure seekers. Another anonymous contributor [codename Slingshot] from near Atlanta wrote in 2008 debunking the myth by noting the geographic distance between Keith, Georgia and Rocky Face Ridge: “Most believe Rocky Face is the location of the lost cave. This mountain has been scoured by Civil War relic hunters for the past 50 years looking for relics from the battle that took place there in 1864.” One relic hunter from Biloxi, Mississippi noted in 2008 on a North Georgia Treasure online forum: “20 years ago [1988] I saw the cave with my own eyes it is on Rocky Face. The opening is the size of a basketball. So busy hunting for relics that i didnt hunt it. but i do know where its at. then moved back to Mississippi and then still wonder bout it. learned bout Gold there years later. Today still could go to its burned its image in my brain.”

Another contributor to the treasurenet.com forum wrote in 2007: "William Waterhouse, a young white farmer of Keith, Georgia...claims to have found a cave in the fastness of the mountains.." Ernest Andrews, who wrote "Georgia's Fabulous Treasure Hoards" claims to have found a Waterhouse family who owned a hotel in Cohutta, Georgia, a few miles east of Keith. He guesses that the cave would be located on Rocky Face, based on earlier research. This, by the way, would put it almost exactly in the middle of the old Cherokee gold fields” (Treasurenet.com 2011; Andrews 2011). Rocky Face Ridge, it should be noted, does not lie within any known gold bearing geological formation.
Figure 9. Collector Artifacts Attributed to Snake Creek Gap and Recently Offered for Sale (A. New York Militia Buckle; B. Uniform Shoulder Card; C. Gun Tool (Relicman.com 2011; Jim Stanley & Associates 2011; Horsesoldier.com 2011).
B. FORMAL CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES

Archaeologist Philip Smith (1962:19, 21) examined the rock arrangements on Rocky Face Ridge in 1956, as part of a broader study of aboriginal stone arrangements on mountain tops in piedmont Georgia. He described the stone walls,

The walls commence immediately north of Dug Gap...The main sections of the walls run along the narrow ridge of the mountain, with a short section about half-way down the west side...The walls along the west are not continuous but are broken up by gaps...Because of the amorphous form of some of the intervening stone it is difficult to establish exactly how many wall sections there are, but probably there are seven. Throughout, the walls are composed of medium-sized, casually piled stones with no effort made at layers or tiers. The best preserved section is at the southern end [well to the north of Dug Gap] and the construction becomes smaller and poorer as one goes along. The maximum height is about 3 feet, although in some places it is closer to 1 foot, and the width varies from 6 feet to 2 feet. The stones all seem to have been derived from the immediate vicinity. The total length of walls is approximately 1234 feet, but this figure, it should be remembered, includes several short gaps between walls as well as one large interval of 158 feet separating the northernmost section of the wall from the rest.

For its entire length the walls skirt along the steep precipices which form the west face of the mountain. Towards the central section, however, the wall has been extended to the very edge of the cliff and part of the outcrop and boulder formation seems to be incorporated into the walls....Several hundred feet downhill from the central section of walls, on the west side and in an area of heavy rockfall and outcrops, a short wall 108 feet long was observed. It is composed of large stones and its construction is much cruder than the walls on the crest. It stands about 3 to 4 feet high, and incorporates a number of small boulders and rock outcrops...There were no indications from surface examination of burial or habitation areas, nor of any clearing or area which may have been of particular significance in terms of the wall itself. Likewise, no artifacts were recovered anywhere near the wall.

Smith (1962:19, 21) refused to accept local lore that stated that the walls were Civil War defenses and he concluded that the rock walls on Rocky Face Ridge were likely of aboriginal origin. Smith argued,

Persistent accounts among local residents concerning its use as a defense during the Civil War are not corroborated by historical sources, and a personal examination of its configuration and location makes it difficult to accept as a defensive measure...The unnecessarily rambling nature of these walls makes it very unlikely that they were intended as boundary markers, and likewise it is difficult to imagine them as defensive constructions. The precipice on the west side of the mountain is sufficiently steep that no wall would be necessary to fight off an attack. Any defensive wall should have been built to guard the east side of the ridge, where ascent is much easier, yet such is not the case here; the walls are aligned along the steep west face and give the impression of being definitely tied in with the steep bluffs and immense rock outcrops on that side.

Smith’s study (1962:22) included a sketch map of the rock walls on Rocky Face Ridge, although the map coverage does not extend to the Dug Gap vicinity. From his written description, it appears that Smith’s reconnaissance did not extend south of Dug Gap Road. Smith’s sketch of the stone walls on Rocky Face Mountain is reproduced in Figure 10.
Smith’s grasp of the “historical sources” and the Civil War combat on Rocky Face Ridge and Dug Gap was severely flawed. Military accounts make numerous references to the stone wall defenses on the west side of Rocky Face Ridge and at Dug Gap. Smith’s argument that the stone walls are of aboriginal origin cannot be entirely ruled out and it is possible that the Confederate engineers possibly took advantage of pre-existing rock work in building their defenses. This, however, seems very unlikely. The Union threat to the Confederates was from the west, which negated the need for any defenses on the eastern side of Rocky Face Ridge. That these features
were used for protection by the Confederates is evident, however, from the bullet spatial 
patterning displayed in the archaeological record, as documented in the present study.

Billy Townsend (1973), former historian with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 
recognized the significance of the Dug Gap battlefield. The resource was recorded in the Georgia 
Heritage Trust files at that time.

Lawrence Meier and Edward Dittmar (1979) completed an archaeological survey of portions of 
Researchers (Meier and Dittmar 1979:9; Fearrington 1984:63-71) identified the remains of four 
military breastworks and two rifle pits on Rocky Face Ridge and Dug Gap. Military Work #1, a 
sandstone breastwork, was given the U.S. Forest Service site designation 9-WD-27. This section 
of Confederate defenses was located on Land Lots 308 and 309, 3rd Section, District 12, 
Whitfield County, which was on U.S. Forest Service land in 1984. The field researchers 
identified 820 linear feet of stone breastworks in three sections in this vicinity. They noted, “It is 
a low dry-stone breastwork built apparently to defend the saddle-like low elevation south of Dug 
Mtn. The original alignment has been broken and damaged by recent land use and relic-hunting 
activities. Nowhere does the work exceed three feet in height or ten feet in width in cross- 
section. Its length is difficult to determine exactly without removal of the humus cover, but the 
field team measured 820 linear feet of exposed rock in three segments” (Fearrington 1984:63).

Military Work #2, a sandstone breastwork, was given the U.S. Forest Service site designation 9- 
WD-8 (Meier and Dittmar 1979:21-22). This extensive breastwork is located on land not 
currently owned by the U.S. Forest Service, following a land exchange. It is currently located in 
a military park that is closed to the public. Although Meier and Dittmar and Fearrington discount 
this earthwork as a battlefield site, concluding that it was not constructed by the Confederates 
until after May 8, such judgment may be premature. The battle of Dug Gap on May 8, 1864 was 
not the only Civil War combat event on Rocky Face Ridge. Meier noted that a relic collector 
(Thomas S. Dickey) recovered a 3 inch Hotchkiss shell from this section of breastwork, as well 
as a portion of an artillery ramrod (presumed to be associated with a Confederate artillery battery 
on Rocky Face Ridge). Hotchkiss shells were commonly fired in Rodman guns, so the specimen 
retrieved by Dickey likely was fired by Geary’s artillery battery from May 8-12, 1864 (Taylor 
1864:358).

Military Works #3 is a grouping of three rifle trenches, which are also located north of the 
present study area on privately owned land. The site was recorded as U.S.F.S. Site 9-WD-23. 
These trenches were located on U.S. Forest Service property at the time of Meier and Dittmar’s 
(1979:23) study.

Military Works #4 is a single rifle pit, which is on the crest of a ridge spur, immediately south of 
Military Works #3. Military Works #4 was also recorded as U.S.F.S. Site 9-WD-24. This site is 
also located north of the present study and no longer on U.S. Forest service property (Meier and 
Dittmar 1979:23).

In January, 1983, Forest Service archaeologist Charles Willingham surveyed 772 acres in the 
Armuchee Ranger District and he recorded Forest Service Site GA01108 (Willingham 1984:1).
This site was later recorded in the Georgia Archaeological Site File as 9WD5 (Wynn 1984). Willingham (1984:12-13) provides this description of the Civil War site that he observed in January, 1983:

This is a 525’ long undulating stone wall with two breaks and three rifle pits near the center. The breaks are about 18’ wide, and the rifle pits are about 20’ wide with curving 11’ long sidewalls.

The stones are loosely piled, one to two feet high, on a slight natural break in the western hillslope, where boulder outcrops occurred. The natural boulders were incorporated into the fortifications where feasible. At one place about 50’ long near the middle, the wall is represented only by the natural boulders, with no sign of additional stones being piled on and around them to complete the wall, leaving numerous spaces between the boulders. The overall effect of this relatively low defensive wall is greater when viewed from the downhill (attacking) side, where it appears to be from three to six feet high, and partially guarded by large natural boulders downslope.

The back or uphill side may be higher than is currently visible, having been filled in by slopewash in the 120 years since it was constructed. No test excavations were made behind the wall to evaluate that possibility, in order to avoid stimulating other digging by vandals. The north group of breastworks, above Dug Gap Road, were extensively damaged prior to Meier’s [and Dittmar’s] (1979) survey. He reported several relic hunters had items dug from that area.

This group of fortifications is located 100 yds southwest of the electronic tower atop Dug Mountain, at elevations between 1660’ and 1760’ AMSL. The placement varies from 80 yds downhill from the ridgeline to less than 20 yds, finally crossing over the ridgetop in a shallow saddle near the end. At that point, the wall is very low, and curves gently back to face southward, presumably to protect the defenders’ flanks.

Willingham (1984:12) noted that the northern group of breastworks, which were investigated by Meier and Dittmar (1979), were on a land parcel that was exchanged from the U.S. Forest Service to the Whitfield-Murray Counties Historical Society as a historical park. Willingham (1984:13) marked a “100-150’ wide by 600’ long corridor” as a protected zone around the southern group of breastworks, which were recorded U.S. Forest Service archaeologist Jack Wynn as 9WD5 (Figure 11). Wynn recommended this site eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and it was recommended for avoidance by further land-disturbing activities. It should be noted that both Willingham’s and Wynn’s location map for the stone breastworks at 9WD5 show it too far south of its actual location.

The spatial dimensions of site 9WD5 were substantially expanded as a result of the present battlefield study. The site limits were extended primarily to the north and west. For practical purposes the site boundary ended at Dug Gap Road. This arbitrary boundary for the site reflects the northern and western extent of U.S. Forest Service property.

Approximately 1 mile south of 9WD5, U.S. Forest Service Archaeologist Becky Bruce located a stone construction, which she recorded as site 9WA170 and interpreted as a possible Civil War cannon emplacement (Bruce 1996). Wynn (1980) also investigated several rock shelter sites on Dug Mountain that had been reported by Meier and Dittmar (1979). Wynn and Bruce did not report any Civil War artifacts associated with these.
The eastern slopes of Chestnut Mountain contain several archaeological traces of Civil War entrenchments. These likely are portions of a expansive complex of Union defenses, which are shown in the Civil War Atlas (Plates 57). Construction of these defenses was begun by the 15th Army Corps in May, 1864, which were occupied days before (and possibly during) the battle of Resaca. They may have been augmented by other U.S. Army troops in October, 1864, although no documentation for any trench expansion was located.

A segment of military trench work, west of Chestnut Mountain, was recorded in the archaeological files in 1993 (Evans-Shumate et al. 1993:5; Evans-Shumate 1993:1-2). The site was designated FS Site GA01-265 and state site 9GO170. The Forest Service surveyors identified it as “Civil War Trenches” that were in a disturbed condition and they recommended “Clearance” for the proposed timber harvesting activity. The site was described as follows:
This is a historic entrenchment associated with the Civil War period in this area...It is located along the side of a ridge and on the west side of the 212B Road. The trench has been adversely impacted by road use and repair and is also impacted by an existing log landing. The area is surrounded by a mixed pine/hardwood forest.

No artifacts were visible on the surface, in the trench walls, nor in the surrounding tree root tip-ups. The site lies in an area historically associated with local Civil War battles. Other features of this nature occur around this Chestnut Mountain area.

Both surface and subsurface investigations at this site suggest no evidence of debris or deposits capable of identifying persons, events, or activities of prehistoric or historic significance. Nor is this site capable of yielding information as required under Criterion D of 36 CFR 60. Therefore, this site is recommended for cultural resource clearance and is NOT ELIGIBLE for nomination to the National Register (Evans-Shumate et al. 1993:16).

The site dimensions for site 9GO170 recorded on the site form as180 m by 3 m. The southern end of 9GO170 lies approximately 1.9 km northwest of the northern end of the entrenchment investigated by the 2011 PIT Crew (Evans-Shumate 1993:2).

Other traces of suspected Civil War trenches were recorded at Sites 9GO122, 123 and 124 by Panamerican Consultants during a 1992 cultural resources survey for the USDA Forest Service (Walling 1992; Moore 1992a-c). Site 9GO122 is located east of the PIT Chestnut Mountain study area. This site contains a section of Civil War earthworks approximately 75 m in length by 1 m in width (Walling 1992; Moore 1992a). This suspected Civil War site was investigated by a single shovel test, no artifacts were recovered, but the site was recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP. Site 9GO123 is located east of the PIT Chestnut Mountain study area and south-southwest of 9GO122 (Walling 1992; Moore 1992b). This site contains another section of Civil War earthworks described as 100 m in length and oriented just west of north. Site 9GO124 is located northwest of the PIT Chestnut Mountain study area (Walling 1992; Moore 1992c). This site contains a small section of trench, 4 m by 1 m, and attributed to a saw mill. Walling notes the site’s association with the Civil War and its proximity to previously mapped Civil War entrenchments (Meier 1979).

Schneider (1978) and Willingham (1982) completed separate archaeological surveys for Forest Service roads in the Chestnut Mountain vicinity. No Civil War resources were noted in either of those studies.

The military action in the study vicinity is interpreted by several historical markers. A historical marker commemorates the movement of Geary’s Division to Dug Gap:

May 8, 1864, Brig. Gen. J.W. Geary, with Buschbeck’s & Candy’s brigades 2d div., A.C., marched on this road from Near Gordon’s Springs. Turning E. here (near Whitfield – Walker County line), Geary’s troops moved to Dug Gap in Rocky Face Ridge 5 miles from this points.

This move was made to outflank Johnston’s army at Dalton by seizing Dug Gap & also to give support to McPherson’s Army of the Tennessee which moved via Ship’s Gap & Villanow to Snake Creek Gap. Geary failed to take Dug Gap; McPherson’s occupation of Snake Creek Gap led to the evacuation of Dalton by Johnston’s forces (Georgia Department of Natural Resources 2001).
One historical marker commemorates Dug Gap:

Dug Gap was so named because a pioneer road, cut out of the hillside, passed through a cleft in Rocky Face Ridge at this point.

The road led east to Dalton and the Western and Atlantic Railroad, important military objectives. Federals sought in February and again in May, 1864, to pass through the gap but were repulsed.

May 8, 1864 as the Atlanta Campaign began, Geary’s Division of the Federal Twentieth Corps attacked Dug Gap, but was driven back after a brisk action. Direct attacks on Dalton failing, Sherman flanked toward Resaca through the broken, wooded area to the west (Georgia Historical Commission 1959).

Another more recent historical marker also commemorates Dug Gap:

An excavation at the summit of Rocky Face Ridge on the direct route between Dalton and LaFayette.

This gap was guarded by Confederate forces when Dalton was occupied after the retreat from Missionary Ridge in Nov. 1863.

Federal forces made two efforts to seize the gap: Feb. 25 and May 8, 1864. The latter attempt was made by Buschbeck’s and Candy’s brigades of Geary’s (2d) div., 20th A.C. These troops scaled the W. scarp of the ridge, but failed to dislodge the defenders: 1st and 2d Arkansas reg’ts., under Col. J. A. Williamson, and Grigsby’s brigade of Wheeler’s cav., supported by Cleburne’s div. of Hardee’s Corps (Georgia Department of Natural Resources 1986).

Another historical marker commemorates the ascent to Dug Gap:

1.5 Mi. W. this road ascends to and crosses the summit of Rocky Face ridge -- a direct route between Dalton and LaFayette.

May 7, 1864. Grigsby’s brigade (Wheeler’s Cav.), after retreating from Tunnel Hill to Mill Creek Cap, camped on this road at foot of the ridge - all except Dortch’s battalion, which ascended to the gap, joining the infantry post of Williamson’s Arkansans.

Dortch’s arrival there, being reported to h’dq’rs at Dalton, prompted a peremptory order to Grigsby to send cavalry scouts across the ridge. The 9th Ky., on reaching Dogwood Valley, early the 8th, found the Federals advancing (Georgia Department of Natural Resources 1989).

Another historical marker describes the battle of Dug Gap:

May 8, 1864. Maj. Gen. J.W. Geary, with Buschbeck’s & Candy’s brigades of the 2d div., 20th A.C., moving from near Gordon’s Springs, reached this, the Babb Settlement, at 3 p.m.

Planting McGill’s Penna. Battery (3 inch Rodman guns) near Joel Babb’s house, the Confederate position at Dug Gap in Rocky Face Ridge was shelled. This was followed by a concerted assault up the steep scarp by Buschbeck’s brigade on the right, Candy’s on the left.

Repeated attempts by the Federals to seize the gap ended in failure, but under cover of this engagement, McPherson’s troops occupied Snake Creek Gap, 6 mi. S.W. (Georgia Historical Commission 1954a).
An adjacent historical marker notes the following:

Ante-bellum domain of Joel Babb (1809~1882) - on Mill Cr., foot of Rocky Face at Dug Gap.

May 8, 1864. 1 A. M.: Col. W.C.P. Breckinridge’s 9th Ky., Grigsby’s brigade, Wheeler’s cav., descended from Dug Gap & patrolled the roads N. & W. to ascertain if any Federals were there. By 1:30 P. M. Breckinridge found Dogwood Valley swarming with Federals, a brigade of which, in support of Kilpatrick’s cav., was enroute S. to Villanow. Later, the 9th Ky., confronted by 2 brigades, Geary’s div., 20th A. C., moving E., was forced to retreat to Dug Gap. Geary, reaching this vicinity at 3 p. m., deployed his 2 brigades for the storming of Dug Gap (Georgia Historical Commission 1954b).
V. Rocky Face and Dug Gap (9WD5)

Civil War combat on Rocky Face Ridge is referenced in the 19th century and early 20th century military literature by the following place names: Babb’s Gap, Dug Gap, Buzzard’s Roost, Mill Creek Gap, Rocky Face Mountain and Rocky Face Ridge. Rocky Face Ridge is many respects a natural fortification, which Major General Joseph Johnston used to great advantage against Major General Sherman prior to the battle of Resaca. Rocky Face Ridge extends for several miles above and below Mill Creek and Dug Gaps. Except for these two gaps, Rocky Face Ridge is largely unbroken and its steep slopes are formidable. Mill Creek Gap is approximately 6.8 kilometers north of Dug Gap, although Mill Creek follows the western flank of Rocky Face Ridge and it flows near Dug Gap. Thus, when writers refer to action at Mill Creek, often it is difficult to distinguish whether they are referring to action at Mill Creek Gap or at some point along the Mill Creek valley. References to action at Rocky Face Ridge, or Rocky Face Mountain, may include specific action in the vicinity of Dug Gap, although this is often unclear in the writings. Buzzard’s Roost is a prominent escarpment, north of Mill Creek Gap where other important military action occurred.

Dug Gap, also known as Babb’s Gap, is the lower east-west passage across Rocky Face Ridge in Whitfield County, Georgia. The archaeological remains in this area are recorded as 9WD5. It was the scene of hostilities on two occasions in the American Civil War and the primary focal point of the present study. The first combat in Dug Gap was on February 25 and 26, 1864. This action was part of the first Battle of Dalton, It was known also as the battle of Crow Valley. Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston summarized the February engagement in October, 1864,

The force detached was probably exaggerated to Major General Thomas, for on the 23[rd] the Federal army advanced to Ringgold, on the 24th drove in our outposts, and skirmished on the 25th at Mill Creek Gap and Crow Valley, east of Rocky Face Mountain. We were successful at both places. At the latter, Cayton’s brigade, after a sharp action of half an hour, defeated double its number. At night it was reported that a United States brigade was occupying Dug Gap, from which it had driven our troops. Granbury’s Texas brigade, returning from Mississippi, had just arrived. It was ordered to march to the foot of the mountain immediately, and to retake the gap at sunrise the next morning, which was done. In the night of the 26th the enemy retired (Macon Telegraph 1865:1).

The February engagement on Rocky Face Ridge pitted approximately 17 Union brigades against 18 Confederate brigades. This was the only action on Rocky Face Ridge until the first week of May, 1864 (Brown 1890:22; Calhoun 1900:37). A Confederate guard was posted in Dug Gap on February 25 (Brown 1890:22). The following day (February 26, 1864) Union Colonel Thomas J. Harrison’s 29th Indiana Mounted Infantry stormed Dug Gap, south of Mill Creek Gap. Union Generals Baird and Crufts moved their commands through the gap in Rocky Face range, driving the Confederates into the Rocky Face valley. Captain Simonson’s 3rd Indiana Artillery established his battery at the top of a hill and carried on a fierce artillery duel with the Confederates that lasted the remainder of the day (Illustrated New Age 1864a:2). The Cincinnati newspaper reported estimated the Union losses from the entire reconnaissance effort to be less than 300 and “that of the rebels is greater”. The next day Brigadier General Hiram B. Granbury’s Texas brigade, “made an impetuous charge”, and drove the Union troops out of Dug Gap (Heidler et al. 2002:551; Brown 1890:22).
Rocky Face Ridge once again was an objective of Major General Sherman when he began his campaign to Atlanta in May, 1864. The 4th, 14th and 20th Army Corps were given this task. General John Newton, who commanded the 2nd Division, 4th Army Corps, was issued orders on May 7 to, “threaten Buzzard Roost Pass to-morrow and then attempt to gain possession of part of Rocky Face Ridge. You will endeavor to gain possession of the northern end of said ridge with one regiment, and push it along to capture the enemy’s signal station thereon. You will move a brigade as a support to this regiment, or move a brigade to the north end of the ridge, and send up a regiment from it. A guide will be furnish[ed] to you from these headquarters. Move at 6 a. m. to-morrow” (ehistory.com 2011). General Newton would achieve his objective on May 10th but not without a high price in Union casualties. That particular combat was located several kilometers north of the present study.

The premiere military contest at Dug Gap came on May 8, 1864 when two brigades of Union troops under commanded of Brigadier General John W. Geary assaulted the Confederate stronghold at Dug Gap. The U.S. troops were repulsed and the battle was scored as a Confederate victory. Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston summarized the May 8th engagement, “On the 8th, at 4 P.M., a division of Hooker’s corps assaulted Dug Gap, which was held bravely by two regiments of Reynolds’ Arkansas brigade and Grigsby’s brigade of Kentucky cavalry, fighting on foot, until the arrival of Lieut. Gen. Hardee with Granbury’s brigade, when the enemy was put to flight. On the 9th five assaults were made on Lieut. Gen. Hood’s troops on Rocky Face Mountain. All were repulsed” (Macon Telegraph 1865:1).

The following day (May 9) the action morphed to an artillery duel with Confederate artillery firing from Dug Gap. Other minor action may have taken place at Dug Gap in the days, weeks and months after the May 1864 battle, but these were of little consequence. Other action took place on the northern portion of Rocky Face Ridge from May 8-11 but that action was beyond the present U.S.F.S. property and outside of the area of consideration for this study.

Another Confederate perspective of the engagement was provided by an anonymous author identified only as “P”, who wrote from Dalton on May 9th,

I witnessed a battle at the Dug Road Gap, near Jerry Ray’s mill. The fight commenced at 2 o’clock P.M. We had at the commencement 200 Arkansas infantry troops, 200 Georgia and Mississippi infantry, and 400 Kentucky cavalry, who dismounted and fought as infantry, who fought Hooker’s corps 4000 or 5000 strong, until Cleburne’s division marched 6 or 7 miles to reinforce them. Our loss is said to be 3 men killed and 28 wounded. We took 7 prisoners besides some wounded Yankees taken off the field this morning. The mountain side is said to be strewed with dead Yankees. One person said it appeared to him that every bullet our men shot killed a Yankee (Macon Telegraph 1864a:2).

A. UNION ACCOUNTS

The Union troops engaged in battle at Dug Gap were part of Brigadier John W. Geary’s 2nd Division of Major General Joseph Hooker’s 20th Corps. General Geary’s 2nd Division at the time of the battle consisted of 330 officers and 6,713 enlisted men (of which 4,363 were present in the general area of the battle). Only portions of the 1st and 2nd Brigades participated in the action. Major General Sherman had given orders for Brigadier General Geary’s 2nd Division to mount a
feinting maneuver at Dug Gap to distract the Confederates from learning of Major General McPherson’s (15th Corps) movements towards Snake Creek Gap. As General Geary noted in his orders, posted by his Assistant Adjutant General on May 9, the feint was successful. This diversion came at substantial cost to the U.S. troops in Geary’s division, however, as the Confederates were well positioned and managed to hold that position with relatively few casualties. Geary received these orders from Lieutenant Colonel and Assistant Adjutant-General H.W. Perkins shortly after 10:30 a.m. on May 8, 1864, “I am directed by the major-general commanding the corps to instruct you to march without delay to seize the gap in the Rocky Face Ridge, called Babb’s, and to establish yourself strongly at that post. Take your two brigades and send word as soon as you are in position. Take no wagons, and but few ambulances. Avoid a fight if you have to make it at disadvantage. Lieutenant Colonel Asmussen will accompany you” (ehistory.com 2011).

At 7:20 p.m. on May 8, Major General Hooker reported to Chief of Staff General Whipple, “Geary reached Mill Gap 3 p.m. Formed infantry and artillery to attack; approaches to gap covered with thick woods; had met with few cavalry squads. Hope to be able to report in an hour that the ridge was taken” (ehistory.com 2011). At 8:15 p.m. on May 8, Brigadier General Geary reported from his position at “Babb’s House” to Lieutenant Colonel H.W. Perkins, “I have the honor to inform you that my command is in camp opposite the mouth of the gap out of shelling distance. We gained the second ridge of the mountain summit by assault four times, but had to leave it before superior numbers and galling fire. I withdrew my troops at dark under protection of heavy fire from my artillery. We retired slowly and in good order. Surgeon Ball informed me that our loss will not exceed 150. My Third Brigade has reported. Will send details as soon as possible” (Ehistory.com 2011).

General Geary again reported to Lieutenant Colonel Perkins on May 9, 1864,

COLOREL: I have the honor to inform you that the First and Second Brigades and the two batteries of my command marched at 11:15 a.m. yesterday, pursuant to orders, from Thornton’s farm, on the Rome road, to this point. The Third Brigade has been detailed to support General Kilpatrick’s cavalry in a movement toward Villanow. My lines were advanced from the base of Rocky Face Ridge, up the precipitous mountain side, at 3 o’clock, and found the enemy in force, afterward re-inforced, posted behind breast-works on the summit, to the right and left of Dug Gap, which we attempted to force. We reserved our fire until near the enemy’s lines, and during the action made five assaults, portions of the line gaining the second ridge four times, but were forced back by superiority of numbers, several of the men being thrown over the precipice. The gap was protected by abatis some distance down the sides of the mountain. The enemy could not be flanked in this vicinity, owing to the ridge being protected by high perpendicular palisades, and my force was too small to detach a portion to attempt a flank movement at a distance. In the evening I learned that General McPherson had succeeded in passing through Snake [Creek] Gap to the south of us, and deeming further efforts involving loss of life unnecessary, at 8 o’clock, after five hours fighting, I retired my command slowly and in good order, under protection of a picket-line, and a warm fire from one of my batteries, preventing the enemy from following. We encamped below, out of range of artillery (ehistory.com 2011).

Sergeant Charles McKay, Company C, 154th New York Infantry, recalled how, “Gen. Geary then rode out in front and made us a little speech. He said that he wanted us to take possession of the mountain; that it was occupied by a couple of regiments of Arkansas cavalry, and closed by saying: ‘If you take the hill it will be a feather in your cap’” (Dunkelman and Winey 1981:103;
NPS 2011). General Geary’s formal announcement to his troops was made by Assistant Adjutant-General Thomas H. Elliott at 2nd Division headquarters at Mill Creek, Georgia. It stated,

The general commanding division takes pleasure in announcing his appreciation of the gallant conduct of the troops of this command in their assault upon Rocky Face Ridge yesterday, in execution of peremptory orders to attempt to take the gap leading through it. The troops of the division, by their exhibition of valor in assaulting the almost impregnable position of the enemy, sustained its proud prestige. Night approaching, and the mountain offering no shelter for the troops, and our engagement of the enemy having diverted his attention from General McPherson’s advance and enabled him to pass through Snake [Creek] Gap south of us, you were withdrawn to encamp. You have accomplished an object of great bearing upon the success of the present movements. Officers will, without delay, get their commands in complete condition for further progress of the campaign, in prospect of which there exists the conviction in the minds of all that the soldiers of this division will, as heretofore, individualize it in deeds of prowess (ehistory.com 2011).

Colonel Adolphus Buschbeck filed his report on the 2nd Brigade’s action at Dug Gap (ehistory.com 2011):

May 8, broke camp at about 11 a. m., and, pursuant to orders, moved in the direction of Mill Creek Gap, Ga., a pass in the Chattooga Mountain. The Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers being on picket, received orders to follow the division. The brigade moved about a mile in column, the One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers as advanced guard, when, coming to a fork in the road, the One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers and Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers moved on the road to the left and the One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, and Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, taking the road to the right, each column throwing out skirmishers well in advance, proceeded about three-quarters of a mile to a place where the roads formed a junction near the open ground, across which the road runs leading to the gap. At this point they were formed in line of battle in the following order: One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers on the right, Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers on the left, Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers and One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers on the right and left center, the One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers deployed as skirmishers, covering the front of the brigade, the First Brigade following at supporting distance. The line then advanced in the direction of the gap (the Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers moving on the roads a cheval) over very difficult ground, much obstructed by fences, a heavy underbrush, and the creek running at the base of the mountain. The ascent of the mountain was found very steep and arduous, requiring frequent halts to rest the men during the advance. The skirmish line of the One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers was strengthened by detachments from each regiment. The skirmishers were engaged in a desultory fire soon after beginning the assault, the enemy retiring until the line had reached to within 300 or 400 yards of the palisades of rock which form the ridge. Here the fire became general, engaging the whole line, the troops steadily advancing until the nature of the ground affording superior facilities for the ascent upon the extreme of the line the regiments diverged slightly to the right and left. The One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers and One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers shortly after charged up the palisades and succeeded in planting their colors on the crest of the mountain; but few only could climb at a time, and the enemy, massing their force at the several points of attack, soon dislodged the brave heroes who had actually gained the very summit. The side of the mountain being so precipitous it was impossible to reform there, and the One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, and the Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers were obliged to retire some distance from the ground held by them previous to the charge. The ground occupied by the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers being better adapted for reforming, this regiment fell back about 100 paces. After
reforming, the One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, and Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers were moved to the support of the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers; the One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers formed line to the left of that position. The Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers having reported, was assigned a position in the rear of the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers. At this time orders were received to advance again, and, if possible, dislodge the enemy. For this purpose four companies of the Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers were thrown to the left of the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers to extend its line. The nature of the ground, as before, prevented much regularity of movements, but the officers and men rushed forward impetuously, determined to carry the heights, and so far succeeded that the greater part of the advance gained the crest, but the enemy having every advantage of position poured in a fire so destructive that after a brief struggle the line was again forced back to its last position. Here the several regiments held the ground, keeping up an irregular fire until about 7 o'clock, when, in obedience to orders received from the division commander, the several regiments retired to the base of the mountain. During the action six regiments of the brigade only were engaged, the One hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers having been detached two days previously as guard for the train. I cannot too highly recommend to you the heroic behavior of Lieutenant Colonel A. H. Jackson, One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, who, although opposed by an overwhelming force of the enemy, held his position with firmness. Lieutenant Colonel E. Fourat's (Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers) coolness and bravery inspired the officers and men of his regiment to noble deeds. Colonel Lockman, Lieutenant-Colonel Allen, and Major Cresson did honor to their country. They were always to be found where the engagement was the hottest. Captain Davis, of your staff, did handsomely at the head of the re-enforcements he brought to my right. Cols. P. H. Jones and G. W. Mindil, although unwell, were with their commands and deserve great praise. High praise also is due to the officers of my staff-Captain C. C. Brown, acting assistant adjutant-general; Captain Courtois, provost-marshal; Lieutenant T. H. Lee, acting aide-de-camp, and Lieutenant J. L. Harding, acting assistant inspector-general-in conveying my orders promptly to the very front of the skirmish line and exposing themselves regardless of danger to the fire of the enemy. It is with deep regret that I announce the death of Captain Henry C. Bartlett and Lieutenant Joseph L. Miller, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers. They were killed while gallantly leading their men in the last assault. Captain Edwin Forrest, One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, is reported fatally wounded. Captain James R. Sanford, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, was severely wounded and has since had a leg amputated. All were officers of gallantry and merit, whose loss will by deeply felt in their several commands. Colonel P. H. Jones and Captain C. P. Vedder, One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers; Lieutenant Moses Baldwin, One hundred and ninth New York Volunteers, and Lieutenant Sidney R. Smith, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, were slightly wounded, but I trust will soon be able to rejoin their commands. The casualties of regiments engaged are as follows: Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1 enlisted man killed and 5 enlisted men wounded; Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1 enlisted man killed, 30 enlisted men wounded, and 10 enlisted men missing; One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, 1 commissioned officer and 12 enlisted men wounded, and 1 enlisted man missing; One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, 11 enlisted men killed, 1 commissioned officer and 23 enlisted men wounded; One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, 8 enlisted men killed, 2 commissioned officers and 41 enlisted men wounded, and 7 enlisted men missing; Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, 2 commissioned officers killed, 2 commissioned officers and 25 enlisted men wounded, and 3 enlisted men missing; total, 2 officers and 25 enlisted men killed, 6 officers and 136 enlisted men wounded, 21 enlisted men missing.

Colonel Ario Pardee, Jr., filed a report of the action of the 147th Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteer Infantry of the regiment’s involvement at Rocky Face Ridge from May 8-12, 1864, which stated,

In the action of Mill Creek Gap Sunday, May 8, 1864, the regiment was detailed to support McGill's (Pennsylvania) battery, and formed part of the command detached from the First Brigade,
under Colonel John H. Patrick, Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry. Its first position was in rear of the battery when posted on the rise of ground north and between the two branches of Mill Creek. When the battery took position at the base of Mill Creek ridge two companies, A and F, under command of Captain Jacob P. Kreider, were placed on the left of the battery as skirmishers, extending to the left and rear of the field hospital, facing toward the road leading to Buzzard Roost. The remainder of the regiment was held as a support for the bakery. When the troops were being withdrawn from the gap Geary, along Mill Creek, with the main reserve of the regiment near the principal ford, for the purpose of covering the crossing of the troops, where we remained until the evening of May 9, when we were relieved by Lieutenant- Colonel Randall, One hundred and forty- ninth New York Volunteers, and joined the brigade. There were no casualties in the regiment. At 10 p. m. May 9, orders were received to prepare for an attack, and the regiment was placed under arms and marched to a position on the left of the road leading from Mill Creek Gap to Snake Creek Gap, having on its left the One hundred and second New York Volunteers and on its right the Seventy- eighth New York Volunteers, being temporarily separated from the brigade, where a line of breast- works was thrown up. May 10 and 11 was spent in the above position. At 7 a.m. May 12 the regiment took up the line of march, passing through Snake Creek Gap to Sugar Valley, distant about seven miles from Resaca.

Colonel Pardee included a list of casualties with his report, which included: “1 officer and 16 men killed, 8 officers and 173 men wounded, and 1 man missing; total, 19” (ehistory.com 2011).

Union General J.D. Cox wrote of Geary’s attempted assault at Dug Gap,

Geary’s division of the Twentieth Corps made a strong effort to carry the summit of Rocky Face at Dug Gap, but were foiled by the same physical difficulties which baffled all other attempts along this palisaded ridge. The skirmishers advanced, scrambling over the rocks and through the undergrowth, till, already blown and nearly exhausted, they found themselves facing a perpendicular wall with only cliffs and crevices leading up through it, the narrow roadway which had been their guide being strongly held by the enemy and intrenched. A gallant effort was made to reach the crest, but the smaller force of Confederates was led by General Hardee in person, and held their natural fortress (Brown 1890:28).

The engagement at Dug Gap lasted six hours. It consisted of four charges by the Union troops up the steep slope of Rocky Face Ridge. The engagement ended at twilight and the Union troops retreated to make camp at the foot of Rocky Face Ridge. There most of them remained until May 11 or 12, when they marched to Snake Creek Gap.

General Geary wrote to his wife on the day after the battle of Dug Gap (Blair and Wiley 1995:172). This personal letter contains few details of the engagement.

General Thomas estimated that three officers and 46 enlisted U.S. soldiers were killed in the assault of May 8. His estimate is low, however, when compared with the casualty figures presented by the regiments involved in the engagement. For example, the 28th Pennsylvania alone had 43 soldiers killed, wounded or missing; the 29th Ohio had 28 soldiers killed; the 134th New York lost one officer and 11 enlisted killed, the 154th New York had 8 men killed, and the 33rd New Jersey lost two officers and four enlisted men.

Surgeon H. Earnest Goodman, Surgeon in Chief for Geary’s 2nd Division, reported on September 22, 1864 that a field hospital was established, “half a mile from foot of Taylor’s Ridge and one mile from the enemy”. There the surgeons performed 11 amputations and seven resections. Surgeon Goodman noted the division hospital received 184 wounded and of these, seven died
during the night and one died in transit. The wounded were removed the next day (May 9) to a hospital in Ringgold, Georgia (OR Vol 38:148-149). Surgeon Goodman also made brief mention of the action at Dug Gap noting, “Engagement lasted six hours. Made four charges up the ridge over large rocks and stones; enemy intrenched” (OR Vol 38:148-149).

Brown (1901:138) noted in his biography of Major Joseph General Hooker: “When the expedition against Atlanta was planned, General Hooker was retained as commander of the 20th corps, and he fought at Snake Creek Gap, May 8, 1864, Rocky-face Mountain, May 9, 1864, Resaca, May 13, 1864, Dallas, May 27-28, and Peach Tree Creek. July 20, 1864. At Snake Creek Gap the 20th corps, under the personal direction of General Hooker, carried by storm the two Confederate redoubts.”

Major General George H. Thomas (1866:315-317) reported that McGill’s Pennsylvania battery had been, “placed in the field near Babb’s house, from which they could reach the crest with their fire”, but that later the artillery battery, “crossed the creek near Babb’s house, and taken position on a cleared knoll at the base of the ridge”, and later, “Two sections of McGill’s battery were brought across Mill creek at Hall’s mill, and from a position at the foot of the ridge, on the left of the road, they kept up a continuous fire on the enemy” Lieutenant James D. McGill commanded [Knap’s] Battery E of the Pennsylvania Light Artillery in the Atlanta Campaign (Bates 1871). McGill’s battery was armed with three or more 3-inch rifled [Rodman] guns. These may be similar (or identical) to those shown in the 1862 photograph of the Battery, which was taken at Antietam in September, 1862 (Figure 12). No losses were reported by Battery E as a result of the action at Mill Creek Gap. The 5th Ohio Infantry, 66th Ohio Infantry, and 147th Pennsylvania Infantry regiments were, “left to guard the artillery” at Babb’s house (Thomas 1866:316).

![Figure 12. Knap's Battery E, Pennsylvania Light Artillery at Antietam in 1862.](image)

B. 1ST BRIGADE, 2ND DIVISION, 20TH ARMY CORPS

Colonel Charles Candy, commanding Thomas’ 1st Brigade was positioned on the Union left. The 1st Brigade was composed of the 5th, 7th, 29th, and 66th Ohio Infantry regiments and the 28th and 147th Pennsylvania Infantry regiments. Colonel Candy filed his report on May 11th of the action of the 1st Brigade at Dug Gap on May 8th:
May 8, broke camp at Nuckles' house about 9 a.m. and marched for this point (Mill Creek Gap), arriving about 2 p.m. was ordered to form line in rear of Second Brigade, and to support them in the taking of the gap. On arriving at the foot of Chattoogata Mountain (opposite Mill Creek Gap), the Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteers was held in reserve by the general commanding division, the Twenty-ninth Ohio Volunteers, with the Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers, was ordered forward to assist the Second Brigade in the assault on the gap; the Fifth and Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteers, with the One hundred and forty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, was held as a support to the artillery and to prevent any flank or rear attack of the enemy on it. The orders given to the Twenty-ninth Ohio and Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers were to take the gap, and on reaching the summit to halt. The regiments went at the work bravely, and ascended the mountain to within thirty yards of its summit, but to arriving at that point found it so naturally defended, in addition to obstructions placed by the enemy, as it would be an impossibility to proceed any farther. They held their ground bravely, losing heavily in both officers and men (recapitulation of casualties is herewith annexed), until recalled by the general, it being nearly dark. Before being recalled the Fifth, Seventh, and Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteers were ordered to form in rear of the advance to protect the withdrawal of the advance regiments, with ordered, as soon as all had passed, for them to fall back slowly and prevent the enemy from following. The assault of the Twenty-ninth Ohio and Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers on the gap, led by their gallant officers, was spirited and with a determination to take it, if possible, but from its natural defenses it was found impossible. Both regiments lost heavily in officers and men, especially the Twenty-ninth Ohio. The gallantry and bravery of Colonel William T. Fitch, Lieutenant Colonel Edward Hayes, and Adjt. James Fitzpatrick, Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers, cannot be passed over without especial mention. They all received severe wounds while leading their gallant and brave men forward. In addition to the foregoing, thanks are due to the commander of the Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers, Lieutenant Colonel John Flynn, and to his officers for the prompt manner all orders were executed, and for the spirited manner his regiment was handled (ehistory.com 2011).

Colonel Candy reported on the movements of the 1st Brigade from May 9-12: “On the night of the 9th instant, about 9 p.m., received instructions to form the brigade on the rising ground and build intrenchments, which was done, occupying the entire night. Remained in that position until the 12th instant. May 12, marched from Mill Creek Gap, Ga., to east end of Snake Creek Gap, distance about ten miles” (ehistory.com 2011). Colonel Candy’s report of casualties in the 1st Brigade were reported and are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Colonel Candy’s Casualty Report, 1st Brigade.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regiments</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Severely Wounded</th>
<th>Slightly Wounded</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th Ohio Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th Ohio Volunteers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colonel Chas Candy, Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteers, Commanding Brigade

The 29th Ohio Infantry Regiment participated in and suffered major casualties in the assault on Dug Gap in May, 1864. They included eight non-commissioned officers and 20 private soldiers killed. SeCheverell (1883:91) noted that the regiment’s losses were, “more than double that of any other regiment engaged”. He estimated the total casualties of the 29th Ohio to be 26 killed, 67 wounded, and one captured. Captain Myron T. Wright reported on the action of the 29th Ohio Infantry from May 8-12, 1864:

I have the honor to report that the Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Veteran Volunteer Infantry occupied the extreme left of our battle line at Mill Creek Ga., in the action of the 8th day of May, 1864, at the foot of the mountain. Our right rested on the road leading up the hill; arrived at point nearest the enemy's line, our left was swung to the right so that our entire line rested parallel to and at the road, our left not more than 120 yards from the top of the hill. We could have held our position if supplies of ammunition could have reached us, but after stripping the cartridges from the dead and wounded, and exhausting them we were ordered to fall back. I immediately deployed a line of skirmishers, and directed the killed and wounded to be moved off the field. The ammunition of the skirmishers being entirely expended the enemy became more bold. Their fire being directed on those engaged in carrying off the killed and wounded, obliged us to abandon some of our dead; the wounded were all brought off. After leaving the field the Twenty-ninth joined the brigade on the road a half mile south of the hospital; remained until 11 a.m. of the 9th; moved 500 paces south, constructed breast-works, and remained in this position until 7 a.m. of the 12th (ehistory.com 2011).


Newcomb, Company I, died at Ringold, Georgia, “of wounds received at Dug Gap, Georgia, May 15, 1864”. Private George F. Braggington, Company G, died of wounds he received at Dug Gap on May 8, 1864 (SeCheverell 1883:218, 224, 270).


Adjudant James B. Storer, 29th Ohio Volunteers, aged 25 years, received a gunshot fracture of the spinous process of the fifth dorsal vertebra at Buzzard Roost, Georgia, on May 8th, 1864. He was treated in the field hospital until the 12th, when he entered the Officer’s Hospital at Nashville. On May 28th, 1864, the ball was extracted. The patient was discharged from service on November 30th, 1864. The case is reported by Surgeon J. E. Herbst, U. S. V. On November 24th, 1866, Pension Examiner W. Bowen reported that the pensioner had paralysis of the right lower limb, and partial loss of power of the left, also incontinence of the urine and faeces. His disability is rated total and probably permanent (United States Surgeon General’s Office 1870).

The 28th Pennsylvania Infantry participated in the second wave of assault up Rocky Face Ridge at Dug Gap. Colonel John Flynn stated in his September 8, 1864 report, “May 8, marched to Mill Creek Gap. At this place, called variously by the names of Dug Gap, Rocky Face Ridge, &c., the regiment encountered the enemy. A fierce and obstinate engagement ensued, beginning at near 2 o’clock and ending with the twilight, in which the regiment sustained a loss of “43 in killed, wounded, and missing” (ehistory.com 2011). Major Fitzpatrick, 28th Pennsylvania Infantry, was wounded “by three bullets passing through both legs” in the May 8 battle (Thomas 1866:317). Colonel Flynn further noted, “We retired to a position covering the gap and near the battle-ground, which we occupied until May 12, when we moved to the right, passing through Snake Gap without incident, a distance of four miles, and built breast-works on an eminence commanding the road leading from Resaca to Rome, Ga.” (ehistory.com 2011).

The 5th Ohio, 66th Ohio, and 147th Pennsylvania infantries were posted as guards for the artillery in the battle of Dug Gap (ehistory.com 2011). The 7th Ohio Infantry, part of the Candy’s 1st Brigade, 2nd Division, 20th Army Corps, was held in reserve in the May engagement at Dug Gap.
and Rocky Face Ridge (Wilson 1907). Colonel John H. Patrick, commanding the 5th Ohio Infantry, filed this report of the regiment’s action from May 8-12:

On arriving at Mill Creek, Ga., the Fifth Ohio Veteran Volunteer Infantry was ordered to support a piece of artillery of McGill's battery on the road running east, remaining perhaps one hour when ordered in conjunction with Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteers and One hundred and forty-seven Pennsylvania Volunteers, to support two batteries at the base of Rocky Face Ridge. At 4.30 p.m. the regiment was ordered to proceed up the mountain and relieve the Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry (by order of Colonel Candy). The knapsacks of the men were left under guard at the base of the mountain and the regiment ascended the mountain. On our way up the mountain an order was received from Colonel Candy, through Lieutenant Hedges, of the pioneer corps, that the Fifth Ohio Veteran Volunteer Infantry would relieve the Twenty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, who were engaged with the enemy near the crest of the mountain. General Geary gave orders to the commanding officer of the regiment to instruct Colonel Candy that the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry should be placed in position to cover the retreat down the mountain, which would take place after dark. Orders position in line of a ridge on the right of the road (with Company A deployed as skirmishers), with its right thrown back, the left resting on the road. This being done, Companies I and K were thrown forward fifty yards on the left of the road. We remained in this position until all the troops on the mountain had fallen aback, when the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry was ordered to retire, leaving a line of skirmishers in charge of Lieutenant Plaisted instructed to fight our way down the mountain if attacked. We retired in good order without firing, arriving at the point from which the fight began at about 10 p.m. Four men of Company A, who were deployed as skirmishers, were missing, and have not been heard from, supposed marching. Moved with the brigade to the east end of Snake [Creek] Gap and went into camp for the night (ehistory.com 2011).

Captain Robert Kirkup, 5th Ohio Infantry, filed this report in September of the regiment’s action at Rocky Face Ridge from May 8-12:

May 11 [sic, May 8], on arriving at Mill Creek, Ga., the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry was ordered to support a piece of artillery of McGill's battery on the road running east, remaining perhaps one hour, when ordered, in conjunction with Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry and One hundred and forty-seven Pennsylvania Volunteers, to support two batteries at the base of Rocky Face Ridge. At 4.30 p.m. the regiment was ordered to proceed up the mountain and relieve the Sixty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry. By order of Colonel Candy the knapsacks of the men were left under guard at the base of the mountain, and the regiment ascended the mountain. On our way up an order was received from Colonel Candy, through Lieutenant Hedges, of the pioneer corps, that the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry would relieve the Twenty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, who were engaged with the enemy near the crest of the mountain. General Geary gave orders to the commanding officer of the regiment to instruct Colonel Candy that the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry should be placed in position to cover the retreat down the mountain, which would take place after dark. Orders were then received from Colonel Candy to place the regiment in position in line of a ridge on the right of the road, with Company A deployed as skirmishers, with its right thrown back, the left resting on the road. This being done, Companies I and K were thrown forward fifty yards on the left of the road. We remained in this position until all the troops on the mountain had fallen back, when the Fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry was ordered to retire, leaving a line of skirmishers in charge of Lieutenant Plaisted, instructed to fight our way down the mountain if attacked. We retired in good order without firing; arrived at the point from which the fight began at about 10 a.m. Four men of Company A, who were deployed as skirmishers, were missing, and have not been heard from, supposed to have been captured. There were [no] casualties. May 12, received orders to be ready for marching; moved with the brigade to the east end of Snake [Creek] Gap and went into camp for the night (ehistory.com 2011).
Lieutenant Colonel Eugene Powell, who commanded the 66th Ohio Infantry on May 8, filed this report of the regiment’s activity on May 17,

I was ordered by Colonel J. H. Patrick, commanding detachment of First Brigade, to support two sections of a battery which had taken position in front of the gap. I soon after received orders to report to General Geary, commanding division, who was then attacking the enemy in the gap. I immediately reported to General Geary, who ordered me to take position covering the main road through the gap, to prevent a flank movement by the enemy; while in this position I received orders from Colonel Candy to return down the mountain and place my regiment on picket at its base. I have no casualties to report (ehistory.com 2011).

Captain Thomas McConnell, 66th Ohio Infantry, stated in his report:

This regiment, together with the Fifth Ohio and One hundred and forty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, all under command of Colonel Patrick, of the Fifth Ohio, were ordered to support the artillery. After taking up position in rear of the artillery, I was ordered to report with my regiment to General Geary, commanding Second Division, Twentieth Army Corps, who was at that time with the division up the hill and engaged with the enemy. After reporting to the general, I was ordered to take up a position in the rear and left of the First Brigade, to cover our left flank. Then the troops fell back. I was ordered to place my regiment on picket at the foot of the hill, and guard the approaches of our camp; no casualties to report. May 9, relieved from picket by a regiment from the Third Brigade, and joined the brigade. Worked all night throwing up works against any attack the enemy might make. May 10 and 11, still in camp/ May 12, moved for Snake Creek Gap, which we reached at 3 p. m., and went into camp. May 13, marched for the forks of the Snake Creek Gap and Resaca road, Calhoun and Dalton road, and formed line to the right of, and with angles to, the last named road and threw up intrenchments (ehistory.com 2011).

The 33rd New Jersey Infantry participated in and suffered significant casualties in the assault on Dug Gap on May 8, 1864. These included two officers and four enlisted men killed on the day of the battle and two officers and 23 enlisted men who were wounded. Several of the wounded died soon afterwards from their injuries (Shaw 1884). Captain Henry Clay Bartlett, Company G, was among those who were killed. 1st Lieutenant Joseph L. Miller, Company F, was, “killed in action at Rocky Fall [sic, Face] Ridge, Ga., May 8, 1864” (Shaw 1884:181). Sergeant John A. Fenner, Company F, died at Atlanta on May 28, 1864, “of wounds received at Rocky Face Ridge, May 8, 1864” (Shaw 1884:182; Abrams 2010). Captain James R. Sanford was severely wounded in the battle and his leg was later amputated (OR vol. 38:217). Privates Lorenzo Schnarr and Frederick Witt, Company A, Private Casper Schafer, Company B, Private Henry De Costa, Company K, were killed in action at Mill Creek Gap on May 8, 1864 (Shaw 1884:175-176, 182).

Private Louis Starnkopf, Co. A, 33d New Jersey Volunteers, aged 36 years, was wounded at the battle of Buzzard Roost, Georgia, May 9th, 1864, by a conoidal musket ball which fractured and depressed a portion of the frontal bone. He was sent to the hospital of the 2d division, Twentieth Corps, thence was sent via Chattanooga and Nashville, Tennessee, to the Jefferson Hospital, Indiana, where he remained under expectant treatment until the 27th of July. He was then furloughed, and at the expiration of his leave was admitted to the Ward Hospital, New Jersey. On the 28th of September, 1864, he was returned to duty. On June 23d, 1865, Assistant Surgeon P. Adolphus, U. S. A., reported the patient suffering from chronic cerebritis with softening of the brain; whereupon he was discharged the service June 29th, 1865, and pensioned, his disability being rated three-fourths (United States Surgeon General’s Office 1870).
C. **2ND BRIGADE, 2ND DIVISION, 20TH CORPS**

Colonel Adolphus Buschbeck commanded the 2nd Brigade, which was positioned on the Union right. The 2nd Brigade was composed of the 33rd New Jersey Infantry, 119th, 134th, 154th New York Infantry, and the 27th, 73rd, and 109th Pennsylvania Infantry regiments.

The 119th New York Infantry Regiment was, “deployed as skirmishers, up the mountain” at the beginning of the assault on Dug Gap on May 8, 1864 (Thomas 1866:316). From the action from May 8-10, 1864 on Rocky Face Ridge, the 119th New York had one enlisted man killed and one officer and 10 enlisted men wounded (Phisterer 1912).

The 134th New York Infantry Regiment participated in and suffered many casualties in the May 8 action at Dug Gap. Lieutenant Colonel Allan H. Jackson reported on May 9 that the 134th New York suffered 11 enlisted men killed and one officer and 24 enlisted men wounded. Captain Forrest was mortally wounded in the assault, dying on May 20, 1864 (OR::237-238; Van Horne 1875:416). Privates Daniel Frederick, Company H, and Jacob Bellinger, Company K, were among those killed in action and Privates H.H. Burbank and William Thomas Levy, Company H, were among the wounded (Yates 1902:346-371).

The 154th New York Infantry was a significant participant in the assault on the Confederates at Dug Gap (Dunkelman and Winey 1981:103-109). Major L.D. Warner, 154th New York Infantry, wrote from his camp near Cassville, Georgia to his friend, Fay, on May 21, 1864, giving this account of the assault on Rocky Face on May 8:

> After seventeen days constant marching or fighting, we have at length halted to take breath and recover our exhausted energies, preparatory to a fresh effort, to finish what has been so gloriously commenced, by driving the foe within the entrenchments of Atlanta, or compelling him to offer battle before he reaches that important stronghold. The 20th corps left Lookout Valley on the 4th of the present month, except Butterfield's division, which preceded the rest by several days. We moved to the right of the enemy's positions at Tunnel Hill, Dalton, &c. On the eve of the 7th, our division encamped about ten miles west of Dalton from which we were separated by high range of hills, (the same in which Buzzard Roost Gap is situated.) A road crosses these hills at a point about four miles south of the last named gap and the crest where the road crosses was in possession of the enemy. About 11 A. M. of the 8th we were ordered to march on a reconnaissance in the direction of this ridge, which here bears the local name of Rocky Faced Mountain. Arriving at about 1 1/2 miles from this point, we were halted, and our brigade was formed in line of battle, with skirmishers in front, and were ordered to advance and storm the hill, in front of which was two ranges of foot-hills steep and heavily wooded. The march over these hills in line of battle was very fatiguing to the men, and by the time they arrived at the foot of the main ridge they were well-nigh exhausted. The face of the hill is very steep and covered with loose rolling stones, none of them large enough to afford shelter to the men who toiled up its rugged sides. Along the crest runs a ledge of rocks with a perpendicular face of from five to ten feet, affording a most excellent shelter to the enemy, who, without exposing themselves, could deliberately fire upon our men as they ascended from the vale beneath. After resting for a few moments, the order to advance was given, and under a galling and deathly fire from the crest, our brave boys advanced (many of them never to return) to the charge, cheering lustily as they climbed the almost perpendicular ascent. As they neared the summit, the fire from above became more fatal, and the 27th Pa. halted and utterly refused to advance, the 73d Pa, which was on our left, (the 27th being on our right) did some better, but they could not be induced to advance to the foot of the ledge of rocks. The 154th, although losing men every moment, advanced steadily to the foot of the glacis, where they were partially protected from the fire of the foe, and halted for a
moment to rest ere they made the desperate attempt to mount to the summit. I will here state that
the failure of the 27th to come to time enabled the enemy to turn his whole attention to us, and the
154th was exposed to a deadly fire, not only from its front, but from the right flank, (which last
was the more deadly of the two). This regiment claimed that their time had expired, and were bold
in declaring that they would not fight. At length Col. Jones gave the command to rise up and
forward, and what were left of 200 men mounted the ramparts, and our colors were planted on the
mountain's crest! To maintain the position, unsupported as they were, was impossible. After a
short conflict they were compelled by superior numbers to fall back, and retreat to the foot of the
hill, with a loss of 14 killed and 42 wounded, making an aggregate of 56, besides many who were
much injured by the loose rolling stones with which the face of the moun-tain was covered. Col.
Jones, who had for several days been suffering from indisposition, but mounted the hill at the head
of his regiment, was thrown from the rocks at the summit, and so severely injured that he was the
next day obliged to return to Chattanooga for treatment. Our color-bearer, Geo. Bishop, (brother of
Lewis Bishop, who lost his life in endeavoring to save our glorious banner at Gettysburg) was
shot dead just as he had planted our flag fairly upon the crest, and three others were successively
stricken down in the endeavor to bring them off, which was done by Corporal Alexander
Williams, of Co. D. Thus ended the part taken by the 154th in this unsuccessful attack upon an
almost impregnable position, defended by numbers, according to Rebel accounts, superior to the
assailants. The attempt to carry the heights was made at other points, all were alike unsuccessful.
The 154th was the only regiment which gained a footing upon the crest, and had they been
properly supported, they would have maintained their position. The object of the demonstration
seems to have been to draw the enemy's attention to this point, while McPherson passed through
Snake Creek Gap, in the same range, nearly opposite Resaca, which he successfully accomplished,
and thus gained a position in the enemy's rear. The whole loss sustained by our forces on the 8th,
was something over 200, the 154th sustaining far the heaviest, being nearly 30 per cent of our
whole force. After dark we retired to the open ground near where we first formed our lines, near
which place we remained until the 12th, when we marched for Snake Creek Gap, through which
we passed, and until the Rebs evacuated we were engaged in the series of manoeuvres and fights
which ended in Johnson's evacuation and our pursuit. Our boys are in good spirits, although they
feel that they have been again sacrificed by being joined with troops on whom no reliance can be
placed. The 27th Pa. should not have been ordered in where anything depended upon them, as they
(never very reliable) are now very much disaffected, and will not stand under fire. We have now
140 guns, hardly enough to be called a regiment, but as good for our numbers as any in the army
(New York State Military Museum and Veterans Research Center 2011).

The *Olean Times* printed this description of the actions of the 154th New York Regiment at
Rocky Face Ridge:

Heroism in the 154th Regiment.

We publish elsewhere a list of the casualties in the 154th Regiment, Col. P. H. Jones,
commanding. Dr. Van Aernam, who kindly furnished us the list, gave us a thrilling account of the
heroism of the men, particularly of the devotion to their colors, at the battle of Rocky Faced
Ridge, Ga. George Bishop, of this village, where he leaves wife and two or three children, was
regimental color bearer. He was ordered to plant the standard on the crest of a hill in view of the
Rebel entrenchments. He had scarcely done so, when a Rebel sharp-shooter sent a bullet through
him, killing him instantly. Sergt. Augustus Shippey, of Co. B, seeing the colors fall, scaled the
ridge and replaced them. He had just accomplished this, when a Rebel bullet killed him! Corp. T.
E. Aldrich, of the same Co., then sprang forward and replanted the colors, standing unmoved
planted the colors, standing unmoved among the whistling messengers of death, for some
moments. But a Rebel sharp-shooter finally brought him down and he died without a groan!
Private Orzo C. Greeley—a distant relative of Horace Greeley, of the Tribune—then seized the
colors, planting them firmly holding the staff in his right hand. He occupied his position for a few
moments and fell dead at his post. Orderly Sergt. Ambrose F. Arnold, of Co. D, then rushed
forward, seized the flag and waved it in defiance at the enemy, and continued to do so until
ordered away by his superior officers. Dr. Van Aernam says a hundred bullets whizzed by Serg. Arnold while he stood there, not one of which took effect. His four dead comrades lay within four feet of him, but he neither flinched nor looked behind him, while daring and determination marked every feature of his countenance and action. This is heroism of the truest and purest character, and it is questionable which of these five braves—four dead and one living—displayed the most nobleness, daring and courage. It is easy, however, to decide which was the most fortunate. Is this incident of this terrible war paralleled anywhere? we think not (Olean Times, cited in New York State Military Museum and Veterans Research Center 2011).

The 73rd Pennsylvania Infantry was engaged in the action on Rocky Face Ridge on May 8, 1864. Private Joseph Simon, Company C, died at Rocky Face Ridge, Georgia on May 8, 1864 (Bates 1871). The official report of Major Charles C. Cresson, who commanded the 73rd Pennsylvania Infantry, written on May 9, 1864 contained this description of the action:

May 8, at about 10 a. m., when the regiment was still encamped near Gordon's Springs, orders were received to march at once and to follow the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, also to detach two officers and sixty enlisted men to the ammunition train and provost guard, so that the regiment mustered only 135 muskets; the march was directed toward Mill Creek, Ga.; when arrived there, at once several shots were heard and our advance guard had to skirmish with some rebel sharpshooters; line of battle was formed. On the right of the regiment was the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, and on the left the One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, and then the whole line advanced with skirmishers in front toward Rocky Face Ridge. The slope of the ridge on which the regiment advanced was the steepest and very rocky, so that the men had partly, one by one, to climb up till it reached the largest rocks, then it became impossible for three-fourths of the regiment to advance farther, although it was several times tried to charge with the One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers together. The other fourth of the regiment, however, went around the slope with the One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers and charged with them up to the mountain, but they also failed to reach the very summit on account of large rocks and the heavy fire of the enemy. The rebel sharpshooters kept up all the time a very lively fire; however the regiment maintained its position till after sundown, at about 7.30 p. m., when the regiment received orders to fall back toward the road and to rally again. This was done without pursuit; for the night the regiment was formed in line of battle fronting Mill Creek and camped there. The loss in the fight from the Twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers was 1 man killed, 3 men severely wounded, and 3 men slightly wounded. May 9, the regiment changed camp and remained in the wood during the day. At about 9.30 p. m. the regiment was ordered to march to division headquarters and to build rifle-pits there between the One hundred and eleventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, on the left, and the One hundred and second New York Volunteers, on the right, fronting toward Rocky Face Ridge. May 10, the regiment remained on the same place. May 11, the regiment remained on the same place. May 12, the regiment marched toward Snake [Creek] Gap, a distance of fourteen miles, and remained there for the night. May 13, the regiment marched three miles on the road toward Resaca, Ga., where heavy firing was heard. The brigade formed several lines, the regiment being in the front line; at sundown we had to change position and had to occupy the rifle-pits built by the First Division of the corps (OR:256-257).

D. OTHER UNITS IN COMBAT ON ROCKY FACE RIDGE

The 125th Ohio Infantry Regiment, commanded by Colonel Opdycke, was selected to make the initial advance up Rocky Face Ridge on May 8th. The Milwaukee Sentinel reporter noted a few days after the battle,
The response of Col. Opdycke and his ‘Ohio Tigers’ was prompt, fearless, and steady. The veteran regiment climbed the steep ridge, ever and anon stopping to cross some rocky gorge, or scale almost perpendicular bluffs, where to miss a step was certain death. Arriving on the summit of the ridge, the regiment immediately encountered the skirmishers of the enemy, whose small force extended across the ridge. The enemy was driven slowly from the ridge toward Dalton, retreating before the unerring fire of the brave regiment that confronted them. So many natural and artificial obstructions were encountered, that the regiment didn’t move more than half a mile per hour. Learning that the rebels were moving to our left against our forces in large numbers, Gen. Harker was ordered to throw his whole brigade up to the ridge to support the 125th. The order was obeyed with alacrity, and the enemy was driven about three miles when a deep gorge was encountered, which checked the advance for the rest of the day (Milwaukee Sentinel 1864a:2).

The 125th Ohio Infantry Regiment suffered eight killed and 31 wounded at Rocky Face Ridge. Adjutant R.C. Powers, 125th Ohio Infantry reported the following killed at Rocky Face Ridge, Cornelius Infelt, Co. A; William A. Dana, Co. B, Eli Swinchart, Co. C., Corporal Frank Worth, Co. I, Corporal Francis M. Garloch, Co. I, Thomas Cassady, Co. I, William Slienel, Co. K, and George McCollum, Co. K (Plain Dealer 1864b:2). Adjutant Powers also reported in detail on those men in the 125th Ohio who were wounded. Lieutenant Colonel D.H. Moore received a slight wound to the breast and abdomen. Four men in Company A suffered injuries to the wrist, shoulder, leg and hand. One soldier in Company B was wounded in the right foot. Eight men in Company C were injured in the right leg, arm, hand, bowels, thigh, foot, left shoulder and right thigh. Two men wounded in Company D suffered injuries to the left hand and foot. Five men in Company E suffered injuries to the left leg, right hand, foot, neck, and left hand. Two men in Company F were injured in the hand and thigh. One soldier in Company H was wounded in the arm. Three soldiers were wounded in Company I including three in the hand, one each in the left breast, arm, and leg, and two severely wounded in unspecified locations. Four men in Company K were wounded in the forehead, thigh, left hand and right side (Plain Dealer 1864b:2).

The 15th Ohio Infantry saw action at Rocky Face Ridge in May, 1864 (Cope 1916:428-438). Even though the regiment was not on the front lines for the May 8-9 engagement, they nevertheless were impacted by the battle. Soldiers from the regiment served picket duty and the regiment also suffered losses at Rocky Face Ridge in a lesser known action on May 12.

The 49th Ohio Infantry Regiment formed part of the 1st Brigade, Third Division, 4th Army Corps. The regiment was commanded by Colonel William H. Gibson and Lieutenant Colonel Samuel F. Gray. The 49th Ohio Infantry saw action at Rocky Face Ridge in May 1864 and experienced five casualties, although these may have happened on May 10 rather than the 8th. Private Andrew C. Torrence, Company C, was killed in the battle of Rocky Face Ridge on May 8, 1864. Private George V. Stover, Company I, died at Jeffersonville, Indiana of wounds received May 10, 1864, in action near Rocky Face Ridge, Ga. Private Henry H. Beebe, Company F, died of wounds he received on May 10, 1864 in battle of Rocky Face Ridge. 2nd Lieutenant Edwin Haff, Company I, was discharged from the army on July 27, 1864 for wounds received on May 10, 1864 in action on Rocky Face Ridge. Private Henry F. Heller, Company F, was wounded on May 10, 1864 in action at Rocky Face Ridge (Ohio Roster Commission 1884:534-535, 520, 793-794).

The 64th Ohio Infantry suffered severe losses in the assault on the north end of Rocky Face Ridge. Colonel Alexander Mcllvaine, commander of the regiment, and 1st Lieutenant Thomas H. Ehlers were killed at Rocky Face Ridge, May 9, 1864 (Van Horne 1875:425; Cope 1906:431).
The 113th Ohio Infantry, led by Brigadier General John G. Mitchell, participated in the Union advance on Rocky Face Ridge in May, 1864 (Milwaukee Sentinel 1864a:2; The Federal Publishing Company 1908, Volume 8:178).

The 6th Kentucky Infantry, U.S. Army, camped at the foot of Rocky Face Ridge in early May, 1864. The regiment suffered several casualties as the result of Confederate riflemen and sharpshooters who held the high ground above their camps (Johnston 1864:128-138). Captain Isaac N. Johnston noted,

Pickets were posted on the mountain-side to watch the movements of the enemy while the army slept; but as soon as day began to dawn the sleepers were aroused by quick, sharp reports from the rifles of the rebel sharp-shooters; their fire called forth corresponding activity on the part of our men, who fired on them with great effect. At eight o’clock, A.M., the Sixth Kentucky advanced as skirmishers; and passing up the mountain-side drove the enemy into the first line of their works upon its summit; which line it would have been madness to attempt to storm, as it was a strong position by nature, and so well fortified in addition that a single line would be amply sufficient to keep an army in check (Johnston 1864:136-137).

The 21st Wisconsin Infantry (Fitch 1905) The 21st Wisconsin formed part of the 1st Brigade, 1st Division, 14th Army Corps. The regiment was commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Harrison C. Hobart and Major Michael H. Fitch.

The 2nd Michigan Cavalry Regiment was engaged on May 13 and 14, 1864 in a skirmish with Confederates at Dug Gap, as part of the “Demonstrations on Dalton” (Braden and Wantz 2011; NPS 2011). Unless these dates are incorrect, this may represent another minor military action at Dug Gap in May, 1864.

The New York Times (1864) covered the story of the battle on Rocky Face Ridge, which read:

MILL CREEK GAP, ROCKY FACE, Ga., Tuesday, May 10, 1864.

A battle was fought at this point on the afternoon of the 8th inst., the primary object of which was to engage the attention of the enemy immediately around Dalton, while McPHERSON was penetrating the mountain at Snake Gap, some six or seven miles further south, and gaining a position in the enemy's rear. The plan was successful, and McPHERSON passed through the defile without opposition. We are here immediately abreast of Dalton, distant four miles, and the mountain pass is strongly fortified. Rocky Face is about one thousand feet in height, and this point difficult of access. There is really no gap, but only a mountain road crossing at a slight depression in the crest.

Two brigades of Gen. GEARY's division, HOOKER's corps, made the attack. They were led by Gen. GEARY in person, and much regret was felt by him at the absence of his Third Brigade, which had been detached to support Gen. KILPATRICK in a reconnoisance southward. It was scarcely expected that the pass could be gained by so small a force as 4,000 men, but our men fought resolutely and with great determination, and at one time had gained the crest, but were forced to retire by overwhelming numbers.

In the attack Col. BUSCHBECK's brigade led the advance, but were speedily reinforced by CANDY's brigade, which is much the larger. The troops were formed in line of battle at the base of the mountain, the line extending to the right and left of the road leading through the gap.
Skirmishers were thrown forward and the whole force advanced steadily and in good order. Little resistance was offered until quite near the crest, where the activity is so steep that it was almost a physical impossibility for the men to retain their footing. On the summit the enemy had a formidable breastwork, from behind which they poured down a merciless fire upon our men.

Gen. GEARY's orders were to take the position if he could do so without fighting to disadvantage, out in no case to hazard his small command in a futile effort against a larger force in impregnable position. Our men were furiously eager to gain the crest. CANDY's brigade, which took part in the memorable struggle resulting in the capture of Lookout Mountain in November last, having a lively recollection of the success attending the furious onslaught they then made, were inclined to adopt the same course of action now, fully confident of a like result.

It was of no avail. The steep height, surmounted by uplifting palisades -- a general feature of the mountains in this region -- could not be carried in this way, and our force was too small to detach portions of it for a long detour to turn either the right or left of the position. We had already lost about 350 men in the aggregate.

After more than four hours' hard fighting, at great disadvantage, night came on, and, with great reluctance, our men retired in obedience to orders. The enemy did not follow us. We had done all that was required, and more. The Twenty-ninth Ohio, Col. FITCH, Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania, Lieut.-Col. FLYNN, and Thirty-third New-Jersey, Col. MINDEL, behaved with great gallantry, as did other regiments engaged.

Among our losses were Capt. BARTLETT and Lieut. MILLER, Thirty-third New-Jersey, killed; Col. FITOS and Lieut.-Col. HAYS, Twenty-ninth Ohio, severely wounded; also Adjt. STORE, of the latter, mortally. The Twenty-ninth Ohio went into the fight with about 350 men, and lost 97 in the aggregate.

Mill Creek Gap is a key position to Dalton, and in this respect is of equal importance with Buzzard's Roost. Either of these gaps in our possession, and Dalton would be untenable for the enemy. The same object may have been gained by menacing both, while MCPHERSON was taking possession of Snake Gap, the third in the series. Thus much has been accomplished, and, the enemy's communications southward having been put out at Resaca, it remains to be seen what will follow.

The successes of the Army of the Potomac reach us by telegraph, and our camps have this morning been enlivened by hearty cheers as the dispatch from Gen. HALLECK is communicated to the regiments respectively. God is with us, and a final victory is not far in the future.

NICKAJACK.

Theodore Davis’s illustrated the May 1864 battle of Dug Gap and the engagement at Snake Creek Gap were published in the June 4, 1864 edition of *Harper's Weekly*. These are reproduced in Figures 18 and 28. The newspaper noted,
by Stevenson’s Rebel Division. Colonel Clark, of the 145th New York, was among those thrown from the top’ (Harper’s Weekly 1864).

E. CONFEDERATE ACCOUNTS

Lindsley 1886:87-88) wrote this summary of events in northwestern Georgia in his history of the Confederate’s Army of Tennessee,

About two and a half to three miles west of Dalton lies Rocky Face Ridge, whose general trend is nearly north and south. There is a gap in this ridge three and a half miles north-west of Dalton, through which passes Mill Creek and the railroad from Chattanooga to Atlanta. The ridge extends only some three miles north of Mill Creek Gap. Farther to the south, and west from Tilton, is Snake Creek Gap. Between the two gaps the ridge protects the railroad on the west, and covers the approach to Resaca from the direction of Chattanooga. On' the 5th of May General Johnston formed his troops to receive the enemy, who were already in motion. He posted them in Mill Creek Gap and along the west of the mountain to the right, in the valley east of the mountain, and in front of Dalton, facing north, to resist an attack from the direction of Cleveland. On the 7th the enemy advanced slowly, and by three in the afternoon had driven back the Confederate cavalry within Mill Creek Gap. During the two following clays several affairs took place along the lines, with little damage to the Confederates, but with heavy loss to the enemy, which, in the language of General Sherman, "attained the dimensions of a battle." On the 9th Johnston received intelligence of the arrival in Snake Creek Gap of McPherson's army. Reports on the 11th indicated a general movement of the Federal troops in that direction, covered by Rocky Face. A reconnaissance on the 12th revealed the fact that Sherman's main body was marching toward Snake Creek Gap, on its way to Resaca. During the night of the 12th and 13th the Confederate infantry and artillery were withdrawn from the front of Dalton and marched to Resaca, the cavalry following after day-break as a rear-guard.

Lindsley (1886:454) further noted:

During the winter the Federals made a feint or two, but on the 1st of May, 1864, their entire army commenced a forward movement. It then numbered not less than seventy-five thousand, while ours barely reached fifty thousand; and by May 4 the respective armies were confronting each other at Rocky Face Ridge. This was a strong position and well fortified; and though a number of small engagements occurred, yet we repulsed the enemy at all points. Our brigade occupied a position to the left of the road and reaching to the summit of the ridge, and was under fire several times, losing a few men from the artillery — one shell bursting in quite a crowd of the Tenth and Thirtieth regiments, killing and wounding some ten men. As the Federals could not drive us from our position after trying for a number of days, Gen. Sherman commenced flanking it on the left, which maneuver Gen. Johnston met by falling back and again fortifying. And then commenced the celebrated Georgia campaign between two of the ablest Generals that were produced by the war.

Confederate Colonel C.P. Breckenridge (1888b:279-281) wrote of the action and strategic blunders at Dug Gap, Rocky Face Ridge, and Snake Creek Gap,

The army lay behind an impassable ridge, through which, on its left flank, were only two accessible gaps, — Dug Gap, less than four miles south-west from Dalton, on the main road from Dalton to Lafayette, and perhaps six miles from Mill Creek Gap; and Snake Creek Gap, some eighteen miles south from Mill Creek Gap. With these gaps fortified, the left flank and rear of that army were absolutely safe; for while the Rocky-face and Chattooga ridges protected our flank, through these gaps we had access to attack the flank of the enemy if he attempted to make a march so far to the left and rear as to threaten our communication south of the Oostenaula or Coosa.
These gaps were capable of easy and impregnable fortification. Dug Gap was a mere road cut out of the mountain-side and really needed no breastworks, for the natural palisades and contour of the mountain rendered easy its defense by resolute men. Snake Creek Gap was a gorge apparently cut through the mountains by the creek that ran through it. It was a narrow defile between Milk Mountain and Horn Mountain, which are merely a prolongation of Chattooga Mountains, and capable of impregnable defense.

These gaps were well known to both armies. Through them ran public roads, and soldiers of both armies had marched through both. Late in February Dug Gap had been seized by an Indiana regiment and held until Cleburne retook it. As early as February General Thomas, knowing that at that time Snake Creek Gap was unguarded, proposed a campaign, the plan being to attract General Johnston's attention by a demonstration on Buzzard Roost, and to throw the main body of the army through Snake Creek Gap, and cut his communications between Dalton and the Oostenaula.

Neither of these gaps was fortified, and on May 8th, when the campaign opened, Dug Gap was guarded by a small command of Arkansas troops under Colonel Williamson, numbering perhaps 250, while Snake Creek Gap was left wholly unprotected. At Resaca, where the railroad crosses the Oostenaula, Cantey's brigade was held on the evening of the 7th of May, on its way from Rome to Dalton.

General Sherman had in hand for attack nearly 100,000 men and 254 guns, divided into three armies — the Army of the Cumberland, commanded by General Thomas, numbering 60,773; the Army of the Tennessee, General McPherson, 24,465; the Army of the Ohio, General Schofield, 13,559. It was a superb army, admirably equipped, abundantly supplied, excellently led. It was veteran, and had known victory. It had pushed its antagonist out of Kentucky with the surrender of Donelson; had captured Tennessee; captured Vicksburg; repossessed the Mississippi River; driven its foe over Missionary Ridge in flight. It knew how to fight, and was willing to fight.

On May 7th our cavalry was driven through Mill Creek Gap. On that night, after we had gone into camp, Colonel Grigsby, who commanded the Kentucky cavalry brigade, was ordered to send a regiment to the front of Dug Gap, to guard the approaches to it. In obedience to that order the 9th Kentucky Cavalry passed over Rocky-face Ridge, and near midnight bivouacked on Mill Creek, about a mile from, and in front of, Dug Gap. Heavy picket lines were thrown out on all the roads leading down the valley. There were several of these roads, and scouts were sent out to ascertain the movements of the enemy. By daylight it was discovered that very large bodies of troops were moving down the valley on all the roads leading to the south. General McPherson had marched from Chattanooga to Rossville, thence west of Chickamauga Mountain to Shipp's Gap and to Villanow, where the road forks — one branch leading down the east foot of Taylor's Ridge, the other leading across toward Rocky-face; this road again forks — one branch leading through Dug Gap, the other down the valley to Snake Creek Gap. Until McPherson reached Villanow it was only a conjecture as to his course, and until the head of his column turned toward Snake Creek Gap his destination was uncertain. His march was concealed by Hooker's corps of the Army of the Cumberland, which corps, forming Thomas's right, marching from Ringgold via Nickajack Gap and Trickum, hid the flank movement of McPherson. The plan was for Hooker to seize Dug Gap and push forward sufficiently to protect the flank of McPherson, and strike the flank of Johnston if he turned on McPherson; while McPherson, marching through Snake Creek Gap to Resaca, should not only destroy but hold the only railroad tributary to Johnston. The possession of Dug Gap by Hooker not only would render Dalton untenable, but would make a retreat from Dalton by the line of the railroad extremely hazardous, and completely protect McPherson from attack on his left flank. With Hooker descending from Rocky-face on our left flank and rear, McPherson holding Resaca, Thomas, with the corps of Howard and Palmer, pushing to Dalton, and Schofield to his left, our army would have been in a perilous situation.

The march of Hooker and McPherson was discovered early on the morning of May 8th by the scouts of the 9th Kentucky Cavalry, and timely information was given that at least an attack on Dug Gap was certain, and that the columns on the march were very heavy and their movements
were guarded by forces too large to be either resisted or developed by the detachments sent out by
the 9th Kentucky. On this information the remainder of Grigsby's brigade was ordered to Dug
Gap, and reached there none too soon. All possible delay to the march of Hooker's corps was
made, but about 2 P.M. Geary's division of that corps drove the 9th Kentucky across the creek and
slowly up the mountain-side, until the regiment fell back in its proper position in the gap, where it
found the brigade drawn in mere skirmish-line along the edge of the mountain-side. As one-fourth
of cavalry soldiers are detailed to hold the horses, I presume that we had about 800 of our brigade
in the fight and 250 Arkansas troops; and this handful of men held that gap until nightfall,
repelling every assault. After nightfall Granbury's Texas brigade relieved us, but the assault was
over. Hooker had failed in his part of the mission. That flank of our army was safe.

The importance of holding that gap was so manifest that Generals Hardee and Cleburne, with their
staffs, galloped to the scene to encourage us by their presence and to aid Colonel Grigsby by their
suggestions; and though the fight was made under their eye, that command needed no
encouragement, and its officers and men knew that they were holding one of the doors to Dalton.

I hold in my hand the official report of General Geary, by whom that attack was made, and on the
whole it is a fair and soldierly report. But he is mistaken in his belief that we had two lines of
intrenchments, or that we were ever driven from our first position. Our loss was very small — in
killed and wounded not a score. He reports that he made that attack with two brigades of infantry
and two batteries, being an aggregate of perhaps 4500 men, or about four to one, besides the
batteries. Assault after assault was made from 3 o'clock until after dark, and each assault was
repulsed with loss. At first, in a mere spirit of exuberant fun, some of the men rolled stones down
the mountain-side; but when the effect was noticed they were directed to use these means as part
of our defense; great stones were rolled down on the supporting lines on the mountain-sides or at
its foot; and as these boulders would go leaping, crashing, breaking off limbs, crushing down
saplings, we fancied we could see the effect of the unexpected missiles. It also proved a valuable
resource to us, for without them our ammunition would have given out; indeed it was about
exhausted when the attack ceased.

General Geary reports an aggregate loss of 357 officers and men, of whom some 50 were the
adventurous advance, who actually reached the crest, only to be made prisoners. After dark our
brigade, being relieved by the Texas brigade of Granbury, was ordered to the foot of the mountain
to feed and to obtain ammunition....Fortunately McPherson knew that Hooker had failed in his
attempt to seize Dug Gap, and that consequently the road from Dalton was free to any Confederate
column moving on him. The intrenchments at Resaca were formidable, and when McPherson felt
the lines, the response was resolute and spirited. As Hardee came to re-enforce us at Dug Gap, so
here Hood joined us. He and part of his staff came to share our fate. Calmly we waited for the
inevitable assault. We did not doubt that it would be made. McPherson was young, ambitious, and
able. In our ranks he was accounted the equal, perhaps the superior, of Sherman. Here was an
opportunity that Sherman might well say "does not occur twice in a single life"; and not for a
moment did we doubt that such a soldier, with such an army, would seize such an opportunity.

I recall the scene, as a group stood on a knoll and watched the skirmishers advance. As the puffs
of smoke arose in the distance, as the sharpshooters paid compliments to this group, General Hood
rode up, and after a few moments' gaze turned the head of his horse and rode a few feet, and by
motion called Colonel Grigsby to him; in another moment Grigsby called me, and General Hood
said in a cheery yet grave tone, "We must hold until night."

Just at dusk the enemy began to fall back, and to our surprise the retrograde movement ended near
to the point at which we had commenced our fight in the morning.

Broomfield Lewis Ridley (1906:343), Aid-de-camp to Lieutenant-General A.P. Stewart, Army of
Tennessee, C.S.A., wrote a summary of the action in early May, 1864:
On the 5th of May his [Sherman’s] army was in line between Ringgold and Tunnel Hill and after skirmishing on that and the following day, on the 7th pressed back our advanced troops to Mill Creek Gap. On the same day Brigadier-General Cantey reached Resaca with his brigade and was halted there. On the 8th, at 4 p.m., a division of Hooker's corps assaulted Dug Gap which was bravely held by two regiments of Reynolds' (Arkansas) brigade and Grigsby's brigade of Kentucky cavalry fighting on foot, until the arrival of Lieutenant-General Hardee with Granbury's brigade, when the enemy was put to flight. On the 9th five assaults were made on Lieutenant-General Hood's troops on Rocky Face Mountain. All were repulsed. In the afternoon a report was received that Logan's and Dodge's corps were in Snake Creek Gap. Three divisions under Lieutenant-General Hood were therefore sent to Resaca. On the 10th Lieutenant-General Hood reported the enemy retreating. Skirmishing to our advantage continued all day near Dalton.

Confederate forces at the May 8 battle included, “a brigade of Arkansas infantry, two regiments of Kentucky cavalry, and Cleburne’s division”, according to Union reports. Major General George H. Thomas received word that 69 Confederates were killed in the battle, which was greater than his own estimate of 49 Union soldiers killed in the action (Thomas 1866:317-318). Confederate Major General Joseph Wheeler’s cavalry also was involved in the action on May 8 at Dug Gap. Dodson (1899:175-176) noted,

On the 8th [May 1864] an attempt was made [by Geary’s 2nd Division] to gain our rear, by passing over Taylor’s Ridge over Dug Gap. General Wheeler met and repulsed this with Grigsby’s small but brave brigade of Kentucky cavalry, which, after a fight of two hours, entirely defeated and drove back a corps of the enemy who had made repeated assaults upon the position so bravely held by these few men, who dismounted and partially screened by temporary barricades, poured deadly volleys into the enemy’s advancing columns until toward evening, when they finally withdrew and made no further attempt to take the position they found so ably defended.

Thus, by taking advantage of the favourable ground, one small brigade of dismounted cavalry defeated an entire corps of the enemy, saved our army from being flanked out of position, and in two hours killed and wounded more of the enemy than they had engaged.

The 28th Alabama Infantry may have been engaged in hostile action at Dug Gap in April, 1864. Private Hiram Bird Caradine, Company L, 28th Alabama Infantry was, “wounded at Dug Gap, Georgia in April of 1864” (Walker and Curren 1997:337). The 38th Alabama Infantry lost 37 percent of its 490 men at Chickamauga and suffered another 214 casualties at Chattanooga in 1863. The regiment participated in the action on Rocky Face Ridge (NPS 2011). The 58th Alabama Infantry participated in the Atlanta campaign. It was engaged at Rocky Face Ridge but its most horrific action was in the battle of Peach Tree Creek in Atlanta, where it lost 48 percent of its men (NPS 2011).

The 4th Tennessee Infantry [Neely’s regiment] fought at Dug Gap in May 1864 (Goodspeed 1887; Lindsley 1886:189; NPS 2011). The 1st Tennessee, 12th Tennessee, 16th Tennessee, 10th Tennessee (transferred to Tyler’s Brigade), 29th Tennessee, 38th Tennessee and 45th Tennessee Infantry also were engaged at Rocky Face Ridge in May, 1864 (Goodspeed 1887). Lieutenant Blunkall, Company L, 1st Tennessee [Colms’ regiment], was among the Tennessee troops killed at Rocky Face Ridge (Lindsley 1886:167; NPS 2011).

Brigadier General Daniel H. Reynolds commanded the 1st and 2nd Arkansas Cavalry regiments, who were key participants in the battle of Dug Gap. General Reynolds likely was not present in the battle of May 8 (Confederate Veteran 1911:8). The 1st Arkansas Mounted Rifles were among
the Confederate troops who stood in defense on the crest of Rocky Face Ridge at Dug Gap. The Arkansas troops were dismounted at the time of the battle. First Lieutenant Thomas L. Preston, Napoleon Rifles, 1st Arkansas Mounted Rifles, was killed in action at Dug Gap, Georgia, May 8, 1864. First Sergeant Coke Witten, Co. F, 1st Arkansas Mounted Rifles, was killed in action at Dug Gap, Georgia, on May 8, 1864. Private George D. McCaigg, Companies B and I, was wounded at Dug Gap on May 8, 1864, where he had one finger amputated. He was retired to the invalid corps on September 1, 1864. Captain George M. Henry, Chicot Rangers, 1st Arkansas Cavalry, was killed at Dug Gap in 1864 (Brannon 2004; Gerdes 2011c). Sergeant Silas Smoot, Company F, 1st Arkansas, was killed at Dug Gap on May 8. 1st Sergeant William M. Clifton was wounded at Dug Gap on May 8, 1864 (Gerdes 2011a-b). G.T. Hoge, 2nd Arkansas, is buried in a marked grave in the Confederate Cemetery in Dalton, Georgia (Wells 2010). Private W. Prince, Company B, 1st Arkansas Cavalry, was captured on May 10, 1864 at Dug Gap, Georgia. He was confined at military prisons in Louisville, Kentucky and Rock Island, Illinois before enlisting in the U.S. Navy on June 10, 1864 (Gerdes 2011d).

J.M. Evans, Company I, 1st Arkansas, was wounded at Dug Gap, “Notwithstanding this wound [a shoulder wound from the battle of Chickamauga] he remained in camp, and was soon engaged in the battle of Dug Gap, where this regiment held the Gap against Hooker's entire corps; after this fight retreated to Resaca; at New Hope Church, where a bullet shattered his arm at the shoulder, and entered his body where it still remains. After this wound, his arm was amputated at the shoulder, and after a month in the hospital and another month with a friend in South Carolina, he crossed the Mississippi River, and went to Texas, where he remained till the end of the war” (Goodspeed 1891:65). Another Arkansas soldier was not so lucky. Surgeon D.C. O'Keefe reported on one non-commissioned officer in the 2nd Arkansas Regiment, Sergeant M. V. Temples, Co. A, aged 24, who was mortally wounded at Rocky Face Ridge on May 8, 1864. Sergeant Temples was wounded by a conoidal ball, which entered just in front of the left ear, passed upward and forward and emerged just above the right eye…He died on June 8th” (United States Surgeon Generals Office 1870).

The Kentucky cavalry at Dug Gap was commanded by Colonel C.P. Breckenridge. One veteran of the engagement stated that these cavalrmen were not Grigsby’s (Austin 1899:123). Willis noted that the 1st, 2nd and 9th Kentucky Cavalry fought at Dug Gap (Mann 1909:88, 473).

Relic collector information left by artillery expert Thomas Dickey indicates that the Confederates on Rocky Face Ridge had artillery support (Civilwarartillery.com 2011; Meier and Dittmar 1979). Marks (Semple’s/Goldthwaite’s) Artillery Battery was an Alabama artillery unit assigned to T.R. Hotchkiss’ Artillery Battalion and it commanded by Captain Richard W. Goldthwaite in May, 1864. Its armaments at that time were four 12-pound Napoleons (ehistory.com 2012). The battery was on Rocky Face Ridge in early May, 1864 but possibly at a location north of the PIT study area. The presence of Marshall’s battery and Semple’s [Alabama] battery at Dug Gap is noted by Lindsley (1886:825-826):

The battalion belonging to Stevenson's division was composed of Marshall's, Rowan's, and Corput's batteries. These three commands, from December, 1863, camped together, marched together, and fought side by side till the end of the war. Shortly afterward the curtain rose on the Dalton campaign, and an ordeal began in comparison with which previous trials were trivial. ‘For ninety-three days,’ says Hardee, ‘the armies never lost their grapple.’ On the 6th of May the
battalion of artillery went into position with Stevenson's division five miles north of Dalton, on the heights called Rocky Face, and skirmished with the enemy's lines for two or three days. In these passages not many of the enemy were killed, but a great many were wounded, says Vanhorn in his 'History of the Army of the Cumberland.'

At the opening of this campaign the officers of Marshall's Battery were: L. G. Marshall, Captain; First Lieut. James M. Cockrill, of Nashville, commanding the first section; Second Lieut. Watson, of Memphis, commanding the second section; and Second Lieut. Finis E. White, of Paris, Tenn. (promoted from Orderly Sergeant), commanding the caissons. Of non-commissioned officers there were: Sergeants, James Bailey and Gilliam, of Tracy City; Wilson, of Brownsville. Thomas Peters, of Memphis, Ordnance Sergeant; G. W. Cheatham, of Walnut Hill, Arkansas. William Wilson, of Lewisville, Ark., Orderly Sergeant. Quartermaster Sergeants, Day, of St. Louis, and Allman, a Georgian. Corporals, Frank McKnight, of La Fayette, Ark., and Wise, of Mississippi. Unfortunately the names of several veteran Corporals — brave and experienced gunners — are not recalled.


The *Macon Telegraph* (1864c:1) contained a brief account of the battle at Dug Gap by an anonymous author penned as “Max” and dated Monday 2 o’clock, P.M., in its May 14, 1864 edition, which read,

The little battle at Dug Gap, which I briefly telegraphed you last night, excites universal enthusiasm. It lasted all the afternoon and was particularly gratifying. The enemy had tried to delude us with his advance into Mill Creek Gap, whilst he rapidly threw a corps over to the left. It consisted of three divisions, Geary’s Butterfield’s and Stinwher’s, under Hooker. Col. Grigsby with his Kentucky cavalry met them with open arms, they poured volley after volley of stones and musketry into them, and they reeled back from their first charge, leaving several tokens of warmth on the field. Ben Hill came up before it was over. Gen. Johnston had sent him with a bit of a brigade, and he was no sooner spied by the men, among whom he is recognized as the bravest and truest, than they sent up several hearty cheers. Gen. Strahl also got up at the hustling. Also, General Hardee and Gen. Cleburne and before night it was a perfect jubilee. Three cheers for Dug Gap and its gallant handfull of defenders.—Had we lost it, we had lost Dalton. It is a key.

Another southern newspaper’s version of the engagement at Dug Gap, written from Mill Creek Gap at 4 P.M. on May 10, was reprinted in a northern newspaper, which began, “Our army has been in line of battle for three days. On Sunday evening the enemy attempted to pass through Dug Gap, but were gallantly repulsed by Gen. McNair’s brigade, and Gen. Grigsby’s dismounted cavalry. Our casualties were very small. The enemy left fifty dead on the field, and had about two hundred wounded. We captured about fifty prisoners” (*Illustrated New Age* 1864b:1). The writer continued,

During the day, yesterday, the enemy was massing heavy forces in our front, trying to develope the position of our lines. A heavy artillery duel was going on the greater portion of the day. About four o’clock on yesterday evening, the enemy made three efforts to storm our rifle-pits on the brow of the ridges facing Mill Creek Gap. The enemy advanced in heavy columns around the points of the hills.

Our officers ordered their men to reserve their fire until the enemy should get in short range. When they got within seventy-five yards, the order to fire was given, when volley after volley was poured into their ranks. They broke in confusion and fell back beyond the hill, and formed their lines again and advanced to the charge, but the same bloody welcome was tendered them, and again they sought the safety in flight. A third time they endeavored to turn our left, in order to
enfilade our works, but the movement was promptly met by the officers in command, and the enemy was driven in great confusion from the field. Many of the enemy were seen to fall at each volley was fired into them.

Our casualties are very small, perhaps not more than a dozen in killed and wounded. Our rifle-pits were held by the 58th and 38th Alabama, and 38th Tennessee regiments. Our artillery was handled with consummate skill throwing shells frequently into the very lines of the enemy. There was considerable skirmishing yesterday in front of General Stevenson's lines, but no advantage was gained by the enemy. General Maney’s brigade posted on the top of Rocky Face Ridge, had several men wounded by the enemy’s sharp-shooters (Illustrated New Age 1864b:1).

Only two military maps were located that depict the battle lines at Dug Gap. One is a manuscript map drawn in 1864 (Blakeslee 1864). This map is reproduced in Figure 13. Figure 14 is an enlargement of the portion of Blakeslee’s map showing Dug Gap. Another large scale map of the Dug Gap vicinity in the Civil War Atlas, compiled by Edward Ruger, that illustrates, “The First Epoch of the Atlanta Campaign” (Ruger, printed in Cowles 1895: Plate 57, Map 2). Ruger’s map shows a series of Confederate lines on the crest of Rocky Face Ridge, including that flanks both sides of “Dug or Babb’s Gap” in the PIT project area (Figures 15 and 16).

Maps of the battlefield vicinity made soon after the battle offer additional graphic orientation. One of these was produced and distributed later in 1864 by the Western and Atlantic Railroad Company (Matthews, Northrup & Co. 1864) (Figure 17).

Sketch artist Alfred Rudolph Waud made several drawings of the action at Dug Gap on May 8, 1864, which are curated at the Library of Congress (Waud 1864a-e). Waud was an English artist who worked as a war illustrator for Harper’s Weekly in 1864. Five of his sketches, which are curated in the Library of Congress, are reproduced in Figures 19-23. A post-war illustration of the assault at Dug Gap by Chappel is reproduced in Figure 24.
Figure 13. Atlanta Campaign Map, Showing Study Areas (Blakeslee 1864).

Figure 14. Enlargement of a Portion of Blakeslee's Manuscript Map, Showing Dug Gap (Blakeslee 1864).
Figure 15. Portion of Ruger’s Map Showing Dalton-Resaca Theatre (Cowles 1895: Plate 57).
Figure 16. Confederate Defenses on Rocky Face Ridge Flanking Both Sides of Dug Gap (Cowles 1895:Plate 57).

Figure 17. Map of Dalton and Vicinity (Matthews, Northrup & Co. 1864).
Figure 18. General Geary’s Assault on Dug Gap, Georgia (From a Sketch by Theodore R. Davis 1864).

Figure 19. Waud’s Sketch of the “Battle of Dug Gap. May 8, 1864” (Waud 1864a).
Figure 20. Waud’s Sketch of “Federal Troops at Dug Gap” (Waud 1864b).

Figure 21. Waud’s Sketch at Dug Gap, Showing Rock Outcrops (Waud 1864c).
Figure 22. Waud’s Sketch at Dug Gap, Showing Log Defenses at Rock Outcrop (Waud 1864d).

Figure 23. Artist's Rendition of the Battle of Mill Creek Gap (Waud 1864e).
Figure 24. Artist’s Rendition of the Attack at Rocky Face Ridge (Chappel 1874).
VI. Snake Creek Gap (9WA335)

Snake Creek Gap was the scene of several separate actions in the Civil War. The major event involving this area was the battle of Resaca. The core area of the Resaca battlefield lies east of the U.S.F.S. study areas but some of the sites on the USFS property pertain to the story of the battle of Resaca. These areas have the potential for public interpretation about the main battle (Robert and Company 2001; Secrist 2010).

From his headquarters at Ringgold, Georgia, Major General Sherman sent these orders to Major General James McPherson, who was at Gordon Mills, Georgia on May 5, 1864:

The enemy still lies about Dalton, and from all appearances is on the defensive, guarding approaches mostly from the north and west. He occupies in some force the range of hills known as the Tunnel Hill. By to-morrow night our forces will be about as follows: Schofield at Red Clay; Thomas at Ringgold - his left, Catoosa Springs, center at Ringgold, and right (Hooker) near Wood's Station; and you at Gordon's Mills. If you are all ready I propose on Saturday morning to move against the enemy - Thomas directly on Tunnel Hill; Schofield to Varnell's and the gap between it and Catoosa Springs, feeling toward Thomas; Hooker will move through Nickajack Gap on Trickum and threaten the road which runs from Buzzard Roost to Snake [Creek] Gap. As these are in progress I want you to move, via Rock Spring, Tavern Road, to the head of Middle Chickamauga; then to Villanow; then to Snake [Creek] Gap, secure it and from it make a bold attack on the enemy's flank or his railroad at any point between Tilton and Resaca. I am in hopes that Garrard's cavalry will be at Villanov as soon as you, for, you know, I have sent General Corse to meet him at Shellmound and conduct him across the mountain to La Fayette and to you. But, in any event, his movement will cover your right rear and enable you to leave all incumbrances either at Ship's Gap or Villanov, as you deem best. I hope the enemy will fight at Dalton, in which case he can have no force there that can interfere with you. But, should his policy be to fall back along his railroad, you will hit him in flank. Do not fail in that event to make the most of the opportunity by the most vigorous attack possible, as it may save us what we have most reason to apprehend - a slow pursuit, in which he gains strength as we lose it. In either event you may be sure the forces north of you will prevent his turning on you alone. In the event of hearing the sound of heavy battle about Dalton, the greater necessity for your rapid movement on the railroad. It once broken to an extent that would take them days to repair, you can withdraw to Snake [Creek] Gap and come to us or await the development according to your judgment or information you may receive. I want to put this plan in operation, beginning with Saturday morning if possible. The sooner the better for us (ehistory.com 2011).

In a report to Captain Thomas Elliott written on May 22nd, Colonel Adolphus Buschbeck, commander of a brigade in the 2nd Division, 20th Corps, wrote about the action at Snake Creek Gap,

After the battle of Mill Creek Gap, on the 8th instant, the command encamped at the foot of the mountain. The day following, the 9th instant, the brigade moved into the woods and encamped, remaining there the 10th and 11th instant, throwing up breast-works and doing picket duty. May 12, marched at 7 a.m. through Snake Creek Gap and bivouacked. May 13, moved forward in the direction of Resaca, and at night, about 9 o'clock, bivouacked behind breast-works on the left of the road, forming the left of the division. The brigade remained in this position until the next afternoon, when the regiments were disposed so as to occupy the whole of the breast-works previously held by the whole division, the other two brigades having moved to another position. Between 10 and 11 p.m. the brigade marched, and about 3 a.m. on the 15th instant took position in the rear of the division. At 10 a.m. the command moved forward against the enemy, who
occupied a strong position on the crest of several hills, and well fortified by rifle-pits; about 1.30 p. m. formed in three lines of battle and moved forward, the Third Division in advance, driving the enemy from the first three lines of rifle-pits. The column halted and reformed at the base of the third hill. The One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, and One hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteers forming the first line. The One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, Seventy-third and Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, held the line of works immediately in rear of the first column. The four regiments mentioned above received orders direct from Major-General Hooker to advance and take a battery in their front. Colonel Lockman, One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, being the senior officer in command, took command of that portion of the brigade. The detachment moved forward over a line of breast-works from which the enemy had been driven, and over the works and down the slope. The men charged up the hill under a severe enfilading fire, some of the men entering the battery. I respectfully refer you to the report of Colonel Lockman for further information in regard to the movements of these four regiments. Colonel Cobham, commanding Third Brigade, having been placed in command of the line by order of General Hooker, these regiments remained with him until late in the evening. The One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers and Twenty-seventh and Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers remained in their position until about 9 p.m., when they were sent out to relieve troops in front and to assist in removing the four pieces of artillery which had been commanded by our troops since the assault. The regiments remained chiefly engaged at this work and throwing up rifle-pits until the desired object had been attained, when the whole brigade took position in the line of breast-works held previously, they having been relieved by other troops. Officers commanding regiments of this brigade-Colonel J. T. Lockman, One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers; Lieutenant Colonel A. Riedt, Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers; Lieutenant Colonel A. H. Jackson, One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers; Lieutenant Colonel E. Fourat, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers; Major C. C. Cresson, Seventy-third Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteers; Major L. D. Warner, One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, and Captain F. L. Gimber, One hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteers-behaved with coolness and bravery, and all officers and men sustained their previous reputations for gallantry and soldierly qualities. It is with sorrow that I announce the death of Lieutenant Colonel Edward F. Lloyd, One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, who fell mortally wounded while gallantly leading his men to the assault on the battery. Captain N. K. Bray, Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, was wounded in the thigh, and Lieutenant Charles A. Ahrests, acting adjutant One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, was slightly wounded in the head, and has since returned to his regiment. Losses in the regiments are as follows: Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, 4 enlisted men slightly wounded, 1 enlisted man missing; Thirty-third New Jersey Volunteers, 2 enlisted men killed, 1 commissioned officer and 24 men wounded, 1 missing; One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers, 4 enlisted men wounded; One hundred and nineteenth New York Volunteers, 1 commissioned officer killed, 12 enlisted men wounded and 1 missing; One hundred and ninth Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1 enlisted man killed and 7 wounded; Seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, 5 wounded; One hundred and thirty-fourth New York Volunteers, 1 commissioned officer and 11 enlisted men wounded. May 16, the enemy having retreated during the night, the brigade moved at 8 a.m., fording the Oostenaual River. The One hundred and fifty-fourth New York Volunteers was here detached to proceed to Fields' Ferry to procure boats.

The 26th Iowa Infantry, 1st Brigade, 1st Division, 15th Army Corps, saw combat at Snake Creek Gap on May 10-12, 1864 (Byers 1888; NPS 2011).

The 66th Illinois formed part of the 2nd Brigade, 2nd Division, 16th Army Corps and were armed with Henry rifles when they fought at Snake Creek Gap on May 9, 1864 (NPS 2011). Jones (2006) noted, “The Sixty-sixth had the honor of opening the campaign by driving Wheeler's cavalry and a Brigade of rebel Infantry through Snake Creek Gap, and holding until night the
high hills of Resaca”. Photographs of two uniformed officers in that regiment are reproduced in Figure 25.

![Figure 25. First Lieutenant Alvin Haskins Davis (left) and Lieutenant W.C. Jones, 66th Illinois Infantry Regiment.](image)

The 81st Ohio Infantry formed part of the 2nd Brigade, 2nd Division, 16th Army Corps when it fought at Snake Creek Gap and Sugar Valley on May 9, 1864 (NPS 2011). Corporal Charles Wright, Company C, 81st Ohio Infantry, wrote of the movements of the Army of the Tennessee at Snake Creek Gap and Ship’s Gap in the initial advance towards Atlanta,

> the Army of the Tennessee passed to the right and entered the mountain ranges at Ship’s Gap on the evening of the 8th of May. We marched to within a mile of the southern outlet, known as Snake Creek Gap, and bivouacked in the narrow pass. Early on the morning of the 9th of May comrades of Company C will remember that they were getting their coffee ready when firing was heard at the south end of the pass, and some of Kilpatrick’s cavalry came back in a hurry, two or three wounded men among them…Company C with the 81st hurried to the mouth of Snake Creek Gap (Wright 1887:94).

The 50th Ohio Volunteer Infantry was assigned to the 3rd Brigade, 4th Division, 23rd Army Corps when it fought at Snake Creek Gap. The regiment joined with Sherman’s army on May 23, 1864. William Wylie, in Captain Thomas Gwinn’s Company, was killed by a minie ball at the battle of Snake Creek Gap, Georgia on May 31, 1864 (Mansfield 1899).

General Marcellus Monroe Crocker’s Iowa Infantry Brigade, comprised of the 11th, 13th, 15th and 16th Iowa Infantries, assigned to the 3rd Brigade, 4th Division, 17th Army Corps saw combat
at Snake Creek Gap on October 15 and 16, 1864 (NPS 2011). W.H. Jennings, Crocker’s Iowa Brigade [11th Iowa Infantry], wrote of the action at Snake Creek Gap in October, 1864:

Leaving Resaca we moved west a few miles and met the rear guard of Hood’s army, well fortified at Snake Creek gap, a narrow passage to the mountains. The rebels had felled trees across a road for several miles that took our troops all day to remove. There were several rebels killed and wounded near the mouth of the gap. The leaves in the woods took fire and I saw several rebels, with their clothing all burned off but their shoes. We continued our pursuit of Hood’s army, until we reached Galesville Alabama, October 26th (Jennings 1915:40).

Confederate accounts of the action at Snake Creek Gap are even more rare than the Union accounts. Confederate Colonel C.P. Breckenridge provided this post-war description of the action:

While this attack had been going on, McPherson had steadily marched toward Snake Creek Gap, to protect which no steps had been taken. Undoubtedly if a cavalry force had been started to Snake Creek Gap at the moment Grigsby was ordered to Dug Gap, it would have reached there before McPherson, and held it during the night of the 8th, during which time infantry support could have reached there. I do not wish to be understood as offering any criticism on these facts; I am merely stating the facts as I believe them to be. Why these gaps were left unguarded, why a prompt effort was not made to hold Snake Creek Gap, I neither pretend to know nor venture to guess; nor do I offer any criticism. That they were not guarded, and that this gave Sherman the easy means of causing the evacuation of Dalton and the retreat to Resaca, is undoubtedly true. That we could have held Dalton or made an attack on Sherman if these gaps had been held is a problem over which military men may differ. Whatever may have been the reason or cause, the fact is that the provision made to hold Snake Creek Gap was an order to Grigsby during the night of the 8th to move his brigade to its mouth. The 9th Kentucky had been on duty continuously for over twenty-four hours; the whole brigade for over twelve hours, and under fire all the afternoon. But with cheerful alacrity the command began its march as soon as it could feed, after being relieved by Granbury — possibly about 10 o'clock. The night was dark, the road rough and unfamiliar, and it was difficult to find guides. But just at dawn we came in sight of the eastern mouth of the gap, and, contrary to our information, found it in possession of the enemy. Colonel Grigsby had been informed that a company of Georgia troops was on picket on the road to the gap, and at or near its eastern outlet. We had not seen that company, and Colonel Grigsby naturally concluded that the troops we saw a few hundred yards before us were those. The usual confusion of an all-night march and the halt of the head of the column had jammed the different organizations somewhat together in a narrow lane. The advanced vidette reported the troops to be Federals. Colonel Grigsby, still supposing them to be Georgians, ordered a small scout to the front. In these few minutes the enemy, having discovered us and being concealed by the character of the ground and the forest, had formed line of battle, while our column had become more confused by many of the men dismounting to rest. Between us and the foot of the mountain was a fallow cotton-field, on the near edge of which was a row of deserted cabins. The road ran along this field a few hundred yards with a gradual descent until it passed through a fringe of willows and underbrush, beyond which there were other open fields, and then on both sides of these open fields were also thick woods.

Suddenly a long skirmish-line broke from the woods, ran to the fringe of willows, and directly through toward the row of cabins, keeping up a brisk fire as they ran. Behind the skirmish-line was developed a line of infantry. For a moment the fire staggered the head of the column, and the order to fall back and form could not be executed. The 9th Kentucky was in front, and very quickly its front companies were dismounted and a dash made for the cabins. Fortunately our men reached them first and drove the Federal skirmishers back. This gave breathing time, of which immediate and brilliant advantage was taken by Major J. Q. Chenowith, who led a portion of the 1st Kentucky, on horseback, on a devour to the right through the woods until he reached the fringe of
willows, when at full run he charged the skirmish-line on the left, and the dismounted men of the
9th Kentucky charged on foot through the open field. The audacity of this sudden and unexpected
dash caused the skirmish-line to run at breakneck speed, and the line of infantry to halt and to
await reinforcements. This gave ample time to form the brigade for its day's work of retreating
fight. The immediate result of this was a delay to the Federal column of several hours, increased
cautions on the part of McPherson in his march during the day, and prompt information of his
movement to our army headquarters.

The force under McPherson was so large that our small brigade of cavalry could not force it to
develop its line. All that was possible was to cause the march to be as slow as that of a skirmish-
line. This was done. It was late in the afternoon when McPherson drove us into the works before
Resaca, which were defended only by Cantey's brigade and ours. It was a gloomy prospect. We
knew that McPherson had a force of from 15,000 to 20,000, and that there was no possibility of
our receiving any reinforcements that afternoon or night. One serious attack by McPherson, and
Resaca must have been captured (Breckenridge 1888b:280-281).

Who were the troops that defended the entrance to Snake Creek Gap at Site 9WA335? Were they
part of Major General Wheeler’s Confederate cavalry, some unidentified artillery brigade or
battery, or possibly part of Major General Hood’s rear guard that was, “well fortified at Snake
Creek gap” in October, 1864? Or could it have been a Union artillery position? The presumed
artillery battery at 9WA335 was not identified by the preliminary historical research for this
study. No military defenses are shown at this location in the published Civil War Atlas
(Blakeslee 1864; U.S. Army Dept. of the Cumberland. Topographical Engineers 1864; Cowles
1895: Plate 57) (Figures 26 and 27). Manuscript maps may exist in archival repositories such as
the NARA, Cartographic Unit in Maryland, or in personal papers, but these have not been
researched. Other documents pertaining to Snake Creek Gap need to be researched (Figure 28).
The site also remains to be studied and its significance assessed archaeologically. It remains a
topic for future study.

Figure 26. Enlargement of a Portion of Blakeslee’s Map, Showing Snake Creek Gap (Blakeslee 1864).
Figure 27. Snake Creek Gap (Cowles 1895:Plate 57).

Figure 28. Artist’s Rendition of Engagement at Snake Creek Gap, Georgia (From a sketch by Theodore R. Davis 1864).
VII. Chestnut Mountain Entrenchments (9GO326)

The lower western and southwestern slopes of Chestnut Mountain face the Snake Creek valley. Snake Creek, and particular, Snake Creek Gap was the scene of important engagements in the 1864 campaign. General James B. McPherson’s 15th Corps was ordered by General Sherman to this area in early May (Figure 29). In what many perceive as a timid move, General McPherson chose to entrenched the 15th Corps rather than immediately assault the Confederates who were gathering in force at Resaca. The surviving entrenchments on the lower slopes of Chestnut Mountain are almost certain the remains of McPherson’s entrenchments dating to the several days prior to the full investment at Resaca. No major military conflict is recorded in the official records at Chestnut Mountain and it is quite likely that the entrenchments did not see significant fighting. The archaeological traces of military earthworks at 9GO326 represent a temporary encampment and headquarters command facility.

Alternatively, this site could have been so worked over by metal detectorists that the evidence for conflict has been thoroughly removed. This seems most unlikely, based on this archaeologist’s experience in following in the footstep of seemingly mined out areas. Enough typically remains in the ground to confirm a battle site, even if the return is meager compared to the yields reported in the 1960s to 1980s. The findings at Dug Gap, as described in Chapter 9 attest to this trend. Gauging the extent of past metal detecting at this site is difficult. A metal detecting duo was observed by the USFS-led reconnaissance team at Site 9GO326 prior to the PIT project in January, 2010. This may indicate that clandestine metal detecting is routine on this area of the Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest.

The section of trenches explored in the PIT project at 9GO326 is but one small piece of a much larger defensive complex. These Union defenses are mapped in the Civil War Atlas and several other military maps (Cowles 1895:Plate 57, Map 2; Plate 58, Map 3; Plate 63, Map 4; [unattributed] American Memory 2012) (Figures 30-33). A battlefield map printed in the field on May 13, 1864 depicts the environment around Resaca, which includes McPherson’s defenses along Snake Creek. This map does not extend north to include Dug Gap, however (U.S. Army Dept. of the Cumberland. Topographical Engineers 1864).

Several other previously recorded archaeological sites, including sites 9GO122, 9GO123, 9GO124 and 9GO170, may contain other segments of these same defenses. This could be accomplished by comparing the extent of the defenses mapped in the Civil War Atlas and other battlefield maps with our current archaeological knowledge of the military landscape. Since the PIT project focused on trench remains on a single ridge finger, the entire understanding of the entire trench complex is beyond the scope of this study.
Figure 29. Major General James B. McPherson, U.S. Army.
Figure 30. Union Defenses East of Horn Mountain Along Snake Creek (Cowles 1895:Plate 57).

Figure 31. Union Defenses, 15th Army Corps, May, 1864, Showing Defenses at Chestnut Mountain on Left (Cowles 1983:Plate 57(2)).
Figure 32. Battlefield Map of “Environ of Resaca, Georgia” (Right) with Enlargement Showing McPherson’s Defenses Along Snake Creek (Left) (U.S. Army Dept. of the Cumberland. Topographical Engineers 1864).

Figure 33. Manuscript Map Labeled “McPherson Snake Creek Gap” (Right) with Enlargement Showing McPherson’s Defenses at Snake Creek (Left) ([unattributed] American Memory 2012).
VIII. Ship’s (Maddox’s) Gap (9WA201)

Many troops in Sherman’s Army of the Mississippi marched through Ship’s Gap in the 1864 Georgia campaign. Most of the soldiers passed through the area without incident and their only archaeological footprint would be the limited debris or features resulting from a brief overnight encampment. One example is the 99th Indiana Infantry, which was part of the 3rd Brigade, 4th Division, 15th Army Corps. Chaplain Daniel R. Lucas, 99th Indiana Infantry, wrote of his regiment’s movements through Ship’s Gap on May 8, 1864 on their way towards Resaca, when the regiment, Marched at 11:45 a.m.; “crossed Taylor’s Ridge at Mattock’s or Ship’s gap, camped at 6 p.m. near Villanow, having marched nine miles” (Lucas 1900:90). The regiment returned to the area in October, 1864 in pursuit of Confederate General Hood’s forces. Lucas (1900:128-130) noted, “The division arrived at Rome the 12th, and next day marched toward Ressaca, reaching that place and passing through it and Snake Creek Gap on the 15th. We passed Villanow the 16th and stopped for the night in Ship’s Gap on Taylor’s Ridge. On the 17th we moved to Lafayette…”.

Combat at Ship’s Gap took place on October 16, 1864. Major General David Stanley, commanding the 4th and 14th Corps, was in pursuit of Major General Hood in northwestern Georgia. General Sherman gave orders to General Stanly to occupy the western end of Snake Creek Gap while General Howard and the Army of the Tennessee pushed towards General Hood from the east. Fletcher noted: “Hood, fighting with his rear-guard, protected by Wheeler’s cavalry, which had now joined him, retreated rapidly, and holding Ship’s Gap, a pass in a parallel range of hills between Villanow and to Lafayette, covered his entrance into Lafayette and the valley of the Chattanooga. Sherman, still pursuing, captured a portion of the rear-guard at Ship’s Gap, and on the 18th entered Lafayette…” (Fletcher 1866:378-379).

Union regiments that claim participation in the October 16 battle at Ship’s Gap include the 11th, 13th, 15th, 16th and 26th Iowa Infantry, 76th Ohio Infantry, and 29th, 31st and 32nd Missouri Infantry (ehistory.com 2011; Sheel 1998; NPS 2011). The 26th Iowa Infantry and 76th Ohio Infantry were assigned to the 1st Brigade, 1st Division, 15th Army Corps. The 29th, 31st and 32nd Missouri Infantry were assigned to the 3rd Brigade of the same division and corps. General Marcellus Monroe Crocker’s Iowa Infantry Brigade, comprised of the 11th, 13th, 15th and 16th Iowa Infantries, assigned to the 3rd Brigade, 4th Division, 17th Army Corps saw combat at Ship’s Gap on October 15 and 16, 1864 (NPS 2011).

Confederate regiments engaged at Ship’s Gap included the 24th South Carolina Infantry and the 46th Georgia Infantry (NPS 2011; Wettstaed 2010). No documents were located by the present research effort pertaining to the action of any of these military units at Ship’s Gap.

Cartographic information about the battle at Ship’s Gap is limited (Figures 34 and 35) (Blakeslee 1864; Cowles 1983:Plate 57). Historical markers provide a few clues as to the battle location. A historical marker at Ship’s Gap bears this inscription:

May 7, 1864. Col. J.W. Sprague's (2nd) brigade, Veatch's (4th) Div., 16th A.C., having camped with the corps on the little Chickamauga (near Catlett 4 mi. N.), pushed forward in a surprise move and seized this gap in Taylor's Ridge at 9p.m.
This enabled Dodge & the 16th A.C. (McPherson's Army of the Tenn. [US]) to march E., unopposed, to Villanow & Snake Creek Gap, May 8.

The 15th Corps (same army) crossed at Gordon Springs Gap, 4 miles N.E. McP[h]erson's move to Snake Creek Gap outflanked the Confederate forces under Gen. J.C. Johnston [CS] at Dalton -- resulting later in the evacuation of that place and the two days of battle at Resaca (Georgia Department of Natural Resources 1992).

Another historical marker located south of Ship’s Gap states:

Southward for several miles is the pleasant little valley of W. Armuchee Creek; Dick Ridge on the E.; Taylor's Ridge on the W.

Situated 3 mi. S. are Old Shiloh Ch. & the Wm. Little res. - where Maj. Gen. John B. Hood was taken from the field of Chickamauga to recover from a leg amputation. Sept. - Oct., 1863.


Figure 34. Enlargement of a Portion of Blakelsee’s Manuscript Map, Showing Maddows [Ship’s] Gap (Blakeslee 1864).
Figure 35. Ship's or Maddox Gap (Cowles 1983:Plate 57).
IX. Battlefield Material Evidence

A. ARMS ARTIFACTS

The most obvious evidence of Civil War action in the PIT project was weapon-related artifacts. As noted earlier in the report, the study vicinity long has attracted relic collectors. Since the 1960s, and possibly even earlier, relic collectors were armed with remote sensing equipment that enabled them to locate metal objects buried in the landscape. Consequently, an unknown body of information about the battles in this area has been removed from the battlefield landscape. Despite this handicap, the PIT crew managed to locate enough arms-related artifacts to enable us to weave an informed story. With the exception of one small lead buckshot, which was recovered from the Chestnut Mountain Encampment, all arms related artifacts found by the PIT project were from the Dug Gap battlefield.

No evidence of artillery ordnance or accoutrements was recovered by the PIT survey crew. We know that both Union and Confederate artillery were used in the battle for Dug Gap and Rocky Face Ridge and relic collectors reported finding evidence for artillery. At least one documented example is preserved in the Thomas S. Dickey collection at the Atlanta History Center. The Union (Pennsylvania) artillery battery consisted of three 3-inch Rodman guns. Initially, the Union battery was positioned near the Babb house but as the battle progressed it was repositioned at Hall’s Mill. Both of these locations would be on present-day privately owned land in the Mill Creek valley, west of the USFS study site.

The artillery pieces used by the Confederates were not determined, although documents reveal that the Confederates did have an artillery battery on the crest of Rocky Face Ridge. What is not known, however, is the exact location of that battery on the ridge. Evidence that would indicate a Confederate artillery battery may include earthen or stone batteries and discarded friction primers. Any artillery rounds fired by the Confederates likely were deposited on the privately owned land, west of the PIT study area. None of this type of archaeological evidence was observed on the study tract.

Firearms are the primary evidence for the battle discovered by the PIT project. No gun parts were recovered by the PIT survey crew. Bullets, percussion caps and one Spencer shell casing were the only artifacts located in the project. These included 42 lead bullets, 47 lead (probable bullet) fragments, 38 brass or copper percussion caps and one Spencer brass shell casing. Examples of these artifacts are shown in Figures 36 through 43.

The most common bullet used by the U.S. Army troops in the Civil War was a 3-ringed bullet, often called a 3-ringer. This general type of bullet, which was fired in Springfield Arsenal issue 1861 and 1863 rifled muskets, was prevalent on the Dug Gap battlefield. Eighteen examples were identified in the collection. Only one of these bullets appeared to be unfired. It measured 14.5 mm in diameter (.57 caliber), 16 mm in length, had a basal concavity of 8 mm and weighed 34 g. Sixteen measured examples ranged in diameter from 13.5 to 32 mm (on a heavily impacted specimen). All of the fired examples were deformed to varying degrees but the
Assemblage appears to correspond to .55 (2 examples) and .57 caliber (3 examples). The 16 bullets weighed an average of 28.56 g.

Figure 36. In Situ Minie Ball Unearthed by PIT Survey Member at Dug Creek Gap.

The standard Springfield musket fired a .58 caliber projectile with an effective range of 200-300 yards. Most Union 3-ringer bullets were factory made, whereas a great many Confederate bullets were field cast. A wide variety of 3-ringed bullet types are identified by Civil War enthusiasts. Interestingly, Williams Cleaner rounds, often encountered on Civil War sites in Georgia, were not identified in the PIT project assemblage.

Enfield bullets were commonly used by Confederate troops. Enfield bullets lack the exterior rings of many other varieties of Civil War bullets. In many respects, however, the Enfield bullet had superior ballistics. When fired, the .577 caliber Enfield bullet flared to make a tight seal within the gun barrel, a trait that many other bullet types lacked. This important characteristic gave Enfield bullets somewhat greater trajectory and accuracy. Enfield bullets were intended for use in British Pattern 1853 Enfield rifles, which had an effective range of 600 yards. Bilby (2005:58-60) notes that while the intended ammunition for most Confederate Enfields was a .777 caliber bullet, several smaller-sized Enfield weapons were used by the Confederates, and soldiers often fired improper caliber bullets (undersized or slightly oversized) in their weapons. This latter habit led to frequent misfires or jams.

The PIT survey crew recovered two examples of Enfield bullets and both displayed evidence of impact. One measured 16 mm in diameter (.63 caliber), 22.5 mm in length, and weighed 37 g and the other specimen measured 13 mm in diameter (.51 caliber), 24 mm in length and weighed 31 g. Both examples were badly deformed so the caliber measurements should be viewed with caution. Since most of the Confederate weapons were aimed down slope the relative low frequency of Enfield finds within the USFS property is predictable.
Most of the Confederate troops who defended Dug Gap on May 8-12 were cavalrymen. Their preferred weapons were carbine style guns and pistols, with shorter barrels than the standard infantry muskets. Carbines generally fired a smaller caliber ball than that used in infantry muskets.

The single Spencer brass shell casing was recovered from a sandstone outcrop on the western slope above Dug Gap. This outcrop would have been an excellent perch for a Confederate gunman. Spencer repeating rifles and carbines were a late addition to the Civil War arsenal. Most were used by the Union, although by 1864, many Confederate units, particularly those in Major General Joseph Wheeler’s cavalry corps were armed Spencers. Spencer rifles were capable of firing seven .52 caliber rounds without reloading. Spencer rifles had an effective range of about 200 yards. Spencer carbines had a .56 caliber bore. The repeating fire gave Spencer rifles gave the cavalry a decided edge over most infantry guns for dispensing deadly force (Coates and Thomas 1990:35, 48). The recovered Spencer shell case from Dug Gap was used in a .56 caliber Spencer carbine.

The PIT survey team recovered many mangled, distorted, fragmented, melted, or otherwise unidentifiable bullets or bullet fragments. PIT surveyors also discovered numerous small melted lead fragments adjacent to rock outcrops and outcrop fissures at Dug Gap. At first their function was somewhat of an enigma, as surveyors speculated that melting resulted from forest fires, or perhaps a bored Confederate soldier sitting by a campfire. As more metal detected data were gathered on these small blobs of molten lead, however, their function and source of origin was elucidated. They represent the liquefied remains of bullets that struck the stone outcrops. Proof for this was represented by two stone fragments recovered from Dug Gap, which had lead adhering to the stone surface. A number of the impacted bullets resembled small fried eggs, also the result of softer lead bullets striking a solid, harder stone surface.

One Union bullet was retrieved from a dead cedar tree on the southern part of the battlefield. A keen survey member (Edwin Goad) located the bullet while using his metal detector to scan the fallen tree. Figure 37 shows the downed cedar tree facing upslope to first shelf of sandstone rocks. In this photograph the scanner coil of the detector marks the find location in a rotted limb of the tree, about 21 feet above base of roots. It is shown, still embedded in the wood, in Figures 38 and 39. Once this discovery was made, the crew scanned many other downed trees, as well as standing trees, for additional evidence of “airborne” bullets. The results of this exercise were mostly negative except for some small unidentifiable lead fragments in downed wood near a large rock outcrop. This outcrop contains other bullet debris and the small lead bits in the downed trees may well date to the Civil War period. None of these lead fragments was diagnostic.
Figure 37. Downed Cedar Tree Containing Union Minie Ball (LN52), Metal Detector Head Marks Approximate Location of Find on Tree Trunk.

Figure 38. Bullet Embedded in Cedar Tree, LN52, Dug Gap.
Figure 39. Union Minie Ball in Downed Tree on Rocky Face Ridge at Dug Gap (LN52).

Figure 40. Melted Lead on Quartzite Rock from Dug Gap (LN129).
Figure 41. Examples of Bullets from Dug Gap (Top row, left to right: LNs 154, 66, 173, 51, 159; Bottom row: 164, 167, 168, 171, 172).

Figure 42. Examples of Heavily Impacted Bullets from Dug Gap (Top row, left to right: LNs90, 94, 116, 149, 155; Bottom row: 156, 162, 165, 170).
Figure 43. Examples of Deformed Lead Bullets from Dug Gap (Top row, left to right: LNs, 89, 106, 125; Bottom row: 157, 158, 169).

Percussion caps are an informative artifact type on the battlefield and the PIT survey team recovered 38 examples from the Dug Gap battlefield. Examples of percussion caps are shown in Figures 44-46. The percussion caps can be grouped into three categories—fired (N=2), unfired (N=31), and undetermined (N=5). All are made of copper or brass and had no identifiable markings and were not distinguished as to Federal or Confederate. The collection of percussion caps ranged in diameter from 6 to 7 mm with an average weight of 0.505 grams.

Percussion cap weapon technology was invented by Joshua Shaw about 1814 but Shaw kept his invention secret until 1822 when he was issued a patent. Shaw obtained another patent in 1828 but by 1826 the percussion cap was widely used for personal weapons. Military service use of percussion cap technology lagged behind by nearly two decades. The British adopted it for their service weapons at Woolwich in 1843 (Researchpress.co.uk 2003).

Fired percussion caps are an important indicator of a soldier’s firing position, since these artifacts rarely traveled very far from their point of use. Once a soldier fired a shot using a percussion cap, that useless piece of brass was quickly removed from the gun nipple and replaced by another cap.

Unfired, or dropped percussion caps also have a story to tell. They may point to confusion among the troops, where in the haste of battle, useful munitions were dropped or otherwise lost. One may envision many situations where unfired percussion caps could be dropped and thereby enter the archaeological record. Most of these situations do not bode well for their owner, who may have been shot and fallen. The PIT team discovered a cluster of 27 unfired percussion caps and two iron, 4-hole buttons in an area on the western slope above Dug Gap. This find is interpreted as the contents of a small cloth pouch containing percussion caps and secured by the
two buttons. Percussion caps were issued in small cylindrical tin or brass cans with a tight-fitting metal lid. Soldiers in battle may have carried percussion caps in a more convenient form, such as a small cloth bag, which could be accessed more quickly than the small tin can.

Figure 44. PIT Survey Crew Explores Percussion Cap Cluster on Slope East Above Dug Creek Gap.

Figure 45. Spencer Cartridge Casing and Fired Percussion Caps from Dug Gap (Top row, left to right: LN132, 139, 140, 141, 142; Bottom row: 143, 144, 145, 146, 147).
One possible rifle pit was located in the Dug Gap study tract. It was located on a ridge, approximately one-half way down the slope of Rocky Face Ridge. It consisted of a shallow trench, approximately 4 m in length and 1 m in width and 50 cm in depth. It was oriented perpendicular to the ridge and it would have afforded protection for Confederate troops who were being assaulted from below. The area downslope from this pit, beginning approximately 10 m from it, was a precipitous cliff that could only be climbed with care and great difficulty. It is unlikely that this particular section of slope was chosen by the Union infantry as a route of ascent. No bullets, percussion caps, or other metal artifacts were found in the immediate vicinity of this pit.

Confederate marksman and regular troops took strategic and protected positions behind the rock wall and rock outcrops at Dug Gap. Consequently, these areas received more than their share of
return fire from the advancing Union soldiers. The PIT crew identified several locations where deadly Confederate marksmen were positioned. These locations are recorded by the co-presence of incoming Union bullets and fired percussion caps.

The relatively low yield of Civil War bullets at Dug Gap may be attributed to three factors. Perhaps the most severe impact to their recovery has been the decades of relic collector activity on the battlefield site. The Civil War engagement at Dug Gap has been no secret and its wooded remoteness and easy highway access made it vulnerable to frequent visits by collectors. Although a large portion of the battlefield has been in Federal ownership for decades, many collectors ignored authority and property ownership concerns in collecting and digging items from the battlefield. This illicit behavior goes back many decades but was accelerated in the post-World War II era when metal detectors were added to the collector’s tool kit.

B. CLOTHING ARTIFACTS

The PIT survey team recovered three metal buttons. All three were likely associated with the battle of Dug Gap. Only one of these was military issue and it was a U.S. Army General Service button (Figure 47). It was a small, two-piece domed brass button that weighed 1.2 grams and was 14 mm in diameter. The button was in poor condition but it displays a spread eagle with an American shield and clutching arrows in its left talon and an olive branch in its right talon (similar to GI-97 in Albert 1976:40-41). No marks were visible on the button’s obverse side. This button, which is a uniform cuff button, is significant as it serves to locate the advance position of one U.S. Army soldier who was involved in the assault up Rocky Face Ridge at Dug Gap. It was recovered from a sloping area below an outcrop that was likely used by Confederate pickets or snipers. The U.S. Army soldier doubtless lost this button while facing an intense hail of lead from the opposing Confederates who enjoyed the better battlefield position.

The other two buttons were small undecorated 4-hole iron buttons. Both of these iron buttons were found associated with a cluster of 27 unfired percussion caps, which were previously described. Collectively, these likely represent the remains of a small cloth pouch used for arms accoutrements that was secured with two metal buttons. Civil War historian Mark Pollard notes that sutlers at modern Civil War re-enactments offer cloth bags with metal button closures that are essentially identical to the specimens from Dug Gap. This percussion cap pouch was dropped by a soldier from one of the two armies, U.S. or Confederate. Unfortunately, the artifacts themselves do not provide conclusive evidence for the association with either side. Given the location of this artifact cluster on the Dug Gap battlefield, however, it seems likely that it was dropped by an advancing U.S. Army soldier who became befuddled in the face of the gallling Confederate fire.

PIT surveyors located one small, rectangular iron buckle on the Dug Gap battlefield. No other artifacts were found in direct association with this buckle. It may represent a harness buckle and is not associated with a military uniform. Its association with the Civil War remains unclear.
C. ARCHITECTURE ARTIFACTS

Machine cut square nails were frequently encountered in the survey. The greatest concentration of machine cut nails was observed on the ridge flat west of the Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment. Metal detector survey at 9GO326 yielded 96 machine cut square nails. Forty of these were collected and the remaining 46 were left in situ. Two major clusters and one minor cluster at that location were indicated by the metal detector survey. The two larger clusters represent two wooden building sites. Metal detecting at Dug Gap yielded four machine cut square nails, all were collected.

Machine cut nails enter production in the 1790s and are common throughout the first three-quarters of the 19th century. They were the nail in common use during the American Civil War. Their presence in the field does not necessarily mean, however, that they had a military association. They may indicate the location of a barn or other building site that were unrelated to the war. In the case of the Chestnut Mountain site, the U.S. Army troops thought to be linked to this site were only there for a period of a few days in May, 1864. If this was the headquarters of Major General James McPherson, then some hastily constructed buildings may have been erected on the spot and these nails may be from that rapid construction effort.

D. ACTIVITIES ARTIFACTS

Activities at the study sites are represented by a very limited array of artifacts. An iron chisel was located at Chestnut Mountain (9GO326). Items in this category from Dug Gap (9WD5) include an iron buckle, brass cap, four melted lead strips, knife blade fragment, brass rivet, lead cylinder, and other unidentified iron.

Figure 47. U.S. Army General Service Button from Dug Gap (LN61).


X. Spatial Distributions

Artifact and feature data from the Dug Gap, Ship’s Gap, and Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment sites were entered into an ArcGIS (Version 10) project database. A series of spatial distribution maps were generated that depict patterning across the battlefield landscapes. A selection of these is presented in this chapter. These begin with a base map showing the topography in the general study area and the relative locations of Dug Gap, Ship’s Gap and the Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment sites (Figure 48). More detailed maps of each battlefield are provided in Figures 49-55 and 57. Figure 56 shows a representative cross-section (from West to East) of the Union entrenchments at Chestnut Mountain.

Figure 48. Topography in the Study Vicinity.
Figure 49. Distribution of Battle Artifacts at Dug Gap (9WD5).
Figure 50. Distribution of Union (3-Ringer) Bullets at Dug Gap (9WD5).
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Figure 51. Distribution of Confederate (Enfield) Bullets at Dug Gap (9WD5).
Figure 52. Distribution of Non-Diagnostic Bullets and Lead Fragments at Dug Gap (9WD5).
Figure 53. Distribution of Percussion Caps at Dug Gag (9WD5).
Figure 54. Identified Cultural Resources at Ship's Gap (Rock symbols marked approximate limits of stone wall).
Figure 55. Topographic Map of Entrenchment at Chestnut Mountain (Jopling 2011).
Figure 56. Representative East-West Profile of Chestnut Mountain Trench (Showing natural ridgeslope on left, ditch and berm).
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Figure 57. Identified Cultural Resources at Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment.
XI. Interpretations

The Chattahoochee-Oconee National Forest lands include important vestiges of the American Civil War. Preliminary NRHP evaluations for the three military sites investigated by this PIT project are provided here. As noted earlier, time and resources did not permit an investigation of the suspected Civil War artillery battery at Snake Creek Gap (9WA335) but a site form was completed for that site and additional archaeological study of it is recommended. Because of the abundance of modern metal trash on that site, however, metal detecting is not likely to be a productive strategy for the next phase of study. Interpretations and recommendations for 9WA201, 9WD5 and 9GO326 are provided in the following.

A. SHIPS (MADDOX) GAP

The Ships Gap site (9WA201) was the least thoroughly explored of the three examined sites and it yielded the least information about Civil War action in the region. Archaeological evidence on the hill side included a portion of a low rock wall. This wall is located in an extremely rocky area. The military character of this wall as a Confederate defensive feature seems likely, but the absence of any battle debris suggests that no serious engagement took place at this section of the battlefield. Oral information provided by a passerby suggests that other, better battlefield loci exist in the area northeast of the area examined in the PIT study, but such evidence remains to be corroborated by scholars. The conflict at Ships (Maddox) Gap in October, 1864 is poorly described in the documentary records. No battle maps of this engagement are known to survive. The battle resulted in loss of life on both sides but the post-battle accounts are limited in their research potential. Preliminary research for this study located some information about the battle, but more substantial historical and archaeological data is needed before this site’s NRHP evaluation can be completed.

Additional fieldwork should include metal detector and reconnaissance survey of adjacent Forest Service lands, investigation of the battery described by Fearrington, and detailed mapping of the rock wall examined in the present study (Fearrington 1984). Fieldwork also should include reconnaissance of the Forest Service lands northwest and west of the area examined in the present study, where the oral information stated battle debris had been collected.

B. DUG GAP AND ROCKY FACE RIDGE

The Dug Gap site (9WD5) was the most thoroughly explored of the three sites in the project and it yielded the most information about Civil War battle action. Defensive features on this site include a low rock wall, which is discontinuous along Rocky Face Ridge. Other segments of the rock wall continue onto Whitfield County property on the north side of Dug Gap Road but the area north of the highway was not explored in the present study. Rocky Face Ridge, of which Dug Gap and Dug Mountain form part, was the scene of several military engagements in the Civil War.
Many U.S. Army regiments claim participation in the action at Dug Gap. The 21st Ohio Veteran Volunteer Infantry Regiment, for example, embroidered on its battle flag the words, “Rocky Face Ridge”, along with other significant engagements fought by the regiment (Ohio Historical Society 2012). That regiment also lists “Dug Gap” on its battle flag, but that refers to a battle on September 11, 1863 engagement that took place at a different, totally-unrelated Dug Gap, many miles northwest of the Dug Gap in Whitfield County. On May 8, 1864, the 21st Ohio attacked at Buzzard’s Roost on Rocky Face Ridge, north of the PIT project area. The battle at Dug Gap is more remembered in the historical record by Union participants than by Confederates. Those few surviving Confederate accounts of the engagement at Dug Gap corroborate the perceived significance of the conflict by the rebels.

Official military records attest to more than one engagement on Rocky Face Ridge and Dug Gap in the war. A minimally described action at Dug Gap in February, 1864 is followed by the better documented Union assault on May 8-9, 1864. Many of the participants in the various actions on Rocky Face Ridge (and Dug Gap) often omit specific geographic descriptions of their location on the ridge. Rocky Face Ridge covers a long section of Whitfield County, which limits the usefulness of these vague battle descriptions and make it difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish battle actions in the different portions of the ridge system.

The area of USFS property at Dug Gap (9WD5) that was examined by the PIT project is considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A and D. Criterion A applies to historic properties that, “are associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history”, and Criterion D applies to properties that, “have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history” (U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service 2002). Site 9WD5 possesses both historical significance and site integrity for meaningful public interpretation. The site may be eligible for listing at the State level of significance, under both criteria.

Historical and archaeological research clearly shows that this area was a battlefield in the American Civil War. The American Civil War (1861-1865) was a watershed event in American history. The Civil War is recognized as an event that contributed greatly to our history. The clash at Dug Gap was a strategically important military event in Major General Sherman’s March to Atlanta campaign. The diversionary assault by the Sherman’s 20th Corps at Dug Gap allowed the 15th Corps to pass relatively unimpeded to near Resaca, Georgia, where a major battle ensued. Subsequent events during Sherman’s movement through Georgia, particularly the fall of Atlanta, influenced the timing (and possibly the outcome) of the Civil War.

Archaeological research at Dug Gap has yielded, and is likely to continue to yield, information important about American history. Battlefield archaeology at Dug Gap revealed battle debris, primarily bullets and percussion caps, and defensive positions (rock walls and boulder outcrops). Careful metal detection of these areas helps to tell the story of the battle and it provides tangible evidence of the rigors endured by its participants. The archaeological site demonstrated that it possesses the potential to inform us about the Civil War engagements that occurred there and that the preserved archaeological information at Dug Gap is unique.
History records many details of the May 1864 battle and the archaeological evidence supports many of the primary accounts. The battle artifacts establish the position of the U.S. Army soldiers in their advance up a slight break in the precipice of Rocky Face Ridge. Their approach was from the northwest to the southeast. They encountered well-positioned Confederate riflemen just below the crest of Rocky Face Ridge. The scattering of bullets and percussion caps at a series of rock outcrops and a segment of low, rock wall attests to the fiercest part of the battle. This area is identified by a section of the rock wall labeled “Defensive Position” on Figures 49-53. Most of the bullets were incoming rounds fired by the advancing 20th Corps. The patterning of the Union bullets reveals the location of the intended targets—Confederate riflemen who held a superior position on the military crest of Rocky Face Ridge. While a few Confederate bullets were recovered on the battlefield, most of these may be deposited in deep sediment or on private property west of the present study tract. The Confederate bullets were fired at the advancing Union soldiers from some distance. Historical accounts state that, being low on ammunition, the Confederates adapted to conditions by rolling loose boulders onto the unwitting men of the 20th Corps. Although sections of the rock wall continue to the south of the main conflict area, only minimal battle debris was located in those areas. The patterning of battle debris shows that the Union soldiers did not achieve the crest of Rocky Face Ridge. A full delineation of the lower portions of the battlefield would require access to private property and possibly deep testing in the colluvial deposits. Clearly, the entire Dug Gap battlefield was not delineated by the present study, but a significant (and relatively well preserved) portion of it was defined.

History records that the soldiers in the 20th Corps left their packs with an armed guard at the foot of the ridge prior to their assault. By doing so, the soldiers were more nimble in scaling the cliff. Their lack of baggage also manifests itself in the archaeological record by the dearth of military accoutrements left by the dead and wounded Union troops. The Confederates, who held the crest of Rocky Face Ridge throughout the battle, exited the battlefield with their possessions intact. The interpretation of the Dug Gap Battlefield could benefit from additional archaeological exploration. This next phase of research should include detailed mapping and test excavations at sections of the rock wall and in areas adjacent to large outcrops, where metal detected objects were recovered by the present study. Deeper soils in those areas may harbor additional metal objects that were not detected by the present study and these areas also may yield non-metal objects relevant to the Civil War engagement. Many of the crevasses between the rocks and boulders may harbor other categories of military artifacts that were not discovered in the upper soil zones. This battlefield has been subjected to relic collecting for many decades and many of the shallow objects were removed from the battlefield in unknown quantities by collectors past. Deeper exploration may offset this negative impact from heavy collector pressure. These suggested test excavation areas also may yield non-metallic artifacts or cultural features associated with the battle, which would further enhance our understanding of the engagement. These test excavations also would enhance our understanding of the defensive character of Rocky Face Ridge.

Test excavations, and systematic shovel test survey, at Dug Gap also has the potential to refine metal detection survey methods for archaeologists. A controlled 5 meter shovel test grid in the main engagement areas, as currently defined by this study, should be undertaken. Parts of this
area are on moderate to extreme slope, which traditionally have not been covered by shovel test sampling strategies. Shovel testing and excavation may not be feasible at some locations, because of extreme slope or the presence of bedrock at the survey.

Detailed mapping of the rock outcrops is another task that would better define the battlefield landscape. The present study time and budget constraints did not allow for this task to be completed. The Confederate marksmen clearly took advantage of this natural protective cover, but the distribution of boulders on the battlefield is poorly documented at present. LIDAR mapping would be an effective technique for a quick, accurate and detailed topographic map of selected battle areas.

C. CHESTNUT MOUNTAIN ENTRENCHMENTS

The Chestnut Mountain Entrenchment site (9GO326) received intermediate study of the three study sites and it yielded information about U.S. Army defenses but no evidence of any battle action. We conclude that it was not a battlefield but it does likely represent a fortified military encampment. It contained two concentrations of machine cut square nails, which probably represent two distinct buildings on the site. This site continues onto private property on its southern end and that portion of the site was not explored by any metal detecting or excavation. The entrenchments on this site are well preserved and offer interpretive potential. Historical research suggests that these were part of a large complex of defenses that were constructed by U.S. Army troops in Major General James McPherson’s 15th Corps in May, 1864. General McPherson and his corps were the first Union troops to arrive near Resaca and these entrenchments were likely constructed by his men as they waited for the arrival of additional U.S. troops. General McPherson was killed in July, 1864 in the battle of Atlanta. The Civil War Atlas shows extensive Union earthworks in this vicinity, of which the investigated portions are part (Cowles 1895: Plate 57, Map 2; Plate 58, Map 3; Plate 63, Map 4).

The area of USFS property at the Chestnut Mountain entrenchment (9GO326) that was examined by the PIT project is considered eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criteria A and D. Criterion A applies to historic properties that, “are associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history”, and Criterion D applies to properties that, “have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history” (U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service 2002). Site 9GO326 possesses both historical significance and site integrity for meaningful public interpretation. The site may be eligible for listing at the State level of significance, under both criteria.

The ditch work at 9GO326 is clearly military in character and was probably constructed by U.S. Army troops in the 15th Corps in May, 1864. The trench was examined is probably part of a larger network of defenses that surrounded Major General McPherson’s command. General McPherson’s 15th Corps played an extremely important role in Major General Sherman’s Georgia campaigns. The present study establishes a clear link between the archaeological remains at 9GO326 and Civil War events. Its association with the Civil War provides the historical significance necessary for listing under Criterion A. The ditch work is relatively intact at 9GO326, although the site’s integrity and research potential remains to be fully explored.
Under Criterion D, site 9GO326 has yielded important archaeological information about important events in American history. The establishment of the geographic location of important military defenses on the 1864 Civil War landscape in the Dalton-Resaca theatre is an important discovery. While the preliminary metal detection research conducted in the present study failed to locate any obvious battle debris, two areas with dense scatters of machine cut, square nails were identified by the PIT team.

A NRHP nomination for this site should be framed in terms of the more extensive network of defenses built in the vicinity by the 15th Corps, of which 9GO326 is likely part. Related archaeological sites may include 9GO122, 9GO123 and 9GO124, and 9GO170, all of which are located on National Forest lands. Other traces of these defenses continue onto private property and others may exist on unexamined U.S.F.S. property. Additional archaeological study of 9GO326 is recommended. This should include test excavation within the machine cut square nail clusters (#1 and #2), as well as test excavations within the trenches. These tests should provide additional data that would aid in the site’s interpretation. Targeted survey of other trenches in the area, on Forest Service lands and privately-owned property, would help to broaden our understanding of this Civil War defensive network. Also, the NRHP status for site 9GO170, which was deemed ineligible for listing in the NRHP by the prior researcher, should be revisited in light of the present discussion. Phase II archaeological studies of 9GO122, 9GO123 and 9GO134 also should be considered.
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