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Archeologists with Coastal Heritage Society received a National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program Grant in July 2007 for a one year study. The purpose of the project was to locate, identify, and determine the level of preservation of as many archeological sites as possible in the City of Savannah that are related to the October 9, 1779 Battle of Savannah. To achieve these goals archeologists conducted extensive primary document research at repositories in Georgia, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. This research examined text and map documents. The gathered map data was entered into a GIS computer program and then overlaid on a recent digital map of the city. Archeologists used the location of their recent (2005) discovery of the Spring Hill Redoubt as one of the points of alignment between the historic maps and the modern map. Archeologists then analyzed the GIS data to determine which battlefield components appear to fall into modern green spaces owned by the city, such as town squares. Archeologists selected as many of these locations to ground-truth as time and budget allowed. They used a combination of ground penetrating radar, shovel test survey, metal detector survey, and test unit excavation. Areas examined included Madison Square, Lafayette Square, Emmet Park, Colonial Park Cemetery, Cuyler Park, Dixon Park, and Myers Park.

The project was extremely successful. Archeologists located a defensive ditch (almost two meters deep) dug by the British in 1779, defended during the battle, and in-filled by the Americans in 1782. The ditch lies in what is now Madison Square. Brick fragments/rubble in the ditch was part of the brick from the barracks razed by the British less than two weeks before the battle. The brick was used in the defenses around the Central redoubts and was pushed into the British trenches following the British evacuation of the city in 1782. In nearby Lafayette Square, archeologists discovered artifacts that were likely discarded by British soldiers occupying the defensive lines near and in the Central Redoubts, and by civilians associated with the soldiers. Emmet Park revealed a deep (3.5 ft.) feature that may have been constructed as part of the river battery associated with nearby Fort Prevost. Not only did archeologists discover evidence of numerous unmarked graves in Colonial Park Cemetery, but also an anomaly that appears to be one of the ditches running toward a redoubt. Archeologists found no evidence of Revolutionary War activity in Cuyler, Dixon, and Myers parks. These locations were the most tenuous of the GIS data, since they were the farthest from the control points that were used to align the maps. This negative evidence will help reduce the search area for these sites during future investigations. The Savannah Under Fire project greatly expanded the battlefield resources, from one discovered in 2005 to four additional ones this year in areas that few people expected to contain Revolutionary War content. The project not only located and identified these resources, but revealed that they are in an excellent state of preservation. Additionally, the project served to share this exciting information with the public at large, including local residents, tourists, and city, county, and state officials. Numerous partners were involved in the project, with the most extensive in-kind and financial support provided by The LAMAR Institute of Savannah, Georgia. In addition to the promised in-kind match, The LAMAR Institute provided a $4,000 grant to extend fieldwork after the discovery of the extensive deposits in Madison Square.
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Chapter 1. Introduction
Chapter 1. Introduction

During the dawning of the morning of October 9, 1799, a massive battle exploded across the landscape of fields and swamps surrounding the colonial city of Savannah. A polyglot of shouting in French, Polish, Haitian, African American, Native American, Scottish, and Irish languages and dialects among the multi-national troops filled the air. This cacophony was punctuated by the deafening roar of cannon and musket fire, creating a blinding curtain of smoke and haze. In less than an hour, approximately 800 troops were wounded or killed in some of the fiercest fighting in the revolution. The overwhelming British victory resulted in a disproportionate loss of less than 50 British casualties. The decisive allied Franco-American defeat reinvigorated Loyalists and allowed Great Britain easy access to Charleston, ultimately sweeping the southern theater of the American Revolution. Historians estimate that 8,000-12,000 troops participated in this Battle of Savannah. In 1779, British Major General Henry Clinton called the British victory, “…the greatest event that has happened the whole war” (Wilson 2005:175).

Savannah was a major colonial southern. By the beginning of the American Revolution, Savannah claimed 2,500-3,000 residents, making it the twentieth largest town in the colonies (Georgia.gov; city-data.com). At the same time, the population of the entire colony of Georgia was approximately 35,000 (Georgia.gov). Savannah served as an import port throughout the colonial period and during the revolution. The British realized the strategic importance of occupying Savannah during the American Revolution, not only for the value of her port, but for the ability to use that location as an in-road to attacking Charleston and ultimately controlling the southern theater of the war. The British captured Savannah in December 1778.

Even as the British occupied Savannah, America and her allies were making plans to retake the city. A successful capture would strengthen the American position in the southern theater of the American Revolution and demoralize Great Britain. British Major General Henry Clinton claimed, “Should Georgia be lost I shall have little hope of recovering that Province and also of reducing and arming South Carolina” (Lawrence 1979:69).

The attempt to take Savannah from the British was a joint effort by American Major General Benjamin Lincoln and French Admiral Comte d’Estaing. Lincoln’s troops included General Lachlan McIntosh and the Georgia militia along with General Casimir Pulaski’s Legion (cavalry) and the South Carolina Light Dragoons. D’Estaing troops included land and naval forces, a huge fleet, and volunteers in the Chasseurs de San Domingue/Santo Domingo (now Haiti). The 1779 Siege and Battle of Savannah marked the first occasion of on-the-ground troop action involving French troops. The Franco-American alliance at Savannah was plagued with problems throughout the campaign. The initial plan was to besiege the city until the British surrendered. Diplomatic efforts by the British during the siege allowed British reinforcements to slip into the city and the extra time enabled the British to strengthen the defenses surrounding the city. This defensive strengthening, in addition to poor allied planning, the growing threat to French vessels from hurricanes, the lack of an allied supply line, and petty squabbling among the allies rendered the siege unsuccessful and resulted in an allied attack of the city known as the Battle of Savannah.

There were 14 redoubts encircling Savannah by October 1779. These redoubts were connected by an assortment of trenches and protected by an abatis. Various redoubts were associated with artillery positions, staging/camp areas, reserve troops, offensive trench works, and troop movements, including several feints. All of the redoubts were important in defending British-occupied Savannah from an allied Franco-American attack during the Battle of Savannah. Spring Hill Redoubt, located on the southwestern side of the city, played a pivotal role in the battle. The most intensive fighting occurred at Spring Hill and the redoubts flanking it. The NPS ranks Spring Hill as a Class A battlefield. Figure 1 is one of many versions of period-maps illustrating Savannah and her defenses in 1779.

Project Background

In 2005 Coastal Heritage Society archeologists and their team located the remains of Spring Hill Redoubt. This discovery met with surprise, as some thought the redoubt was located to the east and many others thought that nineteenth century construction activities by the Central of Georgia Railroad destroyed all remains of the redoubt. This discovery led archeologists to ponder the likelihood
of the existence of Revolutionary War battlefield remains in other areas of the city that were less disturbed than the Spring Hill location. They also realized that they now held a key that could be used to locate other battlefield resources. The discovery of the Spring Hill Redoubt could serve as a control point in a GIS overlay of historic battle maps onto the modern Savannah landscape, identifying where other potential resources might lie. In addition, the ground-swell of community enthusiasm over the discovery of the Spring Hill Redoubt indicated that area residents, city leaders, tourism officials, visitors, and many others were interested in supporting the identification and preservation of Savannah’s unique battlefield resources.

Armed with these new insights, CHS applied for and received a National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program (NPS ABPP) grant in July 2007 for the 2007-2008 project.

**Description of Study Area**

In 1733, Savannah was established as the first settlement in Georgia, the 13th and southern-most British colony in North America (Figure 2). Savannah is located on a sandy bluff 42 feet above mean sea level, overlooking the Savannah River (USGS 1978). The city lies near
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Savannah lies along the eastern border of Georgia, with the Savannah River dividing the states of Georgia and South Carolina. Savannah lies approximately 18 miles from the Atlantic Ocean. It is surrounded by low, flat marshlands on its eastern and northern sides. Modern satellite images show this aquatic environment. Savannah lies amidst a riverine environment, including rivers, inlets, swamps, and the Atlantic Ocean. Land to the west and south reaches elevations as high as 51 feet (city-data.com). Half of this terrain is woods and wooded swamps. Savannah has a semitropical climate with sweltering summers and mild winters. The city occupies 75 square miles. Today, the city is located in Chatham County. In 2007, a total of 130,331 people called Savannah home (city-data.com).

Cultural Landscape

The overriding feature of colonial Savannah was the town plan, still easily visible today. Savannah proudly claims title to one of the first planned cities in the United States. The plan of squares and wards was unique to Savannah and only a few nearby settlements, such as New Ebenezet (which is no longer a town). General James Oglethorpe established Savannah’s orderly town plan of large common areas known as squares. Squares were used for activities related to the common good, such as markets and exercise areas. Each square was surrounded by four blocks known as tythings containing 10 houses each. (An alley divided each tything in half.) Four tythings and a square constituted a ward. Originally, Savannah consisted of four squares and by 1855 had expanded by another 20 squares (Lane 1994). The town consisted of six squares, or wards, at the time of the American Revolution. Figure 1 shows the town plan layout in 11779. The existence of the town plan is relevant to this project on several levels. First, the town plan arrangement clearly demarcated the city, which was useful in creating the defensive boundary that would come to surround the city by 1779. Secondly, Savannah’s expansion following the American Revolution, through the Victorian period, and into the early twentieth century was a continuation of this original plan of squares and wards. Results from this project show that the continuation of the squares helped protect key pockets of battlefield resources, since the squares provided fewer opportunities for wholesale development and adverse soil impacts. It also limited the amount of artifacts discarded immediately following the revolution that would have might have clouded the interpretation of the work. This is exemplified by the bricks archeologists uncovered in Madison that, by default, are tied to the 1779 destruction of the brick barracks in that area. Thirdly, the street and city block locations have not changed significantly since their founding. Street intersections were key to aligning historic and modern maps in GIS, which is the basis of our “surgical’ archeology methodology. (See the methods section of this report for more details.)

Current Land Use

The oldest parts of Savannah’s town plan, constituting 24 squares, were made into the city’s first National Historic Landmark District in 1966 (Reiter 2004). Today, the city has almost a dozen National Register Historic Districts featuring neighborhoods of different periods and architectural styles. Figure 3 shows a map of the all-encompassing Savannah Historic District. In 1979, for example, the Victorian Historic District was created followed by the Ardsley Park/Chatham Crescent district. Savannah’s historic zoning ordinances were born in 1968 when the Georgia State Legislature passed an amendment to the state constitution authorizing such zoning (Reiter 2004). In 1973 Savannah established the Savannah Historic District Board of Review, which “exists to protect the values of property associated with history, unique architectural details or relation to a square, park or area within the Landmark Historic District. A certificate of appropriateness is required for all exterior changes.
visible from the public right of way, new construction or demolition, or signage within the historic district boundaries” (MPC 2004). Such measures have resulted in the preservation of countless structures throughout the city. Unfortunately, the archeological resources have not fared as well. In spite of decades of attempts at creating similar preservation ordinances for the archeological components of these structures and other sites, there are no protective measures for the non-renewable archeological resources.

Land use in the city is mixed residential and commercial. Houses, shops, houses above shops, businesses, schools, and cultural institutions are sprinkled throughout the town. Several major road thoroughfares and highways either cross or come into the city. Chronologically, the oldest part of the city begins at the river and slowly gets younger to the south. The south side of town consists of mid-twentieth century to recent subdivisions, as well as suburban schools, strip malls, large-scale shopping malls and the myriad of typical small businesses and convenience stores. Industrial areas occupy the southern bank of the Savannah River to the east and west of the city. The port infrastructure of the Georgia Ports Authority blankets the west side, while chemical plants and other industries dot the banks east of the city.

Previous Work

Savannah has had limited archeological investigations in the downtown area. And few extensive studies have been situated in the areas likely to contain Revolutionary War battlefield components. These investigations are reviewed briefly below. Figure 4 depicts the general locations of these projects.

General Area

The first large scale archeological project in downtown Savannah was conducted by the University of Florida prior to the construction of the General Services Administration’s Juliette Gordon Low federal building on Oglethorpe Avenue (Honerkamp et al. 1983). That effort, which exposed a large area of the the early part of Savannah revealed a wide range of 19th century deposits. No Revolutionary War era or colonial features were identified by their work, however.

In 2000 TRC Garrow Associates conducted Phase II archeological investigations in the area then owned by the Atlanta Gas Light Company (Pietak 2000). The project area was bounded by East Bay and East Broad streets. The project was in the vicinity of Fort Prevost/Fort Wayne, and
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Figure 4. Previous archaeological investigations in the general area.
Phase I work consisted of documentary research to identify areas of the project area likely to contain in situ historical deposits. Archeologists excavated seven trenches between 10 and 20 feet deep. Due to the depth of the trenches, archeologists did not enter them, but used video cameras to access and examine the stratigraphy. The only features they recorded related to the gas plan and a “probable brick pier”. No deposits associated with the forts were identified, nor were any other historic features uncovered. Few artifacts were collected due to the toxic nature of soil fill and only four were noted in the entire excavation, although no soil was screened.

Daniel Elliott led a survey in 1990 of 18th century settlements, which included portions of downtown Savannah. The project was funded by the National Park Service, the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, and private funders. The portion of the project conducted in Savannah included shovel testing along Bay Street and in Reynolds Square. Elliott recorded two archeological sites in these areas and completed a site forms for the Georgia Archeological Site Files (GASF). The Bay Street Strand site was recorded as 9CH781 in the GASF. His team excavated 12 shovel tests on Bay Street and four in Reynolds Square (Elliott 1990). These results are discussed in Chapter 5 of this report, as they are relevant to the Emmet Park work for this project.

Daniel Elliott and Jeffery Holland (1994) conducted a reconnaissance survey for Garrow & Associates and the Georgia Department of Transportation on portions of sidewalks along Montgomery Street, Liberty Street, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. That study was conducted in advance of a sidewalk beautification project related to the 1996 Summer Olympics. Archeologists excavated a series of 50 by 50 cm units on selected areas along the study corridors. The shovel tests revealed a series of buried sidewalks, streetscapes, utility ditches, and 19th and early 20th century artifacts. No Revolutionary War era artifacts or features were identified in these tests. Site 9CH695 was recorded as a 100 by 3 m area on Montgomery Street, between Liberty an Charlton streets. The site dated from the 18th through 20th centuries and was undisturbed. Another site dated to the same period, and had the same measurements, but was located on Liberty Street between Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Montgomery streets. This site was deemed to have been re-deposited.

Theresa Hamby (2000) reported on a survey of a 0.8 acre area on Savannah’s west side for a proposed public transportation facility. The project area was located several blocks northeast of Spring Hill Redoubt. Fieldwork included backhoe trenches in the block bounded by Turner Street, Montgomery Street, Oglethorpe Avenue, and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The work did not locate any Revolutionary War features or artifacts.

Investigations at the Andrew Low house are relevant to the current project due to the house’s location. It is situated on a city block between Madison and Lafayette squares. While the house post-dates the revolution, the area beneath and around it would have been adjacent to the two central redoubts and the horseshoe battery between them. The first archeology at the Low house was done in 2001 when Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI) investigated an area of the southwestern downsout in the dry “moat” that surrounds the Andrew Low house. The excavation was located in the south portion of the moat and uncovered a brick floor approximately one meter below the moat surface (Kratzer 2001). Archeologists also uncovered a portion of a brick arch.

In 2005 Brockington and Associates conducted a ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey at the Andrew Low House in an effort to locate archeological features and identify existing drainage patterns (Weaver 2005). This information was desired in advance of planned renovations to avoid adverse impacts to the archeological site. The survey covered a relatively small area that contained a large number of functional spaces, such as the small courtyard of the carriage house, two rooms inside the carriage house, the old kitchen room in the main house, the rear garden, and front and side yards. The management letter states that the radar anomalies in the western and southern moats and in the southwestern corner of the house “…could be the remains of the jail and the bastion built around Savannah in 1814” (Weaver 2005:4). The rear garden radar showed an anomaly interpreted as a wall “…that may be associated with earlier structures, such as the jail or jail compound” (Weaver 2005:4). While the investigations suggest that aspects of the War of 1812 defensive works and the old city jail were located, the limited 2000 and 2001 archeology revealed no definitive revolutionary features or artifacts.

At Spring Hill Redoubt

While archeological investigations at Spring Hill Redoubt did not begin until the 1980s, interest and discoveries in there date back to the late eighteenth century. President George Washington embarked on a tour of the southern states in mid-March 1791 (Sparks 1846:434). On this tour he visited Savannah and the site of the 1779 Siege. President Washington was entertained with a ball that was held at the Silk Filature building, facing Reynolds Square. In a newspaper account of the visit, General Lachlan McIntosh, who had participated in the attack, memorialized the site by saying: “the earth-mounds covering the slain, the lines of circumvallation, the approaches, the sand-batteries and gun chambers had not
then yielded to the obliterating influences of time and an encroaching population. The scars of the siege were still upon the bosom of the plain” (Jones 1890:323).

Although historians and military leaders continued to deify the heroic (albeit poorly planned and implemented) unsuccessful siege, the collective memory of the siege in the minds of many of Savannah’s residents quickly faded. In the decades following the American Revolution the Spring Hill locale was urbanized and vestiges of the important military events were obliterated by development. A 1782 Plan of Savannah and Its Environs (Waring 1970b) does not show the outer defenses nor does it indicate any features in the study except a road labeled “Ebenezer Road” and a “Jewes burying ground”, located south and west of the study area. The single most destructive agent was the railroad and the construction of railroad related facilities. The land surfaces at Spring Hill were drastically modified during construction and vast amounts of fill were imported from outlying uplands to fill gullies and swamps. Several newspaper accounts of these land-altering activities included important clues to the whereabouts of the war dead. The earliest subterranean, non-archeological discoveries relating to the Revolutionary War battle were made by Central of Georgia Railroad construction workers, who were digging on Savannah’s west side. The details of their discoveries are limited to only a few brief newspaper accounts from the mid-19th century. [These accounts are discussed in the Spring Hill section of this report.]

Historical interest in the battlefield at Savannah continued throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries. This interest was mostly marked by numerous newspaper articles, commemorative speeches, and erection of monuments and historical markers. Battlefield archeology was not part of this commemoration. The general vicinity of the Spring Hill Redoubt area has been examined by several previous archeological studies, to various degrees. Most of the investigations have been cursory reconnaissance or survey level investigations.

References to other parts of the 1779 battlefield at Savannah are infrequent. As late as 1850, remnants of the French siege works, approximately five feet deep, were visible on Savannah’s east side (Lossing 1852:737). The topic is further confounded by the subsequent creation of fortifications and ditch work that surrounded Savannah in the War of 1812 and American Civil War.

Limited archeological investigations in the larger area around Spring Hill include a variety of small projects with a few larger ones interspersed (Figure 3). In the 1970s Georgia Department of Transportation archeologist Peggy Crawford conducted a little-known archeological study prior to the construction of the Interstate 16, Montgomery Avenue off ramp (Crawford 1980). Crawford did not document any Revolutionary War artifacts or features. One of the larger studies in the immediate area included the Fahm Street project. Southeastern Wildlife Services archeologists examined an area northwest of the Spring Hill Redoubt for the Fahm Street Extension project in the early 1980s (Wood 1984; Wood 1985). While most of the archeological information gathered by that study was associated with later historic settlement in the area, the artifact inventory did include several battle-related artifacts. South of Spring Hill stands the Jewish Cemetery that served as a strategic point in the battle and survives today. The Jewish cemetery dates to 1769 or 1770 and it contains more than 89 burials (Rubin 1983; Levy 1999). Rick Leech and Larry Babits (1990) examined the Jewish Cemetery and made a scaled map of it.

**Battlefield Reconnaissance**

Cursory research on a few limited areas of the battlefield was conducted by Matt McDaniel. McDaniel was hired through the Georgia Historic Preservation Division with funds from the National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program to gather information about Georgia Revolutionary War sites as part of a larger, national study funded by the NPS. The 1778 and 1779 Battles of Savannah were two of several battles McDaniel researched. His work did not include any archeological investigations and included very limited primary document research. McDaniel examined Spring Hill and Brewton Hill as part of his ABPP study (McDaniel 2000a, 2000b). He looked at the 1778 and 1779 Battles of Savannah as part of his thesis project (McDaniel 2002). McDaniel’s observations in 2000 were that, “The site [Spring Hill Redoubt] was largely regraded and thereby obliterated during the construction to redevelop the area for use by the railroad” (McDaniel 2000a). This was a widely held belief prior to the discovery of the Spring Hill Redoubt features by archeologists in 2005.

**Marriott Hotel**

The Marriott Hotel is located on the east side of Martin Luther King Jr. Blv’d and on the south side of Liberty Street. It is across Martin Luther King Jr. Blv’d. from where the Spring Hill Redoubt was founded in 2005. In 1999, Daniel Elliott conducted test excavations for the proposed Marriott hotel prior to its construction. This study was funded by the City of Savannah and its single purpose was to determine the presence or absence of any “mass graves” noted in primary documents written immediately after the 1779 Battle of Savannah. The project consisted of the excavation of a series of backhoe trenches across the development tract. Archeologists mapped features contained in these trenches. No mass graves
were identified by the sample, nor was any evidence for Revolutionary War era fortifications or occupation identified. A small brick cellar was identified. It was tentatively dated to the earliest decades of the 19th century and was not likely in existence at the time of the American Revolution.

**Liberty Street Parking Garage**

Daniel Elliott (2001) conducted test excavations for the proposed Liberty Street Parking Garage for the City of Savannah. This project area was located south of Liberty Street on the lot immediately east of the aforementioned Marriott Hotel. This project also was limited in scope and included excavation of a series of backhoe trenches. Features within these trenches were mapped and a small sample was excavated. The late-18th and 19th century site was given the GASF number of 9CH696. Potentially significant 19th century features and building ruins were located but no artifacts or features from the American Revolution were identified. Elliott recommended additional excavations on this development tract but no additional archeological work was done prior to construction of the parking lot.

**Red Building**

Larry Babits and his colleagues at Armstrong State College conducted several archeological projects in the vicinity of the Spring Hill Redoubt. Figure 5 shows the location of work by him and others in the immediate area of the Spring Hill Redoubt. One project included excavations in the head house of the Red Building. The Red Building was a cotton warehouse for the Central of Georgia Railroad. It now houses Savannah College of Art and Design offices and a museum. The building is north of the former passenger train shed (current Visitors’ Center and Savannah History Museum) across the parking lot that was once used to temporarily hold cotton bales shipped by train. Babits’ excavations uncovered a cellar. While Babits did not identify any Revolutionary War era deposits in this cellar, he did make an interesting observation about the early landscape of this area, “The cellar itself can be shown from documentary sources to have been in existence prior to 1801. Discovery of a cellar at this level of the ground indicates that the leveling attributed to the Central of Georgia may not have occurred in the area north of the Louisville Road and the original ground surface in this area may still be intact. In association with this interpretation, it should be pointed out that West Broad Street must therefore be seen as having been raised some eight to ten feet since 1801” (Babits 1983:i).

**Passenger Train Shed and Parking Lot**

Babits also conducted test excavations inside the Passenger Train Shed (now the Savannah History Museum) prior to construction for the Savannah Expo (Babits and Barnes 1984). Figure 5 shows the location of these trenches. They identified multiple resources pertaining to the railroad activity, some earlier plow scars dating prior to the 1830s but no archeological evidence of the Revolutionary War battle. They documented fill zones, in addition to a circa 1840-1855 lens with brick fragments on top of a stratum of railroad track laid in 1836 and modified in the mid-1850s (Babits 1985:4). Babits conducted a small shovel excavation on the east side of the parking lot immediately north of the Passenger Train Shed. This was done at a proposed location for a Savannah Expo sign, near the extant brick wall separating the parking lot from what is now Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Babits documented six feet of fill in the unit and reported seeing no buried A horizon. Numerous pipes and other disturbances were observed (Babits 1985:4).

**Other Central of Georgia Facilities**

Edwaed Rutsch directed test excavations in search of Savannah’s Revolutionary War resources (Rutsch and Morrell 1981). Rutsch’s work included documentation of the Central of Georgia Railroad facilities as well as a search for Revolutionary War evidence (Figure 5). Despite the excavation of multiple backhoe trenches that traversed portions of the battlefield, Rutsch and Morrell did not identify any features, strata, or artifacts associated with the 1779 event. Figure 5 depicts the locations of dozens of Rutsch’s trenches across what is now Battlefield Park and throughout the Central of Georgia complex.

Rutsch’s report contained a map showing the trenches in relation to each other and some of the extant structures in the railroad roundhouse complex (Rutsch 1981). No datums have survived from his work, however, and this fact along with the scale of his map allow for a margin of error when overlaying his map on modern survey maps of the area. CHS archeologists worked with the maps to get the best fit based on certain relationships, such as the distances between Rutsch’s southern-most row of trenches and Harris Street, and the distance between trenches and other similar points. While this puts his trenches in a generally correct location, the entire map of his excavations likely has a margin of error of a few meters. This is obvious when looking at Figure 5, showing one of Rutsch’s longest eastern trenches running through the same area as the 2005 trenches uncovering the Spring Hill Redoubt ditch. Rutsch did not locate the redoubt in his trenches, and the later CHS trenches did not uncover Rutsch’s trenches, clearly indicating that the two
Figure 5. Archeology in immediate area around Spring Hill/Spring Hill Redoubt.
archeological excavations did not occupy the same area. It is likely that Rutsch’s map needs to shift a few meters to the south.

In 1982 Larry Babits, at Armstrong State College, recorded a GASF site form citing Rutsch’s report and artifacts held by collectors. Babits recorded the site as consisting of a 12-acre tract. Copies of the map showing the boundaries are indecipherable. Remarks on the form state that the Savannah Expo development in the passenger train shed and the archeology in conjunction with it were underway at that time. The site received the state site file number of 9CH703.

**Louisville Road & MLK Blvd.**

In 2004, ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey was applied to four areas in the suspected general vicinity of the Spring Hill Redoubt (General Engineering Geophysics, LLC 2004:1-4). This project was conducted for the Coastal Heritage Society, under the direction of then Assistant Curator, Gail Whalen. The job was a collaborative effort of the General Engineering Geophysics engineers and the MALA GeoScience USA staff, led by Jorgen Bergstrom.

The four areas are demarcated in Figure 5 and included the following:

- A section of Louisville Road, beginning at its junction with Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (MLK) and heading west (measuring 79 m east-west by 18 m north-south)
- A section along the sidewalk of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard (beginning at the intersection with Louisville Road and heading south, measuring 55 m north-south by 3 m east-west)
- An area in the green space between Louisville Road and Harris Street (measuring 67 by 12 m); and
- Another area in the green space between Louisville Road and Harris Street (measuring 43 by 18 m).

The 2004 GPR survey by Bergstrom and his colleagues was conducted using 200 MHz and 250 MHz antennas. Their study produced maximum effective GPR signals between 8 and 10 feet depth (2.4-3 m). One output from their study was a series of animations that depicted the radar reflections in plan view at various depths. Their study did not reveal any obvious Revolutionary War fortifications or ditch works. Many linear utility ditches were mapped by their study.

**Spring Hill Redoubt**

In August 2005, the Coastal Heritage Society launched an archeological search for the Spring Hill Redoubt (R. Elliott 2006a). This project was undertaken immediately prior to the organization’s construction of a large replica Revolutionary War redoubt across Louisville Road, from the Visitors’ Center, on the eastern end of the block near Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard [MLK] The construction project called for the digging of a ditch that would be part of the redoubt replica, and for digging ditches for site drainage. The three-week archeological field effort employed trenching with heavy machinery, shovel shaving, and hand excavation of features and limited soils strata in order to sample portions of green space located south of Louisville Road and west of MLK. Heavy machinery was necessary to cut through the layers of coal, cinders, and clinkers deposited by the railroad during its use of the site in the 19th and 20th centuries and also through brick rubble from early 20th century meat packing plants and their cellars lining the lot along MLK Jr. Blvd. (formerly known as West Broad Street). These structures had been demolished years prior to archeological investigations.

During the third week of fieldwork, archeologists discovered an intact section of Revolutionary War fortification ditches, which contained artifacts directly associated with the 1779 Battle and palisade post stains (Figure 5). Figure 6 shows a profile cross-section of the bottom of this ditch, which measures approximately one meter deep. Note the black palisade post stain and the early nineteenth century stratum above it capped in turn by a thick railroad lens of cinders, clinkers, and coal. The post mold stops shy of the base of the trench. It would have been anchored in the trench, however, by five to six feet of trench fill.

The intersection of the two ditches was interpreted as the southeastern corner of the Spring Hill Redoubt. One ditch radiated to the northwest and another to the northeast. Archeologists followed the northwestern ditch, hoping to find the next corner of the redoubt. Unfortunately, they encountered a great degree of railroad-related disturbance at this location, which appeared to have destroyed the southwestern corner of the redoubt. Archeologists excavated a trench between the northeastern redoubt ditch and Louisville Road, but did not encounter additional portions of that redoubt section. A continuation of the trajectory of the two redoubt ditch sections would place the center and northern portions of Spring Hill Redoubt in Louisville Road, extending to the northern side of the road under the Passenger Train Station and possibly in the courtyard area. Archeologists left a portion of the uncovered redoubt unexcavated, and backfilled the area along with a drain pipe placed in association with the
Figure 6. Profile of fortification ditch excavated at Spring Hill Redoubt in 2005. Stratigraphy is annotated below.
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construction of the replica redoubt. Between 2005 and 2008, the Coastal Heritage Society completed most of the basic elements of the 1779 Battlefield Memorial (also known as Battlefield Park). To date, this includes 800 flat memorial stones, the Spring Hill Redoubt replica, a berm marking the actual location of the Spring Hill Redoubt based on the 2005 discoveries, interpretive signage, and grass, trees, and benches.

Railroad Ward

Coastal Heritage Society archeologists conducted an examination of cultural resources in advance of a proposed development for a series of Marriott Hotel “cottages” in Savannah’s Railroad Ward (D. Elliott 2008; R. Elliott 2006b). This project was located on the block bounded by MLK Boulevard and West Harris, Purse, and Charlton streets (Figure 5). The specific area of investigation did not extend to MLK Boulevard, but stopped at the back of the convenience store on that street. Likewise, most of the project area lay on the northern half of the block, and did not extend to the southern half bounded by Charlton Street. Archeological investigations were restricted to the northern half of the block (which contained property owned at that time by the Coastal Heritage Society), although the construction project also included the southern half of the block. The archeological investigations consisted of systematic shovel testing, test unit excavation, backhoe stripping and feature excavation, and GPR survey. Stripping and feature excavation sampled only the northwestern quarter of the project area, based on results from the Phase I shovel testing and GPR survey. Investigations uncovered numerous features created during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by residents of the primarily residential/light commercial area. Many of the residents were workers at the adjacent railroad roundhouse complex. No Revolutionary War features were discovered and very few artifacts from the battle were recovered from the sampled area. A construction worker later reported finding a bullet mold from somewhere within the northern and southern portions of the construction area (Personal communication, anonymous construction worker to Rita Elliott, September 2008). It is likely that the construction on the southern portion of the block destroyed Revolutionary War features and artifacts.

The northern half of the development tract was covered by GPR Blocks PA and PB. The GPR survey, and supplemental historical research pertaining to this portion of Savannah, was documented in a LAMAR Institute research report (Elliott 2008). GPR Block PA covered a 85.5 m east-west by 25 m north-south area immediately south of West Harris Street and east of Purse Street. It was examined by 178 radargrams. GPR Block PB covered a 13 m by 13 m area of the development tract and was located immediately south of Block PA on its western end. It was examined by 27 radargrams. Both of these GPR samples indicated a preponderance of subsurface anomalies, which were likely cultural in origin. Many of these, including a privy, were excavated after backhoe stripping.

The two streets, West Harris and Purse, adjacent to the proposed Marriott development, were also included in the GPR survey in April 2006. Harris Street was partially covered by GPR survey from the eastern end of GPR Block PA to the west side of its intersection with Purse Street at the entrance to the Railroad Roundhouse complex. Only the southern portion of West Harris Street was included in this survey, as a severe thunderstorm prevented the completion of this particular survey grid. A total of seven radargrams was collected along a 92.5 m east-west by 3 m north-south section of West Harris Street. This represented 668.5 linear meters of GPR coverage. Purse Street was completely covered by GPR survey from West Harris Street to Charlton Street. The survey covered an area measuring 60 m north-south by 2.5 m east-west. Six radargrams were collected for a total of 359.5 m of linear GPR coverage.

Both West Harris and Purse streets are underlain by numerous utility lines and ditches. Surface evidence for this included manhole covers and other access points. These utilities were well defined by the GPR data. Other very large radar anomalies, which may predate this network of utility lines, were indicated beneath both streets. The age and function of these deep features is not known, although many of them may be cultural in origin. It was not possible to determine which, if any of these, related to the military activity (D. Elliott 2008). Portions of the street and utilities beneath it and adjacent to it were modified and/or created for this construction project.

Railroad Ward House

In 2008 Coastal Heritage Society purchased and relocated a railroad worker’s house slated for demolition. The house was located on a lot fronting Jones Street, which was adjacent to a lot owned by CHS (Figure 5). CHS conducted archeology on the lot under its ownership. That small parcel fronts West Charlton Street and measures approximately 44 feet along the road by 78 feet perpendicular to the road. Prior to archeological investigation, approximately 12-16 inches of soil was removed in order to remediate industrial contamination. Following remediation, archeologists shovel shaved the area and mapped and excavated features. No Revolutionary War features were uncovered (Seifert in press).
Project Objectives, Goals and Research Design

The project objective was to work toward preserving the 1779 Battlefield of Savannah, Georgia, by identifying and documenting its components and sharing this information with policy makers, preservationists, and the public. Using the recently discovered Spring Hill Redoubt location, along with primary maps and documents gathered during the project, archeologists made GIS overlays with modern maps. Archeologists used these maps to visit potential battlefield areas on city-owned property, and to conduct limited archeological and ground penetrating radar (GPR) investigations. Phase 1 produced a technical report, brochure, exhibit upgrade outline, state site file forms, and a Powerpoint CD. This information was shared, and will continue to be shared, with the public through various media, public presentations, and portions of a museum exhibit.

Project Goals and Strategies

- **Goal – To Discover, Document, and Verify An Accurate Battle Account**
  1. Locate wide assortment of primary and secondary text documents.
  2. Locate 18th-21st century maps.
  3. Expand and detail list of Defining Features
  4. Verify and further refine the Order of Battle.
  5. Collect archeological data from various battlefield components.
  6. Interpret data obtained from above by using KOCOA standards (Key Terrain, Observation and Fields of Fire, Cover and Concealment, Obstacles, Avenues of Approach)

- **Goal-To Ascertain Location and Degree of Preservation of Extant Battlefield Components**
  1. Do initial reconnaissance to identify modern landscape, topography, and natural and cultural features.
  2. Identify surface features that may be battlefield-related.
  3. Identify areas that have potential for various field techniques (GPR, shovel testing, metal detector survey, etc.)
  4. Continue supplementing Defining Features list.
  5. Conduct appropriate fieldwork, either one or more combinations of GPR, shovel testing, test unit excavation, or feature identification, to identify battlefield features and their condition of preservation when possible.

- **Goal-To Interpret Findings**
  1. Research other battlefield sites that have been studied.
  2. Use project data to write a comprehensive technical report.

- **Goal-To Promote Battlefield Preservation**
  1. Make recommendations based on project interpretations.
  2. Share findings through public presentations in which public comment and brainstorming are invited.
  3. Distribute copies of report to partner organizations.
  4. Speak to partner organizations about community involvement and opportunities for synergy.
  5. Investigate, with partners, city government, chamber of commerce, and tourism officials the feasibility of promoting and preserving the sites as a walking tour opportunity.
  6. Create a brochure.
  7. Design an updated exhibit component.
  8. Use newspaper articles and web accounts to share information and promote preservation efforts among community organizations.
  9. Contact partner organizations and private property owners identified
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as likely to have battlefield components on their land to determine feasibility of a Phase II project.
10. If current project supports it, apply for ABPP funding for Phase II project, to include investigation of private property holdings and completion of a National Register District nomination form for the battlefield, or supplement current National Register District(s) by submitting the battlefield components for inclusion on sites or districts already listed.

Research Questions

1. How accurate are the published accounts of the battle?
2. Which accounts were inaccurate, and why?
3. Which of the other 13 redoubts, besides Spring Hill, saw battle activity, and to what degree?
4. What was the order of battle and how did troop movements contribute to the end result of the battle?
5. Can an accurate number of wounded and killed on each side be determined by unit?
6. What features of the landscape aided or hindered the opposing forces and which are visible in the modern landscape?
7. What were reserve troops doing before, during, and after the battle?
8. Were standard military procedures followed before, during, and after the battle? Why or why not, and how did this affect battle operations?
9. Were defensive works constructed following military engineering standards of the day?
10. What types of extant features survive archeologically and what do these tell us about the period immediately before, during, and immediately after the battle?
11. How well were the opposing forces supplied with food, ammunition, and other necessities of battle?
12. What effect did the weather have on activities leading up to and during the battle?
13. Did the multi-national nature of the allied forces affect their operations? If so, how?
14. What efforts did British forces make to defend their position?
15. Did the battle affect the strategies used by America and Great Britain in the remainder of the war?
16. Did the battle have significant impact on the American Revolution, and if so, how?
17. What battlefield components, either above or below the ground surface, have survived and why? Which have not survived, and why?

These questions and possible answers are discussed throughout this report.
Specific methodologies were employed during various phases of this project. These phases included archival research, geographic information systems, fieldwork, laboratory analysis, curation, and public outreach. The methods used in each are detailed below. The historic spelling of people and place names was universally inconsistent. This report keeps the original spellings when quoting historical documents. General text of this report uses the versions of names most likely to be used by the individual bearing that name (based on signatures on historic documents, such as Augustin Prevost, rather than Augustine) and place names most likely used or understood today (like Beaulieu).

Historical and Archival Research

Rita and Daniel Elliott conducted historical research in Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania from November 27 through December 16, 2007. They examined primary documents at the following repositories: the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; the Morgan Library, the New York Public Library, and the New York Historical Society, all in New York, New York; the David Library, Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania; and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Prior to these visits historians contacted each repository with requests for appointments to visit, a summary of research interests for the visit, and a list of the collections and/or items of interest held by each repository. Researchers also completed application forms in advance when necessary, sent in letters of reference as required, and reviewed the rules and policies specific to each facility. Many of the repositories have online catalogues containing a varying degree of detail ranging from general entries to more specific abstracts. These were consulted in advance to maximize the amount of research time available during site visits. Key words searched on these online catalogues included, but were not limited to, words and phrases such as, “Georgia and battle, savannah and battle, Georgia and map, Savannah and map, Savannah, Savannah 1779, Siege of Savannah, Georgia and Revolution, Georgia and Benjamin Lincoln, d’Estaing, Prevost, Pulaski, Dillon, Jasper”.

William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The Elliotts spent three days (November 28, 29, and 30) conducting research at the Clements Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Prior to visiting, they searched the library’s online catalogue, MIRLYN, for relevant key words. The Clements Library allowed use of laptop computers but not digital cameras. Researchers, therefore, typed notes whenever possible and requested copies of lengthy materials or items that could not be typed. Copies included Xerox copies of letters in the Clinton Papers, letters/pages from the Moncrief Papers, and scans of maps or scans of transparencies of maps from the map collection.

On site, researchers examined maps found on MIRLYN. These included: British Capture of Savannah, 1778; Chart of the Coast of Georgia (Joseph F.W. Des Barres), ca 1779; The Coasts, Rivers and Inlets of the Province of Georgia (Joseph F.W. Des Barres), ca. 1779; Draught of Part of the Province of South Carolina Shewing the March and Encampments of the British Troops Under the Command of Major Genl Prevost Upon an Expedition Into That Province, 1779; Plan of the Decent and Action of the 29th Dec. 1778, Near the Town of Savannah By His Majestys Forces, Under the Command of Lt. Colo. Campbell of the 71st Regt. Foot (John Wilson), 1778; Plan of the Siege of Savannah with the Joint Attack of the French and Americans on the 9th October 1779 in which They Were Defeated By His Majesty’s Forces Under the Command of Major Genl Augustin Prevost (Publ. by Wm Faden), 1784; Plan of the Town of Savannah, With the Works Constructed For Its Defence, Together With The Approaches & Batteries of the Enemy, and the Joint Attack of the French and Rebels on the 9th of October, 1779 (John Wilson), 1779; Proposed Fortifications for Savannah (Patrick Ferguson), 1780; Savannah and Its Defenses, 1777-: A Chart of Tibee Inlet in Georgia (A.B.), 1776; and Savannah River and Savannah Sound, 1777-. Several of these maps proved to be maps not yet seen by the researchers, who requested scans in order to have digital copies at 300 dots per inch (dpi) in order to use as layers in the GIS portion of the research project.

Researchers also examined bibliographic materials only available on-site. This included the Georgia section of Guide to the Manuscript Maps in the William L. Clements
Library (Brun 1959) for any items in the holdings that might not be in the online catalogue. None were located. The Elliotts also looked in the hard copy of the Map card catalogue under “Savannah”, but found no additional relevant maps that were not already located through MIRLYN. Dan Elliott examined, card-by-card, the hard copy card catalogue of the Sir Henry Clinton Recipient Files to locate any letters of correspondence to Clinton from military personnel, politicians, or others associated with the battle but not written between September 1 and December 31, 1779. Researchers examined every letter in the collection written during this period (Volumes 67-82). There were approximately 50-75 documents per volume. Each document was examined for any particulars relating to the battle; logistics before, during, and after; and any other related information. Researchers found numerous relevant items, including some written by people not directly in Savannah, but who were associated with the siege and battle in some way. This includes military officers sending orders to be carried out in Savannah; military intelligence about troop movements in other areas of the country that would impact events in Savannah; and military and civilian correspondence. Examples of some of the correspondents who have documents in the Clinton Papers include Oliver DeLancey, Frederick de Peyster, Patrick Ferguson, Archibald Campbell, Lewis Fuser, Patrick Toneyn, Augustin Prevost, Lord Germain, Alexander Innes, Cortland Skinner, James Wright, and others. The hard copy of the Subject card catalogue was examined for “Prevost”, but there was nothing relevant listed in it that was not cross-referenced in the Sir Henry Clinton Papers. Researchers also looked up items referenced in the card catalogue under Nathanael Greene, but located no items from the time period associated with the 1779 Battle of Savannah. The search of the Sir Henry Clinton Recipient Files card catalogue for key names known to be associated with battle activities resulted in a list of specific letters. These dated to periods other than the pertinent September 1 through December 31, 1779 range. The list included specific letters in Volumes 50-54, 84, 92, and 101 containing very useful information.

Researchers also examined British engineer James Moncrief’s letters, including all items in Box 1, Folders 9, 10, 11, and 12. The Moncrief Papers, Box 1, “Correspondence and Works”, held folders dating October 4, 1778 through May 1780 and September 1781 through August 1782. Box 4, “Bound Volumes”, held the James Moncrief Letter Book 1780-1782, and Untitled Bound Letterbook. The Moncrief Papers included two of James Moncrief’s journals, one from St. Augustine, East Florida and one from Charleston, South Carolina. Unfortunately, there was no journal in the Moncrief collection for Savannah. Researchers did examine the Charleston journal, however, since it dated to 1780 and might have contained some information related to Moncrief’s work in Savannah in the fall of 1779. They found no information specific to Savannah.

The Morgan Library, New York, New York

Researchers visited the Morgan Library (formerly known as the Pierpoint Morgan Library) in New York on December 3 and were able to examine the relevant materials. Prior to the visit they did a detailed search of the library’s online collection catalog using, “Corsair”, the catalogue’s search engine. This uncovered multiple items of interest. The Morgan allowed the use of laptop computers to facilitate note-taking.

The Elliotts examined several items from the bound volume entitled, Autographs of the Generals of the American Revolution. In spite of the name, the collection contained complete documents. It included four letters written by Augustin Prevost. He wrote three while headquartered at Ebenezer in 1779 and one while at Hudson’s Ferry during the same year. They were written after the Battle of Kettle Creek but before the October 9, 1779, Battle of Savannah. Prevost wrote of military activities at Brier Creek. One of the letters made minimum mention of Savannah, when Prevost requested that any idle soldiers about Savannah be sent to him to add to his troops. In another letter, Prevost mentions engineer Moncrief’s name to Colonel Archibald Campbell, but it is unclear whether the letter refers to Savannah or another of Moncrief’s fortifications. Prevost says, “Shaw is gone to town to hurry what necessarys [sic] are wanted for the Carolinians. Moncrief is gone there also to see that the works are completed, those here are forwarded as much as possible” (Prevost 1779c). It is most likely that Prevost is referring to Savannah, as it is the only town anywhere near Ebenezer at that time. In one of his other letters, Prevost mentions going to Savannah while headquartered at Ebenezer.

Researchers also looked in Michel Hilliard d’Auberteuil’s, “Essais Historiques et Politiques sur les Anglo-Americains, 1781-2”, Volumes I and II, for maps of Savannah. Researchers examined a map in Volume I and an index for both volumes in Volume I. They found no maps of Savannah area.
New York Public Library, New York, New York (NYPL)

Prior to their visit, researchers contacted archivists at the New York Public Library and received information from staff in the library’s various divisions, including the Manuscripts and Archives Division; Rare Books Division; the Milstein Division of U.S. History, Local History & Genealogy; the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture; and the Prints Collection in the Wallach Division. Researchers visited all these divisions on site, except the Milstein Division, and also examined documents in the Map Division. Pre-site visit research included a search of the NYPL online catalogue, CATNYP, which produced a list of potential resources to examine on-site. This search included a review of the Thomas Addis Emmet Collection finding aid (digital and hard copies) to locate relevant materials related to Savannah and the Revolutionary War. Documents in the Emmet Collection include letterbooks of officers, orderly books, returns, and muster rolls. Relevant materials in the Emmet Collection and in other collections were located throughout four different divisions of the New York Public Library. Each division has different hours, policies, and locations within the main library or elsewhere in the city. Researchers allocated three days (December 4, 5, and 7) to examine the relevant holdings of the various departments of the NYPL.

Manuscripts and Archives Division

Several files within the divisions’ “Miscellaneous File” were examined. This included files containing primary documents written by Benjamin Lincoln (Box 154), Lachlan McIntosh, and Casimir Pulaski (Box 85). Researchers too notes on relevant materials.

Rare Books Division

Researchers examined A History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781, in the Southern Provinces of North America (Tarleton 1787). They also copied the French document, Relation de L’Attaque de Savanach Par l’Escadre de M. D’Estaing (KVB 1780), in case it has not been translated already at another repository or in a secondary source.

Wallach Division, Prints Collection

The Emmet Collection is owned by the New York Public Library and portions of it have been redistributed throughout the library’s many divisions. The collection is rooted in Thomas A. Emmet’s purchased of a history book and subsequent illustration of it. Emmet used contemporary images to illustrate it, and in one case (that of Button Gwinnett) actually commissioned an image specifically for the book (Personal communication, Margaret Glover, Archivist in Prints Collection). Two groups of prints from the Emmet Collection were of interest to Savannah project researchers. This included the Emmet Collection Folders 7345-7398 and Folders 7300-7531. The latter set of folders no longer contained the maps, which had been removed and redistributed throughout the NYPL. The “dwelling of General McIntosh” (Folder 7346) was of interest. Unfortunately, the line drawing or wood block print did not indicate if this was McIntosh’s house during the 1779 Siege and Battle of Savannah, or where he lived after the war, upon his return to Georgia from Virginia. Researchers also examined prints in the Phelps Stokes Collection of American Historical Prints. This collection included the Map of Savannah 1779 (digital ID 54221) that was helpful. The View of Port of Savannah in 1775 (digital ID 54476) was such a stylized view as to be extremely inaccurate. It illustrated Savannah as a stone-fortified medieval European city. Researchers also examined 18th century political cartoons for relevant items, since the NYPL has copies of many cartoons from this period. They looked up “Savannah, 1778, 1779, siege, Georgia, rebels, revolution” and similar key words in the Catalogue of Political & Personal Satires Vol. V, 1771-1783 by M.D. George and printed by the British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings (1935). Unfortunately, copies of two potentially relevant cartoons were not held by the NYPL.

Map Division

Two maps in the Karpinski Collection were of interest to researchers. Both were bound in the same volume. The Plan du Siege de Savannah en Amerique, 1779(?) (Karpinski 167) and the Plan du Siege de Savannah Fait Par Les Ordres de Mr. Le Cte. D’Estaing Vice-Admiral de France en 7avo et 8avo 1779 (Karpinski 166) were useful map documents for research. The maps were similar to each other, however; No. 166 was the most detailed of the two and also contained a legend. Other maps in this division were of interest to researchers. These included the Plan of the Siege of Savannah w/th the Joint Attack of the French and Americans on the 9th October 1779 (EM 7342), which was a printed map showing a “Main Guard & King’s Store Houses” along the Savannah River at the center of town, in addition to French trenches and French and American camps. A digitized version was available of the French watercolor map, Lieues Marines de 20 au Degre´ (1779) that showed ships, the City of Savannah, a central redoubt, trenches, English vessels, the “Menis house and dragoons” (B113, 1779, R32-56).
Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, Harlem, New York

The Elliott’s pre-site, online search of CATNYP located several items of interest regarding the Haitian involvement in the American Revolution, and specifically their role in the Battle of Savannah. On December 7, researchers went to Harlem to examine a finding aid and two rare books at the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. Researchers reviewed the finding aid for the Kobler Manuscript Collection. The collection contains miscellaneous materials collected by Kobler in preparation for a book that was never completed. There were no items specific to the Haitian role in the Battle of Savannah. One of the rare books studied was How the Black St. Domingo Legion Saved the Patriot Army in the Siege of Savannah (Steward 1899). This overview of the battle did provide a few names associated with the Haitians and their role under d’Estaing. The other rare book was written by Arthur A. Schomburg (1921) entitled, Military Services Rendered by the Haitians in North and South American Wars for Independence-Savannah, Georgia, 1779. Unfortunately, this book did not provide a great deal of new information. Once on site, researchers did a search and spoke to the archivist about any other materials in the Schomburg holdings that might shed light on the role of African Americans, freed or enslaved, in the Revolutionary War in Georgia.

New York Historical Society, New York, New York

Pre-trip research by the Elliotts on the New York Historical Society’s online catalog, Bobcat, provided a list of primary documents including maps, letters, and other items that warranted an on-site visit. Researchers visited the site on December 6 and were able to examine the holdings associated with the society, in its Map Department, Manuscript Department, and Rare Book Department. Later, researchers also searched the society’s online map database for additional documents not listed in Bobcat. This search located one additional map, which was examined on December 7. The three maps are summarized below, as are other items studied during the visit.

Researchers examined two original maps in the society’s Map Department and both offer rare and unique information to the project. The Sketch of the Blockade of Savannah & the Attack 9th Oct 1779 (M25.1.29) appears to be a hurried sketch of Savannah and the surrounding landscape. The shape and numbers of redoubts and abatis lines are quite different than all other maps of the period. This map is loosely attributed to a “Col. Stuart”. This was written in 20th century on the back of the document.

The second map proved to be the original of a map researchers located on microfilm at the NYPL the day before. The two versions differ slightly. Like the microfilm map at the library, the map at the historical society was originally in Benjamin Lincoln’s papers and purchased by Charles C. Jones Jr. in 1888. The Battle of Savannah map dates to 1778 and is attributed to A. Fraser. The historical society sketch map shows minor details of Savannah and greater details of the surrounding area, including avenues of retreat, troop and vessel locations, and other important details.

Researchers examined items in the society’s Manuscript Department. This included the folders “British Prisoners, etc.” and “British Prisoners By Capitulation” in the Revolutionary War Box 1. Neither item was associated with Savannah. Other manuscript collections examined included the Frederick De Peyster papers (1741-1836), the Nathaniel Pendleton Papers (1756-1821) [microfilm], the 1782 Orderly Book of Nathanael Greene [microfilm], and the British and Hessian Revolutionary War Collection (1773-1782).

The Rare Book Department of the society contained some documents of interest. Researchers made a copy of The Particular Case of the Loyalists: In addition to the General Case and Claim of the American Loyalists, a document published in London in 1783 by Wilkie. They also examined Official and Private Correspondence of Major-General J.S. Eustace and the Nathaniel Pendleton Papers for relevant information. These were interesting but not directly related to the research at hand.

On the revisit to the New York Historical Society, researchers were able to spend enough time to ensure that they located the items of greatest interest for the project. They did this by perusing items that had a possibility of containing some related information but not as likely as the documents identified during the initial search of the repository’s holdings. This included the finding aid for the Baron von Steuben Papers. Researchers examined it for items related to Savannah. None were found, however, because examination revealed that most of the materials dated from 1780 to 1782. A search for John Harris Cruger, who was in the battle, revealed several hits. Further examination showed these to be related to pre-war New York City activities. A search for Isaac Allen, Arthur Dillon, John Dooly, and Isaac Huger revealed no holdings. Additional searches for Francis Marion, Thomas Sumter, Andrew Pickens, Charles Pinckney, and Thomas Pinkney revealed no associated manuscripts. D’Estaing’s name was associated with Languedoc documents only, predating 1779. Researchers examined a catalogue of abstracts created by A.J. Bowden, who was auctioning 55...
letters written by George Washington to Benjamin Lincoln between 1777 and 1779 (Bowden 1907). They examined the abstracts with the possibility of finding an obscure document related to the battle. A few interesting quotes by Washington showed the degree of anxiety and ignorance on the part of the American army while waiting to hear news of d’Estaing’s operations.

Researchers had the time to examine secondary sources held by the society. This included two books by Peter J. Guthorn that had succinct biographical information about mapmakers involved in mapping Savannah during the revolution. These books, British Maps of the American Revolution (1972) and American Maps and Map Makers of the Revolution (1966) had entries for Patrick Ferguson, John Wilson, and Alexander Fraser. Researchers completed study of the society’s holdings feeling confident that they had exhausted the most relevant documents in the holdings.

The David Library of the American Revolution, Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania

The David Library of the American Revolution consists primarily of microfilm holdings of original documents from around the world relating to the American Revolution. This facility holds copies of a large number of documents related to the research interests of the Savannah project. Researchers visited the David Library on December 11 and 12. Prior to the visit they searched the repository’s online catalogue. Researchers examined other catalogs on-site. One such catalog was The Guide to the Sol Feinstone Collection of the David Library of the American Revolution (Fowler 1994).

Numerous items in the Cornwallis Papers contained relevant information for the Savannah project. Researchers reviewed the finding aid, The Cornwallis Papers, Abstracts of Americana (Reese 1970) to identify documents likely to provide new information and then looked at copies of these documents on microfilm at the David Library. Documents on microfilm at the library are in the “411 Film” series and have roll numbers designated “P.R.O.###”. The P.R.O. (Public Records Office) in England holds the original documents. Items of interest ranged from petitions by Savannah residents in 1780 for compensation to their war-damaged property, to military letters discussing redoubts at Savannah, to political letters about Georgia Governor Wright’s use of prisoners of war held by the British in Savannah.

Researchers examined another series of microfilm, Series 590, indexed in Documents of the American Revolution 1779-1783 and 1770-1783 (Davies 1972-1978; Davies 1977). This series contained information concerning Native Americans during the period, particularly interaction between Great Britain and the Creek Indians. It also included documents related to engineering efforts in Savannah and correspondence about the actual Battle of Savannah. Researchers made photocopies of the documents, took digital photographs of them, or occasionally both when the quality of the film was poor in an effort to get the most legible copy.

One item of interest to researchers included a copy of Frances Rush Clark’s, “Journal of the Siege of Savannah”. Important documents included correspondence between key individuals. Such correspondence included George Washington to Henry Lee regarding d’Estaing’s attack on Savannah and Lachlan McIntosh to Benjamin Lincoln regarding plundering and troop movements. Researchers also examined Early American Orderly Books, 1748-1817 (Research Publications, Inc. 1977). The Index to the George Washington Papers at the Library of Congress (LOC 1964) provided leads to relevant letters from Benjamin Lincoln to George Washington from early November 1779 to late January 1780 and Lincoln to the Continental Congress and to the South Carolina Correspondence Committee on October 22, 1779.

Researchers also examined, The Diary of the American War: A Hessian Journal, written by Captain Johann Ewald and translated by Joseph Tustin (1979). It contained some useful information relevant to the Hessians in Savannah. The French Navy and American Independence (Dull 1975) also proved informative. Copies of a variety of maps were studied, as well, with some having been examined previously by researchers at other repositories. The Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, Vol. II (Falconer 1906) was a document reprinted in 1972. Researchers copied relevant material dealing with Savannah and with the siege.

The Elliotts examined the Guide to Hessian Documents of the American Revolution, 1776-1783 (Miles and Kochan 1989a; updated 1993). This was a guide to microfilm holdings of transcripts and translations from the Lidgerwood Collection at Morristown National Historical Park in Morristown, New Jersey. Through this guide researchers identified various document groups (DG) on microfilm to be examined, and the following contained useful data: (DG BZ) Matters Concerning the Garrison Regiment von Wissenbach, 1780-1783; (DG D) Report of Granadier Regiment von Woellwarth 1777-1783; (DG KB) Report of Various Commanders of Hessian Regiments, 1777-1783; (DG W) Journal of the Garrison Regiment
von Knoblauch, 1776-1784, and (DG R) Journal of the Grenadier Battalion von Plate, 1776-1784 (fiche 294). Researchers examined some of the original documents, which were written in German, and many English typescript translations. Documents relevant to the Hessian occupation and defense of Savannah were copied.

Researchers examined a portion of the Ward Chipman Papers, which relates to the Loyalist regiments at the end of the American Revolution and shortly thereafter. These include muster lists and payrolls for several regiments that participated in the 1779 Siege of Savannah. None of these records date to 1779 but they provide later information on the composition and troop strength of the various military units. They also provide information on various officers of each regiment. This microfilm series includes many poor quality images that are difficult to decipher. Time did not allow a complete review of these valuable documents.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

On December 13 and 14 the Elliotts conducted research at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Pre-site preparation included consulting the society’s online public access catalog and examining its website. Many of the society’s holdings, however, are not yet listed in either of these computerize databases, but reside in hard-copy card catalogs on site. These include PC 1 (Manuscript Catalog) and PC 2 (Library Company of Philadelphia Manuscript Catalog).

Researchers initially looked up dozens of names associated with the 1779 Battle of Savannah that might be listed within the PC 1 manuscript card catalog. Names searched included Allen, Bentalou, Bodiker, Boyd, Brown, Bulloch, Campbell, Carr, Clarke, Delancey, Dillon, Dooley, Durnford, Duportail, Elholm, d’Estaing, Few, Goebell, Greene, Habersham, Hammond, Howe, Huger, L’Enfant, Irvine, Jasper, Jefferson, Jones, Laurens, Lincoln, Maitland, Marion, McCull, McIntosh, Moncrief, Motte, Moultrie, d’Peyster, Pinkney, Posey, Prevost, Pulaski, Tawse, Wayne, White, and Wilson. In addition, researchers tried to locate the following subjects in the catalog: East Florida Rangers, Georgia, Hessian, Kings Rangers, New Jersey Volunteers, New York Volunteers, Savannah, and South Carolina Royals. The Name and Subject card catalogue searches uncovered a much longer list of potentially relevant documents than had been located on the computer databases. These were requested during the two days of research. Researchers also looked through the hard-copy card catalog for Graphics (PC 4), which includes Maps and Atlases (PC-4d). They found one map of Savannah by looking up “Savannah”, “Georgia”, “Moncrief”, and “Wilson”. Keywords searched in the PC 2 catalog included: Campbell, Delancay, d’Estaing, fort, Huger, Lincoln, McIntosh, Marion, Moncrief, Moultrie, Motte, Prevost, Pulaski, Savannah, and Wilson. This catalog contained few items directly relevant to project research. Most, if not all of the items located in the hard-copy card catalogs were not listed in the online searchable databases, so on-site searches were crucial to locating relevant documents.

Researchers examined the finding aid for the Henry Laurens Papers [Collection 356] (Hamer 1968). That examination revealed several documents with the potential to have relevant information. These included extracts of a letter about provisioning the Cherokee and Creek Indians and maintaining Tory slaves. It also contained a letter written by a sailor in the Charlestown harbor in January 1780. Boxes 1 and 2 held these documents.

Several other collections of papers held useful items for this research. The Gratz Collection contained multiple relevant documents. These included correspondence by John Laurens, Arthur Dillon, William Moultrie, and others. The Dreer Collection contained correspondence between Samuel Elbert and Lachlan McIntosh, Isaac Huger to Benjamin Lincoln, Pierce Butler to Lachlan McIntosh, and James Prevost to Thomas Pinckney. The Irvine Papers included a letter from Nathanael Greene regarding British cruelty in Georgia (Vol. 7:75) as well as correspondence between Greene and Anthony Wayne. The Anthony Wayne Papers provided a large number of relevant documents from the American perspective, which was an important compliment to the British perspective of the Clinton Papers at the Clements Library in Ann Arbor. The collection includes correspondence between Wayne and numerous individuals.

Researchers continued to examine historical documents upon their return to Georgia throughout the project. Georgia archival repositories included the Georgia Department of Archives and History, the Georgia Historical Society, the University of Georgia libraries, the Georgia Archeological Site File, and the Bull Street Library. The Internet was an additional source of data.

Georgia Department of Archives and History, Morrow, Georgia

The Georgia Department of Archives and History (GDAH) contains a wide variety of early Georgia records from the Colonial period through statehood. The GDAH has an
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extensive collection of personal family papers, including many from Savannah. It also has the official Georgia military records, including correspondence, militia orders, and pension affidavits. While this collection includes some British records, most deal with the Patriots’ perspective. While some U.S. Army and Continental Army records are contained in the collection, the GDAH records are most useful for researching the Georgia militia. The repository has a copy of the Colonial Records of Georgia and the Revolutionary Records of the State of Georgia (Candler 1904-1916; 1908). Other useful information includes a series of articles on Georgia’s fortification that were published in the 1960s by the GDAH Forts Committee. Copies of these articles were reviewed. The John Goff Forts Collection is another major collection at GDAH that contained relevant information about Savannah’s military defenses. Many records at GDAH have been placed online for public access. These include early colonial wills, plats, early photographs, and some historic maps.

Georgia Historical Society, Savannah

Researchers examined several collections at the Georgia Historical Society. The Alexander Lawrence Papers contained documents and copies of documents pertaining to Savannah in the American Revolution. These research papers were collected by Lawrence in preparation for his seminal book on the Siege of Savannah. The Joseph Vallence Bevan Papers contained many primary documents, as well as notes and draft manuscripts written by Bevan, who was Georgia’s first historian. Unfortunately, Bevan died before his book on Georgia history was completed. His research collection remains largely untapped by modern scholars. Examinations were also made of early Georgia newspapers and the Dolores and Marmaduke Floyd Collection. Researchers also looked at the three-volume compendium of early Savannah maps constituting the Waring Map Collection.

University of Georgia Libraries

The University of Georgia Libraries in Athens possess a wealth of primary documents and secondary historical information about Savannah and the Revolutionary War activity. The Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library holds original manuscripts by Benjamin Lincoln and Charles C. Jones, Jr. The Benjamin Lincoln Order Book (1779-1780) contained general military administration orders and troop discipline, including marches/sieges at Savannah. (There are no entries between June 28 and September 13, 1779.) Another collection contained the Benjamin Lincoln notebook. Major manuscripts in this collection, which included many documents relevant to 1779 Savannah, include the Keith Reed, Telemon Cuyler, and Charles C. Jones collections. The Levi Sheftall Family Papers are located in the Keith Read Collection and described “Levi’s activities as a U.S. Agent for fortifications in Georgia, a diary listing departures, deaths, etc. of Jews in Savannah, and deeds and legal documents. The Mordecai Sheftall Collection contains materials relating to Mordecai’s “…activities as Assistant Deputy Commissary General of Issues of the State of Georgia during the Revolutionary campaigns in and about Savannah” and other items related to Savannah and the Revolution. The Digital Library of Georgia and the Hargrett’s online collection of early Georgia maps, which are searchable online, were major sources of information.

The Main Library of the University of Georgia owns microfilm of the papers of Benjamin Lincoln (Allis 1967; Allis and Frederick 1967). It also has primary documents relating to Major General Benjamin Lincoln’s command (Hyne 1779-1780). The main library also has an extensive collection of published secondary sources about the Revolutionary War, including many rare and obscure volumes from the 19th century.

Bull Street Branch, Live Oak Library System, Savannah, Georgia

This local repository contained information about Savannah history, primarily in its Genealogy and Local History Room (aka “Georgia Room”). Researchers examined a variety of sources including secondary sources, nineteenth century sources, specific journal entries in the Georgia Historical Quarterly, and the vertical files. The latter included newspaper articles, a broadside, and materials related to the preservation of Savannah’s parks and squares.

The Bull Street Library branch also owns the Thomas Gamble collection, which is a wealth of information about early Savannah history. The vertical files contain entries for many relevant topics, including the Siege of Savannah, Savannah’s squares, and the historic preservation efforts in Savannah, as reflected in newspapers and local magazines. Many of these newspaper articles date to the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
Georgia Archeological Site File, Athens

The Georgia Archeological Site File is located at the Laboratory of Archeology in the University of Georgia’s Department of Anthropology. It contains a vast collection of archeological reports, site maps and artifact catalogs. These resources include many obscure and unique paper documents, as well as online (searchable) report and manuscript abstracts and site locational data. Much of this information is searchable online. Researchers accessed the online holdings to gather information about archeological sites in or near the project areas.

Internet Sources

Researchers conducted extensive research on the internet at various sites including newspaper, genealogy, and repository sites. Sites containing copies of historical documents have become prevalent on the internet. Some of the ones searched include Footnote.com, Ancestry.com, GenealogyBank.com, Project Gutenberg, and Books.Google.com. Researchers also searched sites having scanned copies of historic newspapers. Many repositories not only have a catalog of their holdings accessible on the World Wide Web, but also have scans of the actual documents. The Library of Congress’ “American Memory” website is an example of one such site. Researchers examined numerous Revolutionary War pension records of veterans and their widows on the “Footnote.com” web site. Both footnote.com and Southerncampaign.org contain copies of Revolutionary War pension applications from files originally held by the National Archives and Records Administration (RG 15, M804) in Washington, D.C. Researchers examined many of these pensions on line. They searched the following keywords in the Revolutionary War Pension records to locate relevant pensions: Savannah (and its variants), siege, 1779, 1779 and south, 1779 and Georgia, siege of Savannah, Casmir Pulaski, Pulaski and Georgia, Pulaski and Savannah, Lynah, and Wasp (the vessel). They also searched the general Revolutionary War records on this site using the keywords: Polish, Poland, Pulaski’s Legion, and Litominski (and its variants). Some key words, such as “Wasp” had no hits, while others, such as “Pulaski’s Legion” had over 3,000 hits. This was too many to examine in the scope of this project, but they were sampled. A list of names several pages long representing individuals known to have been in the Battle of Savannah were researched on the web site, “Ancestry.com”, for pension and service records. Some of the individuals did have related records.

Other websites provided vast amounts of primary information. These included British orderly books (Robertson et al 2008), pension records (SCAR 2008), and Loyalist records and lists (Cole and Braisted 2000, United Empire Loyalists 2008, DeMond 1940, BPRO 2008, Polen 2008).

Other General Sources

Additional research included the examination of several general sources. Written accounts of the siege, including firsthand accounts, secondary contemporary accounts, and later histories, were studied for specific information on features in the Spring Hill vicinity. Examples of these include published works by Lossing (1852), Jones (1879, 1890), Hough (1866, reprint 1975), Lawrence (1951, reprint 1979), Steward (1899, reprint 1969), Kennedy (1974), and Rogers (1997); primary accounts by John Wilson (Davis 1986), Benjamin Lincoln (Allis 1967), and others (Library of Congress Manuscript Division 1779).

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

To find potential locations of archeological resources, historic maps were compared to the modern landscape of Savannah. Using ArcView 9.2, scans or digital photographs of Revolutionary War-era maps were georeferenced to GIS data from the City of Savannah. A minimum of three control points, or common points, were needed to align the maps. Previously, the only common geographic elements on both the historic and modern maps were streets. These were not the most desirable points, as streets and their widths and edges tend to vary through time. The archeological discovery of the southeastern corner and extending trenches of the Spring Hill Redoubt in 2005 allowed for an additional control point directly related to elements on most of the Revolutionary War maps. While this addition proved helpful, it did not resolve issues dealing with the level of accuracy of historic maps and the need for a uniform distribution across the project area of accurate control points. Figure 7 marks the areas targeted for investigation based on GIS data.

In 1779, Savannah was bounded by Bay and South Broad streets (the latter was renamed Oglethorpe Avenue) to the north and south, respectively, and Lincoln and Jefferson to the east and west, respectively. The four intersections of these streets, the center of town at the intersection of
Bull and Broughton streets, and the corner of the Spring Hill Redoubt were the preferred control points in georeferencing the historic and modern maps. The historic maps contained varying degrees of detail, therefore, archeologists used as many of these control points as possible. Occasionally, it was necessary to add less-accurate control points from the landscape (for example, at the intersection of a tributary and the Savannah River). These points allowed us to distribute our control points throughout the map, making the transformation more accurate overall, while sacrificing local accuracy.

Using these control points, new maps were created using first order polynomial (affine) and adjust transformations to align each historic map with the modern landscape. First order polynomial transformations only shift, scale, and rotate the historic map, but do not warp it. Adjust transformations use both the polynomial transformation and a triangulated irregular network to increase accuracy. Second order polynomial transformations were not used as they resulted in very large root mean square (RMS) errors and too much distortion in the historic maps. Archeologists then examined the new overlay maps to find locations were the historic buildings, redoubts, camps, and other structures intersected with city green spaces, such as parks and “squares”.

Errors increase as distance from the control points increases. For our maps, this generally means any locations in downtown Savannah are fairly accurate; however, the error is much larger in the midtown districts, and continues to increase as one moves farther south and away from the old downtown. Another source of error is the inherent inaccuracy of much of eighteenth century mapping. In addition, the evolution and redevelopment of the city over the past 229 years has caused some shifting in the centerline and edges of streets since 1779, causing inaccuracy in matching the control points.
Fieldwork

Archeologists identified areas to target (Figure 7) for field reconnaissance and/or survey (Figure 8) based on the GIS map overlays they created of historic maps and a modern city map. The GIS overlays included copies of primary document maps (dating predominantly from 1778 and 1779) and a recent geographic database of natural and cultural features on the landscape. Areas that were identified on the GIS overlays as containing battlefield-related components were examined in relation to modern and online map data. Archeologists used an electronic database to determine which areas were public property and were accessible to archeological investigation. Archeologists used Google Earth satellite map images and drive by “windshield surveys” to determine which tracts were inaccessible because they contained structures, basements, and other obstacles. (Parking lots and streets were not considered obstacles since they could be investigated through the use of ground penetrating radar equipment)

Archeologists attempted to obtain current City of Savannah GIS map data for utilities and other known underground disturbances as part of the GIS overlay process. This would have been helpful information to have during the GPR data collection and analysis portion of the project, as well as helping to select areas to excavate unimpeded. Archeologists were denied access to the utility information because it was proprietary information. They did participate in the Utilities Hotline “Call Before You Dig” program to have buried utilities identified and marked. This process, however, did not always catch all the utilities.

Archeologists spent several months working with various city departments and staff to obtain the electronic databases needed to be able to create and compile the GIS overlays. They used the online SAGIS software to identify property owners in addition to other databases. The project then focused on public property owned by the City of Savannah. Areas of potential for battlefield related sites as identified on the GIS overlays, and being in private ownership, were noted.
Once specific areas had been targeted, archeologists did a reconnaissance on Google Earth and/or in person to determine site conditions. At this time they identified initial field methods to be used that would work best in each area. Once in the field, the methods were modified as needed to effectively deal with environmental and cultural conditions. Archeologists then selected targets for field investigation after assessing the following:

- **Environmental Conditions** (such as accessibility for a GPR unit, tree cover, man-made obstacles, gravel or rubble strata, asphalt or concrete paving, deep fill deposits, amount of prior ground disturbance, etc.)
- **Historic Resources** (such as short term bivouacs, defensive or offensive trench works, redoubts, palisades, abatis, batteries, long-term camps, landing or staging areas, historic roads, etc.)

Prior to beginning fieldwork, archeologists coordinated with the Utilities Hotline “Call Before You Dig” and the City of Savannah’s Park and Tree Department. The former was done in order to locate and avoid underground utilities. The latter was done to ensure that there were no scheduling conflicts with other park and square use (such as weddings, concerts, grass cutting, etc.), to avoid buried irrigation lines and other park-related infrastructure, and as a professional courtesy. In an effort to work with the Park and Tree Department, archeologists restricted excavations to weekdays and avoided leaving excavations open over weekends. All sod was removed in large squares and kept for replanting upon backfilling of units. All soil was sifted on tarps to ensure clean, complete backfilling. In addition, archeologists made concerted efforts to leave all roots larger than two inches in diameter intact while digging.

Archeologists conducted all research, fieldwork, laboratory analysis, and reporting following recognized professional standards as set forth by the United States Secretary of the Interior in the *Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation*. Activities associated with this project were conducted in accordance with Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, in consultation with other Federal, State, and local agencies, and Indian tribes, as appropriate. Field methods included a combination of the following: visual ground surface survey, metal detector survey, GPR survey, shovel testing, and/or test unit excavation (Figure 8). Archeologists used a total station laser transit to identify grid coordinates of shovel tests and metal detector hits on sites, as well as test units and man-made surface features (Figure 9). Transit readings were also taken for corners of GPR survey areas in order to tie them to the grid. Archeologists conducted metal detector surveys in a systematic manner. This included surveying specific areas, making maps of the areas surveyed, and recording the precise horizontal and vertical locations historic artifacts excavated.

Archeologists began each field investigation by establishing a grid in that area. These areas included Louisville Road, Emmet Park, Madison Square, Lafayette Square, Colonial Park Cemetery, Cuyler Park, Dixon Park, and Myers Park. Only the grid on Louisville Road was tied to our previously established grid at the Spring Hill Redoubt and the surrounding area. The other areas were too distant to easily connect to the same grid without expending a very large portion of our field time in doing so. For this reason, archeologists gave each area its own grid. These were roughly based on the relative location of one to the other, with datums on each varying by several thousand northing and easting numbers in order to avoid later confusion. In spite of the relative numbers assigned to these grids, archeologists were able to map everything on each site relative to each other, including archeological and landscape components. Each area is tied to our base...
map through common landmarks such as building corners that were mapped with the laser transit. In addition, the transit readings archeologists took of fountains, sidewalks, flowerbeds, and other above surface landscaping allowed them to place the archeological components on current and future maps.

In order to avoid possible confusion, archeologists kept a running list of Accession Numbers (Lot Numbers), Test Unit numbers, and feature numbers for the entire project. This successive numeration for all sites avoided possible duplication and the accidental combination of artifacts from different sites that might otherwise have had the same test unit or shovel test number.

Artifact types that archeologists noted but did not recover (other than samples) included brick, mortar, oyster shell, ballast rock, and stones. Brick and mortar were weighed in pounds and discarded. Samples of half and whole bricks of various dimensions and manufacturing techniques were saved from specific proveniences. Ballast rock uncovered in moderate or large amounts were also weighed in pounds. Archeologists did not save modern items such as clear glass, aluminum cans and other late-20th century or later objects. They did document the presence of modern debris so that any evidence of contamination to later period stratigraphy and features could be interpreted correctly.

Ground Penetrating Radar Methods

Ground Penetrating Radar, or GPR, uses high frequency electromagnetic waves, or microwaves, to acquire subsurface data. The device uses a transmitter antenna and closely spaced receiver antenna to detect changes in electromagnetic properties beneath them. The antennas are suspended just above the ground surface, and the antennas are shielded to eliminate interference from sources other than directly beneath the device. The transmitting antenna emits a series of electromagnetic waves, which are distorted by differences in soil conductivity, dielectric permittivity, and magnetic permeability. The receiving antenna records the reflected waves for a specified length of time (in nanoseconds, or ns). The approximate depth of an object can be estimated with GPR, by adjusting for electromagnetic propagation conditions.

The GPR sample blocks in this study area were composed of a series of parallel transects, or traverses, which yielded a two-dimensional cross-section or profile of the radar data. These samples are termed radargrams. This two-dimensional image is constructed from a sequence of thousands of individual radar traces. A succession of radar traces bouncing off a large buried object will produce a hyperbola, when viewed graphically in profile. Multiple large objects that are in close proximity may produce multiple, overlapping hyperbolas, which are more difficult to interpret. For example, an isolated historic grave may produce a clear signal, represented by a well-defined hyperbola. A cluster of graves, however, may produce a more garbled signal that is less apparent.

The GPR signals that are captured by the receiving antenna are recorded as an array of numerals, which can be converted to gray scale (or color) pixel values. The radargrams are essentially a vertical map of the radar reflection off objects and other soil anomalies. It is not an actual map of the objects. The radargram is produced in real time and is viewable on a computer monitor, mounted on the GPR cart.

GPR has been successfully used for archeological and forensic anthropological applications to locate relatively shallow features, although the technique also can probe deeply into the ground (Conyers and Goodman 1997; Conyers 2002). The machine is adjusted to best probe to the depth of interest by the use of different frequency range antennas. Higher frequency antennas are more useful at shallow depths, which is most often the case in archeology. Also, the longer period of time that the receiving antenna is set to receive GPR signals (measured in nanoseconds, or ns), the deeper the search.

The effectiveness of GPR in various environments on the North American continent is widely variable and depends on solid conductivity, metallic content, and other pedo-chemical factors. Generally, Georgia’s coastal soils have moderately good properties for its application. The technology has been used previously in Savannah and coastal Georgia with favorable results (General Engineering Geophysics, LLC 2004; D. Elliott 2003a-c, 2006, 2008).

GPR signals cannot penetrate large metal objects and the signals are also significantly affected by the presence of salt water. Although radar does not penetrate metal objects, it does generate a distinctive signal that is usually recognizable, particularly for larger metal objects, such as a cast iron cannon or manhole cover. The signal beneath these objects is often canceled out, which results in a pattern of horizontal lines on the radargram. For smaller objects, such as a scatter of nails, the signal may ricochet from the objects and produce a confusing signal. Rebar-reinforced concrete, as another example, generates an unmistakable radar pattern of rippled lines on the radargram. Larry Conyers notes: “Ground-penetrating radar works best in sandy and silty soils and sediments that
are not saturated with water. The method does not work at all in areas where soils are saturated with salt water because this media is electrically conductive and ‘conducts away’ the radar energy before it can be reflected in the ground” (Conyers 2002).

A ground penetrating radar survey was conducted in several areas of the Savannah Under Fire, 1779 project. This survey coverage builds on two previous GPR surveys, which focused on the Spring Hill Redoubt locality; General Engineering Geophysics, LLC (2004) and the LAMAR Institute’s survey at the Marriott cottage location (Elliott 2008). Both of these studies were performed for the Coastal Heritage Society and both were done prior to the present study.

The GPR survey for the ABPP study consisted of complete coverage of 12 sample blocks (A-M, excluding I) in five areas of Savannah (Figure 10). The sample areas were selected based on findings from the historical and cartographic research, the GIS maps created for the project, and by the availability of land surfaces suitable for use of the GPR machine. Areas containing standing buildings, thick vegetation, or other major obstructions were excluded. Survey was restricted to property owned by the City of Savannah.

The survey was composed of 682 individual radargrams that covered 30,297 m (30.2 km) of ground and an approximate total area of 16,957 m² (16.9 ha). All radargrams in this survey were spaced parallel and 50 cm apart. All radar data was collected unidirectionally.

Radargrams were collected along a rectangular grid and were numbered consecutively.

The GPR hardware used in the survey was a RAMAC X3M radar unit, 500 MHz shielded antenna, and MALÅ...
monitor. This equipment was mounted on a wheeled cart and powered by a Li-ION 12V battery pack.

The GPR data collected by the survey was post-processed using several software packages. These included: GroundVision, Easy3D, and GPR-Slice. A series of profiles and plan views were generated for each sample block. JPEG animations were created for each sample block, using GPR-Slice. These animations can be viewed by clicking on the GPR-Slice icon on the accompanying CD Rom disc. Selected images of survey output are included in the report discussion.

**Laboratory Analysis**

All artifacts were brought to the Archeology Lab in the Curatorial Department of the Coastal Heritage Society, in Savannah, Georgia. There, artifacts were washed, counted, analyzed, and rebagged for curation. Artifacts were analyzed by using a coding system based on broad functional categories generally aligned with South’s (1977) classification system and then tied to specific alphanumeric sequences. Examples of these broad categories include A=Architecture, C=Clothing, K=Kitchen, M=Miscellaneous, P=Personal, R=Arms, T=Tobacco, and Z=Activities. An example of the alpha-numeric sequence for a brass button would be CM0220; the “C” stands for a clothing artifact and the “M” indicates it is metal. The number represents all brass buttons. Likewise KC1511 is the code for a piece of plain Delft, whereas KC1504 stands for blue hand-painted Delft. Comments and details specific to artifacts were recorded in separate columns in the database. Codes were then entered into a computerized database. The coding enabled archeologists to ask questions of the data easily. The Microsoft Access software allowed them to ask the questions in the form of queries. The artifact inventory is provided on the digital appendix with this report.

The above system allowed archeologists to analyze artifacts by functional attributes as well as by other traits. These traits included method of manufacture, material, decoration, size, color, and other characteristics. Archeologists used these traits in conjunction with studies and published research by recognized experts in various fields.

Examples of references consulted included: ceramics (Greer 1996; Hume 1985, South 1977), military button typologies (Albert 1997; Tice 1997, Troiani 2001), bottle manufacture (Fike 1967, 1987; McKearin and Wilson 1978, SHA 2008), and general colonial artifacts (South 1977, Noel Hume 1985, and Neumann and Kravic 1989). They also used a variety of sources to identify arms artifacts, such as Flayderman (1980), Hamilton (1976), Moore (1967), Neumann (1976, 1991), and Sivilich (1996). See the bibliography of this report for additional sources.

Bottle glass color was noted during the analysis phase of laboratory work. Color was not used as a chronological marker to date specific strata or features for the reasons outlined below. For example, the presence of fragments of aqua or olive green glass did not result in archeologists assigning a specific date to an assemblage based solely on color. Other dating methods, however, were used. For example, the method of manufacture of the bottles was analyzed rather than the color, for dating purposes.

The inability to use the color of bottles as age indicators is due to the number of variables involved in bottle production. Iron impurities in sand used in bottle manufacture produce uncontrolled results in terms of color. Lower levels of iron create “bluish to greenish aqua” whereas higher levels produce darker greens (SHA 2008). In addition minerals in the potash used and the amount of oxygen in the fire used to melt the glass affects the color.

The Parks Canada Glass Glossary by Jones & Sullivan (1989) as cited on The Society for Historical Archeology web site sums up the use and abuse of color as a chronology indicator in archeological studies.

Because colour is a universal attribute of glass and is convenient for mending and establishing minimal vessel counts, it has been latched onto by some archeologists as a classification device. Although classification by colour is simple to do, the end result is of little value for the following reasons: colour does not have a direct relation with glass type (the common green, amber, and brown glass colours can occur in soda, potash, and lime glasses; many lead glasses are coloured); colour is not related to the technology of glass object production (i.e., it has nothing to do with whether the glass is free blown, mould blown, pressed, or machine made); colour is only weakly related to the function of the object (almost all colours can be found in all types of objects, an obvious exception being “black” glass which does not occur in tableware). Given these factors there is little justification for using colour as a means of classification. There is a very broad chronology of popularity of various colours over time; however that chronology cannot be applied to individual glass objects with any significant level of meaning...(SHA 2008).
Conservation

Select, unstable artifacts were conserved for their protection. The Brown Bess cock and the iron frizzen spring were electrolyzed by Coastal Heritage Society staff experienced in such procedures. The 5th Regiment pewter button, pewter buckle and other select pewter was conserved by Coastal Heritage Society staff based on recommendations made by professional conservator Katherine Singley, who has conducted numerous conservation projects for the State of Georgia.

Curation

Artifacts remain the property of the property owner, the City of Savannah. All artifacts, field forms, photographs, notes, hard copy inventory, and the final report are curated with the collections managed by the Coastal Heritage Society and currently housed in the Savannah History Museum in Savannah Georgia. Long-term plans for the collection are to relocate it to a new, state-of-the-art curation facility to be owned by the City of Savannah and managed by the Coastal Heritage Society. This facility will be a new structure located in the Georgia State Railroad Museum complex across the street from the current museum. Meanwhile, the collection will remain with the other collections housed in the current Savannah History Museum. Select artifacts will be incorporated into an updated Revolutionary War exhibit within the Savannah History Museum.

Public Outreach and Involvement

Archeologists engaged the public at all seven study areas. Figures 11, 12, 17-19 provide examples. Madison Square harbored the largest numbers of passers-by. These included city residents, businessmen and women, area residents, city administrators and staff, school children, college students, independent tourists, and tour groups. Lafayette Square was second in the number of visitors present. Tour groups who came by on an impromptu basis included a walking tour, several tour guides, and multiple passages of horse-drawn carriage tours, tour buses, and tour trolleys (Figure 11). A history teacher brought three classes of students from the neighboring St. Vincent’s Academy for tours and talks about the site (Figure 12). Two student groups passing through the square stopped for a quick...
Figure 12. Students from nearby St. Vincent’s Academy visit the excavations in Lafayette Square.

Figure 13. A Coastal Heritage Society Banner greets traffic on Bull Street, adjacent to Madison Square excavations.
history lesson. On average, an estimated 500 people a day came by archeologists while working in Madison and Lafayette Squares, with smaller numbers of visitors at Emmet Park, Colonial Park Cemetery, and Myers Park. A handful of people visited us at Cuyler and Dixon parks. There were approximately 3,000 visitors, total.

The response from visitors to the project areas was overwhelmingly positive. Archeologists encouraged visitors to stop, read the signage, see some of the artifacts, watch the work in progress, and ask questions or engage in discussions. To encourage this, archeologists hung banners at strategic entrances to the squares that proclaimed, “Archeology” and the names of the organizations conducting the work (Figures 13 and 14). These banners were used to attract attention and show visitors where to find us. Once at the excavation areas, visitors had the opportunity to read two signs. One provided the background context, such as who was doing the project, how it was being funded, the steps involved, and the project goals (Figure 15). The other sign was vinyl letters on a dry erase board. This sign asked the common questions such as, “What are we looking for?” “What have we found?” and “Why are we looking here?” The dry erase board allowed archeologists to update the sign on a daily basis as needed. This was particularly useful in attracting the “repeat” visitor such as local residents and business people routinely passing by daily and/or on their lunch hour (Figure 16, 17, 18).

In spite of a very small crew size, and the sometimes harried pace of Friday finishes, archeologists made concerted efforts to speak to visitors (Figure 19). New finds were announced as they occurred and examples of artifacts passed around to visitors present, with commentary on the value of the artifact as it relates to its context in a Revolutionary War feature. Some visitors shared important information about finds in their yards nearby or historical documentation. Visitors to the project area were enthusiastic, excited, and eager to learn about the work underway and how that related to the Savannah’s role in the American Revolution.

The media captured the exciting discovery of the almost six-foot-deep Revolutionary War ditch uncovered in Madison Square. This included a very successful media event coordinated by Coastal Heritage Society’s Public Relations personnel, Michael Jordan. As a former television news anchor and current documentary videographer, Jordan not only sent out press releases and contacted various television stations and newspapers, but he also filmed some of the event. This film was aired on television stations and used in a documentary about the Revolutionary War in Savannah. Throughout the project,
Chapter 2. Methodology

Figure 15. (above) A sign for visitors explaining the NPS ABPP project.

Figure 16. (above) A dry-erase sign with daily updates about archeological discoveries.

Figure 17. (left) The signs attract bikers and pedestrians.
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Figure 18. An impromptu tour group stops in Madison Square to learn about the project.

Figure 19. Business people, families, and local residents stop to watch and talk.
media coverage included stories in the following venues (along with on-line versions for each):

WTOC Channel 11 (March 21, 2008; April 17, 2008);
WJCL Channel 22 (March 21, 2008; April 17, 2008);
CitySpan (Savannah Government Channel) (April 2008);
WSAV Channel 3 (Randi Hempel, March 21, 2008);
*Savannah Morning News* (Chuck Mobley, March 27, 2008; September 10, 2008); and *Connect Savannah* (Linda Sickler, March 26, 2008).

The project and resulting information was also shared with the public through presentations and lectures by Rita Elliott. She gave PowerPoint presentations at:
Coastal Georgia Archeological Society, Savannah, Georgia (June 2008);
Fort Frederica National Park/Glynn County Teachers’ Workshop, St. Simons Island, Georgia (July 2008);
Coastal Heritage Society Revolutionary War Lecture Series, Savannah, Georgia (September 2008);
Fort Morris State Historic Site, Midway, Georgia (November 2008); and Armstrong Atlantic State University Anthropology Class, Savannah, Georgia (November 2008). Other presentations are slated for the Lifelong Learning Class at Hilton Head Island, South Carolina (January 2009) and the Ocmulgee Archeological Society in Macon, Georgia (March 2009). Elliott expects to give additional presentations in 2009, particularly as individuals, project partners, and supporters receive copies of the report and want the information shared with members of their organizations.
A number of key factors contributed to the overwhelming defeat of the Franco-American forces at the Battle of Savannah. These included poor planning, bad timing, strategic miscalculations, and an ineffective order of battle. The lack of planning is obvious in hindsight. Strategic miscalculations began with the blunder in September that allowed Major General Augustin Prevost time and opportunity to reinforce his position, rather than attacking immediately. Poor planning was later evident on multiple levels. For example, the guides who were supposed to lead the troops from their outlying camps to the battlefield surrounding Savannah were few, and were ignorant of the local terrain. This contributed to the troops’ arrival well after the pre-dawn assault was scheduled to begin. The late arrival skewed the timing so the feints on the Central redoubt area and the attack on the Spring Hill Redoubt were not simultaneous events. The skewed timing also resulted in columns of soldiers becoming entangled with each other and not attacking in the right order or being forced into the swamp by that confusion and the artillery fire. A more careful consideration during the planning of the battle of the swampy terrain might have suggested potential problems. Instead of the swamp offering only cover and concealment, it also served as a quagmire in the avenue of approach that mired columns of soldiers into total disarray as they tried to attack Spring Hill. The allies also miscalculated the strength and skill of the troops in the Spring Hill Redoubt sector the morning of the battle. Finally, total rearrangement of troops and officers created overall confusion as soldiers and commanders struggled to fight next to unfamiliar troops. In spite of a few fleeting minutes in which allied colors were planted on the Spring Hill Redoubt, the allies were soundly defeated. The part of the battle at Spring Hill Redoubt resulted in the greatest slaughter of French and American allied troops. The entire 55-minute battle saw less than 50 British forces wounded or killed contrasted with an estimated 800 dead or wounded on the allied side.

There were an enormous number of key players involved in the Battle of Savannah. Many of their roles, assignments, and ranks changed before and during the siege, before and during the battle, and after the battle. The rearranging of French and American troops under different commands the morning of the battle contributes to the confusion in deciphering and understanding the order of battle. The outline below is further confounded as one realizes that ranks, regiments, and battalions were fluid throughout the war, as casualties resulted in promotions and amalgamations of various military units, often with astounding frequency. The configuration below is extracted from the order of battle as researched by historian David Wilson (2005:177-181), with minor modifications based on research for this report. The content is derived from a variety of cited sources. The purpose of the list is not only to examine the order of battle but to provide brief biographical sketches of select officers and soldiers involved.

### Key Players, British Command

#### Major General Augustin Prevost

Augustin Prevost was in command of the combined British and Loyalist forces at Savannah beginning in January 1779. Prevost was a battle-hardened officer with years of military experience dating back to the French and Indian War. Augustin Prevost and his wife, Anne, came to Savannah from Prevost’s headquarters at St. Augustine, East Florida. Both Augustin and Anne left written accounts of the siege, which have been published.

Prevost arrived in Savannah with his 60th Regiment and a collection of other Loyalist regiments. He arrived as a Brigadier General but was promoted to Major General early in 1779. Major General Prevost had headquarters in Savannah, New Ebenezer, and Hudson’s Ferry at different times throughout 1779. After a failed attempt to capture Charleston, South Carolina, in mid-1779, Prevost returned to Savannah and maintained his headquarters there until his departure from Georgia in May 1780. Prevost retired from the military following service in the Revolutionary
Lieutenant Colonel John Maitland (71st Regiment)

Lieutenant Colonel John Maitland (1732 - Oct 25, 1779), 71st Regiment, was the eighth son of Charles Maitland, 6th Earl of Lauderdale and Lady Elizabeth Ogilvie. He was a member of the 71st Highlanders, also known as Fraser’s Highlanders. The 71st Highlanders were known for their distinctive and eerie sounding bagpipes before battle and their fierce fighting thereafter.

The 71st Regiment became involved in Savannah prior to the 1779 battle. Two battalions of the 71st Regiment sailed from New York, via Sandy Hook, New Jersey, and arrived in Savannah in December of 1778 under Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell. Campbell had a checkered military career in the American Revolution. He was captured by the Patriots when his ship arrived in Boston Harbor in 1776. He was held prisoner for nearly two years and was freed in exchange for Ethan Allen. Campbell was chosen by Lieutenant General Henry Clinton (who was also Commander in Chief of the British Army in America), to lead the expedition to Savannah in 1778. Campbell learned of his mission southward only days before leaving Sandy Hook. His capture of Savannah was nearly flawless. Immediately after conquering Savannah, the 71st Regiment marched northwest up the Savannah River watershed to New Ebenezer. After establishing a command post at Ebenezer it marched further upstream towards Augusta, establishing military posts along the route.

Campbell was miffed by the arrival of Brigadier General Augustin Prevost in Savannah in mid-January 1779. Prevost, the ranking officer, assumed command over the Georgia theater of the war and was promoted to a Major General. Campbell returned to England in mid-March 1779 and was not present for the September/October 1779 Siege of Savannah. His military accomplishments, however, served to tighten the British stranglehold on Savannah, which would endure until July 1782.

Lieutenant Colonel John Maitland was in overall command of the 1,000 men in the 71st Regiment. He rapidly marched his portion of healthy troops from their post in Beaufort, South Carolina, to reinforce Prevost in Savannah. He successfully eluded French and American forces and slipped into Savannah with 800 much needed troops (Wilson 2005:145). Many historians postulate that without Maitland’s reinforcements, Prevost would have capitulated or lost the battle. Sixteen days after the Battle of Savannah, Maitland died from malaria while on a march through swampland (Wilson 2005:176).

Major Archibald McArthur (71st Regiment, 1st Battalion) and Major McDonald (71st Regiment, 2nd Battalion)

The 71st Highland Regiment consisted of two battalions. Major Archibald McArthur commanded the 1st Battalion.
Major McDonald led the 2nd Battalion. On September 27, during the Siege of Savannah, McArthur led a successful sortie against one of the allied batteries (Russell 2000:119).

Major Colin Graham (Light Corps)
Major Colin Graham, 16th Regiment, commanded a company of Light Infantry at Savannah. It included the 16th, 60th, and 71st regiments (Wilson 2005:180). Major Graham led a successful sortie against the French trenches on September 24, 1779 (MacLean 1900). That sortie was a setback for the besiegers resulting in numerous killed and wounded.

60th Regiment, Royal Americans
This British regiment was initially raised in America to fight the French during the French and Indian War. In less than 20 years, however, it had become a regiment of almost all Europeans rather than colonials. The regiment was commanded by Major General Augustin Prevost, who had served in it since the French and Indian War. The 60th Regiment had been based in St. Augustine prior to marching to Savannah. On the way to Savannah, the 60th Regiment paused long enough to conquer Sunbury on January 9, 1779. Within two weeks the regiment was present in Savannah with its 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Battalions.

Royal Artillery
The Royal Artillery recruited soldiers throughout the American Revolution in an unsuccessful effort to maintain a full contingent. This recruitment included Loyalists already serving in various Provincial Corps, even including some regiments in Jamaica (Cole and Braisted 2000). Soldiers desiring to leave their current units were allowed to do so to join the Royal Artillery. Blacks worked in the Royal Artillery, but as laborers or craftsmen and not soldiers. For example, a return dated April 28, 1780, revealed 92 laborers, 7 carpenters, 2 collar-makers, and 1 blacksmith among the “Negroes Employed”. In addition, 30 African Americans in the Royal Artillery had smallpox and another 22 were listed as sick and lame (Cole and Braisted 2000). [See below for additional information on black troops.] The Royal Artillery used cannon of various sizes.

Thomas Tawse, Light Dragoons
Thomas Tawse is listed as a Lieutenant or a Captain in various documents (Cole and Braisted 2000; Kennedy 1900:89; Sabine 1864). He was a Lieutenant in the 71st Regiment (Dragoons), 1st Battalion, and a Captain in the Provincials. While a Captain, Tawse posted a notice in the Royal Gazette on August 12, 1779, recruiting men for his Georgia Light Dragoons. A new recruit would be given “…full dragoon pay from the date of his attestation, and receive three guineas bounty money, with compleat dragoon clothing and accoutrements” (Cole and Braisted 2000). By December of that year, soldiers in the Light Dragoons were reimbursed for horses purchased for use in their military service (Cole and Braisted 2000).

Tawse commanded a company of South Carolina Royalists and was killed in the October 9th Battle of Savannah. He died on top the Spring Hill Redoubt, leading the Carolina troops in a staunch defense against the French vanguard attacks there. He reportedly, “…slew three of his foes with his own hand, and was himself killed in defending the gate, while his sword was in the body of the third victim” (Sabine 1864 vol.3:346).

Hessians
Hessian troops became involved in the American Revolution when England’s King George III decided he needed reinforcements in America. He signed treaties with regional counts, known as Landgraves, of various Germanic states in the Hesse-Kassel area of the Holy Roman Empire. These treaties led to the transportation of almost 17,000 Hessian soldiers to North America (Cole and Braisted 2000). These, combined with other troops from the Holy Roman Empire constituted about one-third of the British force in North America. Hessian jägers were the elite of these forces. They were well trained in using rifles (as opposed to less accurate muskets) and agile in the forests (Figure 20). Approximately 1,500-1,700 jägers, half the number the British desired, were included in the total number of Hessian troops (Cole and Braisted 2000).

Researching the Hessians in Savannah was confusing, particularly because of the frequent renaming of the regiments and the various misspellings of the surnames of each regiment’s namesake. The two regiments in Savannah were often blurred in correspondence between their commanding officers and the Landgraf. The sequence of the two regiments was as follows:

The Regiment von Rall became the Regiment von Woellwarth, which became the Regiment von Trümbach. It appears that the Trümbach Regiment then became the Regiment von Bose and Regiment d’Angelelli. The Regiment von Wissenbach** later became the Regiment von Knoblauch.
Trümbach and Wissenbach were the regiments’ official names in September and October, 1779. The Hessian regiments were further distinguished by types, including Grenadiers, Infantry, Musketeers, and Garrison regiments. The Musketeer Regiment von Bose may have served in the 1779 Battle of Savannah, as did the Grenadier Regiment von Trümbach, even though some researchers refer to them by other designations. Most of the troops known as the Regiment von Bose did not participate in the battle but remained in the northern theater.

Loyalist historian E. Lowell noted that two Hessian regiments accompanied Lieutenant Colonel Campbell’s force to Savannah in November 1778. He cites from a manuscript journal of the Regiment von Wissenbach that was probably written by a non-commissioned officer named Reuber. The historian penned that once the Hessian troops arrived in Savannah, “They were quartered in the fine barracks of the town” (Lowell 2002:239-240).

The British National Archives contains a “Report of Col Campbell on the Expedition to Savannah, including the Hessian Battalions of Wissenbach and Wollwarth 16 Jan 1779.” That document includes a list of troop losses. The British National Archives also contains a long report of Major General Prevost at Savannah, dated November 1, 1779. It covers the months of September and October with a general return of his corps and list of casualties, including Hessian regiments Wissenbach and Trümbach (CO 5/182/176ff: f202, f204). The two parts of the volume contain numerous reports from Savannah. An online British National Archives finding aid contains summary information on the Hessian regiments. It notes that these regiments participated in the Siege of Savannah:

- Grenadiere Regiment von Rall (named Regiment von Wollwarth from 1776 to 1778; and known as Regiment d’Angelell from 1780)
- Musketeer Regiment von Bose (named Regiment von Trümbach prior to 1779).

The British National Archives finding aid indicates that the Garrison Regiment von Wissbach (renamed the Regiment von Knoblauch from 1780 to war’s end) was in Savannah in December 1778. The regiment later fought at Stono Ferry, South Carolina in June 1779. It makes no mention of the regiment’s participation in the 1779 Siege of Savannah, however.

Researcher Eelking noted that the Regiment von Wissbach and Regiment Von Trümbach both were quartered in Savannah, where they also served with distinction during the battle. Eelking further stated that the Regiments von Trümbach and Wissenbach, commanded by Colonel von Porbeck, were, “behind the palisades and traverses, in the center, in the Siege of Savannah”. The Regiment von Trümbach was later sent to Charleston and the Regiment von Wissenbach remained in Savannah (Rosengarten 1893:162, 175).

Regiment Rall later became designated Regiment von Wollwarth and in late 1778 was again redesignated as Regiment von Trümbach. The Regiment von Trümbach was later designated Regiment von Bose, although portions of the regiment remained in the Northeast and were not present at the 1779 siege or Battle of Savannah (Lowell 2002:241). Major J.J. Matthaeus was serving in command of the Regiment von Trümbach in Savannah in January 1779. Matthaeus signed a memorial in Savannah on February 4, 1780, which was submitted to Sir Henry Clinton, as “Commander of the Regiment de Trümbach” (Clinton papers). By July 1, 1780, however, Matthaeus was dead and on November 16, 1780, Major Bode was given command of Matthaeus’ company (Zuleger n.d.:13, 20, 22). Matthaeus’ 1780 memorial indicates that the regiment was then known as the Regiment von Trümbach, rather than Regiment von Bose.

Grenadier Regiment von Rall became Grenadier Regiment von Woellwarth in 1777. At the time of the regiment’s departure from New York in November 1778, F.F. Matthaeus described it as “the vacant v. Woelwarth Regiment”, implying that the regimental commander Woellwarth was dead by that time. By early 1779 it was designated the Grenadier Regiment von Trümbach, and by 1780 it became the Grenadier Regiment d’Angelelli.
The regiment served in Savannah in 1778, 1779, 1781, and 1782 (Johannes Schwalm Historical Association, Inc. 2006).

Lieutenant Colonel von Porbeck was Field Officer of the Day for the British right wing on October 9, 1779. He was in the Spring Hill Redoubt when it was attacked. Lieutenant Colonel Friedrich von Porbeck commanded over 500 men in the Wissenback regiment. He remained in command at Savannah following the battle. Major General Prevost complimented him on his service in the Siege of Savannah (Lowell 2002:242).

Porbeck wrote to the Landgraf from Savannah on January 1, 1781. His letter discussed rampant sickness in the Regiment d’Angelelli. He noted, “Continuous sickness among the officers has delayed the accounting and book replacing of the companies of the deceased Lieutenant General von Wissenbach” (Zuleger n.d.:31). Among the Hessian officers in Savannah was Captain Boedicker, who commanded a company of Regiment von Knoblauch in December 1781. Boedicker filled the vacancy of Captain Captain Guendemann as commander of that company (Zuleger n.d.:41).

Royal Marines

The Royal Marines contributed men to the British defensive efforts at Savannah in 1779. Prevost had the support of the captains on all the King’s naval vessels anchored in the Savannah River near town. The captains ordered their marines and the ships’ guns unloaded from the ships. The marines then temporarily joined the grenadiers of the 60th Regiment and the artillery was placed in various batteries around the city (Wilson 2005:149). Approximately 40 Royal Marines and 117 seamen participated in the Battle of Savannah (Wilson 2005:181).

(New York Volunteers)

The New York Volunteers were commanded by Colonel Frederick DePeyster, a prominent New Yorker of Dutch descent (DePeyster 1758-1834). In DePeyster’s absence, however, Lieutenant Colonel George Turnbull commanded the New York Volunteers from at least October 1777 to 1778. Major Henry Sheridan was next in command. Frederick DePeyster was a prominent New Yorker of Dutch descent. The New York Volunteers Regiment was sent to East Florida in October 1778. It accompanied General Prevost to Savannah and was present in September 1779. The New York Volunteers Regiment was posted along Savannah’s northeastern defenses in the 1779 Siege. That area saw relatively little combat during the siege. The regiment suffered one Sergeant killed, one
In May 1780, the regiment participated in the British Siege of Charleston and in the battles of Camden and Hobkirk’s Hill. It returned to Savannah and New York in August 1782. In 1783, Colonel DePeyster went with his troops to settle in Canada. The regiment was disbanded after arriving in Canada. DePeyster’s business records at the New York Historical Society indicate he returned to New York a few years afterward.

Brigadier General DeLancey (DeLancey’s Brigade)

Oliver DeLancey was Brigadier General of DeLancey’s Brigade, and at the same time was Colonel of the 1st Battalion (Raymond 1899). DeLancy replaced Major John André as the Adjutant General of the British Army in America. DeLancey was known for his skills in gathering Loyalist intelligence (Cole and Braisted 2000). He was from New York.

DeLancey’s Brigade was a Loyalist unit formed in New York by Oliver DeLancey. Oliver DeLancey, who held the title of commander of DeLancey’s Brigade, was not physically present at Savannah for either the 1778 or 1799 battles. Lieutenant Colonel John Cruger, son-in-law of DeLancey’s Brigade, was in charge of the Regiment in his father-in-law’s absence. Cruger also commanded the 1st Battalion (Boatner 1992:90). Stephen DeLancy, Oliver DeLancey’s son, commanded the 2nd Battalion (Raymond 1899). The 1st and 2nd battalions of DeLancey’s Brigade were sent to Halifax, Canada, and then to Savannah in October 1778. These united with Lieutenant Colonel Campbell and participated in the capture of Savannah in December 1778. These battalions of DeLancey’s Brigade participated in the 1779 Siege of Savannah. Delancey’s Battalion fought in South Carolina during December 1779. In February 1782, the battalion evacuated to New York. Some troops chose to disband in New York while others continued on to Nova Scotia where they were disbanded (Cole and Braisted 2000). Those troops settled in New Brunswick, Canada, where they eventually received land grants.

Lieutenant Colonel John Cruger (1st Battalion)

Colonel John Harris Cruger, DeLancey’s Battalion, was from a prominent New York family with a long tradition of public service. Cruger commanded DeLancey’s Battalion in Georgia and South Carolina, where it participated in many battles. The 1st Battalion of DeLancey’s Brigade was posted east of Savannah in a forward redoubt where Cruger’s troops engaged in combat with Americans in the 1779 siege (Faden 1784). He later defended the British fortifications at Ninety-Six, South Carolina against an unsuccessful American siege led by Major General Nathanael Greene. In 1783 Cruger accompanied his troops to New York and then went on to settle in Canada.

Lieutenant Colonel Stephen DeLancy (2nd Battalion)

Stephen DeLancy was the son of Brigadier General Oliver Delancy. The 2nd Battalion of DeLancy’s Brigade was held in reserve behind an epaulement, west of the 1st Battalion’s location at a forward redoubt. After several years of fighting and sustaining numerous casualties, the 1st and 2nd Battalions in the southern theater were reformed into a new 1st Battalion, and the 3rd Battalion on Long Island became the 2nd Battalion.

Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen (Skinner’s New Jersey Volunteers Regiment)

Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen (ca. 1741-1806) commanded two battalions of the New Jersey Volunteers in the southern campaign and was in command throughout the 1779 Siege of Savannah. He was a prominent lawyer from New Jersey. Allen received his officer’s commission on December 3, 1776, and he was a staunch loyalist throughout the war. His 2nd and 3rd Battalions formed part of the garrison that was stationed at a large redoubt, “on the south side of the city, near the river” (Stryker 1881:18). Although many of the New Jersey Volunteers in Savannah were somewhat removed from the major infantry engagement on October 9, 1779, Captain Daniel Cozens was killed in the battle on December 29, 1778, in which the British took Savannah (Stryker 1881:18, 22). In 1783 Allen went with his troops to settle in New Brunswick, Canada. There Allen continued to practice law politics until his death (Stryker 1881:18, 28; Sabine 1864).

Skinner’s New Jersey Volunteers Regiment was formed in New Jersey by Brigadier General Cortland Skinner (Stryker 1881). Skinner was not in Savannah in 1778 or 1779 with his troops, however, having remained in the Northeast. The regiment sailed from Sandy Hook under command of Lieutenant Colonel Campbell. Two battalions of Skinner’s New Jersey Volunteers were assigned to accompany Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell in his southern campaign. One ship carrying some of the New Jersey Volunteers, including Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen, was separated from the fleet at sea and sailed too far southward. Instead of joining with Campbell’s force, that group of loyalists participated in the Siege of Sunbury and aided in the capture of Fort Morris in early January 1779. Another group of New Jersey Volunteers apparently did
make it to Savannah with Campbell, however, and fought in the December 1778 capture of that city. Captain Peter Campbell, New Jersey Loyalists, was killed in the fight on Brewton’s Hill, east of Savannah (Stryker 1881:46). Both battalions of the New Jersey Volunteers participated in the 1779 Siege of Savannah. In May 1780, the New Jersey Volunteers were involved in the British siege of Charleston.

British Legion

In July of 1778, successful recruiting led to the raising of the British Legion in New York. Part of this regiment was sent to Savannah and fought in the battle. A total of 24 British Legion soldiers were documented as being in the October 9, 1779, Battle of Savannah (Wilson 2005:181). In December the legion marched to Charleston where it helped lay siege to that city. Some stayed on in Charleston to hold the city after it was taken. The remainder of the legion (excluding those that had remained in New York) fought with Cornwallis in South and North Carolina and Virginia. The legion was ultimately captured at Yorktown. Those soldiers in the legion that were in New York and Charleston were transferred to the King’s American Dragoons (UK National Archives 2008).

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Brown (King’s Florida Rangers)

The East Florida Rangers were formerly known as the King’s Rangers (Cashin 1989). They accompanied Augustin Prevost on his march from St. Augustine to Savannah in January 1779. The rangers were commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Brown. Brown was a Georgia colonist and Loyalist who arrived in the colony a few years before the American Revolution and established a plantation north of Augusta. He was in command of the East Florida Rangers in early 1779, and by the fall of that year, Lieutenant Colonel Brown also commanded an assortment of Loyalist Creeks and other Tories. Brown’s Rangers had come to Savannah after evacuating New Ebenezer, where they narrowly escaped the arrival of Pulaski’s Legion. The civilian Tories of New Ebenezer fled the town with Brown’s Rangers and sought refuge in Savannah during the siege. Cashin (1989) provided a thorough biography on the colorful life of Thomas Brown.

The East Florida Rangers were posted on the western defenses of Savannah in October 1779. They participated in the repulse of the French and American attack at Spring Hill on October 9. The rangers suffered only one Private killed and one wounded, although five Privates deserted in October 1779 (Prevost 1779a; Beatson 1804:184-185). Colonel Alexander Innes (South Carolina Royalists)

The South Carolina Royalists Regiment was composed of Loyalists from that colony. The regiment was raised in East Florida in May 1778. It was formed into two troops of rifle dragoons and four companies of infantry. The regiment was sent to Savannah in August 1779, where it assisted in defending the city. The South Carolina Royalists later participated in the Siege of Charleston in May 1780. The regiment fought in several engagements in South Carolina and evacuated to New York in November 1782. Alexander Innes commanded the regiment of South Carolina Royalists during the Siege of Savannah. The regiment was posted on the southwestern defenses of Savannah at the Carolina Redoubt, northwest of the Spring Hill Redoubt.

Lieutenant Colonel John Hamilton (Royal North Carolina Regiment)

Lieutenant Colonel John Hamilton commanded the regiment of Loyalists from North Carolina who participated in the Siege of Savannah. Hamilton helped raise the regiment in January and February 1779, soon after the arrival in Georgia of Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell’s invasion force. The North Carolina Loyalists were somewhat reduced in number following engagements at Vann’s Creek and Kettle Creek in the upper Savannah River region (Davis and Thomas 1974). By September 1779, they were a formidable fighting force, and they performed admirably in the defense of Savannah.

Major Wright (Georgia Loyalists and Volunteers)

A recruiting notice posted by James Wright in August 1779 proclaimed that “All Spirited Young Men Have now an opportunity of distinguishing themselves…by joining the Georgia Loyalists…for two years, or during the continuance of the said rebellion” (Cole and Braisted 2000). Recruits were promised best treatment, immediate pay, and a five guinea bounty. The regiment was raised in Georgia in early 1779. Major Wright commanded the Georgia Loyalists in Savannah during the 1779 Siege. The Georgia Loyalists were posted on the northeastern defenses around Savannah. After the failure of the French and American siege at Savannah, the Georgia Loyalists participated in engagements in South Carolina. The regiment merged with East Florida Rangers in June 1782. They went to New York, where they were disbanded.

Captain Simpson of the Georgia Loyalists was killed in October 1779. One Sergeant and two Privates also were killed and one Private wounded in October. Two sergeants and 11 privates from the Georgia Loyalists
were listed as deserters that month (Prevost 1779a). The Georgia Loyalists faced an attack by a small contingent of the French Volunteers. They also came under naval bombardment from the French and American vessels anchored in the Savannah River, which may have accounted for some of their casualties.

Enslaved African Americans, Volunteer Negroes, Seamen, and Black Pioneers

There were few opportunities for blacks in the British military during the American Revolution. Various workers were categorized as slaves, volunteer Negroes, Black Pioneers, seamen, and other miscellaneous troops (Wilson 2005:181). Figure 21 is an artist rendition of a black pioneer in uniform.

One limited opportunity was to become a pioneer, who “… was a soldier whose main task was to provide engineering duties in camp and combat. These were things such as clearing ground for camps, removing obstructions, digging necessaries [outhouses], etc.” (Cole and Braisted 2000).

General Clinton encouraged blacks to form a company known as the Black Pioneers after 71 runaway slaves tried to join his forces in North Carolina in 1776. The Black Pioneers was commanded by non-commissioned black officers and commissioned white officers, with Marine Lieutenant George Martin as the first Provincial Captain. Clinton promised these Black Pioneers their freedom after the war and tried to see that they were treated well with provisions, clothing, and respect during their service (Cole and Braisted 2000).

The Black Pioneers accompanied Clinton to New York and Philadelphia, and then followed him to the Siege of Charleston two months later. In Charleston, the company met another Black Pioneer corps. This latter one had formed in Savannah during the siege in September and October 1779 (Cole and Braisted 2000). According to Hessian Captain Johann Heinrichs, a Staff Captain in the Jäger Corps, 300 blacks were assigned the task of creating 15 batteries in Savannah during the siege (Alexander 1938:167). It is unclear if his estimate was for Black Pioneers only or included other blacks in Savannah at the time laboring for the British. The Black Pioneer company from Savannah may not have been provincial soldiers. A provincial soldier was, “fed, armed, clothed, paid and under the same discipline as a British soldier, but was only liable for service in North America. Once enlisted or commissioned, a Provincial soldier served for the duration of the war” (Cole and Braisted 2000).

Following the British defeat, many Black Pioneers and other blacks who were able to get to the British lines in New York by December 31, 1782, were taken by the British to Nova Scotia, Canada. There the Black Pioneers disbanded and helped settle the new community of Birchtown where they got small land grants (in relation to land grants awarded to whites) (Cole and Braisted 2000).

Ironically, in May 1779, the British Governor of Jamaica, John Dalling, had proposed raising a corps of Black Loyalists consisting of a regiment of mulattoes and a regiment of free Negroes (Cole and Braisted 2000). Each regiment of 530 men would be light Infantry with duty in the West Indies. The corps was proposed to serve...
defensive purposes and supported by Great Britain. It appears that this proposal was not put into effect.

Native Americans

Captain Heinrichs was among the British forces at Savannah. He recorded in his diary that, “…three hundred of the Cherokee have just joined our forces at Savannah and one thousand more are hourly expected” (Alexander 1938:157). He went on to describe their method of warfare in contrast to European methods, “As soldiers, they are anything but dangerous to one accustomed to balls, lead, and hand-to-hand combat. They do not station outposts and pickets, but scatter about in the woods and lie down in small bands…The only reason why the King attempts to have some of them in his pay is to have all Indians as his friends, for in reality they cost many times more than real soldiers and do more harm then good” (Alexander 1938:159).

The British engaged in repeated attempts to keep Native American allies. Often the customs of the Native Americans and the British were so different as to be incompatible. In spite of these differences, there was a great deal of interaction as the British tried to win their influence with extensive talks and bribes of tokens. One example of this attempt at an alliance is evident in Lieutenant Archibald Campbell’s discourse in March of 1779. Campbell intended to deliver it to the Headmen and Warriors of the Creek Nation at a meeting with them in Augusta, but even after waiting 14 days, they did not show up. Campbell wrote that he

“Sends this Talk to acquaint them with his reasons, & to prevent their imagining that his Return proceded from Fear of the Rebels. As soon as they acquaint him with the time of their coming, an army shall be sent to meet them, & act in Concert against the Rebels. Acquaints them that the People of Georgia on this Side Savannah River are to be looked upon as good Subjects. Begs they will listen to the White People, & not molest the Families which they point out to them as Friends” (Campbell 1779).

Engineers and Engineering the Defensive Works

Lieutenant Colonel James Moncrief, Royal Engineers

James Moncrief was an Englishman and the ranking Engineer who served under Major General Prevost at Savannah. Moncrief, whose rank is various given as Captain, Major, and Lieutenant Colonel during his service in the Southern theater, was primarily responsible for the design and completion of the British defensive works that were built prior to (and during) the September-October 1779 siege. Moncrief’s accomplishments in the rapid design and implementation of the British defenses in Savannah were heralded by the British military and press. Moncrief was decorated for heroism he displayed in the defense of Savannah and the capture and subsequent defense of Charleston. A portion of Moncrief’s papers is curated by the William Clements Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and were reviewed for this report. Interestingly, Engineer Moncrief not only designed and constructed fortifications, but he was in charge of torching the extant fort at Tybee Island on September 10, 1779 (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W113). Moncrief was killed at Dunkirk, in 1793, when the fort he was defending was stormed.

Moncrief was responsible for a large number of British fortifications during the American Revolution. His skill as an engineer was quickly apparent to those who benefitted from his designs and those who attacked them. In addition to the skill reflected in his engineering, Moncrief also gained the praise of his commanders. General Clinton wrote to Lord Germain,

…but to Major Moncrieff [Moncrief], the commanding engineer, who planned, and, with the assistance of such capable officers under him, conducted the siege with so much judgement, intrepidity, and laborious attention, I wish to render a tribute of the very highest applause, and most permanent gratitude; persuaded that far more flattering commendations than I can bestow will not fail to crown such rare merit (Tarleton 1787:38).

General Augustin Prevost echoed many of these sentiments about Moncrief’s engineering skills in Savannah following the Battle of Savannah in 1779. Prevost writes,

I would also wish to mention Capt. Moncrief, Commanding Engineer; but sincerely sensible, that all I can express will fall greatly short of what the gentleman deserves, not only on this, but on all other occasions, I shall only, in the most earnest manner, request your Lordship taking him in your protection and patronage, to recommend him to his Majesty as an officer of long service, and most singular merit (Prevost 1779b:294).

Moncrief met with approval from the Hessian quarter, as well. Captain Heinrichs wrote glowingly of “the indefatigable engineer, Captain Moncrieff” (Alexander 1938:165). He explained,
There is no more fascinating sight for a soldier than that of the demolished works of the truly great Moncrieff, thrown up, as they were, in a disorderly fashion only out of sand and a few boards...shows convincingly that a grain of presence of mind, that a barrier hastily thrown up, but in the nick of time and at the right spot, is worth many thousand times more than the most splendid theoretical problems...But how would Savannah, how would the garrison have fared had Captain Moncrieff been killed before the enemy withdrew? Certainly none too well! (Alexander 1938:163).

Andrew Durnford

Durnford was a Lieutenant in the Royal Engineers stationed in Savannah under Lieutenant Colonel James Moncrief. Durnford (1744-1798) was the younger son of Elias Durnford Sr. In 1779 he was appointed Deputy Assistant Quartermaster-General to his brother, Elias Durnford, Jr. Andrew Durnford was charged with improving Savannah’s defenses after Moncrief relocated his command post to Charleston in early 1780. Durnford accompanied the British and Loyalist troops to New York in 1783, whereupon he was sent to serve as an engineer in Bermuda. Durnford had a long career as a British military engineer, mostly in Bermuda (Skempton 2002:198; Forbes 2008). It was unclear from the present research if Andrew Durnford had a hand in constructing the Savannah defenses in September 1779, but he did make improvements to the fortifications in the battle’s aftermath.

Lieutenant John Wilson, Engineer, 71st Regiment

John Wilson (1755-1798), 71st Regiment, was an ensign when he accompanied Lieutenant Colonel Campbell to America in June 1776. In route, the flotilla was captured and everyone was taken prisoner. Wilson was kept as a prisoner for an unknown period of time. He was likely released at the same time as Lieutenant Colonel Campbell, since he was “ordered to duty as an assistant engineer” in May 1778 and accompanied Campbell on the Southern Campaign in November 1778 (Guthorn 1972:48). Wilson participated in the capture of Savannah, and he followed Lieutenant Colonel Campbell on his trek to Augusta in early 1779. Wilson had spent some time at New Ebenezer by March 1779, where he directed the construction of an extensive fortification system. That system of seven redoubts linked by ditch work and abatis lines, albeit smaller in extent, bore a striking resemblance to the defensive net that surrounded Savannah in the 1779 Siege. He was promoted to Lieutenant prior to the October 1779 siege and kept the title of Assistant Engineer at that time. Wilson was wounded on October 16, 1779, possibly in the Savannah vicinity, and he received another wound in the Siege of Charleston (Davis 1986:13).

John Wilson served as assistant engineer to Moncrief in the defense of Savannah and, although Moncrief received all the praise for the rapid construction of a fine defensive complex, Wilson undoubtedly had a hand in its design and implementation. Wilson was also heavily involved in the May 1780 Siege of Charleston and helped build both the British defenses at Charleston and its outlying defenses, after the British capture the city (Davis 1986). Wilson also constructed several other British fortifications in Georgia and South Carolina. As late as 1781, Wilson wanted a company in the 71st Highlanders rather than being with the Engineers. He felt the latter offered little opportunity for promotion. He reluctantly accepted, however, and is listed in the army in 1781 as a “Practical Engineer and Second Lieutenant” (Guthorn 1972:46). Davis (1986) transcribed Wilson’s journal and provided important biographical information about him. Some of Wilson’s papers are preserved at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Other records pertaining to Wilson and his military engineering may exist in Great Britain (Powers 2006).

Map Makers

Alexander Fraser

Despite his Scottish sounding name, “Alexander Fraser” was actually a native of South Carolina. He entered the 1st South Carolina Regiment as a 2nd Lieutenant in 1778. Nine months later he was promoted to 1st Lieutenant (Guthorn 1966). Fraser is associated with a 1778 map of the Battle of Savannah, indicating that he was likely there when the British took the city.

Patrick Ferguson

Patrick Ferguson had a long military history beginning in 1759 when he was in the 2nd Royal North Dragoons. After various engagements, he was promoted to Major in the 71st Highlanders (Fraser’s). Ferguson commanded 300 Loyalists in the southern campaign of the American Revolution (Guthorn 1972:21). He appears to have been responsible for at least two maps, including the “Proposed Fortifications for Savannah 1780”. He was killed at Kings Mountain in October of 1780.

James Moncrief and John Wilson were also engineers in the British Service. See previous biographical sketches about them above.
Captain Alexander C. Wylly

Captain Alexander C. Wylly was from a prominent Georgia family with divided loyalties. His younger brothers Richard and Thomas were both Patriots. Captain Wylly’s role in the Siege of Savannah included that of cartographer (Wylly and Bowen 1779). Alexander Wylly fled Georgia for the Bahamas, where he was later a prominent politician.

**Key Players, American Command**

The Patriots assembled a truly international military force to battle the British in September and October 1779. By all accounts, the combined forces of Patriots vastly outnumbered the forces assembled by the British for the town’s defense. Between primary and secondary accounts, the troop size estimates vary considerably. The number was somewhere between 6,000 and 8,000 armed men.

**Major General Benjamin Lincoln**

Major General Benjamin Lincoln of the Continental Army commanded the American land forces (Figure 22). Lincoln was born in Massachusetts in 1733. He went from being town clerk at the age of 24 to Lieutenant Colonel and member of the colonial legislature by the age of 39. He commanded a militia in New York in 1776 and the following year George Washington placed him in command of a Continental division. He was seriously wounded in 1777 while commanding all of New England’s militia. In September 1778, Lincoln took command of the southern campaign (NPS 2001).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Players, American Command</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advance Guard-(Cavalry)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier General Count Casimir Pulaski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigadier Gen. Count Casimir Pulaski (Pulaski’s American Legion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major John Jameson (1st Reg. of Virginia Light Dragoons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Daniel Horry (S.C. Light Dragoons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right Assault Column – Lt. John Laurens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. John Laurens Light Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Light Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenadier Company, Charleston Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Francis Marion (2nd S.C. Continental Regiment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. William Thompson (3rd S.C. Continental Regiment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Richard Parker (1st Virginia Continental Levies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Maurice Simons (1st Battalion, Charleston Militia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left Column – Brig. General Lachlan McIntosh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Charles Pinckney (1st S.C. Continental Regiment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Co Alexander McIntosh (5th S.C. Continental Regiment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brig. Gen. Isaac Huger’s Column (Georgia Militia)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. William Few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. John Dooey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. John Twiggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Robert Middleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Leonard Marbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina Militia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. William Skirving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. William Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. Benjamin Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brig. General Andrew Williamson’s Brigade of S.C. Militia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. Brandon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd Battalion Charleston Militia

Reserve - Maj. General Benjamin Lincoln

Col. Barnard Beekman (4th S.C. Reg. of Continental Artillery)

---

Figure 22. Major General Benjamin Lincoln.
Benjamin Lincoln was at the Siege and Battle of Savannah in 1779 and was initially in command of the Continentals, state militias, cavalry, and other local military units. Once General Count d'Estaing arrived in the Savannah theater Lincoln relinquished supreme command of the combined forces to d'Estaing.

Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski; Advance Guard-(Cavalry) & Pulaski's Legion

Pulaski was significant for his individual actions at various campaigns in the American Revolution (including the Battle of Savannah), but he was also important for establishing basic cavalry concepts in America. William Moultrie indirectly illustrated this when writing to General Lincoln, early in 1779. Moultrie penned, “...Captain Newman is come to camp with a small Company of Horse, 25 in number, armed with pikes and flags in the Pulaski manner, [emphasis added] they seem to be a good company” (Moultrie 1779).

Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski commanded the Patriot cavalry, which was known as Pulaski’s Legion (Figure 23). American troops under Pulaski’s command included the American South Carolina Light Dragoons who were commanded by Lt. Colonel Daniel Horry, while the 1st Regiment of Virginia Light Dragoons was under the command of Major John Jameson (Wilson 2005:159; 177).

Pulaski was a renowned horseman and fighter, who had battled tyranny in his Polish homeland almost a decade prior to his arrival in America (Figure 24). He died in the October 9, 1779 Battle of Savannah but not before his military feats had earned him a secure place as a Patriot in American history.

Paul Bentalou, of Pulaski’s Legion in the Continental Army, served as a junior officer under Pulaski in the Siege and Battle of Savannah. Bentalou was Captain of the 1st Cavalry Troop of Pulaski’s Legion at this time (Heitman 1914:100). Bentalou was wounded in the October 9, 1779 battle and he was with the mortally wounded Count Pulaski at his death. Bentalou apparently continued to serve in the U.S. Cavalry after the death of Count Pulaski. Bentalou later defended Pulaski’s actions in a rebuttal to an article by Johnston (Stevens 1859:235; Bentalou 1978 [1824]).

The soldiers in Pulaski’s Legion were an assortment of patriots, adventurers, and soldiers of fortune. Private Joseph Bertoulin, a French immigrant and a baker who was about 25 years old in 1779, was a volunteer soldier in Lieutenant Bentalou’s company. He provided his story in his 1830 pension application, I was born and raised to manhood in France, and understanding a Revolution had occurred for the Independence of the American Colonies, then subjects of Great Britain, I embarked in 1777 on board the French Ship Count de Soubrar and bound to Charleston, then colony

---

Figure 23. The flag carried by Pulaski’s Legion (Plate in Emmet Collection, MS Division, EM7528, New York Public Library.)

Figure 24. Casimir Pulaski became immortalized in America and in his homeland upon his death in the Battle of Savannah. (courtesy of www.americanrevolution.com).
of South Carolina, where I remained sometime, carrying on the business of a Bakery. Savannah in Georgia being attacked by the British Forces and soldiers being much wanted I volunteered my services and marched to the aid of Savannah in the company commanded by Captain Bantalas [sic, Bentalou] and under the immediate command of the brave Polaskis [sic, Pulaski]. The enemy being successful, we were bound to retire to South Carolina… (SCAR 2008 [Joseph Bertoulin R802]).

Private Bertoulin was apparently one of the more fortunate of Pulaski’s Legion in the attack on Savannah, as he reported no wounds from that action.

Some historians report that Pulaski’s Legion also contained Hessian and British prisoners and deserters (Fleming 1963:179; Wilson 2005:137). Other historians state that the deserters were only Germans and they were in the infantry (Kajencki 2004:78-83). Recruiters enlisted men for the Legion in early 1778, as newspapers in Pennsylvania and New Jersey record. The April 4, 1778 edition of the Pennsylvania Gazette advertised:

“YORK TOWN, MARCH 31, 1778.

CONGRESS having resolved to raise a Corps, consisting of Infantry and Cavalry, to be commanded by GENERAL COUNT PULASKI, All those, who desire to distinguish themselves in the service of their country, are invited to enlist in that corps, which is established on the same principles as the Roman Legions were. The frequent opportunities, which the nature of the service of that corps will offer to the enterprising, brave and vigilant soldiers, who shall serve in it, are motives which ought to influence those, who are qualified for admission into it, to prefer it to other corps not so immediately destined to harass the enemy; and the many captures which will inallibly be made, must indemnify the Legionary Soldiers for the hardships they must sustain, and the inconsiderable sum given for bounty, the term for their service being no longer than one year from the time that the corps shall be compleated. Their dress is calculated to give a martial appearance, and to secure the soldier against the inclemency of the weather and season. The time for action approaching, those, who desire to have an opportunity of distinguishing themselves in that corps, are requested to apply to Major JULIUS, Count of North Fort, at Head Quarters.” (The Pennsylvania Gazette 1778).

Others in Pulaski’s Legion were Americans who were attached to his Legion. Private John T. Holland, a young man of 18 years, enlisted in Captain Brown’s “Troop of Horse” in Baltimore, Maryland in early 1779. His unit was attached to Pulaski’s Legion and Private Holland participated in the attack at Savannah. Like Private Bertoulin, Holland escaped significant injury in the battle (SCAR 2008 [John T. Holland S34923]).

Captain Bentalou later explained the intended mission of Pulaski’s Legion on October 9th, “This assault was to be made on the right of the British lines. Two columns, one French, and the other American, were to attack, at the same time each a particular redoubt. In the rear of the columns the whole cavalry, American and French, was to be stationed, under the command of Count Pulaski. Should, as was confidently expected, the redoubts be carried, and the way opened, that intrepid leader was with these united troops of horse, to enter the place, sword in hand, and to carry confusion and dismay among the garrison.” (Bentalou 1978 [1824]:29). As history records, allied columns did not penetrate Spring Hill Redoubt, therefore Pulaski’s Legion failed to achieve its goal and many of their number were killed or wounded in the attempt.

Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Horry (S.C. Light Dragoons)

Daniel Horry was a wealthy planter from South Carolina. Horry commanded the South Carolina Light Dragoons at the Siege of Savannah. Horry’s dragoons were state cavalry troops, consisting of about 50 horsemen. His dragoons were later commanded in battle at Moncks Corner, South Carolina, in April 1780 by Colonel William Washington. Daniel Horry died in 1785 (Rowland et al. 1996:230).

Right Assault Column – Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens

South Carolina Continental Regulars included the Corps of Light Infantry and Grenadier Company of the Charlestown Militia, under command of Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens. Colonel Francis Marion led the 2nd South Carolina Continental Regiment, and Colonel William Thompson commanded the 3rd South Carolina Regiment (Wilson 2005:177). The 1st Battalion of the Charlestown Militia was led by Colonel Maurice Simons. These troops, along with the 1st Virginia Continental Levies (commanded by Colonel Richard Parker) constituted the right column of attack during the 1779 battle (Wilson 2005:177).

Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens, Light Infantry, 2nd Regiment, South Carolina Continentals (1754-1782), was the son of Henry Laurens, a prominent statesman from South Carolina. John Laurens fought in the 1779 Battle of Savannah as commander of the Light Infantry, 2nd South Carolina Regiment of Continentals and the First Battalion Militia.
of Charleston Militia. Major General Lincoln’s orders for attack given the day before the battle called for Laurens to lead the initial charge on the Spring Hill Redoubt (Moultrie 1802). Colonel Laurens and his men attacked Spring Hill Redoubt and fought with valor (Stevens 1859:215). Garden (1822:88, 111) noted that, while leading the charge of the Light Infantry, Laurens, “was among the first to mount the British lines at Savannah”, and that Laurens, “actually mounted one of the British Redoubts, but was compelled, after sustaining considerable loss, reluctantly to retire”. Although he survived the Battle of Savannah relatively unscathed, as well as battles in Charleston and Yorktown, John Laurens was killed during a “trifling skirmish” with the British near the Combahee River in South Carolina on August 27, 1782 (Garden 1822:89).

**Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens’ Corps of Light Infantry**

Major Pierre Charles L’Enfant was in John Lauren’s Corps of Light Infantry. L’Enfant led five American soldiers in a mission to burn part of the abatis to aid in the allies’ attack. The mission was unsuccessful due to the greenness of the trees (Wilson 2005:157). L’Enfant is better remembered in the American memory for his part in designing Washington, D.C.

**Colonel Francis Marion (2nd S.C. Continental Regiment)**

Lieutenant Colonel Francis Marion commanded the 2nd Regiment of South Carolina Continentals. Marion, nicknamed the “Swamp Fox” for his prowess in eluding the British in the South Carolina Lowcountry, is a legendary figure of the American Revolution. Details of his personal life and military exploits, however, are not well known. Marion had a plantation on the lower Santee River, where his remains are buried alongside those of his wife in a small cemetery. Two of Marion’s order books from the Revolutionary War were examined in an earlier ABPP study of Sunbury, Georgia, and these books have since been transcribed and published (Elliott 2005; O’Kelley 2006). Those two order books contain no details of the Siege or Battle of Savannah

**Left Column – Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh**

Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh, Continental Army, commanded the Georgia Continentals and Georgia militia at Savannah in 1779. These totaled, at that time, approximately 300 or 400 men according to various historians (Jackson 2003; Wilson 2005:147). McIntosh’s command was greatly reduced from what it had been in 1776. William Mosby was a Captain in the 2nd Regiment of the Georgia Continentals. He recounted, “The greater part of our Regmt. were kild and taken prisoners in the Town of Savannah in December 1778” (Mosby 1802). The four regiments (or battalions as they were often termed) of the Georgia Continentals suffered from three recent losses: including Savannah (December 1778, where numerous Georgia Continentals were killed or captured; Sunbury (January 1779, where many of the 3rd Battalion were captured); and Brier Creek (March 1779, where many Continentals were killed or captured). Brigadier General Samuel Elbert, who had commanded the Georgia Continentals after McIntosh was reassigned to the Northern theater, was captured at Brier Creek. General Elbert remained aboard a British prison ship at Charleston, South Carolina, at the time of the 1779 Battle of Savannah.

When the Georgia Continentals were mustered at Augusta in early August 1779, the reduction in force was quite apparent. The 1st Georgia Battalion contained only five officers, three non-commissioned officers, and five rank and file (13 men total). The 3rd Georgia Battalion had dwindled to one officer, six non-commissioned officers, one drummer, and 10 privates (18 men total). The 4th Battalion contained only three officers, two non-commissioned officers, 3 musicians, and three privates (11 men total). [The muster list for the 2nd Battalion was unavailable.] Some Georgians, including Colonel John White, 4th Battalion, were serving at Camden, South Carolina, on that date and not present for the muster. Nevertheless, only 42 men in the 1st, 3rd, and 4th Battalions were present and ready for action in Georgia on August 2, 1779. Jackson (2003) indicates that the number of Georgia Continentals who arrived at Savannah to participate in the siege was only about 30, which was a far cry from the nearly 700 men who comprised the Georgia Continentals in 1777. The 30 men were even further reduced following the October 9 action.

McIntosh, who was active early in the war in the Georgia theater, returned from the northern states to unite the Continentals under his command with Major General Lincoln’s troops. McIntosh and his men arrived at New Ebenezer soon after General Lincoln’s troops departed for Savannah, and they later reunited outside of Savannah. In addition, officers who lost most or all of their Georgia Continental troops at the previous battles of Savannah and/or Brier Creek headed to Savannah, as did troops from Virginia (Lawrence 1979:15). Many of the Georgia militia were assigned to various outposts in the colony and could not be spared for the campaign to retake Savannah.

During the Battle of Savannah, Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh led the left column. This included three South Carolina Regiments. The 1st South Carolina Continental Regiment was commanded by Colonel Charles Pinckney.
The 5th South Carolina Regiment was under command of Lieutenant Colonel Alexander McIntosh. Lieutenant Colonel William Henderson commanded the 6th South Carolina Regiment (Wilson 2005:177). McIntosh and his men were placed in the second line of attack on October 9, 1779, but the chaos and devastation suffered by the first wave of Allied troops affected tactics for a second assault. McIntosh’s Georgians suffered some losses in the attack.

Major John Jones, Georgia Continentals, was from Liberty County, Georgia. He was the grandfather of Charles C. Jones, Jr. Major John Jones served as an aide to Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh, who commanded the Georgia Continentals in the Battle of Savannah. Jones was killed by a four pound shot in the assault on Spring Hill (McCall 1816:271; Jones 1874:27). Major Jones left several first-hand accounts of the siege leading up to the battle in a series of letters he wrote his wife in Liberty County, Georgia.

Following the 1779 battle, the Georgia Continentals were reorganized into the Georgia Battalion. It would be several years before the Georgia Battalion was an effective fighting force.

**Colonel Charles Pinckney (1st S.C. Continental Regiment)**

Charles Pinckney was born in Charleston, South Carolina, into a wealthy planter family and was the son of a lawyer (Figure 25). At the age of 22, he left his own emerging law practice to join the militia and became a lieutenant (University of Groningen 2006). Pinckney was promoted to colonel and led the 1st South Carolina Continental Regiment into battle at Savannah on October 9, 1779. He was captured when the British took Charleston in May 1780 and was released in 1781.

**Lt. Colonel Alexander McIntosh (5th S.C. Continental Regiment)**

Wilson (2005:177) notes that there were about 166 men in the 5th S.C. Continentals. These troops were commanded by Alexander McIntosh. They were part of Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh’s Left Column in the 1779 Battle of Savannah.

**Brig. Gen. Isaac Huger’s Column (Georgia and South Carolina Militia)**

The 2nd South Carolina Continental Regiment was commanded at Savannah by Brigadier General Huger. Huger, a French Huguenot descendant from coastal South Carolina, was educated in Europe. He became a lieutenant in a battalion commanded by Colonel Thomas Middleton, raised by the colony of South Carolina in 1760 for protection against the Cherokee Indians. During the American Revolution, Huger rose from lieutenant colonel to colonel in the South Carolina Continental Line in 1776. By 1779, he achieved the rank of a brigadier general and was actively engaged in all major southern theater battles. He was wounded at the Battle of Stono in the summer of 1779. By the fall, Huger led the Georgia and South Carolina militia in the Battle of Savannah. Like many other Continentals, he went on to the Siege of Charleston in 1780. Huger was wounded again, this time more dangerously, at the Battle of Guilford Court House. Huger survived to become an officer in the Society of the Cincinnati (Kershaw County Historical Society 2007).

On October 9th, General Isaac Huger executed his orders from Major General Lincoln to attack British defenses on the east side of Savannah, in an attempted feint at drawing British attention from the main attack at Spring Hill Redoubt. General Huger led the 2nd South Carolina Regiment, “through the low rice ground on the east [of Savannah], reached his appointed post, and was received with music, and a brisk discharge, which killed twenty-eight of his men and compelled him to retreat” (Stevens 1859:218).

Immediately following the battle there were rumors and accounts of spies or deserters giving intelligence to the British of the battle plan, including identification of the targets for the feints and the real attack on Spring Hill.
Redoubt. These accounts were relayed by many officers and troops and picked up by newspapers. Moultrie (1802:42) repeated the account that the British apparently had been given intelligence of the impending feint attack and the primary target at Spring Hill by an unidentified Sergeant in the Charleston Grenadiers, and they adjusted their manpower in anticipation (Moultrie 1802:42). Prevost, himself, however made no mention of such intelligence in his papers, nor did his accounts mention relocating troops or artillery to Spring Hill. All the redoubts were reinforced with men and arms in the days preceding October 9.

Brigadier General Isaac Huger’s column contained the bulk of the South Carolina militia. Colonels William Skirving, William Harden, and Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin Garden commanded the South Carolina Militia battalions. Brigadier General Andrew Williamson’s Brigade of South Carolina Militia included Independent Companies and units commanded by colonels Hammond, Thomas, Williams, Reed, and Brandon. The 2nd Battalion of the Charlestown Militia fought in this column as well. The Georgia militia were under General Lachlan McIntosh’s command, but were temporarily placed under General Huger’s command on October 9th. The 403 Georgians were organized into five units, led by Colonels John Dooly, William Few, John Twiggs, Robert Middleton, Leonard Marbury (Wilson 2005:178, 190).

**Lieutenant Colonel William Few, Jr.**

William Few, Jr. (1748-1828) and his family opposed the royal government in North Carolina as early as 1771, when their opposition resulted in the hanging of his brother and the destruction of the family farm (Jones 1881:340-358; University of Groningen 2006). Few moved to Georgia in 1776 and immediately became a political activist aligned with the Whigs (Figure 26). In addition to leading a Georgia militia regiment in the 1779 Battle of Savannah, Few was a member of the provincial congress in 1776 and served in the state assembly in 1777 and 1779.

**Reserve - Major General Benjamin Lincoln**

Reserve Troops were led by Major General Benjamin Lincoln. This was an artillery reserve consisting of the 4th South Carolina Regiment of Continental Artillery led by Colonel Barnard Beekman. A total of 10 cannon was in the reserve unit (Wilson 2005:178). The South Carolina Continental Artillery included a number of artificers who worked in October 1779, undoubtedly making things needed during the siege. Artificers included two wheelwrights, four blacksmiths, three joiners, one bricklayer, one coal burner, and one turner (Grimke Papers).

Other artillery regiments also participated in the Siege of Savannah. Lieutenant William Hasell Gibbes commanded a detachment of the Charleston Artillery Battalion at Savannah. According to Gibbes, his detachment, “made approaches to the enemy in concert with the Continental & French troops and had one man killed by the enemy (by the name Douglass)” (SCAR 2008 [William Hasell Gibbes S9339]).

**Engineers**

Captain Antoine Francoise Terance O’Connor was d’Estaing’s principal military engineer at Savannah. Captain O’Connor served with the French forces on October 9, 1779 and left an account of the siege, that was later annotated by d’Estaing (Georgia Historical Commission n.d.). Captain O’Connor noted that M. de Saumoy was “an engineer presently in the American service” (Kennedy 1974:65; Walker 1992:264-272).

The Americans also had their own engineers at Savannah. John Christian Senf was an engineer with General Lincoln’s army and who was likely involved in constructing the American siege works. Colonel Senf was instrumental in building flatboats to transport the American troops across the swollen Savannah River at Purysburg.
several weeks before the battle. Senf later distinguished himself as the engineer in charge of building the Santee Canal in South Carolina.

Major Ferdinand DeBrahm, a staff officer with General Lincoln, was another engineer in the Continental Army who was probably at the Siege of Savannah. Like his better known uncle, William DeBrahm, Ferdinand was a skilled cartographer. Major DeBrahm’s account of the Siege of Charleston is an important historical document for that engagement. Unfortunately, if Ferdinand DeBrahm kept a similar journal for the Siege of Savannah, it has not been located. Major DeBrahm did make a field map of General Lincoln’s headquarters and the various encampments at Purysburg, several months prior to the October 9th Siege, but no similar maps for Savannah were discovered (Walker 1992:273-276).

Neither the Americans nor the French had sufficiently skilled engineers during the Siege of Savannah. Multiple accounts of the French construction of saps and offensive trenches describe problems with the designs of the trenches, the gun mounts, and the correct angle for firing onto the defenses without being impacted by returning deadly enemy fire. The engineers in the French and American service were no match for the British Engineer Moncrief.

Key Players, French Command

General Le Comte d’Estaing

Count Charles Henri d’Estaing (1729-1794), Vice Admiral of the French Navy and General of the French Army, was a Frenchman who began his military career in the infantry (Figure 27). In 1778, as Vice Admiral of the French Navy and General of the French Army, he was sent to help reinforce the West Indies. From there he agreed to aid the Americans, which included frantic requests from Charlestonians and other South Carolinians to protect them from impending British attack.

The French fleet under command of Vice Admiral d’Estaing participated in the Siege and Battle of Savannah. Naval vessels transported French infantry to Georgia. Sailors from the French Navy and Marines also participated in the land action at Savannah by manning a series of artillery batteries. The pieces of heavy ordnance in these batteries were naval guns that had been aboard the vessels and were offloaded and transported to the Savannah Under Fire:
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The colonel of the Avant-Garde was Jules Jacques Éléonore, vicomte de Béthisy. He was wounded in the Battle of Savannah and “carried to safety by his own men” (Kennedy 1974:26). The Avant-Garde consisted of grenadiers and chasseurs. Three Volunteer Grenadier Companies were commanded by captains Aubery, Herneville, and DeVeone. Other troops included the: Grenadier Company of Armagnac, Chasseur Company of Armagnac, Grenadier Company of Agenois, and the Chasseur Company of Gatinois (Wilson 2005:178).

Right Column - Comte Arthur Dillon

French ranks also were swelled by “…hundreds of Irish expatriates” who served under the command of Arthur Dillon (Wilson 2005:137). Arthur, vicomte de Dillon (Count Arthur Dillon) was an Irish man in the French service who commanded Walsh’s and Dillon’s Regiments of the Irish Brigade of France in the Siege and Battle of Savannah (Murphy 1954:307-321 (Figure 28). Arthur Dillon was put to death by guillotine during the French Revolution in 1794 (Stevens 1859:226).


Count Dillon had orders to lead his column of Irish infantry around the Musgrove Creek swamp and take the rear of the Ebenezer Road Redoubt (Stevens 1859:215). That movement was intended to be under cover of darkness, but Dillon and his men did not arrive at their destination until after daylight. They met with a galling fire and were repulsed,

The near approach of d’Estaiing also drew upon his troops a most destructive cannonade—the guns loaded with grape, chain, and canister shot; and the muskets of the Hessians, Grenadiers, and Loyalists, made

Count d’Estaing participated in the French charge on the Spring Hill Redoubt, and he received two painful, but not deadly wounds in the charge. Shortly after the battle ended d’Estaing ordered a retreat and lifted the siege. The first ground-force cooperative effort by the French and American military resulted in an allied defeat. (An earlier attempt in 1778 to join American and French forces for an assault at Newport, Rhode Island did not materialize when D’Estaing sailed his forces off the coast.)

After his repulse at the Battle of Savannah, d’Estaing took his fleet to winter in the Caribbean and returned to France in 1780. d’Estaing was executed by guillotine during the French Revolution in 1794 (Stevens 1859:226-228).
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awful havoc amidst those well-drilled troops. They fell like grass before the mower (Stevens 1859:215).

Count Dillon and his officers rallied their men and they continued their attack, making it as far as the abatis. In addition to the heavy fire from the British and Loyalist land forces, Dillon and his men were bombarded by the H.M.S. Germain and several British galleys (Stevens 1859:215).

Left Column – Baron de Stedingk

Like Dillon, Stedingk was not a French national. Curt Bogislaus Louis Christophe, Count von Stedingk, was a Swede in the French military. He was wounded during the Battle of Savannah (Kennedy 1974:26; Hoffberg et al. 1906:515-516). Stedingk commanded the left column of the French army. It consisted of two regiments of Fusiliers. One regiment included the fusilier companies of Armagnac, Auxerrois, Foix, Dillon, and Walsh. The other regiment consisted of fusilier companies of Cambresis, Haynault, Le Cap, Guadeloupe, and Port au Prince. The Dragoons of Conde and of Belzunce [dismounted] fought within this group as well. Baron de Stedingk, “led one of the two principal assaults, and, after planting the American flag on the last intrenchment, was wounded and compelled to retreat with the loss of half his brigade of 900 men” (Appleton’s Encyclopedia 2001).

Reserve Column – General Le Vicomte Louis Marie de Noailles

French General Le Vicomte Louis Marie de Noailles commanded a division at Savannah, in spite of his youthful age of 23 (Figure 29). He was well-connected, being the brother-in-law of the Marquis de Lafayette. De Noailles commanded the Corps de Reserve at the Battle of Savannah. These reserve soldiers were taken from the Right and Left Columns. The reserve also included artillerymen and fieldpieces (Wilson 2005:179). De Noailles survived the Battle of Savannah and served in Rochambeau’s forces the following year (Kennedy 1974:26).

Troops Remaining Entrenched – Major Jean-Claude-Louis de Sablières

Major Jean-Claude-Louis de Sablières commanded the entrenched French troops. French Captain de Terson, of the Company of the Agenois Grenadiers wrote that Sablières commanded the feint (Kenedy 1974:20). Other entrenched troops included the Royal Corps of Marines, Chasseur Company of Martinique, the Fusilier Company of Martinique, the Dragoons of Conde and of Belzunce,
Volunteer Chasseurs of San Domingo (Chasseurs-volontaires de Saint-Domingue) (mulattos)

In 1779 Haiti was a French colony known as Saint Domingue or San Domingo (one of several name variants). The Volunteers of San Domingo constituted the first free black regiment in the French army. (“Volunteers” refer to their non-drafted, yet paid, status.) The Chasseurs originally formed during the Seven Years’ War and then disbanded. In March 1779, d’Estaing re-formed the group in anticipation of the Savannah campaign (Garrigus 1992:116). Unlike the previous war, the new Chasseurs were prohibited from having black men as officers. The regiment, therefore, was led by whites. D’Estaing set sail to Georgia with 545 free blacks who signed up to be in the Chasseurs. He was only able to raise 156 whites for the Volunteer Grenadiers (Garrigus 1992:118). Both the Volunteer Chasseurs of San Domingo and the Volunteer Grenadiers of San Domingo were listed as “entrenched troops” during the battle. The grenadiers were commanded by Major Des Francais. The Battle of Savannah in 1779 was an historic moment for the corps, as it was the first time in history that France sent free black troops into battle. The Chasseurs earned a reputation for quite adeptly covering the retreating French and American forces and discouraging British troops from following the retreat. Two months after the battle, almost 150 of the Chasseurs arrived in Grenada and were required to serve there for at least two and a half years. Twenty became marines on the Le Citoyen in 1780 (Chartrand 1998:40). Some went on to Charleston and were involved during the siege of that city. Others accompanied d’Estaing to France, and part of the chasseurs was dispersed (Garrigus 1992:119). It would be three years before all of the Volunteer Chasseurs were allowed to return to San Domingo.

Captain Louis Baury de Bellerive commanded a corps of volunteer chassuers from St. Domingo, who participated in the Siege of Savannah. Louis Baury served after the war as an aid to General Lincoln, who praised his service. Captain Baury’s widow, Mary Baury, aged 83, filed a memorial with the U.S. Congress in 1854, in which she stated,

Your memorialist, of American parentage, became the wife of Louis Baury in 1784; and his widow in 1807. Her husband was born in the Island of St. Domingo, in 1754, and received his military education in France. When, in 1779, Count d’Estaing embarked with 6000 troops at Cape Francois, destined for the Southern part of North America, a corps of volunteer chasseurs, under the command of Louis Baury, formed a part of that army....In a letter from General Vincent, it appears, that Louis Baury was employed in the siege of Savannah. From 1779 to the peace of 1783, Louis Baury was with the army of the Revolution. (SCAR 2008 [Louis Baury de Bellerive W28025]).

Engineers and Engineering the Offensive Works

There was only one engineer among the French troops. His name was Antoine François Terrence O’Connor. D’Estaing praises O’Connor as being “…everywhere” and writes, “…he carried out the most perilous reconnaissance, laid out the trenches, directed the workers in digging the trenches, from which he could not be made to leave except by an express order” (Kennedy 1974:42). This description directly contradicts many primary source accounts by French soldiers and officers who say there was no engineer to direct them in the proper digging of siegeworks. There may have been political reasons for d’Estaing’s praise of O’Connor, least of all the fact that O’Connor gave a written account of the battle to the Navy minister, to which d’Estaing appended his own remarks.

Artist

Pierre Ozanne (1737-1813), was a French artist who accompanied the French fleet and who witnessed the 1779 Siege of Savannah. Three of his artworks commemorate the event. The first is a perspective map that shows the French, American, and British defenses. The second shows the frantic struggle by a group of French and American soldiers to capture Spring Hill Redoubt and their ultimate repulse by the British. The third is a detailed map of the battlefield (Ozanne 1779a-c).

Summary

The siege culminating in the October 9, 1779 battle involved thousands of soldiers that the outline above merely references indirectly by military unit. The most
recent published historical study by David Wilson (2005) suggests that previous histories have vastly underestimated the number of troops involved in the battle. Wilson’s research supports the number of Allied troops at 7,722 to 4,813 British forces. His work was based on examining primary documents, including military Commissary Returns. Wilson computes the number of fit-for-duty troops based on commissary returns (which, unlike the Strenght Returns, the Commissary Returns also includes sick soldiers, black soldiers and pioneers, and all officers), after subtracting for a 28% invalid rate (Wilson 2005: 272). This seems to be the most accurately derived number of troops, considering the huge disparity in various primary accounts by those involved on both sides of the war and in later secondary accounts. The newly derived numbers result in a British to Allied ratio of 1.6 to 1. A ratio of 3 to 1 is most commonly accepted by military strategists as being necessary for victory when attacking a fortified position such as Savannah. Wilson’s research indicating a greater number of troops in the battle, and lower ratio of British to Allied troops, suggests a major reason for the massive Allied defeat.
Chapter 4: History

Savannah and Her Defenses, An Overview

Savannah was established in 1733 as the first town in the British colony of Georgia. From its original rectangular configuration, which was comprised of four wards, Savannah continued to expand throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, replicating the town plan as new wards were added. The Smith map in Figure 30 shows the six town wards that constituted Savannah in 1779 (Smith 1779). Military fortifications were part of the design from the onset, but the main focus of defense was along Savannah’s waterfront. By the mid-1750s, as indicated on a plan of the town drawn by William DeBrahm, a defensive perimeter encircled the town. On DeBrahm’s 1757 map, the southwestern defense of the town was just beyond the corner of Jefferson Street and Oglethorpe Avenue (formerly South Broad Street). By the 1770s, the defensive buffer had been significantly broadened to encompass additional wards that were added to the city. Land use in large parts of the study area was predominantly rural, as shown in a detail of a map originally drawn by Thomas Shruder (1770).

Prior to the end of 1778, an outer set of earthworks was built in the vicinity of Spring Hill by the Americans to defend the town from the British during the American Revolution. Contemporary maps show the unfinished fortifications that partially encircled Savannah by that time. The incomplete defensive works and poorly constructed extant works allowed the city to be taken by the British with relative ease in December 1778. Figure 31 shows details from a map drafted by Wilson in 1778. The map depicts the incomplete works around the city. It also illustrates several areas along major roads leading into Savannah where militia and “Georgia Rebels” and “Carolina Rebels” held defensive positions. When British troops captured the city, they completed these unfinished fortifications and strengthened the completed ones, as shown in at least 10 contemporary maps (Anonymous 1779, 1780a, 1780b; Wilson 1780; Wylly 1779; Prevost 1779; Faden 1784; Carrington 1881; Jones 1874). These maps vary substantially in their accuracy and detail, however, and none was sufficiently precise to allow the pinpointing of potential archeological features in the study area. The 1779 Wilson map and the 1784 Faden map (Figure 32) provide some of the best detail on the relative position of British troops and fortifications. An artist’s rendition of the Spring Hill battlefield viewed from the French perspective facing north, by Pierre Ozanne, also provides some information on the fortifications on Savannah’s southwestern flank (Ozanne 1779b). Ozanne’s map is examined in greater detail later in this report.

The British began reinforcing the defenses less than one and a half months after taking the city. On February 17, 1779, British Engineer Major James Moncrief (60th Regiment) directed Major John Wilson (71st Regiment) in Savannah to “…put Savannah in as good a state of defence as possible, you will therefore git all the Redouts Abbaties Rownd at about 50 yards Distance from the work – you are to remain...
Figure 3. Savannah in 1778 when attacked by Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell’s British forces (Wilson 1778; Courtesy of William L. Clements Library).
Figure 32. The 1784 Faden map details British redoubts and batteries and Allied saps and camps (Courtesy Savannah History Museum).
in Savannah till ou hear from me…” (Moncrief 1779c). This level of effort palled in contrast with the efforts the British frantically expended in the Fall of the year when confronted by the immediate threat of attack from allied American forces.

### Revolutionary War Context and Savannah

United States History books, particularly textbooks, frequently focus on the dearth of supplies, food, clothing, equipment, and arms suffered by the American army. That is factual history and the many stories surrounding Washington’s army at Valley Forge accurately reflect these hardships. Historical research for this project located large numbers of primary documents that show that the British forces were as often ill-supplied and ill-equipped as the Allied forces in the southern campaign. The lack of appropriate clothing and nutritious, bountiful food were the bane of both armies. Added to this was the problem of chronic and deadly illnesses; a problem of particularly staggering proportions in the southern theater of the war where summer epidemics of malaria and dysentery killed huge numbers of soldiers and made many others too sick for duty. The Hessian Regiments suffered particularly large numbers of illness and death from disease rather than battle-related injuries. The Trümbach Regiment had “…136 dying of sickness and wounds in 1779, alone, of a total strength of less than 500” (Atwood 2002:235). In early November, General Clinton reported 6,000 British soldiers ill in North America (Clinton 1779a). Illness and a lack of food, supplies, and arms were only some of the problems faced by the British, French, and American armies in North America and at the siege and ensuing Battle of Savannah in 1779.

The deadliest part of the Allied engagement in the siege and battle from September through October 1779 was the attack on the Spring Hill Redoubt. While contemporary estimates of the number of men killed in this battle vary wildly, it is clear that several hundred people died on the battlefield on October 9, 1779. Estimates range upward of 800 men wounded or killed by the battle. An unknown number of those killed were buried on, or near, the battlefield. Their burial is weakly documented in contemporary military accounts, as well as mid-nineteenth century newspaper accounts of Revolutionary War graves that were disturbed by railroad construction crews in the Spring Hill locale in the 1840s. War records indicate that the American and French allies were granted truces to gather and bury their dead. The British buried their own dead, as well as those of the allies who had reached their parapet. Some war dead may have been interred in other areas (such as where Bonaventure cemetery is now, near Thunderbolt). These burials away from Spring Hill are particularly likely for those who were mortally wounded and died within a few days of the battle.

Allied forces included a variety of ethnicities, nationalities, and types of soldiers. General Benjamin Lincoln led the American troops. Prior to Lincoln’s arrival in Savannah, most of the North Carolina Regulars and other militia had left the army. This left Lincoln with a limited number of South Carolina Continental Regulars, in addition to Continental Regulars from Georgia and Virginia, as well as militia from Georgia and South Carolina (Wilson 2005:137). His forces in September 1779, totaled approximately 1,500 men (Wilson 2005:147). The combined forces of the Americans, led by Major General Benjamin Lincoln; the French, led by Admiral Count Charles-Henri Theodat d’E斯塔ing; and other allies numbered between 5,983-7,722 men. The latter number is based on recent research by Wilson (2005) as described below. It appears to be the most accurate given the types of records he consulted. The largest body of nationals on the allied side consisted of French troops. Serving under French command were French, Irish, and Caribbean troops. Both the French army and navy were represented. The French allies were under the command of Vice Admiral d’Estaing (Admiral and General Le Comte d’Estaing), who brought a huge armada of ships to the coast of Georgia in September 1779. This included, “…twenty-two ships of the line, nine frigates, and several dozen transports…” (Wilson 2005:135). French troops included mainland soldiers as well as colonial troops from Caribbean islands. The French troops included 250 grenadiers and provisional regiments from Martinique, Guadeloupe, and St. Dominique in the West Indies.

The Savannah Garrison numbered between 2,360 and 4,813 British troops (Wilson 2005:272). This wide range is a result of new research by historian David Wilson, who provides very different troop totals than traditionally stated for both sides of the battle in his book, *The Southern Strategy, Britain’s Conquest of South Carolina and Georgia, 1775-1780* (Wilson 2005). Wilson argues that the garrison at Savannah was twice as large as historians have estimated. His examination of commissary returns and strength returns provides larger numbers than obtained by traditional sources, such as by Alexander Lawrence in his book, *Storm Over Savannah, The Story of Count d’Estaing and the Siege of the Town in 1779* (Lawrence 1979). Wilson notes that the commissary return is a more complete record because it reflects the number of “black soldiers and pioneers serving in the lines” whereas the strength returns reflect only white “…British and Hessian regulars, provincials, and militia” (Wilson 2005:272-273). Wilson notes that even with these differences, the numbers...
are not radically different between the commissary and strength returns, thereby serving as a confirmation of the accuracy of both. Researchers for the Savannah Under Fire project examined and transcribed an Abstract of the Number of Men, Women, Children, Negroes, and Prisoners at the Commissary General’s Stores at Savannah From 11th to 20th October 1779, which is presented in Table 1. Wilson hypothesizes that the allied defeat was caused, in part, by the extremely low ratio of American allied troops to British troops (1.6 to1) contrasted with Lawrence’s estimated ratio of 2.53 to 1. Military strategists have determined that a ratio of attacking forces to defenders of 3:1 is necessary for any chance of taking a well-fortified target successfully (Wilson 2005:272). This rate is even lower, however, than the ratio d’Estaing alludes to as being acceptable standards of the day. D’Estaing indicates that 4.5 to1 was the correct ratio of besiegers to besieged (Kennedy 1974:45). Wilson also examines other traditional historical sources that have put the number of British forces as much lower and makes the argument for how each is inaccurate. Table 2 compiles Wilson’s estimates, other historians, and 18th century contemporaries. It appears that Wilson’s estimates are grounded in both the research of previous historians and additional research on primary documents not examined by others. His research, supported by the facts he outlines, appears to be a more accurate reflection of the actual numbers present on both sides of the battle.

British troops consisted of Regular army, South Carolina Royalists, and militia from North Carolina, as well as Provincials from New Jersey and New York (Wilson 2005:137). British troops included the renowned Scots, fierce 71st Fraser’s Highlanders and the well-regimented German Hessian soldiers with their sharpshooting abilities. African-Americans constituted much of the engineering muscle as they built and strengthened various earthworks. The British redoubt at Spring Hill was manned by South Carolina Royalists (Loyalists) commanded by Captain Thomas Tawse and Lt. Colonel Thomas Brown, East Florida Rangers. Brown was a notorious Loyalist leader who commanded a diverse group that included Creek Indians and Rangers. In addition, soldiers from Colonel John Maitland’s 71st Scottish Highlanders, the British 60th Regiment, grenadiers attached to the 16th Regiment of Foot, and a small contingent of British Marines were deployed to defend the Spring Hill Redoubt. Notable soldiers who died in the battle included Sergeant William Jasper, of the 2nd South Carolina Continentals; Brigadier General Kazimierz (Casimir) Pulaski, who led the cavalry, and Captain Tawse, commander of the Loyalists (Rodgers 2002, 2007).

Several military maps show the position of the combined British forces that surrounded the city. The southwestern flank of Savannah was protected by Wisenbach’s Hessians, a German regiment that included a number of African Americans from South Carolina; the 2nd Battalion of the 71st Highland Regiment; and North and South Carolina Loyalists.

Savannah Prior to 1778

Georgians experienced the American Revolution years before the British took Savannah in 1778. Several historians have documented the violence occurring throughout Georgia and the South during the revolution, much of it marked by personal assaults resulting in tar and feathering or death, and attacks on personal property including the burning of homes. Such ruthless attacks were perpetrated by both rebels and Tories and occurred throughout southern cities and rural areas. Alexander Wylly was a prominent Savannah resident who was a victim of such violence in Savannah. In 1776 a mob threatened to tar and feather him. He barely escaped and fled to Tybee Island. There he was was captured by a group of rebels and Indians who let him go under the condition that he leave the province. Wylly went to St. Augustine, leaving slaves and six houses in Savannah (William L. Clements Library 1780a).

British Occupation of Savannah, 1778

British forces first took the City of Savannah on December 29, 1778. A fleet of ships landed on Tybee Island after a perilous, storm-filled voyage. A brief summary of the taking of Savannah was recounted in a report of the Grenadier Regiment von Woellwarth. The account stated,

After the line of attack had been given out at a rendezvous the assault was made at once on the town, and within four hours, (before 5 o’clock in the afternoon) we had taken complete possession of the town with only a slight loss on the side of the English and of the Honourable Regiments, we only having had two privates severely wounded (Miles and Kochan 1989c).

Archibald Campbell’s 1778 return of troops reported that the number of killed under his command totaled two officers and five rank and file. The number of wounded equaled one subaltern, one drummer, and 17 rank and file (in Clinton 1779c). British forces under Campbell captured a total of 453 Georgia and South Carolina troops and militia prisoner during and after the December 29, 1778 taking of Savannah (William L. Clements Library 1778).

When the British took Savannah in 1778, they also took arms and artillery from the rebels. While it obviously
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Battalion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71st Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Artillery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Infantry</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Dragoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Troop</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Troop</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Battalion</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Loyalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers of Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Legion</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Rangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Royalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Battalion</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Battalion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Light Dragoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Battalion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Battalion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Loyalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Volunteers</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Militia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. de Trumbach’s Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. de Wissenbach’s Battalion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissary General’s Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Master General’s Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrack Master General’s Dept.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General’s Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes Employed in Redoubts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Negroes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Pioneers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes in Service of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Majesty’s Ship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowey</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm’d Brig Keppel</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamen</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariners</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of people using British commissary rations in Savannah, October 11-20, 1779. (Continued on next page.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Adjutant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Stokes Esq. Chief of Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. Barclay on half pay list</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissary of Prisoners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebel Officers on Parole</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevost Martial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners in Prevost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners in Main Guard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners in General’s Redoubt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Hospital</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galley Hornet</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seament in Jamaica Battery</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgade Major Skelly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honble. Colonel Maitland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Officers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galley Thunder</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Boat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeons of Navy Hospital</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 (Continued). Number of People Using British Commissary Rations in Savannah, October 11-20, 1779. (William L. Clements Library 1779b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>Number of Troops</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historians and 18th Century Accounts</strong></td>
<td>American Allies</td>
<td>British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>4,813 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Alexander Lawrence</td>
<td>5,983</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stedman</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Fortescue</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3700 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Ward</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles C. Jones</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Wright</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Ramsay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,000-3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer cited in Hough</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faden Map</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Officer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,790 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Francois d’Auber de Peyrelongue</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Estimates of troop strength, October 9, 1779, Battle of Savannah.

Figures for this table are taken from Wilson (2005:272-275).(a) 3:1 is ratio suggested by military scholars.(b) Represents sick & fit troops. Of these 3,466 troops fit for duty. (c) Excluding black laborers. (d) Of these 2,200 fit for duty.
had not been enough weaponry to defeat the British in the recent battle, it did help British troops arm some of the new defenses being prepared around the city. This included weapons that the French had supplied to the Americans before the former became involved in actual ground and naval combat. The weaponry the British took from the Americans at that time also included many that were "unserviceable" or had been intentionally spiked in an effort to keep the enemy from using them. These iron and brass ordnance were itemized by the British in the *Return of Iron & Brass Ordnance & Stores belonging to the Rebels taken at Savannah in Georgia by Order of Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell Commanding a Detachment of the Royal Army, 8th January 1779* (William L. Clements Library 1779a:7). Items included:

- 32 iron and brass mortars (10 “unserviceable”);
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 12, and 18 pounders (totaling 36 guns);
- 7, 18 pounders that had been spiked;
- small arms from Savannah residents and civilians outside town;
- 59 muskets with bayonets;
- 78 muskets without bayonets;
- 500 muskets needing repair;
- a variety of shot (loose round, case, and bag);
- shells;
- casks, barrels, and hogheads of gunflints for muskets and carbines;
- assorted gun carriages, wagons; and barrels and hogheads of gunpowder (William L. Clements Library 1779a:7).

In addition to the American ordnance captured at Savannah, an impressive arsenal was taken at Fort Morris at Sunbury in January 1779. When the British troops at Sunbury were recalled to Savannah in early September, 1779, these weapons (at least those that were serviceable) were likely taken to Savannah to strengthen the defenses (Elliott 2005). Jones (1883, Volume II:332) tabulated the captured ordnance at Sunbury, which included:

- Twenty-four pieces of brass ordnance, one brass seven-inch mortar, twenty pieces of iron ordnance, eight hundred and twenty-four round shot of various sizes, one hundred stands of case and grape shot, thirty shells, fifty hand-grenades, one hundred and eighty muskets with bayonets, twelve rifles, forty fuses and carbines, four wall-pieces, and a considerable quantity of powder and small arm ammunition.

By January of 1779, the British had a wide-arching array of posts and defenses in the region around Savannah.

Alexander Innes reported his observations of this at the time,

> The Posts now occupied by the British Troops are the Town of Savannah, Cherokee Hill, Abercorn, Zubly’s Ferry, Ebenezer and the two Sisters [ferry] being a Chain of thirty five miles above Savannah. The River below is effectivelly secured by the *Vigilant* man of war carrying 16, 24 Pounderslying opposite Augustine Creek the *Fowey* twenty Gun Ship at Cocksbur the *Phenix* of 44 Guns at Tybee Light House and it was proposed to station a Galley of Force at the entrance of Calibogue Island, which would command that Part of the Carolina Shore and the Island navigation to the Province from the River Savannah (Innes 1779b).

The British headquarters at Savannah saw a great deal of activity related to the war prior to the October 9, 1779 battle. For example on June 29, 1779, numerous rebels were paroled there, many of them being from Savannah and nearby areas. The parolees were obligated to sign a document stating,

> We the Subscribers being Prisoners of War taken by his Majesty’s troops, thereby engage and Promise upon our words of honor that we shall remain wherever the Commanding Officer of his Majesty’s Army in Georgia shall think proper to have us quarter’d and remain within the bounds to us prescribed. And also that we shall not directly nor indirectly Act and Serve Against his Majesty and Government until we are properly exchanged either for officers of the Same Rank or on such terms as may be agreed upon when ever a Cartel is fixed upon. Witness our hands at Savannah… (NYPL 1779b:[7534])

The list of parolees reads like a “Who’s Who” of colonial Savannah and is transcribed in Table 3. Numerous other lists of prisoners and lists of prisoners’ exchanges exist with “Savannah” on the date line. Such lists and exchanges were common not only in Savannah but throughout the theaters of the American Revolution.

Not all prisoners were paroled. The British maintained prison ships in the Savannah River. At least one of these ships was moored near town and the other was moored near Tybee Island. Hundreds of American soldiers who were captured at Sunbury, Brier Creek and other battles in Georgia and South Carolina were kept in these ships, usually under poor conditions.

Private James Barnes served in the North Carolina militia. He fought at Brier Creek and was taken prisoner, as he vividly recalled for his 1832 pension application,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank/Unit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saml Elbert</td>
<td>B.G.</td>
<td>and Servant Henry Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Habersham</td>
<td>Maj. 1st C. B. Geo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lane</td>
<td>Maj 3 Geo. B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Douglass</td>
<td>Aid de Camp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morrel</td>
<td>Leit. Geo Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lucas</td>
<td>Captn 4th C. B. Geo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peter Wagnon (Wagner?)</td>
<td>2nd Leit.&amp; Quar.Mr</td>
<td>Servt. Richd Burten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai Sheftall</td>
<td>D.C.G. of Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Halling</td>
<td>Surgn. Genl. Hospl</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. Saml Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm Mathews</td>
<td>Captn &amp; Mustn Mr C troops Geo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likley Mosby</td>
<td>Captn 2d Geo Battn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Booker</td>
<td>Captn 3d C. Geo. Batt.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. Mark Judkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Davenport</td>
<td>Leit. 2nd G. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mosy</td>
<td>Leit. 2d G.B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement Nash</td>
<td>Captn 3d G.C. Battn &amp; asst Depty Quar Mr.</td>
<td>and Servt. Wm. Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genl. To the Conl troops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hornby</td>
<td>Captn 4th G.C. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>Lieut. 4th G.B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rains Cook</td>
<td>Captn B. Geo. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Frazer</td>
<td>1st Lieut 3d G.C. B.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. David Mokley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Daniel Cuthbert</td>
<td>Captn 1st B.G.C.T.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. Obadiah Fergusen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McIntosh</td>
<td>Captn 1st G.B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan. Brydie</td>
<td>Surgeon 2d G.B. C. Troops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell</td>
<td>Lt. Geo. Artillery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Goodwyn</td>
<td>Lieut. 3d So. Carl. Regt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller Dixon</td>
<td>Let. 4th G. B.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt Ja. Combs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Maxwell</td>
<td>Leut. 3d Geo. Regt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos. Day</td>
<td>Captn. 4th Geo. B. C. L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Farish</td>
<td>Captn. Lt. C. G. Dragoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Payne</td>
<td>Let. 2d G. Battn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Hillam (?)</td>
<td>Ens. 4th G. Mt.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. John Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Deyong (?)</td>
<td>Surgeon the Congress Galley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corin. Collins</td>
<td>Lieut. &amp; G.B.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. John Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meanly</td>
<td>Lt. 3d G. C. Battn.</td>
<td>&amp; Servt. Obada. Plumley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Robinson</td>
<td>Let. 3d So. Carl. Regt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igsns. Few</td>
<td>Captn. 3d Compy. G. Lt. Dragoons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadrich Wright</td>
<td>Captn 1st Geo. Battn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Patriot parolees, Savannah June 19, 1779. (Transcribed from NYPL 1779b [7534]1).
Chapter 4. History

myself & 255 Men were taken Prisoners then the British Marched us to Dogester [sic, Dorchester] then to Savannah Town there the British staid three days & we were sent down the River in boats to Tibe [sic, Tybee] inlet there we were put on board of the Prison Ship called unificence [H.M.S. Munificence] there we stayed on board of her about two months then we were transferred to the Prison ship Dorety [sic, Dorothy?] there we stayed three days & was transferred to the Prison ship Betsy and while on board of the Betsy the American & French Fleet hove in sight we were Run of the River to Savannah Town and was there on board of the Betsy on the 9th Day of October 1779 when the Battle was Fought & Pulaski killed after that we were all taken round to Charleston & about the 15th day of November 1779 I was Exchanged in Charleston & on the 24th day of November 1779 I was permitted to return home by order of General Linkhorn [sic, Lincoln] (SCAR 2008 [James Barnes S1746]).

Private James McElwee was one of about 29 men in Major Ross’s company of South Carolina militia taken prisoner at Brier Creek and,

marched as a prisoner to Savannah and put on board the ever memorable and celebrated prison ship called the Munificence then lying in the harbour at Savannah. all this last mentioned services were in the county or district of York in said State of South Carolina and occupied the space of one month. he states that he remained a prisoner on board said ship in said harbour deprived of common necessaries of life for the space of more than Eight months when he was exchanged at Savannah and delivered to the Genl commanding at Charlestown whose name was Lincoln (James McElwee pension application W9553).

Private William Poplin provided additional details of his imprisonment on a ship at Savannah. Poplin was a horseman in Colonel Philip Alston’s Chatham County mounted militia. The militia fought at Brier Creek and Poplin was one of 130 men captured. He described in his pension application, being

carried down to the mouth of the Savannah River and put on board a prison ship that was laying there. This affiant states that he was there confined for about six months as a prisoner where he was induced from a fear of starving to death to enlist in the British services. He states that during his imprisonment he was allowed a pint of Rice a day and 3/4 lb of fresh beef a week. This affiant states that he left Col. Alston a prisoner on board the same ship that he was in That after he had enlisted he was then carried up to Savannah where he was kept at work on the fortifications for four or five weeks (SCAR 2008 William Poplin).

Private Poplin managed to make his escape from the British in Savannah, prior to the September siege. His account is significant because it shows that American prisoners, desperate to avoid starvation, enlisted in the British forces and were among the work crews who built the British defenses that surrounded Savannah. This practice has been documented elsewhere in the South during the Revolution (Babits 2001).

Private Augustine Balthrop, a soldier in the North Carolina militia, was captured in the battle of Brier Creek on March 3, 1779 and, in his own words, “he was carried to Savannah Town in which Town he was kept some few days, from thence he was taken down the River and confined on board a prison ship” (SCAR 2008 [Augustine Balthrop W8113]).

Privates Barnes, McElwee, Poplin, and Balthrop lived to tell of their confinement. Many more American prisoners who were confined on prison ships at Savannah and Tybee Island were less fortunate.

The Siege

In hindsight, d’Estaing’s motive and strategy to attack Savannah and wrest it from British control seems clear and obvious today. In the autumn of 1779, however, d’Estaing’s plans and movements were anything but clear to the British. This confusion was fueled further by the lack of quick and reliable news. Unlike today’s global media networks that transmit war footage instantaneously, 18th-century warfare relied on few and often unreliable reports of events in theaters considerably distant by travel methods of the day. Inaccurate newspaper accounts; the capture of scouts, couriers, and vessels carrying documents; and spy and counter-spy subterfuge contributed to the level of misinformation in 18th century warfare. Apparently contemporaries were aware of the credibility issues they faced. A prime example was the British capture of a vessel carrying a letter written by d’Estaing. Clinton reported,

We have no certain intelligence of any one thing except of d’Estaing’s intention on the 25th of August by the intercepted letters. How far he may have altered them must be matter of opinion (Clinton 1779g).

East Florida Governor Tonyn responded to a report of the sudden sighting of a French fleet by writing, “...Although I do not altogether credit the Report of the French Fleet being off Tyby [Tybee Island, Georgia], yet I would not in
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a matter of such moment overlook even a slight Report...”
(Fuser 1779).

The Arrival of the French

Even when some of d’Estaing’s ships had been sighted, the
British were not certain about the size of his force and his
ultimate target. The Hessian von Knoblauch wrote from
aboard his vessel on September 4, 1779,

The news was received that five French men-of-
war with some sloops and schooners had been
seen off the harbour on Tybee Island; it could not
be determined, however, whether they were alone,
or whether they formed part of a larger force; or
whether they had been landing troops in Carolina.
Orders were therefore sent by General Prevost to
all outposts, that they were to hold themselves in
readiness to join the army in Savannah, as it was quite
possible that the enemy had their frigates stationed
in Port Royal Bay, thus cutting off communications

One of General Clinton’s advisers, an admiral (probably
Admiral Thomas Marriott) thought d’Estaing was going
to attack Jamaica. Clinton wrote that Lord Cornwallis
was of the same opinion, although he himself did not believe
that d’Estaing was targeting that island. Clinton wrote,
however,

…that place [Jamaica] is of so much importance
that I did not hesitate to send all [troops] I could
spare amounting to near 4000 all British, except
the Queens Rangers, which is the only Provincial
Corps I dare send from the Continents. The Admiral
who was clearly of opinion that Jamaica was the
object too handsomely sent all his Force in Line of
Battle Ships and the Troops were Embarked under
Lord Cornwallis who requested the Command,
and agreed in opinion with the Admiral that such
were the Intentions of the Enemy. The whole were
under Sail without the Hook, when the Admiral
received such information of D”Estaing’s being
on the Coast of Georgia… (Clinton 1779d).

Upon this news the troops were diverted back to America.

While Clinton was right that Jamaica was not d’Estaing’s
target, he was wrong about the target as well. Clinton
wrote,

…Now for a little matter of opinion of my own, I
did imagine D’Estaing would have paid R.[Rhode]
Island a visit in the Month of August, as to this place
I am of opinion he will not look at it, and indeed ‘tis
almost too late for R. Island, if as it seems the General
opinion he has been on the Coast of Georgia, he
certainly has reinforced South Carolina considerably,
if he has done nothing else, and make the hopes from
our intended operations for that side very different
from what they would have been had we had nothing
to contend with but the Rebel force. West Florida
is threatened. I wish no worse (Clinton 1779d).

Numerous accounts by British officers, Loyalists, and
other individuals from Florida to New York reveal the
anxiety, fear, and confusion that precipitated d’Estaing’s
attack. The panic began as soon as d’Estaing’s ships were
sighted off the coast of Georgia and immediately the
British attempted to rationalize his most likely target or
targets. Few realized it was Savannah. Lieutenant Colonel
Lewis Fuser wrote to Florida’s Governor Tonyn,

If the Report...be true, the French in conjunction
with the Rebels will without doubt have undertaken
something against our Troops in Georgia before
now...Therefore it is to be presumed that if
Circumstances are not favorable to him he will
make his Retreat towards this place [Florida], and
it is natural to suppose that the Enemy will attempt
to cut it off by sending vessels in the midway (St.
Marys and St. Johns) and not unlikely they will send
a Detachment of their Fleet and army to this place
before General Prevost can reach it... (Fuser 1779).

Fuser went on to write that Fort St. Mark is in “deplorable”
condition, but he will defend it and needs 200 “Field
Negroes” with tools and overseers to help him rebuild the
fort.

Other accounts reveal the level of surprise and panic,
and the range of opinions on where the terrifying French
fleet of more than forty heavily armed vessels would
attack. Major General Augustin Prevost, headquartered in
Savannah, was as startled as anyone by the appearance of
French ships off the city’s coast. This astonishment was in
part attributed to the fact that it was hurricane season and
a dangerous time for ships to anchor in the unprotected
waters of the Atlantic Ocean. On September 11, 1779,
Prevost wrote,

…we are coop’t up, a French Fleet, as is reported,
came from the West Indies...we had no reason to think
that a Fleet of 50 vessels of which the half of them are
Ships of the Line would be suffered on our Coast...
The Season seemed to promise us that we had nothing
to fear this year from such Forces... (Fuser 1779).

General Clinton sums up the anxiety of the British
command in a letter, writing, “You will naturally say, what
are you afraid of? And I should as naturally answer, the
combined fleets and armies of France, Spain, and the rebel colonies” (Clinton 1779g).

Benjamin Lincoln Brings American Forces

As soon as Major General Benjamin Lincoln learned of d’Estaing’s arrival, he began calling in American troops and securing flats to float French supplies. Lincoln ordered General Lachlan McIntosh to take as many men as possible from Augusta and march to Ebenezer. Lincoln hoped to provide 1,000 men alongside d’Estaing’s 3,000 troops from the French fleet. Lincoln also summoned troops from Fort Moultrie and six companies of militia supplied by the South Carolina Governor. In spite of obstacles such as destroyed bridges and the lack of boats to cross rivers and streams, the troops united with the French on September 16, twelve days after the march began.

Vessels, The River, and The Landing

The French fleet began arriving off the coast of Georgia on September 4, and it took eight days for the troops to embark at Beaulieu plantation on the Vernon River and another four days after that for them to ring the city with camps and troops (Kennedy 1974:90). Meanwhile, Augustin Prevost used the 12 days advantageously by relocating artillery from ships to batteries and redoubling around town, relocating troops from nearby outposts at Ebenezer, Sunbury, and Beaufort, and by putting engineer Moncrief to work redesigning the city’s fortifications through the manual labor of hundreds of soldiers and Negroes. The sighting of French ships off the coast and near Tybee Island led the British to give up its small post on Tybee and bring it ships up the Savannah River closer to Savannah. Moncrief, who had only recently completed construction of the British fort at Tybee, was ordered to burn it to the ground to avoid it being captured and used by the Americans. A Hessian officer noted in his journal that on September 10th, “Captain Moncrieff set the fort on Tybee Island on fire, and returned with the [Hessian] garrison to the lines by water”, and that the army, “encamped about 200 paces before the town” (Miles 1989b).

A British naval officer noted that on September 7, 1779, he was involved in sounding the North Channel so that the vessels Rose, Keppel, and Germain could moor there. The H.M.S. Rose was an older 20-gun Navy frigate that arrived at Tybee Bar on September 9, 1779 (Stevens 1859:205). The Rose was built in Hull, England, in 1757. Her commander in 1774 and 1776 was Captain James Wallace. Captain Philip Browne, Royal Navy, commanded the Rose in 1779. Captain Browne, along with his two brothers, was killed in Savannah in 1779 (Morgan 1970:5). Lieutenant Richard Lock also served with distinction aboard the Rose, as well as on a smaller tender vessel, which, in September, had alerted Major General Prevost of the approaching French fleet (Allen 1858:283). The Keppel and the Germain were armed vessels that were sailed up the Savannah River as the French navy approached Savannah (Stevens 1859:215). They were privately owned vessel that had been hired out to the British Navy (Allen 1858:283). The artillery aboard the Germain was fired against the Patriots who were attacking Savannah’s western defenses on October 9 (Stevens 1859:215). Captain Mowbray commanded the Germain (Allen 1858:283-285).

The following day the HMS Fowey and the Savannah anchored there as well. The H.M.S. Fowey was a 20-gun warship that arrived at Tybee Bar on September 9, 1779 (Prevost 1779; Stevens 1859:202). The Fowey was commanded by Captain John Henry (Allen 1858:283). The Rose, Savannah, and four unnamed troop transports were intentionally scuttled in the Savannah River below the town by the British as an effective obstruction to Patriot navigation (Prevost 1779a; Stevens 1859:205).

The sunken remains of the Rose were partially destroyed by U.S. Corps of Engineers channelization activity in the 19th and 20th centuries. The Georgia Historical Society retains a few relics that are possibly associated with this British frigate. Other objects from the wreck of the H.M.S. Rose were placed aboard a replica of the H.M.S. Rose.

The Maritime Museum of San Diego provided this historical background about the original H.M.S. Rose, (depicted in the painting in Figure 33):

The original “H.M.S.” Rose was built in Hull, England in 1757. At that period in naval history ships were divided by “rates,” first rate being the largest with 100-110 guns carried on three individual gundecks. The original Rose was a sixth rate ship, the smallest class of ship that would be commanded by someone holding the rank of Captain. In size, she was about the modern day equivalent of a destroyer. She would not have participated in major fleet engagements except perhaps to relay messages. The job of the frigate was to operate as a scout ship for the fleet or to patrol the coasts of any belligerent country. (TallshipRose.org 2008).

The replica Rose was constructed in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia (TallshipRose.org 2008). The replica was built by John Fitzhugh Miller and completed in 1970. The ship was built using the construction drawings for the original
had taken all 40 guns off the *Rose* and *Fowey* and distributed them to various batteries (Kennedy 1974:94). The galley *Thunderer* joined the *Comet* in firing on rebel galleys that approached the city. Other British galleys, including the *Scourge*, *Vindictive*, *Viper*, *Hornet* and *Snake*, were present in the Savannah area at the time of the 1779 siege (Allen 1858:283). Figure 34 is from a 1779 French map showing the French vessels along the Savannah River and the British vessels crowded along the city’s riverfront and channel.

Although d’Estaing’s fleet was formidable, only one of his warships, the *Truitte*, and possibly a few of the smaller tenders actually participated in the battle. The rest of the fleet was hindered by the sunken British ships that formed an obstruction to the Savannah River traffic. The *Truitte*, anchored behind Hutchinson Island, bombarded the city with its heavy guns. The *Truitte*’s location is shown on several of the battle maps.

By September 10, 1779, the British were hastily trying to strengthen Savannah’s defenses. A receipt filed from Savannah by Charles Shaw of the Engineering department and approved by James Moncrief provides fascinating details about the fortifications and the level of effort the British put into strengthening them. Table 4 is a transcription of the receipt. Shaw noted on the receipt that part of the money was “…for Trenching tools, Iron Potts for Coking for the Negroes Employed in the works. Empty Hogsheads for the different Redoubts and Carpenters tools by him Supplied for Carrying on His Majesty’s Works…” (James Moncrief Papers Box 1:30). The receipt lists a variety of 803 hand tools, including 360 spades. It suggests that minimally, 360 people were working at one time, since that is the largest number of the same tool type. (One person could use several tools throughout the day, but would have no need for two of the same type of tool.) The presence of felling axes indicates that they were cutting down trees, probably for the palisade, abatis frame, and other purposes. The broad axes and chisels suggest that some of the felled trees were shaped, probably for creating large timbers. The broad hoes and spades reflect repairs to the trench works around, and connecting, the redoubts. Those involved in the work included “carpenters”, “Negroes”, prisoners, and probably enlisted soldiers.

By the second week of September, the British prepared the prison ships for traveling upstream (Kennedy 1974:81). The galley *Comet* joined the *Keppel* and the *Fowey* further upstream, near Long Reach. By September 16, the British

---

**Figure 33. Artist’s conception of the HMS Rose (Scott Kennedy 2002).**
Two interesting details revolve around the construction of the redoubts. The receipt itemized “55 Empty Hogsheads” for the redoubts, or almost four for each redoubt at Savannah. This suggests that these very large casks were used in their construction or repair. It is likely that the hogsheads were used as infrastructure for either the redoubts, and/or the batteries, with soil piled inside the casks and around them. The hogsheads would give structure to the sand and offer more protection to the soldiers from shot, shells, and what would later be called shrapnel. Hogsheads were used as defensive blinds at the Battle of Yorktown and elsewhere throughout the American Revolution, by Andrew Jackson’s forces during the Battle of New Orleans in the War of 1812 (they were full of sugar), and also during the Civil War. An 1852 account mentioned that the “blinds” near the redoubt at the Siege of Yorktown in 1781 “…were made of hogsheads and pipes filled with sand; they were placed there by the British…” (New Haven Courier 1852). The account described soldiers ducking behind the blind when two incoming shells exploded, and none of the 400 soldiers in the redoubt were hurt by the shells or related debris. The use of hogsheads in redoubt construction would be detectable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>10 dozn best Felling Axes</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 70/£</td>
<td>£ 352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 ditto best broad hoes</td>
<td></td>
<td>42/£</td>
<td>£ 84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th</td>
<td>30% ditto of Spades</td>
<td></td>
<td>90/£</td>
<td>£ 270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Large Iron Potts</td>
<td></td>
<td>56/£</td>
<td>£ 336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 .............. ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/4£</td>
<td>£ 36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dozn Claw hammers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 £ 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Empty Hhds.</td>
<td>3£</td>
<td>8/56£</td>
<td>£ 448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th</td>
<td>12 hand Saws</td>
<td>13/£</td>
<td>7 £ 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Bunches Gimblets [gimlets?]</td>
<td>6/8£</td>
<td>2 £ 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 broad Axes</td>
<td>6/6£</td>
<td>9 £ 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Chizels</td>
<td>2/6£</td>
<td>2 £ 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 dozn Padlocks</td>
<td>42/£</td>
<td>8 £ 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 274.00</td>
<td>17 £ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Transcription of a receipt for items used by British engineers overseeing defensive works (Moncrief 1779d).
On September 10, “A commencement was made with the work on the batteries, trenches and the making of fascines” (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W113). The following day, soldiers removed the heavy cannons from the men-of-war. The disembarking of the French at Beaulieu on September 12 spurred on the frantic labor to get the defensive works ready before an attack. Prevost ordered all commanding officers to render all possible assistance, so that the newly constructed works may be finished tomorrow as quickly as possible, as several other works in the front of the army on the right and left flanks have yet to be constructed. The fascines must be made better (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W114).

The redoubts were designed to be “…connected by a chain of sentries, but the latter are not to be placed so close together that they can speak to each other” (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W114).

British Reinforcements

While Prevost made frantic preparations for a defense, Lieutenant General Henry Clinton, Commander in Chief of the British Army in America, worried from afar. He knew d’Estaing’s fleet posed an overwhelming threat to Prevost’s forces in Savannah. Clinton feared that there were not enough troops positioned in the city to counteract this threat. He felt unable to send additional troops to reinforce Prevost. Clinton wrote,

…but while d’Estaing threatens our port, I dare not move up in great force, nor could I indeed at this Moment if he was out of the question as we have near 5,000 Sick, many Regiments have not 100 Men fit for duty, some much less… (Clinton 1779d).

Clinton’s forces in “Georgia South Carolina etc.” only totaled 3,587 “at each station fit for duty”, with another 1,161 not fit for duty at the time French troops disembarked on Georgia soil [September 15, 1779] (Clinton 1779 d).

General Prevost nervously waited for the only reinforcements for which he could hope—those from a 50 mile radius. In the first week of September, Prevost’s garrison at Savannah was extremely weak. Captain Heinrichs estimated that the garrison at that time, “…consisted of fewer than a thousand men, made up of English, Hessians, and provincials, amongst whom were approximately sixty horse” (Alexander 1938:163). This force, he noted, was insufficient to cover the terrain around the defenses, much less withstand the overwhelming French and American force gathering on the coast.

Much to Prevost’s relief, by September 10 Savannah had been reinforced with troops from the outposts at New Ebenezer, Cherokee Hill, Ogeechee, and Sunbury (Kennedy 1974:94). The troops from Sunbury, led by Lieutenant Colonel Cruger, consisted of all his fit-for-duty. They destroyed the fort and supplies at Sunbury (Ft. Morris). Prevost was able to reinforce his troops further by buying time under the guise of asking for a truce to consider terms of surrender. This strategic tactic was against the accepted morals of warfare of the day. It proved successful, however, as Colonel Maitland was able to avoid French and American forces by coming around Daufuskie Island, “…dragging his boats empty through a cut…” and entering the Savannah River upstream from the enemy (Kennedy 1974:96). Maitland was assisted in relocating his troops by the H.M.S. Vigilant, a vessel that brought them through what is now known as Wall’s Cut. The Vigilant was commanded by Captain Hugh C. Christian, although at the time of the October 1779 siege, the Vigilant was commanded by Lieutenant Thomas Goldeborough. It was armed with 18 guns (Allen 1858:283-285). Maitland and his troops arrived on September 16 and 17. They included the New York Volunteers and the 71st Highlanders and totaling 500 men.

An easy argument in hindsight is to say that French and/or American troops should have cut off Maitland’s access to Savannah via all waterways and land routes from Beaufort, South Carolina. Figure 35 is a modern satellite image of the area, but provides a good idea of the many creeks, cuts, inlets and other waterways weaving throughout the area. Such navigable thoroughfares apparently proved difficult to block, although d’Estaing’s force of over 40 vessels suggests that he could have denied Maitland access to water routes. French primary documents indicate, however, that the French would have been unable to stop a land route. French Captain de Terson, of the Company of the Agenois Grenadiers recorded that, “They were afraid that we would harass them [Maitland’s troops], but we by no means have the ability to do so; only about half our troops have landed and not a single artillery piece” (Kennedy 1974:13).

Skirmishes

A former Lieutenant of the galley Congress reported to the British that the enemy “…have surrounded Savannah with Intrenchments; the French by the East and the Rebels by the west; that their Intrenchments are joining.” He went...
General Casimir Pulaski and his cavalry met French troops at Beaulieu plantation on September 13. Two days later Lincoln transported his 1,500 troops across the Savannah River and bivouacked at Ebenezer, 40 miles north of Savannah. Here he met up with the 1st Battalion of Virginia Continental Levies (Colonel Richard Parker) and the 1st Regiment of Virginia Light Dragoons (Major John Jameson) (Wilson 2005:147). Lincoln then marched his troops from the Ebenezer area (Zubly’s Ferry) to Cherokee Hill, seven miles north of Savannah (Wilson 2005:147). On September 16, 1779, Lincoln arrived at Miller’s plantation, the camp of General Lachlan McIntosh, three miles from Savannah. McIntosh also met at this time with Admiral d’Estaing. Lincoln and Colonel Francis Marion then learned of the truce between Prevost and d’Estaing.

Wasting little time upon his arrival in Savannah, Pulaski began menacing the British. On September 15, 1779, a detachment of soldiers from Pulaski’s Light Cavalry and some French troops charged a British picket, taking six prisoners. The detachment lost a horse and two men (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W115).

Meanwhile, the allied vessels tried to reach Savannah via the Savannah River. On September 20, rebel galleys and a French ship heading upstream prompted the British to remove most of the stores on board and scuttle the Rose in the channel in hopes of creating an impassable obstruction. At the same time, the armed ship Savannah and the transport Venus were burned, with all their “guns and provisions, ammunition” on board (Kennedy 1974:83). In addition, the British burned the sails and sunk two or three other transport vessels at Five Fathom Hole (near extant Fort Jackson). This deep spot on the river was adjacent to Fort Jackson, which at that time was a small earthen battery taken, along with Savannah, by the British in 1778.

The French made a second attack on pickets on the night of September 22. Fierce fighting took place and the French retreated in the wake of British shelling (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W117). The land sorties were punctuated by naval action throughout the siege. On September 24, allied galleys “advanced near the works” and the British galleys “exchanged several shot with them and returned under the sea battery” (Kennedy 1974:83).

On September 23, Lincoln gave French troops all the entrenching tools they had, and the French worked on the enemy’s left (Kennedy 1974:125). D’Estaing groused, accurately, that there were not enough tools. Throughout September, the French continued to dig offensive lines ever closer to Savannah’s defensive works. There was one engineer among the French troops and one serving the Americans, although numerous accounts indicate that number was insufficient and that the construction of the offensive lines suffered seriously as a result of the absence of an engineer. Captain de Terson reported that on September 26, “The siege works are not going forward, but some artillery arrived which we could put into position if we knew how” (Kennedy 1974:17). Two days later Terson again stated, “Our works are proceeding very slowly and are not going forward. In addition, we are beginning to get tired; we are spending every third night in the trenches (Kennedy 1974:18).

On the night of September 24, the French erected a battery of four guns in front of the centre of the army, and constructed an entrenchment to within 100 paces before the lines. At 7 o’clock in the morning they commenced firing with cannon, and at the second shot one man belonging to the Leib Company of a Hessian Regiment was killed before the tent. This battery of the enemy’s was silenced by our guns from the lines (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W117).
The British, led by Major Graham, attacked the French battery under heavy musket fire for 15 minutes before the attackers retreated. The French chose to chase after the British and were immediately cut down by artillery fire from the British defenses. Eight British were killed and 15 wounded. A total of 159 French soldiers were killed or wounded, including 14 officers (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W118).

Three times the following night, the French attacked British pickets, with little success. Meanwhile, the French managed to repair the damage done to the battery by the charge the day before. On September 26 French soldiers digging entrenchments faced a surprise attack by Major McArthur and 200 men. The French outnumbered the sortie, which retreated. In spite of the retreat, the French suffered far greater numbers of casualties than the British. The former suffered three wounded contrasted with 50 men killed on the British side (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W118).

Naval forces on both sides continued a cat-and-mouse game in the Savannah River (Figures 36 and 37). On September 28, a French frigate, La Truite, moored on the Back River, keeping Hutchinson Island between it and Savannah. The British galley Thunderer cannonaded the frigate that day and the following day, but the frigate did not return fire (Kennedy 1974:84). Two small allied vessels joined the frigate on the Back River.

Meanwhile, on the night of the 28th, Prevost ordered a regiment of the Scottish Highlanders to conduct another sortie onto French trenches. The British suffered three casualties and the French none, until they fired on their own work parties later in the dark. This resulted in the wounding or death of 17 of their men (Wilson 2005:153).

Finally, by October 4, the French had completed their batteries. Again, however, they suffered for want of an engineer during battery construction. Captain de Terson recorded,

For two hours the cannonade was quite brisk, but we had to stop it, or rather slow it down, because our left battery collapsed due to poor construction and the great shock caused by our cannon….We also had a mortar battery firing simultaneously, but it fired so poorly that the bombs fell into our trenches. What else could we expect? We have neither an artillery officer nor a gunner (Kennedy 1974:19).

The first week of October brought massive amounts of shelling and cannonading from both sides. Vessels in the Savannah and Back rivers also took part in the firing. The French frigate, Truite in the Back River and allied galleys fired throughout this time but had little impact. Prevost sardonically wrote in his journal, “The frigates and galleys cannonade our left without other effect than to point out where to make traverses and giving us plenty of twelve-pound shot of which we had none before and had two guns of that caliber consequently useless” (Kennedy 1974:99). The British galley Thunderer returned fire, with negligible results (Kennedy 1974:85).

French and American forces were under-supplied for the siege, lacking sufficient amounts of both food and clothing. This proved critical at a time when the allies chose a siege as their tactic rather than instant and direct attack. Traditionally the besieged should have suffered from lack of food, water, and supplies, rather than those besieging the city. Early shortages were the result of trying to get supplies from the fleet’s vessels to the troops who landed and marched inland. Lincoln provided assistance by ordering rice from Charleston for the French (Kennedy 1974:125). Initially allied forces arriving in the Savannah
area plundered the countryside for livestock and ate heartily. The thousands of allied soldiers, however, severely reduced this supply of food, already strained from previous raids by both British and American forces operating throughout coastal Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina. In addition to the lack of food, some of the troops had difficulty adjusting to the type of food available. For example, d’Estaing reported that “Our black soldiers from Saint Domingue would not drink the mixture of sugar, water and fermented molasses which makes up the nectar the Americans call grog” (Kennedy 1974:52). "It was a lucky prize for us; without it we would have starved to death" (Kennedy 1974:17). This was supplemented by the capturing of eight or nine other British ships carrying much needed items such as shoes, hats, saddles (given to the dragoons), and cordage and anchors (for the fleet) (Kennedy 1974:31). The capture of the Victory gave the allies meat and wheat (Kennedy 1974:17-18). French Captain de Terson claimed that, "Our arms are in fearfully bad condition if we have not the misfortune of being attacked. Our cartridge pouches are soaked" (Kennedy 1974:19).

The allies were also ill-supplied with arms and equipment. During the siege, Captain de Terson noted that his French company had to fire its cannons, “...slowly because we were afraid of running out of ordnance” (Kennedy 1974:18). In the rainy weather, the French troops’ lack of arms was even more apparent. Terson’s company was in a trench only 200 yards from British lines when he noted that, “Our arms are in fearful bad condition if we have the misfortune of being attacked. Our cartridge pouches are soaked” (Kennedy 1974:19).

The Besieged and the Bombardment

Unlike many of the soldiers involved in the Siege and Battle of Savannah, civilians were an unwilling party to the difficult and dangerous events. Savannah residents felt the effects of the revolution most directly in 1778 when the British first took the city. The ensuing year brought challenges to both Patriot and Tory supporters living in town. Neither Patriots nor Tories, rich nor poor, were immune to having their houses torn down if the structures threatened the ability of the British to defend its holdings. Such was the fate of Philip Allman (aka Alman) when a General Order for the Public Works fated all the structures on his town lot be demolished in September 1779 in order to “fortify the lines”. The Allman family appears to have been prosperous, as their home and outbuildings were valued at £360 sterling. These included a two-story house (26 by 18 ft.) with two piazzas, another two-story house (26 by 16 ft.), a one-story carpenter’s shop and store room (30 by 16 ft.), another room for a kitchen (24 by 14 ft.), a separate one story kitchen building (16 by 12 ft.), a “Stable, Chair and Fowl House” (40 by 14 ft.), two privies (6 by 8 ft.), a pigeon house, a brick well, and a post and board fence (Cornwallis Papers 1779). In 1780 Augustin Prevost recommended that Allman get compensation for his losses.

Another Loyalist in Savannah whose house was damaged by the war was Alexander Wylly. Wylly had fled rebels in Savannah in 1776 returned after the British captured the city in 1778. He was in Savannah, helping defend it during the siege and reported his, “...Houses being almost torn to pieces by the Enemy’s Bombs and Shot” and was unable to repair them after the battle (William L. Clements Library 1780a).

Some non-residents also participated in the defense of Savannah during the siege and suffered grievous losses to their property miles away. Numerous residents of the Georgia Queensborough Township reported that they had joined Colonel Archibald Campbell as a Volunteer Company and left their families to join the British defense of Savannah during the siege. While gone, “…their Settlement, Being Obnoxious to the Rebels, on Accnt of their Loyalty, is almost wholly destroyed” (William L. Clements Library 1780a). Residents living in the rural areas surrounding Savannah suffered plundering and livestock seizure during the siege, as well. Phillipe Séguier de Terson, captain of a company of French grenadiers camped outside Savannah’s defenses during the siege, remarked, “…we shut our eyes to looting. My faith, they [allied soldiers] did not curb themselves in that pursuit; there were pigs, turkeys, and geese everywhere!” (Kennedy 1974:12).

Anthony Stokes, Chief Justice of Georgia, fled to Savannah from his home in the country when d’Estaing’s fleet disembarked. His home “…on the Salts” was looted by French forces and he
...lost the wine, provisions, furniture, some books and other articles that were left behind. Several of my negroes were also left at the plantation, and Fanny, that was just delivered, ran into the woods to avoid being taken (Kennedy 1974:108).

In October 1779, it was reported that Augustin Prevost had in Savannah “...a great quantity of Salt Provisions...[and] many hundred head of Cattle drove in & put upon Hutchison’s Island...” (Fuser 1779). This would prove advantageous in the event of a siege. While Prevost had a quantity of stores on hand in Savannah during the siege, he also had the responsibility to feed a large number of soldiers and civilians. The population of the town swelled with the arrival of soldiers, many of their wives and children (as was often the practice of the day), black laborers, and others who accompanied the military. British commissary returns dating to the period immediately after the battle include American and allied prisoners from the battle, but also show the numbers of individuals the British had supported in the days preceding it. The totals were as follows: 5,112 men, 256 women, 174 children, 620 negroes, and 34 prisoners (William L. Clements Library 1779b:10). The details regarding this information was presented earlier in Table 1.

British forces patrolled Savannah’s defenses intently. A lieutenant colonel guarded the Spring Hill Redoubt and a major the east road. They shared rounds to ensure that all men were at their posts, both to the left and the right of the barricades (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W115). The trenches and redoubts were heavily patrolled in case of a surprise attack. The town, however, less so, as able-bodied soldiers were still in dire need to build the defenses. Prevost assigned “...convalescents and exhausted men” as town guards (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W116).

Sporadic, isolated fighting between detachments and pickets occurred in September. On September 25, it became less localized as the British and French exchanged mortar and cannon fire constantly throughout the night. At daybreak, the French began firing crossbar shot, but this apparently had little effect on the British redoubts or men (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W118). D’Estaing fired 300 firebombs before beginning to fire mortar shells. He recorded his strategy in this way, “We chose to begin firing the firebombs at night in order to make them more terrifying. They are less frightening in the daytime, but they were supposed to scare even more the citizens who had to sleep outside the fortifications” (Kennedy 1974:61). On October 2, French ships, including frigates and galleys, aimed a cannonade at the left wing with less than spectacular results. The British returned fire. The next day townspeople and soldiers on both sides endured the noise from a battery of 15 guns, in addition to two hours of shelling from nine French mortars. The French continued the bombardment the following day for 11 hours with no relief. This included firing from 9 mortars, 37 heavy guns on land and 16 guns from vessels (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W1179). Townspeople were terrified.

The Governor and Lt. Governor betook themselves to the trenches. Major Selig was lying ill in the town, a bomb-shell struck the house where he lay and burst in front of his bed; he was conveyed from these quarters to the Government House, where in a few minutes the same thing happened to him again without his receiving any injury, but most of his equipment was destroyed (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W119).

Others were not so lucky. In many respects the British troops were safer in the redoubts and trenches than the civilians were in their houses and cellars in town. As late as October 7 and 8 the cannonade by both the British and French continued.

Anthony Stokes described the abject terror of civilians in Savannah during the week-long bombardment. He detailed shells raining down, shot striking houses and passing through roofs and walls, and the incessant and dangerous search to find safe haven even as each of the prior buildings he took refuge in were destroyed by shells, explosions, and fire. Stokes lost most of his property during the cannonade. Even worse, eight enslaved African Americans bound to him perished in one of the houses set afire by the bombardment. Stokes mentions several civilians who were killed by the shelling, including “…the daughter of one Thomson [who] was almost shot in two by a cannon ball” (Kennedy 1974:110). Everywhere crowds of hysterical women and children, and enslaved and free men pressed into areas they hoped were safe from shelling. This included houses and cellars in town, buildings and ditches at Yamacraw Bluff, structures on Hutchinson Island, and British ships on the river. Virtually none of these places were safe. Stokes detailed the town’s appearance with these words,

…there was hardly a house which had not been shot through and some of them were almost destroyed. Ambrose, Wright, and Stute’s, in which we lived, had upwards of fifty shot that went through each of them...old Mr. Habersham’s house, in which Major Prevost lived, was almost destroyed with shot and shells” (Kennedy 1974:113).

David George was a free African American preacher living in Savannah with his wife Phillis and their children. After a cannonball hit the the house they were, they fled to a cellar at Yamacraw bluff (Davidson 2007). Ironically, civilians suffered far more during the bombardment than the British troops, who were well protected along the defensive line.
An ensign in Captain Robert Parris' Company of South Carolina Royalists gave the following account of the siege,

We have had perhaps as hard sege as Ever ahs been since the Rebellion began/we were brocked up both by land and water from the 10th of September until October the 8th. During which time a great part was taking up in Cannading and Ball Bumbarding from both sids the[y] threw upwards of a 1000 Shells into our works. Besides Some thousands of Balls and a quantity of Carcasses in order to burn the town/October the 9th the[y] made a general attack… (Buffington 1779).

By the eve of the battle, Savannah had become a stalwart fortress unlike its appearance only a few weeks earlier. It also had survived the shelling and bombardment of the siege. Major Thomas Pinckney, 1st South Carolina Continentals, described the defenses at Savannah, in an 1815 post-battle account:

It appeared now to be the Determination of the Generals, to endeavour to carry the Post by regular Approaches; for the Enemy’s Line of Defence, which was scarcely begun when d’Estaing’s Summons was given, had, in that Interval of ten Days, become formidable; it extended along the sandy Ridge or Bluff, on which Savannah is built, from the Swamp below the Town to Yamacraw Creek, which is its upper Boundary. It consisted of a chain of redoubts with batteries, the whole: covered in front by a strong abatis. The principal battery appeared to be in the Centre of the line, where stood, when we first approached it, a large public building of brick, but which disappeared in one night, and in a day or two a formidable battery was opened upon us from its site. The next Work in Importance was the Spring Hill Redoubt, which was on their extreme right, and commanded Yamacraw creek, at the mouth whereof was stationed a British galley. This line was admirably adapted to the Enemy’s Force; if it had been a closed line, their two thousand five hundred troops could not have manned the Whole, especially as they were obliged to have some slight works on each Flank, and to pay some attention to their front on the river, as the French had sent some small Vessels of War with a Bomb-ketch into the Back River, which is only separated from the main Channel by an island of Marsh (Hough 1866:162-163).

In case of an alarm…Captain Stuart of the British Legion, together with his men is to take up his position in the fortifications which are situated on the right side of the river. The main guard is to be relieved by those of the Hessians who are knocked up and fatigued. Major Wright’s Corps is to send its men into the old fort, some men to the old redoubt next to the old fort, and 70 men to the redoubt on the left wing on the road to Tattnel House. The militia is to assemble behind the barracks; the Light Infantry, Dragoons, and Carolina Light Horse as a reserve 200 paces behind the barracks; 50 men of the King’s Rangers under command of Colonel Brown are to go into the small redoubt on the right hand, the rest form a line in the direction of the large redoubt situated on the right hand. The Carolinas are to occupy the 2 large redoubts; the men belonging to the Battalion of the 60th Regiment into the redoubt on the right hand. The Grenadiers form a line on the left along the defences towards the barracks; the Hessians will occupy the whole space as far as the barracks completely. To the left of the barracks comes the 3rd Battalion, further to their left DeLancey and New York Volunteers; and to their left the 71st Regiment, forming one line down the defences towards the redoubt on the left wing, which borders upon the road to Tattnels (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W112-113).

In reality, when Prevost saw the way the battle was unfolding on the dark and foggy morning, he held the troops at their posts, with orders “…to charge them [the enemy] whenever they should attempt to penetrate and whilst entangled with the advanced redoubts which with the fire of the field artillery placed to support them, gave a good chance of putting the enemy into some confusion” (Kennedy 1974:100). Prevost showed no indication of having advanced knowledge that the attack was to focus on Spring Hill. In fact, on the contrary, he wrote that he expected the left, not the right, to be the target.

Troop movements for the October 9 battle actually began on October 8. D’Estaing held a Council of War to discuss the following day’s attack on Savannah. A detail of the French map by Ozane shows his depiction of the order of battle (Figure 38). By midnight d’Estaing had rearranged the troops into unfamiliar units within the columns, resulting in arguments among his staff and a disgruntled rank and file. This reorganization delayed the march by three hours. The guides charged with leading the French troops to the appointed location to join the American forces did not know the roads, terrain, or fortifications, slowing the march further (Lawrence 1979:69-70). At 2 a.m. the Americans were impatiently awaiting the late

The Battle

General Prevost’s plan for defense against a direct attack on the city was recorded in the Journal of the Garrison Regiment von Knoblauch. Prevost’s plan, as of September 9, 1779, exactly one month before the battle was as follows:
arrival of French troops. At 4 a.m. the French troops arrived at the American camp (Wilson 2005:160). The Americans then delayed the movement further, until finally almost 5,000 men in the two allied armies began the joint march (Wilson 2005:161).

The front files just began reaching the edge of the woods at dawn, the intended beginning of the attack. Instead the column formation was just beginning. By 5 a.m. the French reserve column, commanded by General Noailles, took its position on a slight rise just left [west] of the Jewish Cemetery, approximately 400 yards beyond the British fortifications (Wilson 2005:161). One half hour later, the five troop columns were not yet in line, with many still marching toward the assembly area. In spite of this, between 5:30 and 6:25 a.m. the feint on the central redoubt began, one and a half hours later than planned. The delayed attack allowed sunrise to reveal the early attacks as feints and illuminate the allied columns as targets for British artillery fire. Hearing the feint, d’Estaing began the attack on Spring Hill Redoubt with only the columns that had formed at that time. Leading the advance charge of 180 men were majors d’Erneville and Jean-Gaspard Vence of the Navy (Lawrence 1979:71). Colonel de Béthisy and the remainder of the troops followed.

They were met by “…a few troops of the Sixtieth Regiment, North and South Carolina Loyalists, marines, sailors, and a handful of dismounted provincial cavalry” (Lawrence 1979:71). The British later claimed that only 417 men defended the lines at this point; French forces claimed the British were “…heavily massed”. Documents indicate that Spring Hill was manned at that time by a total of 110 British troops, including 54 South Carolina Royalists, 28 dismounted light dragoons (who were formerly 71st Regiment infantrymen), and 28 men of the 4th Battalion of the 60th Regiment (Wilson 2005:163).

The planned unified attack of columns became a piecemeal attack of small battalions. After a substantial gap, during which the French received an artillery and musket onslaught, Dillon’s right column arrived to support d’Estaing’s troops. Dillon’s troops met the same fate, as
the allies were ordered not to fire their muskets until they took Spring Hill.

A company of Dillon’s (Dillon’s Irish Regiment led by Major Thomas Brown) broke through Spring Hill Redoubt. Meanwhile the French left column, under Baron de Stedingk’s command, advanced through the swamp to come to the left, loosing formation. As the column approached Augusta Road, it was almost annihilated by British fire. In the interim, the right column drifted to the left (away from British fire) and became entangled with the left column. The mass confusion caused many French troops to break away from the fire into the nearby woods and swamp. Soldiers failed to obey new officers appointed to command them only that morning (Wilson 2005:164).

The cavalry of Pulaski’s Legion advanced and tried to break through the abatis. Pulaski was mortally wounded, and his legion, under command of Lt. Colonel Daniel Horry of the South Carolina Light Dragoons, was pushed off to the left by enemy fire. The legion rode through the American column that had begun attacking Spring Hill Redoubt. This column was commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John Laurens of South Carolina and consisted of approximately 670 men, including his Corps of Light Infantry, grenadier company and 1st Battalion of the Charlestown Militia, and Francis Marion’s 2nd South Carolina Continental Regiment. Laurens was assigned to attack Carolina Redoubt, northwest of Spring Hill. Instead he went directly to the Spring Hill Redoubt when he saw the French being repulsed. His column experienced lighter artillery fire and reached the redoubt ditch where the troops engaged in bayonet fighting with the British, who were currently fighting the French in hand-to-hand combat (Wilson 2005:167).

Lieutenants in the 2nd South Carolina Regiment planted their colors on the Spring Hill Redoubt, only to be killed. New bearers planted the flags again, but met the same fate. In all, lieutenants Bush, Hume, Gray, and Sergeant William Jasper died placing the flag on the redoubt’s parapet.

Meanwhile Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh, commander of the second American column, asked d’Estaing for new orders based on changes to the plan of attack. McIntosh was told to move his column left of the chaotic columns and towards Carolina Redoubt. He brought his column into the woods where it became mired in the swamp while being fired on from both the Carolina and Spring Hill Redoubts. Retreat was ordered before McIntosh’s column emerged from the swamp (Wilson 2005:169).

As d’Estaing tried to rally troops for another Spring Hill assault, he was wounded again, more seriously. Dillon replaced d’Estaing’s second in command (Viscount de Fontanges) who was wounded and carried away. Dillon immediately called a retreat that resulted in a mass exodus from the battlefield into the swamp, with troops in total disarray. The British seized the opportunity to counterattack and followed the fleeing troops. Major General Viscount de Noailles ordered his reserve troops to advance from the cemetery area to cover retreat. This discouraged the British troops from following the retreating soldiers, but Noailles’ troops were fired upon and suffered casualties (Wilson 2005:169-170).

The following are excerpts of some accounts of soldiers and officers at the battle. Major Thomas Pinckney gave a recounting of Major General Lincoln’s orders of October 8 for the assault and of the battlefield events transpired on the following day:

…on that Day [October 8] we were ordered to parade near the Left of the Line at 1 o’clock of the next Morning, where we were to be joined by the French, and to march to the Attack in the following Order: — The French Troops were to be divided into three Columns, the Americans into two, the Heads of which were to be posted in a Line, with proper Intervals at the Edge of the Wood adjoining the open Space of five or six hundred Yards between it and the Enemy’s Line, and at 4 o’clock in the Morning, a little before Daylight, the whole was, on a Signal being given, to run forward and attack the Redoubts and Batteries opposed to their Front. The American Column of the Right, which adjoined the French, were to be preceded by Pulaski, with his Cavalry and the Cavalry of South Carolina, and were to follow the French until they approach the Edge of the Wood, when they were to break off and take their Position. This Column was composed of the Light Infantry under Col. Laurens, of the 2d Regiment of South Carolina, and the 1st Battalion of Charleston Militia. The second American Column consisted of the 1st and 5th South Carolina Regiments, commanded by Brigadier General M’Intosh of Georgia. A Corps of French West India Troops, under the Viscompte de Noailles, the Artillery, and some American Militia, formed the Reserve under General Lincoln (Hough 1866:164-170).

All historical accounts attest to the fact that the Battle of Savannah did not even remotely resemble the battle plan and was a fiasco. Major Thomas Pinckney recalled,
A faint [feint] Attack by the South Carolina Militia and Georgians, under Brigadier General Huger, was ordered to be made on the Enemy’s Left; but, instead of the French Troops being paraded so as to march off at 4 o’clock, it was near four before the Head of that Column reached our Front. The whole Army then marched towards the Skirt of the Wood in one long Column, and as they approached, the open Space were to break off into the different Columns, as ordered for the Attack. But, by the Time the first French Column had arrived at the open space, the Day had fairly broke, when Count d’Estaing, without waiting until the other Columns had arrived at their Position, placed himself at the Head of his first Column, and rushed forward to the Attack. But this Body was so severely galled by the Grape-shot from the Batteries as they advanced, and by both Grape-shot and Musketry when they reached the Abattis, that, in spite of the Effort of the Officers, the Column got into Confusion and broke away to their Left toward the Wood in that Direction; the second and the third French Columns shared successively the same Fate, having the additional Discouragement of seeing as they marched to the Attack, the Repulse and Loss of their Comrades who had preceded them. Count Pulaski, who, with the Cavalry, preceded the right Column of the Americans, proceeded gallantly until stopped by the Abattis, and before he could force through it, received his mortal Wound. In the mean Time, Colonel Laurens at the Head of the Light Infantry, followed by the 2d South Carolina Regiment, and 1st Battalion Charleston Militia, attacked the Spring Hill Redoubt, got into the Ditch and planted the Colours of the 2d Regiment on the Berm, but the Parapet was too high for them to scale it under so heavy a Fire, and after much Slaughter they were driven out of the Ditch.

Pinckney continued his account,

When General Pulaski was about to be removed from the Field, Colonel D. [Daniel] Horry, to whom the Command of the Cavalry devolved, asked what were his Directions. He answered, ‘follow my Lancers to whom I have given my order of Attack.’ But the Lancers were so severely galled by the Enemy’s Fire, that they also inclined off to the Left, and were followed by all the Cavalry, breaking through the American Column, who were attacking the Spring Hill Redoubt. By this Time the 2d American Column headed by Gen. M’Intosh, to which I was attached, arrived at the Foot of the Spring Hill Redoubt, and such a Scene of Confusion as there appeared is not often equalled. Col. Laurens had been separated from that Part of his Command that had not entered the Spring Hill Ditch by the Cavalry, who had borne it before them into the Swamp to the Left, and when we marched up, inquired if we had seen them. Count d’Estaing was wounded in the Arm, and endeavouring to rally his Men, a few of whom with a Drummer he had collected. General M’Intosh did not speak French, but desired me to inform the Commander-in-chief that his Column was fresh, and that he wished his Directions, where, under present Circumstances, he should make the Attack. The Count ordered that we should move more to the Left, and by no Means to interfere with the Troops he was endeavouring to rally; in pursuing this Direction we were thrown too much to the Left, and before we could reach Spring Hill Redoubt, we had to pass through Yamacraw Swamp, then wet and boggy, with the Galley at the Mouth annoying our left Flank with Grapeshot. While struggling through this Morass, the firing slackened, and it was reported that the whole Army had retired. I was sent by General M’Intosh to look out from the Spring Hill, where I found not an Assailant standing. On reporting this to the General, he ordered a Retreat, which was effected without much Loss, notwithstanding the heavy Fire of Grape-shot with which we were followed (Hough 1866:164-170).

French Captain de Terson summed up the debacle well in his journal when he wrote,

The order of attack, call it rather disorder…” (Kennedy 1974:20). Terson went on to describe the confusion that resulted in the carnage of the allied assault, “…M. Dillon’s and Baron Steding’s columns got mixed in with the vanguard. Dawn broke before we heard the sounds of the feint attack, then we fell on the redoubt in a rush. We easily bypassed the abatis, but we met stiff resistance at the redoubt. We fought for a long time without taking it….With sixty men from different regiments I stayed between the abatis and the redoubt [Spring Hill] for almost fifteen minutes, taking all the enemy fire and waiting for reinforcements. But many of the soldiers were already retreating. I did not know that, but when no one came to my support, I fell back too (Kennedy 1974:20).

A journal description by 2nd Lieutenant de Peyrelongue provides a similar account. After struggling through the marsh by Spring Hill Redoubt he wrote,

The scouts deserted us when the firing became a little brisk. The column on the right pressed on the one on the left in order to avoid the fire of a battery that was making things hot, so that the two attacks merged into one which was a great misfortune. We had to march in the open for 425 yards. Then we intended to cross the abatis, jump down into the trench, and clamber up the redoubt. As soon as the English saw us, they set us a very stiff fire against our troops and greatly retarded our march. Those who were stuck in the marsh not being able to follow, the column was broken and the first ones to reach the glacis were easily knocked down. The 600 rebels advanced to attack and added...
to the disorder. They looked like a crowd leaving church…Those who had overrun the trench were not supported and practically all killed. Some of them climbed up the redoubt from which they were soon dislodged. The troops gave way a little, were rallied, but they advanced only very apathetically. The enemy received reinforcements suddenly, his fire became stiffer, and everyone fled (Kennedy 1974:37).

Engineer O’Connor described a similar scene. He noted that at Spring Hill, “…the fire of the Scotch Regiment which protected the redoubt was particularly galling” (Kennedy 1974:68).

Prevost’s account states,

Under cover of the hollow they advanced in three columns, but having taken a wider circuit than they needed, and gone deeper into the bog, they neither came so early as intended, nor, I believe, entirely in the order. The attack, however, was very spirited, and for some time obstinately persevered in, particularly on the Ebenezer Road redoubt. Two stand of colors were actually planted and several of the assailants killed upon the parapet, but they met so determined a resistance, and the fire of three seamen batteries and the field pieces, taking them in almost every direction, was so severe that they were thrown into some disorder, at least at a stand. And at this most critical moment Major Glasier of the 60th Grenadiers and the marines, advancing rapidly from the lines, charged, it may be said, with a degree of fury. In an instant the ditches of the redoubt and a battery to its right in rear were cleared, the grenadiers charging head long into them, and the enemy drove in confusion over the abatis and into the swamp. On this occasion Captain Wickingham of the 2nd Battalion of 60th Grenadiers was greatly distinguished. On the advance of the grenadiers, three companies of the 2nd Battalion of the 71st ordered to sustain them, but thev these lay at an inconsiderable distance, and advanced with the usual ardour of that corps, so precipitate was the retreat of the enemy, they could not close with him. A considerable body or column more to their left was repelled in every attempt to deploy out of the hollow by the brisk and well directed fire of a militia redoubt. And Hamilton’s small corps of North Carolinians on its right moved there with a field piece to take them obliquely. A sailor battery still more to the right took them in flank directly (Kennedy 1974:101).

Dillon’s troops were almost able to take the Carolina Redoubt, northwest of Spring Hill Redoubt. In the confusion, however, only 50 of his men followed, and they received severe fire on their flank. They were not reinforced and had to retreat.

Even those soldiers on the outskirts of the battle were in imminent danger. For example, Private Christopher Garlington in Captain Daniel Mayczk’s Company of 2nd South Carolina Continentals and was recuperating from a serious illness. For that reason he assigned to guard the regiment’s baggage in the rear lines. This was no safe haven, however, as he recounted in his 1833 pension application, “A cannon ball passed near him, shook some spokes from the wagon wheel and killed a horse” (SCAR 2008 [Christopher Garlington S6874]).

The feints designed by the allies were uniform failures. The feint on the Central Redoubt and those from the siege trenches were poorly timed and not synchronized with the late arrival of the French and American troops positioning themselves to attack Spring Hill. These feints were virtually ignored by the British. The arrival of dawn aided the British in determining the plan of attack and likely helped them determine which attacks were feints based on the small number of troops involved. The feint from the Savannah River was a failure because the two vessels to conducting the bombardment did not arrive at their specified location in time. One was at anchor were it had been towed and the other had taken on serious amounts of water in its hold. The feint on the right, between Spring Hill and the river also did not materialize.

The Reserve Corps was stationed near the Jewish Cemetery, southwest of Spring Hill Redoubt. French Captain de Terson attributed the British reluctance to pursue the retreating enemy as resulting from the “good discipline” of the reserve corps that “so impressed the enemy that they did not dare pursue us” (Kennedy 1974:21). For the next several hours, allied soldiers continue to trickle into camps as they found their way out of the swamp and woods. The French carried their wounded to an ill-supplied hospital at Thunderbolt. Most that were wounded to any degree were abandoned or already dead (Wilson 2005:173).

The Aftermath of Battle

Prevost reported that following the battle at 10 a.m., French and American forces requested a truce to bury their dead. Prevost granted the truce “…for those who lay at a distance, or out of sight of our lines; those within or near the abatis [sic] we buried, number 203 on the right, on the left 28; and delivered 116 wounded prisoners, greatest part mortally. – A good many were buried by the enemy; many were self-buried in the mud of the swamp; and no doubt many were carried off (Prevost 1779b:293). Prevost sent a list of the British casualties to Clinton, which is transcribed in Table 5.
Table 5. "Return of the casualties in the different corps during the siege camp in the lines of Savannah Oct. 1779 (Henry Clinton Papers, Vol 73, Folder 73:24, William L. Clements Library)
The Dead and Wounded

The appalling number of deaths is vividly portrayed in this contemporary account by a British officer behind the lines,

...The Ditch was filled with Dead, and in Front, for 50 Yards, the Field was covered with Slain. Many hung dead and wounded on the Abattis; and for some hundred Yards without the Lines, the Plain was strewed with mangled Bodies, killed by our Grape and Langridge [bolts, nails and pieces of iron bound together] (Hough 1866:85-86).

While all accounts of wounded and dead are high (reflecting the true outcome of the battle), virtually every primary and secondary source contains conflicting and widely variable numbers of casualties in the American, French, and British armies. The range between these totals varies widely. Examples are cited here.

A letter from a loyalist citizen of Savannah, dated November 24, 1779, provided these casualty estimates: “The French lost 67 Officers killed, and 594 Privates killed and wounded. The Rebels lost 633” (Hough 1866:81). Another account by a British soldier differs, saying,

I posted back to my General (who is as brave as Caesar), and gave him the pleasing Account. Soon after a Flag came from d’Estaing for Liberty to bury their Dead, and requested their Wounded. ’Twas granted. Another Flag came from General Lincoln, who commanded the Rebels, for the same Purpose, which was also granted; and the whole Day was taken up in this Service...the Rebels lost over 500. The French honestly own they have lost in killed 800, and many wounded...Killed and Wounded on our Side during the Siege, 163 (Hough 1866:85-86).

A French account of the siege, published in the Paris Gazette on January 7, 1780, placed French casualties as follows: “Total of the Killed, 15 Officers, and 168 Subalterns and Soldiers. Total of the Wounded, 43 Officers, and 411 Subalterns and Soldiers” (Hough 1866:175). An account by the American Major Thomas Pinckney placed the losses in the siege as follows: “The loss of both Armies in killed and wounded amounted to 637 French and 457 Americans [attributed to Moultrie], 1000 [estimates attributed to Marshall]. The Irish Brigade in the French Service, and our 2d Regiment, particularly distinguished themselves and suffered most. The Loss of the British amounted only to fifty-five” (Hough 1866:168).

Many in America nervously awaited news of the outcome of the affair at Savannah. This news was communicated by conversations, personal correspondence and in newspapers, and the information was not always factual.

Edmund Pendleton wrote from his home at Edmundsbury plantation in Virginia to his nephew, Captain William Campbell, an officer in the northern theater, on November 9th with the disappointing news,

We had various ways an account of the surrender of the enemy’s troops in Georgia, but unfortunately it was not true – our army had surrendered [sic, surrounded] them & made regular approaches to within 150 yds of their walls, from whence they were bombarded with considerable effect & perhaps that way might have forced a surrender, but the order of our troops induced a general assault & our men marched bravely to the very walls, against a destructive cannonade, but were obliged to retreat with the loss of 50 kill’d & wounded – among the former was the brave Pulasky the only particular officer I have heard of – they retired to their lines & were very eager for an attack next morning, but the General restrained them & so our account left them –Count d’Estaing got wounded in the leg & arm (SCAR 2008 [William Campbell W4149]).

In addition to the multiple hundreds of men killed, large numbers were wounded but did not die of battle related injuries until decades after the war, while others suffered grievous wounds and lived to a surprisingly old age. Some of these injuries are evident in pension applications filed years later by veterans or their widows. In the small number of examples studied, saber cuts were the dominant wounds. This reinforces the concept that much of the fighting during the Battle of Savannah was hand-to-hand combat with sabers and bayonets rather than musket firing. It is possible, however, that the survival rate is greater for wounds inflicted by sabers, in contrast to mortal wounds from heavy artillery and musket fire. The saber attacks and counterattacks also serve to show which companies, battalions, and regiments got close enough to British defenses for hand-to-hand combat. The following are just a few examples of allied forces wounded in Savannah during the 1779 battle.

Uriah Odum was among the American troops in the Battle of Savannah. He was a Virginia that enlisted as a dragoon under Pulaski (Odam 1832). In 1832 Odum filed a pension application at the age of 74. He recounted,

We...attempted to take the city by storm, but were defeated with considerable slaughter. Pulaski, in his attempt to gain the rear of the enemy’s batteries was morally wounded, by a musket ball and this applicant saw him fall from his horse, and in the same charge received a saber cut upon the head, which covered him with gore, and the dragoon by whose hand my blow was given, received almost in the same moment...
a death blow from my own Lieutenant Bird Duponey [?]”. “Lieutenant Bird Duponey” is probably a horrendous transcription of Charles Baron de Frey, who later rose to Captain in what had been Pulaski’s Legion) (Pulaski’s Independent Legion 2008).

Captain Paul Bentelou is an example of a well-known casualty. Captain Bentelou, who commanded the 2nd Troop of Dragoons in Count Pulaski’s Legion suffered battle wounds while at Savannah that plagued him the remainder of his life. Bentelou returned to France to have his wounds treated. The French doctor reported,

the consequence of a wound in his left hand …he shall always retain a want of motion in the middle fingers, the sensor [?] nerves of which have been cut, as for the wound of the bayonet which he has received in his neck, it is my opinion that the cure of it is completed; but with regard to the wound in his left hand he will always retain a sort of lameness thro’ it (Weltner 1780).

If that weren’t enough, Bentelou was captured by the British on his return to America. The Continental Congress committee recommended Paul Bentelou get back pay and rations (Committees on Applications of Individuals 1781).

Captain Bentelou recalled the fate of his fellows in Pulaski’s Legion,

The enemy had been informed of his plan by spies. They knew the intended point of attack, and the direction in which the approach of the assailants was to be made. Accordingly, they collected all their force where it would be required, and, at the first alarm, opened a tremendous and deadly fire. Pulaski, impatient to know when he was to act, determined, after securing his cavalry under cover, as well as the ground would admits to go forward himself, and called to accompany him one of the captains of his legion, who is yet living, but far advanced in years. — They had proceeded only to a small distance, when they heard of the havoc produced in the swamp by the hostile batteries. d’Estaing himself was grievously wounded. Aware of the fatal effects which such a disaster was likely to produce on the spirits of French soldiers — and hoping that his presence would reanimate them, Pulaski rushed on to the scene of disorder and bloodshed. In his attempt to penetrate to the murderous spot, he received a swivel shot in the upper part of his right thigh; and the officer who had accompanied him, was, while on his way back, wounded by a musket ball (Bentalou 1978 [1824]:29).

Richard Clough Anderson was a Lieutenant Colonel in the 1st Virginia Continentals. He fought in numerous battles between 1776 and 1781. His widow, Sally described his wounds as follows, “…he received two wounds, one from an ounce ball, in New Jersey, the other from a saber, at Savannah” (Anderson 1848). Major Richard Clough Anderson, “sustained a sword thrust in the shoulder” at Savannah (Wilson 2005:277). Wilson speculated that Anderson may have been struck by Captain Tawse’s sword, since only commissioned officers carried swords and Clough’s unit was engaged in the assault on the Spring Hill Redoubt where Captain Tawse was in command (Wilson 2005:277). Wilson doesn’t mention, however that sergeants carried hangars and soldiers likely carried stilettos and dirks. His statement tying Tawse to Anderson’s wound, therefore, is somewhat shaky.

Private John Garretson served in Captain Peter Horry’s Company of the 2nd South Carolina Continental Regiment. Garretson participated in the assault on the Spring Hill Redoubt,

and there by the falling of a Stockade this declarant had his right arm broken, and at the same time received a rupture with which he has been afflicted ever since, and becomes more troublesome as this declarant advances in years and is often unable to stir from his house – And declarant further States that he was discharged solely on the ground of his being ruptured, and unfit for the Service, and this declarant now here produces his discharge, signed by Colonel Francis Marion (SCAR 2008 [John Garretson S35962]).

From Garretson’s description of his wounds, he was probably one of those who reached the Spring Hill Redoubt and attempted to scale its walls. The “falling of a Stockade” indicates the chaos and intensity of the action that took place at that point in the Spring Hill area of the battlefield.

Benjamin Munnerlyn was another soldier in the 2nd S.C. Continentals who was wounded at Savannah. According to his widow, Munnerlyn “was in the battle at that place [Savannah], and was wounded in the leg with a musket ball” (SCAR 2008 [Benjamin Munnerlyn W84790]).

Absalom Hooper was in Captain Jesse Baker’s Company of Colonel William Henderson’s Regiment of the South Carolina militia. The regiment was part of General Isaac Huger’s column on the east or central part of the battlefield. Hooper was wounded in the action but he survived the war. When he was 68 years old, he applied for a Federal pension based on his Revolutionary War record. He recalled marching with the American army to Savannah. His pension application stated, “in that Siege this declarant was wounded in the right arm by a musket”. In spite of his wound, he continued on to Charleston with the troops. (SCAR 2008 [Absalom Hooper W7813])
Private Edward Doyle served in Captain Levi Casey’s Company of Colonel Williams’ Regiment, in General Williamson’s Brigade of the South Carolina militia. He fought in the Siege of Savannah. In his pension claim, Doyle stated,

This assault was made about Day Break & the moon gave light. He with Capt. Casey, Col. Williams’ regiment & Gen. Williamson’s Brigade charged on the lower side of the Town. Gen. Úgee [Huger] & Gen. Williamson commanded the South Carolina Militia—Col. Marbrey who had formerly commanded the Light Horse was in the Charge with the Militia & saw him rallying & encouraging them in the assault. In this assault Capt. McClure of Col. Williams’ Regiment was mortally wounded in the shoulder. His arm was cut off & he died in a few days thereafter (SCAR 2008 [Edward Doyle S32216]).

It is unclear from Doyle’s description whether Captain McClure’s arm was cut off by a saber, a cannonball, or a surgeon. Williamson’s Brigade was part of General Isaac Huger’s force, which made the feint attacks on Savannah’s east and central sides.

Private Adam Gitsinger (Goetzinger) served in Captain Charles Sheppard’s Company of the German Fusiliers of Charleston. Gitsinger’s widow stated in an 1838 pension deposition that in the attack upon Savannah in October 1779, Adam, “received a wound in the arm and in the leg from musket balls, which confined him for some time to his bed”. Gitsinger survived the war, dying in 1807 (SCAR 2008 [Adam Gitsinger W8880]). The German Fusiliers were part of the Charleston militia. The two battalions of Charleston militia were divided on October 9, the 1st Battalion served under Lincoln’s command in the primary assault on the western defenses and the 2nd Battalion served under General Huger and participated in the feints on the central or eastern side of Savannah.

Private Joseph Gilmore was a private in the South Carolina militia. According to his widow, Private Gilmore fought in the battle at Savannah, where he was wounded in the right hand (SCAR [Joseph Gilmore W355]). His wounds did not prevent him from further service in the militia where he remained as late as October 1781. Gilmore died in 1825.

Some who were killed in the October 9th battle had their stories told by their compatriots. Captain William Davis commanded a company of Colonel Williams’ regiment of South Carolina militia. Upon arrival at Savannah, their company was assigned duty under Colonel Francis Marion, 2nd South Carolina Continentals and they apparently assisted in the assault at Spring Hill. Captain Davis was mortally wounded, as Private George Watts later stated, “Applicant was in the whole of the action and Captain Davis whilst standing by his side was mortally wounded by a grape shot and fell against him”, and, as Private John Martin, another soldier in Davis’ company later stated, “Capt. Davis was wounded and died of his wounds in three days after the battle” (SCAR [George Watts W1009]; and [John Martin S15935]). The testimony of privates Watts and Martin imply that their company was fighting in close proximity to Colonel Marin’s 2nd South Carolina Continental Regiment. Private Martin stated that he, “on the day of the battle was put under the immediate command of Genl. Francis Marion” (SCAR [John Martin S15935]). The order of battle, offered by Wilson however, locates the 62 men in Colonel Williams’ regiment in General Huger’s column on Savannah’s south central and east sides (Wilson 2005:177-178).

Other troops that were fortunate to have survived the battle and/or battle wounds were not lucky enough to avoid capture. Many of the wounded were captured by the British and put on prison ships in the Savannah River. Dr. John Love was a surgeon’s mate in Colonel White’s Regiment and escaped the British capture of Savannah in 1778. He returned in 1779 as a Lieutenant in one of the Carolina companies and joined in the attack to wrest Savannah away from the British. He was “wounded in the knee at the battle on Spring Hill” (Love 2008). Love’s widow recounted how John,“…after having received said wound, was taken prisoner by the Enemy and conveyed on board of a British vessel then lying near Savannah” (Love 2008).

Ironically, some aboard prison ships anchored at or near Savannah found escape during the siege and ensuing battle. William Algood was taken prisoner when Major Lane’s troops surrendered Fort Morris. He was then, “marched down to Savannah and transferred to the Whitley prison Ship where he remained nine months & five Days – when he made his Escape at the time the Siege of Savannah (SCAR 2008 [William Algood S41408 (fn 28 GA)])

**Allied Troop Movements After the Battle**

Even though the American allied forces were resoundingly beaten on October 9, the British remained concerned that Americans or French would attack again before they left the area. The Hessians recorded that by October 17, 1779,

The French were busied with embarking their wounded and artillery. Many deserters from the
enemy came over to the British army which during the siege had remained in the trenches every night up to now; a third of every Regiment or Corps stood under arms on the parapet ready for any emergency. On the morning of the 18th the outposts reported that the enemy had retreated... all the bridges had been destroyed and the French had gone on board at Augustine Creek, and the rebels were already so far away they could not be overtaken" (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W123). General Prevost and his officers decided against pursing the rebels because the British army was “…too greatly weakened through the long fatigues, the loss of so many killed and wounded and the large number of sick” (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W123). British forces in Savannah also were in need of clothing and forage as “…the Southern Detachment was not paid when we Left Savannah owing to the Scarcity of money (Turnbull 1779).

In reality, the French and American forces were in equal or worse shape than their British counterparts. The French Letter of Marque, La Théresa, was taken by the British ship the Perseus, on November 6, 1779. The H.M.S. Perseus was commanded by George Keith Elphinstone (Stevens 1859:225). La Théresa was taken off the coast of Virginia. An entry in La Théresa’s journal highlighted the bad condition of the French fleet,

They all agree the fleet is in very bad condition, not only as to provisions and water, but also as to Cables and Anchors: The Lively and others had none, the Prize lost four, and has now the Stream Anchor of the Guerine and the Cable of the Fier. They allege their misfortunes ashore to most of the people Being in the interest of Britain, and a General dislike to General Lincoln, because he is a Bostonian. It is said that they have left many cannon behind them, and the fleet suffered much thro’ fatigue and Sickness (William L. Clements Library 1779c).

The British fears of a renewed attack by the French and American troops were groundless. Unbeknownst to the British, the “Convention of Retreat from before Savannah between Count d’Estaing and Genl. Lincoln” was signed by both parties on October 13, 1779, and outlined their intent to leave the Savannah area as quickly as possible. The convention outlined four tenets. The first was to secure the artillery, stores, sick, and wounded. The second tenet had the American troops leaving on a night both generals would determine, “…in order to make as great a march as possible and leave the swamps between them and the English” (NYPL 1779a:[7505]). Meanwhile that night the French would leave their trenches, with the right going to camp at Brewton Hill and the left going to the “…post formerly occupied by Mr. de Rowrai[?]”. The third order of the agreement had the French maintain that position for 24 hours, allowing the American troops to retreat safely. The fourth and final tenet stated that

All the ostensible proceedings as well as the discourse of the two Generals—will be calculated to persuade their respective troops that they are to retreat together to Charles Town – and that no one may have reason to complain/ the superior officers are to be no better informed than the rest of the army—until the evidence of execution… (NYPL 1779a:[7505]).

By the day after the battle, the French were already dismantling their artillery batteries and moving them to the Brewton Hill landing (Wilson 2005:173). D’Estaing decided to depart from Causton’s Bluff rather than Thunderbolt. For seven days, from October 11-17, the French worked feverishly to move heavy artillery overland to Tybee Island and to transport the wounded there. By October 18, the Volunteers of San Domingo (French army rear guard) oversaw the last of the departures from Causton’s Bluff (Wilson 2005:174). The Americans under Major General Lincoln retraced their route northward to the area near New Ebenezer, where they briefly rested before crossing the Savannah River. On the 19th, the troops entered South Carolina. And by the following day, the last of the French troops were shuttled to the waiting fleet at Tybee Island (via St. Augustine Creek and the Savannah River) (Wilson 2005:174).

While British and American allies in the immediate area of Savannah knew the outcome of the Battle of Savannah immediately or shortly thereafter, the British Army headquartered in the New England area was tensely waiting for news. They did not know the victor of the battle nor where d’Estaing was planning to attack next.

The October 22, 1779 edition of the Pennsylvania Gazette, a Patriot newspaper, contained the latest news from Charleston about the situation at Savannah, but that news was almost a month old (September 29) and it was written prior to the October 9th attack. It read,

CHARLESTOWN (South Carolina) September 22.

Since our last, we have had no direct advices from either of the armies employed upon the Southern expedition. All we certainly know is, That Count d’Estaing did land as many troops as he thought necessary at Beulah [Beaulieu], nearly opposite to the Orphan House, 12 miles from Savannah, in the night between the 11th and 12th inst. and without the least opposition; and that a communication had been opened between him and General Lincoln; that General Lincoln had been joined by General
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Macintosh; and that the Head Quarters of our army, a week ago, were at Cherokee hill, 9 miles from Savannah: That General Count Pulaski was advanced with the cavalry, and had not only taken an advanced picket of the enemy, but also surprised one of their captains and three privates at Ebenezer. That Colonel Maitland had abandoned Port Royal Island, with the whole force he had there, on the 12th inst. after breaking off the trunnions from the cannon, and having buried upwards of 200 men, leaving behind also 300 negroes, for want of means of transportation: That his embarkation was made rather hastily, on board the Vigilante, the Gallies, and some other small craft, with an intent to push through Skull Creek, and join General Prevost at Savannah: But, it is doubted whether he has been able to effect that junction: it is rather believed, that his vessels are blocked up in Skull Creek, and his troops confined to Hilton Head Island; the troops he embarked are said to amount to between 6 and 700, 200 of them sick and wounded; some say 600 effectives and about 400 invalids.... The enemy, before they quitted their post at Ebenezer, burnt their magazine there. The smallpox, we are told, rages most violently among the Creek Indians at present, so that they will hardly be able to do anything for their British brothers in this campaign.

Just as this paper was going to press, letters were received from the camp of the Charlestown militia, dated at Zubly Ferry last Friday. The following is an extract of one of them:

-- ‘We reached here yesterday, are to cross Savannah river this day at noon, and suppose shall join Gen. Lincoln army tomorrow. The news from the other side is chiefly as follows, viz. That Count d’Estaing had landed two detachments, one at Brevett plantation, with 36 pieces of brass cannon, the other at Girardeau point: That the active and enterprising General Count Pulaski, with the cavalry, had so thoroughly cleared the way, and broke up all the enemy advanced posts, as to afford Major General Lincoln the opportunity of an interview with the French General at the Orphan house on the 16th, when and where the plan of operations was settled: That some of the French men of war had got into the harbour, and possessed themselves of all the British shipping below Brewton, amongst them the Fowey man of war, which, tho’ grounded, had all been got off and into the fleet: That the fortifications at Savannah were but trifling, consisting only of 9 redoubts (no lines) and abbatis: That the force to defend these consisted of about 1000 regulars, and 1,200 militia, refugees and protection gentry: That Colonel Maitland had not been able to effect a junction with General Prevost, and it was supposed had been repulsed in an attempt to get through Skull creek yesterday morning, when we heard a heavy cannonade: That the enemy soldiery, in general, were much dissatisfied; and though it was pretended that Savannah would be defended, even the officers gave their opinions publicly that it must capitulate.

Sept. 29. On Saturday last the Marquis de Bretigny, who went lately in one of the gallies of this State to serve against the enemy in Georgia, brought into this port a large prize sloop from New Providence, mounting four guns, which he boarded in a boat with 8 men, as she came to anchor in Savannah river.

We have abundance of intelligence from the American army commanded by the Honorable Major General Lincoln, acting in conjunction, in Georgia, with that of his Most Christian Majesty (our great and most respectable Ally) under the command of his Excellency General Count d’Estaing - But, as it is likely that a general attack upon Savannah cannot be made before tomorrow or next day (bad weather, excessive bad roads, and the many difficulties that have attended the bringing up of heavy cannon and mortars, from a great distance, having prolonged that event) we shall defer giving particulars till the fate of the State of Georgia be decided, which is not doubted will be in a few days.

The most remarkable occurrence in that quarter has been, - a sortie made last Friday morning, upon a covering party of about 200 French, to a battery erecting near the barracks, by 200 British Light Infantry, commanded by Capt. Campbell, who were repulsed and pursued into their redoubts, with the loss of 53 men, amongst them Capt. Campbell, Lieut. McPherson (not long since a prisoner here) and another officer, and near 100 wounded: Our Ally loss is said to be 26 killed and 84 wounded, amongst these ten officers. The eagerness and impetuosity of the French was so great, that, instead of waiting for the enemy, they leaped out of their trenches, attacked and pursued them, using chiefly the bayonet, till they were gallied by the cannon from the British redoubts, by which they sustained their greatest loss.

A gentleman from the Southward says he saw, last Sunday, a number of people and tents, upon the small island called Buck Island; supposed to be the sick and wounded which Col. Maitland removed from Port Royal, and had not been able to get into Georgia...” (The Pennsylvania Gazette 1779a).

On October 26, 1779, George Washington wrote from his headquarters at West Point to General Benjamin Lincoln,

We are most anxiously waiting for accounts from the Southward having received no official intelligence.
from thence since the 7th of September which barely announced Count d’Estaing’s arrival upon the Coast... The Enemy by their late movements seem apprehensive of a visit from the Count – on the 21st they evacuated their Posts at Kings Ferry and have fallen down to New York. I have not heard from Rhode Island since the 15th— they were then to every appearance preparing for an evacuation of that Post also (Bowden 1907).

General Lincoln wrote back to General Washington with the disappointing news of the defeat. Lincoln also wrote to Congress in Philadelphia and that letter was published in the November 17, 1779 edition. In it Washington not only summarized the events which transpire, but also tried to mend Franco-American alliance that had frayed during the the Siege and Battle of Savannah. Lincoln wrote,

PHILADELPHIA

SIR, Charlestown, October 22, 1779.

IN my last of the 5th ultimo, I had the honour of informing Congress that Count d’Estaing was arrived off Savannah:

Orders were immediately given for assembling the troops - they reached Zubly ferry, and its vicinity, on the 11th, and some were thrown over - the 12th and 13th were spent in crossing the troops and baggage, which was effected though not without great fatigue, from the want of boats, and badness of the roads through a deep swamp of near three miles, in which are many large creeks - the bridges over them the enemy had broken down. We encamped on the heights of Ebenezer, 23 miles from Savannah, and were there joined by the troops from Augusta under General McIntosh. The 14th, not being able to ascertain whether the Count had yet landed his troops, though several express had been sent for that purpose, we remained encamped. On the 15th, being advised that the Count had yet landed his troops, though several express had been sent for that purpose, we remained encamped. On the 15th, being advised that the Count had disembarked part of his troops, and that he would that night take post nine miles from Savannah, we moved and encamped at Cherokee hill, nine miles from the town. The 16th we formed a junction before Savannah. After reconnoitering the enemyworks, finding the town well covered, and knowing their determination to defend it, it was deemed necessary to make some approaches, and try the effects of artillery. From the 18th to the 23d we were employed in landing and getting up the heavy ordnance and stores; a work of difficulty, from the want of proper wheels to transport them, the cannon being on ship carriages. On the evening of the 23d ground was broke, and on the 5th inst. the batteries of 33 cannon and nine mortars were opened on the enemy, and continued, with intervals, until the 8th, without the wished effect. The period having long since elapsed, which the Count had assigned for this expedition, and the engineers informing him that much more time must be spent, if he expected to reduce the garrison by regular approaches, and his longer stay being impossible --- matters were reduced to the alternative of raising the siege immediately, and giving up all thoughts of conquest, or attempting the garrison by assault; the latter was agreed on, and in the morning of the 9th the attack was made - it proved unsuccessful; we were repulsed with some loss.

When the Count first arrived, he informed us that he could remain on shore eight days only; he had spent four times that number, his departure therefore became indispensable, and to re-embark his ordnance and stores claimed his next attention; this was compleated on the 18th.

The same evening, having previously sent off our sick, wounded, and heavy baggage, the American troops left the ground, reached Zubly ferry the next morning, recrossed, and encamped that night in Carolina. The French troops encamped on the night of the 18th, about two miles from Savannah; they were after 24 hours to re-embark at Kincaid landing.

Our disappointment is great, and what adds much to our sense of it, is the loss of a number of brave officers and men; among them, the late intrepid Count Pulaski.

Count d’Estaing has undoubtedly the interest of America much at heart. This he has evidenced by coming to our assistance, by his constant attention during the siege, his undertaking to reduce the enemy by assault, when he dispaired of effecting it otherwise, and by bravely putting himself at the head of his troops, and leading them to the attack; in our service he has freely bled; I feel much for him, for while he is suffering the distresses of painful wounds, he has to combat chagrin. I hope he will be consoled by an assurance, that, although he has not succeeded according to his wishes, and those of America, we regard with high approbation his intentions to serve us, and that his want of success will not lessen our ideas of his merit.

I should have enclosed a list of the killed and wounded in the last action; but the Adjutant General, in whose hands they are, though on his way, is not arrived in town… (The Pennsylvania Gazette 1779b).
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While Congress and Pennsylvanians received news of the outcome of the Battle of Savannah by just after mid-November many in Britain were unaware of the crown’s victory. General Clinton may have heard rumors of the battle and its outcome; however he had yet to receive official reports from his officers in the field. D’Estaing’s blockade of Georgia prevented the flow of information to British forces outside of the area, including to Clinton in New York. The blockade also made incoming messages difficult, as it captured incoming vessels containing British intelligence, orders, and general correspondence. As late as a month after the battle, General Clinton wrote to Lord Germain in England:

The accounts from the Southward are yet so vague that it is not possible to conclude what may have been the fate of Georgia. The Admiral has sent a Cruizer with Orders to proceed to Savannah, and Major General Leslie sails by this opportunity. He goes to relieve Major General Prevost who has sometime since requested permission to resign his Command.

The Reduction of South Carolina and the Operation relative to it in Chesapeak Bay are still in view; but tho’ we do not relax in every preparatory measure, Yet it cannot be thought adviseable to put to Sea until it is ascertained where Count d’Estaing’s Squadron is, or that we know Rear Admiral Parker to have followed him to this Coast. (Clinton 1779a)

Clinton was anxious for word about the battle and wrote to Marriot Arbuthnot in October 1779. He penned,

Sir

At our last meeting you were so good to say that you would prevail on the merchants to send out privateers runners, etc to endeavour to push home war[d] to Tybee for information; if Ships, Gallies & troops that move with Col. Maitland at Beaufort got safe to Savannah I think Georgia may be saved but it will be necessary to send some Reinforcements there that however cannot be helped till we have some accounts … (Clinton 1779f).

Finally, Clinton received word of the American and French defeat at Savannah. News of the British victory came by letters from Florida Governor Tonyn and Lt. Col. Fuser (commander of the garrison at St. Augustine) sent aboard a privateer (Clinton 1779b). Tonyn wrote the letter November 18, but it took some time for it to travel from Florida to New York. Word spread across Europe, and the Franco-American defeat became fodder for conversation and caricature (Figure 39).

As late as December 15, over two months after the Battle of Savannah, General Clinton still did not know much about d’Estaing’s plan for his flotilla and what parts of North America he might target next. On that day Clinton wrote to Lord George Germain,

My Lord We have remained in ignorance of the measures taken by Count d’Estaing subsequent to his late attempt upon Savannah. Some Ships of his Squadron are said to be in Chesapeak bay and Some Frigates at Charlestown, but neither of these facts are pointedly related in any information received as yet. Every disposition is made for the Embarkation of the Force destined to Act in Carolina, and I wait in anxious Suspence for further Accounts of the French Fleet. Until we have these, it is thought too hazardous to proceed (Clinton 1779e).

By this time, accounts written shortly after the battle were reaching destinations across the country. One such account, by Peter Dubois written in October 1779, reported,
We have Just Received Accounts from the Southward of the Total Route & defeat of Lincoln’s Army. It is further asserted that their famous Partisan Count Polaski is killed. I think you may Rely upon the Account tho’ no particulars have as Yet Transpired It is Said The Count d’Estaing’s fleet is gone to The West Indies. Many Vessels are loading flour at Philadelphia for The French W. Indies. The Army are upon the move. Wayne is at Requeghenoack [?] the time for which the Most of his men were Enlisted is Expired and Expiring. Soon every means is used to Induce them To Enlist again but with Little Effect. General dissatisfaction prevails among them. And if the Country Between Pauls Hook & Hackinsack could be scoured of the Patroling parties of militia, that constant Scout in those woods. Great Numbers would probably desert from Wayne’s Corps (Dubois 1779).

Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

105

Chapter 4. History

Savannah Recovered From the Battle

The number of British troops in Georgia on November 15, 1779 totaled 3,469, according to a return filed by Oliver DeLancey in New York the following month (William L. Clements Library 1779d). This represented 13% of the total number (27,530) of British-controlled forces in North America. In contrast, a secret coded letter sent on December 3, 1779, indicated that Benjamin Lincoln’s patriot forces at that time totaled 1,000 men “…and the utmost he will be able to muster will not make his Garrison to exceed four thousand armed men” (Stansbury 1779).

British soldiers remaining in Savannah immediately following the battle fared well, judging by the account of Ensign Moses Buffington, in the South Carolina Royalists. Two months after the battle he reported,

…we are in grate Spirits and hops to Return to our homes again in a short time/We have as good wheat Bread and porke and Butter and Rum and a great Plenty of it as perhaps Ever was made use of…goods is very plenty here although Midling deer as is all ways the laye in war time” (Buffington 1779). In spite of the variety of food and generous portions, however, Buffington missed home cooking, lamenting that “…I have not Eaten one mouthful of Corn Bread Sense I Left home… (Buffington 1779).

Other residents tried to return to as much normalcy as possible during the war. This included African Americans and whites. The African American preacher, David George lived with his wife Phillis, and their children Jesse, David, and Ginny (Cole and Braisted 2000). All were free blacks. Throughout his and his family’s tenure in Savannah from 1779 until at least 1781, the family found support in British officials including Georgia’s Governor Wright and Alured Clark. David contracted small pox and his wife Phillis supported the family by washing clothes for General Clinton’s forces in the area (Cole and Braisted 2000). David eventually moved to a hut in Savannah and operated a butcher’s stall for two years [probably 1780-1782]. David routinely received passes to allow him to travel in and out of town without being harassed by whites. In December of 1779, Wright issued a pass

let to David George a free Negro Man my House Garden and Field situate two Miles from Savannah near the little Ogeechee. Any person Molesting or disturbing him in the possession of the premises will be prosecuted to the Utmest riger of the Law (Cole and Braisted 2000).

Clark issued passes in 1780 and 1781 allowing David to travel the Savannah area unmolested.

1780 to War’s End

Savannah remained in British control following the 1779 Battle of Savannah. The American attack on British Lieutenant Colonel Brown’s post in Augusta in the fall of 1780, however, made soldiers and Tory civilians in Savannah fearful that American forces would return to Savannah. There was talk in Savannah among the officers and Engineer Moncrief of strengthening Savannah’s defenses again at this time. Lieutenant General Alured Clark wrote to Lord Cornwallis in support of this idea (Cornwallis Papers P.R.O. 30/11/3 16-187).

Meanwhile, the British continued to use the port of Savannah to move goods and people, and to supply the military. Vessels carried large amounts of bread, beef, pork, butter, peas, rice, oatmeal, and rum, in addition to soldiers and other passengers. For example, on one day in February, 1780, British vessels off of Tybee Island included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Thomas Brown</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>Baflour</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>John Rankin</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munificence</td>
<td>Thos Elding</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Briton</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menerva</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amity</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Eel</td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(William L. Clements Library 1780b)
British commanders continued to worry about the state of defenses in Savannah, particularly as the war dragged on without a clear British victory in sight. From his headquarters in Charleston, General Leslie directed British engineer James Moncrief to strengthen Georgia’s defenses. In December of 1781, Moncrief was stationed in Charleston and wrote to his sub-engineer in Savannah, Lieutenant Andrew Durnford. Moncrief directed Durnford as follows,

"At the request of General Leslie I am to give you my opinion, what strikes me will strengthen the works at Savannah on the present critical situation, which is as follows. To close all the flanking works, by making them into close Redoubts, opening Embrazures into the Rear so as to see into the Town; these works ought to be Frazed if Possible, should the Enemy attempt to Pass between them, All the Cavalry and a Corps of picked Infantry as a Reserve should attack them, the moment the real attack is discovered (Moncrief 1781)."

While the British had been quick to gloat over their victory at the Battle of Savannah, which was soon followed by the British capture of Charleston, South Carolina, the tide of war eventually turned against them at Yorktown in October 1781. Georgia and South Carolina remained a war zone following Yorktown, however, and Savannah remained a British headquarters during this period.

On July 11, 1782, fearing the advancing American Army of General Anthony Wayne, the British authorities handed over the keys to Savannah to the American Colonel Henry Jackson without major incident and evacuated their troops and many Loyalists to St. Augustine, Florida. Savannah remained in Patriot control from this time through the end of the war.

In 1782 many British troops were regrouping in East Florida. Engineer James Moncrief wrote to Assistant Engineer John Wilson (of the 71st Highlanders) regarding the Negros employed within the Engineering Department. In October, Moncrief wrote,

"It has been reported to me, that a considerable number of negros have been sent from Georgia, to East Florida at the Evacuation of Savannah, who were employed in the Engineer department—you will inquire into this matter, and send an exact list of their number, names, and owners—They may be kept employed on the works until the commander in Chiefs directions are known on that head (Moncrief 1782)."

David George, the African American living with his family in Savannah at the time of the siege and battle, took his family to Charleston in 1782 and was able to board a ship containing 200 white Loyalists fleeing the Patriots and sailing to Halifax, Nova Scotia (Davidson 2007). (George eventually helped found a colony of black Loyalists and others in Sierra Leone.)

The Hessians described how they departed Savannah on July 11, 1782,

"The whole garrison marched out of Savannah under command of General [Alured] Clarke as far as beneath Fort Prevost, where some 60 large boats were in readiness in which they embarked (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W162)."

Officers and soldiers of the von Knoblauch Regiment “...occupied the two redoubts to the right and left of the Fort, and had to remain there till the General had arranged everything” (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W162). The 60 boats arrived at Tybee Island on July 12 and the soldiers disembarked and encamped, with the von Knoblauch Regiment next to the lighthouse. From there, fleets began leaving for the West Indies carrying “...the militia and the King’s negros”; for St. Augustine carrying “...the Indians on board who had served in the British army, together with the crackers”; and for New York carrying the Hessians of the von Knoblauch Regiment and the remainder of the brigade (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W162).

On July 12, 1782, General Anthony Wayne reported from Savannah that,

"The British Garrison evacuated this place yesterday at 12:00 o’clock leaving the works, & town, perfect for which the inhabitants are much obligated to that worthy and humane officer Brigd Genl. Clarke. It is the prevailing opinion that the Enemy will continue at Tybee for ten or twelve days (Wayne 1782)."

**Historical Significance of the Battle of Savannah**

Sir Henry Clinton realized the dire implications if Savannah was to fall to the American allied forces. He wrote that if Maitland was,

"taken at Beaufort with the elite of that army, all the frigates and galleys—then Georgia must soon be reduced and St. Augustine follow….for all the force of this [British] army and navy will find it a difficult task to make head in that country of inland navigation without galleys, flat boats, etc. (Clinton 1779g)."

The significance of the Battle of Savannah and a victory in 1782 has been widely noted as a turning point in the American Revolutionary War. The city of Savannah remains a significant site in the history of the United States, commemorating the courage and sacrifice of those who fought and lived there during the war.
or defeat there is reflected in Clinton words, “Should Georgia be lost I shall have little hope of recovering that Province and also of reducing and Arming South Carolina” (Clinton 1779a). Prevost echoed the importance of Georgia following his victory at the Battle of Savannah. Prevost wrote,

And my real opinion, now more than ever, is that if the Carolinans are not powerfully reinforced from the northward or from Europe, they will not make a great resistance to any adequate force that is sent against them (Kennedy 1974:105).

Anthony Stokes, the Chief Justice of Georgia, held this sentiment as well, claiming after the victory that Savannah was, “…the key of the southern provinces and the Gibraltar of the Gulf passage” (Kennedy 1974:108).

Others supported the view that possession of Savannah was integral to an overall victory in the war. Hessian Captain Heinrichs penned this opinion in his diary,

Why did the English not fortify the city strongly before the enemy was upon it, since whoever is in possession of it is master of Georgia?...Even if they [the French] had no such right to these provinces, they could have been expected there for the following reasons: 1. to make Charleston all the safer and stronger; 2. to hurt the West India trade of the English and to strengthen their own” (Alexander 1938:161).

Heinrichs went on to explain the trade rationale further by emphasizing that,

…the current from the Gulf of Florida compels all fleets on the return voyage from Havana and the Windward Islands to sail along the American coast as far as Cape Hatteras... making the harbors of Savannah and Charleston extremely important (Alexander 1938:163).
Chapter 5. Archeological Results and Integrated Archeological and Historical Interpretation

Material Culture

Archeologists excavated a total of 9,706 artifacts from the Savannah project; 8,108 in Test Units 1-7 and 1,598 in shovel tests. Only a small number of shovel tests were excavated. Many of them were in Cuyler, Dixon, and Myers parks and encountered dense nineteenth century deposits. The 8,108 artifacts from test units were grouped into recognized artifact classifications. Subtracting the bone count (n=1,650), miscellaneous metals (n=1,229), and counted brick (n=669) results in a total of 4,560 artifacts in the test units. The total number of artifacts for artifact classification is as follows: Kitchen (n=2,182), Architecture (n=1,489), Activities (n=793), Tobacco (n=57), Clothing (n=44), Arms (n=31), Personal (n=28), and Furniture (n=3). The percentages of each classification type within the 4,560 artifacts in Test Units 1-7 are as follows: Kitchen (48%), Architecture (33%), Activities (17%), Tobacco (1%), Clothing (1%), Arms (0.7%), Personal (0.6%), and Furniture (0.06%). Percentages are rounded up. A variety of artifacts was recovered from six sites during this project, a few of these artifact types will be discussed in greater detail here. This includes Arms, metal Clothing, Ceramics, and Activities artifacts.

Arms artifacts include lead balls, gunflints, and gun parts. While no cannonballs were identified, they are discussed in relation to the overwhelming numbers mentioned in the primary documents and in reference to one examined from the yard of a Savannah resident.

Artillery, Guns and Projectiles

Primary documents describe the tremendous amount of carcass (incendiary projectiles used to set fire to ships or building), mortars, cannonballs, and shrapnel-filled shells raining down on Savannah during the siege. The British responded by firing similar ammunition on American and French sorties during the siege and then later during the October 9 battle. The siege and battle included the use of mortars, cannon, and howitzers. Mortars were especially useful to besiegers, since they shot explosive projectiles in high arcs that could go well over the walls and defensive works and into the town and artillery posts surrounding the town. These arcs were the result of the mortars’ fixed angle of 45 degrees. The amount of gunpowder used in the charge determined the target location. Small mortars, with a 4 ²/5 inch bore, were called coehorns. Mortars were important weapons for terrorizing the besieged, since their shells often bounced around inside a fortification before exploding.

Cannon operated on the opposite principal of mortars and were pointed (moved left or right) and the barrel elevated (up or down) for each target, using a fixed charge based on the projectile size. Cannon were operated at a much lower barrel angle than mortars and were often used to fire on lines of attacking troops. Guns, or cannon, had smooth bores and were muzzle-loaded. They were often put at a four degree angle. This relatively shallow elevation maximized the amount of damage that could be inflicted on a large number of infantry and horses from a single projectile, contrasted with less damage from a steeply falling, bouncing cannonball. Cannons were made of
iron or bronze, each raw material having its benefits and weaknesses.

Soldiers used a variety of projectiles in cannon. The most recognized by the public today were solid, cast iron cannonballs. The farther the range set for a cannon, the less effective the shot since it resulted in a much lower velocity cannonball that ricocheted rather than penetrated its intended target. Cannon ranged in various size and were identified by the weight of the solid shot they could fire, such as a “3 pounder” or a “6 pounder”. Bombs, or hollow, exploding shells filled with gunpowder, were another type of projectile used in cannon. Other artillery projectiles commonly used during the American Revolution included langridge, canister, case, and grape shot. These were “scatter shot” projectiles having a similar effect to a shotgun, and were effective anti-personnel ammunition. Langridge incorporated rocks, nails, and other metal objects. Canister contained iron balls and case shot had lead balls. Canister and case shot were deadly up to 200-300 yards. Grape shot projectiles were housed in a canvas bag with a wooden base and cover connected by a metal rod, rather than the metal cylinders used in canister and grape shot. Grape shot was larger than musket balls. A combination of case and grape shot could be lethal up to 600 yards (Muller 1780 [2005], American Revolution 2008).

Howitzers were short-barreled, large caliber guns that fired hollow, gunpowder-filled shells that exploded (American Revolution 2008). The elevation of a howitzer could be modified up to a 20 degree angle. Howitzers were often more easily mobile than large cannons.

Cannon Balls in Savannah

There are several accounts of Revolutionary War cannonball discoveries in yards in downtown Savannah. Given the enormous number of projectiles fired during the September and October 1779 siege, this is not surprising. Some accounts of civilians coping with cannonball bombardment were mentioned in the previous history section of this report. A few others are examined here, as they relate to the project.

Two local residents provide examples of discovering cannonballs in Savannah. One resident, Mr. Rolfe Glover, visited the project’s archeological excavations in Madison Square in April. He told archeologists about a cannonball he found in his yard that was later examined by the city bomb squad and found to be inert (Personal communication, Mr. Rolfe Glover, April 16, 2008). Mr. Glover showed the artifact to project archeologists. The projectile appears to be a 6 pounder solid shot that bore a “V” British mark known as a “Broad Arrow” (Figure 40). It came from the 100 block of East Jones Street, which would have been outside the British defenses in 1779. Another Savannah resident mentioned finding a cannonball in the yard of her house on Oglethorpe Avenue (Personal Communication, Laura Kessler, April 22, 2008). That projectile would have been within the British defenses in 1779, which suggests that it was fired by the French or Americans, or possibly was an unfired British round. The authors did not examine this artifact for the present study.

Primary documents describe cannonball or shell impacts to virtually all of the houses in Savannah during the siege bombardment. A specific example involves the house occupied by the David George family. While in Savannah, “…a cannonball came through the roof of the George home” (Davidson 2007). Numerous similar examples exist and some of them were recounted in Chapter 4 of this report.

A lone brick house currently stands as a testament to the many houses that dotted Savannah in the American Revolution and were hit with projectiles during the October 9th battle and/or preceding siege. Documentary evidence from files at the National Register of Historic Places indicates that several cannon balls, probably those fired from American or French artillery positions south of Savannah, were retrieved from inside this brick dwelling at 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue (formerly South Broad Street), sometime prior to 1919. These battle relics were reported as being in the possession of the Georgia Historical Society. This information is consistent with the known firing positions as indicated on contemporary battle maps.

That house on Oglethorpe Avenue, now used as a law office, is located one lot east of Drayton Street. The house was built ca. 1758-1762 and is purported to be the first
brick dwelling in town. During the American Revolution, the building was associated with the Eppinger family, who operated a tavern. The building was known in 1783 as “Eppinger’s Long Room” (Shreck’s list n.d., in NRHP 1966; Savannah Morning News 1951).

The dwelling may have been the home of Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh after 1782 until his death in 1808, according to local lore, although his ownership is unconfirmed by a preliminary review of lot ownership records. An illustration of this dwelling was including in a discussion of the Revolutionary War engagements at Savannah by Benson Lossing. He visited Savannah in 1852 and identified the house as the dwelling of General McIntosh (Lossing 1852). He noted that it was the third house east of Drayton on South Broad Street [Oglethorpe Avenue], between Drayton and Abercorn Streets. McIntosh’s family, refugees in Savannah at the time of the 1779 siege and bombardment, was probably not living in this house at the time of the battle, but were in another dwelling that faced Telfair Square (Savannah Morning News 1956).

In 1854, the dwelling was acquired by John D. Robinson, Sr., and the property remained associated with the Robinsons’ business interests until the late 1950s, when it was conveyed to the newly formed Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc. (Savannah Morning News 1950; Hunter 1956). In 1959 the Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc. sold the property to its current owner.

The best evidence in regards to the involvement of the brick dwelling at 110 East Oglethorpe Avenue in the 1779 Siege comes from the correspondence of Ana R. de Janer. She was a former occupant of the house and daughter of owner John Robinson. De Janer provided considerable information about the history of the dwelling in a letter to her brother, Charles V. Robinson, dated July 30, 1919. It was during the Robinson family’s period of ownership that the building was raised from a two-story to three-story dwelling and many other improvements were made. In that letter she remarked, “If I were an Astor or a Vanderbilt I would be only too proud to restore the house to its exact conditions of one hundred years ago, oblige the Georgia Historical Society to return the letters, etc. and cannon balls discovered in the spaces between floors of bedrooms and ceiling of parlor, then make a gift of all to Savannah so that Tourists could tread the same timbers that George Washington, Lafayette and perhaps Tomochichi and the Yamacraw Indian Chiefs when saluting the Americans” (NRHP 1966).

Among the items in the collection held by the Coastal Heritage Society is a section of a wall from another Savannah residence, which contains a hole reportedly created by a cannonball fired during the 1779 Siege of Savannah. This architectural relic has an interesting pedigree. Mahla Kent Wilson, great-granddaughter of Ezra Kent, wrote a short history of the Kent house in 1979. Her writings were included as supporting documentation when the section of wall was donated by her son, Randolph Kent Wilson, Sr., to the Coastal Heritage Society (Wilson 1979).

In 1889 Adelaide Wilson provided this history of the building:

Down on the west side of West Broad Street [MLK Jr. Blvd.], opposite St. Julian Street stands an old house, the only one known to bear a mark of the siege of 1779. The wooden part of the house is two stories high on a brick basement in the front, as it now stands, and just about on a level with the floor of the second story there is a hole in the weather-boarding six inches across. This was made by an American or French cannon, tradition says, on the last day of the siege. At that time the house stood on Trinity church site, the west side of Telfair place and belonged to the Sheftall family, and was probably built by one of them. Its age is not known, but it must be nearly one hundred and fifty years old. All of the wood in the house was hewed or sawed with a small handsaw—then there were no large saws in the country. The nails are hand-made and strong, and the pine has become so hard it is almost impossible to drive a nail into it. It would easily knock off the edge of a saw. Its present owner, Mr. A. Kent, whose grandfather bought and moved into it where it now stands, thirty or more years ago, says that he once started to put on a new piece of weather-boarding to hide the hole but that his grandfather, Mr. Ezra Kent, prevented him. The gaping souvenir was untouched. Let it remain so till the remorseless hand of Progress levels those well seasoned timbers. Then let that historic plank be carefully treasured as relics of that by-gone day (Wilson 1889:68-69).

The cannonball house story was retold over the years. Sholes (1900) repeated the story of the Kent house and the cannonball in his chronology of Savannah. He also included a photograph of the house as it stood on West Broad Street. In his History of Savannah and South Georgia, William Harden described the house around 1916, which was then the Kent family home, and its history. Harden noted that Alfred Kent,
was born March 31, 1823, on West Broad street, opposite the head of St. Julian street, this part of the city having part of the Kent family since the early part of the nineteenth century. His parents were Ezra and Harriet (Vallotton) Kent, the latter having been the daughter of James Vallotton of South Carolina. Ezra Kent was born in Rhode Island in 1793 and came to Savannah about 1819. He was a wheelwright by trade and established in 1820 the business that was after his death continued by his son. After the custom of earlier days, the home and the shop were adjacent, and during all the years that the wheelwright and carriage business was carried on by the Kents, father and son, the work place adjoined the residence on West Broad street. This residence (No. 35 West Broad street), which until recently was occupied as a home by William Alfred Kent, the son of Alfred Kent, is one of the historic structures of Savannah. It is one hundred and fifty years old, one of the oldest houses in the city, and adjoining it on the south is the house in which President Monroe was entertained in May, 1819. It [the Kent house] was moved in 1845 to its present location by Ezra Kent from the site where now stands Trinity Methodist church, on the west side of Telfair place, and still bears in its front the hole made by a cannon ball from Count d’Estaing’s fleet during the siege of Savannah in 1779 (Harden 1913:668).

That house, known locally as the Sheftall-Kent House, or “Cannon Ball House”, was standing as late as 1919, when it was demolished to make room for a garage. Photographs of this dwelling were taken prior to its demolition, and news articles about the house were published in Savannah and Macon, Georgia, newspapers (Macon Telegraph 1919:9).

Spracher (2002:9-10) notes that the property owner F. Chris Cramer displayed a portion of this house with the cannonball scar in the newly constructed two-story garage. Spracher identified it as originally the home of Levi Sheftall, built about 1762 on the southwest Trust Lot of Telfair Square and later owned by the Kent family. The original location of this house, (known as the Sheftall-Kent family home in 1845), is the place where Trinity Methodist Church now stands at 225 West President [formerly King] Street (Sagis.org 2009). The present Trinity Methodist Church sanctuary building was completed in 1848. From Harden’s description, the original home faced eastward towards Telfair Square. Assuming that this is correct, the hole on the building’s front façade would indicate that the cannonball entered the building from the east, southeast, or northeast. The section of salvaged wall contains a hole measuring six inches in diameter, the alleged battle scar. The wall is currently curated by the Coastal Heritage Society, as part of the collections held at the Savannah History Museum. If the hole does represent a cannonball impact feature, then the cannonball was slightly less than 6 inches diameter, or most likely a ball fired from a 18 or 24 pounder cannon (Russell and Moffett 1998). The original location of this dwelling would have been inside the city, within the British defenses. The house faced incoming artillery from several directions during the siege and battle, including the American positions located south and southeast of the house, the French from the extreme southeast of the house, and from British “friendly-fire” to the northeast from Fort Prevost and to the north from British vessels. The American artillery rounds would most likely have struck the southern or eastern outer walls of the house and the French artillery could have struck the northern, southern, or eastern wall, whereas the British ordnance would have entered the northern side of the dwelling. It would seem unlikely that the British were firing cannons at targets within their own lines, unless that area was being overrun during the attack. There is no evidence the Allies completely breached the British lines, suggesting the cannon was fired by either the Americans or French. The French artillery batteries were located at a greater distance than the American batteries, and historic maps indicate that their fire was directed more towards the central and eastern parts of Savannah. Interestingly, the house would have been directly in the line of fire from French gunboats aiming at the Spring Hill Redoubt from the north side of Hutchinson Island. The French batteries south of Savannah included numerous 18 pounder cannons, any one of which may have fired the shot that hit Levi Sheftall’s house (Kennedy 1974:34). Had the shot been fired from the left (western) battery the cannonball would have entered the building on a sharp angle, which would have produced a glancing entry. A more likely scenario is that it was fired by one of the 18 pounds on the right (eastern) battery. Based on the locations and distances of American and British fire, and the location of French vessels, we tentatively conclude that the cannonball that struck the Kent home was most likely fired by the French, either from a French vessel or from the eastern (right) French artillery batteries.

Battle accounts by the participants in the assault on Spring Hill Redoubt include several references to grapeshot fired at the attackers by the British defenders. While no grapeshot was located by the present archeological sampling, one historical relic is located in the collection of the Georgia Historical Society. Dr. James Lynah (1735-1809) was a commissioned military surgeon in the Colonel Joseph Maybank’s regiment of the Berkeley County [South Carolina] militia. Dr. Lynah served at the Siege of Savannah in 1779 as Chief Surgeon for Daniel Horry’s Regiment of Light Dragoons. Horry’s regiment fought
in tandem with Pulaski’s Legion on the day of the battle, which accounts for Dr. Lynah attending to the wounded Pulaski (Lynah.com 2008a). Dr. Lynah removed a large iron grapeshot from his body and kept it as a keepsake. The item stayed in the Lynah family before it was donated to the Georgia Historical Society by the Lynah family. James Lynah, grandson of Dr. James Lynah, provided this testimony concerning his father’s association with Pulaski and the Pulaski Grapeshot:

In this capacity he was with Colonel Horry and Count Pulaski at the siege [sic] of Savannah—and there present on the field when the disastrous assault was made on the Town by the Cavalry in which Pulaski was wounded. My Grandfather and my Father, then acting as Surgeon’s Mate, a youth of 18, and a faithful negro servant named Guy, lifted and brought the Count out of the range of fire—and on the open field my Grandfather extracted the bullet, that caused the Count’s death several days afterwards when he was on board the French fleet and attended by their surgeons. The bullet and a note from an Aide de Camp of Pulaski, are now in my possession (Lynah.com 2008b; Lynah 1965).

This relic is currently mounted on an engraved silver candlestick and displayed at the Georgia Historical Society in Savannah. The mount is inscribed, “Grapeshot which mortally wounded County Casimir Pulaski, October 9, 1779, extracted from his body by Dr. James Lynah, ancestor of present owner, James Lynah, Esq.” (Georgia Historical Society Artifact Collection, Item A-1361-48) (Georgia Historical Society 2008).

Captain William Davis, South Carolina militia, was another Patriot officer who was struck and killed by grapeshot on that day. Two of his compatriots documented his deadly wound in their pension applications decades later. Countless other soldiers in the October 9 battle were struck by grapeshot, but their stories went unwritten. Major Thomas Pinckney and others remarked about the scathing fire against the Allies on that day (Hough 1866:164-170). As Georgia historian William Stevens poetically put it, the galling fire from the grapeshot was so fierce that, “They fell like grass before the mower” (Stevens 1859:215).

Adelaide Wilson summarized the consequences of the bombardment of Savannah in the siege:

At the time of the siege, Savannah had consisted of about four hundred and fifty houses, and seven hundred and fifty inhabitants; when it ended, one hundred and sixty houses were utterly uninhabitable, having been used as military quarters by the soldiers and negroes. Over a thousand shot and shell poured into the town from the batteries of the allies, bringing havoc and destruction in their train; four houses were burned, several were demolished, and a large number injured almost beyond repair. Shots from the galleys in the river reached Zubly’s meeting-house in Decker Ward, and from the frigate shells went quite across the camp to the barracks. Public buildings were in ruins, but grape and shell had not been more destructive than the rough usage of troops in times of war (Wilson 1889:64).

Swivel Guns and Wall Guns

A swivel gun was a small cannon that employed a touch-hole to allow ignition of the gunpowder. A swivel gun had an iron fork, “the yoke” that allowed it to swing up and down and from side to side. Swivel guns were mounted on a fort’s parapet. Swivel gun ammunition usually consisted of “multiple loads against personnel” (Neumann and Kravic 1989). A wall gun resembled a very large musket that was considered a “semi-shoulder firearm”, although they were generally mounted on a swivel on the forestock or metal stud hooked over a parapet (Neumann 1976; Moore 1967). They were known by the term, “amusettes”. Wall guns were easier to transport than cannon, used a flintlock mechanism, and had larger gunflints than muskets. Wall and swivel guns were commonly used at 18th century fortifications.

Primary sources and archeological accounts indicate that there were both swivel and wall guns along the defensive works of Savannah in 1779. At least one author suggests that Pulaski was shot by a swivel gun (Szymanski 1994:236, 239). Archaeologists recovered a gunflint from the 2005 Spring Hill Redoubt excavations measuring the correct size for a wall gun.

Muskets

Both the early French “Charleville” musket and British “Brown Bess” pattern musket represent the first standardization of musket sizes and designs according to model specifications. European muskets were individually made at small factories across Europe as late as the second decade of the eighteenth century. Orders only required a barrel length and approximate bore size, and the rest was designed by each contractor. Standard dimensions for muskets eventually evolved, and by 1717 the French had the first officially recognized French musket. Less than ten years later, Britain had designed the Brown Bess musket (Neumann 1976:16). Until the French infusion of arms, approximately one-third of the arms in the 13 colonies were made in colonial America and had little standardization, with bore sizes ranging from .50 to .80
caliber (Neumann 1976:36). These arms were made in small gun manufactories throughout the colonies.

The American army was in dire need of muskets and other armament, a need felt by the British to a lesser degree. Washington’s army procured vital, additional arms in one of four ways: soldiers used their own muskets, rifles or other guns; weapons were seized from Royal colonial arsenals or from the capture of soldiers, forts, or ships; Congress and/or local safety committees purchased weapons for troops; and arms were imported from Europe (Neumann 1976:22). France was the major exporter of guns to Washington’s army. The first French shipment in 1777 included 23,000 French muskets manufactured in Saint-Étienne, Charleville, and Maubeuge (Neumann 1976:20, 22). Eventually, France shipped more than 100,000 muskets to the fledgling republic. In addition to American, French, and British weapons, Dutch weapons appeared in the American Revolution as well. The British purchased a large number of Dutch weapons to supply the Hessian troops (Neumann 1976:22).

Archeologists recovered two gun parts during the excavations, both from British Brown Bess muskets. They retrieved an iron cock from TU 3, approximately 1.46 cm bd. It was missing the top jaw screw portion. The other item was an iron frizzen spring discovered in TU 4, Level 13. Both gun parts came from the ditch dug by the British as part of the defensive works near the Central Redoubts. Figure 41 shows both gun parts recovered archeologically along with a photograph detailing these components on a Brown Bess musket.

In addition to the two gun parts recovered in the present study, the 2005 excavation of the British ditch at the Spring Hill Redoubt yielded one gun part. That item was a brass barrel band with ramrod guide hole most likely from a French pistol. This item was flattened from its original shape. This damage may have occurred in battle, or within a few years following the battle, since the band was recovered from a secure 18th century context. In spite of the change in its appearance from this unintentional modification, the band most resembles either a Model 1766 or 1773, both French cavalry pistol. The Spring Hill specimen is similar in appearance to the Garde du Corps du Roi [The French King’s Body Guards] flintlock pistol, manufactured in Maubeuge, France (Antiek.net 2008a-b). Early weapons expert George Neumann suggests that the “furniture” on these guns was most often made of iron for land forces and brass for naval personnel (Neumann 1976:182). The brass barrel band from Spring Hill, therefore, allows for several possible explanations for its presence on the battlefield. It may have been carried by: a French infantryman who previously served in the King’s guard; a French sailor who disembarked and fought under d’Estaing as a temporary member of the land forces; a French infantryman who was supplied with a French naval pistol; or a cavalryman serving under Pulaski and armed with French pistols.

**Lead Balls**

Most of the balls excavated on the Savannah project were irregular in diameter, making accurate caliber measurements with calipers difficult. Such irregularity is typical (even among unfired balls), due to the method of manufacture. Hamilton’s study of firearms at Fort Michilimackinac (1976) explains this irregularity as resulting from “…the method used in routing out their molds” (Hamilton 1976:33). According to this process, Hamilton says that the molds used to pour the molten lead in were often “…wider from side to side than from front to back” because of the routing.

Lead balls intentionally had a loose fit in the barrel of eighteenth century guns. This was due in part to the routing explained above, and also to allow enough space as the barrel became smaller with soot buildup during use. The windage, or difference in the diameter of the barrel and the lead ball, varied according to where the weapons were manufactured. Table 6 lists caliber estimates for various British and French 18th century gun barrels and associated lead balls. American long arms were not included on this list due to their lack of standardization during this period and the extremely wide assortment of weaponry used by Continentals.

Archeologists recovered a total of 14 lead balls, 3 smaller lead shot, and 2 Minie balls (the latter post-dates 1840). Examples appear in Figure 42. The Minie balls were not within Revolutionary War features or contexts. Table 7 details the lead ball inventory. This small assemblage is inadequate for any detailed statistical analysis, although it provides some information about the weapons fired on various parts of the battlefield. Most of the balls were imperfect spheres. One fired ball struck an object. One ball was altered, and the remaining balls either were not shot or did not hit anything solid after discharge. Table 7 lists the caliber of the balls and their locations. The most common caliber size recovered was .69, totaling five balls. The remaining caliber sizes are as follows: .58 (n=2), .54 (n=2), and one each of .66, .64, .56, .52-.56, and .50. The smaller lead shot measured .23 (n=1) and .28 (n=2).

The five .69 caliber balls would have been too large for any of the arms on the list in Table 6 except the British Brown Bess musket. Table 6 lists the most common guns and bore sizes in use during the American Revolution, although it is not a completely comprehensive list given the wide variation of arms used, particularly by American...
troops. It is likely that the .58 caliber balls were also British, possibly for use with British trade guns. The .54 caliber balls could have been used in British trade guns pistols, or rifles. The .66 caliber ball likely represents a French gun, but which type is uncertain. It and the .64 caliber listed next, may have been used in carbines, possibly ones carried by the cavalry of Pulaski’s Legion. Wright notes that the Continental Cavalry lacked carbines (Wright 1931:186-209). The .64 caliber ball may have been used in French or British arms, as its size fits the range between several types. The remaining balls are probably from British trade guns or pistols, as they are much too small and would have had too much windage to be shot from any of the French guns listed on the table. The three smaller lead balls measuring .23-.28 caliber are from buck and ball cartridges.
Spring Hill yielded 10 lead balls. These ranged in caliber as follows: .63 (n=3), .64 (n=1), .66 (n=1), and .69 (n=5). Only one specimen showed slight damage on one side. The others did not exhibit any signs of impact and they may represent “dropped” balls. Archeologists recovered all from a secure 18th century context undoubtedly associated with the October 1779 attack.

### Lead Ball Depth

Archeologists plotted the depth of various caliber lead balls excavated in Test Units 3 and 4 near the Central Redoubt. Figure 43 depicts this scatter graph. The .50-.69 caliber balls cluster between approximately 40 and 195 cm bd. This admittedly small sample size of 14 balls shows three relatively distinct areas within the cluster. The first sub-cluster consists of two likely British balls of .50 and .58 caliber and one possible French ball of .66 caliber at a depth of 40-75 cm bd. The second sub-cluster consists of the five .69 caliber British Brown Bess musket balls, interspersed with one French .64 caliber ball. This second sub-cluster ranges from approximately 65-170 cm bd.

### Table 6. Caliber estimates for various 18th century guns and shot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gun Type</th>
<th>Ball Caliber</th>
<th>Gun Bore Caliber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Bess Musket</td>
<td>.69-.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbine, Light Infantry,</td>
<td>.54-.55</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalry, Light Horse</td>
<td>.56-.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbine, Heavy Dragoon</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British trade gun/pistol</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British trade gun</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Infantry guns &amp; certain</td>
<td>.63-.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade guns</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskets</td>
<td>.57-.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbines</td>
<td>.56-.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalry Pistols</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the lead balls recovered by the present study, the 2005 excavations in and adjacent to the British ditch at Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah's Revolutionary War Battlefield

Figure 42. The first row contains examples of some of the lead balls recovered from the Savannah Under Fire project.
overlapping the first cluster slightly. The third sub-cluster consists of five British-made balls from small caliber weapons. The balls were recovered from 170-195 cm bd.

In spite of the small sample size of lead balls, the data suggests a few patterns related to caliber ratio and depth. The Spring Hill Redoubt ball sizes represent an almost equal distribution between British and French/American arms. The former and latter each totaled five balls. In contrast to this 1:1 ratio, the balls excavated near the Central Redoubt (in what is now Madison Square) represent a ratio between British and French arms of 12:1. The French and Americans were ordered not to fire their weapons during the Spring Hill Redoubt attack, but to take the fortification by storm and use bayonets in hand-to-hand combat. Meanwhile, British forces were shooting artillery and small arms. The lead ball ratio of 1:1 indicates that the harried combat at Spring Hill was hard-fought on both sides, with combatants loosing lead balls and cartridge boxes in the heat of battle. Even the British forces appear to have lost more balls than they shot, at least in the sample recovered archeologically. In contrast, the overwhelming number of unspent British shot to French shot (12:1) at the Central Redoubt suggests a longer-term occupation by British forces rather than an intense firefight or battle fought equally by both sides.

Table 7. Lead ball locations in Test Units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Unit</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth (Avg.) cm bd</th>
<th>Caliber (Avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of smaller caliber British balls at and near the base of the trench suggests the defense of the Central Redoubt area during the Allied feint was done with small arms in addition to some musket firing. This was most likely accompanied by heavy artillery as well. Musket balls were lost periodically by the British troops occupying Savannah during the two years following the 1779 battle. The mix of French and British balls near the middle and top of the ditch were scraped from the surrounding berms, along with the soil in 1782, when the Americans filled in the trenches after the British evacuated the city.

Limited comparisons can be made between the lead balls recovered from Savannah and other sites. Coastal Georgia’s Fort Morris, south of Savannah in
Gunflints

Gunflints were essential components of 18th century small arms. A gunflint produced the necessary spark to light the gunpowder when the flint was forced against the gun’s steel frizzen. Flints could produce an undependable range of “one to over forty shots” before wearing out (Neumann and Kravic 1989:121). They generally required replacement or at least resharpening after 15 shots (Larry Babits, personal communication, March 2009). The two gunflint varieties of the period were the spall and the blade. The former was typically a British-produced gunflint made of dark gray flint with one bulbous wedge side. Archeological research has suggested that the French, however, also made spall gunflints out of brown chert (Hamilton and Emery 1988:244). The French blade was honey-color flint made into a flat, bi-level rectangular shape with small, bevel edges. The French blade was perceived to be the superior gunflint, however 20th century experiments suggest there is little difference to the sparking ability or durability of the blade and spall gunflints (Hamilton and Emery 1988:247). The British did not make blade gunflints that were used in America until 1800. In fact, the British were in the process of perfecting their own blade gunflint manufacturing during the American Revolution (Witthoft 1966; Hamilton and Emery 1988:23, 26). Since the industry was just beginning, Britain somehow managed to purchase the superior blade French gunflints and use them against the French in the American Revolution. While the French blades were the gunflint of choice, British troops continued to use spall gunflints when they had no other option during the Revolution.

Gunflints sizes varied according to the size of the weapon they accompanied. Table 8 shows the range in gunflint sizes for various gun types based on Hamilton and Emery’s (1988:21) work at Fort Michilimackinac in Michigan. Wall guns required some of the largest gunflints. Wall guns were made by French, Dutch, British, and American manufacturers, among others. They were larger and usually heavier than muskets, but meant to be portable enough to place on ramparts. Wall guns fell between muskets and cannons in size, appearance, and function. Wall guns often sat on a swivel to cover a wide range from their vantage point.

Archeologists found a total of two gunflints and three possible gunflint fragments during the Savannah project. The whole gunflints are shown in Figure 44. One gray English spall gunflint came from Test Unit 4, Level 15, Zone A in modern Madison Square (LN88). It measured 32 mm wide (side to side), 28 mm long (end to end), and 9 mm at its thickest. Based on Hamilton and Emery’s table, this gunflint would have fit a fowler or most likely carbine. The second gunflint (LN76) was a blade flint of dark gray to black chert from Test Unit 3, Level 1 (LN66), may represent part of a gunflint and minimally appears to be European chert. It was not complete enough to measure. Test Unit 1, Level 1, in Emmet Park contained a possible gunflint fragment made of dark gray English chert. The third possible gunflint was of European chert and came from Test Unit 7, Level 2. Archeologists recovered a variety of chert flakes in Emmet Park, Madison Square, and Lafayette Square. Many of these were extremely small fragments. While some may be gunflint fragments, most are probably not. Many, such as ones in Emmet Park are probably associated with Native American flint-knapping. Other European chert fragments are in upper levels of soils in Madison and Lafayette Squares and are likely fragments from European ballast stones.

Excavations at the Spring Hill Redoubt in 2005
uncovered an extremely large English gray spall gunflint. It still wore the lead patch around one end and is almost certainly from a wall mounted gun. This gunflint measured 36 mm wide by 32 mm long by between 4-7 mm thick. (The lead patch made obtaining an accurate thickness measurement difficult.)

Chapter 5. Archeological Results and Integrated Archeological and Historical Interpretations

Metal Clothing Artifacts

This category primarily includes metal buttons \( (n=18) \) and buckles \( (n=4) \). Figure 44 includes photographs of some examples. Non-metal buttons, such as glass, porcelain, and other materials, are not discussed here since they are not traditionally part of military uniforms and were recovered from non-Revolutionary War contexts. They are inventoried in the database. Other metal clothing artifacts documented by the project include a shoe heel plate, brass sequins, snaps, and a safety pin. The latter two artifacts post-date the American Revolution and are not detailed here. Many of the metal buttons were either plain or unidentifiable fragments and are not likely associated with the American Revolution given their provenience that post-dates the war. The military metal clothing artifacts are detailed below.

Two of the four buckles are related, or most likely related, to Revolutionary War activity. One buckle is possibly 20th century and the other is probably Civil War period. The latter is the back hook/tang of a large copper alloy buckle (LN 50) illustrated in Figure 45. It was found in Level 1 of Shovel Test E6 in Emmet Park. The remaining two buckle parts date to the 18th century and were recovered from TU 3 in what is now Madison Square. Buckles were common accoutrements on both clothing and activities artifacts in the 18th century. Buckles held garters around socks and held flaps on shoes together. Knapsacks, military paraphernalia, harnesses, and bridles incorporated buckles. The buckle fragment (LN 28) shown in Figure 45 is part of an iron buckle, possibly for tightening knee length breeches at the knee. The buckle is missing the two metal tongues. The buckle fragment dates from 1750-1800. It was documented in Level 3 of TU 3, in what is now Madison Square. The other buckle has a pewter frame with an iron tongue. Just over half of this buckle survived and was recovered by archeologists within the British defensive trench. It would have been almost two inches long by one inch wide. The buckle was uncovered at 169 cm bd in Level 14 of TU 3. Given this context, this pewter buckle is undoubtedly associated with activities in and around the British defensive trench during and immediately following the Battle of Savannah. The buckle was probably not a shoe buckle given its rounded rather than flat back and is probably associated with military uniform accoutrements, such as pouches, bags, etc.

Four of the 18 metal buttons are associated with the American Revolution in Savannah. A fifth button is likely a military button that was recovered in Level 4, Zone B of TU 6, in what is now Lafayette Square. But this one is embossed with a spread-Eagle and likely dates to the Civil War. The four buttons’ association with the Revolution is based on the diagnostic nature of the button (including method of manufacture and surface design) and context of the buttons in Revolutionary War features or strata in the ground. Four buttons came from deep zones within the British trench excavated in TU 3 and TU 4 (in what is now Madison Square).

The first definitively military button from TU 3 was located in Level 7. It is shown in Figure 45 as LN 32. It is a brass button similar to Stanley South’s Type 9 (South 1977:100). This button consists of a flat brass disc and a soldered, footless eye. While decorations were often stamped on the face of this type of button, the specimen recovered from TU 3 was plain. Hume cites Type 9 as dating to circa 1726-1776 (Hume 1985:90). Archeologists identified a second brass button when they excavated Level 13-14 in the balk of TU 3. This button had a soldered shank and a stamped design on the button back and is inventoried in LN 105.

The only regimental button recovered from the project was excavated from Level 15, Zone B, of TU 3. This
pewter button (LN 89) measures 24 mm in diameter and is illustrated in Figure 46. It is similar to South’s Type 8, with a mold seam across the back, an iron wire eye cast in place in a pewter foot in boss (South 1977:100). Unlike the brass Type 8, however, this specimen is pewter. The flat pewter button has a raised “V” on the front and the edge of the button is encircled with a border of large leaves. At first glance, the “V” might indicate a South Carolina 5th Regiment button, a regiment that served in Savannah. At least one such button has been recovered in Savannah (Troiani 2001:143). While that regimental button was the same size as this one, the former had a “thin incised border” and not the leaf border along its edge (Troiani 2001:143). A button of the same size as the one recovered during the Savannah project, with a “V” and leaf border was worn by the British 5th Regiment after 1778 and until 1790. The large pattern was for enlisted men (Troiani 2001:21). The appearance and time period of the British 5th Regiment button make it a match for the button archeologists excavated during the Savannah project.

The only problem is that the British 5th Regiment served in New England from 1774-1778, after which time it was sent to the West Indies. It never fought in Savannah. So how did this 5th Regiment button find its way into a British defensive trench 170 cm below ground surface? It was common practice for men to be drafted to serve in units other than their own. This would account for the errant
button. It is possible, also, that this exemplifies the supply problems experienced by the British in America. British troops frequently were poorly supplied in all provisions including uniforms, food, and arms. Soldiers frequently wore entire uniforms or cannibalized uniform parts from other regiments when necessity required it, regardless of military regulations. Wearing improper uniform regalia was commonly done among American forces as well, and often went as far as wearing uniform parts of the enemy. D’Estaing’s capture of several British vessels exacerbated the British supply problem. In particular, in 1779 the French capture of the British ship Experiment and several other vessels took not only nine months of payroll out of British circulation, but also “…military stores for Georgia” and “…4,000 suits of soldiers’ clothing” (Virginia Gazette 1779a, 1779b). It is likely that many British troops had to make do with whatever buttons and other supplies that they could access, thus explaining the presence of a 5th Regiment button among the British troops in Savannah.

Another button came from Level 13 of TU 4. It was the fourth button recovered from the portion of the British defensive ditch excavated by archeologists during the Savannah project. This brass button was made in the manner of South’s Button Type 2. It is a hollow, convex button with a wire eye soldered on the reverse, between two manufacturing holes for expanding gases (South 1977:100). This type was also manufactured between 1726 and 1776 (Hume 1985:90). No design could be identified on the specimen recovered.

Archeologists recovered one small brass heel plate for a shoe from TU 2, Level 1 in Emmet Park. Figure 44 shows the decorative nature of this functional item. The size suggests it came from a woman’s shoe. Heel plates were nailed to the bottom of shoe and boot heels to decrease wear and provide longevity to the heel. Decorative heel plates were used in the 18th and 19th centuries. The heart was not an uncommon design on heel plates. A similar heart-shaped heel plate was recovered by other archeologists from the 18th century shipwreck, Machault, which carried almost 500 pairs of new men’s shoes as part of her cargo (Sullivan 1986). A search of the internet shows that metal detectorists in other parts of the United States have dug up heel plates with heart motifs. At least one non-heart decorative heel plate was dug up by metal detectorists in the Savannah area. Unfortunately the context around that find was destroyed in the digging process, without archeological documentation. The context of the heel plate from Emmet Park suggests that it is probably 19th century and not associated with Revolutionary War activities. Its decorative nature suggests that the shoe’s owner was likely of upper-class status.

An interesting metal clothing artifact discovered by archeologists during the project is more likely related to an Activities classification than a Clothing classification. Nine large brass sequins were recovered in Level 2 of Test Unit 2 in Emmet Park. Unlike modern sequins, these specimens are larger, stiffer, and made out of metal (Figure 47). They each measure approximately 9 mm and have a slit from the center hole radiating to the edge of the sequin. Several examples of identical sequins (including a circular wear pattern around the hole) reveal that one use for them was to decorate military flags. Two examples are shown here. The blue flag belongs to the Savannah Volunteer Guards and dates to the mid-19th century (Lydia Moreton, personal communication, October 2008). It is currently on loan to the Coastal Heritage Society in Savannah, Georgia. It uses metal sequins to carry out a complex design, including a star shape (Figure 48). The red, white and blue flag displays a more simple sequin design, with an angled cross on a field of blue (Figure 49). This flag is a Confederate “Bible Flag” that was auctioned on the internet (Bridgman 2007). Bible flags were small flags made by important women in soldiers’ lives and given to the men to use as bookmarks in their bibles. While sequin flags appear to be more common in the nineteenth century, at least one example was located for the eighteenth century and there are probably others that existed as well. A pair of “pipe bannerets”, or small flags to hang from bagpipes, was made circa 1794-1802 for a Scottish Highlander Regiment known as Reay’s Fencible Highlanders. These silk flags were 2.9 feet by 21 inches. They were embellished with a Scottish thistle and sequined leaves (Mackay 1908:1-3). These late eighteenth/early nineteenth century flags suggest that sequined flag in general may date to earlier in the eighteenth century, as well.

Ceramics

Excavations on the Savannah project recovered a total of 780 historic ceramics. Most were small sherds indicative of repeated impacts after disposal, such as being trampled in middens or on the ground surface of heavily traveled areas, as opposed to larger sherds protected in features such as privies or wells (Figure 50). Test Units 3 and 4 in Madison Square contained sherds definitively linked to the 1779 British construction and occupation of defensive works outside the city. Ceramics here and in excavations in Emmet Park and Lafayette Square were extremely useful for providing information, including Mean Ceramic Dates (MCD), helpful in assessing chronology of soil levels predating and post-dating the revolution, as well as levels and features coinciding with Revolutionary War activity. Ceramics were also useful for providing Terminus Post Quem (TPQ) dates for stratigraphy and features, particularly as other diagnostic artifacts were not in abundance.
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Figure 47 (above). Sequins recovered from Emmet Park features. (Same scale as Figure 48.)

Figure 48 (left). Sequins on mid-19th century Savannah Guards flag. (Same scale as Figure 47.)

Figure 49 (right). Sequins on Confederate Bible flag. (Not to scale of Figures 47 or 48.)
Colonial period ceramics such as tin-glazed earthenware, porcelain, coarse earthenware, salt-glazed stoneware (refined white, gray, and scratch blue), and redware sherd were recovered from appropriate contexts, such as the British ditch. Creamware also made an appearance in some contexts, however, with manufacturing dates that span both sides of the revolution. It has a begin date of manufacture in 1762 and an end date of 1820. It is reasonable to expect creamware to show up in Revolutionary deposits in an American port city 17 years after manufacturing of that ceramic type began. Later ceramics such as pearlwares and transfer-prints were not present in the middle and lower levels of the ditch fill and occupation zones. They were present in portions of TU 1 and 2 in Emmet Park and in Lafayette Park. MCD for TU 2 in Emmet Park consistently got older with depth, going from 1874.5 in Stratum B to 1836.2 in Stratum C. Likewise, the Strata in TU 3 and 4 got older through time, as indicated by MCD. Stratum B dated to 1811.1, Stratum C to 1773.7, and the Stratum below C dated to 1742. Many of these dates were based on very small sample sizes. The strata are depicted in profile drawings in this chapter. They are physically distinct natural and or cultural soil layers. Arbitrary levels excavated within these strata are also depicted on the profile drawings. Both are explained in the text in greater detail further in this chapter.

Many military sites, especially camps, headquarters, and fortifications, often contain moderate amounts of ceramics relating to the domestic nature of feeding and housing large numbers of troops. Archeologist Stanley South’s patterns for Military-Frontier Sites, for example, reflect a ceramic ratio index ranging from .11 to .25 of the artifact assemblage (South 1977:171). Artifact totals were combined for TU 3 and 4, and for TU 5, 6, and 7. South’s method for determining ceramic ratios was duplicated and produced the following results for the Savannah data. Test Units 3 and 4 produced a ceramic ratio of .22, Test Units 5, 6, and 7 had a ceramic ratio of .09, and Test Unit 2 had a ceramic ratio of .10. Test Units 3 and 4 fall clearly within South’s .11-.25 ceramic ratio range for Military-Frontier sites. Test Unit 2, at .10 is very close to the lower limit, and Test Units 5, 6, and 7 are outside the lower limit by .02. One would expect a British defensive ditch to have...
some broken dishes in the occupation zone from soldiers using the ditch. The number of sherds should be far smaller, however, than one would expect in the bakery or kitchen/provisioning area of a camp. The upper layers of the ditch were filled with the surrounding berms originally created by digging the ditch. These soil layers in TU 3 and 4 had few ceramics because no houses, stores, or taverns were located in this area prior to ditch construction so there were few opportunities for dishes to be discarded in the area. The exception to this is the military barrack located in the general vicinity. The occupation period and occupancy rate of this barracks is unknown.

It may be more beneficial to examine the quantity of ceramics in relation to the various test unit clusters. To do this requires examining the ceramic totals per cubic meter, since the excavation depths of the test units varied. Table 9 lists totals and ratios based on the data collected from the Savannah project, including ceramic totals per cubic meter. Madison Square Test Units 3 and 4, encompassing the British ditch contained only 20 ceramics per cubic meter excavated. In contrast, Lafayette Square Test Units 5, 6, and 7 had 63 ceramics per cubic meter excavated. While these three test units did not come down directly on a ditchwork, they should have been in proximity to one similar to TU 3 and 4. The difference in the amounts of ceramics between the two locations is striking. The number of ceramics per cubic meter in TU 5, 6, and 7 is more similar to TU 2 in Emmet Park. That unit contained 62 ceramics per cubic meter. The larger number of ceramics in these four units suggests greater domestic activities such as cooking, eating, drinking, and/or primary or secondary refuse disposal occurred in these areas than in the area of the British ditch.

Test Units 6, and 7 contained more of all artifact types, not just ceramics, per cubic meter than the other units. (Test Unit 5 should also be included, even though its totals appear to be low. This frequency of artifacts is arbitrarily low and a result of including four sterile layers in the amount excavated, skewing the totals. Removing these sterile layers would make the artifacts per cubic meter in TU 5 greater than TU 2, 3, and 4.) The fact that archeologists excavated a larger number of cubic meters in TU 3 and 4 even further highlights the fact that TU 6 and 7 contained greater numbers of artifacts per cubic meter. as an example and separated the American component of the Fort (Fort Moultrie “A”) from the British component of the Fort (Fort Moultrie B”). He had limited data from various other sites available at the time. Since then, excavation on military sites in Georgia has increased and some of this new data can be used to compare and contrast the Savannah project data. These sites include colonial Mount Pleasant and Fort Argle, Revolutionary War period Fort Morris, and early nineteenth-century Fort Hawkins.

Table 10 depicts the ratios of European ceramics to olive green bottle glass at these sites. Based on calculations for this report, the revolutionary war sites of Fort Morris and Fort Moultrie (A and B) have a fairly wide range in ratios from 0.33-1.56. The ceramic to bottle glass ratios from two of the Savannah sites fall into this range. Test Units 3 and 4 have a ratio of 0.83:1 and Test Units 5, 6, and 7 have a ratio of 1.13:1. Test Unit 2, however, with a ratio of 1.89:1 is above the upper end of the range. It is still a closer match than any of the other ratios in the table. What is interesting about the data in Table 10 is that it suggests that not all military sites reflect a greater ratio of spirit/wine/case bottles to ceramics as South had proposed. Certainly Fort Moultrie depicts this relationship, with two to three pieces of glass for every ceramic represented. Fort Morris data, however, is almost the opposite, with one piece of bottle glass for every one and a half sherds. Fort Argyle comes nearest to South’s concept, with one piece of bottle glass for every one and one-third sherds. The other non-revolutionary, military sites reflect an enormous disparity between bottle glass and ceramic counts. Every one piece of bottle glass at Fort Hawkins was countered by over four and one-half sherds. Mount Pleasant was virtually off the chart, with one piece of glass for every nine and one-third pieces of ceramics. What appears most obvious within the Savannah data comparisons is that Test Units 3 and 4, clearly within the British ditchwork, reveal a higher ratio of bottle glass to ceramics. While it is only slightly higher, it is the one of the three sites on the Savannah project that has a higher ratio of bottle glass to ceramics. Test Units 5, 6, and 7 do not, but show a closer 1:1 ratio than any of the other comparable sites in the table. Given the disparity in the data, one suspects that other variables may come into play in the ceramics to olive green bottle glass ratios, making the calculations more complex than originally suggested by South.

### Bottle Glass

Stanley South first examined the ratio of colonial wine bottle glass to ceramic sherds as a way to distinguish military from domestic and frontier archeological sites (South 1977:168). He hypothesized that military sites would contain higher ratios of wine bottles. South used the Revolutionary War site of Fort Moultrie, South Carolina, as an example and separated the American component

### Activities

Boredom among soldiers between battles is well documented throughout history and this is often reflected in the archeological record. Archeologists have found various items made out of lead balls by bored soldiers in trenches. On the Savannah project, archeologists excavated a lead die fashioned out of a lead ball. Figure 51 shows a
### Table 9. Artifact summary totals and ratios for Test Units 2 through 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Excavated (cubic meters)</th>
<th>Artifact Total</th>
<th>Artifacts per cubic meter</th>
<th>Ceramic Total</th>
<th>Ceramics per cubic meter</th>
<th>Olive Green Bottle Glass Total</th>
<th>Olive Green Bottle Glass per cubic meter</th>
<th>Ceramics to O.G. Bottle Glass Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TU 2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 3</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 4</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 6</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.Artifact summary totals and ratios for Test Units 2 through 7.
closeup of this rather misshapen device, and one can only wonder if anyone questioned its legitimacy in gambling activities. Lead and bone dice have been documented on numerous fort sites from across the Roman empire to throughout North America, including Fortress Louisbourg in Nova Scotia, Canada; and Revolutionary and Civil War sites in America (Neumann and Kravic 1989:129).

Smoking tobacco in kaolin pipes was a common eighteenth-century past time. The Savannah project recovered a total of 57 tobacco smoking pipe fragments. One piece was from a stoneware pipe and the rest were of kaolin manufacture. Pipe stems and pipe bowls were almost equally represented in the sample. The majority of the fragments were plain. Decorations were simple and included glazing, leaf designs with and without yellow glaze, a linear design, a dot and line design, and a punctate design around the rim of a bowl fragment. Two decorated bowl fragments were too small to identify the design. One pipe stem showed teeth marks. Test Unit 3 contained the greatest number of tobacco pipe fragments, totaling 12. Test Units 3 and 4 combined had 19 pipe fragments while Test Units 5, 6, and 7 combined contained 16 pieces of kaolin pipes. Test Unit 2 had seven fragments, including the later stoneware pipe bowl fragment from Level 2. Archeologists uncovered the remaining pipe stems and bowls in Test Unit 1 (n=8) and in shovel tests (n=7). Pipe stem dating can be helpful in establishing chronology on a site. This is not a concern in Test Units 3 and 4 since the primary documents and other artifacts have established a three year window for this feature. Pipe stem dating would be useful for the areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archeological Site</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Ceramic Total</th>
<th>Green Bottle Glass Total</th>
<th>Ratio of Ceramics to Green Glass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant 9Ef169</td>
<td>1730s-1750s</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9.33:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Argyle 9Bn28</td>
<td>1730s-1750s</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1.36:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Morris 9Li168</td>
<td>1770s-1780s</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1.56:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hawkins 9Bi21</td>
<td>1806-1821</td>
<td>12,505</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>4.62:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Moultrie(A) South Carolina</td>
<td>Revolutionary War</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>0.47:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Moultrie(B) South Carolina</td>
<td>Revolutionary War</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>0.33:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah TU 2</td>
<td>1730s-later</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.89:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah TU 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>1770s</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.83:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah TU 5, 6, &amp; 7 All</td>
<td>1770s-later</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1.13:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Ratio of ceramics to green bottle glass on select fortification sites.

Tobacco Pipes

Figure 51. Close-up of two sides of a lead die. (See Figure 42 for scaled photograph.)
of Test Unit 2 and even Test Units 5, 6, and 7 to enable a more concise date range. The numbers of pipe stems recovered, however, are far fewer than the 100 pipe stems needed for a statistically valid sample.

Battlefield Landscapes

Cartography

An assortment of maps was created by cartographers and less accomplished draftsmen before, during, and after the Siege and Battle of Savannah. Detailed maps of Savannah for the period of the American Revolution can be classified into nine general categories:

1.) Original British battle manuscript maps
2.) Original French battle manuscript maps
3.) Original American Patriot battle manuscript maps
4.) Original Hessian battle manuscript maps
5.) Original Spanish battle manuscript maps
6.) Redrafts of Original battle manuscript maps
7.) Early published battle maps
8.) Later published battle maps
9.) Historical interpretive maps

Researchers for the Savannah Under Fire project examined a total of 72 maps during the background research phase of this project. This included some of the ones detailed above. Approximately 22 were examined for their potential to be used in GIS overlays for the fieldwork component of the project. Table 11 lists the 72 maps, along with their dates, cartographers, and repository location. Each of these map categories possesses useful information for locating battlefield features on the modern landscape. The most notable maps are discussed below and are presented in ascending chronological order.

At the onset of the American Revolution, Savannah was only lightly fortified. The Royal government authorized improvements towards its defenses in the mid-1750s and Surveyor William DeBrahm was authorized to design and implement a series of fortifications at Savannah and other important settlements. DeBrahm drew a plan for Savannah’s fortifications that included surrounding the existing town with a stockade and series of armed corner bastions on its southern side. That plan surrounded six town wards with its southern side along South Broad Street (present-day Oglethorpe Avenue). The proposed southwestern bastion would have been near the intersection of present-day Jefferson Street and Oglethorpe Avenue and the southeastern bastion would have been in the vicinity of Lincoln Street and Oglethorpe Avenue. (For details regarding the fort on this map, see the section of this report about the Emmet Park site.)

One map of Savannah, apparently drafted soon after the December 1778 battle survived into the late 19th century, when it was copied by historian M.C. Kollock (1891). The original map apparently no longer exists. While the author of the original map is not known, it appears to have been a primary battlefield map drafted by a British cartographer from the December 1778 engagement. Since the original map cannot be located, the penmanship of the origin cartographer is unknown, therefore his identity remains elusive. Several cultural features are noteworthy on this map, including:

- Two lines of fortifications surrounding portions of Savannah
- The Road to Augusta
- The Town of Savannah [shown as a undifferentiated rectangle]
- Nine other unnamed roads exiting the town on the east and south sides.

Some of the most accurate cartographic evidence from the American Revolution in Georgia was left by John Wilson. Lieutenant John Wilson was an Engineer in the 71st Regiment. Wilson arrived in Georgia in December 1778 with Lieutenant Colonel Campbell’s force, and he served in Georgia and South Carolina throughout the balance of the war (Davis 1986). Wilson was Engineer James Moncrief’s assistant and was likely involved in the design and implementation of Savannah’s defenses in 1779.

Several of John Wilson’s maps of these defenses have survived. Figure 31 shows Savannah at the time of the December 1778 battle (Wilson 1778). Although this map is unsigned and undated, the artist’s style and its content attest to Wilson as its maker and the 1778 battle as the subject. Since Wilson was on the move with the 71st Regiment in early 1779, this map have been prepared sometime in early to mid-1779, but likely prior to the 1779 siege (Davis 1986). The map shows several important features that are relevant to the 1779 siege, which include:

- An incomplete system of fortifications surrounding the town of Savannah [a section near Bull Street and another south of the Augusta Road have no fortifications indicated]
- Barracks south of the town and town fortifications
- The Augusta Road, Bull Street/White Bluff Road, and the Ogeechee River Road [the latter two unnamed]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Source</th>
<th>Mapmaker</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Wilson, John</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Plan of the decent and action of the 29th Decr. 1778, near the town of Savannah; by his majestys forces under command of Lt. Colol. Campbell of the 71st Regt. Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>British Capture of Savannah [probably drafted in 1779]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>177-</td>
<td>Savannah River and Savannah Sound [dates after January 1779]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Wilson, John</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan of the town of Savannah, with the works constructed for its defence, together with the approaches &amp; batteries of the enemy, and the joint attack of the French and rebels on the 9th of October, 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHS</td>
<td>Fraser, A.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>No title. &quot;Purchased at the sale of the papers of Maj. Genl Benjamin Lincoln 1888&quot; &amp; “Purchased at the sale of the Library of Charles C. Jones Jr.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHS</td>
<td>Fraser, A.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Copy made by CC Jones of Map No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHS</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Sketch of Blockade of Savannah &amp; the Attack 9th Oct 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAV</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Sketch of Blockade of Savannah &amp; the Attack 9th Oct 1779-similar to 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan of the Siege of Savannah with the Joint Attack of the French &amp; Americans on the 9th October, 1779 [Lithograph G. Haward 171 Pearl Street NY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan du Siege de Savannah fait par les Troupes du Roy aux Ordres de Mr. le Cm D’Estaing Vice-Amirad de France en 7bre et 8bre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan du Siege de Savannah en Amerique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>177-</td>
<td>No title visible. Accessioned as “Savannah and Its Defenses”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>No title visible. Accessioned as “Proposed Fortifications for Savannah”; attributed to Patrick Fergusson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGM</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Sketch of Blockade of Savannah &amp; the Attack 9th Oct 1779-refined version, similar to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan of the French and American Siege at Savannah…Prevost [in Jones 1874]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHM</td>
<td>Faden, William</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Plan of the Siege of Savannah with the Joint Attack of the French &amp; Americans on the 9th October, 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plano de Savanas con todas las operaciones del crito Capo las Ordenes del …del 1779 [Original in Madrid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>O’Connor</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Untitled (in French and German) [original in Paris]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Puisegur, Chastener</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Entrée de la Riviere de Savannah dans le Continent de l’Amerique Levee en Octobre 1779 par mr le C de Chastener Puisegur [Original in Paris?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Force, Peter</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Untitled [Peter Force Collection, LOC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Ozzane, Pierre</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Siege de Savannah…en 7bre et 8bre 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Untitled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>Fort Prevost in 1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>Plan of Savannah &amp; its Environs in 1782.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Ozanne, Pierre</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Vue de la Ville de Savannah...[Perspective map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMN</td>
<td>Wilson, John [DesBarres]</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Wylly, A.C. [Bowen, J.S.]</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Plan of Attack and the Fortificatons at Savannah as Described by Capt. A.C. Wyly, Who was Present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Shruder [Fries, A.L.]</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Savannah [1899 copy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Mccall [McKinnon, Rockwell]</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>Copy of a certified copy of a Plan of the Forty five and Five acre Lots…Chatham.[1798 &amp; 1908 copies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Savannah in Chatham County State of Georgia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Savannah?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Savanna Town in Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>Lossing, B.</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Siege of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASU</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Untitled, 12 [Fort Wayne ca. 1812]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASU</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Fort Wayne? [Savannah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Plan of the City of Savannah in 1818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Maps consulted for the Savannah Under Fire project (continued on next page).
### Table 11. Maps consulted for the Savannah Under Fire project (continued from previous page, source key on next page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Source</th>
<th>Mapmaker</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 UGA</td>
<td>Kollock</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Plan of the Town of Savannah Taken from the Rebels on the 29th Decr 1778 by His Majesty’s Troops Under the Command of Lt. Colonel Archd Campbell 71st Regt. [1891 copy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 UGA</td>
<td>Stouf, I.</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Plan of the City &amp; Harbour of Savannah in Chatham County State of Georgia Taken in 1818.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 UGA</td>
<td>Barnett, A.C.</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>copy of an old map of the City of Savannah [1856]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 MYERS</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Draught of Part of the Province of South Carolina, Shewing the March &amp; Encampments of the British Troops Under the Command of Major Genl Prevost. Upon an Expedition into that Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 NARA</td>
<td>Stouf, I.</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Plat [Fort Wayne, RG77 Land Papers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 DeBrahm, W.G.</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Plan of the City of Savannah and Fortifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>A Plan of the City of Savannah; With a Drawing of the Part of the City Burnt in the Dreadful Fires of the 26 November &amp; 6 December, 1796.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 LOC</td>
<td>Campbell, Archibald [, William]</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Sketch of the Northern Frontiers of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 UGA</td>
<td>McKinnon, John</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>City of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 UGA</td>
<td>Colton, H.H.</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>The City of Savannah Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 DAV</td>
<td>Sears, Robert</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Savannah, 1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 UGA</td>
<td>Houston, Mossman</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Map of the City of Savannah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 SCAD</td>
<td>Vincent, Edward A.</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Vincent’s Subdivision map of the city of Savannah, Chatham County, state of Georgia : shewing all the public and private buildings, lots, wards, etc. together with all the latest improvements from surveys and authentic records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 GOOG</td>
<td>Carrington, Henry B.</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Siege of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 GOOG</td>
<td>Carrington, Henry B.</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Siege of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 GOOG</td>
<td>Carrington, Henry B.</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Siege of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 UTX</td>
<td>Waring, G. E., Jr.</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Savannah Georgia Sewerage Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 NYPL</td>
<td>Emmett Collection</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Savannah im Jahre 1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 BAT</td>
<td>Chandler, Harry A.</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Map of a Portion of Historical Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Unk</td>
<td>McKinnon, John [Minis, F.]</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Savannah [1917 copy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 AASU</td>
<td>Shellman, J. M.</td>
<td>18...</td>
<td>Untitled [Fort Wayne Gas Works]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 UGA</td>
<td>Sholes</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>City of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 NARA</td>
<td>Hoffman, E.F., and H.A. Ulffers</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Map of Savannah and Vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 UGA</td>
<td>Hogg, J.B.</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Map of the City of Savannah, GA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 UGA</td>
<td>Howard, John W.</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Map of the City of Savannah and Vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 DAV</td>
<td>Lossing, B.</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>French Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 UTX</td>
<td>Waring, G. E., Jr.</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Plan of the City &amp; Harbour of Savannah in Chatham County State of Georgia. A.D. 1818.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 UTX</td>
<td>D. Appleton &amp; Co.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>City of Savannah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 NARA</td>
<td>Hoffman, E.F., and H.A. Ulffers</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Map of Savannah and Vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 NARA</td>
<td>Hoffman, E.F., and H.A. Ulffers</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Map of Savannah and Vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 NARA</td>
<td>Sater, C.S.</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Map of the Union &amp; Rebel Intrenchments in Savannah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 DUKE</td>
<td>DeBrahm, W.G.</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Plan of the City of Savannah and Fortifications [C.C. Jones, Jr.’s undated copy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 DUKE</td>
<td>Hogg, J.B.</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Map of City of Savannah, GA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 LOC</td>
<td>Sneden, Robert H.</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Map Showing the Investment and Siege of Savannah Georgia by Genl Sherman’s Army Decr 1864.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5. Archeological Results and Integrated Archeological and Historical Interpretations

Several other roads that exit the Savannah fortifications to the eastward.

Lieutenant John Wilson also drafted later maps of Savannah and its defenses, following the October 9, 1779 Battle (Wilson 1779, 1780). James Moncrief signed a map of Savannah and the October 9 battle, although the draftsmanship on this map is eerily reminiscent of John Wilson’s hand. That map contains a legend identifying the British defenses and Patriot batteries. Moncrief’s legend records:

- Captain Alexander C. Wyllie, who was a Georgia Loyalist and a participant in the 1779 Siege, provided information for a battlefield map that may have been drafted by Emanuel Bowen (Wyllie and Bowen 1779). This undated map (Figure 52) contains several important elements not shown on other maps. Its overall tone is schematic and less detailed than maps made by Wilson or Moncrief, so its usefulness for precise location of the British redoubts is minimal. The map includes the following features:

  - The Augusta Road [shown leaving the city and immediately southwest of a redoubt]
  - Thunderbolt Road [shown leaving the city on its southeast side]
  - Fort Charlotte [a square fort with four projecting diagonal corner bastions on the bluff northeast of Savannah]

### Table 11. Source key (continued from previous page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Library/Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASU</td>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT</td>
<td>Daniel Battle Collection, Coosaw Island, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>William Clements Library, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAV</td>
<td>David Library of the American Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE</td>
<td>Special Collections, Duke University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>Books.google.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>Historical Society of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>Huntington Library, San Marino, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYERS</td>
<td>Ken Myers Collection, Savannah, Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARA</td>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMM</td>
<td>National Maritime Museum, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHS</td>
<td>New York Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPL</td>
<td>New York Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGJM</td>
<td>Royal Green Jacket Museum, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAD</td>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHM</td>
<td>Savannah History Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGA</td>
<td>Hargrett Library, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTX</td>
<td>Perry-Casteneda Library, University of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>Unknown source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Map References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batteries No.</th>
<th>No. of Guns in each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Artillery placed in the intervals of the 2nd Chain of Redoubts—15 Mortars and Coehorns 11 Total 108 Ordnance

- A—French Battery of 18 Guns
- B—French Battery of 12 Guns
- C—French Battery of 4 Guns
- D—French Battery of 6 Mortars
- E—French Battery of 3 Mortars and 3 Guns

Total 45 Ordnance

- F—Epaulements and Traverses to Cover the Encampment
- G—Barracks pulled down and made into a horn work
- H—French Columns
- I—Rebel Columns
- K—Magazine made during the Siege

The works Coloured Green were erected before the Summons and the others during the Siege.

[ship profile sketch] —Rebel Galleys

James Moncrief
Comdt Engineer

- The firing positions of the heavy ordnance removed from the H.M.S. Rose, on the bluff northwest of Savannah
- The relationship of the abatis line to the forks of White Bluff and Ogeechee roads
- A series of 14 redoubts and 13 batteries, all shown as squares and otherwise unidentified
- The French camp, southeast of Savannah
- The column of attack [at Spring Hill]
- The line of march of the French
Figure 52. Stylized defenses depicted on the Wylly and Bowen map of 1779 (Hargrett Library, University of Georgia).

- Other unspecified British and Patriot troop positions
- The City of Savannah with 12 Squares.

English cartographer William Faden’s published map of the Siege (Faden 1784) is derivative of the earlier maps by John Wilson and James Moncrief. Faden published many battle maps of the American Revolution, but he never visited Savannah, so his version relied on information from others (Figure 32). The “References” section of Faden’s map contains the following information: William Faden created many maps relating to the American Revolution and his maps are widely reproduced, including his map of the Siege of Savannah. Recent critical analysis of the accuracy of Faden’s map of Philadelphia (Selig 2008), however, forces a careful review of this map to look for errors or discrepancies. On his Philadelphia map, Faden incorrectly placed the British defensive line on the landscape, as demonstrated when his map was compared with several other lesser known 18th century maps of that city. This cartographic error is likely one reason that major defensive features in Philadelphia have gone unnoticed in the archeological record.

C.C. Jones, Jr. (1874) acquired and had published a little known battle map of Savannah. While the author of the map remains unidentified, the details on the map clearly indicate it was a contemporary map that was drafted soon after the October 9 engagement. In assessing this map’s heritage, Jones noted,
The original map (of which we have here a reproduction by the photolithographic process), was purchased in London at the late sale of Lord Rawdon’s papers, and was selected from his military portfolio. While its general resemblance to the map of the siege of Savannah contained in ‘Faden’s Plans of Battles in North America’ will be readily conceded, we think the present map more elaborate and satisfactory in its details. It is apparently the work of a German or Swiss engineer who may have been

connected with either Wissenbach’s or Trümmbach’s Hessian regiment, both of which were present at the siege and constituted a part of the English garrison. By an endorsement it seems at one time to have been the property of Lieutenant Finnegan of the Sixteenth regiment of Infantry. Two companies of that regiment held the entrenchments to the left of the Augusta road, and rendered efficient service in the repulse of the assault of the 9th of October (Jones 1874:8).

We concur with Jones that this map was drafted by a person whose native language was not English or French and most likely by someone associated with the British. The specifics on the map regarding the British troop placement are more detailed than the knowledge of the Americans or French would have allowed. Also, a few words and phrases on the map, whose legends and labels are mostly in English, betray the German native language of the cartographer. For purposes of discussion, we refer to this map by its owner, Charles C. Jones, Jr., at the time of its publication, or Jones (1874).

Jones’ 1874 map shows this placement of heavy ordnance in land batteries (clockwise from the Savannah River):

- 16 Can. [in defenses on bluff northeast of town]
- 12 Canon [perpendicular to main British defenses, facing northeast]
- 4 Can. [just south and west of previous, between New Jersey Volunteers and Savannah militia]
- 1 Can. [east of Savannah militia]
- 3 Can. [between Savannah militia and Hessian regiment]
- 4 Can. [southeast of New York Volunteers]
- 15 Can. [southeast of 16th Light Infantry]
- 7 Can. [south of former barracks manned by Royal Marines]
- 3 Can. [south of Wissenbach Regiment]
- 2 Can. [south of Wissenbach Regiment]
- 7 Can. [between Wissenbach Regiment and 16th Regiment]
- 7 Can. [northwest of Carolina Redoubt and southwest of 71st Regiment, 2nd Battalion]
- [Battery with 6 cannons shown but not labeled, southwest of Grenadier Battalion]
- 2 Can. [northwest of King’s Rangers, northwestern extent of British defenses]

Jones’ 1874 map also shows other relevant features, including:

- 15 square redoubts (only 2 named)
- Angled defenses (7) on the bluff northeast of Savannah
- Road to Eben Ezer and Augusta [Augusta Road shown northwest of Carolina Redoubt]
- A small fort with corner blockhouses on Ellis Square
- A Poudre Magazin [Gunpowder Magazine, just east of town]
• A Mag. Gard. [Magazine and Guardhouse, immediately north of town]
• 16 City Squares

Jones’ 1874 map depicts the following British troop positions (listed in clockwise position from the Savannah River bluff, east of town):

- American Gallee [unnamed American galley, and associated artillery lines of fire]
- Eng. Frigate Rose was Sunk [H.M.S. Rose, scuttled]
- French Frigate La Truit [French Frigate Truit, and associated artillery lines of fire]
- Engs Marshands Shipps [6 British merchant ships]
- Prisonier Shipp [unidentified British prison ship]
- Bntt. [an unidentified British ship]
- Britt. Previater [an unidentified British privateer]
- Frigatts [an unidentified frigate, probably the Germain]
- Britt. Gallee [an unidentified British galley]
- [3] Vessels that were Sunk [3 watercraft linked by a boom, just upstream from Savannah]

The unidentified frigate illustrated on Jones’ 1874 map is possibly the Germain, which was the only heavily armed British war ship present in the Savannah River channel at the time of the battle. Other British vessels at Savannah during the battle were the Fowey (unarmed), the brig Keppel, and the galley Comet (Hough 1866:140). Stevens (1859) noted that the Germain was a privately-owned vessel that was used by the British Navy during the battle to bombard the Patriot attackers on October 9.

The unidentified British galley shown on the map could represent any of several British galleys that were positioned upstream from Savannah. These include the galleys Comet, Scourge, Vindictive, Viper, Hornet, and Snake (Allen 1858:283). The unidentified American galley shown on Jones’ 1874 map could represent any of several American galleys that were positioned downstream from Savannah.

An untitled and undated manuscript map of the Savannah defenses, from the French perspective, was drafted by O’Connor (n.d.). O’Connor was the principal engineer for the French in the Siege of Savannah. He may have been affiliated with the Irish Regiment who participated in the battle. This map provides many details about the fortifications, roads, and troop locations. O’Connor’s map provides little detail of the city of Savannah, which is shown as an irregular polygon. His depiction of the British and French redoubts, batteries, and trenches are more...
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precise. The original map is curated at the Huntington Library in California and was not examined for the present study, but a low quality photocopy of the map was procured from the Clements Library.

Some of the most detailed graphic evidence of the Savannah battlefield, from the French perspective, was made by Pierre Ozanne. Ozanne was an accomplished French artist who accompanied the French Navy and documented many of the events and places that he witnessed in the American Revolution. Ozanne prepared several views of the Savannah battlefield including one or more maps, one perspective view, and one action view of combat at the Spring Hill Redoubt (Ozanne 1779c; Kennedy 1974: Frontpiece, LOC 2008). Ozanne’s map of the Siege of Savannah contained a lengthy legend that has a wealth of information about the troop positions, ordnance distribution, camps, and fortifications (Figure 53). This French legend is reproduced below.

Post-war maps of Savannah offer additional clues about the Revolutionary War defenses and the general condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGENDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Batterie de Droite de 5. pieces de 18. et de 6. pieces de 12. a laquette on a fait un retour pour 5. autres pieces de 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Batterie des Ameriques de quatre pieces de 4. places Su la Face gauche du Redent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Batterie des Ennemis d’Onze pieces de canon quils ont Demasquee pendant le Siege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Batterie des Ennemis de 9. pieces de canon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Batterie des ennemis de 5 pieces de Canon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Batterie des Ennemis de 7 Mortiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Batt. Des ennemis de 5 pieces de Canon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Batterie ennemie a Gauche de la Redoubte de SpringHill de 5 pieces de Canon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Batterie ennemie de 5 pieces de canon don’t deux flanquent la Redoubt de Spring Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Batterie des enemies de 5. pieces de Canon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Batterie de 5. pieces de canon que les ennemis ont eleves pendant le Siege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Retranchement en Sable en Seconde ligne, avec un Fosse large et Profond dans Lequel la Garnison de Savannah se tenoit a couvert du Feu des Assiegeans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Batterie ennemie de 5 pieces au Bord de la Riviere a Gauche de la Ville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Place d’Arme en forme de Redoubte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Magasin a Poudre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Carps de Calerne Demolis pendant le Siege</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTA
Chapter 5. Archeological Results and Integrated Archeological and Historical Interpretations

Figure 53. 1779 "Siege de Savannah" map by French artist Pierre Ozanne (Library of Congress).
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of Savannah in the late 18th century. Some of these maps are illustrated in later sections of this report. Barnett (1856) provided a redrawn map of the city. It shows the town consisting of six wards, similar to the wards shown on the Revolutionary War-era maps. Several maps show the details of Fort Wayne, which was a U.S. Army fort built on Savannah’s northeast side. A notable feature of that defensive work was its curved design. Remnants of this massive brick fortification may still be seen as one approaches Savannah from the east on President Street. Fort Wayne is also shown on an 1818 map of Savannah (Stouf 1818).

Information about the city’s cemetery appears on several maps. DeBrahm’s 1757 plan of Savannah identifies the “Burial Ground Gate” on the southeast side of town beyond Anson Ward (Oglethorpe Square). The configuration of this cemetery is not indicated on DeBrahm’s map. Barnett’s (1856) redraft of an older map of Savannah shows a large Church Cemetery as a rectangle measuring 396 feet east-west by 211 feet north-south, just southeast of the town. This cemetery tract is bounded on the west by Abercorn Street, which was 75 feet wide and on the north by a wide strip of land (later South Broad Street or Oglethorpe Avenue). By 1800, this Cemetery is shown as a square, which reflects its expansion southward (Lane 1994:43). On Stouf’s 1818 map of Savannah, the “Burial Ground” is shown covering most of a city block with a narrow rectangular division on its eastern flank. That division was later developed for purposes other than a cemetery.

At least four 18th century perspective drawings of Savannah are known to exist. The earliest, attributed to Peter Gordon and Nobel Jones, dates to the early colonial period and has minimal relevance to the Revolutionary War era. The next is an anonymous engraving entitled in German, “Savannah im Jahre 1778”, or translated into English, “Savannah in Year 1778”. The artist of this view is unknown and the image contains many obvious inaccuracies (Figure 54). The artist’s perspective is from north of town, possibly on Hutchinson Island, facing southeast. A few relevant features were noted, including a small rectangular fort containing a central blockhouse northeast of Savannah. Beyond this small fort is a low wall or fence that surrounds a portion of the town on its northeast and east sides. The southwestern part of Savannah, where Spring Hill was located, is obscured by trees in this artist’s view. The Savannah River bluff along Savannah’s waterfront is shown as an irregular series of slopes. One stairway or ramp to the river is indicated on the northeast side of Savannah.

A third image was made by Pierre Ozanne (1779b). He sketched an aerial view of the Siege of Savannah from the French perspective, from an imaginary eminence southeast of town. On this sketch entitled, “Vue de la Ville de Savannah, du Camp, des Tranchees en de L’attaque Octobre 1779”, Ozanne locates the French siege trenches, the attacking columns of October 9, and the distant City of Savannah. Smoke from the military action at Spring Hill and the bombardment from the armed vessels in the Savannah River are shown in the distance. Interestingly, the configuration of the French siege trenches shown on this sketch nearly correspond to Ozanne’s mapped version of the trenches.

A fourth sketch includes details of Savannah’s waterfront by Major Edward White (1786). He shows the town several years after the American Revolution. This sketch is noteworthy, as it provides information about the buildings that existed at that time along Bay Street. White depicts 16 buildings, which are clustered in two blocks. They include a mix of one and two story buildings of varying sizes. Approximately one-half of the buildings are oriented parallel to the Savannah River, while the remainder are aligned perpendicular to the river. These buildings are very closely spaced, with a few of them likely sharing common walls. The various buildings are identified in script, which was illegible in the reproduced version of the sketch that was examined for this study. A closer inspection of this original artwork should prove fruitful (White 1786, reproduced in Lane 1994:64-65). White’s sketch is important because a major fire in 1820 destroyed most of Savannah’s original waterfront and this drawing is a unique view of this part of Savannah shortly after the war.

Other Images

Only a few above-ground structures from the Revolutionary War period remain in Savannah. Some of the buildings that managed to survive into the mid-19th century, when photography became available, have long since been destroyed. In some cases, photographs of these buildings have survived. A few of these are published and many more are contained in several large photograph collections in the Georgia Historical Society, including the Cordray-Foltz collection. Examples of buildings that were photo-documented include the Sheftall-Kent house (discussed earlier), Eppinger’s Tavern (later Lachlan McIntosh’s house), and the house used by Major General Prevost for his headquarters (Wilson 1889).

Defining Features

The features and terminology below are defined by the NPS (NPS 2000) and were used in this project.
Archeologists also developed a Defining Features List that included natural and cultural features/locations of battlefield related sites identified in primary text and map documents. The acronym **KOCOCOA**, describes terrain features that are integral to deciphering battlefields and their components. The acronym stands for Key terrain, Obstacles, Cover and Concealment, and Avenues of Approach and Retreat. Some examples of defining features include the natural, cultural, and military features listed below under “Battlefield Resources”.

- **Military Terrain**—This is the landscape as seen by a soldier and can be divided into the following:
  - *Key Terrain*—“…typically high ground—that gives its possessor an advantage”
  - *Obstacles*—“…terrain features that prevented, restricted, or delayed troop movements…rough, impassable ground, a swamp, a dense wood, a river, or even a small stream if swollen by rain at the time of battle, or fences, ditches, and hedges…Commanders sought to anchor their flanks on some local feature—a hill, ravine, stream, or swamp.”
  - *Cover and Concealment*—“Cover is protection from the enemy’s fire, e.g. the brow of a hill or a stone fence. Concealment is protection from vigilant eyes.”
  - *Observation*—Locations, such as high ground [not necessarily key terrain] or open fields that allowed the movements of the enemy to be observed.
  - *Fields of Fire*—“…Open terrain in front of the battle lines for weapons.”
  - *Dead Ground*—“…an area, a swale or ravine, that cannot be observed or fired into, thus a place for the enemy to conceal themselves.”
Avenues of Approach and Retreat – “…primarily defined by the transportation network…used for mobility…to supply lines, and forward objectives…crossroads, bottlenecks (mountain gaps, fords, bridges) important to possess.

- Battlefield Resources: The NPS defines four broad classes of battlefield resources quoted below (NPS 2000).

  Natural Features – “…defined by the drainage pattern and relative elevation…includes rivers, streams, and swamps, hills and valleys, and the natural land cover-forest, meadow, desert.” This includes nuances of terrain. “Terrain features are typically the most durable of battlefield resources.”

  Cultural Features – “…elements of the historic landscape created by humans” and “…influenced the location and direction of combat.” Examples include canals, villages, farms, mills, churches, houses, patterns of fields and fences, and roads.

  Military Engineering Features – “Military earthworks (field fortifications, entrenchments, trenches) constructed by soldiers or laborers…”

  Artifacts – “Items made or used by people during a battle, or during activities associated with a battle, including, but not limited to artillery positions, staging/camp areas, reserve troops, offensive & defensive trench works, troop movements, battle feints, bivouac areas, landings, field hospitals, field quarters, river crossings, etc. Examples of military artifacts include weapons, ammunition, and other accoutrements. Archeological evidence includes not only the artifacts, but their relationships to each other, to features, to soils, and to the landscape.”

Defining Features, Natural

Brewton Hill

Any hill in the coastal plain is cause for celebration among military strategists. Brewton Hill (aka Brewton’s Hill) was located east of Savannah at Girardeau’s Plantation on the Savannah River. Lincoln and d’Estaing went here for “…a pretty good view of the left of the town and of the vessels off Brewton’s Hill” (Kennedy 1974:124). D’Estaing also had a post in front of the hill. Figures 38 and 53 show Brewton Hill. This hill is a defining feature for the 1778 Battle of Savannah, as discussed by McDaniel (2000b, 2002). Large portions of Brewton Hill were developed in the early 1940s as a 500 unit housing project for the shipworkers (Savannah Morning News 1941).

Savannah River

This natural feature was important terrain. The river borders the northern side of the City of Savannah. The Hessian Captain Heinrichs detailed the Savannah River in his diary. He reported that “…ships of four hundred to five hundred tons” could sail up the Savannah River to the city from the ocean (Alexander 1938:155-157). The depth of the river at Savannah was 3 to 3.5 fathoms (18-21 ft.). “Above the city the river can be navigated only by single-masted ships and large boats as far as Augusta…The entire river is full of turns and islands and banks. The current is swift, and at Savannah the difference between high and low tide is nine and one-half feet” (Alexander 1938:155-157). The siege and naval blockade prior to the battle curtailed most of the use of the river as a supply line for the British in Savannah. During the siege, bombardment, and possibly during the battle, many civilians fled their flaming houses and ran to the British naval vessels seeking shelter. Five Fathom Hole, which is located several miles downstream from Savannah, was approximately 30 feet deep at the time of the American Revolution. Five Fathom Hole was defended by an earthen battery, known as Mud Fort (superceded by Fort Jackson, which still stands today) (Candler and Evans 1906, Volume 2:65). What is presently referred to as Wall’s Cut, located near Turtle Island, figured significantly in the Siege of Savannah, since it was the inland water passageway by which Major Maitland brought his men from Beaufort to reinforce the British. Wall’s Cut was also a vital interior water route in the American Civil War. The Confederates created obstructions there that the U.S. Engineers later removed (Thienel 2006:1). Other important natural features associated with the Savannah River are located at the river’s mouth. These include several access points; including Girardeau’s Plantation (Brewton Hill) and Thunderbolt, the Tybee lighthouse, and the Tybee Bar. Since these features are quite removed from the immediate study, the research on these localities was very limited.

In spite of their massive fleet, the French had great difficulty using the Savannah River as a gateway of attack.
on the City of Savannah. Many of their vessels had too deep of a draft to navigate the channel. Those of shallower draft could, but the French had difficulty finding river pilots who were experienced and willing to aid the French in locating the channel and avoiding the sand bars. It took 16 days for the French vessel *La Truite* to reach Savannah from the mouth of the river, in part because the crew had to sound fathoms to locate the channel, wait for high tides to provide enough draft, and wait for winds to carry them around bends in the river (Kennedy 1974:60).

The river provided both a buffer and an access point for both sides. It also offered the chance for swifter communication than by overland couriers. British vessels initially kept French ships from sailing up the river as far as the city. The departure of the *Vigilance*, however, allowed the *La Truite* and several galleys into the Savannah River and within 1,500 yards of the town or less (for the galleys) (Kennedy 1974:31). During the battle, the brig *Germain* and two British galleys aimed their guns on the Augusta Road (present-day Louisville Road), near Spring Hill Redoubt. Shooting broadside, they killed many of the troops attempting to regroup from the swamp along the high ground of the roadway. The river also was to be the source of another feint in which the French militia (Haitian Volunteers of San Domingo) and others were supposed to draw attention away from the Spring Hill Redoubt. The feint was mildly, if at all, successful (Wilson 2005:171).

**Hutchinson Island**
This island is located in the Savannah River directly across from the City of Savannah. It provided a barrier of safety for allied ships attempting to get close to Savannah while staying out of gun sights. The island also served as a questionable refuge for civilian evacuees trying to escape bombardment in Savannah. The island was referred to as a rice swamp by Anthony Stokes (Kennedy 1974:113). Hutchinson Island contained several large rice plantations in the 18th century (Granger 1947). It would not have presented a significant obstacle for the artillery field of fire from the French and American vessels since these rice fields were largely cleared of trees.

**Back River**
The Back River is actually a secondary channel of the Savannah River, whose flow is diverted by Hutchinson Island. The Back River flows on the north side of the island, whereas water on the south side is used as the main channel of the Savannah River. The Back River provided an area of protection for allied vessels from British guns along the riverbank and at other fortification as well as from armed British vessels. The Back River location provided allied ships with an opportunity to cannonade the city, either directly from their Back River location or by coming out into the main channel at opportune moments. The cannonading from this location hit the rear of the British camp and throughout town but did inconsequential damage to the fortifications or troops (Kennedy 1974:85).

**Yamacraw Bluff**
This area was named for the Yamacraw Indians and was situated along the Savannah River west of Savannah. In 1779 it contained an array of buildings lining the bluff, some of which were warehouses. The allies apparently had armed vessels in the river here. Many Savannah civilians fled to the bluff in terror, trying to avoid the bombs and shells hitting the town. There was also a Hessian hospital at the bluff (Kennedy 1974:112).

**Swamps/Marshes** (southwest of Spring Hill Redoubt and south, southeast, and east of the city)
Engineer O’Connor described the area to the city’s right as an “unassailable swamp” and the area left of the city as “low-lying, some-what marshy ground” (Kennedy 1974:54). The swamp located southwest and west of Spring Hill Redoubt was a natural feature that served as military terrain. It was a “double-edged sword” strategically because it stymied quick troop and artillery movement, and provided a deadly obstacle in retreat; however, its trees hid allied troop movements from the British and offered some protection from small arms fire and shrapnel. While d’Estaing’s plan to use the swamp to his advantage failed, the disadvantages of the terrain were soon apparent as described here.

The swamp proved a major obstacle to troops trying to attack the Spring Hill Redoubt. Lachlan McIntosh’s troops became bogged down in this swamp during the battle. Columns of soldiers forced into the swamp and woods by fierce British fire became merged and confused and could not continue the attack as planned. A French Army officer reported, “More than half of those who enter [the swamp] are either killed or remain stuck fast in the mud” (Wilson 2005:165). Another account by French 2nd Lieutenant of Artillery, François d’Auber de Peyrelongue, described the initial attack at Spring Hill Redoubt. “The marsh which covered the front of the attack had not been taken into account, and we maneuvered in it awkwardly. Those who lost only their shoes were the most fortunate” (Kennedy 1974:37).

The swamp again proved deadly to the allies as they tried to retreat from Spring Hill Redoubt. French Captain de Terson recounted that retreating from the Spring Hill Redoubt “…was not easy to do because we could not stay out of the marsh to our rear; that was the way we had made our approach. The path was so narrow and difficult to find that the entire army plunged into the marsh during the retreat. The retreat order had to
be given several times” (Kennedy 1974:20). De Terson went on to write, “So we had to blunder about for an hour in that swamp until we got to the edge, unable to find the way back to camp to which we had been ordered to retire. Several of our wounded men could not get out of the marsh, and there were a number of men wounded there” (Kennedy 1974:20). Others retreating from the battle were stopped by the swamp and found themselves regrouping on the high ground of Louisville Road, where they lined up as an easy target for decimating British artillery fire.

Captain Bentalou commented on the swamps that were encountered by d’Estaing as he led his Frenchmen towards Spring Hill in the early morning hours of October 9th. Bentalou wrote, “d’Estaing led in person the French corps of attack. Wishing to avoid a circuitous advance round a swamp, and supposing the ground at the bottom to be sufficiently firm, he marched directly through it” (Bentalou 1978 [1824]:29). That detour, however, caused the army to arrive late for the battle. This delay proved a crucial factor in the British victory, since it deprived the Allies of the cover of darkness in their approach. Long-time Savannah residents Philip Minis and Levi Sheftall served as guides for d’Estaing (Ferris and Greenberg 2006:37; Huhner 1909:94, 99-103; Sheftall 1984:74-75; Kole 1992:65).

Woods (Surrounding the town, less than one mile away) A forest provided cover for the allied troops to establish a relatively safe camp from which they would begin an offense and from which they would ultimately march to battle. Engineer O’Connor with the French troops reported, “On the 22nd [of September] the army, 3,000 men strong, began to march and took up a position less than a mile from the enemy trenches under cover of the woods. The American army arrived and stationed itself on our left...” (Kennedy 1974:52). D’Estaing added to this description by writing, “A small stream and thick branches overhead gave cover and prevented us from being seen. The large pines took the place of fortifications and protected us from the fortress’s fire. Without them we could not have sustained such an attack” (Kennedy 1974:52). O’Connor described the small creek providing cover as being located 400 yards from the enemy’s lines at the center defensive works (Kennedy 1974:54).

D’Estaing proffered his rationale for selecting the specific place of attack on the defenses. It had a great deal to do with the protection offered by the forest cover. He wrote, “The incalculable advantage of having cover within 400 yards of the enemy and of attacking suddenly determined the point of attack. It was also better than the other side because it was closer to the mouth of the Savannah River from which I was expecting large cannon that the men-of-war were to send me” (Kennedy 1974:54).
road continued to the White Bluff. White Bluff was a prominent bluff where the village of Vernonburg was later created. As one left town, the name of Bull Street changed to White Bluff Road. Bull Street went past (or possibly through) the British barracks, where the central redoubts and batteries were constructed in 1779. Just past this point, the road forked with the southwestern fork leading towards the Ogeechee River, then known as the Ogeechee Road. The French and Americans established picket posts on either side of Bull Street/White Bluff Road and it probably served as a figurative and literal dividing line between the two allied forces. The road is a defining feature for the 1779 battle because of its association with the central fortifications of the British, the Allied fortifications that were aligned along both sides of the road facing the British, and as a transportation route where men and supplies traveled.

Ebenezer Road/Augusta Road/Louisville Road
The road extending from the outskirt of Savannah, on its southwestern corner, was known alternately as Ebenezer Road, Augusta Road, Liberty Street, and Louisville Road, since it connected all three towns by those names. The road left the outskirts of Savannah along a route that would best navigate the swamps of Musgrove Creek. It then headed generally north-northwest. It was described by d’Estaing as running “between two marshes” (Kennedy 1974:70). Heinrichs reported, “…to the right and left of the Ebenezer Road to within twenty paces of the abatis there are morasses…” (Alexander 1938:169).

At the time of the battle, the road was the only high ground in that area. The linear, high ground of the road was surrounded by a swamp and low-lying land. Today the exact opposite is true. The road appears extremely well executed” (Kennedy 1974:37). The only way these soldiers were able to safely use the road to retreat was to access it farther west, out of the range of fire from the Spring Hill and Carolina redoubts.

Jewish Cemetery (located approximately 0.3 of a mile southwest of the Spring Hill Redoubt)
Allies selected the Jewish Cemetery as the location to place reserve troops (Wilson 2005:161). It would also be the area behind which French and American troops would regroup should a retreat be necessary. The cemetery was located on the relatively high ground of a bluff adjacent to the swamp and woods in one direction. It served as a good viewing platform for the battleground to the north and would have allowed reserve troops to observe when they would be needed. While the Jewish Cemetery is a cultural feature, its location on a slight bluff provided the natural feature relevant to military terrain. Engineer O’Connor referred to it as an “Old Jewish Cemetery” [italics added], even though it was established only nine years earlier in 1770 (Rubin 1983; Levy 1983, 1999). The French reserve column stationed at the cemetery was under command of General Noailles and included Haitian troops and two, four pound guns to help cover an allied troop retreat, should it occur. Upon arrival at the cemetery, the reserve corps was “…placed on its right and a little to the rear the four 4-pounders” (Kennedy 1974:67).

There are actually two distinct Jewish cemeteries in the same general vicinity and both existed at the time of the 1779 battle. The two cemeteries are separated by only a short distance and the Allied reserve forces who were stationed there probably covered the entire area. The largest Jewish Cemetery was created in 1770 by Mordecai Sheftall, although the bronze plaque on the cemetery entrance states that it was dedicated in 1773. The Jewish community in Savannah had formerly buried their dead in a cemetery located on present-day Oglethorpe Avenue, between Bull and Whitaker streets. That cemetery became filled and Savannah’s Jews petitioned to expand that cemetery’s boundaries. Their requests were not approved and Mordecai Sheftall, who was a prominent member of Savannah’s Jewish community at that time, decided to dedicate about 1.5 acres of his 5 acre garden lot for the purpose of a Jewish burial ground. The burial site that he chose was near the pre-existing Levi Sheftall family plot. Levi Sheftall, Sr. was born in Savannah in 1739. Benjamin Sheftall was buried in the Levi Sheftall cemetery in 1762, which indicates it was in use by that time. The bronze plaque at this cemetery, which is a smaller enclosure than the Mordecai Sheftall cemetery, however, states that it was dedicated in 1773. The larger cemetery has a plaque with the same dedication year, so it is possible that while the family cemetery was older, it was dedicated or rededicated in 1773 along with the new Jewish Cemetery. To this day, the two cemeteries in this part of Savannah are distinct.
Limited archeology has been conducted within the smaller enclosure of the Sheftall Family Cemetery, including mapping tombstones and depressions (Levy 1983;1999:41-42; Leech and Babits 1990).

Defining Features, Military Engineering

Savannah Defensive Works
The defensive works around Savannah were military engineering features designed by British engineer Captain James Moncrief (Figure 55). He created five layers of defense around the city that included (from the farthest outside of town to the nearest) cleared fields, an abatis sandwiched between ditches, a series of fourteen redoubts with artillery batteries on either side and a line of earthworks about 50-100 yards behind them, and a tactical reserve (dragoons and Major Graham’s Light Infantry Corps standing ready to close a breach in the lines (Wilson 2005:159). In addition to these defensive works, others should exist in this general area. These include: American fortifications, batteries, and outposts constructed prior to December of 1778; later War of 1812 earthworks constructed by the United States; and possibly Civil War trenches. Hessian Captain Heinrichs estimated the length of the defensive works, “...from the river on one side of the city to the river on the other” to be over 12,500 ft. (Alexander 1938:164-165).

Savannah lay relatively defenseless as late as September 3. Captain Heinrichs of the Hessians describes the condition of the defenses before General Prevost had engineer Moncrief begin his frantic endeavors. Heinrichs wrote, “Savannah was still half open...the entire fortification consisted of a double tenaille open on the land side and situated this [the east] side of the city...a rectangular redoubt on the Ebenezer road [Spring Hill], two others between the latter and the double tenaille, and abatis around the entire line...The works were less than twelve feet thick and half-crumbled, having been thrown up of mere sand and a few fascines. No sandbags, no gabions, nothing was in readiness that could be used to repair the breastworks” (Alexander 1938:165). Captain Paul Bentalou, who arrived in the Savannah area with Pulaski’s Legion on September 13, was not impressed with the city’s defenses as he later remarked, “Savannah was neither a fortress nor a walled city. It was merely a town fortified with batteries, redoubts, and abatis.” (Bentalou 1978 [1824]:88).

Moncrief’s feverish work transformed the questionable defenses into a stronghold for the British. According to Heinrichs, Moncrief had 15 batteries constructed and mounted with 76 cannons. He had an additional 13 batteries constructed between the old redoubts (Alexander 1938:167).

A 2nd Lieutenant in the French artillery described the works, “The enemy entrenchments consisted of a large abatis along the entire front of their line, which was studded with five redoubts [ca September 25], each of which protected it. In the intervals between the redoubts were the batteries. In front of all of this they had a ditch nine feet deep. Behind it there was a second ditch into which they would probably have jumped if they had been expelled from the first one. The whole defense line was protected by 130 pieces of cannon of all caliber, but mostly 4-pounders. It backed up on the river on two sides, and its flanks were defended by swamps” (Kennedy 1974:32).

O’Connor, the engineer with the French troops, recorded additional details about the British defenses at Savannah. “The city of Savannah is located on the right bank of the river of the same name in flat, sandy terrain. It was defended by a primary line of redoubts and batteries a half mile out from the city. For a half mile in front of it everything had been destroyed or laid bare by fire. The walls were of sand, buttressed by sandbags. The batteries were sixty yards in front of the trenches and were protected by sturdy oak walls. A thick abatis extended all the way around the edge of the line and was especially strong on the right. I did not get a view of the second enemy line because it did not have a communication trench with the first one. It appeared to be a wide trench where they camped under the protection of the cannon. The deserters all maintained they kept their regular troops there and that only militia and sailors manned the first line. The first line was furnished with fifty cannon, mostly 9-pounders and only two pieces of which were 22-pounders. Aside from these there were a few small mortars. Several small field guns, 4-or 6-pounders, were seen to the rear” (Kennedy 1974:53).

D’Estaing essentially agreed with O’Connor’s description above, except that d’Estaing claimed the British had more artillery, much of it pulled from their ships in port including guns from the Rose and the H.M.S. Ariel before being scuttled. D’Estaing reported over 100 pieces of cannon in several of the British batteries. In addition, the British placed 24 and 36 pounders along the bank of the Savannah River. The majority of the other guns were 9 pounders, with 8 or 10 large caliber pieces. D’Estaing also mentioned that deserters described “new interior lines” built between the redoubts during the siege. Previous lines there had been destroyed by fire, presumably by the cannonade from French artillery. D’Estaing reported that the British “...did not open up their embrasures” (Kennedy 1974:53).
D’Estaing described the abatis by Spring Hill Redoubt as “…appearing stronger than it actually was” because it “…did not stretch very far, was for the most part scarcely an obstacle…” and “…stones and rubbish had been thrown out in front to slow down an attack” (Kennedy 1974:71).

Spring Hill Redoubt, Central Redoubts [including barracks] (See separate discussions below regarding these defining features.)

Allied Offensive Works
The French artillery officer was very familiar with the offensive works, describing them as follows: “Our battery was set up 424 yards from the enemy line. The sandbag fascines were perfect. For cover we used some sand-filled wicker baskets hastily made in proportions much larger than the ordnance. We had only naval gun carriages, so that, as a short cut, the battery was at barbette, and we were exposed from the knees up. To offset this disadvantage, on both sides of the platforms small, two-foot ditches were dug in which the cannoniers stood, which made firing less and less rapid….Communications between the battery and the trench had not even been established. We had to run about 85 yards in the open” (Kennedy 1974:33).

He went on to write, “All the batteries were set up at approximately the same distance from the enemy, 424 yards away, except the mortar batteries which were 640 yards away”(Kennedy 1974:34). American forces established a battery on the French flank, using four 6 pounders on loan from the French. The left battery contained six each of 12 and 18 pounders. The right battery had seven 12-pounders and five 18-pounders. A later constructed far right battery contained five 12 pounders. The French also had 10 mortars, including a 9-inch one (Kennedy 1974:34).

Hessian Captain Heinrichs offered a critique of the main battery constructed by the French. He observed,

For a breach battery it is too far away, and for a demounting and ricochet battery, too close. If he had used ricochet fire (and the ground between the two works permits of it), he would certainly have done great damage. But at this distance a point-blank shot would go over the lines into the empty houses, or, if aimed lower, would strike into the sand and die (Alexander 1938:167).

Based on siege and battle accounts, it appears that Heinrichs’ observations were correct.

Field of Fire
The main field of fire consisted of the areas outside the abatis that surrounded the City of Savannah on the east and south, which were open fields of fire. These areas had been cleared “…for several hundred yards” by British forces so they could have a clear shot at the approaching enemy (Wilson 2005:157). This created deadly fields of fire during the siege as French troops dug offensive works and saps, or trench extensions toward a point beneath the British fortifications, south of the abatis. This deadly field of fire was also responsible for the annihilation of attacking allied troops on October 9, as they marched across the barren areas while being bombarded with artillery fire, shells, cannon balls, and shrapnel.

A secondary field of fire was along the Augusta/Ebenezer/Louisville Road. This cleared, elevated roadway offered little protection from artillery fire of the Spring Hill and Carolina redoubts to French and American troops amassed on the road.

A third field of fire was the river front. The fortification on the northeastern corner of town (known as Fort Halifax and alternately as Fort Prevost, and then later as Fort Wayne) and an adjacent battery to its west fired on French and American vessels in the main channel of the Savannah River and in the Back River, behind Hutchinson Island. While the Hutchinson Island offered some protection for Back River vessels, the Savannah River provided an unobstructed field of fire.

This project investigated multiple battlefield landscapes including Spring Hill Redoubt (at Battlefield Park), the two Central Redoubts (Madison and Lafayette squares), the area of Fort Prevost (Emmet Park), the French and American camps (Cuyler, Myers, and Dixon parks), and Colonial Park Cemetery. The map in Figure 7 depicts these locations.

Spring Hill Redoubt (Battlefield Park)

Defining Features, Natural, Cultural, and Military Engineering

Spring Hill Redoubt
D’Estaing chose the Spring Hill Redoubt as the location of the main attack because he felt it was the least fortified, due in part to the defining natural feature of the swamp/marsh. In his words, “The marsh in front of it reassured the enemy in that sector” (Kennedy 1974:66). In addition, the French artillery was farthest away from Spring Hill than from any other redoubts, and therefore would be a target least expected by the British. Finally, the works at Spring...
Hill invited attack. D’Estaing noted that, “The trenches were not continuous; we could pass between them. The one behind the abatis extended only a little beyond the Spring Hill Redoubt. That redoubt was not close enough to the marsh to prevent several columns from forming on a rather wide front between the marsh and the redoubt. A small brook, near the marshy ground but not touching it, made a sort of breastwork” (Kennedy 1974:67).

D’Estaing went on to say that grazing horses, soldiers and deserters were observed passing through this area without encountering any obstacles such as abatis or continuous ditches. Lincoln noted that on September 18 the British right was protected by the range of fire from armed ships in the river. The area on the right also contained a deep creek and a rice field—both deterrents for an attack (Kennedy 1974:124).

Prevost was aware of the Achilles heel of his right flank, but was at a loss as to how he or engineer Moncrief could fix the problem. Prevost noted that, “The ground towards both our flanks, notwithstanding all a good engineer could do, was still favorable to the enemy. On the right a swampy hollow brought him under cover to within fifty yards of our principal works, on some points still nearer” (Kennedy 1974:100). But it was the left flank that Prevost expected the enemy to attack, since its covered ground was much firmer than the swampy land around Spring Hill.

Battery
Another defining military feature associated with the Spring Hill Redoubt was the battery to the right of the Carolina Redoubt, just north of the Spring Hill Redoubt. According to Heinrichs, that battery mounted five guns (Alexander 1938:169). It provided flanking fire against forces attacking the Spring Hill and Carolina redoubts.

Historical Significance

M. de Béthisy commanded the French vanguard assigned to attack and overrun the Spring Hill Redoubt. His command for this task consisted of 180 men divided into three divisions, led by officers from two chasseur companies and the grenadier companies of Armagnac and Agénois (Kennedy 1974:20).

On October 9, 1779, Hessian Lieutenant Colonel de Porbeck (in Wissenbach’s Regiment) was Field Officer of the day on the right wing of the British defensive

Figure 55. This map shows the location of Spring Hill Redoubt (Faden 1784, Savannah History Museum, Coastal Heritage Society). North is towards the river, at the bottom of this map.
works. Porbeck held Spring Hill Redoubt throughout the French and American allied attack. He was supported by approximately 100 men, including the South Carolina Royalists, Captain Tawse and his dragoons (dismounted), and the 4th and 60th Battalions (Miles and Kochan 1989b: W121).

### Viewsheds

Ironically, what is known as Spring Hill has neither a spring nor a hill visible on the landscape today. Initially the area was outside the original boundary of colonial Savannah and made up a portion of the triangular garden lots used by residents. The Spring Hill Redoubt was one of the few defensive works around Savannah when d’Estaing landed in September 1779. The location may have been fortified even earlier to protect the town during the Seven Years War (DeBrahm 1757). The hill would have offered a strategic spot for a redoubt fortification. Not only was it high ground, but it sat adjacent to a swampy lowland that offered additional protection on one side. In addition, a fort at this location served to guard a major road (Augusta/Ebenezer Road) coming into the town.

### Urban History of the Project Area

The first use of Spring Hill by Europeans was as garden lots of Savannah. The town lots measured 60 by 90 ft. This size lot would accommodate a small kitchen garden but nothing substantial enough to provide food throughout the year. Oglethorpe’s design of the garden lots, however, allowed town residents to farm a larger subsistence garden just outside of town. The spring near these garden lots would have been an added bonus to gardeners. Oglethorpe made the 16 acre tract a public reserve that was held from 1733-1765 (Smith 2002:1). In 1763 the Crown granted the tract to four individuals who appear to have been commissioners representing Savannah. The commissioners put the property up for lease in 1766 (Smith 2002:1). Thirteen years later, the area became the scene of the horrific Battle of Savannah in October 1779.

Prior to the battle, when General Prevost realized that Savannah was d’Estaing’s target, the British general had engineer Moncrief begin hastily fortifying the city. This included strengthening Spring Hill Redoubt. Ditches, earthworks, parapets, and an extensive abatis sprung up. Trees were cut down to use in construction and to clear the view of approaching enemies.

Following the battle, the landscape changed again with the addition of multiple graves and one or more mass graves dug to take the large numbers of dead. To date, no large mass grave has been located. A series of individual graves were discovered, however, in the nineteenth century.

Adelaide Wilson noted that industrial construction for the Central of Georgia Railroad resulted in the discovery of battle-related items. She wrote: “When the ground was cut down, in 1837, to fill up a place where the Central Railroad depot stands, many articles of warfare were found, mementos of that day, where the blood of many nations mingled their streams in the sandy soil of Savannah. To-day, in this busy work-a-day century, a depot of the vast Central Railroad system marks the spot of fearful carnage” (Wilson 1889:60)

Nineteenth century newspaper articles recount the discovery of some smaller, multiple graves, as transcribed below.

‘LIBERTY COUNTY, Dec. 20, 1842.

To W. H. Bulloch, Esq.

Dear Sir:- I enclose you the annexed communication in regard to the erection of a monument, to the memory of the officers and soldiers who fell whilst attempting to storm the works of the British at Savannah, Oct. 9, 1779. It is an enterprise which must ensure the good will of all; and you will much oblige a subscriber by giving the following brief remarks a place in your columns. ‘Respectfully, H.

‘Approaching the city, a short time since, by the Ogechee road, a few hundred paces in the rear of the old barracks, a small mound was pointed out to me, as one of the spots where the ashes of those heroes repose who fell, October 9, 1779, in the ever memorable siege of Savannah. The rude tumuli which was hastily erected over their remains, amid the gloomy silence which pervaded our stricken ranks, are now almost obliterated and levelled to the ground by the peltings of the thousand storms, which have beat upon them for more than sixty years. Citizens of Savannah, why do the bones of those gallant spirits whose lifeblood once watered your now prosperous soil moulder on without tablet or inscription, with no requiem but the sighing of the mournful pines, and destined ere long to be lost in the tide of oblivion? The lofty column which rears its marble head, towering high o’er the summit of Bunker, tells truly where the gallant Warren and his brave compatriots fell, and proclaims the truth, that although long departed, still they live fresh in their country’s memory. Did Jasper and the hundred who with him shared a bloody grave, fight in a less...
The laborers at the Rail Road Depot, on Tuesday, disinterred the remains of other officers or soldiers who were buried during the siege of Savannah. Numerous bones and skulls were exposed to the light of day- also, a portion of a military cap, several belt buckles with portions of the belts- a small gold buckle, probably a shoe buckle, an ivory comb, and last, not least, a moiety, apparently of a pistareen as the larger portion of the letters of the word Hispaniarum are visible. This piece of silver coin has a hole bored in it indicating that it was divided as a keepsake, or memento of love or affectionate regard for some friend, from whom the wearer was separated. Both he who wore it and she for whom it was worn have been numbered with the dead, while curious eyes at this day can only conjecture the use of this mutilated coin, which perhaps served as a talisman to nerve the brave soldier in the deadly conflict’ (Daily Georgian, February 27, 1845:2).

The “Hispaniarum” pistareen was probably a small Spanish silver coin. These coins were commonly used in America and the West Indies throughout the 18th century. They are frequently associated with sites from the American Revolution, although they were also in common circulation before and after the war. Spanish coinage was accepted as legal tender in the United States, in fact, as late as this newspaper article.

A third newspaper article, which carries a residual tone of anti-Union sympathy characteristic of the Reconstruction era, appeared 16 years later:

‘Revolutionary Relics--Discovery of Human Bones, Old Coins, & c.

On Saturday last, while the workmen were engaged in excavating for the foundation of the new Freight Depot for the Savannah and Charleston Railroad, a number of interesting and curious relics of the past were discovered, which carry us back to the first rebellion in 1776 and by violent contrast to struggles more recent for the same great principles of self-government. The new freight depot is being built in the yard of the Central Railroad, south of the passenger depot. At this point was unearthed the bones of several human beings, and amongst them a human skull, to which was still adhering a bunch of hair, plaited in three plaits.

This skull evidently was that of an Indian, or one of the old school gentlemen of the period. There were also found a number of coins which, from their position (being in a pile together), had been in a bag or purse which had passed away into
mother earth, saving the metal behind. Amongst the coin were two one dollar silver pieces and five Spanish quarters, bearing dates from 1754 to 1776.

Some of the bones were found in a regularly made grave, and it is reasonable to suppose had the excavation been continued more of these relics of the past would have been brought to light. Who knows but that old “Tomochichi” himself may not claim these remnants of mortality as his own, or that some of the distinguishing old “Rebs” who followed the noble Count Pulaski at the siege of Savannah may not quietly sleep at this spot, even amid the continual bustle and noise of the iron horse as it daily goes and comes.

This spot is a portion of the hill upon which, during the siege of Savannah in 1779, the Americans had erected a redoubt, and the conclusion is not harsh to suppose that the remains found are those of some of the first “Rebs” who died gallantly during battle for the right of self government.

We hope the coin will be collected and preserved and that the Georgia Historical Society will throw some light upon this interesting inquiry' (Savannah Morning News, June 6, 1870:3).

The preceding newspaper reference is less informative as to the identity of the human remains but they indicate continuing encounters between railroad construction crews and human burials in the vicinity of the Spring Hill Redoubt. This newspaper account is corroborated by a later document by Jacob R. Strate.

A Central of Georgia Railroad machinist named Jacob R. Strate made a speech to the Georgia Historical Society in 1879 in which he briefly described his excavation of the remains of a British soldier near the railroad roundhouse. Strate noted that the grave contained a 1758 Spanish coin and that he [Strate] gave it to the Georgia Historical Society (Strate 1879). Strate’s description of the find is not specific enough for precise location on the battlefield. No information has surfaced on any additional graves discovered since those cited above.

The Spring Hill Redoubt area contained fewer connecting ditches than other fortified areas of town. It is unclear, therefore, if anything here was in-filled under General Anthony Wayne’s order to do so in 1782 following the departure of the British. Erosion did its own infilling quickly in the sandy soils and between nature and man-made changes, Spring Hill Redoubt eventually disappeared.

By 1783, Savannah distiller William Hornby petitioned the Georgia Assembly for a grant of the sixteen acre tract known as the Spring tract (Smith 2002:8). It is unclear if he was successful, however two years later the assembly and the City of Savannah leased the tract to James Watson for a term of ten years. The following year Watson advertised the opening of a “Cold Bath” at that location (Smith 2002:8).

The area underwent extensive changes in 1800 when the city carved up the entire area into three sections, of which were further subdivided by lots. The center section included the spring and contained Lot 22. The swamp became Lot 23 and occupied the western section. The eastern section was divided into 21 lots. Lots 22 and 23 were leased for a brickyard and clay mining. The east portion of Lot 22 was sublet to distillers, who opened a distillery within two years. The distillery, under different management was still in business in 1819 (Smith 2002:8).

From 1800 to the 1830s a handful of commercial interests and buildings occupied the area (Smith 2002:11). One such structure was located less than 50 m away from where the redoubt once stood. Archeologists located this domestic site, including a privy and midden, in 2005 during the search for the Spring Hill Redoubt (Elliott 2006a).

The city provided property at Spring Hill for the establishment of a railroad. The arrival of the Central of Georgia in the 1830s brought the most intensive changes to the landscape. An account of railroad bridge construction activities at Spring Hill told of “…one hundred and fifty laborers with mules and carts… excavating at the hill. The earth was carted over the bridge for the embankment. This work was completed in the spring of 1838. Many war relics-shot, shell and copper hoops – were unearthed in the excavation at Spring Hill…” (Smith 2002:13). The railroad did additional leveling of any remains of Spring Hill so that track could be laid and trains would have flat and easy access to the roundhouse complex. In addition to pushing any remaining high parts of Spring Hill down slope to level the area, the railroad also increased the elevation of the entire area by dumping coal, cinders, and clinkers across the ground. This fill ranges between at least 50-75 cm thick in some places. It generally gets thicker as one moves west from Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Central of Georgia construction including: the first passenger train shed south of Louisville Road and then the extant one along the northern edge of Louisville Road, the Red Building freight warehouse north of the passenger shed and across the cotton yard, and the construction of the entire railroad complex encompassing and surrounding the roundhouse also brought drastic changes to the Spring Hill landscape. Construction of some of these buildings...
resulted in the location of graves, as mentioned previously. By the late 19th century, the eastern side of the Spring Hill Redoubt area contained numerous two-story commercial buildings fronting Broad Street (now Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.). By the early 20th century, these buildings and their basements were used by the meat packing industry and multiple railroad tracks paralleled each other across the former Spring Hill to allow refrigerated train cars to reach the buildings and load meat.

The Central of Georgia boom continued throughout the early part of the 20th century. By 1968, however, the area containing Spring Hill Redoubt was no longer in use by the railroad. Eventually, the meat packing plants were razed. The rail shops at the roundhouse complex closed. At this time, forward-thinking citizens renewed the over 150 year-old push to memorialize the battle events at Spring Hill (Smith 2002:26). Between 1975 and 1980 the City of Savannah had formal plans and studies made for a Revolutionary Battle Park. The property received National Historic Landmark status in 1980. In 1984 an $80 million dollar development was announced, which was terminated the following year.

A forgotten clause in the original deed from the city to the railroad allowed the city to regain the property. Today, the Coastal Heritage Society (CHS), a 501(c)3 non-profit operates and maintains the property for the city. In 2005 CHS made plans to begin construction of a replica redoubt as part of overall plans to create a battlefield park. At this time CHS staff archeologists investigated the area and located the actual remains of the Spring Hill Redoubt. This location was then incorporated into the design plan of Battlefield Park. In 2008 CHS completed most of the park construction, including memorial stones and interpretive signage. CHS staff archeologists continue to work within and nearby the park. Most notably, for the current project, archeologists conducted a GPR survey in Louisville Road, immediately adjacent to the Spring Hill Redoubt footprint.

the area that is now Louisville Road (formerly known as Augusta Road or Ebenezer Road). While the general location of the road dates to the time of the battle, it shifted slightly (either to the north or to the south) over the years, particularly with the impacts from railroad buildings and track construction. Figure 56 shows the relationship between the historic and modern map features in this area. Archeologists returned to Spring Hill to conduct a GPR survey of Louisville Road. Archeologists examined the road directly adjacent to the redoubt’s footprint and adjoining areas to the east and west. The survey block to the east connected with the radar block done previously in 2004, when CHS initially looked for the Spring Hill Redoubt. The current radar block was extended west to the “jog” in Louisville Road. Archeologists obtained a city permit to close the road while they conducted the survey. Upon completion of the road survey, archeologists surveyed the area of the redoubt footprint in Battlefield Park in an effort to see what the unexcavated portions might look like, particularly when surrounded by recent land disturbance and fill episodes.

Ground Penetrating Radar Results

**Archeology**

Spring Hill was revisited for this project. The discovery of the redoubt here in 2005 showed that it extended into

![GIS overlay of the Faden map and a modern Savannah map showing Spring Hill Redoubt (#11) now cut by Louisville Road. North is up on map.](image-url)
Block A was placed along a portion of Louisville Road, west of Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. Block A was a long narrow block that measured 94 m east-west by 12.5 m north-south. A total of 2,444 m on 26 radargrams was contained within Block A. The ground surface of Block A was entirely paved. The eastern limit of Block A approximately corresponds to the western limit of previous GPR survey performed by General Engineering Geophysics, LLC (2004).

**Block B**

Block B was placed immediately west of Block A along Louisville Road and the two GPR blocks are contiguous. Block B measured 94 m east-west by 8.5 m north-south. A total of 1,692 m on 18 radargrams was contained within Block B. The ground surface of Block B was paved with asphalt. Together Blocks A and B cover a contiguous sample measuring 188 m by 8.5 to 12.5 m along the Louisville Road corridor.

Figure 57 contains plan views of GPR Blocks A and B at a lower time depth of 111-131 ns. Although many anomalies are presented in these two plan views, none are oriented northwest-southeast and none of them clearly correspond to the 1779 ditch work. Nor do these plan views indicate any northern continuation of the defensive ditch work discovered in 2005. The strong radar reflections are more abundant and widespread in Block A, compared to Block B.

**Block C**

Block C was placed on a grassy area, just south of the southwestern side of Block A. Block C measured 15 m east-west by 5.5 m north-south. It was examined by 12 radargrams that totaled 180 linear meters of survey. Figure 58 is a plan view of Block C at a lower time depth of 109-114 ns. This view shows a concentration of GPR anomalies on the southern half of this sample.

**Block D**

Block D was placed just east of the partially reconstructed berm of the redoubt archeologically confirmed by Rita Elliott and her crew in 2005. Block D measured 61 m east-west by 24.5 m north-south. It was examined by 50 radargrams that totaled 3,050 linear meters of survey.

Figure 59 is a plan view of Block D at a lower time depth of 105-110 ns. A strong radar reflection is present in the northeastern part of this block. Another strong reflection is located on the southwestern corner of the block. Although the radargrams in this block were collected from west to east, a series of narrow parallel lines are faintly visible.
in this view, which are oriented north-northeast to south-southwest. These may represent buried agricultural furrows from the late 18th or early 19th century.

**Previous GPR Coverage**

None of the present GPR sample blocks, nor the previous GPR survey samples conducted by General Engineering Geophysics, LLC (2004), or a previous GPR survey by CHS and LAMAR Institute researchers on Savannah’s Railroad Ward along Harris and Purse Streets yielded any definitive evidence of Revolutionary War defensive features (Elliott 2008). Substantial radar anomalies were prevalent in all of these GPR samples, but their function remains largely undetermined. Many are linear and are likely related to present and former utility lines. Others may have greater antiquity and may be interesting subjects for future investigations. The GPR work, both present and past, did not provide any significant new information about the locations of the defensive network that surrounded Savannah in 1779. This negative evidence can be interpreted in several ways. One explanation is that defensive features, such as redoubts, ditch work, or artillery batteries, were not present within the sampled areas. Another explanation is that such features were
present but their archeological traces elude the GPR technology or the GPR interpreters.

Central Redoubts (Madison and Lafayette Squares)

Defining Features, Natural, Cultural, and Military Engineering

The Barracks was a defining cultural feature of the Central redoubts and was turned into a military engineering feature (Figure 60). In 1778 it was referred to as the “new” barracks. While some primary documents examined for this project mentioned the barracks, none detailed its construction or much about its use. It is likely that it was built under the auspices of Royal Governor Wright prior to the Patriots’ commandeering Savannah in 1778. By the fall of 1778, British forces had taken the city, and by the fall of 1779, the British determined that the barracks was a liability along the defensive lines. The British, probably under Moncrief’s orders, decided the barracks would be more serviceable if it was razed and part of the foundation incorporated into the defensive works along the center of the abatis, between two redoubts. Research located numerous references to the barracks which are detailed here.

Historical Significance (correlated with primary source information)

In January of 1779 a witness described, “…an excellent Barrack fit to contain 1000 men now occupied by the Hessians and quarters might be found in the Town for 2000 men without distressing the Inhabitants there at present” (Innes 1779a).

Between March and December of 1779, blacksmith Frederick Fahm made items for the barracks as requested by Engineer Moncrief. The receipt listing the items he made does not give the barracks location, other than Savannah. It is unclear if it references the barracks at what is now Madison Square, or another barracks, perhaps at Fort Prevost along the river or elsewhere.

The receipt itemized several types of hardware “...for the Barracks”. This included hasps, staples (square and round), and large hinges. The 9 pairs of hinges suggest an assortment of doors and possibly windows in the barracks. The receipt includes instructions below the date on payment.

Savannah in Georgia

31st Dec. 1779

Sir

You are hereby directed & required to Pay Frederick Fahm BlackSmith the Sum of Two Hundred Nine Pound, Nine Shillings & Ten Pence Sterling being for Black Smith work by him performed & trenching tools supplied for carrying on his Majestys Works in the Engineer Department between 11th March & 31st Dec 1779…James Moncrief Comdr Engineer” (Moncrief 1779a)

Ironically, if the receipt is for the central barracks, then Moncrief was refurbishing six months or less prior to razing it.

Figure 60. The red rectangle represents the brick barracks within Savannah’s defensive works prior to barracks demolition by the British (Ozanne 1779, Library of Congress).
Witnesses reported that on September 16, 1779, d’Estaing’s troops,

…marched to attack the Town and encamped by Mr. Tattnell’s Brick Kilns close to his house. They threw up a two Gun Battery opposite to the New Barracks [italics added] which they fired upon, but without effect; and their Battery was soon destroyed by Captain Moncrieff. They then erected another of species of Canon to the left of the former one, opposite to some Redoubts on our Right towards Yamakra and kept up a brisk Fire for two days upon them. On Saturday finding they made no Impression on our Redoubts they withdrew their Canon and returned to the Brick-kiln where they are now encamped in hopes of Starving out the Garrison… (Fuser 1779).

Tattnell’s Plantation was off the main road at the east side of town, which headed to Thunderbolt (Innes 1779a). By September 21, 1779, “a new battery of seven 6-pounders and 9-pounders was erected in front of the barracks, as the enemy was throwing bomb-shells into the town (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W116).

General Prevost … “had the barracks pulled down and a great battery erected” (Miles and Kochan 1989b:W118). A British naval officer reported that on September 24, “The new battery behind the barracks finished this day, mounted with two 18-pounders, two 9-pounders and field pieces (Kennedy 1974:83). The dismantling of the barracks was apparently begun on September 27 when Prevost recorded, “We begin to unroof the barracks” (Prevost 1779b:292). On that day, the British completed the destruction of the barracks, “…and carried off the wood, leaving the lower part as a breastwork, to prevent it being fired from the enemy” (Kennedy 1974:85). The French watched the barracks dismantling with interest. French Captain de Terson observed, “On their right they are tearing down a very fine barracks. We do not know why. We think they will build a battery behind or above it, filling up the inside which could impede us. Such a battery could enfilade our lines” (Kennedy 1974:18). On September 29, Prevost reported, “The barracks leveled the back wall to the ground, the front to a good parapet height from the floor, converted into a very respectable work in our center” (Prevost 1779b:292).

The French dug trenches in an effort to attack the barracks’ battery. Engineer O’Connor reported, “On the night of the 24th we were supposed to continue the parallel up to the barracks, and the Americans were to dig another one up to that point from their side” (Kennedy 1974:56). O’Connor wrote that d’Estaing decided the Americans had too few tools and workers, and that the French should build a battery 425 yards from the barracks, “…immediately behind the communication trench and a little above the center of it” (Kennedy 1974:56). The battery was poorly positioned and only shot from the cannon on the left side could reach the barracks. D’Estaing admitted that, “Moved forward a few yards and to an angle, the battery could have blown the barracks to pieces and had within its circular range not only the barracks but also the whole line of fortifications as far as the Spring Hill Redoubt” (Kennedy 1974:56).

On September 24, a British sortie of three light companies was intended to draw the French troops out of the sap they just constructed to determine their strength and to fire on them. Prevost wrote that the light companies would be protected should the French pursue them back to the British lines, by “…the Highlanders concealed behind the barracks…” (Kennedy 1974:97).

By the time d’Estaing decided to end the siege and begin an attack, the British had considerably strengthened the fortifications in the barracks area as part of a response to attacks from the nearby French battery. The British relocated artillery and troops to the “barracks front” as d’Estaing called it and also fortified the works there with a second trench and the extension of the abatis (Kennedy 1974:65). For these reasons, d’Estaing felt the Central Redoubt was a poor and dangerous choice for an assault but might serve as a good location for a feint. The British might expect an assault here since the French put great efforts into constructing trenches and a battery there.

Deciphering the history of the barracks becomes complicated due to several factors. First, it was not the only barracks in Savannah in 1779. Another barracks was located near Yamacraw Bluff, on the northwestern side of the town. That building appears to have remained standing after the barracks near the central redoubts was dismantled in late September 1779. There may have been another barracks constructed outside Fort Wayne and used from 1821-1851 (Grice 2005:1). And yet another barracks, Oglethorpe Barracks, was in use by the 1820s and completed in 1834 near or possibly on, the site of the barracks dismantled in 1779. Oglethorpe Barracks was a response to the City of Savannah petitioning the federal government to furnish the supplies and soldiers for construction on land provided by the city.

The 19th century barracks was known as Oglethorpe Barracks and was constructed north of Madison Square, just across East Harris Street. Figure 61 is a photograph of a painting of the barracks. The painting currently hangs in the nearby Andrew Low House. This painting is labeled, “U.S. Cantonment at Savannah 1838 By Wm Thads. Williams”. At this time the cantonment consisted of two imposing, two-story brick structures with multiple
chimneys on each. The buildings are aligned north-south and occupy the eastern and western sides of an entire block which was enclosed by a picket fence. Federal troops used Oglethorpe Barracks from the 1820s (while under construction) until about 1850 (Grice 2005:2). Between 1838 and 1853, several one-story buildings were added on the periphery of the block until by 1853 there were seven such structures, in addition to the two large brick buildings.

In 1850 the Savannah Republican newspaper posted the following announcement.

The site formerly occupied by the old U.S. Barracks beyond the Jail has lately been surveyed by James W. DeLyon, City Surveyor, and the whole ground (some 25 acres) laid off into one hundred lots 60 by 90 feet — corresponding with the streets and lanes of the city. The same will soon be valued and offered for sale” (Savannah Republican News 1850).

In 1853 the city purchased the barracks from the United States government. This U.S. Barracks appears on an 1853 map of Savannah (Figure 62 Vincent 1853). While the barracks was still labeled on a city map made three years later, the surrounding division of tythings, blocks, and squares was clearly depicted on this newly developed area of town that followed Oglethorpe's original Savannah town plan. The map illustrates the new Madison Square, just across the street from the barracks. It also shows that almost every town lot in the blocks around Madison Square contained buildings and outbuildings. The burgeoning mid-19th century population of Savannah was quite ready to expand south at this time. The newspaper announcement described the area as “…the site formerly occupied by the old U.S. Barracks…” [italics added] (Savannah Republican News 1850). In spite of the development around the barracks block, the building continued to be used by the military. Local militia companies used it during the Civil War until the Union captured it along with the city of Savannah in 1864. From that time until 1879, the barracks stayed in the hands of Union soldiers (Grice 2005:2). During that year, the Savannah Hotel Corporation purchased the property and razed the barracks (Grice 2005:2). Ensuing construction of the DeSoto Hotel did not occur for another eight years and was completed in 1890.

Prior to 1889, Georgia Weymouth (Wilson 1889:83) made a sketch of a house in Savannah that was built next to a pre-existing two-story brick chimney and incorporated the chimney into one of its exterior walls. Weymouth offered this notation, “The chimney that served for the Old British Barracks during the Colonial times when Georgia was a Province. Francis Roma bought the Lot and built his Residence to the Chimney in 1800. It now belongs to the...
Thomasson family and is occupied by the Great-Great Grandchildren of Francis Roma.” The location of this house (owned by the Roma and Thomasson families) was not determined by the present research. While the 1800 date suggests that the chimney may be associated with the pre-1778 barracks, it is also possible that the 1800 date is incorrect. It appears much more likely that the chimney in question was actually a chimney from the U.S. Barracks built in the 1820s (or for one of the dependency buildings in the complex), rather than for the “Old British Barracks during the colonial times”. The rationale for this is that British engineer Moncrief tore down the British barracks in September of 1779 when beefing up the city’s defenses. It is unlikely that he left a chimney standing, and that the chimney would have endured the allied artillery bombing during the siege, and would have survived ensuing cleanup following the war and later development. It is much more likely that the chimney was a later one associated with the U.S. Barracks used from the 1820s to 1853 by the Federal government and then later by the City of Savannah. More work is need to resolve this question, including chain of title research for the Roma property.

The redoubt in what would become the Lafayette Square area was a focus of attention, as well. Prevost mentions on October 2, 1779, that his troops were beginning “…a new battery for fifteen guns to the left of the barracks, and … [were strengthening] our works to the left, where it is probable the French may assault (Prevost 1779b:292). This redoubt was the location of the initial feint beginning the attack on October 9. Prevost reported, “The firing began upon left of our center in front of the French trenches, and very soon after upon our left and right” (Kennedy 1974:100).

Urban History of the Squares

Exactly 100 years after the fall of Sergeant William Jasper, 15,000-20,000 people pressed into Madison Square to memorialize his contribution to America’s fight for independence (Philadelphia Inquirer 1879). Twenty infantry, cavalry, and artillery companies of volunteer soldiers, marching in a line over one-quarter mile long, paraded into the square. The anniversary also marked the laying of the cornerstone for the Jasper Monument in the middle of Madison Square. Almost nine years later, in February 1888, the newly constructed monument was unveiled (Macon Telegraph 1888).

Archeology, Madison Square

Archeologists selected Madison Square as having potential to contain the West Central Redoubt, based on primary map sources and GIS overlays. Figure 63 shows one GIS overlay for this area. Archeologists began fieldwork in Madison Square on February 20, 2008, by using a laser transit to establish a grid across the park. They established a datum in the southwestern corner of the park, using an arbitrary grid coordinate of 4000N, 7000 E, with a 100 m elevation. GPR survey commenced and continued the following day with completion of the entire square, excepting obstacles. Based on the GPR information,
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Northeastern quadrant of the square appeared to be the best target for the excavation of a test unit.

**Metal Detector Survey**

Archeologists attempted to conduct a metal detector survey on Madison Square. The large number of modern metals made it difficult to locate historical artifacts. This, in addition to approximately 15 centimeters of garden soil and topsoil across the ground rendered the artifacts beyond the range of the detector. In addition, archeologists did not want to excavate deeper lying artifacts during a metal detector survey, preferring to use test unit excavations that would document the finds more completely.

**Ground Penetrating Radar**

Savannah’s Central redoubts flanked both sides of the Great Ogeechee Gate entrance to town via Bull Street. These defenses were constructed atop the dismantled brick barracks building. Two areas of the Central redoubts were examined by GPR Survey. The western Central Redoubt was sampled by GPR Block E in Madison Square. The eastern Central Redoubt was sampled by GPR Block K in Lafayette Square. The combined GPR survey in these two sample blocks represents 4,504 m² of radar coverage.

Block E was placed in Madison Square. Block E measured 54.5 m east-west by 55 m northsouth. A total of 4,609 m on 141 radargrams was contained within Block E. The ground surface of Block E consisted of grass, sidewalks, small shrubs, and scattered large hardwood trees. Nearly the entire square was examined by the survey except for areas with thickly planted shrub vegetation and the area occupied by the massive monument to Sergeant Jasper.

The GPR results from Block E were quite exciting and informative. Figure 64 shows two plan views of Block E. One is a radar map at an intermediate time depth of 30-35 ns and the other is at deeper depth of 78-83 ns. The upper view shows concentrations of strong radar reflections (shown in shades of blue) on the eastern, northern, and southern parts of the sample. The western section of Madison Square appears relatively quiet. The central (white) portion of these plan views marks the location of the Jasper Monument and its massive pedestal. The brown coloration surrounding the monument indicates the extent of subsurface ground disturbance that resulted from the installation of the monument.

The lower view shows two concentrations of strong radar reflections. The strongest and most extensive of these is along the northern fringe of the sample. A lesser concentration is located in the southwestern corner of the sample. Based on these GPR findings, combined with the results for the GIS overlay of historic battle maps, “ground-truthing”, or verification by archeological excavation, was recommended by the GPR Specialist. An area, just south of the main northern concentration in the northeastern quadrant of Madison Square was selected for a test excavation. That location was explored by Test Units 3 and 4. Both of these test units encountered very deep cultural deposits associated with the British defensive works. A massive ditch was identified that was oriented northwest-southeast. The strong radar reflections on the northern side of Block E may indicate deeply buried brick fragments/rubble that was associated with the military defenses of the Central Redoubt.
Figure 64. Madison Square GPR Block E plan maps at upper (top) and lower (bottom) depths. White areas are locations of monuments or flower beds that could not be accessed for GPR. Grid North is up.
Excavation

Archeologists returned to Madison Square on March 21, 2008, to begin excavations based on GIS and GPR data. They established Test Unit 3 in the northeastern quadrant of the square (Figure 65). This location was chosen based on GPR data, in addition to efforts to avoid known buried utilities, and large tree roots from established old live oaks and younger understory trees. Excavation levels below for Test Unit 3 correspond with profile strata as follows: Stratum A = Level 1; Stratum B = Levels 2, 3, 4; Stratum C = Levels 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; Stratum D/F = Level 13; Stratum E = Level 14; Stratum G = Level 15; Stratum H = All zones; and Strata I/J = Level 16. For a detailed list and count of artifacts and their descriptions, the reader is referred to the index of this report. Artifacts referenced below are to provide examples of the material culture for the various provenances excavated. Unless otherwise noted, most of the artifacts below are present in low numbers, and usually singly within the level. There
was a total of 1,101 artifacts (excluding brick and shell) recovered from Test Unit 3.

**Test Unit 3**

This unit measured 2 by 1 m and was oriented north-south. Level 1 was a natural level measuring approximately 17 cm thick. Level depths began at 17-19 cm bd and terminated at 33-35 cm bd. Soil was a very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loamy humus. Artifacts in this level indicated a mix of modern and older items, including machine cut nails, window glass, a 1984 quarter, a kaolin tobacco pipe stem, bottle glass (dark green, colorless, and aqua), ceramics (whiteware, ironstone, porcelain, pearlware), animal bone, plastic, a possible cufflink, lead and copper scrap, a ceramic marble, battery carbon cores, animal bone, and a modern U.S. penny.

Level 2 was an arbitrary 10-12 cm thick layer of homogeneous soil measuring from 33-35 cm to 45 cm bd. The dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam contained nails (cut, wrought, and unidentifiable), buttons (2 glass, 1 white metal, 1 milk glass), iron, window glass, bottle glass (amber, aqua, colorless, and cobalt), a slate pencil, ceramics (redware, Rhenish stoneware, porcelain, pearlware, creamware, whiteware, and polychrome hand-painted refined earthenware), a kaolin pipe stem and a pipe bowl, machine made brick fragment, slate, pewter and lead scrap, sheet iron, copper, animal bone, oyster shell, and iron wire. The TPQ was 1830 based on a late variety of polychrome (red/green/blue/black) hand painte refined earthenware.

Level 3 soils were extremely similar to Level 2, if not the same. These were identified as a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) sandy loam mottled slightly with a brown (10YR4/3) sand. Archeologists excavated Level 3 as an arbitrary 6 cm level (45-51 cm bd) in an attempt to eliminate modern contamination without sacrificing much of the potential Revolutionary War stratum, if it existed here. Level 3 contained 4.25 lbs. of brick fragments, marking a general correlation between greater quantities of brick and an increase in test unit depth. The first lead ball made an appearance in this level. The ball measured 0.58 caliber. It was very flat on one portion. This flatness appears to have been intentionally cut and polished smooth, rather than having been the result of the lead ball impacting a hard object when fired. Additional artifacts in Level 3 included ceramics (blue Delft, plain whiteware, pearlware, and porcelain), window glass, wrought and unidentifiable square nails, a buckle fragment, bottle glass fragments (colorless, olive green, and aqua), oyster shell, and animal bone. The buckle, shown in Figure 66, is actually the inner “tongue” portion of a knee buckle dating from 1750-1800 based on style.

**Figure 66. Inner tongue of a knee buckle.**

Level 4 (51-61 cm bd) consisted of an arbitrary 10 cm thick stratum. It had a slightly lighter and more orange color soil than Level 3. Level 4 contained a sandy loam mixed with brick fragments/rubble. The rubble appeared to cover the full extent of the unit horizontally but was concentrated more in the bottom of the level. The rubble totaled 10 lbs. Artifacts from Level 4 included a woman’s brass ring, bottle glass (olive green, aqua), a cut nail, lead scrap, animal bone, oyster shell, ceramics (creamware, pearlware, earthenware, and porcelain), plate glass, slag, slate, a kaolin pipe bowl fragment, mortar, and chert.

The next 10 cm arbitrary level was Level 5 (61-71 cm bd) and consisted of a yellowish brown sandy loam with brick fragments. Archeologists noted 12.5 lbs. of brick from Level 5. They recovered the following artifacts: wrought and unidentifiable square nails, olive green and aqua bottle glass, a British .75 caliber lead ball, ceramics (creamware, Delft, Jackfield, and white salt-glazed stoneware), glass tableware glass, and two pipe stems. Level 5 produced a TPQ of 1762 based on the creamware.

Soil color and composition remained homogeneous; however, archeologists began a new arbitrary 10 cm level with Level 6, in case there was a temporal difference in the artifacts correlated to the depth of the deposits. Level 6 was 71-81 cm below unit datum. Artifacts in this level included a small amount of ceramics (two creamware and one hand-painted pearlware), two colorless and one olive green bottle glass, wrought nail, buck shot (0.28 caliber), animal bone, and oyster shell. Archeologists recorded 18 lbs of brick.

Level 7 measured 81-91 cm bd of yellow brown sandy loam. As in the previous levels, brick fragments abounded. Brick fragments in this level appeared to be larger, generally, and archeologists observed a concentration of brick fragments/rubble and one piece of mortar extending out of the southern and eastern walls of the test unit. Level 7 artifacts included olive green bottle glass, animal bone, a rosehead nail, two unidentifiable square nails, a kaolin pipe bowl, a lead ball, lead scrap, a brass button (South
Type 9) [made from 1726-1776 and described earlier in this report], charcoal, and oyster shell. A total of 14 lbs. of brick was recorded.

Level 8 (91-101 cm bd) consisted of a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand with brick fragments/rubble. This arbitrary level contained a lead scrap, unidentifiable square nails, slate, creamware, redware, tableware glass, kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, and animal bone. There were 23 lbs. of brick fragments in this level.

Level 9 soils were slightly darker, with a Munsell reading of brown (10YR4/3) sand. This arbitrary 10 cm level contained 20 lbs. of brick fragments/rubble. Artifacts included a pewter fragment, nails (wrought/unidentifiable square/and unidentifiable), kaolin pipe bowl, ceramics (creamware, Delft, refined white salt-glazed stoneware, and transfer print underglazed refined earthenware), olive green bottle glass, European chert flake, animal bone, and oyster shell.

Archeologists completed the excavation of Test Unit 3 through Level 9 by the end of the work day on Friday evening. Under an agreement with the City's Park and Tree Department, archeologists tried not to leave units open over weekends, and we were requested to conduct fieldwork only during weekdays, therefore archeologists backfilled the incomplete unit. Prior to doing so, however, an effort was made to determine the vertical extent of the deposits. Archeologists excavated a shovel test (LN 35) measuring 50 cm², in the southeastern corner of the unit. Shovel test excavation extended from 110-156 cm bd (90-136 cm below ground surface). Artifacts recovered from the shovel test included one each of the following artifacts from the shovel test included olive green bottle glass, European chert flake, animal bone, and oyster shell. Soils throughout the shovel test were consistent with those of Level 9. Soils throughout the shovel test were consistent with those of Level 9. A tube core sample was collected from 136-164 cm below ground surface (156-184 cm below datum). The core indicated that the fill continued, minimally, the length of the sample (28 cm). Metal detector readings of the test unit wall revealed a copper coin at 119 cm bd in the west wall. The recovered coin was well worn coin with only some of its stamped letters visible. These were identified as “...EORGIIUS II REX” “BRI...AN...NIA”. It is a 1742 British half penny minted during the reign of George II (Seaby and Purvey 1980). At this point archeologists began backfilling with the hopes of returning to the location to complete the work on another field day.

When archeologists returned to Madison Square to map the unit one week later, they discovered that all of the grid and datum points established previously had been removed except two in Test Unit 3. Archeologists decided to establish a new grid and to shoot in multiple common points between the old and new grid so that they could be overlapped electronically. Fortunately, this allowed the radar survey and test unit excavation to be tied together with the above-ground and landscaping features. All aligned perfectly, indicating that the grids were rectified. From this point onward, archeologists were careful to use relatively permanent fixed points (such as the points of letters on inscribed bronze sidewalk plaques) as grid datums.

Archeologists returned to Madison Square on April 14 to reopen Test Unit 3, finish excavating it to subsoil, and to excavate an additional 2 by 1 m test unit adjacent to Test Unit 3. This would enable archeologists to get to the bottom of the feature and interpret the feature with greater clarity. The west wall of Test Unit 4 was aligned along the east wall of Test Unit 3, creating a 2 by 2 m unit. After establishing the corners of Test Unit 4, archeologists began removing the backfill from Test Unit 3 to avoid any contamination to the new unit and to uncover the initial unit to the depth (base of Level 9) where the previous fieldwork ceased. This discussion will now examine the first nine Levels of Test Unit 4, after which time the discussion will encompass the remaining levels (10-16) of both units.

Test Unit 4

This unit was placed adjacent to the eastern wall of Test Unit 3 in order to open a larger portion of the feature discovered in the initial unit. A larger window on the feature would aid archeologists in determining the feature function, along with other aspects of it as well. In addition, the soil stratigraphy recorded in Test Unit 3 would help archeologists as they excavated Test Unit 4. There were 1,158 artifacts, excluding brick and shell, in Test Unit 4.

Level 1 of Test Unit 4 was an arbitrary 10 cm level extending from 20-30 cm bd. Modern artifacts dominated the assemblage. A religious jewelry cross, soft drink can pop-tops, plastic, bottle glass, and three modern U.S. coins (1962 penny, 1982 and 1989 dimes) certainly reflected the use of Madison Square as a public park site. A dark gray English chert fragment in the level may have been part of a gunflint, but the specimen was too small to positively identify. Other artifacts included a piece of slate and some brick and shell. Soils were recorded as a very dark (10YR3/1) sandy silt.
Level 2 measured an arbitrary 10 cm (30-40 cm bd) and contained the same soil color and type as Level 1. Relatively modern artifacts continued in this level. These included a .22 caliber shell, a modern bullet, and glass. Additional artifacts included a wire nail, lead nail heads, ironstone, coal, a safety pin, and animal bone. Older artifacts in this level were only present in small numbers and included a variety of ceramics such as pearlware, porcelain, cream colored ware, coarse earthenware, redware, Jackfield, and transferprint underglazed ware. Level 2 also contained a minnie ball, cut nails, battery carbon core, a brass button fragment, glass (olive green, cobalt blue, amber, and colorless), an embossed panel medicine bottle fragment, ceramics (creamware, cream colored ware, gray/brown salt-glazed stoneware, gray salt-glazed stoneware, doped ware, redware, Delftware, brown transfer printed ware, porcelain, whiteware, ironstone, burned unidentifiable, and hand-painted refined earthenware), a fragment of a telegraph insulator, nails (wrought, cut, unidentifiable square), a horse shoe, and a modern piece of jewelry. Level 3 also contained sheet iron and copper, and oyster shell. The level contained 2 lbs. of brick fragments/rubble.

Level 4 proved to be the upper part of the military ditch fill. Soils were a dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam grading into a gray (10YR5/1) sandy loam with increasingly greater amounts of brick fragments/rubble. This arbitrary level ranged from 12-16 cm thick, due to the variation in depth of the natural stratum of Level 3. Level 4 was terminated at the arbitrary depth of 60 cm bd. Archeologists noted that artifacts were less concentrated in this level than the previous level. Artifacts in Level 4 included a decorative silver-coated brass item, nails (unidentifiable square and wrought), glass (plate and window), bottle glass (olive green, aqua, amber, and colorless), a glazed kaolin pipe stem, ceramics (porcelain, coarse earthenware, Delftware, creamware, and whiteware), tableware glass, a rim-fired shell casing, sheet iron, sheet copper, lead scrap, worked chert, slate, and animal bone. A total of nine lbs. of brick fragments/rubble came from this level.

Level 5 was an arbitrary 10 cm level ranging from 60 to 70 cm bd. Soils were a grayish brown (10YR5/2) sandy loam grading into a brown (10YR5/3) sandy loam. Approximately 30 cm of the northeastern edge of the test unit contained mottled gray circular areas that may be indicative of root stains disturbances. That area contained a beige piece of plastic. Archeologists noted fewer, but larger brick fragments in this level. Artifacts recovered included ceramics (plain and blue porcelain, coarse earthenware, and brown salt-glazed stoneware), bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and cobalt blue), window glass, a honey color chert fragment, oyster shell, and animal bone. A round ivory button missing its shank came from this level. Unlike previous levels, few nails (one wrought and one square unidentifiable) were present in Level 5. A total of nine lbs. of brick fragments came from this level.

Level 6 extended from 70-80 cm bd as an arbitrary level. Soils were consistent with the last level and recorded as a brown (10YR5/3) sand. Archeologists uncovered a .50-.52 caliber lead ball, glass (olive green, aqua, amber, and colorless), animal teeth and bones, nails (wrought and unidentifiable square), ceramics (blue and white porcelain, plain porcelain, creamware, pearlware, and ironstone), nails (wrought and unidentifiable square), a kaolin tobacco pipe stem, slate, slag, window glass, and animal bone. The level contained 10 lbs. of brick fragments.

Level 7 was an arbitrary 10 cm level excavated from 80-90 cm bd. Soil color and texture was the same as Level 6. Brick fragments/rubble continued in this level, with fewer small fragments and a greater number of larger pieces. Archeologists recorded nine lbs. of brick fragments from Level 7. Artifacts included the base of a medicine bottle, nails (wrought and square), Delftware, glass (olive green and aqua) bone, oyster shell, iron fragments, slate, brick, charcoal, and oyster shell. A chert core was in this level, also.

Level 8 (90-100 cm bd) had predominantly the same soils as Level 7. Some brown (10YR4/3) sand appeared in the northeastern quadrant of the unit, representing a localized soil disturbance. A piece of colorless glass and machine-made brick fragment likely came from this disturbance. This 10 cm level also contained tableware glass, a wrought nail fragment, two square unidentifiable nails, olive green glass, sheet iron, nails, animal bone, and oyster shell. Artifact density decreased in this level contrasted with previous levels. A total of 12 lbs. of brick was recorded.

Level 9 was an arbitrary 10 cm level extending between 100-110 cm bd. The soils were the same as Level 8. The soil disturbance observed in the northeastern quadrant of the unit in the previous level continued in Level 9. One
lead ball came from this area. Other artifacts in Level 9 included animal bone, blue and white porcelain, white salt-glazed stoneware coarse earthenware, colorless tableware glass, sheet iron/steel, slate, olive green bottle glass, a kaolin pipe stem, nails (cut and unidentifiable), and oyster shell. Brick fragments were larger in this level than in some of the previous levels. There were 19 lbs. of brick fragments in Level 9.

At this point, the base of Test Unit 4 was at the same elevation as the base of Test Unit 3. For Test Unit 3, Level 10 was the first new level dug since the previous fieldwork session. Archeologists continued to excavate each unit separately, by level. For ease in discussion, however, the ensuing section of the report will detail both units simultaneously, a level at a time.

Test Units 3 and 4

Level 10 was a 10 cm thick arbitrary level of brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam with small charcoal flecks. The level measured from 110-120 cm bd. Archeologists noted a dramatic increase in the amount of brick fragments/rubble in this level and recorded 27 lbs. of brick fragments in Test Unit 3 and 34 lbs. in Test Unit 4. Artifacts in Test Unit 3, Level 10 included melted lead scrap, wrought nails, underglazed hand-painted porcelain, a dark gray blade gunflint, olive green bottle glass, charcoal, and animal bone. Artifacts in this level of Test Unit 4 included a lead ball of .63-.65 caliber, bottle glass (olive green and aqua), hand-painted porcelain, gray and brown salt-glazed stoneware, coarse earthenware, animal bone, window glass, and oyster shell. Archeologists pedestaled a 70 cm² section in the southwestern corner of Test Unit 3, around the area of the previously excavated and back-filled shovel test. They did this to avoid contamination to the remaining levels of both test units.

Level 11 (120-130 cm bd) contained the same soil types as Level 10. Artifacts recovered from Test Unit 3 included unidentifiable nails, sheet iron, ceramics (Delft, light gray and brown salt-glazed stoneware), burned wood, an animal bone, and oyster shell (burned and unburned). Test Unit 4 contained wrought and unidentifiable square nails, a piece of metal hardware, burned wood, animal tooth enamel and bone, and olive green, clear, and aqua glass. Both units contained brick fragments/rubble. Archeologists noted an increase in mortar and brick in Test Unit 4, with a concentration in the northern section of that unit. The northern central area joining both units contained a concentration of five large pieces of brick that were mapped in plan.

Level 12 was an arbitrary 10 cm level extending from 130-140 cm bd. Soils were generally brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam in both units, with some pale brown (10YR6/3) sand noted in Test Unit 3. This level was characterized by a decrease in artifact density and variety and an increase in brick and mortar rubble. Test Unit 3 contained olive green bottle glass, animal bone, oyster shell, and 39.5 lbs. of brick fragments/rubble. Test Unit 4, Level 12 artifacts included a lead ball (.68-.70 caliber) recovered from the northwestern corner of the test unit, along with an iron cask hoop, wrought and unidentifiable square nails, iron, olive green and aqua bottle glass, a European dark gray chert flake, wood, and animal bone. Test Unit 4 had 106.5 lbs. of brick fragments/rubble. The base of Level 12 revealed faint, but distinct soil changes across both units for the first time. These zones were mapped (Figure 67), photographed, and sampled with a tube-corer. [These zones were suspected to be fill zones within the military ditch feature we were excavating. The zones were later confirmed to be the sloping edges of the lower side and base of a very wide ditch. This ditch is discussed in greater detail in the interpretations section of this chapter.]

Level 13 was excavated as a 10 cm level (140-150 cm bd). Soils were consistent with the previous level.

Test Units 3 & 4

Plan View, Base of Level 12

Figure 67. Plan drawing of Test Units 3 and 4, Base of Level 12.
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Archeologists did not excavate the zones individually at this time due to the faintness of the zones. It was hoped that removing another 10 cm might reveal the zones more clearly for excavation purposes. Artifacts from Level 13 included brass wire, animal bone, brick, and oyster shell. A total of 20 lbs. of brick and mortar came from Test Unit 3. A color change was noted at the base of this level in Test Unit 3. At this point, archeologists removed the pedestaled balk (containing portions of Levels 10-13) in the southwestern corner of Test Unit 3 to the base of Level 12. This was screened separately and contained the following artifacts: an olive green case bottle fragment and spirit bottle fragment, unidentifiable nail, a kaolin tobacco pipe stem with possible teeth marks, sheet iron, oyster shell, and animal bone. Test Unit 4 artifacts in Level 13 included a piece of redware that may be a roofing tile or unrefined kitchenware, iron, a wrought nail, olive green bottle glass, a brass button with shank (South Type 2), a kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, animal bone, and oyster shell. The level also contained an iron frizzen spring from a Brown Bess musket. Figure 68 illustrates the frizzen spring before and after conservation. (See Figure 41 for more information.) Brick fragments in Test Unit 4, Level 13 totaled 33 lbs. The shovel test area in the southwestern corner of Test Unit 3 was again pedestaled at this point in a continual effort to avoid contamination from the lower portion of the shovel test with the test units.

Level 14 soils remained somewhat mottled, being a brown (10YR4/3) sand mottled with a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand. Soil variations at the base of Level 13 were clear enough to map, but not differentiated enough to follow during excavation. The excavation of Level 14, however, revealed very distinctive zones at its base. These are illustrated in Figure 69. The amount of brick and mortar rubble dropped considerably from the previous levels. A total of 11 lbs. of rubble was recorded in Test Unit 3 and eight lbs. in Test Unit 4. Test Unit 3, Level 14 contained a very low density of artifacts, which included patinated olive green bottle glass, brick, oyster shell and animal bone. Artifacts in Test Unit 4 included wrought and unidentifiable square nails, one wrought tack, and animal bone.

Figure 68. Frizzen spring before conservation (top) and after (bottom).

Level 15 also saw the removal of the last of the shovel test balk ( Levels 13-14) in the southwestern corner of Test Unit 3. Artifacts in this section of the shovel test/shovel test balk included a brass button with a soldered shank and stamped, illegible maker’s mark on reverse, an unidentifiable square nail, olive green bottle glass, a piece of colorless tableware glass, brick and animal bone. The removal of the last of the shovel test balk allowed the exposure of the feature beneath it. The clarity of soils uncovered at the base of Level 14 enabled archeologists to excavate Level 15 by zones within the test units, rather than in an arbitrary 10 cm level. Zones A and B were clearly defined and fill from each was excavated and screened separately. Zone C was the subsoil. Three piece plots were recorded at the base of Level 14. Two of these, Piece Plots A and C, were in Test Unit 4. Piece Plot A was uncovered at 166 cm bd. It was a lead ball with a caliber of .69-.71. Piece Plot C lay at 170 cm bd and was a .52-.56 caliber lead ball. Archeologists recorded Piece Plot B in Test Unit 3. It was a buckle at 169 cm bd.

Zone A extended across most of Test Unit 3 and into the southeastern half of Test Unit 4. This zone was the centermost military ditch fill of those zones uncovered, and it extended the deepest. Zone A occurred from 160-173 cm bd at its deepest in the southwestern corner of Test Unit 3. Soil in this zone was a brownish yellow (10YR6/6) fine sand. Test Unit 3 artifacts in Zone 15A included bottle glass (two olive green and one aqua), a glass-tipped pontil scarred bottle base (Piece Plot D), and the usual minor amounts of oyster shell and animal bone. There was a total of 12 lbs. of brick in Test Unit 3, Zone A. Artifacts from Level 15, Zone A in Test Unit 4 included a blue
Zone B extended from the northeastern corner of Test Unit 3 and across the mid-section and southeastern corner of Test Unit 4. This zone represented the fill in the bottom edge of the ditch. Zone B soils were a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand mottled with a black (10YR2/1) sandy loam. This zone extended from 160-184 cm bd. As with Zone A, the fill in Zone 15B generally sloped from northeast to southwest. Test Unit 3 artifacts in Zone B included a wrought spike, a window glass fragment, olive green bottle glass, a square nail, a cut nail, gray and brown salt-glazed stoneware, a kaolin tobacco pipe stem, and an animal rib bone. A pewter military button embossed “V” and a kaolin pipe stem fragment were recovered from the southwestern corner of the test unit. The pewter button is the British 5th Regiment button discussed earlier in this report (Figure 46). Level 15, Zone B of Test Unit 3 contained 34 lbs. of brick fragments. Test Unit 4 artifacts in Zone B included a wrought nail fragment, a lead die made out of a lead ball, burned animal bone, and oyster shell. Figure 51 previously in the report is a photograph of the die. Three piece plots were made at the base of this zone. All were lead balls. Piece Plot E was flattened on one side and measured between .50-.57 caliber. Piece Plot F was a lead ball of between .53-.55 caliber. Piece Plot G was a lead ball of between .53-.57 caliber. There was a greater amount of mortar mixed with the brick fragments/rubble in this area than in others. A total of 26.5 lbs. of brick occupied this zone of the unit.

Level 16 occurred as a natural level measuring up to 12 cm thick. The level sloped to the southwest, with the lowest elevation along the southern edge of both test units. Soil in Test Unit 3 was predominantly brown (10YR5/3) sand. A small portion of the northeastern quadrant along the ditch slope contained light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sand mottled slightly with very black (10YR2/1) sand and charcoal. This soil extended along the edge of the slope into Test Unit 4 where it grading to the south into the brown (10YR5/3) sand. Soils in Level 16 were very compacted. Artifacts from Test Unit 3 included olive green bottle glass, creamware, one wrought and one unidentifiable square nail, animal bone, oyster shell, and 22 lbs. of brick and mortar. Archeologists piece-plotted a lead ball (Piece Plot H) at 1.97 m bd in Test Unit 3. The ball was .58 caliber, although one side was slightly flattened and measured .57-.59 caliber. Test Unit 4 contained 52 lbs. of brick and mortar rubble. Two faint stains appeared in the base of Level 16. (Figure 70). Archeologists mapped these and excavated them individually. The soil in stain A was a light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sand. The soil in stain B was a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand. Both were shallow and faint stains. While stain B looked like a post when mapped in plan view, excavation of both stains suggested that they might have been the result of minor root or soil disturbances at the base of the trench when the trench was constructed and during initial use. No artifacts were recovered from either stain. Archeologists encountered the base of the military ditch feature with the completion of Level 16 excavation (Figure 71).

At this point archeologists cleaned, photographed, and drew the soil profiles to scale and completed test unit forms. While the analyses of pollen, phytoliths, and macrobotanicals in soil samples were not attempted for this project, archeologists took a large number of soil samples from Test Units 3 and 4 to bank for future analyses when funding permits.
Interpretation

With the excavation of Test Units 3 and 4 in Madison Square, archaeologists came down directly on top of a military ditch dug by British forces in 1779. Immediately after taking the City of Savannah in the fall of 1778, British forces began strengthening the four extant redoubts. By October 9, 1779, they had also created an additional 10 redoubts and connected the ditchwork and abatis surrounding the entire western, southern, and eastern portions of the colonial town. The trench discovered by archaeologists in Test Units 3 and 4 may be a trench extending off of the right-central redoubt (Figure 63). This redoubt was one of the two central redoubts located along the southern defensive line. These redoubts were located at the center of town, along the southern edge. They flanked the entrance of a major road (now Bull Street) that entered the city.

Figures 72, 73, 74, and 75 are scaled profile drawings of Test Units 3 and 4. The drawings depict the depths of the excavated levels in relation to the natural stratigraphy. The reader is referred to these figures for the ensuing discussion. The easiest way to interpret the profile is to begin at the bottom of it where the oldest activities are represented. Both the northern and eastern profiles clearly show the base of a ditch at those locations, visible in Strata H through J and Stratum O. The ditch angles deeper to the southeast and northwest, indicating the entire ditch is...
Figure 72. Northern Profile of Test Units 3 and 4.

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam
B- 10YR4/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam
C- 10YR4/3 brown fine sand mottled with charcoal, brick, and mortar fragments
F- 10YR5/3 brown sand with larger brick and mortar fragments
G- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown fine sand with minor charcoal and brick fragments, and clay sand mottles (from subsoil)
H- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam and charcoal mottled with 10YR4/3 brown sand and large brick and mortar rubble
I- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand with a lens of 10YR4/3 brown sand and charcoal flecks
J- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
K- 10YR7/3 very pale brown sand with slight mottling of 10YR7/4 very pale brown sand- Unexcavated subsoil
L- 10YR7/2 light gray fine sand
M- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
Test Unit 4
East Wall Profile

Levels 1-2
Levels 3-5
Levels 6-9
Level 10
Level 11
Level 12
Level 13
Level 14

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam
B- 10YR4/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam
C- 10YR4/3 brown fine sand mottled with charcoal, brick, and mortar fragments
F-10YR5/3 brown sand with larger brick and mortar
H- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam and charcoal mottled with 10YR4/3 brown sand and large brick and mortar rubble
J-10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
K- 10YR7/3 very pale brown sand with slight mottling of 10YR7/4 very pale brown sand- unexcavated subsoil
M-10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
N-10YR4/2 dark grayish brown sand
O-10YR5/6 yellowish brown silty sand mottled with a lens of 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand and 10YR2/1 black loam
P-10R4/3 brown sand mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand

Figure 73. Eastern Profile of Test Unit 4.
South Wall Profiles

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam
B- 10YR4/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam
C- 10YR4/3 brown fine sand mottled with charcoal, brick, and mortar fragments
F- 10YR5/3 brown sand with larger brick and mortar fragments
G- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown fine sand with minor charcoal and brick fragments, and clay sand mottles from subsoil
H- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam and charcoal mottled with 10YR4/3 brown sand and large brick and mortar rubble
I- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand with a lens of 10YR4/3 brown sand and charcoal flecks
J- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
K- 10YR7/3 very pale brown sand with slight mottling of 10YR7/4 very pale brown sand- unexcavated subsoil
M- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
O- 10YR5/6 yellowish brown silty sand mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand and 10YR2/1 black loam
P- 10YR4/3 brown sand mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand

Figure 74. Southern Profile of Test Units 3 and 4.
Test Unit 3  
West Wall Profile

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam  
B- 10YR4/2 dark grayish brown sandy loam  
C- 10YR4/3 brown fine sand mottled with charcoal, brick, and mortar fragments  
D- 10YR3/2 very dark grayish brown sand with minor brick, mortar, and charcoal  
E- Lenses of 10YR3/2 very dark grayish brown sand with minor brick, 10YR6/3 pale brown sand, and 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand  
F- 10YR5/3 brown sand with larger brick and mortar fragments  
G- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown fine sand with minor charcoal and brick fragments, and clay sand mottles from subsoil  
H- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam and charcoal mottled with 10YR4/3 brown sand and large brick and mortar rubble  
I- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand with a lens of 10YR4/3 brown sand and charcoal flecks  
J- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand  
K- 10YR7/3 very pale brown sand with slight mottling of 10YR7/4 very pale brown sand unexcavated subsoil  
M- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand  
P- 10YR4/3 brown sand mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand

Figure 75. Western Profile of Test Unit 3.
aligned on that axis. This northwest-southeast orientation is further confirmed in the ditch soil zones drawn in plan view at the base of Level 12 (previous Figure 67). The northern profile of Test Units 3 and 4 also reveals that the bottom of the ditch visible in Test Unit 3 is not the deepest part of the ditch. Strata H, I, and J angle downward into the unit’s west wall, clearly revealing that the ditch extends deeper to the west, beyond the area of excavation. The continuation of the downward angle indicates that Test Unit 3 may be near the center of the ditch, but did not uncover the very centerline of it. Test Units 3 and 4 uncovered the area from east of the ditch centerline toward the eastern side of the ditch. The eastern edge of the ditch was not exposed in Test Unit 4, as the strata continued into the eastern wall of the unit. The combined test units measured 2 by 2 m and did not expose a complete half of the ditch, suggesting the massive size of it. Based on these measurements and the observed soil stratigraphy, the military defensive ditch would have measured more than 13 ft. wide and over 5.5 ft. deep (4 m wide by 1.7 m deep).

Mean ceramic dates for various strata indicate a relatively undisturbed sequence of deposition. Primary documents reveal that the defensive ditch was dug in 1779. A mean ceramic date (MCD) for all of the lowest strata combined (those below Stratum C) was 1748.6, based on a statistically invalid sample of six sherds. These fill lenses followed the angle of the ditch wall. Stratum C was on top the uppermost lens and consisted of a much thicker and more even layer of soil. The MCD for Stratum C was 1773.7 (n=21). Again, the sample size is small. Stratum B was located directly on top of Stratum C. The former was an uneven, thinner layer than the latter. Stratum B produced a MCD of 1811.1, based on a sample of 37 dateable ceramics.

The horizontal and vertical location of lead balls in Test Units 3 and 4 provide useful information about the strata. Figure 76 shows the location of six lead balls that were piece-plotted in these two units. An additional seven balls were recovered from the two units while screening. These were distributed almost equally between Strata B and C. The piece-plotted balls were located between 1.6-1.95 m below datum, in the lowest part of the ditch (Stratum O). One lead ball was flattened, one was sawn flat on one side, and the rest were pitted, somewhat irregular spheres. Most of them did not show clear evidence of impact. Some may have rolled into the trench and come to rest near the bottom of it. Whether the lead balls were fired or not, they do indicate that those lowest lenses of the trench were not fill zones, but rather a part of an open trench that saw daily activity. This would have included soldiers entering and exiting it so they could safely walk between redoubts, Africans and African American workers traveling along it from redoubt to redoubt as they worked on the defenses, and soldiers and civilians perhaps taking cover in it during siege bombardments.

Three of the four gunflints recovered from the project came from Test Units 3 and 4. One, a dark gray fragment, was from Level 1 of Test Unit 4, and two were from the lenses below Stratum C (Level 10, TU 3 and Level 15A, TU 4). The gunflint in Level 10 was a gray English blade type, and the one in Level 15A was a gray English spall type flint. The fourth was a dark gray fragment of a gunflint from Level 1 of Test Unit 1. The Brown Bess cock was recovered from the shovel test in Test Unit 3, at approximately 1.46 cmbd.

The significance of the brick at this location has been mentioned earlier. To recap, there were no structures in the area in 1779 except a large brick barracks constructed sometime prior to the fall of 1778. The southern limit of the town of Savannah at that time was at South Broad Street (present-day Oglethorpe Avenue). General Prevost ordered most of the super-structure of the barracks torn down in September of 1779. The foundation and the lower part of the barracks’ walls were used in the horseshoe battery that British engineer Moncrief constructed around it. The brick fragments/rubble was used to build up the earthen embankments surrounding mortars, gun batteries, and redoubts and connecting ditches. Brick located within Test Units 3 and 4 was hand-made. Few whole bricks were present. Test Unit 4, Level 12 contained the greatest amount of brick, followed by Level 16 (Figure 77). A total of 106.5 lbs. of brick came from Level 12 and 52 lbs. from Level 16. While it contained smaller amounts, Test Unit 3 mirrored the same general distributional spikes in brick amounts by level, with Level 12 containing just less than 40 lbs. of brick. This was followed by Level 15b and then Level 16 with 22 lbs. of brick.

In summary, Test Unit 3 and 4 excavations, along with relevant primary documents, suggest the following activities. In 1779 the British dug a portion of a trench angling northwest-southeast that would connect the right-central redoubt to the redoubt just to the northwest. The ditch saw a good bit of use before and during the Battle of Savannah and for the next three years of British occupation. In the summer of 1782, after the British left Savannah, General Anthony Wayne ordered American troops to fill in the ditches. Infilling was done by pushing the dirt that lined the edge of the ditches back into the ditch, along with the bricks, lead balls, gun parts, and other items in the dirt or on the ground surface. This infilling is apparent in the upper lenses below Stratum C, as well as Stratum C. Stratum B may represent modifications done to the landscape at the end of the 18th century and first decades of the 19th century. This appears to have included pushing and leveling soils. The later re-routing of Bull
Test Units 3 & 4
Plan View of Level 14, 15, and 16 piece plots

Zones at 160 cm bd (Base of Level 14)
Zone A- 10YR6/6 brownish yellow fine sand
Zone B- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand mottled with 10YR2/1 black sandy loam
Zone C- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand

Piece plots
PPA- Musket ball- 166 cm below datum
PPB- Buckle- 169 cm below datum
PPC- Musket ball- 170 cm below datum
PPD- Dark green bottle base- 165 cm below datum
PPE- Musket ball- 166-188 cmbd
PPF- Musket ball- 177 cm below datum
PPG- Musket ball- 178 cm below datum
PPH- Musket ball- 197 cm below datum

Figure 76. Piece plots of lead balls and other artifacts.
Figure 77. Test Units are represented by colored lines. Test Unit numbers and lines are denoted in legend box at right.
Street around, rather than through, Madison Square may be reflected in the upper stratigraphy of the unit.

Archeology, Lafayette Square

The area around Lafayette Square was not occupied heavily until the nineteenth century. It was still fairly isolated in the 1820s when the United States constructed the Army Cantonment nearby. By the 1830s Savannah was expanding south and by the 1850s many of the lots in the area had been developed, sold, or rented. See additional details about this development earlier in this chapter.

Metal Detector Survey

A metal detector survey of Lafayette Square proved to be ineffective for locating any evidence of the 1779 battle. The soil layer that contained artifacts from that era was too deeply buried for feasible location with the detectors. Although battle maps depict this area as heavily bombarded by the French, no cannonballs or shell fragments were located.

Ground Penetrating Radar

Block K

Block K was placed on the northern one-third of Lafayette Square (Figure 78). Block K measured 65.5 m east-west by 23 m north-south. A total of 2,428 m on 132 radargrams was contained within Block K. The western side of Block K extended halfway into the southbound lane of Abercorn Street.

An area just west of the center of this square was only partially covered by the survey, owing to the thick growth of planted shrubs in this vicinity. One open archeological excavation (Test Units 6 and 7) and one backfilled test unit (Test Unit 5) were extant in the western portion of Block K during the GPR survey. Together these two excavations interrupted a 2 m by 2 m area of the GPR sample.

The GPR survey of the upper strata of Block K revealed many utility lines and ditches. These were nearly all oriented along the town grid. Figures 79 and 80 shows two plan views of the radar reflections in Block K. The upper view is at an intermediate time depth of 32-37 ns. The lower view is from 94-96 ns. The upper map shows widely dispersed radar reflections. One area of strong reflections surrounds the test unit vicinity. A second area of strong reflections flanks either side of a hedgerow that was located near the center of Lafayette Square.

A third concentration of radar anomalies is apparent on the eastern one-third of Block K in both views. The lower view shows this same area of strong reflection on the east side of Lafayette Square, only stronger and more pronounced. This area was not investigated by any test excavation so the character, age, and function of these radar reflections remain undetermined. If they are cultural, they represent a massive subsurface disturbance.

A fourth anomaly appeared just west of, and overlapping Anomaly 2. Anomaly 4 was a curved linear area of moderately strong reflections is visible on the west-central part of Lafayette Square in the lower view. That anomaly measures approximately 18 m northwest-southeast by 4 m northeast-southwest. It terminates near the center of Lafayette Square.

It is important to note the recent history of land use modifications in Lafayette Square because these modifications probably affect the GPR output. A major revitalization effort was implemented for Lafayette Square in the early 1980s. That included the installation of the large fountain in the center of the square and many plantings of shrubs and other ground cover. Prior to that, Lafayette Square contained a central emergency roadway that was reserved for fire protection. This road followed the north-south axis of the town grid and it also followed a primary water main for the City of Savannah. That waterline is shown on 19th century Sanborn Maps of this part of town. Other major utility lines also follow this route through the center of Lafayette Square. Consequently, the central part of Lafayette Square running north-south is highly disturbed and unlikely to contain intact cultural deposits, particularly within the upper 1.5 meters. On either side of this disturbance, however, Lafayette Square may contain widespread buried deposits associated with the 18th and early 19th century landscape. The existence of intact midden deposits and dense brick fragments/rubble was demonstrated in Test Units 5, 6, and 7. The strong radar reflections evidenced at deeper depths in Block K may relate to the 1779 British defenses of one of the two the Central Redoubts.

Excavation

Test Unit 5

Archeologists established Test Unit 5 as a 2 by 1 m unit oriented on a north-south axis in Lafayette Square on...
April 15, 2008. The general location for the test unit was selected because GIS maps suggested that this quadrant of the park once contained a portion of one of the Central Redoubts and related trenches (Figure 81). The specific location for the unit was derived from the need to place the unit away from utility lines and large trees. Archeologists established the unit in the northwestern quadrant of Lafayette Square (Figure 78).

Level 1 was an arbitrary 10 cm level generally beginning at 17 cm bd and generally extending to 27 cm bd. Level 1 soils were a black (10YR2/1) silty sand. Archeologists noted the presence of a small number of artifacts including one each of the following: colorless bottle glass, edgeware (unscalloped, rim impressed), a 2001 U.S. nickel, plastic, plastic comb, crown cap, animal bone, slag, coal, and a brass jewelry ring. Charcoal was noted but not recovered. Archeologists weighed and discarded a total of three lbs. of brick fragments.

The 10 cm thick soils of Level 3 extended from 37-47 cm bd and were the same color and texture as Levels 1 and 2. Modern and semi-modern artifacts continued in this level, and included Styrofoam, carbon battery cores, plastic, and a 1930s spark plug. Other artifacts uncovered included animal bone, slate, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, cobalt, amethyst, amber, and colorless), a medicine bottle, milk glass, a lamp chimney globe, plate glass, window glass, a toy jack from a set of jacks, ceramics (pearlware, redware, transfer printed ware, yellowware, and ironstone), nails and a piece of an iron-capped pipe. Two pieces of dark green bottle glass came from this level. This level consisted of modern top soil with modern and historic artifacts.

Level 2 soils were similar to that of Level 1, but showed an increase in artifact density. Level 2 consisted of an arbitrary 10 cm level (27-37 cm bd). The mix of modern and historic artifacts in this level included ceramics (hand-painted and plain porcelain, brown salt-glazed stoneware, lead glazed stoneware, green edgeware, creamware, pearlware, and ironstone), nails (cut and unidentifiable), window and plate glass, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, amber, and colorless), milk glass, carbon battery cores, plastic, flat iron, colorless tableware glass,
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Figure 79. Radar map of upper level deposits at Lafayette Square. Grid North is to the right. Note the light blue cluster trending NE-SW in the 50-64 m section.

Figure 80. Radar map of lower level soils at Lafayette Square. Grid North is to the right. Note the disappearance of the light blue cluster in the 50-64 m section.
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Level 4 was an arbitrary 10 cm level (47-57 cm bd). While more orange-brown with brown mottles, the soil of Level 4 continued to retain much of the color and texture of soils in the preceding levels. Archeologists recovered nails, ceramics (lead glazed, pearlware, earthenware, creamware, porcelain), unidentifiable iron, lead scrap, bottle glass (olive green, dark green, cobalt, and amethyst), pressed glass, milk glass, window glass, oyster shell, an iron button, animal bone, slate, an 1861 Liberty penny, coal, and chert flakes. A total of five lbs. of brick was discarded from Level 4.

Level 5 was a natural level approximately 2-4 cm thick. Soils in this thin lens are a continuation of those described for Level 4. Archeologists temporarily terminated Level 5 after four centimeters when they encountered a soil change. They noted a stain in the southern half of the unit that did not quite extend to the eastern wall of the excavation. They designated the stain as Zone 6 and photographed it. Zone 6 soil was a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) silty sand mottled with brown (10YR4/3) sand and a large amount of brick fragments. Excavation of Zone 6 revealed that it angled under the soils of Level 5, although it appeared that the northeastern portion of the zone intruded into the level. Archeologists, therefore, continued to excavate Level 5 in the northwestern corner of the unit, taking it down to 67 cm bd. Soils were a very dark brown (10YR2/2) sand mottled with a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) sand. Level 5 contained a large amount of artifacts including ceramics (plain and decal porcelain, creamware, pearlware, redware, transfer printed ware, and ironstone), bottle glass (olive green, aqua, colorless), a bottle base with a pontil scar, nails (unidentifiable square, cut, and wire), window glass, a European chert flake, tableware glass, coal, iron, slag, animal bone, and oyster shell. Discarded brick and mortar weighed five lbs.

Level 6 was designated as Zone 6. It was a natural level measuring between 9 and 13 cm thick. The top of the

Figure 81. This overlay (one of many examined) shows one potential location of the eastern Central Redoubt in Lafayette Square. Note the relationship of this redoubt to the western Central Redoubt in what is now Madison Square. North is up on this overlay.
zone was at 61 cm bd. The base ranged from 68 to 74 cm bd. The zone was characterized by a well defined layer of brick fragments/rubble (Figures 82 and 83). The brick was crumbly. Individual bricks and brick fragments were not mortared and articulated, but were at a uniform elevation the entire length of the test unit. This suggests an intentional spreading of the rubble and either intentional or unintentional tamping of it. This brick fragments/rubble totaled 112 lbs. Brick samples were recovered from Level 6. Other artifacts included ceramics (creamware, pearlware, and redware), bottle glass (olive green spirit bottles, and colorless fragments), window glass, tableware glass, wrought nails and a wrought spike, a battery carbon core, slate, and oyster shell. Soil in this zone consisted of a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) silty sand mottled with brown (10YR4/3) sand. The northwestern edge of Zone 6 angled under remnants of Level 5. The northeastern edge of the zone appeared to be intrusive into the level.

Archeologists excavated Level 7 as a natural level ranging in thickness from 1-10 cm. Beginning depths were between 61-70 cm bd and ending depths for the level ranged from 71 to 74 cm bd. Soil consisted of a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand mottled with a very dark gray (10YR3/1) sand. Level 7 shows signs of contamination from Zone 6. Both have similar soils and Zone 6 intruded Level 7. Artifacts in Level 7 included ceramics (plain whiteware, transfer printed ware, and refined earthenware), wrought nails, a possible button (brass), an embossed bottle fragment, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and colorless), window glass, slate, coal, and hard plastic. A total of three lbs. of brick came from this level.

Soil in Level 8 matched that of Level 7. Archeologists noted a slight soil change between the edge of brick layer of Zone 6 and that of the remainder of the unit. This change was too subtle and soils dried too quickly to excavate the soils separately. Level 8 was an arbitrary level beginning at 71 cm bd and terminating between 80 and 81 cm bd. Level 8 in the northwestern corner of the unit terminated at 78 cm bd. Artifacts in this level included window glass, mirror glass, olive green and colorless bottle glass, machine made bottle fragments, coal, wrought and square nails, ironstone, creamware, animal bones, and slate. A total of two lbs. of brick fragments came from this level.

Figure 82. The brick lens of Level 6 is clearly visible in the West wall of Test Unit 5.
Zone 9 may represent a modern intrusion, although it contained some older artifacts. The zone was first noted with the observation of Zone 6. Zone 9 extended out of the eastern wall of the unit, approximately 20 cm at the north end of the unit and up to 60 cm in the southern portion of the unit. The portion of the zone in the unit is generally oriented northeast-southwest. Zone 9 was excavated as a natural level between 3-12 cm thick (80-83 and 80-92 cm bd) and consisted of dark grayish (10YR4/2) sand. Archeologists recovered window glass, a cut nail, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and colorless), porcelain, pearlware, redware, whiteware, ironstone, animal bone, slate, and a European chert flake from Zone 9. They recorded one lb. of brick fragments.

Zone 10 surrounded the edges of Zone 9, with the former located primarily in the western half and extreme southern edge of Test Unit 5. Zone 10 soil was a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand mottled with a grayish brown (10YR5/2) sand and charcoal flecks. Archeologists excavated this as a natural zone averaging 12 cm thick. Base depths ranged from 89 to 94 cm bd. Artifact density was extremely low, consisting of only one piece of glazed brick noted in this zone.

Zone 11 was excavated as a natural level, by zones. Archeologists thought they completed the excavation of Zones 7, 8, 9, and 11 at this time, but portions of these reappeared later in mottles layers of Level 14. Soils remained the same in these zones. Level depths were as follows: northeastern corner (89-106 cm bd); southeastern corner (92-96 cm bd); and the center (88-114 cm bd). The low density of artifacts consisted of window glass, whiteware, a kaolin tobacco pipe stem, olive green and colorless bottle glass, slate, and an unidentifiable nail fragment. Archeologists recorded one-half pound of brick fragments. The amorphous and irregular nature of the soils at this elevation may be the result of tree roots and a planting hole.

Level 12 was an arbitrary 10 cm thick level across the entire unit except for the northeastern corner. The level generally measured from 92 to 103 cm bd. The only cultural material in this level was a cut nail fragment and a few brick fragments smaller than one-quarter inch in diameter. The brick was not recovered. Tube coring at the base of Level 12 revealed approximately 50 cm of similar soils below, with apparent subsoil beneath that. Level 12 soils were dominated by swirling mottles of sand and sandy loam.

Figure 83. Profile drawing of the West wall of Test Unit 5.
Level 13 was similar in soil type and thickness to Level 12. The former terminated at a depth of 110-114 cm bd. Two small brick fragments were found during this excavation. The swirling, mottled soil was concentrated in the southern end of the unit.

Level 14 was an arbitrary 10 cm level excavated up to 123 cm bd. Soils remained the same. Zone 11 feature soils reappeared at this level. One cut nail was recovered. Zone 11 artifacts at this level included one pound brick fragments and two small pieces of coal. Zone 11 was excavated 18 cm deeper than Level 14.

Level 15 was the final level excavated in Test Unit 5. This 10 cm thick level ranged from 120-132 cm bd. Soils were the same as the matrix in the previous level. This level was sterile.

Test Units 6 and 7

Archeologists returned to Lafayette Square in August to try to understand the stratigraphy and features uncovered in Test Unit 5 better. Toward this end, they established Test Unit 6 running west off of the southwestern wall of Test Unit 5. Test Unit 7 was also aligned east-west, with the east wall of the unit adjacent to the west wall of Test Unit 6. (See previous Figure 78.) Test Units 6 and 7 were excavated simultaneously to provide a larger view of the area.

Test Unit 6

This 2 by 1 m unit was oriented east-west. Archeologists excavated Level 1 as a natural level measuring between 22 and 32 cm thick. The top of the level ranged from 0 to 10 cm bd and the base ended at 32 to 35 cm bd. The soil was a black (10YR2/1) silty sand. This likely represents a topsoil and gardening layer. The level was terminated at a slight change in the soil appearing as brown mottling with some brick fragments. Artifacts consisted of modern and historic items including window glass, plate glass, machine made bottle glass, other bottle glass (olive green, aqua, cobalt, amber, and colorless), milk glass, tableware glass, ceramics (Delft, porcelain, plain and hand painted creamware, plain and hand painted pearlware, scalloped and impressed edgeware, black glazed redware, ironstone, whiteware, transfer printed refined earthenware, and other earthenware), chert flakes, kaolin tobacco pipe stem, metal embossed tag, lead scrap, a screw, nails (cut and wire), styrofoam, slate, a battery carbon core, flat iron, wire, concrete, slag, oyster shell, coal, and brick.

Level 2 was another natural level containing similar fill as Level 1. Level 2 was a 3-7 cm thick level extending to 39 cm bd. Archeologists terminated this thin layer when they observed a soil change along the western half of the unit. Here they noted a more yellow-brown soil with whole bricks and broken brick bats. The artifact density increased from the previous level, and contained older items. Two religious medallions found in this level are probably from members of the congregation of the nearby Catholic Cathedral of St. John the Baptist, or from female students attending the adjacent Catholic school, St. Vincent’s Academy. The following artifacts appeared in Level 2: a sacred heart and a Virgin Mary medallion, a porcelain doll fragment, a possible French blade gunflint fragment, a lead ball (.26-.28 caliber), ceramics (plain porcelain, pearlware, coarse earthenware, green edgeware, wormy finger painted ware, mocha on white body refined earthenware, creamware, whiteware, and ironstone), nails (cut and wire), oyster shell, window glass, bottle glass (olive, aqua, amber, dark green, and colorless), pewter scrap, a kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, a glass marble, coal, slag, and animal bone. Archeologists recorded 2.6 lbs. of brick fragments in this level.

Archeologists designated a soil stain at the base of Level 2 as Feature 6. This circular feature measured approximately 90 cm in diameter (Figure 84). All except the southernmost tip of the feature was exposed in Test Unit 6. Feature 6 soils consisted of a very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam mottled with a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sandy loam. Several horizontal bricks or brick fragments were exposed at the top of the feature. This basin shaped feature extended a maximum depth of 23 cm, to 60 cm bd. Artifacts in this feature included ceramics (plain porcelain, hand-painted and annular pearlware, creamware, redware, transfer printed ware, yellowware, plain ironstone, whiteware), bottle glass (olive green, aqua, cobalt, and colorless), window glass, plate glass, possible clasp pocket knife fragment, a rubber Goodyear rubber button with cross-hatch design, nails (cut and wire), animal bone, slate, slag, iron chain links, sheet iron, an iron flat strap, and oyster shell. The feature contained relatively large amounts of whole and half bricks, totaling 15 of each. These were hand-made bricks of swirly clay measuring 10.5 by 6.5 cm by 22.5 cm and denser, thinner bricks measuring 10 by 5.5 by 20 cm. Both types were without extrusion holes. In addition to these complete and half bricks, archeologists recorded a total of 142 lbs. of brick and brick fragments from the feature fill. A broken portion of a four inch diameter, redware utility pipe stuck out of the upper 4 cm of the feature. It was thrown in with the fill and was not in situ in any pipe trench.

Level 3 of this unit corresponded to Levels 2 and 3 of Test Unit 7. Level 3 in Test Unit 6 exposed the same brick
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Test Unit 6
Plan View, Base of Level 2

Feature 6

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sandy loam
B- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam

horizontal bricks

Test Unit 6
Feature 6, Southwest Profile

A- 10YR3/1 very dark gray sandy loam mottled with 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sandy loam. Full of various types of brick bats [Feature 6]

brick

Figure 84. Feature 6 plan (top) and profile (bottom).
fragments/rubble zone discovered in Test Unit 5. Soils in this level were a black (10YR2/1) silty sand mottled with a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand and brick fragments. At the base of Level 3 archeologists noted three zones. Zone B was a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand. Zones C and D both were brown (10YR3/3) sand with brick fragments. Zone C, however, contained a much greater density of brick chunks. This included quarter and half pieces of brick. Near the southern boundary of Zones C and D, archeologists piece plotted an 18 cm square piece of cast iron that had a slight curvature. A total of 15.5 lbs. of brick fragments was recorded in Level 3 and several samples saved. Archeologists recovered shell, ceramics (gray salt-glazed stoneware, brown salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, polychrome pearlware, redware (coarse and refined), lined wares, transfer print wares, yellowware, ironstone, burned refined earthenware, and whiteware), nails (cut and wire), a screw, kaolin tobacco pipe bowls (one plain and one leaf embossed), kaolin pipe stem, a battery carbon core, plastic, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and colorless), slate, window glass, coal, oyster shell, and animal bone.

Zone A became a feature archeologists observed at the top of Level 4. Most of the feature occupied the northeastern quadrant of Test Unit 7, extending only slightly into the northwestern quadrant of Test Unit 6. For this reason, the feature is detailed within the Test Unit 7 discussion, below. Artifacts recovered from Zone A, Level 5 of TU 6 included one piece each of window glass, coarse earthenware, and a metal can. There were four pieces of animal bone.

Level 4, Zone B occupied the eastern one-third of the unit. Excavation revealed this to be a pipe trench for an iron pipe. The pipe runs north-south. The trench cuts through and post-dates the brick layer. The feature was excavated from 50-75 cm bd. Feature fill contained a nineteenth-century U.S. Army military button with an eagle motif. The button was made of brass with an iron backing and shank. This was a General Service button issued by the army between 1854 and 1902 (Albert 1997:40-41). Other artifacts in the fill included goblet stem and bowl, nails (wrought and square), ceramics (plain and decal porcelain, blue edgeware, yellowware, transfer printed ware, and whiteware), bottle glass (olive, aqua, amber, embossed), goblet base, tableware glass, ceramic marble, lead scrap, window glass, slag, coal, oyster shell, and animal bone. There were 13.5 lbs. of brick fragments in the fill.

Level 4, Zone C and Zone D occupied the central and western thirds of the unit, respectively. Archeologists excavated the zones as natural levels. These ranged from 50-59 cm bd in the eastern side to merely 58-59 cm bd on the western side. The only difference between these two zones was the size of the brick fragments. Both zones had a great density of brick pieces that totaled 64 lbs. The fill also contained bottle glass (olive green, aqua), a bottle glass flake, a kaolin tobacco pipe stem, ceramics (redware and creamware), window glass, a flat iron strap, a wrought nail, oyster shell, and animal bone. The brick layer in this level was a continuation of the brick layer uncovered in Test Unit 5.

Feature 8 cut through the brick lens of Level 4, Zone C and the underlying Level 5. The feature also appears to cut through the soil of Zone B, Level 4. Artifacts in Feature 8 appear to have originated in Zone C and Level 5. Artifacts in the feature included one edgeware rim sherd and one piece of slate. Artifacts such as metal, slag, nails, and coal found in the levels above Level 4 are not present in Feature 8 fill. This suggests that Feature 8 post-dates the brick lens and predates Levels 3, 2, and 1. Feature 8 is circular in plan and extended out of the north wall of the unit. It measures 29 cm in diameter. The feature’s profile is long, vertical, and has a rounded base. The feature is 84 cm from top to base (50-134 cm bd). Feature fill consists of a brown (10YR5/3) fine sand mottled with a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) sandy loam. Occasional brick fragments were noted in the fill. The low frequency of artifacts included blue edgeware, a piece of slate, and part of a ballast stone. Feature 8 first appeared to be a tree root disturbance in its upper levels. It did not become more visible or better defined until 99 cm bd, at the top of Level 7. At this point archeologists began excavating it as a separate feature. Upon excavation, the edges were fairly well defined and perfectly vertical. The feature appeared to be an extremely large and deep post mold.

Level 5 (59-75 cm bd) was an approximately 15 cm thick natural level. This very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam contained the remainder of the brick layer in this unit that began in Level 4 and was first identified in Test Unit 5. In addition to the 71 lbs. of brick fragments weighed, artifacts included dark green bottle glass, creamware, pearlware, redware, tableware glass, cut and wrought nails, slag, window glass, slate, oyster shell, and animal bone. Archeologists piece plotted an olive green glass bottle seal embossed, “PG & Old Bristol Porter Co” next to the south wall of the unit, 71 cm west of the unit’s southeastern corner. Level 5 may be a buried A horizon later capped by the brick lens.

Level 6 soils were a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam that leached into a brown (10YR4/3) sand. This natural level measured approximately 9 cm thick and terminated at 84 cm bd. Artifact density decreased significantly in this level. Artifacts included window glass, olive green bottle glass, a piece of melted glass, and less than one pound of brick fragments.
Level 7 marked the end of unit excavation. This natural level was approximately 15 cm thick (84-100 cm bd) and consisted of brown (10YR4/3) sand. The level was almost sterile, with less than one pound of brick fragments and some charcoal. Archeologists took soil samples from a column area in the southern balk of Test Units 6 and 7 (the southwestern balk of Test Unit 6 and the southeastern balk of Test Unit 7). Soil samples for pollen/phytolith and macro studies are being curated for future, undetermined processing.

**Test Unit 7**

This unit was aligned on an east-west axis. Its eastern wall shared the western wall of Test Unit 6. Level 1 was a natural level generally extending from 11-41 cm bd. This roughly 30 cm thick level contained very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam that graded at the base of the level into a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam and a small amount of very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam. Level 1 of Test Unit 7 contained the same strata as Levels 1 and 2 of Test Unit 6. There were a large number and wide variety of artifacts within Level 1. These included: ceramics (plain porcelain, plain creamware, hand-painted pearlware, Delft, lead-glazed, molded Jackfield, lined wares, transfer printed ware, plain whiteware, and plain ironstone), ceramic tile, bottle glass (olive green, light green, cobalt, amethyst, dark green, and amber), pressed tableware glass, metal pop tops, tableware glass, window glass, nails (cut and wire), buttons (porcelain, milk glass, white metal), clothing snaps, brass cartridge, kaolin tobacco pipe stem, slag, flat iron, slate, coal, and animal bone. Mortar and brick fragments totaled five lbs. One feature was exposed at the base of Level 1. This consisted of a brick concentration in the northwestern corner of the unit, and archeologists designated this Feature 5.

Feature 5 was located in the northwestern corner of Test Unit 7. It extended east off of the west wall 40 cm and south off of the north wall 60 cm (Figures 85 and 86). The portion of the feature exposed in the test unit was oval in plan view. Feature 5 fill consisted of a very dark gray (10YR3/1) slightly compacted sand dispersed throughout the crevices of a brick cluster. The top elevation of the feature was recorded as 26 cm bd and the base at 63 cm bd. The feature had a flat to very slightly concave base. This 26-38 cm thick feature contained ceramics (plain creamware, ironstone, and whiteware), bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and colorless), tableware glass, nails (cut and unidentifiable), tin can, iron fragments, an iron button, coal, slag, ballast rock, and animal bone. Archeologists

![Figure 85. Feature 5 extends out of the northwestern corner of Test Unit 7.](image-url)
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recorded a total of 51 lbs. of brick, 18 lbs. of ballast stones, and 5.5 lbs. of slag. They saved samples of each. Of the 51 lbs. of brick fragments, 19 were half bricks. Some of the bricks had a variegated red and yellowish brown paste. Feature 5 was a pit filled with brick, mortar, and ballast debris.

Level 2 was an arbitrary level measuring approximately 9-12 cm thick. Archeologists terminated the level at 50 cm bd. Soils were a very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine to medium sand. The fill contained the following artifacts: ceramics (gray salt-glazed stoneware, plain and hand-painted pearlware, blue edgeware, impressed edgeware, transfer printed ware, yellowware, white ware, and ironstone), window glass, buttons (porcelain, bone, and iron), bottle glass (olive green, spirit bottles, embossed, amber, and colorless), glass bottle stopper (embossed), pressed glass, tableware glass, white scrap metal, minie ball, kaolin tobacco pipe bowls (one plain, one with dots around rim), kaolin tobacco pipe stem, iron screw hook, nails (cut and unidentifiable), slate, animal bone, cinder/clinker, oyster shell, and slag. Brick and mortar fragments in Level 2 totaled 0.25 lbs.

Level 3 (50-58 cm bd) was a natural level that stopped on the top of two stains, Zones A and B. Zone A was located in the northeastern corner and Zone B extended out of the southwestern corner. These stains are detailed below. Soils in the Level 3 matrix were a dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam with a thin lens of light brownish gray (10YR6/2) possibly waterlain sand. This matrix overlies a more compact soil zone in Level 4. The sand lens covered the entire unit except the northeastern corner where Zone A was located, and along the western wall of the test unit where other features (Feature 5 and Zone B) intrude upon it (Figure 87). The Level 3 matrix contained a scattering of small ballast pebbles. Archeologists recovered ceramics (plain and hand-painted porcelain, plain creamware, coarse earthenware, Delft, transfer printed ware, whiteware, and ironstone), bottle glass (olive green spirit, aqua), window glass, a brass ring, tobacco pipe bowl, a brass button, metal hardware nuts, nails (cut and unidentifiable), oyster shell, and animal bone.

Zone A occupied the northeastern corner of Test Unit 7. It extended off the north wall approximately 44 cm. The zone extended off the east wall of the unit 72 cm. Zone A was a homogeneous very dark gray (10YR3/1) fine to medium sand. This feature began in Level 3 and in the unit profile appeared to have the same general soils as that level. The feature appeared to be late 19th century and cut through the brick lens. Zone A was a conical-shaped basin feature measuring 47 cm thick. It began at 37 cm bd and ending at 85 cm bd. Artifacts in Zone A included window glass, nails (unidentifiable square), ceramics (stoneware, plain pearlware, brown transfer printed ware, and whiteware), bottle glass (olive green and aqua), animal bone, oyster shell, and brick. A cast iron pot rim came from the Level 6 portion of Zone A. Coal and slag were present in Zone A. The feature was a pit containing architectural and domestic debris.

Level 4 was a natural level beginning at 58 cm bd and extending to 65 cm bd in areas not containing features (Zone A, B, and Feature 5). The matrix of Level 4 was a black (10YR2/1) sandy loam with brick fragments/rubble. The rubble and sand of the level was thin on the western part of the unit and became thicker in the eastern part of the unit. Virtually no coal and slag were recorded in Level 4. Artifacts in this level represented a good 18th/early 19th century context including creamware, pearlware, redware...
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Level 5 ranged from 65 to 74 cm bd as a natural level. Soils were a very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam mottled with a dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) sandy loam. This level is suspected to be a buried A horizon. Zone B became much more clearly defined at the base of Level 5, and the zone was then designated Feature 7. Artifacts in Level 5 included a small ironstone sherd, whiteware, olive green bottle glass, a kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, iron, two unidentifiable square nails, slag, oyster shell, coal, possible steel can fragment, animal bone, and a few small brick fragments.

Zone B initially extended from the southwestern corner of Test Unit 7. It ran 34 cm north and 35 cm east. Zone B was clearly visible at the base of Level 2 (50 cm bd) and likely started somewhere within that level. Zone B was not clearly defined and designated a feature until Level 5. Zone B was approximately 28-42 cm thick, depending on where the top of it actually begins. At the base of Level 5, Zone B (Feature 7) measured 20 cm east-west by 26 cm north-south (Figure 88). At that 74 cm bd elevation, brick, rock, iron, and coal were clearly visible in the rectangular shaped feature. The feature had vertical walls, rounded corners, and a flat base. Zone B/Feature 7 fill was similar in color and texture to Zone A, although somewhat less consolidated. Artifacts in Zone B included aqua bottle glass, window glass, animal bone, a steel can fragment, slag, one piece of coal, and oyster shell.

Level 6 was an arbitrary level beginning at 75 cm bd. The level extended to 85 cm bd in the eastern half of the unit and 90 cm bd in the western half. The soil was a brown (10YR5/3) sand. The matrix soils of this level were sterile.

Level 7 was an arbitrary level beginning at 85 cm bd on the east side of Test Unit 7 and 90 cm on the west side of the unit. Archeologists terminated the level, and the unit, at 100 cm bd. The soil was consistent with Level 6 and was sterile except for one piece of black glazed, unrefined redware.

Interpretation of Test Units 5, 6, and 7

Archeologists recovered numerous artifacts from the 1730s-1770s in these units. They documented a few items in these three units that could be related to military use,
including a .28 lead ball, one possible gunflint fragment, and several possible gunflint flakes. Archeologists also uncovered a large number of artifacts from the nineteenth century. They attempted to use relative dating of the stratigraphic sequences and mean ceramic dates to determine when this area was used and if it was associated with the Revolutionary War. Figures 89 and 90 show the northern and southern profiles of Test Units 6 and 7 and Figure 91 represents the western profile of Test Unit 5. Note the numerous pits and other disturbances in the profiles. Such disturbances undoubtedly rearranged some artifacts from one stratum to another. These disturbances also made it a challenge to correlate strata between test units. Archeologists ran a MCD for the diagnostic ceramics in the brick lens level (TU 5, Level 6 and Test Units 6 and 7, Level 4). The MCD for this Stratum was 1805.6 (n=20). This MCD is based on a very small, statistically invalid sample size. Archeologists ran a MCD on the level below the brick lens (TU 5, L.8 and TU 6 and 7, Level 5). This produced a MCD of 1803.6 (n=11). While both assemblages suffer from a small sample size, numerous intrusive disturbances, and difficulties in correlating strata, the MCD data is telling. It suggests that the area containing these three units was used during the Revolutionary War and then in the first decade of the 1800s, prior to Savannah’s encroachment and resulting intensive settlement of the area.

Unlike the units in Madison Square and Test Unit 2 at Emmet Park, all three test units in Lafayette Square were impacted by later trash pits of similar appearance and content. These pits were generally small to medium basin shaped holes. They were dug through the brick fragments/rubble layer dating to circa 1805, and thereby post-dating the 1778 military barracks destruction and resulting ground leveling. The trash pits contained large amounts of brick rubble with half or often whole bricks and other architectural and domestic debris.

Other analytical clues that may help decipher the date and function of the Lafayette Square units include ceramic ratios and ceramic to wine bottle ratios. Both the ceramic ratio (ratio of ceramics to all other artifacts) and the ceramic to wine bottle ratio calculations were mentioned previously in this report for TU 5, 6, and 7. They were calculated again for just the stratum underlying the brick...
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Figure 89. Note the many pits cutting through the Stratum D brick lens.

Figure 90. A pit lies beneath the brick lens in the South profile.
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Test Units 5-7 contained large concentrations of handmade brick fragments/rubble. Test Units 3 and 4 also contained remnants of brick fragments/rubble. Figure 77 shows a graph of this brick fragments/rubble, by Level within Test Units. A few patterns emerge from this data. Brick levels peak in Level 12 of Test Units 3 and 4 and Level 6 of Test Unit 5. The brick fragments/rubble of Level 12 (TU 3 and 4) represents tertiary deposits, with the brick salvaged from the barracks in late September/early October 1779 and included as part of the embankments constructed along the trenches connecting the Central and nearby redoubts. After this secondary deposition, the embankments containing the brick rubble was then pushed into the trenches in 1782 when General Wayne ordered the trenches filled after the departure of the British. The brick fragments/rubble of Level 6 (TU 5) probably represents a different brick source and definitely represents a later secondary deposition than that of TU 3 and 4. Interestingly, both TU 4 on what is now Madison Square and TU 5 in what is Lafayette Square, had similar brick totals at their peak. The former contained 105 lbs. of brick in one of its levels compared to 110 lbs. of brick in one of the levels of TU 5. This seems an odd coincidence that is not explainable by current data.

Another common factor of Test Units 5, 6, and 7 is that they contained the greatest concentration of artifacts. Test Unit 6 contained the second greatest, with 865 artifacts per cubic meter. Test Unit 7 had a total of 962 artifacts per cubic meter. Test Unit 5 artifact totals are somewhat skewed, since four levels were intentionally excavated into subsoil to ensure that no additional cultural levels were buried deeper.

by the British during the final days of September 1779. This is unlikely however, as artifacts that post-date the Revolution were found below the brick. If this brick is from the British barracks, it is a secondary deposit. The brick in Lafayette Square test units is most likely associated with War of 1812 defenses or the later U.S. Army barracks built during the first two decades of the 1800s.

Savannah Under Fire:
Identifying Savannah's Revolutionary War Battlefield
In summary, the archaeologists were left with questions remaining as to who was using the area that is now Lafayette Square and when was it being used? Test Units 5, 6, and 7 contained a large number of artifacts from the eighteenth century. Porcelains, creamware, salt-glazed stonewares, refined redwares, and other artifacts from that period were common. Handmade brick was abundant. Yet late 18th and early 19th century artifacts were also present, including diagnostic sherds that contributed toward a MCD of 1806 (n=20) for the brick stratum and 1804 (n=11) for the stratum beneath the brick layer. The fact that this area was not occupied by townspeople during the 1730s-1770s strongly suggests that artifacts from this period were deposited here during the siege and ensuing 1779 battle. This debris may have been generated by soldiers living in the barracks prior to its razing by General Prevost and Engineer Moncrief. The debris may also have come from soldiers occupying the Central redoubts and the horseshoe battery nearby. Some of the ceramics, cooking utensils, and animal bone may have resulted from cooking to feed the soldiers and African Americans toiling on the British fortifications. Some of the trash may have been generated by civilians. Primary documents record that it was safer to be in tents near the defensive works surrounding the city than in the houses and basements in town. It is likely that families of British officers and other civilians took up temporary shelter in such areas, including where TU 5, 6, and 7 were located.

Late 18th and early 19th century artifacts in this area obviously did not come from the Revolutionary soldiers or associated civilians. Some items are most likely associated with the construction of War of 1812 defenses in the area. Soldiers, civilians, and the enslaved working on these may have camped in the area during construction. It is likely that the artifacts from this period were generated by the soldiers, craftsmen, and civilians associated with the U.S. Army Cantonment on the neighboring block.Documents indicate that the army post was already in use in the 1820s, prior to its completion. It would have been easy for the area nearby to become a convenient dump for refuse associated with the construction of the base (including brick fragments/rubble and architectural debris) and trash associated with the domestic side of life on base, the cooking, cleaning, eating, and similar activities that may have been done by soldiers, civilians or both. This interpretation would also explain the similarity in the ceramic to wine bottle ratio with the Fort Hawkins site, which was a U.S. military fort dating from 1806-1821. The artifacts in the Lafayette Square units generated by a mix of civilians and soldiers through time would also explain the ceramic ratio of 0.39 falling between the ratio for military sites and domestic sites. Clearly, further research is needed for the Lafayette Square and surrounding area. The scenario above is currently the most plausible one based on the data at hand.

Riverfront (Emmet Park)

Defining Features, Natural, Cultural, and Military Engineering

A defining feature located in the Emmet Park area is the fort that sat on the northeastern corner of town. It was constructed on the high bluff overlooking the Savannah River. Both the bluff and the river are defining natural features that determined, in large part, the location of the fort. The fort was used before, during, and after the Battle of Savannah. It had numerous names and appears on several maps. These are discussed below.

Historical Significance (correlated with primary source information)

The northeastern corner of the original town limits was prime real estate for a fort. The bluff overlooking the river and protecting the town was a strategic location for a defensive work and served to support such for more than 150 years. As early as 1734, that location housed a 12 gun battery and two block houses with four guns each (Byous 2008). Eventually a succession of forts, or at least fort names, was assigned to this spot. Figures 92 and 93 contain a few illustrations of some of these forts.

Fort Halifax was, “a square fort completed in 1760 and made of planks with a caponiere at each corner” (Johnson 2003:58). The location of this fort is shown on a 1765 map of Savannah, although the fort is not identified by name (Ettwein 1765; Lane 1994:40). This fort is not shown on Surveyor DeBrahm’s 1757 plan of Savannah, which suggests that it was not part of DeBrahm’s plan for fortifying the city. DeBrahm’s fortification plans for Savannah may not have been fully implemented. An archaeological search for his southwestern bastion failed to locate any trace of it (Elliott and Holland 1994; Elliott et al 1995). Even if the southeastern and southwestern bastions shown on DeBrahm’s plan had been constructed, they would have been obsolete by the American Revolution, since Savannah’s boundaries were expanding. The Patriot defenses that existed in 1778 were several hundred yards further south of South Broad Street.

Fort Halifax, on the other hand, was constructed and was still in use in 1766, when it was used by the Rangers and Royal Governor Wright during the civic unrest over the Stamp Act (Johnson 2003:58-60). The 1765 map of Savannah shows the town consisting of six wards, instead of the four wards shown on DeBrahm’s map eight years later.
Figure 92. Various renderings of the fort known at different times as forts Halifax, Charlotte, Savannah, Prevost, and Wayne. Top: Anonymous “Savannah and Its Defenses”, ca. 177- (William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan); Middle: “Proposed Fortifications for Savannah” attributed to Patrick Ferguson ca. 1780 (Clements Library); Bottom: Inset from Middle image.
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Figure 93. Additional depictions of the fort with many names. Top: Plat of Fort Wayne, 1809, by I. Stouf (National Archives and Records Administration, RG77 Land Papers); Middle: Anonymous, “Fort Prevost”, 1781 (Library of Congress). Bottom: Inset from “Savannah im Jahre 1778”, (Emmet Collection, New York Public Library).
earlier. Apparently Savannah had grown considerably eastward in those few years.

The small fort on Savannah’s northeast corner that defended Savannah’s northeast side has an identity problem. This fort is also later identified as Fort Charlotte on one map. That designation was either in error or it was a name that was not widely used. Another Fort Charlotte, which was constructed upstream on the Savannah River in South Carolina, was built prior to the war (Davis 1949). That Fort Charlotte was more widely acknowledged as the fort by that name. The fort also was known as Fort Savannah (Johnson 2003:58). The same general area of fortification was greatly expanded by the British in 1779-1782, when it was designated Fort Prevost. Two plan maps of Fort Prevost have survived, which reveal the extent and detail of the fort. Alexander Innes reported in January 1779 that, “The Fort occupys the westernmost [?] end of this bluff a place of no strength ye works intended not having been completed…” Clearly this fort was of limited substance prior to the British attack in 1778, and Innes’ account and maps indicate that the British had not done much to this fort since they took Savannah (Innes 1779a and 1779b). The fort was likely renamed Fort Wayne after the British evacuated the city in 1782 and following the American re-entry into town.)

Primary documents mention the “river battery”, which appears to be the battery on the northeastern portion of the riverbank, near the fort known sequentially as Halifax, Prevost, and Wayne. General Prevost acknowledged in his journal that the firing of four French galleys “…oblige us to retire under the river battery…” (Kennedy 1974:98). The British added an eight inch howitzer to the battery. Prevost noted that the water battery had two 12 pounder guns mounted there (Kennedy 1974:99). Fort Prevost and the river battery played a significant role in protecting Savannah from allied landing forces attacking the town from the river bank and in keeping armed French and American vessels in the river from firing at even closer range.

**Viewsheds**

Emmet Park occupies the edge of the high bluff overlooking the Savannah River (Figures 94 and 95). The viewshed to the north is the river below, interspersed with various historic structures that once housed cotton factors’ offices. The view to the east includes the ramp going down the bluff to the river. Beyond this to the east is a hotel in an area that would have been just east, and outside of the city’s defensive works. To the south, the site is border by East Bay. This is an historic street established in 1733 with the town plan, and as the town grew to the east, Bay Street was extended two additional wards up to East Broad Street. Beyond this to the south, the viewshed consists of...
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Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

By the nineteenth century, the area around Fort Wayne was changing. Underneath the bluff near the fort stood a steam mill that milled lumber. It consisted of a mill and two small buildings valued at $30,000 in 1820. The mill caught fire in March of that year and arson was suspected. The Steam Saw Mill was owned by S.C. Dunning (New York Evening Post 1820).

A tragic incident in 1831 contains details about the area and indicates that Fort Wayne was still in use. There were 140 kegs of gunpowder in “…the Powder Magazine at the extreme Eastern verge of the city” (Savannah Georgian 1831). These were determined to be dangerous and were moved to “…the Magazine of Fort Wayne” (Savannah Georgian 1831). In the process 150-200 pounds of it was considered damaged and transferred into a half rice tierce (a cask holding 42 U.S.gallons). During the move a spark was created on the metal straps on the rice barrel, setting off an explosion. Seven people died. The Fort Wayne magazine, constructed of brick, “…was driven to pieces, and fragments thrown in every direction to the distance of two hundred yards…The end of the building was hurled against the Artillery Old Laboratory (brick) about 15 feet distant, which crushed it, and the roof being of wood caught fire and burnt with the other wood work…The bodies of two and detached parts of two more of the cooperers, have been found, together with another body, which it is hardly possible to identify as black or white, from the effects of the fire…” (Savannah Georgian 1831).

In November of 1843, the federal government had an assistant quartermaster, Captain R. S. Sibley, survey and make a map of both Fort Wayne and the public ground at the Oglethorpe Barracks (Marcy 1846). The associated reimbursement paperwork refers to the fort as “old Fort Wayne”. The survey may have been the government’s attempt to assess the condition and necessity of this 60 year old structure. On the 1884 and 1888 Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of Savannah the area later to become Emmet Park is generally identified as “The Battery”, as appropriate for an area that housed a fort and gun emplacements.

By the end of the 19th century, the area in and around Fort Wayne was evolving. In 1898 the mayor and aldermen of Savannah passed an act giving John Rourke title to a tract running along Reynolds Street from Bay Street to the Savannah River (excluding a 50 foot section of River Street). The tract was located across Bay Street from the Gas Works and at the easternmost edge of the survey area for this project. The John Rourke & Son Iron Works sat at the north side of Bay Street and the east side of East Broad. It is demarcated on the 1888 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The company sat conveniently next to

historic structures post-dating the revolution. To the west is more of Emmet Park and addition green space, similar to the open spaces that would have been town commons areas during the American Revolution.

Urban History of the Area

A few years after the American Revolution, as the vestiges of Fort Prevost lay abandoned, the fortifications were resurrected as Fort Wayne. Fort Wayne was a U.S. Army fort, which was also supported by the State of Georgia. Partial plan maps of Fort Wayne have survived. Some vestiges of the Fort Wayne-era brickwork also survive along the northeastern bluff, east of East Broad Street. Fort Wayne was referenced in numerous newspaper articles. It appears to have been in active use in 1797 when the Wayne was referenced in numerous newspaper articles. Partial plan maps of Fort Wayne have survived. Some vestiges of the Fort Wayne-era brickwork also survive along the northeastern bluff, east of East Broad Street. Fort Wayne was referenced in numerous newspaper articles.

In 1802 the fort was the anchorage location chosen for incoming vessels from Charleston, where pilots had to stop for examinations by the Health Office in Savannah (Georgia Gazette 1802). In 1810 Fort Wayne was the scene of an apparent suicide by an overdose of laudanum, taken by a recently arrived merchant from Charleston (City Gazette 1810).

By 1812 growing tensions with England caused Savannah to assess the condition of Fort Wayne and it was found wanting. The city resolved to request a refund from the federal government to reimburse Savannah for improvements to the fort. The City Council posted the following in the newspaper: “whereas, it is deemed expedient, to immediately commence the rebuilding of Fort Wayne, contiguous to this city. The citizens of Savannah, and its vicinity, are requested to furnish such of their male slaves whose labor can be dispensed with… the negroes furnished from the country, will be provided with provisions and lodgings. Those patriotic citizens, who are desirous of contributing their aid and services to the forgoing works, are invited to do so” (City Gazette 1812). The fort was still standing in 1820, as an article about a structure in the area was referenced as being “near Fort Wayne’ (New York Evening Post 1820).
a coal wharf on the pier. The iron works employed iron and brass founders, machinists, blacksmiths, and boiler makers. An advertisement for the ironworks shows a detailed drawing of the plant. Interestingly there is no river bluff visible and the large complex of industrial structures seems to lie on a wide, flat plain.

In 1903 the Iron Works and Marine Railway caught fire. The fire and resulting explosion of “cartridges and powder in the casting room” created $125,000 worth of damage for the underinsured Mr. Rourke (Macon Telegraph 1903). The city sympathized in the newspaper with the man who gave “free spreads and fires salutes from his cannon” on July 4th.

By the mid-20th century, plans were made for beautifying the Emmet Park area. A newspaper article reported on concepts for landscaping Emmet Park, including plantings, benches, and other items. The article stated that Emmet Park was deemed public property since May 1, 1760, although it provided no source for this. The description continued with a mention of an old powder magazine located in it near Lincoln Street and “an Indian village, [in] the central portion where the walks throughout the park converge” (Hunter 1957). DeBrahm’s 1757 Plan of the City Savannah detailed the Native American site, saying, “Between the City and the Trustee’s Garden is an artificial Hill upon the Bay, part of which in 1760 was dug through (to open a communication with this Suburb and City) whereby a Stratum was opened near the plane of the City filled with human bones...” (DeVorsey 1971; Byous 2008:2). The map shows “Indian Hill” located along the eastern end of what is now Emmet Park. Archeologists found the “Indian village” in shovel tests excavated along the eastern side of the central portion of the park. It is likely that the entire Native American site extends along the bluff, from at least East Broad Street to our shovel test locations, and probably farther in all directions.

Archeology

Metal Detector Survey

In March, archeologists conducted a controlled metal detector survey of portions of Emmet Park in March. Initial use of the detector revealed an enormous amount of buried objects registering on the detector as iron and others that were non-ferrous. Archeologists surveyed the western portion of the park with five transects spaced at 6 meter intervals, in addition to conducting random transects. They did a short transect on the eastern side of the park. Archeologists adjusted the metal detector to signal for non-ferrous metals in hopes of focusing on military-related items that would have been present during the American Revolution. They recorded a total of 45 non-ferrous “hits” located between 5 and 15 cm below ground surface. These were all identified as modern objects. Archeologists reset the detectors for ferrous readings and got 25 “hits”. Of these, eight were unidentifiable by age, and six were deemed modern. The remaining objects were determined to be worth excavating. The locations of non-modern artifacts were mapped with the laser transit, as were areas of iron concentrations (Figure 96). The low ratio of non-ferrous to ferrous metal detector hits suggests that this area has probably undergone previous extensive metal detector combing by collectors in previous years when the park was accessible for such activities. Another possibility is that the metal items from the Revolutionary War period in Emmet Park lie more deeply buried, below metal detector range. This might be especially true for cannon balls, mortar shells and similar large and heavy projectiles. The large number of ferrous materials underground also contributes to the challenge of using metal detectors as a tool for isolating Revolutionary War artifacts in this particular area.

Archeologists intentionally limited the amount of metal detector survey after initial investigations showed that the park contained a large number of buried ferrous objects and a small number of non-ferrous items. In this particular location, they determined that shovel tests and test units rather than large numbers of scattered metal detector hits would provide a greater amount and diversity of information.

Ground Penetrating Radar

Archeologists began work in Emmet Park in February by establishing grid points with the laser transit. These points were part of the grid needed for the GPR survey. They also included datums that would be used to map landscaping features, metal detector hits, and shovel tests. Actual GPR survey and transit mapping of landscaping features was conducted in March. Most of the park, except for streets, monuments, utility poles and other above-ground obstacles, hedgerows and large trees, was included in the GPR coverage.

River Bluff

Four GPR blocks (F, G, H, and J) were placed along green space sections of Savannah’s river bluff. The combined coverage of Blocks F, G and H was 5,851 m² or 236 m along the Savannah River bluff (east-west). Block J was a resurvey of portions of Block H. These focused on the eastern end of the colonial town and west of former forts.
Figure 96. Locations of non-ferrous, excavated metals, shovel tests, and test units.
Halifax, Prevost, and Wayne, or from about Lincoln Street east to East Broad Street, and immediately north of the sidewalks along the north side of Bay Street. Each block is described below.

**Block F**

Block F was placed on the western end of Emmet Park. It measured approximately 58 m east-west by 22 m north-south. A total of 2,580 m on 45 radargrams was contained within Block F. The ground surface of Block F consisted of grass, sidewalks, small shrubs, and scattered hardwood trees.

Figure 97 shows two plan views of Block F. The first map shows the block at an intermediate time depth of 26-29 ns. A concentration of strong radar reflections is displayed in the southwestern corner of this block. This may represent an area of increased human activity and deposition. The lower GPR map shows Block F at a deeper time depth of 88-91 ns. The western portion of Block F displays a series of strong radar reflections that generally trend northeast-southwest. These reflections may be geologic in nature.

**Block G**

Block G was placed on the east-central portion of Emmet Park. Its southwestern corner was at Datum Point 9 (9004.43N 9122.41E), which was located near the east side of the Vietnam Memorial (erected in 1991). Another monument to the Chatham Artillery, erected in 1986, is also contained within Block G. Block G measured approximately 125 m east-west by 26 m north-south. A total of 6,500 m in 69 radargrams was collected in Block G. Block G terminated on its eastern end at a driveway, separating it from Block H.

Figure 98 shows two plan views of Block G. The first map shows the block at an intermediate time depth of 30-33 ns. In this view some utility ditches are visible on the western portion of the block. Several areas of strong radar reflections surround the Chatham Artillery monument (erected in 1986), which appears as a white
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rectangular space in the west-central portion of both maps. A concentration of strong radar reflections (indicated in yellow) is revealed on the eastern end of the sample. Two shovel tests in that vicinity confirmed the existence of deeply buried cultural deposits (both aboriginal and historic).

The second map GPR shows the block at a greater time depth of 89-91 ns. Strong radar reflections again appear near the Chatham Artillery monument vicinity and at the southeastern corner of Block G. Intermediate radar reflections are widespread in this view, although they are more concentrated on the southern side of the GPR sample. These intermediate reflections display a slight tendency to be oriented northwest-southeast. While these deeply buried northwest-southeast reflections could possibly reveal ancient soil geology, they are oriented about 90 degrees from those observed in the lower portion of Block F. The two blocks (F and G) are separated by a short distance, which makes the ancient geological explanation unlikely.

**Block H**

Block H was placed on the eastern tip of Emmet Park, opposite the driveway from Block G. Block H measured 53 m east-west by 25 m north-south. A total of 1,746 m in 51 radargrams was collected in Block H.

Figure 99 shows two plan views of Block H. The upper view shows Block H at approximately 1 m depth. The lower view shows the block at about 3 m depth. Both of these views display a northwest-southeast trend for many of the linear radar reflections. This trend is more pronounced in the lower view.

A series of strong radar reflections are evidenced at approximately 1-1.3 m below ground in Block H, which probably represents a former land surface dating to the 18th or 19th century. Layers of fill were likely intentionally placed over this surface to level the ground. Block H was further investigated by two small test units (Test Units 1 and 2).

Test Unit 1 investigated a large GPR reflection that appeared to be a deep excavation. This suspected feature, later designated Feature 1, is shown in profile in Figure 100. Test Unit 1 confirmed the existence of a deep feature in this vicinity. The lateral extent of this feature awaits archeological verification. Based on the GPR data, however, Feature 1 appears to measure at least 11 m east-west by 2.5 m north-south. Horizontal planking and hand-wrought spikes were revealed in the base of Test Unit 1 and, although the age of this construction remains undetermined, it may represent some type of military
construction, such as an artillery battery. This location on the Savannah River bluff would have been a strategic location for heavy ordnance to defend against an attack by river.

The land use history of the Block H vicinity is similar to that of Blocks F and H with some exceptions. The "Old Harbor Light", a large gas lamp and navigation aid built in 1858, is located just south of Block H. This area is also known as Centennial Park, owing to its creation in 1958 honoring the 100th Anniversary of the Old Harbor Light. The northern side of Block H is supported by a massive retaining wall. This construction, on its western end, is known as Factor’s Walk, but on its eastern end it may have incorporated a surviving portion of British Fort Prevost or the U.S. Army’s Fort Wayne. Several large ship anchors are on display in this park, and these presented an obstacle for complete GPR survey of the area.

Historic maps of Fort Wayne indicate that it was located east of the Emmet Park study area. Its predecessor, Fort Prevost, is shown on contemporary maps as a sprawling fort with many angles. Outlying features of either of these two forts may have extended onto the area of present

---

*Figure 99. GPR plan views of Block H. Top image is shallower than bottom image. Grid North is up.*
Figure 100. GPR profile showing extremely large and deep feature.
day Emmet Park. If so, Feature 1 may be associated with Savannah’s military defense and possibly existed at the time of the 1779 Siege. Two undated, unattributed maps in the Henry Clinton papers depict the extensive fortifications in this vicinity. At least one of these maps probably dates prior to the 1779 Siege, since the defenses surround Savannah’s southern and eastern perimeter are shown as incomplete. Two maps showing Fort Prevost, which likely were drafted after 1779 siege, also show extensive fortifications that would extend onto portions of present-day Emmet Park. Clearly, more excavation in the Block H vicinity would help determine the age and function of this feature and other related features that may exist.

Block J

Block J was a resurvey of the southwestern portion of Block H in Emmet Park. It covered an area of 4.5 m north-south by 20 east-west. A total of 200 m of 10 radargrams was collected in Block J. The purpose of Block J was to better delineate the extent of Feature 1, which was first discovered in Block H and test excavated in Test Unit 1. The same GPR equipment configuration was used for Block J as was used for Block H. The two sample blocks had the same southwestern corner.

Figure 101 shows two plan views of Block J at different depths. The upper view displays the block at 29-34 ns time depth. This view contains many strong anomalies. These flank the north and south edges of the large depression, which is not readily apparent in this view. The lower view shows Block J at 89-91 ns time depth. In this view, several point source anomalies are located on the eastern one-third of the block. These anomalies are also located outside of the Feature 1 depression. One of these anomalies, which continues north of Block J, is sub-rectangular in plan and measures approximately 2 m east-west and more than 1 m north-south. This anomaly also appeared in the upper view, although it was shown to be considerably smaller.

Any discussion of the GPR findings in Emmet Park must consider the land use history of the area. In the 18th century, this landform was an irregular bluff. Although this part of Savannah was unoccupied during that period, the area suffered from erosion that was exacerbated by continuous traffic by people, draft animals, and wheeled carts. By the mid-19th century, townspeople addressed this problem by the creation of Factors Walk.

Figure 101. GPR plan views of Block J. Top image is shallower than bottom image. Grid north is up.
Edwards (1985) has extensively researched the history and architectural construction of Factors Walk. Factors Walk is a massive stone and brick retaining wall that was built along the Savannah River bluff between 1854 and 1869. More recently Edwards (2006:5-6) noted,

Factors Walk Retaining Wall is a stone ballast retaining wall reaching heights of 19 feet built during 1855-1869. The wall is constructed mostly of limestone brought over as ships ballast on European cargo ships. The ballast stone was used to construct the wall to reduce the eroding, forty-foot high sandy Savannah River bluff from further erosion. It was also built to protect Factors Walk, a narrow paved roadway where Factors displayed their products.

Most of the GPR survey blocks, except for a portion of Block H, were located well to the south of Factors Walk and this area may not have been directly affected by its construction. The area south of the retaining wall was probably leveled after Factors Walk was built, however, and this was likely accomplished by the introduction of fill dirt to level the gullies.

Excavation

The GPR and metal detector surveys provided information useful in choosing shovel test and test unit locations. Archeologists excavated six shovel tests and two 1 by 1 m² units in the Emmet Park area (Figure 96). Shovel tests are summarized in tables below and detailed in the report text. Counts and artifact details for Test Units 1 and 2 can be found in the digital appendix of this report. General artifact information is supplied in the body of the report.

Archeologists excavated Shovel Test E1 near the center of a large oval radar reflection produced by the GPR survey. This anomaly was located in the western end of the park. The shovel test was 110 cm deep and contained artifacts from 21-75 cm bs. Modern debris was not saved, but noted in the first 21 cm. Table 12 details the soil stratigraphy and artifact information for this shovel test.

Shovel Test E2 was located at the area of another large GPR anomaly. Brick and mortar fragments, concrete, and cement with gravel from 0-25 cm bs were not collected from this shovel test. Artifacts occurred from 0-110 cm bs and continued beyond the base of the excavation at 110 cm. Shovel Test 2 uncovered a dense Native American midden. This was characterized by a dark, organic-rich soils and a compact layer of oyster shells punctuated with Native American pottery. Table 13 summarizes ST E2.

Archeologists chose the location of Shovel Test E3 because it was near the hand wrought nail recovered in MD4, but away from nearby utility lines. Table 14 details ST E3 data.

Shovel Test E4 was placed near MD7. Archeologists recorded a wrought spike at that location. No modern artifacts were recorded in this shovel test. Brick fragments were present in Level 3. A large root at 83 cm prevented further excavation. Artifacts and soil stratigraphy in ST 4 are detailed in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Depth (cm below surface)</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-21</td>
<td>Very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam and roots</td>
<td>Modern artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 21-43</td>
<td>Brown (10YR5/3) sandy loam</td>
<td>22 cal. Shell, 2 handmade brick fragments, 1 window glass, 1 light aqua bottle glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 43-47</td>
<td>Brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam mottled w/yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand and limestone</td>
<td>1 Rock and coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4, 47-75</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown (10YR3/6) loamy sand w/mottling on south side</td>
<td>Coal, 1 slag, 2 lt chert flakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 75-110</td>
<td>Strong brown (7.5YR4/6) loamy sand</td>
<td>Sterile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Emmet Park Shovel Test E1 data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Depth (cm below surface)</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-20</td>
<td>Very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>1 window glass, 1 blue hand painted white bodied sherd (probable pearlware), 2 olive green bottle glass, 2 clear glass tableware, 1 iron fragment, 1 oyster shell, 1 slag, 8 brick fragments, coal, rock, Cement &amp; gravel not collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 20-25</td>
<td>Brown (10YR4/3) sand</td>
<td>1 window glass, 2 cut nail fragments, 8 handmade brick fragments, 1 piece mortar, 1 plain pearlware, 1 stoneware (possibly British Brown Saltglazed), 2 plain whiteware, 1 milk glass, 1 clear bottle glass, 3 sheet iron fragments, 2 cinder/clinkers, 1 worked chert fragent, 14 oyster shell fragments, 1 clam shell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 25-27</td>
<td>Black (10YR3/1) asphalt lens</td>
<td>4 cut nail fragments, 1 window glass, 22 u.d. brick, 1 plain blue tinted stone china, 1 plain creamware, 2 plain pearlware, 1 u.d. dec. pearlware, 1 amber/olive green bottle glass, 2 u.d. olive green glass, 3 clear tableware, 1 aqua and 4 light aqua bottle glass, 3 clear bottle glass, 1 coal, 2 u.d. iron 1 copper sheet with drilled holes, 3 unmodified stones, 1 ud. bone, 10 oyster shell, 2 flakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4, 27-36</td>
<td>Very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand</td>
<td>2 cut nail fragments, 12 oliver green bottle glass, 1 plain pearlware, 1 transferprint underglazed u.d., 4 handmade brick fragments, 7 plain Native American sherds (NA), 1 check stamped, 4 NA u.d. dec., 8 cordmarked, 1 incised, 1 NA u.d., 75 bone, 41 oyster shell, 11 u.d. shell, 3 charcoal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 36-52</td>
<td>Brown (10YR5/3) sand</td>
<td>12 oyster shell, 4 clam shell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 6, 52-78</td>
<td>Brown (10YR5/3) sand w/oyster shell</td>
<td>Native American oyster shell midden; shell only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 7, 78-110</td>
<td>Very Dark gray (10YR3/2) fine sandy loam</td>
<td>Some oyster shell from above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Emmet Park Shovel Test E2 data.
### Table 14. Emmet Park Shovel Test E3 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Depth (cm below surface)</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-16</td>
<td>Dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>Modern glass, cloth, 1 window glass, 8 cut nails, 1 mortar, 4 u.d. brick, 1 u.d. coarse redware, 1 amethyst glass, 3 clear bottle glass, 1 cobalt bottle glass, 8 olive green bottle glass, 1 plain kaolin pipe bowl, 3 u.d. bone, 2 oyster shell fragments, 1 rock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 16- 36</td>
<td>Dark brown (10YR3/3) sand</td>
<td>1 window glass, 1 u.d. nail, 5 handmade brick fragments, 1 olive green bottle glass, 1 plain kaolin pipe bowl, 1 ceramic marble, 3 animal bone, 1 u.d. chert fragment, 1 cinder/clinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 36-86</td>
<td>Brown (7.5YR4/3) sand</td>
<td>Sterile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15. Emmet Park ST E4 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Depth (cm below surface)</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-20</td>
<td>Dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>Ballast rocks, 1 window glass, 1 cut nail, 1 lead glazed coarse earthenware, 2 aqua bottle glass, 1 clear bottle glass, 1 slate, 13 u.d. brick fragments, 5 bone, 1 oyster shell, 1 flake (European flint), 3 worked chert fragments, 4 thinning flakes, 13 unspecialized flakes (10 w/no cortex).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 20-32</td>
<td>Brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam</td>
<td>Ballast rocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 32-83</td>
<td>Brown (10YR5/3) sandy loam</td>
<td>1 window glass, 5 u.d. brick fragments, 2 plain pearlware, 1 green scalloped rim impressed straight edgeware, 4 bone, 6 oyster shell fragments, 3 unspecialized flakes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-22</td>
<td>Dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>Modern road gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 22-33</td>
<td>Very dark gray (10YR3/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>4 window glass, 1 plate glass, 6 cut nails, 6 u.d. nails, 9 u.d. brick, 1 plain pearlware, 1 milk glass, bottle glass (5 lt. aqua, 1aqua, 1 clear, 1 olive green), 2 clear tableware, 8 u.d. iron, 11 bone, 6 flat iron straps, 1 u.d. worked chert, 6 oyster shell, 4 rocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 33-65</td>
<td>Dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam mottled w/grayish brown (10YR5/2) sand</td>
<td>1 window glass, 4 u.d. nail fragments, 6 u.d. brick fragments, 1 Whieldon ware, 1 plain creamware, 1 u.d. decorated pearlware, 1 underglazed blue hand painted pearlware, 6 clear glazed white slipped redwares, 1 willow ware pearlware, bottle glass (1 lt. aqua, 4 olive green), 1 coin (1840 cent) [33-50 cm], 1 percussion cap, 1 molded kaolin pipe bowl, 1 kaolin pipestem (4/64”), 1 slate, 1 flake (European chert) 1 NA plain, 2 NA u.d. dec., 4 bone, 17 oyster shell fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4, 65-100</td>
<td>Dark brown (10YR3/3) sand w/ oyster</td>
<td>1 cordmarked, 8 bone, 1 animal tooth, 2 clam shell, 1 thinning flake, 1 unspecialized flake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 100-110</td>
<td>Dark yellowish brown (10YR3/4) sand</td>
<td>Sterile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Emmet Park Shovel Test E5 data.

Archeologists located Shovel Test E5 in the area of a large GPR anomaly. Table 16 summarizes this shovel test. An 1840 U.S. cent provided a TPQ of the middle of Level 3, at approximately 40 cm bs. Some aboriginal pottery was found below this coin, in the lower portions of Level 3. Below this, archeologists discovered a dense Native American shell midden in Level 4, from 65-100 cm bs. Level 4 soils were a dark brown loamy sand, indicative of a midden; as was the thick zone of oyster shell, pottery, animal bone, and a chert flake. Excavations of ST E5 terminated at 110 cm bs, with artifacts ceasing at 90 cm bs. The GPR clearly located this Native American midden, as ground-truthed by ST E5.

Archeologists excavated ST E6 at the location of MD11, which was a piece of melted iron. Table 17 details the stratigraphic and artifact information from the shovel test. Level 2 (17-29 cm bs) contained a much larger number of nails relative to the other levels of the test. It also contained plastic. Artifacts resided as deep as Level 4, 55-70 cm bs. Level 5, 70-105 cm bs, was a sterile zone.

**Test Units**

Archeologists excavated two 1 by 1 m² units in Emmet Park. Both were located in the eastern section of the park, in the area near the harbor beacon (Figure 102).
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Unit 1 was placed in an area where the metal detector survey located a partial cask hoop and where brick was discovered. Archeologists based the location of Test Unit 2 on a radar anomaly. The GPR survey indicated the presence of a large feature measuring 10 m east-west by 3 m north-south at this location.

Test Unit 1

Level 1 consisted of a natural level of extremely disturbed soils measuring 21 cm thick and generally extending from 18-39 cm bd. It consisted of various lenses of fill, including a dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) sandy loam, a brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam, a very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy silt, and a dark yellowish brown (10YR4/4) sandy silt. Artifacts in Level 1 included historic and modern objects such as window glass, nails (unidentifiable/square), pearlware, ironstone, a hob-skirted soft drink bottle, a gunflint fragment, wire, slate, coal, iron, slag, and mortar.

Level 2 was designated as Zones A1/C, D, and A2/B. These zones overlapped each other to various degrees and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Depth (cm below surface)</th>
<th>Soils</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Level 1, 0-17</td>
<td>Dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam</td>
<td>3 window glass, 6 machine made brick, 1 plate glass, 4 cut nails, 1 u.d. nail fragment, 1 buckle, 1.u.d. porcelain, 1 plain whiteware, bottle glass (3 lt. aqua, 1 aqua, 6 clear, 2 olive green), 1 kaolin pipestem (5/64&quot;) 7 u.d. iron, 3 slag, 1 cinder/clinker, 2 coal, 3 oyster shell, 1 thinning flake, 1 unspecialized flake (European chert), 1 u.d. chert fragment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 17-29</td>
<td>Brown (10YR5/3) &amp; yellowish brown (10YR5/2) sandy loam</td>
<td>1 window glass, 8 cut nail fragments, 4 machine brick, 1 olive green bottle glass, 1 bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 29-55</td>
<td>Yellowish brown (10YR6/4) &amp; Grayish brown (10YR5/2) sandy loam</td>
<td>3 window glass, 4 u.d. brick fragments, 1 overlaze enameled polychrom handpainted Chinese porcelain, 1 plain creamware, 1 u.d. decorated pearlware, 1 unscalloped rim impressed edgeware, 2 olive green bottle glass, 1 clear tableware glass, 2 u.d. iron fragments, 1 slag, 1 kaolin pipestem (4/64&quot;), 2 bone, 2 oyster shell fragments, 1 rock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4, 55-70</td>
<td>Yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand mottled w/ Light yellowish brown (10YR6/4) sandy loam</td>
<td>1 window glass, 3 cut nails/fragments, 6 u.d. brick fragments, 1 dotted yellow slipware, 4 olive green bottle glass, 1 clear tableware, 1 u.d. iron fragment, 11 plain kaolin pipe bowl, 1 NA u.d. decorated sherd, 30 bone fragments, 1 thinning flake (European dk gray chert).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 70-105</td>
<td>Dark brown (10YR3/3) sand</td>
<td>Sterile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Emmet Park Shovel Test E6 data.
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Test Unit 1

Plan View, Base of Level 2

A- Zone E (top)- 10YR5/8 yellowish brown sand mottled with 10YR4/4 dark yellowish brown sand and 10YR3/2 very dark grayish brown sand 60 cm below datum

B- Zone B (pipe trench)- 70 cm below datum

C- Level 3 (top)- 2.5Y5/3 light olive brown sandy loam mottled with 2.5Y4/2 dark grayish brown sandy silt- 49 cm below datum

Archeologists then stepped down Level 4 to a shovel test extending off the southern wall of the unit. This test measured 22 cm east-west by 32 cm north-south. They excavated it as one natural 34 cm thick level extending from 67-101 cm bd. Soils were the same as Level 3, however, archeologists bagged the artifacts in the shovel test separately from Level 3 artifacts. Level 4 artifacts included several chert flakes, cordmarked sherds, and oyster shell. The base of the shovel test encountered a distinct soil type.

Archeologists terminated Test Unit 1 at this juncture. The majority of the unit could not be excavated deeper due to the presence of the iron pipe. Also, much of the unit was disturbed by the associated pipe trench (Figure 104). In addition, the presence of aboriginal sherds in apparently in situ soils in a shovel test suggested that there would be no Revolutionary War horizons or features below this (67 cm bd).

Test Unit 2

Archeologists positioned this 1 by 1 m unit to intercept a large GPR anomaly identified at this location. TU2 contained 603 artifacts, excluding brick and shell. Strata letters on the soil profiles correspond to excavated levels in the following manner: Stratum A = Level 1; Stratum B = Levels 2, 3, 4, 5; Stratum C= Levels 6, 7, 8; and Stratum D = Levels 9, 10, 11.
Level 1 (18/21-37 cm bd) represented a fill episode of compact sand and humus. It was excavated as a 19 cm thick natural level of dark gray (10YR4/1) sandy loam containing rock, small brick fragments, and a large number of artifacts. Most types of historic ceramics were present in this level, including creamware, pearlware, redware, transfer printed ware, green edgeware, ironstone, whiteware, porcelain, salt-glazed stoneware, and lead-glazed stoneware. Architectural artifacts consisted of brick, window glass, plaster, mortar, and a wire and a cut nail. Bottle glass included aqua, amber, colorless and olive green fragments. Tableware and bone were present. A kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, lead scrap, copper sheet fragment, battery carbon core, .22 cartridge, and 1909 U.S. cent represent some of the activity and personal items recorded. A total of five lbs. of brick and ballast rock was weighed and discarded.

Level 2 (37-53 cm bd) was a 16 cm thick level. Soils were the same as in Level 1, however, there was an increase in the amount of brick and rubble in Level 2. The variety of ceramics in Level 2 was lower than in the previous level. Level 2 ceramics included pearlware, stoneware, whiteware, porcelain, ironstone, and an ironstone.
chamberpot rim. Other artifacts included a porcelain button, a heart-shaped shoe heel plate (Figure 45), a stoneware tobacco pipe bowl, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, cobalt blue, and amber), tableware glass, a goblet rim and base fragments, a heart shaped jewelry pendant, nails (wrought and unidentifiable square), lead scrap, sheet copper, large-sized brass sequins (Figure 47), animal bone, machine made brick, slate, and chert flakes. A total of 15.75 lbs. of rock and mortar came from Level 2.

Level 3 was a 12 cm thick level (53-65 cm bd) of very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam. Artifacts in this level included: nails (wrought and unidentifiable square), plain pearlware, plain whiteware and hand painted and transfer printed ware, window glass fragments, bottle glass (olive green, aqua, and amber), chert flakes, coal, oyster shell, ballast rock, and some animal bone. Ballast rock and other rocks from this level combined for a total weight of 14.5 lbs.

Level 4 was a 10 cm arbitrary level of very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam that extended from 65-75 cm bd. This level contained unidentifiable nail fragments, olive green bottle glass, oyster shell, plain whiteware, and ballast rocks. Archeologists recorded eight lbs. of ballast rock from this level.

Level 5 soils were the same as Level 4. Archeologists excavated Level 5 as an arbitrary 10 cm thick layer from 75-85 cm bd. They observed a much lower density of artifacts in Level 5. These included three unidentifiable nail fragments, two oyster shells, and eight lbs. of ballast rock.

Level 6 (85-100 cm bd) revealed the bottom edge of the GPR feature that archeologists were trying to ground-truth with this unit. At 100 cm bd, archeologists observed the end of the feature fill in the western side of the unit. They tube-cored the base of Level 6 in an effort to confirm that it was indeed subsoil and not feature fill of a different type. The 20 cm thick core hit a very compact brown (10YR4/3) sand. While the (10YR4/3) soil color was similar to part of the mottled soils that would be found at the base of the feature in the eastern half of the unit, the compactness suggests that it was not the same zone at an elevation 44 cm higher. The feature fill did continue into the eastern side of the unit as a brown (10YR5/4) soft sand. Soils were a dark brown (10YR3/2) sandy loam and ballast rock that graded into a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand. This level revealed the first Native American artifacts in the unit, which consisted of a cordmarked sherd, and an incised sherd (both sand tempered), and an indeterminately decorated grog tempered sherd. Two chert flakes were present. Historic artifacts in this level included: plain creamware, hand-painted pearlware, plain whiteware, scalloped impressed edgeware, plain ironstone, aqua bottle glass, cobalt blue bottle glass, nails (unidentifiable and unidentifiable square), coal, slate, animal bone, and oyster shell. Ballast stone totaled 16 lbs. Archeologists stepped down the unit to follow the edge of the feature, which consisted of the entire eastern half of the unit. Levels 7-11 were excavated only on the eastern half of Test Unit 2, an area measuring 1 m north-south by 50 cm east-west.

Level 7 was an arbitrary 10 cm thick level in the eastern half of the unit extending from 100-110 cm bd. Soils were a yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sand. Archeologists recovered a small number of artifacts including a blue transfer-printed whiteware, a kaolin pipe stem, window glass, a chert thinning flake, two cordmarked sand tempered sherds, animal bone, brick, and oyster shell.

Level 8 contained the same soil type as the previous level and was excavated as an arbitrary 10 cm layer. The level was terminated at 120 cm bd. Artifacts included one Stallings Island punctuate rim sherd, a kaolin pipe stem, and oyster shell.

Level 9 soil (120-130 cm bd) was a continuation of the previous two levels. For this reason, archeologists continued to use the arbitrary 10 cm thick level standard. They uncovered one plain aboriginal sherd, one-half of a brick, one plain whiteware sherd, 10 oyster shells, and two lbs. of rock.

Archeologists continued to follow the Feature 1 fill in Level 10, which they excavated in an arbitrary 10 cm layer. This level extended from 130-140 cm bd. The yellowish brown (10YR5/4) sandy soil continued. Archeologists uncovered a wrought iron spike with wood fragments attached, two kaolin pipe stems, an olive green bottle glass lip, oyster shell, slate, brick fragments, and a cordwrapped impressed sherd. They weighed and discarded one lb. of rock.

Level 11 encountered the base of the feature. It was a natural level of brown (10YR4/3) sandy loam having slight mottling of yellowish brown (10YR5/8) sandy loam. This level was a 22 cm thick zone ranging from 140-162 cm bd. There were few artifacts in this level; however, additional evidence of the feature appeared. Artifacts included one each of the following: olive green bottle glass, a kaolin tobacco pipe bowl, two thinning flakes, and mortar. There were nine oyster shells in the level. Figure 105 shows a scaled plan view of the base of Level 11. Archeologists uncovered a portion of a wooden plank in the southeastern corner of the unit. The plank was oriented east-west and was lying near the base of the feature. Wooden plank remnants began at 150 cm bd and were mapped to a depth of 162 cm bd. These may have been wooden planks.
of a floor. The area immediately west of the board was charred. Samples of the wood collected were extremely deteriorated and fragile. The wood was not heart pine. A small lens of ash extended out of the southern wall near the southeastern corner of the unit. It was approximately 20 cm long. The edge of the base of the feature was well-defined in the southern half of the unit. It became less so in the northern half and appeared to undercut the pedestaled area to the west. This may be the result of the root activity in the lower 12 cm of the entire level. In addition to a wood sample, archeologists took four soil samples to curate for potential future pollen, phytolith, or ethnobotanical study. Figures 106 and 107 are unit profiles which include Feature 1.

**Interpretation**

The GPR, shovel tests, and test unit excavation uncovered a well-preserved, multi-component site in Emmet Park. This study confirmed the presence of components initially identified in Daniel Elliott’s Lost City Survey in 1990, which included a section of the current project area in Emmet Park. It also discovered a new component of the site that may be related to the military activities of the gun battery and adjacent Fort Prevost/Fort Wayne.

The results of the 1990 survey are summarized here for interpretation with this current project. Four of the 12 shovel tests excavated in 1990 along Bay Street fall within Emmet Park, an area examined by this current ABPP survey. Elliott also conducted a surface survey in the west-central portion of Emmet Park following ground disturbance for the recently constructed Vietnam Memorial Monument.

He noted exposed artifacts on the ground around the monument. Artifacts from all of his shovel tests along Bay Street produced a mean ceramic date (MCD) of 1802.4 (n=83), while the surface collection yielded a MCD of 1799.4 (n=306). All 12 shovel tests located very deep deposits (up to 120 cm) that included early historic materials (Elliott 1990:33). Possible military artifacts included lead scrap and later arms items such as a brass percussion cap and a brass shotgun shell casing.
Figure 106. This profile indicates a stepped in portion of Feature 1.

A- 10YR4/1 dark gray sandy loam humus
B- 10YR4/1 dark gray sandy loam with rocks
C- 10YR3/2 very dark grayish brown sandy loam with rocks
D- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand
E- 10YR4/3 brown very compact sand (Tube core)
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Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

Test Unit 2
East Wall Profile

A- 10YR4/1 dark gray sandy loam humus
B- 10YR4/1 dark gray sandy loam with rocks
C- 10YR3/2 very dark grayish brown sandy loam with rocks
D- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand (unconsolidated)
E- Rotten plank with 10YR7/1 light gray ashy sand
   150 cm below datum
F- 10YR5/4 yellowish brown sand mottled with 10YR5/6
   yellowish brown sand
\Large iron spike

Figure 107. East Profile of Test Unit 2.
Revolutionary War period artifacts included kaolin pipe bowls and stems, wrought nails, redware, gray salt-glazed stoneware, white salt-glazed stoneware, brown salt-glazed stoneware, Delft jar and tile fragments, blue-decorated porcelain, and creamware (Elliott 1990:34-38). Shovel tests here also encountered the buried Native American deposit, represented by oyster shell and the following pottery: Deptford check stamped, cordmarked, and plain, all sand tempered.

The 2008 Savannah Under Fire survey of Emmet Park further refined the area potentially associated with the Revolutionary War. The GPR survey and resulting Test Unit 1 excavation uncovered the presence of a deep feature (Feature 1) that is possibly associated with Fort Prevost. The GPR survey indicates that the entire feature dimensions are approximately 10 m east-west by 3 m north-south, or approximately 33 by 10 ft. The feature appears to be a large, wooden-floored trench. The portion of Feature 1 exposed in the test unit was minimally, 90 cm-144 cm (2.9-4.7 ft.) below the ground surface. It is possible that some strata above 90 cm bs are part of the feature, but this could not be confirmed due to the small one meter square test unit sample. Test Unit 2 came down in the middle of the feature, therefore, the intrusive edge of the top of the feature was not visible in plan view. The edge of the bottom of the feature was uncovered in profile at 100 cm bs. The dates of the artifacts suggest that the Feature 1 trench was filled after the American Revolution. The MCD are based on very small sample sizes, and few diagnostic artifacts contributed to TPQ dates. The upper feature fill, Stratum B, had a MCD of 1874.5 (n=22).

Below that a sample of seven sherds provided a MCD of 1836.2. Stratum D contained only one sherd. That piece of whiteware provided a TPQ of 1820. The nineteenth century dates do not necessarily mean the feature is unrelated to the Revolution. The feature may have been dug before or during the Revolution and infilled much later after years of use. The location of the feature on the river bank and near Fort Prevost/Fort Wayne, suggests that such a feature, whether it be a trench, gun emplacement, or other subsurface military construction would have been strategically located for a defensive work well beyond the American Revolution, and including the War of 1812, and possibly even the Civil War. Archeologists speculate that this feature was in-filled around the time of the construction of Factors’ Walk (ca. 1854-1869) and the associated stone retaining wall construction.

French and American Camps
(Cuyler, Myers, & Dixon Parks)

Defining Features, Natural, Cultural, and Military Engineering

Figures 108 and 109 are drawings of the allied military camps by a contemporary eye-witness, Pierre Ozanne. Defining features of these French and American camps exist, but the general areas of the camps are more difficult...
to isolate in the modern landscape. This is in part due to the nature of the GIS overlays, which are less precise as one moves south of the control point of Spring Hill Redoubt. Once one or more of the camps are located, however, many of them can be tied to the current and past natural and cultural landscapes. Map information, although variable by document, offers some information regarding the defining features of the French and American camps. Natural features appear to have played some role in determining the camp locations. The southeastern-most French camp (near Dixon Park today) appears to have a tributary or small branch as its northeastern border. The American camp farthest to the southwest was bordered on its west by the swamp. The swamp would have made an attack on the camps by British forces outside of Savannah difficult from that direction, thereby enhancing the safety of all the camps. It also appears that the allies wanted to cast a wide net between natural borders in order to make it difficult for the British to enter and leave Savannah by land. They tried to secure the roads, as well. The entire ring of allied camps stretched along an east-west road that ran more than the entire length of the city. This road is not named on the primary maps. Not only would camp locations along this road secure it for the allies, but it would make transporting their supplies, artillery, wagons, and troops easier. The camps ringing this road also, by default, guarded Bull Street, the main road into the city and one perpendicular to the east-west road.

### Historical Significance

Numerous primary documents detail the establishment of the French and American camps on the outskirts of the city. The reader is referred to the history section of this report for select details. Generally speaking, the camps were located just far enough away to be out of British artillery range but close enough to begin construction of offensive ditches. Interestingly, the French and Americans were not eager to camp in proximity to each other, preferring to keep their distance. The American camps were located south and southwest of the city and the French were south and southeast of town. The camps would have housed 7,000-8,000 troops and camp followers, including some families of officers, servants, African American slaves, laundresses, and other camp followers. Figures 108 and 109 depict the enormously long rows of tents in encampments surrounding the city. The occupation of these camps by thousands of individuals for a period of several weeks should have resulted in a notable archeological record. Privies, trash pits, graves, hearths, bakeries, kitchens, quartermaster areas, and service areas would have left tangible features and artifacts in their wake. In addition to the research potential these camps would offer, the camps are also of importance and relevance to the battle, as the majority of the troops left directly from these locations on their march to the battle in the early hours of October 9, 1779.
Urban History of the Area

Today these areas are part of downtown Savannah and all are residential and light commercial areas, interspersed with public parks. The areas of Myers and Dixon parks were settled in the mid and late nineteenth century and many of these homes are still standing. Myers Park lies near the heavily traveled intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Victory Drive. The area around Cuyler Park was recently redeveloped. Houses surrounding the park today look old, however most have been constructed recently as part of an in-fill housing development. The park lies near the very large Laurel Grove cemetery.

Archeology

Primary maps and GIS overlays suggested that Cuyler, Myers, and Dixon parks might contain remnants of Revolutionary War French and American camps. These parks are located at some of the farthest distances from the GIS control points, making the GIS data less reliable. The margin of error in the overlays increases with the distance from the control point. In addition, soil stratigraphy in these outlying parks were unknown, and archeologists were unaware of any reports of 18th century artifact finds there. For these reasons, shovel testing was chosen as the method of investigating the three outlying parks. Such tests would provide stratigraphic information and would be more likely to locate 18th century artifacts that might be distributed widely, or only in select locations, across the parks. The discovery of any such artifacts, or soils suggestive of having features or buried-A horizons that might date to the period of study, would allow archeologists to focus on those areas with closer interval shovel tests and test units. Metal detector surveys proved incompatible with the surroundings at Cuyler Park, where over a meter of modern refuse contained large amounts of metals, and at Dixon Park where deeply buried nineteenth and twentieth century refuse along the western side contained large amounts of metals.

Cuyler Park

Cuyler Park (Figure 110) was the projected location of an American camp. Archeologists excavated a total of nine shovel tests in Cuyler Park at 20 m intervals (Figure 111). These included Shovel Tests C1-C8 and C10. Table 18 details each of these. Generally, soils in the park followed this profile: 20-30 cm of very dark grayish brown (10R3/2) and/or dark grayish brown (10YR4/2) sands overlying lighter soil layers of either yellowish brown (10YR5/6) sand and/or brownish yellow (10YR6/6) sand. When unsurpassable obstructions were not encountered, archeologists excavated many of these tests to 90 and 100 cm and cored the others to these depths. Shovel tests revealed horizontally extensive, deep, modern fill deposits across the park. These may be related to relatively recent construction of in-fill housing surrounding the park on all sides. Modern debris such as plastics and late 20th century coins were located as deep as 60 cm bs. In two shovel tests, a mix of older and modern artifacts were recorded at depths below 80 and 90 cm. While it is possible that Revolutionary War deposits exist in Cuyler Park, they are at a depth inaccessible to this current archeological research project. It is much more likely, however that the camps are in the general area but not specifically within the boundaries of this park.
### Table 18 (Below). Cuyler Park shovel test data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Cored</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0-80 cm</td>
<td>80-110 cm</td>
<td>Screw cap bottle; window, bottle and tableware glass; screen wire, modern bottle cap, oyster shell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>0-70 cm</td>
<td>70-100 cm</td>
<td>Cut nails, window glass, u.d. iron, amber bottle glass, animal bone, ironstone, annular ware, late decal ware, coal, yellow ware, and oyster shell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0-65 cm</td>
<td>65-90 cm</td>
<td>Green &amp; amber glass, decal ware, asbestos shingle, oyster shell, animal one, brick, TV antenna wire &amp; other modern materials at 60 cm bs. (The latter &amp; brick not recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>0-50 cm</td>
<td>50-75 cm</td>
<td>1 small clear curved glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>0-50 cm</td>
<td>50-75 cm</td>
<td>Cut nail, glass, old brick, ironstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>0-92 cm</td>
<td>92-117 cm</td>
<td>0-92+ cm: plastic animal, whiteware, clear flat glass, clear &amp; amber bottle glass, 30-44 cm bs glass, purple transfer print, u.d. nail-possibly square, bottle neck for cork or glass stopper, 3 window glass, amber &amp; clear curved glass, 1 oyster shell. (Only sample of artifacts recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>0-80 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Clear bottle and flat glass, iron bolt, brick fragments, plastic barette, u.d. penny, oyster shell, screw cap jar. 1989 penny at 65 cmbs. Linear stain at 48 cm bs w/ board fragment &amp; brick and coarse sand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>0-125 cm</td>
<td>125-145 cm</td>
<td>Amber bottle glass, whiteware; clear, amber, &amp; green bottle glass; iron strap, plastic, brick fragments, oyster shell, gravel, clothing snap. (None recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>0-90 cm</td>
<td>90-115 cm</td>
<td>Mix of square &amp; wire nails, brick fragments, modern button, plastic, clear and green glass, blue transfer print, yellow ware, bone, bathroom porcelain, washer. (None recovered.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 111 (Right). Location of shovel tests in Cuyler Park.

![Cuyler Park shovel test locations](image)
GIS overlays suggested that Myers Park may have been the location of General Lincoln’s headquarters, just south of a portion of the American camps (Figure 112). The possibility of locating either the headquarters or part of the camps was the impetus for the Myers Park investigations. (While this GIS overlay projected the camps two blocks north, archaeologists felt that the margin of error this far south from the control points might put the camps in the park. The possibility of finding either the camps or the headquarters was enough of an incentive to invest some time here. Investigations at Myers Park included 23 shovel tests (Figure 113, 114). Table 19 provides details for each. Nineteen shovel tests and these were generally at 20 m intervals. The other four (Shovel Tests M21-M24) were at 10 m intervals surrounding ST M7, which contained a British brown salt-glazed stoneware sherd. The soils in the shovel tests appeared to be relatively in situ. The stratum at the ground surface was a dark brown topsoil followed by a gray sand overlying a typical yellowish brown subsoil. The sandy soils were easy to excavate but generally contained few artifacts. The western edge of the site was adjacent to historic houses. Shovel tests located along the western side of the grid contained more artifacts. These shovel tests had a high frequency of late 19th century artifacts that may represent dumping episodes from historic house construction. Shovel Test M10 exemplified this. That test contained a bone die, eyeglasses, jewelry, wire nails, an eye-screw, and brick. Shovel testing suggests that the park was not heavily used historically for anything prior to it becoming a park. The limited number of late 19th century artifacts archeologists discovered were likely deposited during construction and use of the neighboring historic houses. One 18th century artifact, an unrefined white salt-glazed stoneware sherd, tantalized the crew; however additional shovel testing could not locate other period items. It is likely that this artifact was either an isolated find from general activities in the area or was an heirloom that found its way into the park at a later day. The lack of 18th century artifacts in even small to moderate amounts suggest that the Revolutionary War

Figure 112. This GIS overlay shows General Lincoln’s headquarters as a faint rectangle falling in what is now Myers Park. North is to the top of this map.

Figure 113. Shovel test locations in Myers Park.
Dixon Park

Archaeologists selected Dixon Park as a target based on a GIS overlay suggesting it might contain remnants of a French camp (Figure 115). Dixon Park slopes gently to the southeast. Archeologists excavated 16 shovel tests at Dixon Park (Figures 116 and 117). These tests were placed at 20 m intervals whenever sidewalk and playground obstacles allowed. Archeologists discovered a dense, thick fill deposit with artifacts dating to the late 19th-early 20th century. The camp was not located directly within this Park, but may be very close given the map overlay information.
centuries. The top of this fill zone ranged in depth from just below ground surface to 50 cm the surface. The base of it was located between 60 and 97 cm below the surface and possibly deeper. Soils generally consisted of 20 cm of black (10YR2/1) sand changing into 20 cm of black sand mottled with brownish yellow (10YR6/6) sand. This overlaid approximately 10 cm of very dark grayish brown (10YR3/2) sand over 25 cm of very dark grayish brown (10YR3/1) sand. Below this was 15 cm of very compact gray (10YR6/1) sand. Most of the shovel tests encountered the compact gray to white sand at 50, 70, 80, or 90 cm bs. Generally below this compact sand was 20 cm of black (10YR2/1) sand.

Shovel tests along the western edge of the grid tended to contain the thickest fill deposits. They also intercepted pipe trenches more often. The general uniformity of the deposits and soil stratigraphy across the site and the thickness of the deposits suggest that the area now containing the park was either intentionally filled to raise the elevation of the ground surface, or it served as a dump for refuse from parts of Savannah. Table 20 details

Figure 115. A GIS overlay shows a row of French camps bisecting modern Dixon Park (the green square bordered by Java Place and East Duffy Street. North is up on this map.

Figure 116 (Above and Right). Shovel testing in Dixon Park.
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the artifacts documented in the shovel tests. It is possible that 18th century artifacts are located below the 50-100+ cm deposits of later refuse, but unlikely as such low-lying ground would not be a choice position for an 18th century camp.

Interpretation

Cuyler, Myers, and Dixon parks showed little potential to contain Revolutionary War features or artifacts in the upper 80 to 100 centimeters. While this was disappointing, it did provide important negative evidence that archeologists can use to refine the area of focus in future searches for the French and American camps. Locating these camps would broaden the geographical extent of Savannah’s Revolutionary War and would have the potential to provide unique information about the Franco-American alliance and the condition of its troops.

Colonial Park Cemetery

Boundaries

Today, the Colonial Park Cemetery lies in the heart of historic downtown Savannah. It is bounded by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (below surface)</th>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Cored</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>0-90 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-80 cm</td>
<td>Fill deposit. Aluminum pop-top lid, oyster shell, modern glass, blue transfer print, wire nails, slate, coal, old bottle neck. (Brick and modern glass not recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>0-90 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-60 cm</td>
<td>Bottle glass (19th century), iron, modern bottle cap, brick, oyster shell (Modern items not recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>0-86 cm</td>
<td>86-106 cm</td>
<td>0-70 cm</td>
<td>0-20 cm bs - edgeware bottle glass (clear, green), oyster shell, brick; 20-37 cm bs - ironstone, mortar, iron, clear glass, nails; 37-70 cm bs-clay marble, flake, dark green bottle glass. (Modern not recovered.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 (Part I). Dixon Park shovel test data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Cored</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>0-82 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-82+ cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encountered PVC pipe on east side. All fill deposits. Clear, amber, green bottle glass, wire and cut nails, fountain pen, metal, suspender part, brick, coal, slag, rubble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>0-90 cm</td>
<td>90-110 cm</td>
<td>0-60 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill deposit. 1 elbow pipe bowl fragment recovered. Glass (clear, lt. green, amber, lt. olive green), metal, shell &amp; brick (not recovered).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>0-80 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10-60 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyster shell, bone, square nail, brick, iron fragment, bottle glass, window glass. The following not collected: brick, cement, modern clear bottle glass, oyster shell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>0-100 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-91 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-32 cm bs-Rockingham on yellowware, modern bottle glass, brick, oyster shell; 32-53 cm bs-brick, iron, nails; 53-65 cm bs-dark green bottle glass, nails, porcelainmarble, brick, clear glass (also thin feature here); 65-91 cm bs-whiteware, coal, brick, clear glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>0-90 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-90+ cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar to D1. All fill deposits. Slag, morter, cut nails, bottle glass (clear, amber, green, red), globe glass, clothing snap, white glass marble, shell, coal, brick fragments. (No artifacts collected.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>0-75 cm</td>
<td>75-98 cm</td>
<td>0-55 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-27 cm bs not collected: u.d. nails, brick fragments, oyster shell. 27-55 cm bs recovered: 1 slate pencil fragment, oyster shell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>0-80 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-70 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill deposit. Refined earthenware, brick, wire, old bottle glass, old Pepsi bottle, brick, modern clear glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>0-97 cm</td>
<td>97-122 cm</td>
<td>0-97+ cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill deposit. Lg amount of bottle glass (clear, amber, lt. green), curved iron plate ‘plate’, u.d. nail, flat glass, brick, mortar, oyster shell (none recovered.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 (Part II). Dixon Park shovel test data.
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Defining Features, Natural, Cultural, and Military Engineering

The GIS map overlays generated by the Savannah project indicate that a British ditch used as part of the defenses in the Battle of Savannah cut through what is now the southeastern quadrant of Colonial Park Cemetery (Figure 118). Archeologists conducted a GPR survey of this quadrant with the goal of locating this military engineering feature (Figure 119). The cemetery’s brick wall provided

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST #</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Cored</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>0-95 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50-70 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dense oyster shell, brick and artifact midden or fill. Included high frequency of ceramics, bottles, metal*, wire &amp; cut nails, ironstone, bottle glass (clear, lt. green, dk.green, blue).*(Not recovered.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>0-95 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-85 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pipe trench fill deposit. Battery carbon core, jewelry part, 4-5 cut nails, bottle glass (clear &amp; lt. green), oyster shell, lg brick fragments. Iron pipe encountered at 50 cm bs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>0-75 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-50 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Battery carbon core, modern glass (not recovered), window glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>0-61 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-40 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High frequency of architectural debris, especially in 0-20 cm. Few artifacts below 20 cm. Upper 30 cm had brick, slate, marble slab fragment, oyster shell, and charcoal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>0-100 cm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0-95 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fill deposit. Bottle glass (clear, soda, green, red., cobalt), cut nails, u.d. metal, some brick, shell, and bones. These late 19th-early 20th century items not collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 (Part III). Dixon Park shovel test data.

---

East Oglethorpe Avenue to the north, Habersham Street to the east, East Perry Street to the south, and Abercorn Street to the west. The cemetery is enclosed by an iron fence on three sides and a brick wall on its east side. It has expanded multiple times and its history is summarized below. Additional details can be found in Piechocinski (1999) and Wilson (1887). Historic photos exist from ca 1896 (Savannah Park and Tree Commission). A cultural defining feature because it helped demarcate the age of particular sections of the cemetery, as described below. The cemetery itself is a defining cultural feature located near what would have been the outskirts of town. While the cemetery at that time was not as expansive as it became, it did provide a geographical and moral boundary to follow when the British strengthened and built the fortifications around the city prior to the 1779 attack. In other words, the British were more inclined to skirt what was the cemetery at that time than to dig a fortification ditch directly through it and burials within it. The 1779 boundaries of the cemetery directly impacted the location of the adjacent military ditchwork.
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Figure 118. GIS overlay showing British defenses in Colonial Park Cemetery. North is towards the top of this map.

Figure 119. Collecting radar data in Colonial Park Cemetery.
Historical Significance and Urban History of the Area

Colonial Park Cemetery History

Colonial Park Cemetery was first developed as the cemetery for the Parish of Christ Church. Christ Church Parish was one of several parishes created at the beginning of Georgia’s Royal Government. The Colonial Park Cemetery is actually the second major public cemetery in Savannah. The first public burying ground, started during the Trustee Period, was located northwest of Colonial Park Cemetery. As the town expanded and the population grew, there was a demand for a larger burial ground. A new cemetery was established, immediately south of Oglethrope Avenue and east of Abercorn Street. This Colonial Park Cemetery was established in 1750 and continued in use until 1853.

The Georgia Supreme Court heard a case in 1889 pertaining to the Colonial Park Cemetery. In their decision, they provided physical details of the cemetery:

April, 1763, (Colonial Acts, 197, 198.) reciting that the cemetery in the parish of Christ Church belonging to the said parish had become too small for the occasion, directed that the cemetery be enlarged and extended to the line of Abercorn street to the westward, and 100 feet to the southward,—the whole to contain 210 feet square; and the church-wardens and vestrymen of the parish were empowered at their discretion to agree with and hire workmen to complete, inclose, and finish the same. Another act, passed April 11. 1768, (Id. 433.) reciting that the cemetery or public burial ground for the parish of Christ Church, notwithstanding the previous addition, was apparently too small to answer the purposes intended, authorized the church-wardens and vestry to lay out an addition of 170 feet in length, of and from the common of the town of Savannah, and adjoining the cemetery or public burial ground, to the eastward; and that the addition so laid out should from thenceforth forever be and remain as part and parcel of the said cemetery or public burial ground: and the wardens and vestry were empowered to inclose the same accordingly, at their discretion. Both these additions were made, as we may assume from the record and from the argument of counsel in the present case. A still further addition was made, under an ordinance of the municipal council of Savannah, in 1789, during the same year that the corporation of the plaintiffs in error was created, and some months before that creation; but as this case addition is not now in controversy, we need not further notice it for the present. 1. We can have no doubt that the original cemetery, with the two enlargements made by the provincial legislature, was church property, and vested in the spiritual corporation consisting of the incumbent of the parish, constituted by the act of 1758. That act must be understood as it was intended by the provincial legislature. It has the same meaning for us in 1889 as it had for the courts of the province, or for those of Westminster Hall, in 1758…(The Southeastern Reporter 1889: 538).

The brick crypts were described as follows, “These vaults were and are brick structures, mostly with a portion above ground, though there are a few which are wholly beneath the surface” (Gardiner 1903:206).

The cemetery was surrounded by a brick wall, as Gardiner noted:

The cemetery was subsequently surrounded by a thick brick wall, of which but one side now remains, the wall being about twelve feet high, and toward which General Washington contributed to the erection. [This brick wall apparently did not exist at the time of the American Revolution-authors’ comments.] Several years ago Christ Church gave to the city of Savannah the cemetery to be made into a park, on condition that the remains there deposited should not be disturbed by the city authorities.

Gardiner further noted,

the wall was taken down on three sides facing three streets, leaving but the rear wall on an alleyway which separates the cemetery from the police barracks, and, in lieu of trees, shrubs and palms have been planted and walks laid out (Gardiner 1903:207).

Historical records indicate that,

When the City of Savannah decided to tear down the surrounding wall, Christ Church sued to save it. The city won the law suit and demolished the wall. However, the judge also ruled that the city was to protect the gravemarkers and convert the old cemetery to a park. The Park and Tree Commission began to beautify the spot in 1896 (City of Savannah, Department of Cemeteries 2008).

A Savannah newspaper noted in 1819 that people who died of yellow fever or other contagious or infectious diseases were not allowed to be entombed in vaults or buried in the Colonial cemetery (Columbian Museum and Savannah Gazette 1819, cited in Gardiner 1903:212-213). Those who died from these diseases were buried in a common burying ground for that purposes. Apparently no burial records for that cemetery have survived.
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Many of the human remains that were interred in the Colonial Park Cemetery were later, through the efforts of their descendants, exhumed and re-interned in Savannah’s newer and more popular municipal cemeteries (Jerry Flemming personal communication October 15, 2008). The City of Savannah currently operates several municipal cemeteries. These include Bonaventure and Laurel Grove.

Previous archeological exploration within the Colonial Park Cemetery occurred in 1959. This work focused on locating and verifying the grave of Button Gwinnett. That excavation, led by archeologist Lewis Larson, provided evidence that led the commission to conclude that Gwinnett’s remains were located and his gravesite verified (Savannah-Chatham County Historic Site and Monument Commission 1959).

The City of Savannah, Department of Cemeteries (2008) reported,

In 1990 the City of Savannah began an extended preservation project to maintain Colonial Cemetery for future generations. Several areas of investigation were undertaken in order to understand the site thoroughly. Historical research documented changes that took place over the site’s 250-year history. Researchers updated an existing map and photographed and inventoried all markers. Burial records, city council minutes, newspaper articles, probate records, and early maps revealed additions to the site, periods of disrepair and upheaval, landscaping changes, ownership changes, and previous restoration efforts. Archeology was used to locate unmarked graves. In addition to the 557 marked graves, archeologists located 8,678 unmarked graves, suggesting the likelihood of overburials and overlapping of graves from different decades.

At that time archeologists with the Chicora Foundation used a penetrometer probe to locate likely graves and also examined four tombs (Trinkley 1999a, 1999b). No Revolutionary War information was uncovered. No GPR survey was conducted until archeologists worked there in 2008 on the Savannah Under Fire project.

**Archeology**

**Ground Penetrating Radar**

GPR survey in the Colonial Park Cemetery vicinity consisted of two sample blocks (L and M). Their combined coverage was 2,961 m². Each block is described below.

**Block L**

GPR Block L was placed in the southeastern corner of the City of Savannah’s Colonial Park Cemetery. GPR Block L was a rectangular grid block the measured 47 m north-south by 53.5 m east-west. A total of 3,928 m in 108 radargrams was collected from Block L.

Block L included portions of Sections E, G, I, and J of the cemetery, as delineated on a Savannah Cemetery map (City of Savannah, Department of Cemeteries 2008). Numerous tombstones and several large brick crypts were located within this study area. The area also contained several sections of sidewalk, which were made as faux tabby and contained oyster shells, cement and small granite gravel. Several of the larger brick crypts and other large obstacles within the study zone made complete survey coverage of this area difficult (Figure 120). This area was surveyed on October 15 and 16, 2008. The field crew included Dan Elliott, Laura Seifert, and Rita Elliott, and volunteers Diane Morris, Ethan Morris, Mark Morris, and Raleigh Morris.

Figure 121 (top) shows a plan view of Block L at 31-37 ns time depth. Many historic graves are displayed in this.
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Figure 121. GPR BLock L. Top image is shallower than bottom image. Grid North is up.
A large cluster of grave anomalies is evident in the north-central portion of the block.

Figure 121 (bottom) shows a plan view of Block L at 84-90 ns time depth. In this view, the historic graves of Colonial Cemetery are mostly undetected. This zone contains strong radar reflections, which have a east-northeast to west-southwest orientation. It consists of strong reflections flanking a broad area of weak radar reflection. The area of weak reflection averages about 25 m in width and extends over the entire sample on its long axis (more than 60 m in length).

As expected, the GPR revealed an abundance of radar reflections characteristic of human burials. Only a small fraction of these were confirmed with above-ground evidence in the form of burial markers. The vast majority of the suspected graves were unmarked.

The archeological intent of this study was not to map the graves in the cemetery, although that was an added bonus of the research. Since these graves were not the primary subject of study, they are not discussed here but will be described in greater detail in a future LAMAR Institute publication. The purpose was to search for evidence of British defensive ditch work associated with the 1779 fortifications. The GIS overlays of the various battle maps suggested that a large linear section of ditch (or possibly an abatis line) traversed the southeastern portion of the Colonial Park Cemetery on a diagonal (northeast-southwest) course. Therefore, the archeologists hoped to identify evidence of a large deeply buried feature with that orientation, which lay beneath most, if not all, of the graves in the cemetery.

The GPR survey results in Blocks L tend to confirm the expectation of a deep, wide, linear feature that crosses the cemetery on a diagonal course. This linear feature continues into Block M, which is discussed below. While this linear radar alignment is strongly considered to be deeply buried evidence for the British fortifications, final confirmation will require verification by archeological excavations. Since Block L contains a great many human burials, any ground verification should focus on the area of Block M, which did not display burial radar reflections.

**Block M**

GPR Block M was placed 1.1 m south of the Colonial Park Cemetery fence and north of Perry Lane. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps for this part of Savannah reveal that this tract was part of a City Pound (or City Lot) in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The 1888 map shows several wood frame buildings on this lot. These buildings are not depicted on the 1916 Sanborn maps, however, where the area of Block M is shown as part of the Colonial Cemetery.

The eastern end of this grid was located at a cement sidewalk, and the western end was near the outer fringe of the canopy of a large hardwood tree. This grid block measured 47 m east-west by 9.5 m north-south. A total of 940 m in 20 radargrams was collected in Block M (Figure 122). This area was completely covered in manicured grassy vegetation. A water meter and water line were located approximately 34 m west of the eastern end of Block M. This area was surveyed on October 16, 2008 by Dan Elliott and Laura Seifert.

Figure 122 shows a plan view of Block M at 64-70 ns time depth. This view displays attributes quite similar to that shown in the previous figure for Block L. A strong area of radar reflection is concentrated on the southeastern side of the block. Lesser patches of strong reflection are located on the western side, where they follow a east-northeast to west-southwest trend. Between these two areas of strong reflection is a wide band of weak radar reflection, approximately 10 m in width and 18 m in length.

As noted for Block L, the archeologists hoped to identify a long, linear alignment in Block M, which followed a diagonal (northeast-southwest) course. Such evidence was discovered and is thought to be unconfirmed proof of a large deep feature that may be a British fortification ditch from 1779. This feature extends for at least 78 m.
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(or completely across both GPR blocks) and varies in width from 10-25 m. This GPR anomaly shares many attributes with the deep ditch that was located in Madison Square. Again, ground verification is needed to positively determine if this feature is military in nature and if it contains artifacts from the Revolutionary War-era. The property within Block M, which is mostly undeveloped green space owned by the City of Savannah, appears well suited to an exploration of this type.

Historic graves were noticeably absent from the GPR survey of Block M. The main reason for this is that Colonial Cemetery was surrounded by a strong fence. Once the cemetery had filled with graves, it was officially closed for public burial and other cemeteries were used. The wall apparently served to deter burials outside of the official bounds of the cemetery. Since the potential for burials in Block M appears to be minimal, this area may be well suited for future explorations of the suspected deeply buried British defense works.

Results

Due to the site’s nature as a cemetery, no shovel test or test unit excavation was conducted within the Colonial Park Cemetery, nor was a metal detector survey made. The green space outside of the cemetery wall along East Perry Street did not contain the numerous anomalies indicative of unmarked graves that archeologists documented inside the cemetery wall. It did contain a portion of the linear anomaly that may be a Revolutionary War fortification component. This southern green space outside of the wall, therefore, has the potential to allow archeological excavation and confirmation of the anomaly’s function and age, with little risk of encountering unmarked graves.

Interpretation

Two examples of similar work in similar situations are noted here as comparable case studies. Both involved using GPR to try to locate Revolutionary War features in later cemeteries. One was the site of New Ebenezer, about 25 miles from Savannah, Georgia. The other project involved a site in Baden, Pennsylvania.

In 2002 Daniel Elliott used GPR in the cemetery at New Ebenezer, Georgia to try to locate surviving remnants of one of the seven British redoubts that surrounded the colonial town. He conducted a radar survey of the northeastern portion of the Jerusalem cemetery, where John Wilson’s map of the Ebenezer defenses suggested that Redoubt Number 3 was located. The GPR mapping revealed the location of a portion of Redoubt 3, which was an octagonal fortification. This fort was located beneath several areas containing human burials of more recent age. Many other suspected human burials of unknown age were located north of the existing cemetery fence (Elliott 2003a). The presence of a deep, Revolutionary War era fort ditch in this vicinity was confirmed by two excavated test units. Ground-truthing to verify the existence and age of the many suspected and unmarked human graves remains to be done.

Remote sensing studies at General Anthony Wayne’s cantonment at Legion Ville (near present-day Baden, Pennsylvania) was complicated by the existence of a later cemetery. Researchers were able to distinguish some of the Revolutionary War features from the later human graves (Johnson 2003:1-8; Riley and Johnson 2004:1-9). The GPR survey at New Ebenezer and at Legion Ville demonstrated that both types of cultural resources, forts and graves, can be generally distinguished even in situations where these resources are overlapping.

Project Summary

The Savannah Under Fire project used extensive historical research of primary map and text documents to identify specific areas that might contain extant archeological or above-ground resources related to the 1779 Battle of Savannah. Fieldwork examined as many potential areas as possible and incorporated one or more of the following: metal detector survey, GPR survey, shovel testing, and test unit excavation. The project successfully located multiple buried resources related to the battle and identified several additional areas that should be examined in order to locate as many of the extant battlefield boundaries and other elements as possible, to enable preservation of the site.
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Threat Assessment

Development continues to be the number one threat to Revolutionary battlefield resources in Savannah. Most of this development does not require archeological investigation prior to construction. In 2007 Savannah’s ranking went from 78th to 34th among all metropolitan areas for its ability to grow and sustain jobs, which is directly related to development (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). In 2007 Savannah also ranked 10th in the nation for mid-size city boomtowns, based on Inc. magazines’ research (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). Development fuels construction projects, most of which do not require archeological investigation first. The few projects that do require archeology usually do not have ample funding, time, or expertise allocated. In addition, development projects that do require archeology traditionally spawn other developments that do not require archeological investigation. For example, the Savannah River Landing is expected to revitalize a large corridor on the east side of town, along President Street. It is unlikely that most of the spin-off developments from this will require archeology. The Savannah River Landing Project alone covers 54 acres containing 700 high rise condominiums, 2 hotels, and 200,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space.

The intensity of development in historic downtown Savannah includes many revitalization projects currently underway or planned in the immediate future (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). The News Place Development in historic downtown will include 50 residential condominiums, 150 suite hotel rooms, and 30,000 square feet of office and high end retail space. Upcoming redevelopment includes the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Corridor and the Montgomery Corridor on the historic west side of town. An area west of the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Corridor is slated for the construction of a new Civic Center Arena and Performing Arts Center (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). In 2007 there were 37 new hotel projects planned or built and an additional 4,000 hotel rooms expected within the next two years (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007:38). Most of these involve construction of basements, drain and utility trenches, and deep foundations (either dug out or pile-driven).

Areas outside of downtown are also undergoing development. Of particular note are the retail developments on the south side and west side. Developments beyond downtown have the potential to destroy Revolutionary War sites related to troop landings, embarkations, and camps. Much of the development in these outlying areas includes retail and housing construction. In 2007 there were 2,304 new homes constructed in the county (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). Many of these were outside of historic downtown.

Downtown development also includes the ongoing process of building new monuments in the parks and squares. Such construction involves ground disturbance for foundations and supporting utilities. In some cases, such as that of the Vietnam Memorial, an extensive area was dug deeply as part of a sunken fountain area, thus destroying the colonial and Revolutionary War features there. The case of the William Jasper Monument on Madison Square is another example. The GPR survey revealed an extensive and deep disturbance under and around the monument created during construction. Large, heavy monuments such as Jasper and the Pulaski Monument in Monterey Square, require particularly deep ground disturbance. The Pulaski Monument, at 55 feet tall, was estimated to require a foundation of “…six feet deep, or more, if the soil requires it” (White 1855:309).

There were approximately 43 monuments in Savannah in 1998 and several more were added within the past 11 years, including the Salzburger and Haitian monuments (Venegas 1998). Currently there are plans to add a WWII monument to the list. That monument appears destined for a green space, whether it be in Oglethorpe Square or Daffin, Forsyth, or Emmet Parks, or some other park is unclear as of now (Savannahnow.com:2008a, b). The City of Savannah had the foresight to include archeology in the process of monument planning and erection. The Savannah-Chatham County Historic Site and Monument Commission includes the following in its guidelines for a monument application, “The proposed site should not have a high probability of significant archeology unless an archeological study is part of the proposal” (SCHSMC 2008). Unfortunately most people are unaware of the potential of Savannah to contain archeological sites, and in many areas the potential is unknown until a professional archeological study is undertaken. In most
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cases, therefore, such a study should be undertaken during the planning stages of selecting a monument location. While an archeology guideline is part of the application process, it is unclear how many times, if any, archeological study has been a precursor to monument construction. The construction of the Vietnam memorial and the Salzburger memorial are two relatively recent examples where archeology did not take place. Remnants of a dense artifact scatter on the ground immediately following the construction of the Vietnam memorial strongly suggests the presence of an archeological site prior to ground disturbance. It is unclear whether the archeology guideline was in place at the time of construction of those monuments. The Haitian Monument, dedicated in October 2007, is a very recent example of monument construction that appears to have occurred without benefit of archeology. The monument is located in the heart of downtown, nearby the colonial market place known as City Market. It would be extremely likely that this area would have contained an archeological site. The planned World War II monument will be a case study, and an opportunity to show that the archeology guideline is useful in documenting resources before they are destroyed forever.

While there are preservation ordinances in place for standing structures in historic downtown, the city lacks any such ordinances to preserve archeological resources and the information they contain, or to mitigate their destruction through data recovery. In addition, while the city recognizes the importance of its history as a magnet for heritage tourism, efforts to protect archeological resources that would enhance tourism have met with lackluster response for the past two decades. The acknowledged purpose of the historic district is stated as follows:

(a) **Purpose.** The purpose of the historic district is to promote the educational, cultural, economic and general welfare of the city pursuant to the provisions of the amendment to Ga. Const. art. XI, ratified November 5, 1968 (1968 Ga. Laws, page 1591). These provisions provide for the preservation and protection of historic buildings, structures, appurtenances and places that are of basic and vital importance for the development and maintenance of the community’s vacation-travel industry, its tourism, its culture, and for the protection of property values because of their association with history; their unique architectural details; or their being a part of or related to a square, park, or area, the design or general arrangement of which should be preserved and/or developed according to a fixed plan based on economic, cultural, historical or architectural motives or purposes” (City of Savannah 2008b).

Currently the City of Savannah Historic Preservation Ordinance contains 23 pages related to historic structures and what can and cannot be done with or to them. There is no mention of the non-renewable archeological resources in the Ordinance. It is hoped that the Savannah Under Fire project and future projects will demonstrate the positive impacts of protecting archeological resources from an economic, preservation, and educational perspective.

**Preservation Recommendations**

Archeological resources within the City of Savannah and Chatham County at large are in dire need of protection. Development and looting have already permanently destroyed vast numbers of archeological sites and the information they contain. Measures can be taken now, however, to minimize future destruction of the remaining non-renewable resources entrusted to the care of city and county leaders.

- **Archeology Ordinance**- The city and county are encouraged to enact appropriate archeology ordinances that will protect some of its most valuable resources and contribute to its economic, educational, and tourism base.

- **City Archeologist**- A funded city archeologist and small staff can help the city oversee 106 compliance work done by consultants, can conduct small projects, can develop a public outreach and tourism program, and can help city departments avoid damaging important archeological sites.

- **Archeology Tourism Initiative**- Work with archeologists to promote cultural tourism related to the city and county’s archeological sites. This can include tours, conferences (state, regional, national, and international), workshops, and symposia.

- **Archeology Education Initiative**- Work with archeologists and educators to promote K-12, collegiate, and life-long learning educational initiatives. Archeology is an exciting
multidisciplinary topic that lends itself perfectly to teaching all subjects and many state and national educational standards. An Archeology Education Initiative can increase the learning skills of K-12 students and improve the cultural quality of life of area residents.

- **Support Archeological Research**
  - Tourists visit Savannah because of its history and many new residents relocate to the area for the same reason. Authenticity is the key to increasing both the tourism and new residents market. In today’s virtual computer world people thirst more than ever for authenticity in content and objects. Legitimate archeological research in Savannah and Chatham County can provide unique and authentic content to satisfy these needs. The Savannah Under Fire project is one example of uncovering the authentic locations, objects, and stories of the American Revolution in Savannah.

- **Support Archeological Preservation**
  - Historic structures are merely the tip of the iceberg. Support preservation of the largest portions, the archeological components underground. Encourage and support the inclusion of all significant components of a site (above and below ground) in preservation activities. An example would be the inclusion of archeological components on National Register site, district, and landmark nominations. Prevent looting on city and county owned properties.

Savannah has a broad diversity of archeological sites representing the many different cultures who have lived and worked in the area throughout history and prehistory. One example is the Revolutionary War component of this history, with its multi-national forces and its civilian and military drama. The Savannah Under Fire project and the archeological resources it has located can be used as a case study for many of the suggestions above.

**Future Public Involvement**

Tourism in Savannah is one of the city’s top industries. In 2007 there were over 6.88 million visitors to the city (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007:38). In 2006 tourists spent $1.84 billion in Savannah. Tourism spending involves various sectors of the city’s economy from hotels and restaurants to retail and cultural attractions. Studies clearly demonstrate that cultural tourists spend more time and money than other tourists and allocate money for paid lodging and air transportation. Visiting historic sites are at the top of the list of popular historic and cultural activities and “specific cultural, arts, historic or heritage activities or events can influence choice of destination and scheduling of trip(s)” (Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce 2007). The 2008 Savannah Under Fire project clearly demonstrated that archeological projects are compelling attractions to both tourists and locals. Savannah’s future should and must include the discovery, identification, and documentation of its archeological resources, and their protection when feasible or their archeological mitigation when protection is not a viable option. Such a future naturally translates into cultural tourism dollars, educational opportunities for local residents, and the preservation of non-renewable resources for countless future generations.

The two most compelling aspects of the Savannah Under Fire project were the:

- location and identification of well-preserved Revolutionary War resources
- enthusiasm of the public in learning about them

The first aspect has been discussed above and the second aspect is detailed here. Archeologists at Coastal Heritage Society take seriously the responsibility for disseminating knowledge gained from historical and archeological research. While they will continue to share this information with the public through presentations, they also are working on other venues to reach the widest audience possible. This includes:

- upgrading the Savannah History Museum Revolutionary War Exhibit with new information and related artifacts discovered by this study
- making the brochure designed through this study available for distribution via web sites and in hard copy
- providing content information for the upcoming development of an unrelated Podcast project on the American Revolution in Savannah
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- working with the City of Savannah and the general public on a Phase II NPS ABPP grant proposal in 2009

Savannah History Museum Exhibit

The Savannah History Museum currently houses an exhibit about the Revolution in Savannah that was installed in 2004. This exhibit contains graphic/text panels, reproduction uniforms of various armies, a diorama constructed in the early 1980s, three realistic mannequins, a replica of a Revolutionary War period cannon, and a handful of period artifacts on loan (but not necessarily associated with the battle). This exhibit was created prior to the discovery of the Spring Hill Redoubt in 2005, and prior to the current archeological discoveries made across the City of Savannah and the massive amount of primary research gathered for this project.

The proposed upgraded exhibit will examine multiple aspects of the Revolution in Savannah. The upgrade will:

1.) enhance the overall context
2.) examine military strategy
3.) review personalities involved
4.) look at civilian life in Savannah during the Revolution
5.) analyze the need for identification and protection of battle-related resources

These five aspects are important in expanding the current exhibit. The significance of Savannah lies in understanding the larger context of Georgia, the southern theater of the war, Georgia’s role in relation to the other colonies, and the global context of English, French, European, Caribbean, African/African American, and Native American relationships and agendas. It is the development of this context that makes the story so interesting and profound. Local, regional, national, and international military strategies and techniques resulted in the Battle of Savannah and its ultimate outcome. These strategies involved timing, weather, terrain, expertise and training (or lack thereof), and the personal background and experiences of generals and other officers. Some might argue that the “great man” theory of history is applicable, at least to some degree in the Revolutionary War events in Georgia. An examination of some of the key figures and the decisions they made would be of interest and importance to understand events of the times. While many war stories often hinge on the officers and soldiers of a battle and their heroic or infamous deeds, this exhibit also would examine the tremendous impacts of the battle and the war on colonists in Savannah and across America. The destruction of colonists’ personal property, the constant realigning of allegiances as a survival mechanism, and often their deaths, is frequently a story unknown to the general public. This will be brought to light through first-hand accounts that truly personalize this great American struggle. Throughout the exhibit, visitors will encounter concepts related to the documentation and preservation of the places of significance related to the Battle of Savannah and will be challenged to consider ways to support preservation.

The proposed new exhibit plan calls for retaining most of the extant exhibit items in some form. It also will include the addition of archeological information that relates directly to the Battle of Savannah and literally connects the modern city’s landscape to the past. The new exhibit will include some of the many fascinating primary source document details that bring the actions 230 years ago to life. This will be done in an exciting, immersive, hands-on format that will engage the public.

Photographs of archeology in progress universally engage the public. These can be used to capture the visitors’ attention in preparation for sharing more detailed information about history and preservation. Life-size image panels can be used to help create an immersive environment in which the visitor immediately steps into archeological sites and begins making interpretations about the past. This can be done with the aid of additional photographs of features, such as the Spring Hill Redoubt and the six foot trench discovered in Madison Square. Such images will not stand alone, but will be incorporated into hands-on components.

The upgraded exhibit will contain actual artifacts directly connected to the siege, battle, and its aftermath in Savannah. This will include weaponry artifacts such as lead balls, gun parts, and gunflints. Other artifacts can be used to show the totality of the soldier, officer, and militia experience at the time: the lead ball turned into a lopsided die for gaming, the animal bones depicting the troops’ diet, and the domestic debris of wine bottles and dishes in use. Other seemingly nondescript artifacts, such as the handmade brick dismantled from the barracks by the British in 1779 and reused in defensive works, can help museum visitors understand the struggle made by the British in defense of the city, right up through the battle. These same artifacts, capping layers of trench infill deposited by the Americans in 1782, can highlight the importance of stratigraphy on an archeological site and how that information provides important clues to events in the past, leading to an understanding of the importance of site preservation.
The proposed immersive exhibit environment can include site “furniture”, such as archeological tools, as one of many components. Such tools and interactivity will include not only the digging aspects of archeology, but the documentation involved in the work. Such items can contribute to the ambiance and also the information available to the visitor. These three dimensional items can be imbued with low and high technology products that will aid in visitor interpretation. For example, a no-to-low tech item might be a tripod and screen in the exhibit. Visitors could shake the screen to make artifacts visible in the bottom of it (either by incorporating a thin glass case across the base of the screen with replica artifacts and pseudo-sand substance; or by mounting a lenticular lens image across the bottom that shows sand from one view and then changes to artifacts when looked at from a different angle). Another example of a low tech aid might show visitors the type of GIS research leading to the discoveries of this project. For instance, visitors could slide Plexiglass panel overlays of various historic maps over the modern city map, showing the way the British defensive works appear to fall in Madison Square. [A slightly higher technology version of this would allow visitors to tap a touch screen computer to see GIS overlays.] (Only close up sections of areas that fall in publicly safeguarded green spaces would be used to avoid encouraging looting at other potential sites.)

Another immersive exhibit component could examine civilian life during the siege and battle. The largest number of casualties during the siege occurred among the civilian population of Savannah. A life-size diorama could be incorporated in the space underneath the raised floor leading to the adjacent gallery. This space could be constructed to represent one of the basements in a colonial Savannah house, packed full of terrified women and children amid hogsheads of goods and other possessions. An audio earphone, with background noise of shelling and bombardment of the town, would be the backdrop to actors reciting journal entries and letters written by Savannahians who fled to cellars for safety, only to have the shells blast through house roofs and walls, setting homes on fire.

Another moderate-level technology aid in the exhibit might include a touch screen panel that allows visitors to touch different places of a Savannah map to discover what battle events took place in what areas, and what archeological discoveries have been made there. High tech elements of the exhibit could include a digital dig, which would allow visitors the excitement of uncovering specific Savannah Revolutionary War features and artifacts in a virtual world. The product could also include a “digital preservation” component that allowed the visitor to choose how he or she would protect the resources, and a “digital outreach” component that would allow visitors to create a temporary digital exhibit, brochure, or drawing.

The new exhibit would contain myriad opportunities for programming. This could include pre-site visit activities, site activities, and post-site visit activities. A great deal of this could be accessible through the CHS website. Such programming could include opportunities for school groups, homeschoolers, and scouts, as well as programming for post-K-12 ages. This information could be tied directly to the Georgia Performance Standards mandated by the Georgia Department of Education. In addition, the programming could tie directly to Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) content that teachers are under great pressure to teach. Other programming activities could provide resources and information for interested college students, history organization members, civic groups, tourism organizations, and the general public.

**Brochure Distribution (web and hard copy)**

A brochure was designed as part of the Savannah Under Fire project. It details the goals of the project and initial findings. A copy of this brochure can be found in the appendix of this report. Hard copies will be made of this brochure, and it will also be placed on the Coastal Heritage Society website at [www.chsgeorgia.org](http://www.chsgeorgia.org).

**Working With Other Entities**

Foreign Language Brochure Content Contribution

Coastal Heritage Society recently secured a grant to develop a series of brochures about Savannah and the role of three countries in its history. The brochures will target foreign tourists and will be written in the appropriate language or dialect. One brochure will examine the French experience, one will look at the Germanic contributions, and a third will study the Haitian role. Coastal Heritage Society archeologists will make a copy of this NPS ABPP report available to the brochure writers should they desire content related to the Revolutionary War participation of these groups while in Savannah.

**13th Colony Trail**

Efforts are currently underway to develop a 13th Colony cultural heritage tourism trail along approximately 17 coastal and coastal plain counties of Georgia. Initial
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Planning has involved the state’s tourism department (Tourism Product Development), multiple county municipalities, non-profit organizations, community groups, and other interested parties. Coastal Heritage Society archeologists have been involved in many of the activities to date and will make the Savannah Under Fire final report available to interested parties involved in this endeavor.

American Revolution Organizations
Numerous organizations now exist that are actively involved in the scholarly research of the American Revolution, particularly those events relating to it that occurred in the southern United States. One such example is the Southern Campaign of the American Revolution (SCAR). The final report of the Savannah Under Fire project will be made available to individuals within this organization who desire that information.

Historical Significance of Battle of Savannah and Associated Sites

Assessment for NRHP eligibility

Battlefield Boundaries
The battlefield boundaries are subdivided into three categories, including the Study Area, Core Area, and Potential National Register Boundary. These are defined by the National Park Service (NPS 2000) as follows:

- **Study Area**-Encompasses the ground over which units maneuvered in preparation for combat; determined by historical research, regardless of changing land use over time. It is the “maximum delineation of the historical site…contain[ing] all places related or contributing to the battle event” including troop maneuvers, deployment, and fighting “…before, during and immediately after combat… that directly contributed to the development and denouement of the battle.”

- **Core Area**-Area of combat; always within Study Area; determined by historical research, regardless of changing land use over time. “It includes those places where the opposing forces engaged and incurred casualties”.

- **Potential National Register Boundary (PotNR)**- Those portions of the battlefield that have retained integrity; determined by integrity and may encompass parts of both the Study and Core Areas. It “…indicates to preservationists and planners what remains to save” and provides “…important information on which to base nominations of the battlefield to the National Register of Historic Places and other historic preservation planning decisions. “Any parts of the Study and Core Areas that have been compromised by modern development, erosion, or other destructive forces and that can no longer provide a feeling of the historic setting should be excluded from the PotNR boundary.”

Savannah has a large National Historic Landmark District consisting of the town’s original two dozen squares and surrounding town lots as arranged on the 1733 town plan. The city also has almost a dozen National Register Districts made up of neighborhoods created during different periods in history. Neither the National Historic Landmark District nor the National Register Historic Districts examine, feature, or include a Revolutionary War focus. None cite or delineate the specific geographic areas around and across town that contribute to the story of the American Revolution as played out in Savannah. None of the districts equate these locations with the significant events that were important not only to colonial Savannah at the time, but more importantly that shaped events and outcome of the American Revolution in America and Europe. The 1779 Battle of Savannah was a pivotal point in the attempt to gain a strategic foothold in the southern theater; a foothold that would lead to the attack of Charleston and ultimately the British hold on the southern colonies.

The Savannah Under Fire project has shown that substantial remains of the battlefield still exist today. Primary research indicates that the Study Area extends from the Savannah River north of Hutchinson Island (where French vessels bombarded the British), south to the French and American camps. On the western side, the study area encompasses the swamp, Augusta Road, and the Spring Hill and Carolina redoubts and continues east through town. The eastern portion of the study area includes the Savannah River inlets, Bonaventure Plantation area, and embarkation points of Tybee Island and Beaulieu Plantation.

The Core Area within this Study Area includes:
• the area in and around the Central Redoubts
• horseshoe barracks battery between the Central Redoubts
• Spring Hill Redoubt
• Carolina Redoubts
• Battlefield Area of the allied column charges extending north of the camps to the line of defensive works along the southern edge of the town
• Augusta Road (the section beginning at Spring Hill Redoubt and running west)
• the Savannah River
• the riverfront
• Fort Prevost
• Jewish Cemetery (retreat area and reservists’ counter attack)

The Potential National Register Boundary (PotNR) for the 1779 Battle of Savannah is just emerging with the Savannah Under Fire, 1779 study. This project successfully demonstrated that there are significant extant resources related to this battle in the Study and Core Areas. This current research has highlighted the Central redoubts in and around Madison and Lafayette Squares, the Spring Hill Redoubt, and the area around Fort Prevost as partial boundaries of the PotNR. These are not complete boundaries, however, and expanding on this project with additional archeology will be a cost-effective way to determine the entire PotNR more completely.

Phase II Investigations

CHS archeologists are applying for a second grant from the National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program in 2009. This grant would build on the foundation of knowledge gathered during the 2008 grant. It would use the extensive, primary document evidence gathered, the GIS results using historic and modern maps, and the archeological discovery of specific battle-related components to extend the reach of the project much farther and expand the site boundaries. While a large portion of the Savannah Under Fire project was absorbed with gathering research from various repositories and establishing the GIS database, the 2009 project would begin immediately with using this information to investigate additional potential resources. In addition, this project has demonstrated that significant battle resources still exist, paving the way for locating additional resources that will enlarge the PotNR boundary. A Phase II project would allow the identification of additional resources to expand the boundaries of the Battle of Savannah and work toward their preservation. The 2009 proposed project would extend the results of this initial study by building on recently acquired information. It would also be cost-effective, since archeologists would not have to produce the entire report over, but rather contribute an addendum to it with the 2009 information. Ultimately, Phase II work would extend the reach of the Savannah Under Fire project and provide a recognizable level of identification and preservation for the 1779 Battle of Savannah resources.

Summary

The Savannah Under Fire project was extremely successful on multiple levels. Archeologists surprised an array of skeptics by locating significant, in situ features and artifacts directly related to the Battle of Savannah in downtown, urban Savannah. They demonstrated the potential for additional associated sites to exist throughout the city. The project stretched the limited budget in virtually all areas, including research, fieldwork, and reporting. Researchers gathered thousands of pages of documents above and beyond what they anticipated. Fieldwork and labwork was extended by the addition of a supplemental grant given by The LAMAR Institute after a major discovery was made in Madison Square. The applicant further supplemented the reporting phase of the project with thousands of dollars of in-kind support above that stipulated by the grant match. Finally, the most visible signs of the success of this project appeared in the overwhelming enthusiasm it generated among the public, preservationists, and policy makers. The project will build on this momentum as we continue to work with many entities towards the preservation of Savannah’s Revolutionary War archeological sites.
The reader is referred to Table 11 for a list of additional map sources consulted, but not necessarily cited in this report.
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Appendix i.
Brochure
Savannah Under Fire

Tracing the Footsteps of the Revolution in Savannah, Georgia

This material is based upon work assisted by a grant from the Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of the Interior.

Image Courtesy of the Army Art Collection, U.S. Army Center of Military History
On Oct. 9, 1779, American and French forces mounted an unsuccessful attack on British-held Savannah resulting in massive Patriot casualties. Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists, supported by the National Park Service’s American Battlefield Protection Program, revealed Revolutionary War archaeological sites throughout downtown Savannah.

Our Discoveries:

- **Madison Square**: a 5 1/2 foot deep ditch dug and defended by the British in 1779. American troops filled the ditch in 1782.

- **Lafayette Square**: dishes and other artifacts used by British soldiers in 1779.

- **Emmet Park**: a deep feature that may be related to the gun battery or to Fort Prevost.

- **Colonial Park Cemetery**: Using ground penetrating radar, we identified a large anomaly that may be part of Revolutionary War defenses.
Appendix 2.
Digital Artifact Inventory
Appendix 3. Miscellaneous
GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
1990
Official Site Number: 9CH906 Revisit

Institutional Site Number: __________________ Site Name: Colonial Park Cemetery
County: Chatham Map Name: Savannah USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17 UTM East: 491521 UTM North: 3548570
Owner: City of Savannah Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 100+ meters Width: 60+ meters Elevation: ± 12 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.): Probable fortification now in cemetery
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement, Graves
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded
Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in
Colonial Park Cemetery included a GPR survey of its SE quadrant. GPR revealed an anomaly that may
be part of the fortification trench for the Revolutionary War defenses of the British.
State Site Number: 9CH906 Revisit


National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local 2. State 3. National


3. Unknown

RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott  Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society  Date: June 2009

Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

Other Reports:

Artifacts Collected: None

Location of Collections:

Location of Field Notes: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401

Private Collections:

Name: __________________________ Address: __________________________

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: 18th-19th Centuries

Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
1990
Official Site Number: 9CH1218

Institutional Site Number:  
Site Name: Dixon Park
County: Chatham  Map Name: Savannah  USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17  UTM East: 491400  UTM North: 3547091
Owner: City of Savannah  Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 95 meters  Width: 65 meters  Elevation: + - 10 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present  2. Absent
  5. Unknown  6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.): House sites and/or domestic dump, L19th c.
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Dixon Park included a shovel test survey. Archaeologists found no evidence of Rev. War camps.

SKETCH MAP
State Site Number: ___________ Institutional Site Number: 9CH1218

Public Status: 1. National Historic Landmark  2. National Natural Landmark  

National Register Standing: 1. Determined Eligible  2. Recommended Ineligible  

National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local  2. State  3. National

Preservation State (Select up to Two): 1. Undisturbed  2. Cultivated  
9. Graded  10. Razed

3. Unknown

RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott  Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society  Date: June 2009

Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

Other Reports:

Artifacts Collected: Bottle glass (all colors), edgeware, nails, ceramic marble, chert flake, blue transfer print, slate, square nail, porcelain, whiteware, slate pencil, architectural debris, etc.

Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401

Location of Field Notes: Same as above

Private Collections: Name: ___________ Address: ___________

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: Late 19th–Early 20th centuries

Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
1990
Official Site Number: 9CH781 Revisit

Institutional Site Number: Addendum
Site Name: Emmet Park, West/Central (aka Bay St. Strand)
County: Chatham
Map Name: Savannah
UTM Zone: 17
UTM East: 492080
UTM North: 3549029
Owner: City of Savannah
Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 260 meters
Width: 38 meters
Elevation: ± 10 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.): 18th c. urban, 19th c. industrial, Abo mound rem./village
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): River Bluff
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Emmet Park (west and central portions) included GPR, metal detector survey, and shovel. Archaeologists located 18th & 19th century deposits, as well as a Native American midden.

(Section east of Rossiter Place Road is different site, on separate site form).

SKETCH MAP

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)
State Site Number: __________________

Public Status: 1. National Historic Landmark 2. National Natural Landmark

National Register Standing: 1. Determined Eligible 2. Recommended Ineligible

National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local 2. State 3. National

Preservation State (Select up to Two): 1. Undisturbed 2. Cultivated 3. Eroded
   9. Graded 10. Razed

   3. Unknown

RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society Date: June 2009
Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield
Other Reports:
Artifacts Collected: Pearlware, olive green glass, stoneware, creamware, oyster shell, ceramic marble,
coarse earthenware, cut nails, edgewear, & flakes, check stamped, cordmarked, incised Native American
sherds, etc.
Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401
Location of Field Notes: Same as above
Private Collections:
Name: __________________ Address: __________________

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: Native American (Deptford), 18th and 19th centuries
Phases: __________________

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
1990
Official Site Number: 9CH1219

Institutional Site Number: __________ Site Name: Emmet Park, East End
County: Chatham Map Name: Savannah USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17 UTM East: 492013 UTM North: 3549027
Owner: City of Savannah Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 60 meters Width: 50 meters Elevation: + - 10 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.): Possible fortification feature
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): River Bluff
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Emmet Park East included GPR, metal detector survey, shovel tests and 2, 1x1 m square units. Archaeologists located a 10 x 3 m feature possibly associated w/Forts Prevost/Wayne, but infilled ca 1874.

SKETCH MAP

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)
State Site Number: _______ Institutional Site Number: 0CH1219

Public Status: 1. National Historic Landmark  2. National Natural Landmark  

National Register Standing: 1. Determined Eligible  2. Recommended Ineligible  

National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local  2. State  3. National

Preservation State (Select up to Two):  1. Undisturbed  2. Cultivated  3. Eroded  
9. Graded  10. Razed

3. Unknown

RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott  Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society  Date: June 2009
Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield
Other Reports:
Artifacts Collected: Heel plate, stoneware pipe bowl, kaolin pipe fragments, bottle glass (all colors represented), sequins (possibly military flag), animal bone, machine made brick, nails (wrought & u.d.), ballast, slate, brick, whiteware, coal, mortar, etc.

Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401
Location of Field Notes: Same as above
Private Collections: 
Name:  Address:

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: Nineteenth century; possibly late eighteenth century (ca 1779)
Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Site Number: __________________ Site Name: Lafayette Square
County: Chatham Map Name: Savannah USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17 UTM East: 491334 UTM North: 3548337
Owner: City of Savannah Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 60 meters Width: 55 meters Elevation: + - 12 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.) American Revolution fortification
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Lafayette Square included GPR, metal detector survey and 3. 1x2 m test units. Archaeologists located a 19th century brick lens capping ca. 1810 deposits and Revolutionary War period artifacts.

SKETCH MAP

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)
State Site Number: 1


National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local  2. State  3. National


RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott  Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society  Date: June 2009

Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield

Other Reports:

Artifacts Collected: Early 19th century and older Revolutionary War period artifacts. Porcelain, creamware, saltglazed stoneware, refined redware, handmade brick, animal bone, bottle glass, kaolin pipe fragments, lead ball, possible gunflint fragment, green edgeware, ironstone, whiteware, etc.

Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401

Location of Field Notes: Same as above

Private Collections:

Name:  Address:

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: 1779 and early 1800

Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

Date Name Institutional Affiliation
5/25/2009 Rita Folse Elliott Coastal Heritage Society
GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM
1990
Official Site Number: 9CH1221

Institutional Site Number: Site Name: Madison Square
County: Chatham Map Name: Savannah USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17 UTM East: 491107 UTM North: 3548401
Owner: City of Savannah Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 60 meters Width: 55 meters Elevation: + - 13 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.) American Revolution fortification & battlefield
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Madison square included GPR, metal detector survey and 2, 1x2 m test units. Archaeologists located a 5.5' deep trench in the 2 m deep test units. This trench was dug by the British in 1779 and used in the October 9th Battle of Savannah. It was part of extensive fortifications around the city in-filled in 1782.

SKETCH MAP

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)
State Site Number: 9CH1221  Institutional Site Number: 


National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local  2. State  3. National


RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS
Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott  Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society  Date: June 2009
Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield
Other Reports:
Artifacts Collected: 18th & later 19th century artifacts, Musket hardware, gunflints, lead balls, buckle fragments, lead scrap, olive green glass, Delft, Jackfield, white salt-glazed stoneware, creamware, porcelain, Rhenish stoneware, kaolin pipe stems, animal bone, bricks, pearlware, animal bone, wrought and cut nails, etc.

Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401
Location of Field Notes: Same as above
Private Collections:  
Name:  
Address:  

CULTURAL AFFINITY
Cultural Periods: Revolutionary War, 1800s
Phases:  

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION
Date: 5/25/2009  Name: Rita Folse Elliott  Institutional Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society
Institutional Site Number: ____ Site Name: Myers Park
County: Chatham Map Name: Savannah USGS OR USNOAA
UTM Zone: 17  UTM East: 489635  UTM North: 3546222
Owner: City of Savannah Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402
Site Length: 85 meters Width: 75 meters Elevation: + - 9 meters
Standing Architecture: 1. Present 2. Absent
5. Unknown 6. Underwater
Type of Site (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.) Houses and/or domestic dump, L19th c.
Topography (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace
Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement
Additional Information: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant funded Coastal Heritage Society archaeologists to survey Savannah for Revolutionary War sites. Work in Myers Park included a shovel test survey. Archaeologists found no evidence of Rev. War camps.

SKETCH MAP

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)
9CH1222

State Site Number: Institutional Site Number:

Public Status: 1. National Historic Landmark 2. National Natural Landmark

National Register Standing: 1. Determined Eligible 2. Recommended Ineligible

National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local 2. State 3. National

Preservation State (Select up to Two): 1. Undisturbed 2. Cultivated 3. Eroded
9. Graded 10. Razed

3. Unknown

RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society Date: June 2009
Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield
Other Reports:
Artifacts Collected: 1 British brown saltglazed stoneware (isolated find), bottle glass (all colors), coal,
die, jewelry, wire nails, brick, etc.

Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401
Location of Field Notes: Same as above
Private Collections: 
Name: Address:

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: Predominantly late 19th century.
Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE FORM**

**1990**

**Official Site Number: 9CH703 Revisit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Site Number:</th>
<th>Site Name: Spring Hill Redoubt, Battlefield Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County: Chatham</td>
<td>USGS OR USNOAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Name: Savannah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Zone: 17</td>
<td>UTM East: 490460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UTM North: 3548644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: City of Savannah</td>
<td>Address: City Hall, P.O. Box 1027, Savannah, GA 31402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Length: 300+ meters</td>
<td>Width: 75+ meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation:</td>
<td>Elevation: + - 10 meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Unknown 6. Underwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Site: (Mill, Mound, Quarry, Lithic Scatter, etc.) American Revolution fortification, battlefield &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography: (Ridge, Terrace, etc.): Terrace L18th-E19th c. house site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Vegetation (Woods, Pasture, etc.): Grass, Trees, Pavement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Information:** In 2005 Coastal Heritage Society (CHS) archaeologists located portions of Spring Hill Redoubt. In 2008 they returned under a grant from the National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program Grant. Initial work included backhoe trenching and hand excavation. Later work consisted of a GPR survey in Louisville Rd adjacent & west. (In 2004 CHS hired a consultant to do GPR at intersection of MLK & Louisville Rd, resulting in negative evidence).

**SKETCH MAP**

(Include sites, roads, streams, landmarks)

**State Site Number:**

**Institutional Site Number:**


National Register Level of Significance: 1. Local 2. State 3. National


RECORD OF INVESTIGATIONS

Supervisor: Rita F. Elliott Affiliation: Coastal Heritage Society Date: June 2009
Report Title: Savannah Under Fire: Identifying Savannah’s Revolutionary War Battlefield
Other Reports:
Artifacts Collected: 18th & later 19th century artifacts, including ceramics, brass Charleville pistol musket barrel band, wall gun gunflint, lead balls, olive green glass, kaolin pipe stems, animal bone, bricks, pearlware, animal bone, wrought and cut nails, etc. (19th century artifacts from later house site midden and privy.) Revolutionary War artifacts from trench containing palisade posts.
Location of Collections: Savannah History Museum, 303 MLK Jr. Blvd., Savannah, GA 31401
Location of Field Notes: Same as above
Private Collections:
Name: Address:

CULTURAL AFFINITY

Cultural Periods: Revolutionary War, L1700-E1800s (20th century meatpacking area heavily impacted prior to 2005; buildings razed, cellars infilled with structural debris, etc.)
Phases:

FORM PREPARATION AND REVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institutional Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/2009</td>
<td>Rita Folse Elliott</td>
<td>Coastal Heritage Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>