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I. Introduction

The project objective of the Sunbury Battlefield American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) research project was to identify the historical resources at Sunbury, Georgia associated with the Revolutionary War battles that took place in 1778, 1779, and 1782. This research project was conducted in 2003 and 2004 by the historians and archaeologists with the LAMAR Institute through grant funding provided by the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) of the National Park Service (NPS) and the Historic Preservation Division (HPD), Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Sunbury is located on the Medway River in Liberty County, Georgia (Figure 1). It was for a few short decades the second largest town in colonial Georgia and a thriving seaport. Sunbury was established in 1758 by Mark Carr and other trustees composed of prominent landowners in St. Johns Parish. It was established as a shipping port for members of the Midway community and other plantation owners in the vicinity. The town also hosted numerous warehouses for companies involved in the lucrative Indian trade. Sunbury was a boom town and it quickly grew into the second busiest shipping port on the Georgia coast. By the 1830s Sunbury was nearly a ghost town.

Figure 1. Sunbury Vicinity.
Sunbury’s economy was wrecked by military events of the American Revolution. The town was fortified by the Americans in 1776 and had a permanent Continental Artillery garrison. In addition it was used as a staging area for American campaigns against East Florida in 1776, 1777, and 1778. Sunbury was attacked by the British in 1778 and 1779, whereupon it was captured and garrisoned by loyalist troops. A lesser known military engagement occurred in early 1782 when Americans raided the town. Another obscure event took place later that year when Loyalists, led by Captain Scallon, burned portions of Sunbury.

The struggle for control of the port town of Sunbury was instrumental in the domination of Georgia during the American Revolution. Sunbury had been a rebel stronghold and a hotbed of liberty. Many insurrectionists hailed from Sunbury and Liberty County and the British were eager to make an example by capturing the town. To do so also would place a stranglehold on the Georgia economy since Sunbury and Savannah were its only major seaports. Sunbury was surrounded by fortifications and it possessed an impressive artillery battery, therefore the British waited until they had sufficient force in place before conquering the town. It was the last major town in Georgia to fall to the British.

Controlling Sunbury meant controlling the economy of all of the frontier between Spanish East Florida and the Ogeechee River. The British accomplished this goal on January 9, 1779 and held all of coastal Georgia until Spring, 1782, when the Americans, led by Major General Anthony Wayne, made a concerted effort to reclaim Georgia. Thus, the capture of Sunbury was an essential component of British control of the colony for the three-year period from 1779 to 1782.

This study is the first systematic archaeological examination of the town of Sunbury. It also follows closely on the heels of, and significantly expands on, an in-depth study of Fort Morris sponsored by the State of Georgia (Elliott 2005b). The historical and archaeological research for Sunbury was greatly aided by the previous efforts of Agnew (1974a-c, 1975a-b), Baker (1970), Jones (1997 [1878]), McDaniel (2002), McIlvaine (1971), Midgette (1971a-c, 1973, 1976), Rosier (n.d.), and Sheftall (1995 [1977]).

Project participants gathered historical information about the military operations and battles at Sunbury. The research team conducted archaeological survey on selected portions of the colonial town site and its periphery. The field survey included topographic mapping to identify related features on the modern landscape, systematic shovel testing, metal detector survey, test unit excavation, and Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey. These field data were synthesized and used to compile a technical summary report. The report is supplemented by a series of four appendices, which are contained on a DVD disc. Appendix 1 contains a summary of the chain of ownership of Sunbury’s town lots. Appendix 2 contains a complete inventory of the artifacts located and/or recovered by the study. Appendix 3 contains summary tables of artifacts by individual sites. Appendix 4 contains selected artifact images. This information should serve as the basis for subsequent historic preservation efforts at Sunbury.
II. Methods

RESEARCH METHODS

Local historical research was conducted at several repositories in Georgia. One major source of information is the Georgia Department of Archives and History (GDAH) in Morrow. This repository also houses the records of the Georgia Surveyor General. Resources examined at the GDAH included the John Goff Forts Collection and many published Revolutionary War histories and memoirs. The National Archives and Records Administration, Southeastern Region in East Point, Georgia also was visited. Research was conducted at the University of Georgia libraries in Athens, Georgia and at Columbus State University’s Schwob Library in Columbus, Georgia. The Georgia Historical Society in Savannah, Georgia was another important source of historical information pertaining to the study area.

More distant archives that were visited for this study, included the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and Library of Congress (LOC), Washington, D.C. and College Park, Maryland; the National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, the Churchill Public Library, Churchill, Manitoba, Canada; the Huntington Library, San Marino, California; and the Perkins Library, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

John Sheftall (1995) compiled a significant body of historical data concerning the colonial town of Sunbury, as well as its associated fortifications. His research efforts provided a sound basis for further research. A review of other published research pertaining to the forts at Sunbury was conducted for the 2002 Southern Research project (Elliott 2005b). This included the Colonial Records of Georgia, Revolutionary Records of Georgia, and relevant articles in the Georgia Historical Quarterly (Candler 1904-1916; 1908, 2001). Other published works that were consulted include Davis (1979, 1986a, 1986b), DeVorsey (1971, 1972), Hawes (1957, 1968), and Moultrie (1802, 1980). A cursory review of contemporary newspapers provided some information on the events at Sunbury (Caledonian Mercury 1779; Georgia Gazette 1763-1776; South Carolina Gazette 1732-1775; Kilborne 1999).

Wright (1983), and J. Wright (1976). Histories of the War of 1812 also were consulted. These included works by Hickey (1989) and Mahon (1972).

Archaeologists examined military manuscript collections, which were directly relevant to Sunbury’s history, at several archival repositories. These included collections at the Georgia Historical Society, Savannah (Bevan and Cate collections); Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia (Cuyler, Jones and Reid collections); the Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, Georgia (Goff collection); New York Public Library, Manhattan; and the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor (Clinton and Wayne collections). Military records and maps at the Library of Congress, including the Fortifications Files, also were examined. Published bibliographies, calendars, and finding aids on the American Revolution were consulted (Floyd 1997; Goff various dates; Harper 1983; Historical Manuscript Commission 1901-1906; Kennedy 1900; Mitchell 1978; Peckham 1978; Robertson et al. 2002; and White 1988).

Historical research in the present study focused primarily on the period from 1733 to 1865, although earlier and later periods were studied as they related to the survey area. This vicinity, for example, may have been the prior location of a Guale village during the Spanish colonial era (Worth 1995). The recent history of the area also is incorporated into the research as it relates to the factors that led to the preservation or destruction of the archaeological resources there.

Archaeological and historical site reports from other Revolutionary War and War of 1812 forts were consulted for relevant information (Calver and Bolton 1950; Hanson and Hsu 1975; Stone 1974). Contemporary military maps were examined and interpreted with an awareness of their flaws and biases (Carrington 1877, 1881; Hulbert 1907; Harley et al. 1978; Marshall and Peckham 1976).

The historical research for this project included visits to the following libraries and archival repositories:

- Library of Congress (Regular Stacks, Manuscript Division, and Geography and Map Division), Washington, D.C.;
- National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. and the Cartographic Unit, College Park, Maryland;
- Churchill Public Library, Churchill, Manitoba, Canada;
- National Archives of Canada, Ottawa;
- New York Public Library, New York, New York;
- Henry Pierpont Morgan Library, New York;
- Perkins Library, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina;
- William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan;
- Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta;
- Historic Preservation Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Atlanta;
- Effingham County Courthouse, Springfield, Georgia;
- Georgia Historical Society, Savannah, Georgia;
- University of Georgia Libraries, Athens; and
Collections that were examined at the Library of Congress (LOC) included:

- Anthony Wayne Papers (LOC 1782);
- George Washington Papers (LOC 2002);
- Archibald Campbell’s 1780 map, entitled “Sketch of the Northern Frontiers of Georgia”;
- a manuscript map, entitled, “Roads and country that Col. Campbell marched thro’ –Ebenezer to Augusta in Georgia, 1779”;
- An unattributed manuscript map of “Savannah and Ogeechee River, circa 178-“; and
- Papers of Benjamin Lincoln, particularly Lincoln’s Journal (Lincoln 1733-1810).

Collections that were examined at the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) repositories included:

- U.S. Army Fortifications Files (Record Group 77);
- Office of the Quartermaster General (Record Group 92);
- War Department Collection of Revolutionary War Records (Record Group 93);
- Additional Revolutionary War Records (Record Groups 39, 53, 92, 93, 94, 107, and 217), M853;
- Orders, Returns, Morning Reports, and Accounts of British Troops, 1776-1781 (M922);
- Supply Records, Records of Issuance and Receipt of Provisions, 1776-83 and 1786 (M853);
- Letters, Orders for Pay, Accounts, Receipts, and other supply records concerning weapons and military stores, 1776-1801 (M927 from RG 93, RG94, RG92);
- Ledger of Military Stores Received and Delivered, March 1780-May 1795 (M927);
- Record Books Concerning Mil. Op & Serv, Pay & Settlem of Accts & Supplies..Rev War Supply Records Records of Military Stores Received and Delivered at Various Places, Feb. 15, 1777 – Aug, 8, 1783 (M853, Roll 39);
- Miscellaneous Unbound Record Items, 1776-1783 (M927);
- Letters, Returns, Accounts, and Estimates of the Quartermaster General’s Department 1776-1783 in the War Department Collection of Revolutionary War Records (M926); and
- Miscellaneous Numbered Records (the Manuscript file) in the War Department, Collection of Revolutionary War Records, 1775-1790 (M859, Roll 4 Georgia).

Military service records for individuals were, for the most part, not fully researched in this study, although the index was examined (NARA various dates). Those that were researched included commanding officers of various military units, such as Anthony Wayne, Stephen Moylan, and Benjamin Lincoln.
Collections that were examined at the New York Public Library included:

- Hessians in America manuscripts, 27 transcripts, Brunswick Papers, Vol. 2 (Ms and Archives Section, Room 328);
- Papers of Anthony Wayne (1 folder in Personal Misc. papers);
- Papers of Benjamin Lincoln (1 folder);
- Chalmers Collection, Georgia (745, 1 volume);
- Letters of Anthony Wayne, Benjamin Lossing’s Field Book, Volume 10 (EM6738- EM6740);
- Plan of Purisburg [Purysburg, S.C.] by F. DeBrahm, EM6753;
- Siege of Savannah, Lincoln Papers (Campbell to Lincoln EM7389);
- Thomas Addis Emmet Collection; and
- Great Britain—Army, 71st Foot Regiment, 1775-1784, Ford Collection.

Three volumes of bound letters of Anthony Wayne at the New York Public Library were reviewed. These are transcribed copies of papers of Anthony Wayne, which form part of the George Bancroft Collection (Bancroft 1606-1887, Vols 378-380). Collections that were examined at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York included the Augustin Prevost Letters, a letter from Thomas Posey to Nathanael Greene, and other pertinent Revolutionary War records.

Collections that were examined at the University of Georgia Libraries included:

- Benjamin Lincoln Papers, microfilm collection (Allis 1967; Allis and Frederick 1967);
- Benjamin Lincoln’s Order Book, Volume 2 (Hyrne 1779-1780);
- Charles C. Jones, Jr. Collection;
- Telemon Cuyler Collection;
- Keith Read Collection;
- James Wright Collection;
- Colonial Records of Georgia; and
- various other published and microfiche Revolutionary War sources.

The original copy of Benjamin Lincoln’s Order Book, Volume 2, which is housed in the Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library was a very important historical resource (Hyrne 1779-1780).

Books that were consulted at the Columbus State University’s Simon Schwob Library, Columbus, Georgia included the Documents of the American Revolution (multi-volume set published Irish series, edited by K. G. Davies 1972-1978), the Georgia Historical Quarterly, and the published volumes of the Colonial Records of Georgia (Candler 1904-1916).

Duke University’s Perkins Library in Durham, North Carolina maintains a collection of Revolutionary War primary documents, including many that are relevant to a study of Sunbury and Fort Morris (Dunn 2002). Budgetary constraints did not permit a visit to this institution for the present study, but a visit to examine these collections is highly advised. Collections of particular note include those of Samuel Elbert, William Few, John Gibbons (Gibbons family), Nathanael Greene, Charles C. Jones, Jr., Benjamin Lincoln,
Samuel Stirk, John Twiggs, George Walton, and Sir James Wright. The most useful document located at this repository was Charles C. Jones, Jr.’s plan map of Sunbury, a modified lithograph of which was published in his *Dead Towns of Georgia* (Jones 1997).

Research queries were made to a number of other archival facilities and additional documents were obtained. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania possesses a large collection of Revolutionary War order books, including General Wayne’s order book, which was maintained by his aid Benjamin Fishbourne. Relevant portions of this document were obtained and reviewed but it contained no specific references to Sunbury. Several documents relevant to Georgia were located during the LAMAR Institute’s earlier study of New Ebenezer, Georgia in the Andre DeCopppet collection at Princeton University Library and copies of these were obtained by mail.

Biographies and compilations of patriots and loyalists provided useful information on soldiers who were posted at Sunbury (Calhoon 1973; Clark 1981; Cole and Braisted 2002; Egerton 1971; Heitman 1967; Gwalthmey 1973; Kelby 1932; Knight 1970; McCall 1941; Palmer 1984; Sanchez-Saavedra 1978). Numerous important papers, autobiographies and biographies of military officers who were either garrisoned and/or spent some time at, or heavily influenced the events of Sunbury were examined. These included works on:

- Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Brown, King’s Rangers (Olson 1970; Cashin 1989);
- Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell, 71st Highland Regiment (Campbell 1981; McGeachy 2003; Nunis 1961; Davis 1986a);
- Samuel Elbert, Continental Army (Harden 1902);
- Major General Horatio Gates, Continental Army (Saltzmann 1979);
- Major General Nathanael Greene, Continental Army;
- Major General Robert Howe, Continental Army (Howe 1776-1778a, 1776-1778b, 1778c; Grimke 1911, 1912; Naisawald 1951; Lawrence 1952; Bennett and Lennon 1991);
- Lieutenant Colonel Henry Jackson, Georgia Legion (Charlton 1809; Foster 1947; 1960);
- Lieutenant Colonel Henry Lee, Lee’s Legion (Lee 1969; Royster 1981; Hartmann 2000);
- Major General Benjamin Lincoln, Continental Army (Lincoln 1733-1810, 1777-1780; Hymne 1779-1780; Allis 1967; Mattern 1995);
- Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh, Continental Army (Hawes 1957, 1968; Jackson 1979);
- General Francis Marion, Continental Army (Horry and Weems 1859; Simms 2002);
- Brigadier General William Moultrie, Continental Army (Moultrie 1802, 1980);
- Lieutenant Colonel Charles Cotestorth Pinckney, Continental Army (Zahniser 1967);
- Major General Augustin Prevost (Prevost 1979a-f; C. Prevost n.d.);
- Governor John Adam Treutlen, Continental Army (Morgan 1998); and
Two of Major General Robert Howe's orderly books were examined for this study (Howe 1776-1778a, 1776-1778b). A third source of primary information pertaining to Robert Howe, the Robert Howe Papers, was identified in the research. These materials were located in North Carolina but was not examined (Howe 1732-1786). Other details of Robert Howe's service in Georgia are recorded by his aid Major John Fauchereau Grimke, Continental Army. Grimke also served as an aide to Major General Benjamin Lincoln. Grimke's order book and journal, which have been published, provide unique details of activity in Sunbury and Fort Morris (Grimke 1911, 1912). A recent biography of Robert Howe also provided useful information pertaining to the study area (Bennett and Lennon 1991).

Other significant documents were examined in various locations. The Huntington Library contains many documents from the American Revolution that pertain to Georgia and Sunbury. The Huntington’s collection of Revolutionary War documents is the largest west of Chicago. These include primary manuscript documents related to General Prevost’s Georgia campaign. The Yonge Library contains many documents pertaining to British East Florida and the military campaigns that were launched from Georgia, as well as campaigns launched by the British from East Florida. Documents include correspondence by Governor Tony and others. The Perkins Library at Duke University contains a variety of manuscript collections pertinent to the American Revolution in Georgia and Sunbury, particularly the Robert Howe papers. General Howe participated in the East Florida campaigns and was a frequent visitor to Sunbury.

Two major primary sources included Lieutenant Colonel (Sir) Archibald Campbell’s journal (Campbell 1981) and Ensign John Wilson’s journal (Davis 1986a). These documents, as well as other unpublished manuscript material by Campbell (1779a and b) and Wilson (1779, 1780), provided vital insight into Sunbury's role in the war. An important aspect of future research should include the development of summary biographies of the various officers and soldiers posted at Sunbury. This list should include both American Patriot, Loyalists, and British soldiers. Table 15 contains a preliminary list of American, British and Loyalist officers who served at Sunbury. Those American officers who were most influential in Sunbury's history include: Major Generals Charles Lee, Robert Howe, Benjamin Lincoln and John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg; Brigadier Generals Samuel Elbert, Lachlan McIntosh, and William Moultrie; Colonels Charles C. Pinckney, Thomas Morris, George Walton, and John White; Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Sumter; Major Joseph Lane; and Captains Mark Carr, Patrick Carr, John Baker, and John Dollar.

Biographical data on American enlisted men at Fort Morris was not compiled in the present study. A wealth of information is available for these men in pension applications, muster lists, troop returns, and scattered throughout official correspondence. Some of this information is available in family histories and other genealogical sources. This study identified many primary and secondary sources where additional information about the common soldier at Fort Morris can be gleaned. No images of these men were located.
Biographical information and images of British and Loyalist officers proved to be more elusive to obtain than for the Patriots. Images for only one of the officers at Sunbury was located--that of Major General Augustin Prevost. Important British and Loyalist officers who served at Sunbury and deserve further study include: Major General Augustin Prevost; Lieutenant Colonels Isaac Allen, Thomas Brown, John Harris Cruger, Lewis V. Fuser, John Marc Prevost and Captain Patrick Murray.

Muster lists, troop returns, and payroll lists for some of the British and Loyalist regiments that were at Sunbury have survived. These were not fully researched in the present study. As for the Americans, few period images of British or loyalist soldiers exist. None were located that specifically pertained to the troops at Sunbury.

The gathering of relevant, comparable archaeological excavation data on Revolutionary War military sites proved to be a difficult task. Although many survey and excavation projects have been conducted on major military sites in the country over the past 150 years, most of the reports on this work were produced in very limited quantity, are unpublished, and are not widely circulated. A bibliography of these types of studies was included in John Cotter's bibliography on historical archaeology (Cotter 2003). A review of Cotter's compilation reveals quite a few references to Revolutionary War era excavations at battlefields, encampments, and fortifications, such as, Monmouth, Saratoga, Trenton, Valley Forge, and Yorktown. Most of these are manuscript reports, however, are only on file in state or federal park offices and are not readily available to researchers in Georgia.

A wide range of archives, libraries, agencies, private collections, and other sources was consulted for the present research. As the researchers delved deeper into the mysteries of Fort Morris, more potential sources were uncovered. It was not possible to examine all of them and much historical research remains to be conducted on future Fort Morris projects. A few potential sources that were identified in the present study, but were not examined, are discussed below. Continued study of these materials will allow a more comprehensive and interesting story to unfold about Sunbury's forts.

Additional research should be conducted at the Library of Congress and the National Archives and Records Administration at their facilities in College Park, Maryland and Washington, D.C. A few collections that have particular bearing on Sunbury and the American Revolution in Georgia include: The Papers of William Drayton (Drayton 1778) and other materials in the Peter Force Papers (Force 1848, various dates). The Papers of the Continental Congress and the Journal of the Continental Congress were consulted in the present study, but were not fully explored (NARA 1959, 1774-1789; United States Continental Congress 1959). Additional study of these records is advised. The Journal of the Continental Congress is available online at the Library of Congress website (LOC 2003).

Documents pertaining to the history of British East Florida and subsequent Spanish East Florida are located in various repositories within the State of Florida, including the Florida State Archives, Tallahassee, and the University of Florida Library, Gainesville.
None of these repositories were visited in the present study. A more thorough examination of the historical documents from the loyalist Floridian perspective would enhance the accuracy of the story of Fort Morris and Sunbury.

Collections of the New York Historical Society include many books and documents pertaining to the loyalists from New York and New Jersey who were associated with Sunbury, Georgia. While a minor amount of research was conducted at this repository that benefited this study, many more sources were identified from the site’s BOBCAT search engine but not physically examined. These include limited edition books by Dawson (1886) and many unpublished manuscripts. Relevant manuscript collections at the New York Historical Society include: the Captains Frederick DePeyster, Sr., and Frederic DePeyster, Jr. papers at the New York Public Library. Captain DePeyster commanded the New York Volunteers, who participated in the Georgia campaign, although he and his men are not positively linked to Sunbury. The DePeyster papers may contain information relevant to the loyalist troops at Sunbury (DePeyster 1758-1834).

Sources in Europe were not directly examined in the present study but many exciting archival resources were identified by the research. The primary resource for research in England is the British Public Records Office at Kew. Many libraries and private manuscript collections also have the potential to shed new light on events in Sunbury in the American Revolution. One example identified by this research is the private papers of Sir Christopher Prevost, which are located in Europe and include numerous documents pertaining to his ancestor, Major General Augustin Prevost. Copies of these materials are available on microfilm at the National Archives in Ottawa, Canada, where they form part of the Sir George Prevost fonds (Reference Number R9686-0-4-E, Transcripts No: MSS982). The author corresponded with Sir Christopher for this project. Sir Christopher Prevost was kind enough to provide an electronic image of his ancestor, Augustin Prevost, which is included in this report.

Online resources on the World Wide Web proved to be a vital research tool in the present study. The future trend should make this type of research even more significant and useful. Several websites were cited in this report. An exemplary case is "The On-Line Institute for Advanced Loyalist Studies", which contains a wealth of information on the men and loyalist units in the American Revolution (Cole and Braisted 2002). Other distinguished examples include: AmericanRevolution.org (2002), The American Revolution Round Table (2003), The Brigade of the American Revolution (2003), Independence Hall Association (2003), Revwar.com (2002), Sons of the Revolution (2003), and Land & Sea Battles of the American Revolution (Robertson et al. 2002).

Various modern publications provided information on British and American military units, personnel, and their uniforms and equipment. These included:

- American Navy, (Allen 1913; Clark 1964; Mahan 1913; Millar 1978);
- American medical department, (Ashburn 1929; Duncan 1970; Gillett 1990; Reiss 1998; Risch 1981);
• American and British artillery, training techniques, and fortifications (AmericanRevolution.org 2002; Muller 1780; Peterson 1969; Vauben 1968; Von Steuben 1985);
• British Army units, (Bruce 1985; Curtis 1926; May 1974);
• British Navy, Tilley (1987);
• British medical department, Kaufman (2001); and

Other collections that were examined in-house, or via the internet included the Revolutionary Records of Georgia, CD-Rom edition, and various records at the British Public Records Office, PROCAT online search (Candler 2001; BPRO 2004).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY METHODS

The town of Sunbury is recorded as 9Li4 and Fort Morris is recorded as 9Li168 (Georgia Archaeological Site File (GASF) 2001; U.S.G.S. 1958). Fort Morris was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1970. Sunbury has not been nominated to the NRHP.

The survey team attempted to re-establish the site grid that was used in Midgette’s archaeological investigation (Midgette 1973). No benchmarks from Midgette's study were located, so this relocation was approximate. Midgette's Transit Station A was located on the rampart crest of the northeast bastion of the fort. It was near this point that the present archaeological team established Datum 1, which was a hollow aluminum rod that was driven into the ground. UTM Coordinates were compiled for this location, using a Garmin V hand-held GPS receiver with WAAS capability, which guaranteed an effective accuracy of 5 m or better. Eleven readings at this grid point were taken and averaged, in turn, these results were averaged to yield a UTM location for Datum 1 of E473508 N3513888. The degree of accuracy for each of these calculations ranged from 3.3 to 4.6 m. The last four digits of the north and east coordinates of the averaged UTM location (3508 North 3888 East) served as the site's coordinate system. Grid numbers increased to the north and east from this point and decreased to the south and west, accordingly. Grid North was synonymous with Magnetic North, which was derived by using a hand-held compass. Midgette's site plan indicates that he also employed Magnetic North as his Grid North. Since the GPS hand-held units characteristically yield inaccurate elevation data, an arbitrary elevation of 10 m above sea level was created by the survey team for the ground surface at Datum 1.

The topographic mapping of the site was accomplished by a two-person crew with a Topcon Total Station and a TDS data collector. Transit data was downloaded using Survey Link software and post-processed using Surfer and Design CAD software.

The Fort Morris State Historic Site (9Li168) property, consisting of approximately 70 acres, was sampled by shovel tests spaced at regular and irregular intervals. The present survey effort was integrated into this previous survey work by Southern Research in 2001 (Elliott 2005b). During that study, the interior of the Fort Defiance parade ground was
systematically covered with shovel tests spaced at 5 m intervals. The flanking areas to the south and west were less rigorously examined and spacing between the tests was variable. The area of park property beyond site 9Li168 was examined by a reconnaissance-level shovel test survey in 2001. No shovel tests were excavated where improvements (i.e., parking lot, roads, visitor's center, utility corridors, etc.) were located. Nor were any shovel tests excavated in wetlands. The location of each positive shovel test in the undeveloped portions of the study area was recorded using Garmin-brand handheld Global Positioning System (GPS) receivers with WAAS capability, which guaranteed an accuracy rate of 5 m or better. All shovel tests within the developed areas of the park were recorded with the laser transit. The undeveloped area of the state property west of the developed parts of Fort Morris yielded only two positive shovel tests in the 2001 study. The shovel test survey within the parade ground and west of the fort also served as a check of the remote sensing study.

In the present study additional shovel tests were excavated on developed and undeveloped portions of 9Li168. The placement of these tests was guided by metal detector finds. The combination of these two survey methods proved quite fruitful, as described below.

**Ground Penetrating Radar Background and Methods**

GPR was developed by the U.S. Department of Defense during the Vietnam War as an aid in remotely locating Viet Cong tunnels. Since then the technique has been extensively miniaturized and the technological capability enhanced to a point where today a single individual with a minimum of instruction can conduct a GPR survey with ease. GPR has been demonstrated to be an effective, non-destructive tool in archaeological research (Conyers and Goodman 1997; Conyers 2002; Conyers et al. 2002; Briuer et al. 1997).

The GPR device uses high frequency electromagnetic waves 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 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). The approximate depth of an object can be estimated with GPR, by adjusting for electromagnetic propagation conditions.

Ground penetrating radar signals cannot penetrate 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 cannon or man-hole 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. 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).

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 soils have moderately good properties for its application. Both metal and salt water were expected to be present in the Fort Morris vicinity. It was anticipated that metal and salt water would have some effect on the data that was gathered. The soils at the Fort Morris site were well drained, however, and salt water was not a significant problem at shallower depths.

GPR has been used to a limited extent on archaeological sites in Georgia yielding mixed results. A study of a Creek habitation site in Muscogee County, which was part of the Uptoi village, ca. 1790 to 1825, included GPR as part of a battery of geophysical techniques that were employed to delineate these sites (Elliott et al. 1999; Briuer et al. 1997). The GPR technique was able to identify disturbed areas of soil, at least some of which resulted from Creek-related phenomena. In the brief time that has elapsed since Briuer and his colleagues conducted this study, the GPR technology and equipment has significantly improved. Elsewhere in Georgia, GPR has been used to survey a number of Indian earthworks and historic cemeteries (Wynn 2002, Friends of Scull Shoals 2002). Most recently GPR was employed to study Revolutionary War resources at the New Ebenezer town site in Effingham County, Georgia, and at the Colonial era Horton House site in Glynn County, Georgia (Elliott 2005a; Rita Elliott 2002).

GPR has been successfully employed at early domestic sites, cemeteries, and military sites in the eastern United States (Hodge et al. 2002, Kvaamme 2002). Historic graves are often easy to recognize in radargrams, as evidenced by a pronounced hyperbola. When 3-D slices intersect these hyperbolas the graves are usually clearly evident in plan view.

The GPR survey at Sunbury consisted of two weeks of fieldwork, followed by post-processing of the data and write-up. Fieldwork for the GPR survey commenced on January 5, 2004. This work was conducted by Mr. Daniel T. Elliott with one field assistant. The survey employed the latest RAMAC system that was leased from MALÅ GeoScience USA, Charleston. Elliott has used this system on numerous previous GPR projects with great success.

The GPR equipment used for this study consisted of a RAMAC/X3M Integrated Radar Control Unit, mounted on a wheeled-cart and linked to monitor. MALÅ GeoScience’s Windows-based acquisition software program Ground Vision (Version 1.3) was used to acquire and record the radar data (MALÅ GeoScience USA 2002). The radar information was displayed as a series of radargrams, or radar profiles of each transect. Easy 3D
software (Version 1.0), which was developed by MALÅ GeoScience, was used in post-
processing the radar data and 3-D imaging. This entailed merging the data from the series 
of radargrams for each block. Once this was accomplished, horizontal time slices of the 
data were examined for important anomalies and pattern clusters of anomalies, which 
were likely of cultural relevance. These data were displayed as aerial plan maps of the 
sample areas at varying depths below ground surface. These horizontal views, or time-
slices, display the radar information at a set time depth in nanoseconds. Time-depth can 
be roughly equated to depth below ground. This equivalency relationship can be 
calculated using a mathematical formula.

The GPR sample blocks at Sunbury were composed of a series of parallel transects, or 
traverses, which yielded a two-dimensional cross-section or profile of the radar data. 
This two-dimensional image is constructed from a sequence of thousands of individual 
radar “pings” or 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 present GPR fieldwork at Sunbury and Fort Morris built upon previous GPR survey 
work, which was conducted on the Fort Morris State Historic Site in September 2002 
(Elliott 2003a, 2005b). The earlier project was exploratory in nature and represents one of 
the first attempts to apply the GPR technique to military sites in Georgia. In the initial 
GPR study of Fort Morris, two areas of the Fort Morris site were examined: the parade 
ground of Fort Defiance, and an area west of Fort Defiance. [The Revolutionary War Fort 
Morris was obscured by the construction of the War of 1812 Fort Defiance (Gadsen 
1815). The spatial relationship between these two forts is discussed in greater detail later 
in this report, or see Elliott 2005b]. Subsurface radar signatures, which often indicate 
archeological deposits such as features or concentrations of artifacts, were located in 
each of these areas. Although salt water may affect the radar signals at greater depths, 
the soils containing most of the archeological strata are relatively well-drained and 
produced adequate radar signals.

The present study included continued study of areas north and south of Fort Defiance, as 
well as two areas in the town of Sunbury—the Sunbury Cemetery and one town lot. 
These GPR blocks were identified by letter designations. Blocks A through G were 
completed in the 2002 study. The ABPP study included Blocks H, J through N, P through 
Z, and AA through AC. The sampling interval used for all of the GPR sample blocks in 
the present study was 40 cm. A 500 megahertz (MHz) shielded antenna was used for data 
gathering. Transects in all blocks were run from East to West and lines progressed from 
South to North. Odd numbered transects were made from west to east and even numbered 
transects ran from east to west. Horizontal time slices of the GPR data were generated for 
the sample blocks using the Easy 3D software. This report presents a series of these 
images. All of the aerial (or plan) views of these time slices in the report are oriented with 
grid north facing up.


Metal Detector Survey

Nautilus and Fisher brands of metal detectors were employed in the present study to locate buried metal objects related to the forts. These tools proved to be very important for locating certain classes of artifacts that were rare in the excavations. The locations of metal detected items were plotted with the laser total station. Artifacts were bagged by provenience and related information of the depth of artifact was recorded on field forms. The metal detector also was useful for locating non-ferrous metal items in the levels within the excavation units so that they could be carefully retrieved by troweling. This knowledge led to the careful recovery of many fragile items, particularly buttons, brass and lead objects.

Archaeological Testing

A limited number of test units was excavated in selected areas of Sunbury for this project. The dimensions of the test units were 1 m by 1 m and 1 m by 2 m. Excavation was accomplished in 10 cm arbitrary levels, or natural levels within 10 cm levels. The topsoil zone, or plowzone, was removed as a single stratum. The contents of the test units were screened through ¼ inch hardware cloth. All artifacts except oyster shell and brick, stone and mortar building debris were saved. The discarded material was first quantified by weight, which was recorded in grams or kilograms. The floor of each excavation level was carefully cleaned and inspected for any evidence of features. Plan drawings and photographs were made of excavation levels containing features.

Features were excavated separately from the rest of the unit level. Soil samples were collected from non-post features for special study. Where feasible the excavations were continued to sterile subsoil. A minimum of one soil profile was drawn and photographed at the completion of each test unit excavation.

Laboratory Analysis and Curation

Artifacts were returned for processing to the LAMAR Institute laboratory in Box Springs, Georgia where they were washed, cleaned and cataloged to professional standards. Selected metal artifacts were subjected to electrolysis for long term conservation. Analysis sheets were completed for each provenience. Artifacts were categorized according to a classification system based on South's (1977) Activities, Architectural, Arms, Clothing, Furniture, Faunal, Kitchen, Personal, and Tobacco groups.

The Activities, Furniture, and Personal Groups traditionally contain the fewest number of recovered artifacts. The Activities Group contains items such as axes, glass flaked tools, hatchets, plow parts, sheet copper or iron, lead strips or other items used in an activity. The Furniture Group consists of furniture hardware such as brass tacks, braces, cushion
springs, lock plates, and escutcheons. The Personal Group contains items traditionally belonging to or used by an individual, such as jewelry, a watch, or a hair comb.

The Tobacco Group includes tobacco pipe bowls and stems, typically of kaolin, stoneware, redware, or aboriginal clays. Tobacco pipestem date estimates were calculated using four different formulas, that of Binford, Hanson, Heighton and Deagan, and Omwake (Binford 1962; Hanson and Hsu 1975; Heighton and Deagan 1972; Omwake 1956, 1958, 1967). Other sources consulted for the identification of tobacco pipes included Walker (1977) and Stone (1974).

Architectural Group artifacts include brick, hardware, mortar, nails, plaster, tile, and window glass. Fragments of brick, rock, tabby, tabby mortar, and plaster were weighed in grams, recorded and discarded in the field (except where selected samples were retained). Large pieces of brick were analyzed by method of manufacture, including hand made, machine made, and unidentifiable. Nails were analyzed by method of manufacture (wrought, cut, or wire) when possible. Many nails were only identified as wrought or cut (square but too corroded for further identification) or unidentified (indeterminate as to square or round). Because of their overwhelming bulk in the artifact assemblage, nails were tabulated by weight. A large sample of nails also was counted and weighed. Estimates of nail counts for proveniences where only weights were recorded were derived from these data.

Artifacts within the Arms Group can include bullets, gunflints (English spall and French honey colored flints), gun hardware, lead shot, and musket balls. Gunflints were measured in an effort to determine the type of gun on which they were used. The diameter of lead balls also was recorded to the nearest one hundredth of an inch, or caliber. Important references consulted for identification of the arms group artifacts included Darling (1987), Hamilton (1976), Hamilton and Emery (1988); Kenmotsu (1990); Neumann (1967, 1991); Neumann and Kravic (1989), and Sivilich (1996).

The Clothing Group consists of clothing fasteners such as buckles, buttons, and hooks and eyes. Buttons were identified and dated, when possible, by manufacturing technique and material (Olsen 1963; South 1964, 1977; Troiani 2001). Other items were coded according to material, such as brass, iron, or pewter. Important sources for buckle identification included Abbott (1973), Stone (1974), and Hanson and Hsu (1975).

Kitchen Group artifacts include items such as ceramics, bottle glass, and tableware. Ceramics were identified according to paste and glaze and classified into ware categories, based on South (1977), which includes earthenware, stoneware, and porcelain. They were further categorized by decoration and motif (Miller 1991). Other ceramic identification sources were consulted as necessary (Bivins 1972; Coysh and Henrywood 1982; DeBolt 1994; Garrow 1982; Godden 1996; Greer 1981; Ketchum 1975; 1991; Kovel and Kovel 1986; Noel Hume 1983; Rauschenburg 1991; Seidel 1990; Sloan 1964; South 1977, 1993). When possible, sherds were classified by vessel morphology (rims, bases, bodies, or handles) and vessel type (plate, platter, bowl, or cup). Bottle glass was analyzed by method of manufacture, color and function depending on the elements of the bottle.
recovered from the archaeological record. Analysis attributed function to bottles and fragments whenever possible, such as spirit, medicine, or condiment bottle (Jones 1986, 1993; Jones and Sullivan 1985; Lorrain 1968; McKearin and McKearin 1989).

All data were recorded on artifact analysis sheets, along with an artifact code for each artifact type. Data from analysis sheets were entered into a Microsoft Access database to enable data manipulation for the production of mean ceramic dates (MCD) based on South (1977) and terminus post quem (TPQ) dates, along with other artifact interpretation methods.

Artifacts requiring special conservation were properly treated. All artifacts were packaged in archival quality interlocking plastic bags (minimum 3 mm thick) or in small archival boxes. Each bag was labeled with its proper catalog number and other pertinent location information. In addition, this information was placed on an acid-free paper label within each bag. All collections were packed in acid-free archival boxes, 15 in by 12 in by 10 in, with each box properly labeled front and back. Paper records were boxed separately from their associated artifacts.

The archaeological fieldwork will began on December 29, 2003 and was completed in early February 2004. Fieldwork was conducted by a four-person crew over this period. The crew was housed at the Fort Morris State Historic Site “Glenn Mills” cottage.

**Strategy for Recording Battlefield Boundary and Intrasite Patterning**

The three known Revolutionary War skirmishes/battles for control of Sunbury and Fort Morris covered a large geographic area, which included the entire town of Sunbury, its terrestrial and riverine approaches, and the fortifications that surrounded the town. The Sunbury Battlefield survey followed established ABPP procedure for defining battlefield boundaries, which begins with the encampments of the attacking force on the eve of battle and ends at the close of day after the battle is completed. Using this definition, it was not possible to survey all of the geographic locations that were deemed relevant to the battle in the present study. Many of the resources are likely submerged in the Medway River, tributary creeks and marsh. Other associated sites are several miles from the primary core study area of Sunbury, such as Colonel’s Island. British camp locations on the eve of battle are known only from historic accounts. The geographic locations of any American camps also are restricted to the historical record. The survey was expected to find some evidence of encampments that were near Sunbury. Some of these may be associated with other military campaigns, such as the three failed American attempts to conquer British East Florida (from 1776 to 1778). Sunbury was used as a staging area and hospital during these three campaigns.

The survey targeted areas of high probability for containing archaeological remains. This included areas that have not been severely altered by modern developments. Recent developments (defined as those constructed since 1990) in the study area include a restaurant, condominium, houses, and a large pond. No underwater resources were examined in the present study, except those encountered on the exposed surface along the
shoreline. Archival documentation of potential underwater sites related to the battles at Sunbury was gathered by the survey. A series of Defining Features for the Sunbury Battlefield was identified from the historical research. These are listed below.

List of Defining Features for Sunbury Battlefield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Relevance to Battle</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Field Comment</th>
<th>Map?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>9Li1</td>
<td>Captured town</td>
<td>Jones; RRG</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fort Morris</td>
<td>Liberty County, GA</td>
<td>Patriot fort</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fort George</td>
<td>9Li1</td>
<td>British fort</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>British battery</td>
<td>9Li1</td>
<td>Bombed Ft. Morris</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Tentative ID</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>British lines</td>
<td>Outside Ft. Morris</td>
<td>British troop position</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>American camp</td>
<td>Outside Ft. Morris</td>
<td>Bivouac for E. Fla. Campaigns</td>
<td>Moultrie</td>
<td>Tentative ID</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Galley Bullock</td>
<td>Sunbury bar</td>
<td>Destroyed in battle</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Galley Washington</td>
<td>Ossabaw Island</td>
<td>Beached &amp; burned</td>
<td>Sheftall</td>
<td>Outside study</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Galley Trumbull</td>
<td>Ossabaw Island</td>
<td>Beached &amp; burned</td>
<td>Sheftall</td>
<td>Outside study</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>POW camp</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>American &amp; British POWs</td>
<td>Sheftall</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Moultrie</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>9Li1 (4 cemns known)</td>
<td>Soldiers (likely buried)</td>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>Inferred</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medway River</td>
<td>Liberty County, GA</td>
<td>Watercourse</td>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>Identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Campbell 1779; Jones 1997; RRG-Revolutionary Records of Georgia (Candler 1908); Murray n.d.; NOAA-National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Historical Charts 2005; Sheftall 1995.

During the planning phase of the ABPP work, landowners were contacted to obtain access properties in areas likely to contain these camps. One such area, the Charles Jones tract—a 10 acre tract immediately adjacent to the Fort Morris State Historic Site property, was available for study. This area was examined through systematically placed shovel tests and test units. Areas on the Fort Morris State Historic Site property also were systematically examined with shovel tests for this purpose. A metal detector also was employed to hone the areas selected for study.

GPR survey was used on the periphery of the existing earthworks at Fort Morris State Historic Site, east and west of the extant Fort Defiance earthwork, to investigate buried evidence of that fort, as well as earlier and later forts that have been leveled or obscured from any surface indications.

Resources in the study area were mapped using GPS handheld devices and a total station. The GPS devices were used in more remote areas that were difficult to access. Topographic maps were made in three sections of the study area with the aid of the total station. These included:

- Areas surrounding Fort Morris, particularly east of the fort;
- Areas surrounding the Sunbury Cemetery to the Sunbury Road; and,
- Areas surrounding an area on Sunbury’s northwest side.

The topographic maps were established using existing geographic reference data and the site grid created in 2002 for the Fort Morris State Historic Site. In other areas datum rods were erected and coordinates determined by using GPS devices and existing land lines or significant landmarks.
Estimate of Remaining Site Resources

The archaeological survey of the Sunbury battlefield resulted in the destruction of a very small fraction of the entire site. We estimate that under 0.00001 percent of the site was sampled by shovel tests or small test units. The site is quite large, encompassing an entire eighteenth century town and its surrounding fortifications. The initial estimate of the study area size was given at 150 acres. In reality, it is probably considerably larger than that, particularly if the associated campsites and approaches are included. Approximately 30 percent of the archaeological resources remain in the project area. The ABPP project resulted in a more informed estimate of the battlefield’s extent.

Archaeological Resources Protection Act Procedures and Other Federal Permit Requirements

The survey area included no Federal Property or Native American (Indian) property. Consequently, no Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) permits were required for the present study. Sunbury contains two known cemeteries and the possibility that additional human remains are located within the study area is highly likely. The present survey was designed so as not to disturb these remains. GPR survey, which is a non-destructive survey technique was used in areas where graves are extremely likely to occur. This included the margins of the two known cemeteries.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

An important component of the Sunbury Battlefield Survey project was public outreach (Figures 2 and 3). This began by contacting landowners in Sunbury to secure formal permission to conduct research on their property. Conversations with various landowners in Sunbury were conducted throughout the project, and in these conversations, the researchers tried to impart the goals and public value of the project. A number of important alliances were forged as a result of these conversations. Many landowners provided unique historical information about the former land use in part of Sunbury and stories about notable artifacts and accidental discoveries of antiquities in Sunbury over the past few decades.

The public also was involved in the archaeological fieldwork at Sunbury. Volunteers included the staff at the Fort Morris State Historic Site, various local residents, and two Boy Scouts who were seeking to complete requirements for their Archaeology merit badge.

Public presentations formed another type of public outreach activity. Eight presentations on the current research at Sunbury were made in the course of this study, which included:
Figure 2. Boy Scouts Assist an Archaeologist in Excavating Test Unit 4, Sunbury.

Figure 3. Hilton Head Chapter Members Tour Sunbury, January 2004.
Hearty members of the Hilton Head Chapter of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina toured Sunbury on a chilly January morning. The participants were fascinated by the “high tech” RAMAC X3M set-up used in the GPR survey.

CURATION STATEMENT

The artifacts, notes and other records amassed by the Sunbury Battlefield ABPP research grant project are curated at the Riverbend Laboratory, Georgia Museum of Natural History, Athens, Georgia.
III. Sunbury's History

Sunbury was established in 1758 on a bend in the Medway River near its mouth. The town was created out of 500 acres conveyed by King George II to Mark Carr by royal grant on October 4, 1757 (Jones 2001:497). Three hundred acres of Carr’s 500 acres was designated for the town of Sunbury and 100 acres was designated as a common for the use of the future inhabitants (Jones 2001:497). Of the 500 acres allocated, the actual town occupied only 300 acres (200 acres for lots and 100 acres for town commons). Historian George White noted in 1854: "It [Sunbury] was laid out, in 1758, by Mark Carr and proposals were afterwards made to him to make a deed of trust for this tract of land, and accordingly he executed a deed to James Maxwell, Kenith Baillie, John Elliott, and John Stevens" (White 1854:513-514). These men laid out the town.

C.C. Jones, Jr. described the town plan,

The plan…embraced three public squares, known respectively as King’s Church, and Meeting, and four hundred and ninety-six lots. These lots had a uniform front of seventy feet, and were one hundred and thirty feet in depth. Lots numbered one to forty, inclusive, fronting on the river, were denominated Bay Lots, and carried with them the ownership of the shore to low water mark. Four lots constituted a block, bounded on three sides by streets, and on the fourth by a lane. The streets were seventy-five feet broad, and the lanes twenty feet wide. The plan of the town was entirely regular. The streets in one direction ran at right angles to the river, and were, at right angles, intersected by the cross-streets and lanes. From north to south the length of Sunbury, as thus laid out, was 3,430 feet. Its breadth on the south side was 2,230 feet, and on the north 1,880 feet (Jones 2001).

Jones further noted, “Within a short substantial time wharves were constructed, the most marked of which were subsequently owned and used by the following merchants: Kelsell & Spalding, Fisher, Jones & Hughes, Darling & Co., and Lamott” (Jones 2001:499). During one period in the eighteenth century Sunbury was the second largest town in Georgia (Sheftall 1995; Jones 1997:142-223; McIlvaine 1971, 1976).

Mark Carr’s civil ordinance in 1758 called for lot owners, within one year of purchase, to build, “on each front lot…an House of at l east 32 feet long & 18 feet wide covered w/ cypress shingles, floored with boards, & a brick, stone, or lime chimney…”, or pay a penalty for each month that the house was not built. This rule apparently applied only to the Front lots (Sheftall 1995:7). In addition to his providing the property for the creation of Sunbury, Mark Carr also was one of its prominent town lot owners. A November 8, 1764 advertisement in the Georgia Gazette, announced the sale of Carr’s, “lot in Sunbury, no. 1”, and other commodities, including 20 negroes, livestock, and, “a quantity of wool” (Kilborne 1999a:79). Carr did not actually sell the lot until three years later, however (Liberty County Deed Book B:534-41). Other Sunbury town lots owned by Mark Carr included Lots 41, 72, 249, 250, 265 and 266. Carr, in concert with the Sunbury Trustees, was also listed as grantor for dozens of other town lots in Sunbury in the late 1760s. Mark Carr’s will was recorded on June 8, 1767 and his estate was appraised on February 27, 1768 (Georgia 1767, 1768).

The original settlers of Sunbury were part of the Midway settlement of Congregationalists who came to Georgia from Dorchester, South Carolina and who can trace their religious
origins to Dorchester, Massachusetts. These Congregationalists established a church at Midway and also at Sunbury. These churches evolved into Presbyterian churches by the early nineteenth century. The Sunbury Congregationalist Church was organized between 1763 and 1765 and its first pastor at Sunbury was Reverend James Edmunds. Reverend Edmunds was succeeded by Reverends Reuben Hitchcock and William McWhir. Reverends Hitchcock and McWhir also served as headmasters of the Sunbury Academy.

The State of Georgia granted a charter to the Congregational Church of Sunbury on March 20, 1790 (Mallard 1918:9; Groover 1987:22). Groover submits that the Sunbury Congregationalist Church had failed by 1793, after which the congregation attended services at Midway Church. Mallard (1918:9) indicates that the Sunbury Congregationalist Church had a longer life than three years. Reverend McWhir, who was a prominent figure in Sunbury, was ordained as a Presbyterian minister, so the Sunbury Congregationalist Church may have become transformed into the Sunbury Presbyterian Church during his ministry. Documentation to support this transformation, however, was not located. The Reverend McWhir is buried in the Sunbury Cemetery and his grave is clearly marked.

In 1763 Royal Governor James Wright wrote to Lord Halifax in reference to Sunbury,

\[ I \text{ judged it necessary for his Majesty’s service that Sunbury, a well settled place having an exceedingly good harbor and inlet from the sea, should be made a port of entry; and have appointed Thomas Carr collector and John Martin naval officer for the same. There are 80 dwelling houses in the place. There are considerable merchant stores for supplying the town and the planters in the neighborhood with all kinds of necessary goods; and around it, for about 15 miles, is one of the best settled parts of the country (Wright, cited in Mallard 1918:9). } \]

Distant views of Sunbury are shown on several other late eighteenth century maps, including the Campbell and Desbarres maps, but these maps are of little value in determining the internal organization of the town (Figures 4 and 5).

C.C. Jones, Jr. redrafted an original map that had been in his family’s possession. Several versions of this map are extant, including a printed version published in Jones’ Dead Towns of Georgia (1997). One manuscript version, drawn by the hand of C.C. Jones, Jr. was located at Duke University, which is shown in Figure 6. Jones noted the town plan had been the property of his grandfather Joseph Jones, a resident of Sunbury, who was killed in the Siege of Savannah in October 1779. From Joseph Jones the map passed to his widow then to C.C. Jones, Jr. Unfortunately, the original town plan that was the basis of this map did not survive and no detailed town plan from the town’s hey-day are known. A later town plan of Sunbury, drawn by LeConte in the 1920s, is likely derived from Jones’ 1878 redraft. C.C. Jones, Jr.’s redraft of his grandfather’s copy of the Sunbury town plan is the best historical cartographic source available for Sunbury.
Figure 4. Portion of Campbell’s Map Showing Sunbury (Campbell 1779a).

Figure 5. Portion of Desbarres Map Showing Sunbury (Desbarres 1780).
Figure 6. Plan of Sunbury (C.C. Jones, Jr. Manuscript Collection, Courtesy, Perkins Library, Duke University).

Jones compiled a list of Sunbury lot owners in an effort to present the town as it appeared in 1775 on the eve of the American Revolution. Jones observed that about 371 of the town’s 496 lots had been sold by that time. Town lots that remained unsold were primarily located on the western and northern parts of town. The occupied lots in Sunbury were represented by numerous real estate transactions, which are summarized in Appendix 1.
In the spring of 1773, naturalist William Bartram visited Sunbury and he noted,

There are about one hundred houses in the town neatly built of wood frame having pleasant Piasas [sic] around them. The inhabitants are genteel and wealthy, either Merchants or Planters from the Country who resort here in the Summer and Autumn, to partake of the Salubrious Sea breeze, Bathing & sporting on the Sea Islands...Here is a Custom house and Naval office for the incouragement of Commerce (Bartram’s diary, cited in Sheftall 1995:19).

Reverend Jedidiah Morse, a former minister at the Midway Congregationalist Church, provided this summary of Sunbury in his 1798 American Gazetteer, “Sunbury, a port of entry and post-town of Georgia, Liberty co. about 15 miles S. of Great Ogeeche R. It is a very pleasant healthy town, and is the resort of the planters from the adjacent country, during the sickly months. An academy was established here in 1788. It is 40 miles S. of Savannah, and 974 from Philadelphia” (Morse 1798). Jedidiah and Richard Morse provided a brief summary of Sunbury in their 1821 Universal Gazetteer, which stated, “…It is a pleasant and healthy place, and is resorted to in the summer months by the planters of the adjacent country. In 1788, an academy was established here, which is a flourishing and highly respectable institution. The average number of students is 100” (Morse and Morse 1821:716).

Reverend Adiel Sherwood, a Baptist minister, provides a brief summary of Sunbury in his 1829 Gazetteer of the State of Georgia, which described the town as containing, “a flourishing academy, a house of worship for the Baptists, twenty dwelling houses, two stores, three offices, and a population of one hundred and fifty” (Sherwood 1829, cited in Jones 1997:218).

**SUNBURY’S DEFENSES**

The defense of Georgia’s coast and interior coastal plain has a rich history extending back more than a decade before the colony was established. Fort King George was established by South Carolina in the early 1720s near Darien (Cook 1990). The Savannah River borderlands were defended by other forts at Beaufort, Stokes Bluff or Palachacolas, and Sand Bar Ferry (Ivers 1974; Johnson 1992). Forts defended against the enemy who were, in the beginning, the Spanish, French and unfriendly Native American groups. During the first six years of its existence, military defense of the Georgia colony was administered by South Carolina’s governor and it was not until 1739 that Georgia had its own army under General James Edward Oglethorpe. General Oglethorpe is considered a brilliant strategist for his victory over the superior invading Spanish forces on St. Simons Island in the early 1740s, although this victory was probably more the result of the Spanish military’s ineptitude rather than a superior military plan on Oglethorpe’s part.

Throughout history, the forts of lower Georgia never fared well. The most well-known defeats include the Revolutionary War siege at the Spring Hill redoubt in Savannah and those at Forts Pulaski and McAllister in the Civil War. A lesser known defeats includes the capture of Fort Mount Venture on the lower Altamaha, where most of the garrison was killed by Spanish-allied Indians in 1742. Other forts, such as New Ebenezer, saw no direct action, although they often served as places of refuge and staging areas for other events in the theater.
of war, indirectly and severely impacting residents on both sides of the conflict (Hough 1975; Lawrence 1951; Elliott 1999, 2001, 2002; NPS 2003b).

Despite their flaws and embarrassing defeats the story of Georgia’s forts is most exciting and the search for their remains is a monumental task. Georgians have recognized several forts and have preserved them as parks, including Forts Frederica, King George, McAllister, Morris, Pulaski, and Wormsloe, but most fortifications lie forlorn in the wilderness patiently waiting the outcome of the race between development and historic preservationists. Meanwhile, these sites also are being negatively impacted by looters and metal detector enthusiasts.

The history of Fort Morris is inextricably linked to that of the colonial and early federal town of Sunbury, located immediately north of the fort site. The southern boundary of Sunbury is located a short distance north of the fort, and what is now Fort Morris State Historic Site property (Sheftall 1995:106-107, Illustrations 9 and 10). Consequently, few architectural features associated with the town site were expected to exist within the State Park property.

The military defenses along the Medway River actually predate the establishment of Sunbury with Captain Mark Carr's 1741 fort. The area of the current state park is within a 500-acre tract originally granted by the Georgia Trustees to Captain Mark Carr. Carr commanded a marine ranger company in Georgia during the Trustee period (ca. 1732 to 1751). He also owned property at several locations along the Georgia coast. Carr’s plantation, which was defended by “a guard of soldiers”, was attacked by Spanish-allied Indians on March 18, 1741 who were responsible for, "killing several of the soldiers and servants, wounding others, 'locking down the women and children in the cellar,’ pillaging the house, and carrying [sic] away the booty in a large boat belonging to the plantation” (Jones 1997:143-144). Although the precise location of Captain Carr’s fortified plantation is not known, resources associated with it may be contained within the State Park. No archaeological evidence of Carr’s fort was located in the present study. Such evidence may have been obliterated by subsequent fort construction or it may lie deeply buried beneath it.

In response to an Indian uprising in 1756, residents of the Medway River locality chose the “building and place for a fort, and it was determined by a majority that it should be at Captain Mark Carr’s, low down, and upon the river near the sound” (Jones 1997:178).

Historian George White cited this information on early defenses in Sunbury, which were recorded in the Midway Church records:

1756.-A letter came to us from the Hon. Jonathan Bryan... giving an account of some Creek Indians being slain ... and advising us with expedition to build a fort for our safety. People ... were immediately had about the building and place for a fort, and it was determined by a majority, that it should be at Captain Mark Carr's, low down, and upon the river near the sound, at about seven or eight miles distance from the nearest of the settlement of the Society, which accordingly was begun on the 20th September, 1756.... 1757, July 11.-.... we were called down this day to Sunbury, where we raised a couple of batteries, and made carriages for eight small cannon, which were at the place. 1757, July 16.-Before day, we were alarmed by the fire of cannon at Sunbury, whither we repaired, and a boat went out, but could discover nothing... (White 1854:517-518).
The French and Indian War was raging in 1757 throughout many parts of North America. As Sunbury was created the need for defensive fortifications was immediately realized by the Georgians. The Royal Colony of Georgia implemented a defense program in 1757, which included construction of numerous forts and other earthworks at key settlements, including Sunbury. Governor Henry Ellis also established the parish system for Georgia and the town of Sunbury was planned as the primary town of St. Johns Parish. On May 30, 1758 Governor Ellis wrote in a letter to the Board of Trade regarding condition of military defenses of the colony: "On my way I touch’d at the River Ogeeche and saw the Fort [Fort Argyle] that had lately been raised there in consequence of the Resolutions of the Assembly last year. It is a Quadrangular Figure, each side measuring 100 yards, constructed with thick logs set upright, fourteen feet long, five whereof are sunk in the Earth, and has four little Bastions, pierced for small and great guns that would render it very defenceable. From thence I proceeded to Medway where I found the Inhabitants had inclosed their Church in the same manner, and erected a Battery of eight guns at Sunbury in a very proper situation for defending the River" (Jones 2001, v. 1:530). Mark Carr conveyed property to be laid out for the town of Sunbury in June, 1758.

By 1760 a good log fort had been built at Sunbury. Neither the location of this fort nor its size and configuration was noted in the colonial Georgia records. The engineers charged with constructing Georgia's defenses during the third quarter of the eighteenth century included William DeBrahm and Henry Yonge. Of these, DeBrahm was the senior and more active participant. While no specific reference was located linking DeBrahm to Sunbury, his influence was almost certainly felt there. DeBrahm's forts at other locations in the southern colonies followed contemporary eighteenth century military thought in their placement and design (DeVorsey 1971). Examples that may serve as parallels to the 1760 log fort at Sunbury include fortifications at Charleston, Fort Barrington, Fort Loudon, Fort Barrington, New Ebenezer, and Savannah, Georgia.

Royal Governor Wright wrote to the Board of Trade in 1762 on the state of military affairs in Georgia, in which he gave descriptions of the various forts: “The number of the whole Militia in the province by my return to your Lordships in Decr. 1760, was 895 and which are now encreased [sic] to about 1100, which are divided into three Regiments. One, of the Inhabitants in, about and near Savanah [sic]. One, of the Inhabitants about Sunbury, and to the Southward” (Wright 1762:18).

The American Revolution ushered in a new role for Sunbury's fortifications, in which they were used against the British who had authorized their construction. From the beginning of the American Revolution until January 9, 1779 the Americans were in control of Sunbury and Fort Morris. As early as June 26, 1775 the Whigs of Sunbury displayed resistance to the laws of England, when they drove Isaac Antrobus, one of His Majesty’s customs officials, from the town (Sheftall 1995:20-21). On November 4, 1775 the Continental Congress passed a resolution authorizing the formation of one Continental battalion in Georgia, which was to consist of 728 men, including officers. The Georgia battalion was to be divided into eight companies, each containing: “one Captain, two Lieutenants, one Ensign, 4 Sergeants, 4 corporals, two drums or fifes and seventy-six privates” (Candler 2001: 1:77-78). Colonel
Lachlan McIntosh, Lieutenant Colonel Samuel Elbert, and Major Joseph Habersham were appointed to command the Georgia battalion (Candler 2001: 1:273).

Other troops, in addition to Georgia’s Continentals, were likely stationed at Sunbury. Georgia’s 3rd Regiment of militia was composed of men from St. Johns parish and adjacent areas to the south (Sheftall 1995:22). This regiment, which was formed in 1759 under the leadership of Colonel Mark Carr, was organized into one battalion at the beginning of the American Revolution. Its commanders during the war included Colonels Elisha Butler (1766-1776), John Baker (1776), James Screven (1776-1777), John Sandiford (1777-1778), John Elliott (1778-1779), and John Baker (1779-1781). John Baker was commissioned by the Georgia Council of Safety as captain of the St. Johns Riflemen and John Screven received a commission as captain of the St. Johns Rangers in January 1776 (Sheftall 1995:22).

The first military engagement at Sunbury was on April 21, 1776 when two armed British schooners—the Hynd and the anchored off the mouth of the Medway River. The Hinchinbrook sailed to Sunbury and its crew set fire to two ships—a brigantine, which was docked in a nearby creek where it was being loaded with lumber and an unidentified ship that was in dry-dock where it was being outfitted as a privateer. The American troops responded as the retreating ships passed by St. Catherine’s island when, “they were attack’d by about 6 hundred and Fifty or Sixty Crackers…on the Island of St. Catherine” (Sheftall 1995:22-23; Morgan 1964-1973, Volume 5:187, 367).

On June 8, 1776, the Georgia Council of Safety issued a resolution ordering Colonel John Baker and his 3rd Regiment, Georgia Militia, “to hire a number of negroes to finish in a more proper manner the intrenchments around Sunbury” (Collections of the Georgia Historical Society 1991 4:60). This record shows that the Georgians had already begun constructing fortifications at Sunbury by early June 1776. On July 5, 1776 the Continental Congress passed a resolution authorizing the erection of forts in Savannah and Sunbury. This resolution provided,

\begin{quote}
That two Companies of Artillery be raised, consisting of fifty men each, officers included, for the purpose of garrisoning such forts, in case they shall be erected at the expense of the said Colony, and that blank Commissions be delivered to the Delegates for the officers, to be fixed up by the Assembly or Convention of said Colony (Journal of the Continental Congress [JCC], 1904-1937: July 5, 1776; Candler 2001, v.1:197).
\end{quote}

The Continental Congress authorized the construction of a fort at Sunbury in July, 1776. On July 30, 1776 the Georgia Council of Safety authorized funds for Mr. Andrew, “for erecting a battery in the Town of Sunbury” (Sheftall 1995:24). Sometime between April 1777 and November 25, 1778, Fort Morris, a Revolutionary War fort, was constructed by the Americans on the southern edge of the town of Sunbury (Jones 1997:179; Boatner 1968; Sheftall 1995:30-31). Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell’s map of his invasion route depicts the fort at Sunbury as a rectangular fort with projecting corner bastions (Campbell 1779a). Campbell’s map also shows fortifications encircling the Town of Sunbury with periodic bastions positioned at key points on the perimeter. Campbell's map is the most detailed contemporary depiction of Sunbury's forts that has been located to date.
Sunbury was a strategic place in the American Revolution. It was used as a supply depot, shipyard, and bivouac point for American troops. Construction and outfitting of five American galleys took place at Sunbury or at the shipyard on nearby Colonel’s Island. On August 9, 1776, James Kitching, loyalist customs collector at Sunbury, wrote to East Florida’s British Governor Tonyn advising him of, “an Armament by Land & Sea”, that was currently being prepared in Sunbury, “…consisting of a large flat on which was Mounted One Twelve pounder & Six Swivels with two Small Schooners Attendants and about One hundred and Eighty Men, destined for the River St. Marys…” (Morgan 1964-1973, volume 6:134-135). Days after that letter Continental troops from Virginia and North and South Carolina under Generals Charles Lee, Peter Muhlenberg, Robert Howe and William Moultrie arrived at Sunbury.

Sunbury was used by the Americans as a staging area for three unsuccessful attempts to capture East Florida. The American Patriots desired to control East Florida because it was the only southern British colony that was not firmly in their control in the early years of the war. The first of these efforts was in September 1776 when North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia militia assembled at Fort Morris. This campaign was cut short by a duel between two American primary officers from Georgia, Lachlan McIntosh and Button Gwinnett. Gwinnett died as a result of his wounds and General George Washington soon transferred McIntosh to the northern theater. The next attempt to take Florida was in June 1777 when the Georgia Continentals, led by Colonel Samuel Elbert, grouped at Fort Morris. This campaign failed, largely as the result of a power struggle between Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh and Georgia Governor Button Gwinnett. That struggle for power, which resulted in Gwinnett’s death and McIntosh’s reassignment to the northern war theater. In the third and final attempt to control East Florida, approximately 2,600 troops, including Georgia and South Carolina Continentals, Georgia and South Carolina Militia, and the American Navy, led by Major General Robert Howe, converged at Fort Morris. General Howe held a council of war at Fort Tonyn, which was located just across the Georgia-Florida border near the town of St. Marys. Despite the fact that they held the edge on the retreating loyalist Floridians, that body decided against probing further into Florida and they retreated eastward. These three attempts or campaigns by American forces to control East Florida, are detailed below.

**FIRST CAMPAIGN**

The first campaign of the American Army against British and Loyalist forces in East Florida lasted approximately one month, from August 21 to September 20, 1776. Sunbury played an important role in this campaign. Once organized, the troops of the Southern Continental Army implemented a campaign to conquer East Florida. Sunbury’s role in this campaign was primarily as a headquarters, supply depot and bivouac point.

The American Southern Army was commanded by five Major Generals throughout the war; Charles Lee, Robert Howe, Benjamin Lincoln, Horatio Gates, and Nathanael Greene. The commander of the first Florida campaign was Major General Charles Lee, who was the first commander of the Southern District. Lee was an English-born Irishman who had emigrated to American and, because of his English military training, was made second in command in the fledgling American army. Before the campaign was completed, however, Major General
Lee was sent orders to meet with George Washington on August 8, 1776, whereupon he was relieved of his command in the South and reassigned to the North (Chase 1993, v. 5:65). Lee was later court-martialed for his peculiar behavior (ordering a retreat for no apparent reason) on the battlefield at Monmouth, New Jersey (Alden 1951). His military prowess in Georgia affairs were equally suspect.

The single battalion of the Georgia Continental Army in 1776, who were under the command of Colonel Lachlan McIntosh, and the other military forces in Georgia were described by Major General Charles Lee in a letter to the Board of War and Ordnance on August 27, 1776,

The present State of the strength of this Colony consists of Colonel McIntosh's Battalion (a return of which is here inclosed) a Company of Independent artillery consisting of 3 officers & 23 privates with about twenty five hundred militia of all sorts, but in a very great part of these (as I learn from the authority of their own Captains) very little confidence can be placed—their principles being extremely contaminated by a most pernicious banditti of Enemies to the common liberty—McIntosh's Battalion is really a very fine one (one of the best I think on the Continent)... (Lee and Bunbury 1872-1875:242).

Colonel Samuel Elbert commanded the Georgia Continentals from 1776 to 1779. Archaeologists consulted information relevant to the Sunbury vicinity in Samuel Elbert's published orderly book (Harden 1905). Both Generals McIntosh and Elbert played extremely important roles in Georgia’s military defense. The Georgia Continentals were greatly reduced as a result of the December 1778 capture of Savannah, the January 1779 capture of Sunbury, and the March 1779 defeat in the battle of Brier Creek. For a significant portion of the war, those who were not killed or captured fought in battles outside of Georgia. Also, many of the men who enlisted in the Georgia Continental regiments were from other colonies. Although most of the 1st Georgia Regiment was composed of local Georgians, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Regiments included many men from other colonies. By early August 1776, as it began their first unsuccessful expedition against East Florida, the Georgia Continental army consisted of: the 1st Georgia Regiment, 2nd Georgia Regiment, 3rd Georgia Regiment, 1st Georgia Continental Artillery, and the Georgia Regiment of Horse Rangers, which consisted of 10 Ranger troops (Oglesby 2002).

American Major General Lee dispatched Colonel John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg and the 8th Regiment, Virginia Continentals, commonly known as the German Regiment, to Sunbury as the advance element of the East Florida campaign. Peter Muhlenberg was a Lutheran minister, whose church in the Shenandoah Valley was comprised of a nearly equal mix of German and English speakers (Muhlenberg 1849; Hocker 1936). Upon General Washington's urgings Reverend Muhlenberg formed a regiment from his church congregation in mid-1776 and quickly marched south to join Major General Lee's army. One of the regiment's first assignments was in Sunbury, Georgia. Major General Lee issued marching orders from Savannah on August 21, 1776, which read,

Colonel Mughlenburg's [sic] Regiment to be supplied with two flints per man from the Stores-Capt. Harden's Company to furnish themselves immediately with skins for Monkeshins in leggings—powder horns and shot bags. Those who have not arms shall be furnish'd at Sunbury to which place they and Muhlenburg's [sic] are to march to-morrow morning--Hardens to have two spare Flints (Lee and Bunbury 1872-1875: 1873:253).
The ranking officers in the Continental Army’s 8th Virginia Regiment of Foot, or German Regiment, on that march were Colonel John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, Lieutenant Colonel Abraham Bowman, and Major Peter Helphenstine (Sanchez-Saavedra 1978:54-55). The regiment consisted of 10 companies, which were commanded by Captains, in (ascending numerical order by company): John Stevenson, Jonathan Clark, George Slaughter, William Darke, Richard Campbell (riflemen), Abel Westfall, David Stephenson, Thomas Berry, James Knox, and William Croghan. Muhlenberg’s Regiment also possessed 42 wagons and 11 horses (Lee and Bunbury 1872-1875: 1873:252).

The number of men in these companies under Muhlenberg’s command at Sunbury in 1776 was partially reconstructed by archaeologists during this project, from an examination of the surviving payroll lists. This reconstruction is detailed below.

Captain Berry’s Company, for the period from May 5, 1776 to April 30, 1777 consisted of 10 officers and 44 enlisted men. Of these, however, only 21 were listed as present on May 14, 1777 (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain (later Major) William Darke Company payroll for the same time period consisted of 11 ranking officers, 1 drummer, 1 fifer and 34 privates. When the muster was taken for Darke’s company on August 6, 1777, only 24 of these were listed as present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain James Knox’s Company payroll for the same period and muster roll, which was taken on August 15, 1777, list four officers and six privates. Of these only seven were present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain Abell Westfall’s Company payroll for the same period, and muster list taken on June 13, 1777, contained seven officers, 1 drummer and 42 privates. Of these only 33 were present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain Jonathan Clark’s Company muster roll of June 13, 1777 listed eight officers, one drummer, one fifer, and 33 privates. Only 20 of these were listed as present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain Matthias Hite’s Company (formerly Captain Richard Campbell Company) payroll record for July 31, 1776 to April 30, 1777 was badly mutilated. A muster roll for this company was taken on August 6, 1777 and it listed 12 officers, 1 fifer, and 56 privates. Only 46 of these were listed as present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain (later Major) Croghan Company’s muster list of May 18, 1777, listed 12 officers and 56 privates, although only 29 were listed as present on that day (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain George Slaughter’s Company muster list for May 18, 1777 contained 12 officers and 45 privates, although only 16 of these were listed as present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).
Captain David Stephenson’s Company muster roll for August 6, 1777 listed nine officers and 30 privates, although only 20 of these were present (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Records for John Stevenson Company were not located. Records for Captain Robert Higgins’ Company, which may be the same as Stevenson’s, were located. The payroll for Higgins’ Company from “the time of their enlistment to September 30, 1777” was recorded with a muster roll on October 15, 1777. The muster roll contained five officers and 15 privates. Of these, only nine were present on that date (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

Captain Abraham Kirkpatrick, who served as a staff officer for Muhlenberg’s regiment, had three officers and six privates under his command on April 26, 1778. Of these only seven were listed as present on that date (NARA M-881, Roll 1038).

The estimated size of the 8th Virginia Regiment in mid-1776 was about 474 troops, including Colonel Muhlenberg, as shown below. In addition to these men were 42 wagon drovers, and an unknown number of other support personnel. In all, the 8th Regiment at Sunbury numbered well over 500 people. The field and staff officers in May 1777 consisted of Colonel Bowman, Chaplain Christian Streight, Major Richard Campbell, Adjutant Abraham Kirkpatrick, Quartermaster Hezekiah Noakes, Surgeon Cornelius Baldwin, and Surgeon’s Mate Frederick Fleming (NARA M-246, Roll 106). The total number of them who died at Sunbury remains speculative. By mid-1777 however, at least 235 officers and soldiers were missing from the regiment. While many of these were killed or wounded in later battles, some portion of those died and were buried at Sunbury.

**Troop Strength of the 8th Virginia Regiment in 1776 and 1778.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total men</th>
<th>Present in 1777</th>
<th>Confirmed dead by 12/31/1776</th>
<th>Net Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croghan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 467 232 59 235
Citing William Moultrie, Peter Muhlenberg’s biographer, Henry A. Muhlenberg noted that Muhlenberg’s troops were, "…marched off in the utmost hast, without one necessary article, without artillery, and without even a medicine chest", and a few weeks later, were followed by "Generals Lee and Howe and Colonel Moultrie, with a considerable body of South Carolina troops" (Muhlenberg 1849:68).

Captain John Harden commanded a Company of North Carolina militia, who also formed Major General Lee's army in Georgia (Hocker 1936:71). Harden’s North Carolina militia also was garrisoned at Sunbury, although the details of their assignment there were less well documented in the official records.

Pension records filed by several enlisted men in the 8th Regiment provide additional insight into their time spent in Georgia. The pension application of Adam Cabbage, a Private in Captain Jonathan Clark’s Company, 8th Virginia Regiment, attests to the grueling trek of Muhlenberg’s men. After enlisting in the regiment in February 1776, Cabbage marched to the South under General Lee and then to Philadelphia; Williamsburg and Suffolk, Virginia; Charleston, South Carolina, then to Savannah, Georgia, and “from there to Sansberry [Sunbury] in the State of Georgia… most of the Company was sick, many of them died, those that were well were furloughed to go home” (Cabbage 1835). After their furlough the soldiers in the Company met at Millerstown, Virginia and marched to Philadelphia, Trenton, York River, Philadelphia, Monmouth, Brandywine and Germantown (Cabbage 1835). Another applicant was Private Joachim Fetzer, who served in Captain Clark’s Company, 8th Virginia Regiment for two years. Fetzer’s affidavit is more terse but notes that, “he marched to Sunbury in Georgia and back again” to Middlebrook, New Jersey (Fetzer 1823). A pension application for Adam Bible, 8th Regiment, which was filed by his wife Magdalena Bible in 1839, made no mention of any experience at Sunbury stating that, “under Col. Mulenberg he [Adam] served first a tour or two of duty to the South…marched as far as Charleston in South Carolina and that he afterwards marchd to the north…[where he fought] in the battle of Brandywine” (Bible 1839).

After leaving Sunbury and the South, Brigadier General Peter Muhlenberg’s 8th Virginia Regiment continued as an integral component of Washington’s Continental Army in the northeastern war theater. The 8th Regiment served valiantly in numerous battles, including Brandywine, Chesapeake Bay, Northern New Jersey, Monmouth, Trenton, the Defence of Philadelphia, and endured the hardships of a winter at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania in 1777 and 1778 (National Park Service 2005).

The 8th Regiment consisted of approximately 86 men who were organized in 10 companies while at Valley Forge. Colonel Abraham Bowman served as regimental commander. Five of the 8th Regiment’s 10 captains who were present at Sunbury, were present at Valley Forge. Captain Jonathan Clark was promoted to the rank of Major. Captain William Croghan, who had been at Sunbury, led a company of the 8th Regiment at Valley Forge and was appointed Brigade Major of Scott’s Brigade in May 1778. The other captains who were still with the regiment included Thomas Berry, David Stephenson, and Abel Westfall. By 1778 the 8th
Regiment also included members of the 4th Virginia Regiment. A review of the 8th Regiment’s muster rolls from Valley Forge reveals very few German surnames, which suggests that the ethnic composition of the regiment had undergone a transition between July 1776 and December 1777. Privates Cabbage and Fetzer, whose pensions were summarized above, were not among those in the Valley Forge muster rolls. Peter Muhlenberg ended his service in the Continental Army in 1783 after being brevated as a Major General.

A review of the pension applications of many of the officers of the 8th Virginia Regiment, including Abraham Bowman, Richard Campbell, Abraham Kirkpatrick, contained no mention of their service in Georgia or Sunbury (NARA M-804, Roll 305, 459, 1496). The pension claim of Captain Leonard Cooper, filed by his widow, stated that he had served under Muhlenberg from 1776 to 1785 and that he was in the “Battle of Bulltown Swamp”, but it made no mention of Sunbury. Captain Cooper did participate and was wounded in the skirmish at Bulltown Swamp in southern Liberty County, but that battle took place in November 1778, more that two years after the 8th Virginia Regiment had left Georgia (NARA M-804, Roll 648; Georgia Historical Commission 1958).

The ethnic transition of the 8th Regiment by 1778 and the absence of many of the enlisted men and officers who were in the regiment when it was in Georgia, may have been a result of the high level of mortality and sickness during its campaign in the South.

Rebel Captain Hugh McCall stated that Virginia and North Carolina troops, commanded by General Robert Howe, and South Carolina troops, commanded by General William Moultrie, marched to Georgia as part of Lee's campaign in 1776 and McCall noted, "General Howe proceeded as far as Sunbury. The sickly season had now commenced and disease prevailed to an alarming degree. The mortality was so great, that from ten to fifteen, became victims to the climate in one day" (McCall 1909:323-324).

East Florida’s Governor Tonyn summarized the ill-fated Patriot’s campaign in a letter to Lord Germain, dated October 18, 1776,

_I have the honour to acquaint your Lordship, that the intended expedition of the Rebels against this Province and their investing this Garrison has proved abortive, and I am credibly informed is laid aside. General Lee had collected about two thousand five hundred men in the southern Colonies in rebellion, and had advanced as far as Sunbury on his way to this Province. Lee was suddenly called to the North; the Troops then under the rebel Generals Armstrong and How were sickly, ill provided within military stores, and were backward in advancing._

_What chiefly contributed to frustrate this scheme was information that the Cherokees had declared in favour of the Government, and that two thousand had actually commenced hostilities on the back Settlements and that I had a considerable Body of Indians not only to cooperate in repelling them, from this Province, but to let loose and lay waste the frontiers of Georgia (Pennington 1930:29)._  

The Georgia army returned to American territory from their East Florida expedition in October 1776. That fall and winter the 2nd Georgia, 3rd Georgia, 1st Georgia Artillery, and 2nd Georgia Artillery were reorganized (Oglesby 2002).
In January 1777 the Regiment of Horse Rangers was reorganized into 12 troops. In February a 4th Georgia Regiment was authorized by the Continental Congress and the Georgia Provincial Artillery was adopted into the Continental Army and renamed the 3rd Georgia Continental Artillery Company (Oglesby 2002).

Although his campaign in Georgia was a disaster, Major General Lee outlined his plan for defense in Georgia, which was later implemented by Major General Robert Howe. Lee wrote to the Board of War and Ordnance on August 27, 1776:

...Three gallies are already on the stocks in this Port...besides the equipment of these gallies and boats, I propose establishing little Forts or Redoubts in certain situations on the Rivers St. Mary's Satilla, Sapello, and Altamaha which may enable us to make incursions from time to time (when circumstances require it) into East Florida, and render it dangerous for them to make attempts of a similar nature into Georgia. These Redoubts or little Forts will likewise serve as places of rendezvous, refreshment & retreat for Body's of Horse Rangers which ought continually to be patrolling on the Frontier...(Lee 1873:243-244).

SECOND CAMPAIGN

After Major General Lee left Georgia in September 1776, the Southern District command was held by Major General Robert Howe--a North Carolinian (Howe 1776-1778a, 1776-1778b; Bennett and Lennon 1991; Grimke 1911, 1912). Major General Howe lost no time in organizing another offensive against the British in Florida. By February 1777 the British troops from East Florida, under Colonel Lewis V. Fuser, were threatening Georgia. Colonel Fuser made an attempt to capture Fort Morris at Sunbury but was rebuffed. British troops penetrated as far north as Ogeechee Ferry (approximately 45 km north-northwest of Sunbury) in that campaign (Moultrie 1802:189). On February 1, 1777, one third of the Georgia militia from St. Matthews Parish was ordered to Medway [Midway] Meeting House, where they were to remain until further orders (Candler 2001: 1:225). By April 1777 the Georgians launched a second offensive against East Florida, which would also prove unsuccessful.

Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh continued in command of the Georgia Continentals during the period of the second offensive (Hawes 1957, 1968; Jackson 1979). His command was based at Sunbury in March 1777 (Hawes 1957:363). In January 1777 McIntosh ordered the Georgia Continentals to be distributed among the garrisons at Darien, and Forts Howe and Beard's Bluff on the Altamaha River, and Fort McIntosh on the Satilla River (McCall 1909:324). The fortifications at Forts Howe, Beard's Bluff, and McIntosh all met with unfortunate ends. Fort McIntosh, which was garrisoned by 40 men of the South Carolina 3rd Regiment and 20 Georgia Continentals, under command of Captain Richard Winn, were attacked by Colonels Brown, Cunningham, and McGirth and 70 East Florida Rangers and 80 Loyalist Indians on February 17, 1777. The British were reinforced by Lieutenant Colonel Fuser and the 60th Regiment on the following day, whereupon Captain Winn surrendered Fort McIntosh and it was burned by the British (McCall 1909:325-329).

Groover (1987:15) noted that the expedition by land and sea, “got underway at Sunbury on August 30, 1777”, ending less than a month later after it, “got as far as the Saint Marys River where it met with resistance from British land and sea forces”.
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The second campaign against East Florida was interrupted by the personality clash of two Georgians, Lachlan McIntosh and Button Gwinnett. Gwinnett was a resident of Liberty County. Gwinnett served as one of Georgia's delegates to the Continental Congress and was a signer of the Declaration of Independence (Jenkins 1926; Jensen 1926; Virtualogy 2005). Part of the conflict between McIntosh and Gwinnett involved the question who was to lead the Georgia troops--a role both men envisioned for themselves. It culminated with a duel on May 16, 1777 that was fought on a plantation near Savannah, in which both men were wounded and Gwinnett died from his wounds within two weeks. Shortly after the duel, McIntosh was reassigned to command the Northern Continental Army. For most of the rest of the war, McIntosh was busy in campaigns outside of Georgia, he returned to Georgia in mid-September 1779 to assist Major General Lincoln's Southern Army in the American siege of Savannah. McCall noted that McIntosh had returned to Georgia by July 1778, although this date may be incorrect (McCall 1909:332-335).

During the period of disagreement between McIntosh and Gwinnett, the Council of Safety intervened and gave military control of the Georgia troops to Colonel Samuel Elbert. Elbert, being a junior officer, was surprised by this great responsibility. The campaign consisted of Elbert's troops advancing by water to the St. John’s River in East Florida and Colonel John Baker's troops approaching from inland. The Georgia Continentals and Georgia militia returned on May 4, 1777, commanded by Colonel Samuel Elbert. Colonel Baker's troops retreated to Frederica and were ordered from there to Sunbury (McCall 1909:341-345; Oglesby 2002).

The reasons for the abandonment of the campaign are unclear, although a lack of support from additional troops and war materiel were probably to blame. The other American troops in the southeast failed to provide any significant support of the second East Florida campaign. McCall observed that the term of service for the North Carolina militia had expired and the South Carolina Continentals were needed to defend their own coast. Upon learning of Colonel Fuser's capture of Fort McIntosh, however, troops were mobilized to send to Georgia. Colonel Francis Marion and 600 South Carolinians were sent to Savannah.

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Sumter and his 2nd Rifle Regiment (South Carolina militia) were commissioned into the Continental Army under Major General Robert Howe in 1776 (Bass 1961; Bates 2003; Cummings 2002; Gregorie 1931; Moss 1983:908). Sumter and his men were ordered to Georgia in February 1777. They commandeered boats on the Savannah River at Purysburg and drifted downstream to Savannah where they arrived by March 1777 (Bass 1961:42). By December 1777 Lieutenant Colonel Sumter and his regiment were back in Charleston. Sometime between 1776 and 1777 Sumter’s command changed from the 2nd Rifle Regiment to the 6th Regiment. Sumter resigned from the 6th Regiment on September 23, 1778. He rose to the rank of Brigadier General and commanded militia units in South Carolina and neighboring states. For the remainder of war Brigadier General Sumter and his militia were kept busy in South Carolina.

Major General Robert Howe wrote from Savannah to General William Moultrie on March 16, 1777: “[Captain] Thompson’s are at Purisburgh, and will be ordered to march
tomorrow”. Before Howe’s reinforcements could advance to Liberty County and other parts of the Georgia frontier, Colonel Fuser and his British troops had retreated into East Florida (McCall 1909:345). General Howe wrote to North Carolina Governor Caswell in April 1777 concerning Georgia’s defenses, noting that the situation: “...is truly deplorable; it must fall if it cannot get its battalions full”. By June 1777 Howe had returned to Charleston and the 2nd Campaign against East Florida had ended without success (Moultrie 1802:189, 191-192; Naisawald 1951:25).

The role that Sunbury played in the 2nd Campaign was as a headquarters, troop encampment, supply depot and outfitting station, hospital, and jail. Samuel Elbert’s accounts, which included cash paid in December 1777 for bringing John Arons, “of the Florida Scout” to the “Guard House” at the “Sunbury Gaol” (Elbert 1776-1788). Sunbury was critical for both logistics and military strategy.

On September 20, 1776 Major General Howe wrote to Button Gwinnett, then Speaker of the Georgia House of Assembly, on the strategic military importance of Sunbury,

>I think Sunbury a place so important that it ought by all means to be maintained, in view of a good bar, from which ships may reach the town in an hour, opening a passage into every part of your country, with a fine harbor before it, a situation for troops that is both comfortable and secure, and in the neighborhood of many islands abounding in stock; it cannot but become an object to the enemy, should they ever attack you at all, for I persuade myself that they could station themselves at no place so beneficial to them, or injurious to you. All this militates strongly against suffering them to take possession of it, which by a battery built upon a point near the Town that commands the passage up the river, and by some works thrown up in town may, I am persuaded, be easily effected...” (Leconte n.d., cited in Sheftall 1995:25-26).

Clearly, General Howe’s esteem for Sunbury’s military importance was reinforced in the months after he took charge of the Southern Army. On December 11, 1776, the Georgia Executive Council appointed several people to construct a battery and public works in Sunbury, although later Georgia records that would testify to their accomplishments have not been located (Sheftall 1995:26). On December 28, 1776, John Graves, chairman of the “Sunbury Committee” inventoried the armaments in the public magazine at Sunbury, which included, “2,555 pounds of powder, 500 pounds of lead balls, two 18-pound cannon, seven 12-pound cannon, four four-pound cannon, and four two-pound cannon” (Candler 1908, v. 2:65).

Writing in Savannah on December 24, 1777, Major General Howe quoted Brigadier General William Moultrie concerning the Scopholites, who were threatening the interior of Georgia: “The Scopholites were some of the Tories who were led by one Col. Scophol, Col of militia, an illiterate, stupid, noisy blockhead” (Moultrie 1802:197). The Scopholites, commanded by Colonel Scovel, were a group of 500 to 800 loyalists who, in April 1778, cut a path from Ninety Six in South Carolina to East Florida, burning and plundering Whig settlements in Georgia (Olson 1970:9-10; Lambert 1987). This group was part of a broader migration of loyalists who left the Carolinas for East Florida in 1777 and 1778.
Meanwhile, the Georgia militia concerned themselves with strengthening their defenses at Sunbury. On December 5, 1777 Colonel Samuel Elbert issued these orders to Captain Jean Pierre Andre Defaupeyret, commander of a French volunteer artillery company:

> You are to proceed immediately to the Town of Sunbury, in this State, where are a corps of Continental Artillery posted, which you are constantly to be employed in teaching the perfect use of artillery, particularly in the Field. Both Officers and Men are hereby strictly ordered to attend on you for the above purpose, at such times and in such places as you may direct; and the Commanding Officer of the Troops in that place, on your showing him these Orders, will furnish Men to do the necessary duty in the Town & Fort; so that there will be nothing to prevent Captain Morris and his Company from being perfected in the Business for which they were raised. Such pieces of Artillery as you approve of, have mounted on Field-Carriages; and for this purpose you are empowered to employ the necessary Workmen, and procure Materials... (Jones 2001, v. 2:300).

**THIRD CAMPAIGN**

In February 1778 the Continental Congress resolved that Major General Howe should implement a plan to invade British East Florida. On February 13, 1778, the Continental Congress heard a committee report on the state of Georgia’s defenses, along with recommendations for their improvement. Two thousand continental troops were requested for Georgia. At that time Georgia’s defenses included: four Battalions of Infantry, one of Horse, three Companies of Artillery, and six Row Gallies (Journal of the Continental Congress 2002). Revisions to the troop composition in Georgia were proposed, which included, "...the Privates of the three artillery Companies to be incorporated into two: the first under Captain Thomas Lee and his officers to remain in and about Savannah; and the other under Captain Thomas Morris and his officers in and about Sunbury...". On March 13, 1778 Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Brown, 100 of his East Florida Rangers and 10 Loyalist Creeks captured and burned Fort Howe [Barrington] on the Altamaha River (Brown 1778a; Tonyn 1778; Prevost 1778). Brown had been ordered into interior Georgia by Governor Tonyn to observe the conditions in Georgia. On April 16, 1778, Brown wrote from Fort Tonyn [on the St. Marys River] to Brigadier General Augustin Prevost regarding the American troop movements in Georgia,

> The newly created General Elbert is on his march with about 700 men and 2 thirds of the Militia, was at the Altamaha last night, he has seven field pieces with him. The Gallies and Transports are advanced to Sapello and that his intentions are to destroy Fort Tonyn... The number of Elberts party consists of three hundred men, upon receiving information of the march of the Carolinians he set off from Savannah for the Altamaha in order to intercept or harrass them on their march. Part of the South Carolina and Georgia militia marched [to] Hogechee and returned (Brown 1778b).

Apparently the fortifications at Sunbury remained under construction on March 24, 1778, as noted in the minutes of the Executive Council. The Council ordered: “That the persons appointed by resolve of Convention dated the Eleventh day of December one thousand Seven hundred and Seventy Six be required with the utmost expedition to complete the Battery and other public Works in Sunbury pursuant to the directions of the said resolve”(Candler 2001, v.2:65).
On April 7, 1778 a Captain Melvin and 25 men were ordered by Colonel Elbert from Midway Meeting house to Sunbury where they were to embark on the American galleys for the Altamaha River and Fort Howe (Jones 2001:289). By then the Americans hopes for success were high, particularly after Colonel Elbert captured the British ships *Hinchinbrook*, *Rebecca*, and an unnamed British brig. These vessels had been bound for Sunbury and their capture deflated, at least temporarily, the British efforts to take Georgia. Historian Hugh McCall noted that, at that time, Colonel Elbert and his men were posted at Fort Howe on the Altamaha River (McCall 1909:353). By April 1778, however, Fort Howe had been destroyed by the East Florida Rangers.

On April 7, 1778 the Executive Board of Georgia ordered that,

> WHEREAS it appears that there is reason to apprehend an attempt by Sea is intended against the Town of Sunbury—Ordered that it be left to the discretion of the Commanding Officer in Liberty County whether to march the Militia with the Continental Troops, or to keep them for the defence of Sunbury—

> ORDERED That the said Commanding Officer draft a detachment sufficient to Mann the Galleys at Sunbury and that they go on board the same as Marines and that the Commanding Officer of the Galleys act in concert with the Officers of the said Militia this order Nevertheless to be left to the discretion of the said Commanding Officer of Liberty County who being on the spot will be better enabled to judge from circumstances

> ORDERED That 12 9lb Cannon Shot be delivered out of the Arsenal for the use of Sunbury (Candler 2001, v.2:72-73).

In May 1778 the Georgians, including many of the troops posted at Sunbury, participated in the third and final unsuccessful offensive against East Florida. Groover (1987:16) notes that, “a 2,000-man sea and land force was staged at Sunbury” and that, “it departed on May 1, 1778”. Major General Howe ordered Lieutenant Colonel Charles C. Pinckney and his forces to join him at Fort Howe. Pinckney commanded the 1st Regiment, South Carolina Continentals (Moss 1983:774). Before reaching Fort Howe, Howe and his force encountered a party of Loyalist refugees under command of Colonel McGirth at Midway, which forced Howe to retreat to St. Mary's (McCall 1909:354-355).

This third campaign by the Americans suffered from a lack of subservience among the commanding officers, as well as rampant sickness among the troops. After pushing as far south as Fort Tonyn on the St. Mary’s River, Howe called a council of war to discuss their strategy. The council was held on July 11 and the officers present were: “Maj Gen Howe and Cols Elbert, White, Pinckney, Everleigh, Taarling, Stirk, Rac; Lt. Cols Roberts, Henderson, Scott, McIntosh; Majors Brown, Wise, Habersham, Romans, Pinckney, Lane, and Lowe” (Howe 1776-78a:181). The campaign was ended, largely as a result of the sickness that was so prevalent among the ranks. Historian Jones (2001) noted that more than one-half of the American army in Georgia was ill at the end of the 3rd Campaign. William Moultrie wrote in his memoirs that his troops were succumbing at the rate of eight per day while in Georgia (Moultrie 1802). Most of these were taken to Fort Howe for immediate treatment. The sick and convalescent were placed on board the galleys and such vessels and large boats as could be accumulated, and, under the direction of Colonel C. C. Pinckney, were transported by the
inland passage to Sunbury. Writing from Sunbury to William Moultrie on July 23, Colonel Pinckney noted,

*It is with the greatest pleasure I embrace this opportunity of informing you that the sea air has already had a surprising effect on the men with me. The weak and convalescents are getting strong daily, and the sick recovering fast. We have hitherto been very much crowded in our vessels, but as the Georgia troops will be landed here, we shall soon have more room… (Jones 2001:301).*

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Sumter was not present at the council of war at Fort Tonyn. His biographer noted that Sumter had ague [probably malaria] and was hospitalized at Sunbury in June 1778 (Bass 1961:45). This secondary source testifies that Sunbury was used as a military hospital during the 3rd Florida campaign. Major General Howe's orders contain numerous references to transporting the sick and wounded by water from the interior to the coast, via Sunbury, although he does not record any specific reference to its use as a hospital (Grimke 1911, 1912).

Colonel William Few, a Georgia patriot who was a participant in the 1778 campaign, provided this candid summary:

*In the Spring of 1778, the military force of the State was collected, which consisted of Militia, and six or eight hundred Continental Troops which were commanded by Genl. Howe. The militia were commanded by Govr. Houstoun. This force was supposed to be sufficient for this conquest of East Florida; but the whole was defeated not by the sword of the Enemy, but by the dissension of the Governor and General. They contended, which should have the command, until the season for Military operations was too far advanced. The hot weather commenced, and the fever raged in their camp, and destroyed more than a general action. A retreat became necessary, to save the remainder of the troops, of which near one half had been destroyed or dispersed, without seeing the face of the enemy. Thus terminated an expedition, foolishly planned and worse executed-- We had neither stores of provisions, munitions of war, nor money in our Treasury (Few 2002).*

Private David Allen, Jr., a soldier from North Carolina under the command of General Butler, recounted in his pension application how he, “…marched thence [from South Carolina, sometime after mid-1777] to Georgia, crossing Savannah River just below Augusta, we marched down said river on the Georgia side to a place called Sunbury, where we had an encounter with the British who were in the act of crossing the river, & their [rear?] was in part taken prisoners…” (Allen 1832). It is unclear from this account whether Allen is referring to the 2nd or 3rd East Florida campaign, or to which specific engagement he refers.

Upon the return of the Georgia Continentals from Fort Tonyn, Colonel John McIntosh and 127 men were posted at Sunbury (Jones 2001:303). These men probably comprised the garrison at adjacent Fort Morris for the Summer of 1778. The garrison was reinforced by additional troops, which brought the garrison strength to slightly more than 200 men.

By the fall of 1778 the tide of war in Georgia was turning. By November 27, 1778 Howe wrote to Moultrie from his headquarters a few miles south of Ebenezer at Zubby’s Ferry advising Moultrie that Georgia was in a “…serious state of being lost” to the British. Moultrie responded the following day advising Howe that, “…Thompson’s Regiment is not far from you, they are taking the shortest rout to Purisburgh”. On December 8, General Howe
informed Moultrie, “…the enemy undoubtedly are at St. Simon’s where they are repairing the fort, and where the regulars remain…” (Moultrie 1802:243-249).

From 1776 to the Fall of 1778 the British in East Florida had repeatedly harassed the Georgians with minor raids by regular troops, Tories, and Indians. Over that same period of time Sunbury was controlled by American interests and the threat of a British invasion was relatively slim. Between October and November 1778, however, the American military in Georgia was in a state of high alert in anticipation of a British attack. The Americans took precautionary measures, which included: “storing food provisions in magazines at Sunbury, Savannah, Augusta, Brownsboro, Wrightsboro, Ebenezer, Telfair, Tenats, Lawson’s Fort, New Savannah, Colemans, and Heard’s [fort] and Denis’s forts” (Barrs 1932; Naisawald 1951:24; Searcy 1985:158). On August 26, 1778, Colonel Graves applied for, "a sum of money out of the Treasury for the Fort, Barracks, and other works in Sunbury" (Candler 2001, v. 2: 91). His request for funds were postponed by the Board until their next meeting. This indicates that, as of late August 1778, the defenses at Sunbury were incomplete.

Major General Robert Howe, the former commander of the Southern District, arrived with his army at Sunbury by December 8, 1778 (Searcy 1985:164). Howe’s army numbered less than 1,000 and included 600 to 700 Georgia and South Carolina Continentals and Georgia militia. The Georgia Continentals were led by Colonel Samuel Elbert and the South Carolina Continentals were led by General Isaac Huger. The Georgia militia was commanded by Colonel George Walton. After a brief stay, Howe's army moved on to Savannah.

By December 17, 1778 the British invasion fleet that had departed from New York for Savannah was passing near Charleston, which alerted Major General Lincoln, the next commander of the Southern District, and his staff to the threat of a major Southern invasion (Searcy 1985:164-166). Ten days later Lincoln was pressing his reinforcement troops from the Carolinas towards Georgia to aid in Howe’s defense. Howe had moved his force back to Savannah and had drawn all of the available troops in Georgia, except for the garrison at Sunbury and Colonel Marbury's regiment at Augusta, to his aid (Howe 1879:266). The American Southern Army shifted to a more defensive role and the Savannah River became the dividing line between two grand armies.

The British attacked Savannah before Lincoln’s reinforcements arrived and General Howe, hopelessly outnumbered, foolishly chose to defend the town. That decision resulted in the loss of more than half of his army. The remnants of General Howe's troops fled in disarray into the Savannah River swamps and surrounding areas. Those who were able found their way across the Savannah River into South Carolina to Purysburg where General Lincoln’s army was camped. General Howe met briefly with Major General Lincoln before heading north to consult with General Washington. Thereafter, General Lincoln had command of the Southern Army, although those troops who were in Georgia remained in a state of confusion for some time.

On December 29, 1778, General Howe issued orders to American Major Joseph Lane, commanding the garrison at Fort Morris, to abandon the post. These orders were delivered to Fort Morris by Captain Moseby (Howe 1879:234). Instead, Lane chose to defend the
fortification with approximately 120 Continentals and residents of Sunbury (Searcy 1985:167).

Major General Howe later testified to these events:

_I have confessed that I ordered the garrison at Sunbury to evacuate the fort, and I will add that I was so anxious to have it done, that my first order was written with a pencil, on horseback, in the field, and on the retreat. Fearful that this order might miscarry, and still anxious for the fate of the garrison, upon a halt we made about eight miles from town, I, in another letter more explicit in its contents, repeated the order for evacuation, and directed, that if the stores could not be removed they should be destroyed, and the cannon spiked. This letter, and another to the same purpose not an hour afterwards, were dispatched by officers. Some, if not all, were received, but the Major who commanded there delayed obeying the order until he heard from me again, in consequence of which he and his party fell into the enemy's hands a few days afterwards. How this order, had it been wrong in itself, since it was not obeyed, could contribute to sacrifice the capital and the State, let those who framed the charge explain. I think it appears plain that nothing very erroneous in my conduct has happened, when; notwithstanding a strong desire to have me censured, charges so futile and ill-grounded are exhibited against me. It would have been horrid in me to have suffered a garrison to have remained in a work too extensive for five times the number of men, ill-constructed, unfinished, without casemates, and without the least probability of relieving it....Major Lane, who commanded the fort, had recently been in it second in command, when an attack upon it by the enemy had been gallantly repulsed. The Magistrates and citizens of the town, hoping to defend it again, solicited, implored, and beseeched him to remain in it. Combined with these, he was in the bloom of youth, and in the hey-day of blood and spirits--an enthusiastic ardor for fame, which it is better for an officer sometimes to be misled by that than never to feel, and which, tho' it may now and then induce excess, it is at worst but the excess of a good quality. All these prevailed upon him to delay an execution of his orders, and he had his punishment in his fault_ (Howe 1879:299).

Major Lane had been present at the Fort Tonyn council of war on July 11, 1778 (Grimke 1911:200). Major Lane received the orders in late 1778 from Major General Howe to abandon Fort Morris (Lane 1778, 1779a-c; LOC 2002, Washington Papers February 7, 1780; LOC 2002, JCC 1904-1937: March 3, 1780:225). Lane wrote in reply requesting a reliable guide to lead the garrison through the swamp to join Major General Howe's army (Lane 1778). Major Lane remained with his garrison at Fort Morris to defend it against the British. The Americans surrendered the post on January 10, 1779 (Lane 1778). Major Lane was taken prisoner where he compiled a return of the garrison in Fort Morris who were taken prisoner, as well as a list of the Sunbury militia company who were made prisoner. On February 22, 1779 Major Lane composed an account of the surrender of Fort Morris, which was submitted to Major General Lee. In that account he noted that the officers were placed as prisoners in Sunbury and the non-commissioned officers and privates were assigned to prison ships at Savannah (Lane 1779 a-c).

Captain Thomas Morris commanded the 2nd Georgia Continental Artillery at Sunbury and it was in his honor that Fort Morris was named by Colonel John McIntosh on November 25, 1778 (Sheftall 1995:38). After the October 1779 siege of Savannah, Captain Morris, Mordecai Sheftall, and others fled Sunbury harbor by ship, but were later captured on the open ocean by a British vessel. Lieutenant Morris and his shipmates were taken to Antigua where they were held captive. Top level negotiations between George Washington and Sir
Henry Clinton for Morris' release, in exchange for the Antiguan John Burke, extended into November 1780 (LOC 2002; Washington 1780a, 1780b).

Major General Howe, meanwhile, received the official notification of his recall in late November 1778. He was aware that Congress was frustrated with his performance, but did not know that it had decided in June to recall him. By November the massive British attack forced Howe to remain in Georgia until his replacement, Benjamin Lincoln, arrived (Naisawald 1951:27-29). The American forces under Howe, who defended Savannah against Campbell, were soundly routed from the town and were scattered into the interior of Georgia and South Carolina. On December 30, 1778, Major General Howe, camped 4 miles from Zubly’s Ferry, wrote to Lincoln advising him of the bad situation (NARA 1774-1789, 1959:189). Howe’s army in Georgia was in complete disarray. Archibald Campbell reported to Lord Germaine on January 16 that: “…on the 3rd of January the last scattered remains of General Howe’s army retreated across at the Two sisters [Two Sisters Ferry was on the Savannah River in present day Effingham County]” (Davies 1972-1978:17:37).

Major General Lincoln and the other ranking officers in the Southern Army realized that Howe had made a strategic blunder in defending Savannah against the British rather than retreating, particularly in the face of such overwhelming odds. Brigadier General Moultrie later criticized Howe’s military strategy in a summary of the Savannah engagement: "It was a total rout, and the whole had nearly been cut off from their retreat; the 2d brigade was entirely so, those of them who made their escape, were obliged to file off to the right, and cross the Spring Hill causeway, and some were obliged to swim Yamacraw creek, leaving their arms behind; those who could not swim, were either killed or taken…”(Moultrie 1802:252). Major General Robert Howe was recalled to meet with George Washington, following the capture of Savannah in December 1778. Howe was court-martialed in December 1781 for his handling of the war in Georgia and the proceedings of General Howe’s court-martial were later published (Howe 1879). Robert Howe was completely exonerated in the court martial trial for his actions on the battlefield, much to the chagrin of the Georgia government.

FIRST BRITISH SIEGE OF SUNBURY

Royal Governor Patrick Tonym of East Florida wrote to British Brigadier General Prevost on December 24, 1777 from St. Augustine and provided him with a lengthy assessment of the British military in the South. The East Florida military forces included the East Florida Rangers, who were, "composed of the Inhabitants of this Province & Refugees from the Province of Carolina & Georgia", Indians, and the 60th Regiment (British Public Records Office [BPRO] 30/55/816). Naval forces had included the HMS Hinchinbrook, which was dispatched to attack Sunbury in April 1778. These plans were thwarted when that ship and two others were captured by the Patriots in the Frederica River (Harden 1905).

The British effort to retake Georgia from the Rebels was renewed in November of 1778 with a two-pronged attack by a naval force, led by Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell and a combined force of British and Scottish Army regulars and Loyalists from New York, and a land force, led by Brigadier General Augustin Prevost and a smaller army from St.
Augustine, Florida. After quickly conquering Savannah, Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell began his march towards Augusta, by way of Ebenezer, and his route was recorded on a map, which is cited as Campbell (1779a; Campbell 1981:32).

The November 1778 attack on Sunbury was led by Lieutenant Colonel Lewis V. Fuser. Colonel Fuser’s troops sailed up the Medway River, where his 60th Regiment occupied the vacant northern portion of Sunbury and their ships took position, “in the front of the fort and in the back river opposite the town simultaneously with the investment on the land side by the infantry and artillery” (Jones 1878:189).

Patrick Murray, at the time a captain in the 60th Regiment, wrote in his memoirs of the attack in November 1778 by Lieutenant Colonel Fuser. Fuser's force included: "...Major Prevost with all the Cavalry, East Florida Rangers, South Carolina Royalists and McGirth's men, with the Grenadiers of the 2nd. Battalion [60th Regiment], and 70 chosen men of the 3rd [3rd Battalion, 60th Regiment], amounting in all to 750 men with a 4 1/2 inch Cohorn mounted on a Congreve Carriage..."(Murray n.d.:306). Murray noted that the British Cavalry were to rendezvous with the Infantry on Sapelo Island and then, "...attack Sunbury in conjunction with Lieutenant Colonel Fuser, who proceeded along the inland communication with 250 men of the 4th Battalion, the armed Flat Thunderer of 2 24 pounders, and 2 Swivels..."

(Murray n.d.:306).

Captain Murray provided one of the best descriptions of the events at Sunbury on November 24 and 25, 1778:

Colonel Fuser landed at Colonel's Bluff at the mouth of Newport, where he learned that, 2 Privateer's men having deserted and given the alarm, 300 men had been marched to Sunbury. The Colonel mounted the 2 Swivels on a cart, by way of carriage and leaving 60 men to guard the boats, proceeded towards Sunbury with 180 men receiving shots from their look-out men who fled to the woods whenever Ensign Schoedde [Ensign C. L. T. Schoedde, 4th Battalion] with the flanking party advanced upon them. There was no firing on our part except by 3 or 4 of Brown's Rangers acting as guides. When we came to the marsh which divides the Island from the main, and is passable at low water, the detachment was ordered to form at open order, there being wood beyond the marsh, and the Medway on the right. Captain Murray was ordered forward to cover the left flank and clear the wood: Captain Wulf with his Grenadiers to support them....We bivouacked at night on the slope of the high ground opposite the fort and made fires in our rear which was considerably more elevated, so that when our Drums beat the Retreat they fired several cannon shot at our fires over our heads. This salute being performed, Colonel Fuser and Captain Wulf went closer to the Fort to reconnoitre. They found it well provided with heavy arms and men, but no appearance of a gate on that side; that towards the sea was known to have a battery of 18 pounders. Captain Murray was sent with his Light Company to try if he could not get into the town, which he did from the Medway Road...(Murray n.d.:307-308).

Ensign Schoedde and his party captured an unidentified American galley, which was anchored at the wharf in Sunbury. Afterwards Ensign Schoede and his men joined Captain Murray, who had taken post in the Sunbury Courthouse. Since the Sunbury Courthouse was an unfinished building Colonel Fuser took his quarters in a merchant's house where:

... a puncheon of rum was broached, with other refreshments he distributed among the D[etachment] but no plundering allowed. Although Captain Wulff patrolled the town up to the Citadel without finding a gate, only 2 men were found, all the rest having taken refuge in
the Fort; every now and then they fired great guns at our fires while our men occupied six houses with stores for 18 hours (Murray n.d.306-308).

Captain Johnstone, who led a company of the East Florida Rangers proceeded to Medway meeting house [Midway] but returned to Sunbury the following morning to report that Major Marc Prevost and his troops had "pushed on to Ogeechee". Captain Murray continued his recollections of Colonel Fuser's next move against Sunbury,

Ensign Schoedde was posted 3 miles on the Medway road to look out. Colonel Fuser summoned the Fort allowing an hour; in two hours Colonel McIntosh sent Major Lane with a spirited answer. An American Detachment entered by the Newport road and it being highwater, Colonel Fuser would not suffer us to attempt to storm the Fort, but drew out the Detachment until Ensign Schoedde's party was withdrawn; the Light Company in front of the line at open order. The Detachment then filed off by Medway road [after] a few shots from our Rangers, and the Light Company closing the march and leaving an astonished enemy who durst not disturb us. When we turned to the left and passed the pond behind the town two or three shots were fired at us, [but] we proceeded to our boats without any interruption (Murray n.d.:308).

Nineteenth century historian William Pickett provides this colorful account of the exchange that took place at the gates of Fort Morris in November 1778,

In 1778 a portion of the garrison of St. Augustine, under General Provost, marched by land to join a force from New York to attack Savannah, then in the occupation of the whigs. "Rory" [Roderick McIntosh] was a captain of light infantry upon this expedition. On the march they passed near a small whig fort [Fort Morris], commanded by Captain, afterwards Colonel John McIntosh. Early one morning, when "Rory" had made rather free with the morning glass, he insisted on sallying out to summon the fort to surrender. His friends were unable to restrain him, and he presently advanced, with claymore in hand, followed by his faithful negro, Jim. Approaching the gate of the fort, he said, in an audible and commanding tone, "Surrender, you miscreants! How dare you presume to resist his majesty's arms! " Captain McIntosh knew him, and, forbidding any of his men to fire, threw open the gate, and said, "Walk in, cousin, and take possession." "No," said Rory, with great indignation, "I will not trust myself with such vermin, but I order you to surrender." A rifle was fired at him, the ball of which passed through his face. He fell, but immediately recovered. He retreated backwards, flourishing his sword. His servant, seeing his face covered with blood, and hearing the shot falling around him, implored his master to face about and run for his life. He replied, "Run yourself, poor slave, but I am of a race that never runs." In this manner, he backed safely into the lines, flourishing his sword in defiance, and keeping his face to the enemy (Bell 2005).

After Lieutenant Colonel Marc Prevost failed to rendezvous with Lieutenant Colonel Fuser at Sunbury, Colonel Fuser chose to retreat to East Florida. In his retreat, his troops burned the Midway Church, destroyed numerous houses, confiscated 1,000 head of cattle, some sheep, about 300 horses, and 200 enslaved African-Americans from the area (The South Carolina and America General Gazette 1778, cited in Sheftall 1995:39).

The Pennsylvania Gazette published this account of the November 1778 battle at Sunbury on three months later,
some vessels, at the same time, off Sunbury, which they apprehended to be our fleet: But that, previous to their going off, they had sent away near 1000 head of cattle, some sheep, about 300 horses, 200 negroes, and other plunder. That altho’ the enemy had destroyed almost everything in their way, within a mile of each side of the road sout of Ogeachie, yet many buildings and other property, supposed to have been burnt and destroyed, were after their departure found untouched...the land force which came against Georgia consisted of 86 regulars, and about 500 Scofelites and rangers in one body, who entered the country at Fort Howe, and march on by land, under Col. Prevost; when between 4 and 500 regulars, in another body, commanded by Col. Fuser, landed upon Colonels Island near Sunbury, fordable at low water, and marched into that town. That the enemy naval force consisted of no more than the ship Lord Germaine of 20 guns (two and three pounders) the brig Spitfire of 16, the sloop Musquito of 10, the sloop Tobyn Revenge of 8, a large galley with swivels, and generally lay at St. Simon inlet. And that, after Colonel Fuser withdrew from Sunbury, the two bodies joined at Newport ferry, where they intrenched, to cover and give time to their hunters to get off with the cattle, and when that was accomplished they followed (The Pennsylvania Gazette 1779).

SECOND BRITISH SIEGE OF SUNBURY

Brigadier General Augustin Prevost held command of all British troops in the South. Prevost and his brother Mark had created the 60th Regiment, or the Royal Americans, in the French and Indian War. The regiment was assigned to St. Augustine along with Prevost. The 60th Regiment was composed mostly of Irishmen, many who had been rejected by other British Regiments. It developed, however, into one of the more renowned units of the British colonial period, particularly during the French and Indian War (Summers and Chartrand 1981). The 60th Regiment later became the King’s Royal Rifle Corps, which was reformed in 1966 to become part of the 2nd Battalion, Royal Green Jackets (Mills 2002).

The British military units that participated in the Sunbury siege included the 16th Regiment, 60th Regiment, Carolina Royalists, New Jersey Volunteers, East Florida Rangers, and the Loyalist Creek Indians. Most of these men were probably present at Fort Morris for only a few days. After the British captured the fort at Sunbury, which was renamed Fort George, it was garrisoned by Loyalist troops from New Jersey and New York. The New York and New Jersey troops were part of Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell's invasion fleet, who arrived in Georgia from Sandy Hook in November 1778.

The East Florida Rangers and their loyalist Creek allies were among the conquering British force at Fort Morris in January 1779. Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Brown commanded the loyalist rangers in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina (Olson 1970; Cashin 1989). Brown was a Georgia colonist. Brown's troops were known by various monikers during the war (Carolina Rangers, East Florida Rangers, and, finally, the King's Rangers). One of Brown's rangers was killed in the attack while reconnoitering when he approached too close to Fort Morris and was struck by a bullet (Murray n.d.:310-311).

Three companies of New Jersey Volunteers were aboard a ship that was separated from Campbell's fleet before joining up with Prevost's army (Murray n.d.: 309; Butler 1913-1932). Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen led three companies of New Jersey Volunteers, who arrived aboard the HMS Neptune. That ship and another troop transport ship were part of the flotilla from Sandy Hook, New Jersey but the two vessels were separated at sea from the main
British invasion fleet bound for Savannah and the Neptune rejoined the British at St. Marys, Georgia (Searcy 1985:166; Murray n.d. 309). The Neptune carried 14 mariners and, “upwards of 100 men, who had chiefly their families with them” (The Pennsylvania Gazette 1779).

General Prevost dispatched Major Graham with three companies of the 16th Regiment and Captain Murray’s Light Company, 4th Battalion, 60th Regiment to gather food for the army. This detachment later joined troops led by Major Marc Prevost and, together in January, they laid siege to Fort Morris (Searcy 1985:166-167). Major Prevost’s force consisted of 100 British regular infantry and 300 Rangers and Indians. Their artillery consisted of a single 4.5 inch Cohorn. They had arrived in Georgia on November 19, 1778 and had minor engagements before reaching Sunbury. The most involved of these was the fight at the Midway Meeting House.

In the days immediately before the January 9, 1779 siege, Captain Murray's Company, Major Graham's companies and Ensign Schoedde's party were assigned to kill cattle for the army and 26 head of cattle were slaughtered (Murray n.d.:309-310). Captain Murray's Company arrived at Sunbury on January 7, as he noted in his memoirs,

\[\text{In less than an hour the 16th [Regiment] and 4th Battalion Light Company [60th Regiment] were despatched to Sunbury, where our Cavalry were supposed to be investing the place; but none appearing Captain Murray entered, and the advance took post in the ditch of the intrenchment which covered the town. A ranger guide reconnoitring too near the fort was killed, and we took post in the ditch of the entrenchment, opposite the Fort. The next morning 23 horses were sent out of the fort when a Sergeant, with a few men drove in the escort and the horses were captured... (Murray n.d.:309-310).}\]

Murray continued:

\[\text{General Prevost came that day with the remainder of the troops, two 8-inch Howitzers and a Cohorn. The gallowies when the tide was high, fired into the town, as did the fort. On the 3rd day the enemy attempted a small sally which Major Graham drove in; three men of the 16th were wounded, not dangerously, Sergeant Balany Royal Artillery threw some shells at the gallowies, which dislodged them, and a shell fell upon a building where the rebel Officers messed, and killed and wounded 9 of them, and shattered about 50 stand of arms; upon which they proposed to capitulate; which being refused and 2 more shells falling into the fort, they hauled their colours down and surrendered at discretion... The gallies made for the Bar (Murray n.d. 310-311).}\]

Captain Murray provided valuable details on the events at Sunbury following the battle:

\[\text{Captain MacDonald [3rd Battalion, 60th Regiment] mounted guard in the Fort with the 3rd Battalion Grenadier Company and next morning Captain Wulff relieved him with those of the 4th. [Battalion]. Captain Macdonald delivered his report to the General and dropped down dead at his feet. The Garrison with their Commander Major Lane embarked for Savannah. They, with prisoners brought in by our mounted rangers might amount to between 300 and 400. Lieutenant Colonel Allen was left at Sunbury with the Jersey Volunteers, Mr. [Roderic] Mackintosh was appointed Captain of the Fort, he lost the use of his eye (Murray n.d. 310-311).}\]

Captain Murray also provided information on the Americans who were taken prisoner in the engagement: "The Flank Companies except the Grenadiers of the 4th [Battalion, 60th
Regiment] who escorted the prisoners by the inland passage marched to Savannah by Medway and Ogeechee…One galley blew up on Sunbury bar; a sloop and 2 galleys were taken by our cruisers and a ship in the harbour" (Murray n.d. 310-311).

In his biographical sketch of Captain John Braddock, commander of the galley Lee, Claghorn (1988:30) noted that following the fall of Sunbury in January 1779, the galleys Bullock, commanded by Captain Hatcher, and Washington, commanded by Captain John Hardy, were intentionally burned by the Americans to escape their capture by the British. A return of, “men taken Prisoners in the Washington & Bullocks Galleys”, off of Sunbury and dated January 13, 1779, listed seven privates (Allis 1967: Reel 3).

A brief British account of the siege appeared in the Annual Register for 1779:

*The major-general having at length brought forward a few pieces of artillery, suddenly surrounded the town and fort of Sunbury, on the frontier of Georgia. The garrison, consisting of about 200 men, made some shew of defence, and gave the command the trouble of opening trenches. But although they were supported by some armed vessels and gallys, yet all hope of relief being now totally cut off by the reduction of the rest of the province, they found it necessary to surrender at discretion* (Annual Register 1780:35).

The number of people killed in the January 9 siege is not well documented. British losses included the unfortunate East Florida Ranger guide, whose death was described by Captain Murray. Another Loyalist casualty was Bristol Munro, Jr., an enslaved African-American belonging to Loyalist Simon Munro. Bristol was killed in the siege and another of Munro's slaves, Bess was maimed. Bristol's father also met his death at Sunbury, while working for the Patriots earlier in the war (Cole and Braisted 2003). It is notable that all three of Simon Munro’s enslaved were killed or wounded while in service to the Patriot cause. This indicates that Simon lost control of his servants early in the war.

The Henry Clinton papers included a return of the military ordnance and stores at Fort Morris on January 13, 1779 (Clinton 1779, vol 52:8), which is transcribed in Table 2 (Return of Brass & Iron). This inventory was compiled by British Captain Jonathan Fairlamb, Light Royal Artillery Regiment (Fairlamb 1779). The list of heavy guns includes one mortar and 24 cannons, and a large quantity of shoulder arms, ammunition and related accoutrements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armament</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inch Mortars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Pounders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 &quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Guns</td>
<td>18 Prs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison Carriages</td>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 &quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 &quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Shot</td>
<td>18 Prs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case of Grape Shot</td>
<td>18 Prs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladles &amp; Wad Hooks</td>
<td>18 Prs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 “</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Arms</td>
<td>Musquet with Bayonets</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rifles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzes &amp; Carbines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wall Pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty Shells</td>
<td>4 2/5</td>
<td>Hand Granades Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>Musquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartridges</td>
<td>Carbine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder</td>
<td>Barrels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Musquet Ball Dtto</td>
<td>150(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flints</td>
<td>Musquet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartridges Boxes</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pouches with Powder Horns</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claw Handspike</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Fairlamb
Capt. L. R. Artillery

(Fairlamb 1779; C.O. 5, Roll M-347: Doc. 1674)

**A Return of the Garrison in Fort Morris commanded by Major Lane the 10th January 1779**-

Continental Troops
Commissioned Officers: 1 Major; 3 Captains; 7 Lieutenants
Staff Officers: 1 Adjutants; 1 Mates

12 Serjeants; 1 Drums; 129 Rank & File
Sunbury Militia

Commissioned Officers: 1 Captain; 2 Lieutenants
2 Serjeants; 43 Rank & File

Total
  1 Major; 4 Captains; 9 Lieutenants; 1 Adjutants; 0 2nd Masters (?); 0 Surgeons
  1 Mate; 14 Serjeants; 1 Drums; 172 Rank & File

Staff-
David Rees Judge Advocate
David Flemming Asst. Dy 2r Mr.General
Francis Coddington Com.y of Issues
David Austin Dr Comy of __ Dto __
Isaac Antrobus (?) Com.y of the Hospital
Jonathn. Holden Waggan Master

(Clintion Papers, C.O. 5, Roll M-347:Doc. 1669)

Following the British victory at Fort Morris, the loyalists New Jersey Volunteers in garrison at the newly renamed Fort George were under command of Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen were soon supplemented by the arrival of Delancey's Brigade, 1st Battalion, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger (Cole and Braisted 2002). Together, these troops probably constituted the "hundred Provincials" that comprised the Sunbury garrison described by Colonel Innes' January 23 letter to Sir Henry Clinton. The team of Colonels Allen and Cruger as co-commanders of British garrisons continued as the British Army moved into South Carolina. The command of the British garrison at Ninety Six, South Carolina was also shared by these two Loyalist officers.

The 16th Regiment participated in the British capture of Fort Morris at Sunbury in early January 1779. The main body of the 16th Regiment marched to Savannah where they were garrisoned from mid-January 1779 to 1782. Elements of this regiment were also garrisoned at Sunbury, while other soldiers in the 16th Regiment patrolled in and around Ebenezer. The 16th Regiment remained active in coastal Georgia and was among the last British troops who evacuated Savannah on July 11, 1782.

The six battalions of the Loyalist New Jersey Volunteers, also known as Skinner’s Light Infantry or Cortland's Greens, were commanded by Brigadier General Cortlandt Skinner. The New Jersey Volunteers were provincial troops. Upon their arrival in Savannah in December 1778 Skinner’s 3rd Battalion consisted of between 60 and 76 men. Skinner’s 3rd Battalion was employed in the 1779 Siege of Savannah (Hough 1975:60; Campbell 1981:11, 102; Allis 1967: Reel 3; Jones 1972).

Three companies of the New Jersey Volunteers, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen, were stationed at Fort George at Sunbury immediately after the British captured Sunbury on January 10, 1779. Allen was probably in the 3rd Battalion while at Sunbury. Cole and Braisted (2002) have compiled a roster of officers who served in the New Jersey Volunteers from 1776 to 1783, which includes Allen and many of the other loyalist officers who served at Sunbury.
The Carolina Royalists, or South Carolina Loyalists, were commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Robinson and Colonel Alexander Innes. Colonel Innes was an active participant in the events around Savannah and his letters provide important details on the events in late 1778 and early 1779. The South Carolina Royalists formed part of Brigadier General Prevost's siege force at Sunbury in January 1779. By December 1, 1779 Innes commanded the South Carolina Royalists, who were garrisoned at Savannah (Clark 1981, Volume 1:1). The other officers in the South Carolina Royalists at that time included:

- Captain-Lieutenant Charles Lindsay
- Chaplain William Devaux
- Adjutant Charles Lindsay
- Quartermaster Peter Denwerth
- Surgeon George Clark
- Mate William Hatton
- Sergeants Charles Riley (sick in quarters), Sam Stevenson, and Hugh Wiseman
- Corporals Shadrack Stevens, Jacob Singley, William Morgan
- and Drummer Black Sancho

The balance of the Carolina Royalists consisted of 29 privates, although six of these were listed as deserters. Thus, this contingent consisted of about 37 men in March of 1780. On April 24 of that year, the South Carolina Royalists consisted of Colonel Innes, 45 junior officers and 165 enlisted men. In addition to these aforementioned men who were present and fit for duty, three sergeants, one drummer and 46 privates were on command and recruiting; six sergeants and 57 privates were sick; and three soldiers had died since the previous muster (Clinton 1750-1838, Volume 94:43).

Colonel Innes of the British army wrote to Sir Henry Clinton from Savannah on January 23, and provided him with an assessment of colonial Georgia’s defenses,

...The Posts now occupied by the British Troops are the Town of Savannah, Cherokee Hill Abercorn, Zubby’s ferry, Ebenezer and the two Sisters being a Chain of thirty five miles above Savannah...Sunbury Town and Fort is 40 miles to the Southward of Savannah on the banks of a large Creek and fine Bason which communicates with the sea five miles below—here we have a Garrison of a hundred Provincials and to this place the Rebel officers taken Prisoners were sent on Parole. The reinforcement brought from Florida by Genl Prevost will necessarily alter the numbers at the different Posts and he may also have been induced to extend his Quarters (Innes 1779a:3).

In his memoirs Colonel Henry Lee wrote that Major General Prevost detached, "Lieutenant-Colonel Cruger with one of the Provincial regiments to Sunbury", following the first attempt to capture Charleston in the spring of 1779 (Lee 1969:133). Clinton's letter to Lord Germain, however, suggests that Cruger's corps never left the state on that campaign. The "hundred provincials" that were left to garrison the fort at Sunbury were part of the 1st Battalion, Delancey's Brigade. Loyalist troops under the command of Brigadier General Oliver Delancey included the 1st and 2nd Battalions of Delancey's Brigade and Delancey's Refugees, who arrived in Georgia with Lieutenant Colonel Campbell in November 1778. Delancey's Brigade was composed of recruits from Westchester, Kings and Queens Counties, New York. Each battalion of DeLancey's Brigade was to consist of 500 men.
Brigadier General Augustin Prevost ordered the 1st and 2nd Battalions of Delancey's Brigade to garrison Fort George at Sunbury. Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger led the 1st Battalion, Delancey's Brigade. When they arrived in Savannah in December 1778 Delancey’s 1st Battalion was comprised of approximately 54 men and his 2nd Battalion numbered 20 men (Campbell 1981:11; Clark 1981, Volume 3:1). A muster roll of Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger’s Company, 1st Battalion, Brigadier General Oliver Delancey’s Brigade, was recorded in Savannah on November 20, 1779. Officers serving in Cruger’s Company included:

- Captain-Lieutenant George Kerr
- Ensign John Wormley
- Chaplain ___ Bowden (at New York)
- Quartermaster Nehemiah Rogers
- Surgeon Nathan Smith (prisoner with rebels)
- Mate Daniel Cainwell
- Sergeants Lawrence Connoly (died 19 Nov 1779), Robert Chambers (prisoner in Charlestown)
- William Paradie, and George Lynch
- Corporal Samuel Dawson
- and Drummer William Kitts (Clark 1981, Volume 3:1)

Also serving in Cruger’s company were 18 privates, although 11 of these were not present at the muster. Privates William Hayman and James Devur were listed as, “sick at Sunbury”, five others were prisoners with the rebels, two others had died in September, 1779, and one had deserted on October 3, 1779.

A third company in Delancey’s Brigade, as recorded in the November 20th muster, was commanded by Captain George Kerr. Captain Kerr’s junior officers included: Sergeants John McKinny, Timothy Sulovan, and Patrick Field (the latter two at New York); Corporals Patrick Campbell, Peter Quain, John Wallace (prisoner with rebels) and Drummer William Curdoe (sick, Regimental Hospital) (Clark 1981, Volume 3:18). Also serving in Kerr’s company were 43 privates, although 25 of these were not present at the muster for various reasons, including five that were dead, two sick at the Regimental Hospital, two sick at Sunbury, and 14 that were prisoners with the rebels.

The 2nd Battalion of Delancey's Brigade was assigned to garrison duty at Sunbury for an unknown period. When the 2nd Battalion was disbanded in 1783, their commander was Lieutenant Colonel Richard Hewlett. By 1783, however, Delancey's Brigade had been reorganized and Lieutenant Hewlett's Battalion was formerly the 3rd Battalion, and that battalion never served in Georgia (Cole and Braisted 2003). Consequently, little is presently known of the officers in the 2nd Battalion who served at Sunbury.

Lieutenant Colonel Cruger's 1st Battalion of Delancey's Brigade and any other British troops in garrison at Sunbury and other outlying outposts were summoned to Savannah by Major General Prevost in early September, 1779. Cruger's effective force was quick to reach Savannah before the French army had established their siege positions (Lee 1969:137). Lawrence (1951:156) noted that Cruger and the effective men from the Sunbury garrison had
reached Savannah by September 10. Many of the soldiers in Delancey's Brigade who were at Sunbury were ill, however, and Captain Thomas French was ordered to escort these men to Savannah by inland passage. French served under Lieutenant Colonel Cruger and his troops were garrisoned at Fort George at Sunbury.

The events at Sunbury from January to September 1779 are not well documented. The scant documentary evidence suggests that the British maintained control of the town and Fort George during this period. The Patriots were eager to reclaim coastal Georgia, however, and Sunbury was one of their objectives. Colonel John Dooly, commander of the Georgia militia, wrote from his camp at Butler Creek (just south of Augusta, Georgia) in a letter to Major General Benjamin Lincoln, “…Col. Baker who I have been Informed was ordered by you to Join me is gone off towards Sunbury with about one Hundred & fifty men without giving me the least information of his Intended Route …” (Dooly 1779:1). If Colonel Baker’s troops made any attempt to retake Sunbury, no records were found to attest to it.

After the British capture of Sunbury in January 1779, loyalists held the town and its fort until September 1779, when the British troops were ordered to Savannah to help defend that city against the impending American and French attack. Lieutenant Colonel Cruger quickly marched with the able bodied men of Delancey's 1st Battalion to assist General Prevost in the defense of Savannah, arriving there by September 10. Shortly after his arrival in Savannah, Augustin Prevost was promoted in rank from a Brigadier General to a Major General.

Lieutenant Colonel John Marc Prevost, Augustin's brother, led the 60th Regiment, Royal Americans in the capture of Fort Morris. Prevost also participated in the unsuccessful 1778 British campaign in Georgia. Following quickly on the heels of the capture of Fort Morris, Lieutenant Colonel Prevost was instrumental in the British victory at Brier Creek. Once the lower coast of Georgia was securely in British hands Lieutenant Colonel John Marc Prevost was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Georgia.

**British Troop Strength in the South**

On March 2 Lieutenant Colonel Campbell wrote to Augustin Prevost with his recommendations for the British garrison strength at the various posts in Georgia. The defense of Sunbury was an essential part of Campbell's plan. Campbell explained his strategy for this arrangement of troops:

> When I consider the Strength of His Majesty’s Forces in Georgia, and that of the Rebels on the opposite Banks of the Savannah, I am inclined to think it would be imprudent at this Juncture, to follow other Views than those of securing the Conquest already made; and consequently our Attention ought to be directed to three essential Objects: The Security of Savannah, Ebenezer and Sundbury. Whatever may be the Policy or Movements of the Enemy, it is certain that those important Posts ought never to be neglected...(Campbell 1981:70-71).

Campbell's strategy for securing coastal Georgia for the British is outlined by Ensign John Wilson:

> In the months of March & April this post [Ebenezer] was made very strong with additional Redoubts and Artillery; for it was always considered that it ought to be made one of the
principal posts because a Chain of Communication across the Country and the Ogeechee river might have it’s right flank well fixt and secure at Ebenezer while it’s left might extend to and be covered by the Garrison at Sunbery [sic], these posts it was supposed would secure the lower part of the Province, and protect the lower part of the Province, and protect it’s Inhabitants against the Incursions of South Carolina (Davis 1986b:195).

Sir Henry Clinton wrote to Lord Germain on May 21 advising him of the situation in the South. This letter contained specific information on the placement of British troops in Georgia:

Lieut.-Colonel Prevost, who with three companies of grenadiers, Wellworth’s regiment, one battalion of Delancey’s and of the New Jersey Volunteers, with some Carolinians, was left to protect Georgia if necessary or to join the army with such part of the troops left with him as could be spared with propriety whenever the progress of our first division or the retrograde movements of General Lincoln should permit it, had by this time [late April or early May, 1779] crossed the river at the Sisters with all the horse, the grenadiers, and part of Wellworth’s battalion, leaving a sufficient garrison in Ebenezer, Savannah and Sunbury, and joined the army with some supplies ...(Davies 1978: 17:127).

One can get an idea of British troop strength in the area at this time by examining a return of Brigadier General Prevost’s troops from East Florida, made on January 17, 1779 included 38 officers and 905 rank and file, composed of the 16th and 60th regiments and companies of New Jersey Volunteers, South Carolina Royalists, East Florida Volunteers, and Rangers (BPRO CO 5/97, pt. I, fols. 135v-137, cited in Campbell 1981:114-115). This troop list included those stationed at Sunbury, as well as Savannah, New Ebenezer, and other posts in Georgia.

Returns of British troop strength on February 15 and May 1, 1779, placed the number of the British effective force in Georgia at 4,330 and 4,794 men, respectively (Carrington 1877). Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Innes’ “State of His Majesty’s Provincial Forces in Georgia per Return of 1st July 1779 by Alex. Innes, Inspr Genl P. Forces” reveals the details of the Loyalist troop strength in mid-1779 (Innes, in Clinton 1750-1838).

Major General Prevost wrote from Savannah to Henry Clinton on July 14, 1779 noting, “On my arrival at Beaufort [South Carolina] finding that a number of the back Inhabitants of Georgia… had taken Arms and infested the lower Settlements…the Battalion of Wissenbach with Brown’s Rangers were order’d immediately to Savannah, to be followed by the York Volunteers, Second Battalion Delancy’s” (Historical Manuscripts Commission 1901, 1:473). These statements by Prevost probably indicate that the 2nd Battalion, Delancey's Brigade, ceased to be posted at Sunbury after mid-July, 1779. Some of the troops in the New Jersey Volunteers and Delancey's Brigade may have returned to garrison Sunbury in October 1779 following the Siege of Savannah. On May 1, 1780 the total number of men in the New Jersey Volunteers, 3rd Battalion that remained in Georgia was 278, which included 52 men who were held prisoner by the Americans and 27 who were sick. The number of Delancey's 1st Battalion who were still in Georgia on May 1 was 226, which included 52 who were held prisoner and 19 who were sick. The number of Delancey's 2nd Battalion in Georgia was 174, which included 38 sick and an unlisted number who were held prisoner. The March 1st troop return included 490 men in the New Jersey Volunteers or Delancey's Brigade who were fit for duty. Cole and Braisted (2003) noted that the 1st Battalion, Delancey's Brigade and the
3rd Battalion, New Jersey Volunteers were ordered to march from Georgia to Charleston by July 10, 1780. Consequently, by mid-July, 1780 most of the loyalist troops who had been assigned to garrison duty at Sunbury had left that place.

Names of the Officers charged in the within Account [1st Bat Delancey's Brigade commd by Lt. Col. J. H. Cruger, 60 days pay 25 Feb 1782 to April 24]

Colonel Br Genl Oliver Delancey
Lieut Colo John H. Cruger
Major Joseph Greene
Captains James Galbreath
Jacob Smith
Barent Roorbach
George Ker
Thomas French
James French
George Dunbar
Captn Lieut Charles McPherson
Lieutenants Thos Cunningham
Alexr McMillan
Benjn Lester
Daniel Hallet
Benjn Griffeth
Colin Campbell
Daniel Cameron
James Supple
Nehh Rogers
Ensigns Ne[illeg] Old
Richard Boyle
Henry Ferguson
William French
George Brewerton
James DeLancey
Chaplain Revd Mr. Bowden
Adjutant Tho Cunningham
Q Mastger Nehh Rogers
Surgeon Nathan Smith

(British Headquarter Papers 1778, Reel M-361: Doc. 7507(3))

2nd Bat, Delanceys Brigade commd by Colo Gabriel G. Ludlow, 60 day pay Feb 24 to April 24 1782 includes
1 Colonel
1 Lt Colonel
1 Major
7 Captains
1 Captain Lieutenant
8 Lieutenants
8 Ensigns
1 Chaplain
1 Adjutant
1 Qr Mastger
1 Surgeon
1 Mate
27 Serjeants
26 Corporals
8 Drummers
266 Privates
18 Contingent men

Deduct
36 Prisoners

Dead were James Scott, died Feb 2; Wm Nibler Died March 43; Pat McGraw died Feb 23; John Koldridge died Feb 23

Names of the Within Officers
Colonel Gab. G. Ludlow
Lt. Colonel Richard Hewlet
Major Bowden
Captains E. Allison
Gil. C. Willet
Chr Hewlet
Ely Stiles
Thos Lester
Barth. Doughty
Geo. Clowes
Captn Lieut John Smith
Lieutenants E. Evans
Saml Clower
John Clower
Gab. D. Nolan
Wm McFailane
Michl Laffan
Harry Jackson
Zach. Brown
Ensigns Nath. Barnum
Wm. Montgomery
Francis D. Neber [Neler?]
Thos Carpenter
Shad. Chaw
G. Lystger Mingus
Ebenezer Brown
Brewerton
Chaplain W. Walter
Adjutant Thos Carpenter
Qr Mastger Richd Floyd
Surgeon Ara. Doughty
Mate Geo. A. Dunkill

(British Headquarter Papers 1778, Reel M-361: Doc. 7508(1))

Numerous contemporary accounts of the Siege of Savannah were recorded by officers and observers on both sides of the conflict. These include accounts by Augustin Prévost, Benjamin Lincoln and others (Lawrence 1951; Jones 1897:258-268; 1968; Hough 1975). Prévost described to Lord Germain the events in Georgia in August and September 1779,

On the 18th of August we received accounts from Augusta and its neighbourhood that the rebels were assembled there in force and that...they held the intention of coming down to attack us. Proper dispositions were therefore made at Ebenezer and the other advanced posts
to receive them...[September] 7th and 8th. ...Expresses to all the outposts to join, Beaufort, Ebenezer, Cherokee Hill, Ogeechee, Sunbury, the latter to dismantle the fort and to destroy what could not be carried off (Davies 1978: 17:241).

AMERICANS RETAKE SUNBURY

The next officer to hold command at Sunbury, albeit very briefly, was American Colonel John White. Jones noted that Colonel White, "had been for some time stationed at Sunbury, and commanded not only the continental troops there concentrated, but also all detached companies operating to the southward" (Jones 2001:301).

Colonel White's capture of five British vessels and more than 100 loyalists with a force of fewer than a dozen men is one of the more amazing stories of the American Revolution in Georgia. It is a story that has enormous public interpretive value and public appeal. Historian George White provides a description of Colonel White's accomplishments in capturing a substantial portion of Delancey's Brigade:

Colonel White effected, during the siege of Savannah, one of the most extraordinary captures the annals of warfare ever recorded. When General Prevost called in his detachments, he ordered the commandant at Sunbury, on the Georgia coast, upon evacuating that post, to put the invalids on board of the small-armed vessels, and to send them by the inland navigation to Savannah, under the care of Captain French, of the British Regulars. In consequence of head winds, Captain French and his command were detained until some of D’Estaing’s fleet were in possession of the pass, and he was induced to sail up the Ogeechee River until he reached a point about twenty-five miles from the city of Savannah. Having arrived here, he learned that the passage over land was also blocked up by the allied force, and he therefore made a descent upon the shore, and finally took post with his party about fifteen or twenty miles from Savannah. Colonel White, having ascertained that Captain French's force consisted of one hundred and eleven soldiers, possessing one hundred and thirty stand of arms, and that he also had under his charge, in the river Ogeechee, adjacent to his camp, five vessels, four of them fully armed, and one of them mounting fourteen guns, and manned by forty seamen, formed the resolution of capturing the detachment. He disclosed his plan to those who were with him. McCall, in his History of Georgia, says that the party consisted of Colonel White, Captains Geo. Melvin and A. E. Elholm, a sergeant and three privates, seven in all. Other historians make no mention of Captain Melvin, or of a sergeant, but give the whole praise to Colonels White, Elholm, and three soldiers, reducing the number to five. White built many watch-fires around the camp, placing them in such a position, and at such intervals, as to induce Captain French and his soldiers to believe that he was absolutely surrounded by a large force. The deception was kept up through the night by White and his companions, marching from fire to fire with the measured tread and the loud challenge of sentinels, now hailing from the east of the British camp, and then shifting rapidly their position and challenging from the extreme west. Nor was this the only stratagem; each mounted a horse and rode with haste in divers directions, imitating the manner of the staff; and giving orders with a loud voice. The delusion was complete. Captain French suffered himself to be completely trapped. White carried his daring plan forward by dashing boldly and alone to the camp of the British, and demanding a conference with French. ‘I am the commander, Sir,’ he said, ‘of the American soldiers in your vicinity. If you will surrender at once to my force, I will see to it that no injury is done to you or your command. If you decline to do this, I must candidly inform you that the feelings of my troops are highly incensed against you, and I can by no means be responsible for any consequences that may ensue.’ French thanked him for his humanity, and said, despondingly, that it was useless to contend with fate or with the large force that he saw was around him, and announced his willingness to surrender his vessels, his arms, his men, and himself to Colonel White. At this instant Captain Elholm came suddenly
dashing up at full speed, and saluting White, inquired of him where he should place the artillery. 'Keep them back, keep them back, Sir' answered White, 'the British have surrendered. Move your men off, and send me three guides to conduct them to the American post at Sunbury.' The three guides arrived. The five vessels were burned, and the British, urged by White to keep clear of his men, and to hasten their departure from the enraged and formidable Americans, pushed on with great celerity, whilst White retired with one or two of his associates, stating that he would go to his troops in the rear and restrain them. He now employed himself in collecting the neighbourhood militia, with which he overtook his guides, and conducted them in safety to the Sunbury post. Lee, in his account of this affair, says: 'The extraordinary address of White was contrasted by the extraordinary folly of French, and both were necessary to produce this wonderful issue. The affair approaches too near the marvellous to have been admitted into these memoirs, had it not been uniformly asserted, as uniformly accredited, and never contradicted.' Captain Elholm was an officer of Pulaski's Legion. Captain Melvin, it is believed, lived and died in Savannah (White 1854:367-369).

The September 30, 1779 capture by Colonel White, 4th Battalion, Georgia Continentals, of a British detachment at the Ogechies [Ogeechee River] consisting of Delancey’s 1st Battalion, totaling 142 men, under command of Captain Thomas French. Articles of Capitulation were signed on September 30, 1779 between Captain French and Colonel White. Captain French surrendered himself, 1 Lieutenant, 1 Surgeon, 5 Sergeants, 9 Corporals, 87 Privates, and 1 Bombadier. The captured British troops were to be conveyed to Sunbury. Article 5 of the agreement provided for convenient hospitals for the sick in Sunbury. Another tally of captured British troops suggests that the number captured by Colonel White and his men was substantially more than 105 men. A "Return of the Officers & Men belonging to the 1st Bat. of Brig. Gen. Delancey surrendered to Col. White, 4th Battn Ga", listed 142 men taken at Ogeechies on October 1, 1779 (Allis 1967:Reel 4).

Lawrence (1951:159) provides a slightly different summation of this event, which he dated to October 1, 1779. He placed the number of captured at 110 troops in five ships and he located this military action near the Thomas Savage plantation. The five ships were burned by Colonel White's men, but the location of this potentially informative underwater archaeological site has not been determined. When the muster of his company was recorded, also on November 20, Captain French was listed as, "sick at Sunberry". French’s junior officers included: Ensign N. Rogers, Sergeant Thomas Wright, Corporal Robert Miller (died 2 Oct 1779) and Drummer Thomas Dutill (Clark 1981, Volume 3:10-11). Also serving in French’s company were 31 privates, although 19 of them were not present at the November 1779 muster for various reasons.

Other men of Loyalist Delancey's Brigade were assigned to other posts in Georgia. On January 9, 1779 Lieutenant Colonel Campbell assigned the 2nd Battalion of Delancey’s Brigade to garrison the post at Cherokee Hill above Savannah (Campbell 1981:39). An unsigned document, dated April 30, 1779 and sent to Benjamin Lincoln at his Purysburg headquarters, probably represents a Rebel spy’s intelligence of the British troop departure from Ebenezer:

The army & Co in readiness to march this Eveg [sic] at 7 oclock, Rangers advanced, the detachment of the Lt Infant with their guns—one Batt 71 of the New Y volunt Hugston’s Regt to open in back the Artill 2nd Batt 71st –Rear guard 2d Batt Delaneys [DeLancey’s]. Four Comp Lt In: 4 on the left flank, when formed Rangers & Lt Inf: cover the Front, when formed

60
This hastily scribbled document clearly places the 2nd Battalion of Delancey's Brigade on the Savannah River area on January 9, 1779. The whereabouts of Cruger's 1st Battalion, Delancey's Brigade at that time has not been determined. Elements of Delancey's Brigade were employed by the British to garrison several small posts on the Georgia coast, in addition to Sunbury.

From January 10 through the first week of September 1779 the British military held control of Sunbury and Fort George. The British, no doubt, made repairs and improvements to the works at Fort George during this period. For most of this period the garrison consisted of the 1st Battalion of Delancey's Brigade. The East Florida Rangers, 60th Regiment Royal Americans, and Loyalist Indians, who had helped to capture the place, probably occupied Sunbury for a short period before most of these troops were shifted to the Savannah River region.

During the first two-thirds of 1779 the Americans made two small-scale attempts to harrass British-held Sunbury. The first was on June 4, 1779 when an unidentified American privateer, commanded by Captain Spencer, landed a dozen men at nearby Belfast plantation, where Colonel Cruger, loyalist militia Colonel Roger Kelsall, and a party of officers were captured. Colonels Cruger and Kelsall were paroled to Sunbury where both officers was soon exchanged for an American prisoner and resumed his command of Fort George. The second raid was also in June 1779 when Colonel John Baker and 30 Americans attacked a house near Sunbury where some Georgia loyalists, led by a Captain Goldsmith, were gathered. Several loyalists, including a Lieutenant Gray, were killed (Sheftall 1995:46-47, 55; McCall 1909:529).

**SUNBURY AFTER THE SIEGE OF SAVANNAH**

The military events that occurred at Sunbury following the British departure in September 1779 are poorly documented. A “Monthly Return of the Troops in Georgia under the Commd of Major General Prevost March 1st 1780” reveals the troop composition in the months following the Siege of Savannah.

Tarelton Brown, an American Ranger, penned his memoirs of the war years noting that he had formed a Ranger company, which was based in Cracker's Neck, South Carolina, and: "During our stay at Cracker’s Neck, we took two trips to Sunbury, Midway Settlement, Georgia, under the command of General Pickens and Twiggs" (Jarrell 2002). Brown's recollection does not include specific dates for these events, but the sequence implies that these events followed the capture of Charleston by the British.

The British captured Charleston in May 1780, along with the commander of the Southern District, Major General Benjamin Lincoln. Once the British had captured Charleston, concern with military affairs at Sunbury among the high command was lessened. By mid-1780 the theater of war had largely shifted from the Georgia coast to the Carolinas.
Cruger and his men were assigned to garrison the British fort at Ninety Six in the South Carolina piedmont. Major victories by the British at Camden led to the replacement of Major General Lincoln with Major General Horatio Gates. Gates was replaced by Major General Nathanael Greene in October 1780. Greene established his headquarters in the Carolinas and remained in the Carolinas throughout the duration of the war. During their tenure neither Gates nor Greene were greatly concerned with Sunbury, Georgia.

No historical documents were found to indicate that any regular British troops were garrisoned at Sunbury from 1780 to 1782. During that period Sunbury was defended by 3rd Regiment of Foot Militia (or the Sunbury Regiment of Loyal Militia), commanded by Colonel Roger Kelsall, and Lieutenant Colonels Simon Munro and Charles Watts. The Loyalist militia was charged with defending all of St. Johns Parish, however, which suggests that their forces were spread quite thinly over the region (Loyalist Claims, cited in Sheftall 1995:53; Coldham 1980:269-270).

Correspondence between Lord Cornwallis, Lord Germain, Royal Governor Sir James Wright, and John Graham, indicates that no British regular troops were stationed at Sunbury in 1780. Governor Wright wrote to Lord Germain on July 19, 1780 advising Germain of his suggestions for an adequate defense of Georgia to Lord Cornwallis, which included a garrison of 50 men for Sunbury (Wright 1873:310). Lord Cornwallis declined to send the troops telling Wright, "That the Propriety of a Post at Sunbury will of Course be Refer'd to Lieut. Colonel Clarke to whom his Lordship has given the command of the Troops in Georgia & East Florida...." (Wright 1873:314-315). As of August 20, 1780 approximately 500 British soldiers defended Savannah, another 240 in Augusta, but none were in Sunbury (Wright 1873:314-315). Graham wrote to Wright on November 21, 1780 noting that, "...the small Garrisons at Savannah & Augusta" were, "the only Military Posts in the Province..." (Wright 1873:324). Wright wrote to Lord Germain on December 1, 1780 describing his efforts at strengthening the fortifications at Savannah. From October to December, Wright noted, more than 400 negroes had been working to construct five redoubts and batteries around the town. By December, 1780 Governor Wright had apparently given up hope of receiving any troops for a garrison at Sunbury and he focused his resources on Savannah where he resided. No documents were found to indicate that Lieutenant General Clarke dispatched any troops to Sunbury. Any troops that were at Sunbury were probably recalled to Savannah in January 1782 by British Lieutenant General Allured Clarke.

CARR’S RAID ON SUNBURY

The Americans did not ignore the vulnerability of Sunbury, although it took them some time to muster sufficient strength to approach the place. Captain Patrick Carr and Georgia militia troops were able to make a successful raid on Sunbury in the Spring of 1782. Few details pertaining to this raid were located from the historical research. Captain Patrick Carr was active in Georgia and South Carolina throughout the war but his exploits are poorly documented. Carr’s command has been variously described as a Company of Burke County, Georgia militia, a Ranger Company, volunteer dragoons, and mounted militia (Jones 2001). By early 1782 Captain Carr’s troops formed part of the Georgia Brigade, which was an amalgam of soldiers from various defunct units of the Georgia military.
Georgia Governor John Martin described Captain Carr’s Corps in a May 23, 1782 letter to Major General Anthony Wayne,

> Captain Carr’s Corps is entirely upon a new plan. It is to consist of two companies, thirty men each, one of Dragoons, the other of Riflemen, and is called Carr’s Independent Corps, and commanded by two captains, two lieutenants, and a captain commandant, with which compliment he is not a little pleased. They will shortly proceed upon the business intended, agreeable to your orders (Martin 1917).

Captain Carr and his Independent Corps were apparently commanded by Major John Habersham in 1782, although this chain of command is not entirely lucid. Major Habersham’s Georgia Battalion was organized into three companies in 1782 and 1783. Captain Carr may be listed as one of the “Extra Officers” as shown below.

- 1st Company, Captain Lucas, June 1782 to November 1783
  - Captain L. McIntosh, January to December 1782
- 2nd Company, Captain Lucas, January to December 1782
  - Captain W. McIntosh, June 1782 to November 1783
- 3rd Company, Captain W. McIntosh, January to December 1782
  - Captain J. Ducoin, June 1782 to November 1783
  - Extra Officers, January to December 1782
  - Field and Staff, January to December 1782 (NARA M-246, Roll 32).

The field and staff officers in 1782 and 1783 included:

- Major John Habersham
- Lieutenant and Adjutant Nathaniel Pearce
- Lieutenant and Quartermaster John Peter Wagner
- Surgeon James Boyd Sharpe (appointed December 6, 1782)
- Sergeant Major Frederick Long [Lang?] (appointed July 19, 1782)
- Quartermaster Sergeant John Christopher Buntz (appointed June 20, 1782)
  (NARA M-246, Roll 32).

Captain Lucas’ 1st Company, Georgia Battalion, consisted of 59 soldiers (including 8 above the rank of private) in 1782-1783. Germans from the New Ebenezer settlement were well represented in the 1st Company, represented by one dozen men.

On February 12, 1782, General Wayne ordered Lieutenant Colonel James Jackson, commander of the Georgia Brigade, to march with his dragoons and a detachment of militia to “an intermediate position between the town of Savannah and the Ogeechee”, to defend against a British and loyalist Indian attack from the south. Although his orders included no reference to Sunbury, his words made clear a concern for an attack by the enemy from that direction (Jackson 1782). Lieutenant Colonel James Jackson, Georgia Legion, had previously engaged the British Dragoons at the Ogeechee River with some success in early November 1781 (Jackson 1781). By late 1781, Captain Carr was under the command of Jackson although he also received direct orders from Major General Anthony Wayne. In one of these orders from Wayne, Captain Carr was instructed to proceed to Sunbury, which was possibly the impetus and authorization for Carr's 1782 raid.
In early 1782, Major John Habersham was sent by General Wayne to intercept a party of Indians who were bound for Savannah. Habersham, who had served as Brigade-Major to Colonel Elbert in December 1778 in the conflict at Midway Church, was captured at least twice by the British at Savannah and Brier Creek (Jones 1891:71). Jones (1891:74) noted that Habersham was accompanied on his 1782 mission by Major Francis Moore, some South Carolina cavalry, and Captain Patrick Carr and his mounted militia. Major Habersham sought to negotiate with the Indians but as Jones observed in this description of Carr’s raid on Sunbury

*His plans were subsequently frustrated by reason of the indiscretion and disobedience of a lieutenant who, with a portion of the mounted militia, slew several of the Indians present, and then, making a rapid descent upon Sunbury, killed eleven loyalists, residents of the town (Jones 1891:74).*

Jones’ secondary description of Captain Carr’s raid on Sunbury in early 1782 is, unfortunately, the most detailed account of that engagement. Jones’ description of those involved in the raid is somewhat puzzling, since he refers to a lieutenant in command and makes no reference to Captain Carr’s direct involvement.

Jones (2001) also noted that the British maintained posts at the Ogeechee River and Sunbury in 1781 and 1782. The primary British force, however, was concentrated at the Ogeechee River. Sunbury was lightly garrisoned by Colonel Roger Kelsall’s 3rd Regiment of Foot Militia at the time of Carr’s raid. Colonel Kelsall’s small force was spread throughout St. Johns Parish and the actual troop strength at Sunbury at the time of the raid was not determined.

On April 17, 1782, Major General Anthony Wayne wrote from his headquarters at Ebenezer, Georgia to Governor John Martin concerning Patrick Carr’s actions following an attack on the Americans at Read’s Bluff on the Altamaha River on April 10: “Captain Lyons being joined the next day by Captain Carr, they and their people unanimously determined to repass the river, and avenge the blood of their gallant leader, and as they both write me that their party is in high spirits and respectable in numbers. I am in hopes of having it in my power to announce their success in the course of a few days” (Wayne 1782a:1).

Also in April 1782, the British galley *HMS Arbuthnot*, commanded by Captain Scallion [possibly Captain Roger Scallon, or Scallan?], made a raid on Sunbury, in which, according to the loyalist claims of Colonel Roger Kelsall and Captain Simon Paterson, large portions of the town and the fort were destroyed and burned. This relationship, timing, and impact of Captain Scallon’s raid with that of Captain Carr’s raid on Sunbury is not known (Sheftall 1995:57; Morse 1791:221). Historical records archived in England may hold important clues about this engagement. The British National Archives holds ships paybooks and muster lists for the galley *Arbuthnot* dating from 1780 to 1786. These were not researched in the present study.

On May 14, 1782, General Wayne wrote to Governor Martin requesting a rifle corps, in which he noted, “Capt. Carr is going where an enterprise most is to be effected more by surprise, than numbers—so that he is not to interfere with the Rifle Corps” (Wayne 1782b).
The May 21, 1782 minutes of the Executive Council record this resolution regarding the application for Captain Patrick Carr’s proposed formation of Dragoons and Riflemen:

RESOLVED, That the Council approve the same, that they may be raised for three months, to commence, from the time of their going to duty, and to be known by the name of Carrs Independent Corps, to consist of two Companies of thirty men each; one, of Dragoons and the other Riflemen, commanded by one Captain Commandant; two Captains and two Lieutenants; And that Commissions be issued accordingly by his honor the Governor for that purpose (Candler 2001, 2:337-338).

Captain Patrick Carr wrote from his camp at Silver Bluff on August 11, 1782 to Georgia Governor John Martin advising him of the conditions in interior Georgia, particular in Burke County. This letter indicates that Captain Carr and his troops had left Sunbury by early August 1782. Carr noted that the frontier contained groups of men committing robberies and murders and many settlers feared Indian attacks. The Ogeechee settlement had been abandoned and only Galphin’s settlement in the Old Town remained populated. Captain Carr was seeking directions from the governor on how best to deal with the situation. Carr stated in his letter,

This is to Acquaint your Honour with the Situation of things at present in the part of the Country and to Desire your Directions how I shall act, there is a number of fellows about, Some give up to the Millitia Officers, and numbers still sculking about their homes, they are Chiefly fellows who stole out of Savannah before and about the fall of the Town, I have got the Copy of the Oaths & the enlistment from the Honble. Genl. Wayne, but I have been so Exceedingly ill since I got home that I have been obliged to keep my bed, I am now upon the Recovery, and I hope well able to put in Execution your Honours Orders as soon as I receive them, it is with the Greatest grief that I have been Laid up Sick, While poor travelers has been annoy'd by that infernel set of Outliars with Sam Moor, I have sent parties out without success, But you Honour may Depend as soon as I get able to ride I will make them Shy or catch them -- they have all got Wives who harbours them and their plundered property, and without the men is killed or the Women Secured these will be no end the Roberies & Plunders committed in Georgia but your Honour may depend that my best Exertions Shall be used in Suppressing those Troublesom set of villians who are a pest to Society, & to full fill and put in force What ever Orders I shall receive from your Honour from time to time -- you may depend their is some of the Worst of men now up among us. I dare say only waiting for an Opportunity to do mischief and to slip off But it is in your power by giving me orders how to Act to put a stop to them – Ogeechee Settlement in Burkis intirely abandoned, by the Indians Coming in and now and then Picking of a Tory, they have killed never a Whigg yet, but it has thrown them into such fever it has made them all fly to Buck head

Mr Galphins Settlement at the Old Town Still Stands by my persuation, if that is broak up Burk County will certainly follow, their is Several Desineing Men thats wants it Done by trying to Secure the people that is Settled there that they mite so the ruin of the County -- I have got Some half Breeds to live there that has give themselves up to me, as soon as I get able to rede & assist the people on the Line I hope I shall have it my power to persuad them to return to their former places of Abode through the order I formaly Receved from you Honour (Carr 1782:1-4).

The October 19, 1782 minutes of the Executive Council read and considered the application of Captain Carr and issued these orders

ORDERED, That His Honor the Governor be requested to prepare a Commission to Capt Barton, to raise a Company of Volunteer Horse, to consist of one Captain, one Lieutenant, one Cornet & Thirty privates to be annexed to Carr’s Legion, under the command of Capt. Patrick Carr, for the defence and protection of this State. also,
ORDERED, That Capt. Patrick Carr, be immediately furnished with thirty pair of pistols, for the use of his Legion he to be accountable for the same (Candler 2001, v.2:384).

A few other primary documents pertaining to Captain Carr were located. On January 13, 1783, the Georgia House of Assembly read the, “Petition of Patrick Carr on behalf of himself, Officers and men now under his Command, Praying for a Certain Quantity of Land to be Reserved for them on the Oconees between the Two trading paths the Horse and Uchy Path” (Candler 2001, 2:214). Other letters by Patrick Carr to Governor Martin and Lyman Hall from 1782 and 1783 are known, but provided no additional details on the events at Sunbury (Carr 1917:337-343). By September, 1784, Patrick Carr had risen in rank of Major in the Georgia militia (RRG, 2:695).

SUNBURY AS A PRISONER OF WAR CAMP

History records that Sunbury was used as a prisoner of war camp by both Americans and British in the American Revolution. Few details about the camp have survived. As early as 1777 Sunbury was used as a “gaol” for loyalist prisoners (Elbert 1776-1788). We know that most of the officers that were placed on parole were allowed free movement within the town. Their quarters were probably in private residences in Sunbury. American non-commissioned officers and enlisted men were mostly kept off shore on prison ships. Some of these ships may have been moored in the Medway River, but most were concentrated in the Savannah River nearer to the British high command. When Savannah was taken by the British troops under Colonel Campbell in December 1778, George Walton commanded a battalion of General Robert Howe's army. In this battle Walton was wounded and taken prisoner. He was paroled until he recovered from his wound, and then transferred to Sunbury, as a prisoner of war. In 1779 he was exchanged, and in October of that year he was elected Governor of the State of Georgia (White 1854:211).

George Walton wrote to Major General Lincoln requesting that he be exchanged quickly. Walton feared that he and his fellow prisoners would soon be massacred by the unruly loyalist guerillas. The British troops of Delancey's Brigades had abandoned Sunbury for Savannah, which left the American prisoners, who remained in Sunbury on their honor, vulnerable to attack (Walton 1779:1-2). In October 1779 Captain John Baker, Georgia Continentals, wrote to Major General Lincoln advising him that, by Lincoln's orders, Baker had posted 25 men at Sunbury (Baker 1779). Sheftall (1995:49) noted that these soldiers were Georgia militia, commanded by Colonel John Elliott.

In September 1779 Sunbury changed dramatically from serving as an American to a British prisoner of war camp. Captain French and his fellow loyalist troops must have been held only briefly at Sunbury by the Americans who retreated towards Charleston by mid-October 1779 following the unsuccessful siege of Savannah. Shortly thereafter the British again reclaimed the town and used Sunbury as a prisoner of war camp. Although British troops were almost certainly posted there after mid-October, 1779, the identities of the troops in garrison are subject to question. It seems likely that a detachment of DeLancey's Battalion was assigned to that task, possibly led by Lieutenant Colonel Cruger. Most of DeLancey's corps had been engaged in military campaigns in South Carolina earlier in 1779 and again in 1780.
Many enlisted men and non-commissioned American officers were held prisoner at Sunbury and their fates are mostly unknown. One who survived this imprisonment was Private David Childers, who was in the 2nd Georgia Regiment, Continental Army. Childer’s pension claim noted that he served nearly three years, until in an engagement with the British at Sunbury in Georgia this deponent [Childers] was taken prisoner and conveyed on board ship and kept in close confinement for six months, as a means of coercing him to enlist in the British service, and finding no alternative but remain in prison, he at length through strategem did enlist and in about two months he deserted from said service…(Childers 1818).

Another Continental soldier who survived the British prison ships was Private Henry Smith, a soldier in the Fort Morris garrison of Continental Artillery. Smith was captured on January 9, 1779 where he was taken prisoner and sent to Savannah. His prison ship was moored off the coast of South Carolina and he escaped from it on September 2, 1779 (Smith 1834). Another survivor was Private Peter Brumback, a Virginian who was taken prisoner at Sunbury after being wounded in the thigh by a musket ball. Brumback later escaped from the British (White 1992).

In mid September 1779 Sunbury served as a prisoner of war camp for captured more than 100 members of the 1st Battalion, Delancey's Brigade. The 1st Battalion was commanded by Captain Thomas French. These Loyalists were captured on the Ogeechee River by Colonel John White, 4th Georgia Continentals. Colonel White marched the mostly invalid prisoners to Sunbury, where their care was to include hospital facilities. The events pertaining to the outcome of their capture and subsequent treatment are undocumented. After the Americans lost control of coastal Georgia following the Siege of Savannah in early October, the Southern Army retreated to South Carolina and, within a few months, Captain French was back in action. This suggests that at least some of the prisoners from Delancey’s Brigade, who were held at Sunbury, were later released.

Within a month the tables were turned and Sunbury served as a POW camp for imprisoned Patriots. On October 17, 1779, Captain John Dollar, an American prisoner of war and senior officer in Sunbury, wrote to Lincoln from Sunbury requesting vessels to move the families of continental officer’s who were prisoners of war there to Carolina (Allis 1967: Reel 4). Negotiations for the release of American soldiers in the South continued for many months, even involving high level talks between General George Washington and Sir Henry Clinton.

The location of Sunbury’s prisoner of war camp has not been identified, either from documentary research or by the archaeological investigation. Most of those held by the British were probably held captive on prison ships, which were mobile. These may have been anchored near Savannah. Officers who were held prisoner were granted privileges whereby they moved freely about town and were quartered in civilian’s houses. Consequently, the archaeological expression of British prison life in Sunbury may have left a very faint record. Those held prisoner by the Americans were held in some type of compound in, or near
Sunbury. The Americans lacked the prison ships. As with the British, however, the archaeological traces of prison life at Sunbury may be difficult to identify.

NAVAL ACTION AT SUNBURY

Sunbury was an important seaport on the southern coast in the American Revolution. Both the American and British military dispatched watercraft to Sunbury at that time. In 1776 the Continental Congress recognized Sunbury’s importance when they authorized the building of four galleys, which was partially accomplished in, or near, Sunbury. These were the galleys Bulloch, Congress, Lee, and Washington.

Galleys in the Revolution were used extensively for coastal defense by both the Americans and British (Fleetwood 1995; Chapelle 1935, 1949; Guilmartin 2002). Although some records have survived pertaining to the construction of the galleys in Georgia, no detailed descriptions or drawings of these watercraft are known, nor have any wrecks of these vessels been located archaeologically. One characteristic of the galleys that were built in Sunbury and Savannah was that they were well armed, despite their small size. These craft are sometimes referred to as “row galleys”, which indicates that they were powered by oars, although they probably also had some provision for sail power.

More than a little confusion was encountered while researching the galleys at Sunbury. The source of the confusion was the similar names that were assigned to a fleet of American galleys that sailed in Lake Champlain under command of Captain Benedict Arnold. Arnold’s fleet had galleys bearing the names Congress, Trumbull, and Washington, which, like the fleet of Georgia-constructed galleys, were built in mid-1776 (NARA 1776-1778 M-853). Each of Arnold’s galleys were defended by 18 guns, including 18, 12, 9, 6, 4, and 2 pounder cannons and 8 to 10 swivel guns. Arnold’s fleet may serve as an analog for Sunbury’s galleys, although Arnold’s fleet sailed in a land-locked body of water and the galleys at Sunbury were designed for travel on the Atlantic Ocean.

The crew size of an American galley was about two dozen men and a captain. A return of, “men seeing duty on board of the Bulloch galley”, for the period from August 18 to August 21, [1779], listed:

- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Boatswain
- 1 Yeoman
- 4 Cosender[?]
- 1 Armor
- 3 Seaman
- Moredos [?]
- 12 Negros
- Rations for 24 men (Reid 1779).

In early April 1777, the galleys Washington and Lee guarded Sunbury and the Medway River. On April 27 these galleys were part of Colonel Samuel Elbert’s force against British East Florida (Harden 1905:14-21). The American “fleet” was under command of
Commodore Bowen (Siebert 1943:70-71). Loyalist Governor Wright wrote that the expeditionary force, which was, “fitted out from Sunbury”, consisted of, “3 Row Galleys, 2 armed Sloops and some Transports carrying in the whole 20 Pieces of Cannon from 12 to 24 Pounders besides Swivels &c &c”. Elbert and Bowen’s combined force sailed as far south as Amelia Island before turning back for Sunbury at the end of May 1777 (Siebert 1943:71). The American expedition failed and by December 1777, three American galleys were anchored back at Sunbury (Jones 1911:14-21). On December 12, after the arrival of Major General Howe at Sunbury, the three American galleys were ordered to other areas of the Georgia coast (Sheftall 1995:39).

The American fleet remained active in the waters off the Georgia coast over the next few months. Colonel Samuel Elbert listed the following American ships in Frederica Harbor on April 19, 1778:

- *Galley Washington*, Captain Hardy
- *Galley Lee*, Captain Braddock
- *Galley Bullock* (Bulloch), Captain Hatcher
- *Sloop Rebecca* [a captured British vessel]
- *Hinchenbrook* [a captured British vessel] (Moultrie 1802, 1:375-376)

Colonel Charles C. Pinckney noted in a letter to Brigadier General Moultrie, dated May 4, 1778, that, “The design of the Hinchenbrook, Rebecca, and the other vessels that were lately taken, was to attack Sunberry…but the capture of those vessels has, I believe, considerably dampened their ardor…” (Moultrie 1802, 1:380-381).

Major General Robert Howe wrote a letter from his camp at Fort Howe on the Altamaha River to Brigadier General Moultrie, dated May 23, 1778, in which Howe requested, “I would wish a row-boat with five hundred canteens, two hundred kettles, and as many tents as could be got, be dispatched with them, with orders to proceed, both by night and by day, to Sunberry, where they will receive orders, &c.” (Moultrie 1802, v.1:381-382). Obviously, a sizeable row-boat would have been required to transport the items requested by Howe. Hence the term “galley” and “row galley” were used interchangeably in reference to the American watercraft.

Two unidentified American vessels are mentioned in Captain Murray’s account of the January 1779 battle of Sunbury. These include a galley, which was bombarded and sunk during the battle and a sloop, which was later captured by the British in the open sea and sailed to Antigua. Among those captured in the unidentified sloop was Colonel Thomas Morris, the namesake of Fort Morris. Three American galleys that were lost in the January 1779 siege of Sunbury are tentatively identified as the Bulloch, Washington, and Trumbull. The galleys Washington and Trumbull were abandoned by their crews and intentionally burned on Ossabaw Island and the Bulloch was bombarded and exploded and burned on the Sunbury bar. The crew of the galleys Washington and Trumbull were subsequently captured by the British after they boarded an American schooner and were in the open Atlantic Ocean (Murray n.d.:307-308; Sheftall 1995:44-45).
Many British ships visited Sunbury during the American Revolution. Determining the identify of the British vessels that were assigned to Sunbury is also problematic (Tilley 1987). Several of the vessels are unnamed in the primary accounts, while others have names that were possibly shared with other ships in the British Navy.

The *HMS Arbuthnot*, a British galley commanded by Captain Scallion (or Scallon), attacked Sunbury in April 1782. According to the Loyalist claims of Colonel Roger Kelsall and Captain Simon Paterson, both former officers in Sunbury’s Loyalist militia, the crew of the *Arbuthnot* destroyed and burned much of Sunbury, including the Sunbury fort (Loyalist Claims, cited in Sheftall 1995:56; Coldham 1980:269-270, 380-381). Muster lists for the *Arbuthnot* for the period including April 1782 are preserved in the British National Archives (BPRO 2004). These records were not examined in the present study.

Historical substantiation of Sunbury’s burning by the British is provided by Jedidiah Morse (1791:221) who described the town in 1791, "Sunbury is a sea-port town, favoured with a safe and very convenient harbour. It is a very pleasant, healthy town, and is the resort of the planters from the adjacent places of Midway and Newport, during the sickly months. It was burnt by the British in the late war, but is now recovering its former populousness and importance. It has a flourishing academy".

The *HMS Hinchinbrook*, a schooner commanded by Lieutenant Ellis, was involved in the April 12, 1776 attack on Sunbury that resulted in the burning of two American ships (a brigantine loaded with lumber and a privateer being outfitted near Sunbury) (Cooney 2005). The *Hinchinbrook* was part of a plan to attack Sunbury two years later, but these plans were thwarted when the ship was captured in April 1778 in the Frederica River (well to the south of Sunbury) by the Americans under Samuel Elbert (Morgan 1964-1973, 5:197, 367; National Archives of Canada M-346, Doc. 1058, Colonel Tonyn to William Howe, March 31, 1778). Muster lists for several Revolutionary warships known as *HMS Hinchinbrook* are preserved in the National Archives in Great Britain. Muster lists for the ship in question have survived and cover the period from July 1775 to August 1777 (BPRO 2004: ADM 36/8520).

The ship *Hynd* that was involved in the April 1776 attack on the two American ships in Sunbury was possibly the *HMS Hynde*. No details about the *Hynde* were obtained for the period of the American Revolution, although in 1795, the *HMS Hynde*, possibly the same vessel, was commanded by Captain Putman (Morgan 1964-1973, 5:197, 367; BPRO 2004).

The primary invasion force, which was transported from Sandy Hook, New York to coastal Georgia in November 1778 by Commodore Sir Hyde Parker, arrived at the mouth of the Savannah River as planned. Several ships, including the *HMS Neptune*, were separated from the convoy and strayed off course. These ships later linked up with the British force in St. Augustine. Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen and his fellow New Jersey Loyalists who were aboard those wayward ships, became participants in the January 1779 siege of Sunbury. Muster lists for the crew of the *HMS Neptune* during the period including 1778 and 1779 are preserved in the British National Archives (BPRO 2004).
The *HMS Rebecca*, commanded by Captain Mobray, also was captured by Elbert at Frederica (National Archives of Canada M-346, Doc. 1058, Colonel Tonyn to William Howe, March 31, 1778). This ship had been bound for an attack on Sunbury in April 1778 before it was captured.

The *HMS Spitfire* was described by American Colonel John White on November 21, 1778 as “a Brig of 10 Guns” and he reported that it was accompanied by “her Tender” as part of a convoy that was led by the Ship *George* and also included “a Galley mounting two 18 P.s [18 Pounders] and a large Flat” (Lincoln 1779, cited in Sheftall 1995:34).

The *HMS Thunderer* was described by Captain Patrick Murray, 60th Royal Regiment, as an, “armed Flat *Thunderer* of 2 [two] 24 pounders, and 2 Swivels…” (Murray n.d.:306). This vessel took part in the November 1778 invasion of Sunbury. Muster lists for the *HMS Thunderer* for November 1778, are preserved in the British National Archives (BPRO 2004).

Other craft that were probably docked at Sunbury during part of 1779 include the five unidentified British vessels (two armed schooners and three other vessels) that were captured and burned in the Ogeechee River by the Americans, led by Colonel John White, in September 1779 (Lincoln 1779, cited in Sheftall 1995:49). Those vessels were transporting the invalid troops from Sunbury to Savannah when the ships were captured and their occupants marched to Sunbury.

**SUNBURY AFTER THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION**

By late July 1782 the British had completely evacuated their troops from Sunbury to East Florida. The American Revolution was officially ended by treaty with Great Britain in 1783 followed by an uneasy peace for nearly two decades. Apparently no defensive construction was undertaken at Sunbury during this period, possibly in part because the international border between the United States of America and Spain was further south at the St. Mary's River. There the Americans established Fort Point Peter. This post was one of two federal garrisons in Georgia during this period, the other being Savannah. The American Navy established a fleet of gunboats to patrol and defend the Georgia coast, which reduced the need to construct or maintain fortifications at individual coastal settlements.

Most of Sunbury’s Loyalist population, including its townspeople and the Loyalist troops from East Florida, New Jersey, and New York, who were garrisoned in that Georgia town, did not return to Sunbury after the American Revolution. Those troops and Loyalist refugees who remained in Georgia in July 1783 made their way to St. Augustine before settling in the Bahamas and the Turks and Cacaos Islands. Approximately 45,000 British subjects migrated to Canada at the end of the war. Delancey’s Regiment, commanded by John Harris Cruger, and the New Jersey Volunteers, commanded by Isaac Allen, went from the Carolinas to New York before settling in the Canadian Maritime provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in 1783. Most of these men settled in the middle area of the St. Johns River in New Brunswick. Isaac Allen later served as an Assistant Judge in New Brunswick (Ward Chipman Papers 1776-1785; Fryer 1980:307; McNutt 1984:21, 31, 51).
Miraculously, the town of Sunbury survived the American Revolution, although the war had a debilitating effect on the people and businesses at Sunbury, which was further aggravated from the devastating effects of strong hurricanes in 1804 and 1824. These factors contributed to the abandonment of the town (Forts Committee, Department of Archives and History n.d.:40). The declining significance of Sunbury is evident from the cartographic record. A 1796 map (Figure 7) shows the town as a relatively important place but on later maps it is shown less prominently. By the 1820s Sunbury had declined in economic importance and the defense of the area became less significant. Coastal defensive strategies in the United States also had evolved by that era with a new generation of fortifications required (Lewis 1970). Apparently, the Fort Morris vicinity was not deemed a suitable or necessary spot for a major fortification at this time.

![Figure 7. Portion of a 1796 Map Showing the Sunbury Vicinity (Carl Vinson Institute of Government [CVIOG] 2004).](image)

The period following the American Revolution up to the War of 1812 was not without hardship or military threat to the citizens of Sunbury. Creek Indian raids were frequent in the 1780s and early 1790s. No battles or attacks within the actual town of Sunbury, however, are reported for this period.

Letters by Thomas Lewis, the first schoolmaster of the Sunbury Academy, provide some insight into the conditions and quality of life in Sunbury in the first decade of the nineteenth century (Lewis 1802a-b, 1803a-b; Milo Lewis 1801-1846). Writing to his parents in New England, Thomas Lewis wrote one week after arriving in Sunbury on January 4, 1802,

*Last week on Wednesday I arrived in this place. Since my arrival in this country I have been treated with great attention and kindness, by the people to whom I have been introduced. I am very far from pleased with the face of the country or with the manners of the people at large in Georgia. Still I find many among the higher class of people who are agreeable, and some apparently religious. In passing from Savannah to this place, which is at the distance at least 45 miles there is leave [?] the appearance of a hill or a stone. It is a dead level, mostly*
covered with lofty pitch pines. The country appears to be but thinly settled. On the road I believe I did not pass a house oftener than one in five, or six miles. The buildings even of the wealthy inhabitants are very poor; no better to be seen than the one in which I have been accustomed to reside in Connecticut. In Sunbury the houses are tolerably good and the situation pleasant. It lies on a beautiful bay, and open to the Sea, which renders it not only pleasant, but, in the opinion of the people, quite healthy. In this country there are at present three preachers, two presbyterians, and one baptist. The baptist preaches in this town, to one audience not an individual of which, I believe, embraces the sentiments peculiar to the baptist sect. The people here of any religion, I believe are universally presbyterians or congregationalists. The gentleman who preaches here is a young man of a liberal education, apparently pious, but an indifferent preacher. Still he is very popular among the people. I find in this country a much greater disposition to support the appearance of good order, morality and religion, than I had expected before my arrival. God grant they may be supported not only in appearance, but in reality.

The Academy in this place is not yet supplied with an instructor. Nor is the building yet in readiness to receive a school. Within about two months the building will probably be completed and the school commence. I am requested to take charge of it, for the consideration of seven hundred dollars by the year, together with my board. I am yet undetermined whether to accept their proposals. I have chosen to defer an answer on this subject, until I shall have an opportunity to judge whether the climate will prove favorable to my constitution. When I first arrived in Savannah my health for four or five days was not quite as good as usual—but at present I feel very well, my appetite is exceedingly good, and I am attended with fewer symptoms of my peculiar complaints, than I have experienced since the first of September. By the mercy of God I am entirely free from symptoms of a cough or fever.

The climate in this country, I find to be very mild, and the weather at present very warm. I have seen no fire today, and am now sitting in a room without one, and find myself quite warm enough to be comfortable. The people here are full in their assurances that, considering my constitution and complaints, I may expect to enjoy much better health in this country than at the northward. How the fact will prove God only knows, and time only will reveal. Many circumstances appear favorable to persons of consumptive habits. Not only the mildness of the climate but the enjoyment of the sea air, the abundance of fish especially of oysters, and the vegetable diet seem calculated to recruit a person of bodily habits like my own. The gardens here, even at this season, afford abundance of lettuce, raddishes, turnips, cabages &c. And this to be seen is the season most unfavorable to the cultivation of vegetable production. However, I hope I shall not be too confident confirming my health, by the change of climate and manner of living, lest [illegible] they prove ineffectual, I may be too much deferred by the disappointment....(Lewis 1802a:1-3).

Writing two years later, Thomas Lewis’ friend James E. Morris wrote from the Sunbury Academy to Thomas Lewis’s father informing him of Thomas’ death, stating,

...About the 12 of December last past your son was taken ill with the fever and ague the common disease of this climate. This was a consequence of an increased affliction of his lungs, which by gradually debilitating him, put an end to his useful life...(Morris 1804a).

Morris promised Thomas on his death bed to “take care of his affairs”, which included medical bills and funeral charges (Morris 1804b:1). Thomas’ friend, Eliza G. Maybank, wrote to his father on August 17, 1804, in which she requested to know Thomas’ age, noting, “as we wish to have tomb stone put over him” (Maybank 1804:2). Eliza Maybank also was responsible for having Thomas’ eulogy published (Elliott 1855). Apparently, the climate of Sunbury was not wholly agreeable to Thomas Lewis, who died on March 3, 1804 and was buried in Sunbury. On September 17, 1804 James Morris wrote to Thomas’ father noting,
“his remains lie buried in the graveyard at Sunbury and a tombstone will be erected to his memory” (Morris 1804c).

War of 1812

Tensions between Great Britain and the United States of America mounted at the beginning of the nineteenth century, culminating in the War of 1812. Georgians prepared for the war and sent soldiers to fight against the Native American Red Sticks in Alabama, however few battles were fought on Georgia soil in this war. Of these few, the worst battles were fought on the St. Marys River, where Fort Point Peter and the town of St. Mary's were attacked and destroyed. These attacks occurred after the war was over and peace had been declared. The British officers were unaware that peace had been declared at the time of their invasion, but they learned about it shortly thereafter. Consequently, the British did not pursue their campaign against Georgia, and Sunbury never became a point of attack.

The residents of Sunbury were cognizant of the British threat during this period and they desired military protection. They appealed for aid from Major General Thomas Pinckney, who was in charge of the 6th Military District, which included Georgia. Pinckney made his command at Fort Hawkins, Georgia. The need for a defensive build-up in Georgia was recognized by federal and state authorities. Federal agents were sent to inspect the defenses in Georgia and one of them, Thomas Gadsen, made a schematic plan of the fort (Gadsen 1815). Gadsen observed that the fort was not that well-designed, although he noted that a substantial amount of energy had been invested in its construction. Consequently, he recommended to Major General Pinckney that its design be left "as is" and the post strengthened with additional artillery pieces. Before any substantial strengthening of the fort was accomplished, however, the war had ended.

During the War of 1812 Fort Defiance was built on the former site of Fort Morris (Smith 1997). The earthen remains of this fort are largely intact. Although Fort Defiance was probably garrisoned throughout the War of 1812, and for several years afterwards, no battles are recorded there throughout the period. Jones (1997:219) notes that Sunbury was defended by a company of about 40 men (composed of Sunbury residents), under command of John A. Cuthbert, and another company of boys from the Sunbury Academy, under command of Captain Charles Floyd.

Georgia’s role in the War of 1812 is poorly represented in scholarly literature and some surprises may await the diligent researcher (c.f., Mahon 1972 and Hickey 1989). At the beginning of the war state and federal funds were allotted for strengthening Georgia’s coastal defenses. These funds were directed at Savannah and St. Marys. The primary threat to Georgia in this war came a few weeks after the war was officially over, following the Treaty of Ghent. The combined British naval forces, who had suffered a major loss at New Orleans made a bitter retreat. After laying siege and capturing Fort Bowyer on the Mobile River they sailed eastward and attacked the St. Mary’s River region, sacked and burned the city of St. Marys. In this invasion the British established a large Army camp on the lower end of Cumberland Island. The British apparently did not consider Sunbury a significant target at that time, as it was not attacked.
The history of the War of 1812 in Georgia has not been fully explored. Although very few battles occurred in Georgia during this war, Georgians were significantly affected by it. The 1814 Fort at Sunbury, now named Fort Defiance/Fort Defense, was being built in the footprint of Fort Morris and as the war drew to a close its interior features were probably never finished. It is unknown if the fort was garrisoned for any period in the War of 1812, but if so, archaeological traces of this occupation are not strongly manifested at all.

Civil War

During the American Civil War Sunbury was a minor Confederate post. Civil War era maps reinforce the impression that Sunbury was a relatively inconsequential place by the 1860s. Weld’s map of the roads between the Ogeechee and Medway rivers depicts, “Sanbury” [Sunbury] (Weld 1964). The Liberty Independent Troop was encamped at Sunbury during parts of the war and a Confederate hospital was established at Sunbury (Breeden 1970:365). Joseph Jones, the older brother of Charles C. Jones, Jr., served as one of the physicians at the Sunbury hospital.

The Union Navy established a blockade along the coast early in the war. Sunbury was defended by the Confederate Savannah Mounted Rifles Company. Confederate records for September, 1861, noted that 57 soldiers (3 officers and 54 enlisted men) were stationed there. No artillery pieces were noted in this return (U.S. War Department et al. 1882:286). These troops were likely positioned in the vicinity of Fort Morris, since it represents the most strategic position militarily. Charles C. Jones, Jr., who commanded the Georgia artillery regiments late in the war, noted that several cannons from Fort Morris were taken to coastal forts (Jones 1997:182-183).

The Georgia campaign of General William Tecumseh Sherman brought a major influx of Union Army soldiers. In late 1864, these troops captured settlements along the Georgia coast, including Sunbury. On December 13, 1864 Brigadier General J. Kilpatrick, commanding the U.S. Cavalry wrote from Kilkenny Bluff, Georgia to Major General W. T. Sherman,

I am at Kilkenny... I have directed my troops under Colonel Murray to encamp to-night at Midway, one regiment at Sunbery. With two regiments I have been examining the entire country below Fort McAllister around to a point opposite Sunbery....I have opened up communication with my people at Sunbery, and have directed Colonel Murray...to destroy the bridge (over the Altamaha), telegraph wire, &c.... (Kilpatrick 1864, in OR 44:705-706).

Kilpatrick’s Cavalry captured Sunbury and subsequently burned the Sunbury Baptist Church building as a signal to the other Union troops of their presence. On the same day [December 13, 1864] Lewis Wess, aboard the U.S. Bark Fernandina moored at Saint Catherine’s, Georgia, reported to General John G. Foster, “I have just communicated with our army at Kilkenny. General Kilpatrick and his staff are there. His forces hold the coast between here and Sapello. He wishes to make this place a base for supplies....” (ehistory.com 2004, 44:709).
Later Sunbury

After December 1864, Sunbury ceased to have any military significance. The town dwindled to fewer than a dozen dwellings. An 1867 coastal navigation map shows some features in the town, including roads, fields, wharves, and at least eight buildings (U.S. Department of Commerce 2004). Although some of these buildings are clustered and some may be original to the colonial town, they do not obviously reflect the original town plan. A variety of events at Sunbury are recorded in the early to middle twentieth century. By that time Sunbury was no longer a town but probably remained an active port for local fishermen.

Historical information about the dwelling houses in Sunbury is extremely limited. The original design for the town specified some construction details, although it is not known how closely the residents adhered to this plan. Only three photographic images of early dwellings in Sunbury were located. The earliest, a 1908 view of an unidentified house at Sunbury, is shown in Figure 8. This home is a one story cottage with a central chimney, with an attached two story addition.

The other is the Charles Odingsells Screven house, photographed in 1961, after the house was abandoned and in a dilapidated condition. The Screven house photograph is reproduced and its location shown on a 1945 plat (Sheftall 1995: 126, Illustration 19; 132, Illustration 21). McIlvaine (1971) presents an even more dilapidated rendition of the Screven home on the cover of his book. The Screven house was a large two story wood frame dwelling on a raised foundation with two end chimneys. The location of the Screven house was not examined in the present study, although its former location may be pinpointed from the 1945 plat.

The Allen Stevens family owned large portions of the town site in the early decades of the twentieth century. A photograph of the home of Allen Stevens, shown in Figure 9, provides some indication of the general land use in Sunbury in the 1950s. Mr. Stevens was responsible for “cleaning up” the Sunbury cemetery and marking its approximate boundary by plantings of azaleas. Historian Hill noted:

In the spring of 1951, Mr. Allen A. Stevens, Stevens Supply Co., Savannah, Ga., who owns the land surrounding the cemetery, cleared and restored the cemetery placing a wire fence and gate, and planted about 1,000 azaleas and wisteria to beautify it. Many of the early graves had wooden markers. Some were burned and otherwise destroyed. There are about 33 graves that have markers now, in this enclosure. Mrs. Percy H. Perkins, Jr., has compiled a list which she copied from the tombstones (Hill 1951).

Three compilations of the inhabitants of the Sunbury cemetery were located in the present research. The earliest was compiled in 1932 and lists 35 names and one unknown grave marked only by a cypress marker (LeConte Genealogical Collection 1932). An undated list by Monroe (n.d.) lists 35 marked graves. An unattributed list of 32 tombstone epitaphs was located in the Midway Museum in the present research (Anonymous 1951). A composite list of the known graves in Sunbury, including additions made by the present survey, is presented below.
Figure 8. House at Sunbury, 1908 (Vanishing Georgia 2004).

Figure 9. Allen Stevens Home, Sunbury, 1958 (Vanishing Georgia 2004).
Known Graves in Sunbury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Given name</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Adam [C. or G.]</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>George W.</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Hannah Mary</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Jacob H.</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Mrs. Anne H.</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Rev. Jacob H.</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Thomas H.</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>Thomas J.</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/A</td>
<td>U/A [cypress marker]</td>
<td>U/A</td>
<td>Church Square, Dunham lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>[Little] Sallie</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Capt. Peter Winn Fleming</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Elizabeth C.</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Geo. Troup</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Josiah Law</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Mary C.</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Matilda Emma</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Mrs. Matilda H.</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Ann [Marie or Martha]</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Charles H.</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>James P.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Mary H.</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Mrs. Rebecca G.</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Mrs. Temperence</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Rev. Josiah S.</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel S.</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Samuel Edward</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Thomas Gould</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Thos. Barrett</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Church Square, Law lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>J. T.</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhir</td>
<td>Rev. Wm.</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McWhir</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Eliza Anne</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Mrs. Semor</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Church Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/A</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>U/A</td>
<td>Kings Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Meeting Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Meeting Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Leconte Genealogical Collection 1932; Monroe n.d., Anonymous 1951; Lewis 1804b)

Elsewhere in town, Mr. Stevens may have played a hand in the eradication of grave markers on a large cemetery south of the Sunbury cemetery. According to Mr. Essau Fuller, who assisted Mr. Stevens as a laborer in landscaping the Sunbury cemetery, tombstones were
destroyed at another cemetery in town (possibly the cemetery on Meeting Square), and at least one human burial was disturbed by a worker who was digging fence posts in that area. Although Mr. Fuller did not participate in the latter “landscaping project”, he agreed that it the area in question was probably the cemetery presently located on the Goodman property (Essau Fuller personal communication January 27, 2004).

Sunbury remained a local seaport in the twentieth century. The docks and desirable moorage at Sunbury continued in use long after the town was largely abandoned. A 1960 view of a shrimp fleet docked at Sunbury is shown in Figure 10. A public dock remains in use at Sunbury today.

Figure 10. Sunbury Shrimp Fleet, 1960 (Vanishing Georgia 2004).
IV. Previous Research at Sunbury

Historical interest in the ruins of Sunbury and Fort Morris was stimulated by the publication of Jones’ *The Dead Towns of Georgia* (Jones 1997). Jones described Sunbury as it appeared around 1878:

> Its square, lots, streets and lanes have been converted into a corn field. Even the brick of the ancient chimneys has been carried away....The old cemetery is so overgrown with trees and brambles that the graves of the dead can scarcely be located after the most diligent search. Fort Morris is enveloped in a wild growth of cedars and myrtle. Academy, churches, markets, billiard rooms, wharves, storehouses, residences, all gone…(Jones 1997:221).

At Jones’ suggestion, Mr. Samuel L. Fleming made a plan map in 1876 of the fortification ruins, which was published in Jones’ work and entitled “Plan of Fort Morris” (Jones 1997:180, Illustration 4). While Jones acknowledged that a later fort, “Fort Defence” had been constructed at the same location, he made no comments distinguishing the two forts in this plan drawing. Jones, who commanded Georgia’s artillery for the Confederacy in 1864, apparently mistook the ruins of Fort Defiance for those of Fort Morris. His detailed description is very important, as it provides great insight into the condition of the fortification ruins in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Jones’ description of the fortifications at Sunbury in 1878 is reproduced below:

> Located some three hundred and fifty yards due south of Sunbury, and occupying the bluff where it first confronts Midway River as, trending inward from the sound, it bends to the north, Fort Morris was intended to cover not only the direct water approach to the town, but also the back river by means of which that place might be passed and taken in reverse. Its position was well chosen for defensive purposes. To the south stretched a wide-spread and impracticable marsh permeated by Pole-haul and Dickerson creeks, two tributaries of Midway River, whose mouths were commanded by the guns of the fort. This marsh also extended in front of the work, constituting a narrow and yet substantial protection against landing parties, and gradually contracting as it approached the southern boundary of Sunbury. This fortification was an inclosed earthwork, substantially constructed. Its walls embraced a parade about an acre in extent. The eastern face, fronting the river, was two hundred and seventy five feet in length. Here the heaviest guns were mounted. The northern and southern faces were respectively one hundred and ninety-one and one hundred and forty feet in length, while the curtain, looking to the west, was two hundred and forty-one feet long. Although quadrangular, the work was somewhat irregular in shape. From the southern face and the curtain no guns could be brought to bear upon the river. Those there mounted served only for defense against a land attack. The armament of the northern face could be opposed to ships, which succeeded in passing the fort, until they ascended the river so far as to get beyond range. It also commanded the town and the intervening space. The guns were mounted en barbette, without traverses. Seven embrasures may still be seen, each about five feet wide. The parapet, ten feet thick rises six feet above the parade of the fort, and its superior slope is about twenty-five feet above the level of the river at high tide. Surrounding the work is a moat at present ten feet deep, ten feet wide at the bottom, and twice that width at the top. Near the middle of the curtain may be seen traces of a sally-port or gateway, fifteen feet wide. Such is the appearance of this abandoned work as ascertained by recent survey. Completely overgrown by cedars, myrtles, and vines, its presence would not be suspected, even at a short remove, by those unacquainted with the locality. Two iron cannon are now lying half buried in the loose sand of the parade, and
a third will be found in the old field about midway between the fort and the site of the town. During the recent war between the States, two 6-pounder guns were removed from this fort and carried to Riceboro. No use, however, was made of them. Two more, of similar calibre, of iron, and very heavily reinforced at the breech were taken by Captain C. A. L. Lamar, whose company was then stationed at Sunbury, and temporarily mounted on the bluff to serve as signal guns. Notwithstanding their age and the exposure to which they had so long been subjected, these pieces were in such excellent condition that they attracted the notice of the ordnance department, and were soon transported to Savannah. There they were cleaned, mounted upon siege carriages, and assigned to Fort Bartow, where they remained, constituting a part of the armament of that work, until the evacuation of Savannah and its dependent forts by the Confederate forces in December, 1864, they passed into the hands of the Federal army (Jones 2001:283-285).

Historian John T. Faris published this contemporary description of Sunbury in 1924,

It is now seventy-five years since Sunbury ceased to exist. The buildings have disappeared. The streets cannot be told from surrounding cultivated ground. The graves are hidden among the undergrowth. A recent visitor to old Fort Morris...has told how large trees are growing on its parapets. The footpaths are obscured by an undergrowth of weeds and briers. But when the ramparts of the old defense are reached, they can be traced in detail...(Faris 1924:49).

Historian Charles Jenkins visited Sunbury in the spring of 1925 and observed,

...but two houses standing on the site of the once thriving town. One of these dated back to the days of its prosperity; the other was a modern cabin occupied by coloured folks. Here and there through the fields, the ruins of brick foundations and of chimneys were to be seen, while the graveyard was a tangle of impenetrable brush and vines. The streets and squares have gone, the high bluff, where once stood the busy warehouses...are empty and bare except for two oyster wharves...(Jenkins 1926:34).

For nearly a century the ruins of Sunbury and Fort Morris lay abandoned and were subject to pilfering and clandestine “excavations” by local residents. A small swivel gun, possibly a 2-pounder, was excavated from Fort Morris around 1900 by Roland H. Brewton, Sr. For several decades this gun was displayed outside of the residence of Louise Woods’ house in Hinesville but it was stolen in the 1960s. A sole photograph of the swivel gun is documentary evidence of its existence (Roland H. Brewton, Sr. n.d.; Brewton 2002; Marshall Brewton, Jr. personal communication December 4, 2002).

A small cannon, which is presently on display outside of the Liberty County Courthouse in Hinesville was, “excavated at the site of the ruins of the famous Revolutionary fortification in 1940” (Georgia Historical Commission 1958). No documentary support for the 1940 discovery was located.

A third cannon, which is displayed in the Fort Morris State Historic Site Museum, was formerly possessed by C.C. Jones, Jr. and had been displayed for decades outside his residence, called Montrose, in Augusta, Georgia. Accession records in the Fort Morris museum state that this cannon dates to ca. 1812.

Fragments of a fourth cannon, whose exact geographical provenience is not well established, also is displayed in the Fort Morris museum. The fragments were attributed
to Mr. Olin Fraser, Hinesville, Georgia, who donated them in 1976. Prior to 1909 this cannon was on display at the Liberty County Courthouse and records in the Fort Morris museum state that the cannon was broken in 1909 or 1910 after it was taken from the courthouse to the Fraser farm and discharged, whereupon the barrel exploded.

Several people collected other military artifacts, including grapeshot, cannonballs, musket balls, a gun barrel, and gunflints from the area of Sunbury and Fort Morris. Some of these artifacts were donated to the Midway Museum and the Fort Morris museum. For the most part, the location information for these artifacts is rather vague and of limited use in understanding the geographic layout of the Sunbury battlefields.

Modern archaeological interest in Sunbury and Fort Morris dates to the 1950s when archaeologist Lewis Larson made a surface collection at the town and recorded the area as an Indian village site. Ironically, Larson's surface collection, which was examined in the present study, consisted primarily of eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts, yet his site form contained no mention of the historic resources at the town.

Renewed interest in Sunbury blossomed in the 1960s and 1970s, as historians rifled through primary documents for information concerning Sunbury and Fort Morris (Georgia Forts Committee n.d.; McIlvaine 1971). McIlvaine (1971:64) describes the appearance of Sunbury in 1971: “Today there is only a small restaurant and dock catering to fishermen, a few neat houses, many historical markers, the ruins of Fort Morris, now undergoing restoration, and the abandoned old cemetery”.

In 1968 the State of Georgia acquired the property later to become Fort Morris State Historic Site. As part of the development of this historical park, the Georgia Historical Commission dispatched archaeologist Steven Baker to conduct a preliminary assessment of the interpretive archaeology potential of Fort Morris (Baker 1970). Although Baker visited the property, he did not conduct any archaeological excavations or record any surface collections. Many of the recommendations contained in Baker's assessment remain valid concerns in 2003. Paramount was his observation of the interlocking character of Fort Morris and the town of Sunbury. Baker urged the acquisition of portions of the original town site so that its archaeological remains could be compared with the archaeology at Fort Morris.

Archaeological study within the town of Sunbury remained dormant for decades, however, following Baker’s recommendations. The town site was recorded in the Georgia Archaeological Site File (GASF) as site 9Li4 by Lewis Larson in the 1950s. Larson made no mention of the sites eighteenth and nineteenth century components, however, and recorded it as a historic Indian village. Recent examination of Larson’s surface collection from the site at the University of Georgia, Laboratory of Archaeology, however, revealed mostly eighteenth and nineteenth century artifacts and very few aboriginal artifacts.

In the 1980s anthropology students from the University of South Florida conducted excavations at Sunbury but no report of this work was produced. A participant, John
Darsey, noted that test excavations were conducted on more than one area of town. Shovel tests were located on “Mr. Ginter’s daughter’s property back of Luanne Smith’s”, which revealed the area to be “all disturbed”. These tests encountered groundwater at about 50 cm below surface. One small test unit was excavated by these students in the area, “where the new restaurant is going” on the Maley property (John Darsey personal communication February 2, 2004).

Georgia Historical Commission archaeologist Gordon Midgette directed a preliminary study of the Fort Morris site whereupon he submitted a draft report to the State (Midgette 1973). Midgette’s report to the State of Georgia was never finalized for a variety of reasons (Morgan 1973, 1974f; Gailey 1971). A more complete version of Midgette’s research was later submitted for his Masters of Arts thesis at the University of Georgia, Department of Anthropology (Midgette 1976). Midgette's 1976 thesis contains a more comprehensive discussion of his 1971 excavations, as well as a thorough rebuttal of the assertions of his colleagues. Extant collections from the 1971 excavations are presently curated at Fort Morris State Historic Site.

Midgette conducted excavations inside and outside of Fort Morris. His excavation units were designated 1 through 6. Midgette drafted a detailed topographic map of the Fort Defiance ruins, which he labeled, “Fort Morris” (Midgette 1973, Plate 29). His map roughly corresponds to Swift’s 1815, “Plan of Fort Defiance” and Fleming’s 1879 “Plan of Fort Morris” (Sheftall 1995:82, Illustration 5; Jones 1997:180, Illustration 4). Archaeological investigations were conducted on the fort in 1971, but the true identify of Fort Defiance was not realized until after this work was complete (Baker 1970; Agnew 1974a-c, 1975a-b; Midgette 1971a-c, 1973, 1976; Sheftall 1995).

Historian Tom Agnew produced a follow-up report on the historical resources at the Fort Morris State Historic Site for the Department of Natural Resources, which was critical of Midgette’s interpretation of Fort Morris. In it Agnew presented a photocopy of a ca. 1815 plan of Fort Defiance, that had been discovered at the National Archives and Records Administration in Washington, D.C. Agnew was critical of Midgette's historical research and Agnew postulated that Fort Morris was not necessarily within the boundaries of the Fort Morris State Historic Site. Agnew's position caused quite a stir, since if confirmed, meant that the State of Georgia had not actually purchased Fort Morris but had only gotten a War of 1812 fort of lesser acclaim. In his Masters thesis Midgette included Agnew’s report as an appendix to his thesis. Midgette's thesis contains a lengthy rebuttal to Agnew (Agnew 1974a, reproduced in Midgette 1976).

In 1973 John R. Morgan, Midgette’s successor as archaeologist at the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, also compiled a scathing critique of Midgette’s work, including a detailed accounting of the research deficiencies, which was followed the next year by a proposal to rectify the situation at Fort Morris (Morgan 1973, 1974f). As a result of the controversy over the identification and archaeological confirmation of Fort Morris/Fort Defiance, the Bicentennial celebration at Sunbury was subdued (Stember 1974:22-23).
The Georgia Department of Natural Resources commissioned a historical study of Sunbury and environs in the 1970s, which was written by historian John Sheftall (1995). Sheftall postulated the differences in the size and configuration of the two forts and he presented his historical conjectural hypothesis and relative relationship of the two forts (Sheftall 1995:106-107, Illustrations 9 and 10). Sheftall used letters, deeds, plats and maps to weave a convincing argument for his proposed relocation. A particularly key document in Sheftall’s study was a 1786 plat made for Josiah Powell, which identified an, “angle of fort's bulwark”. In his conjectural reconstruction Sheftall interpreted this angle of fort's bulwark to be the southwestern corner bastion of Fort Morris. Sheftall's conjectural model places Fort Defiance only partly within the boundaries of Fort Morris with the eastern wall and approximately 1/3 of the parade of Fort Defiance completely east of the earlier fort. Sheftall's methods for calculating the dimensions of his conjectured Fort Morris are not explicitly described in his monograph. He speculated that Fort Morris was a square construction with four projecting corner bastions. His evidence for the approximate location of the northwestern bastion is based on a description by Lachlan McIntosh. Sheftall places the northwestern bastion, "just south of Lot 93 [in Sunbury]" (Sheftall 1995:104). The location for Sheftall’s hypothesized fort, however, had not been tested archaeologically prior to the present study.

Subsequent archaeological research on the Fort Morris State property was conducted by the Historic Preservation Division, first by John R. Morgan in 1974 and 1975, and most recently by archaeologists Ronnie Rogers and David C. Crass of the Archaeological Services Unit. Their studies did not locate any eighteenth or nineteenth century artifacts nor any other potentially significant cultural resources. Rogers (2002) examined an area for a proposed outdoor interpretive area, which was located east of the Visitors’ Center. (The interpretive museum at Fort Morris has had an active interpretive program since the late 1970s, which most recently has included this area near the Visitors’ Center) (Townsend 1974; Morgan 1974a-f, 1975, 1978; Winchester 1990).

Other information about Sunbury’s archaeological resources was acquired from numerous individuals. These included current residents of Sunbury, former residents of Sunbury, archaeologists and former anthropology students, and relic hunters. Some of this information was quite valid but the precision of the reported finds was insufficient for their location on modern maps. Other reports were sketchy but could yield important data if pursue by additional research. This information is presented below.

In July 1991 anthropology students from the University of South Florida conducted informal investigations at Sunbury. That work was accomplished by Darsey and his colleagues M. Goetz, Larry Lee, and Dorothy Ward, who excavated two small units and several shovel tests on portions of Sunbury. While no report of this work was prepared, some information on this work was provided by one of the participants, John D. Darsey, Jr. He graciously provided field maps, field forms, and other information about unpublished test excavations at Sunbury. Darsey noted that two 2 m by 1 m test units were excavated, although the field forms state that Test Unit 1 measured 1 m by 1 m. One of these units was placed on Town Lot 34 and the other was located further south, in the approximate vicinity of Lots 69 through 76. Test Unit 2, Level 2 (15-25 cm), contained
27 pieces of metal (including nails, metal forks, knives, and spoons), 34 glass (including clear, colored, and wine bottle glass), more than 83 ceramics (including green and blue edged whiteware, creamware and redware). Aboriginal pottery was recovered from the lower levels. Test Unit 2 was possibly the excavation that was located on Lot 34, although this could not be confirmed. Darsey also provided a copy of the plat of property owned by Ronnie D. and Luanne G. Smith, with the pencil notation and approximate location for four shovel tests (numbered 1-4). This property is located immediately north of the Charles M. Jones Tract (on its eastern end). The findings from these shovel tests was not determined.

In addition to artifacts from these two test units and shovel tests, Darsey collected numerous metal artifacts from disturbed areas on the surface at Sunbury over a period of years. These included saddle parts, bridles, a boat steering wheel, a belt buckle, and a copper lantern wick holder (John Darsey personal communication February 2, 2004). Their test unit 1 measured 1 m by 1 meter. It contained an oyster shell feature with historic artifacts. Their Test Unit 2 measured 2 m by 1 m and contained two historic period features containing brick, oyster shell, and bone. Four shovel tests were placed on the property of Ronnie D and Luanne G. Smith [Lot 13, Calder Subdivision], which is the tract located immediately north of the east end of the Jones tract (Williams 1987). The test units approximate location is indicated on a copy of the property plat. Darsey described the Smith lot as extensively disturbed with a shallow water table. The field data records from Darsey’s exploration were incorporated into the documentation of the present project for future reference. The informal project is otherwise undocumented.

Mr. Edgar Edwards, former Liberty County School Superintendent, visited the survey crew in the field and described his history of relic hunting at Sunbury. Mr. Edwards noted that he obtained a metal detector in 1960 and was one of the first people in coastal Georgia to do so. Mr. Edwards avidly searched Sunbury with his detector and recovered coins, including Spanish silver coins, cannon balls, and other items. His cohort in this relic hunting activity was Mr. Richard Riggs, deceased. Mr. Edward’s exploration was widespread across the town and included many areas now developed as residences.

Mr. George Ginter moved to Sunbury in 1980 and he owns two lots in Sunbury (portions of original Lots 37 and 38). Mr. Ginter had a collection of historic and aboriginal artifacts that he and his family had collected in various parts of Sunbury since 1980. The sherds in the collection spanned the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Three Archaic period stemmed projectile points were included in his collection. Archaeologists traced these chert tools in outline.

Ms. Luanne Smith, George Ginter’s daughter, found a gold ring in Brigantine Dunmore Road, before the road was paved. This ring was briefly examined and photographed in the present study. The ring has inscribed on its interior, “In Christ and thee my Comfort be”. The exterior of the wedding band (or mourning band) is undecorated (Figure 11). The style of the engraved letters were typical of eighteenth and early nineteenth century script.
Figure 11. Inscribed Gold Ring, Found in Brigantine Dunmore Road, Courtesy of Luanne Smith.

Other archaeological resources in Sunbury mentioned by oral informants were noted, although most of these were anecdotal in character and were not pursued in the present study. For example, Mr. Alexander noted that the Linton house was constructed on the site of an earlier building, and evidence of two chimneys was discovered when the house was built. The Linton property was not examined by the survey team. Mr. Alexander also led the survey team to a place immediately south of Mr. Layton Frazier’s driveway, where a brick foundation was exposed when Brigantine Dunmore Road was paved in 1998. Several early bricks were observed at that location, which was recorded by GPS waypoint A381 (UTM E 473386 N3514656). Mr. Alexander also pointed out a location on the west side of Brigantine Dunmore Road where old silver coins were found during the installation of a waterline. That location was recorded as GPS waypoint A382 (UTM E 473384 N3514690).

Renewed interest in Sunbury was sparked in 2000 when Matt McDaniel conducted a reconnaissance survey of the Fort Morris/Sunbury vicinity, which was commissioned by the National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program. This project also examined nine other Revolutionary War Battlefields and Sites in Georgia. These data were submitted in multi-media format to the National Park Service for consideration and possible inclusion in a summary report to the U.S. Congress on the state of Americans Revolutionary War and War of 1812 battlefields and associated sites. This study also served as a Master’s thesis for its author (McDaniel 2002).

Underground remnants of fortifications lie beyond the visible earthworks of Fort Defiance, the War of 1812 fort. These buried fortification ditches and palisades are part of the Revolutionary War Fort Morris. Archaeological evidence from Block D and Trench 1 of the Southern Research 2002 study indicate that Fort Morris was significantly larger than Fort Defiance on its southern end. It was probably not as large, however, as suggested by Sheftall (1995).

One aspect of the fort's layout that has not received serious attention is the configuration of Fort George. Fort Morris was renamed Fort George shortly after its first capture by
the British. The British garrisoned the post and they outnumbered the previous American garrison in Fort Morris. Understandably, the British required more space for their operations and expanded personnel. Although no specific references were found that describe any rebuilding or expansion efforts by the British, these actions were almost certain. Examples from other locations where the British expanded the fortifications after wresting them from the Americans include Fort Prevost in Savannah and the Star Fort at Ninety Six, South Carolina (NPS 2003a). In Savannah the Americans had built a series of fortifications in and around the town. The British expanded on these fortifications by constructing Fort Prevost on the lower edge of Savannah. This fort was a complex with at least 13 projecting angles. The engineers who were charged with designing and building Fort Prevost were likely the same ones that would have been available at Fort George.

Similarly, when the Loyalist troops, led by Lieutenant Colonels Cruger and Allen, occupied Ninety Six they built a complex star fort, whose remains are extant today. At New Ebenezer, which had been lightly fortified by the Americans prior to 1779, the British wasted no time in building a series of redoubts that were connected by an abatis, or palisade line (Elliott 2005a). As at Savannah, Ninety-Six, and Ebenezer, the Loyalist troops at Fort George probably made significant modifications to the ruins of Fort Morris. These changes probably included expanding the fort from its original size to accommodate a greater number of troops.
V. Results of Fieldwork

FIELDWORK SUMMARY

Sunbury was a large town that thrived from its beginnings in 1758 until it faced a lingering death around the 1820s. Since it was a large town and the current research was financially limited, only a sample of the town was examined. Nevertheless, the archaeological exploration of the town of Sunbury and its associated military resources by the LAMAR Institute team resulted in the location of approximately 3,983 artifacts, numerous features, and valuable interpretive information. These artifacts were widely distributed across the town and several important loci were identified. The following discussion presents the findings for each area within the town that was explored. These are presented by their original lot function (i.e., domestic town lots, public squares, streets, etc.) and by present land ownership tract (i.e., Jones, Baroody, Fort Morris State Historic Site property, etc.). All of the resources, except for those located on the Fort Morris property, are part of State Site 9Li4. The resources on the Fort Morris property, which are situated immediately south of Sunbury on the town commons, are identified as part of State Site 9Li168. A complete artifact inventory, by provenience, is located in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 contains summary tables of artifacts from this site.

The LAMAR Institute survey team excavated test excavation units in five areas of Sunbury. The approximate locations of these excavations is shown in Figure 12.

EXPLORATION OF DOMESTIC LOTS, NORTHWEST SUNBURY

Alexander Property

The Alexander property (354 Dutchmans Cove Road) is located immediately west of Dutchman’s Cove Road, south of the Parker property and east of a wetland feature. It contains the Alex Alexander residence and landscaped yard.

Mr. Alexander led the survey crew to a spot in his front yard where he had discovered several large portions of a plain creamware plate while planting azaleas several years earlier. The azaleas were well established but the location was recorded with a GPS waypoint.

Archaeologists systematically shovel tested the Alexander’s front yard with tests spaced at 10 m intervals, with closer testing in selected areas. Most of the yard was devoid of cultural material, but several tests in the vicinity of Mr. Alexander’s creamware find
yielded artifacts. The shovel tests revealed a deposit of historic artifacts distributed over an area approximately 60 m northwest-southeast by 30 m northeast-southwest, or approximately the northern one-third of the Alexander’s front yard. Artifacts recovered from shovel tests included three undecorated creamware sherds, one polychrome hand painted (early variety) pearlware bowl sherd, one plain pearlware sherd, one unidentified square nail fragment, Deptford Check Stamped pottery, other unidentified decorated and undecorated aboriginal pottery sherds, one chert unifacial flake tool, chert debitage, and oyster shells.

Figure 12. Test Unit Locations, 9Li1.

The historic locus on the Alexander property was further explored by a small test unit and by metal detector survey. The test unit, which was designated Test Unit 1, measured 1 m
by 50 cm (Figure 13). The long axis of the test unit was oriented on a bearing of approximately 340 degrees and its northeast corner was at UTM E472946 N3514993. This places the unit in the general vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 384. It revealed a shallow deposit of topsoil with a large portion of an early historic brick. Artifacts from the test unit included brick, nails, olive green bottle glass, and aboriginal pottery. The test unit was excavated in two levels to a maximum depth of 28 cm below ground surface.

A small earthen mound a short distance west of the Alexander’s house and immediately east of the wetlands, was pointed out to the survey team by Mr. Alexander. He suspected it to be an aboriginal mound. This earthwork was explored by a single shovel test placed on its summit, which revealed it to be a charcoal-filled mound. This feature is probably related to early naval stores industry and may have research potential. The area surrounding this mound has been impacted by the construction of the Alexander’s dwelling, driveway and other support features. In addition to the historic resources on the Alexander property, this tract also contained a low frequency of aboriginal chipped stone and Woodland period ceramics.

As noted Mr. Alexander’s lot included Lot 384 in the original town of Sunbury. Lot 384 was one of numerous lots sold by Mark Carr and the Sunbury Trustees to Patrick McKay in 1767. McKay sold this and numerous other lots to Helen Gordon and Alexander Duff in 1768. It is unlikely that either McKay, Gordon, or Duff lived on Lot 384. The subsequent owners of the lot were not identified (see Appendix 1). The archaeological evidence from Test Unit 1 and the area immediately surrounding the Alexander property reveal that the lot contained a dwelling in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth century (probably after 1762 and before 1830). A very small sample of six historic sherds from the Alexander property yielded a MCD of 1795.2. The residents of this dwelling were not determined in the present study. The artifact’s sparseness and their limited diversity suggest an occupation of relatively short duration by persons of lower economic status. The occupation possibly represents an enslaved dwelling or poor white renter.

Figure 13. Plan and North Profile, Test Unit 1, 9L.i4.
Baroody Property

The Baroody property (4876 Sunbury Road) is located immediately north of Sunbury Road. An area on the northwest side of the yard was sampled with shovel tests and revealed moderately dense eighteenth century domestic debris. The artifacts were concentrated in the vicinity of the Barody’s small vegetable garden. Although he only recently acquired the property, Mr. Alan Baroody reported finding many historic artifacts in this area. Despite the disturbance from the recent house construction, pond, septic drain fields, and buried sprinkler system, this area may retain substantial research potential.

Sixteen shovel tests were excavated on the Baroody property and all but four were positive. The historic component was located south of the Baroody residence and west of a small pond. It covered an area approximately 50 m north-south by 30 m east west. The component possibly continues onto other property to the north and west but those areas were not sampled by the survey. One of the negative shovel tests was located south of the pond on the property, near an isolated surface find (a handmade flooring brick).

Artifacts from the shovel tests included brick, unidentified cut or wrought nails, unidentified iron fragments, gray salt glazed stoneware, white salt glazed stoneware, Jackfield ware, Whieldon ware, delftware, creamware, blue hand painted pearlware, undecorated and red overglazed hand painted porcelain, unrefined redware, yellow slipware, tableware glass, olive green bottle glass, aqua pharmaceutical bottle glass, milk glass, clear bottle glass, brass tack, tobacco pipe fragments, brass wire button back, undecorated aboriginal pottery, chert debitage, animal bone and oyster shells.

The concentration of early historic material on the Baroody property is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 209. Lot 209 was granted to Edward Mahan at an unknown date. No record of later lot owners was found (see Appendix 1). Edward Mahan was also granted adjacent Lot 210. A small sample of historic ceramics from the Baroody property yielded a MCD of 1768. The range of artifacts strongly suggests that the town lot was abandoned about the time of the American Revolution. The occupational debris on the Baroody property is likely associated with Edward Mahan, or an unidentified successor to the property.

Christiansen Property

The Christiansen property is located south of Dutchman’s Cove Road and north of a wetland feature. The property contains a large residence and areas of slope. This property was reconnoitered for surface artifacts or features. The reconnaissance was negative and no subsurface tests were attempted.
Findley Property

The Findley property (260 Dutchmans Cove Road) is located immediately south of Dutchman’s Cove Road and north of a wetland feature. The property includes the Findley’s residence, yard and areas of pine woods. The property was examined by a surface walkover and three shovel tests. One shovel test yielded a single Terminal Archaic fiber tempered sherd and the other two tests, which were located 10 m east and west of the positive test, were negative. No historic artifacts were observed on the surface or in shovel tests. Mr. Findley showed the survey team several iron spikes that he had collected from his yard. These spikes were likely associated with a logging tram that crossed this area of Sunbury. Other evidence for the tram was located on the Glen property (which is discussed later in this chapter).

Matyok Property

The Matyok property (Dutchmans Cove Rd) is located east and north of Dutchman’s Cove Road and south of the Glen property. The property is in medium growth pine forest and contains no improvements. The property was examined by 26 systematic shovel tests that were spaced at 10 to 15 intervals. Four shovel tests yielded cultural materials and these were dispersed across the property with no apparent concentration. The shovel tests revealed a low frequency scatter of Terminal Archaic fiber tempered pottery and oyster shells. One flat iron fragment was recovered from one shovel test at E472993 N3514835. A neighbor, Mr. Findley, reported that numerous railroad spikes have been collected from this tract and that these were associated with a former logging tram. No historic occupation was indicated on the Matyok property.

O’Steen Property

The O’Steen property (362 Dutchmans Cove Road) is located immediately west of Dutchman’s Cove Road and south of the Alexander property. This property, which contains a large residence, is located on a slope and it was sampled by only four shovel tests. All of the tests were negative. The property is situated on a moderate slope above a tidal creek.

Parker Property

The Parker property (370 Dutchmans Cove Road) is located immediately east of Dutchman’s Cove Road and north of the Alexander Property. The tract was systematically shovel tested at 10 m intervals. Two creamware sherds and oyster shells were located in one shovel test, which may be part of the historic component on the adjacent Alexander property. One undecorated aboriginal pottery sherd was recovered from one shovel test on the Parker property. An oyster shell concentration was
encountered in a shovel test, which may be a continuation of a Woodland period occupation that was discovered on the nearby Glen property (discussed later in this chapter).

**Smith Property**

The Smith property (60 Blackbeard Cove Road) is a residential lot located immediately east of the Sunbury Cemetery property. Mr. Glen, who owns the neighboring tract, noted that a large quantity of fill dirt was brought in to raise the level of this lot, prior to construction of Mr. Smith’s residence. The accessible areas of the lot were examined by six shovel tests that were spaced at 10 m intervals. One line of tests was oriented north-south and was located 6 m east of the Sunbury Cemetery cement fence. The other line of tests was also a north-south line on the eastern side of the Smith property. None of these tests contained any artifacts and the soil profiles support Mr. Glen’s observations regarding the introduced fill soil on this property. This tract appears to have little archaeological potential and was formerly wetlands.

**Starling Property**

The Starling property (46 Dutchmans Cove Road) is located immediately north of Sunbury Road and west of Dutchman’s Cove Road. It includes Mrs. Starling’s residence and an adjacent vacant lot that is currently in a mature pine forest. A dense deposit of mid-eighteenth century domestic refuse was discovered on the eastern end of this wooded lot.

The property was covered by systematic shovel tests that were spaced at 10 intervals. Additional tests were placed to narrow the search for a suitable spot for a small test excavation. Artifacts from the shovel tests included brick fragments, nails, spikes, window glass, molded refined white salt glazed stoneware, blue and brown dotted white salt glazed stoneware, British brown stoneware, delftware, yellow slipware, creamware, pearlware, annular ware, and porcelain sherds; olive green bottle glass, aqua pharmaceutical bottle glass, clear pharmaceutical bottle glass, tobacco pipe fragments, melted lead, grinding stone fragment, unidentified decorated aboriginal pottery, fiber tempered pottery, quartz and chert debitage; animal bone, and oyster shell. The shovel tests revealed a distribution of historic artifacts over an area approximately 70 m east-west by 40 m north-south. It may represent debris from more than one dwelling.

GPR Survey was conducted on the Starling property in the vicinity of the eighteenth century component. GPR Block AB was placed in the vicinity of Test Unit 2, completely surrounding it. This sample measured 15 m east-west by 8 m north-south. The southeastern corner of the block was located at UTM 473109E 3514561N (Figure 14). The GPR plan shows several interesting large anomalies, which are best observed a approximately 60 cm depth. These probably represent a series of structure foundations, such as several buildings or a series of construction features.
Test Unit 2, a 1 m by 1 m excavation, was placed on the Starling property in the southeastern part of the historic artifact deposit (Figure 15). The southwestern corner of the test unit was located at UTM E473126 N3514567, which is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 281. The test unit was excavated in four levels to a maximum depth of 70 cm below ground surface. Most of the artifacts were contained in the upper two levels. Level 3 contained one small sherd and one clear glass fragment and Level 4 was sterile. This test unit revealed a well-preserved eighteenth century midden deposit that contained a wide variety of artifacts. Although no features were identified in the test unit, the midden was intact and suggests that the site has the potential for containing colonial period features, in addition to having excellent research potential.

Artifacts from Test Unit 2 included brick, wrought nails, window glass, Rhenish stoneware, British brown stoneware, white salt glazed stoneware, Jackfield ware, redware, yellow slipware, delftware, porcelain, olive green bottle glass, clear tableware glass, one brass tack, tobacco pipe fragments, one olive green bottle glass flake, one English ballast flint flake tool, animal bone and oyster shell. A complete summary of the artifacts recovered from the Starling property is contained in Appendices 2 and 3.

The historic artifacts on the Starling lot indicate a domestic occupation beginning in the mid-eighteenth century (or at the time of the initial settling of Sunbury) and continuing to about the American Revolution. A sample of 62 historic sherds from the Starling property yielded a MCD of 1747.3. The latest artifact type recovered from the site (pearlware) was being produced by 1774. The absence of any later artifact types from the early nineteenth century may indicate lot abandonment about the time of the American Revolution.
Sunbury Lot 281 was granted to John Bryan at an unknown date. The lot was sold as a confiscated estate to Thomas White in 1784 and later resold as a confiscated estate to Thomas Bailey in 1792. In 1809 the community of Sunbury sold the lot to John Kell, who was serving as the trustee for James Holmes (see Appendix 1).

EXPLORATION OF DOMESTIC LOTS, NORTHEASTERN SUNBURY

Community Lot Property

Property known as the Community Lot is located immediately west of Brigantine Dunmore Road and a recently constructed condominium (Figure 16). This area was composed of domestic lots in original Sunbury. The ground on this property was extensively disturbed during the construction of the condominium for use as a septic drain field. Large ditches were excavated within the tract for the placement of drainage pipes. This construction resulted in the accidental discovery of an early historic house site. The developer allowed members of the Sunbury community to conduct archaeological salvage operations on this house ruin, which were led by Mr. Larry Sheffield, a resident of Sunbury with some undergraduate experience in archaeology. The Community Lot excavation had been recently backfilled just prior to the present field study.

An aerial photograph of the Community excavation, provided by Mr. Alexander, shows the complexity of the house construction (Figure 17). These cultural features were not visible at the time of the present study because the excavation had been backfilled. Sheffield noted that their excavation yielded an abundance of eighteenth and early nineteenth century artifacts, which remain to be studied (Larry Sheffield personal communication Sunbury, Georgia January 7, 2004). One noteworthy artifact uncovered by that digging was a small brass piece marked with the words, “Liberty for Georgia”.
Sheffield later noted that the collections from the Community excavation were to be studied by anthropology students at Georgia Southern University (Larry Sheffield personal communication April 10, 2004). The artifact collection from the Community excavations, other than the previously mentioned brass piece, was not examined by the LAMAR Institute team.

The present study included systematic shovel testing and GPR survey of portions of the Community Lot. The shovel tests were generally nonproductive and revealed the extensive disturbance related to the previously mentioned condominium drain field that was recently constructed.

A total of eight shovel tests was excavated on the Community Lot in the area south and southeast of Sheffield’s excavation block and north of Mariner Street. Six of these tests yielded cultural material, including brick, nails, aboriginal pottery and oyster shell. Two shovel tests were negative. Soils in the positive tests appeared heavily disturbed, probably as a result of the recent drain field trench construction.

The GPR survey of the Community Lot consisted of one sample block (Block V) which was located at the common property corner of the Community Lot, Lusk, and Smith properties. The sample block included portions of all three tracts. GPR Block V measured 10 m east-west by 18 m north-south sample. The southeast corner of Block V was a PVC datum pipe from Sheffield’s excavation. An aerial view of Block V at 50 cm below ground surface is shown in Figure 18. Sheffield’s excavations in this vicinity had identified a possible cellar. The southern part of the sample block contained modern construction trenches associated with the condominium drain field.

The Community Lot property is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 135. Lots 134 and 135 were granted to James Miller at an unknown date. The lot was sold by Samuel Miller to William Love in 1771 (see Appendix 1). No later deed record for Lot 135 was located.
The most productive area of the Community Lot property was sampled by Sheffield and his party. The area that was shovel tested in the present study was extensively disturbed and exhibited poor research potential. Sheffield noted that intact areas with good research potential probably are contained in the area north and west of his excavations. These areas of good potential include private property adjacent to the Community Lot.

Figure 17. Aerial View of Community Lot Excavations, ca. 2003 (Courtesy of Alex Alexander).
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Another GPR sample, Block AC, was surveyed on Brigantine Dunmore Road, northeast of the Community Lot and northwest of the new condominium. The portion of Brigantine Dunmore Road in this vicinity is not oriented on the town grid but is approximately 10 degrees east of north. The radar transects were oriented with the road. The survey of Block AC was interrupted by a severe thunderstorm. The electrical interference from the lightning that preceded this storm may have affected the radar data. The southeast corner of this sample block was located at UTM E473421 N3514833 (Figure 19). An area approximately 6 m east-west by 30 m north-south was established for this sample but was not completed because of the dangerous inclement weather.
Frazier Property

Mr. Alexander led the survey crew to a historic brick foundation in the front yard of the Frazier property (immediately south of Frazier’s driveway on Brigantine Dunmore Road). The foundation of the property was disturbed when Brigantine Dunmore Road was paved sometime around 1998. Several handmade bricks were observed in the ditch bank, adjacent to the Frazier’s driveway, and the location was recorded as GPS waypoint A381. This is the approximate vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 109. No further investigations were conducted at this loci.
Unknown Property 1

Mr. Alex Alexander, who proved to be a very reliable informant, led the survey crew to another spot where an early silver coin had been discovered several years ago during the construction of a waterline along the west side of Brigantine Dunmore Road. Mr. Alexander, who currently supervises the water supply for the community, was very familiar with the discovery. This location was recorded as GPS waypoint A382 (UTM E 473384 N3514690) but no further excavations were conducted at this loci. No other details about the coin were determined.

Klein Lot

An isolated historic grave is located on Dr. Klein’s property, just east of Brigantine Dunmore Road, just north of its intersection with Sunbury Road. This grave is marked by a large marble slab with an engraved epitaph that was quite worn and difficult to decipher (Figure 20). It marked the grave of Barbara ____ [barely illegible, probably Clark]. The tombstone was photographed and its location recorded as GPS waypoint A383 (UTM E 473399 N3514572). This grave is located west of, or possibly within, original Sunbury Lot 71 on King’s Square. A child named Barbara Clark, daughter of Hugh Clark, lived nearby on Lot 73 or 74. Interestingly, Hugh Clark’s last will and testament, written in 1771 and probated on June 16, 1773, provided for his body, “to be buried in the town of Sunbury with my deceased wife and Children” (Glynn County Will Book 1773, Book AA:93-94). Perhaps this lone grave marks the Clark family plot, which may include the graves of Hugh Clark, his wife, and other unnamed children.

Figure 20. Marble Tombstone Slab, 9Li4.
Documentary evidence of burials in Sunbury other than in the church cemeteries is found in the will of Captain Joseph Jones, dated February 29, 1844 and probated November 2, 1846, which mentions his Sunbury lots numbered 21, 22, 23, and 24 “with improvements”, and numbers 29 and 30 “vacant, where the remains of my dear mother lie” (Fuller 1973). The Jones family held clear title to Sunbury Lots 29 and 30 after 1774 (see Appendix 1). Lots 29 and 30, which may contain the remains of Mrs. Jones (and possibly other family members), were not examined in the present study.

**Maley Lot**

An area thought by some to be the possible location of an British earthwork that supported the artillery in the January 1779 siege was visited briefly in the present study. It was located at the south boundary of the Maley property, east of Brigantine Dunmore Road. A remnant mound of soil was observed, flanked by an area of pavement. The area south of the earth mound has been disturbed recently by construction of the condominium complex. A seafood restaurant, located northeast of this loci, was under construction at the time of the survey. Darcy noted that one test unit was excavated on this property in 1991 in the vicinity of the recent construction. A GPS waypoint was recorded for this earthen mound but no excavations were made.

An area approximately 70 m east of GPR Block AC, which is located in a narrow wooded tract between the condominium and another area of the Maley Lot under construction, is purported to be the site of the British artillery emplacement. An area of mounded earth was observed (UTM E473490 N3514889). This feature is located on the bluff, east of original Sunbury Lot 33. The attribution of the mounded earth to the British artillery works was third-hand heresy. The original source of this speculation was Roger Durham, a former manager of the Fort Morris State Historic Site (Arthur Edgar personal communication January 3, 2004). The mounded earth does appear to have some antiquity, judging from the age of the live oak growing on its edge, so Durham’s suspicion may have credence. This vicinity has been largely compromised by recent construction of the condominium and a restaurant parking lot, therefore the potential for research is greatly diminished. This mound, and any associated subsurface features, may still retain a few clues as to its function and age and more study is warranted.

**EXPLORATION OF DOMESTIC LOTS, SOUTHEASTERN SUNBURY**

**Hilliard Property**

The Hilliard property consisted of three lots (Lot 42 on the south side of Brigantine Dunmore Road and Maxwell Street, and Lots 24 and 25 on the south side of Brigantine Dunmore Road and Screven Street). These lot numbers do not correspond to the original Sunbury lots.
Five shovel tests were excavated on Lot 42 and four of these yielded artifacts. The Hilliard property on Screven Street was sampled by seven shovel tests, of which all were positive. Artifacts recovered from these shovel tests included brick, tabby, coquina, window glass, unidentified square nails, wire nails, black basalt ware, creamware, pearlware, mocha ware, slipware, delftware, porcelain, redware, bottle glass (olive green, amber, aqua and clear), ballast flint, coal, unidentified aboriginal pottery, fiber tempered pottery, quartz debitage, animal bone and oyster shell.

Test Unit 5 was excavated on the Hilliard lot off the south side of Screven Street. The southeastern corner of the test unit was located at UTM E473398 N3514297, which was in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 104. This test unit measured 1 m by 1 m (Figure 21). It was excavated in three levels to a maximum depth of 41 cm below ground surface. Two features were defined in this test unit at the base of the topsoil zone. Feature 3 was a small circular post near the center of the test unit. It measured 17 cm in diameter and extended 14 cm into the subsoil. Feature 4 was a sub-rectangular post located in the east wall of the test unit. It measured 28 cm north-south by at least 12 cm east-west and extended 16 cm into the subsoil.

Artifacts from Test Unit 5 on the Hilliard tract included: brick, tabby, nails, creamware, blue edgeware, polychrome slipware, and other ceramics, bottle glass, tobacco pipe fragments, animal bone, and oyster shell. The abundant eighteenth century artifacts and the two post features located in Test Unit 5 suggest that a dwelling was present in the vicinity. The presence of well-preserved features also indicates that the archaeological resources on this property have substantial research potential.

Mr. Hilliard told the survey team that he had cleared and plowed the lot at the corner of Maxwell Street and Brigantine Dunmore Road. He also noted that he had allowed metal detector enthusiasts to search his property. Mr. Hilliard reported finding a Civil War
button and the family has also found a lot of stoneware and other ceramics. The lot where
the Hilliards reside had a tabby foundation buried approximately two feet below the
surface. Mr. Hilliard believes that the area was partially filled to level the lower portion
containing the foundation (Mr. Hilliard, personal communication, January 29, 2004).

Mr. Lyle, a local resident who rented a house on the Hilliard property (as of February
2004), made a surface collection of artifacts from his yard over a period of years. This
collection had been piled around a tree. It was collected and the pile location was
recorded at E473369 N3514266 in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lots 103 and 104.
Although the context of this collection is somewhat compromised, it indicates a broad
span of historic occupation on the Hilliard property from the 1750s to about 1860.

Slater Property

The Slater property, which is located at 105 Maxwell Street and the adjacent vacant lot, is
a residential tract on the south side of Maxwell Street. The vacant lot, west of the Slater
residence, was shovel tested, revealing a shallow, low frequency deposit of historic
artifacts. A total of eight shovel tests was excavated south and west of the Slater
residence and four of these contained historic artifacts or oyster shell. This area appears
to have been disturbed, possibly graded and some topsoil removed. These activities may
have reduced the lot’s research potential. Artifacts from these tests included brick
fragments, one gray salt glazed stoneware sherd, one wrought nail, and oyster shells. This
location is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 101.

Unknown Property 2

The wooded tract immediately across Maxwell Street from the Slater Property contained
a small tabby ruin and a surface scatter of bricks and slate. The ruin measured
approximately 30 cm north-south by 1.75 m east-west. The original function of the tabby
ruin was not determined. It may represent a portion of a larger structure, a grave, or
possibly a chimney base. The survey team was unable to obtain access to this property, as
the land owner was not determined. The ruin is located at UTM E473400 N3514274
(GPS waypoint A119). This location is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 103.

EXPLORATION OF DOMESTIC LOTS, SOUTHERN SUNBURY

Jones Property

The Jones property (Brigantine Dunmore/Fort Morris Road, and Calder Avenue) was the
most extensively examined tract in the present study. It is located immediately north of
the Fort Morris State Historic Site property and south of the Goodman property. An
abandoned dirt road, identified as Calder Avenue, divides portions of the state property
from the Jones tract on its south side. The Jones property is divided on its east-west axis
by Fort Morris Road/Brigantine Dunmore Road. Most of the property is in mature
maritime forest, although one palm tree and several walnut trees were observed. This tract represents the largest remaining contiguous block of relatively undisturbed woodlands in original Sunbury.

Topographic mapping was conducted on a portion of the Jones property. The mapping included five large areas containing evidence of looting. The largest area of disturbance was intentionally sampled by Test Unit 3 in the ABPP study. The disturbance measured approximately 15 m northwest-southeast by 9 m northeast-southwest. The other disturbed areas were smaller, measuring about 4 m in diameter. Figures 22 and 23 show aspects of this disturbance.

In an area measuring approximately 110 m north-south by 120 m east-west, archaeologists excavated 97 systematic shovel tests that were spaced at 10 m intervals. At least four eighteenth and/or early nineteenth century occupation areas were discovered by these tests, although historic artifacts were distributed over nearly the entire area. Only 17 negative tests were excavated. Of these, 16 were located on the west side of the sample area, where the soils become poorly drained.

Metal Detector Survey on the Jones property yielded disappointing results, with one notable exception. The general absence of non-ferrous metal readings suggested that most of this area has been exhaustively combed by metal detector enthusiasts in previously years. One complete eighteenth century iron shoe buckle was located, recovered, and its provenience documented on the Jones property during the metal detector survey.

GPR survey of the Jones property consisted of one sample (Block Y) on a portion of Lot 93. Block Y was a 10 m by 10 m square located east of Test Unit 3 in a heavily looted area. Several large looter holes were present within the GPR block. The southeast corner of Block Y was located at UTM E473436 N35144011. An aerial view of Block Y at approximately 50 cm below ground surface is shown in Figure 24. Block Y covered portions of original Sunbury Lot 93 and adjacent areas of Sunbury Commons, immediately south of Lot 93.

In order to assess the extent of damage caused to the archaeological resources on Lot 93 by looting, archaeologists placed Test Unit 3 within an obviously disturbed area of the lot. The southeast corner of Test Unit 3 was located at UTM E473425 N3514012. This test unit measured 2 m east-west by 1 m north-south and was excavated in 10 levels to a maximum depth of 1.6 m below ground surface. Arbitrary levels were 10 cm thick. Selected profile and plan drawings of Test Unit 3 are shown in Figures 25 through 28. Figures 29 and 30 show two views of Test Unit 3 following the completion of its excavation.
Figure 22. Extensive Looter Disturbance, Jones Property, Sunbury.

Figure 23. Tabby Blocks Displaced by Looters, Jones Property, Sunbury.
Figure 24. Plan View of GPR Block Y at Approximately 50 cm Depth.

Test Unit 3 contained abundant artifacts from the eighteenth century occupation of Lot 93. The upper levels were contaminated by the previous looting activity. The effect of this activity was to invert and/or mix the soil strata and to remove selected artifacts (of unknown type and quantity) from the midden. Test Unit 3 yielded architectural artifacts, including wrought nails, window glass, brick, tabby, and mortar. It also yielded a wide range of eighteenth and early nineteenth century ceramics, including Rhenish stoneware, British brown stoneware, Jackfield ware, creamware, and several varieties of pearlware. Other kitchen group artifacts included bottle glass (olive green, light green, and clear), tableware glass, an iron fork, and abundant food bones and oyster shells. Many tobacco pipe fragments were contained in the test unit. Clothing items included two brass buttons, one bone button, a brass thimble, straight pin, and an iron buckle. One Olive green bottle glass flake tool was identified.

Several varieties of transfer printed pearlware, including blue, green, and purple decorated wares, were present in the upper six excavation levels. These types of ware were not produced until after 1800, which suggests that if the dwelling on Lot 93 was demolished by the Patriots in the American Revolution (as historically documented later
in this discussion), another dwelling was rebuilt on this site soon thereafter. Pearlware was present in the excavations as deep as Level 9, but its presence at that depth may indicate that it was deposited in the well, possibly after the dwelling was abandoned.

Two features were defined in Test Unit 3. Feature 1 was a concentration of midden and building rubble that was identified at the base of Level 3 (about 78 cm below ground surface). It measured minimally 1.4 m east-west by 75 cm north-south. This feature was apparently undamaged by the looters.

Feature 2 was a trash pit that measured minimally 81 cm east-west by 36 cm north-south and was at least 32 cm deep. The feature was identified at a depth of about one meter below ground surface, as revealed in a great increase in artifacts rather than any apparent soil discoloration. The feature was located in the northeast corner of the test unit.

At the last excavation level (160 cm below ground) it was evident that the mottled clay fill contained a light scatter of historic artifact. The interpretation of this deposition was ambiguous. It may represent a builder’s trench for the construction of a well. Brick and tabby building rubble, which was abundant in the previous excavation level on the southeastern part of the test unit, may represent a collapse of the upper part of the well casing, but this evidence was inconclusive. One large tabby fragment revealed wood-molded impressions and likely served as the “lip” at the top of the well. The excavations were hampered at this depth by groundwater. The use of a metal probe suggested that a brick lined shaft may be present. Some eighteenth century artifacts were observed in the shaft. Further investigation of this feature was not attempted in the present study.
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Figure 26. Plan at Base of Level 10, Test Unit 3, 9Li4.
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Figure 27. North Profile, Test Unit 3, 9Li4.
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Figure 28. South Profile, Test Unit 3, 9Li4.
Figure 29. Test Unit 3, Jones Property, West View.
Figure 30. Test Unit 3, Jones Tract, South View.

Test Unit 3 is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 93. Lot 93 was granted to Robert Bolton in 1760. Robert Bolton also owned three other Sunbury town Lots 78, 257 and 258. Robert and Ann Bolton sold Lot 93 to Thomas Young in 1773. Thomas Young also owned other town lots in Sunbury but historical documents indicate that his residence was on Lot 93. Young, who owned the property during the American Revolution, is discussed in greater detail below. The property of Thomas Young, a staunch Loyalist, was confiscated and sold in 1782 to John Jenkins (see Appendix 1). Lot ownership following John Jenkins was not researched.

Archaeologists located a historical document that pertains to Thomas Young’s dwelling on Lot 93 and Test Unit 3. In a letter to Major General Benjamin Lincoln, dated Feb 12, 1779, Lieutenant Colonel John McIntosh wrote:

Sir-

I have just received a Letter from Mr. Thomas Young, acquainting me that the Certificate which I gave him for pulling down his House at Sunberry at the time Colonel Fusor took possession of it—wherein he acquaints me my Reasons were not fully set forth, for destroying of said house—I wish therefore Sir endeavor to State them in a clearer manner—being apprehensive of an attack from the Enemy, I though it prudent to have the Buildings which were near the Fort pulled down, that I might have no obstruction in the use of the Artillery—this House of Mr. Young’s laying near the North East corner of the Fort. I was apprehensive of the Enemy’s taking possession of it and annoying of me within the walls. I though it prudent, and with the advice of my officers to have it destroyed which I accordingly did—

I am Sir With Esteem
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Thomas Young was a prominent plantation owner, tanyard owner, and slave master in Sunbury. He was a Loyalist and spent the period after early 1779 away from Sunbury. Following the war he settled in Savannah where he resided with his family until 1785. Young filed a claim for his losses at Sunbury with the British Crown, which consisted of real estate, including two town lots in Sunbury, and “leather and hides left in tanyard at Sunbury…stores pulled down; negroes taken from plantation; cooper’s and carpenter’s tools; (Coldham 1980:546-547). Although Thomas Young was reimbursed for his losses, he never returned to Sunbury.

Thomas Young’s house may well be the dwelling remains uncovered in Test Unit 3 on Lot 93. The archaeological evidence demonstrated an occupation from the 1750s through the early 1800s, which reveals that someone occupied the property after Young’s dwelling was demolished under Lieutenant Colonel McIntosh’s orders. It is highly unlikely that Young ever received any reimbursement from the Americans for his losses. The location of Young’s tanyard was not determined in the present research.

The archaeological investigations on Lot 93 uncovered a wealth of cultural data pertaining to life in Sunbury during the Colonial, Revolutionary War, and Early Federal periods. Numerous other loci on the eastern part of the Jones property likely harbor a similar record. Lot 93 also was distinguished because of the historical information that related to it. History records that the lot was home to a wealthy Loyalist named Thomas Young. When the American patriots began constructing Fort Morris, Young’s residence on Lot 93 was demolished by the Americans. The archaeological evidence indicates that the lot was later reoccupied and that occupation continued into the early decades of the nineteenth century.

The shovel testing data (and evidence from looter holes) indicate that many other lots in the southeastern corner of Sunbury have similarly impressive stories to tell from the archaeological record. Although looting of this area is widespread, it has not completely destroyed all the information or the potential for archaeology to uncover what has survived.

The terrain to the west of Lot 93 drops in elevation and becomes poorly drained. Shovel testing was not attempted in the poorly drained areas but resumed to the west once higher elevations were encountered. The central section of the Jones property also contained an eighteenth century component. This portion, which consisted of an area approximately 120 m north-south by 80 m east-west, was systematically covered by shovel tests, spaced at 10 m intervals. Positive shovel tests were excavated over the entire area, revealing a
greater concentration of artifacts on the northern side. A total of 51 positive and 34 sterile shovel tests was excavated in the west central area of the Jones property.

Archaeologists excavated Test Unit 4 to sample the concentration of eighteenth century artifacts in the west-central part of the Jones property. Test Unit 4 was a 1 m by 1 m excavation that was placed in an area of disturbed midden. The southeastern corner of the test unit was located at UTM E473142 N3514036, which is in the vicinity of original Sunbury Lot 233. A view of the Test Unit 4 at the completion of excavation is shown in Figure 31.

![Figure 31. Test Unit 4, Jones Property, Facing South.](image)

Test Unit 4 was excavated in three levels to a maximum depth of 35 cm below ground surface. No features were identified in this test but a thin artifact-rich midden was present. Most of the artifacts were contained in the upper two levels. Artifacts in Level 3 included small bits of oyster shell, brick fragments, and chert debitage. A variety of artifacts was recovered from this test unit. Most of these dated to the eighteenth century occupation.

**EXPLORATION OF SUNBURY’S PUBLIC LOTS**

The public property of Sunbury included three squares (Church, King, and Meeting squares), streets, lanes and the Sunbury Commons. The resources or potential resources associated with the public squares are discussed in this following section. The roads leading to Sunbury, the roads and lanes within the town, and the wharves on the Medway River are also discussed. The Sunbury Commons is discussed in the ensuing section.
A number of public buildings were built in Sunbury in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century and these were likely placed on public lots. Public buildings included the Sunbury Academy, an academy or seminary of learning for boys, established in 1786 and incorporated in 1799, and the Sunbury Female Asylum for orphaned girls, incorporated in 1819. (Georgia Legislative Documents 2004; McIlvaine 1971:58; Groover 1987:22,24). In 1811, the State of Georgia granted the Commissioners of the Sunbury Academy the use of 166 and two-thirds acres of land, “That one third of a tract of land adjoining Sunbury, & known by the name of the Distillery Tract, confiscated as the estate of Roger Kellsall, and now the property of the state…” (Georgia Legislative Documents 2004).

Reverend William McWhir served as headmaster of the Sunbury Academy by 1793, replacing Reverend Reuben Hitchcock (McIlvaine 1971:59; Groover 1987:23). McWhir served longer than any of the academy’s headmasters, for about 30 years (Jones 1837:214). Rev. Thomas Lewis served as headmaster from April 1802 to March 1804. His assistants included Mr. Hoyt, who died September 10, 1803, and Doctor Bond (Lewis 1803a, 1803b; Morris 1804a; Elliott 1855).

Teachers at the Sunbury Academy in the early nineteenth century included:

- Rev. Reuben Hitchcock;
- Rev. William McWhir;
- Rev. Thomas Lewis;
- Mr. Hoyt;
- Dr. Bond;
- James E. Morris;
- Rev. Shannon;
- Rev. Thomas Goulding;
- Uriah Wilcox;
- Rev. John Boggs;
- Captain Joseph William Hughes, Sr.;
- G.C. Lee;
- Rev. A.T. Holmes;
- Rev. S.G. Hillyer;
- Major John Winn;
- W.T. Feay and,

The Sunbury Academy was a renowned educational institution in coastal Georgia. It served as a preparatory school and many of its graduates entered colleges such as Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The estimated average attendance of the school was about 70 and it was co-educational (Jones 1878:215; McIlvaine 1971:59).

The former location of the Sunbury Academy building on the modern landscape remains undetermined. No specific land deeds or grants for the Sunbury Academy were located that provide any degree of specificity that would be helpful in finding its location archaeologically. Jones (1878:216) states that the Sunbury Academy building was
constructed in King’s Square and was a wooden structure, two and a half stories high and about sixty feet square. He added that the building was, “pulled down and sold some time about the year 1842”.

A 1932 description of Sunbury by a Baptist historian provides a few contradictory clues to the academy’s possible location on one side of the Sunbury [Baptist] Church, facing Church Street (the third street from the river and perpendicular to Bay Street). That would place the approximate location of the Sunbury Academy near the Church Square, which is discussed in more detail below. Reverend Lewis’ letter to his parents, dated January 4, 1802 (Lewis 1802), indicates that an academy building was then under construction, which begs the question, were there two possible sites for the Sunbury Academy—one on King’s Square and another near Church Square?

**Church Square--Sunbury Cemetery Property**

Today, the best known of the public areas of Sunbury is the Sunbury Cemetery, which is located on Church Square in the northwestern part of town. Several important religious and secular facilities may have existed on Church Square, including the Congregationalist and Baptist Churches, the Sunbury Academy, and a large cemetery.

No surviving drawings or photographs of the Sunbury Congregationalist Church are known to exist. Likewise, the original Congregational church at Midway was destroyed in the American Revolution and no images of the original church are known. The Midway Church was rebuilt in the 1790s, however, and remains extant. That sanctuary was documented in the 1930s by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) (Figure 32). The architectural plan of the building provides some indication of how the church at Sunbury was configured, since a secondary source indicates they were virtually identical (Cain 1932:16).

The changes between the protestant denominations that are represented at the Midway Church and at Sunbury becomes clouded by the 1760s. One preacher who, in 1763, was called to preach to the Midway congregation was Reverend John Alexander. His presence in the community is proven by his marriage at Midway in 1764. By 1766, Alexander was a missionary representative of an Anglican mission society and he preached in Sunbury as an Episcopal clergyman, transferring to Puryburg, South Carolina in 1767 (Sheftall 1995:17). The Sunbury Episcopal Church had trouble securing a replacement for Reverend Alexander, as noted in a 1775 petition to Governor Wright that was signed by 35 members of the Sunbury community (Sheftall 1995:17-18). The final dissolution of Sunbury’s Congregationalist, Episcopal, and Presbyterian congregations is apparently undocumented.
The Baptist faith was well represented in Sunbury, where it included a mixed congregation of Euro-American and African-American worshippers. The Baptist ministry was a relatively new arrival in Georgia but it quickly gained in popularity. The Sunbury Baptist Church was established by 1802 (Mallard 1918:9). The Sunbury Baptist Church is listed in the earliest surviving minutes of the Savannah River Baptist Association in 1813 (Savannah River Baptist Association 1813; Parker 1966; Chapman 1969; Cornelius 1999). Later minutes of the association, dated October, 1816, identify Pastors Thomas F. Baron and Jonathan Loper at Sunbury, and noted that the congregation included: 73 baptized [in that year]; two received by letter; one dismissed; four [illegible, possibly “extend”]; five restored; six dead; and a total of 373 members (Savannah River Baptist Association 1816:6).

The Sunbury Baptist Church was later part of the Sunbury Baptist Association, which included Baptist churches in Savannah and other areas of coastal Georgia. In its first decades the Sunbury Baptist Church had a mixed Euro-American and African-American congregation, which gradually gave way by the mid nineteenth century to an all African-American congregation. Groover (1987:36) noted that the members of the Sunbury
The movement to provide religious instruction to the enslaved African-American within the Baptist denomination is an important aspect of Sunbury and Liberty County history (The New Englander 1846). In numerous instances, educated Euro-American clergy and plantation owners promoted this activity. Among those prominent in this endeavor in the Congregationalist/Presbyterian community from the 1790s to the mid-nineteenth century were Reverends Cyrus Gildersleeve and Charles C. Jones, Sr., Robert Quarterman, John Baker, Oliver Stevens, John Osgood, Jr., and John Dunwoody (Groover 1987:36). Prominent Baptists who were involved in missions to the African-Americans in Sunbury and Liberty County in the early to mid nineteenth century included Reverends Samuel S. Law, Thomas Sumner Winn, Jacob Dunham, and Abraham Harmon (Groover 1987:36; Elliott 2004; Love 2005; Simms 1888).

Two African-American churches in Savannah, which were part of the Sunbury Baptist Association, are recognized as the oldest African-American church congregations in North America (Simms 1888, 2004; Love 2005; McCombs 1999). The Sunbury Baptist Church was another very early African-American church in North America. James M. Simms, a Baptist preacher and historian, wrote about the formation of the Sunbury Association in 1888:

The church at this period [about 1815] was strong and prosperous. Many young men and women of natural ability and intelligence became connected with the church, and the number of her members largely increased. Yea, this seems to have been a time when the Lord favored his Zion, the set time had come, though we can only draw these facts from the figures given at a subsequent period, having no statistics to guide us until 1818, when it became necessary for the Savannah River Association to dissolve the union which was organized in 1802. The division was mutual, the South Carolina churches withdrawing to form an organization of their own in that State, and the Georgia churches to meet at Sunbury, in Liberty County, on the 7th of November, 1818, to organize a new Association, which took the name of the village in which it was held and the church with whom they met, the Sunbury Baptist Church, Rev. Charles O. Screven being the pastor. The churches at this organization were the First Colored, the Savannah (white), Second Colored, Great Ogeechee, and Sunbury, mixed membership.

This church was represented by Deacons Adam Johnson and Josiah Lloyd, and reported her membership as 1712. The Second Colored Church reported 538, and the Great Ogeechee 460. The First was represented by Rev. Henry Cunningham, Deacons Thomas Anderson and George Carter; the latter by Deacon John Cubbage. So we may clearly see that this church had continued increasing her numbers; doubtless the largest portion were from the river plantations near the city, but her popularity as the mother church--the Jerusalem of the colored race--kept her, of course, in the lead, as has been said; so that in 1810, when the three colored churches' membership combined was about 1500, this church comprised over half. So now it may be seen by comparing the figures above,--which continued for many years,--as the records of the Sunbury Association, which we have in full, will show (Simms 2004).

Although Reverend Simms places the formal organization of the Sunbury Baptist Association in 1818, its actual formation was some years earlier. The discrepancy is probably due to the fact that Baptist records dating prior to 1818 are extremely scarce. Fisher (1922:387) refers to Baptist records from 1817 that list "Coloured Brethren of the
Sunbury Association, Georgia”, as contributors to a foreign mission. Love (2005:7-8) noted that the Second African Baptist Church (Savannah) was formed in December 1802 out of the First African Baptist Church; the Ogeechee African Baptist Church was formed in January 1803. The Sunbury Association met at Sunbury in November 1924 and the First African Church was represented at that meeting and the total membership was 1712. A split in the Baptist community in Savannah occurred in 1832, leading to the expulsion of the First African Baptist Church of Savannah from the Sunbury Association (Love 2005:10-11). The exact date of the formation of the Sunbury Baptist Church was not determined but it probably was created about the time of the other African-American churches in Savannah. Early pastors of the Sunbury Baptist Church included:

- Charles Odensell Screven;
- Samuel Spry Law;
- Josiah Spry Law;
- Thomas F. Baron and,

In October 1932, the New Sunbury Association held a meeting at the site of the old Sunbury Baptist Church. The minutes of that meeting provide insight into the history and conditions of Sunbury (New Sunbury Association 1932:1-17). The New Sunbury [Baptist] Association ceased to be directly associated with the Baptist church at Sunbury after the sanctuary was destroyed by the Union Army in 1864. The minutes recall the event,

the New Sunbury Association met in its Sixty-seventh (67th) Anniversary on the spot of the extinct Town of Sunbury where the Baptist Church stood and which was destroyed by order of the Federal commander in the winter of 1864. By a pre-concerted agreement the Federal officer set fire to the church as a signal that he was in possession of the town, that the warships might come into the harbor...The purpose of this gathering was to memorialize the spot and to recall that the Sunbury Association was organized in this church October, 1918 (New Sunbury Association 1932:8).

C.W. Morgan, aged 77 in 1932, “described in graphic words the scenes when the church that stood on the very spot where he spoke was burned in 1864…” (New Sunbury Association 1932:9). Apparently Mr. Morgan was a youthful eye-witness to the event. May Wood Cain provided a historical summary of the Sunbury Baptist Church for the 1932 meeting, which was published in the minutes. Cain (1932:16) noted, “The church house was burned because it was the only building in Sunbury at that time not used as a dwelling. The few members of the church who were there were allowed to take the Bible and church furniture from the building before it was burned”.

Cain (1932:16) also noted that,

The Sunbury Church was almost a duplicate of the Midway church. There was a gallery for slaves for there were always many more blacks belonging to the church than whites. The church faced Church street. On one side of the church was the academy. The street on one side led to Bay street and at its foot was Baptismal Landing. Church street was the third street from the river. The Barrington ferry road passed one side of the church and led to South Newport....
Cain’s church history contains many other important details about Sunbury Baptist Church, which are extracted below,

- 1801 and 1802—Rev. Charles O. Screven preached in the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches in Sunbury
- Date unknown—Charles O. Screven gave land for the Baptist meeting house
- 1806—Sunbury Baptist Church Constituted, Sunbury Baptist Church admitted to the Savannah River Association.
- 1818—Savannah River Association renamed Sunbury Association
- 1829 to 1830—Rev. Samuel Spry Law pastor of Sunbury Baptist Church
- 1830 to 1839—Rev. J. S. Law pastor of Sunbury Baptist Church
- 1839—Rev. Augustus O. Bacon pastor of Sunbury Baptist Church
- 1856—“the white membership of the church had decreased to nineteen” (Cain 1932:13-14).

The pastors were all Euro-Americans, as were several of the other Baptist ministers in the coastal Georgia area, such as the Reverends Abram Harmon and William W. Wash, who preached to their African-American brethren (Elliott 2004:127-128, 132; Simms 1888; Love 2005). Even the Reverend Charles C. Jones, who was not Baptist, preached to the congregation in the Sunbury Baptist Church (Cornelius 1999). In its early years the Sunbury Baptist Church was a mixed congregation but by 1866 it had transitioned to an entirely African-American church, when the New Sunbury Association (white) was formed. By 1840, the Baptist Sunbury Association in Georgia listed more than 4,000 African American members attending seven black-led churches (Raboteau 2000, cited in Blosser 2004:10). (See “Meeting Square” section of this report for additional information about transformation of the Sunbury Baptist Church to the Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church in 1866).

The Baptist Archives at Mercer University may be able to provide additional historical facts pertaining to the Sunbury Baptist Association, and its successor, the New Sunbury Baptist Association. The holdings at Mercer extend back to 1818.

The Sunbury Cemetery is defined by the Liberty County Tax Assessor as a one-acre lot (of unspecified ownership), which is currently maintained by the Daughters of American Colonists. It is defined and identified by a large cement fence, a bronze historical marker, and a stone monument. This cemetery was associated with the Congregationalists and Presbyterians at Sunbury. This cemetery was used by the Baptists and others in the town for burial purposes. For example, Reverend Samuel Spry Law (1775-1837), was originally a member of the Sunbury Congregationalist Church, although in 1827 he was ordained as a minister by the Sunbury Baptist Church. His son, Reverend Josiah Spry Law (1808-1853) became the minister of the Sunbury Baptist Church in 1830. Both men were buried in the Law family plot in the Sunbury Cemetery (Groover 1987:31).

Although the Sunbury Cemetery probably dates to the town’s founding in 1758, or shortly thereafter, most graves from its early period are not commemorated by tombstones. Nevertheless, many dozens, if not hundreds, of people died and were buried in Sunbury during the colonial period. A letter dated December 1, 1766, from Reverend
John Alexander in Sunbury to the Society for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, an Anglican mission society in London, related how, “some houses are without inhabitants; the whole families having been swept off by fever…” (Alexander 1766:131-132). Numerous deaths from “fever and ague” continued to haunt Sunbury into the early nineteenth century (Lewis 1803b; Morris 1804a). Deaths in Sunbury resulting from the devastating hurricanes in 1804 and 1824 were most likely numerous but mortality statistics for these deaths (and many others) in Sunbury went unrecorded. Many of these dead were buried in Sunbury.

By the early twentieth century the Sunbury Cemetery was overgrown and fast becoming forgotten. Cain (1932:16) provided this description,

> Morgans, Stevens, Kells, Dunhams, Girardeaus, LaMottes, Spaldings, Chisholms and McIvers were among the families who lived at Sunbury. There is a large and interesting cemetery among the pine trees on the edge of where was once the old town. The cemetery is near the road to Midway. In it the vaults of the Dunhams and Screvens have stood unopened for over a half century. The tombs of the valorous preachers of the days are covered by the vines and leaves and moss of the years. The spirit which convicted and called and made missionaries of Jacob Dunham, Charles Screven, Samuel Laws, Augustus [sic, Augustus] Bacon, Charles Jones [Note: Charles Jones is actually buried in Midway Cemetery] and others still lives.

The Sunbury cemetery is located immediately north of Dutchmans Cove Road in the southwestern quadrant of the original Church Square, possibly continuing onto domestic lots to the south of the Church Square. The cemetery is presently identified as a one acre enclosure, whose perimeter is marked with a cement fence. Additional graves probably continue north of the fenced enclosure onto the Glenn property and possibly to the west, although the area to the west was not examined (McDaniel 2002:63). The graves apparently do not continue towards the east, since that area was formerly poorly drained and the ground level elevated by the introduction of artificial fill in the late twentieth century. Figures 33 and 34 show views of the Sunbury Cemetery in January 2004.

Survey of the cemetery included detailed topographic mapping; photo-recording of grave markers, fenced enclosures and general viewsheds; partial recording of tombstone information (including name and date of death), and GPR survey. The GPR survey coverage in the cemetery vicinity consisted of Blocks Q through U, Z, and AA. The location of these GPR blocks is shown in Figure 35. No excavation was conducted on this property.

GPR Block Q was a 5 m east-west by 3 m north-south sample that was placed over the grave of J. T. Stevens (Figure 36). Stevens died October 7, 1861 and his grave is marked by a marble headstone and footstone. The orientation of the headstone faces east-southeast and oriented at a bearing of approximately 100 degrees. This GPR sample did not reveal clear indication of Mr. Steven’s grave.
Figure 33. Slate Tombstone of Eliza Ann Richardson, East View, Sunbury Cemetery.

Figure 34. Sunbury Cemetery, North View (Glen Property in Woods Visible in Background).
Figure 35. GPR Survey Coverage at Sunbury Cemetery, 2004.
GPR Block R was located inside the Law-Fleming families cemetery plot, which is surrounded by a cast iron fence. Unlike most of the other GPR sample blocks, Block R consisted of five transects and all transects bearing north, which progressed from west to east. It measured approximately 12 m north-south by 2 m east-west (Figure 37). Figure 38 shows a front view of GPR Block R. In this view, numerous graves are visible in profile as prominent hyperbola. A strong metal signal, possibly a metal coffin, is indicated by a strong anomaly of horizontal banding.

GPR Block S was a 15 m north-south by 6 m east-west sample that was located in an open area (containing no apparent grave markers or grave shaft depressions) of the Sunbury Cemetery (Figure 39). Block S is joined by Block U on the north side of Block S and the two samples combined form a 30 m by 6 m sample within the cemetery lot. A front view of GPR Block S is presented in Figure 40. Many large radar anomalies, visible as hyperbolas, were observed in this image. Most of these anomalies may represent historic graves.

GPR Block T was located within the Dunham family cemetery plot, which was surrounded by a cast iron fence. The Dunham plot contained many marble headstones and footstones, which formed significant obstacles for the survey. A total of seven transects were made in Block T. A number of radar anomalies, which likely represent human graves, are visible in Block T (Figure 41).
Figure 37. Plan View of GPR Block R at 50 cm Depth.

Figure 38. Front View of GPR Block R.
Figure 39. Plan View of GPR Block S at 50 cm Depth.
GPR Block U was located immediately north of GPR Block S on the north-central part of the Sunbury Cemetery. It measured 15 m north-south by 6 m east-west. This sample was located in an open area of the Sunbury Cemetery and it contained no apparent grave markers or grave shaft depressions. The transects in Block S were oriented north (odd numbered) and south (even numbered) and the progress of the transects was from the west to east. One large tree stump formed a substantial obstacle on the first transect in Block U. Many large radar anomalies were observed in this sample block (Figures 42 and 43). Most of these anomalies may represent historic graves.

GPR Block AA was located in Sunbury Cemetery and began immediately north of Mrs. Semar Smith’s brick crypt. A large slate headstone and footstone marked the grave of Eliza Ann Richardson and her grave was entirely within this sample block. The sample measured 9 m north-south by 4 m east-west. The transects in Block AA were oriented north (odd numbered) and south (even numbered) and the progress of the transects was from the east to west. Block AA contains a number of strong anomalies, which likely represent human graves (Figure 44).
Figure 41. Plan View of GPR Block T at 50 cm Depth.
Figure 42. Plan View of GPR Block U at 50 cm Depth.
Church Square--Glen Property

The Glen property is located immediately north of the Sunbury Cemetery and east of Dutchman’s Cove Road. It includes portions of the Church Square of original Sunbury. It also includes several domestic lots north of Church Square. The latter, however, were apparently little occupied. Archaeologists covered most of this tract by systematic shovel tests that they excavated at 10 m intervals. No historic artifacts were revealed from these tests. An area immediately north of the Sunbury Cemetery contained numerous elongated depressions, which were suspected to be graves. Shovel tests were not excavated in this vicinity but the suspected cemetery area was subjected to GPR survey and detailed topographic mapping. This area of suspected graves extends approximately 15 m north of the existing cemetery fence.

The horizontal extent of these possible grave depressions was outlined by plantings of azaleas. According to Liberty County resident Esau Fuller, these azaleas were planted by former landowner Allen Stevens, sometime after Stevens acquired the land in 1938. Mr. Fuller added that he worked for Stevens in this endeavor, as part of a general clean-up of the Sunbury Cemetery (Esau Fuller personal communication Sunbury, Georgia, January 27, 2004 (Sheftall 1995:124). The size of the cemetery, as legally recorded by Liberty County and as delineated by a cement fence, is smaller than the extent of the cemetery as indicated by Mr. Fuller.
GPR Block Z was located immediately north of the Sunbury Cemetery cement fence on the Glen property. This block covered slightly less than 50 percent of the suspected cemetery extent on the Glen property, based on the outline formed by the planted azaleas and the distribution of suspected grave shaft depressions that were visible on the surface. Block Z measured 21.2 m north-south by 12 m east-west. The transects in Block Z were oriented north (odd numbered) and south (even numbered) and the progress of the transects was from the east to west. An aerial view of Block Z, viewed at approximately 50 cm below ground, is shown in Figure 45. Several dozen large anomalies can be discerned in Block Z, which likely represent human burials. Many of these anomalies are clustered, possibly representing separate family plots. These radar data, coupled with the surface evidence of grave depressions and other landscaping features, attest to the extension of the Sunbury cemetery more than 10 m north of its currently established boundary.
A small prehistoric Woodland period Native American Indian component was identified on the Glen tract. This component covered an area approximately 55 m east-west by 35 m north-south. This occupation contained Deptford Check Stamped pottery, unidentified cordmarked pottery, non-diagnostic chert debitage, and oyster shell. At least one shovel test encountered an intact shell midden or shell-filled refuse pit. The shovel test data from the areas east and south of the Glen’s residence indicate a partially intact Woodland occupation site. Construction of the Glen’s house, and its associated utilities, disturbed an unknown portion of the site.

No historic artifacts were retrieved from the Glen Property. This was unexpected given the proximity to the Sunbury Cemetery and the well-drained landform. The absence of refuse strongly indicates that large portions of the Church Square were not used for domestic refuse disposal. If a church building, or other buildings, were located in this vicinity, their presence was not detected by close interval shovel testing. Examination of the property lying immediately southeast of the Glen property revealed that it was poorly drained and also is unlikely to contain remains of any buildings. Examination of the property lying immediately west of the Glen property showed that it was better drained, but also contained no trace of any buildings or early historic occupation. The area immediately west and south of the Sunbury Cemetery tract was not investigated in the present study.

Archaeologists observed traces of a logging tram causeway on the northwest part of the Glen property. The trace was oriented north-northeast to south-southwest. This earthwork crosses a small branch at UTM E473139 N3514942. This feature probably dates to the late nineteenth or early twentieth century and is unrelated to the Sunbury Church or the eighteenth and nineteenth century town.
Meeting Square--Goodman Property

The Goodman property is located immediately west of Brigantine Dunmore Road, south of Sunbury Road and north of the Jones property. The property contains approximately 40 acres and includes the Goodman’s residence, a large artificial pond, and a large area currently being prepared for a 77-unit housing development known as, The Village at Sunbury, operated by Terra Firma LLC. Although negotiations between the Goodmans and Terra Firma LLC and the ABPP survey team to allow access to the property for archaeological survey in the present study ended unsuccessfully, some information on the cultural resources on the property was gleaned by conversations with Mr. Goodman, a brief surface examination of the cemetery loci, and previous information on the cemetery gathered by the LAMAR Institute in January 1996. The other potential resources for most of the Terra Firma LLC property were not assessed.

A large cemetery is shown in the vicinity of the Goodman property on twentieth century topographic maps. Intact cemetery furniture was located at UTM E473136 N3514266 (USGS 1958). This cemetery was disturbed by heavy equipment in January 1996 and several tombstones and other funerary stones were displaced. Two of these are shown in Figure 46. This cemetery may be associated with the Sunbury Baptist Church.

In 1866 the Sunbury Baptist Church became the Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church (Johnson 1974). The original Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church sanctuary was located in Sunbury. By 1918, the Church’s congregation was dissatisfied with its location, since most of its members moved inland, and the church sanctuary was relocated near its present location on Trade Hill Road. The 1918 church building was replaced by the present brick and cinder block structure sometime in the late twentieth century. The present congregation consists solely of African-Americans.

The Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church Cemetery was noted for its distinctive wooden markers carved by Siras Bowen, which were documented in the 1930s and 1980s (WPA 1940). These markers have since been destroyed (McDaniel 1988; Esau Fuller personal communication Sunbury, Georgia January 27, 2004). Several scholars interpreted these mortuary markers to be derived from African traditions. It is reasonable to expect that earlier graves associated with African-American descendants in the Sunbury Baptist Church at Sunbury would have been marked with similar wooden markers.

The Sunbury Baptist Church (or its successor, the Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church) was located in Sunbury for at least 116 years. The brief survey examination revealed that the cemetery probably contains many more than the five or six graves, as reported by the landowner. A significantly higher number of interments also is indicated by the historical data. A sampling of early Baptist church records indicated that in one year (1816) six members of the church died, out of a total congregation of 373 persons, or 1.6 percent of the congregation. The Sunbury Baptist Church undoubtedly experienced substantial fluctuations in its congregation size from 1802 to 1918, but assuming a constant size of 373 people, an estimate of 696 dead over this 116 year period is returned. If the cemetery
on the Goodman property is synonymous with the Sunbury Baptist Church cemetery, it may easily contain several hundred interments. In addition, if the survey findings at the northern Sunbury cemetery are any indication, the cemetery on the Goodman’s land is substantially larger than has been acknowledged and it may cover several acres. Cartographic data also supports a larger size for the cemetery on the Goodman property.

The cemetery on the Goodman property was in use as late as 1918, based on the observed tombstone evidence. Coincidentally, that is the year that the Sunbury Missionary Baptist Church moved from its location in Sunbury to its present location on Trade Hill Road (Esau Fuller personal communication Sunbury, Georgia, January 27, 2004). The cemetery on the Goodman property is located on one of the original public lots of Sunbury.

Figure 46. Displaced Tombstones on the Goodman Property, January 1996.

Transportation—Sunbury Road

The Sunbury Road is an early transportation route that linked interior Georgia with the port of Sunbury. The road was authorized by the Georgia Legislature in 1786, although portions of it, particularly that portion near the colonial town site, were already in existence decades earlier. A June 7, 1764 real estate advertisement in the Georgia Gazette described the, “broad road to Sunbury within four miles of Midway Publick
Landing” (Kilborne 1999a:61). By 1790 the Sunbury Road was well established from Greensboro to Sunbury was well established (McIlvaine 1971:56).

An extensive segment of this early road remains as a roadway in Liberty County. The old road can be traced from a point where it veers from Georgia Highway 38, a short distance from Interstate 95, to a point where it intersects Brigantine Dunmoor Road in Sunbury. The first segment of the road passes through uninhabited woodlands and the road is an unpaved road. The final segment of the road is a short section improved gravel road where it passes through the town of Sunbury. Traces of the road continue east of this intersection onto private property, possibly ending at the Medway River.

The Sunbury Road was field-documented by three methods, photography, GPS waypoint recordation, and topographic mapping using the total station (Figure 47). From the intersection of Brigantine Dunmore Road the Sunbury road proceeds westward on a gradual descent. The old road crosses a wetland just west of the town limit of Sunbury, which has been modified in modern times. The Sunbury Road divides the northern one-third of the town of Sunbury from the southern two-thirds on a nearly east-west route.

![Figure 47. South View of Topographic Mapping of the Sunbury Road from the Starling Property.](image)

**Surface Transportation—Sunbury’s Streets and Lanes**

Sunbury was built on a rectangular plan that consisted of 496 town lots surrounding three public squares. The lots were divided by a series of north-south and east-west roads and
lanes. The original names of the streets are mostly unrecorded but may include Church and Bay Streets.

Sheftall (1995:15) identified two roads from historical documents that served Sunbury in the years leading up to the American Revolution. One was built in 1755, which, “joined the Fort Barrington Road 10 miles from Sunbury at Midway Congregational Church”, and the other was constructed in 1762 and, “led south from the town to the North Newport Ferry”. The section of the 1755 road leading from Sunbury probably became part of the later Sunbury Road, which serviced the interior of Georgia up to Greensboro. The other road was abandoned, although traces of this road were identified during this survey on the Jones tract, following a nearly parallel course to the Fort Morris Road. Other portions of the North Newport Ferry road may exist on private land south of the Fort Morris State Historic Site but this area was not examined in the present study (Arthur Edgar personal communication January 15, 2004).

Maritime Transportation—Sunbury’s Wharves and Maritime Resources

The eastern end of the Jones property includes some original bay lots of Sunbury. The original owners of these lots were granted wharf privileges. One wharf, identified as, “Lamotte’s”, on C.C. Jones, Jr.’s map of Sunbury is shown on the property now owned by Jones. Another wharf identified as, “Lamotte’s” is shown on the northeast side of Sunbury. To avoid confusion, the wharf on the Jones property was designated Lamotte’s wharf (South). Andrew La Motte was a merchant in Sunbury by 1769 and is almost certainly the person associated with the Lamotte wharves (Sheftall 1995:218). Remnants of a wharf that correspond to the location shown on Jones’ map were observed in the marsh. A sketch map of the rotting pilings was made and the general location was marked by a GPS waypoint. Remnants of 18 posts were observed, forming two parallel lines heading from shore towards the Medway River. The two lines of pilings were spaced approximately 2 m apart. Another lone post was located in the marsh, approximately 15 m east of the shoreline and about 18 m south of the rows of pilings. Archaeologists made a sketch map of the rotting pilings and marked the general location by GPS waypoints A352 and A353 (UTM E473554 N3514011 and E 473553 N3514024).

Sunbury’s commerce was closely tied to maritime shipping and mercantilism. Many stores and warehouses were located in Sunbury during its heyday. Some of these were very large operations. Other businesses were probably small endeavors that were operated from the owners’ houses. It was quite common in Colonial America for the ground floor to serve as a business establishment and the upper floor as living quarters. Such an arrangement would have served to disperse the businesses across the town, since not all store owners, skilled tradesmen, or other businesses were fortunately enough to obtain riverfront property. From the onset of the town’s creation, the waterfront lots were larger and more valuable than the other town lots. Lots that were the farthest from the river were the least valuable in terms of their initial purchase price.
At least 22 trading firms operated in Sunbury prior to the American Revolution, and these included the firms of:

Arthur;
Blamine;
Darling and Munro;
Darling and Co. (Kelsall, Darling and Munro);
Dunbar, Young and Simpson;
Elliott;
Forbes, Swinton, Swinton and Ogilvie;
Fisher and Jones;
Fisher, Jones and Hughes;
Gordon and Duff;
Heart;
Jones;
Jones, Dupont and Brewton;
Kell;
Kelsall and Munro;
Kelsall and Spalding;
La Motte;
Miller and Coddington;
Munro;
Pettigrew;
Swinton, Forbes and Co., and;
Young and Simpson (Sheftall 1995: Appendix F, 213-221).

At least 13 trading firms operated in Sunbury after the American Revolution, and these included the firms of:

Baker and Troup;
Bishop;
Carter;
Donworth;
Duncan;
Foster and Pray;
Graves and Pray;
Hornby;
Lanchester;
McIver;
Pray and Forester;
Schmidt and Molich, and;
Van Yeveren and James (Sheftall 1995: Appendix F, 213-221).

Many of the trading partners of the firms were British Loyalists who fled Sunbury in 1782-1783. This fact, plus a general decline in the economic importance of Sunbury by the end of the eighteenth century, account for the decline in Sunbury’s trade.

Sunbury, no doubt, was serviced by a wide range of skilled tradesmen and many of them conducted their trades and sold their products in town. Other businesses, such as James Rutherford’s tavern, were service related. Rutherford was one of several tavern keepers in Sunbury. He owned at least three town lots in Sunbury, Lots 22, 23, and 54. Rutherford placed a November 26, 1766 Georgia Gazette advertisement offering, “one
town lot in Sunbury, on which is a large dwelling house at present inhabited by Mr. James Rutherford, tavern keeper” (Kilborne 1999a:184). We suspect that Rutherford’s tavern was likely located on Lots 22 or 23. Abraham Williams and Joseph Williams also operated taverns in Sunbury prior to the American Revolution (Sheftall 1995:221).

**SUBMERGED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

At present very little is known of the submerged archaeological resources at Sunbury. Anecdotal tidbits have been provided by local residents about informal diving exploits by relic enthusiasts. None of these ventures have resulted in any useful documentation for public interpretation of the resources, or for submerged site stewardship. Although the historical research has indicated the potential for numerous sunken watercraft in the waters surrounding Sunbury, no specific locations or other details of these wrecks have been documented.

One type of early American vessel known to have sunk at Sunbury was the galley, also known as the row galley or gunboat, dating to the American Revolution. No images have been located for the vessels specifically associated with Georgia. Fleetwood (1995:73-83) provides a good discussion of the four galleys (Bulloch, Congress, Lee, and Washington) that were constructed in Georgia between 1776 and 1778. The first two galleys constructed, Washington and Lee, were in service by early 1777. He notes that the vessels were constructed in Savannah under the supervision of Philadelphia shipbuilder Thomas Rice. The galleys were fitted with sails, each galley requiring 229 yards of canvas.

Fleetwood (1995:73-83) notes that the historical data on these vessels is not sufficient, “to compose an accurate picture of these craft”, which points to the importance of maritime archaeology in their study. The galleys were not originally intended for operation in the open ocean, although they frequently skirted the Georgia coastline beyond the barrier islands. Fleetwood surmises that the Georgia galleys were shallow draft vessels with, “broad hulls and flattish bottoms”, that measured between 50 and 70 feet in length, and were powered by lateen sails and oars.

Similar galley gunboats, funded by the U.S. Navy, continued in use on the Georgia coast until after the War of 1812 (Elliott 2002). Fleetwood provides a redraft of a 1799 diagram of a galley designed by Philadelphia designer Joshua Humphreys intended for use along the coast of Georgia and South Carolina. This is the only known surviving ship diagram of a galley vessel for this region of the coast. That vessel measured, “50 feet, 6 inches in length, 13 feet, 6 inches across the beam, and over 6 feet deep in hold, drawing about 5 feet of water” (Fleetwood 1995:82). That craft was powered by a two-masted lateen rig. Fleetwood notes that other galleys built following Humphrey’s design were similar but, “slightly wider, shallower, and longer, at 51 feet 6 inches in length”.

Two more distant analogs from the Lake Champlain locale provide additional context for a study of Georgia’s Revolutionary War galleys (Pedersen 2005). The wreckage of
Benedict Arnold’s galley *Congress*, which was abandoned in 1777 has been partially documented by archaeological research, although the vessel has been extensively damaged by its relocation in the nineteenth century. Several War of 1812 galleys have been studied in Lake Champlain and ship diagrams for at least one vessel are available. The galleys that operated in Lake Champlain were undoubtedly designed differently from the ones in Georgia because of the substantially different nautical conditions in each area. The Georgia galleys, while not meant for travel on the open ocean, were designed to sail for short periods in the ocean. Consequently, their hull designs had to withstand more harsh conditions.

The galleys *Congress* and *Lee* were captured by the British on the Savannah River in March 1779. Captain John Braddock had earlier commanded the galley *Lee*, but was not at the helm at the time of its capture. These ships were renamed the *Scourge* and *Vindictive* (Fleetwood 1995:76-77). The *Washington* and *Bulloch* were beached and intentionally burned by their crew on Ossabaw Island in January 1779 after the fall of Sunbury. Other unidentified American galleys were present in Georgia in the American Revolution. Captain Braddock commanded an unidentified galley in September 1781 that was involved in a battle with the British brigantine *Dunmore* off St. Catherine’s bar (Fleetwood 1995:78). Although the name of the ship is not known, it was described by the captain of the *Dunmore* as, “schooner rigged…the largest, commanded by John Braddock, mounted two carriage guns and a number of swivels, had upwards of 50 men, is about 60 feet long, and rows with 26 oars” (Fleetwood 1995:78).

If historical accounts are correct, then the waters near Sunbury may contain three burned or exploded galley wrecks—the *Bulloch*, *Washington*, and another unidentified galley. Since the *Lee* was not taken in that engagement, by elimination the other sunken American galley is probably the *Trumbull*, since the remaining American galley in this theater was the *Congress*, commanded by Captain Milligan, which was captured by the British in the Savannah River in late March 1779—two months after the Sunbury affair (Murray n.d.:307-308; Allis 1967:Reel 3). Following battle at Sunbury on January 9 and 10, the *Congress* was sailed to Purysburg on the Savannah River, where it’s stores were inventoried for refitting on January 15 (Allis 1967: Reel 3).

Doubtless many other private watercraft were lost or abandoned in the waters near Sunbury. Marx (1983:184-186) noted that the English merchantman *Friends Endeavour*, sank while crossing over Sunbury bar in 1763 and that the English merchantman *Albion* wrecked on nearby St. Catherine’s Island in 1824.

**EXPLORING THE SUNBURY COMMONS**

A portion of the Sunbury Commons on the south side of town was explored. A large portion of this property is owned by the State of Georgia. An earlier research project on the Fort Morris State Historic Site property was completed by Southern Research Historic Preservation Consultants for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. That study was thoroughly documented in a technical report (Elliott 2005b). The present study
provides supplemental information on the archaeological resources on the park property. Other areas of the Sunbury Commons, which are in private ownership also were explored. The archaeological resources on the Fort Morris property are considered part of State Site 9Li168.

One product of the current research was an improved topographic map of the area surrounding Fort Morris, which is shown in Figure 48. This map includes the southeast corner of Sunbury and the small marsh/branch that separates the town from the Fort.

![Figure 48. Topographic Map of Southeastern Sunbury and Fort Morris.](image)

**North Flank of Fort Defiance**

Metal detector survey of the Fort Morris State Historic Site property yielded three new metal debris loci, which were previously unknown. The first area was located in the small branch north of Fort Defiance (the existing earthworks). Numerous strong metal readings were noted in this wetland area. One non-ferrous reading was chosen for exploration. It proved to be the brass butt plate of an eighteenth century musket. This item was heavily corroded and apparently undecorated.
The present GPR survey of the Fort Morris property built on the previous GPR survey by Southern Research (Elliott 2003a). The earlier work (GPR Blocks A through G) focused on the interior of Fort Defiance and one sample outside of that earthwork on its northwestern flank. The present GPR survey examined two areas immediately north and south of the Fort Defiance earthwork. No additional shovel tests or test excavations were attempted in these areas. The area immediately north of Fort Defiance (Block H), as well as the crest of the northern parapet of Fort Defiance (Blocks J and K) was surveyed using GPR. Each sample block is described below.

GPR Block H was a 10 m by 10 m square that was located just north of the Fort Defiance earthwork near its center. The southeast corner of Block H was located at 3899.96N 3493.04E at an arbitrary elevation of 8.36 m. The same area was resurveyed as a 10 m east-west by 12 m north-south block the following day with similar results.

Block H reveals what appears to be a large, deeply buried construction feature. This anomaly measures approximately 11 meters north-south by 7 meters east-west. It is semi-circular in shape and possibly open on the eastern side. The GPR picked up the outer wall of this construction at approximately 70 cm below ground surface (Figure 49). At 90 cm, a smaller area of dense radar anomalies appears within the suspected structure (Figure 50). This may represent a chimney or concentrated debris deposit.

The GPR data indicates the presence of buried architectural remains north of the existing earthwork. This structure and artifact deposit was probably covered by overburden when the existing parapet and ditch on the north wall of Fort Defiance were constructed. A similar process of burial and obscuring of the older earthwork ditches was observed on the south side of Fort Defiance in Excavation Block D, as reported previously (Elliott 2005b).

GPR Block J was a 15 m east-west by 6 m north-south sample that was located on the crest of the north parapet of Fort Defiance, near its center. A large looter hole was located immediately south of the sample block. The southwest corner of Block J was located at 3884.00N 3482.98E at an arbitrary elevation of 9.56 m. The GPR results from Block J were inconclusive. Although some linear anomalies that formed an east-west line were observed on the southwestern portion of this sample, these may represent buried architectural features that have been disrupted on the eastern side. A plan view of Block J at approximately 70 cm below ground surface is shown in Figure 51.

GPR Block K was a 8 m north-south by 5 m east-west sample that was located in the northwest corner bastion and parapet of Fort Defiance. The northwest corner of Block K was located at 3893.64N 3452.93E at an arbitrary elevation of 9.47 m. A plan view of Block K at approximately 70 cm depth is shown below (Figure 52). Concentrations of anomalies are visible on the north and south side of this sample block and the central area is relatively devoid of anomalies. The observed anomalies may represent structural support for the bastion walls, whereas the central area may contain homogeneous soil.
Figure 49. Plan View of GPR Block H at 70 cm Depth.

Figure 50. Plan View of GPR Block H at 90 cm Depth.
Figure 51. Plan View of GPR Block J at 70 cm Depth.

Figure 52. Plan View of GPR Block K at Approximately 70 cm Depth.
Possible Blacksmith Shop Northwest of Fort Morris

The second area of metal concentration was located in the woods immediately northeast of the museum’s interpretive shed and garden. A series of metal readings were recorded and a sample was investigated. Most proved to be wrought iron nails or iron scrap probably associated with a blacksmith shop. Lead also was found in this area. Twenty metal “hits” were investigated by metal detecting and shovel tests in this area.

The third area of metal concentration was located north of the small cabin, known as the Glenn Mill’s cabin prior to State Park creation, west of the museum parking lot. The Glenn Mill’s cabin is a small cinderblock building, which is the sole remainder of a series of seasonal cabins that once existed in this vicinity. This area was investigated by metal detector survey. Artifacts from this area included lead and iron. Modern twentieth century trash, associated with the cabin, also is present in this locality.

This area also was in the vicinity of the handicap access area, which was recently constructed by the state park. This access measured approximately 4 m in diameter and its center point was located at UTM E473261 N3513811. The topsoil removed for the pouring of the concrete handicapped parking pad from the excavation for this developed area had been banked in a large pile, in anticipation of the arrival of the archaeologists. Volunteer archaeologists working with the project, returned to the park at a later date and screened the entire contents of this pile through ¼ inch hardware mesh. The artifacts that were recovered from this effort were incorporated into the present study collection. The handicapped parking area contained Woodland or Mississippian and Proto-historic aboriginal and eighteenth century artifacts, which included:

- 2 yellow slipware foot ring sherds (which articulate);
- 1 blue hand painted delftware body sherd;
- 3 olive green bottle glass;
- 1 light green window glass;
- 1 iron scrap;
- 2 lead scrap (1 is possible impacted ball);
- 7 chert debitage;
- 13 plain aboriginal body sherds;
- 2 cord marked body sherds;
- 1 unidentified decorated body sherd and,
- 1 folded pinched applique rim sherd.

A narrow strip of ground, west of the museum parking lot and paved road and east and west of an old bulldozed road was covered by two lines of shovel tests, spaced at 10 m intervals. None of these seven tests contained any cultural material.

South Flank of Fort Defiance

Archaeologists used GPR to survey several large areas on the southern and southwestern flanks of Fort Defiance. No excavations were conducted in these areas during the present study, although the previous survey and testing of the site in 2001 revealed deeply buried evidence here of a ditchwork associated with Fort Morris. That ditchwork was located.
south of the Fort Defiance ditch, which indicates that Fort Morris extended south of the existing fortification earthwork. What was not known as a result of the 2001 testing, however, was the full extent and configuration of these Revolutionary War defenses, or whether earlier defensive structures were contained in this area. One problem encountered in the 2001 excavations was that spoil dirt from the excavation of the Fort Defiance moat was piled on top of the pre-1814 land surface, south of the Fort Defiance ditch. The effect of this “reverse stratigraphy” was to cover the Revolutionary War deposits with several feet of fill, which confounded the interpretation of the stratigraphy and made an intensive survey in this vicinity very difficult. A prominent rise, which may be part natural river terrace and part artificial construction, is located in this vicinity. Substantial portions of this prominence and other areas to the west were covered by the GPR grid.

GPR Blocks N and P formed a contiguous 20 m east-west by 10 m north-south sample on the southwest side of Fort Defiance. GPR Block N measured 10 m by 10 m and was located near the suspected location of the southwestern corner bastion of Fort Morris. A backhoe trench (from the 2001 testing project) was located just north of Block N. A large depression was located on the northwestern and western side of the sample block. The east side of the block begins to slope rapidly upward. The southeastern corner of Block N was located at 3800.57N 3433.44E at an arbitrary elevation of 6.50 m. GPR Block P was a 10 m by 10 m sample that was located southwest of Fort Defiance and immediately east of Block N. As noted for Block N, the suspected location of the southwest corner bastion of Fort Morris is in this vicinity. A large depression of unknown function was located just east of Block P. Two large trees presented substantial obstacles within this sample block. A composite view of Blocks N (at approximately 70 cm depth) and P (at approximately 82 cm depth) is shown in Figure 53.

![Figure 53. Composite Plan View of GPR Block N at 70 cm Depth and GPR Block P at 82 cm Depth.](image)

GPR Block W was a 15 m east-west by 14 m north-south sample located south of Excavation Block D (Elliott 2005b). The old excavation block, a 2 m by 2 m square, which was backfilled, was contained within this GPR sample on its northeastern corner. Four large trees presented substantial obstacles within this sample block. GPR Block X was a 15 m east-west by 10 m north-south sample. This sample was a partial resurvey of the area covered by Block W. A plan view of Block X at approximately 44 cm depth is
shown in Figure 54. The anomalies at this depth are concentrated in the central and eastern portion of the block. These probably represent concentrations of objects or an area with different soils, which is the backdirt that was created in the excavation of the south ditch of Fort Defiance. A plan view of Block W at approximately one meter depth is shown in Figure 55. At that depth many areas of anomalies were observed, particularly on the western portion of the block.

Figure 54. Plan View of GPR Block X at 44 cm Depth.

Figure 55. Plan View of GPR Block W at 1 meter Depth.
Mark Carr’s Possible Settlement

A new loci, which was considered part of 9Li168 on the Fort Morris State Historic Site property, was located several hundred meters west of Fort Defiance and south of Fort Morris Road. This wooded locale was covered by reconnaissance level investigations in 2001 but no cultural remains were identified there in that study.

In the present study a metal detector was employed across the ridge and numerous metal readings were encountered. A sample of these were excavated and found to consist of iron, brass, and lead items. Two concentrations of metal were noted on the low ridge. One of the concentrations was focused around a shallow depression, which was suspected to be a cellar or some other type of cultural feature.

Archaeologists excavated a series of shovel tests across the ridge and surrounding the metal detected areas. Seven shovel tests yielded cultural material and four were sterile. The shovel tests also revealed two loci, which may represent two separate buildings. Shovel tests in the eastern building area, which encompasses the large shallow depression, contained a variety of architectural artifacts, including brick, tabby, daub, and one nail. Other artifacts from the eastern loci included: an iron key; one tobacco pipe fragment, yellow slipware, delftware, and colono ware sherds; one light green (hand blown) bottle glass sherd, one faceted glass button fragment, a cinder, and numerous oyster shells. One shovel test, which was placed in the center of the shallow depression, yielded no cultural material. The depression, which was initially suspected to be a cellar, may actually be a looter’s hole. The western building loci, which was sampled by fewer shovel tests, yielded daub, one brass candlestick, two iron fragments, and dark green bottle glass (Figure 56).

Figure 56. Brass Candlestick Base.

One artifact collected from this vicinity is probably specifically associated with the January 9, 1779 Siege. It is a large piece of iron shrapnel from a hollow explosive mortar
Similar artifacts were recovered in the vicinity of Fort Morris in a prior study. The present specimen was located some distance from the American fort and it may represent shrapnel fired at the British, whereas the previous examples more likely represent British shells fired at the Americans. The American armaments within Fort Morris did include several large mortars capable of firing this artillery round.

The area if the archaeological loci is a candidate for the location of Mark Carr’s settlement, which pre-dates the town of Sunbury by a decade or more. The artifacts that were recovered from this area are from the eighteenth century. After Sunbury was created in 1758 this location was part of the Sunbury commons and should not have contained any domestic settlement. The status of this area as a town commons was maintained throughout the eighteenth century. Consequently, evidence of settlement in this area either corresponds to an occupation before Sunbury was created, or it may represent a military encampment from the American Revolution.
VI. Interpretations of Sunbury Battlefield

SUNBURY AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Revolutionary War archaeology in the Southeastern U.S. is underdeveloped, despite important work in South Carolina at Camden and forts Moultrie, Ninety Six, and Watson (South 1970, 1971, 1974; Holschlag and Rodeffer 1976, 1977; Prentice 1996; Ferguson 1973). Research in Florida has focused on the forts at St. Augustine and exploratory work to locate Fort Tonyn (Bullen 1951; Chatelain 1941).

Few military sites from the Revolutionary War period in Georgia have been explored by professional archaeologists and even fewer documented in technical reports, and a general dearth of literature pertaining to these sites exists. Exploration in Savannah has turned up some evidence of the 1779 battlefield but archaeological traces of the defenses have not been located (Wood 1985; Rutsch and Morrell 1981; Elliott 1999, 2001). Recent research at New Ebenezer has identified many military earthworks and other related Revolutionary War features (Elliott 2005a). Survey was also conducted in Georgia on 10 Revolutionary War sites for the National Park Service, American Battlefield Protection Program (Matt McDaniel personal communication, September 15, 2002). Revolutionary War archaeology in Georgia remains in its infancy, however, and many important sites are yet to be located and studied.

Sunbury, Georgia was the scene of at least five important military engagements in the American Revolution. The most often cited are the November 1778 attempted siege and the January 1779 successful siege by the British. Lesser known events include the naval raid by the British in April 1776, which resulted in the destruction two American ships near Sunbury. Two important raids, both of which are poorly documented, took place in 1782. The first was Captain Carr’s raid where Georgia troops surprised a lightly defended town, killing fewer than a dozen men. The second was Captain Scallion’s raid where British and Loyalists attacked in the galley Arbuthnot and burned the town. The extent of destruction by those aboard the Arbuthnot is undocumented, but it may have had a substantial negative impact on the built environment of Sunbury. In addition to these battles, Sunbury served a major role in the war as a bivouac station, supply depot, and military hospital.

The present study represents the first in-depth archaeological study of the town of Sunbury, Georgia. This work follows a recent investigation of the adjacent Fort Morris State Historic Site property, which is located immediately south of Sunbury (Elliott 2005b). Because Sunbury was a large town, it was not feasible to obtain archaeological survey coverage from all sectors of town within the budgetary limits of the present study. Figure 58 shows the major study loci that were examined. Each of these areas yielded important and unique information about the historical town, as detailed in this report and summarized below.
The Alexander property yielded evidence of low density occupation, which typified Sunbury’s northwest quarter. The dearth of historic period occupation in this part of Sunbury serves to confirm the historical records, as cited by Sheftall (1995).

The Starling and Baroody properties both yielded evidence from Sunbury’s early history. Archaeological findings suggest that the colonial dwellings on these properties may not have survived the American Revolution, since no artifacts made after 1774 were recovered from survey tests in these areas. Perhaps the homes on these lots were destroyed during Captain Scallion’s raid, additional archaeological study can help to pinpoint the time of abandonment of these town lots, in addition to fascinating
information about what daily life was like during this tumultous period of American history.

The southern and eastern sides of Sunbury appear to have weathered the American Revolution better than other areas of town. Artifacts produced after 1774 are more widespread in these areas. The Hilliard property was one area that archaeologists sampled in southeastern Sunbury, which yielded features and artifacts spanning the mid-eighteenth through early nineteenth centuries. The Hilliard lot is situated in a relatively developed residential neighborhood. This typifies the difficulties in reconstructing Sunbury’s early landscape in these environments that have been impacted by modern construction. By far the most comprehensive survey coverage was done on the Jones property, which covered most of the south side of Sunbury and a portion of the Meeting Square. The Jones land was entirely wooded, although many portions of it were previously cultivated. Shovel testing on this property revealed many fine archaeological study areas, two of which were sampled by small test units. A third area, northwest of Fort Morris Road and south of the Goodman property, was carefully mapped. A series of ditches, mounds and depressions in this area perked our interest. The metal detector survey affirmed the presence of early military activity in this locale. Although some of these ditches may pertain to later agricultural uses, some may relate to Sunbury’s fortification system.

The southern flank of Sunbury was probably used in defense of the town beginning with its founding. This location affords an excellent opportunity to fire artillery at any sailing ships that may have been approaching the town from up the Medway River. We know from historical documents that a battery for eight cannons was built by the late 1750s and that by 1760 the defenses at Sunbury consisted of "a good log fort". No maps of these early defenses have survived, nor has any archaeological evidence been recovered to date, that would verify their location.

The urgency to defend Sunbury abated in 1763, however, when the Seven Years’ War ended by treaty. For the next decade, history suggests that the people of Sunbury worried little about the military defense of their town since the threat of a sea attack by Spain and France was greatly diminished. By 1774, a new enemy was being recognized in Sunbury-Great Britain. The people of Sunbury and St. Johns Parish included many of the strongest and most vocal proponents for independence from British rule.

Troop size varied at Sunbury’s forts as it did at various theaters throughout the Revolutionary War. The effective force of the British military in Georgia was enumerated at 4,330 men on February 15, 1779. By May 1, 1779, and following the unsuccessful British campaign to capture Charleston, South Carolina, that number had climbed slightly to 4,794 men (Carrington 1877). By July 1, 1779 the number of Loyalist troops in Georgia was slightly more than 1,800 men. The combined number of officers and enlisted men in Delancey’s Brigade (1st and 2nd Battalion) and New Jersey Volunteers, 3rd Battalion in Georgia on July 1, 1779, was 961 men. This included 643 effective fighting men, 216 sick, 327 absent on command and recruiting, 124 held prisoner by the Americans, and an unknown number of wounded (Innes, in Clinton 1750-
1838). Probably fewer than 500 of these troops were stationed in the Sunbury and Liberty County area after July 1779. By that time most of the action had shifted further north and east and Sunbury were essentially behind enemy lines.

The hundreds of British troops stationed at and near Fort George, however, left abundant material culture from this occupation that is preserved archaeologically. This assemblage of cultural material reveals many fascinating details of daily life in a Revolutionary War fort. The British troops of the 16th and 60th Regiments, the Carolina Royalists, New Jersey Volunteers, East Florida Volunteers, Royal Artillery, and East Florida Rangers who helped capture Fort Morris were likely present at the site for only a few days. Consequently, while these men probably left only a modest trace at Fort George, other troops are well-represented in the archaeological record. Most of the living debris left by the British was the product of the New Jersey Volunteers and Delancey’s Brigade. British Brigadier General Augustin Prevost assigned three companies of New Jersey Volunteers to garrison Fort George in January 1779. These men were supplemented by troops from Delancey's Brigade. Together, the New Jersey Volunteers and Delancey's Brigade comprised the garrison at Fort George from late January to early September 1779. The New Jersey Volunteers were commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen, and Delancey's Brigade was commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John H. Cruger. Theirs is a fascinating and culturally-rich story about America’s traumatic birth on Georgian soil, a story waiting to be told through archaeology and historical research.

Elliott (2002) described a deeply buried and dense archaeological deposit of material culture is preserved beneath a building in the northeastern part of what was later the Fort Defiance parade ground. A structure (Structure 1) was built on top of this deep deposit and probably occupied by the British. The deposit was first considered to be a cellar associated with the building. This interpretation is clouded by the possible presence of a bomb crater on the eastern side of the feature. The southern edge of the deeply buried midden roughly coincided with the southern edge of the building but the angle of slope of the buried midden deposit is inconsistent with a cellar.

One possible interpretation for this midden is that it represents the filled-in American ditchwork of Fort Morris. Since the dateable artifacts that were retrieved from this midden are Revolutionary War vintage, the midden’s association with the war seems unquestionable. Once the British captured and entered Fort Morris, they were most likely met with a scene of total devastation. Their one-day bombardment likely destroyed most of the buildings in the fort. Those that were not destroyed were probably badly damaged. Bomb craters were common and debris was strewn about the interior of the fort. The British and Loyalist officers probably wasted no time in having their men police the grounds, fill-in any craters, raze any destroyed or badly damaged buildings, and construct a series of new dwellings and other buildings to suit the needs of the British Army.

The British may have intentionally burned any American debris as part of this clean-up effort. The purpose of burning would have been two-fold. It would have reduced the vermin and pests that probably infested many of the Americans’ clothing and bedding. It also reduced the mass of debris, which allowed for greater movement within the fort.
walls. Since the British occupation force was larger than the Fort Morris garrison, the British most likely required an enlargement of the fort to accommodate their troops. Some of Fort Morris' rampart walls may have been dismantled or modified at that time. If so, the obsolete rampart ditches of Fort Morris would have served as easy repositories for debris from the British cleansing. Also as part of this clean-up, any useful or valuable items were probably claimed by the British and reused.

Archaeologists located evidence of a burned building in the northwestern part of what was later the Fort Defiance parade ground. This is interpreted as an American barracks building, although the architectural plan of the building was not fully delineated. It was designated Structure 2. The floor of this structure was composed of brick and tabby rubble. Its hearth was a burned, sandy clay area of minimal preparation. The building possessed some glass windows and these were most evident on its southwestern side, where many melted window glass fragments were recovered.

Archaeologists also located a buried deposit of Revolutionary War material culture and features in the central parade ground of Fort Defiance. This deposit contained a mixture of American and British occupation materials, which is capped by a zone of nearly sterile soil. The age of this deposition was not determined. One pit feature was associated with the British occupation and possibly dates to immediately after the January 9 conflict.

Any doubt as to the location of Fort Morris was extinguished by the 2002 excavation project. Evidence of the January 9, 1779 bombardment of Fort Morris was widespread in the 2002 study area. Shrapnel, large solid shot and grapeshot were recovered from Excavation Blocks A through D and in Trenches 1 and 3, as well as in several other contexts that were located with the aid of a metal detector. Several pieces of shrapnel were from explosive mortar rounds, which were 8 and 9 inches in diameter. These artifacts corroborate the historical record, which described the use of a 9 inch mortar in the bombardment. Direct evidence of the bombardment was suggested by stratigraphic discontinuities on the northeastern side of Block A and by a concentration of scattered gun hardware. These arms were probably part of a destroyed weapons cache of American muskets that was mentioned by British Captain Patrick Murray, 60th Regiment, a participant in the 1779 attack on the fort.

We know from historical sources that buildings in Sunbury were used as a military hospital and prison for both the British and American armies. The precise location of the hospital and prison facilities remains unknown. The British fleet in Georgia included a number of prison ships, which were anchored in the Savannah River. It is not known if any prison ships were berthed in the Medway River, which flowed past Sunbury and Fort Morris. Although its role as a British prisoner of war camp for the captured American officers is well documented, Sunbury's role as an American camp for British prisoners is not as widely known.

The American captors had very few men and no prison ships at their disposal. Their prisoners were likely held on land in Sunbury, possibly at Fort Morris/Fort George. For example, the Americans, under command of Colonel John White, marched Captain
Thomas French and other captured members of Delancey's Brigade from Savage Point on the Ogeechee River to Sunbury, where they were held captive. Invalids from Delancey's Brigade were listed as sick at Sunbury in official British troop returns. When the Americans conducted their assault on Savannah, their Sunbury prisoners were likely considered of secondary importance. When the American assault failed Major General Lincoln recalled his army to South Carolina and the American contingent at Sunbury probably marched with them. The fate of their British prisoners is not clear. Most of these men were invalids prior to their capture and consequently, many died in the ensuing days and weeks. At least some of them, including Captain French, continued to wage war in South Carolina.

Disposition of the Military Dead

As a class, military dead from the American Revolution represent an enigma in the United States. Although historical records tell us about the hundreds of officers and soldiers that were killed, most of their graves are unknown. This dearth of location information for military cemeteries is particularly true for Georgia (Arnold and Burnham 1993).

Many American officers and soldiers that were killed in battle were hastily buried on battlefields in Georgia. The most deadly engagement in the American and French allies' siege of British-held Savannah from September through October 1779 was the attack on the Spring Hill and Ebenezer Redoubts. These redoubts defended Savannah's southwestern flank. American, French, and other allies (including a number of Haitian soldiers) losses were quite high (possibly as many as 750) contrasted with British losses, which totaled less than 100. Although contemporary estimates of the number of men killed in this battle vary wildly, it is clear to all that several hundred people died on the battlefield on October 9, 1779. An unknown number of those killed were buried on, or near, the battlefield. Their burial is weakly documented in contemporary military accounts, and in 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 several truces during the battle to gather and bury their dead, and the British buried their own dead, as well as those of the allies who had reached their parapet. Some of the war dead may have been later interred in other cemeteries (such as the allies buried at Bonaventure cemetery near Thunderbolt), although many were left on the battlefield.

During the battle of Savannah, the combined forces of the Americans and other allies numbered approximately 7,000 men (Hough 1975; Lawrence 1951). The British, led by General Augustin Prevost, held Savannah with 2,500 British and Loyalist troops. The battle for Savannah was one of the most severe losses of the war for the Americans and the story attracted worldwide attention. The loss of life among the American and French armies was severe and many battlefield cemeteries were created. 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 1975:81). Contemporary accounts published in the Royal Gazette noted that the British granted several requests from the Americans and French to bury their dead on the battlefield (Royal Gazette, December 15, 1779, cited in Hough 1975:73-74; Pennsylvania Gazette, March 22, 1780). Peter Horry, an officer in Francis Marion's brigade, recalled the mass burials following the Spring Hill assault: "We then proceeded to bury our dead; which was done by digging large pits, sufficient to contain about a hundred corpses. Then taking off their clothes, with heavy hearts, we threw them into the pits, with very little regard to order, and covered them over with earth" (Horry and Weems 1859:70). One example, described by historian George White was Major John Jones, Continental Cavalry:

Major [John] Jones was in the forlorn hope which led on the attack upon the Spring Hill battery. A French and an American standard were for an instant planted on the parapet of the redoubt; and here, in the fiercest and most desperate part of the contest, he was struck by a cannon-ball in the breast, and instantly killed. The attacking columns, although literally mowed down, pressed gallantly on, and sustained the murderous fire for nearly one hour before a retreat was ordered. The dead were hastily buried. An intimate friend, passing by one of the pits, discovered an exposed hand, which he recognized as that of Major Jones. He had his body disinterred, and carefully and properly buried (White 1854:537).

Although the actual numbers of people who were killed in the battles at Sunbury is low, the number of those dying from secondary causes was probably high. Few documents have survived that provide quantitative support for the non-combat casualties. The surviving muster lists for troops posted at Sunbury provide some information but most muster lists have not survived.

Their experiences in Georgia and South Carolina were ones that most of the soldiers of the 8th Virginia Regiment would rather have avoided, as they were dogged by malarial fevers and other ailments (Reiss 1998:206). For example, a return of the 8th Regiment, made on April 11, 1777, listed seven of its 10 captains sick, including four with smallpox (Sanchez-Saavedra 1978:56). Major General Lee wrote from Purysburg, South Carolina on August 15, 1776 to Brigadier General John Armstrong in Charleston: "One hundred and forty seven of Colonel Mughlenburghs [sic] Regiment with two Captains and three subalterns are left sick at Charlestown; as fast as they recover I must request you to order 'em back to Williamsburg where they are to aggregate themselves with Capt. Cochrane's Company of that Regiment…” (Lee 1987:230). Colonel Muhlenberg wrote to his father, Reverend Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, on December 20, 1776 describing the devastation in the 8th Regiment due to sickness and death while in Georgia (Hocker 1936:72). The sickness that was rampant in the German regiment during their stay in the South also afflicted Colonel Muhlenberg and is likely to have contributed to his premature death. Colonel Muhlenberg's third in command, Major P. Helfenstein, died from sickness shortly after returning to Virginia from Georgia (Hocker 1936:72; Muhlenberg 1849:69). Records for Colonel Muhlenberg's 8th Virginia Regiment provide some information about its time at Sunbury. Muster lists and payrolls for the 8th Virginia Regiment which were written in 1777, record several officers and enlisted men (59 soldiers total) who died during the second half of 1776. Many of these may have died while the company was at Sunbury. These casualties are summarized below. Mortality records from seven of 10 companies in the 8th Regiment have survived. If the mortality rates in the
undocumented companies were consistent with the surviving records, then another 20
deaths probably occurred in the 8th Regiment in the second half of 1776. Furthermore,
numerous deaths are noted in the muster lists but their specific dates of death are not
indicated. Several of these soldiers also may have died while at Sunbury. These muster
and payroll lists also include five soldiers who were “left sick in Georgia”, for whom
there are no later records. These include: Sergeant James Newman, Slaughter’s
Company; Privates Richard Fanshear, Berry’s Company; Simon Simon, Clark’s
Company; William Mills, Stephenson’s Company; and Andrew Layton, Westfall’s
Company. Some of these men also may have died in Sunbury after the regiment had
vacated the place. None of them are included in the Valley Forge muster rolls from 1777
or 1778 (National Park Service 2005).

We conservatively estimate that 90 soldiers of the 8th Virginia Regiment died in the
second half of 1776. During about half of this period they were garrisoned at Sunbury
and Fort Morris. Probably more than half of these deaths occurred as a result of
secondary causes while the troops were encamped at Sunbury. The burial site of these
valiant war veterans remains undetermined. Only one record pertaining to burial was
located. A receipt, dated Savannah, Georgia, December 7, 1776, of Lieutenant Colonel
Bowman for $8.00 for “two coffins Samuel Watson Capt. Darke’s Company Henry Wallis
Capt. Knox Company” was received by Malthus Clark (NARA M-246, Roll 106).
Neither death (Samuel Watson or Henry Wallis) was recorded in the muster or payrolls
for the companies of Captains Darke and Knox (NARA M-246, Roll 106).

This exploration of the mortality pattern of the 8th Virginia Regiment is but one example
of the many regiments that were posted at Sunbury. The surviving records for the 8th
Regiment, while comparatively scant when compared to other regiments in the northern
war theater, are more extensive than those for many of the Georgia, South Carolina, and
North Carolina Regiments that were garrisoned at Sunbury.

The 8th Regiment mortality statistics can be used as a gauge to make estimates of the
mortality rates in other regiments posted at Sunbury. The 8th Regiment did not engage in
any major battles or skirmishes during their stay at Sunbury. Sickness was probably the
foremost cause of death. The other regiments suffered similarly with deaths from natural
causes. In addition, however, deaths resulting from battle wounds probably served to
elevate the death rate in the other regiments. New Ebenezer provides an example of
increased mortality rates at a camp that also served as a hospital. In an earlier study of the
New Ebenezer headquarters muster and payroll records from the Colonel Thomas
Posey’s Virginia Regiment were used to estimate the mortality rates for that camp (Elliott
2005a). A large hospital for the wounded and sick soldiers also existed at, or near, New
Ebenezer, which helped contribute to the mortality rate for that post. Since Sunbury
served as a military hospital for those casualties, it also probably served as their final
resting place for many of these soldiers.
Mortality in the 8th Virginia Regiment, July-December, 1776.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Death Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Ensign</td>
<td>William Mead</td>
<td>11/20/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>Rese Brown</td>
<td>9/6/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Luke Hines</td>
<td>11/10/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Denis Kingore</td>
<td>9/8/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Buckley</td>
<td>9/16/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Hugh Burns</td>
<td>10/21/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Thomas McVoy</td>
<td>10/1/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Thomas Hankins</td>
<td>11/29/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Chamblin</td>
<td>10/31/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Peter Flecker</td>
<td>11/10/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Neil McDade</td>
<td>11/25/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jarrott Trotter</td>
<td>10/19/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Lewis Rossett</td>
<td>11/10/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Sergeant Major</td>
<td>John Hoy</td>
<td>12/3/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>George Carroll</td>
<td>11/6/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Mathew Toomey</td>
<td>12/20/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Humphrey Price</td>
<td>11/24/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Walter Warner</td>
<td>10/4/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Nathan Brittan</td>
<td>10/17/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Thomas Brittan</td>
<td>11/29/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Mathias Funk</td>
<td>12/20/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Maxwell</td>
<td>12/28/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Isaac Dent</td>
<td>11/3/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crogham's</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Jas Tucker</td>
<td>12/27/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crogham's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Rob Cockran</td>
<td>9/16/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crogham's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Lewis Henry</td>
<td>11/1/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crogham's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jas Smith</td>
<td>10/18/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Herrin</td>
<td>12/1/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Jeremiah Humphreys</td>
<td>10/27/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Potson</td>
<td>10/26/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Pingle</td>
<td>12/11/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>George Smith</td>
<td>10/11/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>George Ketcher</td>
<td>10/24/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Charles Carter</td>
<td>12/24/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Vance</td>
<td>9/16/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>James Carr</td>
<td>11/23/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Wilson Zette</td>
<td>11/8/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Barnett McGinnis</td>
<td>11/25/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Drummer &amp; Fifer</td>
<td>Henry Clatterbuck</td>
<td>7/26/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Abbott</td>
<td>10/28/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Nehemiah Wood</td>
<td>10/6/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Elijah Dawson</td>
<td>10/14/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Corbin</td>
<td>12/10/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Weekley</td>
<td>8/5/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Cabbage (Cabbage)</td>
<td>11/24/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Abram Field</td>
<td>8/6/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Reuben Hollaway</td>
<td>8/3/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Bozil Freeman</td>
<td>11/15/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Settle</td>
<td>11/23/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Lewis Yancy</td>
<td>9/11/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Edward Cannady (Kennedy)</td>
<td>12/3/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Uly Jackson</td>
<td>8/20/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Cornelius Meborn (Mewborn)</td>
<td>8/4/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Raymond Major</td>
<td>11/22/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>12/8/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall's</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
<td>Hugh Lewis</td>
<td>10/16/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall's</td>
<td>Fifer</td>
<td>Patrick Callihan</td>
<td>9/20/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William McCormick</td>
<td>12/28/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>John Huff</td>
<td>9/16/1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfall's</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>William Thynets (?)</td>
<td>9/10/1776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The British and Loyalist troops also suffered from sickness and disease while garrisoned at Sunbury. Among the dead in Lieutenant Colonel Allen’s 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers were

- Allen’s Company, 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers, were Privates Michael Dennis (died May 2, 1779), James Powel (died February 11, 1779), and Jacob Welsh (died February 10, 1779);
• Harrison’s Company, 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers—Privates Nathan Kelly (died February 6, 1779) and John Henderson (Died July 26, 1779);
• Hunloke’s Company, 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers—Private Patrick Lynch (died August 24, 1779); and,
• Hatcher’s Company, 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers—Privates Robert Grahame (died September 1, 1779), Sam Brady (died August 26, 1779), John Myres (died August 23, 1779), Amos Preston (died August 20, 1779), Thomas Pollock (died February 7, 1779), Zack McPherson (died February 1, 1779), and Henry Branner (died January 13, 1779) (Ward Chipman Papers 1776-1785).

All 13 of these soldiers in the 3rd Regiment, New Jersey Volunteers were stationed at Sunbury at the time of their death and were likely buried there. Their cause of death was not recorded. Some may have died from wounds received in the January 9 engagement. Muster lists were located for regiments of Delancey’s Brigade, who were stationed at Sunbury under command of Lieutenant Colonel Cruger, but these lists did not cover the periods when those troops were at Sunbury.

In the decades following the American Revolution the Spring Hill locale was urbanized and vestiges of the important military events were obliterated by development. Railroad construction workers encountered, on at least two occasions, human remains that were probably associated with the Siege of Savannah (Daily Georgian, December 30, 1842:p.2, c.7; Savannah Morning News, June 6, 1870:p.3, c.2). Since 1870, no human remains from the American Revolution have been reported in Savannah. Of more than 1,000 soldiers killed in that battle, only the grave of Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski is known. Although historians and military leaders continued to praise the heroic, albeit poorly planned and implemented, unsuccessful siege, the collective memory of the siege in the minds of many Georgians quickly faded.

Other National battlefields and historical parks in the South, such as Yorktown (Virginia), King’s Mountain (North Carolina), Cowpens, and Ninety Six have not located the burial sites of the military dead. The South is not alone in seeking the missing graves of America’s Revolutionary War dead. Archaeological attempts to locate the cemetery at Morristown battlefield in New Jersey were unsuccessful (Rutsch 1972). Nor have the graves of any war dead been located at Trenton or Monmouth, New Jersey, or Saratoga, New York.

Camp Security, Pennsylvania provides an excellent example of a site that cannot account for the dead that were buried there, which is a situation relevant to Sunbury. Camp Security was a large prisoner of war camp near York, Pennsylvania, which was built by the Continental Army to contain more than 1,000 British prisoners (Historic York, Inc. 2002; Saving Graves 2002). Many of these prisoners probably died in camp and were buried. No grave sites are currently known, however, in the Camp Security locale.

Some attempts at locating Revolutionary War mass graves, however, have been successful. At Cherry Valley, New York, a monument commemorates the mass grave of Americans killed in a massacre (Rosman 2003). At Washington Square in Philadelphia,
the tomb of the Unknowns purportedly rises over the bodies of 2,000 Revolutionary War soldiers who were buried in a mass grave (Pennsylvania Society of the Sons of the Revolution 2003). And in New York, nineteenth century accounts tell of nearly 11,000 Patriots buried in mass graves that were discovered during construction of the Brooklyn Bridge. These corpses were allegedly American prisoners who died aboard British prison ships that later rotted and sank in the harbour (The American Revolution Round Table 2003; Schecter 2002). The cemetery at Salem, New York contains the graves of approximately 200 Revolutionary War soldiers. A website for the cemetery notes: "Local legend has it that after the Battle of Saratoga in 1777, about 100 soldiers bodies were loaded like 'cord wood' on wagons and brought to Salem for burial in one common grave in this cemetery" (Childs 2003).

Excavations at eighteenth century forts in the northern U.S. confirm an association between forts, battlefields, and military graveyards. British dead were buried at forts, prisoner of war camps, hospitals, and battlefields. In some instances, the sites where British officers were killed also became their graves. For example, Major William Montgomery, British 40th Regiment of Foot, was "Killed by a Spear in entering the enemy's works" during the capture of Fort Griswold in Connecticut, September 6, 1781. He was buried in the fort’s parade ground (Regiments.org 2002; Revwar.com 2002). Excavations at Fort Stanwix, located in Rome, New York, revealed a military cemetery approximately 50 m west of the fort (Hanson and Hsu 1975:163-164). Excavations at Fort Laurens, an American fort in Ohio, revealed a cemetery about 70 m west of the fort (Gramly 1978:89, Map 2, 92, Map 5). Gramly suggests that Fort Lauren's cemetery was immediately adjacent to the hospital, which is certainly plausible. Fort Laurens, Ohio is a most relevant example for Sunbury, since both was built under command of Brigadier General Lachlan McIntosh. The Fort Stanwix and Fort Laurens examples both demonstrate a close association between military fortifications and military cemeteries. In both cases the cemeteries were less than 100 m from the fort wall.

Recent research has shown that eighteenth century forts in Georgia often have cemeteries located nearby. This was the case at Fort Argyle, Fort Mount Pleasant, and New Ebenezer. Soldiers’ graves are also mentioned in contemporary accounts of forts at Beards Bluff, Carney's Cowpen and others in coastal Georgia (Elliott and Elliott 1991, Elliott 1991, 1997). The grounds of Sunbury and its adjacent fortifications almost certainly contain buried Revolutionary War dead. The burials probably include soldiers who died from sickness while in garrison, such as men of the 8th Virginia Continental Regiment; soldiers killed in the struggle for Fort Morris, such as British Captain McDonald, the enslaved African-American Bristol Munro, Jr.; and other unknown American, British, and Loyalist soldiers. No human graves were located in the present study and those that may exist await future discovery. The present GPR survey eliminated several areas for consideration as possible graves sites.

At least four loci in Sunbury used for burying the dead are documented. These include: Sunbury Cemetery, the cemetery on the Goodman property, the Clark grave, and the Jones grave. The Sunbury Cemetery is the best known of these mortuary sites.
The cemetery on the Goodman property was not delineated in the present study. Two identified gravestones and other unidentified gravestones were observed by the author in 1995. This cemetery is possibly associated with the Sunbury Baptist Church, ca. 1810-1918. This Baptist church was functioning by about 1810, and possibly earlier. An 1805 act of the Georgia General Assembly secured to churches or religious societies the lots of land that were previously conveyed to them for erecting churches and meeting houses (Georgia General Assembly 1805:15-16, in Georgia Legislative Documents 2004). The Baptist Church was not extant in the American Revolutionary War period. This cemetery is located on an original public square of Sunbury. Since this was public land, it would have been well suited for a public cemetery prior to its use by the Baptists.

The grave of Barbara Clark was observed on an undeveloped lot in northeastern Sunbury. This grave marker, which consists of a large horizontal marble slab, is located a few meters east of Brigantine Dunmore Road. This grave probably correlates with the Sunbury property formerly owned by Hugh Clark and his descendants. This grave possibly indicates the location of a small family graveyard.

Other graves may be scattered across Sunbury on the individual town lots. These may represent small family graveyards. One example, which is documented historical is the grave of the mother of Joseph Jones. The Last Will and Testament of Captain Joseph Jones, dated February 29, 1844 and proven November 2, 1846, mentioned his lots in Sunbury: numbers 23, 22, 23, and 24 “with improvements” and numbers 29 and 30, “vacant where the remains of my dear mother lie”. This early reference indicates that a family cemetery plot was located on Lots 29 and/or 30 in Sunbury. The current status of this cemetery was not determined in the present study.

Records of others who died and were likely buried in Sunbury are found in Revolutionary War pension applications. The pension application for Captain Daniel Alexander Cuthbert, Georgia Continental Army, for example, which was filed by Samuel S. Law in 1835, states that he died at Sunbury, “in or about the year Eighteen hundred and four [1804]”, and that his brother, Isaac Cuthbert also died in Sunbury, “in or about the year Eighteen hundred and nine” (NARA M-804, Roll 725).

Works Progress Administration (WPA)-era interviews with African-American residents Uncle Jonas, Elizabeth Roberts, Emma Stevens, and Mary Stevens of the Sunbury community provide some insight into their local burial customs of the 1930s. Below is the WPA transcription of a portion of the interview with Elizabeth Roberts:

The conversation turned to burial customs in the section and the women told us that ‘settin-ups’ were still held for those who died. We all sit wid duh body an sing an pray an keep duh spirit company,’ said one of them. Another added, ‘At duh fewnul we sing an we puts our hands on duh cawpse tuh say goodbye. It bad luck not tuh do dis. [We had heard in other communities that in case of death away from home the body is brought back to its native town for burial. This custom is also prevalent in Sunbury, we learned.] Everybody wannuh be buried in deah own town,’ Elizabeth said. ‘An we nebuh bury strainjuhs wid our own folks. Ef a strainjuh die yuh, we bury em in duh strainjah’s lot’ (WPA 1940:14).
Military Personalities Associated with Sunbury

One result of the present research on Sunbury and its Revolutionary War battlefields was a greater understanding and appreciation for the people involved in these conflicts. Most of the officers and soldiers associated with the Revolutionary War in coastal Georgia remain obscure. Biographies of a few American officers, such as Charles Lee, Robert Howe, Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg, Lachlan McIntosh, and Thomas Sumter, are published, but even these lack detailed insight into their movements and actions at Sunbury. Others, despite their significant role in the military operations in the South, such as Augustin Prevost, John Marc Prevost, Lewis V. Fuser, John Harris Cruger, and Isaac Allen, have no published biography. The present research gathered many biographical facts about some of these soldiers. Short biographies of a sample of these is presented in the following.

Lieutenant General Augustin Prevost was Swiss and was born on August 23, 1723. He married Anne (Nanette) Grand of Lausanne and Esnon. The couple bore six children. Their oldest George James Marc, was born in 1767 and their youngest, Mary Louisa, was born on May 10, 1781. Augustin saw military service in the French and Indian War where he formed and commanded the 60th Regiment, or Royal Americans. Augustin was severely wounded in the head by shrapnel in the siege of Quebec in 1759. He managed to survive the wound, and the trepanning cure, but was left with a noticeable scar and the nickname, “Bullethead”. Augustin Prevost served as a commissioned officer in the British military from May 1, 1776 to May 24, 1780. He was appointed Brigadier General on April 1, 1777. In December 1778 Prevost was promoted to Major General. Augustin Prevost was succeeded in command of the Southern District by Lieutenant General Alured Clarke. Prevost returned to England in May 1780 where he retired to his estate of Greenhill Grove near Barnet. He died on May 16, 1786 with the military rank of Lieutenant General (Sir Christopher Prevost personal communication October 15, 2002, n.d.; Prevost 1949; Sir George Prevost Fonds 1776-1857; Williams 1973).

Lieutenant Colonel James Marc Prevost, also known as Mark Prevost, was Augustin Prevost’s younger brother. He was born in 1736. Mark also served as an officer in the 60th Regiment in the French and Indian War. In the American Revolution Marc Prevost held the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and commanded the 60th Regiment. When the American Revolution began Marc was living in Paramus, New Jersey. After the capture of Savannah in December 1778, Marc was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Georgia—a post that he held only briefly. He accompanied a number of troops to Jamaica. Assigned to Jamaica in 1781, Marc Prevost died from the effects of wounds received in action in the American Revolution. His wife apparently wasted no time grieving over her husband’s death. Within weeks after learning of his death, she became involved with a young American officer, Aaron Burr, who was posted a few miles from her plantation. She, widow Theodosia Bartow Prevost, of Shrewsbury, New Jersey, married Aaron Burr in July 1782 (Prevost 1949).

Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger was a prominent New Yorker of Dutch descent. His family had been active in New York politics for several generations and John served
as the city’s mayor in 1764. He was born in New York City in 1738. Cruger held the rank of Lieutenant Colonel and commanded Oliver Delancey’s Brigade in the American Revolution. Colonel Delancey was Cruger’s father-in-law. Cruger was captured at Belfast, Georgia in June 1780 and was soon exchanged for Colonel John McIntosh. After leaving Georgia, Cruger and his men were garrisoned at Ninety Six in South Carolina from June, 1780 to July, 1781, where they fell under siege by Major General Nathanael Greene and American troops. While Cruger and the men of Delancey’s Brigade were at Ninety Six they constructed earthworks, including a large star fort, whose remnants are well preserved. Cruger and his men also served valiantly at the battle of Eutaw Springs, South Carolina. At the end of the war, Cruger settled in New Brunswick, Canada. Cruger later returned to London where he died on June 3, 1807 (NPS 2002, 2003; Holschlag and Rodeffer 1976, 1977; Prentice 1996; South 1970, 1971; Appletons Encyclopedia 2001).

Lieutenant Colonel Isaac Allen was a lawyer from Trenton, New Jersey, who received his commission in the New Jersey Volunteers in early 1777 (Jones 1927:9). Allen commanded three battalions of the New Jersey Volunteers, also known as [Brigadier General Cortland] Skinner’s Greens, in the American Revolution. Allen’s exact battalion command in the New Jersey Volunteers is somewhat problematic. Jones associates Allen with the 2nd Battalion but Cole and Braisted (2002) noted that Allen received a commission as Lieutenant Colonel in the 6th Battalion, New Jersey Volunteers on December 3, 1776, and another commission as Lieutenant Colonel in the 3rd Battalion on May 25, 1778. At the end of the war, Allen settled in New Brunswick, Canada, where he became an Assistant Judge.

Lieutenant Colonel Lewis V. Fuser commanded the British troops who laid siege to Sunbury and Fort Morris on November 25, 1778. That siege was abandoned when Fuser became concerned that Lieutenant Colonel Marc Prevost had not met up with his troops as planned and was convinced that a large body of the enemy was moving to surround and attack him. Fuser was dead by March 2, 1780 (Prevost 1780).

Major General Robert Howe was from North Carolina. At the beginning of the American Revolution he served under Major General Charles Lee. When Lee was reassigned by General Washington to the Northern theater, Howe was appointed Major General of the American southern forces. Howe led the third and final campaign against East Florida in 1778. That campaign was fraught with illness among the American troops, however, and after reaching and capturing Fort Tonyn, the campaign was abandoned and the troops returned to Georgia. Howe was in command of the Americans at Savannah when the British captured it in December 1778. He narrowly escaped capture and his army was badly defeated. Following the defeat, Howe returned to confer with General Washington. Court-martial proceedings were held to determined Howe’s handling of the Savannah affair, for which he was exonerated. The Georgia government remained angry with Howe’s actions, which resulted in the fall of Georgia (Howe 1776-1778a, 1976-1978b; Grimke 1911, 1912; Naisawald 1951; Bennett and Lennon 1991).

Brigadier General John Peter Gabriel Muhlenberg was the son of prominent Lutheran clergyman, Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg. John was a protestant minister in the
Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. He came to America from Germany in 1742 and returned to Germany at age 16 to attend school. He returned to America and joined the 60th Regiment and served as secretary to one of its officers. He was discharged in 1767 and by 1772 he had moved to Woodstock, Virginia to pastor a church. Muhlenberg received a call to arms from George Washington, and he responded by forming a regiment in early 1776 within his church congregation. The regiment was the 8th Virginia Regiment, also known as the German Regiment.

The 8th Virginia Regiment marched to South Carolina under command of Major General Charles Lee. When the first campaign was launched by Lee against East Florida, Colonel Muhlenberg’s regiment was assigned to duty at Sunbury. Before the campaign was implemented, however, General Lee, who was one of the few formally trained officers in the American Army, was reassigned to duty in the Northern theater. The 8th Virginia Regiment was ordered to follow. By that time, however, sickness was rampant throughout the ranks and large numbers of Muhlenberg’s men, including Muhlenberg and several of his junior officers, were either dead or quite ill. Despite their incapacity, the 8th Virginia marched to the North and his men joined up with Washington’s army. Muhlenberg became one of George Washington’s most trusted officers and attained the rank of Brigadier General. He saw action at the Battle of Brandywine (September 1777), Germantown (October 1777), Monmouth (June 1778), Stony Point (July 1779), and Yorktown (October 1781). After the war Muhlenberg retired to Philadelphia (Muhlenberg 1849; Jackson 2001).

Colonel John McIntosh was born in what is now McIntosh County in 1755, the son of Colonel William McIntosh and Mary Mackay. He was commissioned a Lieutenant Colonel in the Georgia line in 1775. Colonel McIntosh held command of Fort Morris when it was laid siege by Lieutenant Colonel Fuser in November 1778. McIntosh is mostly remembered for his reply of, “Come and take it!” when Fuser requested the fort’s surrender. He died on November 12, 1826 in McIntosh County (Colonel John McIntosh Chapter, DAR 2005).

Major Joseph Lane was in command of Fort Morris in the days and weeks leading up to its capture by the British on January 9, 1779. Lane was captured by the British and held in Sunbury, where he compiled a list of prisoners and casualties that was communicated by General Prevost to the American ranks.

Sunbury’s Loyalists

The story of Sunbury’s Loyalist population was neglected by historians for decades. Recent historical research on the plight of the Loyalists in the South has partially illuminated the story of their past (Coldham 1980; Clark 1981; Kozy 1983, 1991: Troxler 1989, 1974). Some prominent residents of Sunbury who remained loyal throughout the war included:

- Dr. John Irvine—a surgeon and physician and resident of Savannah and Sunbury, fled Georgia in 1782 (Coldham 1980:253)
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Colonel Roger Kelsall—a merchant in Sunbury, commander of the St. Johns Loyalist militia, lost his Sunbury Lot 9 in the war (Coldham 1980:269-270)

John Miller—a merchant in Georgia, lost his Sunbury Lot in a 1781 confiscated estate sale (Coldham 1980:346-347)

Lieutenant Colonel Simon Munro—a wealthy resident in Sunbury who later filed a claim for 13 slaves killed or taken in the war (BPRO, Audit Office 36/793)

Captain Simon Paterson—a merchant in Sunbury, commander of a company of St. Johns loyalist militia, lost several Sunbury lots in the war (Coldham 1980:380-381)

Thomas Young—resident of Sunbury from 1773 until June 1779, when captured in raid by Americans; owned two Sunbury Lots; filed a claim for “leather and Hides left in tanyard at Sunbury with David Fleming, since deceased” (Coldham 1980:546-547)

SUNBURY BATTLEFIELD

Historical research identified four engagements from the American Revolution that directly involved the town of Sunbury. These were:

1. British Lt. Colonel Fuser’s unsuccessful siege in November 1778
2. British Brigadier General Prevost’s successful siege in January 1779
3. American Captain Mark Carr’s raid in the Spring of 1782
4. British Captain Scallion’s raid in April 1782

A clear link between the archaeological record and historically documented engagements occurs with the January 1779 siege. GPR survey, metal detector survey, and additional shovel testing accomplished in the present study provided an improved understanding of the location, composition, and complexity of the Fort Morris site (9Li168).

The GPR survey on the north side of the Fort Defiance parapet ditch (GPR Block H) located a large, deeply buried anomaly, which may be related to an earlier fort construction. The other GPR samples, which examined parts of the northern parapet, northwest bastion, and southern periphery of Fort Defiance, revealed many large anomalies. GPR Block H revealed the most recognizable configuration of anomalies possibly related to fort construction or modification. The GPR coverage from the 2004 survey is shown superimposed on the topographic map of the area in Figure 59.

The metal detector and shovel test sampling allowed for several eighteenth century activity areas to the west of the fort to be tentatively delineated. One activity area was located on the state historic site property, immediately south of Calder Avenue and east of the Interpretive area near the Fort Morris museum. Another activity area was located just north of the Glenn Mills cabin on the state historic site property. Debris associated with the siege, including gun parts, were recovered from the wetlands north of the fort.

A more distant loci of military-related artifacts was found on the Jones property on the southwestern side of original Sunbury. That loci consisted of a cluster of lead balls,
which were located by metal detector. These finds coincided with a series of low ditches that may be related to military activity in the area.

The recovery of several fragments of mortar shrapnel from a 9 inch mortar, which was used by the British in the January 9 battle provide proof of the location of Fort Morris. Shrapnel from these rounds was found within Fort Defiance, southwest of Fort Defiance within the older Fort Morris ditchwork, and several hundred meters west of the fort. The latter specimen may be shrapnel from a mortar fired by the Americans from within Fort Morris towards the British who were laying siege during the January 1779 battle. While
many other military artifacts from the period were recovered from other areas of Sunbury and the Sunbury commons, most of these items cannot be conclusively linked to a single event.

Historical documentation for Carr’s raid and Captain Scallion’s raid is exceedingly sparse, making the archaeological record even more valuable. What is know is the approximate seasons of the raids and the general outcomes. Loyalist sources state that Captain Scallion’s force burned the town of Sunbury and Fort Morris. American sources state that Captain Carr’s force attacked the town, which resulted in some Loyalist deaths. Captain Scallion had the armament of the galley Arbuthnot at his disposal. If Captain Scallion’s men burned Sunbury and Fort Morris, as alleged, then this event is almost certainly recorded in the archaeological record. Captain Carr’s mounted force was probably lightly armed and may not have had any artillery available for this raid.

The ABPP historical and archaeological study of Sunbury and its Revolutionary War battles yielded many interesting details about the officers, soldiers and civilians involved in the battles. This research provides a better understanding of the geography of the battlefields and the military defenses on the contemporary and modern day landscape. The archaeological work provides tangible support for the historical documentation. The archaeology also provides important information about the battle not found in historical sources. This study identified several areas where well-preserved archaeological deposits relating to these battles exist.

The ABPP, NPS requested for its surveyors to delineate three distinct battlefield areas on the USGS topographical maps. These include: the Study Area, the Core Area (if possible), and the PotNR (Potential National Register) boundary. Previous ABPP survey work at Sunbury by McDaniel (2002) presented preliminary delineations for these three areas. The LAMAR Institute offers refinements of these delineations, based on the results of the present study. The Study Area is determined by history and includes the land where the battle was fought and over which the combatants maneuvered after initial contact was made and the fighting began. The Core Area is centered around Fort Morris and includes the areas that would be within mortar and musket range. A tentative PotNR boundary is offered which identifies portions of the study area that retain enough integrity to meet standards of eligibility for the NRHP. Readers are cautioned that this PotNR is a preliminary boundary and not an official NRHP boundary. Figure 60 shows the revised Study Area, Core Area and PotNR boundaries.
Figure 60. Sunbury Battlefield Study Area, Core Area, and PotNR Boundaries.
VII. Management of Sunbury’s Resources

Three key factors threaten the historical resources of the Sunbury vicinity: (1) residential development, (2) commercial development and (3) looting. In the past decade more than 20 private homes have been constructed at Sunbury. In addition to the immediate destruction to the underlying archaeological resources, utility trenches and extensive landscaping have damaged other areas. In the past five years a large restaurant and condominium complex have been constructed on the town causing further damage to the resources. Most recently, development of approximately 77 home sites, identified as “The Village at Sunbury”, is underway on the Goodman property. At least 31 acres of the historic site of Sunbury will be negatively impacted as a result of this construction project (Donahue 2004a:1, 2004b:1).

Looting evidence, consisting of excavated holes and spoil piles, was observed on a large wooded section on the south side of Sunbury. Anecdotal evidence of past uncontrolled and unreported digging activities include holes dug with shovels and backhoes, and metal detecting. This suggests that a significant portion of the town’s archaeological resources have been lost as a result.

The archaeological resources at Sunbury are irreplaceable and fragile. Ground disturbing activities, such as those caused by residential and commercial construction and site preparation, can result in their complete devastation. Large buildings in the sandy soils at Sunbury require deep foundations, and landscaping activities and other yard modifications, such as driveways or utility construction trenches, negatively impact the archaeological deposits. Continued residential and commercial development in Sunbury will continue to reduce the archaeological resources at Sunbury. The cumulative effect of this degradation will ultimately threaten the research context and research potential for this colonial and early federal period town site. Continued looting of archaeological resources also will reduce the resource base and, if unchecked, this destruction will eventually result in inadequate resources for historical study. Sunbury contained several hundred homes and business in its heyday and was a significant player in the pivotal piece of American history, known as the American Revolution. Sunbury has a story to tell about the past but once the archaeological record is destroyed the story is lost forever.

Public awareness of the archaeological resources at Fort Morris and Sunbury has increased lately. In 2002 there was a series of media articles about the 2002 excavations (c.f., Holland 2002:1-4; Toner 2001:1; Watkins 2002:1, 3, 15; American Archaeology 2002:11; Midgette 2002:2-3). Federal attention also was focused on Sunbury in 2002 in a reconnaissance/land use study of Georgia’s Revolutionary War resources (McDaniel 2002). Most recently, media attention was generated by the present study (c.f., Donahue 2004a:1, 2004b:1; Holmes 2003). This attention was supplemented by the concerted efforts of the LAMAR Institute archaeologists to contact current residents and landowners of Sunbury in an effort to share project information, obtain property access, learn of artifactual and documentary discoveries, and encourage site preservation. Archaeologists also made numerous presentations before, during and after fieldwork in
an effort to share their recent discoveries with a diverse public audience. This venue provided an excellent opportunity to explain the site’s significance and advocate for preservation.

Fort Morris is presently listed as a historic site on the National Register of Historic Places. Sunbury, however, is not presently listed, nor were its archaeological resources well documented prior to the present study. A National Register District or National Historic Landmark status should be pursued for the historic town of Sunbury and its related cultural resources. McDaniel (2002:69, Figure 6:4) presented a tentative boundary for the limits of the Sunbury battlefield. The present study would extend that boundary further to the north to include the entire town of Sunbury, as well as to the east to include any related underwater resources. More distant resources, such as the British landing site on Colonel’s Island, the colonial shipyards on Colonel’s Island, the burned wrecks of the American galleys on Ossabaw Island, and related skirmishes and raids at nearby plantations, may represent resources that are more appropriate for a multiple resource NRHP nomination.

Additional historical research on Sunbury’s maritime history should provide important clues about the Revolutionary War battles at Sunbury, as well as data concerning domestic and international private shipping. For example, the American galley Congress, which was captured by the British and renamed the Scourge remained in service until at least May 1786. The ship’s pay books for the period from May 3, 1779 to May 18, 1786 and the ship’s muster rolls for the period from May 1779 to May 1786 have survived and are archived in the British Public Record Office (BPRO ADM 35/1832; ADM 36/10427). Similar records for the British galley Vindictive, formerly the American galley Lee, also have survived and include the ships’ pay books from May 3, 1779 to April 30, 1782 and the ship’s muster rolls from May to October 1779 (BPRO ADM 35/2033; ADM 36/10429). These documents can be requested online (at considerable expense per digital page of 7.60 pounds), or they can be examined at no charge by a research visit. Examination of these documents would help provide a better understanding of the size and organization of the vessel, particularly in terms of the number of sailors and artillerymen on board. These data would be directly comparable to a study of the galleys Bulloch and Washington, both associated with the battles at Sunbury, and having similar construction to the galleys Congress and Lee.

The State of Georgia recently added an Underwater Archaeologist to the staff of the Archaeological Services Unit, Historic Preservation Division, Department of Natural Resources. The state is now better positioned to initiate a study of the submerged resources at Sunbury and related sites at Sunbury Bar, St. Catherine’s Island, Colonel’s Island, and Ossabaw Island. Hopefully, this report will provide information useful in conducting that research.

The present work provides critical documentary information and previously unknown archaeological data on portions of Sunbury. A complete survey of the town should be considered in the not too distant future. National Register status should be achieved; however, such status alone will not preserve Sunbury’s heritage. Other preservation
efforts should be mounted to work in tandem with any additional NRHP nomination attempt. This ABPP project was instrumental in providing a major focus on a significant resource. Currently, the LAMAR Institute is working with the Archaeological Conservancy to discuss preservation options with residents of Sunbury. These negotiations are a direct outcome of the ABPP project. Clearly, many more exciting discoveries await in this area of the Georgia coast.
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