

1970

## Historical Perspective at Ninety Six with a Summary of Exploratory Excavation at Holmes' Fort and the Town Blockhouse

Stanley South

University of South Carolina - Columbia, stansouth@sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth\\_books](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth_books)



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

South, Stanley, "Historical Perspective at Ninety Six with a Summary of Exploratory Excavation at Holmes' Fort and the Town Blockhouse" (1970). *Research Manuscript Series*. 1.  
[https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth\\_books/1](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth_books/1)

This Book is brought to you by the Archaeology and Anthropology, South Carolina Institute of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Manuscript Series by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [digres@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:digres@mailbox.sc.edu).

---

## Historical Perspective at Ninety Six with a Summary of Exploratory Excavation at Holmes' Fort and the Town Blockhouse

### Keywords

Excavation, Ninety Six, Antiquities, Archaeology, South Carolina

### Disciplines

Anthropology

### Publisher

The South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology--University of South Carolina

### Comments

In USC online Library catalog at: <http://www.sc.edu/library/>

Publication date is approximate.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE  
AT NINETY SIX  
WITH A SUMMARY OF EXPLORATORY EXCAVATION  
AT HOLMES' FORT AND THE TOWN BLOCKHOUSE

by  
Stanley South

# 9

Prepared by  
The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology  
University of South Carolina  
under the sponsorship of  
The Star Fort Historical Commission

### Frontispiece

A Piper from the 77th, Montgomery Highlanders Regiment (raised in 1757, disbanded in 1763), Which Was a Primary Unit in Sir Archibald Montgomery's Expedition Against the Cherokee in 1760.

Permission for use granted by Seeley, Service & Co., Ltd., publishers of Regiments and Uniforms of the British Army by Major R. Money Barnes. London:1967, Plate V, Figure 12.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Chapter	Page
	1. INTRODUCTION	Robert L. Stephenson . . . . . 1
	Acknowledgements	Stanley South. . . . . 8
I	THE INDIAN FRONTIER	
	2. GOUDY'S TRADING POST SITE OF 1751, AND FORT NINETY SIX 1759-61 (38GN1). . . . .	10
	3. THE MONTGOMERY EXPEDITION OF 1760. . . . .	19
	4. THE GRANT EXPEDITION OF 1761 . . . . .	26
	5. THE ARCHEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE HISTORICAL REFERENCES ON GOUDY'S TRADING POST AND FORT NINETY SIX . . . . .	34
	6. APPENDIX . . . . .	
	Some Notes on the Appearance of the Troops of Montgomery's Expedition - Montgomery's Highlanders (The Old 77th Regiment of Foot). . . . .	43
	The First Regiment of Foot (Royal Scots) . . . . .	44
	The Third Regiment of Foot (The Buffs) - Garrisoned at Fort Prince George . . . . .	48
	Some Notes on the Appearance of the Troops of Grant's Expedition - The 17th Regiment of Foot . . . . .	49
	The 22nd Regiment of Foot. . . . .	49
	The Provincials, Rangers, and Indians . . . . .	49
	Bibliography . . . . .	50
II	THE VILLAGE	
	7. THE TOWN OF NINETY SIX - THE COURTHOUSE AND JAIL (38GN4). . . . .	52
	The Beginning of the Town of Ninety Six. . . . .	52

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part	Chapter	Page
	The Jail at Ninety Six . . . . .	54
	The Courthouse at Ninety Six . . . . .	56
	The Village of Ninety Six - The Maps . . . . .	57
	The 1851 Lossing Map . . . . .	61
	The 1902 McCrady Map . . . . .	61
	The 1909 Avery Map . . . . .	61
	The 1958 Commager & Morris Map . . . . .	62
	Bibliography . . . . .	64
III	CHOOSING SIDES	
	8. "A WARM ENGAGEMENT" AT NINETY SIX - THE FIRST BATTLE OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE SOUTH - AT WILLIAMSON'S FORT . . . . .	66
	Archeological Implications for the Site at Williamson's Fort . . . . .	77
	Bibliography . . . . .	79
IV	THE STORM OF WAR	
	9. HOLMES' FORT AND THE BLOCKHOUSE AND JAIL REDOUBT AT NINETY SIX (38GN2, 38GN5) . . . . .	80
	Exploratory Archeology at Holmes' Fort (38GN2) . .	84
	The Palisade and Ditches Around the Town of Ninety Six (38GN5) . . . . .	91
	The Blockhouse Site at the Northwest Corner of the Town of Ninety Six (38GN5) . . . . .	95
	The Jail Redoubt at Ninety Six (38GN4) . . . . .	100
	Bibliography . . . . .	103

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
Frontispiece	A Piper from the 77th, Montgomery Highlanders Regiment (Raised 1757, disbanded in 1763) . . .	Frontispiece
1.	A Grenadier of the 17th Regiment of Foot, 1751. . .	28
2.	Maps of Ninety Six, Illustrating the Evolution from 1822 . . . . .	58
3.	The Blockhouse Defending the North Entrance to Ninety Six, and the Jail Redoubt (38GN5). . . .	Jacket Pocket
4.	Holmes' Fort at Ninety Six - 1780 (38GN2) . . . .	Jacket Pocket
5.	Archeological Base Map of the Sites at Ninety Six . . . . .	Jacket Pocket

## INTRODUCTION

by Robert L. Stephenson

The Ninety Six Project is a complex of historically significant archeological sites in Greenwood County, South Carolina, near the present town of Ninety Six. The sites, together, form a more-or-less integral unit, yet each is separable from the others with its own historical and physical identity. They are all identifiable with the eighteenth century colonial period of development of the Upper Country of South Carolina, primarily in relation to the Indian Trade, the French and Indian War, and the American Revolution. In historical perspective only a short period of time is really involved -- some three decades -- but during that time some of the most significant actors of the drama of early American history paraded across this tiny stage turning the footlights of decisiveness up high on the scenes and acts that effected the whole theatre of Colonial America.

There are five individual sites that have been identified within the Ninety Six Project so far. These are:

- 38GN1 - Goudy's Trading Post Site of 1751 and its successor on the same location, known as Fort Ninety Six of 1759-61
- 38GN2 - The Holmes' Fort Site of 1780
- 38GN3 - The Star Fort Site of 1780-81
- 38GN4 - The Town of Ninety Six Site
- 38GN5 - The Stockade Site of 1780 around the Town of Ninety Six.



Other individual sites may be isolated and identified by numbers later, as the archeological and documentary research progresses. These would be Williamson's Fort, The Charleston Road, The Ninety Six Jail Redoubt, The Town Blockhouse, The Town of Cambridge, and perhaps others. All of these are encompassed in less than a square mile of land.

Concern with the Ninety Six Project is not a new effort. The Star Fort Historical Commission was established a number of years ago for just this purpose. As the name implies this Commission centered its initial concern on the Star Fort Site because it was the only portion of the whole complex of sites that existed as a visible, above-ground ruin. The earthworks of this fortification are still standing as a spectacular, star-shaped, embankment and moat. All of the remains of the other sites in the complex have long since been leveled except for a water-filled depression at Goudy's Trading Post that presumably was Goudy's cellar. The Commission began to actively pursue a course of action that would lead to an understanding of the people and events that took place at these sites, by employing Mr. W. Bruce Ezell, of Ninety Six, as Project Director. Mr. Ezell, who had previously been interested in searching out documentary references to Ninety Six, intensified his research and devoted much effort to it.

In 1961 the Commission contracted with the South Carolina Department of Archeology (now the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology of the University of South Carolina) under the direction of Dr. William E. Edwards, for archeological work at the sites. Dr. Edwards, with varying crews, worked sporadically on the project for a period of five years.

During this time eight trenches of varying lengths were excavated in and around the Star Fort and two long trenches were excavated at the site of the jail and the courthouse respectively. The Commission had a surveyor prepare a field map of these features showing the excavated trenches. The artifacts recovered during this period were cataloged and the catalogs, map, and most of the artifacts are now in the files of the Institute. Unfortunately the photographs and field notes from this initial period of excavation at the Ninety Six Project have not survived.

Meanwhile Mr. Ezell continued his research of the documents and also continued to plan, with the Commission, for a rather ambitious program of development of the sites and the immediately surrounding area.

Late in the fall of 1968, Mr. Ezell contacted the, then newly re-organized, Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, for advice on continuing the archeological research. Plans were made between the Commission and the Institute for a full-scale archeological excavation of the area but could not begin until the work, then in progress, was completed at the Charles Towne Site in Charleston.

In the spring of 1970, arrangements were made between the Commission and the Institute to begin a long range excavation program. Mr. Stanley South, of the Institute staff, began working with Mr. Ezell on the documentary research in April and spent the month of May 1970 with a small crew of four to six men excavating at the sites. During these four weeks of exploratory excavation, a great deal of the area was examined by the "slot-trenching" technique, the purpose being simply to locate the features such as palisade lines, ditches, cellars, redoubts, and other

architectural features in the ground and to accurately plot them on a master map. Since the Star Fort (38GN3) was already located and visible above ground, no work other than surveying was done there. Also since documentary evidence suggested that the remains of Williamson's Fort would be nothing but a well, no effort was made to locate that site. This exploratory excavation revealed the general location and approximate outlines of Goudy's Trading Post and the Fort Ninety Six (38GN1), Holmes' Fort (38GN2), The Site of the Town of Ninety Six (38GN4), and the Stockade Fort around Ninety Six (38GN5). In addition to this, the open tunnel or "mine," dug in May and June 1781 by Count Kosciuszko in an attempt to blow up the Star Fort, was explored. All of these features were carefully plotted on a large-scale annotated map of the area and a brief report of the work was prepared (Stanley South, "Exploratory Archeology at Ninety Six (38GN1-38GN5)." M.S., September 1970).

The second Institute effort began on October 5, 1970, and lasted through November 25. During these eight weeks Mr. South, with Mr. Steven G. Baker as crew chief, and a crew of eight men, concentrated the main effort on opening up the excavations at Holmes' Fort (38GN2); in further explorations of the Jail Redoubt in the Town of Ninety Six (38GN4); and in excavation of the Blockhouse and palisade ditches around the Town of Ninety Six (38GN5). The results of these field investigations are briefly reported as Part IV of the present report.

Archeological research is a long, slow, often tedious process but, if done with the methodical care required of scholarly work, can be a most rewarding process. The excavation itself, the actual digging in

the ground, is only one phase of the work. It is, of course, the most essential phase because it is from the excavation that the raw data are derived. Yet, in terms of the amount of time required for the total process, it is really a minor phase. This is true of any archeological research, whether it be prehistoric or historic, but perhaps is more emphatically true of historic archeology because there are contemporary documents available to be studied. The archeologist is required to first gain as full an understanding of the site he is to excavate as is possible from a study of the terrain and any documents relating to it that he can find before he even begins to excavate. Then he must excavate. Then he must analyse the data from the excavations in terms of how those data fit with the known documentary record of this and other sites. He must study, compare, identify, and interpret the fragmentary artifacts that he has found as well as the architectural features such as postholes, ditches, pits, hearths, and other excavated soil disturbances. These interpreted data must then be combined with the documentary record to provide an intelligible interpretation of the sherds and patches of evidence and thus, as thoroughly as possible, a cohesive story of the life and times of a people living at this place at a specific time. Usually a good rule of thumb for research at an archeological site is to allow three to four months of laboratory research for every month spent in field excavation.

The Ninety Six Project is no exception to this generalization. It is not one, but a complex of historic sites. There are many contemporary documents pertaining to it. There are other contemporary

sites elsewhere that are pertinent to its interpretation. Fortunately Mr. Ezell had done extensive research on these documents before Mr. South began his studies on the project and some pre-excavation time was saved by use of that research. The excavations are proceeding in short increments of one or two months at a time in order to most efficiently integrate units of field data into the evidence from the documentary records. The time between field sessions is devoted to this integration of the two kinds of data and the preparation of reports such as this one. The ratio of one month of field work to three months of laboratory work is proceeding on schedule.

The Ninety Six Project is anticipated to be a large-scale endeavor and plans are for the archeological research to extend over a period of four or five years. The second year of this schedule is about to begin in June of 1971. This report and the previously mentioned report (South, September 1970) comprise reports of the first year of work. Similar reports will be prepared upon the results of work in future years and all of these will then be combined into a single total report of the whole project when the excavations have been completed. Each of these reports, however, is prepared in such a way that, barring subsequent contradictory evidence, they can be revised but slightly to form sections of the total report at the end of the project. The first report emphasized the initial exploratory testing of the sites and the locations of the features that make up the forts, towns, and other units of the Ninety Six Project. This second reports emphasizes the historical perspective derived from contemporary documents and stresses the

corroboration of the documents by evidence from the ground. Only a minor part of this report deals with the excavations of the fall of 1970. Subsequent reports will emphasize other aspects of the whole project.

The Star Fort Historical Commission has generously provided the bulk of the funds for the archeological research in this project. The Commission made a substantial grant for Dr. Edwards' work in 1961-65. It made another substantial grant to the Institute in 1970 for work that year and has made a third, larger, grant to the Institute for work to be done in 1971. Some funding, too, has come directly from the Institute in the form of the regular salary of Mr. South throughout the work; in the majority of salaries and wages paid to laboratory and research assistants during the times when field work was not going on; in administrative salaries of those, like myself, who have put in substantial increments of time on the project; and in providing much of the equipment, tools, supplies, laboratory space, and other facilities already on hand at the Institute.

It is a real pleasure for us in the Institute to work with the Star Fort Historical Commission on this project. Dr. B. M. Grier, Chairman of the Commission, has been most patient and understanding of our attitudes and approaches to the problems. The entire Commission has been thoroughly cooperative and helpful throughout. Mr. W. Bruce Ezell, with whom we have all worked most closely, has provided camping space for the crews, access to his research data, arguments and discussions on both research problems and logistic matters, and in general, has been a fine friend without whose help the project could not have been as effectively done.

## Acknowledgements

by Stanley South

The Star Fort Historical Commission's representative, Bruce Ezell, was, as usual, most helpful with this project at Ninety Six. He was a logistics officer for the project as well as a major collaborator in the historical research, reading the manuscript, and making many pertinent suggestions for filling out details as well as pointing the way to the documents relative to Ninety Six. We are looking forward to a continuation of our working relationship toward a greater understanding of the site at Ninety Six.

I would like to thank Steve Baker, assistant archeologist on the project, for his help throughout the project with provenience control and data collecting, and particularly as manager of the crew in the field as well as at camp.

John Jameson and David Ward were crew members who were particularly helpful in the work of transit-plotting of all the exploratory trenches and the features revealed by them, and John is due a special commendation for his continued work on the drafting table, acting as an assistant draftsman on the maps included with this report.

I would like to thank Richard Polhemus for his work on cataloging and processing the artifacts recovered during the project, and for assistance in putting the expedition into the field.

A special assistant for the project was Maryjane Rhett who helped with the historical research, spending many hours over microfilm and weighty tomes. Her help extends to all phases of the project due to

her primary role of assistant in charge of almost anything that needs to be done. She followed the manuscript as it grew and kept the bibliography up-to-date and in order.

I would like to thank Carleen Regal and Betty Williams for typing the manuscript, and Gordon Brown, our staff photographer, for preparing the photographs included in this report.

The administrative direction of the project was successfully handled by Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director of the Institute, who also wrote the introductory chapter.



I -- THE INDIAN FRONTIER

2

GOUDY'S TRADING POST SITE OF 1751, AND FORT NINETY SIX 1759-61

(38GN1)

We are here making preparations  
to defend our Selves, from the  
barbarity of those Brutes

On May 4, 1738, Thomas Brown, trader and operator of a trading post "near the Congrees Old Fort," received a land grant of 200 acres, "Commonly Called & known by the name of Ninety Six (on the Cherrokee Path) and Butting and Bounding on all sides on Vacent Land..." (Meriwether 1940:53; South Carolina Archives, Colonial Plats II/13/1/7a, Box 206-239, Folder #216. Hereinafter cited as SCA). Brown was looking toward the development of trading centers at critically important junctions of the trading path, such as that at Ninety Six where the Cherokee Path joined the Congaree Path and the Savannah Town Path. However, there is no evidence that Brown ever developed this 200 acres or the 200 acres joining it that he acquired in 1744 (Meriwether 1940:118; SCA, Colonial Plats II/13/1/7a, Box 206-239, #216). There is one small clue to occupation at Ninety Six as early as 1737, when John Lacey purchased three gallons of rum and three pounds of sugar at "a Place called the Ninety Six," indicating a possible trader there at that time (Easterby 1951:566). Perhaps Thomas Brown had a representative at Ninety Six at this time engaging in some trade, the success of which may have prompted him to survey and obtain a grant for 200 additional acres at the site in the following year. The name of Ninety Six originated from the fact that it was ninety-six miles from the Cherokee town of Keowee and was so known as early as 1730

when George Hunter showed the location on his map of the Cherokee country, though it probably was in use some years before that time by the Cherokee traders (Salley 1917:3).

Thomas Brown died in 1747, not having developed his Ninety Six property, and this land, in part at least, was eventually acquired by Robert Goudy (Meriwether 1940:57, 116-118). Goudy (also spelled as Goudey, Gawdin, Gowdey, Gaudey, Gaudy, Gandey, Gandy, Gowdy, Goude, and Goudee)\*, had come from the Cherokee nation to the area of Ninety Six in 1751, having lived among the Cherokee for some time (McDowell 1958:57, 71).

He had come from the Cherokee nation with one hundred horses loaded with leather, indicating the extent of his trading activities (SCA, Journal of the Council, No. 18, Part 1:155. Hereinafter cited as JC).

In November 1751, some months after Robert Goudy's arrival in the area of Ninety Six, "Hamilton's Great Survey" of 200 thousand acres was made. Bordering on the Saluda River and measuring 18 miles on the side, it lay to the north of Thomas Brown's 1738 survey, which may have been bought by Robert Goudy about this time (Meriwether 1940:126). The location of this tract can still be seen on aerial photographs as hedge rows, fence lines, tree lines, and on the ground as well as an embankment running beneath present fence lines along the Hamilton line (Julien 1937).

In May of 1751 a number of incidents with the Cherokee Indians resulted in the "Inhabitation of 96, Seludy and upper Inhabitation of Congree River," fleeing to the Congaree Fort near present Columbia for safety (McDowell 1958:50). From this we learn that there is no fort at

\*Marvin L. Cann in his report "Old Ninety Six in the Revolution, 1730-1781," p. 61, states that the spelling "Goudy" is found in the signature on the will of Robert Goudy, Record of Wills, Charleston County, 1774-1779, Vol. 17, Book B, p. 303, and therefore this is the spelling used here.

Ninety Six at this time. However, in August of the same year John Fairchild reporting to Governor Glen stated that "we thought fit to put up a small Fort with Puncheons in Case Occassion should call for a Place of Retreat" (McDowell 1958:122). This letter was written from "Near 96," at Fairchild's fort, which was said by John Logan to have likely been on the north bank of John's Creek, some 14 miles northwest of Ninety Six (Logan 1859:440-42). From Windsor Forest, or Savannah Town, near Augusta, word was sent by John Pearson on June 7, 1751, that the Cherokees were in an uproar and were holding councils of war, singing death songs, and "...we are here making preparations to defend our Selves, from the barbarity of those Brutes." Pearson asked for some small swivel guns to place in the flankers of the fort (SCA, JC, 18, Part 1:155; SCA, Colonial Plats, II/13/1/7a, Box 206-239, #216). As far as we know, however, no fort was built at Ninety Six at this time.

By 1753 Fort Prince George had been built by Governor Glen at the Cherokee town of Keowee, and Robert Goudy was operating a store at Ninety Six, which was to become highly successful in the years to come (SCA, JC, Part 2:538; Meriwether 1940:132, 206-07). It was not until 1759 that the situation with the Indians had developed to the point that a fortification was required at Goudy's Trading Post at Ninety Six (SCA, South Carolina Gazette, December 1, 1759. Hereinafter cited as SCG).

#### Fort Ninety Six at Goudy's Trading Post - The Lyttelton Expedition of 1759

Throughout the 1750's there were repeated incidents of violence against the back country settlers by the Cherokee Indians, and by the fall of 1759 Governor William Henry Lyttelton took action by leading an expedition into the Cherokee country (Meriwether 1940:218-19). On the afternoon

of November 21, at two o'clock, the army under Governor Lyttelton arrived, with baggage and provisions, at Ninety Six (SCG, Dec. 8, 1759). As far as is known, Ninety Six at this time consisted primarily of the house and barns and other outbuildings of Robert Goudy. Our primary knowledge of Goudy's Trading Post comes from the building of Fort Ninety Six around Goudy's barn, and the account of the attack on the fort by Cherokee Indians a few months later. Because of the importance of these accounts to a proper understanding of Fort Ninety Six at Goudy's place, the accounts will be presented here as they occurred in the South Carolina Gazette.

Nov. 21st, At 9 A.M. Marched for Ninety-Six: arrived and encamped there at 2 P.M. after crossing 2 Creeks. All the Baggage and Provisions got up....

Nov. 22nd, The Ground was reconnoitred for a proper Place to build a Magazine and Stockade-Fort, to secure Ammunition and Provision, and a Retreat if necessary: to save Time, Expense and Trouble, Mr. Gouedy's Barn was fixed on for a Store-house, and it was resolved to stockade it in.

Nov. 24th, Capt. Dugeon, the Engineer, laid out the Ground for the Stockade; the Pioneers, Volunteers, Servants, &c. opened the Ditch for planting the Puncheons....

Nov. 25th, Nothing remarkable happened. Continued to work on the Stockade.

Nov. 26th, Two Runners arrived in the Camp from the Nation, with an English flag, and brought a Talk, and a large Quantity of Wampum: ....

Nov. 27th, The Banquet to the Stockade was finished, and the Gate put up. Some Volunteers from Port-Royal joined the Army. An Express arrived from Virginia. Meazles, Purgings and pleuritic Complaints rather increased than Abated.

Nov. 28th, The whole Army was reviewed, except the Indian Guard and Rangers, and found considerably short of Returns; there were 1299 effective Men. Orders were given to march early on the 29th, for Keowee; during the whole March to which, every Man is to be under Arms an Hour before day, and to continue 'till Sun-rise, to prevent a Surprize, that being always the Time when Indians make their Attacks. A Garrison was to be left at Fort Ninety-Six, which is 90 feet

square, has Sheds on one Side of the Storehouse for the Men, and will be of great Service to the Inhabitants of these Parts in all Times of Alarm (SCG, Dec. 1, Dec. 8, Dec. 15, 1759).

On the following day the forces under Lyttelton marched from Fort Ninety Six, "having finished the Fort there, leaving in Garrison all the Sick and Invalids"(SCG, Dec. 29, 1759). On the trip to Fort Prince George at Keowee they "encamped that Afternoon at Six-Mile Run where at Night they could plainly hear the Indians singing and dancing in some of their Towns" (SCG, Dec. 29, 1759).

From "Fort Prince George near Keowee" on December 10, 1759, Governor Lyttelton wrote:

I Constructed a good Stockake at a place called Ninety Six to secure a Magazine of Provisions (SCA, British Public Records Office, BT Vol. 19, L 69:280).

Apparently the stockade at Fort Ninety Six was not built any too soon, for shortly following the collapse of Lyttleton's expedition in January 1760, Cherokee warriors attacked the frontier.

The day they started a Cherokee wench set out from Fort Prince George in advance of five or six hundred Indians. She arrived at Ninety Six on the 30th, two traders reaching the post the same day, and the alarm thus given undoubtedly prevented a massacre. Twenty men came in from the community that day, and twenty more were expected during the night (Meriwether 1940: 222).

The massacre of 23 settlers at Long Canes was one of the first blows to fall, followed shortly thereafter by an attack on Fort Ninety Six on February 3rd. This attack lasted only two hours, during which the Cherokees lost two men (Meriwether 1940:222). John Pearson reported to Governor Lyttelton on February 8th on the burning and killing, and that they were building more forts.

How long we may continue in Safety in them I know not for the Tarrant hath been so great they have burnt all Goudy's House except the little Fort you built around his Barn, where he and Capt. Francis and some few more are penned up (McDowell 1970:495).

Concern for the safety of Fort Ninety Six was published in the South Carolina Gazette on February 9th, revealing that a well was being dug.

...the Communication with Fort Ninety-Six is cut off: But by Letters from Mr. Thomas Bell and Mr. Williamson, who wrote from that Fort early on Sunday Morning, we learn, that the Garrison was then safe, and consisted of 33 resolute white Men and 12 Stout Negros, all armed: Happily, during the late Expedition, that Fort was built, and a pretty good Stock of Provisions and Ammunition lodg'd there, and when the above Letters were written a Well was digging therein; so that we hope, the Garrison will be able to defend themselves until they can be relieved; but we have Reason to believe, that all below them to this side Saludy-River is destroyed (SCG, Feb. 9, 1760).

Stockade forts such as the one at Ninety Six sprang up virtually overnight throughout the hundreds of miles of the Carolina and Georgia frontier, and were a significant factor in preventing more slaughter by the Cherokees. After the February attacks there was a lull for some days while the Indians celebrated, but then, at a time when the smallpox had two-thirds of the men at the Ninety Six garrison in bed, word arrived that another attack was likely. This warning was brought on March 2nd by two messengers from Fort Prince George and none too soon, for the next morning over 200 Indians attacked Fort Ninety Six (Meriwether 1940:222-24). The South Carolina Gazette for March 15, 1760, carried an account of this attack.

The Particulars of the Affair at Ninety-Six, which we had not Room for in our last, are these, viz. That on Monday the third Instant about 240 or 250 Indians attacked the Fort of that Name, and fired upon it for 36 Hours, without scarce any Intermission, even during the whole Night, but never came within 60 yards of the Stockade, except one Fellow, who was killed and scalped, and whose Body was given to the Dogs, and his Scalp hoisted along-side of the Colours, to provoke the

Enemy to come nearer. On Tuesday Morning the 4th, Major Lloyd, with 11 Men got into the Fort as a Reinforcement, during a hard Shower of Rain, while the Indians were sheltering themselves, and raised the Spirits of the Garrison a good deal. In the Action six Cherokees were killed on the Spot, but 5 of their Bodies carried off as they fell, and many were wounded. In the Fort, one Man was shot thro' the Shoulder, and another in the Mouth; the Ball lodging in the Back of his Neck; but they were both likely to recover. The Morning that Fort Ninety-Six was attacked, Capt. Grinnan with 28 of his Rangers was going thither, but discovering so numerous a Body of Indians, when he got within a Mile and a Half of it, and his People being afraid of the Small-Pox, he thought it most advisable to return and protect the People at Mr. Turner's Fort but first sent them Notice by Doct. Murrey's Boy of the Enemy's being near, &c. In the Afternoon of the 4th, the Enemy withdrew from before Fort Ninety-Six, but had Ambuscaded every where so that Mr. Andrew Williamson with Doct. Murry's boy, made three several Attempts to get into the Garrison, and did not succeed till the 6th. When the Indians filed off, above 100 of them were perceived to separate from the Rest, and go down Saludy-River with their Packs and Blankets, it was supposed to lay waste the Country downwards; and this Supposition was soon Verified, for they have since burnt all the Houses within two Miles of Mr. Turner's Fort and Fort Ninety-Six, among others those of Doct. Murray, Mrs. Edwards at Half-Way Swamp, &c. and likewise all the Grain and Fodder they could meet with, and killed all the large Cattle near.

A Reinforcement of 35 Men are ordered to Fort Ninety-Six. Fourteen Men have died there of the Small-Pox, the Rest were on the Recovery. ...Tis said, that Magazines will be immediately formed at Monck's Corner, at the Congarees, and Fort Ninety-Six, to facilitate the speedy March of the Troops coming from New York (SCG, March 15, 1760).

Two days after the attack the comander of the fort, James Francis, wrote to Governor Lyttelton explaining the events that had occurred there, and provided us with some important details, particularly the fact that the fort had bastions.

Fort 96, March 6th, 1760

Letter from James Francis to his Excellency, William Henry Lyttelton, Esq.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY, SIR, On Sunday last McCormick Boyle and Moses Sinclair arrived at this Fort from Fort Prince George, and gave us an Account of the Discovery they made of the Enemy coming down upon us to the Amount of perhaps 300 by the Number of their Fires. As we had no Reason to doubt their Veracity, we put ourselves in the best Order we were able for their Reception, and as we had good Reason to believe, they would collect their whole Force to get Satisfaction if they might for their last Defeat, and being very weakly manned we insisted on those two Men, not to leave the Fort, at least for some two or three Days, to wait the Enemy's coming; which Freedom hope your Excellency will please to excuse as we at that Juncture stood in such Need of Assistance.

The Event answered our Expectations, for on Monday just after Sunrise, two hundred and more of the Enemy began their Attack upon us, and that with no trifling Resolution, they scarce made any Cessation, but kept almost a constant Fire all that Day and the following Night, and some smart Volleys the next Day. We had two of our Men wounded, but hope not mortal. However Sir, we beg Leave to acquaint your Excellency, that we had the Pleasure during the Engagement to see several of our Enemy drop, and we have now the Pleasure Sir, to fatten our Dogs with their Carcases, and to display their Scalps, neatly ornamented on the Top of our Bastions. These Things Sir, we doubt not but your Excellency will allow may so far irritate them, as to collect their whole Force, and make a stronger Effort if they possibly can to seek Revenge.

And I humbly beg Leave to assure your Excellency, that we had not twenty effective Men during the whole Time of our Engagement, but as Major Loyd arrived here the Juncture of Time that the Enemy left off their firing at us, within a Quarter of an Hour of their last Volley, with an Escort of ten Men from below, we have presumed to withstand his carrying the Whole back, but think to withhold them, until we have some better Reinforcement, which we doubt not your Excellency's Generosity will forward to us, as we have Reason to fear with few effective Men we have, will be greedy to follow the Scout when they come this Way, by which Means the Fort will be left naked, and I know not by what Means to prevent that Evil. It certainly must appear necessary Sir, that this Fort should stand and be defended, as a Barrier to the Province, as well as for a safe Retreat in case of Need &c. Which we humbly submit to your Excellency's far superior Penetration. Humbly begging Pardon Sir, for thus far presuming, I remain in all dutiful Obedience Sir,



Your Excellency's most dutiful and obedient humble Servant  
to command,

Jams. Francis

(McDowell 1970:504).

## THE MONTGOMERY EXPEDITION OF 1760

On February 2, 1760, the day following the Long Cane massacre and the day before the first attack by the Cherokee on Fort Ninety Six, word reached Charleston and Governor Lyttelton of the expected assault on the frontier. The governor and council met and agreed that an urgent request for aid be sent to the governments of New York, North Carolina, and Virginia (Meriwether 1940:222-25). Other measures were taken on a local level, such as the raising of the pay of the rangers, and increasing the bounty for male Cherokee scalps to 72 shillings. An additional regiment was attempted to be raised, with Colonel Richardson operating out of Ninety Six in an unsuccessful effort at securing enough men (Meriwether 1940:226-28).

By March 15th word had been received that New York was responding to the plea of Governor Lyttelton for help, and that 600 troops of the Royal Scots and 600 of Montgomery's Highlanders were preparing to embark for South Carolina (SCG, March 15, 1760). On April first these troops arrived in Charleston in:

His Majesty's Ship Albany, ...from New-York, with 6 Tranports and a Victualier having on board 1200 pick'd Men, fent hither by Major-General Amherst to act against the Cherokees, under the Command of the Hon. Archibald Montgomery, Efq., Colonel of the 77th Regiment of Foot. Thefe Troops confift of 600 Men of His Majesty's 1ft. Regiment of Foot called the Royal Scotch, and 600 of Col. Montgomery's Highlanders. (SCG, April 7, 1760.)

On April 6th and 7th these regular troops marched for Moncks Corner. However, it would be seven more weeks before the slowly moving machine would reach Ninety Six and the Carolina back country. Meanwhile, on May 8th, near

Ninety Six, Robert Goudy's son was captured by the Indians. We can imagine what steps Goudy may have taken to have his son released, for he was well acquainted with the Indians through his trading center. Fortunately, for motives we can only guess at today, the boy was released a week after his capture (Corkran 1962:203). In order to help reduce such incidents, the slowly moving mechanism necessary for supporting an army was grinding away at the red tape. In order to assist Montgomery's army with movement of supplies, the assembly enacted an ordinance for impressment of wagons, horses and drivers, and Montgomery's force:

marching by way of the Congarees, reached Ninety Six on the 25th of May. Here preparations were made and the expedition reorganized for the march into the enemy's country. Richardson retired from the command of the provincials and Montgomery took three hundred and fifty rangers and foot soldiers, leaving the others to guard the frontier (Meriwether 1940:228).

Montgomery was at Ninety Six only three days, until May 28th, when he left for the Cherokee country. The expedition consisted of Montgomery's Highlanders (the 77th Highlander Regiment), in full Highland dress with drums and pipes, the First Royal Regiment of Foot (4 battalion companies), and the grenadier and light-infantry companies of these regiments, rangers, provincials, and Catawba Indians (SCG, April 7, 1760; Lawson 1963:74; SCA, The Amherst Letters, Montgomery to Amherst, May 1760: E472), (Frontispiece). From camp at Ninety Six Montgomery wrote Amherst and expressed his opinion of those provincials with the expedition:

We have not A single man with us that is of any consiquence in the Province Their Regt. of 1000 Men consists of about rightly the half or more good for Nothing,...there are About four hundred Rangers here, I intend to carry three hundred of the men with me...(SCA, The Amherst Letters, Montgomery to Amherst, May 24, 1760.)

At the Cherokee town of Little Keowee, which Montgomery's force stumbled on by mistake, the light infantry company of the Royal Highlanders was assigned to enter the Indian houses and put them to death with the bayonet, which they promptly did (SCG, June 10, 1760). In describing the incident James Grant reported that "We came upon them like light'ning", and the action of the Highlanders and Royals on this and other occasions, along with the flashing red of the plaid tartans and other parts of the Highlander and Royal uniforms, prompted the Catawba Indians to refer to Montgomery's force as the "great red warriors" (SCG, June 4, 1760). Sugar Town and other Cherokee Lower Towns were burned and their crops destroyed, and many bear and buffalo hides were taken from the villages by the troops (BPRO in SCA, XXVIII, Bull to the Board, June 17, 1760:373-74, SCG, June 14, 1760).

With the Lower Towns taken care of by his burning and destruction of crops, Montgomery left Fort Prince George for the Middle Towns on the 24th of June (BPRO, XXVIII, Bull to the Board, June 30, 1760:365). On the trip from Ninety Six to Fort Prince George the expedition had Colonel Montgomery marching at the head of the light infantry corps, followed by James Grant's grenadiers, with the First Royal Scots Regiment of Foot and Montgomery's Highlanders in the rear. In front of the army, forming the advanced guard, were over 100 rangers who, it was said, served the army well. When an Indian town was approached, the order of march changed, with the rangers forming in the rear to allow the brunt of the attack to be delivered by the light infantry corps. Now, however, as they left Fort

Prince George for the Middle Towns, there was no road sufficient to allow the use of wagons for transporting baggage and tents for the troops, so these had to be left at Fort Prince George, and everything transported on horseback (BPRO, XXVIII, June 30, 1760:365; SCG, June 14, 1760).

Without the tents, the troops were forced to sleep without shelter, and at night formed themselves into a square around the little tent of Colonel Montgomery so as to provide the maximum protection for their commander. Even this was not sufficient for complete protection, for the Indians would take long range rifle shots at the little tent pitched in the center of a sea of red from 1000 Highlanders and Royals, with some of the spent balls falling close around the tent (SCG, July 12, 1760).

We will not go into the details of the expedition into the Middle Settlement of the Cherokees on the Little Tennessee River, but some of the reports are of particular value in our interpretation of Montgomery's force as it applies to Ninety Six. For instance, we know that on this expedition many of the Cherokees used arrows instead of firearms, and that the Indians were supplied with better fire-power than Montgomery (SCG, July 19, 1760).

They had vastly the advantage of us, with their rifle-barrel'd guns, which did execution at a much greater distance than our muskets; besides they fought us in their usual way, and we gave them our fire by platoons (SCG, July 19, 1760).

This formalized firing by platoons of the Highlanders was quite a contrast to the Indian's and ranger's method of firing from the cover of trees, and prompted the Indians to remark that it was like shooting turkeys (Meriwether 1940:231).

During the engagement that took place between Montgomery's force and

the Cherokees near the town of Echoe, some of the Indians spoke English and were heard giving forth with some very insulting remarks accompanied by loud cries and whoops. The Highlanders and Royals, however, were no doubt also able to muster some appropriate comments of their own, with cheers accompanied by the waving of their Scotch bonnets in the air.

During the action they endeavoured to frighten us with their yelling, but we turned the cheer upon them, with three whirra's and three waves of our bonnets and hats, which they did not seem to relifh (SCG, July 12, 1760).

In the expedition there were 17 killed and 65 wounded of the regular Highlander and Royal troops and officers, with three provincials killed and ten wounded (SCA, The Amherst Letter, Montgomery to Amherst, July 2, 1760; Meriwether 1940:231). During the engagement, the Indians were able to take two drums and a drummer was wounded, possibly attempting to protect his drum (SCG, July 12, 1760; SCA, The Amherst Letters, Montgomery to Amherst, July 2, 1760). Those killed by the Indians were scalped and mutilated, even the eyebrows being scalped and taken as trophies from dead Highlanders, and their regimentals worn by the Cherokees (SCG, July 12, 1760). We can imagine the mortification suffered by the Highlanders as they retreated from what was to be considered an unsuccessful expedition, when they witnessed Cherokees dressed in regimental tartan and bonnet, perhaps tauntingly beating the military drums taken in battle and flaunting the scalps and eyebrows of a slain Highlander (SCG, July 2, 1760). This scene, of a proud Cherokee warrior offering his unique farewell to Montgomery's Highlanders, against the background of the rugged citadel of the Cherokee mountains, was a sight that few of the Highlanders were likely soon to forget,

symbolizing as it did, the failure of Montgomery's effort to subdue the Cherokees.

On their return to Fort Prince George they stayed only a single night and marched the following day, July 2nd, for Fort Ninety Six. On that day, a soldier of the garrison at Fort Prince George, a man of the Third Regiment of Foot, known as "The Buffs", was strolling about the hill where the army had been encamped, and was shot and scalped by four Cherokees (SCG, July 19, 1760; BPRO, XXVIII, July 20, 1760, 374). His death is significant to us today in that it provides for us the identification of the regiment forming the regular garrison at Fort Prince George. On July 4th Captain John Brown from Augusta arrived at Fort Prince George hoping to join Montgomery's expedition, not having learned of his rather short visit to the Cherokee country. Brown had with him 43 Chickasaw Indians, and 13 white men dressed and painted as Indians, who had come to assist Montgomery in his effort against the Cherokee, but they had arrived too late (SCG, July 19, 1760). Montgomery's attempt to subdue the Cherokees had ended in failure and he marched for Charleston.

On August 11th, 1760, Montgomery's Highlanders and the King's First or Royal Scots Regiment of Foot arrived in Charleston and embarked on the transports awaiting to return them to New York (SCG, August 13, 1760). On the 15th, at the application of Lieutenant-Governor Bull, Montgomery ordered four companies of the Royal Regiment of Foot (Royal Scots) to return to the Congarees to help insure the safety of the country (SCG, August 23, 1760; SCA, the Amherst Letters, Montgomery to Amherst, August 15, 1760). The remainder of his force sailed for New York aboard the transports Amherst, Argo, Two-Friends, Carolina, and Swan, with Montgomery sailing aboard the man

of war Zephyr. The Albany and Thornton remained behind to take the 400 Royal Scots to their next assignment after their duty at the Congarees was over (SCG, August 23, 1760).



## THE GRANT EXPEDITION OF 1761

The defeat of Montgomery and the fall of Fort Loudoun in Tennessee a short time later, inspired the Cherokees, and a blockade of Fort Prince George was undertaken. Lieutenant-Governor William Bull acted to counter this new threat by sending detachments of rangers to various points on the Congaree, the Broad, and Savannah River areas. Ninety Six was the base of operations until 1761, and four swivel guns and 50 men were sent there to insure communication with Fort Prince George (Meriwether 1940:229-33; BPRO, XXVIII, August 15, 1760:390).

With the exit of Montgomery from the scene, the task of protecting the frontier again returned to the provincials and regulars at forts such as Ninety Six and Prince George. Although supplies were left there by Montgomery for the use of that garrison, they did not last long, and it was soon again in need of food. On the first of September, Andrew Williamson left Ninety Six with 50 head of cattle for the relief of Fort Prince George. By October 1760, the garrison was again becoming desperate for supplies, and on the 11th a detachment of 268 rangers with horses loaded with supplies left Ninety Six under Major William Thomson for their relief (Meriwether 1940:234; SCG, September 13, 1760).

With the frontier being protected by the forts such as Ninety Six, as well as new ones springing up throughout those areas exposed to possible attack, Lieutenant-Governor Bull made application to General Amherst for additional aid in overcoming the Cherokee threat (BPRO, XXIX, January 29, 1761:17). Amherst's answer to this request arrived in the form of Col. James Grant, who had been with Montgomery, and 1200 troops. These consisted of four companies of the First Regiment of Foot (Royal Scots), the same regiment having accompanied Montgomery on the first expedition; two companies of the Seventeenth Regiment of Foot (Figure 1), and two of the Twenty-second Regiment of Foot, and eight companies of the new raised Independent Regiment of Foot (BPRO, XXIX, January 29, 1761:17; SCG, March 21, 1761). They were not able to march for the Cherokee country immediately, however, for their baggage had not arrived. It was not until March 21, 1761, that we learn of the arrival of the baggage (SCG, March 21, 1761). During the long weeks of waiting at Charleston for the arrival of the baggage, the officers and men became a familiar sight on the streets of that town, and through their good behavior won the respect and admiration of the Charlestonians. Contributing to this good relationship between the elements of the army and the civilians was the fact that the officers gave a comedy and farce for the citizens as entertainment, which was well received (SCG, March 21, 1761). The South Carolina Gazette on March 21st reported the arrival of the long awaited baggage.

...on wednesday laft 4 large tranfport-fhips, having on board the heavy baggage of his majefty's troops to be employed in the approaching campaign againft the Cherokees (In conjunction with the forces of this province) under the command of Col. James Grant, failed up Cooper-River, for Strawberry, where they are to land the fame...(SCG, March 21, 1761).

Figure 1

A Grenadier of the 17th Regiment of Foot, 1751, Illustrating the Appearance of this Unit of Grant's Expedition Against the Cherokee in 1760.

Permission for use granted by Seeley, Service & Co., Ltd., publishers of Regiments and Uniforms of the British Army by Major R. Money Barnes, London:1967, Plate V, Figure 11.



Arriving with the baggage from Providence, Rhode Island, were additional troops, those of Montgomery's Highlanders, who had accompanied Montgomery on the previous expedition. The plan called for them to remain in Charleston under command of Alexander Mackenzie while the remainder of the army moved to Monck's Corner. This plan was apparently changed, however, for less than two weeks later the Highlanders marched for Monck's Corner to join Grant's force (SCG, March 21, April 4, 1761). Before the arrival of the Highlanders, the troops numbered some 1600 regulars, and 1200 provincials. With the Highlanders the army probably numbered over 3000 (BPRO,XXIX, January 29, 1761:17).

By March 27th Colonel Grant had arrived at the Congaree settlement and found a newly completed magazine for flour for his army. He was faced with the logistics problem of moving his store of flour and other goods for the army along with the army when it moved toward the Cherokee frontier, or sending it on ahead so as to allow more waggons to be available for transporting the army when it moved. He decided to establish a flour and supply magazine at Fort Ninety Six, and sent Major Moultrie of the Provincial Regiment to do the job (SCA, Money Penny 1761:7). On April 14, Moultrie left for Ninety Six.

Major Moultrie, with the Captains Roberts, and Ainfle, Lieutenants Savage, Marion, Terry and Huger, Ensigns Ward and Huger, and 220 picked men of Col. Middleton's regiment, march'd from their encampment at Congarees for Fort Ninety-Six, having 50 waggons loaded with flour...(SCG, April 11, 1761).

Meanwhile, a change in plans apparently was taking place at the Congarees involving Montgomery's Highlanders and the Royal Scots Regiment. By April 18th Montgomery's Highlanders had embarked on board the Mercury transport for New York, and within a few days some of the First Regiment of Foot (Royal Scots) also embarked [probably two companies], along with the Royal American Regiment aboard the Sally, to join General Amherst (SCG, April 18, 25, 1761). Just why these troops did not accompany Grant on the remainder of his expedition is not known. We might speculate that it may have related to some conflict of command regarding Montgomery and Grant. However, it simply may have been a matter of new orders received for these units from General Amherst. It also may have related to the fact that many Royal Scots left at the Congarees by Montgomery had become sick, and it may have been these who were returned (BPRO, XXIX, October 24, 1760:109-110).

Meanwhile, Major Moultrie and his force from Middleton's Provincial Regiment were working on preparations at Fort Ninety Six, particularly the completion of a magazine for storage of supplies, that had been begun before their arrival (SCG, April 11, 1761). They also built two new stockades.

Major Moultrie has finished a new stockade at Ninety-Six, and intrenched his camp:He is now enlarging the old fort and building large store-houses there. The magazine at that place will soon be filled (SCG, May 2, 1761).

From a witness who kept a diary we learn some details of the fort and the enlargement made by Moultrie to receive Grant's army. Major Alexander Money Penny recorded that:

This is a true American Fort, a pitiful palisade thrown around a Barn, a kind of a Flank at two opposite Angles, where a sentry can Stand, no Ditch. Major Moultrie had fell'd down one side & extended it about 30 Feet, to make another shed for provisions. He was camp'd here with the two Light Infantry Companies & 200 Men of Middlton's (SCA, Money Penny 1761:25-26).

With the new stockade built, the old one enlarged, and storehouses and magazines prepared to receive supplies, Moultrie was ready for the arrival of Grant's army. The expedition arrived on May 14, and consisted of:

1,400 regulars	[2 companies of 17th 2 companies of 22nd 8 companies of Independents 2 companies of 1st [Royal Scots]
689 provincials	[Middleton's] (SCG, April 17, 1761).
401 rangers	[Rogers' Rangers included]
240 waggoners ect.	
57 Indians	[Catawbas, Chickasaws, Mohawks and Rogers' Rangers, with Lt. Wassel and 10 volunteers from the 17th Regiment were formed into a corps the day before leaving Ninety Six] (SCG, May 23, 1761).
41 Negro pioneers	

(SCG, May 23, 1761).

The army consisted of over 2800 men. Captain Daniel and 50 men of Col. Burton's regiment were left at Ninety Six as a garrison, and the expedition began moving out of Ninety Six toward Fort Prince George on May 18th (SCG, May 30, 1761;BPRO, XXIX, May 28, 1761:109-10). On the 25th of May, King Haigler and 19 Catawbas joined the expedition (SCG, June 20, 1761).

Grant's expedition carried out the destruction of crops and Indian towns, but the results were not dramatic in terms of manpower affected, except that food became a serious problem for the Lower Cherokees, and a town for the relief of Cherokee refugees was established to the east of Fort Prince George (BPRO, XXIX, June 19, 1761:119). Grant reported that Ensign John Monroe of the 22nd Regiment of Foot was killed, having been wounded the previous year on Montgomery's expedition. Whether this means that elements of the 22nd Regiment of Foot were with Montgomery, we do not

know. It is likely that this man was then assigned to the Royal Scots Regiment. Wounded were Ensign Knight of the Royal or First Regiment of Foot, as well as a number of others, some from Col. Burton's Regiment and Middleton's Regiment (SCG, July 18, 1761).

A peace treaty was signed in Charleston in December 1761 (Meriwether 1940:240), and the role of Fort Ninety Six, and many similar forts in securing the frontier in a time of crisis, was over. In fact, the fate of Fort Ninety Six is unknown, for it is never again mentioned in the records. We don't even have a passing reference, such as is sometimes found, as to it being "in an advanced state of decay," or to its standing "abandoned and alone" or remaining as "a relic of the Indian war." Its story, as recorded by history, ends abruptly with the close of 1761 and the signing of the peace treaty with the Cherokees. Details of the location of Fort Ninety Six, the exact dimension and shape of its outline, and the location of Goudy's buildings, cellars, the fort magazine, and artifacts directly associated with this moment in the history of South Carolina's frontier are being recovered through archeology after a wait of over 200 years.

Bruce Ezell has suggested that since Robert Goudy was such an important and wealthy trader, and with the building of Fort Ninety Six around his barn focusing attention on his trading center, that Goudy himself very likely kept the fort in repair for the protection of himself and his goods during the 1760's and perhaps even into the 1770's. This would certainly seem to be a valid hypothesis.

Though we are forced to hypothesize the final years of Fort Ninety Six, we are on firmer ground when we look at the contribution made by Goudy's Trading Post to the events and the people of the Carolina frontier.



From its beginning as a rude center for Indian trade, to its role as a major intersection and stage for the unfolding drama of colonial events, Goudy's Trading Post was a vital organ in the expanding frontier of the mid-eighteenth century. Goudy himself, in the quarter of a century between 1750 and 1775, had a comparable growth (reflecting the importance of Indian trade to colonial life), moving from the low of a man who has had all his goods and horses stolen by Indians to wealth equivalent to that of a modern millionaire. His role in the growth of the backcountry during the days of the expanding frontier was central to the drama.

THE ARCHEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE HISTORICAL REFERENCE ON  
GOUDY'S TRADING POST AND FORT NINETY SIX

Whenever man sets foot on a site he frequently leaves evidence of his having been there. If an historical reference mentions the fact that activity such as a trading post took place on a site, we might expect that some lost or discarded items might be found there. If an army encamped for as little time as a day on a site we might expect that bones discarded from meals, buttons accidentally popped from uniforms, and buckles broken or lost might possibly be found on the site. If the First Regiment occupied a spot for awhile, it is conceivable that a First Regiment button might be found, provided that particular First Regiment had identifying buttons. However, such clues are so anchored in chance happenings, that it is not often that an archeologist intentionally begins excavation to recover objects from a site unless he has more concrete evidence to go on than the hope of finding a button lost by chance. Excavations are normally undertaken on sites with a view to the location of architectural features such as cellars, fortification ditches, ditches for stockades, foundations of structures, etc. as a first step, with the recovery of artifacts that are subject to analysis and interpretation coming from the various architectural features. In other words, if a document reveals that an army encamped for a night on a site, the archeologist is not likely to undertake to discover clues of this encampment as quickly as he would if the reference stated that the army not only encamped, but also entrenched for protection from possible attack, or dug a latrine, or erected

a palisade. Such references to below ground activity are of particular interest to the archeologist for he knows that he can, through the methods of archeology, relocate the exact position of the trenches for the entrenchment and the ditch for the latrine or palisade. With these features located he knows that objects dating from the period of their use may be found. To the historian a reference that a well was being dug inside a fort might be of significance in illustrating the importance of water and proper supplies to allow a garrison to withstand a siege, but an archeologist reading the same reference is immediately struck by an image of a deep hole into the subsoil which can be located hundreds or thousands of years after it was dug, and the finding of the well could supply the information as to its exact relationship to ditches and cellar holes that are other clues to the specific fort mentioned in the document. The documents relating to Goudy's Trading Post and Fort Ninety Six contain a number of these red-flag clues of value to the archeologist, and these are outlined here, with the archeological implication in parentheses.

May 4, 1738 Two hundred acre tract "on the Cherrokee Path" shown on Colonial Plat with junction of trading paths shown on 1738 Thomas Brown tract, which later became the tract of Robert Goudy.

Nov. 25, 1751 This tract joined the south line of "Hamilton's Great Survey" of 1751 (which can still be seen in hedge rows, fence lines, and tree lines on aerial photographs). By this means, the Goudy tract can be located on modern maps. (A cellar hole standing open on the site pointed to the possible location of Robert Goudy's Trading Post.)

(Preliminary trenching has established at least three palisade ditches on the site, plus an additional cellar hole with eighteenth century artifacts in the fill.)

- Nov. 21, 1759 Governor Lyttelton's expedition encamped at Goudy's Trading Post, with over 1300 individuals. (Such a large group might leave some evidence, but accidental loss or discarded objects could not be identified with Lyttelton's party.)
- Nov. 22, 1759 Goudy's barn chosen as a storehouse. (Possible foundation, or cellar hole, if it had one, could perhaps be located. Since it was chosen as a storehouse, a cellar may have been dug at this time for storage of certain goods.)
- Nov. 24, 1759 Capt. Dugeon laid out the ground for a stockade around the barn, and a ditch was opened for planting the puncheons. (The ditch could be located, with puncheon impressions.)
- Nov. 25, 1759 Work continued on the stockade.
- Nov. 27, 1759 The banquette to the stockade was finished, and the gate put up. (A banquette implies a ditch from which the soil for the banquette could be obtained. The gate might be represented by a large post-hole on each side of a gap in the palisade ditch.)
- Nov. 28, 1759 Fort Ninety Six mentioned as being 90 feet square and having sheds on one side of the barn storehouse to house the men, a barracks. (A ditch defining a 90 foot square area would certainly be a good candidate for representing this fort, with the sheds perhaps represented by postholes flanking a possible cellar beneath the barn.)
- Nov. 29, 1759 Lyttelton leaves Fort Ninety Six.
- Dec. 10, 1759 Lyttelton states that the stockade is a good one and is designed to secure a magazine of provisions. (Again, a cellar may have been required to hold certain of the goods stored in the magazine.)
- Feb. 3, 1760 Fort Ninety Six is attacked by Cherokee Indians for two hours, and the houses of Goudy are all burned except for the barn

inside the stockade. (This attack would have produced musket balls and possibly arrowpoints inside the fort, but associating any found on the site with this attack would be impossible. The burned buildings would leave excellent clues in any hole beneath any burned structure, and the position of such structures may be located by evidence of burning in such cellars or storage holes.)

- Feb. 9, 1760 A well reported as being dug inside the fort. (An excellent clue for helping to identify Fort Ninety Six stockade ditches as those of the 1759 fort and not later forts or additions.)
- March 3, 1760 For 36 hours 240-250 Cherokees constantly attacked Fort Ninety Six, one Cherokee scalped and his body fed to the dogs. (If such dog-gnawed bones found their way into a cellar hole or pit, or were buried and not retrieved by a dog, the archeologist could conceivably find and identify them.)
- March 6, 1760 Scalps of Indians reported neatly ornamenting the top of the bastions of the fort. (This reveals that the fort had bastions, a fact that might be assumed, but a mention such as this clearly identifies this feature. Small palisaded bastions were a usual feature of stockaded compounds such as Fort Ninety Six.)
- March 15, 1760 Fourteen men reported to have died at Fort Ninety Six from smallpox. (They had to be buried somewhere, and likely were placed in graves near the site of Fort Ninety Six.)
- May 25, 1760 Col. Archibald Montgomery arrived with a large force of men, 1200 of whom were the 77th, or Montgomery Highlanders and the First Royal Scots Regiment of Foot. (If identifiable accouterments of these troupes were lost, they might be recovered.)
- May 28, 1760 Montgomery's force leaves Fort Ninety Six for the Cherokee country.
- July 1760 Four swivel guns were assigned to Fort Ninety Six. (It is unlikely that a swivel gun would

be found unless it was damaged beyond repair in an explosion or accident while in use at the fort and discarded.)

- April 1761 Major Moultrie built a new stockade at Ninety Six and entrenched his camp. He enlarged the old fort by taking down one wall and adding 30 feet to enclose an additional shed for provisions. He built large storehouses and completed the magazine. (The new stockade ditch, the trenches of the entrenched camp, the ditch for the 30 foot palisade enlargement to the original 90 foot square fort, cellars for the storehouses and magazines, footings, etc. would all leave traces that could be found archeologically.)
- April 1761 Major Moultrie builds a new stockade at Ninety Six and entrenched his camp, enlarged the old fort, built large storehouses there, and finished a magazine. (The new stockade ditch, the trenches of the entrenched camp, the ditch for the palisade enlargement at the old fort, cellars for the storehouses and magazine would all leave traces that could be found archeologically.)
- May 14, 1761 Grant's army of 2800 arrives and camps at Fort Ninety Six until May 19th. The group contains a number of Indians, and Troops of the 17th Regiment and of the 22nd Regiment of Foot. (Unless some marked relic from these regiments could be found, there is hardly any way to associate any artifacts recovered with this visit of Grant's army to Fort Ninety Six.)

After this date there is no other mention of Fort Ninety Six.

Other than the fact that Robert Goudy operated a successful trading post at his Ninety Six property, that Fort Ninety Six was built around his barn, and that all his houses and buildings were burned by the Indians in 1760, except the barn, we know little else that would be of specific archeological interest regarding his activities at Ninety Six. We do, however, have some reference to the goods he was selling at

his trading post, and from an examination of these we may come to a better understanding of some of the artifacts that we may expect to find in an archeological examination of the trading post and Fort Ninety Six site.

From as early as 1753, we have reference to Goudy taking hogsheads of rum to his store at Ninety Six (McDowell 1958:448). This item was not considered a good one for trade with the Indians, but sometimes it was considered "absolutely necessary," such as its use "to encourage the men to build Fort Ninety Six" (SCA, JCHA, Folio 4, June 11, 1760:278a). Hogsheads of rum would leave virtually no evidence for the archeologist, except perhaps iron bands, but bottles of rum would soon produce empty bottles to be broken and discarded in the nearest trash deposit.

From an affidavit of Robert Goudy himself, we learn of skins stolen from Cherokee Indians in 1751, and of these Indians coming to Goudy at Ninety Six searching for the skins and being able to identify them among the possessions of John White's people by the fact that the Indians had, unknown to the thieves, wrapped some of their "burnt Tobacco Pipes" among the skins (McDowell 1958:72). If these were pipes made by the Cherokee Indians, similar examples may have been broken at Ninety Six to be recovered by the archeologist.

Of particular value, however, in learning of the type of goods being handled by Goudy and other traders, is a list made in April 1758, of goods passed on to Cherokee Indians by Colonel Byrd:

A List of Goods taken from the Traders by Colonel Byrd for the Use of the Indians

April 4th, 1758

6 Boxes Paint	2 Dozen Pr. Ear Bobbs
1 Brass Kettle Wt. 4 1/2	4 1/2 Bunches Barley Corn Beads
5 Pieces Strowds	12 1/2 Lb. Gun Powder
3 Pieces Booting	25 Lb. Lead
3 Guns	4 1/2 Dozen Knives
1 Piece Stript Flannel	3 Pieces Ribbon
7 Pr. Ear Bobbs	14 Tobacco
8 Ps. Blanketts	1 Peck Salt
1 Dozen Hatchets	14 Yards Stript Cotton
2 1/2 Lb. Small Beads	1 Gallon Rum
1 Gross Cadice	2 Pieces Cadice
1 Gross Gartering	2 Ps. Gartering

Those things were taken from Mr. Gowdy and given to the Great Warriour and his Gang by Colonel Byrd, April 4th, 1758.

April 7th, 1758

6 Yards of Negro Cloth (For Powder Baggs)	16 Blanketts
4 1/2 Yards Oznabrigs (for Shott Baggs)	10 Dozen Knives
6 Pieces Stript Flannel	2 Bolts Oznabrigs
2 Pieces Strowds	150 Wt. Gun Powder
6 Pieces Booting	300 Wt. Lead
6 Dozen Hatchetts	2 Pieces Check
4 Pieces Stript Cotton	2 Pieces Strowds

Mr. Gowdy, April 7th, 1758

April 27, 1758

146 10 Pieces Strowds	24 Dozen Cutteau Knives
10 Pieces Stript Cotton	250 Wt. Gun Powder
3 Pieces Duffles	500 Wt. Lead
18 Dozen Check Shirts	1 Bagg Flints
6 Boxes Paint	50 Trading Guns

Mr. Gowdy, April 27, 1758

April 29th, 1758

5 Pieces Strowds	500 Weight Gun Powder
5 Caggs Rum 5 Gallons each	1000 Weight Trading Bulletts
3 Caggs Ditto 4 Gallons each	1 Lb. Oznabrig Thread

Mr. Elliott, April 29th, 1758



April 29th, 1758

2 Pieces Strowds	75 Skins
1 Piece Garlix	2 Arm Plates
1 Box Paint	2 Hair Plates
5 1/2 Yards Callamania	4 Lb. Vermillion
3 Yards Strowds	1 Lb. Bulletts
1 Match Coat	50 Yards Garlix

Mr. Beamer, April 29th, 1758

April 10th, 1758

46 Check Shirts  
4 Caggs Rum, 5 Gallons each  
2 Yards Oznabrigs  
2 Indian Trading Guns out of the Indian Presents at Fort  
Loudon

Captain Paul Demere, April 10th, 1758

(McDowell 1970:456-57)

The objects on this list that would survive archeologically, and that may have become lost or broken and discarded at Goudy's Trading Post and Fort Ninety Six are:

paint  
brass kettle  
guns and gun parts  
ear bobs  
hatchets  
small beads  
hair plates  
barley corn beads  
gun powder  
lead  
knives  
flints  
trading bullets  
buttons from a match coat  
arm plates

Not mentioned here, but likely present at Ninety Six during this period are:

- nails
- window glass
- wine bottles
- case or gin type bottles
- spikes
- ceramics (slipware, white salt-glazed stoneware, delft, Indian pottery, earthenware, Oriental porcelain)
- medicine bottles
- brass furniture hardware
- buttons
- buckles
- iron builder's hardware (hinges, pintles, shutter dogs, etc.)
- pewter spoons
- iron tined-bone-handled forks
- bone-handled knives
- coins

These objects, dating from the period of the 1750's to 1761, would play a significant role in the identification of specific features, and in analysis of the site generally, once full-scale excavation is begun on the site of Goudy's Trading Post and Fort Ninety Six.

## APPENDIX

Some Notes on the Appearance of the Troops of Montgomery's ExpeditionMontgomery's Highlanders (The Old 77th Regiment of Foot)

The old 77th or Montgomery Highlanders, was raised in 1757 by the Hon. Archibald Montgomery. It served in Canada and at Ticonderoga. The uniform was full Highland, the tartan being similar to that of the 42nd. The facings were at first red and were changed to green; the officers' coats and waistcoats being laced with silver. The regiment served in Canada, at Ticonderoga, against the Cherokee Indians 1760, at Dominique 1761, Martinique and Havannah 1762, and was disbanded in 1763 (Lawson 1963:74).

In order to properly interpret the details of Montgomery's Highlanders uniforms for the purpose of drawings or diorama construction, much research on this specific regiment must yet be done. Details of dress and accouterment, such as tartan, bonnet, belt, drums, Highland pipes, pistols, dirk, Highland Broad Sword, bayonet, grenadier's cap, hose, Feilidh Beag (or Little Kilt), sporan, breeches, drawers, leggings, and lace must all be researched, and the nature of these elements of the Highlander's dress determined as they relate to the Highlanders who were with Montgomery at Ninety Six. The illustration of a piper in Montgomery's Highland Regiment in the frontispiece of this report is an example of the type of fighting man who faced the Cherokees in 1760 (Barnes 1967:Plate V, Fig. 12).

A History of the Highland Regiment, published in 1743, describes the arms and clothing of the Highlanders as follows:

To begin with their shoes, the Highlander wears a sort of thin pump or brogue, so light that it does not in

the least impede his activity in running. In the next place, he wears broad garters under the knœe and no breeches, but his plaid belted about his waist, which hangs exactly like the folds of the Roman garment, which we see in the equestrian statues; besides this, he wears a jacket with straight sleeves; as for his arms, they consist in the fuzil, a broad sword, a dirk or dagger, a Highland pistol all of steel, hung, on the other side of his belt opposite the dirk, and a target (Lawson 1963:56).

The Highland regiments in 1751 were allowed to wear bearskin-fur caps, "with the King's Cypher and Crown over it, on a Red ground in the Turn-up, or Flap" (Lawson 1963:102). In 1759, an order from Albany, New York, stated that soldiers were not to carry swords nor sword belt, but that this order did not apply to The Royal Highland Regiment and the 77th, or Montgomery's Highlanders, and that this decision should be left up to the commanding officer of those regiments (Lawson 1963:46). From this we learn that the infantryman in Montgomery's regiment may well have carried swords. Further details of Montgomery's Highlanders must await more research on the subject.

#### The First Regiment of Foot (Royal Scots)

In 1751 a Royal Clothing Warrant was published, outlining the regulations for the clothing of the regiments of foot and the cavalry.

The general information from this warrant is as follows:

THE ROYAL CLOTHING WARRANT, 1751

GEORGE R.

Regulations for the Colours, Clothing, etc., of the Marching Regiments of Foot and for the uniform

Our Will and Pleasure is That the following Regulations for the Colours, Clothing, etc., of Our Marching Regiments of Foot, and for the uniform Clothing of Our Cavalry, their Standards, Guidons, Banners, etc., be duly observed and put in execution, at such times as these particulars

Clothing of the  
Cavalry, their  
Standards, Guidons,  
Banners, etc.

are, or shall be, furnished, viz., Regulation for  
the Colours, Clothing, etc., of the Marching  
Regiments of Foot.

No Colonel to put his Arms, Crest, Device, or  
Livery, on any part of the Appointments of the  
Regiment under his Command.

No part of the Clothing, or Ornaments of the  
Regiments to be altered after the following  
Regulations are put in execution but by Us, or Our  
Captain General's permission.

The King's, or first Colour of every Regiment is to  
be the Great Union throughout.

The Second Colour, to be the colour of the Facing  
of the Regiment with the Union in the upper Canton;  
except those Regiments which are faced with Red or  
White, whose Second Colour is to be the Red Cross  
of St. George in a White Field, and the Union in  
the Upper Canton.

Colours.

In the Centre of each Colour is to be painted, or  
embroidered in Gold Roman Characters, the Number of  
the Rank of the Regiment within a Wreath of Roses  
and Thistles, on the same Stalk, except those  
Regiments which are allowed to wear any Royal Devices,  
or ancient Badges, on whose Colours the Rank of the  
Regiment is to be painted towards the upper Corner.

The size of the Colours, and the length of the  
Pike, to be the same as those of the Royal Regiments  
of Foot Guards. The Cords and Tassels of all Colours  
to be crimson and gold mixed.

Drummers'  
Clothing.

The Drummers of all the Royal Regiments are allowed  
to wear the Royal Livery, viz<sup>t</sup>. Red, lined, faced,  
and lapelled on the breast with blue, and laced with  
a Royal lace: The Drummers of all the other Regiments  
are to be clothed with the Colour of the Facing of  
their Regiments, lined, faced, and lapelled on the  
Breast with Red, and laced in such manner as the  
Colonel shall think fit for distinction sake, the  
Lace, however, being of the Colours of that on the  
Soldiers' coats.

Grenadiers' Caps.

The front of the Grenadiers' Caps to be the same Colour as the facing of the Regiment, with the King's Cypher embroidered, and Crown over it; the little Flap to be Red, with the White Horse and Motto over it, "Nec aspera terrent"; the back part of the Cap to be Red; the turn-up to be the Colour of the Front, with the Number of the Regiment in the middle part behind.--The Royal Regiments, and the Six Old Corps, differ from the fore-going Rule as specified hereafter.

Drums.

The Front or forepart of the Drums to be painted with the Colour of the facing of the Regiment, with the King's Cypher and Crown, and the Number of the Regiment under it.

Bells of Arms.

The Bells of Arms to be painted in the same manner.

Camp Colours.

The Camp Colours to be Square, and of the Colour of the facing of the Regiment upon them (Lawson 1963: 99).

Specific information relating to the First Regiment of Foot is as follows:

The tuft on the top of the Grenadier cap is white (Lawson 1963:30).

In 1749, the coat facings for this regiment were blue (Lawson 1963: 93).

From the Clothing Warrant of 1751, we have the following description of the regimental flag and other details for the First Regiment of Foot.

First Regiment, or The Royal Regiment--In the Centre of their Colours, the King's Cypher, within the Circle of St. Andrew and Crown over it. --In the three corners of the Second Colour, the Thistle and Crown.--The Distinction of the Colours of the Second battalion is a flaming Ray of Gold descending from the upper corner of each Colour towards the centre.

On the Grenadier Caps, the same Device, as in the centre of the Colours; White Horse and the King's Motto over it, on the little Flap.

The Drums and Bells of Arms to have the same Device painted on them, with the Number or Rank of the Regiment under it (Lawson 1963:100).

A clearer description of the appearance of the regimental flag revealing the various colors for the First or Royal Regiment of Foot is:

Blue, with G R in gold on blue field within the green circle of St. Andrew. In the three corners a crown and thistle proper. The colours of the 2nd Battalion are distinguished by a flaming ray of gold, as the pile wavy is here called; scroll without motto (Lawson 1963:172).

In Albany, New York, on May 5th, 1759, an order was issued regarding regulations for British troops in America which provides details of dress:

...officers will take fusil, no sashes but gorgets, either swords or hangers, as commanding officers of battalions shall direct. Regiments to take their colours into the field, the sergeants to carry firelocks, instead of halberts, with cartouche box and bayonet instead of sword, the soldiers no swords nor sword belt, if they can carry their bayonet securely without them; one Drummer per company; the remaining drummers to be put in the ranks; the Grenadiers to take their swords and caps into the field; no woman to be permitted to go with the regiments or to follow (Lawson 1963:46).

As was mentioned previously, the 77th Highlanders of Montgomery were specifically exempted from the regulation regarding no swords. More specific details of uniform are provided by an order regarding the dress of the light infantry which was approved by General Amhurst and Major-General Wolfe:

...the sleeves of the coat are put on the waistcoat, and instead of coat sleeves he has two wings like the Grenadiers, but fuller; and a round slope reaching about halfway down his arm; which makes his coat of no encumbrance to him, but can be slipt off with pleasure; he has no lace, but the lapels remain; besides the usual pockets, he has two not quite so high as his breast, made of leather, for ball and flints; and a flap of red cloth on the inside, which secures the ball from rolling out, if he should fall. His knapsack is carried very high between his shoulders, and is fastened with a strap of web over his shoulder, as the Indians carry their pack. His cartouch box hangs under his arm on the left

side, slung with a leathern strap, and his horn under the other arm on the right, hanging by a narrower web than that used for his knapsack; his canteen down his back, under his knapsack, and covered with cloth, he has a rough case for his tomahawk with a button, and it hangs in a leathern sling down his side, like a hanger, between his coat and waistcoat, no bayonet, his leggins have leathern straps under his shoes, like spatterdashes; his hat is made into a cap with a flap and a button and with as much black cloth added as will come under his chin and keep him warm when he lies down; it hooks in the front, and is made like the old velvet caps in England (Lawson 1963:47).

When Montgomery moved from Ninety Six to Fort Prince George, he marched at the head of the light infantry corps, and the details presented here may be of help in working out interpretive explanations of the appearance of Montgomery's force (SCG, June 14, 1760). Illustrations in the Frontispiece and in Figure 1 should also be of value in this regard.

#### The Third Regiment of Foot (The Buffs) - Garrisoned at Fort Prince George

From the Royal Clothing Warrant of 1751 we learn of the regimental flag for the Third Regiment of Foot (The Buffs), known to have been at Fort Prince George in 1760 (SCG, July 19, 1760).

The Buffs. In the centre of their Colours, the Dragon, being the ancient Badge, and the Rose and Crown in the Three corners of their Second Colour.

On the Grenadier Caps the Dragon; White Horse and King's Motto on the Flap.

The same Badge of the Dragon to be painted on their Drums and Bells of Arms, with the Rank of the Regiment underneath (Lawson 1963:100).

The tuft of the grenadier cap, as shown in Morier's paintings from the early 1750's, is white (Lawson 1963:30). A cap of an officer of the 3rd Foot or "Buffs" is still in existence:

...having a front 10 1/2 inches of buff velvet, in the centre of which is the Dragon, worked in light coloured



silks picked out with orange and green scales, within a crimson Garter. On either side of this is heavy gold embroidery and a rococo design in some thin white metal resembling sequins; this is edged with gold and roses of red and white silk are also introduced into the design. The little flap is crimson having the white horse and the label has the motto worked in gold.\* The crown of the cap is crimson with gold embroidered scrolls and tuft. The turn-up is buff velvet, having the numeral III and a sword and musket saltire worked in gold (Lawson 1963:30).

\*The motto "Nec Aspera Terrent" (Lawson 1963:29-30).

### Some Notes on the Appearance of the Troops of Grant's Expedition

#### The 17th Regiment of Foot

The tuft on the top of the grenadier cap is green and white (Lawson 1963:31).

The color of the facings of the coat is white, with the distinction in the same color being greyish white (Lawson 1963:103).

#### The 22nd Regiment of Foot

The facings for the regiment in 1749 was reddish buff (Lawson 1963:93).

The color of the facings for the regiment in 1751 was buff (Lawson 1963:102).

#### The Provincials, Rangers, and Indians

Considerable research is necessary before a picture of the dress of these troops could be known sufficiently to allow for interpretation in drawings and dioramas. Such research should be done, however, before such interpretation is undertaken.

Bibliography - Chapters 1 through 6

Abbreviations Used:

BPRO British Public Records Office  
JCHA Journal of the Commons House of Assembly  
SCA South Carolina Archives  
SCG South Carolina Gazette

References:

Barnes, Major R. Money

1967 Regiments and Uniforms of the British Army. Plate V, Figs. 11 and 12. Seeley Service & Co., Ltd., London.

Cann, Marvin L.

1969 "Old Ninety Six in the Revolution." M.S., Star Fort Commission, Greenwood County, S. C.

Corkran, David

1962 The Cherokee Frontier. University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Easterby, J. H. (Editor)

1951 The Colonial Records of South Carolina, The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 10, 1736-June 7, 1739. Historical Commission of S. C., Columbia.

Julien, Carl

1937 "Historical Sketch of Greenwood." The Index Journal, June 27. Greenwood, S. C.

Lawson, Cecil C. P.

1963 A History of the Uniforms of the British Army, From the Beginnings to 1760. Vol. II, Norman Military Publications Limited, London.

Logan, John H.

1859 A History of the Upper Country of South Carolina from the Earliest Periods to the Close of the War of Independence. S. G. Courtenay & Co., Charleston.

McDowell, William L., Jr. (Editor)

1958 Colonial Records of South Carolina, Documents relating to Indian Affairs May 21, 1750-August 7, 1754. South Carolina Archives Department, Columbia.

1970 Colonial Records of South Carolina, Documents relating to Indian Affairs, 1754-1765. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Meriwether, Robert L.

1940 The Expansion of South Carolina 1729-1765. Southern Publishers, Inc., Kingsport, Tennessee.

Salley, A. S., Jr.

1917 George Hunter's Map of the Cherokee Country and the Path thereto in 1730. Bulletins of the Historical Commission of South Carolina, No. 4. Columbia.

#### Research Sources:

##### South Carolina Archives

The Amherst Letters. 2 reels of microfilm.

Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1692-1775. 40 vols.

Journal of the Council, and Journal of the Upper House of Assembly, 1721-1775. Together 38 vols. and loose pages of photostats.

Major Alexander Money Penny Original Diary Cherokee Wars with Southern Colonies 1761. Microfilm on file.

Recorded Colonial Plats, Columbia Series, 1731-1775. 21 bound vols.

Records of the British Public Records Office Relating to South Carolina, 1663-1782. Copies of, bound in 36 vols. as Public Records of South Carolina.

South Carolina Gazette, 1731-1775.

Wills, Charleston County, January 9, 1732/3-March 20, 1784. 16 manuscript vols.

##### South Carolina Library

The Index-Journal, 1919 thru Present. Greenwood, S. C.

## II -- THE VILLAGE

7

### THE TOWN OF NINETY SIX - THE COURTHOUSE AND JAIL

#### The Beginning of the Town of Ninety Six

With the close of 1761 and the signing of the peace treaty with the Cherokees, the information from Ninety Six becomes scanty indeed. On June 20, 1762, Cherokee warriors, escorted by Capt. Mackintosh from Fort Prince George, arrived at Fort Ninety Six with a number of naked White prisoners taken during the Cherokee War. Fortunately, relatives and friends of the prisoners happened to be on hand at Ninety Six when they arrived and took charge of the prisoners until they could be exchanged for Cherokee prisoners held for the past two years at Charleston. Word was sent of their arrival, and on July 10th the Indian prisoners left Charleston for Ninety Six for the exchange. While awaiting the arrival of the Indian prisoners from Charleston, the Cherokee escorts used the time to hunt for game in the vicinity of Ninety Six (SCG, July 3, 10, 1762).

This postscript to the Cherokee War is the final word for that era at Ninety Six. We know only a few scattered facts about this period, such as, that in 1764 James Mayson at Ninety Six was subscribing to the South Carolina Gazette, and in October of that year Andrew Williamson was also at Ninety Six, and Robert Goudy found two stray horses and advertised for their owner to pick them up (SCG, August 25, October 1, 1764). In the following year a letter from Ninety Six reported that there were still a great number of villians in the area, openly and boldly violating the law (SCG, June 14, 1765). However, Robert Goudy continued to

successfully operate his business, and at the time he made his will in 1775, he divided his holdings equally between his wife Mary and his son James and daughter Sarah, and left 200 pounds currency each to his three Indian daughters, Peggy, Kiunagree, and Nancy (SCA, Wills, Charleston County, 1774-79:303).

On July 21, 1767, a significant land transaction took place which was to have an important role in the development of a settlement to the north of Fort Ninety Six, which was to be known as the village of Ninety Six. In 1751, John Hamilton's "Great Survey" line had been run bordering on the north side of Robert Goudy's "Ninety Six Plantation," as his property was known in 1767. Fort Ninety Six had, of course, been on Robert Goudy's land at the trading post and barn site, but the new settlement, to be known as Ninety Six, was to develop on this land above Fort Ninety Six, on what was once part of "Hamilton's Great Survey" (Meriwether 1940: 126; SCA, Charleston Deeds, I-3:11-17, June 21, 1767). This transaction was the sale of 400 acres by John Murray and his wife to John Savage (for £200), which Murray had obtained from John Hamilton in 1755, being part of his "Great Survey" of 2000 acres (SCA, Charleston Deeds, T-4:492-96, Nov. 28, 1755; I-3:11-17, June 21, 1767). During the nine years following this 1767 transaction, John Savage apparently sold lots along the Charleston Road for a distance of 400 feet and had set aside ten acres of the 400 acre tract:

for the town lotts, streets & public lands whereon the Court-house and gaol now standeth (SCA, Charleston Deeds, G-5:376; P-4:461, 467, September 9, 1776).

This 1776 transaction was a one year lease on the remaining 390 acres not in the town, to Tacitus and Isaac Gaillard. The development of the

town of Ninety Six on this ten acre tract, which bordered on a creek to be known as "Town Boundary Branch," was closely related to the building of a courthouse and jail in 1772 (SCA, Acts of the General Assembly, 1769-1777, C.O. 5:424. Hereinafter cited as AGA, SCA, Confiscated Estates, James Holmes, 1783).

#### The Jail at Ninety Six

On July 29, 1769, an act was proposed for establishing courts, building jails, and appointing sheriffs and other officers in the province, and the announcement of its approval was made in February 1770 (SCA, Journal of the Commons House of Assembly. Hereinafter cited as JCHA, XXXVIII:273-75). The courthouses were to be built in a plain strong manner of wood (SCA, Commons House Journal, XXXVIII:305). In the General Assembly of January 1772, an act regarding a courthouse and jail for the Ninety Six District specified that they should be built "within a mile of the place where Fort Ninety Six stood" (SCA, Acts 1769-77; C.O. 5:424). In the same month five of the districts had nearly finished the courthouses and jails allotted to them (SCA, British Public Records Office. Hereinafter cited as BPRO, XXXIII:113). The courthouse and jail were apparently completed by 1774, for in that year Thomas Fee, an Augusta blacksmith, was imprisoned in the jail at Ninety Six for killing Mad Turkey, an Oakfuskie chief. Angry frontiersmen soon forced the jail, however, and released Fee (Alden 1944:307). In 1775 the jail was said to have been of brick, with the courthouse apparently of frame construction, for it was said not to have been musket proof (Drayton 1821:387; SCA, JCHA, XXXIX:200). The jail was described as having four windows and a shingled roof at this time (Drayton 1821:387).

In February 1779, David Fanning was imprisoned in the Ninety Six jail and gave a description of some of the details of its construction:

...I was chained and ironed as before, in the centre of a room 30 feet square; forty-five from the ground, the snow beating in, through the roof, with four grates open night and day.... I got my chains off in the night of the 12th; the Gaoler did not chain me down again... (Clark 1904:188).

Fanning escaped on the night of February 13, 1779, by going down stairs and breaking out through the back of the chimney (Clark 1904:188). These details, along with comparative drawings and photographs of jails built during the same period, should permit interpretive drawings to be made of the Ninety Six jail that would be reasonably accurate.

We have a description of the town of Ninety Six as it appeared in 1780 to a soldier, Lt. Anthony Allaire of The American Volunteers, under Capt. DePeyster of Ferguson's Corps. He arrived at Ninety Six on June 22nd, 1780, and described the town.

It is a village or country town--contains about twelve dwelling houses, a court-house and a jail, in which are confined about forty Rebels, brought in prisoners by the friends to Government, who have just now got the opportunity, and gladly embrace it, many of them having been obliged before this to hide in swamps to keep from prison themselves. Ninety Six is situated on an eminence, the land cleared for a mile around it, in a flourishing part of the country, supplied with very good water, enjoys a free, open air, and is esteemed a healthy place. Here were condemned seventy-five friends to Government at one court; five were executed--the others got reprieved.

On Saturday, the 24th, Allaire:

Took quarters in town, opposite the jail, where I have the constant view of the Rebels peeping through the grates, which affords some satisfaction to see them suffer for their folly. Some of them are magistrates; one the executioner of the five that were hanged here some time in April, 1779 (Draper 1954:498).

The jail figured prominently in the Tory-Whig encounter at Ninety Six in 1775, when it was fortified with a swivel gun in each of the four

windows (Drayton 1821:387). It also was a prominent feature during the 1780 seige of the Royal Provincial held town of Ninety Six by General Nathaniel Greene of the American army, when it was fortified (MacKenzie 1787:143). Archeological work on the site has revealed a brick filled cellar and a bastion-shaped fortification ditch around the exposed western side of the jail site (Figure 3). The site of the jail was determined through a study of the maps, the earliest of which is based on data dating as early as the 1770's (Figure 2).

#### The Courthouse at Ninety Six

The courthouse was built of wood, probably weatherboarded, and was mentioned in 1780 during the fortification of the town of Ninety Six by Lt. Col. John Harris Cruger:

I have palisaded ye Courthouse & the principal houses in about one hundred yards square, with Block House flankers... (Greenwood County Library, BPRO, Cornwallis Papers, 50/11/2, F220, Cruger to Cornwallis, October 13, 1780. Hereinafter cited as GCL).

Another witness says:

Colonel Cruger has enclosed the Court House & some other Houses that joined it within a square stockade, flanked by Blockhouses (GCL, BPRO, Cornwallis Papers, 30/11/2, F307, October 29, 1780).

From these references we learn that the courthouse and houses joining it were palisaded inside a square stockade by Cruger in 1780, but there is no mention of the jail being so stockaded. Archeological work on the site is beginning to locate the palisade ditches, fortification ditches, firing wall ditches built under the direction of Cruger, and later, in December 1780 and the early months of 1781, under orders from Lt. Henry Haldane, Aid de Camp to General Cornwallis (MacKenzie 1787:143); (Figure 3).



In addition to the above references to the courthouse, we learn that it was used as a barracks during the occupation of the town by the Royal Provincials under Cruger.

...the court house is an excellent Barrack in the center of the village sufficient for two hundred men... (SCA, Cornwallis Papers, Balfour to Cornwallis, June 24, 1780:193).

The courthouse was constructed of wood, and very likely did not have a cellar. The area of the site where the courthouse might be expected to be found has experienced considerable erosion, so the footings on which it sat were likely destroyed by the plow long ago, thus leaving few if any clues to its location. However, dwelling houses in the area may have had cellar storage areas, and if enough of these are found, perhaps the probable position of the courthouse can be determined through the absence of a cellar. More specific conjecture as to the courthouse location, therefore, must await extensive archeology on the site.

#### The Village of Ninety Six - The Maps

As we have seen, the village of Ninety Six began sometime after 1767, on ten acres of land set aside for the purpose by John Savage who purchased a 400 acre tract at that time (SCA, Charleston Deeds, G-5:376; P-4:461, 467, Sept. 9, 1776; I-3:11-17, June 21, 1767). By 1775 the courthouse and jail were built in the village (SCA, JCHA, XXXIX:200, Feb. 14, 1775). A map of the town, supposedly drawn from records of William Henry Drayton, dating from the period of 1775, reveals the location of "96 Court House," "Brick Gaol," and illustrates two small structures, apparently representing the town of Ninety Six (Drayton 1821:389); (Figure 2). If this map is to be considered literally correct, we see only the courthouse and jail plus two houses in Ninety Six in 1775 (Figure 2).

Figure 2

Maps of Ninety Six, Illustrating the Evolution from  
1822. See bibliography for the source of the maps.

However, by 1780, when Lt. Allaire saw the town, he reported that it was a village or country town containing about 12 houses, with the courthouse and jail (Draper 1954:498). William Johnson's map of the town, published in 1822, reveals 12 houses and one small outbuilding, besides the courthouse and jail, only four of these being located to the south of the junction of the Charleston Road with the road to Cambridge (Johnson 1822: between 140-41); (Figure 2). Only two of these are shown between the courthouse and the intersection of the roads. On Lossing's map of 1851 there are 15 houses shown, with ten of these located south of the junction of the Charleston Road with the road to Cambridge, over twice as many as shown by Johnson in 1821. Also, there are now five houses illustrated as being between the courthouse and the intersection of the roads, instead of only two (Lossing 1851:691); (Figure 2). This difference may indicate that between the time of publication of Johnson's map and the publication of Lossing's version, corrections were made by those who had known the town at the time of the Revolution, and a more proper relationship of buildings was attempted. It is interesting to note, besides the difference in the relationship of the houses to the courthouse, that two structures shown on the Cambridge Road on the 1822 map are not present on the 1851 map. A map of Ninety Six, published in 1902 by McCrady, shows 11 houses and an outbuilding, revealing in their positioning, an origin in the 1822 map of Johnson (McCrady 1902:279). In 1909 a new version of the map was published, showing 12 houses, with the added feature of a seven pointed star fort within a zig-zag abatis, not shown on earlier versions of the map (Avery 1909:294). In 1958 Henry Steele Commager and Richard B. Morris used this 1909 improved version of the map as an

illustration in their book (Commager and Morris 1958:1180); (Figure 2).

In order to answer the question as to which map is the most accurate, we naturally turn to the earlier versions. We know from the archeology on the site that the 1822 Johnson map is considerably out of scale as far as the size of the palisade line around the town is concerned, and that the shape of the palisade line, as well as the omission of the proper seven points plus entranceway on the Star Fort, indicates that this earliest map was apparently made from memory. This is obvious when we compare the map with the actual position of the archeological features thus far recovered on the site (Figure 5). This error in scale may have resulted in later authors attempting to correct this mistake through re-positioning of the buildings shown as being inside the town. In dealing with a map for Ninety Six for general purposes of interpretation, we like to use the evolved Commager and Morris version of 1958, based on the 1909 Avery map (Figure 2). The reason for this is the fact that the proper shape of the Star Fort is shown. However, for determination of how many houses were located in Ninety Six at the time of the Revolution and what their relationship was to the courthouse and jail, we must await detailed archeology on the site. The jail site has been located, as well as specific fortification ditches and palisade lines, but specific information on the positioning of houses and outbuildings, privies, and other features, is yet to be discovered (Figure 5).

From the series of maps shown in Figure 2, we see that, with the exception of the 1821 Drayton map that may or may not represent the site of Ninety Six in 1775, all the maps are based on the 1822 Johnson map (Drayton 1821:389; Johnson 1822:140-41). As has been pointed out

previously, the archeology on the site has revealed that this map is obviously based on memory and verbal descriptions. There should have been a map of Ninety Six made by the British during their occupation of the area, but such a map has yet to be discovered. Besides the difference between the placement and number of houses shown on the 1822 and 1851 maps already mentioned, there are other changes of interest that occurred as the documents and maps were examined by various historians during the past 170 years.

#### The 1851 Lossing Map

1. Dots were added around the line enclosing the town, apparently in attempt to imply or represent palisades.
2. The 19 points on the Star Redoubt are reduced to ten.
3. The contour lines forming a double circle around the Star Redoubt on the 1822 map are reduced to a single solid circle.

#### The 1902 McCrady Map

1. The 19 points on the Star Redoubt are increased to 20.
2. This is basically a better copy of the 1822 map that was the 1851 map.

#### The 1909 Avery Map

1. The points on the Star Redoubt are reduced to the correct seven in number, a point any of the previous map makers could have seen had they observed the Star Fort and counted the points. The eighth point, which produces the symmetry, is an open entrance into the star.
2. "Old Jail" on the earlier maps was changed by Avery to read "Jail, fortified"; "The besieging encampments" is changed to read "American Camps"; "The Lines enclosing the Town" is changed to "Stockade", and then two entirely new features are designated. These are "Covered way from Stockade to Fort", and "Abatis". These changes were based on verbal descriptions in documents of the era. The abatis designation new refers to the many pointed star around the seven pointed star of the Star Redoubt.

3. The zig-zag, original many-pointed star, now symbolizing abatis, is continued around the entire area of the town, based on references that this was the case. Archeology, however, has revealed more evidence for the straight ditches representing palisades than evidence for abatis.
4. The covered way is given an added treatment in this map by Avery, by having parallel lines crossing the two long lines representing the covered way on the earlier map. We get the impression by this treatment that Avery thought the "covered way" had reference to a literal covering of some sort, which he has attempted to indicate by the short parallel lines. A covered way, of course, has reference to a ditch with an embankment on each side to provide protective cover for those moving from one place to another inside the ditch.
5. The mine, shown until this time as a "D" shaped symbol, is here changed to a circle with a cross through it.

#### The 1958 Commager and Morris Map

1. On this map we see the mid-twentieth century stylization of the Ninety Six map of 1822 at its ultimate development. The map is closely based on Avery's 1909 map and is an excellent means of generally representing the features at the Ninety Six Site, incorporating as it does, documentary details not present on the earlier 1822 map, and thus is more in keeping with the verbal descriptions, as well as the appearance of the Star Redoubt itself. As good as it is, however, it is still a far cry from the actual plan of the fortifications as they are now being revealed through archeology, as can be seen by studying the various figures illustrating the actual specific location of ditches and palisades.

Specific differences discovered through archeology so far are:

1. The east line of the fortification does not extend in a straight line from the Charleston Road to the Star Redoubt as is shown on all the maps since the original 1822 version. Rather, it parallels the Charleston Road just back of the row of houses along the east side of that road, then opposite the intersection it angles toward the Star Redoubt.
2. An early palisade, probably Cruger's of 1780, has been found to enclose an area around the houses only, with the outer palisade shown on the maps representing what is thought to be an outer defense ordered by Lt. Haldane when he visited the site in December 1780 (MacKenzie 1787:143); (Figure 3).
3. The fort symbol for the "Stockade Fort" of the 1822 map, having four corner bastions or blockhouses, is now known to be a symbol

and not a representation of the actual appearance of the fort. The fort, a two bastioned hornwork represented by a fortification ditch and firing wall ditches, has been found at the site of the fort, known at the time of its capture by "Light Horse Harry Lee" in 1781, as "Holmes' Fort" (Mackenzie 1787:155; Seymour 1910:28); (see Figure 4 for drawing of Holmes' Fort).

4. Blockhouses are known from the documents to have been flanking the palisade at Ninety Six, but no indication of these was attempted on the 1822 map. Holmes' Fort is known to have had two blockhouses inside of it. A cellar hole has been found just north of the intersection of the roads in Ninety Six, surrounded by large fortification ditches, palisade ditches, and firing wall ditches, all pointing to this cellar as a magazine or blockhouse site (see Figure 3 for map of the work done in this area).

These differences, already discovered, between what was actually at Ninety Six, and the picture we get from the documents and the 1822 map alone, are sufficient to reveal that the 1822 map, and subsequently all those maps based on it, are only generally accurate, for that map was created from memory some 40 years after the features it attempts to illustrate were totally or partially destroyed, intentionally, by Cruger and through the erosion of time. Hopefully, the series of maps now being drawn from archeological evidence will lay a new foundation of understanding of the site of Ninety Six for the use of future historians, whom it is hoped, will no longer be forced to copy, and add to, the 1822 map of Johnson for their illustration of the site on which such significant historic events took place.

Bibliography - Chapter 7

Abbreviations Used:

- AGA Acts of the General Assembly  
BPRO British Public Records Office  
GCL Greenwood County Library  
JCHA Journal of Commons House of Assembly  
SCA South Carolina Archives  
SCG South Carolina Gazette

References:

Alden, John R.

- 1944 John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Avery, Elroy McKendree

- 1909 A History of the United States and its People. The Burrows Brothers Co., Cleveland.

Clark, Walter (Editor)

- 1904 The State Records of North Carolina. Greensboro.

Commager, Henry Steele and Richard B. Morris

- 1958 The Spirit of 'Seventy-Six. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., New York.

Draper, Lyman C.

- 1881 King's Mountain and its Heroes: History of the Battle of King's Mountain, October 7th, 1780, and the Events which Led to it. P. G. Thompson, Cincinnati.

Drayton, John

- 1821 Memoirs of the American Revolution. A. E. Miller, Charleston, S. C.

Johnson, William

- 1822 Sketches of the Life and Correspondence of Nathanael Greene. A. E. Miller, Charleston, S. C.



Lossing, B. J.

1851 The Pictorial Field Book of the Revolutionary War. Harper & Brothers, New York.

MacKenzie, Roderick

1787 Strictures on Lt. Col. Tarleton's History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781, in the Southern Provinces of North America. R. Faulder, London.

McCrary, Edward

1902 The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1780-1783. Macmillian & Co., Ltd., London.

Meriwether, Robert L.

1940 The Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765. Southern Publishers, Inc., Kingsport, Tennessee.

Seymour, William

1910 A Journal of the Southern Expedition, 1780-1783. Historical and Biographical Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington.

Research Sources:

Greenwood County Library

British Public Records Office, Cornwallis Papers.

South Carolina Archives

Acts of the General Assembly. Found under Public Record Office, 1 reel microfilm.

Charleston Deeds, 1719-1800. 21 boxes, 714 reels.

Confiscated Estates, 1780-1790. Under Legislative Acts.

Cornwallis Papers, c.1778-1784. 1 box, 4 reels.

Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1692-1775. 40 vols.

Records in the British Public Records Office Relating to South Carolina, 1663-1782. Copies of, bound in 36 vols. as Public Records of South Carolina.

South Carolina Gazette, 1731-1775.

### III -- CHOOSING SIDES

8

#### "A WARM ENGAGEMENT" AT NINETY SIX - THE FIRST BATTLE OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE SOUTH-AT WILLIAMSON'S FORT

With the courthouse and jail at Ninety Six built by 1773 at the junction of the Charleston Road with the Road to Augusta, the settlement of Ninety Six began to grow around this nucleus, so that by 1775, there may have been a half dozen houses in a row along the Charleston Road.\* By the eve of the Revolution on April 25, 1775, a Committee of Intelligence was created in Charleston:

to correspond with, and communicate to, the inhabitants of the interior and back parts of this colony, every king of necessary information... (Gibbes 1855:107).

Eight men, including William Henry Drayton and Reverend William Tennent, were members of this Committee of Intelligence. Unknown to them at the time, the battles of Lexington and Concord had been fought only a few days earlier, and the members of this committee would soon become involved in "a grand epoch in the history of mankind" (Gibbes 1855:107-09). The news that "the sword of civil war, is ... drawn ... [and] stained with blood!" did not reach the Committee of Intelligence and William Henry Drayton until May 11th, having taken over two weeks to make the journey by horseback from Connecticut (Gibbes 1855:82-91, 107; Drayton 1821:248).

After the news was received there was no general rush to take action. However, on June 14th the Council of Safety, chosen by the Provincial

\*Bruce Ezell has pointed out that most maps show only four roads converging at Ninety Six, with Mills' Atlas indicating six roads in 1820. He states that there were at Ninety Six the Charleston Road, the Martintown (Augusta) Road, the Road to Keowee, Island Ford Road, Long Cane Road, and probably a road to Granby or Columbia.

Congress, began controlling the affairs regarding the dispute between Great Britain and the American Colonies. The Continental Congress shaped and signed "an association ... solemnly engaging their lives and fortunes," which was soon signed by most of the people of Charleston and transmitted into the interior (Gibbes 1855:109-10; Drayton 1821:254-55). The signing of this "Association" was to become the means whereby those in favor of the American Colonies taking a firm stand were separated from those who favored the King. Steps were taken by the Council of Safety on June 26th to insure that the forts held by the King's men were put into the hands of those who favored the American cause. Major James Mayson, with two troops of Rangers under Captains Caldwell and Kirkland, seized Fort Charlotte on the Savannah west of Ninety Six and found "two brass field-pieces, fourteen iron cannon, 6, 4, and 2 pounders--1,750 pounds weight of gunpowder--500 pounds more, somewhat damaged--270 iron shot, for cannon--and a quantity of lead." He then went to Ninety Six Court House, taking with him 250 pounds of powder and 500 pounds of lead, arriving there on the 14th of July (Drayton 1821:317-18). Such actions put significant military stores in the hands of those supporting the American Colonies in any engagement against those favoring the King.

However, Major Mayson was not to hold his powder for long, for not far away were militiamen under Terry, Robinson, and Cunningham who had received a message from Captain Moses Kirkland, one of Mayson's officers at Ninety Six, that he wanted to change sides and would be agreeable to their taking back the powder and lead taken from Fort Charlotte. With this assurance of inside help with their venture, these men rode with 200 horsemen to Ninety Six, arriving there about noon on July 17th. They immediately placed Major Mayson in the Ninety Six jail, took possession

of the powder and lead, and charged Mayson with robbing the King's fort (Drayton 1821:322).

With such actions taking place in the back country of South Carolina, it was clear that not everyone in the area was eager to sign the "Association." In order to counteract any further actions of this kind and to "explain to the people the causes of the present disputes," William Henry Drayton and Reverend William Tennent were ordered on July 23rd by the Council of Safety to go to the back country (Gibbes 1855:105-06). They took with them copies of "The Provincial Association" for the signatures of all those who could be "harranged" into signing (Gibbes 1855:129).

#### The Provincial Association

##### South Carolina

The actual commencement of hostilities against this Continent by the British troops, in the bloody scene on the 19th of April last, near Boston--the increase of arbitrary impositions from a wicked and despotic Ministry--and the dread of insurrections in the Colonies--are causes, sufficient to drive an oppressed people, to the use of arms. We, therefore, the Subscribers, inhabitants of South Carolina, holding ourselves bound by that most sacred of all obligations, the duty of good citizens towards an unjured country, and thoroughly convinced, that, under our present distressed circumstances, we shall be justified before God and man, in resisting force by force--do unite ourselves, under every tie of religion and honour, and associate as a band in her defense, against every foe--hereby, solemnly engaging, that whenever our Continental or Provincial Councils, shall decree it necessary, we will go forth, and be ready to sacrifice our lives and fortunes to secure her freedom and safety. This obligation, to continue in force, until a reconciliation shall take place, between Great Britian and America; upon constitutional principles--an event which we most ardently desire. And, we will hold all those persons inimical to the liberty of the Colonies, who shall refuse to subscribe this Association (Drayton 1821:285-86).

Feelings were running high in Charleston by the second week in August, and those with Tory sympathies were not safe from the violence

of their neighbors, and tar and feathers were resorted to as an inducement for the signing of this document (Gibbes 1855:139). Meanwhile, Tennent and Drayton had found that there was a plot to surprise Fort Charlotte and again place it in the King's service. As to the success of their harrangues, they reported:

We are hemming in the Dissidents on all sides, as much as possible; but their leaders seem determined if possible to bring the people to draw blood, before they have time to be enlightened (Drayton 1821:413).

At the end of August Drayton issued a declaration to outlaw as public enemies all those who took up arms under the defected Moses Kirkland (Drayton 1821:381-82). By September 11th Drayton had established his headquarters at Ninety Six, where he was encamped with about 220 men and four pieces of cannon, which he reported, had terrified the King's men under their leader, Fletchall. Fletchall's men were reported to be planning an attack on Drayton, but this did not materialize. Drayton assured the Council of Safety that he would restore the country to a state of quietude "by eradicating the opposition" (Gibbes 1855:171-73). In preparing for this expected attack, Drayton said:

...the court house was not musket proof--and the prison could not contain a third of our men ... I fortified the prison by mounting a gun in each room below, in each of which I placed a small guard; I lodged the powder in the dungeon. Nothing but setting the prison on fire could force it. In the mean time the body of horse had halted, and I sent Major Mayson to post them in ambuscade at a ford on Saluda, about six miles off. After dark, I marched 100 infantry about a mile and a half from Ninety Six, and posted them to the best advantage in ambush on this side (Gibbes 1855:174).

Tension continued, and on September 17th Drayton reported that his army numbered some 900 strong, and Fletchall's camp contained from 1200 to 1400 men (Gibbes 1855:187). However, there was no battle between the

Tories camped on the opposite side of the Saluda River and the force of Drayton camped three-quarters of a mile from Ninety Six on the Island Ford Road, even though Drayton's men were impatient to be led into a fight (Gibbes 1855:188); (Figure 2). Instead, on September 16th the Treaty of Ninety Six was signed by representatives of both groups which resulted in the dispersal of the forces for the time being (Gibbes 1855:184).

One month later, on October 14, 1775, the Council of Safety appointed Drayton as one of the Commissioners for erecting a redoubt for the protection of Charleston, and he left Andrew Williamson in charge of the militia in the area of Ninety Six (Gibbes 1855:206-07). Williamson reported that "everything seems in perfect tranquility...." However, this tranquility was not to last, due in part to the fact that Robert Cunningham had refused to sign the Treaty of Ninety Six drawn up by Drayton, and so was taken prisoner and put in jail in Charleston. His friends and brother, Patrick Cunningham, sought reprisal for Robert's arrest and seized 1000 pounds of powder being sent to the Cherokee Indians by the Council of Safety through an agreement hoping to insure the neutrality of the Indians in the months to come. This action, plus the fact that Cunningham's force was growing larger daily, prompted the Provincial Congress to send Captains Richardson, Thompson, Neel, Thomas, Major James Mayson, and Major Andrew Williamson, with some 500 men, to intercept the Tory force (South Carolina Library, U.S.C., S.C. & American Gazette, December 8, 1775. Hereinafter cited as SCL and SCAG).

Major Williamson was in charge of the force which reinforced Fort Charlotte with militia and provisions to withstand a possible attack. While there he learned that a Tory force of some 1500 were gathering and planning

to cross the Saluda near Ninety Six. Williamson held a council of war with Major Mayson and all the captains in which it was determined to march against the much larger force. Consequently, on the morning of the 19th of November Williamson's force left Fort Charlotte for Ninety Six with their baggage and provision, arriving with their force of 500 men at daybreak (SCL, SCAG: December 8, 1775; Gibbes 1855:215). Major Mayson described the preparations before the battle:

At first consultation with Major Williamson, we agreed to march and meet the opposite party and give them battle; but, upon consideration, we thought it most prudent to march all our men to Col. Savages' old field, near Ninety Six, as our numbers were small, compared with the other party, and to fortify the same with the rails thereabouts. We arrived there about day break, and in about two hours a square of one hundred and eighty-five yards, was fortified in such a manner as to keep off the enemy... (Gibbes 1855:215-16).

Another account of the fortification which was to come to be known as "Williamson's Fort" is given in a newspaper summary:

...having received certain Intelligence that the Enemy were within a few miles of them hastily erected a slight, square Breastwork of old Fence Rails, joined to a Barn on a Spot of cleared Ground, on which, in proper places, they fixed a few Swivel Guns. On the next Day, and before the Breastwork was quite finished, they were surrounded by about 2000 of the Malcontents, that were led on by Major Joseph Robinson, who sent a Message to Majors Mayson and Williamson, desiring that they and their Men should lay down their Arms, and surrender themselves Prisoners, which was rejected with Disdain. The Gaol, which is about 300 yards distant from the Fort, was taken Possession of by Robinson's Party, who had likewise cut off all Communication between the stockade and the only spring.... (SCL, SCAG: December 8, 1775).

Major Andrew Williamson's account reports on the first preparations and events after their arrival at Ninety Six at dawn:

...and in about three hours erected a kind of fortification of old fence rails joined to a barn and some out houses, which before we had quite completed they had surrounded us with a large body of men

with drums and colors. I then sent out an officer to demand their intention, who on his return reported that Major Robinson and Mr. Patrick Cunningham refused to have any conference but with the commanding officers. I then sent out Major Mayson and Mr. Bowie, whom they sent and Mr. Evan McLaurin met between their men and the fort in sight of both, and after about fifteen minutes conference they returned, and reported that they insisted on our immediately delivering up our arms to them and dispersing; which were the only terms they were determined to grant us, and that at parting they told them to keep our people within the fort, which was the only place where they could be safe; and immediately they took two of our people just by the fort, before my face, whom I gave orders to retake, and a warm engagement ensued, which continued with very little intermission from three o'clock in the afternoon of Sunday, until Tuesday sunset... (Gibbes 1855:218).

A letter from an officer inside the fort provides us with some additional detail from the second day of the battle:

On the second Day after the Engagement began, they (Robinson's Men) set fire to the Fences and old Grass in the Fields all round us, with an Intent to burn up our Fort, which consisted only of old dry Fence Rails, and attack us from behind the Smoak; but the Ground was to wet, and saved us the Trouble of extinguishing the Fire, which we intended to do at any Risk. When they found that Plan defeated, they set to work, and made some Kind of a rolling Battery, behind which they intended to come up and set fire to Col. Savages' Barn, and so burn us up; but this they afterwards dropt, and set Fire to their Engine themselves. Just as they hung out a Flag for a Cessation of Hostilities, it was resolved in a Council of War to make a vigorous Sally about Midnight, and Captains Pickens, Middleton, Robert Anderson, Singerfield and Colson, from Georgia, with twenty picked Men each, were appointed for that Service, and were to attack them in five different Quarters at the same Time. When they went out each Captain was to reconnoitre the Quarter he was to attack, and then his Fire who attacked at the greatest Distance was to be the Signal to the others, who were each to endeavor making one sure Fire, and immediately retreat into what the other Party called our Fort. We have since learned that their Reason for offering a Cessation of Arms was owing to some of our People, who were absent on Furlow when the Affair began, returning to their Duty with as many more as they could raise, and engaging them in some small Skirmishes and harrassing them on the Outside and their learning from a Deserter of us our intended Sally... (SCL, SCAG, December 8, 1775).

From Gibbes (1855:253) we learn that it was John M. Williams who fabricated the machine of "Engine" that had been designed to burn Williamson's



straw, rail, and cowhide fort.

From the account of the officer inside the fort, we discover that there were plans for using the Indians against the King's loyal subjects, and to aid the Indians in distinguishing the Associators from the King's men, the Associators were to wear:

a Piece of Bear's Skin, a Deer's Tail, or a Piece of white Paper wore in their Hats...(SCL, SCAG, December 8, 1775).

The battle continued from Sunday afternoon until late Tuesday, when just at sunset Majors Williamson and Mayson and their men inside the fort noticed a white flag being waved from a window of the jail. A message was delivered by a man carrying a candle, from Major Robinson to Mayson, demanding surrender of arms and dispersal of those inside the fort. This demand was refused and in about two hours the same demand was made in person by Patrick Cunningham, who talked with Major Williamson. It was agreed that a conference would be held on the following day at eight o'clock.

Accordingly, on Wednesday morning Maj. Mayson, Capt Pickens, Mr. Bowie and myself [Williamson] met with Major Robinson, Messrs. Patrick Cunningham, Evan McLaurin and Richard Pearis, and agreed to the cessation of hostilities now inclosed you, which was lucky for us, as we had not above thirty pounds of powder, except what little the men had in their horns; but no scarcity appeared, as no person knew our stock but one gentleman and myself. We had thirty-eight barrels of flour with four live beeves in the fort, and got very good water the third day, after digging upwards of forty feet, so that if we had had a sufficiency of powder we could have stood a seige for a considerable time (Gibbes 1855:218).

Although the 40 foot well was completed and water was found on the third day of the battle, these were thirsty days for the 500 men inside the fort, as witnessed by Major Mayson:

...before three days had expired, our men began to be outrageous for want of bread and water, and we had not above sixteen pounds of gunpowder left (Gibbes 1855:216).

As Williamson reported, it was lucky that the larger force of King's men offered a white flag when they did, for although a water supply was obtained from the well on Tuesday, the powder supply had dwindled during the battle from several hundred pounds, to 30 or less. The number wounded inside the fort was 12 and one dead, with the loss to the army of Major Robinson said to have been "considerable". Greater loss inside the fort was reported to have been avoided due to the blinds of fence, rails, straw, and beef hides of which the fort was constructed (Gibbes 1855:219). More specifics were provided by a newspaper account:

At that time, Majors Mayson and Williamson had nearly expended their Ammunition, a Circumstance they had the address to conceal from their Men. Of our Party 14 were wounded, one mortally; of the Enemy it is known several (some say 52) were killed, and many wounded; but Particulars are concealed: That their Loss exceeds ours is not to be doubted, else why should 2000 Men made Advances for a Suspension of Hostilities to 500, whom they had a few Days before insolently demanded to surrender at Discretion? (SCL, SCAG, December 8, 1775).

Major Mayson reported:

The enemy say they had but one man dead, who is a Capt. Luper, and about the same number wounded as ours; but the best information they have buried at least twenty-seven men, and have as many wounded (Gibbes 1855:216).

The document drawn up at this time to end the three day battle is the South Carolina Archives and is as follows:

Agreement for A Cefsation of Arms between Major Joseph Robison Commander of a Body of his Majesty's Militia now under arms for himself and the Troops under his Command, of one part; and Major Andrew Williamson & Major James Mayson Commanders, of the Fort at Ninety Six for themselves and the Troops therein Under the Direction of the of the [sic] Provential Congrefs.

- 1st. That Hostilities shall immediately cease on both sides.
- 2nd. That Major Williams [sic] & Major Mayson shall March their Men out of the Fort and Diliver up their swivels.

- 3rd. That the Fort shall be Destroyed flat without damaging the Houses therein under the Inspection of Captn. Patrick Cunningham and John Bowie Esquires and the Well filled up.
- 4th. That the Differences between the People of this Dictrict and others disagreeing about the Present Publick measures shall be submitted to his Excellency our Governor & the Council of Safety, and for that purpose each party shall send Dispatches to their Superiors -- that the Dispatches shall be sent unsealed and the Mefsinger of each Party shall Pafs unmolested.
- 5ht. That Major Robison shall withdraw his men over Saludy and there Keep them Embodied or Disperce them as he pleaseth until His Excellency's orders be Known.
- 6th. That no Person of either party shall in the Mean time be molested by the other party either in going home or otherwise.
- 7th. Should any reinforcements arrive to Major Williamson or Major Mayson they also shall be bound by this Cefsation.
- 8th. That Twenty Days be allowed for the return of the Mefsingers.
- 9th. That all Prisoners taken by either party since the second Day of this Instant, Shall be immediately set at Liberty.

In witnefs whereof the Parties to these articles have set their Hand & Seals at Ninety Six this Twenty second Day of November one Thousand Seven Hundred and seventy five and in the sixteenth year of His Majesty's Reign.

Present

Patrick Cunningham  
 Richard Paris  
 Andrew Pickins  
 John Bowie

Jofeph Robinson  
 Andrew Williamson  
 James Mayson

(SCA, Terms of surrender at Ninety Six in 1775: H-2-5)

It appears from the second article of this agreement that the swivel guns were to be surrendered, which was literally the case. However, an unwritten agreement between parties on both sides was to the effect that the swivels were to be returned to Mayson and Williamson, even though they had been surrendered as part of the agreement. This was done on November 25th and they were sent to Fort Charlotte by Major Williamson (Gibbes 1855:216-19).

With the return of the swivels, the first battle of the Revolution in

the South was closed with a 20 day truce. The second engagement would come three months later at the Battle of Moores Creek in North Carolina where Loyalist militia were defeated by a smaller patriot army (Sarles and Shedd 1964:64). This second engagement between Loyalist and Continental forces is often said to have been the first battle since it ended with a victory for the Continentals. The first battle at Ninety Six, however, lasting three days and involving almost as many men as that at Moores Creek, ended with a truce and no decisive victory for the Continentals. It is for this reason, apparently, that it is not considered the first battle of the Revolution in the South, with that designation being assigned by the National Park Service to the battle at Moores Creek. Whether it is officially recognized or not, the fact remains that "a warm engagement" occurred at "Williamson's Fort" at Ninety Six for three days between Loyalist and Continental forces from November 19th through the 21st, 1775; a fact that can hardly be overlooked. Five and one-half years later, Loyalists at Ninety Six would successfully withstand a 28 day seige by the Army of General Nathaniel Greene. In both the engagement of 1775, and that of 1781, the area of Ninety Six was a strong center of Loyalist sentiment.

Bruce Ezell has prepared a list of some of the participants in the first battle of Ninety Six, with the distance and present location of the homes from which the men came. This is designed to show the wide center of interest that Ninety Six occupied at that time.

Richard Pearis	Greenville	60 miles northwest
Thomas Fletchall	Union	" " northeast
Andrew Pickens	Abbeville	22 miles west
Calhouns	beyond "	30/35 " "
Andrew Williamson	Whitehall	15 miles "
Roy Hammond	Augusta, Ga.	60 " south
Robert Starke	Ridge Springs	40 " south

Cunninghams	Laurens County	12 "	north
Williams, Andersons, Saxons		20 "	northeast
James Mason		7 "	north
Moses Kirkland	Saluda	30 "	southeast
Caldwells	Whitmire	40 "	northeast
Roebucks	Spartanburg	65 miles	north
Colsons	Georgia	60 "	west
Gervais	Whitehall	15 "	"
Richard Rapley & Francis Salvador		10 "	northwest

From this study Bruce was able to determine that the Whigs were congregated largely south of the Saluda River and the Tories somewhat north. However, it is interesting to note that the side chosen in this engagement was not necessarily the same one held by these individuals five years later in the full heat of the war.

#### Archeological Implications for the Site at Williamson's Fort

From these accounts of the first battle of Ninety Six in 1775, we learn that the courthouse was not musket proof, implying that it was a frame building. Drayton stated that he mounted a gun in each room below in the jail, thereby implying that there was a second floor. He lodged the powder in the dungeon, clearly revealing a feature that could be located archeologically.

John Drayton's book (1821:389); (Figure 2) shows the location of William Henry Drayton's camp near Ninety Six and the outline of Williamson's Fort. This map was drawn in 1821 using manuscript information of William Drayton dating to 1775, and therefore may be expected to have some errors. However, from this map we can fix the position of the courthouse, jail, and two small structures at Ninety Six, as well as the site of Drayton's camp and Williamson's Fort, using the Charleston Road and other roads and streams as reference points. From this map we know

that Williamson's Fort was built southeast of the junction of the Island Ford Road and that from Savannah to Saluda River. These roads can still be seen today, and from these a general location of Williamson's Fort can be determined. The land west of the stream at the town of Ninety Six is a high plateau on which John Savage had his plantation and on which Williamson's Fort was built (SCA, Charleston Deeds, G-5:376; P-4:461, 467, September 9, 1776). The only archeological clue likely surviving from this fort would be the well dug to a depth of 40 feet during the three day seige, which was ordered to be filled, according to the truce agreement.

Since Williamson's Fort itself was constructed in a few hours, of fence, rails, straw, and beef hides around an area of 185 yards on the side, joined to the barn in Savages' old field, the actual fort outline is not likely to be found. The well, as has been mentioned, would likely be the only identifiable archeological clue. However, if a well is found in the area it might be from the town of Cambridge which grew on the site from the 1780's until 1850's, so positive identification as the well from Williamson's Fort might be difficult. Archeologically then, Williamson's Fort will likely not be identified, and the information we have on it and the events surrounding it will have to continue to be based on documents such as those in the books of Drayton and Gibbes. Interpretation will continue to be an historical one rather than one involving historical archeology.

Bibliography - Chapter 8

Abbreviations Used:

SCA South Carolina Archives

SCAG South Carolina and American Gazette

SCL South Carolina Library

References:

Drayton, John

1821 Memoirs of the American Revolution. A. E. Miller, Charleston, S. C.

Gibbes, R. W.

1855 Documentary History of the American Revolution 1764-1776. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

Sarles, Frank B., Jr. and Charles E. Shedd

1964 Colonials and Patriots. U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington.

Research Sources:

Personal Communication

Bruce Ezell

South Carolina Archives

Charleston Deeds, 1719-1800. 21 boxes, 714 reels of microfilm.

Terms of Surrender at Ninety Six in 1775.

South Carolina Library

South Carolina and American Gazette, 1764-1781.

#### IV -- THE STORM OF WAR

9

#### HOLMES' FORT AND THE BLOCKHOUSE AND JAIL REDOUBT AT NINETY SIX (38GN2)

##### Historical Perspective for Holmes' Fort and Blockhouse

In the years following the "warm engagement" at Williamson's Fort, Andrew Williamson became a brigadier general, and Andrew Pickens, who had also signed the Treaty of Ninety Six, was a colonel commanding a crack regiment from Long Canes (Bass 1962:2,3 ). In May 1780, Charleston fell to the British under Sir Henry Clinton, and Lord Cornwallis was assigned the task of ending the rebellion in South Carolina. Particular attention was focused on the South Carolina militia under Brigadier General Andrew Williamson, and a march was made toward the village of Ninety Six by Lieutenant Colonel Nisbet Balfour, senior field commander under Cornwallis (Bass 1962:2). Before he reached Ninety Six, however, General Williamson surrendered his force to the British with no resistance, and three days later Andrew Pickens did the same.

On June 22, 1780, Balfour reached Ninety Six and made the settlement the headquarters for the British in the Back Country. The Ninety Six regiment was placed under the command of Colonel Robert Cunningham, also a principal figure at the "warm engagement" at Williamson's Fort, who had refused to sign the Treaty of Ninety Six. Cunningham was to play an important role in the British cause, and exactly five months after marching into Ninety Six, Balfour would make him the only brigadier general appointed by the British while they were in South Carolina (Bass 1962:4,31).



Within a month after the surrender of his militia and supplies, Williamson was cooperating with the British. To get him completely committed "Cornwallis used the old money trick," and gave him 200 guineas (Bass 1962:7). Andrew Pickens was paroled, and in the months to follow, both the British and his Tory neighbors pressed Pickens to declare his loyalty to the king. The Whigs also worked on this leader of proven ability in an effort to get him to break his parole promises and join in the American cause. For months he had periodic conferences with both sides without committing himself, but finally in December 1780, he made up his mind and gathered members of his old regiment around him, and, with the help of a diversion to tie down Cunningham's force at Fort Williams to allow them to move unresisted, marched to join General Morgan and the cause of the Revolution. His decision was a significant one and a blow to the British cause in the Ninety Six district, for the regiment under Pickens had been considered "the best in the rebel service" (Bass 1962:52).

Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger, commander of the New Jersey Volunteers, was ordered by Cornwallis to take charge of the important district of Ninety Six, and he urged Cruger to keep possession of the Back Country, for "the success of the war in the Southern district depends totally upon it" (Bass 1962:7).

During the year from the time of his arrival at Ninety Six until the end of the month-long siege by General Nathaniel Greene's army from May 22 to June 19, 1781, Colonel Cruger was involved with the fortification of Ninety Six. The village of Ninety Six itself was palisaded and protected with flanking blockhouses, and two blockhouses were built on the hill west of the town to protect the water supply and this side

of the village. This stockaded fort, with a ditch and parapet in the shape of a hornwork, was Holmes' Fort, connected to the town by a covered way. The jail was fortified by ditching and embankments, as well as a palisade (MacKenzie 1787:142-64; SCA, BPRO, Cornwallis Papers F220, 50/11/2). By the latter part of November, Cruger was disillusioned regarding the ability of the militia to be of much help in an encounter, and expressed these reservations to Lord Cornwallis. This news did not cheer Cornwallis regarding the safety of Ninety Six, so he sent his senior officer of engineers, Lieutenant Henry Haldane, who was also his Aid de Camp, to check on the fortifications Cruger had constructed (Bass 1962:35; MacKenzie 1787:143). Haldane found the works in a much better state than he had expected. For additional protection he ordered construction of a star shaped redoubt on a hill to the northeast of the town, and ditches were opened to create embankments connecting it with Cruger's works (MacKenzie 1787:143; SCA, BPRO, Cornwallis Papers, December 1780, 30/11/4, F296).

These works, composed of the fortified town protected by blockhouses, the Star Fort, and related ditches and parapets on the east of the town, with Holmes' Fort on the hill to the west of the town, were surrounded by the army of General Nathaniel Greene on May 22, 1781, and besieged by him until June 19th. On June 18th, Greene assaulted the Star Fort, while Colonel Henry "Light Horse Harry" Lee attacked and captured Holmes' Fort. Greene was repulsed from the Star Fort and withdrew from Ninety Six rather than face the army of Lord Rawdon which was only a few miles away (MacKenzie 1787:142-64; SCA, BPRO, Ordnance-Colonies, 1787, 5/103/5).

During the siege, a number of classic moves in besieging and defending a fortification were used. A mine was dug by Greene's engineer, Count

Kosciuszko, in an attempt to tunnel beneath the Star Fort to blow it up; flaming "African arrows" were used in an attempt to set fire to buildings inside the fort; Greene and Lee both cut approach ditches and parallels for moving troops and artillery close to the fortifications; Mayham towers were used to raise sharpshooters and artillery high enough to fire down into the Star Fort; and an attempt was made to set fire to the stockade around Holmes' Fort (MacKenzie 1787:142-64; Lee 1812:120-30). Cruger in the town and Major Green in the Star Fort defended their works with equal ingenuity. The roofs of the buildings were removed to prevent their catching fire from the "African arrows"; an attempt was made to heat shot to use in destroying the Mayham towers; a counter-ditch was dug inside the Star Fort to provide additional protection from the sharpshooters in the towers and to intercept the mine when it came beneath the fort (amputating a point of the star, so to speak). A well was dug inside the Star Fort in an unsuccessful effort to reach water for the besieged garrison, and water was obtained by sending naked blacks crawling into the night with buckets to the stream which was under the watchful eye of the pickets of Lee's Legion. Sandbags were used to raise the parapet at the Star Fort and to casemate the artillery pieces to reduce the effect of the sharpshooters in the towers, and sallies by small groups outside of the fort in attacks on the besiegers were outstandingly successful (MacKenzie 1787:142-64). These features of the besieged and the besiegers make the Ninety Six Site one of the most fascinating in the annals of the Revolution.

The historical account of the events surrounding the 1781 Battle of Ninety Six has been presented by many historians. The account upon

which most of these have been based is that provided us by Roderick MacKenzie in his 1787 publication Strictures on Lt. Col. Tarleton's History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781, in the Southern Provinces of North America. This account is from a witness, Lieutenant Hatton of the New Jersey Volunteers, who was at Ninety Six (MacKenzie 1787: 132-64). Another first hand version of the battle is provided by a letter from General Nathaniel Greene (SCA, BPRO, Ordnance-Colonies, 5/103/5, June 20, 1781). Lt. Colonel John Harris Cruger reported on the siege by Greene in letters to Lords Cornwallis and Rawdon, and these too are an important report on the events at Ninety Six (SCA, BPRO, Cornwallis Papers, F). From these accounts the reader can obtain good first hand summaries of the events at Ninety Six in 1781. Another basic source of primary information regarding correspondence of Lord Cornwallis is a manuscript by Robert Duncan Bass entitled "Lord Cornwallis and Ninety Six", in the files of the Greenwood County Historical Society, the Star Fort Historical Commission, and the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina (Bass 1962:M.S.). In this manuscript Bass has included extracts of letters from the Cornwallis Papers that are not available elsewhere.

#### Exploratory Archeology at Holmes' Fort (38GN2)

As we have seen, Holmes' Fort was the defensive bastion on the high ground to the west of the village of Ninety Six. It was often referred to as a stockaded fort (MacKenzie 1787:155) containing abatis before a ditch (Lee 1812:122,128). The maps all indicate that Holmes' Fort was a square

with corner bastions or blockhouses, yet only two blockhouses are known to have been in the fort (BPRO, Greene, June 20, 1781, Ordnance-Colonies, V:103-05); (Figure 2). Other than this we know little about the physical appearance of the fort, except that provided by archeology.

We do have a reference that may well apply to Holmes' Fort, and if it does, it will be of importance in the excavation of the fort site. After Holmes' Fort was captured and then abandoned by Lee, Cruger set about the demolition of the works. On July 3, 1781, a servant of Colonel O.H. Williams, who had been held at Ninety Six by the British, made his escape. The servant, Dominique, had heard orders given to march soon and had seen "all their swivels . . . broken off before he came away...." Another man reported to Williams that iron and other articles which could not be transported were covered in the trenches. Another report stated that the British were to move out on July 10th (Cann 1969:58-59). If these observations were made for the Holmes' Fort area of Ninety Six, then some interesting results can be expected to emerge from the fort ditches.

Exploratory trenching on the suspected site of the fort was done during four days in May 1970, and as a result, the south ditch of the fort was located (South, September 1970:11,35). The October-November Project of 1970 was designed to locate, through exploratory trenches, the shape of the entire fort, and hopefully begin excavation of the contents of the ditches. One week was devoted to trenching on the site to locate the ditch outline of the fort, and the evidence found was drawn onto a map (Figure 4). From this map it was possible, for the first time since the Revolution, to know the actual shape of the ditch around Holmes' Fort. The fort was not at all shaped like the historical documents had indicated,

but like a British hornwork, typical of those of the mid-eighteenth century (Vauban 1740:in Rothrock 1968:94); (Figure 4). The main ditch was found to be in the form of two bastions, a large one enclosing an area of slightly over 50 feet across, with a smaller bastion half the size. The overall size of the fort including the ditches was 100 by 200 feet. It was built on the edge of the high hill overlooking the town of Ninety Six, and in general outline is like that of a large mitten. Hornworks were connected to the town by covered ways or ditches, by means of which free travel between the hornwork and the town was possible. Muller (1746:98) has stated the purpose of a horn or crown-work:

When there is neceffity to conftruct horn or crown-works, either to cover a gate, or to occupy a fpot of ground which might be advantageous to the befiegers, and which can no other ways be taken into the fortification...(Muller 1746:98).

From the map in Figure 4 we can see that the ditch for Holmes' Fort was eight feet wide, with a parallel, burned, firing wall trench located 12 feet inside of it. In interpreting these parallel features we see that the earth taken from the ditch was likely placed on the inside on the 12 foot space between the ditch and the smaller trench in whihc vertical post impressions could be seen. The small trench held vertical posts for a firing wall and allowed the inside of the parapet wall to be a vertical one. The fact that burning of the subsoil around this trench was seen would clearly point to the picketed firing wall having been burned. We suspect that this burning took place in July 1781 when we know Cruger was destroying the works at Ninety Six before withdrawing his force after having withstood the siege of General Nathaniel Greene's army (Cann:1969: 58-59).

Inside the outline formed by the main fort ditch, a short ditch at a right angle to the axis of the smaller bastion was found to measure from six to eight feet wide and 35 feet long. This may have been a ditch for obtaining earth for building a traverse to provide additional cover for the entrance to the covered way leading to the town of Ninety Six. It could also have been a storage magazine for supplies. However, since similar traverses are seen in the hornworks of the eighteenth century, we would suspect that this ditch represents a traverse rather than a magazine. Another ditch was found extending from the north fort ditch a distance of 70 feet, allowing only four feet remaining between the end of this ditch and the west wall of the large north bastion, possibly as a passageway. This ditch very likely also represents a traverse thrown up to provide added protection for the covered way entrance inside the fort.

The two blockhouses known to have been inside the fort have been tentatively positioned on the map (Figure 4) based on the evidence at hand. Further work will be necessary to test the accuracy of these conjectures.

To the north of the small bastion on the west ditch of the fort an additional ditch extends from the fort ditch toward to west. The function of this ditch is not known as yet, and it is conjectured to be an additional traverse or protective arm to provide added protection. Further work will be needed to properly interpret this and any related features.

To the northeast of the large bastion, near the edge of the drop-off of the hill, a trench was found to parallel the main ditch. This may well have been a palisade around the outside of the larger ditch which gave the

term "stockade fort" to Holmes' Fort. This stockade, or perhaps another further out, would provide the additional protection needed against an infantry attack. An abortative attempt was made to burn this stockade by a squad composed of a sergeant and nine infantrymen of Lee's Legion. They were discovered, however, and six of the men were killed, including the sergeant (Lee 1812:122). It is interesting to note that Sergeant Major William Seymour of Lee's Legion reporting on the successful capture of Holmes' Fort by Lee on June 18, 1781, said that Holmes' Fort was captured "with the redoubt therein", possibly indicating that what we have found on the site is the "redoubt" inside the main wall line of Holmes' Fort, which points to a possible outer work yet to be discovered, either a ditch or, perhaps more likely, a palisade line (Seymour 1910:28).

The plan of operation at Holmes' Fort had been as follows: The exploratory work to constitute the first phase of the project, during which time the outline of the fort was to be determined. The second phase was the machine removal of the blanket of plowed soil over the site so the outline of the fort could be studied in greater detail and additional maps drawn of the features. The third phase was the actual cleaning and dressings of the subsoil level to reveal the features, those already discovered through slot-trenching and any others not revealed before. This work requires the services of a large crew with shovels to properly achieve the smoothness of the ground required to reveal the archeological features. The fourth phase involves the excavation of the ditches and other features recovered, with profiles being reached through drawings and photographs so that an understanding of the deposition of the soil in the features can be achieved for proper interpretation of the events that took place



on the site. In this process artifacts are recovered from the various layers examined, with drawings, measurements, and photographs recording the position of these in relation to significant associated features. The fifth phase of the project is the rebuilding of parapets, picketed firing wall posts are replaced, and the ditches and embankments covered with protective sod to prevent erosion. The sixth and final stage in the process is the analysis and writing of the report on the project, with a correlation of the data discovered through archeology with the historical documents to produce a greater understanding of the site than has been possible since it was seen intact at the time of the Revolution.

With the first phase of this sequence completed at the end of the first week on the site in October 1970, machines were brought to the site to begin the second phase, the removal of the plowed soil zone. However, as soon as they were on the site rain began and continued off and on for some three weeks, thus putting a large dent in the excavation schedule. at Holmes' Fort. During this time it was impossible to work on the red clay subsoil of Holmes' Fort, exploratory slot-trenching was carried out in the area north of the intersection of the roads inside the village of Ninety Six. This type work is possible with wet ground whereas the work at Holmes' Fort was not possible under wet conditions. During this alternate work program, an impressive blockhouse ruin was discovered which will be discussed in the next section of this report.

When the rain stopped and the ground dried enough to support the machines, a belly-loading, scoop-type, self-loading, earth moving machine was brought to the site to remove the plowed soil. A road grader was then used to cleanly cut the subsoil surface so that a minimum of hand labor

would be necessary to reveal the features. This process was carried out on the west half of the fort, including both the bastions. At this time the rain began again and work was continued on the exploratory trenching on the blockhouse site. Two weeks later some cleaning of the Holmes' Fort Site was possible, during which brick footings and a cellar hole for a structure north of the main fort bastion were discovered. This ruin probably represents a house of the town of Cambridge of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century which was located on the site of Holmes' Fort. With only two weeks remaining and rain still being a factor, the work at Holmes' Fort was discontinued for the season, with the final emphasis being placed on the blockhouse site and exploratory work at the site of the jail.

Since we have an account of a witness who saw destruction taking place at the Ninety Six fortifications in July 1781 (Cann 1969:58-59), and we have found evidence that the firing wall burned, and since we have seen that in 1821 when the map of Ninety Six was made no one recalled, apparently, that the fort was a hornwork, and since the town of Cambridge replaced the town of Ninety Six as a center for the area after the Revolution, we are led to suspect that the ditches of Holmes' Fort were filled in by Cruger in 1781, thus accounting for the lack of specifics remembered about this feature only a few decades later. Archeology will be able to answer this question for us.

The artifacts found in this project at Holmes' Fort were all from the plowed soil zone, so have a limited usefulness. However, they do provide a clue to the period of occupation of the site and from these we see that the site was occupied from the 1780's to the mid-nineteenth

century, judging from the pearlware, creamware, banded ware, transfer printed ware, and ironstone present on the site. An analysis of these and all other artifacts recovered will be included in later reports, when more work has been carried out on the site.

The major effort of the 1971 excavation will be the revealing of Holmes' Fort in its full visual outline as represented by the ditches which formed its main defense. If funds are made available for stabilization of these ditches once they are opened through archeology and for replacing the embankments accompanying the ditch, as well as the palisades around the outside of the fort and the posts in the firing wall, Holmes' Fort will emerge as an impressive companion to the well-known ruin of the Star Redoubt.

#### The Palisade and Ditches Around the Town of Ninety Six (38GN5)

Exploratory trenching in the area of the intersection of the roads just north of the ruins of the town of Ninety Six revealed palisade trenches, fortification ditches, and a cellar hole. At the junction of the ditch from the Star Fort with the northeast corner of the town, a palisade trench was found to form a small bastion 18 feet wide, located just north of a fortification ditch eight feet wide. Twelve feet south of this fortification ditch another palisade trench was found to parallel the large ditch. The fort ditch angled toward the north near the Charleston Road to form what may have been a protective arm flanking the entrance to the town at this point (Figure 3). A smaller ditch and trench just south of this entrance may well represent a structure from the town of Ninety Six. The palisade trench along the east side of the town site was followed for several hundred feet, verifying that it continues

along this side of town. From the evidence found at the junction of the ditch to the Star Fort with the northeast corner of town, a fortification ditch has been postulated as paralleling the east palisade wall to the outside of this wall (Figure 3).

It is thought that the palisade trench seen along this side of town, along with the northeast corner bastion, represents the original defensive palisade built by Cruger in 1780. On October 13 of that year he stated:

I Have Palisaded ye Courthouse & the Principal houses in about one hundred yards square, with Block House flankers... (GCL, BPRO, 30/11/2, Cornwallis Papers, Cruger to Cornwallis:October 13, 1780:F220).

On the opposite side of the Charleston Road this palisade trench was found to intersect at the corner of the fort ditch, and after 23 feet, make a right angle turn toward the south and continue to the edge of the bank at the north edge of the connecting road to Augusta (Figure 3). This palisade line parallels that on the east side of the town of Ninety Six and is 220 feet away from it. It is thought that this palisade represents the original palisade around the houses of Ninety Six built by Cruger and mentioned by him in the reference quoted above. If this is the case, the palisade should continue on toward the south, forming a west protection to the houses located along the west side of the Charleston Road, until it intersects with the south palisade around the entire area found in the earlier exploratory survey of the site (Figure 5). If this is the case, the town palisade built by Cruger would measure 220 by 400 feet, which fits his description of "about one hundred yards square" for his palisade. At the junction of this west palisade with the south palisade trench found earlier, it is thought that a comparable bastion

should be located, like that found at the northeast corner of the area.

Along the west side of the Charleston Road, north of the fort ditch found on this side of the road, the edge of what is thought to be a ditch comparable to that across the road, was found. This may, however, be merely the edge of an old road bed to the town, but more archeology can answer this question. At a point 60 feet north of the north palisade trench for the town, a separate trench was discovered extending toward the west from the Charleston Road. This palisade trench was followed by cutting slot-trenches and was found to extend for 330 feet, at which point it made a right angle turn toward the south and extended for 125 feet more until it ended about half way down the side of the steep bank beside the road to Augusta (Figure 3). This compound is thought to have enclosed the encampment area for the Royal Provincials defending Ninety Six. This conjecture is supported by the fact that during the visit of Lt. Anthony Allaire of Major Ferguson's Corp to Ninety Six in June 1780 he:

Took quarters in town, opposite the jail, where I have the constant view of the Rebels peeping through the grates, which affords some satisfaction to see them suffer for their folly (Draper 1954:499).

This clearly refers to a point to the north of the jail, which would be inside the compound outlined by this palisade trench.

Cornwallis sent his Aid de Camp, Lt. Henry Haldane, to inspect Cruger's works in December 1780, and he ordered the Star Fort built and the ditches connecting it with the town palisade built by Cruger (GCL, BPRO, 30/11/4, Cornwallis Papers, December 9, 1780:F296, 394; MacKenzie 1787:143). When this was done the ditch was apparently dug inside Cruger's north town palisade, causing an intrusion of the large ditch

across the neck of the northeast palisade bastion of Cruger (Figure 3). A new trench for a firing wall of vertical posts was then dug 12 feet south of Haldane's ditch along the north side of town. On the east side, however, slot-trenching tends to indicate that Cruger's fort ditch extended along the outside of Cruger's east palisade wall. This would allow this palisade wall to be used as a firing wall protected by a parapeted embankment from the soil from Haldane's ditch, thus making the east wall much better protected against artillery fire.

This interpretation is supported by the fact that MacKenzie states that the town of Ninety Six was surrounded by a stockade, and that:

The commandant immediately fet the whole garrifon, both officers and men, to work, to throw up a bank, parapet high, around this ftockade, and to ftrenghen it with an abbatis (MacKenzie 1878:142).

Since we know that during Haldane's visit he ordered ditches dug and abatis placed in front (GCL, BPRO, 30/11/4, Cornwallis Papers, December 9, 1780:F394), we see that MacKenzie is mistaken as to who ordered the earth thrown against the stockade; it was not the commandant, Cruger, who ordered this done, but Haldane. The important fact is not this, however, but the bank that was thrown against the stockade "Parapet high." This surely fits the situation as we see it archeologically along the east wall of the town. The job that now needs to be done to check out this hypothesis is to cut trenches along the outside of the east palisade wall in order to locate the large fort ditch ordered by Haldane to be dug along the outside of the stockade to provide a bank "parapet high."

A profile of "...a field Work such as we have generally built..." was drawn by Major Patrick Ferguson in February 1780 (WCL, Clinton Papers,

February 1780). This profile fits well with what we see the evidence along the east wall of the town of Ninety Six as representing. The only change was the insertion of the palisade post into Ferguson's profile to indicate how the parapet high embankment would appear against the palisade wall (Figure 3). As was mentioned above, more archeological work will need to be done in this area to determine whether the large fort ditch does indeed continue along this east wall as conjectured.

The Blockhouse Site at the Northwest Corner of the Town of Ninety Six (38GN5)

Inside the northwest corner of the palisaded compound for the town of Ninety Six, a fortification ditch eight to ten feet wide was found to form a corner angle inside a similar angle formed by the palisade trench forming the northwest corner of the town palisade. Twelve feet inside this fortification ditch another palisade trench was found, and this also formed a right angle paralleling the large ditch. This trench is thought to be a firing wall such as was found at the Holmes' Fort Site, the measurements at both sites being virtually the same. This inner palisade trench held pickets or vertical posts designed to hold back the dirt taken from the fort ditch.

Inside of this firing wall and a distance of eight feet from it on the west and 15 feet on the north, a cellar hole was found (Figure 3). This dark cellar fill outline measured 20 by 33 feet, with a seven foot wide step-well extending a distance of four feet from the northwest corner. This cellar hole would represent a structure 15 by 30 feet if the foundation wall were placed inside the cellar, or it would probably represent a building about 25 by 35 feet if the cellar were totally

enclosed inside a structure whose footing was wider than the cellar. Since there are two palisade walls, a fortification ditch and a firing wall trench surrounding this cellar, all inside an outer ditch built by Haldane, we might begin to suspect that this cellar was something more than merely a cellar for a house in the town of Ninety Six in which a store of wine and potatoes was cached. For this reason we have conjectured that this cellar represents Cruger's blockhouse site in this corner of town (Figure 3).

To the east of this cellar hole the edge of a disturbance was seen that may represent a trench along this side of the blockhouse, and the interpretive parapet embankment is shown here on the map (Figure 3). The entire area between this edge and the Charleston Road is disturbed to a considerable depth (in one test hole to a depth of over three feet), indicating a feature deeper than a roadbed along this side of the blockhouse. Extensive work in this area is needed to determine the exact nature of this disturbance.

In most cases we would not expect to find evidence for a blockhouse other than perhaps a cellar, particularly when horizontal logs are used, as was the case with most blockhouses. The early nineteenth century blockhouse at Fort Hawkins in Macon, Georgia, had a stone-lined cellar, with horizontal logs above, in association with a palisade wall, which is the usual case. However, a blockhouse accompanied by major fortification ditches, parapets, firing wall, and cellar is not the usual combination of features.

For an interpretation of this type blockhouse we have an excellent written description provided by Patrick Ferguson, as well as profile



drawings. Ferguson was in Savannah in February 1780 and drew his plans for an improved type blockhouse. In May of the same year he outlined a "Plan for Securing the Province of South Carolina" (WCL, Clinton Papers, May 1780) which provides details of value in addition to the February plan. Ferguson suggests that in South Carolina, where roads cross each other, that four or five "Block house redoubts" be built to command all the principle avenues. He explains that:

These block houses are singularly advantagious as forming at once barrack Citadel & Cassmate, they may be raised of strong rough Timbers by means of Negroes in 4 or 5 Days & covered from cannon by a redoubt, which could not be looked at without a force deliberately assembled with Cannon, nor taken or mantained whilst ten men remained in the Block house within. For each Post 30 Invalided Soldiers with as many Militia & 2 Iron Guns would prove Sufficient (WCL, Clinton Papers, May 1780).

This summarizes Ferguson's opinion of what he considered a major improvement on the blockhouses of the time. Fortunately we have his profile drawings and description to demonstrate what he was talking about. He illustrates two trenches set close together with obstructions set in the bottom of these, along with brush abatis placed in front of the counter-scarp of the main ditch. The main ditch is somewhat different from those usually seen in that it has in the bottom four parallel ditches set close together, also having brush and obstructions set in and above these ditches. Near the toe of the scarp he illustrates an outward sloping palisade pole set deeply into the bottom of the fort ditch, behind which was another small trench at the toe of the scarp. Palisade or fraize poles are placed on the surface of the ground with the pointed end facing, and extending over, the ditch. Above this and slightly back from the edge of the ditch is the embankment of earth thrown from the ditch over

the butt ends of the fraize. The embankment earth is allowed to lie at a natural angle rather than being shored up with fascines. Back of this is the firing wall and step, and then inside of this, the cross-section of his blockhouse is shown. The firing ports point upward in line with the top of the parapet so as to intercept anyone coming over the parapet. Two levels are shown, both having firing ports, the bottom story being entirely below ground surface with the firing ports along the top of the cellar level being all that is above ground. The second floor was to be covered with a thick layer of earth three to four feet thick. An alternative to this was suggested where the upper story could serve as a barracks for the men. Ferguson says of his counter-sunk, low profile, earth-covered, bunker-type structure:

This Block house being entirely covered by the Rampart from direct shots is not in any degree to be injured by artillery from without; as the wall being made of 18 Inch Oak Timbers dove tailed at the Angles would not be peirced by ricochet shot, and the roof being Beams well supported in the center, would resist any shell when covered with 3 or 4 feet of Earth (WCL, Clinton Papers, February 1780).

He reiterates the advantages of this type of casemated blockhouse, pointing out that a work without casemates can be reduced without trouble or delay by a few howitzer shells. He states that the usual casemated structures are of masonry construction and are therefore expensive and not suited to the quick need for fortification sometimes found in outlying areas. Yet, something must be done, he says, if England is to have remote colonies. He offers the solution:

Happily the abundance of Timber & of rough Carpenters in America enable an Engineer to procure by contract without any Trouble in a very short time & for a Trifle of Expense block houses to answer every purpose of Casmates & to secure the Garrison from assault.

These Block houses should have five sides Bastion Fashion. The Timbers both of the walls & roof of Oak Eighteen Inches square, & dove tailed at the corners, so as to resist ricochet shot & shells. One block house upon this Principle for every Bastion of the Fort placed within & sheltered by the Ramparts from Direct shots, with a loop holed stockade by way of Curtain to run from the one to the other, would for a mere song of expence form at once Barracks that would last forever (without affording a pretence for repairs & last longer than the Band Boxes usually erected)... (WCL, Clinton Papers, February 1780).

According to Ferguson, it "would be madness to assault a Citadel with blockhouse Bastions". Such a blockhouse would be utterly covered from musketry and could pour:

...a continued loop-holed fire of Musketry rejoining on all sides, to destroy the assailants as fast as they could Possibly crowd within the ramparts, where indeed a Rat could not exist for many Seconds, from the multiplicity of the fires, the shortness of the distance & the unerring safety of the Defendants (WCL, Clinton Papers, February 1780).

With this it surely appears that Ferguson was sold on his concept, but whether Cornwallis and others were equally impressed remains to be seen. We do know, however, that Ferguson was at Ninety Six in June 1780 (Bass 1862:5), and that in July he wrote to Cornwallis asking that he be allowed to build a works, such as he had proposed, at Ninety Six (GCL, BPRO, 30/11/2, Cornwallis Papers, July 1780:F269). Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger and his New Jersey Volunteers arrived at Ninety Six late in June (Bass 1962:6-7), and we might suspect that Ferguson discussed with the new commander of the fort his ideas regarding fortifications. Cruger may not have responded as enthusiastically as Ferguson had expected, and this may have resulted in Ferguson's letter to Cornwallis urging that he be allowed to build the fortification at Ninety Six. Just how much effect Ferguson's plans had on Cruger is not known, but the archeological evidence at the blockhouse site certainly

appears to closely parallel Ferguson's plans for a casemated blockhouse.

On September 3, 1780, Cruger reported to Cornwallis that he had thrown up two redoubts and was building a blockhouse (Bass 1962:10). These were probably the redoubt at Holmes' Fort, a redoubt around the brick jail (to be discussed next) and the blockhouses represented by the archeological evidence discussed here. It is suspected that he later built a second blockhouse at the southeast corner of the palisaded area of the town, for he mentions on October 13, 1780, that the palisaded houses and courthouse had blockhouse flankers, which would indicate more than one blockhouse, probably on opposite diagonal corners of the palisaded area (GCL, BPRO, 30/11/2, Cornwallis Papers, Cruger to Cornwallis: October 13, 1780:F220).

In summary of the yet to be excavated blockhouse site at the northwest corner of the town of Ninety Six, once detailed excavation is completed it would appear that we have excellent evidence for use in making reconstruction drawings and possibly a diorama of the appearance of this blockhouse. It is not often that we have such excellent correlation between the historical and archeological data with which to work in making conjectural reconstruction drawings. The artifacts recovered in this exploratory phase of the project at the blockhouse are primarily of the 1760's to the 1780's in type, and will be covered in detail in a later project on the blockhouse site.

#### The Jail Redoubt at Ninety Six

Exploratory excavation was carried out in the area around the site of the brick jail, and the slot trenches here revealed a fortification ditch from four to ten feet wide forming a pointed bastion 80 feet across

around the site of the jail. The shape of this bastion or redoubt was much the same as the large bastion seen on the hornwork at Holmes' Fort. A particularly interesting fact was that it was located about half-way down the slope of the hill, rather than on more level ground. To the northwest of this feature, beside the road to Augusta, embankments remain that appear to be part of a gun emplacement of some sort that may have accompanied this redoubt ditch in the defense of the jail. Time did not permit a detailed plotting of this feature, so it is not indicated on the map (Figure 3). When a detailed excavation is planned for this jail redoubt, a topographical map revealing the various slopes and elevations will be necessary to properly interpret the various gulleys and possible defensive works that are in the area around the jail.

Two ditches were found to the east of Reference Point 38, south of the jail redoubt, that appear to be palisade trenches. These may have accompanied the fortification ditch around the side of the hill as an additional defense. Also to the south of the jail redoubt, to the east of Reference Point 37, a palisade trench was seen extending from the fortification ditch toward the southeast. Slot trenching followed this ditch for some 80 feet, revealing that this trench probably represents the west palisade around the entire area. This trench probably represents a continuation of the palisade around the area thought to be the Royal Provincials' encampment area north of the road to Augusta. This could have been built by Cruger before the fall of 1780 as an outer defense line connecting the jail redoubt to the stockade around the town, or it may well have been suggested by Haldane at the time of

his visit in December of that year (Figure 3). Considerable excavation on the jail redoubt site is needed before further conjectures as to its details are made. One question that further excavation would surely answer is the nature of the narrow jail redoubt ditch after it turns toward the south, appearing to form a ditch along the west side of the town area inside the palisade wall. This would be expected, but only excavation can answer this question.

#### Plans for Further Work at Holmes' Fort

Additional work is planned on the Holmes' Fort Site in an expedition beginning June 7, 1971, and ending November 5, 1971. During this period, a great deal of work can be done on the important western bastion of the Ninety Six complex of fortifications. A report on these extensive excavations at Holmes' Fort will be written during the winter of 1971-72. Hopefully questions raised in this exploratory excavation can be answered in that report.

During this exploratory work at the blockhouse and the jail redoubt sites, the 38GN5 provenience designation was used, since the town fortifications are involved. In later excavations of more scope, a new site designation will likely be assigned to these ruins.

Bibliography - Chapter 9

Abbreviations Used:

BPRO British Public Records Office

GCL Greenwood County Library

WCL William Clements Library

References:

Bass, Robert Duncan

- 1962 "Lord Cornwallis and Ninety Six." In the files of the Greenwood County Historical Society, the Star Fort Commission, Greenwood County, S. C., and the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Cann, Marvin L.

- 1969 "Old Ninety Six in the Revolution." M.S., Star Fort Historical Commission, Greenwood County, S. C.

Draper, Lyman C.

- 1881 King's Mountain and its Heroes: History of the Battle of King's Mountain, October 7th, 1780, and the Events which Led to it. P. G. Thompson, Cincinnati.

Lee, Henry

- 1812 Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department of the United States. Philadelphia.

MacKenzie, Roderick

- 1787 Strictures on Lt. Col. Tarleton's History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781, in the Southern Provinces of North America. R. Faulder, London.

Muller, John

- 1746 Treatise of Fortification. Ottawa, Ontario.

Rothrock, George A. (Translator)

- 1968 A Manual of Siegecraft and Fortification by Sebastien Leprestre de Vauban. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Seymour, William

- 1910 A Journal of the Southern Expedition, 1780-1783. Historical and Biographical Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware, Wilmington.

South, Stanely A.

- 1970 "Exploratory Archeology At Ninety Six (38GN1-38GN5)." M.S., on file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.

Turner, Joseph Robert (Editor)

- 1910 The Journal and Order Book of Captain Robert Kirkwood of the Delaware Regiment of the Continental Line. Papers of the Historical Society of Delaware, Vol. LVI, Wilmington.

Vauban, Sebastien Le Prestre de

- 1740 Memoire pour servir d'instruction dans la condiute des sieges et dans la defense des places. Leiden.

Research Sources:

Greenwood County Library

British Public Records Office, Cornwallis Papers.

South Carolina Archives

British Public Records Office.

British Public Records Office, Ordnance - Colonies, 1781.

British Public Records Office, Cornwallis Papers.

William Clements Library

Sir Henry Clinton Papers. Patrick Ferguson, May 16, 1780 A.D., endorsed: "Plan for Securing the Province of So. Carolina," 3 pp. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.



