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Overview

Through the use of primary source documents, especially deeds, wills, estate inventories, and historic newspapers, this report attempts to trace the lives of the original group of enslaved men, women, and children who lived at the Davenport House, including Nancy, Bella, Mary, Deeping, Tom, Ned, Ann, Davy, Isaac, Jacob, Jack, Polly, and Peggy prior to their entry into the Davenport House. There is much to be interpreted from seemingly impersonal information such as location and previous owners, as well as from new resources heretofore unconsulted including burial and jail records, ship manifests, later deed records, and wills. For example, Laurel Grove South interment records have allowed us to learn for the first time in centuries when and how two of the Davenport slaves passed away and how they died. Likewise, by retracing the origins of these men, women, and children, it is possible to place one of them at the forefront of the African Baptist movement in Savannah. Perhaps one of the most important newly consulted resources, deed records from the 1840s and 1850s provide the names of enslaved children born at the Davenport House.

For the first time in hundreds of years, these otherwise muted individuals now have stories to tell that may one day be shared with their descendants; stories which emphasize their individual geography and mobility and their individual lived experiences and transcends the limitations of any house or structure. These stories and this report come at a time when perhaps now more than ever, there is increased awareness of the need for more accurate and inclusive historical interpretations in the American South which recognize the lives of enslaved African Americans. The ongoing urban slavery expansion project at the Davenport House Museum is part of a movement to support more holistic interpretations and a groundbreaking overhaul to the site that will allow for an expanded interpretation of enslaved life is set for completion in 2019. This report directly supports this expansion by providing unique and original material for interpretation in the home.
The majority of historic house museums in the U.S. do not have the capacity to conduct cutting-edge historical research. They usually rely on materials developed catch as catch can, without a plan, and are grateful for it, whether it is put together by volunteers or staff in between other tasks required to keep a house open. The Davenport House Museum has been lucky over the years to have developed through research consultants the basis of its interpretation including a furnishings plan (1994) and an interpretive plan with a biography of Isaiah Davenport (1992). Scholar Page Talbott assisted with the Museum’s award winning re-interpretation from 2000 to 2003.

In 2017 as the Museum was on the cusp of a new building project to convert the basement level of the house to an exhibit space and to open the attic up for tours allowing visitors to learn more about enslaved lived experiences in the home, it was faced with a documentation deficit. The great desire was to tell more fully the story of the enslaved individuals who lived and worked at the site. As we tried to grasp the scope of this work, in walked Kelly Westfield. She came to the Davenport House on the recommendation of Dr. Christopher Hendricks, Director of the History Program at the Armstrong Campus of Georgia Southern University, as an exceptional student looking for a Master’s project that would leave a meaningful impact. Kelly began her research in summer 2017 and devoted three academic semesters to its completion.

By combing repositories and record centers both online and in person, Kelly found a wealth of new information tracing the lives of the enslaved men, women, and children owned by Isaiah Davenport. She followed their chain of sale and their documentary footprint as far back as the records would take her, something that had never been done before. She consulted cemetery and incarceration records, newspapers, tax and land records, among other sources, to learn as much as possible about the enslaved members of the Davenport House, and to emphasize their individual experiences and origins. Her final report, The Enslaved Members of the Davenport Household: Geography, Mobility, and Pre-Davenport House Lived Experiences contains biographical sketches for thirteen enslaved people and accompanying materials such as copies of deeds of sale and customized maps showing their geographic footprint in Savannah and beyond.

From this work, which Kelly continues to refine, she presented three different training sessions in early 2018 – each to a capacity crowd of Davenport House docents listening with eagerness and hanging on to her every word. Her work is a remarkable and rare gift for a house museum. Important new themes will be incorporated into the Museum’s story because of her research including the interconnectedness and mobility of slave families between country and city and between squares and neighborhoods; use of chattel property as collateral in financial dealings of the household; the birth of enslaved children within the household; long term service (some domestics remained with Sarah Davenport for decades while others were sold); enslaved worker’s spirituality and religious life (Salzburgers and Ned’s family connection to Brampton Plantation); freedom seeking, resistance and family separation and occupations within the household. Additionally, Kelly’s research does not end with her report; her work uncovered new mysteries and countless new lines of inquiry which will be fodder for future research. The quality and comprehensiveness of Kelly’s work was an unanticipated revelation. It has pulled back the drapery on the lives of half the household and given the Davenport House Museum many new stories to tell and lives to explore for years to come. Because of Kelly, the Davenport House will never be the same.
Jamie Credle
Director
Davenport House Museum
A Property of Historic Savannah Foundation
Introduction

The purpose of this research was to learn as much as possible about the enslaved men, women, and children who once lived and labored in the Davenport House. Upon its completion, the findings were intended to support the expansion of the Davenport House Museum and its interpretation of urban slavery. At the outset, the research trajectory for this project was broad in scope, reflecting a desire to learn everything there was to know about these people and their lived experiences. Later, the focus turned to genealogy, and the hopes of connecting with the living descendants of the Davenport slaves. But after considering the realities of this research focus---that the descendants may never be located or that the search could take years---and after consulting with a genealogist, I decided my research skills would be best applied elsewhere.

In the absence of immediately connecting with descendants and learning about the slaves through oral histories and other family sources, there was a finite resource pool from which to learn about these individuals. Ideally, it would be momentous to learn about their personalities, their everyday lives, relationships, idiosyncrasies, and the like, but this kind of information was not likely to be found among the available source material. Deeds, wills, Freedman’s Bank records, and runaway slave notices provide little of this much longed for detail. No diaries or other personal accounts kept by the Davenport slaves have been recovered, but the existence of this type of first-hand account was exceedingly rare. More general conclusions could certainly be drawn from other research, but these would not reflect specifically individual lives and experiences. Efforts to learn about these men, women and children after emancipation would also be challenged because time was not on their side; by the end of the Civil War, many of the original slaves would have likely already died.

In lieu of producing an archetypal interpretation, but in the absence of knowledge about these individuals while they were living at the Davenport House, it occurred to me that there was yet another way to learn about the individual experiences of the enslaved members of the household. By consulting deed records, wills, and estate inventories and tracing the chain of ownership for each of these people, it was more than possible to retrace their steps and rebuild their lives prior to their entry into the Davenport House and in some cases, after. These seemingly impersonal and succinct types of resources which oftentimes only provide a single name to identify an enslaved individual have the power to put these otherwise silenced people “on the map” so to speak---that is to say, to provide each of them with a geographic footprint. It would be possible and powerful to learn the locations of where these individuals lived, worked, and began their lives, thereby recreating their physical presence in Savannah and elsewhere. By knowing location, there was also infinite potential to draw later interpretations from location-based experiences, generally and more specifically as they relate to Savannah’s history.

Location could be supplemented with other valuable information. These resources would also identify family members and previous owners. Many of the lives of Savannah’s white and slaveholding class have been documented in various written formats, and this information has multiple implications upon the lives of slaves. Two other resource types could also provide valuable information: Savannah’s incarceration and interment records. In the case of the former, at least two of the Davenport slaves ran away, but it has never been known if they were jailed. In the case of the latter, interment records could potentially provide an ending point to the lives of many of these men, women, and children, thereby bringing closure to lives that have for centuries been lost to oblivion.
What unfolds in this report is a close reading of these source types---deeds, wills, estate inventories, as well as newspapers notices and other supplementary information---and the retracing of the lives of the slaves owned by Isaiah Davenport prior to their lives on Columbia Square. In some cases, it was also possible to trace their lives after the 1820s, but this was the exception and not the rule. Accessing these records required many hours spent at the Chatham County Superior Court and Chatham County Probate Court, where after a time I was somewhat jokingly encouraged by staff to apply for a job. This research also required visits to the Effingham County Superior Court, although this constituted only a fraction of the overall research time. This venture would not have been possible without access to numerous digitized records provided on ancestry.com, such as censuses, wills, slave ship manifests, and others, as well as the digital newspaper databases genealogybank.com and Savannah Historic Newspapers provided by GALILEO. The importance of research previously compiled by the Davenport House also cannot be understated, as it allowed this project to have a tremendous jumpstart.

Each of the thirteen Davenport slaves have been researched individually and their stories are compiled here in a parallel, structured format. This format includes sections devoted to pre-Davenport life, locations lived, family members, and life in later years. Additional sections have been included for some where they are relevant. I uncovered more information for some more than others, and the sections below will reflect this. I have made it a point to not just provide the information, but to also explain the research process on an individual basis where appropriate. Overall, I wanted these stories to be delivered in a palatable format that would be easily understood, yet would invoke excitement.

I emphasize here the physical presence of these individuals and their individual geographic stamp, and as a result maps have been included. Other images include wills, estate inventories, newspaper articles, and other sources, where I believed it was important to show each person’s presence in other ways. These images are also potential opportunities for exhibit displays and I have included a diverse collection not only because they are powerful in depicting the lives of the Davenport slaves, but also to spark conversation in regards to preferences for display. The images and maps in this report function best in a digital format. If a print copy is desired, it should be printed in color so that the integrity of the report is kept intact. Appendices at the end of the report include a collection of interment, incarceration, marriage and birth records which provide countless opportunities for future research. The section for each individual ends with a list of further research questions and a summation where possible, which may be used for interpretation. The conclusions drawn in this report are based on the best assessment of the records and on one individual’s interpretation; they are always open to further discussion and critique. Finally, the results of this report were presented during three training sessions to Davenport House docents in spring 2018. Docent- and interpretation-friendly packets summarizing the information were also provided without compromising the detail or accuracy of the information contained in the original report.

This research is meant to be only one part in what I hope will become multiple layers of research into the lives of the enslaved members of the Davenport House, who like many others after centuries of silence deserve to have their stories told. This research is also intended to be followed with discussions of possible interpretations and further potential research questions beyond those provided here. Although this report has been thoroughly proofed, I apologize in advance for any errors on my part and welcome their correction. It is my sincere hope that the next phase of research will focus on locating the descendants of the Davenport slaves. I hope that
once these descendants are located, they will share with us the invaluable oral histories about their ancestors and that these histories will be shared with visitors to the Davenport House to enhance the information compiled here.

Nancy
born ca. 1782
Effingham County, Ebenezer, Georgia
Sister to Peggy, aunt to Peggy’s daughter
The Salzburgers, a very helpful runaway advertisement, and a small but courageous woman

LIFE BEFORE THE DAVENPORTS
More information is known about Nancy than any of the other enslaved men, women, and children who lived at the Davenport House. This is because like many of other slaves, Nancy ran away. And like many other owners, desirous to regain their property, Isaiah Davenport placed a descriptive advertisement in a local newspaper soliciting help in Nancy’s capture. Although this incident was likely a fearful and unhappy time in Nancy’s life, the runaway notice created by Isaiah is replete with valuable details that provide insight into Nancy’s life, her origins, and perhaps why she ran away from the Davenport family. More than 200 years later, this snippet of early nineteenth century life in Savannah helps to set Nancy’s story in motion. The runaway notice, first advertised on October 15, 1812 in the Savannah Republican and Evening Ledger, reads as follows:

Fifty Dollars Reward
Ranaway from the subscriber on or about the 20th of March last, a NEGRO WENCH, Named Nancy, about thirty years of age, four feet ten inches high, has a scar on her neck; she can speak the German language; Nancy was formerly the property of George Rentz, who owns her sister by the name of Peggy; they look very much alike; Nancy was once taken, and got off by passing herself for Peggy; they can only be distinguished by the scar Nancy has on her neck, she has been several times seen passing from Savannah to Wilmington Island. The above reward will be paid on proof of conviction of her being harbored by any white person, or Thirty Dollars if harbored by a person of color, and Twenty Dollars if delivered to the subscriber, or lodged in any gaol in this state, so that the subscriber get her.

ISAIAH DAVENPORT.1

As a result of this advertisement, we learn much about Nancy and are given several leads to investigate:

- In 1812, she is described as approximately thirty years old, placing her date of birth at ca. 1782.
- The only hint of her occupation is Isaiah’s description of her as a “WENCH,” signaling that she was a domestic servant in the Davenport home.
- Nancy was of rather short stature, described as just a few inches shy of five feet, and could be distinguished by what seems to have been a significant scar on her neck. A later ship manifest record also indicates she is 4 feet, 10 inches.
- George Rentz still owned Nancy’s sister Peggy in 1812/13, and Nancy so closely resembled Peggy that she was successful at impersonating her.

---

• Isaiah indicates that Nancy speaks German, but does not say she can speak English.
• Nancy was seen traveling to and from Wilmington Island, indicating the presence of family or a support network here.

The details of Isaiah Davenport’s advertisement signal a brave young woman who’s short stature belied her courageous nature. At thirty years old, Nancy in all likelihood had a family of her own whom she was separated from by her sale to the Davenports. Nancy’s ability to speak German and her previous ownership by a man with the surname of ‘Rentz’ points to her living amongst the Salzburger community. Her sale to Isaiah Davenport was likely both emotionally and culturally jolting, and helps to explain why she chose to put her life at risk by running away.

Isaiah purchased Nancy from George Rentz sometime before March 20, 1812 as described in the runaway advertisement. The deed for Nancy’s sale to Isaiah indicates that she was sold to him on January 4, 1812. This means that Nancy lived with the Davenport family for approximately two and a half months before leaving. She remained on the run for at least a full year; the advertisement of her runaway was still being posted by Isaiah on March 4, 1813, but after this date, it is no longer advertised. It may be because Nancy returned or was captured, but there is no record of her being jailed in Savannah between 1812 and 1815. The earliest date that we know there was a slave named Nancy living with the Davenports was 1828, but we do not know for certain if this was her or when she returned. The Davenports must have been skeptical about Nancy after her runaway, knowing that she was a flight risk capable of alluding capture.

There is another indication that leaving the Salzburger community created such a great shock that it caused not only Nancy, but other slaves to run away when they were sold. When Isaiah’s brother Samuel Davenport died in 1820, one of his slaves, a man named Dave, also ran away. Isaiah, the administrator of Samuel’s estate, issued a runaway notice for Dave, which indicated that he too was formerly owned Salzburger descendants, the Readick family of Liberty Island. This may just be a coincidence, but it may also point to a dramatic difference in both the quality of life for those slaves who lived among the Salzburger community and those who lived outside of it, and a strong relationship among Salzburgers and their slaves.

No deed could be found which shows the sale of Nancy to George Rentz. To make sense of this gap, it was necessary to consult other sources and go back to the last decade of the eighteenth century. If there was no deed record showing George Rentz’s purchase of Nancy, it was possible that she was transferred to his ownership through other means, such as the death of a relative. The inventory of the estate of one John Rentz (1756-1795), a second-generation Salzburger born in Ebenezer, lists nine enslaved men, women, and children, of which two girls

---

2 Deed Record 2D-294, Microfilm Collection, Superior Court, Chatham County Courthouse, Savannah, Georgia.
3 Jail Registers, Record Group 56000 PL-010, vol. 1, City of Savannah Research Archives, Savannah, Georgia. The Archives do not have jail records for 1816-1854, during which time Nancy may have returned.
named Nancy and Peggy are named. According to genealogical records compiled by Salzburger descendants, John Rentz was great-uncle to a George Rentz who was born and lived in Barnwell, South Carolina. However, this does not appear to be the same George Rentz who lived in Savannah and who owned Nancy. The census records throughout the nineteenth century show John Rentz’s great-nephew living in Barnwell, South Carolina, while the George Rentz who once owned Nancy moved to McIntosh County after her sale and later lived in Houston County. Nonetheless, it is known that Nancy was born ca. 1782 and in John Rentz’s estate inventory of 1795, a “girl” named Nancy is listed. We also see that there is a girl named Peggy, who we know is the name of Nancy’s sister. Despite the unclear relationship between John and George Rentz, if this is the Nancy in question, what became of her between the death of John Rentz and her later ownership by George Rentz and how did this transaction come about?

One possible explanation as to what might have become of the Nancy in the above estate inventory fell upon the question of John Rentz’s widow, Agnes, also named in his estate papers: If Agnes remarried, her husband would have had these enslaved individuals at his disposal, assuming that they were not sold at public auction to clear the debt of her former husband or bequeathed to someone else. As it turns out, Agnes did remarry in 1797 to a man named Peter Alter, and no records could be located showing Nancy’s sale to another individual or in a public auction. Peter Alter seemed to be by all accounts an impoverished planter, perpetually hampered by debt. In 1793, just two years before Agnes became a widow, Alter, then living in the White Bluff District just outside Savannah, was listed for failing to pay taxes in 1792. He would have had ample incentive to marry the widow Agnes in hopes of acquiring the estate of her late husband to help ameliorate his financial woes. Alter’s plantation in White Bluff points to his possible connection to the Palatine Germans, a Calvinist Presbyterian group who originally settled in the area and established Vernonburg in 1737. Although the Ebenezer Germans and the Vernonburg Germans had ties, religiously the two were very different.

Agnes’s marriage to Peter Alter proved to be the bridge connecting George Rentz to Nancy: Newspaper and deed records show that George Rentz and Peter Alter were business partners, and that both he and George Rentz were in possession of the effects of John Rentz’s estate following his death. On December 24, 1810, Peter Alter sold George Rentz “30 head of cattle” matching the same number in John Rentz’s probate inventory. On May 17, 1811, Alter and Rentz appear together in a deed selling “…One Hundred acres being two fifty acre tracts, situate at Black Creek, Christ Church Parish, Chatham County” to Thomas Thiess. On April 23, 1814, the Savannah Republican advertised a sheriff’s sale of a “45 acre Lot adjoining B. J. Volleton’s

---

5 Inventory of the Estate of John Rentz (d. 1795), Series R-30, Accession # 79-29, Agency Box No. R1, Chatham County Probate Court, Savannah, Georgia.
6 Gnann, Georgia Salzburgers, 2494-2495.
7 Genealogical Committee of the Georgia Historical Society, Marriages of Chatham County, Georgia, vol. 1, 1748-1852, Savannah, Georgia, 1993, [Copy accessed in the probate court of Chatham County Courthouse.]
8 George Gazette, December 4, 1794, pg. 2, col. 3. Microfilm Collection, Bull Street Library, Savannah, Georgia.
10 Deed Record 2D-8, Superior Court, Chatham County Courthouse, Savannah, Georgia.
11 Ibid., 2D-21.
The inventory of John Rentz (d. 1795) lists two girls named Nancy and Peggy, who are grouped together underneath a woman named Mary (likely their mother). Nancy, Peggy, and Mary appear together in the deed of sale to John Rentz and likely represent a single family unit.

Source: Chatham County Probate Court, Estate of John Rentz (d. 1795), Series R-30, Accession # 79-29, Agency Box # R1.
near Timber Landing, or so much hereof as will satisfy the taxes of John and George Rentz, for the years 1807 and 1808 each..."12

In the years after marrying the widow Agnes, Peter Alter’s financial insolvency remained a problem. This helps to explain why he would be forced to sell Nancy to George Rentz. In 1812, a “...45 acre Lot, in Chatham County, formerly John Rentz’s, six miles from Savannah, on the Skidaway Road, levied on as the property of Peter Alter, to satisfy an execution in favor of C. Bedenback...” was advertised in the Savannah Republican.13 On May 4, 1809, the Republican and Savannah Evening Ledger ran an advertisement for a runaway slave named George, “...lately purchased at [a] Sheriff’s Sale on the first Tuesday in April last...sold as the property of Mr. Peter Alter..."14 The sale of George was the result of the default on a mortgage in January of the same year in which Peter used George as leverage. In addition to the sale of George---a Mary and Peggy---also noted in John Rentz’s probate inventory---and Peggy’s daughter, who seems to have been born in the years after John Rentz’s death, were sold to Thomas and Ann Bourke, but this time by George Rentz, on December 20, 1813. We know from the runaway advertisement that Peggy was still owned by George Rentz in 1812, which helps to substantiate that the Nancy and Peggy named in John Rentz’s estate inventory are the same Nancy and Peggy later owned and sold by George Rentz.

It’s not exactly clear how George Rentz came to own these enslaved women; no deed record can be found. One explanation may help to explain why Nancy is not named in a deed. On December 1, 1810, Peter Alter sells three “men slaves,” Smart, Quarh, and Charles, to George Rentz.15 Once again, we see the same names of Quarh and Charles from John Rentz’s estate inventory. Could this have possibly been the transaction in which Nancy was sold? Perhaps the deed recorder made a mistake and left Nancy out, or perhaps George Rentz later decided he wanted to purchase Nancy instead of one of the men listed here. There was no deed found between George Rentz and anyone else, but its clear that the connection between John Rentz, his widow Agnes, Peter Alter, and George Rentz resulted in Nancy’s later ownership by George Rentz. Nancy may have been acquired by George Rentz as early as 1800, when Peter Alter advertised the sale of John Rentz’s estate, or sometime between 1809 and 1813 when George Rentz and Peter Alter were forced to forfeit their lands and were selling their other slaves.16

Continuing to move backwards through the deed records, it appears that Nancy lived with John Rentz for only a short duration. Records indicate that she was sold to him just two years before his death, in a deed of April 29, 1793.17 The deed indicates that Nancy was acquired from a man named Emanuel Keiffer, a butcher in Chatham County, and that John Rentz was himself a

---

14 Republican and Savannah Evening Ledger, May 4, 1809, pg. 2, col. 1, Microfilm Collection, Bull Street Library, Savannah, Georgia.
15 Deed Record 2D-5, Microfilm Collection, Superior Court, Chatham County Courthouse, Savannah, Georgia.
16 Columbia Museum and Advertiser, March 28, 1800, pg. 3, col. 2, Microfilm Collection, Bull Street Library, Savannah, Georgia.
17 Deed Record M-145, Microfilm Collection, Superior Court, Chatham County Courthouse, Savannah, Georgia.
wheelwright. Emanuel Kieffer (1759-1795) was a third generation Salzburger born in Ebenezer, whose grandfather was also a butcher. Keiffer appears to have relocated to Savannah sometime between 1788, when he was elected to collect taxes in Effingham County, and 1793, corresponding with the deed of sale to John Rentz. Nancy is named in this deed of sale along with three other slaves—Sam, Mary, and Peggy—whose names can also be found in John Rentz’s estate inventory. This record points to other possible relatives of Nancy, perhaps her mother and father, and substantiates a relationship between Nancy and Peggy.

What is intriguing about this deed is Emanuel Keiffer’s occupation as a butcher. We know that Nancy had a prominent scar on her neck, and perhaps it was the result of an accident involving one of Keiffer’s tools. We cannot know for certain, but it’s an interesting possibility. Like Peter Alter and George Rentz, Keiffer also struggled financially, defaulting on his taxes in 1793 and 1794. Nancy, it seems, was sold to pay his debts, though to someone in the Salzburger community who John Rentz was familiar with. Both Emanuel, John Rentz, and his father John Rentz, Sr. are indicated as ministers in the Jerusalem Church of Ebenezer in 1775. No deed could be found that showed Nancy’s sale to Emanuel Keiffer in Effingham or Chatham County, but there other records which help to explain how he may have become her owner.

Emanuel’s brother Israel married Lydia Steiner, the daughter of David and Ann Margaret Steiner, also members of the Salzburger community in Ebenezer. A deed record from 1792 shows that an enslaved girl named Nancy who was “about ten years old” was given in trust by a Mrs. Margaret Steiner, then a widow, to Emanuel’s brother Israel, to be held in trust for her daughter Catharine Steiner. The age of the Nancy named here matches precisely the known age of the Nancy later purchased by Isaiah. As sister-in-law Lydia and brother to Israel, Emanuel would have been in a position to take over the trust if Israel died, particularly since there were no other male sons in the Keiffer family and because the Salzburgers were known for keeping their slaves within their own families. It is a possibility that Nancy then was originally owned by the Steiners originally.

What seems more likely the case is that Nancy descended from the slaves owned originally owned by Theobald Keiffer, II, the father of Emanuel and Israel Keiffer. The will of Theobald Keiffer II, written 1767, stipulates that

…the young Negroes who were born in my House Namely Peter, Ernst, Martha, Catharina, Adam, Judy who were all baptized Shall be kept in my family and be brought up in the Christian knowledge and Shall not be lyable to be given away in

---

18 Ibid.
23 Effingham County Court House, Deed Record Office, Book A & B, pg. 430, Springfield, Georgia.
mortgage or execution but Shall be only sold or changed to one or other of the Family
or to Such as will take care that the ends of Baptized grace shall be obtained...

This request emphasizes the importance the Keiffers and the Salzburgers placed on insulating and protecting their slaves and keeping them within their own families. It also underscores the importance they placed on the role of their Christian beliefs in the lives of their slaves. Theobald’s sons had good cause to honor their father’s wishes, and it is from among the slaves which Theobald specifically bequeathed to his son Emanuel---namely Adam and Judy---that Nancy is likely descended.

Because the Salzburgers were adamant about baptizing the enslaved at birth and raising them with their religious beliefs, many records of birth and baptism of slaves in the Salzburger community have been recorded. Unfortunately, these records only at present extend to 1781, a year before Nancy was born. A review of this collection was conducted nonetheless, but no record of Nancy could be found.

### Nancy: Location and Owner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nancy’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer</td>
<td>1782-1793</td>
<td>Butcher/Planter</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John and Agnes Rentz</td>
<td>1793-1795</td>
<td>Wheelwright/Planter</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>10-12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Rentz</td>
<td>1795-1797</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>12-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter &amp; Agnes Alter</td>
<td>1797-1809</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>15-26 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Rentz</td>
<td>1809-1812</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>26-30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah &amp; Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1813-1816</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>30-33 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHERE DID NANCY LIVE?

With the exception of Isaiah Davenport, all of Nancy’s owners were members of the Salzburger community, and she remained with them until she was thirty years old and was sold to Isaiah Davenport. Until 1812, Nancy lived in modest to indigent households, sustained through humble occupations, and all of these residences were rural locations. Because several of her owners were planters, she may have assisted in rice cultivation or other agriculture.

By identifying the possible locations Nancy lived and worked, later research may uncover a sense of the people and places nearby to Nancy that defined her daily life, experiences, and

---

26 Emanuel Keiffer died in Savannah, and in the deed of sale for Nancy, he is also indicated as being a resident of Chatham County. We also know that he defaulted on his taxes in 1793 and 1794. However, Keiffer had extensive lands in Effingham County, as well as a Lot in Savannah. Nancy could have lived at any of these locations.

Westfield 15
possible relationships. This holds true for the rest of the Davenport slaves. These locations for Nancy are based upon the known landholdings of owners gathered from various records. For example, Nancy likely resided with Agnes (Rentz) Alter and Peter Alter when she was between the ages of fifteen and twenty-six, the time during which she was most likely to have started a family. Research into the nearby slave owning families during this time may help to uncover who Nancy may have had children with.

Because Peter Alter took ownership of the land of John Rentz when he married the widow Agnes, and because he and George Rentz were business partners with mutual land ownership, Nancy lived in the same three locations from 1793-1812. Nearly all of these were on several acres of land outside of Savannah proper. It was not until she was sold to Isaiah Davenport that Nancy experienced living in an urban setting for the first time, where limited space would have been a shock and likely made her feel confined.

A NEW LIFE IN SAVANNAH?

There is uncertainty surrounding if Nancy ever returned to the Davenports and for how long she remained with them. The sources are sparse and conflicting. The runaway notices indicate she was gone at least one full year, but when did she return? Did the runaway advertisement cease because she was captured or came home? Or because Isaiah Davenport simply gave up? We cannot know for certain. It also must be acknowledged that by whatever means she may have returned, after a full year of being on the run, the Davenports may have hesitated in keeping her, since they most certainly would have considered her a major flight risk.

A passenger manifest for the ship Cotton Plant shows that Nancy traveled from Savannah to New York in 1816. The age and height indicated in this record matches the same description given by Isaiah Davenport just four years earlier when Nancy was on the run. Based on this manifest, Nancy must have returned to the

It has long been thought that the Nancy named here is the same Nancy purchased by Isaiah in 1812. But the discovery of a later deed record shows that there was another Nancy born ca. 1822 to one of the enslaved females, which may represent the Nancy named in the public auction of 1828. Source: Savannah Georgian, April 7, 1828, pg. 3, col. 4. Savannah Historic Newspapers, GALILEO.

---

Davenport House sometime before 1816 when she was sent by Isaiah to New York. What is interesting is that there is no record of Nancy’s return. Was she sold to someone in New York in 1816? And could the date of this passenger manifest mark the same time she returned to the Davenport’s, at which time she was sold? It is certainly a possibility. Of Isaiah’s other slaves besides Nancy, only Mary and Peggy were sent by ship, and a later manifest of 1839 indicates that at least Mary did return.\(^{28}\) At the time of her sale to Isaiah, Nancy was already thirty years old, and her sale likely marked Nancy’s separation from her family. Because she posed a

---

\(^{28}\) Ibid.
significant flight risk, and may have been unwilling to produce more children, Isaiah and Sarah may have been convinced that these were good reasons to sell her. It is also possible that Nancy returned home with Sarah, as passenger arrivals in newspapers often indicate women or men returning home with “servants.”

Although no record of this nature was found, Isaiah Davenport posted a notice of his “absence from the state” in 1816, the same year Nancy traveled to New York. This may have represented Isaiah’s traveling to New York in an attempt to sell Nancy, or resettle her in a place where he thought she would not be able to runaway.

While it has long been thought that Nancy appeared listed in the sheriff’s sale of 1828 among Isaiah Davenport’s other slaves this may in fact have referred to a younger Nancy, born to one of the other Davenport slaves in ca. 1822. In the years after Isaiah’s death, Sarah Davenport frequently used her slaves as leverage. Initially, this was done in order to purchase them back at the public auction following Isaiah’s death in 1828. In later years, Sarah borrowed money against her slaves again. In a deed record from 1843 in which she borrows money from Frederick W. Heineman, she backs the loan with four of her slaves, one of which is a twenty-one year old Nancy. This younger Nancy could have very well been the Nancy listed in the sheriff’s sale of 1828, who at the time would have been six years old. An excerpt from the deed reads as follows:

Witnesseth that the said Sarah R. Davenport doth this day executed her certain promissory note...payable sixty one days after date to the said Frederick W. Heineman...the said Sarah R. Davenport desires to secure and save (illeg) the said Frederick W. Heinemann from any loss or injury that may occur by reason of his endorsement of the said note, or any other note in renewal of the same or in renewal of any renewal note from time to time; Now be it know that to effect her said purpose and in consideration of the said endorsement and in favor of the consideration of the sum of One

---

29 See for example Sarah Davenport’s travel to New York City in 1840, in the Weekly Georgian, July 11, 1840, pg. 3, col. 6, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:swg1840-0103
31 For the public auction notice of Nancy and the other slaves owned by Isaiah Davenport, see the Savannah Georgian, April 7, 1828, pg. 3, Col. 4, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:sga1828-043. A younger Nancy appears in a later deed record of 1843. See Deed Record 3B-189, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
32 Ibid.
dollars to her in hand paid at or before the sealing and delivery of these presents... the said Sarah R. Davenport hath bargained and sold... unto the said Frederick W. Heinemann...
All the following named Slaves, to wit, Bella, a woman aged about forty five years, Ann, a woman aged about twenty nine years, Nancy a woman aged about twenty one years, and Morris, a boy aged about fourteen years...  

There is yet another detail about the sheriff’s sale which seems to support the notion that the Nancy listed was the younger Nancy born ca. 1822. With the exception of Bella, who was the mother to at least four of the slaves listed in the sheriff’s sale, all of the slaves whom Sarah bought back may have all been children or teenagers of the same family. We know that Isaac, Jacob, Jack, and Polly, named in an earlier purchase by Isaiah, were aged sixteen, nineteen, and twelve respectively when Sarah bought them back. For the other female repurchased at the auction, Peggy, no deed of sale exists, indicating her parentage by one of the other female slaves sometime between 1809 and as late as 1828. In 1840, a thirty-year-old slave named Peggy was sent by Isaiah Davenport, Jr. from Savannah to New York on board the ship *Clinton*. This may be the same Peggy once owned by Isaiah Sr., and places Peggy’s date of birth at ca. 1810 and her age at the time of the public auction at about eighteen years old.

When attempting to identify Nancy in the slave schedules and the census records, she must be considered alongside the other women owned by Isaiah and Sarah who were of a similar age. This includes Bella, born ca. 1790 and purchased by Isaiah in 1817, and Mary, born ca. 1790 and purchased by Isaiah in 1819. In the Census of 1820, it seems that Mary, Bella, and the older Nancy may all be present, although there is quite a large discrepancy in the age of Nancy which calls into question if she among the women identified. In 1820, there were 2 female slaves between the ages of twenty-six and forty-four living at the Davenport House, and one female at least forty-five or older. Bella and Mary, both born ca. 1790, account for the two enslaved females of ages twenty-six to forty-four; in 1820 they would have both been about thirty years old. The oldest female listed is a woman indicated as being forty-five years old or more, making her year of birth at least 1775. This is seven years earlier than Nancy’s earlier noted birth in 1782. An estimation off by even five years would seem significant enough, but this indicates that the Davenport’s reported a seven year change in Nancy’s age from the deed record of 1812. Such a large discrepancy calls into question whether or not this is Nancy, especially given that she traveled to New York in 1816 for which there is no record of her returning.

The 1830 Census only serves to complicate the story in that the ages of Bella, Mary, and the elder Nancy are now underestimated. The census indicates three enslaved females between the ages of twenty-four and thirty-six as the oldest age grouping. This means that the maximum year of birth for
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33 Ibid.
34 See Peggy, onboard the ship Clinton, traveling from Savannah to New York in 1840, in *Coastwise Slave Manifests, 1801 - 1860* ancestry.com
35 For Bella, see deed record 2G-303 and for Mary, see deed record 2K-125, both in microfilm collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
36 See Isaiah Davenport in the Census of 1820, ancestry.com
37 See Sarah Davenport in the Census of 1830, ancestry.com.
Nancy travels to New York City in 1816, for which there is no record of her returning. Source: *Coastwise Slave Manifests, 1801-1860*, ancestry.com.
Bella, Mary, and Nancy was 1794. For Bella and Mary, this age range is more plausible, as it is only a four year discrepancy. But in the Census of 1820, where Nancy would have been born in at least 1775, there is nearly a twenty year difference in her reported age. This seems an incredible oversight. In the Census of 1840, there are two female slaves reported with a date of birth between 1785-1804. This falls much closer in range to Nancy’s original known birth year, and it also covers the age range for Mary and Bella. Unfortunately, only two female slaves can be accounted for here, and one of them is most certainly Bella. In the same deed record of 1843 which identifies the younger Nancy, Sarah also used Bella as leverage in her loan from Heineman. In this deed, Bella is indicated as being forty-five years old, which places her date of birth now as late as 1798. The other female listed could have been Nancy or Mary, but then there are the Slave Schedules of 1850 and 1860 to consider. These show that only one, elderly, mulatto female slave was owned by Sarah Davenport. She is described as sixty years old in 1850 and seventy years old in 1860, making her date of birth 1790. This most certainly identifies Mary, who is the only enslaved female identified in previous years as having a “yellow” complexion and whose date of birth was 1790.

Since we know that Mary had to be the sixty-year-old and seventy-year-old mulatto female indicated in the slave schedules of 1850 and 1860 respectively, and that Bella, used as leverage in a loan given to Sarah Davenport in 1843, had to then have been one of the two enslaved females identified in the 1840 Census, it must be the case that the two elder female slaves owned by Sarah Davenport in 1840 were Mary and Bella, and that Nancy no longer lived with Sarah Davenport by 1840. While its possible Nancy could have been among those accounted for in the 1830 Census, the large discrepancy in her year of birth, reported as being at least 1775 in 1820 and then increasing to 1794 in 1830 calls into question whether or not Nancy was ever a member of the Davenport household after 1816, when she was sent by sea to New York. There are two slaves owned by Isaiah which cannot be identified through deeds, slaves he acquired when he moved to Savannah. As early as 1810, Isaiah reports ownership of two slaves, who may have acquired through his marriage to Sarah in 1809. One of these unidentified people may account for the woman born in 1775 or earlier listed in the 1820 Census.

It was also certainly a possibility that Nancy was still owned by Sarah, but lived outside of the household. Yamacraw Village in Oglethorpe Ward was a thriving community of free and enslaved blacks during the antebellum years, where many slaves lived relatively independent lives. Although the independent living of enslaved individuals was technically illegal, enslaved men and women hired themselves out and paid a portion of their wages to their owners, which allowed them to live apart. The neighborhoods of Old Fort and Springhill were also communities of free and enslaved blacks, but Yamacraw was by far the largest.

At least four of the Davenport slaves were hired out. The accounting of money received in Isaiah’s estate showed that in at least the years 1827 and 1828, David, Isaac, Jacob, and Polly all

---

38 See Sarah Davenport in the Census of 1840, ancestry.com.
40 Savannah Tax Digests, 1809-1851, ancestry.com.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
earned wages for Sarah outside of the household. Since Sarah and her slaves were participating in the system of hiring out their labor, they may have also participated in the system of living independently.

NANCY’S FAMILY

When Nancy was sold by Emanuel Keiffer to John Rentz in 1793, she was not alone; the deed of sale shows that Nancy was among three others---Sam, Mary, and Peggy. We know that the Peggy named in the deed is Nancy’s sister based on the later description of Isaiah Davenport in the runaway advertisement. The Salzburgers belief that the slaves should remain together and within one’s family, makes it a safe bet to assume that in addition to Peggy, Sam and Mary were also relatives of Nancy. In John Rentz’s estate inventory of 1795, Nancy and Peggy are indicated as being “girls” while Sam and Mary are described as adults. Based on this information, its possible that Sam and Mary are the parents of Peggy and Nancy. The only other verified relative of Nancy’s is her sister Peggy’s daughter, who is sold with her mother to the Bourkes in 1813.

Other possible family members of Nancy’s derive from the other slaves named in the estate inventory of Emanuel Keiffer and John Rentz. Nancy remained with the slaves listed in the inventory of John Rentz from the age of 10 to as late as 1812 when she was thirty years old. To recall, Peter Alter married John Rentz’s widow Agnes in 1797, thereby taking ownership of her slaves. As Peter Alter reached a point of financial insolvency, Nancy and the other slaves named in the inventory of John Rentz’s estate of 1795 begin to be sold off as early as 1810. Nancy herself was sold to Isaiah in 1812. But prior to this time, Nancy would have spent her teenage years and her time as a young woman with the other people named in John Rentz’s estate inventory, from the age of ten until as late as thirty years old. It was then likely that among these fellow slaves that Nancy would have found a mate and perhaps had children. Most of these people were men, including Charles, Will, George, Dick and a girl named Quarhy.

Unfortunately, the estate inventory of Emanuel Keiffer is not as precise as that of John Rentz’s inventory; only one enslaved female is specifically named, a mother of four children named Jude. Besides Sam, Mary, and Peggy---sold along with Nancy by Keiffer to Rentz in 1793, Jude and her children---also owned by Keiffer---could be other relatives of Nancy. The Jude named in Keiffer’s inventory is perhaps the “Judy” Theobald Keiffer bequeathed to Emanuel in his will of 1767. In terms of Nancy’s earliest relatives, these can be found within the will of Theobald Keiffer II of 1767. Theobald requested that Peter, Ernst, Martha, Catherine, Adam and Judy be always kept within the family and not sold. Adam and Judy were bequeathed to Emanuel, and it is perhaps the case that these are Nancy’s parents or grandparents. In Theobald’s will, several other men and women are named and it must be considered that
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44 Estate/Probate Record of Isaiah Davenport, series D-116, accession number 79-29, box D2, Chatham County Probate Court, Savannah, Georgia.
45 See Probate Record of John Rentz, above.
46 See Deed Record 2E-433.
47 See Estate Inventory of John Rentz.
48 See the estate inventory of Emanuel Keiffer, Series K-10, Accession # 79-29, Agency Box # K1, Chatham County Probate Court, Savannah, Georgia.
49 Wills, Colony of Georgia, RG 49-1-2, Georgia Archives, Digital Collection, Virtual Vault, http://vault.georgiaarchives.org/cdm/search/searchterm/Wills,%20Colony%20of%20Georgia,%20RG%2049-1-2,%20Georgia%20Archives(mode/exact).
Nancy may have also descended from any of these people. Many of the people named in Theobald Keiffer’s will can be found in the Ebenezer Record Book, where their birth and baptisms are announced. These people were baptized in the Jersulaem Lutheran Church in Ebenezer and in addition to Theobald being their sponsor, oftentimes his wife and children also acted as sponsors.

The last clue as to possible family members of Nancy or men whom she may have had children with concerns two enslaved males owned by Peter Alter and sold to pay debt in 1810---Prince and July. No age is indicated for these men, who appear in a deed of mortgage in 1802. By 1810, Prince and July were subjected to a public sale to clear the debt of Peter Alter.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Possible Relationship</th>
<th>Earliest Known Owner</th>
<th>Owner before Separation from Nancy</th>
<th>Years Lived with Nancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Sister (confirmed)</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer51</td>
<td>George Rentz52</td>
<td>At least 1793 until 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer53</td>
<td>Peter Alter54</td>
<td>At least 1793 until as late as 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary55</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer56</td>
<td>George Rentz57</td>
<td>At least 1793 until as late as 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy’s daughter58</td>
<td>Niece (confirmed)</td>
<td>Agnes &amp; Peter Alter</td>
<td>George Rentz59</td>
<td>Sometime beginning after 1795 until 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unnamed) b. between 1795-1811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles60</td>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer61</td>
<td>George Rentz</td>
<td>1793 - 1810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 Prince and July appear in Deed Record 2C-525 in 1802. They are advertised in 1810 as being for sale by the Sheriff. See the Republican and Savannah Evening Ledger, April 14, 1810, pg. 2, col. 1.
51 See Deed Record M-145.
52 Isaiah’s runaway advertisement for Nancy states that George Rentz was still Peggy’s owner in 1812 at the time of Nancy’s sale. She is sold to Thomas and Ann Bourke in 1813. See Deed Record 2E-433.
53 See Deed Record M-145.
54 Sam does not appear in any deed records after his sale to John Rentz in 1793 (Deed Record M-145). The last time he is named is in the probate inventory of John Rentz in 1795. It is safe to assume that when Agnes Rentz married Peter Alter two years later, Sam became the property of Peter Alter and lived alongside Peggy. In 1813, when George Rentz sold Mary and Peggy to the Bourke’s, Sam is not sold with them. It is possible that Sam passed away, or remained with either Peter Alter or George Rentz after Nancy’s sale in 1812.
55 The Ebenezer Record Book records the birth and baptism of Maria, born on Theobald Keiffer’s plantation in 1765. Since Theobald was Emanuel’s father, this could be the same Mary sold by Emanuel to John Rentz in 1792, and the same Mary named in Theobald Keiffer’s will. See pg. 3 of the Ebenezer Record Book.
56 See Deed Record M-145.
57 See Deed Record 2E-433.
58 Peggy’s daughter appears for the first time in the deed of sale to Thomas and Ann Bourke, but there is no indication of how old she is. She was born sometime following the death of John Rentz in 1795 and her appearance in the deed of her sale to the Bourkes in 1813.
59 See Deed Record 2E-433.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Father-in-law</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer (1793)</td>
<td>Peter Alter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer (1793)</td>
<td>Peter Alter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer (1793)</td>
<td>Peter Alter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Peter Alter (1802)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Peter Alter (1802)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith or Judy</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer (1766)</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until 1793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer (1766)</td>
<td>Theobald or Emanuel Keiffer</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until _?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60 See Estate Inventory of John Rentz. Deed Record 2D-5 indicates that Peter Alter sold Charles to George Rentz on December 1, 1810.
61 See Estate Inventory of Emanuel Keiffer.
62 Ibid. Will does not appear in later deeds of sale or other records after the estate inventory of John Rentz.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 A runaway notice for George appeared in the *Republican and Savannah Evening Ledger*, on May 4, 1809, pg. 2, col. 1, indicating that George was sold at a Sheriff’s Sale levied against Peter Alter in April 1809. It indicated he was 17-years-old. Bull Street Library Microfilm Collection, Savannah, Georgia. Dick does not appear in a deed of sale or other records after the estate inventory of John Rentz.
67 Ibid.
68 Quarhy appears in the estate inventory of John Rentz and appears to be named in a deed of sale between Peter Alter and George Rentz in 1810. However, this may not be the same Quarhy. There is a discrepancy between the gender and spelling of the name. In the estate inventory of John Rentz, Quarhy is listed as a girl. In the 1810 deed of sale, Quarhy appears as “Quarh” and is indicated as being a male. See Estate Inventory of John Rentz and Deed Record 2D-5.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
71 See Deed Record 2D-5
72 Ibid.
73 See Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book*, pg. 66.
74 See Will of Theobald Keiffer, II.
75 See Estate Inventory of Emanuel Keiffer.
76 Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book*, pg. 38.
77 See Will of Theobald Keiffer, II.
78 Adam is named in Theobald’s will and is bequeathed to Emanuel, but Adam’s name does not appear in Emanuel’s Estate Inventory.
79 King, Sarah, Peter aka “Old Gago”, Peter, Ernest, Glor, Jack, Jonas, and Mary are named in Theobald Keiffer’s will but cannot be found in the *Ebenezer Record Book*.
80 See Will of Theobald Keiffer, II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Parent(s)</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter, “Old Gago”</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;84&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulamith&lt;sup&gt;85&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Aunt/Mother</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glor</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Aunt/Mother</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;88&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherina&lt;sup&gt;89&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Aunt/Mother</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;90&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;91&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha&lt;sup&gt;92&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;93&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;94&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theobald Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;97&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude&lt;sup&gt;98&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Aunt/Mother</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until 1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude’s 4 Children</td>
<td>Nieces/</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Emanuel Keiffer</td>
<td>As early as 1782 until 1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unnamed)</td>
<td>Nephews or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.
<sup>82</sup> See Will of Theobald Keiffer, II.
<sup>83</sup> Ibid.
<sup>84</sup> Ibid.
<sup>85</sup> See Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book* pg. 27.
<sup>86</sup> See Will of Theobald Keiffer, II.
<sup>87</sup> Ibid.
<sup>88</sup> Ibid.
<sup>89</sup> Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book*, pg. 33.
<sup>90</sup> Ibid.
<sup>91</sup> Ibid.
<sup>92</sup> Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book*, pg. 23.
<sup>93</sup> Ibid.
<sup>94</sup> Ibid.
<sup>95</sup> Jones, *Ebenezer Record Book*, pg. 3.
<sup>96</sup> Ibid.
<sup>97</sup> Mary, Maria, and the Mary named in the deed of sale from Emanuel Keiffer to John Rentz may all be the same woman indicated in Theobald Keiffer’s will and the Ebenezer Record Book.
<sup>98</sup> Ibid.
<sup>99</sup> The Jude named in Emanuel Keiffer’s estate inventory is likely the same “Judith” or “Judy” identified in the Ebenezer Record Book and Theobald Keiffer’s will.
<sup>100</sup> See Estate Inventory of Emanuel Keiffer.
<sup>101</sup> Ibid.
The estate inventory of Emanuel Keiffer taken in 1795, just two years after selling Nancy and her family to John Rentz, names Jude and her children, who are possibly relatives of Nancy. Source: Estate Inventory of Emanuel Keiffer, d. 1795, Series K-10, Accession # 79-29, Agency Box # R1, Chatham County Probate Court.
It is my will and Testament that the young Negroes who were born in my House. Namely Peter Ernst, Martha Catharine, Adam Fady, who were all baptized shall be kept in my Family and be brought up in the Christian knowledge and shall not be capable to be given away on mortgage or execution but shall be only sold or changed to one or other of the Family or to such as will care that Ends of Bap

The will of Thebold Keiffer, II provides the names of Nancy’s possible family members and stipulates that the families were to be kept together and not sold out of the family. Source: Will of Theobold Keiffer, II, 1767, Wills, Colony of Georgia, RG 49-1-2, Georgia Archives, Digital Collection, Virtual Vault.
A map of Savannah from 1818 shows some of the locations Nancy lived and worked including Washington Square, Ewensburg, White Bluff, District/Vernonburg, and perhaps Columbia Square. Source: Original Map from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, Plan of the City & Harbour of Savannah by Houston.
This excerpt from a 1780s map of Georgia and South Carolina drawn around the time of Nancy’s birth shows Ebenzer, where Nancy originated, in relation to where she later lived in Savannah. Source: Hargrett Rare Map Collection, University of Georgia Digital Collections, A Map of South Carolina and part of Georgia, De Brahm, 1780.
A WALK IN NANCY’S SHOES: SOME OF THE LOCATIONS NANCY LIVED
FAMILY NEARBY?

A little less than two years after Nancy was sold to Isaiah and Sarah in January of 1812, George Rentz sold Nancy’s sister Peggy, Peggy’s daughter, and Mary, who may have been Nancy and Peggy’s mother, to Thomas and Ann Bourke. To recall, Peggy was Nancy’s sister, as described in Isaiah Davenport’s runaway notice, and Nancy, Peggy, and Mary appeared in the estate inventory of John Rentz in 1795. Two years earlier in 1793, Nancy, Peggy, Mary, and a man named Sam, who may have been Nancy and Peggy’s father, were sold by Emanuel Keiffer to John Rentz. Because we know that Nancy and Peggy were sisters, it may have been the case that the four slaves were a family, and they were sold together in keeping with the Salzburger tradition and the wishes of Emanuel’s father, Theobald.

In December of 1813, nine months after the last runaway notice for Nancy appeared, Peggy, her daughter, and Mary were sold to Thomas and Ann Bourke. What is remarkable about this sale is that like the Davenports, the Bourkes were also lot owners in Columbia and Greene Wards. Thus, if Nancy did return to the Davenport home in March of 1813, corresponding with when the runaway notice no longer appeared, and in the same year her sister, niece, and potentially her mother were sold to the Bourkes, Nancy may have lived in close proximity to her

The Federal Census of 1830 shows that Ann Bourke, who owned Nancy’s sister Peggy, her niece, and possibly her other Mary, were living practically next door to one another. If Nancy was still owned by Sarah in 1830, she would have been able to see her family regularly. Source: Federal Census of 1830, ancestry.com.
family until at least 1816 when we know she traveled to New York and may not have returned. The Bourkes and Davenports were connected not just geographically, but in other ways, increasing the likelihood that Nancy was able to see her family on a regular basis. Isaiah purchased Lot 18 in Greene Ward from Catherine Bourke in 1813. The relationship between Catherine and Thomas is unclear, but prior to 1813, the Lot was owned by Thomas, from 1811 to 1812. In the deed of sale to Isaiah, Catherine sells the Lot in her own right, and is not described as a widow. She may have been the mother or perhaps sister of Thomas. Isaiah and Thomas were also professionally connected: They served two terms together as City Aldermen, from 1818 to 1820.

Tax records show that Thomas Bourke was the owner of Lot 20 in Columbia Ward from 1811 until 1817, and Lot 6 in Greene Ward from 1809 until 1816. Bourke owned these lots when Isaiah and Sarah were owners of lots 13 and 14 in Columbia and 18 in the Greene. While Thomas and Isaiah were certainly the owners of these properties, there is difficulty in identifying which house and ward they were actually occupying. For example, it appears that Isaiah may not have been living in either Columbia or Greene Ward between 1812 and 1814. The death records of Isaiah and Sarah’s children Sarah and Thurston, who passed away in 1812 and 1814 respectively, indicate that the family was then living in Washington Ward. By 1820, Thomas Bourke was no longer the owner of Lot 20 or Lot 6 in Columbia and Greene Wards. When he died in 1821, he is reported as living in St. James Square, now Telfair Square. If Nancy were still living with Sarah Davenport in 1830, and Nancy’s sister Peggy, her niece, and Mary were still owned by Ann Bourke, by this time a widow, it can be said with absolute certainty that Nancy had ready access to her family. The Federal Census of 1830 not only places Sarah and Ann in Columbia Ward, it appears that the two widows may have been living next door to one another, or that Ann Bourke was living on Lot 20: Sarah Davenport and Ann Bourke appear consecutively in the census list. At the time of the Census, there were nine slaves living in Anne’s household. Further research is needed to rule out the possibility that Peggy, her daughter, and Mary were sold by the Bourkes, or if these women were sold at public auction to clear the debt of Thomas Bourke. Even if Nancy and her family never lived in the same ward, the other known locations where Peggy, her daughter, and Mary lived, would have allowed Nancy to remain in contact with her family.

**NANCY in LATER YEARS**

No positive identification of Nancy could be made in the years after her purchase by Isaiah, aside from the ship manifest record of 1816. The Nancy named in the public auction of Isaiah’s slaves could place Nancy in the Davenport home as late as 1828, but the discovery of a twenty-one-year-old Nancy, used as leverage in a loan of 1843, calls into question whether or not this is

---

102 Deed Record 2D-232, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
106 “Knowing the Neighbors: Columbia Lot Owners in the 1820s”, Davenport House Research, provided by Jamie Credle, Director, *Davenport House Museum*, Savannah, Georgia.
107 See Thomas Bourke, Ibid.
her. Nancy being on the run for an entire year, paired with there (1) being no record of her return from New York in 1816, (2) the difficulties in identifying her in the Censuses and Slave Schedules, and (3) her absence from the Davenport home for at least a year, may indicate that Nancy lived out the rest of her life in New York, or that she lived outside of the Davenport home. If Nancy lived until after the Civil War, she would have become a free woman at the age of eight three years old.

---

See Deed Record 3B-189, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.

This snippet from a map of 1813 indicates the location of Nancy and her family in Columbia Square. Source: Original image from “Knowing the Neighbors: Columbia Square Lot Owners in the 1820s,” Davenport House Museum Newsletter, September 2013.
This map of Savannah drawn in 1812 shows the known residences of Nancy and her sister Peggy. Source: Original Map from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, Map of the City of Savannah, Houston, 1812.
Nancy is not named in the later deed records of 1843, 1848, and 1858, in which Sarah Davenport uses her slaves as leverage for loans.\textsuperscript{109} This is interesting, because many of the other slaves purchased by Isaiah and Sarah around the time of Nancy’s purchase were still present. There is no antebellum record of Nancy’s interment in Laurel Grove South, although this may not necessarily mean she lived past the Civil War.\textsuperscript{110}

Isaiah or Sarah Davenport do not appear as guardians in the Registers of Free Persons of Color at any time. Although Archibald Clark Davenport served as a guardian to several free persons, none of these people were named Nancy. One compelling record did show Archibald to be the guardian of Sarah Ann Sallens, whose mother’s name was Nancy Dolly, but the birthdate for both the elder and younger Nancy’s owned by the Davenports is far removed from Nancy Dolly who was born in about 1806.\textsuperscript{111} The ubiquity of first names given to slaves and the absence of last name makes positive identification by first names alone impossible. There are numerous Nancy’s registered as Free Persons of Color, in the Census of 1870, and many Nancy’s are named as family members in the Freedman’s Bank Records. But by the time of postbellum records which fully enumerated former slaves, Nancy would have been between 80 and 90 years old, increasing the likelihood that she had already passed away by this time.

**Summary**

Nancy was born in 1782 in the Salzburger community of Ebenezer, just northwest of Savannah in present-day Effingham County. Before entering the Davenport home, death and debt among Nancy’s owners placed her life in a constant state of uncertainty; she would know five different owners before 1812. However, during this time Nancy remained within the Salzburger community, German-speaking Lutheran refugees once staunchly opposed to slavery. In 1812, Nancy’s final Salzburger owner George Rentz sold her to Isaiah Davenport. Rentz, an impoverished planter, likely sold Nancy to mitigate his insolvency. At the age of thirty, Nancy was forced to live outside of the Salzburger community for the very first time, and adapt a vastly different way of life. Sale to the Davenports also meant separation from parents Sam and Mary, her sister Peggy and in all likelihood her children. This helps to explain why two months after her sale to Isaiah, Nancy ran away.

Isaiah sought Nancy’s capture for at least a year through advertisements in Savannah newspapers, indicating her intelligence and grit in being able to elude her captors for a significant amount of time. Her prolonged escape as well as her practice of impersonating her sister Peggy to elude authorities points to Nancy’s fearless and bold personality. Nancy’s

\textsuperscript{109} See Deed Records 3B-189, 3F-135, 3T-52, and 3R-265, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.

\textsuperscript{110} Laurel Grove Interments records were consulted at the City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{111} See Nancy Dolly and Sarah Ann Sallens in *Savannah, Georgia, Registers of Free Persons of Color, 1817-1864*, ancestry.com. The Register of Free Persons record for Nancy Dolly and Sarah Ann Sallens, is compelling, and can be matched to a Freedman’s Bank Record, also for Sarah Ann Sallens, which provides numerous other family members. The elder Nancy owned by the Davenport’s was born ca. 1782, and the younger Nancy named in the 1843 deed record was born ca. 1822. Its possible that birthdate’s can be grossly in correct. These records are certainly in area for further research. For the corresponding Freedman’s Bank Record, see Sarah Ann Sallens in *U.S., Freedman's Bank Records, 1865-1871*, ancestry.com.
strength of character belied her diminutive stature; she was only 4’10.” She also had a large scar on her neck, perhaps the remnants of physical punishment or profound injury so often seen in runaway advertisements. It is not known exactly when or by what means Nancy returned to the Davenport home, but a ship manifest for the Cotton Plant indicates Isaiah sent her to New York City in 1816. There is no record of her return, and the reported ages of the enslaved females living in the Davenport household indicated on the census of 1820 and 1830 dubiously support her presence. Having eluded capture for at least a year, it is plausible that the Davenports considered Nancy a major flight risk and that Nancy’s voyage to New York City coincided with her sale to a new owner.

There is no deed of sale for Nancy beyond the Davenport family, and her presence on the ship manifest is the last time she appears in the records. It is not clear what her fate was after 1816, but by 1840, it is unequivocal that Nancy was no longer living in the Davenport house. When Isaiah Davenport died of Yellow Fever in 1827, he was heavily in debt, resulting in the public auction of the enslaved members of his household. The name Nancy appears in the auction notice, seeming to imply that Nancy had in fact returned to the Davenport home. However, a later deed record of 1843 recently discovered indicates Sarah Davenport’s ownership of a younger Nancy, who was six years old at the time of the auction. Given Nancy’s history with the Davenports, her shaky presence on the census records, and in light of the fact that Sarah Davenport repurchased the other enslaved children at the public auction, it is likely that this individual represents the younger Nancy named in the deed of 1843.

Nancy’s lived experiences illustrate the uncertainties faced by enslaved individuals in their daily lives as a result of the ever-looming prospect of sale to another owner. The death or financial insolvency of a slave owner could mean the abrupt uprooting of an enslaved individual’s life, and the painful separation from family. But multiple owners could also mean a high degree of mobility and the opportunity to interact with more of the enslaved and free community. By living in Ebenezer and various locations throughout Savannah, Nancy had the ability to build a network, which in all likelihood helped to sustain her during the extensive time she was a runaway. Nancy’s experience also provides yet another example of resistance to enslavement and the fight for autonomy over her own life, despite the potential consequences.

Themes: Sale of the enslaved, family separation, freedom seeking and resistance, mobility, geography and networking, plantation vs. urban enslaved experiences

Future Research Questions
1. How were enslaved lifeways shaped by Salzburger culture?
2. Was the treatment of slaves by Salzburgers diametrically better inside of this community?
3. How did enslaved women within the Salzburger community dress?
4. Was Nancy educated alongside the children of her owners?
5. What do the results of the archeological investigations in Ebenezer conducted by the LAMAR institute reveal, if anything, about enslaved life among the Salzburger community?
6. What is Nancy’s connection to Wilmington Island? Did she have family here?
7. Is there anything to be interpreted from the fact that Nancy and fellow bondman Dave, both previously owned by Salzburger descendants, ran away when they were sold out of this community?
8. Are there any records in New York which may indicate Nancy’s fate after her 1816 voyage?
9. Can it be confirmed that the Nancy named in the auction of 1828 is in fact a younger Nancy?
10. Are there living descendants of Nancy’s pre-Davenport owners

Bella
Born ca. 1789
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina
Mother to Polly, Jack, and twin boys Jacob and Isaac
Hilton Head Island and a “Habitual Drunkard”

LIFE BEFORE THE DAVENPORTS

Five years after the Davenport’s purchased Nancy, Bella and her four children joined the household of Sarah and Isaiah. Bella remained with the Davenport’s until at least 1843, where she is named in a deed record, used by Sarah to acquire a loan. Initially, the search into Bella’s past proved disappointing. Research indicated that Bella was born Beaufort, one of the numerous “burn” counties that went up in flames during the Civil War. Courthouse records were set ablaze by Union forces, and deed records only go back as far as the 1860s, making the discovery of an original deed of sale for Bella impossible. Another impediment seemed to be the lack of information on David Baldwin, Bella’s owner before the Davenport’s. A scant number of documents could be found, and it appeared that this information would not go a long way to telling Bella’s story. But among these few records, information about Bella’s past emerged that may reveal more about her experience prior to living with the Davenport’s than any of the information about her fellow slaves.

David Baldwin is an elusive character, or at least in some respects. As a result, records that might reveal where Bella lived, where she was born, or other details of her early life did not seem promising. Baldwin appears in Savannah tax records only in 1819 and 1820, where it shows that he owned no property. No record could be found of when he was born or died, and there is no estate or will for Baldwin in the Chatham County Superior Court. He also does not appear in any census records. Three deed records exist for David Baldwin, but he is a grantor in all of these and they do not contain the sale of Bella. He is an equally ephemeral presence in newspapers, although a few small articles provide some information surrounding his death. It appears that Baldwin passed away sometime around 1821, when the Superior Court advertised the possession of his last will. Four years later, his estate was still being levied against, when one of his former slaves, a woman named Christiana, was confiscated from the administrator of his estate, Josiah Tippin. Beyond these newspaper findings, a “List of Letters” seems to place David Baldwin in Savannah as early as 1799. He is named many years later as applying for letters of administration for the estate of Townsend G. Baldwin in 1817, but beyond this, the newspapers provide little of his presence in Savannah. An earlier newspaper record from 1781 indicated a David Baldwin owned land in Wrightsborough, located in St. Paul’s Parish, Georgia.

112 See Deed Record 3B-189, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
115 Columbia Museum, October 11, 1799, pg. 4, col. 1, Bull Street Library Microfilm Collection, Savannah, Georgia.
116 Savannah Republican, March 4, 1817, pg. 3, col. 4, Bull Street Library Microfilm Collection, Savannah, Georgia.
117 Royal Georgia Gazette, February 8, 1781, pg. 1, col. 3, Bull Street Library Microfilm Collection, Savannah, Georgia.
Wrightsborough was a colonial town established by Quakers coming from North Carolina, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and other areas. The Quaker settlers were given large tracts of land by the trustees in this area, although they were staunchly opposed to slavery. It was possible that the David Baldwin of Wrightsborough may have been Bella’s owner, but more research is needed to verify this.

The most promising lead seemed to be Baldwin’s connection to Townsend G. Baldwin. Because Bella was sold to Isaiah Davenport in 1817, within months of Townsend Baldwin’s death and David Baldwin becoming the administrator of his estate, it seemed that Bella may have been acquired by David from Townsend upon his death, where she was then sold to Isaiah. In 1818, Townsend’s slaves were sold in Savannah at Public Auction. The advertisement reads, “within the usual hours will be sold, several valuable NEGROES, belonging to the estate of Townsend G. Baldwin, deceased.” Unfortunately, Townsend’s probate record was absent of any estate inventory, including the names of any slaves.

Research into the origins of Townsend G. Baldwin showed he lived in present-day Beaufort just prior to his death in Savannah in 1817. The 1810 Census in St. Luke’s Parish, Beaufort District names Townsend, and indicates his ownership of six slaves. The 1790 and 1800 Census in St. Luke’s recorded an Isaac Baldwin, who seemed to be a possible relative. Beyond these census records, Townsend, like David, seemed to be a mystery. In the absence of vital Beaufort records burned during the Civil War, some deed records and other types of documents can be found in the South Carolina Department of Archives. A search showed that no records existed for David Baldwin, but an interesting petition to the South Carolina Senate in 1817 from one of their residents provided a further lead. In this petition, James Kirk asks the Senate to be allowed to return to the state with “ten negroes” which he recently inherited from

---

120 Ibid.
This petition provides a link between James Kirk, Townsend Baldwin, and David Baldwin. In the petition of 1817, the same year Bella and her children were sold to Isaiah Davenport, Kirk also acquired slaves from Townsend G. Baldwin’s estate. Source: Series S165015, Item 00120, Petitions to the General Assembly, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.
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G. Baldwin. So here was then another new name to research, and a possible new lead to learn about Bella’s origins.

Because David Baldwin does not seem to have been a resident of Savannah, with the exception of 1819 and 1820 when he appears in the tax records, and in light of the fact that Townsend Baldwin was living in St. Luke’s Parish in 1810, it seems that Bella likely was born in the same area of Beaufort or St. Luke’s Parish. Her sale to Isaiah Baldwin within months of Townsend’s death by the administrator of his estate, David, seems more than a coincidence. Bella and her children were likely the slaves of Townsend. But what was the connection between the Baldwins---David, Isaac, and Townsend, and what was their connection to James Kirk, who was also a resident of South Carolina? A misfiled probate record on Ancestry.com held the answer, and more.

What was labeled as a will in Chatham County for David Baldwin showed no more than his name and a page number in what appeared to be only an index of names. Within the pages past this initial index was a combination of wills and witness testimony, which either contested or approved them. It is not clear why this record is not included in the Chatham County Probate Court. By locating Baldwin’s last will in this collection, I discovered that he died in September of 1820. In his last will, he left a large number of slaves and his entire estate to his friend Josiah Tippin, which included “that distribution share of my late Brother’s Estate, Townsend G. Baldwin, deceased.” The relationship between the two Baldwins was now clear, as well as the solid connection between David Baldwin, Bella, and the Beaufort area. In total, David bequeaths sixteen slaves to his friend Josiah: Old Jack, Monday, Doctor, Ned, Tom, Young Jack, Henry, Yellow John, Richard, Charlotte, Christiana, Ritter, William, Hager, Betsey, and Carolina. In May of 1822, several members of David’s family disputed his will, believing that David was not of sound mind. As the testimony goes:

And now on this sixth day of May one thousand eight hundred and twenty two came Isaac Baldwin the Father of the deceased David Baldwin, Henry P. Baldwin, Brother of the deceased, James Kirk who intermarried with Mary E. the sister of the deceased and Mary E. Kirk his wife…who caveat the application of the Said Josiah Tippin…Because The said David Baldwin was not at the time of the execution of the said paper…of sound and disposing mind, but on the contrary was not in his proper senses, and was by reason thereof incapable of making a will….  

---

124 See David Baldwin in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com. David Baldwin’s will is not available in the Chatham County Probate Court. In the record contained on ancestry.com, it does not initially come up. Once inside the record, the will begins on page 213, which must be manually skipped too.
125 Ibid., pg. 213.
126 Ibid., pg. 214. Josiah Tippin was a mutual acquaintance of David Baldwin and Isaiah Davenport, and may explain why Bella and her family were purchased by Isaiah from David in 1817. In 1820, Isaiah appointed Josiah his acting attorney while he was out of town for approximately 2 months. See the Savannah Daily Republican, August 1, 1820, pg. 4, col. 4, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1820-0249.
These excerpts from David Baldwin’s will (above and below) and those who contested it reveal the relationship between the Baldwins, James Kirk, and their connection to the Beaufort area. They also indicate details of David Baldwin that may have significantly impacted Bella’s life. Source: David Baldwin in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com
Now the other relationships were clear. The Isaac Baldwin found in the 1790 Census of St. Luke’s Parish, Beaufort, was the father of Townsend and David, and James Kirk was David and Townsend’s brother-in-law. The 1810 Census in St. Luke’s shows James Kirk there residing and owning thirty-six slaves. While the Baldwin surname is ubiquitous, as are the names David Baldwin, Isaac Baldwin, and James Kirk, genealogical information compiled by Kirk

---

descendants and research by the Heritage Library Foundation of Hilton Head Island identifies that Isaac and his wife Martha Baldwin were originally from New Jersey, and that their daughter Mary was wed to James Kirk Brown in 1807. If the Baldwins were from New Jersey, is it possible that David Baldwin did own land in Wrightsbourough, an area settled in part by Quakers from New Jersey, as the newspaper advertisement suggested? It certainly seems like more than a possibility. Aside from this, Baldwin’s supposed last will also revealed several other valuable bits of information. For one, several possible family members of Bella are named, or at the least, other slaves with whom she likely lived. In the course of the testimony given by those who witnessed the signing of the will by David Baldwin, it was also revealed that he was a “habitual drunkard” and had fathered children with one or more of his slaves. It was reported that two of these children, John and Richard, who are named in the will, were requested by David to be manumitted at the time of his death. It is uncertain how much time Bella and her children spent with David Baldwin, but if it was significant, the fact that her former owner was an alcoholic and was involved sexually with his slaves has major implications for Bella’s life.

Knowing that David Baldwin’s brother and father were living in St. Luke’s Parish in 1790 implies that David himself was as well. The relationship between these men also makes possible that Bella was formerly owned by either Townsend or Isaac. Nancy’s sale to Isaiah Davenport in 1817, within months of the death of Townsend Baldwin and of David becoming the administrator of the estate signals a likelihood that she was owned by Townsend, who was still living in St. Luke’s Parish as late as 1810. Knowing that David Baldwin was, as his family describes him, a sot, may imply an inability to acquire land and slaves of his own.

THE KIRKS AND THE BALDWINS OF BLUFFTON AND HILTON HEAD: BELLA’S ORIGINS in a POLITICALLY RADICAL COTTON & RICE EMPIRE

Confirming the relationship between the Kirks and the Baldwins and between the Baldwin men connects Bella to some of the wealthiest plantation owners in St. Luke’s Parish, in areas which included Hilton Head Island and parts of the mainland Beaufort District. Indigo thrived on Hilton Head during the colonial period and rice was prominent on the mainland. Bella also lived an area where slaves dominated demographically in the colonial and antebellum periods, but where planters were considered the most politically radical in the state. A large African-American population, calls for secessionism, and fears over slave insurrection no doubt made for a tense atmosphere.

By the time of Bella’s birth ca. 1789, sea island cotton was the new staple in Hilton Head and rice continued to be grown on the mainland. James Brown Kirk (1780-1850) named as the

128 “Kirk Genealogy” [compiled by descendants of James Brown Kirk], Rose Hill Mansion, March 13, 2013, http://www.rosehillmansion.com/KirkGenealogy.html. There is discrepancy in the naming of Isaac Baldwin’s wife. Kirk descendants have identified her as Sarah, but this is likely his daughters name, and whom he is buried next to in the Zion Chapel of Ease Cemetery. According to the Heritage Library and History Research Center of Hilton Head Island, Isaac’s wife’s name was Martha. This information is based on An Index to Hilton Head Island Names. The Kirk descendants likely made the mistake of identifying Sarah as Isaac’s wife because her tombstone is next to his in the cemetery.
129 See David Baldwin’s will, d. 1820, Ancestry.com.
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid.
brother-in-law to David Baldwin in the contesting of his will, was made the second wealthiest man in the Parish thanks to his sea island cotton plantations, which included several thousands of acres in Bluffton and Hilton Head Island.\(^{133}\) Moreover, Bella and her children may have increased the wealth of their owner through their labor in agriculture.

**Where did Bella and her Children Live?**

It is difficult to precisely pinpoint where Bella lived prior to her ownership by Isaiah and Sarah; the only owner she can be identified with is David Baldwin, for whom no location in Savannah or St. Luke’s Parish can be found. These considerations, along with the timing of Bella’s sale to Isaiah and Townsend Baldwin’s death makes it seem likely that she was formerly owned by Townsend and/or his father Isaac. Since David cannot be identified on a census from 1790 to 1810 in South Carolina or Georgia, this signals that he was not a head of household. David likely lived in St. Luke’s Parish at the time of Bella’s birth in the household of one of his family members. Therefore, identifying where the Baldwins lived in the area seems the best way to identify where Bella spent the first thirty years of her life.

Isaac Baldwin (1752-1826) began a 290-acre plantation aptly named Baldwin Plantation, located on Hilton Head Island, deriving immense profits from slave-based plantation agriculture much like his son-in-law.\(^ {134}\) In 1810, he was the owner of forty-seven slaves.\(^ {135}\) Research suggests that the Baldwin Plantation was later subsumed by the Kirk’s Cherry Hill Plantation around the time of Mary Baldwin’s marriage to James Kirk in 1807.\(^ {136}\) Cherry Hill was identified as being in the northeastern corner of Hilton Head Island, surrounded by Folly Field on the South and Grass Lawn Plantation and Pope’s Fish Haul Plantation on the north.\(^ {137}\) It is not clear when or for how long Baldwin lived at the Plantation, but it would seem to be sometime around when his daughter sold the Baldwin Plantation in 1807.\(^ {138}\) According to a land sale advertisement from 1806, Isaac Baldwin also owned vast tracts of land located on the May River, adjacent to Montpelier and Octagon Plantations.\(^ {139}\) This was in an area known as Palmetto Bluff, situated on the mainland of St. Luke’s Parish, lying on the south side of the May River across from Bluffton.\(^ {140}\) The advertisement of 1806 indicates that Montpelier and Octagon plantations were also bordered by the lands of William Mongin and Richard Proctor, who appear enumerated consecutively next to Isaac in the 1810 Census. Jacob Harstene, owner of Greenleaf and Chinququin Plantations, also appears consecutively enumerated next to Isaac in the Census.

---


\(^{136}\) Peeples, Hilton Head Names.

\(^{137}\) See Hack, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, before 1861, Hilton Head Island Heritage Foundation Library and Research Center, http://www.heritagelibrary.org/images/27.jpg. (Figure Below)

\(^{138}\) 138 Peeples, Hilton Head Names.

\(^{139}\) *City Gazette (Charleston, South Carolina)*, November 12, 1806, pg. 3, genealogybank.com.

Greenleaf and Chinqupin were located adjacent to Montpelier and Octagon on the southwest and west respectively. Palmetto Bluff contained at least 15 plantations.\textsuperscript{141} Although it is not clear which of these was owned by Isaac Baldwin, his location, and thus perhaps Bella’s locations, can still be relatively well defined.

Townsend Baldwin lived in St. Luke’s Parish as late as 1810 before his death in Savannah. In the 1810 Census, he is enumerated consecutively after several members of the Devant family, who owned Two Oaks Plantation on Hilton Head Island.\textsuperscript{142} Two Oaks was located just north of Broad Creek, \textit{bounded east by Marshlands and Sandy Hill, west by Otter Hole and north by Pineland Tract}.\textsuperscript{143} More importantly, Two Oaks was very close to Cherry Hill, where the Baldwin Plantation was thought to have originally been. There is another indication of location which should be noted about Townsend’s position on the Census of 1810. Enumerated consecutively next to the Devants is another plantation with a large numbers of slaves: that of John Stoney. Stoney is enumerated with 82 slaves, and owned a plantation north of Broad Creek. Just a few years after the 1810 Census, the lands along Skull Creek, which bordered the northwest coast of Hilton Head Island, were pulled together into Skull Creek Plantation by Thomas Henry Barksdale, whom Isaac Baldwin’s daughter Mary sold the Baldwin family plantation to in 1807.\textsuperscript{144}

In sum, Bella was likely born in the northeast region of Hilton Head Island on the Baldwin family Plantation, which was later renamed Cherry Hill. She may have continued to live here or around this area in a nearby plantation as late as 1810, when Townsend appears on the Federal Census, or even as late as 1817 when he passed away and she was sold to Isaiah Davenport. Its also possible that Bella lived or spent some time in Palmetto Bluff, where Isaac Baldwin owned extensive lands, and that he may have been her owner before his son. Bella may have also lived with Isaac’s daughter Mary and husband James Kirk, who accumulated thousands of acres of land spread across Bluffton, Hilton Head, and Callawassie Island. Kirk is considered the founder of Bluffton, where he established his primary home.\textsuperscript{145} Although David Baldwin’s brother Henry is also listed in the contesting of his will, Henry Baldwin does not appear on the Federal Census between 1790 and 1810 in Georgia or South Carolina. Like his brother David, he may have lived with his family in St. Luke’s Parish, but was not considered a head of household.

---

\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., 35.
\textsuperscript{144} Peeples, Hilton Head Names, https://www.heritagelib.org/articles/baldwin-plantation.
### BELLA and HER CHILDREN by LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years When Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived/Worked</th>
<th>Bella’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Baldwin</td>
<td>ca. 1789-1817</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>(1) Baldwin Family Plantation, Hilton Head Island</td>
<td>0-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Cherry Hill Plantation, Hilton Head Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha &amp; Isaac Baldwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Palmetto Bluff, Adjacent to Montpelier and Octagon Plantations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Adjacent to Devant Plantation of Two Oaks, north of Broad Creek, Bounded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eastwardly by Sand Hill and Marshland Plantations, Hilton Head Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Kirk Family Residence, Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>b. 1808</td>
<td>Planter?</td>
<td>Savannah, unknown location</td>
<td>29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>b. 1812</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>(1) Columbia Ward Lot 13 &amp; 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>b. 1812</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Greene Ward Lot 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>b. 1816</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Washington Ward Lot 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Savannah, unknown location</td>
<td>29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah &amp; Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1817 until at least 1843</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>(1) Columbia Ward Lot 13 &amp; 14</td>
<td>29-54 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Greene Ward Lot 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Washington Ward Lot 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BELLA’S FAMILY
When David Baldwin sold Bella to Isaiah and Sarah in 1817, she was not alone; Bella was sold with her four children named Polly, Jack, Jacob, and Isaac. Jacob and Isaac were twins, born ca. 1812. Jack was the oldest child, born ca. 1808, and Polly was an infant of one year old. Bella and her children remained together with the Davenports until at least 1828, when Sarah purchased them back at the public auction of Isaiah’s estate. Their purchase, however, was not wholly altruistic; Sarah simultaneously used her slaves as collateral in a mortgage which allowed her to save her home, which was also up for sale. Several years later, Bella, Jacob, and Isaac were still together, but there is no sign of Polly or Jack; Bella is named in a loan of 1843 secured

---

146 Bella appears in a later deed record of 1843 when Sarah once again used her slaves as collateral in a loan. See Deed Record 3B-189.
147 See Deed Record 2G-303.
148 Ibid.
149 See Deed Record 2O-563, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
A map of Hilton Head Island, showing its numerous plantation at the start of the Civil War. Cherry Hill, the original location of the Baldwin Plantation, is included. Members of the Baldwin and Kirk family are buried in the Zion Chapel of Ease. Source: Original Map from Heritage Library Foundation, Hack, Hilton Head Island South Carolina before 1861.
A map of Palmetto Bluff, showing the Greenleaf and Chinquepin Plantations where Isaac Baldwin owned lands. In addition to Hilton Head Island, Bella may have also spent some of her time here. Source: Original map from Montpelier Plantation (38BU1789) Antebellum Life at Palmetto Bluff. Eric C. Poplin, Pat Hendrix, Connie Huddleston, Alana Lynch, Charles Philips Jr., Catharine Runyan. Brockington and Associates, Inc. 2004 ( tDAR id: 391092 ) ; doi:10.6067/XCV8MW2J1K
An excerpt from a 1780s map of South Carolina and Georgia, showing locations Bella lived and worked in South Carolina in relation to Savannah. Source: Original map from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, University of Georgia Digital Collection, De Brahm, A Map of South Carolina and part of Georgia, 1780.
by Sarah and the twins Jacob and Isaac appear five years later in a loan of 1848, indicating that Bella remained living with her twin sons until at least 1843.\textsuperscript{150}

The will of David Baldwin names sixteen other slaves who may have been related to Bella. Unfortunately, the age or relationship of any of these men and women, or for how long they lived and worked with Bella is unknown. These people include: Old Jack, Monday, Doctor, Ned, Tom, Young Jack, Henry, Yellow John, Richard, Charlotte, Christiana, Ritter, William, Hager, Betsey, and Carolina.\textsuperscript{151}

There are two other people who may have been related to Bella named in deeds of sale by Townsend Baldwin and David Baldwin, respectively: Esther, sold to Josiah Tippin in 1817---the friend whom David Baldwin would later bequeath his estate to---and Phillis, sold to Robert James in 1820.\textsuperscript{152} What is interesting about the deed of sale for Phillis and David Baldwin’s will is that they both reveal what may reflect a particular sentiment towards their slaves: Both Townsend and David wished to manumit their slaves at the time of their deaths. In the case of David Baldwin, the man described as a “habitual drunkard” was no doubt partial to manumitting two of his slaves because they were his children. While Esther may have been fathered by Townsend or was his former sexual partner, it is not clearly stated.\textsuperscript{153}

Like Nancy, whose sister and niece may have lived as close as a few doors down, the slaves bequeathed to Josiah Tippin by David Baldwin who may have been Bella’s other family members remained close to her until at least the time of Josiah Tippin’s death in 1826. Tippin’s precise address in Savannah could not be determined, but a funeral notice indicated his residence to be on South Broad Street, present-day Oglethorpe Avenue.\textsuperscript{154}

**BELLA in LATER YEARS**

We know that Bella remained with Sarah Davenport until at least 1843 when she is named in a loan deed.\textsuperscript{155} But it seems that by 1850, Bella was no longer living with Sarah. Only one female of Bella’s age is listed in the household and because she is listed as “mulatto,” this must refer to Mary, a woman born ca. 1790, purchased by Isaiah in 1819.\textsuperscript{156} It’s possible that Bella may have passed away sometime between 1843, when she is last named in a deed, and 1850, when she no longer appears in Sarah’s household. There is no record of her interment in Laurel Grove South.\textsuperscript{157} It is also possible that she lived independently in the community of Yamacraw, Old Fort, or Springhill.\textsuperscript{158} If Bella lived until after the Civil War, she would have become a free woman at the age of seventy-six years old.

\textsuperscript{150} See Deed Record 3B-189 and 3F-135.
\textsuperscript{151} See David Baldwin in *Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992*, ancestry.com. David Baldwin’s will is not available in the Chatham County Probate Court. In the record contained on ancestry.com, it does not initially come up. Once inside the record, the will begins on page 213, which must be manually skipped too.
\textsuperscript{152} See Deed Records 2G-285 and 2I-473, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah Georgia.
\textsuperscript{153} See the last will of David Baldwin, pg. 216 and Deed Record 2G-285.
\textsuperscript{154} See the *Savannah Georgian*, November 7, 1826, pg. 2, genealogybank.com.
\textsuperscript{155} See Deed Record 3B-189.
\textsuperscript{156} See Sarah R. Davenport of Savannah, in 1850 U.S. Federal Census Slave Schedule, ancestry.com. For the sale of Mary, see Deed Record 2K-125, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
\textsuperscript{158} See the discussion of slaves living independently in Harris and Berry, “Geographies,” 101.
### BELLA’s FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Earliest Known Owner</th>
<th>Owner before Separation from Nancy</th>
<th>Years Lived with Bella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>Daughter (confirmed)</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1801 until at least 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Son (confirmed)</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1808 until at least 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Son (confirmed)</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1812 until at least 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>Son (confirmed)</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1812 until at least 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Jack</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Jack</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime between 1789 and 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow John</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
<td>David Baldwin</td>
<td>Sometime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159 Although David Baldwin is the earliest confirmed owner of Bella and her children, they were likely formerly owned by Townsend or Isaac Baldwin.

160 Polly and Jack appear with Bella and twin brothers Jacob and Isaac in a public auction newspaper advertisement and later in a deed of sale in 1828. See Deed Record 2G-303.

161 Jacob and Isaac are used as collateral in a deed of 1858, meaning they lived with their mother until at least 1843 when she appeared in another deed as collateral. See Deed Record 3F-135 and 3R-265.

162 Old Jack appears listed among 16 other slaves (listed below Old Jack in table) in the 1820 last will of David Baldwin. See David Baldwin in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com. David Baldwin’s will is not available in the Chatham County Probate Court. In the record contained on ancestry.com, it does not initially come up. Once inside the record, the will begins on page 213, which must be manually skipped too.

163 Although we cannot know for certain if the slaves in David Baldwin’s last will, dictated in 1820, were with Bella in 1817, it is a safe assumption to make.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(child of David Baldwin)</th>
<th>(1817)</th>
<th>between 1789 and 1817</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard (child of David Baldwin)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiana</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritter</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsey</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Townsend Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillis</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>David Baldwin (1817)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

164 Esther appeared in a deed of sale from Townsend Baldwin to Josiah Tippin in 1817. This was an interesting deed record, because it stipulated that once Townsend died (which would be in the same year) Esther, described as a girl, was to be manumitted. Josiah Tippin would later inherit the goods of David Baldwin’s estate in 1820. See Deed Record 2G-285, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.

165 Phillis appeared in a deed of sale from David Baldwin to Robert James in 1820, the year of David Baldwin’s death. See Deed Record 21-473, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
A deed of sale from 1843 shows the Bella was still in the Davenport household when Sarah backed a loan with Bella and her fellow slaves. Source: Deed Record 3B-189, Chatham County Superior Court.
The map depicts the locations where Bella lived in relation to South Broad Street, where the other slaves inherited by Josiah Tippin may have lived. Source: Original map from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, University of Georgia Digital Collection, Map of the City of Savannah, Houston, 1812.
possible explanation is that Bella moved to the household of someone else in the family. The only members of the Davenport family with entries in the Slave Schedules of 1850 are Sarah, her son Hugh, and her son-in-law, Henry Rootes Jackson. While Bella does not appear to be living with Sarah or her son-in-law, there is a sixty-year-old black female listed as living with Hugh McCall. This could very well be Bella.\footnote{See Sarah R. Davenport, Henry R. Jackson, and Hugh Davenport in the 1850 U.S. Federal Census Slave Schedule.} Considering that Bella would have been at least seventy years old by 1860 and that the Census from that year shows she was not living with any members of the Davenport family, she may have passed away sometime between 1850 and 1860.

There are no women named Bella under the guardianship of anyone in the Davenport family in the Registers of Free Persons of Color. There is also no indication of Bella in Freedman’s Bank Records. In the Census of 1870, there are no Bellas born ca. 1790 living in Savannah. Although there are several women born ca. 1790 living in nearby South Carolina, there is no indication that any of these women are Bella.

**Summary**

Bella was born in ca. 1789-1798 on the Baldwin Family Plantation, located in the northeast region of Hilton Head Island. Here in St. Luke’s Parish, a plantation packed area of lowcountry South Carolina, where Bella spent the first twenty-eight years of her life and gave birth to four children, Jack, Polly, and twin sons Jacob and Isaac. On Hilton Head and the mainland, Indigo, cotton, and rice were produced by a large slave labor population, which totaled eighty-five percent of all residents in 1820. The wealthy planter elite like the Baldwins who dominated the region were among the most politically radical in the state, calling for succession during the Bluffton movement of 1844.

In 1817, just a year after the birth of daughter Polly, Bella and her four children were sold to Isaiah Davenport by David Baldwin. David was the son of Isaac Baldwin who began the family plantation on Hilton Head Island, and the younger brother of Townsend G. Baldwin, who died a little over a week after the sale of Bella and her children to Isaiah. Anticipating that he would inherit many of the enslaved individuals owned by his dying brother, David Baldwin perhaps sold Bella and her children to obtain the money from their sale. Whatever his motivation, David’s sale of Bella and her children to Isaiah Davenport may have been a relief for the young mother. David Baldwin was a known to family and friends as an “habitual drunkard” who fathered at least two children with his female slaves: Two sons named Richard and John.

Bella’s ownership by David Baldwin implies she may have been subjected to sexual abuse and/or exploitation, an experience all-too-common during the antebellum period. Although there is no evidence to indicate Bella was victimized by David Baldwin, many enslaved females in Savannah were faced with similar experiences. There is also no indication that Bella’s children were of mixed race parentage, but it is curious that Bella was a single mother when sold to the Davenports, and that daughter Polly was only about a year old. Because Bella’s daughter Polly was an infant at the time of her purchase, Bella may have been the wet nurse for the Davenport children, including Benjamin Rush, born in June 1817, Isaiah Jr., born in 1815, and Archibald Clark, born in 1819.

When Isaiah Davenport died of Yellow Fever in 1827, he was heavily in debt, resulting in the public auction of the enslaved members of his household. Bella and her children were faced with
an uncertain future as they were bid on at a courthouse sale in 1828. It must have been a terrifying and emotionally distraught experience, as Bella and her family were faced with the prospect of separation. But the widowed Sarah Davenport repurchased Bella and all four of her children at the sale, including twenty-year-old Jack, sixteen-year-old Isaac and Jacob, and twelve-year-old Polly. Despite the possibility of separation and sale in 1828, Bella and her children remained together for much of their lives. However, deed records indicate that Sarah provided Bella and her twin sons Jacob and Isaac as collateral for loans on several occasions, which placed their futures in a constant state of uncertainty.

Bella’s ownership by David Baldwin does not prove she was abused or exploited sexually, but it does illustrate the exceptional hardships faced by female slaves at the hands of male slave owners. Bella’s life also illustrates the two extremes of lowcountry plantation versus urban living, a change in lifestyle of which she had no control. The death or financial insolvency of a slave owner could mean the abrupt uprooting of an enslaved individual’s life, and the painful separation from family. Bella’s sale to the Davenports as a result of the death and decline of the Baldwin brothers may have been a welcome change for Bella, and fortunately, she was not separated from her children for a period of at least eleven years.

Themes: Sale of the enslaved, urban vs. plantation enslaved experiences, the enslaved as collateral, enslaved female experiences, mobility and networking

Further Research Questions
1. How did life compare for slaves on Hilton Head Island and the Beaufort area versus Savannah?
2. How might have Bella and her children been impacted by the radical, slaveholding ideals of the Hilton Head and Beaufort elite?
3. What other information can be learned about David Baldwin?
4. Was the Peggy or Nancy listed in the public auction of 1828 Bella’s daughter?
5. What became of Polly and Jack and why did they not remain with their mother and twin brothers?
6. Sarah’s family was from the Beaufort area. Were they familiar with the Baldwin family?
7. Is it possible that the “Old Jack” listed in David Baldwin’s will is Bella’s spouse or partner?

BELLA’S CHILDREN:
Isaac, Jacob, Jack & Polly

Bella was sold to Isaiah and Sarah Davenport in 1817 with her four children: Isaac, Jacob, Jack, and Polly. Naturally, because her children remained with her, the lives of Bella’s offspring follow the same trajectory as their mother before they became a part of the Davenport household. The earliest known deed record in which Bella appears and that of her children are one-in-the-same, as are their former owners, locations they lived, and possible family members. Bella lived with her children for at least eleven years after being sold to Isaiah and Sarah. A deed record of
1828 shows that Sarah repurchased Bella and her children at the public auction of 1828. At almost forty years old, Bella was probably one of only a small pool of fortune mothers lucky enough to remain with her children, despite the financial insolvency of her owner. She would have the continued good fortune to live with her twin sons Jacob and Isaac for at least another fifteen years, but this must have been overshadowed by the absence of her youngest child Polly and her other son Jack. Sometime after 1828, Polly and Jack seem to have relocated to another household or perhaps passed away; they do not appear in the later deed records in which Sarah uses her slaves as collateral. Although the lives of Bella’s children remained parallel to hers until at least 1828, the years after this allow for individual examination.

Polly
Born ca. 1816
In St. Luke’s Parish, Beaufort District, South Carolina
Youngest child and only daughter of Bella, Sister to Jack and twin brothers Jacob and Isaac

Polly was likely born on Hilton Head Island, on or near the Baldwin Family Plantation, ca. 1816, just one year prior to the death of Townsend Baldwin. She was the younger sister of three brothers, born to Bella when she was about twenty seven years old. Polly was very in close in age to both Isaiah, Jr. and Benjamin Rush Davenport, who were born in 1815 and 1817 respectively. Although Polly was purchased back by Sarah at the 1828 auction, it is not clear what became of her after this; she does not appear in later deed records as her mother and siblings do. When Polly was repurchased at the sale of 1828, she was simultaneously used to back a mortgage which Sarah Davenport secured from Joseph P. Cumming and Samuel Parkman. The terms of the agreement were that Sarah would repay a loan of $1,960 after six months, or her slaves would become the property of Cumming and Parkman. There is no record of Sarah defaulting on the loan, but in other instances where Sarah secured money with her slaves, there was always the risk they could be sold if the debt was not paid. This may perhaps explain why Polly (and her brother Jack) do not appear in later deed records.

The census records indicate that Polly may have remained in the Davenport Household as late as 1840, but in the Slave Census Schedules of 1850 and 1860, she is no longer present. She also does not appear in the household of any other Davenport family members listed in the schedules. One possible explanation is that Polly was living and earning wages for Sarah in another household. The record of money received in the accounting of Isaiah Davenport’s estate indicates that in 1828, Sarah received $12 for Polly and David’s wages. By 1850, Polly’s

\[167\] See Deed Record 2O-563; See also the public auction advertisement of Bella and her children in the Savannah Georgian, April 7, 1828, pg. 3, col. 4, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:sga1828-0431.
\[168\] See Deed Record 3B-189 and 3F-135.
\[169\] See Deed Record 2G-303.
\[170\] See Deed Record 2O-563.
\[172\] Estate/Probate Record of Isaiah Davenport, series D-116, accession number 79-29, box D2, Chatham County Probate Court, Savannah, Georgia.
absence may indicate that this arrangement moved Polly into another household. If Polly lived until after the Civil War, she would have become a free woman at forty nine years old.

There are numerous women named Polly in the Registers of Free Persons of Color, but there is no apparent connection between these free women and the Davenport family. Likewise, Freedman’s Bank Records also do not provide any leads. Unlike the Registers of Free Persons and Freedman’s Bank Records, the 1870 Census provides numerous leads. Given the ubiquity of the name Polly, there are countless Polly’s born ca. 1816 living in Georgia and South Carolina. The more relevant entries among these are for a Polly living in Savannah, of which there are six. Of these six, one of the surnames matches that of former title holder in Columbia Square, Mrs. Ann White who occupied Lot 24. None fall within one to two years of Polly’s known date of birth, although this could mean little considering the inaccuracy of reported birthdates of slaves. Polly’s known family members do not appear in any of the households.

There is one interesting connection to a Polly Gibbons, born ca. 1820, which may be a promising lead. In the Registers of Free Persons of Color, a carpenter named Jack Gibbons is listed. Jack’s guardian was Shad Solomon, who owned lot 1 in Columbia Ward from 1804 to 1867. Lot 1 is located almost directly behind lots 13 and 14 owned by Isaiah Davenport. While Jack Gibbons cannot be identified as Polly Gibbons brother based on their first names and identical surnames alone, or that either of these people are the Jack and Polly who lived at the Davenport House, it is compelling that Jack’s guardian was Isaiah Davenport’s neighbor, that he was a carpenter, and that Jack does not appear in later deed records after 1828.

In addition to the Polly’s living in Savannah listed on the 1870 Census, there are also two Polly Davenports living outside of Savannah in Oglethorpe and Morgan County, Georgia. Oglethorpe and Morgan counties are both located outside of Athens, twenty-four miles and thirty-one miles respectively. Henry Rootes Jackson’s family owned Halscot Plantation outside of Athens, which may help explain why Polly was living in either of these counties in 1870. What is also interesting about Polly Davenport of Morgan County is that all four of her children have the same names as known slaves owned by Isaiah and Sarah: Nancy, Jane, Jack, and Charles. Unfortunately, the known ages of Isaiah and Sarah’s slaves do not match the ages of Polly’s children. The younger Nancy named in a deed of 1843 was born ca. 1822, whereas the Nancy in Polly’s household was born ca. 1835, Jane, born ca. 1843, is only thirteen years old in the 1870 Census, placing her birthdate in 1857. Charley owned by Sarah was born in 1850, whereas Polly’s son Charles was born ca. 1855. Jack, only five years old in 1870 is clearly not that brother of Polly, though his namesake could easily have come from his uncle.

Polly Davenport of Oglethorpe County provides an even more compelling link to the Davenport family. Polly and her family, which includes James, young Polly, Lucy, and Susan are

---

174 Estate/Probate of Isaiah Davenport.
175 Crawford, “Knowing the Neighbors”
177 See Deed Record 3B-189.
178 See Deed Record 3F-135.
179 See Deed Record 3R-265, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
listed one house away from another Davenport family, Eliza, Ben, Cora, and Susan. There is also a Henry Jackson listed as head of household just a few houses down. The names Eliza and Ben are both connected to the Davenport family, although in two very different records. Lizzy, born ca. 1853 is named as leverage by Sarah Davenport in a deed of 1858. Eliza Davenport of Oglethorpe was born ca. 1848. Eliza’s son Ben, also listed in her household, is only five years old. An incarceration record for a slave named Ben from 1857, owned by one of the Davenports was committed for “safe keeping” and received a punishment of whipping. Could this be Eliza’s husband and young Ben’s father? It is a possibility.

### Possible Leads on Polly in the 1870 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polly Millen‡</td>
<td>Savannah, 21st sub district</td>
<td>House Servant</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Byron b. 1812</td>
<td>Savannah (unspecified)</td>
<td>Laundress</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Peters b. 1821</td>
<td>Savannah, 21st sub district</td>
<td>House Keeper</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Morrison b. 1820</td>
<td>Savannah, 21st sub district</td>
<td>House Servant</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly Gibbons b. 1820</td>
<td>Savannah (unspecified)</td>
<td>Laundress</td>
<td>Age; Jack Gibbons, a carpenter, free person of color, guardian Shad Solomon§ (Lot 1 Columbia Ward)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly White b. 1821</td>
<td>Savannah, district 7</td>
<td>Cannot be determined (ancestry.com error)</td>
<td>Age; Surname identical to Lot 24 Title Holder in Columbia Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or Family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polly Davenport b. 1820</td>
<td>Madison, Morgan County, Georgia</td>
<td>Day Laborer</td>
<td>Children have same names as known Davenport slaves: Jack, Jane, Charles, and Nancy; Madison is close to Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

‡ See Polly Davenport of Oglethorpe County, Georgia, in the Federal Census of 1870, ancestry.com.
§ Ibid.
§§ Jail Registers, Record Group 5600 PL-010, vol. 2, 1855-1858, City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Savannah, Georgia.
‡‡ All data on different Polly’s in Savannah displayed in table taken from Federal Census of 1870, Savannah, ancestry.com.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polly Davenport b. 1815</th>
<th>Oglethorpe County, Georgia</th>
<th>Keeping House</th>
<th>Rootes Jackson Halscot Plantation in Athens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliza may be Lizzy from deed of 1858; son Ben may be named after Ben owned by Davenport family member who was incarcerated; former bondman named Henry Jackson and another Davenport family live nearby; Oglethorpe is close to Henry Rootes Jackson’s Halscot Plantation in Athens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several other compelling leads for Polly that would benefit from a second phase of research. Even beyond the census records examined here, there are countless other leads for Polly’s with a corresponding birthdate throughout Georgia and South Carolina in the Census of 1870. Because Polly was the youngest of the original group of Davenport slaves, it is likely that among one of the entries from the Census of 1870, Polly can be found. There is no antebellum interment record for Polly in Laurel Grove South, but she may have lived several years after the end of the Civil War and may have been buried elsewhere. There are also numerous Polly’s born ca. 1816 who traveled by sea to and from Savannah, but none of these are connected to the Davenports or Henry Rootes Jackson. Future research which examines the slaves owned by families in Columbia Ward may one day reveal Polly’s possible spouse.

Jack
Born ca. 1808
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina
Eldest son of Bella, brother of Polly, Jacob, and Isaac

Jack was likely born on Hilton Head Island, on or near the Baldwin Family Plantation ca. 1808. He was the first child of Bella’s, born to her when she was about nineteen years old. Much like his sister Polly, Jack seems to go off the radar after 1828. Sarah repurchased him at the public auction of Isaiah’s slaves, but he does not appear in later deed records where his

---

186 See Deed Record 2G-303.
brothers and fellow slaves are used as collateral. Like his sister, there is no antebellum record of Jack’s interment in Laurel Grove Cemetery. nothing to report that he ran away, and no indication of his presence among Freedman’s Bank Records. Census records indicate that Jack may have remained with Sarah Davenport until as late as 1830. But by 1840, Jack is no longer accounted for, signaling that he may have been living independently. There is also no indication that Jack was living in the households of Hugh Davenport or Henry Rootes Jackson. While his sister Polly and brothers Isaac and Jacob both earned wages outside of the house, there is no record of Jack doing the same. If he lived until after the Civil War, he would have become a free man at fifty-seven years old.

One compelling possibility is the record of Jack Gibbons, a free person of color. For one, a Polly Gibbons whose date of birth corresponds with the Polly owned by Isaiah and Sarah was identified in the 1870 Census. Jack Gibbon’s guardian was Shad Solomon, a neighbor of Isaiah and Sarah who occupied Lot 1 in Columbia Ward, and Jack was a carpenter. The proximity of Shad Solomon’s home to the Davenport’s, his occupation, as well as the shared surname of Gibbons with Polly makes this a lead worth more research. Unfortunately, Jack Gibbons cannot be located on the 1870 Census.

Jack is an equally ubiquitous name as Polly, and there are countless Jacks living in Georgia and South Carolina listed in the Census of 1870. Five of these Jacks, with birthdates ranging from 1805 to 1810, were living in Savannah at the time of the Census. Of these, three out of the five have identical surnames of either former residents or title holders of Columbia Square in the 1820s and 1830s, including Lloyd, White, and Butler. John Lloyd was the title holder for Lot 20 and Thomas E. Lloyd for Lot 15, Anne White for Lot 24, and Gilbert Butler was living in Columbia Ward at the time of the 1830 Census. In the case of Jack White, born ca. 1810, this matches the surname of Polly White born ca. 1821, who was also on the Census of 1870. There are four Jack Davenports living in Georgia and South Carolina listed in the 1870 Census. Three of these were living in the previously discussed counties of Morgan and Oglethorpe outside of Athens, but all of these listings are for Jacks who were either infants or born several decades after Jack’s known date of birth.

---

187 See Deed Record 2O-563; See also the public auction advertisement of Bella and her children in the Savannah Georgian, April 7, 1828, pg. 3, col. 4, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:sga1828-0431.
189 See Estate/Probate Record of Isaiah Davenport.
190 See Jack Gibbons in Savannah, Georgia, Registers of Free Persons of Color, 1817-1864, ancestry.com, and Crawford, “Knowing the Neighbors.”
192 See Polly White in table above.
This excerpt from an 1812 map of Savannah shows the location of where Jack Gibbons lived with Shad Solomon, located almost directly behind where the Davenports lived. Source: Original image from “Knowing the Neighbors: Columbia Square Lot Owners in the 1820s,” Davenport House Museum Newsletter, September 2013.
### Possible Leads on Jack in the 1870 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Lloyd b. 1810</td>
<td>District 7, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Shares surname with John Lloyd of Lot 20 and Thomas Lloyd of Lot 15, Columbia Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Pitman b. 1810</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack White b. 1810</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Shares surname with Anne White of Lot 24, Columbia Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Butler b. 1805</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Shares surname with Gilbert Butler who lived in Columbia Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Minton b. 1805</td>
<td>District 7, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jack Davenport b. 1845</td>
<td>Oglethorpe County, Georgia</td>
<td>Farm Laborer</td>
<td>Surname; Location is close to Henry Rootes Jackson’s family plantation outside Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Davenport b. 1865</td>
<td>Madison, Morgan County, Georgia</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Surname; Location is close to Henry Rootes Jackson’s family plantation outside Athens; Polly Davenport (50 years old---possibly Jack, Sr. sister) lives in household, as well as Nancy, Charles, and Jane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Davenport b. 1869</td>
<td>Oglethorpe County, Georgia</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Surname; Location is close to Henry Rootes Jackson’s family plantation outside Athens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jacob
Born ca. 1812
_Hilton Head Island, South Carolina_
Son of Bella, Twin of Isaac, younger brother of Polly and Jack

Jacob was likely born on Hilton Head Island, on or near the Baldwin Family Plantation ca. 1812. He was the twin of Isaac, born to Bella when she was twenty three years-old. He was very close in age to Isaiah Davenport, Jr. who was only three years younger. Jacob was repurchased by Sarah at the public auction of 1828. Like his sister, Jacob helped support the Davenport family financially by working outside of the house. The accounting of Isaiah Davenport’s estate showed that Sarah received $2 for hiring out Jacob in December of 1827. While Jack and Polly do not appear in later deed records as collateral, Jacob and his twin brother are provided as collateral for loans in 1835, 1848, and in 1858. In the deed record of 1835, Jacob and his brother Isaac are used to back a loan of $500 from Jeremy Stone. In the deed record of 1848, Jacob and Isaac along with 8 other slaves are provided as collateral in a loan of $1,000 from Cosmo P. Richardson. In the last deed record of 1858 in which Jacob is named, Sarah secures a loan of $700 from Elam Alexander of Macon.

With his twin brother by his side, Jacob spent his childhood, teenage, and adult years with the Davenport family, all told at least forty-one years. There is no antebellum interment record for Jacob in Laurel Grove South; if he survived until after the Civil War, he would have become a free man at fifty-three years old. Although Jacob lived with his twin brother and mother Bella until as late as 1843, he and his brother lived at additional locations in Savannah in the 1850s and 1860s, when Bella can no longer be seen in the Davenport household.

There are several compelling leads for Jacob in the Census of 1870 and 1880. In Savannah alone, there are seven Jacobs indicated in the Census of 1870 born within five years of Jacob’s known date of birth. One of these can be eliminated based on a Freedman’s Bank Record, that of Jacob Golphin. Undoubtedly, the most telling of these is Jacob Jackson, born ca. 1810. By 1860, Sarah and her slaves were living with Henry Rootes Jackson and his family. It is perhaps the case that after the Civil War, Jacob may have taken the last name of Henry Rootes, whom he would have considered to be the head of his household. The Census of 1880 provides what are even more compelling leads. In the Census of 1880, Jacob Godfrey, a carpenter, is listed. Jacob Godfrey and Jacob Davis, also in the Census, were born in South Carolina. Unfortunately, there are no leads in the Registers of Free Persons of Color or the Freedman’s Bank Records for Jacob.

---

193 See Deed Record 2G-303.
194 See Estate/probate record of Isaiah Davenport.
195 See Deed Records 2T-21, 3F-135, and 3R-265.
196 See Deed Record 3F-135.
197 See Deed Record 3R-265.
198 See Deed Record 3R-265.
199 There are several Freedman’s Bank records for Jacob Golphin that indicate his parents and siblings. These family members do not match anyone in Jacob’s known family. See Jacob Golphin in U.S., _Freedman's Bank Records, 1865-1871_, ancestry.com.
200 See Jacob Jackson, Savannah, Georgia, in Census of 1870, ancestry.com.
201 See Jacob Godfrey, Savannah, Georgia, in the Federal Census of 1880, ancestry.com.
**Possible Leads on Jacob in the Censuses of 1870 and 1880**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Fields</td>
<td>District 8, Chatham,</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>ancestry.com error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Jackson</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham,</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah; Shares Surname of Henry Rootes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>ancestry.com error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Morand</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham,</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>ancestry.com error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Roberts</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Holly</td>
<td>District 7, Chatham,</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1815</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>ancestry.com error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Tyson</td>
<td>District 5, Chatham,</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1807</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>ancestry.com error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Godfrey</td>
<td>Sixteenth District, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah; occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Davis</td>
<td>District 6, Chatham,</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Age; Location in Savannah; born in South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An excerpt from the 1880 Census, showing Jacob Godfrey, a carpenter, living in Savannah and born ca. 1810. Source: original image from Federal Census of 1880, ancestry.com
Isaac
Born ca. 1812
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina
Died January 1860
Savannah, Georgia
Son of Bella, Twin brother of Jacob, younger brother of Polly

ISAAC was likely born on Hilton Head Island on or near the Baldwin Family Plantation ca. 1812. He was the twin brother of Jacob, born to Bella when she was twenty three years old.\textsuperscript{202} Isaac was repurchased by Sarah at the public auction of 1828 along with the rest of his family.\textsuperscript{203} Like his twin brother and sister Polly, Isaac worked outside of the Davenport home, earning money for Sarah Davenport. The accounting of Isaiah Davenport’s estate shows that Isaac’s labor compensated Sarah with $11 in 1828.\textsuperscript{204} Isaac was provided as collateral for loans in 1835, 1848, and in 1858.\textsuperscript{205}

One of the most valuable findings pertaining to the original group of slaves owned by Isaiah and Sarah concerned Isaac: Laurel Grove South Interment records show that Isaac was afflicted with dysentery and died in January of 1860. He was buried on January 20, 1860 at the age of forty-eight years old.\textsuperscript{206} In 1860, Sarah was living on Jones Street, between Abercorn and Drayton Streets, and it was here that Isaac likely spent his last days. All told, Isaac spent 43 years of his life with the Davenport family. He is one of only two people among the original group of Davenport slaves whose life can be charted from start to finish. With the exception of Sarah’s residence on Jones Street where she lived with Henry Rootes Jackson and his children, Isaac and his brother Jacob lived as far north as Broughton Street and as far south as Gordon Street (See table on Mary and Ann below). Like many others who lived at the Davenport House, Isaac’s life was cut short by a disease that claimed the lives of many, in a time before sanitary food and water were available.

\textsuperscript{202} O-563.
\textsuperscript{203} See Estate/Probate Record of Isaiah Davenport.
\textsuperscript{204} See Deed Records 2T-21, 3F-135, and 3R-265.
\textsuperscript{205} Interment Report, Laurel Grove South, 1852-1861, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 1. pg. 515, City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Savannah, Georgia.
The Laurel Grove South Interment Report from January 1860 shows that Isaac died from dysentery. Source: Image captured from Interment Report-Laurel Grove South, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 2 City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, compiled onto ancestry.com. The second page of the entry which includes Isaac’s cause of death can be seen at the archives in Savannah.
Later deed records show Isaac and Jacob were used as collateral as late as 1858, just two years before Isaac's death. Source: Deed Records 3R-265 (top) and 3R-135 (bottom) Chatham County Superior Court.
LIFE BEFORE THE DAVENPORTS

Mary was born ca. 1790 in Savannah. According to ship manifest and deed records, she was of a “yellow” complexion and was five feet, five inches tall. She gave birth to her only known child in 1815 and was sold four years later with her daughter Ann to Isaiah and Sarah in 1819. A Letter written in 1849 by Sarah Davenport indicates that Mary was the nurse for at least one of the Davenport children.

Prior to being sold to Isaiah, Mary and her daughter were owned by Charlotte and George Atkinson. While living with the Atkinsons, Mary gave birth to Anne in ca. 1815 when she was twenty-five years-old. George Atkinson died in 1818 and like several of Isaiah Davenport’s other slaves, Mary and her daughter were sold to clear Atkinson’s debt. A notice in the Savannah Daily Republican advertises the sale of George Atkinson’s estate in 1819, which included “One Negro wench and child.”

A review of the tax records for George Atkinson reveals that these slaves were most certainly Mary and her daughter Anne: George Atkinson owned only two slaves each year between 1809 and 1817. In the years before Anne’s birth, Atkinson seemed to own another enslaved female named Betsey. In 1816, George backed a loan from Patrick Duffy using Betsey as collateral. It is likely that when George Atkinson died in 1818, she was forfeited to Duffy, leaving only Mary and Anne. Isaiah Davenport purchased the young woman and her daughter at the auction of George Atkinson’s estate.

Mary can be traced in deed records as far back as 1799. As if to foreshadow her later life, her earliest known owner was a house carpenter. She was sold to George Atkinson, then a
tailor, by Benjamin Tippin, a House Carpenter.\textsuperscript{214} Tippin defaulted on his taxes in Savannah, just two years after Mary’s birth in 1792.\textsuperscript{215} Although Tippin lived in Savannah proper, there is no precise indication of where; the notice of his tax default and his presence on the Census Index of 1793 describes his location only as within the Savannah District.\textsuperscript{216} Nonetheless, these records indicate that Mary, born ca. 1790, was most likely born in Savannah. Other than these few sources, Tippin is somewhat of an enigma. There are no census, vital, or tax records for Tippin, as well as no other newspaper articles. Although Sarah’s mother Susannah was herself a Tippin, there is no known connection between her and Benjamin Tippin at this time.

The Atkinsons and the Davenports were no strangers; from 1809 until his death ca. 1818, George Atkinson owned Lot 25 in Greene Ward, just a short distance away from the Davenport’s Lot 18, and adjacent to Columbia Ward on the west.\textsuperscript{217} The notice of Atkinson’s estate auction also indicates that this was not a rental property; this was his residence. Mary and her daughter likely had contact with the Davenport slaves before they began living with them.

MARY IN LATER YEARS

About six years after moving into the Davenport House in 1825, Mary and her daughter, aged thirty-five and ten, were sold by Isaiah to his mother-in-law Susannah Clark.\textsuperscript{218} In the deed of sale, Mary and her daughter were sold with a man named Deeping. Because they were sold together and were very close in age, it may be the case that Deeping and Mary were married sometime between 1819 and 1825. There is no deed of sale which shows Deeping’s purchase by Isaiah Davenport. Because Isaiah owned at least two slaves prior to the appearance of the first deed of sale, Deeping may have been acquired as a result of Isaiah’s marriage to Sarah in 1809.

Susannah, or Susan, then sixty-four years old, was living in Savannah. According to the tax digest of 1828, she may have been living on lot 30 in Greene Ward.\textsuperscript{219} However, the census records seem to say something different. In the Federal Census of 1820, Susannah Clark is listed among Savannahians such as Sally Habersham, Charles Norris, Rose Noble, James S. Bulloch, and Charles Middleton. James S. Bulloch, separated by Susannah in the Census by approximately six houses, was taxed on a lot in Washington Ward. Eliza Hart, separated from Susannah by approximately 3 houses, was taxed on a Lot in Columbia Ward. James Wallace, listed just before Bulloch, about 5 houses away, was also taxed on a Lot in Washington Ward. Because Columbia and Washington Wards are diagonally adjacent, separated by Broughton Street, the Census makes it difficult to know which ward Susannah was living in. Greene Ward was also adjacent to Columbia, so the same problem is presented.

In any case, although Mary and Anne seemed to have been relocated, they were still close by, and as slaves owned by Sarah Davenport’s mother, they likely shared their time between the two households. For example, a ship manifest shows that Mary travelled to New York City in July of

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
1823, and Isaiah Davenport is listed as her owner. This was only the first of Mary’s trips by sea. She would travel to New York City twice more, in August of 1839 and August of 1853. It was their sale to Susannah which prevented Mary and Anne from being included in the public auction of 1828 after Isaiah’s death.

Susannah Clark died in 1829 as a result of “Paulsey” and her ward at the time was listed as Columbia. This may be an indication that Mary and Anne returned to Columbia Ward sometime between between 1825 and 1829. At the time of Susannah’s death, they were most certainly living in the Davenport House again. After Susannah’s death, Mary and her daughter rejoined the Davenport household where they remained together with Sarah until as late as 1850. Although Mary is not named in later deed records, she appears in the Federal Slave Schedules of 1850 and 1860. Although Bella and Nancy were of a similar age, the Censuses only account for a single mulatto female, which could only have been Mary. It seems that Mary is also mentioned in a letter along with her daughter Anne from 1849. In the letter, Sarah writes to her son Henry Kollock that “your old nurse has given all sorts of good wishes and love to be sent to you and Jeannie.” Because both Bella and Nancy are no longer with Sarah Davenport by 1850, the “old nurse” mentioned in the letter is likely Mary. There is no antebellum interment record for Mary in Laurel Grove South. If she lived until after the Civil War, she would have become a free woman at the age of seventy-five years old. At the time of the Census of 1870, Mary would have been eighty years old. There are no entries in the Census matching Mary’s description living in Savannah. Mary remained with Sarah Davenport for longer than any of the original slaves, as did her daughter.

WHERE DID MARY AND HER DAUGHTER LIVE?

Mary and Anne lived their entire lives in Savannah. With the exception of Benjamin Tippin, whose location cannot be precisely identified, Mary and her daughter lived as far north as Broughton Street, and as far south as Gordon Street. Living with them at nearly all of these locations were twins Jacob and Isaac, whom also remained with Sarah Davenport until 1860. These four men and women---Mary, Anne, Jacob, and Isaac---who became a part of the Davenport household during the second decade of the nineteenth century, were the only slaves from the original group to remain with Sarah and the Davenport family until the eve of the Civil War.

MARY AND ANNE’s FAMILY

Mary and Anne were the only two slaves owned by George Atkinson between 1809 and 1817, and he does not appear in the tax records for any other years in Savannah. However, a single deed record shows that George Atkinson secured a loan from Patrick Duffy in 1816 and provided an enslaved woman named Betty as collateral.

221 See Deed Record 3R-265.
223 See Letter written by Sarah Davenport to son Henry Kollock, January 18, 1849, Original copy contained at the Kenan Research Center, Atlanta, transcribed for the Davenport House, Davenport House Research Materials, provided by Jamie Credle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years When Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived/Worked</th>
<th>Bella’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Tippin</td>
<td>ca. 1790-1799</td>
<td>House Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah, unspecified location</td>
<td>0-9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &amp; Charlotte Atkinson</td>
<td>1799-1818</td>
<td>Taylor Anne b. 1815</td>
<td>Savannah, Greene Ward, Lot 25</td>
<td>9-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah &amp; Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1818-1825</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah (1) Columbia Ward, Lots 13 &amp; 14 (2) Greene Ward, Lot 18 (3) Washington Ward, Lot 8 New York City?</td>
<td>29 to at least 38 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susannah Clark</td>
<td>1825-1829</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah, likely in either Green or Washington Ward</td>
<td>26-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1829- at least 1860</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah (1) Columbia Ward (same place) (2) 31 Broughton Street (3) 4 Gordon Street (5) Jones Street, between Drayton and Abercorn New York City?</td>
<td>29-70 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Betty may be related to Mary and Anne, but it is uncertain why she is not included in Benjamin Tippin’s tax records in the years after Anne’s birth. There were no other deed records at the Chatham County Superior Court involving Benjamin Tippin, and there were also no records held at the South Carolina archives. Neither probate nor estate records were available for Tippin or Atkinson in Savannah. There was one chilling death record of a Thomas Tippin who was a carpenter in Savannah which might be Benjamin Tippin, as he was also a carpenter. Born in 1764 in South Carolina, Tippin was murdered in his home in Savannah in 1817.226 Despite this connection, there is no evidence that Benjamin and Thomas Tippin were the same person. Nonetheless, future research on Benjamin Tippin in other locations in South Carolina which are not burn counties may yield more information.

Based upon the later deed records and the slave schedules of 1850 and 1860, some of the children of Anne and possibly another child of her mother can be identified. This will be discussed below in the investigation of Anne’s life.

---

226 Deed Record 2G-253, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
MARY AND ANNE IN GREEN AND COLUMBIA WARDS

An excerpt from a map of Savannah in 1812 shows the location of the Davenport, Atkinson, and Clark residences in Greene and Columbia Wards. Source: Original map from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, University of Georgia Digital Collections, A Map of the City of Savannah, Houston, 1812.
The map above shows the various locations throughout Savannah where Mary and Ann lived with Sarah. A ship manifest record shows that Mary traveled on board the ship Augusta from Savannah to New York City in 1823 and again in 1839. Source: Coastwise Slave Manifests, 1801-1860 ancestry.com.
Summary

Mary was born in Savannah ca. 1790. She originated with Benjamin Tippin, a tailor, who would eventually sell Mary when she was nine years old, most likely due to financial insolvency. Mary’s daughter Anne was born in 1815 when she was twenty-five years old. At the time of Anne’s birth, Mary was owned by George and Charlotte Atkinson, who were neighbors to the Davenports. The Atkinsons lived in Greene Ward, and it is here that Ann was born. Similar to the experience of the other Davenport slaves, Mary and Anne’s lives were impacted by the death of their owner; George Atkinson’s death in 1818 resulted in the public auction of his estate, including Mary and her young daughter Anne. Isaiah Davenport purchased Mary and Ann at this sale, and both mother and daughter would remain with the Davenport family for the rest of their lives.

Shortly before the death of Isaiah Davenport, Mary and her daughter were sold to Susannah Clark, Sarah Davenport’s mother, who lived nearby Greene Ward. This prevented Mary and Anne from being subjected to public auction in 1828 upon the death of Isaiah Davenport. When they were sold to Susannah Clark, a man named Deeping was sold with them. There is no deed of sale for Deeping by which to trace his origins, but he was very close in age to Mary, born ca. 1795. Because Mary, Anne, and Deeping were sold together, this may be an indication that Deeping and Mary became spouses or partners sometime between 1819 and 1825. When Susannah died in 1829, Mary and Anne rejoined Sarah Davenport’s household.

Later deed records in which Sarah Davenport provided her slaves as collateral for loans indicate that at least ten enslaved children were born into the Davenport household. By comparing these to census records, several of these children can potentially be identified as the grandchildren and perhaps late-in-life children of Mary, although more research is needed. Rennah (b. 1829) and Angie (b. 1830) would have been born when Mary was about forty years old and when daughter Anne was a rather young sixteen years old. In the case of these two children, they could have been parented by either Mary or Anne, or were at least perhaps the grandchildren of Mary. Mary (b.1838), Alvira (b. 1843), Madeline (b.1846), and Lizzy (b. 1853) are also identified in deed records. Born when Mary was forty-eight years old, it is possible that young Mary was her daughter. However, Alvira, Madeline and Lizzy seem more likely to be Mary’s grandchildren.

Mary and her daughter remained with Sarah Davenport the entirety of their lives, and as a result lived at various locations throughout Savannah. Ship manifest records also indicate that Mary made several trips to New York City over the years, in 1823, 1839, and 1853. During her
time in Savannah, Mary would have built up an extensive network of friends and contacts in both the free and enslaved community, and she has left behind an extensive geographic footprint.

Mary’s lived experiences illustrate the uncertainties faced by enslaved individuals in their daily lives as a result of the ever-looming prospect of sale to another owner. The death or financial insolvency of a slave owner could mean the abrupt uprooting of an enslaved individual’s life, and the painful separation from family. Although Mary was not subjected to the public auction of 1828 following Isaiah’s death, as a young mother in 1819 she must have been fearful of the very real prospect of being separated from her four-year-old daughter during the public auction of George Atkinson’s estate. Mary spent some seventy or more years living in Savannah, and was never separated from her daughter Anne. However, by providing Anne and the enslaved children born into the Davenport household as collateral in loans, the fate of Mary’s daughter and her grandchildren were perpetually in a precarious state.

Themes: sale of the enslaved, life in urban Savannah, mobility and networking, family, the enslaved as collateral

ANNE
Born ca. 1815
Greene Ward, Savannah, Georgia
Daughter of Mary, Mother to Mary, and possibly Alvira, Madeline, and Lizzy, Angie, and Rennah
Possible Partner of Jacob or Isaac

Anne was born ca. 1815 in Savannah, likely in the house of George and Charlotte Atkinson in Greene Ward. She became part of the Davenport household at four years old, when she was sold along with her mother to Isaiah in 1819. Anne was nearly identical in age to Isaiah, Jr. and Benjamin Rush was two years her junior. She was also very close in age to Jacob and Isaac. Anne’s complexion was described as “yellow” like her mother’s and she was also five feet, five inches tall. We know from a later deed record and an affectionate ending to a letter that Ann became a seamstress and made clothing for the Davenport children. In a letter from Sarah Davenport to her son Henry Kollock in 1849, she writes that “Anne says she hopes to make the first pants he wears,” which referred to Henry Kollock’s newborn son. With the exception of Benjamin Tippin’s residence, Anne lived in the same locations as her mother Mary from the time of her birth until at least 1860. Later deed records show that she was provided as collateral in

227 For Ann’s age, see Deed Record 2K-125. Because at the time of Anne’s birth her mother was owned by the Atkinsons who lived in Greene Ward, Anne was likely born here.
228 Ibid.
230 When Ann is used as collateral by Sarah in a loan of 1858, her occupation as a seamstress is indicated. See Deed Record 3R-265.
231 See Letter written by Sarah Davenport to son Henry Kollock, January 18, 1849, Original copy contained at the Kenan Research Center, Atlanta, transcribed for the Davenport House, Davenport House Research Materials, provided by Jamie Credle.
loans received by Sarah in 1843, 1848, and 1858.\textsuperscript{232} She also appears along with her mother in the Slave Schedule of 1850 and 1860.\textsuperscript{233}

Later deed records were one of the most important new pieces of research discovered because they reveal the names of the children of the Davenport slaves. Because Ann and her mother were the only women described as being “mulatto,” this allows for identification of Ann’s children, and possibly another child had by Mary, by comparing the deed records with the slave schedules of 1850 and 1860. Aside from Ann and Mary, the Slave Schedule of 1850 identifies two additional “mulatto” females, aged nineteen and five, and a “mulatto” boy aged six. Two years prior to this, Sarah backed a loan from Cosmo P. Richardson which named five of the descendant children. Ten years later, two additional females and one male were identified in a loan of 1858, and there was one female and one male identified in the earliest deed record of 1843.\textsuperscript{234} There are no deed records showing the purchase of these people, which indicates they were born into the Davenport household.

Of the females identified, there are three whose ages from the deed records match with the 1850 Slave Schedule: Angie, identified in the deed of 1848 as being eighteen years old, Rennah, identified in the same deed as being nineteen years old, and Madeline, identified in the same deed as being three years old.\textsuperscript{235} The young boy identified in the Schedule is Alvira, who is described in the deed of 1858 as being about five years old.\textsuperscript{236} Madeline is possibly Anne’s child; Mary would have been fifty-five when she was born. In the case of Angie and Rennah, it is difficult to say if they are the daughters of Mary or Anne. Mary would have been forty years old at the time of their births, and Anne would have been sixteen years old. In the case of Mary, it seems that she would have had Angie or Rennah at what we would consider a late age, and in the case of Ann, the children would have been born to a very young mother. At the very least, we can say that Rennah and Angie were likely the grandchildren of Mary. Alvira, born when Mary would have been fifty-four years old, is certainly Anne’s child, born to her when she was about twenty nine years old. However, this is around the same time Madeline was born. The children may be twins, but they are not described as such in the deed records. Since they are aged one year apart in the 1850 Schedule, Anne could have given birth to them consecutively. Its also possible that their ages were misreported, which was a common error.

In the Slave Schedule of 1860, Angie and Alvira are no longer present.\textsuperscript{237} In addition to Anne and Mary, there are three “mulatto” females, aged twenty-three, fourteen, and eight. The eight-year-old female can be readily identified as Lizzy, described in the deed record of 1858 as being about five years old.\textsuperscript{238} The fourteen-year-old female is Madeline, who was born ca. 1845.\textsuperscript{239} And the twenty-three-year-old female who was not identified on the previous census is Mary.

\textsuperscript{232} See Deed Record 3B-189, 3F-135, and 3R-265.
\textsuperscript{233} See Sarah Davenport, Savannah, Georgia, in the 1830 and 1840 Federal Census, and in the 1850 and 1860 Federal Census Slave Schedules, ancestry.com.
\textsuperscript{234} See Deed Record 3B-189, 3F-135, and 3R-265.
\textsuperscript{235} See Deed Record 3F-135.
\textsuperscript{236} See Deed Record 3B-189, 3F-135, and 3R-265.
\textsuperscript{237} It is difficult to interpret the name of this young boy; the handwriting in the deed record was among the most difficult to read, and there is writing going through the boy’s name. It appears to be Alvira, but this is subject to interpretation.
\textsuperscript{238} See Laurel Grove South Interment Report, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 2.
\textsuperscript{239} See Deed Record 3F-135.
who was named in the deed of 1858, born ca. 1838.\(^{240}\) In the case of the younger Mary, it seems more likely that she is Anne’s child rather than Mary’s; Mary would have been forty-seven years old when she was born, and Anne, twenty-two years old.

There are certain possibilities to consider which might indicate that the other “mulatto” females in the slave schedules are the children of the other Davenport slaves. In the first case, not all of the enslaved individuals listed in the censuses and schedules are named in the deed records. On the other hand, there are no other mulatto women of childbearing age in the 1850 or 1860 Schedules besides Mary, Anne, and either Rennah or Angie, and it doesn’t seem likely or practical that Sarah Davenport would have separated children from their mothers. Its possible that nineteen year old Angie was the mother of five year old Madeline, but this means that she would have been a very young fourteen years old at the time of her birth. Third, in order for the children to have been born from the other female slaves---Bella, Polly, Peggy, or Nancy---this seems it would have required involvement with a man of light complexion man, as none of these women were ever described as being “mulatto.” In the case of Bella, who already had at least four children, this would have required her involvement with another man who was not the father of her children. This is certainly possible, but Bella would have been in her forties and fifties when she gave birth to Angie, Madeline, Lizzy, or Mary. For Polly to have been Angie’s mother, she would have been only fourteen years old. Polly would have been twenty-nine years old at the time of Madeline’s birth, but like her mother Bella, Polly is no longer living with Sarah Davenport and the other slaves by 1850. Finally there is Nancy. Nancy is no longer living with Sarah by 1840, and she would have been around fifty years old at the time of Rennah and/or Angie’s birth and fifty-six years old at the time of Mary’s birth.\(^{241}\) Of all the Davenport enslaved females, Nancy seems the least likely to have been the mother of these children.

Based on these considerations, it seems more than likely that the female children described as “mulatto” were those of Anne. Although Mary would have been about forty years old when Rennah and Auger were born, and forty-eight years old when the younger Mary was born, having children this late in life was a possibility, the possibility that she bore children late in life cannot be ruled out. Moreover, the correct identification of the mulatto children listed in the slave schedules as the offspring of Mary or Ann must be approached with caution. More research is needed to understand how constructions of skin color were assigned when the schedules were created and if descriptions of mulatto alone are enough to connect these children with Mary and Anne. The complexion of Ann and/or Mary’s partners is also unknown, as is how this would have impacted the complexion of their offspring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year Born</th>
<th>Location Born(^{242})</th>
<th>Ann’s Age when born</th>
<th>Mary’s Age when born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angie Welcher or Davenport</td>
<td>ca. 1830</td>
<td>Davenport House, Columbia Ward</td>
<td>About 15 or 16 years</td>
<td>About 40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennah</td>
<td>ca. 1829</td>
<td>Davenport House</td>
<td>About 16 or 17</td>
<td>About 39 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{240}\) 3R-265.

\(^{241}\) For the discussion of Nancy no longer living with Sarah Davenport by 1840, see section on Nancy above.

\(^{242}\) The locations of where the descendant children were born is based upon the known residences of Sarah Davenport at the time of their birth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age, Years</th>
<th>Age, Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>ca. 1838</td>
<td>Davenport House, Columbia Ward</td>
<td>About 23 years</td>
<td>About 48 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvira</td>
<td>ca. 1843</td>
<td>Broughton Street</td>
<td>About 28 years</td>
<td>About 53 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline</td>
<td>ca. 1846</td>
<td>Broughton Street</td>
<td>About 31 years</td>
<td>About 56 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizzy</td>
<td>ca. 1853</td>
<td>Broughton Street</td>
<td>About 38 years</td>
<td>About 63 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other possible siblings: **Monday** (b. 1840) **Morris Walcott** (1829-1855) **Charley Welcher** (b. 1850) **Jane** (b. 1843)

*Charley is the son of Angie (1830-1857) listed above. Charley (Welcher) identifies his mother in a Freedman’s Bank Record as Angie Davenport, although Sarah Davenport indicates her last name to be Welcher at the time of Angie’s interment in Laurel Grove. Since Charley was only five years old at the time of his mother’s death, it seems likely that his later recollection of Davenport is incorrect. See Charlie Welcher in Freedman’s Bank Record of March 3, 1873, ancestry.com.

**ANNE’S SIGNIFICANT OTHER: JACOB OR ISAAC?**

Anne was only a few years apart in age from both Jacob and Isaac. According to both their original deeds of sale, Anne was born ca. 1815 and twins Jacob and Isaac were born ca. 1812. In later years, their ages would be reported differently, making them even closer in age. In the deed of 1858, Isaac and Jacob are reported as forty-four years old, and Anne is reported as forty-two years old. The earliest known ages reported, before time has taken its toll on memory, are more likely to be accurate. In any case, Anne lived with Jacob and Isaac from 1819 until at least 1860, during which time she had children. Given all of these circumstances, either Jacob or Isaac seems likely to be the father of Anne’s children.

**ANNE in LATER YEARS**

Anne lived with Sarah Davenport from the time she was a newborn until she was at least forty-five years old. Like her mother Mary, Anne traveled by water. In June of 1856, she was sent to Charleston by Archibald onboard the ship **Seabrook**. On the ship manifest record, Anne is indicated as being forty-five years old, which changes her year of birth from 1815 to 1811, likely a mistake on Archibald’s part. If Anne’s partner were Isaac, he died when she was forty-three years old in 1860. There is no antebellum interment record for Anne in Laurel Grove South, signaling that she lived beyond the Civil War.

In the census of 1870, there is a single Anne Davenport living in Savannah, but the woman is born in ca. 1810 and is described as “black” rather than mulatto. Still, the record is a compelling one. Within Ann’s household, there is a six-year-old female named Angie Davenport. In the interment records for Laurel Grove South, Sarah buried an enslaved woman named Angie Davenport.

---

243 In the case of Alvira, Madeline, and Lizzy, it is not clear where they were born. Sarah Davenport sold her house on Columbia square in 1840. Her next known address comes from the Savannah City Directories, beginning in 1850. Her 1850 address appears to have been on Broughton Street. By 1858, she was listed at 4 Gordon Street. See Savannah City Directories information located at Bull Street Library or directory information compiled by Davenport House.


Welcher on October 2, 1857. Angie was twenty-seven years old and died as a result of “Consumption.” A Freedman’s Bank Record can also be located for Angie, although she is referred to as Angie Davenport by her son, Charlie Welcher. Charlie’s age matches the known date of birth for Charley in the deed record of 1858. Moreover, the younger Angie in the census of 1870 may have been named after her mother. Living next door to Ann and Angie is Eliza Penny, who indicates she was born about 1845. Lizzy, who is named in the deed of 1858, was described as being born in 1853. If this record for Anne Davenport is in fact Anne, then she is mistaken in recalling her birthdate by five years, and would have to be able to pass as either “Black” or “Mulatto.”

There are numerous other Anne’s living in Savannah at the time of the 1870 Census, born within five years of Ann’s known birthdate. Unfortunately, there are some confounding factors. In the first case, only one of the women are described as “mulatto.” Only one of these women was a seamstress and none were living with the known family members or former enslaved individuals whom Anne is connected to. Anne does not appear in any Freedman’s Bank records. Although there are numerous Anne’s who were registered as free persons, none of the Davenport family members were guardians to these women and there is no indication that any of these women are Anne.

---

247 Laurel Grove Interments records were consulted at the City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 1. When the record of Angie’s interment was recorded, the page number was mistakenly omitted. However, Angie is located between the entry of John Cox, buried August 20, 1857, on located on page 355, and Fanny, buried March 5, 1858, located on pg. 391.

248 Ibid.


250 See Deed Record 3R-265.


252 See Deed Record 3R-265.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Davenport b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Surname; Age; Location; Family member named Angie; Lives next door to Eliza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann G. Boughs b. 1820 (only Mulatto)</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location; Complexion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Brown b. 1810</td>
<td>21st subdistrict, Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Dawson b. 1818</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Laundress</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Jones b. 1820</td>
<td>21st subdistrict, Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Lloyd b. 1815</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Marshall b. 1819</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Mills b. 1819</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Seamstress</td>
<td>Age; Location; Occupation as seamstress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Rohn b. 1820</td>
<td>District 8, Chatham, Savannah</td>
<td>unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Seymour b. 1810</td>
<td>Savannah, Chatham</td>
<td>Keeping House</td>
<td>Age; Location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further Research Questions

1. What more can be learned about the children of Anne and the other children named in later deed records?
2. Who were the Atkinsons, and what more can be learned about them and their impact on Mary and Anne’s life?
3. Mary and Anne remained with Sarah for several decades. What more can be learned about their relationship with Sarah and the Davenport family?
4. Mary, Anne, and Nancy all traveled to New York City. What was the Davenport connection to this area?
5. Is it possible that descendants of George Atkinson may have photos or other information about Mary and Anne?
6. What more can be learned about Benjamin Tippin, where he lived in Savannah, and his impact upon Mary’s early life?
7. What did the descriptions of “Mulatto” and “yellow” really mean and how were these constructed? Are the descriptions of mulatto for the enslaved children enough to tie them to Anne and Mary?
Deeping was born ca. 1795, likely in either Beaufort or Savannah. When Mary and Anne were sold to Susannah Clark in 1825, thirty-year-old Deeping was sold with them.\(^{253}\) Besides this single deed record---no other information could be located on Deeping. There is no deed record showing his sale to Isaiah Davenport and Deeping does not appear in any later deed records involving Sarah. There are also no other records---Census, Freedman’s Bank, Registers of Free Persons, Newspaper, or Laurel Grove South Interments---that mention anyone named Deeping. True, it is a unique name, but it is surprising that it should not appear in any other records. In terms of the census records, there are no Deepings not just in Savannah, but anywhere else in the country. If Deeping were a singularly unique name, by the time of Census of 1870, he may have already died. By 1870, Deeping would have been seventy-five years old. If he lived beyond the Civil War, he would have become a free man at the age of seventy.

There are two possible options to explain why no deed of sale exists for Deeping. Isaiah Davenport moved to Savannah in ca. 1807/8 and first appears in the tax records beginning in 1809. The earliest deed record involving Isaiah’s purchase of an enslaved person was for Nancy in 1812.\(^{254}\) However, the tax records show that his earliest ownership of two slaves was two years prior to this in 1810.\(^{255}\) Since the earliest tax record for Isaiah in 1809 shows he was not taxed on any slaves, this seems to indicate that Deeping did not move with Isaiah from New England to Savannah. Isaiah married Sarah in 1809, and by 1810, he is taxed on two slaves. It seems that Deeping and the other unknown person were acquired by Isaiah through his marriage to Sarah. If this is the case, Deeping may have originated in Beaufort with the family of Sarah Davenport.

**DEEPING in LATER YEARS**

Deeping may be represented on the censuses of 1820 and 1830, but by 1840, he is no longer living with Sarah Davenport. There are two adult males on the 1820 census, aged twenty-six to forty-five.\(^{256}\) In 1820, Deeping was still in the Davenport household, since we know he was owned by Isaiah until 1825. But there are also three other enslaved men to consider: Tom, born ca. 1798, Ned, who is described as an adult carpenter but whose age is not given, and Jack, Bella’s son, born ca. 1808.\(^{257}\) Of the three men, only Ned and Deeping appear in later records.

\(^{253}\) See Deed Record 2N-182.
\(^{254}\) See Deed Record 2D-294.
\(^{256}\) See Sarah Davenport, in Savannah, Georgia, in Census of 1820, ancestry.com.
\(^{257}\) See Deed Record 2F-330 and 2E-104.
meaning that Deeping is most likely one of the men on 1820 census.\textsuperscript{258} The Census of 1830 indicates that only two of the older adult males were by this time living in the Davenport House. By 1830, Jack was old enough to be one of these men and was also repurchased at the 1828 auction. By process of elimination, it would seem that these two men were Deeping and Jack. In the first case, the age description is for a one man aged thirty-six to fifty-five and one man aged twenty-four to thirty-six; either of these match Deeping. Secondly, although Ned was named in the public auction of 1828, Sarah’s repurchase of her slaves at the auction sadly did not include him, suggesting that he was purchased by someone else.\textsuperscript{259} In regards to Tom, he was not even named in the sale, and like Ned, does not appear in later records. Third, the death of Isaiah’s mother-in-law in 1829 brought Mary and Ann back into the Davenport Household, and it would seem Deeping too. By 1840, the Census indicates that Deeping is no longer living with Sarah, nor was Tom or Ned. Deeping may have died by this time, or he may have simply lived independently in the communities of Yamacraw, Old Fort, or Spring Hill by 1840.\textsuperscript{260}

**DEEPING’s FAMILY**

It is unknown whether Deeping had any family. He is named only in a deed of sale with Mary and Anne, potentially indicating that the three were a family unit. It is possible that Mary became his spouse and that some of the later Davenport slaves are his children. Being sold with Mary and Anne is a strong suggestion that he was Mary’s spouse, but this cannot be known for certain. Earlier deed records may have shown other possible family members, but none are available in Beaufort as it is a burn county. Based on Deeping’s owners, it seems that any family he had would have been in Beaufort and Savannah.

**WHERE DID DEEPING LIVE?**

The strong likelihood that Deeping was formerly owned by Sarah Davenport’s family would likely mean he was born in Beaufort or Savannah; Sarah and her family moved to city right at the time of Deeping’s birth in 1795. Unless Deeping lived independently, he would have resided with the Davenports at their houses on Washington and Columbia Ward. He also lived with Susannah Clark beginning in 1825 until her death in 1829. Susannah’s location on the Census suggests that this was also in Washington Ward. The census records also suggest that Deeping may have lived in the Davenport home until at least 1830 or more.

**DEEPING by LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years When Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived</th>
<th>Deeping’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susannah and Archibald Clark</td>
<td>1795-1809</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>St. Helena’s Parish, Beaufort, South Carolina</td>
<td>0 – 14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{258} Deeping is named in the deed of 1825, and Ned is named in the public auction of 1828. See Deed Record 2N-182 and notice of the sale of Davenport slaves in the *Savannah Georgian*, April 7, 1828, pg. 3, col. 4, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:sga1828-0431.

\textsuperscript{259} See Deed Record 2O-563.

\textsuperscript{260} Harris and Berry, “Slave Life in Savannah”, 101.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Age Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah and Sarah</td>
<td>1809-1825</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah (1) Washington Ward, Lot 8 (2) Columbia Ward, Lot 13</td>
<td>14 – 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susannah Clark</td>
<td>1825-1829</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah, likely in Greene or Washington Ward</td>
<td>30 – 34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1829 until at least 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah, Columbia Ward, Lot 13</td>
<td>34 - ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Research Questions**

1. Where did the name Deeping originate from? Was this a singular name or can it be found in other records?
2. The least is known about Deeping compared to all of the other slaves owned by Isaiah Davenport. What more can be found out about his life?
3. Do the descendants of Sarah’s family have any records about Deeping?
Tom
Born ca. 1798
A Short life in Savannah and the Lowcountry

TOM was born ca. 1798, about three years after Deeping. He was likely born in Beaufort, then a part of St. Helena’s Parish, where his earliest known owner resided. Unfortunately, little more is known about Tom than Deeping. He was sold to Isaiah in 1815 when he was seventeen years old by Lydia Turner, a resident of Beaufort. Turner is somewhat of an elusive, yet interesting figure. She was a sometimes resident of Savannah, where she was baptized and a member of the Baptist Church. Her obituary emphasizes that she was known for her piety, and other sources indicate she was also a prominent member in the Baptist Church of Beaufort. Unfortunately, there are no tax records to indicate where she might have lived in Savannah. She also does not appear on census records in Beaufort or Savannah, or in any newspaper articles beyond a death notice and obituary. As is the case with Bella, records to retrace Tom’s origins were burned in Beaufort during the Civil War.

It appears that Lydia never married; at the time of Tom’s sale to Isaiah Davenport in 1815, she acted alone, although Andrew Low was a witness to the transaction, indicating she had ties to Savannah’s high society. The possibility that Lydia was a widow is obviated by her obituary; she is described as Miss Lydia Turner rather than “Mrs.” Because Lydia was a resident of Beaufort, she may have been an acquaintance of the Davenport and Clark families.

TOM in LATER YEARS
Lydia sold Tom to Isaiah Davenport just two years before her death in 1815. Beyond this deed of sale, Tom on paper does not extend past 1815, making him unique among the Davenport slaves, who are documented either prior to, after, or sometime in the 1820s. He is also the only enslaved man whose whereabouts cannot be accounted for in 1828 when the other Davenport slaves were named in the public auction following Isaiah’s death. Deeping, Mary, and Anne were also not named in the auction, but this was the result of their sale to Isaiah’s mother-in-law three years earlier. Because he is singularly absent from these later records, Tom’s presence in the census of 1820 seems unlikely. There are only two males between the ages of twenty-six and

261 See Deed Record 2F-330, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
262 Ibid.
264 See Deed Record 2F-330.
265 See Deed Record 2N-183.
forty-five living with the Davenports. This means that Tom and another enslaved adult male---Ned or Deeping---was no longer living in the Davenport household by 1820. Through the process of

Above is the only record of Tom, his deed of sale from his previous owner Lydia Turner to Isaiah Andrew Low was a witness to the transaction. Source: Deed Record 2F-330, Chatham County Superior Court.
elimination, it would seem that this must be Tom; Deeping and Ned are named in later deed records and in public auction of 1828. The Census of 1830 once again lists two adult males, which through the same process of elimination must be Jack and Deeping.266

Because Tom was not named in the public auction of 1828 and cannot be identified in the censuses or later deed records, the best conclusion is that sometime between his sale to Isaiah Davenport in 1815 and the 1820 census, Tom died. The other possibility is that he lived independently and paid the Davenport’s a portion of his wages, but there is no record of this in the accounting of money paid into Isaiah Davenport’s estate after his death. Wages earned by Polly, Isaac, and Jacob were recorded, so if Tom was hired out, he should have been included here as well.

TOM’s FAMILY

Like Deeping, relatives of Tom have not yet been identified. Tom is named in one deed of sale which includes no other possible family members. Also like Deeping, early deed records from Beaufort which may have indicated other relatives are not available. If Tom did pass away sometime between 1815 and 1820 when he was between seventeen to twenty-two years old, it is possible he never had a family of his own. If he was in fact originally from Beaufort, his family members likely lived in this location.

WHERE DID TOM LIVE?

Because of his ownership by Lydia Turner, Tom likely spent the first seventeen years of his life living in Beaufort. Thereafter, Tom lived with the Davenports in Savannah, although he may have never made it into the Davenport House. As the foregoing discussion suggests, he does not seem to be represented among Sarah and Isaiah Davenport’s household on any of the Censuses.

266 See Discussion of Deeping in the 1830 census above.
Its possible Tom may have died sometime between 1815 and 1820 when the Davenport House was being built and the family was living in Washington Ward.

**TOM by LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years When Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived</th>
<th>Deeping’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Turner</td>
<td>1798-1815</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Beaufort, South Carolina</td>
<td>0 – 17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah and Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>1815-1820?</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah, Washington Ward, Lot 8</td>
<td>17 – ? years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOM in LATER YEARS**

If Tom could be identified on the Census of 1870, this might show that he lived beyond the 1820s. As common as the name Tom was, it appears that there was not a single listing for a man within five years of Tom’s age living in Savannah at the time of the Census. By 1870, Tom would have been seventy-two years old. If Tom did live until after the Civil War, he would have been sixty-seven years-old when he became a free man.

**Further Research Questions**

1. What more can be learned about Lydia Turner and how this impacted Tom’s life?
2. Turner was known as a very pious woman. Could this have impacted Tom’s life in a positive way?
3. Can Tom’s descendants be located in the Beaufort area?
4. Is it possible Tom died as a result of one of Savannah’s early Yellow Fever epidemics?
Ned
Born ca. 1780s
Brampton Plantation
Son of Ned and Minty, eldest brother of Joe and Prince
The African Baptist Movement and Jail in Savannah

LIFE BEFORE THE DAVENPORTS

Ned is the only Davenport slave named in a deed of purchase by Isaiah whose birthdate is not provided. Despite this oversight, it is possible that his relative age may still be gleaned from the deed of sale. He is described as a “negro fellow” which indicates he was probably an adult.\(^\text{267}\) Descriptions of enslaved male children are typically modified in deeds with “boy.” However, sometimes, a “boy” may even describe an enslaved male in his late teens. For example, in the case of Tom, Lydia Turner, his earliest known owner, described him as a “negro boy” despite that he was seventeen years old.\(^\text{268}\) The deed of sale in which Ned is named also indicates that he was “by trade a carpenter” which may further indicate a level of skill only applicable to an older man. Although it seemed at first that Ned’s story would be truncated like that of Tom and Deeping, continuous research revealed his connection to one of the most important historical events in Savannah’s history.

Ned was sold to Isaiah Davenport by Mary Wylly, a widow with ties to Savannah’s wealthiest slaveholding families.\(^\text{269}\) Mary was the daughter of Jonathan Bryan (1708-1788) and the widow of both John Morel (1733-1777) and Richard Wylly (1744-1801).\(^\text{270}\) Mary’s father Jonathan Bryan owned more than 32,000 acres of land in Georgia and South Carolina at the time of his death in 1788.\(^\text{271}\) Despite his vast dominions, the Bryan family seat was at Brampton Plantation on the Savannah River as early as 1765. Bryan was the owner of Andrew Bryan, who is considered the founder of the First African Baptist Church and its first pastor.\(^\text{272}\) Prior to becoming ordained in 1788, Andrew Bryan endured beatings and incarceration for preaching, but

\(^{267}\) See Deed Record 2E-104, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.

\(^{268}\) See Deed Record 2F-330.

\(^{269}\) See Dee Record 2E-104.


Jonathan Bryan is thought to have helped to conciliate the situation on behalf of Andrew and the enslaved Baptist movement and provided a barn at Brampton where the congregation could meet.\(^{273}\)

Notices in local newspapers pointed to Richard Wylly’s various landholdings, which included Rae’s Hall, Fair Lawn Plantation, and another location on the Savannah River. Source: (left) James A. McMillin, Slavery and Freedom in Savannah, pg. 14; (Above) Georgia Gazette, March 4, 1802, Pg. 2, genealogybank.com.

A close-up of Houston’s map of Savannah drawn in 1812 shows the Wylly’s Fair Lawn Plantation to the southeast of the city in the area once comprising the Garden Lots. Source: Original image from Hargrett Rare Map Collection, Map of the City of Savannah, Houston, 1812.
In addition to her father, Mary’s first husband John Morel also owned extensive land. He purchased Ossabaw Island in 1760 and invested a large portion of his slave labor force to its cultivation and development. The Morel’s residence was a five-hundred acre estate on the Vernon River, known as Bewlie, located south of Savannah near Vernonburg. Mary’s second husband Richard Wylly also had extensive landholdings, which included the more than seven-hundred acres of Fair Lawn Plantation, located southeast of the city in the area comprising a portion of the Garden Lots. Wylly purchased Fair Lawn in 1782 at public auction after the plantation was confiscated from Josiah Tatnall, a British loyalist. Richard Wylly married the

276 See Deed Record G-428-429, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia. Fair Lawn Plantation can be seen in Map of the City of Savannah, by Col. Houston, ca. 1812, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, [digital version], http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/hmap/id:hmap1812h6 and in The Plan of the City & Harbour of Savannah, by Col. Houston, 1818, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, [digital version], http://www.libs.uga.edu/darchive/hargrett/maps/1818s7.jpg.
277 See Deed Record G-428-429, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia. Also see Daniel T. Elliott, Archaeological Data Recovery at the Waldburg Street Site, (9Ch1039).
widow Mary Morel in 1784 and the couple lived at Fair Lawn until Wyly’s death in 1801.\textsuperscript{278} Besides Fair Lawn, Wyly also purchased the confiscated lands of Cherokee Hill Plantation in 1795.\textsuperscript{279} Formerly the property of his brother William Wyly, also a British loyalist, Cherokee Hill was located ten miles northwest of Savannah.\textsuperscript{280}

In the years prior to and during the Revolution before his ownership of Fair Lawn and Cherokee Hill, Richard Wyly owned a plantation on the Savannah River of 100-acres, “in sight of town.”\textsuperscript{281} Just over ten years later in 1781, Wyly indicated his residence as Rae’s Hall Plantation, situated on the Savannah River, located five miles northwest of the city.\textsuperscript{282} It is possible that the Revolutionary War forestalled Wyly’s attempt to sell his land, and that his Savannah River plantation and Rae’s Hall are actually the same place. Rae’s Hall was also located adjacent to Brampton Plantation, the home of Jonathan Bryan and his widowed daughter Mary.\textsuperscript{283} The proximity of these two locations helps to explain how Wyly and the widow Mary became acquainted.

Mary became a land owner in her own right through inheritance from her father and husbands. In the years following Richard Wyly’s death in 1801, Mary appears in several land deed records which included a six-hundred acre tract on Skidaway Island, a lot in Ewensburg, an antebellum township west of then West Broad Street, and tracts along the Ogeechee River known as Bryan’s Cowpen.\textsuperscript{284} Nancy’s owners also held a Lot in Ewensburg, making it possible that she and Ned were familiar with one another prior to becoming a part of the Davenport household. Mary also retained at least a portion of Fair Lawn Plantation following her husband’s death.\textsuperscript{285}

The importance of the numerous landholdings of Mary Wyly, her two husbands and her father upon the interpretation of Ned’s life indicates that he could have lived, worked, and originated from a number of different locations. Initially, it seemed that Ned’s life could be traced in deed records only as far back as Mary Wyly and the single deed of sale to Isaiah Davenport, making it uncertain how Mary came to own Ned. He may have been a dower slave or formerly owned by Mary’s father Jonathan Bryan. However, an assessment of what transpired

\textsuperscript{278}Georgia Historical Quarterly, vol. 27, no. 1 (March 1943), 37; Augusta Chronicle, October 17, 1801, pg. 3, Genealogybank.com.
\textsuperscript{279}See Deed Record N-382, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
\textsuperscript{281}James A. McMillin, Slavery and Freedom in Savannah, pg. 14
\textsuperscript{282}Royal Georgia Gazette, February 15, 1781, pg. 4, Genealogybank.com. For a description of the location of Rae’s Hall, see “Rae’s Hall Plantation, Part I,” in the Georgia Historical Quarterly, vol. 26, no. ¾ (1942): 225.
\textsuperscript{283}For Brampton’s location and occupation by Bryan, see Savannah Unit, Georgia Writers’ Project, Work Projects Administration in Georgia, The Georgia Historical Quarterly Vol. 27, No. 1 (March, 1943), 28-55, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40576868.
\textsuperscript{284}See Deed Record 2B-341, X-304, and 3F-172, Microfilm Collection, Chatham County Superior Court, Savannah, Georgia.
following Richard Wylly’s death as well as family wills and estate inventories dating back to the late Eighteenth Century provide evidence that Ned began his life at Brampton Plantation among the enslaved people owned by Jonathan Bryan.

The most natural place to look for Ned’s previous ownership is with Mary’s second husband Richard Wylly. Wylly owed money to several creditors, resulting in the public sale of his property after his death in 1802. This included Fair Lawn Plantation and ten unnamed slaves. Unfortunately, no will or estate inventory was found for Richard Wylly, but if Ned was his property, then he too should have been sold. However, since Ned was still owned by Mary Wylly in 1813, this indicates he was not sold at the 1802 auction. Although Mary did retain at least a portion of Fair Lawn Plantation, apparently repurchasing the property as Sarah Davenport did when she faced the same situation in 1828, there is no deed record showing a similar transaction in regards to the slaves owned by Richard Wylly.

That Richard Wylly was not the original owner of Ned is supported by further evidence: The will and estate inventory of Mary’s father Jonathan Bryan. In the estate inventory which lists some fifty enslaved men, women, and children, A Ned and his son, also named Ned, are among those listed. The elder of these Neds is referenced in Bryan’s will, written five years earlier in 1783. In his will, Jonathan Bryan specifies directions for the fate of his “six negro carpenter fellows,” one of which is named Ned. Bryan requests the carpenters (and sawyers) be kept together, managed by the executors of his will, and that they were to be employed for the purposes of paying his debt for a period of four years following his death. After this four year hiatus, Bryan directed that the enslaved men and their families were to be bequeathed to his children, which included Mary and her three siblings. Bryan reiterates twice in his will that he wished for the families of the carpenters and sawyers to remain together, even after the four-year period ended.

Before settling on Jonathan Bryan as Ned’s original owner, there is also Mary’s first husband to consider. John Morel died in 1777, leaving behind some 155 enslaved men, women, and children listed in the inventory of his estate. Among the people named, there is an enslaved man named Ned, but there are several indications that he is not the man later owned by Mary Wylly. In the first case, the Ned listed seems to have been an elderly and infirm man. In what is a sad description, the appraisers note Ned as “lame & doubtful whether he’ll recover.” Since he is not described as a child in the inventory, we can assume that he was an adult in 1777, placing his birthday somewhere in the 1750s. This would mean that if Isaiah purchased this same man in 1813, he would have been in his sixties. Considered financial investments by their owners who expected returns in the form of years of service and children, slaves in the late

---
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291 John Morel estate paper, #1279-z, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
292 Ibid.
293 Ibid.
stages of life were of much less value than younger slaves in their prime. Moreover, it would have been extraordinary for Isaiah to have paid $400 for a man in his sixties.

Besides the description of the Ned in Morel’s estate inventory, there is the impediment of John Morel’s will. Morel left nearly all of his enslaved population to his sons, leaving to Mary only the choice of “any three of my house negroes.” Additionally, he states that once Mary remarried, these three enslaved individuals she selected were to immediately become the property of his sons and be returned to Ossabaw Island. Despite John Morel’s extensive slave population, his will obviated the possibility that any of his slaves or their children would have remained with Mary until 1813.

As one of four heirs named in Jonathan Bryan’s will and the eldest, Mary stood a good chance of inheriting Ned and his family. If she didn’t initially become Ned’s owner after the four-year interim stipulated by her father, the fate of her brothers and sister made possible Mary’s later ownership of Ned. All three of Mary’s siblings named as heirs in Jonathan Bryan’s will died prior to Ned’s sale in 1813. William Bryan died in 1795, James Bryan in 1797, and Hannah (Bryan) Houston in 1807. No will or estate inventory was found for Hannah Houston. Of the forty-four enslaved people listed in James Bryan’s estate inventory, none are named Ned.
However, in the estate inventory of William Bryan, a Ned is named among some

The estate inventory of Jonathan Bryan’s property shows an elder Ned and his wife Minty, as well as their three sons Ned, Joe, and Prince. Bryan also directly mentions the elder Ned, a carpenter, in his will. This family unit likely represents the Ned owned by Isaiah Davenport at a very young age and his family. Source: Jonathan Bryan, d. 1788 in Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com.

Jonathan Bryan directs in his will (Top) that his carpenters, of whom one is named Ned, were to be divided among his children after four years, but that their families were not to be separated. The Ned named here is likely Ned’s father. Source: Jonathan Bryan, d. 1788 in Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com. The Ned listed in John Morel’s estate inventory (middle) does not represent the Ned later owned by Isaiah Davenport. By the terms of Morel’s will (bottom) his widow was left only 3 slaves, who would no longer be her’s once she remarried, which she did in 1784. Source: John Morel estate paper, #1279-a, Southern Historical Collection, The Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Will of John Morel, Record Group 49-1-2, pg. 1. Georgia Archives Virtual Vault. http://vault.georgiaarchives.org/cdm/ref/collection/cw/id/1387http://vault.georgiaarchives.org/cdm/ref/collection/cw/id/1387.
forty-six slaves owned by William at the time of his death.298 Records show that Richard Wyly
acted on behalf of his wife as administrator for William’s estate. Although Wyly sold most of
his brother-in-law’s estate, including a six-hundred-acre plantation on Skidaway Island, only ten
of his forty-six slaves were sold.299 It is possible that Ned and his family were first owned by
William Bryan, and that he became a part of Mary’s household once William died, but the
ubiqutity of first names makes it just as likely that Mary was Ned’s original owner following her
father’s death.

Regardless of when Ned joined Mary’s household, his sale to Isaiah Davenport by Mary
Wyly in 1813 seemed to be the result of Mary’s financial troubles. By 1807, she was once again
a widow and all of her siblings had died. The year 1809 seemed to initiate a continuous
hemorraging in the sale of Mary’s property. She attempted to sell Fair Lawn Plantation in 1809,
but by 1810 it was listed for sale by the city as a result of tax default.300 Mary’s lot 20 in
Ewensburg as well as a young enslaved male named Andrew were also auctioned in 1809 as a
result of unpaid debts.301 In 1810, Mary sold her three-hundred-acres share on Skidaway Island,
followed by more slaves in 1812.302 An enslaved male named Will was sold at public auction, as
well as twelve other slaves sold to pay the debt of Mary and her late sister Hannah Houston.303
Given this sequence of events, it seems that Ned was sold after a five-year period of similar
transactions as a consequence of Mary’s financial insolvency.

Although at first glance it appears that Mary had access to hundreds of enslaved workers
owned by her two husbands, this was simply not the case. John Morel’s will obviated this
possibility and Richard Wyly’s debt served the same purpose. The only slaves Mary was
bequeathed were those belonging to the estate of her father Jonathan Bryan. Her inheritance, his
specific terms for the enslaved carpenters, and the identification of Ned in both his inventory and
will, stacked against the impediments to Mary’s ownership of dower slaves, make the best
conclusion that Ned began his life at Brampton Plantation with Jonathan Bryan.

Although it is tempting to think that Ned is the carpenter named in Jonathan Bryan’s will,
this simply does not mesh with his later purchase by Isaiah Davenport, who would have been
making a hefty investment in a man in his fifties or sixties. In any case, slaves who worked as
carpenters were almost as ubiquitous as slaves named Ned, making identification by this
description alone impossible. The younger Ned, son of Ned the carpenter named in Bryan’s
estate inventory and will born sometime in the 1780s would have been about thirty years old or

298 See William Bryan, d. 1795, in Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records,
299 Georgia Gazette, February 19, 1795, pg. 1, genealogybank.com.
300 See the Savannah Republican, July 20, 1809, pg. 1, col. 4, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers,
http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1809-0258 and the Savannah Republican, Sep 1, 1810, pg. 3, col. 4,
301 See the Savannah Republican, July 11, 1809, pg. 4, col. 4, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers,
http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1809-0245 and the Savannah Republican, September 19, 1809, pg. 4,
302 See the Savannah Republican, February 17, 1810, pg. 4, col. 1, GALILEO, Savannah Historic
303 See the Savannah Republican, October 10, 1812, pg. 4, col. 1, GALILEO, Savannah Historic
Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1812-0469 and the Savannah Republican, April 9, 1812,
younger in 1813. As the son of a carpenter who remained with his father possibly until adulthood, it would have been normal for Ned to learn his father’s trade.

WHERE DID NED LIVE?

Ned’s presence in the 1788 estate inventory most likely narrows his birthdate to somewhere in the 1780s. He was listed as Ned’s son, and while his father was appraised at $120, young Ned was only appraised at $15, likely a testament to his very young age, perhaps even infancy. At first glance, it would seem impossible to pinpoint the location where Ned was born and spent his early childhood years. Bryan owned tens of thousands of acres in Georgia and South Carolina, spanning some twenty plantations. However, Brampton Plantation was recognized as the Bryan family seat beginning in 1765. It remained the family’s primary residence before, during, and after the Revolutionary War. It was at Brampton in 1784 that Jonathan’s widowed daughter Mary wed Richard Wylly and where Jonathan Bryan composed his last will in 1783. Given these facts, we can trace Ned’s birth to Brampton and assume he spent his infancy and a portion of his childhood here.

When Ned’s whereabouts becomes blurry is following the death of Jonathan Bryan in 1788 and his later purchase by Isaiah Davenport in 1813. By this time, Mary (Bryan) Morel was now Mary Wylly and was living at Fair Lawn Plantation with her second husband. It is certainly possible, even likely, that young Ned became a member of Mary’s household in 1788 and lived with her until 1813. She was the eldest heir, and Ned only appears in a deed of sale with Mary. It seems that the most likely course was that Ned became a part of Mary’s household when Jonathan Bryan died.

Joseph Bryan, the son of Jonathan Bryan’s eldest son Josiah who died in 1774, acquired a large enslaved workforce for his plantation on Wilmington Island, and both he and Mary were administrators of Hannah Bryan’s estate. Although Joseph Bryan’s estate inventory does not show ownership of Ned, it is curious that less than six months after Joseph Bryan’s death in 1812 that Mary sold Ned to Isaiah. Despite this coincidence, the best that can be said about where Ned lived after Brampton Plantation is that he divided his time between the residences and landholdings of the Bryan heirs.

One thing that can be said for certain is that Jonathan Bryan’s son James Bryan was not Ned’s owner, as there are no Ned’s named in his estate inventory of 1797. Since Hannah and Mary were the last two heirs after the death of James Bryan in 1797, Ned most certainly lived

305 Gallay, Plantation Empire, 263.
306 Georgia Historical Quarterly, Brampton, 29.
307 Gallay, Plantation Empire, 266; Georgia Historical Quarterly, Brampton, 32-37.
308 Georgia Historical Quarterly, Brampton, 37; See the will of Jonathan Bryan, d. 1788.
309 See the notice of Joseph Bryan’s death in the Savannah Republican, September 8, 1812, pg. 3, genealogybank.com. Joseph Bryan’s inventory does list a man named Ned, but this inventory appears to have been compiled in 1814. By this time, Ned had already been sold to Isaiah Davenport. In any case, Joseph Bryan was still in his minority when his grandfather died in 1788; he was only fifteen years old. Additionally, Jonathan Bryan willed his young grandson a choice of one bondman or money upon reaching adulthood, and no more. Jonathan did not will him a comparable portion of his estate as he did his children, despite that he was the grandson of his oldest son, who died in 1774. The earliest Ned may have been living with or working for Bryan was in 1795, when he appears in the sale of William Bryan’s estate as having a plantation on Wilmington Island.
with and worked for Mary, Joseph Bryan, or Hannah Houston in the years after. Both Hannah and Mary may have lived with their nephew Joseph on Wilmington Island. Like Mary, Hannah became a widow in 1796 and never remarried. Although Mary held onto her landholdings until the first decade of the Nineteenth century, it is not clear if she lived at any of these locations. Following Richard Wylly’s death in 1801, she may have decided to move back into the city rather than remain alone and relatively isolated at Fair Lawn or live far east of the city at Wilmington Island on another plantation prone to malaria and other diseases. It is not clear where Hannah or Mary lived after the death of their husbands.

Ned lived with the Davenports for a period of at least fifteen years. In the public auction of Isaiah’s slaves in 1828, Ned is named, but he is not repurchased by Sarah at the sale. Although he was a carpenter, he does not earn wages for the Davenport household as Bella’s children do. At the time of the auction, Ned would have been about forty-eight years old, which may explain why Sarah did not repurchase him. His occupation as a carpenter would have made it possible for him to earn wages and live independently.

NED in SAVANNAH’S JAIL

One of the new sources reviewed for this report were the antebellum incarceration records held at the City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives. Although it was thought that there may have been a record of Nancy’s incarceration, none was found. However, there were numerous instances in which Mary Wylly incarcerated her slaves and on one of these occasions it was Ned. Ned was jailed from December 27, 1812 until January 13, 1813. His release date corresponds exactly to when he was sold to Isaiah Davenport. Ned was jailed for “safe keeping.” Oftentimes, this slaves were jailed for safekeeping during transfer in ownership or if they were considered a flight risk. Since the record of Ned’s incarceration does not indicate any punishment, it seems his time spent in Savannah’s jail was the results of the former of these two.

In addition to Ned, nine other slaves owned by Mary Wylly were incarcerated, which was a significant number compared to other slave owners in the jail register. The reasons for the incarceration of Mary Wylly’s slaves besides “safe keeping” included theft, execution, and running away. This begs the question of why? Was Mary Wylly exceedingly cruel to her slaves, or was their some other circumstance which compelled them to endanger their lives and risk punishment, incarceration, or even death? Did this have something to do with Mary being an impoverished widow? This question is worth further research.

[311] See Estate/Probate of Isaiah Davenport.
[312] City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Jail Registers: Record Group 5600 PL-010, vol. 1-3 [No Records available for 1816-1854].
[313] See Deed Record 2E-104.
[314] See Appendix B.
NED’s FAMILY

Because Jonathan Bryan was adamant about not splitting up the families of his slaves, his estate inventory lists his slaves in family units. Ned is listed in Jonathan Bryan’s estate inventory with his parents, Ned and Minty, and his two brothers Joe and Prince. It seems clear from the appraisement of Ned and his family that Prince and Joe were both younger than Ned. Ned is appraised at $15, whereas Joe and Prince are appraised at $10 and $5 respectively. Their lesser value is likely a testament to their young age and indicates Ned as the oldest sibling. Although extended family relationships are not indicated in the inventory, Neds other family members are likely also enumerated. Listing all of the slaves in Bryan’s inventory is too extensive, but further research may indicate who Ned’s other family members were. Jonathan Bryan’s request that the families not be broken up also means that Ned may have lived with his parents and brothers until as late as 1813 when he was sold to Isaiah.

In the grouping of family units on Jonathan Bryan’s will indicates that Ned’s mother Minty, his father, Ned, and his two brothers were named Joe and Prince. If Ned in fact began living with Mary Wyly in 1788, then his family life would have began at some time on Fair Lawn Plantation. The clue to Ned’s spouse and children may perhaps be found in the jail registers. Two women named Sarah and Rachel were incarcerated at the same time as Ned in 1813 for “safe keeping” and “theft” respectively. Is it possible that one of these women was his spouse?

NED by LOCATION

315 See Estate Inventory of Jonathan Bryan, pictured above and below.
| Owner Name                  | Years When Owned          | Owner Occupation    | Locations Lived/Worked                                      | Ned’s Age  
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------
| Jonathan Bryan             | ca. 1780s-1788            | Planter             | Brampton Plantation                                        | 0 – 8 years |
| Mary (Bryan) & Richard Wyly | possibly after 1788 until 1788 | Planter/Merchant       | Brampton Plantation, Fair Lawn Plantation Lot 20, Ewensburg, Savannah Bryan’s Cowpen, Ogeechee River Skidaway Island | unknown    |
| Mary Wyly                  | ? - 1813                  |                     |                                                            |            |
| William Bryan              | possibly after 1788 until 1795 | Planter             | Shelloworth Plantation, Skidaway Island                      | unknown    |
| James Bryan                | possibly after 1788 until 1797 | Planter             | Whitemarsh Island                                            | unknown    |
| Joseph Bryan               | possibly from 1795-1812   | Planter             | Wilmington Island                                            | unknown    |
| Isaiah & Sarah Davenport   | From 1813 until at least 1828 | Master Carpenter     | Savannah Columbia Ward, Greene Ward, Washington Ward        | 33 – 48 years |

### NED’s FAMILY

| Name              | Relationship      | Earliest Known Owner | Owner before Separation from Ned | Years Lived with Ned |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------
| Ned               | Father            | Jonathan Bryan       | Unknown                          | Possibly until as late as 1813 |
| Minty             | Mother            | Jonathan Bryan       | Unknown                          | Possibly until as late as 1813 |
| Prince            | Younger Brother²²¹| Jonathan Bryan       | Unknown                          | Possibly until as late as 1813 |
| Joe               | Younger Brother   | Jonathan Bryan       | Unknown                          | Possibly until as late as 1813 |
| Sarah             | possible spouse?  | Mary Wyly            | Mary Wyly                        | unknown              |
| Rachel            | possible spouse?  | Mary Wyly            | Mary Wyly                        | unknown              |

³¹⁶ In this table, Ned’s age is based on the approximation that he was born in 1780, drawing from Jonathan Bryan’s will where he is listed as the elder Ned’s son in 1788.
³¹⁷ Georgia Gazette, February 19, 1795, pg. 1, genealogybank.com.
³¹⁸ Ibid.
³¹⁹ Ibid.
³²⁰ Jonathan Bryan stipulated more than once in his will that the families of his slaves should never be split up. If they honored his wishes, it’s possible Ned remained with his family until as late as 1813 when he was sold to Isaiah Davenport.
³²¹ In the inventory of Jonathan Bryan, Ned is appraised at $15, Joe at $10, and Prince at $5. These values likely reflect the ages of the boys, where Ned is the elder brother of the two.
The notice of the sale of William Bryan’s Plantation called Shellworth (above) upon his death provides several other valuable pieces of information, including the location of this plantation and those of his nephew and brother-in-law. It also indicates that only ten of his slaves were sold, and shows that Richard Wylly, the administrator of the estate, collaborated with his nephew. Source: Georgia Gazette, February 19, 1795, pg. 1, genealogybank.com. The close-up below shows the location of Brampton Plantation on the Savannah River, adjacent to Rae’s Hall and Springfield Plantations. This close-up is from McKinnon’s Chart of the Savannah River drawn in 1825 (below).
The detailed chart of the Savannah River (above) drawn in 1825 shows the various Savannah River Plantations, including Brampton, as well as their distance from Savannah. Source: Georgia Historical Society, Chart of Savannah River, McKinnon, 1825.
Ned in the Greater Savannah Area
AT THE HEART of THE AFRICAN BAPTIST MOVEMENT

Ned’s connection to Jonathan Bryan and Brampton Plantation puts him at the center of one of the most historically important movements in Savannah. It was at Brampton Plantation during the 1780s where the grass roots movement constituting the earliest stages in the establishment of Savannah’s African Baptist congregation took place. This movement was led by Andrew Bryan, one of Jonathan Bryan’s slaves who also lived at Brampton. Jonathan Bryan promoted Andrew’s preaching and the spread of the evangelical movement among the enslaved community. He allowed Andrew to use a barn at Brampton Plantation to preach and hold meetings, drawing followers from nearby plantations along the Savannah River. It was in a barn at Brampton that the First African Baptist Church was officially established and Andrew Bryan named as its first pastor. In sum, young Ned and his family lived, worked, and worshipped alongside Andrew Bryan at Brampton Plantation and were at the forefront of the establishment of the first Black Baptist Church in the Nation.

322 Ibid.
324 Ibid.
325 Ibid.
This historical account is made all the more extraordinary by Jonathan Bryan’s estate inventory. In the list of enslaved men, women, and children owned by Bryan at the time of his death, young Ned and his parents are listed almost consecutively after Andrew Bryan, his wife Hannah, and his brother Sampson.\(^{326}\) As a child, young Ned would have witnessed the stirrings of the early African Baptist movement and was likely baptized at the Brampton Plantation by George Liele. Liele was a black evangelist who baptized Andrew Bryan, his wife, and many other slaves at Brampton in 1783.\(^{327}\) Was young Ned also baptized by Liele?

**NED in LATER YEARS**

After 1828, it seems that Ned left the Davenport household. When he and his fellow slaves were auctioned because of Isaiah Davenport’s debt in 1828, Sarah did not repurchase him.\(^{328}\) Ned does not appear in later deed records of leverage as Sarah’s other slaves do, and there is no ante-bellum record of his interment by Sarah Davenport in Laurel Grove South. By 1840, census records indicate that Ned, Tom, and Deeping are no longer living with Sarah Davenport. If Ned somehow did remain a member of the Davenport household after the auction of 1828, it is possible he lived independently and paid Sarah a portion of his wages. But when considering he was not repurchased in 1828, does not appear in later deed records, and cannot be identified in census records past 1820, the most likely course for Ned was that the public auction separated him from the Davenport house. The two adult males listed on the census of 1830, one aged twenty-four to thirty-six and the other aged thirty-six to fifty-five, likely represent Deeping and Jack.

In the Census of 1870, a query for Ned Bryan born anywhere between 1770 and 1790 shows no results in Savannah or the U.S. This also holds true in a search for any Ned Wyllys. There are also no Neds living in Savannah. There are also no Freedman’s Bank Records with a connection to Ned. These results are not out of the ordinary. By the time of the 1870 census and Freedman’s Bank Records, Ned would have been about eighty years old.

**Summary**

Ned was born in the 1780s on Brampton Plantation, the Savannah River family seat of Jonathan Bryan (1708-1788). Bryan was one of early Savannah’s most prolific slave and land owners, known for encouraging religious devotion among his slaves. Ned’s childhood coincided with the first meetings of the African Baptist movement held at Brampton, under the leadership of Andrew Bryan, also owned at the time by Jonathan Bryan. Although only a young boy when the first worship services of the African Baptist congregation were held on the plantation, Ned was at the forefront of the movement, along with his father Ned, mother Minty, and two younger brothers Joe and Prince.

Jonathan Bryan died in 1788, bequeathing his enslaved population including young Ned and his family to his children. However, Bryan stipulated in his will that his enslaved carpenters, including Ned’s father, also named Ned, were to remain intact with their families and continue working to pay the remainder of his debts. Ned does not again appear in records until his sale to the Davenports in 1813 by Jonathan Bryan’s widowed daughter Mary Wylly. Similar to the

---

\(^{326}\) See Estate Inventory of Jonathan Bryan.
\(^{327}\) *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, Brampton, 36-27.
\(^{328}\) See Deed Record 2O-563.
experience of the other enslaved members of the Davenport household, Ned appears to have been sold because of Mary’s financial insolvency. Ned was not sold with his family members, and there is no indication what became of them after Jonathan Bryan’s death. However, the terms of Jonathan Bryan’s will indicate that Ned and his family remained intact for at least several years.

Like his father, Ned became a carpenter, and joined the Davenport household and the urban Savannah community sometime in his thirties. His occupation as a carpenter was undoubtedly utilized by Isaiah, in both his work as a master carpenter and in the building of the Davenport house. After spending fifteen years with the Davenports, Ned was among the men, woman, and children subjected to public auction following the death of Isaiah in 1827. However, he was one of the few not repurchased by Sarah, and it is unclear what became of Ned after 1828. While its possible he is on the census of 1830, census records after this do not indicate his presence, nor do any other sources.

While Ned’s experience with the death and debt of his owners and the fear and uncertainty associated with public auction is similar to the experiences of the many other enslaved members of the Davenport household, his lived experiences also differ in one very important way: Ned was incarcerated by Mary Wyly in December 1812, just prior to his sale to Isaiah Davenport. Jailed by Mary for “safe keeping” just two days after Christmas, Ned remained in Savannah’s jail for 19 days. It was common for slave owners to jail the enslaved prior to a transfer in ownership. The description of “safe keeping” could also mean that an enslaved individual was considered a flight risk, although this doesn’t seem to have been the case with Ned; he received no punishment while he was in jail. Notorious for their ramshackle, insecure, and fetid conditions, southern jails were oftentimes no more than single-room buildings where both men and women, free and enslaved, and criminals of all types were held. Although jails were meant to be instruments of power reinforcing the slave system, enslaved individuals like Ned often utilized their time in jail to learn to read or write, or increase their knowledge on religion, politics, or information about their communities. One author has deemed southern jails as “universities of social and political change,” and while meant to disempower and subjugate the enslaved even further, time spent in jail often meant the opposite.

Ned’s lived experiences illustrate the uncertainties faced by enslaved individuals in their daily lives as a result of the ever-looming prospect of sale. The death or financial insolvency of a slave owner could mean the abrupt uprooting of an enslaved individual’s life, and separation from family, oftentimes permanently. However, the terms of Jonathan Bryan’s will indicate that Ned and his family may have remained intact for many years after his death. Because of the landholdings of the Bryan family which numbered in the tens of thousands, combined with Ned’s carpentry skills, his geographic footprint and mobility is potentially more extensive than any of the other enslaved members of the Davenport household. In Savannah, his geography extends from Savannah’s River plantations, to the sea islands of Whitemarsh, Wilmington, and Skidaway, south to Fair Lawn Plantation, and throughout urban Savannah. Ned’s experience in Savannah’s jail illustrates a commonplace means by which slave owners sought to exercise power and control over the enslaved. However, Ned’s time in jail may have been an empowering experience, allowing him to emerge more knowledgeable, and with a heightened awareness of the gross injustice of his enslavement.
Further Research Questions

1. Why did Mary Wylly incarcerate her slaves so frequently? Her father Jonathan Bryan was known for at least supporting the religious beliefs of his slaves and attempting to keep their families together. Did Mary differ in his beliefs? And why did she incarcerate her 10 slaves all in the year 1812?
2. Why is there no estate inventory for Richard Wylly? Can this document be located?
3. Are there any family accounting/plantation books still in the hands of the Wylly descendants that may indicate who became Ned’s owner following the death of Jonathan Bryan in 1788?
4. Young Ned was at the forefront of the African Baptist movement at Brampton Plantation. Can any additional records of his baptism, marriage, etc. be found in the 18th century archival collections of the First African or First Bryan Baptist Church?
5. What was the precise location of Savannah’s antebellum jail, and what were conditions like here? Have any archaeological studies been conducted at this site or any other research done?
6. What is the true meaning of “safe keeping” and “execution” as they apply to incarcerated slaves?
7. The Telfair Academy have artifacts from the Bryan family, including a portrait of Mary Bryan with her children. Do they have any other pictures or information about Mary’s slaves?
8. What was life like on Savannah’s River plantations, Fair Lawn Plantation, and the plantations on Skidaway, Whitemarsh, and Wilmington Islands? Are there any remnants of slave housing or burial grounds at these sites?
Peggy
Born ca. 1810
Savannah
The coincidence of a first name

Peggy is one of only three Davenport slaves who lived in the house during the 1820s that is not identified in a deed of sale to Isaiah. She also does not appear in any later deed records in which Sarah used her slaves as leverage. The earliest known record of Peggy is the public auction of Isaiah Davenport’s slaves in 1828. Unlike fellow bondman Davy, also known as David, who also does not appear in a deed of sale or later deed records, Peggy was repurchased by Sarah at the auction.\(^{329}\) Peggy’s absence from any deed of sale indicates that she was the child of one of the Davenport slaves, or that she was one of the two slaves owned by Isaiah prior to the earliest known deed record of 1812.

The evidence supports the former of these possibilities. A record of Peggy traveling onboard the brig Clinton from Savannah to New York City in June 1840 indicates that she was born ca. 1810.\(^{330}\) It also describes Peggy as being five feet, six inches tall and of dark complexion. Sarah’s son Isaiah Davenport, Jr. is listed as Peggy’s owner or shipper. About two weeks after Peggy made her voyage, Sarah Davenport also traveled to New York City.\(^{331}\) Moreover, these details support the notion that the Peggy named in the 1828 public auction was a young woman of about eighteen years old, born to one of the enslaved females owned by Isaiah.

It is tempting to think that the Peggy named in the public auction was the sister of the elder Nancy, particularly since Peggy lived nearby.\(^{332}\) In a perfect, altruistic slave owning world, the Davenports would have acquired Peggy so that the sisters could be together, assuaging the unhappiness that compelled Nancy to run away. But this possibility cannot be substantiated by documentary evidence. In any case, later deed records and the ship manifest for Peggy’s voyage to New York point to the conclusion that the Peggy and Nancy named in the public auction were in fact not the elder sisters.

PEGGY in LATER YEARS

The ship manifest record for Peggy indicates that she lived with Sarah until at least 1840, from birth until the age of thirty years old. Peggy was close in age to Jack, who was born ca. 1808, and Sarah’s repurchase of the two may indicate that they were married. Besides Jack, Peggy was also close in age to Isaac and Jacob, who were two years her junior. There is no way to know for certain if Peggy was the wife of Jack, Jacob, or Isaac. But it should be noted that Jonathan Bryan was far from being the only slave owner concerned with keeping families together. Many were conscious of this, and if Sarah adopted the same disposition, the slaves whom she repurchased may reflect her attempt to keep related slaves together.

\(^{329}\) See Deed Record 20-563.
\(^{330}\) See Peggy, onboard the ship Clinton, traveling from Savannah to New York in 1840, in Coastwise Slave Manifests, 1801 - 1860 ancestry.com.
\(^{331}\) See the Weekly Georgian, July 11, 1840, pg. 3, col. 6, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:swg1840-0103.
\(^{332}\) See discussion of Peggy and her daughter living with the Bourke’s above.
No return voyage for Peggy was found, which may indicate she remained in New York after 1840, or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RESIDENCE</th>
<th>ORIGIN OF SHIP</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL OFFICER</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL CLERK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NEW YORK CITY</td>
<td>James Brown</td>
<td>David Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Nancy, Mary, and Ann, Peggy also traveled to New York by way of water. The record of her travel provides the only information about her age and appearance. Source: *Coastwise Slave Manifests, 1801-1860* ancestry.com.
that she returned with Sarah sometime later. As was the case with Mary, no record of her return could be found, but a later record showed she had returned and traveled again many years later. The Census of 1840 accounts for Peggy in the Davenport household, but by 1850, Peggy was no longer living with Sarah. It is curious that in the earliest record of Sarah using several of her slaves as leverage, a deed from 1843, Peggy is not named along with the other Davenport slaves of similar ages. She subsequently also does not appear in later deeds. Peggy may have passed away by this time, although she would have only been about forty years old. If Peggy did live until after the Civil War, she would have become a free woman at the age of fifty-five.

A newspaper notice shows that Sarah Davenport traveled to New York City two weeks after Peggy traveled there in 1840. Aside from the public auction notice, the ship manifest record, and potentially the Census of 1840, Peggy cannot be identified in any other records. The Census of 1870 showed no Peggy Davenports in Savannah or the nation. In Savannah, one woman named Peggy McKay born in 1810 was enumerated on the 1870 Census. Aside from Peggy McKay, there were 4 additional Peggy’s enumerated in the Savannah area born within five years of Peggy’s known birthdate. Outside of Savannah in surrounding counties in Georgia and South Carolina, there are countless others, though none with any clear connection to Peggy. There are also no Freedman’s Bank Records with a clear connection to Peggy. There is also no antebellum record of Peggy’s interment in Laurel Grove Cemetery.

**PEGGY’s FAMILY**

No positive identifications of Peggy’s family can be made, although the most likely conclusion is that she was born to one of the enslaved females owned by Isaiah Davenport. However, her birth ca. 1810 makes it difficult to connect her to any of the female slaves purchased by Isaiah. It is possible that Peggy was the daughter of one of the slaves acquired by Isaiah prior to 1812, or that her age was miscalculated as often happened and that she was the daughter of Nancy or Bella. In the case of the former, Nancy may have named her daughter after her sister whom she had been separated from; naming children after family members was a common occurrence. But if Peggy were Nancy’s daughter, this could spell several possibilities. Nancy may have been pregnant with Peggy when she was sold to Isaiah, and would have been on the run with her unborn child. Since Nancy was successful at remaining at large for at least a year, this could mean that Peggy was born during this time, between 1812 and 1813. It is also possible that perhaps Nancy was prompted to return because she was pregnant, and delivered Peggy sometime after coming back.

**PEGGY in the Census of 1870**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Connection to Davenport Slaves or family?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peggy McKay b. 1810</td>
<td>District 5, Chatham, Georgia</td>
<td>Unknown-ancestry.com error</td>
<td>age; location in Savannah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

333 See Discussion of Mary’s travel above.
If Nancy was Peggy’s mother and gave birth to her sometime around 1812 or 1813, this would be a small miscalculation in her age as reported by Isaiah, Jr. in 1840.

For Bella to have been Peggy’s mother, the earliest Peggy could have been born was 1817, which creates a much larger miscalculation in her age. It is a compelling possibility that Peggy and Nancy were also Bella’s children, but there is no way to know for sure. But it should be noted again that at least five of the slaves auctioned and repurchased by Sarah were a family unit, and that Davy and Ned who were not Bella’s children were not among those repurchased.

Is it possible that the Peggy listed in the auction was in fact the sister of the elder Nancy? It is an intriguing possibility. Nancy’s sister Peggy was sold to Thomas and Anne Bourke in 1813, and the Bourkes lived some of the time just a few houses down the street from the Davenports in Columbia Ward. They too also owned a residence in Greene Ward. There are no deed records or records of any other kind to substantiate the idea, but perhaps later research may consider how common it was for slaves to be purchased or exchanged off-the-books.

WHERE DID PEGGY LIVE?

Peggy is the only Davenport slave that seems to have lived exclusively in Savannah with Sarah and Isaiah, although the record of her travel to New York City indicates she spent at least some time living and working outside of Savannah. Born ca. 1810, Peggy would have resided with the Davenports in Washington Ward prior to the completion of their home on Columbia Square. Once the house was completed, Peggy lived here for a period of twenty years until Sarah sold the house in 1840. Perhaps Peggy’s voyage to New York in the same year was connected to this sale, reflecting Sarah’s inability to accommodate the housing of all of her slaves after selling the Davenport home. By 1850, Peggy can no longer be identified on the census. She may have lived with Sarah at least some of the time between 1840 and 1850, but it is not clear where.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years When Owned</th>
<th>Owner Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived/Worked</th>
<th>Peggy’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah and Sarah Davenport</td>
<td>ca. 1810-1827</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Savannah, Columbia Ward, Lot 13 &amp; 14, Greene Ward, Lot 18, Washington Ward, Lot 8</td>
<td>0-17 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarah Davenport 1828 until at least 1840 Savannah, Columbia Ward, Lot 13 New York City? 17-30 years old

**Further Research Questions**

1. Are there any other records which can be found to identify Peggy and her original origins?
2. Was it somewhat common for slaves to be purchased or traded without an official record?
3. Peggy traveled to New York City, as did Mary, Anne, and Nancy. What was the Davenport connection here?

Dave
(Also known as David or Dave)
Born ca. 1790, Died 1856
Another Salzburger Connection and the Myth of Two Davids

Dave, who is invariably referred to as David or Davy, was born ca. 1790 on Liberty Island, located between the Skidaway River and the Thunderbolt region, thirteen miles east of
Dave, like Nancy, ran away, prompting a descriptive newspaper advertisement to secure his capture. The 1822 notice describes Dave as five feet, eleven inches tall and as “well made,” implying a strong, muscular figure. He was also a waggoner by trade and was familiar to many in the area. Dave was formerly owned by Isaiah Davenport’s brother Samuel who died in 1820. Isaiah was the administrator of his brother’s estate, and eventually acquired Dave in 1822 at auction. While it may have originally been thought that Dave, once owned by Isaiah’s brother, was distinct from another enslaved male named David or Davy, originally owned by Isaiah and Sarah, an analysis of the documentary evidence suggests that these names all refer to the same bondman named Dave was once owned by Isaiah’s brother.

Five years after running away, a newspaper notice of 1822 indicated that Dave was sold. However, a man named “Davy” is listed among Isaiah Davenport’s property at the 1828 auction. He is also accounted for in Isaiah’s estate account of 1827 and 1828 for the wages he earned, but he is listed here as ‘David.’ Moreover, it has been assumed that these two people, Dave and Davy or David, were separate individuals; the former, once owned by Isaiah’s brother, and the latter originally owned by Isaiah and Sarah. Not only were their names different, but it seemed unequivocal that Dave was sold out of the Davenport home in an 1822 auction and was not repurchased by Isaiah. However, a review of the evidence indicated that this was not the case.

First, there is no deed of sale showing the purchase of a slave named Davy or any derivation thereof by Isaiah Davenport. This suggests two possible options: (1) Davy was born to one of the enslaved females owned by Isaiah Davenport, which means he was in his mid-teens at the auction of 1828, or (2) was one of the two slaves acquired by Isaiah before the earliest deed of 1812. But the outcome of the auction and a previously unknown deed record almost obviate both of these explanations. Sarah did not repurchase Davy, suggesting that he was not the child of one of the enslaved females and was more likely an older adult, unrelated to any of the Davenport slaves. Secondly and most importantly, a deed of sale from 1828 shows that a month before Sarah repurchased seven of Isaiah’s slaves at the auction, she sold Davy, who is identified in the sale as thirty-nine years old. Sold to Aaron Champion, David, as he is referred to in the deed of sale, was the same age as the “Dave” described in Isaiah Davenport’s runaway notice. The best conclusion to all of this is that David sold by Sarah to Aaron Champion in 1828 is the same Dave once owned by Samuel Davenport and the Davy listed in the auction notice. The timing of his sale suggests that Sarah sold David with the intention of using the money to repurchase the other Davenport slaves and help mitigate her financial insolvency resulting from her late husband’s debt.

335 Davy’s birthdate and probably birth location can be ascertained from a runaway advertisement. See the Savannah Daily Republican, January 23, 1822, pg. 1, col. 4, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1822-0073. Today, Liberty Island is known as Dutch Island. 336 Ibid.
339 See Estate/Probate of Isaiah Davenport.
340 No deed record was located that showed Isaiah repurchased Dave.
341 See Deed Record 2O-540, Chatham County Superior Court, Microfilm Collection, Savannah, Georgia.
Although there is no deed of sale showing Dave’s purchase by Isaiah from the auctioneers in 1822, this is likely because this was an auction held by a private company rather than by the Sheriff. ¹³² When Sarah was left with significant debt following Isaiah’s death and was forced to choose which slaves she would repurchase, she probably made the decision to sell David for several reasons rather than other individuals. Probably first and foremost, he was not a child or family member of the other Davenport slaves. Secondly, he was an adult male, capable of earning wages as a waggoner, a trade which Isaiah describes he was well-known for. Sarah may have also considered that David had lived with the Davenports for the shortest amount of time. Although it is possible that David was one of the two slaves owned by Isaiah and Sarah prior to the earliest deed of 1812, it would be highly coincidental that his name and age were exactly the same as the Dave owned by Samuel Davenport.

LIFE BEFORE THE DAVENPORTS

The runaway notice describing Dave and his life before the Davenports provides much of the same type of information that was also helpful to identify elements of Nancy’s early life. In particular, it identifies the name of his two former owners and their dates of ownership, as well as where Dave previously lived and grew up. ¹³³ The notice indicates that Dave was purchased from the estate of Readick in 1817 and that he “was raised” on Liberty Island near Thunderbolt. A search of estate records in Chatham County shows that Catherine Readick of Liberty Island died in 1817. ¹³⁴ Although an inventory of Catherine’s estate was taken, it only enumerated a single enslaved male named Jim. ¹³⁵ This was an unusual circumstance; no other Readicks died in 1817 and it would seem that if Dave was purchased from Catherine’s estate following her death, he would have been listed in her estate inventory.

Further research into the Readick family, originally spelled ‘Radick’ provided the answers. Catherine was the widow of (John) Peter Readick and the sister-in-law to Peter’s brother (John) Michael Readick. ¹³⁶ The Radick family were German Lutherans from the region of Palatine who joined the Salzburger community in Georgia in 1737. ¹³⁷ Brothers Michael and Peter obtained fifty-acre tracts on Liberty Island by Royal Grant in 1759. Although Peter Readick bequeathed all of his property to his wife Catherine when he died in 1778, he does not provide the names of any of his slaves. Despite this lack of detail, if Dave was a dower slave, he would have been listed in Catherine’s estate inventory; Catherine never remarried, and the terms of her husband’s will made her the owner of his property as long as she remained a widow. ¹³⁸ But as it turned out, Catherine inherited Dave not from her husband Peter, but from her brother-in-law Michael.

In his will of 1792, Michael Readick names some nine slaves, one of whom is named ‘Davy.’ He stipulates that all but two of these individuals, Jenny and Maria, whom he bequeathed to his

³⁴³ See the Savannah Daily Republican, January 23, 1822.
³⁴⁵ Ibid.
³⁴⁶ Gnann, Georgia Salzburger and Allied Families, pg.
³⁴⁷ Ibid.
³⁴⁸ See the will of Peter Readick, died 1778, in Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com.
niece, were to transfer in ownership to his sister-in-law Catherine upon the passing of his wife Saloma. Although no estate inventory or death record could be found for Saloma, an estate sale notice from 1818 following Catherine’s death makes it clear that Saloma died sometime before her sister-in-law. The notice of sale by the administrator of Catherine’s estate identifies ‘David’ as one of four of Michael Readick’s slaves inherited by Catherine and sold as a result of her death. Moreover, this explains why Dave is not listed in her estate inventory. The terms of Michael Readick’s will stipulated that Catherine’s death forfeited her ownership of his slaves and they were to be divided up among her children upon her death. In this notice of sale, Catherine’s slave Jim is listed separately from the slaves she inherited from Michael Readick. They were not listed in her estate inventory because they were no longer her property. Moreover, the conclusion to be drawn from this is that the ‘Davy’ named in Michael Readick’s will of 1792 was two-year-old David, later sold by Sarah Davenport in 1828.

WHERE DID DAVE LIVE?

Michael Readick bequeathed his land on Liberty Island to his wife Saloma and his sister-in-law Catherine upon his death in 1793. In conjunction with Dave’s runaway notice and the advertisement of Catherine Readick’s estate in 1817, this identifies Liberty Island as the location where Dave lived until the age of twenty-seven when he was purchased by Samuel Davenport in 1818. It is not clear when Saloma died and thus when Catherine inherited Dave according to the terms of her brother-in-law’s will, but this does not impact Dave’s location. The runaway notice specifically indicates that Dave “was raised on Liberty Island” and both Michael Readick’s widow and sister-in-law inherited his land here when Dave was only two years old. The estate sale notice of Catherine’s property also notes that the sale took place at her home on Liberty Island.

---

349 See the will of Michael Readick, died 1792, Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com.
351 Catherine Readick died in November of 1817, and much of her estate property was sold within November and December 1817. But Dave and the other slaves were not sold until January 1818. Although the runaway notice posted by Isaiah Davenport indicates that Dave was purchased from Catherine’s estate in 1817, this was an oversight, and an easy mistake to make. See the estate inventory of Catherine Readick, the notice of Dave’s sale in the Savannah Republican, January 3, 1818, pg. 3, col. 3, genealogybank.com, and the advertisement of the sale of Catherine’s estate in the Savannah Republican, November 29, 1817, pg. 1, col. 5, GALILEO, Savannah Historic Newspapers, http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/savnewspapers/id:svr1817-0410.
352 Ibid.
The notice of sale (above) and the runaway notice (below) provide crucial details about Dave that help to reconstruct his life. Although running away must have been a trying experience, it has significantly contributed to piecing together Dave’s story today. Source: (Above) Savannah Daily Republican, Apr. 27, 1822, pg. 4, col. 1, GALILEO. (Below) Savannah Daily Republican, January 23, 1822, pg. 1, col. 4, GALILEO.
Catherine Readick’s estate inventory (above) only listed a single bondman named Jim. This seemed to confound the record that Dave was purchased at her estate sale in 1817, but in conjunction with other records (below) Dave was inherited from Michael Readick and was to become the property of his children once his sister-in-law died. Source: (above) Catherine Readick, d. 1817, Chatham County, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com. (Below): Peter Readick, died 1778, in Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com
Dave, also referred to as Davy or David, is named in the will of Michael Readick in 1792 (Top). The terms of Readick’s will (middle) initially bequeathed Dave to his widow Saloma, but upon her death, Catherine Readick became Dave’s owner. After Catherine died, Dave and his fellow slaves were to pass to Michael’s children. The sale of slaves from Catherine Readick’s estate in January of 1818 clearly delineates those slaves she inherited from Michael Readick, naming Dave and others. It also explains why these men and women are not listed in her estate inventory. Source (From top to bottom): Michael Readdick, died 1792, Chatham County, Georgia, in Georgia, Wills and Probate Records, 1742-1992, ancestry.com. Savannah Republican, January 3, 1818, pg. 3, genealogybank.com.
Dave lived with Samuel Davenport for just three short years. In 1820, Samuel died of Yellow Fever. Although the record of his death indicates that Samuel died on East Broad Street, it also lists Columbia Ward as his location of death. 353 This is a discrepancy, since Columbia Ward only extended as far east as Price Street. It is unclear exactly where Samuel Davenport lived, but it is likely that East Broad Street was correct. Isaiah Davenport owned lot 18 in Greene Ward and an accompanying building, located almost directly on East Broad Street. In any case, Dave would certainly have been known to Isaiah and Sarah and living in Greene Ward would place him just down the street from his future home.

From August 1820, when Samuel Davenport died, until January 1822 when Dave ran away, he must have lived with the Davenports; Isaiah was the administrator of his brother’s estate and Dave was Samuel’s only slave. 354 During this time, Dave would have lived with the Davenports at their home in Washington Ward, and may have spent at least some time at the family’s newly built home on Columbia Square. However, it is unclear precisely when they moved here; as late as 1822, Isaiah was still working on completing the house after two years of construction. 355 Sometime between January and August, Dave was either captured or returned; in August 1822, he is advertised for sale by a private company and at this auction was purchased by Isaiah. 356 From this point on until 1828, he lived at the Davenport home in Columbia Ward.

---

354 Tax records just prior to Samuel’s death in 1820 show that he owned only one slave which had to have been Dave. See Samuel Davenport in Georgia, Land Tax and Property Records, 1809-1938, ancestry.com.
From 1828 until 1856, deed records indicate that Dave lived with Aaron Champion. Unlike any of the other Davenport slaves, there is a record of Dave’s sale by the Davenports which allows a retracing of his steps beyond the Davenport Home. A review of deed records does not indicate that Champion ever sold Dave, despite the fact that he was involved in an extensive number of transactions involving the sale of other enslaved men and women. More importantly, Dave appears in a Laurel Grove Interment Record from April 1856 and Aaron Champion is listed as his owner. Champion’s tax records indicate the various locations Dave may have lived and worked. At the time of Dave’s sale, Champion was taxed on buildings in Decker Ward, where he owned stores which fronted the old Market Square. From this location, Dave would have witnessed the operation of Savannah’s slave market. From 1831 until Dave’s death in 1856, Champion was also taxed on buildings and Lots in Heathcote Ward, Springhill in Oglethorpe Ward, Elbert Ward, Curry Town on Liberty Street, and Jackson Ward. In Jackson Ward, Champion acquired a large home on Chippewa Square in 1852, known today as the Harper-Fowlkes House. Dave would have lived and worked here until his death in 1856.

**DAVE’s FAMILY**

Like Nancy, by the time Dave was sold to Samuel Davenport he was thirty two years old and likely already had a family on Liberty Island. Also like Nancy, this helps to explain why he ran away: Dave had spent his entire life on Liberty Island until Catherine Readick’s death took him away from his family and placed him in an unfamiliar urban environment. There has been no definitive identification of Dave’s family members, but the slaves he is listed with in Michael Readick’s will no doubt represent many of his family members. Some of these slaves are named again in the 1817 auction notice following Catherine Readick’s death. The order of the names in Michael Readick’s will and the 1817 newspaper auction notice may point to familial relationships, but it is difficult to say. Dave and his fellow slaves are listed below in the order they appear in Michael Readick’s will.

Dave was nearly the exact same age as Bella, but it seems an oddity that Sarah Davenport would repurchase Bella and her family while excluding her new mate Dave. It must be considered, however, that Savannah was small enough so that even if a married couple lived on opposite sides of the city, this distance was easily traversed. As a waggoner who traveled the city, Dave surely would have had the opportunity to visit his significant other on a regular basis. If the Peggy and Nancy repurchased by Sarah at the 1828 auction were in fact the children of Bella, this implies she would have had a mate who might have been Dave.

---

DAVE in LATER YEARS

Dave worked for Aaron Champion for twenty-eight years, from 1828 until his death from “old age” on April 9, 1856.\(^{358}\) He was sixty-six years old when he died. A curious note next to his name in the interment record states that David “died out of the vicinity,” an indication that he was not in Savannah at the time of his death. Dave is the only other enslaved individual from the original group of slaves owned by the Davenports besides Isaac for whom there is a known date and cause of death. Had Dave lived until after the Civil War, he would have become a free man at seventy-five years old.

Summary

Dave was born in ca. 1790 at Liberty Island near Thunderbolt, on the Readick family’s Providence Plantation. Here amongst members of the Salzburger community, Dave spent the first twenty-seven years of his life, until the death of Catherine Readick in 1817 and his sale to Samuel Davenport. Like Nancy, Dave was forced to live outside the Salzburger community in urban Savannah for the first time, and adapt what was likely a vastly different way of life. Sale to the Davenports also meant separation from friends and family, and in all likelihood, Dave’s children. This helps to explain why after he death of Samuel Davenport, Dave ran away in January 1822 after only residing with Isaiah and Sarah for a short time.

Isaiah sought Dave’s capture as he did with Nancy through advertisements in Savannah newspapers. Dave remained on the run for at least eight months, a testament to his intelligence and grit in being able to elude his captors for a significant amount of time. Although this was no doubt a traumatic experience for Dave, the runaway notice advertised by Isaiah provides crucial insight into Dave’s origins and life, as well as his appearance and occupation. Dave was 5 feet 11 inches tall, and described as “well made,” likely an indication of a muscular stature. According to the runaway notice, Dave worked as a waggoner for several years, and was well-known in the community. His occupation and familiarity with many in Savannah helps to explain in part how he was able to sustain his life as a runaway for an extended period of time.

When Dave was captured or returned eight months later, he was subjected to public auction, an experience he shared with his fellow slaves again some six years later. The circumstances are not clear, but Dave remained with the Davenports following the auction in 1822, and in 1828, he was subjected to the public auction of Isaiah’s estate following his death. Although Sarah Davenport ultimately repurchased several of her slaves, Dave was not among them. Instead, Sarah sold Dave to Aaron Champion, and Dave would remain with Champion for the rest of his life. In 1856, Dave died from “old age” and was interred in Laurel Grove South.

Dave’s lived experiences illustrate the uncertainties faced by enslaved individuals in their daily lives as a result of the ever-loomimg prospect of sale to another owner. The death or financial insolvency of a slave owner could mean the abrupt uprooting of an enslaved individual’s life, and the painful separation from family. In the case of both Dave and Nancy, it is interesting to note that both originated and remained within the Salzburger community until adulthood, and when forced separation occurred through sale, they both ran away. Dave’s occupation as a waggoner illustrates an exceptional case of mobility. His movement throughout Savannah as a waggoner would have allowed Dave to build an extensive network of free and

\(^{358}\) See David, died April 9, 1856, owned by Aaron Champion, in Laurel Grove Interments records, City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 2.
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enslaved contacts in the community, which no doubt helped to sustain his life on the run. By living in Savannah for the entirety of his life, Dave, like Mary, would have been well-known in the community, and has left behind an extensive geographic footprint.

Themes: *sale of the enslaved, freedom seeking and resistance, urban vs. plantation enslaved experiences, mobility and networking, family separation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Confirmed or Possible Relationship</th>
<th>Earliest Known Owner</th>
<th>Owner before Separation from Dave</th>
<th>Years Lived with Dave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musah</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1790 - ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1790 - ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny (Maria’s mother)</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Michal Readick</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>1790-1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloe</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>Catherine Readick</td>
<td>1790-1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Michael Redick</td>
<td>Catherine Readick</td>
<td>1790-1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Musah</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Younger Sibling</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>Catherine Readick</td>
<td>after 1793 – 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria (daughter of Jenny)</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>Michael Readick</td>
<td>1790 - 1793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Further Research Questions**

1. Why did Isaiah Davenport attempt to sell Dave, but then ultimately purchase him himself? Did he sell him because he was a flight risk, but then change his mind?
2. What does it say that both Dave and Nancy ran away after being sold out of the Salzburger community?
3. As a waggoner, was Dave allowed much more freedom than his fellow slaves? Did this occupation allow him to travel around the city?
4. What was life like for slaves on Liberty Island? Are there any remnants of slave housing or burials here?
5. What was Savannah’s slave market like? Are there any antebellum photos of this location? What could it have been like for Dave to see this regularly?

---

359 Cloe (or Chloe) Hannah, and David all appear in Michael Readick’s will and again in the 1817 auction notice.
6. What was Aaron Champion’s relationship like with his slaves? Are there any records to suggest how he treated his slaves? Does the Harper-Fowlkes House have any documentation on this or about the slaves who once lived in the house?

7. What exactly did wagoners do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Years Owned</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Locations Lived/Worked</th>
<th>Dave’s Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael &amp; Saloma</td>
<td>1790-1792</td>
<td>Planter</td>
<td>Providence Plantation, Liberty Island,</td>
<td>0 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saloma Readick</td>
<td>1792-?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Readick</td>
<td>? - 1818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? – 27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Davenport</td>
<td>1818-1821</td>
<td>House Carpenter</td>
<td>East Broad Street, Greene Ward, Savannah</td>
<td>27-32 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah &amp; Sarah</td>
<td>1821-1827</td>
<td>Master Carpenter</td>
<td>Lot 8, Washington Ward, Lot 13/14, Columbia Ward, Savannah</td>
<td>32-39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>1827 - 1828</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 14, Columbia Ward, Savannah</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The map of above shows the location of Liberty Island where Dave lived until 1817, and its relative distance from the Davenport House on Columbia Square.
The map above shows the location of Liberty Island and its relationship to the other islands like Skidaway, Whitemarsh, and Westfield.
Dave was interred at Laurel Grove South on April 9, 1856. His cause of death is listed as "old age." Source: City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives, Laurel Grove Interment Report, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 2.
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Appendix A: Records of Slaves Incarcerated by the Davenports
City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives
Jail Registers: Record Group 5600 PL-010, vol. 1-3
[No Records available for 1816-1854]

Volume 2: 1855-1858

MATILDA: Incarcerated May 19, 1855, owner name “Davenport” (does not indicate a first name) committed for/offense “safe keeping.” Punishment = “whips 1,” Discharged by owner on May 21, 1855. 3 days in Jail. 360

BEN: Incarcerated September 1, 1857, owner name “Davenport” (does not indicate a first name) committed for/offense “safe keeping.” Punishment = “whip.” Discharged September 2, 1857. 1 day in Jail.

Volume 3: 1855-1864


DOCTOR: Incarcerated April 9, 1864, owner name “H. Davenport” [Hugh] committed for/offense “witness for the state”; Incarcerated March 11, 1864, owner name “H. Davenport” [Hugh] committed for “safe keeping.”

---

360 Slaves committed for “safe keeping” likely refers to imprisonment due to being a flight risk, especially when punishments such as whipping were involved. In the case of Jim above, it appears this was especially true. He was committed in 1861 for running away, and later in 1864 for safe keeping.
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Appendix B: Records of Slaves Incarcerated by Mrs. Mary Wylly
City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives
Jail Registers: Record Group 5600 PL-010, vol. 1-3
[No records from 1816-1854]

Volume 1: 1808-1815


CEASER: Incarcerated April 1, 1812, committed for/offense, “Execution,” released May 15.

BEAUFORT: Incarcerated April 20, 1812, committed for/offense, “Runaway,” released the same day.


RACHAEL: Incarcerated November 23, 1813, committed for/offense, “Safe Keeping,” released same day.

SARAH: Incarcerated March 30, 1813, committed for/offense, “Theft,” released same day.

LINDER: Incarcerated for running away.

SAMPSON: Incarcerated for execution.

---

362 Although it would seem that “execution,” referred to a death sentence, this may have initially been the intended punishment, or perhaps used as a scare tactic. In the case of Peter and Caeser above, they were both incarcerated for execution but were later released.
Appendix C: Antebellum Interments by Sarah Davenport and Henry Rootes Jackson at Laurel Grove South
City of Savannah Research and Municipal Archives
Laurel Grove Interment Report, Record Group 5600CL-090, vol. 1 & 2

Sarah Davenport

VOLUME 1: 1852-1861
SALLY: Buried December 5, 1853, aged 9 days. Died of “Inflammation of Bowels.”
MORRIS WALCOTT: Buried February 4, 1855, aged 26 years. Died of “Pleurisy.”
JOHN COX: Buried August 20, 1857, aged 3 months, 10 days. Died of “Inflammation of Chest.”
ANGIE L. WELCHER: Buried October 2, 1857, aged 27 years. Died of “Consumption.”
ISAAC: Buried January 20, 1860, aged 47 years. Died of “Dysentery.”

Henry Rootes Jackson

VOLUME 1: 1852-1861
ELIZABETH HASCEAN: Buried December 31, 1853, aged 11 days old. Died of “spasms.”
FANNY: Buried March 5, 1858, aged 18 years. Died of “Consumption.”
EDEY STEWART: Buried March 21, 1858, aged 26 years. Died of “Affection of the Heart.”
MARY JANE: Buried May 19, 1858, aged 9 months. Died of “Teething.”
WILLIAM NIXON: Buried December 22, 1859, aged 15 years. Died of “Dropsy.”

VOLUME 2: 1861-1869
EMMA NIXON: Buried November 16, 1863, aged 50 years. Died of “Debility.”

---

363 Morris appears in later deed records. He is the only bondman named in a deed record for which there is a known last name. See Deed Record 3B-189.
364 John Cox does not appear in any other deed records, but he is one of only three Davenport slaves for which last names are known.
365 Angie is one of three Davenport Slaves for which there is a known last name. She is also referred to in a Freedman’s Bank Record in which her son Charlie Welcher is named. In the Freedman’s Bank Record, Charlie refers to his mother as “Angie Davenport.” Charlie (or Charley) appears in a later deed record in which Sarah uses her slaves as leverage. See deed record 3R-265 and Charlie Welcher, March 1873, born in Savannah, aged 21 years old, in U.S., Freedman's Bank Records, 1865-1871, ancestry.com.
366 The spelling of Elizabeth’s last name may vary from “Hascean.” It was difficult to decipher her last name in the interment record.
367 The Spelling of “Nixon” may vary.
Appendix D: Postbellum Interments at Laurel Grove South
City of Savannah Cemeteries Department
Online Database, City of Savannah Website

**Davenport Infant**: Buried April 3, 1898. Aged 5 days.

**Essie May Davenport**: Buried December 7, 1926. Aged 36 years.

**Davenport Infant**: Buried July 18, 1927. Aged ½ days.

**Harlon Davenport**: Buried December 27, 1940. Aged 47 years.

**Davenport Infant**: Buried September 21, 1948. Aged 1 day.

**Laura Davenport**: Buried September 20, 1950. Aged 33 years. Section OLD, Block 0.


**Emma Davenport**: Buried May 1, 1998. Aged 67 years. Section B, Block 0, Lot 64.
Appendix E: Postbellum Marriages of African-American Davenports Compiled by the
Georgia Historical Society
Copy on file at Chatham County Probate Court

Dick Robinson m. Binah Davenport, April 26, 1867. Married by Ira Pettibone, M. G. (Rev. and
Superintendent of Freedman’s School)

Augustus Hines m. Laura Davenport, March 21, 1871. Married by Sylvanus Landrum, First
African Baptist Church

John J. Bryan m. Susan Davenport, June 3, 1874. Married by Ulysses L. Houston, First/Third
African Baptist Church

Osborne Davenport m. Sarah Bacon, December 29, 1871. [No other information available.]

Scipio Davenport m. Pussie Burroughs, March 12, 1872. Married by Lewis J. Moody, J.P.,
Magistrate.

Appendix F: Davenport Congregation Members, First African Baptist Church Archives

First African Baptist Names and Addresses, Box 1, Folder 4, Book 122
Elvira Davenport, listed in Members Book for 1882, under “sisters”

Susan Bryan (Formerly Davenport) ibid.

Miscellaneous Record Book, uncatalogued
Ella Davenport, listed in Special Collections for 1889

Register of Church, 1915
Harlon Davenport
Appendix F: Descendants/Children of Original Davenport Slaves
From Chatham County Superior Court Deed Records, Microfilm Collection


Rennah: Born ca. 1829. Deed Record 3F-135.


Angie: Born ca. 1830. Deed Record 3F-135

Mary: Born ca. 1838. Deed Record 3R-265. House Servant.


Alvira (or Almira): Born ca. 1843. Deed Record 3F-135.


Charley (Welcher): Born ca. 1850. Deed Record 3R-265.

Lizzy: Born ca. 1853. Deed Record 3R-265.
Appendix G: Some of the Black and Mulatto Inhabitants Living with the Davenports From the Census of 1870 and 1880

Henry Rootes Jackson, Census of 1870, Savannah
Rosette Jones: Black, 60 years old, Domestic Servant, Born in GA.
Henry Brooks: Black, 25 years old, Domestic Servant, Born in GA.
Henrietta Van Dorost: Black, 64 years old, Domestic Servant, Born in GA.

Hugh McCall Davenport, Census of 1870, Savannah
Dick Black: Mulatto, 40 years old, House Servant, Born in GA.
Dolly Brown: Black, 20 years old, House Servant, Born in GA.
Bella Turner: Black, 18 years old, House Servant, Born in GA.
Anthony Jones: Black, 30 years old, House Servant, Born in GA.

Archibald C. Davenport, 1880 Census, Savannah
Jane Mallory: Black, 30 years old, Servant, Born in GA. Parents also born in GA.