



# Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution

*www.southerncampaign.org*

Vol. 10, No. 2

Summer 2014

## WHAT CAN PENSION APPLICATIONS CONTRIBUTE TO UNDERSTANDING THE BATTLE OF WAXHAWS AND OTHER EVENTS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR?

### INTRODUCTION

by C. Leon Harris

Twelve years ago when asked what I intended to do as a retired biology professor, spending about eight hours a day transcribing pension applications of Revolutionary War veterans was not the answer that leapt to mind. But one of my plans was to spend some time on genealogy, which led me to transcribe the pension application of fourth great grandfather, Willoughby Blackard (pension application S29638), and that sparked an interest in his battles in the Carolinas. I then had the good fortune to find out about *Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution*, and Charles Baxley suggested I send my transcription to Will Graves, who had a wild vision that online, free and fully-searchable transcriptions of pension applications of all the Revolutionary War soldiers who served in the South might be possible and useful.

This past spring of 2014 Southern Campaign Revolutionary War Pension Statements & Rosters ([revwarapps.org](http://revwarapps.org)) passed a milestone on the way to fulfilling Will's dream – the completion of all the federal pension applications of soldiers from Georgia, the Carolinas, and Virginia. These are in addition to transcriptions of a number of soldiers from the North who served in the South, as well as pension and bounty-land applications to the state of Virginia, and dozens of rosters. The total number of transcribed documents now exceeds 20 thousand. Will not only conceived the project and transcribed about two-thirds of the documents, but he manages the website with the wizard-like help of John Robertson. There are still many federal applications from the North, state applications from Virginia, and unit rosters to be done, so we have not yet reached the end of the trail. But we have climbed a pinnacle.

Will would much rather transcribe than take the time to write a celebratory article, but I cannot resist a look back at the journey so far to enjoy the view and consider whether it has been worth the effort.

When I joined the project seriously around 2006, it was not at all clear that it was possible. The pension file numbers went into the forty thousands, and applications from soldiers who served from the South might account for half of them. Although Will and I were both old enough to have grown up with the dying art of cursive writing, many of the applications were so poorly written or faded that transcribing them took me at least an hour each. It took additional time to research correct spellings and dates to render the transcriptions searchable online. The numbers were so daunting that I do not think either of us dared do the math to figure out how long it might take. Even if it was possible to transcribe them all, there was the possibility that many of the applications were fraudulent, and transcribing them would merely perpetuate the fraud. I also wondered if anything useful could be found in the frail memories of even honest old men recounting their youthful exploits. My own ancestor Blackard had made the improbable claim that after being surrendered at Charleston he was exchanged in time to fight at the Battle of Camden. But the only way to find out was just to transcribe enough of the pension applications to get a feeling for how hard it would be and how reliable the applications were. Fortunately transcribing got to be easier with experience, and it turned out to be a lot of fun. This look back at some of my most interesting moments is for Will, for making it happen.

SCAR Fellow, Dr. C. Leon Harris, is a Renaissance man, a retired zoology professor, author of many scientific articles, a popular zoology text, a novel, and is an accomplished research historian. Leon is a prime mover behind the Southern Campaigns pension transcription project. He lives in Mt. Pleasant, SC when it is and Vermont when it is not. The pension application transcriptions are posted at [www.revwarapps.org](http://www.revwarapps.org).

## The Case of the Lewis Speculating Gentry

I was not very concerned about individual veterans making fraudulent claims, because the money was seldom enough to be tempting. The pension laws of 1818 and 1832 allowed a private only \$24 per year for the minimum of six months service, and up to \$96 per year for two years service. On the other hand the temptation might be great for agents handling many pensions and keeping large portions of them as their fee. So it proved to be for the Lewis Speculating Gentry – a title bestowed upon half a dozen prominent citizens of Lewis County in what is now West Virginia by the District Attorney who investigated them. A full exposition of their conspiracy and the botched investigation is in my appendix to the pension application of David W. Sleeth (S6111).<sup>1</sup>

Briefly, the Lewis Speculating Gentry duped many illiterate old soldiers into signing their Xs on fraudulent applications for pensions under the Act of 1832, then collected the pensions, keeping large portions for themselves. The nature of the frauds varied, but often fictitious tours of militia duty were added to the soldier's real service in order to collect a larger pension than was due. In other cases the conspirators changed ages and dates to make it appear that men who had fought Indians on the frontier after the Revolutionary War had served during the war. Usually the soldiers were said to have served in the militia, where rosters seldom survived, and the claims were made before Justices of the Peace rather than in court to avoid the scrutiny of neighbors. The Lewis Speculating Gentry often wrote false declarations of service with such detail and skill that I was completely fooled by them. I sometimes felt they deserved the money as royalties for creative fiction. It made me wonder how many other fraudulent claims had slipped by me, and if a lot, how much confidence we could have in the pension applications.

After the conspiracy was discovered in 1834, Washington G. Singleton, the young Attorney for the Western District of Virginia, took on the job of investigating it. He soon expanded his investigation throughout much of what is now West Virginia, examining 372 pension applicants in about a year! Generally Singleton, or someone appointed by him, would call on the applicant unannounced (naturally, in the days before telephones and when few people could read), and would ask him to state his age and recount his services under oath. In most fraudulent cases the

applicant gave an account that differed from what was in the pension application and was surprised to learn what he had put his X on. When an applicant's statement to Singleton agreed with what he had sworn to, Singleton sometimes accused him of fraud anyway if he was hesitant or looked too young to have served, or if anonymous informants said he had a bad character.

Of the 89 pension applications submitted by the Lewis Speculating Gentry, Singleton judged 55 to be fraudulent. Most probably were, but it is difficult to be sure, because a suspicious fire destroyed much of the evidence before Singleton could bring the conspirators and pensioners to trial. Singleton also investigated 283 applicants in present West Virginia in which the Lewis Speculating Gentry was not involved, and he rejected 76 of those as fraudulent. In many of those cases as well, Singleton's judgment appears to have been flawed. The most egregious of his misjudgments were in cases where the applicants claimed pensions for protecting frontier settlements from the Indian allies of the British. Singleton persuaded James L. Edwards, the Pension Commissioner, that such service was not military in nature(!), contrary to the clear letter of the 1832 pension act and the regulations that Edwards himself approved. As a result of this decision, applicants after 1834 were wrongfully denied pensions for service against Indians on the frontier.

One of the most satisfying accomplishments of the pension project has been to redeem the reputations of many of the old soldiers, ancestors of many residents of Lewis and neighboring counties. One Lewis County historian went so far as to say that I had become the equivalent of a rock star. He may have exaggerated a little, but it is best to be cautious, so I stay away from Lewis County for fear of being mobbed by young women.

I am convinced that the Lewis Speculating Gentry, bad as it was, was an aberration blown out of proportion by an overzealous District Attorney. I do not believe anything like it could have happened generally, because the conspirators were unusually talented and knowledgeable about the military service they invented. I have come across other cases that were prosecuted for fraud, but they have generally been few and isolated. Some pensions were suspended because an informant alleged fraud, but since the Pension Office did not bother to inform the pensioners, we do not have their side of the story. There have also been a few successful applications that looked fishy to me. On the whole, however, I

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://revwarapps.org/s6111.pdf>

would guess that fewer than one percent of pension applications include deliberate fraud. Fraud was especially unlikely for those claiming service in the Continental Line, because the Pension Office checked the names against muster and pay rolls. Claims for militia service would have been relatively easy to falsify, since they required only the certification by two neighbors that the applicant was honest and had the reputation of having been a soldier of the Revolution. I have often been impressed, however, that applicants tended to downplay rather than exaggerate their services. Many claimed for shorter terms of service than they thought they had served, or stated that they missed a battle because they were sick or served as baggage guards, even though there was no way the Pension Office could have checked. The fact that many old soldiers were reluctant to apply for pensions until poverty overcame their pride also encourages me to believe that relatively few succumbed to the temptation to commit fraud.

### **Historical or Just Hysterical?**

Even honest men can make incorrect statements about events that occurred under stressful circumstances 35 to 60 years past. It is not difficult to find examples in the pension applications. Dozens of applicants claimed they saw Cornwallis personally hand his sword to Washington at Yorktown. Private John Sharp (W4336) even said he “was near enough to Lord Cornwallis when he surrendered to have touched him with his gun.” Of course most of the rank-and-file were too far away to tell Cornwallis from O’Hara, even if they knew what they looked like. In Sharp’s case the obvious explanation is that he had gotten into the British rum supply.

Some anecdotes may not rise to the level of historical evidence but still provide interesting background color. One example is David Buffington’s (W4906) statement that Baron von Steuben, “used, as report said, to send some of the Soldiers to hunt black snakes for him to eat, which he called bush Eals.” I have not seen this particular culinary tidbit verified by any other pension applicant or historical source, but who could blame a historian for quoting it, with the caveat that it was hearsay? And where else but in the pension application of Thomas Badget (S6593) can one learn that Col. Francis Taylor “had gone to the Devil long ago, for his cruelty to his soldiers.” While perhaps not strictly factual, such statements provide insight into what soldiers thought of some of their officers.

Some anecdotes appear independently in so many pension applications that they can be taken seriously as historical evidence. The following quotations show how a historical fact may get battered over time but still retain a kernel of truth.

William Stone R10222: “before joining General Green, Parish became their Captain from Eaves becoming disabled in the following way -- James Richards was Captain of the Volunteer Company & had led for two days - when our Captain (Eaves) insisted upon leading as the others muddied the waters, upon which Captain James Richards attacked Captain Eaves and wounded him in three places -- but in the rencontie, Eaves cut off Richards hand at the wrist who then retired and left the service as this affiant was informed. This he believed was in the winter or spring, after joining Green, they marched to Guilford.”

Moses Smith S31376: “the Circumstance of Captain Richards having his hand cut off by a Captain Eve in Relation to a dispute between the parties in regard to which should march in front on that day they both being captains of our Army, and wishing to assume the same command.”

Arthur Fuller S9337: “we marched towards Hillsboro on the way Captain Eaves cut off Capt. Richard’s hand in a fracas & was cashiered for cowardice. I was then put under Captain Joel Parish marched under him to Hillsboro & so along to different places till we joined the Main Army under General Green 2 or 3 weeks before the battle with Lord Cornwallis at Guilford old Court House.”

James Prim (Primm) S3727: “a few days before the Battle of Guilford Captain Richards had his hand cut off in a encounter with one Benjamin Eakes who was likewise a militia Captain – as declarant’s Captain was rendered unfit for service the company to which he belonged was placed under the command of Captain Harris.”

Sterling Cooper S6776: “There a duel was fought with the broad sword between the two Captains from Franklin, Richards & Benjamin Evis in which Richards lost his sword hand, it being cut entirely off. Both Captains were expelled from the service”

Stephen Richards S4772: “just before the battle of Guilford, Captain James Richards & Captain Benjamin Eaves fought with swords & Captain Eaves cut off the right hand of Captain Richards & for a part of this tour he waited on & attended Captain Richards.”

Vincent Vaughan W4366: “Nunn[?] was in command & a Captain by the name of Eves and another by the name of Richards. This I remember well from a notable occurrence between them. In a fracas between them, Eves with his sword cut off the hand of Richards, of which I was an eyewitness.”

John Sillery [Tillery?] R9571: “his Captain was named James Richards a one armed man having had his hand cut off in a fight with a certain Captain Eaves”

The date varies, and one scribe apparently heard “Harris” instead of “Parrish,” but it is clear that some time before the Battle of Guilford Courthouse captains Benjamin Eaves and James Richards of the Franklin County NC Militia had a duel in which Richards lost a hand. Not a history-changing event, perhaps, but worth noting, and apparently unrecorded except in the pension applications. This and other examples bolster my confidence that the pension applications are a unique source of historical information.

## **BATTLE OF THE WAXHAW: BUFORD’S DEFEAT: A CASE STUDY**

Some data in the pension applications are more indelible than memory and impossible to fake – the scars of wounds the soldiers received in combat. From the type of wound – whether by bullet, sword, or bayonet – the part of the body injured, and the number of wounds, one can potentially extract solid and useful information about the nature of a battle. As an example of what is possible using the large, searchable database of the pension transcriptions, I compared the sword wounds received by survivors of the Battle of the Waxhaws with those at other battles to see if they could shed light on whether Waxhaws was a massacre.

As most readers of this article know, on 29 May 1780 near the settlement of Waxhaws in South Carolina, British Lt. Col. Banastre Tarleton’s British Legion, comprising mostly American Loyalists, overtook a detachment of Virginia Continental infantry commanded by Col. Abraham Buford and demanded their surrender. Buford refused, and his

troops were quickly subdued by Tarleton’s Legion. What happened next is not entirely clear, but according to Tarleton a shot was fired, his horse bolted and fell on him, and his troops, thinking their commander had been shot, acted with “a vindictive asperity not easily restrained.”<sup>2</sup> Tarleton’s cavalymen with their swords and his infantry with bayonets began hacking and stabbing Buford’s captured troops. Approximately 100 of Buford’s 500 men were killed and an estimated 300 wounded, many of them multiple times (see the appendix below).

Reading the descriptions of the wounds certainly gives the impression that the Battle of the Waxhaws ended as a massacre, and so it remains in the minds of most historians of the American Revolution. Of the dozens of Americans who survived the battle and lived to apply for a pension, however, only one, William King (S38121), referred to it as a massacre. For most of the survivors it was simply “Buford’s Defeat.” In his official report Buford charged that many of his troops “were killed after they had lain down their arms,” but he had fled the scene before the carnage began, so he was merely repeating the common report. Dr. Jim Piecuch after a meticulous analysis of the evidence in his book *The Blood be Upon Your Head*, concluded that the one-sided defeat was not a massacre.<sup>3</sup> Readers of Piecuch’s well-researched book may not be convinced of his conclusion, but most will agree that there are few reliable facts about what occurred.

While transcribing pension applications I noticed that a large proportion of Waxhaws survivors reported sword wounds to hands and arms. Such wounds are generally taken as evidence of self-defense by an unarmed person, since people generally do not attempt to parry blows with their arms or hands if they have a musket or other solid object. A larger than expected proportion of sword wounds to arms and hands at Waxhaws would therefore argue that unarmed soldiers were attacked there, which would support the traditional view that the battle turned into a massacre. Doing such a comparison objectively requires a large database that can be readily searched without bias, and the transcribed pensions are the only source I know that satisfies that criterion.

---

<sup>2</sup> Banastre Tarleton, *A History of the Campaigns of 1780 and 1781: In the Southern Provinces of North America* (London: T. Cadell, 1787)

<sup>3</sup> Jim Piecuch, *The Blood be Upon Your Head, Tarleton and the Myth of Buford’s Massacre* (Lugoff, SC: SCAR Press, 2010)

Using Freefind Search at the pension site revwarapps.org I found 1,446 pension applications containing at least one of the following terms: sword, saber, sabre, broadsword, cutlass, cut, slash, and hack. From these I identified 167 transcriptions stating that the applicant suffered a sword wound and describing the location of the wound. (The term “bayonet” was not included in the search, because I am not sure bayonet wounds to the hand or arm were necessarily defensive.) I sorted the 167 accounts according to the battle in which the wound was received, and whether there was a wound to the arm or hand. Each soldier was counted as either reporting a sword wound to the arm or hand or not, regardless of how many wounds he may have reported. Examples of which wounds were counted as being inflicted by swords to the arm or hand and which were not may be seen in the appendix.

At least five sword wounds were reported from each of the following five battles: Battle of the Waxhaws (29 May 1780), Battle of Camden SC (16 August 1780), Battle of Cowpens SC (17 January 1781), Battle of Guilford Courthouse NC (15 March 1781), and Battle of Eutaw Springs SC (8 September 1781). All engagements with fewer than five sword wounds were combined as a control group for comparison with the five named battles. I used Fisher’s Exact Test to determine the probability (P) that the proportion of sword wounds to the arm or hand received at each of the named battles was different from the proportion in the control group.

Those familiar with cutting-edge statistics (sorry) will want to know that I used a one-tailed test of the null hypothesis that the proportion of sword wounds to the arm or hand received at the Battle of the Waxhaws was not greater than the proportion received at the battles in the control group. For the other four named battles I used a two-tailed test of the null hypothesis that the proportion of such wounds was neither higher nor lower than in control group. A P value of less than 0.05 was taken as evidence of a statistically significant difference, meaning that there was less than 5% probability that the difference could be explained by random variations in the data.

The results showed a striking difference in the Battle of the Waxhaws compared with others. Of the 26 pension applicants reporting the locations of sword wounds received at the Battle of the Waxhaws, 62% reported at least one wound to an arm or hand (Table 1). For the four other named battles the percentage of sword wounds to the arm or hand ranged from 29% to 58%. For battles in the control group the average

frequency was 37%. Fisher’s Exact Test shows that only for the Battle of the Waxhaws was the proportion of sword wounds to the arm or hand significantly different from that of the control group. The percentages of sword wounds to arms or hands received at the battles of Camden, Cowpens, Guilford Courthouse, and Eutaw Springs were not significantly different from the percentage from the control group, even if the P value were reduced by half by using a one-tailed test. Data from those four battles were therefore combined into the control group for comparison with the Battle of the Waxhaws (Table 2). That comparison again shows a significantly higher proportion of sword wounds to the arm or hand received at the Battle of the Waxhaws than at all the other battles.

**TABLE 1. Locations of sword wounds received at five named battles compared with those received at other battles (control group).** Numbers of pension applicants reporting sword wounds not to arms or hands, numbers reporting sword wounds to arms or hands, total number reporting locations of sword wounds, percentage reporting sword wounds to arm or hands for five named battles and for others not named (control group). The last column shows results of Fisher’s Exact Test comparing each of the named battles with other battles. P values are one-tailed for the Battle of the Waxhaws and two-tailed for others.

Engage- ment	Sword wound not to arm or hand	Sword wound to arm or hand	Total with sword wounds	% Sword wound to arm or hand	P
Waxhaws	10	16	26	62	0.03
Camden	5	7	12	58	0.21
Cowpens	15	8	23	35	1.00
Guilford CH	10	4	14	29	0.76
Eutaw Springs	6	8	14	56	0.24
Other battles	49	29	78	37	
Totals	95	72	167	43	

**TABLE 2. Data calculated as in Table 1, but comparing the Battle of the Waxhaws with all other battles.**

Engagement	Sword wound not to arm or hand	Sword wound to arm or hand	Total with sword wounds	% Sword wound to arm or hand	P
Waxhaws	10	16	26	62	0.03
Other battles	85	56	141	40	
Totals	95	72	167	43	

Some of the data for Virginia soldiers are from applications to the state of Virginia for pensions and bounty land (file numbers beginning with VAS), and comparable data are not available for soldiers from other states. To be sure this difference was not biasing the results, the data were analyzed again after deleting applications made to the state of Virginia (Table 3). The percentage of sword wounds received to the arm or hand at the Battle of Waxhaws remained essentially unchanged (65%) and significantly higher than the percentage received at all other battles.

**TABLE 3. Data calculated as in Table 2, but deleting applications to Virginia (applications with a VAS prefix).**

Engagement	Sword wound not to arm or hand	Sword wound to arm or hand	Total with sword wounds	% Sword wound to arm or hand	P
Waxhaws	7	13	20	65	0.03
Other battles	85	55	140	39	
Totals	92	68	160	43	

These results show that pension applicants reported a significantly higher proportion of sword wounds to hands and arms received at the Battle of the Waxhaws than at other battles. Such wounds are today regarded in forensic investigations as evidence that the injured party had no weapon or other device for self-defense and resorted to using the arm or hand to protect more vital parts of the body. Such defensive maneuvers are a matter of instinct rather than training, and there is no reason to believe the instincts of soldiers were different during the Revolutionary War.

These results therefore point to a higher proportion of sword attacks on defenseless soldiers at the Waxhaws than at other battles. It might be argued that this was simply the result of Buford's troops being on the losing side. Indeed, the proportion of such wounds was numerically almost as high at another catastrophic American defeat, the Battle of Camden (58%). Although the proportion at Camden was not statistically different from that at other battles, it may well be worth considering whether the Battle of Camden was as much a massacre as the Battle of the Waxhaws. On the other hand, the percentage at Camden was not much higher than at the Battle of Eutaw Springs (56%), which was an American defeat only in the formal sense that they failed to capture the field of battle.

Whether a high proportion of wounds to defenseless soldiers constitutes a massacre or not depends on the definition of massacre. What is clear to me, however, and what is so assuring after Will and I have invested so much time in the pension transcriptions, is that they do have the potential to provide original historical information and insight into longstanding historical questions.

## **APPENDIX: SWORD WOUNDS RECEIVED AT THE BATTLE OF WAXHAWS**

### **IN WHICH AT LEAST ONE SWORD WOUND TO THE ARM OR HAND IS INFERRED**

Leonard Anderson W8329: he was taken prisoner having received in the fight a wound in the arm and one on the thumb from a Sword

John Ballard S37721: he the said Ballard was hewn down by a horseman receiving three cuts (one very deep) in the head & having one of his middle fingers nearly cut off. Afterward one of the infantry pierced his side with the bayonet in consequence of which he was left for dead on the ground

Jonathan Burnside S42112: he was wounded in the left arm and was stabbed in the right side and cut in the face by a sword

Richard Cains S35822: received fore wounds one by a Bayonet through his arm one in his head and right reast [sic: wrist] both by a sword

James Chambers R1836: did receive from the enemy several very severe and remarkable wounds losing his right arm by being cut off. One of the main leaders of the neck cut in two One of the fingers of the left hand cut off & several other wounds of less importance

Tscharner (Ischamer) DeGraffenreidt (Degraffenredd) VAS389: was badly & dangerously wounded but cannot recolect at this time the particular wounds he rec'd. only his head & hands being Cut most shockingly & a Bayonet wound in his Side.... most dangerously wounded in seventeen parts of his [?] with Sword Ball & Bayonet

John Halfpenny (Halpain, Halpane) VAS1360: disabled by a small sword having passed through his right wrist

William Jewell (Jewel) W11946: his Thumb was shot off, a Bayonet ran in his breast, and his arm and head severely wounded by the sword

John Loggins R6414: I received two wounds the scars of which I yet carry, one in the hand the other in the leg one inflicted with a sword the other with a bayonett

Leonard Moseley (Mosely) S36173: he received the following wounds of which I Benjamin Johnson have this day seen the Scars & other marks still remaining – A Sword cut through the right ear & on the right side of the head

above the same, the first finger of his right hand cut off: a ball through his left shoulder near the neck, also one near his right knee – his left wrist cut by a sword, passing through the sinews & muscles on the upper side, & disabling his thumb, & a ball still remaining lodged in the calf of his right leg.

Richard Murray VAS99: has been most severely cut on the left wrist & Hand so as totally to render it unfit for use – he has also other wound on the Body

Ezra (Isrey) Roberts R8874: he received in said battle a wound over the eye and on the arm with a sword, and was bayoneted in the body and near the shoulder blade, which wound last mentioned Nether finally healed up to the day of his death.

James Soyars W6140: first a cut across the instep of the right foot, which divided the tendons, and that the said tendons have never united. Another across the joint of the left elbow, which has occasioned the left arm to be smaller than the others, and two wounds in the head.

John Stokes BLWt526-300: was wounded at the Defeat of Colo. Buford, by which his right hand was amputated, and the use of his left arm considerably Impaired, by a stroke of a Broad sword on his elbow, & the loss of the forefinger of his left hand. Besides these wounds, Captain John Stokes received several Dangerous Cuts of a Sword on his head.

Robert Williams S41355: he is disabled by the following wounds his skull appears to have been fractured in places the use of his right hand is greatly impaired by a Cut with a broadsword, his –t arm has been fractured and he has ? Roan a little below his breast

Thomas Yorkshire S41394: the said Yorkshire was wounded in the wrist & shoulder with a sword

### **THOSE NOT INDICATING A SWORD WOUND TO ARM OR HAND**

Joseph Bouney S35782: got wounded on the head by a sword & fell & while lying in his gore the horsemen rode over him trod on his right ankle and mashed it to pieces.

John L. Crute S24980: He received wounds as

follows Viz. Three on the head apparently with a Sword which made it necessary for him to be trepanned and caused the loss of the sight of his right eye, he has been [illegible word] in the left eye and may lose the sight of it in toto 2<sup>nd</sup> A Sword wound on his right shoulder which nearly cut it off, which prevents his raising his right arm higher than a level with his shoulder and also prevents the motion of the arm backwards, it also prevents the rotatory motion of the said arm on the shoulder thereby, A bayonet wound under his right arm which transfixed his breast.

Reuben Earthen VAS1168: he has received several severe wounds on the Head by a Sword, two of which wounds have seperated the Tables of the Skull. he complains that at times one of the wounds is very painfull which, I think not at all improbable – he has some other evident wounds which at present appear to be but slight but complains of an Injury in the Chest from having been rode over by a Dragoon

William Ely S39493: the applicant was severely wounded by a sabre, on the head and shoulder

Thomas Hord [Hoard, Howard] VAS1608: His nose was cut entirely off & hung down by a small piece of skin – it was sewed on again & became reunited.... he was badly wounded in the face and head

John Jamieson VAS395: has received a number of wounds by the broad Sword & Bayonet – two wounds on the left side of the Head & two on the back of the Head which he says at times affect him greatly & I believe he says truly – another wound in the Belly which has occasioned a partial rupture, he complains much of & I think with reason – three fingers on the right hand are much injured & disabled; & a wound near the Humerus of the right arm

John Kippers S15914: was wounded by three Sabre cuts in the head and two thrust of the bayonet the one in the left shoulder and the other in the right hip.

Judas Levi W8037: his left eye being cut out as he says and we believe by a cutlass — his nose & face scarrified — his skull fractured with the same weapon and a wound in his thigh by a bayonet.

John Seamster S25429: I was severely wounded by cuts of the Sword on the head, a Bayonett was run through my right arm

William Stoker S37472: his wounds received in Buford's defeat, consisting of four wounds in the head, a bayonet through the right hand, two ribs in the right side cut in two with a sword.