

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=51084>

Richard Dellar05-02-2005 07:12 AM

1796 Heavy Cavalry variant

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=36908&d=1115032371>

Regular forum members may recall previous threads in which we have discussed the British heavy cavalry officers sword residing in the Musee de l'Armee in Paris (inventory 08520) which as we can see from the photo below is a variant of the 1796 pattern in that the pattern of piercings to the hilt does not follow the standard pattern.

Whilst I had thought for some time that this sword was fairly unique, I have now found another variant, different to both the Paris sword and the standard pattern. Photographs on next post below.

Richard.

Yes Jean, the standard officers' pattern is pretty rare nowadays. The last time I saw a really decent one was back in 1993 when I didn't have sufficient funds to go for it. It is, without exception, by far my favourite pattern of sword and I am also fascinated by these variants.

Richard.

Is that the star hilt from the sale Saturday, with the Ferrara blade?

No, hc, the variant above is from the Finan sale (lot 13) but it has the standard 1796 blade. The sword with the Andrea Ferrara blade had a standard P1796 hilt (lot 23). The Ferrara blade was quite small and thin, making the hilt look somewhat out of proportion and unbalanced.

Richard

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=80883>

John Hart (Offline)

Forum Family      Posts: 893

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: Sidmouth, in the South-West of the UK

1796 Heavy Cavalry Trooper's Sword - 06-28-2007, 10:09 AM  
Hi All,

Anyone ever seen this mark on a sword before? It's from a suspected reproduction P1796 HC Trooper's sword which I'm on the point of returning to the seller.

The mark appears on the back edge of the blade near the hilt, the front (outer) face of the guard and the top of the scabbard mouthpiece.

Thanks in advance - quick replies appreciated as I only have a short time before I need to get the sword back into the post!

John

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=66241&d=1183039650>

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=32276>

[http://www.antiquearmsandarmour.com/stock\\_detail.asp?ID=307](http://www.antiquearmsandarmour.com/stock_detail.asp?ID=307)

1796 Heavy Cavalry Trooper's sword  
David Critchley      03-13-2004 08:44 AM

1796 Heavy Cavalry Trooper's sword

There's an odd one being sold by West Street Antiques.  
The disk seems rivitted onto the knuckle bow.

<http://www.antiquearmsandarmour.com/...ail.asp?ID=307>

David

shahar waserman      03-13-2004 11:46 AM

seems like a field repair  
perhaps the guard was broken in service and the regiment armoury decided to fix it.

that is unless anyone has ever seen another one just like this one ??!?

David Critchley      03-13-2004 03:08 PM

Yes, my first thought as well Shahar , but then would they have bothered to reattach the langets if that was the case, they seem attached to the repair.

David

John Morgan 03-13-2004 04:33 PM

Curious! This must be a repair, a drastic rebuild. Sword must have been taken apart, and probably in its service life...at least a long time ago.

Appears to have been rebuilt by using two scrap hilts. Presumably using one with good knucklebow but badly damaged disc. The disc then cut to match the diamond top plate. This has then been mated with a good disc with damaged knucklebow, but retaining the first part of the knucklebow and the two riveted together. But why go to this trouble?. Perhaps it was a field repair?.

Note a washer under the riveted tang...not a 1796 feature.

John.M.

John Morgan 03-13-2004 04:41 PM

P.S. ....David, good point about the langets, but I am sure these are riveted to the diamond top plate, so would still be attached to the top plate when the sword reassembled?.

John.M.

John Morgan 03-13-2004 05:03 PM

David,

Most interestig that you have brought West Street antiques to my notice! Refer to their item 6455...QDG 1796.

I have had an almost identical one for many years. Mine is engraved on the guard...QDG D3.... and on scabbard QDG D28.

Sword by WOOLLEY and scabbard by OSBORNE & GUNBY. It also has the langets removed, but the blade retains its hatchet point....the whole in very good condition, except most of the grip leather covering gone.

What is MOST interesting is that item 6455, as mine, also appears to have had its quillon removed ....further evidence to my opinion that the removed its quillons en masse.....I now know of four QDG swords with this feature.

John.M.

John Morgan 03-13-2004 05:06 PM

....SORRY...OMITTED A WORD!.....

....that the REGIMENT removed its quillons en masse....

John.M.

Matt Easton 03-14-2004 09:25 AM

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

Most interestig that you have brought West Street antiques to my notice!

Hi David and John - they appear to be very over-priced by British standards... Sadly something that seems to be common amongst militaria dealers with flash websites.. :)

David, when is Park Lane? I think I'll be in France then :(.

Matt

David Critchley 03-14-2004 01:56 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Matt Easton

David, when is Park Lane? I think I'll be in France then :(.

Matt

Long gone Matt, 15th of Feb. I missed it too. Should be another one around October.

David

David Critchley 03-14-2004 02:08 PM

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

What is MOST interesting is that item 6455, as mine, also appears to have had its quillon removed ....further evidence to my opinion that the removed its quillons en masse.....I now know of four QDG swords with this feature.

John.M.

I find it facinating how these swords were altered and how widespread it was. You'd have thought if the regiment was going to take the trouble to make wholesale alterations then they'd spear point the blade at the same time!

I have seen one without a quillon but it can be disregarded I think, it had a shortened blade - to about 27". I believe the Tower released some 1796's to the Navy for use as cutlasses at one point, very much as they did with the Sapper's sidearm later, and I assume it was one of these.

David

Matt Easton 03-14-2004 02:47 PM

Quote:Originally posted by David Critchley

Long gone Matt, 15th of Feb. I missed it too. Should be another one around October.

Ah.. my memory was telling me I'd be in France at the time - and I was.. I just got the wrong trip to France :).

Next time then!

Matt

John Morgan 03-15-2004 07:28 PM

Have just noticed something about this sword, and that is the knucklebow. It is wider than the standard pattern..especially at the pommel end... and, I think it will be found ...hooks under the pommel instead of extending over the grip and holed for the tang.

I.E..as one in my possession I have discussed before and the example in Robson, revised edition, plate 17.

However, even more interesting, I have found in my files a polaroid photograph of a P1796 heavy cav trprs sword that went through Wallis' sale 398 in Jan 1996.

This sword hilt is IDENTICAL, as far as I can see, to that of the West Street Antiques sword under discussion. This suggests both swords were originally made in this form rather than later modifications or repairs!

John.M.

John Morgan 03-15-2004 07:45 PM

I forgot to add that, although the Wallis' hilt was also marked "QDG", one can see it is definitely not the same sword!.

John.M.

1796 heavy dragoon sword (<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=42906>)

João Rato 10-28-2004 06:15 AM

1796 heavy dragoon sword

1 Attachment(s)

Could you send me some information about this 1796 heavy dragoon sword.

My best regards

João Rato

Portugal  
cavaleiro.rato@sapo.pt

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29629&d=1098958531>  
<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29633&d=1098958845>  
<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29634&d=1098958899>  
<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29635&d=1098958993>

David Critchley 10-28-2004 08:03 AM

Now that is interesting it appears to be a 1796 troopers guard with officers grip backpiece and blade.

David

Richard Dellar 10-28-2004 08:12 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29640&d=1098965545>

Hello Joao,

Well it looks as though you have a very rare and unusual sword here. The wire bound grip, lack of backpiece ears and decorated blade suggest that this is an officer's version of the British P1796 trooper's heavy cavalry disc hilted sword.

However, if that is the case, then it also suggest that the sword might not be British since the P1796 British officer's sword has the well-known "ladder" or first honeysuckle hilt and not a disc hilt.

I see that you are from Portugal, Joao, are there any indications that this sword could be of Portuguese manufacture? Since Britain exported many disc-hilted troopers swords to Portugal (and most of its other allies), it is quite possible that an officer of the Portuguese cavalry might have commissioned this sword as a one-off.

In fact, this is not the first officer's disc-hilted sword I have seen, I have one myself - see photo below.

All very interesting, thanks for posting. Could you give some details of the blade decoration? any royal cypher? I'm sure you will get more replies.

Richard.

Matt Easton 10-28-2004 08:13 AM

And in Portugal - very interesting :).

Matt

Richard Dellar 10-28-2004 08:16 AM

Quote:Originally posted by David Critchley

Now that is interesting it appears to be a 1796 troopers guard with officers grip backpiece and blade.

David

David,

I'm not so sure the guard is British - look at the fixings through the diamond and quillon, they do not look like the normal rivets. My sword (photo above) has small screws rather than rivets.

Richard.

David Critchley 10-28-2004 08:50 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

David,

I'm not so sure the guard is British - look at the fixings through the diamond and quillon, they do not look like the normal rivets. My sword (photo above) has small screws rather than rivets.

Richard.

I see what you mean Richard,

Come to think of it I think I've only seen one other 1796 with acid etched gilding rather than an engraved blade, and that's the one illustrated in Robson.

David

João Rato 10-29-2004 04:56 AM

Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29680&d=1099040212>

Thank to all for your replies.

Portugal cavalry troops used 1796 heavy dragonn (British Government sent to Portugal more then 14.000 during the Peninsula War), from the beginning of the war until many

years after the end of the war and the Local Military Police of Lisbon used this sword during many years. These swords have the portugese regimental marks.

Also D. Pedro de Alcântara, some years after D. Pedro IV, used a kind of 1796 toopers heavy dragoon model.

My opinion, as collector of portuguese swords, is that the sword is portuguese, but I have no documents that guarentee this opinion, and that's the reason that I would like to ear some opinion of international collectors.

I'm gone to send you other photos.

My best regards

João Rato

João Rato 10-29-2004 04:58 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29681&d=1099040283>

another

João Rato 10-29-2004 05:00 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29682&d=1099040440>

another photo

João Rato 10-29-2004 05:03 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29683&d=1099040582>

another photo.

ther are no royal cypher ore maker's marks.

João Rato 10-29-2004 05:04 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29684&d=1099040661>

another photo

the knot that comes with the sword.

João Rato 10-29-2004 05:06 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29685&d=1099040806>



D. Pedro de Alcântara son of the king D. João VI, king as D. Pedro IV, father of the queen D. Maria II.

Juan J. Perez 10-29-2004 06:49 AM

Hello, João

Thanks for this interesting piece of information. In Spain they were also extensively used for the same reason (British supply during the war). However, I'm quite sure they were neither produced here nor made regulation. They were used in Spanish regiments simply while the original stock lasted, along with the Spanish-made official regulation patterns.

Therefore I understand that these HC P1796 were produced in Portugal, am I right? Were they made regulation?

Thanks,  
Juan

João Rato 10-29-2004 09:17 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29688&d=1099055865>

Hello Mr. Juan Perez

As far as I know these swords were used by cavalry troops (regular cavalry troops and Military Police of Lisbon cavalry) replacing the model 1806, a sword based in the 1788 heavy cavalry sword english model.

In the portuguese Arsenal's documents of 1816 these 1806 cavalry swords where mentioned as the swords that have been used by cavalry ( no more mused), and the swords to cavalry troops are mentioned as english swords with steel scabbard, so we can conclude that the portuguese cavalry sword in that moment was the 1796 heavy dragoon sword (it's not reported the regular use by portuguese regular cavalry of the 1796 light dragoon saber).

Many of these 1796 heavy dragoon swords with portuguese regimental marks are in portuguese collections (see photo).

About the production of the swords, the blades of the portuguese swords are generally from Solingen at that time, but we had also at the Lisbon Arsenal production of blades, made, namely, by the prussian workers (Peter Tesch and his team).

The Lisbon Arsenal produced the other parts of the 1796 heavy dragoon (hilts and scabbards).

But many of the swords were imported, namely, from Solingen (in 1815 and 1816 a sword trader, Stchiling & C.<sup>a</sup>, sold to Portugal 3000 cavalry swords that were sent from the Amsterdam harbour).

My best regards

João Rato

John Morgan 10-29-2004 05:26 PM

This is very interesting.

I have a 1796 Pattern Heavy Cavalry officers sword with fairly standard honesuckle hilt. It has a fishskin, wirebound wirebound grip, pronounced beak to the pommel...but no langets.

The hatchet tipped blade is engraved on the back ..."R.SOLINGEN". And engraved on each side of the blade with a Crown...."JR"....and patterns at forte.

The scabbard is engrave in cartouche at throat..."PROSSER late CULLUM, Sword Cutler and Belt Maker to THE KING & H.R.H. the DUKE of YORK Charing Cross, LONDON"....

The "JR" obviously stands for IOANNES REX, King JoHn the VIth of Portugal who reigned from 1816 to 1826.

When researching this sword some 16 years ago I was informed...."British officers served in the Portugese army since the XIVth Century until quite recently. Between 1762 and 1861 many hundreds of British officers served in the Portugese armies occupying some of the highest positionsand being rewarded with some of the highest Portugese condecorations given only for proof of bravery on the battlefields"....

Incidentally, the present engraving seems to have almost erased previous engraving which can be seen to include.... "my country & king"...in large script!!

I have therefore assumed this sword belonged to an officer seconded to, or serving in, the Portugese army who had his blade re-engraved in allegiance to the Portugese monarch?.  
John.M.

João Rato 10-30-2004 05:22 AM

Mr. Morgan:

Do you have some photos of the sword?

It will be great to see this sword.

João Rato

John Morgan 10-30-2004 08:43 AM

Quote:Originally posted by João Rato

Mr. Morgan:

Do you have some photos of the sword?

It will be great to see this sword.

João Rato

Hello Joao, yes I do. I can scan them... and see I if I can post them to this thread,

John.M.

John Morgan 10-30-2004 09:33 AM

Sorry...have scanned the pictures...but can't work out yet how to post them to this thread!..

John.M.

John Morgan 10-30-2004 06:11 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29721&d=1099174304>

P1796 Heavy Cavalry Officer's sword.

John Morgan 10-30-2004 06:34 PM

Managed to post one picture...but the detail pics are apparently a little too big, so beyond my present technical ability!

Sorry,  
John.M.

Jean Binck 11-01-2004 06:23 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29762&d=1099304633>

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

Managed to post one picture...but the detail pics are apparently a little too big, so beyond my present technical ability!

Sorry,  
John.M.

I post these photo for John.

Best,  
Jean

Jean Binck 11-01-2004 06:25 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29764&d=1099304733>

another

Jean Binck 11-01-2004 06:26 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29766&d=1099304847>

next

Jean Binck 11-01-2004 06:28 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=29767&d=1099304936>

Last....

Thank you you John to share this with the community.

Best,  
Jean

John Morgan 11-01-2004 08:50 AM

Many thanks for posting my pictures, Jean. I hope to master the technicalities of doing this soon myself !.

I would mention that the guard on the sword may appear slightly compressed. ...I am sure this has been noticed. This is due to a previous owner..dealer..obviously having dismantled the sword presumably to tighten up looseness.

I am sure a stupid and unnecessary thing to have done when it surely could have been done with wedges for example.

Having dismantled it he/she then, instead of swaging out the tang or welding on a bit, compensated for the shortened tang by fitting a narrower ferule! The substituted ferule in fact looks like a brass ferule from an infantry officers sword.

My intention has been to fit a steel ferule of the correct size...hav'nt found one yet so may have to make one. This discussion has prompted me to get on with the task!!

The sword is otherwise completely original,  
John.M.

Juan J. Perez 11-04-2004 02:45 PM

Mr Rato, thank you very much for your information, it's always interesting for Spaniards to know about weaponry from Portugal, our neighbour country. I knew of Portuguese preference for British patterns, but that HC1796 pattern was one of the very few that served in both nations, hence my curiosity for the details of Portuguese production of this sword.

And nice pictures from such a nice sword, John (and Jean!), thanks too. I never cease to be amazed when facing some dealers/collectors' attacks on antique swords (ups, I meant 'restorations').

Juan

A.Ducote 11-04-2004 04:14 PM

[quote]Originally posted by John Morgan  
[b]

I would mention that the guard on the sword may appear slightly compressed. ...I am sure this has been noticed. This is due to a previous owner..dealer..obviously having dismantled the sword presumably to tighten up looseness.

I am sure a stupid and unnecessary thing to have done when it surely could have been done with wedges for example.

John,

You are right. As I've posted several times bamboo shims tapped into the right places will typically cure a loose hilt. The best thing about this method is that they cause no damage and can be easily removed.

Andre

João Rato 12-01-2004 04:07 AM

Mr. John Morgan:

Sorry by delay in answer, but I have been without internet access during November (a thunderstorm cause damage in the modem and computer).

About your sword, I only want to note that the crown is not the portuguese crown of D. João VI, but the JR seems to be the logo of this portuguese king.

My best regards

João Rato

John Morgan 12-01-2004 11:08 AM

Thanks for the comment, Joao,  
I will have to investigate further!  
John.M.

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=67301>

boars head on a platter on a 1796 heavy cavalry sword?  
(<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=67301>)  
dominic grant 05-25-2006 09:31 AM

boars head on a platter on a 1796 heavy cavalry sword?

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=52412&d=1148563886>

any one know of a unit designation that used a boars head on a platter or dragon? i have attached a pic, i think it is a boars head on a platter, my friend says dragon. i have played with the pic a bit to pull out the engraving on the top of the tang button.

any help would be appreciated

dominic grant 05-25-2006 09:47 AM

i realised after posting that the boars head is for the clan campbell

David Critchley 05-26-2006 05:23 AM

Quote:Originally posted by dominic grant

i realised after posting that the boars head is for the clan campbell

its used by a lot of families both English and Scottish too Dominic.

The Gordon's (just look at the gin bottle :-)) and Grants for two. Fairbairns Crests will give you the complete picture and the little differences between the designs.

David

Bill Goodwin 05-26-2006 06:23 AM

The boars head is used by clans MacTavish / Thompson as well Dominic, among others.

Bill

dominic grant 05-27-2006 06:04 AM

cheers guys i have checked definetly a Campbell

cheers

i must have been brain dead that day

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=68034&highlight=1796>

1796 Heavy Cavalry Ladder hilt - variations in size  
(<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=68034>)  
David Critchley      06-13-2006 10:49 AM

1796 Heavy Cavalry Ladder hilt - variations in size

A couple of months ago I bought a 1796 ladder hilt which had a hilt and grip that are rather on the large side - in fact almost exactly an inch larger than the standard hilt. Today (thanks to John Morgan) I bought one of more standard size. I thought it might be interesting to compare the two.

David

The left one is Wooley and Deakin  
The right is Dawes

David Critchley      06-13-2006 10:50 AM

.

David Critchley      06-13-2006 10:50 AM

..

Bill Goodwin 06-13-2006 10:54 AM

Well done David...indeed.

Would be rather chuffed about those two being in my collection (if I were you).

Prefer the one on the left...the one on the right seems a bit chunky in the grip dept.

Cheers,

Bill

David Critchley 06-13-2006 11:06 AM

Thanks Bill

They've both been re gripped, ..well John's one on the right has, the one on the left looks like the original wood has rotted and been "petrified" with that plastic stuff you repair window sills with. Still the right basic shape though, I need it seeing to properly at some point. I wouldn't have been able to afford either of them if they'd been undamaged.

The smaller Dawes one has a grip size identical to the 1796 Light infantry sabre.

dominic grant 06-13-2006 11:23 AM

beautiful peices, i really like the one on the right even with the grip as it is

Richard Dellar 06-13-2006 12:03 PM

David,

Watch out for article on this pattern of sword in the next edition of Classic Arms and Militaria. And, yes, before anybody says anything, I know that I swore I would never write for them again but they have a new editor, they have given certain undertakings and they have tempted me with the filthy lucre. Just goes to prove how true my motto is (celeriter nil crede).

Richard.

hc bright 06-13-2006 09:39 PM

I'm never going to be able to find one of these good ones...

My raggedy one is the small grip size, as is the only other live one I've seen

**Archival notes. David Critchley edited these and may have image**

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=26165&highlight=1796>

Regimental marking on 1796 Heavy Cavalry Sword  
J.G. Hopkins 06-21-2006 06:37 PM

Regimental markings on 1796 Heavy Cavalry Sword



I have never been good at sorting-out the meaning of regimental markings. Perhaps someone could offer me some guidance?

R6 H 2A C(?)4 No 45

J.G. Hopkins 06-21-2006 07:57 PM

Sadly, I do not have a digital camera (aside from my mobile), so here is a drawing as it appears on the knucklebow of the sword:

<http://pg.photos.yahoo.com/ph/jgileshopkins/detail?.dir=/2214&.dnm=c98a.jpg&.src=ph>

A little more info on the sword itself: The spine of the blade is marked Woolley, Deakin & Co (1805-1806 per Bezdek), and there is a crown over the number 5 struck on the blade.

A pic of the hilt

<http://pg.photos.yahoo.com/ph/jgileshopkins/detail?.dir=2214&.dnm=1cb4.jpg&.src=ph>

(I know it's not the best example, but I was 17 and I wanted a sword like Sharpe's!)

Richard Dellar 06-22-2006 02:29 AM

Re: Regimental markings on 1796 Heavy Cavalry Sword

Quote:Originally posted by J.G. Hopkins

I have never been good at sorting-out the meaning of regimental markings. Perhaps someone could offer me some guidance?

R6 H 2A C(?)4 No 45

They do not look like British markings to me. Britain sent many of the swords abroad to its allies during the Napoleonic wars, eg Sweden received a batch of 2000 around 1806, Spain and Portugal also received supplies, so chances are that your markings are those of one of Britain's allies rather than British.

Richard

WBranner 06-22-2006 01:28 PM

Would the proof mark be on a saber shipped abroad?

Richard Dellar 06-22-2006 05:44 PM

Quote:Originally posted by WBranner  
Would the proof mark be on a saber shipped abroad?

Yes, the inspection stamp is basically proof that the sword is fit for service. The swords would have been held by the Board of Ordnance and then either distributed to regiments or shipped abroad.

J.G. Hopkins 06-22-2006 08:53 PM

Thank you for the information, Richard. Do you know where I could find information about what countries received heavy cavalry swords from Britain? I have to admit that I am a bit disappointed that my sword was likely not used by the British. I guess I'll have to get another one someday!

Richard Dellar06-23-2006 04:37 AM

Quote:Originally posted by J.G. Hopkins  
Thank you for the information, Richard. Do you know where I could find information about what countries received heavy cavalry swords from Britain? I have to admit that I am a bit disappointed that my sword was likely not used by the British. I guess I'll have to get another one someday!

Jonathan,

I had a trawl through Customs records in the Public Record Office (now the National Archive) a few years ago to see if I could find exactly that information. Unfortunately many of the records are missing but I did find the record for 1812 which gives the numbers of swords sent abroad (not split into types though).

On a more general note, John M Sherwig's "Guineas and Gunpowder - British foreign aid in the wars with France 1793-1815" (Harvard University Press 1969) is excellent. Unfortunately the book is long out of print and tends to be very expensive (although by a piece of extreme good fortune, I recently picked up a 1st Edition signed by the author in excellent condition for about \$50 using ABE books). Its a fascinating read, for example, between 1793 and 1815, Britain gave out over £52 million in subsidies and loans to its allies (what is that worth these days!). The cost of the wars overall was something around £900 million.

Richard.

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=14220>

1796 HC sword A.Ducote 01-20-2003 12:41 PM

1796 HC sword

Hello all,

I've obtained a 1796 disc hilted sword which is devoid of any markings whatsoever, not even a government inspector's stamp. The sword looks and feels correct. Has anyone encountered an unmarked 1796 hc sword?

Thanks,

Andre

Richard Dellar 01-20-2003 01:52 PM

Hello Andre,

It is very unusual to have a P1796 HC trooper's sword without any markings whatsoever. Sometimes the maker's name gets rubbed off through cleaning etc. but the inspection stamp normally remains. I have certainly seen P1796 light cavalry sabres without inspection stamps but I cannot recall seeing a disc-hilt (this is possibly because virtually all disc-hilts went to the regular army whilst a substantial proportion of light cavalry sabres went straight to the Yeomanry). Two questions then:

1. Are there any bending test points present? - on the back edge at normally about 7 and 12 in. from the hilt. These can be in the form of a "B", just a line "-" or a combination of both.
2. Are you sure its British? - you may know that the Swedish P1808 cavalry pallasch is virtually an identical copy of the British P1796. Having once compared the two, the only significant difference was that the langets on the Swedish P1808 were slightly longer.

Richard.

A.Ducote 01-20-2003 03:05 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar  
Hello Andre,

It is very unusual to have a P1796 HC trooper's sword without any markings whatsoever. Sometimes the maker's name gets rubbed off through cleaning etc. but the inspection stamp normally remains. I have certainly seen P1796 light cavalry sabres without inspection stamps but I cannot recall seeing a disc-hilt (this is possibly because virtually

all disc-hilts went to the regular army whilst a substantial proportion of light cavalry sabres went straight to the Yeomanry). Two questions then:

1. Are there any bending test points present? - on the back edge at normally about 7 and 12 in. from the hilt. These can be in the form of a "B", just a line "-" or a combination of both.
2. Are you sure its British? - you may know that the Swedish P1808 cavalry pallasch is virtually an identical copy of the British P1796. Having once compared the two, the only significant difference was that the langets on the Swedish P1808 were slightly longer.

Richard.

Richard,

Thanks for your information. I'm at work right now and don't have the sword with me. I'll check it for the bend mark. It may be Swedish. The blade is slightly thinner than my other 1796 hc. This sword has langets, but my other 1796 hc doesn't. What is the correct length on the British sword?

Andre

John Morgan 01-20-2003 09:09 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar  
Hello Andre,

2. Are you sure its British? - you may know that the Swedish P1808 cavalry pallasch is virtually an identical copy of the British P1796. Having once compared the two, the only significant difference was that the langets on the Swedish P1808 were slightly longer.

Richard.

Richard, that is interesting. Are you able to advise of a book or article ...etc..with a photo of the Swedish sword?  
John.M.

Richard Dellar 01-21-2003 03:49 AM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=7357&d=1043135355>

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

Richard, that is interesting. Are you able to advise of a book or article ...etc..with a photo of the Swedish sword?

John.M.

John,

The photo below from "Svenska Blankvapen" by Olof P Berg:

Richard Dellar01-21-2003 03:57 AM

Quote:Originally posted by A.Ducote

Richard,

What is the correct length on the British sword?

Andre

I don't think there is a "correct" length but they seem to be around 1¼ - 1½ in. I didn't measure the langets on the Swedish sword but they certainly struck me as being significantly longer.

Richard.

John Harvey 01-21-2003 08:50 AM

The photo below from "Svenska Blankvapen" by Olof P Berg: [/b][[/quote]

A translation of the comments ("anm.") in the above picture reads approximately: "2000 examples of this sword were purchased from England. The British designation was M1796", which implies that it is the same beast.

John

Richard Dellar01-21-2003 09:53 AM

Quote:Originally posted by John Harvey

The photo below from "Svenska Blankvapen" by Olof P Berg:

A translation of the comments ("anm.") in the above picture reads approximately: "2000 examples of this sword were purchased from England. The British designation was M1796", which implies that it is the same beast.

John [/b][[/quote]

Thanks for that John. However, the one I saw (owned in fact for a short time) was not by an English maker. It had "C R de M" on the back edge and regimental markings that were certainly non-British. As I said, what struck me particularly, were the exceptionally long langets. At this point, I suppose I should admit the possibility that this sword was not Swedish but I had always thought it to be so (and, if not Swedish, where?).

Richard.

A.Ducote 01-21-2003 11:05 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

A translation of the comments ("anm.") in the above picture reads approximately: "2000 examples of this sword were purchased from England. The British designation was M1796", which implies that it is the same beast.

John

Thanks for that John. However, the one I saw (owned in fact for a short time) was not by an English maker. It had "C R de M" on the back edge and regimental markings that were certainly non-British. As I said, what struck me particularly, were the exceptionally long langets. At this point, I suppose I should admit the possibility that this sword was not Swedish but I had always thought it to be so (and, if not Swedish, where?).

Richard. [/b][[/quote]

Based upon Richard's and John's information, for which I am very grateful, maybe my sword is a 1796 made for export. Another thought, was the 1796 hc sword used by Prussia or any of the German states allied to Great Britain during the Napoleonic Wars?

Andre

Richard Dellar01-21-2003 11:49 AM

Quote:Originally posted by A.Ducote

Another thought, was the 1796 hc sword used by Prussia or any of the German states allied to Great Britain during the Napoleonic Wars?

Andre

Not that I know of, Andre, but as we often find out, anything is possible!

Richard.

Juan J. Perez 01-21-2003 12:03 PM

However, as far as I know, it was indeed used by the Spanish forces, along with the LC P1796 counterpart, and I'm still wondering about the possible meaning of your previously owned sword mark: "C R de M" sounds quite Spanish, you know!

Just a guess: Carabineros Reales de Madrid (Royal Carabiniers from Madrid), as Spanish Carabiniers were HC at the time.

or Caballería Real de Madrid, or something like that.

If I come across a suitable regiment or unit association, I'll tell you...

Richard Dellar01-21-2003 12:17 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Juan J. Perez

However, as far as I know, it was indeed used by the Spanish forces, along with the LC P1796 counterpart, and I'm still wondering about the possible meaning of your previously owned sword mark: "C R de M" sounds quite Spanish, you know!

Just a guess: Carabineros Reales de Madrid (Royal Carabiniers from Madrid), as Spanish Carabiniers were HC at the time.

or Caballería Real de Madrid, or something like that.

If I come across a suitable regiment or unit association, I'll tell you...

Hello Juan,

As well as C R de M on the back edge of the blade, there was a foliate wreath engraved both sides at the forte. Other markings include:

On guard:

15  
G  
C7  
C  
29

on scabbard:

24  
C

49

I'm beginning to wish I had kept it now!

Richard.

Richard Dellar 01-21-2003 12:19 PM

Quote:Originally posted by A.Ducote

Based upon Richard's and John's information, for which I am very grateful, maybe my sword is a 1796 made for export. Another thought, was the 1796 hc sword used by Prussia or any of the German states allied to Great Britain during the Napoleonic Wars?

Andre

Andre,

The Portuguese army, of course, used British swords.

Richard.

A.Ducote 01-21-2003 12:28 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

Andre,

The Portuguese army, of course, used British swords.

Richard.

Richard,

How could I forget the Portugese! I just don't really know what to make of this sword. Whatever it is, someone painted the scabbard and guard bronze. I'm trying to get the paint off, but its not easy.

Andre



Richard Dellar01-21-2003 03:17 PM

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=7384&d=1043176661>

1 Attachment(s)

OK then, since we're on the subject of "odd" 1796 heavy cavalry swords, what do you make of this:

Richard Dellar01-21-2003 03:18 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=7385&d=1043176706>

Different angle:

A.Ducote 01-21-2003 03:38 PM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar  
Different angle:

Richard,

I guess I would be asking too much if there were markings on it, eh?

I've not seen a 1796 hc with a "P" shaped guard before. Also, the guard is nicely rolled. The examples I have seen are either the upturned guard or the thin edged guard. Were there any yeomanry heavy cavalry regiments? Could it be an officer's variation?

Andre

John Morgan 01-21-2003 08:36 PM

Richard,

Thanks for posting the photos of the Swedish M1808 sword...but I see the thread has moved on a bit!.....comments I might have made have already been posted by others. To digress I would add that, as the Portugese Army was mentioned, I have a P1796 honeysuckle/ladder hilt officer's sword which has the cypher of King John VI of Portugal (1816 - 1826) on each side of the blade. The blade is by RUNKEL and the scabbard by PROSSER - late - CULLUM. presumably owned by an officer serving in the Portugese cavalry.  
John.M.

Richard Dellar01-22-2003 04:20 AM

Quote:Originally posted by A.Ducote

Richard,

I guess I would be asking too much if there were markings on it, eh?

I've not seen a 1796 hc with a "P" shaped guard before. Also, the guard is nicely rolled. The examples I have seen are either the upturned guard or the thin edged guard. Were there any yeomanry heavy cavalry regiments? Could it be an officer's variation?

Andre

A bit unfair really, Andre, to throw this one in because it has been extensively discussed with Brian Robson, John Morgan, Jean Binck + the National Army Museum, Royal Armouries and the Scottish United Services Museum, all without any firm conclusion. What we can say, though, is that it is British, the blade is by J J Runkel, Sohligen and it is an officer's sword. I have seen disc-hilted yeomanry swords but I don't necessarily think this is yeomanry (in fact, I am firmly against the practice of classifying as yeomanry everything that we do not recognise as a pattern sword). For what its worth and I emphasise that this is entirely speculation on my part, I believe it to be some sort of experimental heavy cavalry officer's sword. It has always struck me as peculiar that the 1796 heavy cavalry officers sword is completely different from the troopers when regulations said they were to carry the same sword (as happened with other patterns). Perhaps, just perhaps, this was a first go at an officer's disc-hilted sword (but we shall never know).

Richard.

Richard Dellar01-22-2003 05:20 AM

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

Richard,

Thanks for posting the photos of the Swedish M1808 sword...but I see the thread has moved on a bit!.....comments I might have made have already been posted by others. To digress I would add that, as the Portugese Army was mentioned, I have a P1796 honeysuckle/ladder hilt officer's sword which has the cypher of King John VI of Portugal (1816 - 1826) on each side of the blade.

The blade is by RUNKEL and the scabbard by PROSSER - late - CULLUM. presumably owned by an officer serving in the Portugese cavalry.

John.M.

John,

I think I have seen your sword - "JR" on the blade instead of "GR"? A really interesting piece and fascinating to think that the blade must have been a special commission by Runkel to his Solingen maker.

Richard.

Richard Dellar 01-22-2003 07:14 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Juan J. Perez

However, as far as I know, it was indeed used by the Spanish forces, along with the LC P1796 counterpart,

Juan,

A few years ago when I was researching something else, I came across the British customs records for 1812. It seems in that year, we exported some 4,351 swords to Spain (but only 20 to Portugal, 163 to Gibraltar and 6 to Malta). The records did not specify which particular pattern however.

Richard.

Juan J. Perez 01-22-2003 07:31 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

Juan,

A few years ago when I was researching something else, I came across the British customs records for 1812. It seems in that year, we exported some 4,351 swords to Spain (but only 20 to Portugal, 163 to Gibraltar and 6 to Malta). The records did not specify which particular pattern however.

Richard.

Yes, I was aware of it. Besides, some Spanish internal reports take account of this fact, stating that Spanish swords were used along with British swords, and even French ones, taken to the enemy. British swords from both 1796 patterns are regarded as being in use well up to 1840 in some cav. regiments.

However, the additional marks you have commented do not sound Spanish to me, we were not so detailed at the time! You know well what a horrible mess that war meant for Spain. They look to me more in the German style of marking. Maybe other forumites more knowledgeable on German swords (Jean, are you there?) could add something more specific.

And yes, we shouldn't have sold any sword, but that's life!

A.Ducote 01-22-2003 11:27 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

A bit unfair really, Andre, to throw this one in because it has been extensively discussed with Brian Robson, John Morgan, Jean Binck + the National Army Museum, Royal Armouries and the Scottish United Services Museum, all without any firm conclusion. What we can say, though, is that it is British, the blade is by J J Runkel, Sohlingen and it is an officer's sword. I have seen disc-hilted yeomanry swords but I don't necessarily think this is yeomanry (in fact, I am firmly against the practice of classifying as yeomanry everything that we do not recognise as a pattern sword). For what its worth and I emphasise that this is entirely speculation on my part, I believe it to be some sort of experimental heavy cavalry officer's sword. It has always struck me as peculiar that the 1796 heavy cavalry officers sword is completely different from the troopers when regulations said they were to carry the same sword (as happened with other patterns). Perhaps, just perhaps, this was a first go at an officer's disc-hilted sword (but we shall never know).

Richard.

Richard,

Well I don't feel half bad making a guess that it was an officer's sword. On thing that I find interesting on your sword is that the edges of the guard are "rolled" for a lack of a better term. To me, this indicates an attempt to avoid one of the problems of the trooper's sword, the rather rough edge of the guard being either uncomfortable to wear and/or damaging the uniform. In other words, I think that the guard has a finer finish to it. The p guard adds a bit more sophistication to an otherwise beastly looking weapon. You obviously know more about this than me, but I can see that there is a strong argument to be made for your sword being an attempt at an officer's version of the disc hilt.

Andre

A.Ducote 01-22-2003 11:45 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Richard Dellar

A bit unfair really, Andre, to throw this one in because it has been extensively discussed with Brian Robson, John Morgan, Jean Binck + the National Army Museum, Royal

Armouries and the Scottish United Services Museum, all without any firm conclusion. What we can say, though, is that it is British, the blade is by J J Runkel, Sohlingen and it is an officer's sword. I have seen disc-hilted yeomanry swords but I don't necessarily think this is yeomanry (in fact, I am firmly against the practice of classifying as yeomanry everything that we do not recognise as a pattern sword). For what its worth and I emphasise that this is entirely speculation on my part, I believe it to be some sort of experimental heavy cavalry officer's sword. It has always struck me as peculiar that the 1796 heavy cavalry officers sword is completely different from the troopers when regulations said they were to carry the same sword (as happened with other patterns). Perhaps, just perhaps, this was a first go at an officer's disc-hilted sword (but we shall never know).

Richard.

Richard,

Well I don't feel half bad making a guess that it was an officer's sword. One thing that I find interesting on your sword is that the edges of the guard are "rolled" for a lack of a better term. To me, this indicates an attempt to avoid one of the problems of the trooper's sword, the rather rough edge of the guard being either uncomfortable to wear and/or damaging the uniform. In other words, I think that the guard has a finer finish to it. The p guard adds a bit more sophistication to an otherwise beastly looking weapon. You obviously know more about this than me, but I can see that there is a strong argument to be made for your sword being an attempt at an officer's version of the disc hilt.

Andre

John Morgan 01-26-2003 04:01 PM

Its a coincidence that this sword of Richard's is being discussed at the same time as, what may be the equivalent early trooper's version, is for sale by Michael D Long. I agree with Richard that one should not too easily dismiss unidentified unusual swords as having been made for the Yeomanry. This is something I have been guilty of ...as I once found out to my cost!!.

Regarding Richard's sword. The backpiece, ears, pommel and double langets are exactly as those on my ( early?) troopers sword. (See the more recent P1796 posting). If Richard's sword is a prototype..or first limited issue...then these components of the early trooper's sword were readily available for it. Note also that the backpiece is pushed into/behind the backpiece as with my trooper's sword.

Does the knucklebow hook under the pommel?.

There is no sword knot slot..further suggesting early issue.

The larger perforations in the disc may be to compensate for a heavier guard?.

The wire binding and faceted knuclebow further suggests an officer's sword.

The rivet heads to the trooper's swords are finished flush. I am surprised these on the officer's are not....this may further suggest a one off prototype?.  
It is certainly a very nice in excellent condition,  
John.M.

Richard Dellar 01-26-2003 06:38 PM

Quote:Originally posted by John Morgan

It's a coincidence that this sword of Richard's is being discussed at the same time as, what may be the equivalent early trooper's version, is for sale by Michael D Long.

I agree with Richard that one should not too easily dismiss unidentified unusual swords as having been made for the Yeomanry. This is something I have been guilty of ...as I once found out to my cost!!.

Regarding Richard's sword. The backpiece, ears, pommel and double langets are exactly as those on my ( early?) troopers sword. (See the more recent P1796 posting). If Richard's sword is a prototype..or first limited issue...then these components of the early trooper's sword were readily available for it. Note also that the backpiece is pushed into/behind the backpiece as with my trooper's sword.

Does the knucklebow hook under the pommel?.

There is no sword knot slot..further suggesting early issue.

The larger perforations in the disc may be to be to compensate for a heavier guard?.

The wire binding and faceted knucklebow further suggests an officer's sword.

The rivet heads to the trooper's swords are finished flush. I am surprised these on the officer's are not....this may further suggest a one off prototype?.

It is certainly a very nice in excellent condition,  
John.M.

John,

In answer to your questions:

- the knucklebow does hook under the pommel
- there is no sword knot slot as you have observed
- the diamond shaped reinforcing plate is not fixed to the disc by rivets ; in fact, these are tiny delicate screws consistent (in my view) with the overall quality of the piece which is superior in many other respects to the troopers' versions
- following on from the last point, the langets are slightly smaller than generally on the troopers' versions and the pommel is more rounded
- if I haven't mentioned it before, blade is by J J Runkel Sohlingen, i.e. the early spelling of Solingen with an "h".

Richard.

Michael.K.G. 01-28-2003 11:26 AM

Just a quickie: were there any yeomanry heavy cavalry? I thought they were all light.

Richard Dellar 01-28-2003 11:41 AM

Quote:Originally posted by Michael.K.G.

Just a quickie: were there any yeomanry heavy cavalry? I thought they were all light.

Hello Michael,

I imagine you are asking this question because of my reference to having seen a disc-hilted HC sword marked to the Yeomanry. However, as you say and so far as I am aware, all the Yeomanry units that existed during the period of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were indeed supposed to be light cavalry (however I stand to be corrected if anyone knows different).

Nevertheless, after the 1796 patterns were superseded, I am sure old stocks of both heavy and light swords were issued to the yeomanry. I have certainly seen a 1796 disc-hilt marked "DYC" (+ numbers). Also, at page 103 of Lyle's Arms & Armour Review 1980, there is an officer's presentation 1796 disc-hilt (although slightly lighter looking than standard) marked "G T Williams, Lieutenant in the Mudford (Somerset) Troop of Yeomanry Cavalry 1831"

Regards

Richard.

Martin Read 01-29-2003 06:31 AM

I believe there was a post-war unit set up by a Waterloo veteran, which fielded a troop of yeomanry cuirassiers - the Furness (North Lancashire) Cuirassiers. A good candidate for yeomanry 1796 hc sword users.

During the war period there are records of yeomanry cavalry units wearing red uniforms; whether any of these units followed up their use of heavy cavalry uniform colour with heavy cavalry equipment is uncertain.

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=51514>

1796 Heavy Cavalry (<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=51514>)

David Critchley 05-13-2005 08:08 AM

1796 Heavy Cavalry

I've seen a few of these all seemingly about 27" to 28" in length.  
I read somewhere that after 1822 a number were adapted for use as cutlasses by the Royal Navy.

<http://cgi.ebay.co.uk/ws/eBayISAPI.dll?ViewItem&category=67577&item=6531626044&rd=1>

Does anyone else recall reading this ?

David

WBranner 05-13-2005 02:12 PM

I bought one off Paul D. a while back. It had the latter style beveled disk hilt & no slot. It had also been rebladed with a later style blade.

When last seen, it was headed for Chicago.

I have pics if interested.

David Critchley 05-13-2005 05:40 PM

Quote:Originally posted by WBranner

I bought one off Paul D. a while back. It had the latter style beveled disk hilt & no slot. It had also been rebladed with a later style blade.

When last seen, it was headed for Chicago.

I have pics if interested.

Did it have any markings on it Wayne? I'm quite inerested since it seems a logical choice for a cutlass when cut down and of course the same thing happened with the pioneers sidearm later in the century.

David

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:13 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37370&d=1116022403>



I just looked it up and here are photos. Looks like a cut down officers blade. I see "Warranted" and possibly a name below.

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:14 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37371&d=1116022442>

next

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:14 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37372&d=1116022481>

again

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:15 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37373&d=1116022536>

and again

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:16 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37374&d=1116022580>

yet another

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:16 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37375&d=1116022614>

ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZ

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:17 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37376&d=1116022652>

yyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyy

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:18 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37377&d=1116022690>

qqqqqqqqqqqq

WBranner 05-13-2005 06:18 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37379&d=1116022725>

last one

Paul Digard 05-14-2005 04:10 AM

This is my notes on what I could make of the etching: "warranted proved" and illegible remains of a cutler's mark "O/C/G (?) ERMAN".

The reblading looked to have been done well and a long time ago, judging by the tang/pommel junction, but the reshaping of the blade tip is a lot cruder.

I wonder if the current owner reads this forum?

Paul

WBranner 05-15-2005 09:05 AM

I don't know if she does or not (yes, she),but she was very into the Sharpe series

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=51659>

1796 Heavy cavalry

D. O'Neill 05-17-2005 01:37 AM

1796 Heavy cavalry

Good evening all,

I am very pleased to have found you, and hope to learn something as well as share what knowlege and items I have. I noticed several threads here about the 1796 Heavy Cavalry sabre. I have one that is marked RG and (I suppose) a trooper number on the scabbard and the guard. What I would like to know is if that refers to the 1st Royal Dragoons or the

Royal Dragoon Guards and what would the difference be with the initials between the two?

Regards,

Dan O'Neill.

D. O'Neill 05-17-2005 01:42 AM

1796 Heavy cavalry sabre

Sorry,

I meant to say it is engraved with 'RD' not 'RG'

Dan O'Neill.

Richard Dellar 05-17-2005 06:24 AM

Hello Dan,

May I suggest that you take a look at this thread

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthr...threadid=50724> where there is a photo of a 1796 HC sword marked to the 1st Royal Dragoons (there was no regiment with the title Royal Dragoon Guards).

Richard.

D. O'Neill 05-17-2005 09:18 AM

Many thanks Richard. There is a picture of a 1st R D sword there with the same markings as mine. The thread cleared up some other mysteries for me as well!!!! (mismatched sword and scabbard numbers) I will post some pictures there to add to the 'pot'

Kind regards,

Dan.

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=51377>

1796 amalgam Peter Richards 05-09-2005 02:52 PM

1796 amalgam

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37214&d=1115664730>

I wonder if anyone could help me with any more info on this sword?

The hilt is 1796 heavy cavalry, but I have been told that the blade is 1788 pattern or even older the twin fullered style I think is called A la Montmorency with a spear point. The reinforcing diamond shaped plate has been removed.

I have weighed the sword and it is 2lb 2oz, the width of the blade is 1 1/4 inches, the back goes from 1/4-1/8 th inch, the length of the straight blade is 35 1/2 inches, the hilt is 4 3/4 inches , and the spear point is 11 1/4 inches, on the knuckle guard I think is F 21 or 24. T The hilt is reptile(crocodile or lizard or snake ?) skin, and is attached with gold and copper wires these have not tarnished. The disc guard has been bent on both sides towards the hand, not very clear in photo.and the backing plate removed. I do not have the scabbard. I have attached photos. Does anyone have any ideas how this sword came to be assembled?

Peter Richards 05-09-2005 02:54 PM

1796

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37215&d=1115664880>

Please find attached new picture, apologies for the length of picture and text!

Peter Richards 05-09-2005 02:56 PM

1796

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=37216&d=1115664992>

More pictures-apologies for size again!

E.B. Erickson 05-10-2005 10:25 AM

Hello Peter,

The blade isn't from a standard 1788 hc sword, as those had single wide fullers and were 38" long. Your blade is a typical English cav style that was used pretty much all through the 1700s.

The grip wrap is most likely modern, and I suspect that's when the sword was assembled, too.

--ElJay

<http://forums.swordforum.com/showthread.php?t=53462>

And I thought my 1796 HC was heavy!  
Rob O'Reilly 06-29-2005 11:20 PM

And I thought my 1796 HC was heavy!

1 Attachment(s) )

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=39076&d=1120101657>

I recently picked up this formidable Italian Heavy Cavalry Pattern 1860 sabre and thought I would share it with you all.

The sword itself is 41" in length, blade is 35" x 1.5" fullered to within 9" of the tip. The grip is 5" within the steel bowl guard, twisted wire wrap over leather. The weight is 2lb 12oz without the scabbard, 4lb 12oz with...a cleaver for sure!

Conversely, my British 1796 HC weighs in at 2lb 7oz without scabbard, 4lb 5oz with.

Rob

Rob O'Reilly 06-29-2005 11:21 PM

1 Attachment(s)

<http://forums.swordforum.com/attachment.php?attachmentid=39077&d=1120101707>

another view

Carter Leffen 06-30-2005 12:59 AM

Very Nice!

Rob,

Extremely nice sword, great pics. No doubt about it, the sabre is a magnificent weapon. Not ambiguous at all. By any stretch of the imagination, it's NOT a butter knife...

Wielded with intent, the sabre could turn an enemy's guts to water... Look how the French HATED the Blucher Sabre- wanted it banned! Anyhow, well chosen, and I wish you and yours well, Sir.

Carter

Rob O'Reilly 07-03-2005 09:24 PM

Thanks Carter,

In re-reading my intial posting I realize I made a mistake on the blade width. It is not 1 1/2" (I was evindently thinking of my 1796), but 1 1/4".

Rob

The following is from the previous rendition of Sword Forum International

.....

A.Ducote  
(Having a Great Time)  
02/22/02 06:46 PM

Thomas Gill

Hello all.

Can anyone tell me the approximate dates that Thomas Gill was in business? Just got a sword with his name on it.

Thanks,

Andre

Richard Dellar  
(Totally Addicted)  
02/23/02 12:46 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: A.Ducote]

Hello Andre,

Thomas Gill traded from Jennon's Row in Birmingham from around 1783 until his death in 1801 when he was succeeded by his sons Thomas, James and John. He was a vociferous proponent of his own and English blades in general which made him one of the most controversial figures of his day. In 1790 he published a pamphlet purporting to show the superiority of his own blades over those of his main rivals in Birmingham, Messrs. Harvey and Woolley, and, in particular over German blades imported by the merchant J J Runkel of London. This, in turn, launched a retaliatory attack by the renowned London cutlers Cullum, Bland & Foster and Loxham who all used Runkel's German blades. Gill was variously described as a "scoundrel" and a "quack". All of this can be found in Appendix V to John Wilkinson Latham's "British Military Swords". It was Gill who first put "Warranted" or "Warranted Never to Fail" on his blades, a commendation later copied in various forms by other cutlers.

Richard.

Jim McDougall  
(Hopelessly Addicted)  
02/23/02 06:09 PM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Richard Dellar]

Richard,  
Some time ago I was researching a heavy cavalry M1796 troopers sword marked to John Gill. I had read somewhere of a contract of 1811 for these swords to Gill. I have never been able to relocate that reference, any suggestions? I thought maybe "Swords for Sea Service" or Robson, but neither had such reference.

A.Ducote  
(Having a Great Time)  
02/25/02 09:19 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Jim McDougall]

I have only heard of Thomas Gill. How long did the Gill firm remain in the swordmaking business? The sword I have is at 1796 heavy cavalry troopers sword. I can't make out the first initial. The blade is stamped with a crown over "4". Does the "4" relate to the inspector or the maker?

Andre

Edited by A.Ducote on 02/25/02 09:20 AM.

Richard Dellar  
(Totally Addicted)

03/04/02 04:45 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: A.Ducote]

Hello Jim and Andre,

Sorry for the delay in replying, I have been away for a week or so.

Anyway, first of all John Gill. This Gill, resident of Masshoues Lane, Birmingham, was from an entirely different family to Thomas Gill (SSS Vol 2 p 317). I have seen several swords by this maker (and his successor Elizabeth Gill) but all were light cavalry and all have the name "John Gill" or "John Gill's Warranted" in full. I have never seen a 1796 HC troopers by John Gill.

However, one of the most common makers of the 1796 HC troopers' swords is the enigmatic "I Gill" and conversely I have never seen a 1796 light cavalry by I Gill. The only I Gill in SSS appears in the London listings - "T & I Gill, 83 St James's St., 1806-1808". I believe that this I Gill is part of the Thomas Gill family. Possibly and very tentatively I might suggest that this is the John who was the son of Thomas (not the John discussed above) and that he used the initial "I" to distinguish himself from his namesake. I say this because a few years ago, David Wright published a list of London cutlers in the Journal of the Arms and Armour Society. This list gives Thomas and John Gill (both sons of the famous Thomas) also at 83 St James's St in 1806-07.

So, in summary, I think the I Gill who made the 1796 HC swords is John Gill, son of Thomas operating from 83 St James's St., London c. 1806-08 (almost certainly in Birmingham as well). The other John Gill of Masshouse Lane, Birmingham I think predominantly made light cavalry sabres (I have one by him). Confused yet?

Finally, sorry Jim, but I have not come across any reference to a contract for 1796 HC swords involving John Gill (or anyone else for that matter).

Richard.

Paul Digard  
(Addiction Setting In)

03/04/02 07:14 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Richard Dellar]



Richard,

You said

" It was Gill who first put "Warranted" or "Warranted Never to Fail" on his blades, a commendation later copied in various forms by other cutlers. "

So the presence of "Warranted" on a blade can be used to date it to no earlier than ~ 1780s? Or is the attribution of "warranted" to Gill no robust enough to make this useful?

Thanks

Paul

Richard Dellar

(Totally Addicted)

03/04/02 07:59 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Paul Digard]

Paul,

Yes, I believe you can date "Warranted" and like forms from around the 1780's onwards but, of course, I stand to be corrected if anyone knows different. It was a fashion, of course, and disappeared around the 1820's

Richard.

A.Ducote

(Real Enthusiast)

03/04/02 09:10 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Richard Dellar]

Richard,

Thanks for the information on the Gills, however many of them that there were. I'm trying to date my 1796 heavy as close as I can. The initial before "Gill" is either a "T" or an "I", does this mean that it was likely made between 1796 - 1808?

Andre

Richard Dellar  
(Totally Addicted)

03/04/02 09:33 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: A.Ducote]

Andre,

I suspect you will find it is I Gill. Sometimes there is a dot between the "I" and the "Gill" if that helps. Anyway, if I am right, then I would date it 1801-08 (i.e. between the death of Thomas senior and the last entry for I Gill).

Richard.

A.Ducote  
(Real Enthusiast)

03/04/02 12:01 PM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: Richard Dellar]

Richard,

Thanks for the additional information. My 1796 is stamped to the Second Dragoons. Perhaps it was carried in the Scots Greys charge at Waterloo!

Andre

Richard Dellar  
(Totally Addicted)

03/05/02 06:59 AM

Re: Thomas Gill [re: A.Ducote]

Andre,

The 2nd Royal North British Dragoons (or Scots Greys) were one of the few regiments who marked their swords (at that time) and because of the part they played in the charge of the Union Brigade at Waterloo when they captured the Eagle of the veteran French 45th of the line, their swords are the most desirable of all 1796HC swords.

Congratulations on your acquisition.

Richard.