

Battle of Corydon - July 9, 1863
Harrison County
31.1961.1

Prepared by the
Indiana Historical Bureau 2010
IN.gov/history

Marker Text

A force of about 400, Indiana militia and citizen volunteers commanded by Col Lewis Jordan, engaged John Hunt Morgan's raiders, 2,400 cavalry, along a wooded ridge a mile south of Corydon. The determined Hoosier defense caused General Duke, Morgan's second in command, to comment, "They resolutely defended their rail piles." Three Hoosiers and eight Confederates were killed. Morgan then brought up his cannon and flanked the militia forcing Jordan to retreat. After Morgan surrounded and began shelling Corydon, Jordan surrendered with 345 men.

Report

Most of the marker text is correct. For further information see W. H. H. Terrell's *Report of the Adjutant General of the State of Indiana* (1869), Simon K. Wolfe's "The Battle of Corydon" from volume 54 of the *Indiana Magazine of History* (1958), and Basil W. Duke's *History of Morgan's Cavalry* (1867). However, there are two concerns with this marker.

First, Basil Duke was a colonel, not a general, during the Battle of Corydon. However, he was a general (inactive) when he wrote the quote on the marker. Therefore the question raised is whether or not it is correct to refer to him as general on this marker, since it may imply that he was a general at the time of the offensive. See H. M. Judah to Ambrose Burnside, 22 July 1863 in *War of the Rebellion*, Series 1, Volume 23 (Part 1) (1889). Judah refers to Duke as colonel in the correspondence, which was after Morgan's forces surrendered.

Second, W. H. H. Terrell complicated the number of Hoosiers killed. He reported the same three soldiers killed as did Simon Wolfe: Harry Stepleton, Nathan McKinzie, and William Heth. However, Terrell then added, "Jacob Ferrace, one of the Commissioners of Harrison county, was mortally, and Caleb Thomas and John Glenn

severely, wounded. Isaac Lang died of heat and exhaustion in the fight.” So, actually four, maybe five, Hoosiers died in the battle. The question raised here is whether or not it is technically correct to say that three were *killed* in combat, whereas the other one or two men died. Further research is needed.