

# THE FIRST AMERICAN MRS. ROSECRANS

Reprinted from  
THE NEW YORK  
Genealogical and Biographical Record  
Vol. xc Numbers 1, 2, 3  
(*January, April, & July 1959*)

CONTRIBUTED By DAVID VERNOOY BENNETT  
Box 201, Wurtsboro, New York

## Part I

*January, 1959*

The following is a strictly factual presentation of episodes in the life of a dauntless and durable woman of early Colonial times on the brawling and battling frontier of what was to later become the Empire State. This woman, Magdalena Dircks, styled the "Flying Angel" in correspondence between the Dutch West India Company and Director-General Peter Stuyvesant, was a daughter of Dirck Volckertsen the Northman and his wife Christina Vigne, and through the latter a granddaughter of the Walloons, Guillaume Vigne and Adrienne Cuvelier, and a niece of "the first male born of Europeans in New Netherland, named Jean Vigne," according to the *Journal of Jasper Danckaerts* under date of September 1679.

At dawn of the day September 15th, 1655, sixty-four canoes manned by Indians swept down the East River and swarmed on the lower Manhattan strand (Pearl St., from Wall St. to Hanover Sq.). The mosquito fleet was, it seemed, merely making a stop on some expedition of the season for hunting and intertribal warring. The natives and the colonists had been at peace for ten years. The faces of many Indians in this band were familiar to residents of the "just beginning city" of New Amsterdam. A few of them debarked and started along the narrow streets. What were they after? they were asked by burghers of the rattle watch. Other Indians, they said.

'Twas a ticklish time to have heathen warriors gathered in force below

## **The First American Mrs. Rosecrans**

the wall of palisades (Wall St.), as so many of the Christian fighting men were then away from "the Manhattans," as the lower Hudson settlements were called. Director General and Captain Admiral Peter Stuyvesant's great armada of three warships and four transports had sailed off with six hundred men three weeks before on an expedition to oust four hundred Swedish "squatters" from the South (Delaware) River basin. Even now, by classic maneuvers with heavy artillery, he was effecting a bloodless capitulation of their stronghold, Fort Casimir.

The scheme of the heathen to wipe out the Christian settlements during the absence of "Sachem Woodenleg" and his cohorts looked too dubious at close view, in so far as New Amsterdam was concerned. The city's home guard was springing to arms; and in the background loomed Fort Amsterdam with its terrible "big thunder sticks" and its garrison. So, when several plucky home guards rushed to the strand and ordered the armada to "move on to Pagganck (Governors Island)," the Indians shoved off. But suddenly, as they paddled away, they let the dismissal delegation have a volley of arrows and musket balls.

Three guardsmen were hit; and one of them, Cornelis Hendricksen Van Dort, was carried dead or dying to his home on Slyck Steght (S. William St.). Magdalena Dircks - his wife for three years and the mother of his child, Marritje Cornelisz was now a widow.

Judged by the known facts of his brief career, young Van Dort had been an up and coming burgher - a doer and darer. Boat building was his business, and his standing in it was already such that he was employed as an expert, to advise the city court as well as various individuals. He was one of the contractors for construction of cannon mounts and the repair of a scow for the provincial government when an attack by the English seemed imminent. He it was, "Kees De Caper" (Kees the Sailor), who retrieved Thomas Young's ketch from the Hell Gate whirlpool when nobody else would take the chance for the sake of the reward. From a financial condition so poor that he was defaulting in rent payments to Evert Duyckinck the glassmaker, he worked up to buying the house and lot, and acquiring a tailor-made cloak forsooth.

However, the loss of any one person at the Manhattans, an area embracing some eight hundred colonists, was immediately swallowed up in the

general holocaust. Although the main band of savages was thwarted in its designs on New Amsterdam, other bands were striking successfully at many outlying plantations and trading posts. About sixteen hundred savages were on the warpath, provoked by the recent shooting of a peach-pilfering squaw by the addlebrained Hendrick Van Dyck. More than a hundred colonists were massacred, more than a hundred and fifty taken captive.

Only a few suburban properties, such as Stuyvesant's stockaded and garrisoned Great Bouwery at Nechtanc (Corlear's Hook), escaped devastation.

The widowed Magdalena Dircks made her debut into court records two months after her husband's death, in the first session of the Orphan-Masters' Board, established to protect the interests of children bereft of a parent. Finding that the deceased Kees Van Dort had no adult blood relative in the country, the Board selected an uncle of the widow, Jan Vigne the Schepen (Alderman), to act as one of the two guardians for the orphan. But Uncle Jan was constrained to report at a later session that the widow had refused to let him inventory the estate. Asked for an explanation of her attitude, Magdalena stated that her uncle Jan had been an "adversary" of her husband and herself and had never "had conversation" with either of them. As a matter of fact, Jan Vigne had been a sponsor at the baptism of the daughter of the couple; but he didn't argue the case, he simply begged to be excused so that he might tend to his own business, brewing. The Board accepted Magdalena's choice of a different uncle, Abraham Verplanck, and a different associate, Andries De Haes, who had been a fellow member with her late husband in the Burgher Guard.

The real rub between Magdalena and her uncle Jan had to do with the estate of her grandmother, Ariaentje Cuvilje, who had died in May of that year possessed of the residuary estate of the wealthy Jan Jansen Damen, her childless second husband, who had died in June of 1650. The inventory of Damen's holdings is seventeen pages long. From Ariaentje, as his "sole heir," stem the titles to some of the most valuable land on earth, the Wall Street belt across lower Manhattan. The old lady was hardly in her grave before her four heirs-at-law—her son and, as their wives' guardians,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

her three sons-in-law, were splitting hairs in the calculation of fourths. The church had to go to court to collect its fee for her burial. Of the three sons-in-law, Dirck Volckertsen “De Noorman,” Magdalena’s father, was the “oldest stander” in the community. He had come from Norway at some time before 1632, probably in the group of Northmen for which Secretary Isaac De Raisiere had applied to the West India Company in 1626 — Northmen who would know how to render pitch from the pines here. In 1632, Ariaentje Cuvilje, about to be married to Damen (the “Old Jan” of the Manatus map of 1639), made the customary settlement with her children by her previous marriage, to Guleyn Vigne, promising each of her married children, Maria and Christina, 200 guilders from the estate of their father, “her lawful husband deceased,” and promising each of her unmarried children, Jan and Rachel, 300 guilders plus their keep and schooling until of age. Dirck Volckertsen, Christina’s husband, put his mark to the agreement. Jan Roos of Haarlem, Maria’s husband, died without having done the same, leaving a son, Gerrit Jansen Roos. Maria took a second husband, Abraham Verplanck of Edam, who had arrived in America in 1634 with his cousin, Jacob Planck, the first commis (clerk) of Rensselaerswyck.

Dirck Volckertsen and Abraham Verplanck stuck together. They and their growing families made their home with mother Ariaentje and stepfather Jan till 1638, when old Jan, tired of being steward for all of Guleyn Vigne’s offspring, threw the whole caboodle of Volckertsens and Verplancks out of the house, injuring Dirck’s wife Christina in the process, and secured a decree of Council approving his action. His youngest stepdaughter, Rachel had just been married off to Cornelis Van Tienhoven, who had come to New Netherland as koopman (keeper of accounts) with Van Twiller in 1633 and been promoted to the provincial secretaryship by the new Director-General, Kieft. The Volckertsens settled at Green Point, across the East River; and the Verplancks at Paulus Hook, across the North River. But, after being forced back to Manhattan by the Indian war of 1643-1645, the two families united again and eventually moved to houses of their own built on adjoining lots in Smit’s Vly (Pearl St., from Wall St. north).

Old Jan, it would seem, owed his start to the Vigne widow he married. The Vigne plantation was the foundation piece of his real-estate holdings.

He was probably the “Jan Damont, laboureur” who had signed the round robin of Walloons seeking passage to “Virginia” in 1621. If so, he undoubtedly migrated to New Netherland with the other Walloons in 1624, — long after the Vignes had settled there.

Guleyn Vigne and his wife, Ariaentje Cuvilje, were Walloons from Valenciennes. Thumbing over the collection of writings on “The Troubles brought to Valenciennes on account of Heresies,” one notes that the names De la Vigne and Cuvelier (the latter the French equivalent of the Dutch Cuvilje) thunder loudly in the index of victims of the Spanish Inquisition and explain a flight of surviving relatives to tolerant Holland. There, a Jean De la Vigne served as Amsterdam’s Walloon dominie from 1585 to 1622; and there, in 1613 or earlier, a Guillaume De la Vigne and Adrienne Cuvelier evidently found employment in expanding Dutch commerce, and their names became Dutchified.

Inasmuch as their son Jan, born in 1614, was “the first male born of Europeans in New Netherland” it is reasonable to suppose they were members of the crew of one of the Dutch trading ships which visited Hudson’s river in 1613, the fourth year after his discovery of it. Of the four ships, one, the *Fortune*, remained over the winter at Castle Island in the upper river, where Fort Nassau was being established? and another, the fine new *Tiger*,<sup>1</sup> caught fire off Manhattan Island and was beached. Guleyn Vigne and his wife must have been in the *Tiger*’s crew, which passed the winter in huts on the southern shoulder (at about 39 Broadway) of the wooded ridge while the tiny *Restless* (New York’s first ship) was being fashioned from salvaged and green materials.

That “some Hollanders” stayed continuously in New Netherland from 1613 on is evidenced by many items in the records, such as the statement by Governor Sir Fernando Gorges of Virginia<sup>2</sup>. It is significant that,

---

1 A relic of the *Tiger* - the forward end of its keel and the after end of its stem, scarfed together, with two charred ribstubs attached — was uncovered at a depth of 30 ft., beneath the fill of 1763, by workmen excavating at Dey and Greenwich Streets in 1916 for a subway extension. The relic is in the Museum of the City of New York.

2 Gorges reported to the English government that Captain Thomas

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

in laying out the fort and bouweries on Manhattan in 1625, when the regular colonization of the island began, Kryn Fredericks, the engineer for the Dutch West India Company, passed over the near and nice bouwerie site which was to turn up later as property of Guleyn Vigne's widow, for the engineer had been instructed not to displace any settler from land already cultivated by him. Obviously, Guleyn Vigne, a "free person" — as distinguished from the regular colonists, who were bound to the Company — was in possession of the tract; and Old Jan Damen acquired it by marrying Guleyn's widow and paying her obligation to her children by Guleyn. The payment to the youngest, Rachel, is evidenced by her husband's receipt for the 300 guilders due her.

The location of Guleyn Vigne's land was just what would seem to have been ideal for people staying at the Manhattans to collect peltry brought down the trails or over the waterways. Most of the surface of lower Manhattan was covered with glacial boulders and conical hills of gravel drift; but there was a fertile tongue of land sloping down to the East River from the north-south ridge (Broadway), bathed by the morning sun, with a clear brook (Maiden Lane) on one side and an inlet (Broad St.) on the other. Manhattan Indians from their village of Werpoes on a point in the Fresh-water (later the Collect) Pond had long since cleared patches of this land and planted maize and tobacco. The tradition is that Guleyn Vigne built his cabin on the East River strand at the spot where Wall St. now intersects Pearl St. His son, Jan Vigne, retained this part of the Old Jan Damen real estate until his death in 1689, though meanwhile other parts were sold off or released to co-heirs of his mother, Old Jan's sole heir.

That Guleyn Vigne's wife, Ariaentje Cuvilje, had been endowed by her schismatic forbears with a violently rebellious streak, may be presumed from the report in Holland that she played football with Indians' heads brought to Fort Amsterdam after Kieft's unholy attacks in 1643. That her daughter, Christina Guleyns, inherited the streak is evident from Christina's resistance to ouster by her stepfather. That her daughter's daughter, Dermer, while sailing down the Atlantic seaboard in 1620, had conferred with "some Hollanders that were settled in a place we call Hudson's river, in trade with the natives."

ter, Magdalena Dircks, was in turn the conduit of the streak we shall see. Living in the American wilderness, as Kiliaen Van Rensselaer observed, didn't tone down people's bad streaks — if such they were.

Anyhow, Magdalena — the woman of whom nothing previous to her second marriage is known, according to the pretentious Rosenkrans genealogy — had family roots in New Netherland running down to the very first year of Dutch occupation. And, in 1655, when she lost her first husband, her relatives were among the high and mighty of the colony; her uncle Van Tienhoven was provincial Schout-fiscal and city Schout and “everything followed his behest,” as the suffering Commonalty complained; her uncle Verplanck, a trader, who held a grant of all the land he wanted anywhere on the South River, had sailed in Peter Stuyvesant's personal entourage to view the conquest of the Swedish “trespassers”; her uncle Vigne was a New Amsterdam magistrate; and her father Volckertsen, whose house on Smit's Vly had been burned by the savages, was at least one step ahead of his creditors, thanks to his expectations from Ariaentje Cuvilje's estate and Van Tienhoven's advances to him from the same.

-----

“There is the chimney sweep in the door, his chimney is well-swept,” cried Magdalena Dircks as she and a sister of hers tripped past Litschoe's tavern and she caught sight of the proprietor, who was incidentally a Fire Warden of the city.

Just what she was implying, we can only surmise — it was the day of her second marriage and she had undoubtedly had some wine — but the jibe struck a sore spot and the warden flew off the handle and the bystanders jeered and some sort of fracas developed. As a result, three days later Magdalena was facing the bench of the city's Burgomaster and Schepens to answer charges against herself and “her bridegroom.”

As the court minutes of the first of March 1657 inform us, Schout De Sille voices his distress that the defendant “has presumed to insult the Fire Wardens of the city on the public highway and to make a street riot,” and he demands condign punishment “for the maintenance of the aforesaid gentlemen's quality.” The defendant “admits that she and her sister passed by the door of the Fire-Warden Litschoe and, as they always joked when Fire-Wardens came to their house to inspect chimneys, she spoke

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

the alleged words — and not another word.”

The “qualities” involved would naturally be an important consideration in the minds of Stuyvesant’s hand-picked magistrates. Complainant Litschoe is not merely a Fire-Warden of the city, he is the hero of a shooting action, in which he struck Patroon Van Rensselaer’s flag for Stuyvesant, settling a jurisdictional dispute of long standing, for which service Stuyvesant has promoted him from Sergeant to Lieutenant. Defendant Magdalena belongs to a family over which a cloud of disrepute has come; her uncle Van Tienhoven has disappeared after being removed from his high offices by order of the Amsterdam Chamber; her uncle Vigne has been denied a reappointment to the city magistracy by Stuyvesant; her uncle Verplanck has incurred magisterial enmity by insulting and threatening burgomaster; and her father has charges against him awaiting trial, for stabbing a cooper in a dice-game brawl. Accordingly, when the worthy men on the bench have jotted down their individual findings, as is the practice, the average spells out a verdict of guilty and a penalty of “two pounds Flemish” for the joking bride.

Since parts of the court minutes are missing, there is no telling what other monstrous crimes Magdalena may have committed. It seems, however, that tongue wagging was a sufficient reason for banishment from New Netherland during the consulship of Peter Stuyvesant. At some time in the spring of 1657, Magdalena was notified that she and Geertje Jacobs, wife of Guert Coerten, were slated for a one-way yellow ticket to Amsterdam. Geertje’s only offense — so far as the records show — had been some tongue wagging: she had gossiped about Francis Rombout and Engeltje Mans, wife of Borger Jorissen the blacksmith, saying the two “had been discovered in something disgraceful,” and her plea that she had mentioned no names was rejected, for she admitted saying, “Such people as nobody would suspect.”

Magdalena’s new husband was a soldier, Harman Hendricksen Rosecrans from Bergen, Norway, sometimes called “Harman the Portuguese” — an indication of service as a Company soldier in Brazil, from which reinforcements had been brought in 1655. Harman secured a discharge by special act of the Council on April 17th, 1657; and, with a view to Magdalena’s exile, he sold her house and lot to Joost Goderis the por-

ter on August 13th, the property being subject to the 500 guilder mortgage held by the guardians for Magdalena's daughter by her first husband. Come October, when the *Waegh* and the *Hoop* sailed for Holland, Magdalena and Geertje were ushered aboard one ship or the other, as was also a third tongue wagger, a Lutheran minister whose tenets irked Peter the Tyrant. Both vessels were detained in an English port on their course to Amsterdam and didn't reach that city till the middle of March 1658.

Replying to Stuyvesant's letter of October 22nd, 1657, the Amsterdam Chamber of the West India Company, which owned New Netherland, wrote on May 20th, 1658, "The two women of bad reputation, Magdalena Dircks and Geertje Jacobs, whom you sent back here on account of their dissolute life, shall not again receive our permission to return to New Netherland, and if they shall come there again by deceitful practices or under a false name, you may punish them, as they deserve it." But, by June 13th, 1658, the Chamber reversed its stand and passed a formal resolution consenting to the return to their colony of Harman Hendricksen and Magdalena Dircks, "alias the *Flying Angel*," on condition they did not keep a tavern or sell intoxicants.

Whence this alias? Had Magdalena started keeping a tavern under a Flying Angel sign? Had she been given the sobriquet because of high-flying talk or angelic conduct during the long voyage? Had she or her husband or some good friend of theirs told the directors a heart-touching story? All we know is that her husband was with her now, if he had not been on the way over, and the couple were already "flying" back, a child with them. The Chamber was trying to strengthen its weak hold on the American mainland: powder and lead had been dispatched on the *Moesman*, and soldiers on the *Bruynvisch* ten days later. On the latter ship's passenger list were "Harman Dircksen from Norway and wife and child." Either this was a slightly false name for Harman Hendricksen or Harman Dircksen disappeared en voyage.

Not long after their return to the Mannhattans, in June 1658, Harman and Magdalena decided — or had it decided for them — that their future lay elsewhere. A man with military training would be a welcome settler at Esopus, where Dirck Smit, an ensign who had crossed with the Rose-

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

cranses on the *Bruynvisch*, was assuming command of the garrison. On November 22nd, 1658, Harman took out "small burgher" papers at New Amsterdam — fee 20 guilders — payable in beavers within eight days — hoping no doubt that the trading privileges would prove advantageous at his new location. He and his wife must have reached there before the winter of 1658-1659 was over, for their son Alexander, baptized in New Amsterdam on April 12th, 1659, registered later as a native of Esopus; and the likelihood that he was is confirmed by references to much coming and going of civilians on military supply yachts, in correspondence between Smit and Stuyvesant, and by the lack of a settled dominie at Esopus, Harmanus Blom having returned to the fatherland to be ordained.

Esopus (the Dutch version of the Algonquian word "siposis," meaning "creeks," the distinguishing feature of the region being the two creeks, Esopus and Rondout) was a point on the Hudson's west shore, three fifths of the way from Fort Amsterdam to Fort Orange. The fertile lowlands and the prospect of owning a plot in fee had been drawing colonists from Rensselaerswyck, where land could be held only on lease from the patroon, ever since two Englishmen from Virginia, Christopher Davis and Thomas Chambers, led the way in 1652, buying tracts from the Indians and getting confirmatory grants from the Dutch authorities. In the spring of 1657, the Indians became hostile, harassing settlers and murdering skipper Bamboes. Stuyvesant promptly appeared on the scene with sixty soldiers, directed the construction of a stockade on the heights overlooking the fields and the removal of houses to the inside. Then, and again in the fall, when he made another trip to Esopus, he demanded indemnities from the Indians and pressed them for a deed to the whole region, to remove the chief causes of friction; but what few sachems of theirs he could assemble slipped away without answering. During the winter, however, Sergeant Louwrens, commander of the Esopus garrison, finally succeeded in getting the sachems' marks on the deed.

-----

On the evening of September 21st, 1659, a party of Indian farm hands was having a spree by a brook on the land of Thomas Chambers, who had donated a bottle of brandy after the day's corn husking. Chambers

said he had no more of the stuff when a second bottle was begged; but a soldier of the escort was more accommodating. The spree waxed livelier, and one of the excited savages fired off the powder charge in a musket. Ensign Smit, the garrison commander, sent out a patrol to investigate. Upon its return with a report that nothing but a heathen frolic was taking place, the Ensign, under orders not to provoke hostilities with the heathen, decided not to interfere.

Some of the settlers were not so level-headed. All the time since delivery of the deed, they had been badgered by Indians who, seeing more and more of the land taken over, complained of delay by Wooden-leg in delivery of the presents due for the land. Only under protection of an armed escort had men been able to work their lawful fields. Even inside the stockade the men couldn't find peace: on a Sunday in August, while Dominie Blom was preaching his first sermon, the heathen had milled about the strand gate howling for Wooden-Leg and jeering at the latest excuse — Wooden-Leg was sick — offered by Chambers and interpreted by Kit Davis.

During September the nervous tension had been increasing. Rumor had it that two Dutch soldiers deserting Fort Orange had been murdered by Indians while making for the English settlement at Hartford. Kit Davis and Claes De Ruyter, the bosom friends of the Esopus tribe, said that they had been advised to get out of the section. A visit by an Indian delegation, who brought sewan to compensate the settlers for a recent trivial offense and dropped remarks about building an Indian fort to offset the white men's, had a sinister significance. It was high time for the settlers to do something for themselves, if Stuyvesant was sick or still thinking in terms of balance due on indemnities rather than on land purchase. Here was a golden opportunity to strike terror in the savage breasts.

Led by Jacob Stol and Evert Pels, and shouting, "We'll slap their mouths," a band of men rushed forth with musket, cutlass, and axe and fell upon the hapless party of Indians on the Chambers plantation, killing and wounding but in the darkness failing to exterminate. Ensign Smit, disgusted by the senseless conduct of people he was trying to protect, threatened to withdraw the garrison as Stuyvesant had authorized him to do, To forestall such action, Chambers and other burghers raced

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

to the strand and removed all river craft within reach. A compromise with Smit eventuated, and Kit Davis was dispatched down the river to inform Stuyvesant of the situation and obtain his instructions.

Eighteen armed men, partly soldiers and partly burghers, the veteran Harman Hendricksen Rosecrans among the latter, escorted Kit to his canoe. While returning to the stockade, the group ran into an ambush. Four of the number made a break for freedom and succeeded; the other fourteen, including the leader, Sergeant Louwrens, surrendered without firing a shot. Soon a host of whooping savages was investing the stockade, their flaming arrows pelting the roofs of the buildings within and keeping bucket brigades busy at all hours. Sheds and stacks in the outside fields went up in smoke, and farm animals which had not been brought behind the palisades, became food for heathen.

Of the fourteen captives taken by the Indians, five were forced to run the gauntlet and then tortured to death by slow fire — among these Jacob Stol and Jan Slegt the brewer's son — and seven were held for ransom. The thirteenth, a son of Evert Pels, was lucky enough to strike the fancy of some Pocahontas and be adopted into her tribe. Just one contrived somehow to elude his captors. In a letter to Stuyvesant eight days after the ambush, Ensign Smit wrote: "At the date of this letter we have got back one prisoner, who ran away from them. I have asked this returned captive, Harmen Hendricksen, how strong they may have been; he said in answer to me that they must have counted over four hundred, and thought our prisoners were all still alive."

So, Magdalena Dircks, whose sister Grietje had already had two husbands slain by Indians — both husbands ex-soldiers turned trader — didn't lose a second husband as she must have feared for a week or so. This escape of Harman was, as we shall see, but one of several evidences of his adaptability to frontier life. Through such experiences as this during the earliest phase of our country's history, there was being developed the woodcraft which, a few generations later, would equip great scouts like Daniel Boone and Kit Carson, men of a type peculiar to our continent. Compare a Harman Hendricksen with the Hans Vos from Baden, a "wild-schut" (gamekeeper), whom Van Rensselaer shipped here with a comment that he "may be employed at the proper time in killing

game to supply food, and at other times in cutting wood.” After a venture or two into the American wilderness, Hans confined his activities to service as a “steeboo” (court messenger).

Stuyvesant, advised of the situation at Esopus, took heroic measures to recruit an overwhelming relief force, offering a moratorium on debts, a grant of land and oxen and a bounty to volunteers and finally drafting able-bodied men by lot. By the 9th of October, he had assembled a hundred and sixty men, besides a band of Long Island Indian auxiliaries. Taking along a Mohawk chief and a Mohican sachem to arrange an armistice for ransom of captives, he landed at Esopus; but the mediators couldn't induce Esopus sachems to face Wooden-Leg in another parley, though they did release two captives at a price. Accordingly, Stuyvesant entrusted the campaigning to Smit's leadership and returned to Fort Amsterdam to negotiate neutrality pacts with tribes which might otherwise aid the enemy.

Ensign Smit, with eighty men on his muster roll, staged a series of expeditions to make the savages “keep their noses out,” destroying their stores of food, capturing a few of them and killing their ancient head sachem, the beloved “Rain-maker,” who refused to flee. By April 1660, three Mohican sachems visited Stuyvesant at Fort Amsterdam to report the despondency of the Esopus tribe over the death of the head sachem and the capture of other members, and the tribe's willingness to evacuate the whole area if the captured members were released. Stuyvesant settled the “if” by transporting Smit's captives to Curacao to be sold into slavery. Then, in July, he met delegates of the Mohicans, Wappingers, Minisinks, Hackensacks, and Mohawks for a peace conference at Esopus, to which four sachems of the local tribe were induced to come by threats of the delegates. Articles were signed confirming the cession of the region by the Esopus Indians and awarding them 800 schepels (616 bushels) of maize in ransom of the captives they still held. A hatchet was trampled into the earth to signify termination of hostilities.

Thereafter the garrison, except for one squad at the riverside redoubt (Rondout), was withdrawn from Esopus and the Burgher Guard, in which Harman served as an adelborst (cadet), took over the defense. On May 16th, 1661 — after Roeloff Swarthwout, who bore a mandate from

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

the Company for the establishment of local self-government with himself as Schout, had cooled his heels for a year — Stuyvesant issued a charter to the settlement, which he named Wiltwyck. A commission began laying out a “Nieuw Dorp” (Hurley) on land farther up the Esopus valley, of which Stuyvesant reserved a choice plot for himself. Philip Pietersen Schuyler, a son-in-law of Magdalena’s uncle Verplanck, was an associate grantee of another huge plot; it was divided into small farms, which were offered rent free for the first year together with a loan of animals and equipment for cultivation.

Harman received at that time Lot No. 3 in a distribution of additional sites for a home and garden within the stockade. On June 24th, 1661, Magdalena joined the church, to be among the first thirty members. Harman, working as a day laborer and trading on the side, was having a hard time to make ends meet. Even the 10 percent in “good-strung and current sewan” due his stepchild on the 500 guilder mortgage on 10 Slyck Steght, New Amsterdam, was not coming in, as uncle Verplanck notified the New Amsterdam court on September 15th, 1661, asking release from his bond as trustee for the child. With so many other colonists in the same straits, Harman couldn’t collect what was owed him for work for Pieter Hillebrantsen: he had to appeal to the court for an order on Pieter to pay 8 schepels of wheat which Pieter admitted owing, and had to be satisfied with an order requiring a payment Of 3-1/2 schepels within three days and the balance within six weeks. Harman, in turn, was among those in arrears with their dues for the dominie’s salary — 10 guilders in “heavy money” (Holland coin) per lot per year.

-----

During the forenoon of June 7th, 1663, as Indians by twos and threes trickled through the gateways into the Wiltwyck stockade, apparently bent on peddling beans and other produce as usual, the people who were there thought little about it, though all but a score or so of the men had gone out to work in the lowland fields. There had been signs of Indian unrest, such as the shooting of a horse at the new village, but the local sachems had just been notified that Wooden-Leg himself would visit Esopus bringing presents in the near future, and the sachems had agreed to meet him, provided the meeting should be in an open field with both

sides unarmed.

An hour before noon, several Nieuw Dorp settlers came riding wildly toward the mill gate and shouting that their village was being wiped out by the Indians. The heathen who had infiltrated the stockade and were scattered about the thirty or forty houses drew weapons from concealment and sprang upon any Christians who couldn't get out of reach too quickly. The men they knocked on the head or shot down without mercy; the women and children they took captive, except two women "big with child," whom they slew. They broke into homes to get at the occupants and find cover from which to shoot down men coming to the rescue. Buildings to windward were set afire.

The stockade was pandemonium as men inside who had survived the sudden onslaught, "most of whom had neither guns nor sidearms," battled the savages with whatever weapons they could lay hand on, while "by degrees" men from the fields outside rushed in to aid. Lieutenant Hendrick Schoonmaker of the Burgher Guard streaked for home from the river gate, where he and Jacob Pietersen the miller had been standing, and "was severely wounded in his house by two shots," but evidently he saved himself and the others there. Captain Thomas Chambers managed to break through, though wounded on his way from his farm, and to issue commands "to secure the gates, to clear the cannon and to drive out the savages." After this fashion the Christians rallied and the heathen, "through God's mercy," were "chased and put to flight." Thanks to a timely shift of the wind, fire fighters were able to limit the loss of houses to ten or twelve.

By nightfall, "69 efficient men, both qualified and unqualified," were guarding the palisades. Twelve men, including three soldiers who had happened to be at the guardhouse, had been killed and eight others had been wounded, one fatally; four women and three children had been struck down or burned alive; four women and six children were missing, among them the wife of surgeon Gysbert Van Imbroeck and the wife and child of Dominie Van Laer. Magdalena Dircks, veteran of three Indian wars, had not been caught napping, it seems. The baptism of her fifth child during the next month indicates that she had given birth to it at about the time of the massacre.

## **The First American Mrs. Rosecrans**

When, on the third day after the massacre, ten Wiltwyck burghers on horseback sallied to the Rondout, they found that it had not been attacked and several people from the Nieuw Dorp had taken refuge there. But this few and the few who had escaped to Wiltwyck, one of them wounded, were all that were left of the new village's population. Three men had been murdered and one man, eight women and twenty-six children had been taken captive.

A relief force of forty-two soldiers under Sergeant Niessen arrived from Fort Amsterdam in a yacht three days later and had to fight its way from the landing with three cart loads of munitions and provisions, suffering casualties of one killed and six wounded. The main force, about thrice as large, commanded by Burgomaster Kregier of New Amsterdam, landed eighteen days later yet — on the 4th of July — and for three days a heavily guarded wagon train shuttled between the stockade and the yachts without being molested.

As fast as leads were developed, Kregier staged drives for resorts of the Esopus tribe, meanwhile angling through Mohawk emissaries for redemption of Christians held by the tribe. During the last days of July, guided by an escapee, Rachel de la Montagne, the surgeon's wife, his grand expedition of 210 men captured the Indian fort up the Rondout valley (at Wawarsing) where she had been held; but the two cannon and two wagons had slowed progress so much that only one female Indian was trapped.

In early September, however, when Lieutenant Van Kouwenhoven, who was in a yacht off the Indian Danskamer (several miles above Newburgh) working with a Wappinger go-between on prisoner exchanges, had learned about a new fort the Esopus Indians were building, Captain Lieutenant Kregier induced a Wappinger to lead him to it and, taking a stream-lined force of 55 — 22 of his own Company, 74 of Lieutenant Stilwell's English Company, 7 burghers and 2 Negro slaves — set out between spells of "great rain," crossed the raging Rondout Kill, followed its tributary the Wallkill up to its meeting with its Shawangunk branch, and then followed the branch. Shortly after noon, forty-eight hours from the start, the force reached the half-finished Indian stronghold (on the east side of the Shawangunk, about two miles south of Bruynswick), on

which the Indians were busily at work. Moving “along the hill so as not to be seen and in order to come right under the fort,” Kregier’s men charged for the palisades. When the chase was over, fifteen Indian warriors, including sachem Papequanaehen, lay dead on the field, along with seven of their women and children. “Probably many more were wounded.” Thirteen had been taken captive; and twenty-three Christians had been released from captivity, thanks to the Mohawk who had visited the fort on the preceding day and laughed at the Esopus Indians for shepherding their captives to the hills each night. The Dutch losses in the fight were three killed and six wounded. So, having only eight horses with them, Kregier’s men had to destroy all but the choice items of loot that would “well fill a sloop” — guns, powder horns, bags of powder, skins, kettles and so forth.

Kregier, with his force doubled, revisited the site a week or so afterwards to devastate it more thoroughly. Thereafter, he made two or three raids on other sites. His contingent of Long Island Indians scoured the region, tracking down Esopus Indians. Lieutenant Van Kouwenhoven continued his prisoner-exchanging activities. In the course of two or three months, all except possibly one or two of the missing Christians were accounted for, and the Esopus tribe’s fragments were scattered among their neighbor tribes.

# **The First American Mrs. Rosecrans**

## **Part II**

*April, 1959*

Kregier had a great deal of trouble with the burghers over such matters as billeting his troops, borrowing horses and carts for expeditions, dividing the spoils of war and repairing the palisades. Either by a more co-operative disposition in these matters or by good work in the actual fighting, Harman Rosecrans must have earned Kregier's special consideration. For, in October, when Schout Roeloff Swartwout prosecuted violators of orders against leaving the stockade without an armed guard and Harman was among the "knechten" (hired men) of brewer Sleght who were being tried, Harman made light of the risk involved. He turned to Kregier, who presided over the Council of War, and asked him to settle the matter for him; Kregier then officially requested the release of the accused men, stating that he had reached an understanding with the brewer.

Magdalena managed to get into a ramification of the case. The Schout alleged that she had interfered with him in the discharge of his duty when he was arresting Aeltje Claes for telling him that the paper he was serving on her husband would be used in the privy. Magdalena's story was that she had simply protested: "Swartwout, why do you want to put this woman in prison? Why do you want to disgrace her? She is neither a whore nor a thief, and there is a private place here from which she cannot run away. The court decided that Magdalena must submit proof of her version or be adjudged guilty, but the charges against her were apparently dropped-along with Schout Swartwout, who had not complied diligently with Kregier's orders to have the stockade repaired.

Magdalena bounced right back into court, however, to support a charge by Eschje Gerrits that Sergeant Niessen, who was in command during Kregier's absence, was unlawfully possessed of a pillow of Eschje's. The Sergeant said Magdalena's declaration was false, based on words uttered by his wife while sick and delirious, and demanded that Magdalena be sworn. The outcome of the case is not shown in the minutes, but it is interesting to note that Niessen's wife was later convicted of various petty thefts in New Amsterdam.

By the last day of 1663, Captain-Lieutenant Kregier, favored by a rain which broke up ice in the Hudson, was “weathering the Long Reach” on his course to his home village of Breuckelen, where he would get foretaste of things to come: a wild English royalist, John Scott, had been attempting an uprising in the five Dutch towns of Long Island and had struck Kregier’s son for valiantly refusing to take off his hat to the English flag. Back in ravaged Esopus, the settlers faced the momentous new year of 1664 with minds necessarily absorbed by economic, rather than political, problems. Theirs was a hand-to-mouth, dog-eat-dog existence.

In January, the new schout, Capito, resorted to court action to collect Dominie Blom’s salary. Harman Rosecrans was on the list, the balance due from him being between 19 and 20 guilders, as against a market value of about 75 guilders for a lot; but Harman could pay nothing on account. Again, in March, Harman was summoned to court because of an unpaid debt, this a note to a New Amsterdam merchant for 27-1/2 guilders in beavers, payable in wheat at the Manhattans, and for 14-1/2 guilders in sewan besides. Harman having conceded the correctness of the claim, a judgment was taken; but the judgment was still unsatisfied in November, when it was exhibited in court and an officer delegated to execute it. New Netherland had been surrendered to the English on September 6th, and a detachment of a dozen English soldiers under a sergeant named Berrisford was garrisoning Esopus, but the Dutch courts were still functioning. It must have been impossible to find assets of Harman’s at Esopus upon which to levy, for in December the merchant, Jan Coo, applied to the court in what was now New York City to confirm the judgment for 66 guilders in beavers and 33 in sewan — the usual doubling of the original indebtedness because of default. Magdalena’s uncle Verplanck stepped into the breach and guaranteed settlement by the following April.

Magdalena was doing her bit to tide the family over. In October 1664, she sought an injunction to prevent Dirck Storm from converting to his own use all the effects of Martin Van der Hague the barber, to the detriment of her claim of 3 schepels of wheat for washing the barber’s clothes — an assignment in her favor having been made by the barber when her husband had caught up with him at the Manhattans. Storm exhibited a pow-

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

er-of-attorney from the barber to take possession of the trunk containing the effects, and he argued that he had paid 28 guilders for it, above the 30 already owed him by the barber. The Esopus magistrates shrewdly asked Storm if he wouldn't care to pay off Magdalena and have undisputed title to the trunk and contents. "No," replied Storm; but on second thought he accepted a postponement for the purpose of working out a compromise with Magdalena.

Uncle Verplanck tried to wash his hands of his poor Rosecrans relations in July 1665, some three months after his guarantee to merchant Coo had become operative. "Harmen Hendricksen, alias the Portuguese," was summoned to the New York City court to take the judgment off Verplanck's back by giving himself up. But Verplanck's son-in-law Adriaen Van Laer, who lived at Esopus, assumed the bail bond and assured the court that a settlement would be forthcoming within two months. Six weeks were all that Mayor Willett and the Aldermen would allow him.

By January, 1666, Harman evidently was seeing daylight through his obligations, for he was offering to settle his church dues if he could get a concession. Would the court accept sewan instead of beavers on the first year's assessment, and would it transfer half of the next two years' assessments to the account of Francis La Cheer, who had apparently been occupying half of Harman's double lot, and would it make an allowance of four days' pay for work on the parsonage; The court granted the petition, inasmuch as the first year's obligation was based on a pledge and the other years' on the number of lots occupied. Harman straightway attempted to stretch his good luck by asking the court to order George Hall, a tapster, to recompense him for firewood taken from a pile cut under contract for the night watch, claiming that Hall had used wood worth a schepel of wheat on each of several past months and the commander of the English garrison, Captain Brodhead, had assured him that Hall would pay. The court would not go further than to suggest refusal of more wood to Hall: it might be playing with fire.

---

On New Year's Day 1667 (New Style), newly married Walran Du Mond, formerly a Dutch soldier, gave a party at his home and among his guests was Magdalena Dircks. The English still held to the Old Style calendar,

and, now that Nieuw Nederlandt was New York, the English garrison commander was insisting upon the English way of life. He, Captain Daniel Brodhead, intruded himself upon the wrong-time gathering. As he scolded the host in abusive terms, one of the women — who but Magdalena? — had the temerity to talk back. She must have been getting the better of it in the exchange of insults — he testified later that she had said his sister was a whore — for the valiant captain threw a glass of beer in her face and dragged her off to the guardhouse.

Clashes between the Dutch-French settlers and the English garrison had been occurring ever since the occupation of Esopus in the fall of 1664. The idea that the English were there to stay and so had better be put up with somehow did not jell in the settlers' minds; Dutch sea power was rated equal to English and French land power was allied to Dutch. On the other hand, orders not to act like conquerors failed to restrain the English. Complaints from both sides came before the Wiltwyck magistrates and the garrison commandant, Sergeant Berrisford, who sat with them. Albert Roosa had threatened three English soldiers with an axe in a dispute over use of his canoe; Tjerck De Witt had called English soldiers bad names; Roeloff Swartwout had broken an English soldier's sword in a fight. Or English soldiers had forced brewer Sleight to serve his "best bier" gratis to them and their friends; they had extorted extra provisions from Aert Van Wagenen and Juriaen Westphal — to trade off for tobacco, Magdalena Dircks declared in this case. The magistrates, with Berrisford riding herd over them, favored the English when they could not avoid a decision.

Then, in May 1665, when it was rumored that Roosa, a sergeant in the Burgher Guard, was to be arrested for a second assault on the English when he took away a soldier's gun, the guardsmen armed and assembled. Having learned that their sergeant was merely summoned to court, they dispersed without taking any action; but their Officers' Council felt constrained to investigate the matter. Adelborst Rosecrans played a part in befogging the issue, testifying that only members of the watch had been given the watchword which made presence on the street possible after nightfall and backing up the testimony of Corporal Van Wagenen that the corporal's son, accused of being on the street, had been substituting for the corporal, who was ill. Captain De Laval of the Governor's Council,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

who happened to be in Wiltwyck, declined an invitation to sit with the Burgher Guard officers in judgment; so the investigation was suspended to await the coming of the Governor himself.

Governor Nicolls, arriving in September, sought to ease the tension by replacing the garrison commandant with a commissioned officer, Captain Brodhead, who had brought his family with him to America with the intention of settling here. He instructed Brodhead to “be single and indifferent as to justice between soldiers and burghers” and “not let insinuations beget a prejudice in his mind against the Dutch.” But the captain turned out to be the hottest partisan of the English lot, especially after the following February (1666), when the Governor ordered him to rush reinforcements to Albany, which might be the objective of a French-Canadian expedition Courcelles was making. Antony D’Elba of the Burgher Guard answered the call for volunteers with the challenge, “Shall we go fight our friends and leave our enemies at home?”

Even with his neighbors at the New Dorp, where he had rented a farm, Captain Brodhead embroiled himself gratuitously. One day he arrived at the store of Louys Dubois while a fight between the stormy petrel Roosa and five English soldiers was going on. Roosa had entered the store in search of a man to repair his plough-colter and, being badgered by the soldiers, who were in there drinking brandy, he had thrown the colter at one who was drawing his sword, scoring a near miss. Three of the soldiers had chased him outside. Brodhead’s presence ended the outside engagement, but Brodhead didn’t go inside to stop the beating the other two soldiers were giving the storekeeper and his wife. It was the English soldiers that preferred charges. The Wiltwyck magistrates, with Brodhead sitting as observer, held Roosa for further examination.

At a later date, when storekeeper Dubois took exception to the free sampling of his brandy by Brodhead, the captain threw the anker (ten-gallon keg) to the ground — without letting the liquor run out, however. Then, surreptitiously, he helped himself to some more. The storekeeper’s wife, Cathryn Blanchan, caught Brodhead in the act and pluckily followed him to his home, demanding payment. The captain, unable to shut her mouth by calling her vile names, finally drew his knife and told her he would be using it on her if she were not carrying a baby. (Her son David

was baptized March 13th, 1667.)

When, on New Year's Day 1667, Magdalena fell afoul of this high and mighty English captain, she was right in the middle of a struggle with one of his men, Richard Cage, who had been domiciled with the Rosecrans family but had moved out in September 1665 without paying for the washing of his clothes for a half year. Not that he lacked the means to pay! He was now renting the front part of Henry Pawling's house for a ten-year term for 240 guilders in sewan. He was peeved because Harman Rosecrans had gotten 6 guilders which should, he thought, have gone to him. He had sued Gerrit Fooken for wages due his deceased servant, Michael Sea, and Fooken had deducted the 6 guilders paid Harman Rosecrans for rescuing Sea from the woods. So, Cage was ignoring the judgment for 8 guilders, or 5 schepels of wheat, which the court had awarded Magdalena after Cage had ignored her summons.

In spite of the worsened hatreds, Harman Rosecrans — in February 1667, sixteen months after the issuance of the judgment against Cage — demanded of the court an attachment of the English soldier's assets. The magistrates wanted Harman to content himself with calling Captain Brodhead's attention to the matter, but they could not deny an unopposed demand for the next usual step in a legal course of action. Accordingly, Magdalena proceeded to locate and tie up sums of money owed Cage. Jan Cornelissen the smith, summoned next month to explain why he hadn't paid the soldier 8 guilders due him, answered that 6 had been credited to Cage's account with Du Mond and the other 12 to his account with Magdalena Dircks, from whom it was Cage's business to obtain release. Roeloff Swartwout, brought before the bar for failure to pay the soldier 8 guilders, declared his readiness to settle as soon as Magdalena's claim was lifted. The magistrates shrugged their shoulders and advised Cage to summon the woman in the case.

Thus fobbed off by legalities, the English soldier resorted to extra-legal measures to revenge himself on the washerwoman who wouldn't be cheated of her pay. He served up the Rosecrans' goats at a dinner for his friends and he used his sword on Harman when Harman protested. How else would one explain the item in the burghers' bill of grievances of April 27th, 1667? — "Harman Hendricx was wounded in his Legge by Richard

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

Cuge in so much that the said Harman is lame unto this present day, and that only because his Goates were eaten by the souldiers.”

Harman was lucky, at that. His friend, Hendrick Cornelissen the rope maker, was murdered by a vicious English soldier, William Fisher, in a soldier-burgher brawl; and his sometime employer, Cornelis Sleght the brewer, was assaulted in his own brewhouse by Captain Brodhead himself and clapped into the guardhouse. This abuse of Sleght, like Roosa, a sergeant in the old Burgher Guard, now the militia, brought about another unlawful assembly of armed burghers. Though Brodhead called out his English garrison, the burghers refused to disperse. Anthony D’Elba leveled a musket at the commander and threatened to shoot him if he advanced one step. The village magistrates intervened with a proposal to try Sleght in their court. Brodhead defied them to take away his prisoner. Only by pledging themselves to make representations to the Governor did they finally induce the burghers to go home.

Governor Nicolls appointed a commission to investigate the “Esopus mutiny.” As he saw it, he could not afford to admit justice was on the burghers’ side; so, as was to be disclosed more than a century later when secret colonial files were opened by Revolutionists, he dictated exactly what the commission’s findings should be. “Appear favorable to the boors,” he wrote, “but severe with the principal Incendiaries. Find that the Dutch rope maker ran upon the soldier Fisher’s sword in attempting to assault the soldier; find that the captain Brodhead merely threatened to fling a dish at the Dutch brewer — merely threatened to draw a sword, but neither did nor could have done it — and that the brewer presently ran in upon the captain and made the assault, giving the first blow.”

The Governor directed the commission to employ no jury and to admit only screened burghers to its sessions. It must make the people realize that unlawful assembly of armed men is treason and inexcusable under any circumstances. Some of the ringleaders must be convicted of malicious and treasonable riot and transported to New York for sentence. Pressure for a more thorough investigation could then be met with the statement that the case had passed into the Governor’s hands. Examination of complaints not covered in the directive could be avoided by suspending Captain Brodhead for disobedience to orders.

The “boors” stood their ground in such lines of testimony as were permitted, maintaining that they could not have done otherwise than back up their abused sergeant and defend their homes, which the garrison was threatening to burn. Even their English captain, Thomas Chambers, confirmed Du Mond’s account of the garrison commander’s conduct at the New Year’s party. But there was no gainsaying the fact that an armed assembly had taken place. The commission sat for only three days, and it failed to reach the charges against any of the garrison soldiers except Fisher, which it had the cut-and-dried answer for.

The commission’s report showed not the slightest deviation from the Governor’s directive. Soldier Fisher was acquitted of homicide on the grounds of self-defense. Captain Brodhead was relieved of his command. Cornelis Slegt, Antony D’Elba, Albert Roosa and Albert’s son Ariaen were convicted of rebellious and mutinous riot and shipped to New York City for sentence. Lieutenant Hendrick Schoonmaker, who had also been arrested, was found to have acted under duress and was released.

Governor Nicolls sentenced the four convicted “Incendiaries” to banishment, with confiscation of property in the elder Roosa’s case. But in the fall of the year, when he learned of the Treaty of Breda, which confirmed English possession of New Netherland, he declared a general amnesty.

In the aftermath of the Esopus mutiny, as the magistrates trimmed their sails to the English wind, Schepen Thomas Chambers accused Henry Pawling, a soldier who had come over with Nicolls, of slandering him by referring to him as a “knave.” Pawling admitted use of the word in characterizing Chambers but contended that Chambers had started the name calling by referring to the Duke of York’s soldiers as “rogues.” Put Schepen Hendrick Schoonmaker, Chambers’ own lieutenant, under oath, Pawling requested, and ask him if he hadn’t heard Chambers do this at the house of Harman Rosecrans. Ask if Chambers didn’t say, “The English who are at present here were banished from England and sent to an island” but “took their course to the Mannhattans without authority of the King of England” and “Stuyvesant had surrendered the country to them.”

Schoonmaker denied that any such ideas had been expressed by Chambers. All that Chambers had said at Harman’s house a year before, counting from the last Shrovetide, was something to the effect that

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

“some English behave in such a manner — cursing, swearing and blustering — as if they were bandits.” Rosecrans testified that he had forgotten just when Chambers made the remarks but what Chambers had said was that “these English who are now here are a party of bandits and had been sent to some island, and that they thus came here and Stuyvesant has given the land to them.” Chambers, who had not contradicted Schoonmaker’s version of his statements, vehemently repudiated the Rosecrans version. It was Harman himself, said he, who had uttered such sentiments.

Pawling wanted Harman’s wife questioned on this point, but Magdalena “whereas she cannot now be present on account of being confined in child-bed” (her seventh child, Anna, was baptized on October 9th, 1667), was not available. Probably she would only have made matters worse, for the Honorable Court, with Sergeant Berrisford watching proceedings again, ruled that Harman’s testimony was inadmissible because he was “passionately prejudiced against Thomas Chambers, which he showed before the court here,” and Magdalena would have shown passionate prejudice too. As it was, Pawling was notified to present more reliable evidence or resign his defense; and Governor Nicolls, reviewing the minutes of the case, approved the court’s action and ordered the expunction of Rosecrans’ testimony and the punishment of Pawling.

Harman’s reason for animosity toward Chambers is obvious: Chambers was letting him down in a bitter legal battle with the schout, William Beeckman, which was coming up in session after session. About a half year before, Adelborst Rosecrans had led the watch to the Beeckman home and slapped a fine on Beeckman’s son Hendrick for failing to report for duty and, according to Beeckman, had used insulting language in the process; but subsequent inquiries of “superior officers” by Beeckman had revealed that none of them had ordered young Beeckman to stand watch on the occasion in question. Moreover, the said Rosecrans, happening upon the scene while the schout was discussing the matter with Captain Chambers, had been overheard muttering, “If he, Schout Beeckman, had come before the door, I would have saluted him with the hammer.”

Harman maintained that his superiors had authorized the assignment of the schout’s son to duty on the watch. As for the alleged insults, said

he, the schout had invited them by roaring at the watch, when it came to levy the fine “You buffaloes, get out of my house.” The peaceable retirement of the watch after such an outburst should be considered sufficiently mollifying for a few harsh words.

Schout Beeckman brushed aside the niceties of balancing insults. The point, said he, was whether or not the captain had ordered the adelborst to have Hendrick Beeckman mount guard. “No,” Captain Chambers testified. At that, Harman, in what seems to have been a sly attempt to trap his captain into an admission by inference, asked Chambers “if he (Harman) would be permitted to keep the schout’s son in his watch.” But the captain avoided committing himself. “Not until he (Chambers) should have given orders to Harman,” he answered.

So, Harman was found guilty and directed to appear at the next session prepared to make public supplication for the schout’s forgiveness and to pay 50 guilders for distribution to the poor. When the time came, however, and he was told that everybody was waiting for him to begin, Harman declared that he would never submit to the sentence. In that event, the schout warned him, he would be conducted before the Governor “for the purpose of upholding the authority of the Honorable Court.” Reyndert Pietersen’s yacht was lying in the river ready to sail for New York. Just let Harman hear what he, Beeckman, would say to the Governor and what the Governor would say to Harman.

As Harman stubbornly stuck to his defiant position, Schepen Schoonmaker went to work on him, accusing him of having vilified both Chambers and him (Schoonmaker). To back up the accusation, he presented declarations by Reynier Van der Coele and Jacob Burhans, another Schepen, that they had heard Harman speak of Chambers and Schoonmaker as “rascals and liars.” Harman retorted that so had the two referred to him in uncomplimentary terms. But the court took cognizance of the new charges and instructed the schout to press them along with the others in his interview with the Governor. Then, with the expressed hope that Harman would have the sense to change his mind over night, the court called an “extraordinary session” for the next day.

It turned out that Harman had used the borrowed time to collect ammunition for rebuttal. His *first* shot was a declaration by Tjerck De Witt

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

that he had been present in Court-Secretary Mattheus Capito's house when Harman reported to Captain Chambers the fining of the schout's son for a delinquency and the captain had commented, "Just remember, for he (the schout's son) is no better than any other farmer's son." Asked to confirm or deny, Chambers admitted that he was correctly quoted. Harman's *second* shot was a declaration by Joost Ariaens that he had been at the home of Hendrick Martensen, one of Chamber's lieutenants, when Harman, as he was leaving, asked the captain about drawing the schout's son for the watch and the captain told him to do so, adding, "If Willem Beeckman is schout, his son shall not be any more exempt than has been my son." Chambers, invited to give his version, stated that his orders to Harman had been to draw all of the sixteen-year-old class.

The *third* shot was testimony by Jan Hendricks that he had heard Harman, standing in front of his own house, report to Chambers that he had twice warned the schout's son about standing guard and the captain had responded, "Just remember," and gone his way. Chambers conceded the truth of this. The *fourth* shot was testimony by Henry Pawling that, right in Lieutenant Schoonmaker's house, he had heard Captain Chambers order the lieutenant to draw the schout's son for the watch. To this, Chambers replied that his orders had been to draw all of young Beeckman's class. Pawling went on to say that, according to talk in the Rosecrans' house, Captain Chambers had specifically mentioned the schout's son and had assumed responsibility for possible trouble over the fine even "if he (Harman) took security therefor from the (Beeckman) house." Chambers said he had not thus committed himself. The *fifth*, and last, shot was a statement by Jannetje Hillebrandts, wife of Francis La Cheer, that Lieutenant Schoonmaker, at the house of Lieutenant Martensen, had remarked, "Why should not Beeckman's son watch as well as my son?" though she couldn't say to whom Schoonmaker was addressing the remark. Schoonmaker allowed that he might have made some such observation, but he couldn't imagine to whom he might have made it.

Having delivered his five rounds, Harman requested an official transcript of the minutes. The court granted the request but advised him that the judgment of yesterday stood unaltered and was now formally before him for compliance. Still grasping at straws, he made a "further request," that Chambers and Schoonmaker should be sent down the river with him

and Beeckman for the Governor's hearing. The court turned a deaf ear and took the opportunity to repeat its prediction of dire consequences for Harman if the case should reach the Governor.

That was it. Harman had fought to the last ditch; at least he had shown that he was the man in the middle. The schout and all three schepens were biased by self-interest, but the Governor would undoubtedly find it politic to uphold them. Why should a man with a large and needy family let his pride lead him to destruction; Harman took the travesty on justice in stride and, as the minutes tell it, he "comt int gevley met schuldbekentnisse voor haer" — he pleaded guilty in a vainglorious manner. Lightly acknowledging that it had been a mistake to lock horns with Schout Beeckman, he offered to let bygones be bygones if the schout would. "And thus," concludes the Court-Secretary, "they both, after shaking hands, buried their differences." As for the fine of 50 guilders, the court decided that "Harman Hendricks himself needs them."

Magdalena, who had been confined at a time when she might have testified for Pawling and her husband, was hardly back on her feet before she went to court as the complainant. On the Saturday after the Sunday on which her baby Anna was baptized, she was there accusing Annetje Adriaens of assault. Annetje had come to her house on the preceding day "with the intention of making trouble," said Magdalena, and, when she took hold of Annetje's sleeve to usher her outside, Annetje had flown at her and beaten her so that her "flesh became discolored." Annetje's story was that she had called to pay Jannetje, Evert Pels' wife, for a schepel of apples and a few words passing to and fro had led to a slight application of force. Jannetje Pels and Henry Pawling bore witness that Magdalena had given no cause for the "bad treatment" by the caller. The court admonished both parties and turned its attention to a complaint by sachem Pamirewackingh of damage to his maize crop by a settler's pigs.

Two months later, in December 1667, Harman was facing the bench as defendant again, but this time several other burghers were bracketed with him. The charge against the group was failure to close sections of stockade for which they were responsible. The magistrates postponed the case to give themselves time to inspect. In January 1668, Harman brought an action to compel his friend and neighbor, Francis La Cheer,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

to return two schepels of wheat that he had abstracted from a shipment of three consigned to Harman by Michael Ver Brugge. Decision was deferred pending word from the consignor. In February, Harman was sued for 14 guilders by Thomas Hall.

Then, in March, Magdalena gave the court something less run-of-the-mill to handle. She had been trying to trick Catryn Mattys, wife of Jan Jansen of Amersfoort, into admission of her husband's connection with the disappearance of some Rosecrans' linen. In the course of a discussion of a recent comet, which in those days was supposed to be an expression of God's dissatisfaction with the conduct of mortals, Magdalena had belittled some astrologer's opinion on the subject and had slyly brought in a reference to the missing linen.

"If he could say who stole your linen, then he must be able to say something else," Catryn had snapped, according to Magdalena's telling. "What else?" Magdalena had bridled. "Who should have stolen chickens and boards," Catryn had shot back. And Magdalena, taking this to be as it undoubtedly was — an insinuation that she too was a thief, had flatly told Catryn, "Your husband has stolen a board from our cool-house and your sister a pocket handkerchief of my husband."

Catryn's account of the give and take differed somewhat from Magdalena's. She had, said she, merely remarked, "If he (the astrologer) was able to say Wychert (Catryn's sister) had stolen linen, then he was able to say other things." Magdalena had been mistaken if she thought this an accusation. It was Magdalena herself who had first mentioned the board and the handkerchief; and, even after the provocation, she, Catryn, hadn't accused Magdalena of anything. Only "in a general way" had she inquired, "Those stealing chickens and boards, are they not thieves? — and those carrying handkerchiefs stolen of Mrs. Blom (the dominie's wife)?"

Henry Pawling, called as a witness by Magdalena and asked by her to state whence he had recovered linen stolen from her garden last winter, answered that he had picked it up in his own garden but he didn't know who had dropped it there; he knew only that it had been carried from Magdalena's garden by "somebody wearing Jan Jansen's shoes."

Jan Jansen, Catryn's husband, was a problem for the Wiltwyck authorities, mainly because of his abuse of his family, and they had tried to

solve it by ordering him to reside beyond village limits. Nevertheless, he was right in court for the hearing, and he rose at the mention of his name to demand proof that he had purloined a board from the Rosecrans' coolhouse to use in making his wheelbarrow. The court went off on a tangent to settle this point, and, finding nothing offered as evidence, directed Magdalena to appear at the next session with something to connect the Rosecrans board with the Jansen barrow.

When the time came and Jan Jansen stood waiting for Magdalena's presentment, she begged Pawling to give the testimony she knew he could. Pawling replied that he was not yet prepared to do so, but he would be at a later date and before the higher court, the General Sessions. The local magistrates, as usual, insisted upon maintaining jurisdiction till the issue could be decided; and Jan Jansen, assuming the offensive, summoned Magdalena and her witness to a later session.

The best that the two, now the defendants, could produce as proof of Jan Jansen's malefaction was Pawling's testimony that he had seen, on the day when Magdalena's linen vanished, traces of Jan Jansen's shoes in her garden going in the direction of his own, Pawling's; and that, on the next day, he had followed the traces to the house of Louys Dubois and found Jan Jansen there. The evidence against Jan Jansen was not conclusive in the court's opinion; Magdalena and Pawling were advised to come back with a stronger case or "be considered unjust accusers and be punished."

# **The First American Mrs. Rosecrans**

## **Part III**

*July, 1959*

“In case the gentlemen would like to get hold of the head, it is buried in Schepmoes’ cellar.”

Magdalena Dircks was doing the talking. It was in the Court of the Justice and the Overseers at Kingston in March of 1677, nine years after her bout at law with Jan Jansen of Amersfoort. There was now a jury of seven good men and true to do the fact-finding.

At last the long-standing friendship between the Rosecranses and Henry Pawling was at the end. He had charged Magdalena and her son-in-law, Leendert Cool, with slandering him by referring to him as a “knave” in the course of their gossiping. In so doing, “for the vindication of his reputation,” he had failed to reckon with the woman’s faculty for discovering the skeleton in his closet — or cellar — and for using bones, or anything else handy, for a weapon when she was cornered. Here she was, offering to reveal the corpus delicti which he had dissected and disposed of five and a half years since.

The build-up of sides for the final showdown had really begun back in 1668, when bad blood between Henry Pawling and Tjerck De Witt was generated by the former’s championing Mattys Blanchan, De Witt’s inveterate enemy. Blanchan sued three lot owners, Harman Rosecrans for one, to recover damages suffered through the impounding of his oxen; and the lot owners made counterclaims for damage done their gardens by the straying beasts, alleging that Blanchan let them run loose continually. De Witt, the official fence examiner, testified that the lot owners’ fences had been up to the mark, and accordingly the court held Blanchan liable for damages, pound fees and court costs.

Blanchan, a Walloon of “advanced age,” publicly denounced the Dutchman De Witt in such slanderous terms that he had to face the bench a week later to answer charges. Far from apologizing, he contended that the term “unjust” nicely fitted the man to whom he had applied it, for De Witt had unjustly confiscated a half anker (5 gallons) of brandy some five years before from Louys Dubois, the Walloon’s son-in-law, and in so

doing had victimized the real owner of the liquor, the Walloon himself. Moreover, De Witt had written to Governor Nicolls unjust complaints about Blanchan's mill. And De Witt's stamp of approval on the fence of "Harman the Portuguese," as the old Walloon styled Harman Rosecrans, was motivated by hatred of Blanchan, not by a sense of justice.

The Dutchman answered the tirade by blaming the mutual dislike on the Walloon. Hadn't Blanchan told people his mill wouldn't grind De Witt's grain if the Dutchman were starving; Didn't Blanchan's son-in-law, Jan Thyssen, sneer at De Witt every time he passed him; Yet he, De Witt, had once extinguished a guardhouse fire that would have spread to Blanchan's mill, notwithstanding the fact that he had to ship grain all the way to Albany because Blanchan wouldn't grind it for him.

Court minutes were searched and it was ascertained that De Witt's seizure of the brandy had been an official act, performed during his term as Schepen, after a charge of smuggling had been lodged against Louys Dubois. The magistrates held that reflections on the personal integrity of De Witt were therefore unwarranted, and they adjudged Blanchan guilty of slander, at the same time expressing a disposition to deal leniently with such an old man. Blanchan, however, would not bow to their verdict; he went on arguing that, even if De Witt had been an agent for the magistracy, he had been exceeding his authority, for he, Blanchan, knew positively that no smuggling charge had been made against his son-in-law. Schepen Chambers, to whom he appealed for verification of this point, said he couldn't recollect just what had occurred in a matter so long out of mind. No, he didn't remember Stuyvesant's asking him whether he drank any of the "stolen wine." And Schepen Burhans, to whom Blanchan then turned, said the tally sheets for 1663, when he was excise farmer, had been lost in the burning of the village by the Indians. And, to complete the discomfiture of the old Walloon, Roeloff Swartwout, who had been the Schout at the time of the brandy confiscation, came forward "for the vindication of his honor" and stated that De Witt had been doing his duty as a court officer.

In December 1668, two months after Blanchan's conviction of slander, De Witt filed a petition demanding remedial action in the case. It was more than his private concern, he said, for he had been a public servant when

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

he confiscated liquor and when he inspected fences. The court agreed with him. Dismissing Blanchan's defense as "frivolous," it sentenced him to confess his guilt, beg forgiveness of God and the magistrates, pay a fine of 600 guilders (\$240) in light money (grain or sewan) and be banished from Esopus for a year beginning "as soon as the river is navigable." His notice of appeal to the governor was suppressed with a denial pending compliance with the local court's sentence, and he was placed under arrest.

At this crucial juncture, Henry Pawling threw his weight upon Blanchan's side of the scales. Pawling was becoming a person of importance in Esopus, and Francis Lovelace, who was taking over the governorship from Richard Nicolls, or somebody close to Lovelace, was looking with favor on Pawling's rise. Not only did Pawling save the aged Blanchan from ignominious detention by offering his own body as security for the prisoner's surrender to the constable on demand, but he also stayed action against Blanchan by serving the court with an order from Lovelace before the ice broke up in the Hudson. In Lovelace's opinion the trespass by Blanchan's oxen had not been proved.

In the following September (1669), the old Walloon turned the tables on the Dutchman De Witt. A high commission had been appointed by Governor Lovelace to regulate affairs at Esopus, and Pawling, now Captain Pawling, was a member of the commission. In the course of its proceedings it granted Mattys Blanchan a hearing "to make good his petition against Tjerck De Witt." The outcome was a setting aside of Blanchan's banishment and a reduction of his fine by two thirds. On the other hand, De Witt was given short shrift on a claim for wages by an Indian he had employed; he was directed to pay in full and pay a heavy fine besides.

Both Pawling and De Witt were close friends of the Rosecranses. The former was so noticeably intimate that in January of 1671 Anna Mattys quoted to Magdalena the opinion of Sarah Roeloffs (daughter of the famous Anneke Jans and mother of Roeloff Kierstede, a local physician) that Magdalena was a whore. Wasn't it known all over town that "she received the fine clothing she wears of Pawling her lover?" And Anna added that she, too, held the same opinion. For this slander Magdalena brought Anna to book in court. Anna's excuse, that Magdalena had called her a

thief, apparently made the case a stand-off; but there was left in the records an impression of Magdalena as a woman militantly virtuous but fond of finery and personable enough to be suspected, by some other women, of a romantic attachment to a young man.

The grudge between Pawling and De Witt flared up into a fight in September 1671. Pawling's version, at the investigation of the incident, was that he had gone to cart grain from the Wassemaecker Stuck (Rainmaker Plot, once Stuyvesant's but now in part reassigned to Pawling, De Witt et al.) and De Witt had shouted at him, "Kill me, as you have done to my pig!" At that Pawling had shouted back, "If you are right, prosecute me according to law!" but De Witt, drawing a knife and approaching, had challenged, "If you are a man, stand firm!" Whereupon he had made a pass which came so close to Pawling's body that the blade severed his trusses and his breeches dropped about his knees. Pawling's counter-thrust in self-defense had naturally ensued.

Witnesses substantiated his story, but added a few details. One, unidentified, said De Witt had first asked Pawling to show him the pig Pawling had shot dead the day before; however, Pawling had denied the deed, claiming he hadn't fired a gun for a year. Also, the witness continued, De Witt had told Pawling he had heard the shooting and he would be revenged on "some Englishman" for the loss. Another witness, Harman Rosecrans, testified that, although he was not so very near at the time, he had heard De Witt cry out, "Kill me, as you did the pig!" Harman was apparently telling as little as possible. But his stepdaughter Marritje, now eighteen years old, added that she too had heard the cry, and also a cry of "Halt, man!" in Pawling's voice; and she had seen De Witt draw a knife and cut Pawling's coat, but get a knife stuck into his own ribs instead. Her stepfather, probably wishing to stop her before she said too much, was suddenly reminded to state further that the wounded De Witt had asked him to take him home.

That was it. De Witt, a notoriously irascible Dutchman, had evidently let his grudge mislead him and had met his comeuppance. Even he himself, seriously but not fatally wounded, allowed the record to stand without raising the question as to Pawling's guilt or innocence in the pig controversy. What, but punishment for slander, would he get if he should

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

accuse Pawling and not be able to prove his accusation; His friends the Rosecranses certainly would not back him. Magdalena assured him, when his wound had healed sufficiently for him to call on her, that his suspicions of Pawling were unjustified, for she knew that Pawling had bought a porker from Evert Pels just before the De Witt porker disappeared.

As it happened, De Witt had hardly left the Rosecrans premises before Magdalena discovered that he was right. Upon going down into her cellar to get bacon, she noticed that the brine in her pork barrel had a reddish hue and ascertained the cause to be the presence of fresh meat — skinned pork. Neighbor Pawling, she concluded, had shot De Witt's pig after all and, fearing a search of his own house, had carried parts of the carcass over to her house. Off she flew at once to find the culprit. "How could he, an officer of two villages, stoop so low," she asked him. All the answer she got was, "Go away, fool, go away!" But that evening he came to the Rosecrans habitation and removed the unwelcome donation of pork.

Magdalena undoubtedly reported her discovery to her husband. He may or may not have told her that he had known all along that Pawling killed De Witt's pig — known it from Pawling's own lips on the very day of the deed. In either case it behooved her to keep her mouth shut about the matter for the time being, for Captain Pawling was a present help in time of trouble and a storm was brewing right then; Harman's vendetta with Cornelis Wyncoop was coming to a climax.

It had begun in March 1669, when Wyncoop went to law to enforce a contract with Harman and one Jacob Jansen for chopping down trees on the Wyncoop farm at the new village (Hurley). The defendants did not dispute the obligation to fell trees; they disagreed with Wyncoop's definition of a tree, arguing that the "strivelle" (saplings of a diameter less than that of a man's leg) were not yet trees. The court's profound decision is not recorded, but it probably did not favor Harman and his partner, for he spoke slightly of Wyncoop thereafter. The result was a summons to court in May 1671 for referring to Wyncoop as a rascal and a "dick beesdt" (thick beast).

Heer Isaac Grevenraedt, a New York merchant recently installed in the

Kingston schout's office so that he might keep an eye on river traffic and spot dodgers of the city of New York's tax on commerce, conducted the prosecution for slander. Dirck Hendricks testified that Harman had spoken of Wyncoop in the alleged terms and had not been provoked by any slanderous words on Wyncoop's part, Wyncoop having merely said, "I have not yet been banished." Dr. Roeloff Kierstede and Hendrick Albertsen corroborated the testimony. Only Jan Jansen, the man of questionable character who had been Magdalena's adversary in the stolen linen case, supported Harman's contention that "thick bear" had been the epithet applied to Wyncoop and that the rejoinder to Wyncoop's taunt about banishment had been duly qualified, "I hold you for a rascal till you prove it."

"Scandalous words!" cried Schout Grevenraedt. "Insults to an honorable commissary!" It behoved the court, said he, to express its indignation by fining Harman a hundred Rix dollars and compelling him to beg forgiveness with bowed head and to confess humbly that nothing was known "about his (Wyncoop's) person but what is honorable and virtuous." And, "in the name of his Royal Majesty the Duke of York and the Very Noble Governor Lovelace," the court sentenced Harman to confess that, for all he knew, the said Wyncoop was "honorable" and "laudable" and to pay a fine Of 25 guilders with costs of 22 guilders, 17 stivers.

Harman and Magdalena were desperately staving off the old schout's attempts to collect this money in the fall of 1671 when their friends Pawling and De Witt were battling each other. The result of the latest attempt was more grist for the court's mill on January 16th, 1672. Although other business was on the docket, the opening of the session was delayed till Harman and Magdalena appeared with their attorney, Pawling, so grave an affront had Schout Grevenraedt suffered. As soon as the couple were facing the bench, the schout hurled his charges: Harman had called him, the court's officer, a "buck" and a "rascal" and had threatened bodily harm to him. Such conduct he said, could not be tolerated in a place "where justice is supreme."

Harman answered with an exhibition of conduct even more intolerable. Thundering that he had been given good reason for his actions, he strode fiercely up to Grevenraedt, grasped the handle of the sword which served

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

as a schout's badge of office, and dared the sword wearer to meet him in a duel outside.

When order was restored, the schout turned his fulminations on the Rosecrans of the weaker sex. Magdalena, he charged, had offered to break his head for him, right in the presence of another official, George Hall.

"Nonsense," scoffed the lady; she had passed some remark about heads, but it was merely that she had "been standing in the presence of grayer heads," and it was made only after this particular grayhead had cast the slur that he "could show what kind of woman she was by documents in his house."

Her alert attorney, Pawling, took the cue. A schout, he said, "had no business to tax her with the same, because she had served her sentence." And, to dramatize his contempt for Grevenraedt, he mockingly drew the old Schout's sword for him and asked him what his orders were. Justice Chambers adjourned the disrupted proceedings.

Captain Pawling had pressing duties as "Officer for Redress of Indian Injuries" at that time. Minisink emissaries had been reported to be in the Wawarsing area plotting with the remnant of the Esopus tribe. The captain must have taken Harman along on his mission, for in that same month, January 1672, Harman and young Hendrick Beeckman, the former schout's son, made a joint purchase from four Esopus sachems of a tract of land at Mombaccus (Accord, in Rochester township), which was on the Minisink trail running up the Rondout Valley. The tract was called "Easineh" (Stony Place) by the Indians. It embraced the Pieter Kill, a tributary of the Rondout Kill, and had possibilities as a mill site. The acquisition of it was probably the first bite into territory beyond Marbletown in the advance of settlers up the Rondout Valley.

Upon Harman's return to Kingston, he found out that Justice Chambers had put teeth in the judgment against him by issuing a writ of execution and attaching a penalty of sixty guilders for violations. Harman betook himself to court to protest that he had tendered payment of the original amount to the schout and the schout had refused to accept it. How so; why, he had offered to return to Grevenraedt stuff worth that much bought at Grevenraedt's store. This artful dodge the Justice would not

countenance; he ruled that the judgment must be satisfied with legal tender. The best he could do, said he, was to cut the penalty down to half.

Months later, however, the schout was still waiting for the money. Possibly the case was being referred to Governor Lovelace, for his records reveal a report to him by a confidential agent that Rosecrans and Pawling had been making a “show” of the Kingston schout. If so, Lovelace was preoccupied with affairs of much greater importance: resumption of the war between England and Holland was in the wind, and arrangements for the defense of New York had to be made. Harman’s name appears on the list of July 19th, 1672 as a subscriber of six schepels of wheat to the governor’s fund for repair of fortifications.

Schout Grevenraedt’s insinuations about Magdalena’s past were naturally echoed by mean people. Jan Pietersen, a fellow arrested at various times for such offenses as beating his wife, drawing a knife during a quarrel, and singing ribald songs on the Sabbath, added injury to insult when he met Magdalena out riding with her six-year-old daughter Annatje. She was goaded into action at his hectoring and expressed her resentment by throwing something at him. Summoned to court for slander and assault, Pietersen admitted he had said, “If I am a rascal, you are a whore,” but not till she had called him a rascal; and that he had “kicked her under her behind,” but not till after she “flew in his face.” But Gommerdt Paulesen, who had been crossing the dam where Magdalena was standing beside her carriage at the time of the incident, testified that he had heard Pietersen ask her, “Why does not your daughter ride along?” The little daughter interrupted the witness with a correction: Pietersen’s question had been, “You also have daughters, why don’t they also drive about?” Anyhow, the witness went on, Pietersen had said to Magdalena, “I haven’t been sent away with a ticket,” and it had been after this remark that Magdalena threw something at Pietersen. The magistrates fined Pietersen six schepels of wheat “because he has behaved disorderly on the public street.”

Corporal Rosecrans was undoubtedly among the hundred and fifty militiamen ordered to New York from outlying posts in the spring of 1673 when a Dutch fleet was rumored to be sailing northward from the West Indies, and ordered back to their posts when Governor Lovelace decided

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

that the rumor was just “one of Manning’s ‘larrums” (Manning was the Fort James commandant). The Kingston men had hardly reached home before a new rumor was circulated: twenty-one Dutch ships had entered New York harbor. Evert Pels, dispatched to New York in his yacht by the magistrates for a look around, found that the rumor was an understatement of fact: the Dutch had captured Fort James and New York was Nieuw Nederlandt again.

It is certain that Magdalena got down the river to New Orange, as New York City was renamed, to exult over the change of rule, for her tenth child, Dirck, named for her father, was baptized there in April 1674 under the sponsorship of her brother Volckert Dircksen, an official of the new Dutch regime, and her sister Annatje Dircks. Harman availed himself of the Dutch ascendancy at Swanenburg, Kingston’s new name, to request reimbursement by the court for expenses he had incurred in attending an English Court of Sessions, citing his success in recovering 24 of the 82 guilders from the New Dorp authorities. In another appearance before the Swanenburg court, he was aiding an Englishman by offering his person as security for the presence of one David Bishop when required at a later date.

The Rosecranses registered their resentment over the Dutch abandonment of the New Netherland territory in the Westminster treaty with the English in 1674. Willem Montagne, who was collecting money due the departed Dutch Lord Governor Colve, complained in January 1675 that “when he came to remind her (Magdalena) of the debt contracted at the vendue for the Lord Governor Colve on account of a cow she had bought, she hit him with her fist on his chest and said she did not intend to pay.” Harman backed her up in court, saying he wouldn’t put up the money. But he added, with a discretion born of experience, “until further orders”; and justice Chambers, once more in the saddle, promptly furnished the further orders, with court costs tacked on.

Yet, hardly four months afterwards, Harman laid himself open to another of the reversals so likely in legal controversy by accusing his neighbor, Jacob Govertsen, of defamation of character. The “difficulty,” Harman explained, had stemmed from a quarrel between Govertsen and another neighbor, Jan Lootman, over a load of manure which he, Harman, had

carted from Hendrick Schoonmaker's place and which he had promised to Lootman. While digging in his garden, he heard an exchange of angry talk, from which he learned that the manure was already spread over Govertsen's land. Then the wives of the rival claimants joined them: "I shall have the manure removed from Harman Hendrix's, he has given it to me," said Jannetje Hillebrants, Lootman's vrouwtje; "I have spread it all over the garden," returned Gertruy Jansens, the Govertsen helpmate. Feeling called upon to intervene, Harman went to the scene and asked Govertsen's wife why she had taken somebody else's property, and then gave her to understand that she would have to gather the manure together again and put it back where it had come from. The woman, laughing scornfully at the idea of her doing any such thing, provoked him into threatening "If I were near you, I'd kick your behind." Thereupon, her husband called out, "What does that whoremonger say there?" So, he, Harman, ran up to the husband, seized him by the shoulder and let him know that he, the "old rascal," would have to prove that Harman Hendrix was that kind of a man. While the scuffling was going on, Govertsen's wife closed in and "beat a hole in his (Harman's) head" with a stick of wood.

Harman's woeful tale resulted in a summons of the two couples to the next session. After hearing the Govertsen rendition, which must be inferred from the court's decision, Sheriff George Hall proposed a fine of 300 guilders for each party for abuse of the other. Justice Chambers delivered a dissertation upon the beauty of neighborliness and pointed it with penalties. The unneighborliness in this case had been about evenly divided, but still Harman had been "the originator of the quarrel, he coming on Jacob Govert's lot with a stick and beating him on his own ground, which is an affair of evil consequences." Therefore, Harman was fined one hundred guilders and Govertsen's wife twenty guilders. The manure was evidently left lying where she had flung it.

But Harman was forging ahead in spite of such setbacks. In July 1676, he was able to add to his landholdings "a certain small island" in the Great (Esopus) Kill which had formerly been "possessed by Juffer De Laet" and was now Suveryn Ten Houdt's. It was probably the same island that Harman had asked the court to confirm to him in February 1667,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

claiming that Stuyvesant had granted it to him and producing two witnesses — one of them Stuyvesant's bouwmeester, Juriaen Westphal — but the court had set aside the petition, holding that Stuyvesant, then on a mission to Holland, would be available sooner or later to give the answer. Stuyvesant returned to this country and lived till just before the recapture of New York by the Dutch in 1673; it is not likely that Harman neglected to appeal to him or that the appeal did any good. Harman paid Ten Houdt four hundred cans of merchantable rum for the island, "the whole to be delivered free at Kingston in the later part of November," and in due course Ten Houdt signed a quitclaim, "having been satisfied for the same from the first to the last penny." Then, Harman, as an owner of land on the far side of the Great Kill, became a party to the agreement for construction of a high bridge over the stream, with the cost shared proportionately to acreage served, allowances made for labor furnished, and fines levied for failure to close the bridge gate.

Meanwhile, Harman, familiar with the practice that gave rise to the term "Indian-giving," was carefully renewing each year, at some cost of presents to sachems, his Indian title to the land at Mombaccus, fifteen miles up the Rondout Kill, which he and young Beeckman had bought in January 1672. A tract of "an island in Rondout river, containing 73 acres, commonly called by the Indians 'Assincke Island,'" and an adjoining tract containing 16-1/2 acres were "laid out for Henry Bateman [Beeckman] and Herman Hendricks by Ro: Ryder, surveyor," under date of December 28th, 1676, according to the Calendar of New York State Land Papers. It was probably his share of this tract that Harman had rented out in December of 1672, for a two-year period at two hundred schepels of wheat for the first year and 223 for the second, to Jacob Jansen (Stoutenburg), his partner in the Wyncoop tree-chopping three winters before. Land bordering upon Harman's newly surveyed "Assincke" (Easineh) tract was purchased in March of 1677 by Leendert Cool, who had been married in 1672 to Harman's stepdaughter Marritje. The family group was beginning to turn toward this area on the frontier.

If Magdalena had been capable of keeping to herself indefinitely all that she knew about such an inviting subject of gossip as the murder of De Witt's pig in September 1671, she would not have been the Magdalena that the records have led us to envisage. Her son-in-law Leendert Cool

had been Pawling's hired man at the time of the foul deed, and sooner or later she compared notes with him. In the course of gossip over the years, the two let some tattler hear their opinion of Captain Pawling. The captain, more sensitive to aspersions since his marriage a half year since to a daughter of the spitfire Roosa, set the law in motion in March 1677, charging Magdalena and Leendert with slander.

At first, Magdalena sought to excuse her allusions to Pawling as a "knave" by claiming that he had spoken of her as a "thief" and had "caused discord between herself and her husband." When he denied that he had ever in his life been guilty of defamation of her character, she submitted declarations by two persons that they had overheard him saying to her, "You lie, you and your husband or your son have stolen it."

The court, now Anglicized to the degree of having a fact-finding jury to assist the Justice and Overseers, was not minded to let insult offset insult and to dismiss the complaint; the declarations had not mentioned what the stolen "it" was. The prying magistrates wanted to know the underlying factors, and they plied questions till Magdalena cried out that no credence was ever given to testimony on her side but anything to the contrary was accepted as gospel truth. Well, so be it! She went on. Henry Pawling was a pig stealer. And she "agreed to prove it."

Her first witness was Robert Bickerstaff, constable of Marbletown. He related how Pawling had come to his house and told of shooting a "hespan" (the Indian name for a raccoon) and had asked him to go along with Leendert Cool to bring in the dead animal. The constable remembered saying to Cool, after one look at the carcass covered with brushwood, "If this is a hespan, then the devil may fetch Pawling." And he had not forgotten his reluctance to help Cool load the carcass upon the cart for transportation to Pawling's gate: under the Duke's Laws, an accessory to a theft might get his ears cropped. Pawling entered a denial that he had sent Cool to fetch the carcass, but Cool contradicted him, arguing that, "whereas he was in Pawling's employ, the same forced him to fetch the same."

Then old Tjerck De Witt took the stand and placed on record his conversation with Magdalena in which, just after his knife duel with Pawling, she had disputed his belief that Pawling was the killer of his pig. Next,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

Harman Rosecrans testified that Pawling had admitted the pig killing to him on the very day of its occurrence; and that the fight between Pawling and De Witt on the following day had grown out of a quarrel begun with De Witt's demand, "Where is my sow you have shot; Here is the place where it has lain." Finally, Magdalena contributed an account of her foiling of Pawling's scheme to rid himself of the corpus delicti, concluding with the dramatic invitation to the gentlemen of the jury to visit the cellar of Schepmoes' house, formerly Pawling's, and inspect the sow's bones.

Supervised by Magdalena and vrouwtje Schepmoes, court officers dug into the designated cellar bottom and unearthed several small bones identified as the head bones of a pig. Vrouwtje Schepmoes, conducted to court, reported that other such bones had worked to the surface at the spot from which these were disinterred. Captain Pawling took exception to the admission of the evidence on the grounds that Magdalena and her son-in-law had become accessories after the fact by failing for so long a time to notify authorities. Sheriff Hall adopted Pawling's line of reasoning and proposed severe punishment of Magdalena and Leendert, whom he had now taken into custody by order of justice Chambers, "because," said the Sheriff, "they tax Pawling with having shot a pig on the wassemaecker's land and Cool has fetched the same to the house."

The decision of the court was not quite so one-sided, although its logic is hardly a pattern for modern jurists. It was: "The same has been hidden a long time, but if the same had been revealed in time it would have been more criminal, but now it is an affair of hatred and envy, because Maddalena Dircks has declared to Tjerck Claessen (De Witt) that Pawling was not guilty in the case. Therefore, it is ordered that Henry Pawling and Maddalena Dircks shall each pay 200 guilders and Leendert Cool 100 guilders in behalf of our sovereign the King."

To old Tjerck De Witt at least, maugre the crocodile tears he may have shed for his friends the Rosecranses, the outcome of the case must have been gratifying. Little did the old mortal know that thirty years later his grandson and namesake, Captain Tjerck De Witt, would be leading to the altar Anna Pawling, a daughter of Colonel Henry Pawling and one of the heirs to the 10,000-acre Pawling's Purchase and the 4,000-acre grant to Pawling's widow.

After the disastrous conflict with their old friend Pawling, Harman and Magdalena Rosecrans did not figure as principals in any litigation of consequence. The saving in fines and costs undoubtedly played a part in the improvement of their financial status, of which traces appear in the records. Also, some legacy may have been received from the estate of Magdalena's father, who died in 1675 or 1676: the name of Dirck Volckertsen is carried on the Boswyck (Bushwick) assessment-roll of August 18th, 1675, as owner of one of the larger farms in the "five Dutch towns of Long Island," but not on the roll of September 23rd, 1676. Anyhow, Harman was among the buyers at the auction in January 1678 of chattels of his deceased adversary Cornelis Wyncoop, making the high bids of 13 guilders for a table and twenty guilders, 13 stivers for a sow. He bought from Harmon Hekam "the savage" in March 1679 his "land, house, lot, stack and barn" at Marbletown, together with the "sowing of 11-1/2 schepels of wheat and 3 schepels of rye," the whole for 600 schepels of wheat or the equivalent, payable in four annual installments.

A glimpse at Harman's timber-cutting business is afforded by an item in an inventory made in February 1680 in connection with the transfer of ownership of an uncompleted house from Thomas De Laval to Hendrick Ten Eyck, brother-in-law of Wessel Tenbroeck (original owner of the State House at Kingston). "To the contract of Harmon Hendrix, 24 guilders; Harmon is obliged to cut and cart 5 beams, 3 woempties, 16 inches thick, 10 inches wide and 24 feet long." Associated with Harman Hendrix, "to cart the wood and stone necessary for making the cellar," was Jochem Hendrix, the eldest son of Hendrick Jochemsen Schoonmaker, another sometime adversary. And a ray of light on Harman's farming operations is cast by a court action brought against him in January 1681 by a hired hand, Evert Price, a former English soldier, to collect for a day's plowing, with Harman counter-claiming for bread baked and property damaged.

In the winter of 1683-1684, Magdalena did indulge in one more notable appearance in the Kingston court, though only as a witness for her old friend Aeltje Claes (Van Slegthenhorst), for whom she had obstructed justice twenty years before while Swartwout was schout. Aeltje was again in desperate straits in a struggle with the magistracy. The hateful minions of the law had just thrown out her suits against Thomas Harmensen and

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

Jan Keller for damages suffered because the one had not begun work as per agreement and the other had quit work contrary to agreement; the one claimed that materials had not been furnished and the other that he had been discharged. Her present suit was for the recovery of six sachel of wheat which, as she alleged, had been promised to her for surrendering a gun to Constable Fisher.

According to her story, a deputy constable named Ward had called at her home two or three times and demanded a gun which she had refused to give up, since Ward could not produce a court order. Then, one day as she was passing Constable Fisher's door, the constable himself had haled her, saying, "Here is a warrant," and she had delivered the gun to him, but only after obtaining his promise of compensation for damages to her garden by the Indian to whom the gun belonged. And now, said she, the constable has twice accused her of unlawfully withholding the gun from the savage, and her answer was that such a falsifier as Fisher was not fit to sit on the King's bench.

The constable admitted the truth of her story except for any promise of compensation; a warrant had finally been issued and was used to get possession of the gun, he said. So, the Court ruled that Aeltje had failed to prove her case and was therefore liable for costs. That wasn't all. For having accused the constable of being "not worthy to occupy the bench," she would have to "give security to enter suit against the Constable."

Flying into a rage, the old woman promptly added Overseer De Meyer to her category of unfit officials, and she cited three particulars in which he had erred during the proceedings. Firstly, when the constable, being a party to the case, had been about to stand aside, De Meyer said, "Sit down, Fisher!" and, his command having gone unheeded, he repeated it, "I say, sit down!" and, still not obeyed, he commanded for a third time, "I tell you to sit down!" causing Fisher to take a place on the bench improperly, since an interested party had no right to be a judge. Secondly, De Meyer, while acting as a judge, rose and stated, "I have myself said that you have taken the savage's gun," obliging her in sorrow to tell a judge, "You lie." Thirdly, De Meyer "falsely lied" again when he said, "The bed of carrots is not bigger than a bedstead," for as a matter of fact the carrot bed was a thirty-footer.

Aeltje then opened fire on Overseer De Meyer's associates on the bench — justice Chambers and Overseers De Witt, Tenbroeck and Whittaker — giving them to understand that she “did not esteem any of them.” It was beyond comprehension, said she, that judges could be so blind that they could not see that she wouldn't have surrendered the gun unless the constable had promised her compensation. To the question, “Are you willing to swear to that?” gotten in edgeways by Tenbroeck, she replied that she wouldn't swear how much had been promised her, but she could swear that it had been enough to cover damages to her garden, payable before the gun was turned over to anybody but herself.

Harking back to her unsuccessful suit against the workmen, Aeltje blasted the whole body of magistrates for its judgment in that case and ended up by singling out De Meyer. “Aeltje Slegthenhorst,” the court minutes report, “says that if she had the power she would tear the heart out of Meyer's body and cut it in four pieces and throw in every corner of the world one piece as an example for other judges, so that they shall pay more regard to their oath than does this Meyer.”

Overseer De Meyer naturally entered fresh charges and the court ordered Aeltje held in bail of twenty pounds sterling for trial at a later date. The trial did not take place for three months. During that interval Aeltje's husband died and the court blocked her efforts to collect 47 guilders owed him by Moses Du Puy, ruling that letters of administration must be presented before it could act.

Aeltje's first move, when the case came up, was to protest the bail bond on the grounds that Constable Fisher had coerced her into signing it; and she had the respected Hendrick Ten Eyck there to bear witness that she had objected to signing but Fisher had been drunk and dangerous. (Fisher was the English soldier who murdered a Dutchman in 1667 but was acquitted by order of Governor Nicolls.) Harman Rosecrans testified in corroboration that he had heard Ten Eyck say to Fisher at the time, “You drunken fool, you always come when you are full.” Nevertheless, the court decided that its constable had not been proved unfit for duty and he had properly executed its decree.

So, making her last stand, Aeltje called upon Magdalena Rosecrans to establish her right to the Indian's gun. Magdalena's testimony, as recorded,

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

was that: “Aeltje Slegthenhorst met her on the road and complained that her garden had been so badly ruined by somebody but she knew not by whom. Thereupon, she [Magdalena] entered her [own?] garden and found a drunken savage sitting in a tub with clothes and busy throwing the linen about. Magdalena asked him what he was doing there. He said he was looking for a shirt that he had lost. She asked him, the savage, by which way he had entered. He said, through Beeckman’s garden. She fetched the savage — *brought syde wilt*. Aeltje Slegthenhorst said, ‘Could the savage have opened the garden?’ They entered the garden with the savage. The savage admitted he had opened the garden on account whereof the damage had been done — *waer de schaedenoor was gekoomen*. Said Aeltje Slegthenhorst, she wanted to be indemnified for the damage, which was interpreted by Madalena Dirx. The savage asked how much damages she wanted. She answered, ‘six schepels of wheat.’ Then the savage said, ‘it is too much.’ And the savage said, ‘keep my gun till I have finished my work and when I shall have finished my work I shall pay you damages.’ And she was not to give the gun to anybody.”

The testimony shows that Magdalena spoke the Indian’s language well enough to make herself understood — with her French mother, Norwegian father, and English friends, she must have had a smattering of at least three more languages for use when the prevailing Dutch tongue was not understood — but the testimony did not alter the court’s opinion that Aeltje had been guilty of pretending damage to her garden and falsely claiming the Indian’s gun. For so doing, a fine of twenty guilders was imposed. That minor issue thus decided, the question of Aeltje’s strictures on the magistracy recurred; and the result as recorded by the secretary (with the vagarious spelling corrected) was as follows: “Whereas the plaintiff hath charged the constable and overseers of the court of Kingston that they would not do her right in an action of 7 guilders, and by balance of the account the defendant (in that action) doth appear to be no more but 3 guilders 4 stivers indebted, which debt the constable promised to be paid immediately as by evidence doth appear, therefore we find for the defendants and that the plaintiff shall pay to the defendants the sum of 30 guilders for wrongfully accusing of the court. The court approves the verdict of the jury, the plaintiff to pay all the charges.” On July 16th, 1684, Harman Hendrix Rosecrans, “husbandman of Kings-

ton in the county of Ulster,” gave a mortgage on his house and lot there to John De Laval, a merchant of New York, to assure payment to him of 100-1/2 schepels of winter wheat before the last of the next January, Indian corn to be acceptable at 3 guilders per schepel in lieu of half the wheat. The item is significant not only of Harman’s trading activities but also his gravitation toward his Mombaccus (Rochester township) property. His eight living children, ranging from twenty-five to ten years in age, were a great capital asset on a frontier farm with its self-sustaining economy, Dame Nature supplying free of charge all the education deemed necessary. His married stepdaughter lived on adjoining land. Other neighbors were making Mombaccus a community. In fact, the tide of settlement was flowing even farther up the Rondout Valley. In January 1683, a group of nine Kingston men — Wessel Tenbroeck, Henry Beeckman, Dirck Schepmoes, Jacob Rutgers, Jacob Aertsen (Van Wagenen), Jan Joosten, Thomas Garton, William De Meyer and Nicholas De Meyer — took the first step toward establishing a community at “Wawaresinck” by filing a petition for a grant of the land there.

Rumblings of the demand for representation of the people were beginning to be heard in the land. By decree of October 17th, 1683, Governor Dongan created a General Assembly for the Province of New York. In due course the Sheriff of Ulster County, Lieutenant George Hall, transmitted to the several towns thereof — Kingston, Fox Hall, Hurley, Marbletown, and New Paltz — the Governor’s instructions for the selection of four men from each town to meet at Kingston in November to choose two delegates to the Assembly, which was to meet in New York. This Assembly was purely an advisory body in the appointment of Overseers for the town courts. The General Court had the final say, and the members of the Court were all appointed by the Governor. So were the County’s Justices of the Peace.

A group of freeholders, Harman Rosecrans among them, petitioned the Governor on January 26th, 1685, for the right “to choice our owne officers to every towne court by the major vote of the freeholders,” so that the petty cases might be decided in the local court, inasmuch as small farmers were involved and costs of higher courts were too burdensome for such persons. The petition was considered to be an affront to his Majesty’s government, and the signers were summoned to a Court of Oyer

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

and Terminer sitting in Kingston in June 1686 to stand trial for “tumultuously and seditiously endeavoring and wholly intending” to subvert and destroy the laws, customs, and usages of the province by sealing and bringing in proposals contrary to the peace of their lord the King. All of the culprits except the principal one, Justice Chambers, pleaded guilty and paid fines of from 2 to 5 pounds, with costs of 4 pounds and 4 shillings each. The stiff-necked old justice stood upon “his county” and faced a jury, but he was convicted and sentenced to pay fifty pounds. Governor Dongan, having scored his point, found it politic to make amends to the county’s leading English citizen by granting him, three months later, a patent on three hundred more acres of the county and creating Foxhall Manor for him.

“Herman Henderiexson” was still carried on the roll of active militia for 1686-1687, among the foot soldiers of Captain Thomas Person’s Company. His eldest son, “Alexander Roosenkrans,” was now serving in Lieutenant Wessel Tenbroeck’s Company of mounted men. And both the old “Harrama Hendricks” and the young “Sander Roosenkranc” were included in the list of adult males who — jubilantly no doubt — took the oath of allegiance on September 1st, 1689, to the new King and Queen of England, the Dutch William of Orange and the English Mary Stuart. James II, the former Duke of York who had ruled New York, had been ousted.

Magdalena Dircks lost her sturdy husband on, or not long after, June 25th, 1692, when “sick in body” he made his will; Doctor Roeloff Kierstede and son-in-law Humphrey Davenport witnessed his signature. Harman bequeathed his entire estate to his “well-beloved wife Maddaleen,” stipulating that half of it must be divided among their children if she should marry again. His stepdaughter, Mary Cornelisz (Cool), might be considered one of their children. His eldest son, Alexander, was to have fifty schepels of wheat added to his share.

The durable Magdalena survived him by thirty-three years or more. In 1697, she and her son Alexander as executors deeded a plot of Mom-baccus land to Moses Du Puy, Alexander’s future father-in-law. In 1699, she filed a petition for confirmation of land grants made to her deceased husband during his lifetime. In a year unspecified but apparently later than 1703, she and Marinus Van Aken applied for a warrant of survey for

a piece of land on the south side of Rondout Kill in Rochester township. In 1703, she made her seventh and last recorded appearance as witness at a Kingston Church baptism, that of her daughter Christina Kortright's first child. But she must have been still alive in January 1726, when her unmarried daughter Sara, making her will, devised her property to her "dear mother Magdalena Rosenkrans" as tenant for life.

Now, to garnish the factual with a sprig of family tradition, let me record a conversation I had a few years ago with a Rosecrans who was custodian of Sam's Point, a peak near Ellenville, New York. I ventured a "guess" that his family had lived in that locality "from way back," and he nodded that I was right. "As far back as when Sam jumped from the cliff to escape from the Indians?" I asked. "Yes," the man replied, "they say that the first Mrs. Rosecrans, when she was very old, had a big bunch on her neck and, knowing how Indians dreaded physical deformities, she used to rush out at any Indians prowling about the place and shoo them away by pulling out the bunch." That sounded like the Magdalena of the records, ancestress of a host of America's fighting men, including Colonel John Rosenkrans of Revolutionary War fame and William S. Rosecrans, a famous Civil War general.

---

Here follows a brief outline of the early generations of the Vigne Family to which Magdalena Dircks belonged.

Guleyn(1) Vigne died in 1632. He married, as her first husband, Ariaentje Cuvilje who died in 1655. Both were Walloons from Valenciennes, France, and their family was one of the first to be established in New Netherland. Ariaentje married (2nd), Jan Jansen Damen of Bunick who died in 1651. She and Guleyn had four children:

i. Maria(2) married (1st), Jan Roos of Haarlem and (2nd), Abraham Isaacs Verplanck of Edam. She had ten children, one by her first husband and nine by the second:

(a) Gerrit Jansen(3) Roos born — ; married (1st), Aeltje Lamberts and (2nd), Tryntje Arents in 1659.

(b) Abigail(3) Verplanck born — ; married Adriaen Van Laer.

(c) Guleyn(3) Verplanck born in 1637; married Hendrickje Wessels in

## The First American Mrs. Rosecrans

1668.

(d) Catalyna(3) Verplanck born — ; married David Pictersen Schuyler in 1657.

(e) Isaac(3) Verplanck born in 1641; died young.

(f) Susanna(3) Verplanck born in 1642; married Marten Van Waert in 1660.

(g) Jacomyntje(3) Verplanck born in 1644; died young.

(h) Ariaentje(3) Verplanck born in 1646; married Melgert Wynantsen Van der Poel in 1660.

(i) Hillegond(3) Verplanck born in 1648; married David Ackerman.

(j) Isaac(3) Verplanck born in 1651; married Abigel Uytten Bogaardt.

ii. Christina(2) married Dirck Volckertsen the Norwegian and had seven children who took the name of Dircksen:

(a) Sara(3) Dircksen born —

(b) Grietje(3) Dircksen born — ; married (1st) Jan Harmensen Schut from Lubeck in 1649; (2nd) Jan Nagelfrom Limburg in 1652; and (3rd), Barent Gerritsen from Swol in 1658.

(c) Magdalena(3) Dircksen born —; married (1st) Cornelis Hendricksen from Dort, in 1652, and (2nd) Harmen Hendricksen Rosecrans from Bergen in 1657.

(d) Rachel(3) Dircksen born — ; married Jan Escuyer from Paris in 1663.

(e) Volckert(3) Dircksen born in 1643; married Annetje Phillips.

(f) Ariaentje(3) Dircksen born in 1650.

(g) Jannetje(3) Dircksen born in 1653.

iii. Jan(2) born in 1614; married Emmmentje Goosens Van der Sluys and died in 1689. They had no children.

iv. Rachel(2) born — ; died in 1663. She married Cornelis Van Tienhoven of Utrecht (who died in 1658) and had the following children:

(a) Lucas(3) Van Tienhoven born in 1649; married Tryntje Bordings.

(b) Cornelis(3) Van Tienhoven born in 1653; died young.

(c) Johannes(3) Van Tienhoven born in 1655.

(d) Jannetje(3) Van Tienhoven born in 1657.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

The material in the preceding articles has been based largely on the translated but unpublished hand-written Court minutes of Esopus, Wiltwyck, and Swanenburg on file in the Office of the Ulster County Clerk in Kingston, New York. In addition, the following standard references were used:

Anjou, Gustave. Ulster County, New York, Probate Records, 2 vols.

Fernow, Berthold. Calendar of Wills on File and Recorded in the Offices of the Court of Appeals of the County Clerk at Albany and of the Secretary of State, 1626-1836; Documents relating to the History and Settlements of the Towns along the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers; Documents relating to the History of the Dutch and Swedish Settlements on the Delaware River; The Minutes of the Orphanmasters of New Amsterdam, 1655 to 1663, 2 vols.; The Records of New Amsterdam from 1653 to 1674, 7 vols.

Hastings, Hugh. Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, 7 vols.

Hoes, Roswell, R., Baptismal and Marriage Registers of the Old Dutch Church at Kingston, Ulster County, New York.

O'Callaghan, E. B. Calendar of Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of State, Albany, New York, 1630-1776, 2 vols.; The Documentary History of the State of New York, 4 vols.; Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, 11 vols.

Van Laer, Arnold J. F. Court Minutes of Albany, Rensselaerwyck, and Schenectady, 1668-1685, 3 vols.; Court Minutes of Fort Orange and Beverwyck, 1652-1660, 2 vols.

Abstracts of Wills on File in the Surrogate's Office, City of New York, 1665-1800. New-York Historical Society Collections, 17 vols.

Baptisms of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York, 1639-1800. New York Genealogical and Biographical Society Collections, 2 vols.

Calendar of New York Colonial Manuscripts indorsed Land Papers, 1643-1803.