

**Pension Application for Henry Rosman or Rossman**

W.17544 (Widow: Catharine)

No deposition by either Henry or Catharine in this folder.

Hudson N.York Jan 12<sup>th</sup> 1842.

Wheeler H. Clark

Hudson N York

Sir.

I send you enclosed the application of Mrs. Margaret Rase, sole surviving child of Henry Roman and Catharine his wife.—Mrs. Rase formerly applied with Stephen Rosman and other children of Peter B. Rosman & your letter of 17<sup>th</sup> May 1841 relates to it. It is requested that application & and [sic] the proofs herewith be annexed hereto and that the claim be examined with refund to the whole proofs now offered. The proofs then sent consisted of an old pay roll of Captain Robinsons Company in Colonel Johannes Hardenburghs regiment in July and August 1776 and the proof is that he served and was at the battle of White Plains in October 1776.

This would make 4 months, as sergeant in 1776—George Denniger's testimony proves this service to which please refer. It also contains proof of his serving in 1780 at Fort Edward under Henry Livingston, Colonel, this tour was 4 months see the depositions of Jacob Spanburgh and George Spanburgh and George Denniger. They both testify to this and the rolls show that they were under Livingston at the same time in 1780. That application also contained a claim for services in 1775.

The present application contains the Comptrollers certificate that Henry Rosman served in Willett's regiment in 1782. L13.15.6. and the reason this was not stated in the former application was because the service could not be found where it ought to have been and the comptrollers certificate will show that there was a mistake made in transcribing. The old Lady in her lifetime stated a 9 mos. Service and she always insisted that her husband served until the war ended.

She also stated that her husband went to Quebec with Montgomery and the letter enclosed will show that on the 10<sup>th</sup> August 1775 he was in Henry B. Livingston's Company. Was this Henry Rosman the husband of the late Catharine Rosman applicants mother; Henry B. Livingston was from the northern part of Dutchess County adjoining the Manor of Livingston, where Henry Rosman resided. Henry B. Livingston was related to those Livingston's who were the owners of the Manor of Livingston, where Rosman lived. These circumstances with the fact that the old lady in her lifetime alleged her husband served with Henry B. Livingston, land my letter to Mr. VanRensselaer to which the enclosed is an answer, was an application to Mr. VanRensselaer to look among Genl Montgomery's papers (as I had heard he had them) for Henry Rosman.

The services of 1782 are continued in the enclosed certificate of the Comptroller. The identity is proven by Peter Winter a pensioner, who is allowed for these same services. Peter Winter is a credible witness, and as to his memory your will be able to Judge if you examine his statement made by him to procure his own

pensions. They were from the same section of country and served in the same company & at the same time.

With regard to the period of their marriage I would remark that George Denniger and Jacob Spanbush both say he was married to said Catharine Rosman in 1780 when they were all in service together. I cannot find any other testimony more conclusive than that already given. I can only find testimony that would be cumulative. I have no doubt myself but that they were married in 1774 from what I have observed in the process of the investigation.

The records of the Church at Johnstown as will be seen by my statement heretofore made, shew that the records would contain the marriage if it took place after 1782. I think I am right in this statement. From my recollection those records have a hiatus from 1770 to 1780, I may not remember directly I therefore refer you to my former deposition or statement.

The circumstances amounts to this, that if they were married by the minister of the church whose records are now found, and then be on Hiatus in those records occurring at the time of the alleged marriage and the marriage be not found on those records either before or after that Hiatus then the inference is that the marriage must have been at some time in that Hiatus. The Hiatus includes the years 1773, 1774, & 1775 & after from the time of the marriage was stated by the old lady & by the applicant before those records were found by us and before they were consulted by us as & before we know that they contained this Hiatus. This it is true is circumstantial evidence; but the circumstance is a stronger & then connected with the positive evidence we have no doubt will be considered sufficient.

It is not claimed that the evidence in this this [sic] case as regards all the services alleged & claimed and the marriage is of the highest character and entirely positive, but still it is considered that taken together it will be found satisfactory and the best that could be procured in this case.

#### Recapitulation

First Services from July 8<sup>th</sup> 1775 to March 1776, Montgomery's Campaign – Say 8 months @ \$6.66----\$53.28.

Second tour from July to Nov 4 months as Sergeant at \$10 per month----\$40.00  
4 months services In 1780 @ \$6.66-----26.64.

Services in 1782 £13.15.6 -----34.43

Total \$154.35

One half of \$154.35 is the sum of \$77.17 per annum from March 4, 1831 to Nov 1838 the time of Catharine Rosman's death.

All which is respectfully submitted. Respectfully yours, Wheeler H. Clarke  
To: Hon. J. L. Edwards