

Pension Application for Jacob Lawyer

R.6209 (Widow: Anna) Jacob and Anna married April 20, 1777. Jacob died July 5, 1823. Jacob was accused of being a Tory.

State of New York

Schoharie County SS

On this 28th day of May in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty nine, personally appeared before the undersigned one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas of the County of Schoharie and State aforesaid, Anna Lawyer a resident of the town of Schoharie in the County and State aforesaid, in the seventy eighth year of her age who being first duly sworn, according to law, doth, on her oath, make the following declaration, in order to obtain the benefit of the provision made by the act of Congress, passed July 4, 1836.

That she is the widow of Jacob Lawyer, Junior, who was a soldier in the Revolutionary War. That he enlisted in the service, at Schoharie, in the year 1776, and she thinks it was in Captain Bradt's company, but what regiment she does not know.

She recollects he enlisted in the time of Pea harvest, and believes it was in August of that year. That after he enlisted he sent to Schenectady, and where he went to from there she is unable to State.

That he was a Lieutenant of said company, and served in it as such till the month of April following.

That sometime in the summer of 1777, he entered the service again and went to Fort Edward and was gone, she thinks, as much as five weeks but whether he served as a private or not she does not know. She remembers[remembers] when he returned they were pulling flax.

That he was in the service at various times up to the close of the war, but she is unable to state the number of times he was called out and how long he was in the service each time, nor can she state whose company he was in each time but thinks he served some of the time in Capt. Stubrach's company in Col. Bowers regiment. She recollects he was in the service at the Fort in Schoharie in October 1780, the time Schoharie was burnt, thinks he served that time as many as seven days and believes it was in Capt. Stubrach's company, in Col. Vromen's Regt.

That in the year 1781, she understood he went from Schoharie to Fort Hunter but in whose company she doesn't know nor does she recollect how long he was absent at that time, and whether he went as a private or not she does not know.

She further declares that she was married to the said Jacob Lawyer, Junior, on the 20th day of April in the year seventeen hundred and seventy seven, at Schoharie aforesaid; that her husband the aforesaid Jacob Lawyer, Junior, died on the 5th day of July 1823 and that she has remained a widow ever since that period, as will more fully appear by reference to the proof hereto annexed. (Signed) Anna Lawyer

Sworn to, and subscribed, on the day and year above written before me. Harvey Watson, one of the Judges of Schoharie County Courts.

Schoharie N.Y. March 26, 1847.

Sir;

In June 1839, I enclosed to you the application of Mrs. Anna Lawyer for a pension for the revolutionary service of her husband Jacob Lawyer, Jnr. Her marriage and his services were proved and your final objection to allowing a pension was contained in a letter to me, dated August 6, 1840, in which you stated "that from recent information received, it appeared that the claimants husband was, at the time of his alleged service, a tory. Her claim therefore could not be allowed". It was in proof by several witnesses that Lawyer was in the 9 months service in 1776, as a Lieutenat in Capt. Bradt's Company, and the Military Rolls prove the same fact, and to say he was a tory at the time of his alleged service is believing the vague assertion of a person of doubtful veracity, in preference to positive testimony and record evidence. I was not, however, satisfied with this decision and went on and obtained farther proof in the case, and before I was ready to send on the affidavits, I was enquired of by a relation of Mrs. Lawyer, how I came on with her pension case, I answered I thought I should record, he replied that she ought not to receive a pension, and his reason was, in substance, that she gave and [?] comfort to the enemy; and on reflection I thought, probably, what he said might be true as she was a daughter of Capt. George Mann, who in 1777 (I think it was) after addressing his company on the propriety of going over to the enemy, he concluded by saying "Who is in favor of King George follow me", and immediately left his company. He was afterwards arrested and confined in jail for a long time, and Mrs. Lawyer, his daughter, was then living at the house of Johannes Lawyer, her father-in-law, about a mile and a half from the fort in Schoharie. This Johannes Lawyer, father of Jacob Lawyer, Jr. was a tory around whose house the enemy were congregated at the time Schoharie was burned, in 1780, this house was not burned but is yet standing and is now owned by one of the grand children.

The widow Lawyer died in this house about four years ago, leaving one child only, who also died about two years ago, leaving children. These grandchildren are about applying for their grandmothers pension, or have already applied. A Mr. Arad Jug of Seneca Co., N.Y. about 150 miles from this place, wrote to a gentleman here to know if the Widow was yet living and if dead whether she left any children? And being answered that none but grandchildren were living he proposed by letter, to obtain this pension for them, and is now employed by therein for that purpose, as I am informed, and has ere now pursued their claim, and will perhaps seemed, if the grand children are entitled to it, for Mr. Jay is very successful as would appear by his handbills in which he says.

"Those who have tried and failed to obtain a pension need not despair if they trust their case to his hands, as he has within a year obtained some 50 pensions, in cases where they had, after a trial of several years, been given up". And he further says he has been in the habit of going to Washington several times a year—and having an agent there who has had 10 or 15 years experience in the Pension Office adds not a little to his success." &c.

I Could not imagine how Mr. Joy living about 150 miles from the Widow Lawyer's residence should know anything about her, or her application.—And how he should have known about the application of Widow Amie Wasson living about 100 miles off, I could not see but when I read his handbill I was not at a loss to conjecture how he got his information. In the case of Mrs. Wasson I had expended about \$15 in trying to procure Record evidence of her marriage, and in causing the church and town records of Middletown, Connecticut to be examined and the result to be certified by affidavit, and also in sending to the State of Michigan for proof. The marriage however, was proved by her Brother who was present at the time of the marriage, and the age of one of her sons was got as circumstantial evidence; but all to no purpose, for you stated in your letter of July 25th 1844, "That neither the service of her husband nor the proof of her marriage had been satisfactorily established."

An in your letter of August 10, 1844, you conclude by saying "her claim was [?] unfounded."

Now, her husband John Wasson was a pensioner of about \$100, a year, and if the evidence he addressed was sufficient to entitle him to a pension I cannot see why that evidence was not good in her case. But be that as it may, I am glad she got her pension, for she was entitled to it.—When Mr Jay got the business in his hands all objections must have vanished, for he could not have produced any further evidence of her marriage, that is certain, for there was no record of it, and there was no person living who was present at the marriage but her brother who had already testified to it. And I have no reason to believe that Mr. Jay addressed any additional evidence of her husbands service, yet it appears a pension was allowed without any apparent difficulty, and a pretty large one too, of which, I am told, Mr. Jay kept one half; a very exorbitant exaction for the small service he rendered even if he had to divide that half with his agent yet it does not help the matter. There has been something wrong in this transaction, as would appear from a comparison of all the facts in the case.

Now in relation to the claim of the grandchildren of Anna Lawyer I have nothing more to say than I have said, but if you should wish the name of the gentleman that informed me of her infidelity which caused me to abandon the case I can give it.
Yours respectfully Elias Holliday.

James L. Edwards Esq.