

**Date:** Tue, 18 Aug 2009 08:52:40 -0400 **From:** E Johnson <[iris.gates@gmail.com](mailto:iris.gates@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** [DUTCH-COLONIES] Marten de/van Waert, Jacobus de Waert

There was recently a discussion about Susanna (Isaacs) Verplanck and her various husbands, her children and family. I was interested of course, since Susanna ended up in Delaware, near where many of my grandmother's ancestors lived, beginning in the Dutch era.

Susanna Verplanck's first husband was Marten van Waert (surname spelled variously). Because there was an oddity or unexplainable name in Susanna's second husband's will (1675 will of John Garland), it prompted me to go over the case of Marten van Waert aka de Waert (Waert, Weert, etc), and just for now I have one question about him. I will have more questions later, but wanted to put this question apart.

My question is:

There was a Jacobus de Waert, a married man, who appears a few times in court in New Amsterdam in the 1650's. In the last mention of him, it's noted that he had sold his household goods and departed on November 4, 1654, and a few years later he was said to be deceased.

In the following decade, a son of Marten de/van Waert and Susannah Verplanck was baptized in January 1664, only a few months after her return to New Amsterdam. This son was called Jacobus.

Was Jacobus de Waert (the adult) related to Marten van Waert or de Waert and his son Jacobus, or not??

The baptismal witnesses for Marten de/van Waert and Susannah Verplanck's son Jacobus don't shed any light on my question.

Marten van Waert seems to have been known both as "de Waert" and "van Waert." He was said to have been a hatter [need source of this]\* and his marriage record in NADRC says he was from Utrecht. The index to Utrecht notarial archives does not turn up his name. He was banished from New Netherland late in 1661 for a series of thefts. Susanna and a child returned in 1663.

New Amsterdam court cases concerning Jacobus de Waert appear in RNA i: 141, 198-199, and in RNA iii:10. He probably departed from New Amsterdam around November, 1654.

The first court case in December 1653 had Matewis (Mattheus) de Vos, plaintiff, against Jacob de Waert, both in default. [RNA i:141] The second case in May 1654 concerned Matewis de Vos, plaintiff, against Beeltje Jacobsen, defendant. This case concerned de Vos' demand for payment of fl. 9 and change, for shoes and stockings and "a line" (whatever that is), which de Vos said were not paid for, and which Beeltje Jacobsen said indeed were paid for, by doing washing and in about fl. 3 worth of peaches. The court ruled in favor of Beeltje, and said that de Vos had to pay for the peaches, and his case, if any, should be against Jacob de Waert, rather than against Beeltje. [RNA i:198-199 --full abstract follows below]

Jacobus de Waert was a baptismal witness once, for Jan Hendrickszen's daughter Lysbeth in NADRC on Nov 16, 1653. The other witnesses were Jan Janszen de Jong and Cornelia de Jong.

In September 1658, Mattheus de Vos, attorney of Paulus Leendersen van der Grift, (plaintiff) was in court against Anthony Clazen Moor (defendant), in which de Vos for van der Grift demanded payment for "book debts exhibited in Court, in favor of Jacobus de Weerdt." There was the usual argument about whether the debts were valid, and Anthony Clazen Moor claimed "that Jacobus de Weert and his wife are dead and the estate is vacant," after which proof was demanded for this statement. The court decided that "the procuration dated 27 July 1654 executed before the Notary Dirck van Schelluyne and certain witnesses in favor of Burgomaster Paulus Leendersen vander Grift is valid, the rather as Jacob de Weert at his departure the 4th Novembr 1654, ceded, transported and conveyed to Melchior Herssele all

his furniture and all his goods; item, his outstanding debts, actions and rights, effects and goods; and all that he the assignor had in the world according to copy of deed." Melchior Herssele, for whom de Vos and van der Grift were acting, was trying to collect a debt that Anthony Clazen Moor owed to Jacobus de Waert. Moor was held responsible for the debt unless he could prove otherwise. [RNA iii:10]

The above case is only germane to my question because Jacobus de Weerdt, as he's called here, and wife (whoever she was), are said to have left New Amsterdam in 1654 and are said to be dead by Sept. 1658.

I guess I have a bonus question. Was Beeltje Jacobsen the wife of Jacobus de Waert, or was she otherwise related to him? In the 1653 case of the peaches and the washing, since Mattheus de Vos was told that if he had any demands, they should be against Jacobus de Waert and not Beeltje. That makes me think they were probably man and wife. Is that so?

Again my original question: was Jacobus de Waert related to Marten de -or van- Waert of Utrecht, first husband of Susanna Verplanck, whose son together was baptized as Jacobus?

Thanks very much, Liz J

\* Mention of trade "hatter" here: <http://archiver.rootsweb.ancestry.com/th/read/dutch-colonies/1999-10/0939820531>

RNA iii:10: Mattheus de Vos, as att'y of Burgomast' P. Leendersen van der Grift, pltf. v/s Anthony Clazen Moor, deft. Pltf. by virtue of a power as substitute of Burgomaster Paulus Leenderzen Vander Grift, demands, that deft. shall admit or deny the handwriting and book debts exhibited in Court, in favor of Jacobus de Weerdt or his assigns. Deft. says, he wishes first to see the qualification. Pltf. replies, as the deft. refuses to admit or deny the handwriting and book debts, that the monies thereof be sequestered. Deft. again demands qualification, to whom he shall render due a/c, and says, that Jacobus de Weert and his wife are dead and the estate is vacant. Pltf. demands proof thereof. The Court decides, that the procuration dated 27 July 1654 executed before the Notary Dirck van Schelluyne and certain witnesses in favor of Burgomaster Paulus Leendersen vander Grift is valid, the rather as Jacob de Weert at his departure the 4th Novemb~ 1654, ceded, transported and conveyed to Melchior Herssele all his furniture and all his goods; item, his outstanding debts, actions and rights, effects and goods; and all that he the assignor had in the world according to copy of deed. Was signed, J. van de Ven, Not~ Pub: And Melchior van Herssele advises Burgomaster Paulus Leendersen van der Grift in his letter dated 16th March, 1656, wherein he writes and sees and finds, that Antony Claesen Moor is still indebted, hoping that the same shall be paid; hopes also the other debtors have paid; if not it remains with your Hon~, who recommended it, to act as with your own debts: —It is therefore decreed as before, that the procuration is good, unless Anthony Clasen Moor can bring some later letters contradicting these.

**Date:** Tue, 18 Aug 2009 16:59:05 -0400 **From:** "Joan Sholl Francis" <[Nowone2@ptd.net](mailto:Nowone2@ptd.net)>  
> **Subject:** Re: [DUTCH-COLONIES] Marten de/van Waert, Jacobus de Waert *References:* <70541d1e090818055217d2db7een1a41ced93a4764d9@mail.gmail.com>

Dear Liz, here's one note re. "hatter" and some other van Waert tidbits. Joan

Found In: The New York genealogical and biographical record, Volume 41, THE DUTCHER FAMILY. TO THE BIRTHS OF THE 5TH GENERATION, WITH A FEW NOTES AS TO SUBSEQUENT MEMBERS, AND AS TO THE ANCESTORS OF ALLIED FAMILIES. ALSO, THE REVOLUTIONARY MEMBERS. Walter Kenneth Griffin, B.Sc., London, B. A., LL.B.

Pgs. 49 - 50 The descent of Maria's husband through the Van Weerts, a family repeatedly connected with the Dutchers, affords me the pleasing opportunity of correcting, in a note, the error of Bolton's Westchester Co., 2d. ed., 309, 541, and of the usually precise Riker (Riker's Harlem, 2d ed., 101 note). The Van Weerts of Tarrytown were not descended

from Marten van Waert, the hatter of Utrecht, kleptomaniac and petty sneak thief, and snapper up of silver spoons at weddings. They descend from Jochem Wouterszen, possibly the "Jochem van Goede," and later "van Waert."\* Nicholas Storm lived at the present Elmsford, and at his house Gen. Schuyler had his headquarters, Oct., 1776, while the Continental Army lay at White Plains. After Marytje's death, Nicholas m. 6 Dec., 1755 (T. M., 294), Engeltie Storm, dau. of Thomas Storm, and widow of Jacob Buys, and had, among others, Rachel Storm, bap. 16 June, 1760 (T., 1686), who (T. M., 438) m. Isaac Van Weert,\* so prominent as a captor of Major Andre. Issue, by Maria Dutcher: \* Van Weerts (van Waerd, van Waert, van Waert, etc.) of Tarrytown. Many Hollanders took at Tarrytown, for the first time, a family name of record, or changed their previous geographical names; e.g.: the Rikers who became known as Kranckheits. Jochem Wouterse, possibly "van Goede" (i. t. Gouda), cons. Bergen's Early Settlers, 394, became "Van Weert." Jochem, possibly the Jochem b. 1637, of Flushing and Midwout, 1667-1683 (id.), m. Christina Janse. With his wife N. Y. Dutch Church members, 1 June, 1676. At Philipsburg, 1693 or earlier. Early Tarrytown members (T., pp. 6 and 7). Jochem an elder in 1699 (T., p. 18, note). Children, among others probably:[ etc.]

Isaac Van Weert's genealogy has never been correctly given. Baptized 25 April, 1758 (T., 1612), son of Martynus Van Weert, who 7 Oct., 1752 (T. M., 255), m. Rachel Williams. Martynus, b. 17 April, 1733 (T., 772), son of Abraham Van Weert, who 23 Aug., 1729 (T. M., 79), m. Aantie Mey, b. in Germany. Abraham, b. 21 March, 1710 (T., 192), son of Gerrit Joachimse Van Weert and Catalyntje Conckling, for whom see preceding Van Weert note, and under No. 11.

**Date:** Tue, 18 Aug 2009 17:45:19 -0400 **From:** E Johnson <[iris.gates@gmail.com](mailto:iris.gates@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: [DUTCH-COLONIES] Marten de/van Waert, Jacobus de Waert *References:* <70541d1e090818055217d2db7een1a41ced93a4764d9@mail.gmail.com> <DFD7FAD60F7C404995B1C2A44FDB843B@JoanPC> *In-Reply-To:* <DFD7FAD60F7C404995B1C2A44FDB843B@JoanPC>

Thanks Joan.... got it.

Riker's Harlem contained a note on p. 101, concerning Pierre Cresson who came to N-N on de Bever 1659. The note mentions Marten van Waert, who also arrived on this ship. Manifest for de Bever (at Olive Tree) refs list in "Papers Relating to the First Settlement of New York by the Dutch containing a List of the Early Immigrants to New Netherland, 1657-1664" from DHNY. The manifest contains the name, Marten van de Wert, lists occupation as 'hatter' and says he's from Utrecht.

Nice! That nails down the source of the occupation, and adds an immigration date & ship.

Thanks very much, Liz J