Philip Schuyler Mansion
Name of Property
Albany County, New York
County and State
67000008
NR Reference Number

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

State/Federal Agency Certification
As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended,
I hereby certify that this _X__ additional documentation ___ move ___ removal
___ name change (additional documentation) ___ other
meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic
Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60.

_____________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Certifying Official/Title:                                                           Date of Action

National Park Service Certification
I hereby certify that this property is:
__ entered in the National Register
__ determined eligible for the National Register
__ determined not eligible for the National Register
__ removed from the National Register
__ additional documentation accepted
__ other (explain:) _____________________

______________________________________________________________________
Signature of the Keeper   Date of Action
The Philip Schuyler Mansion (Schuyler Mansion State Historic Site) is a house museum located on approximately three acres of land in downtown Albany, New York. Construction of Schuyler Mansion began in 1761 by Philip John Schuyler, a wealthy landowner and influential citizen who later became major general of the Northern Department during the American Revolution. In his marriage to Catharine van Rensselaer of Crailo (now Rensselaer) and through the inheritance of land in Saratoga County, Schuyler secured a landed wealth that rivaled many of the large land patents in the Hudson River Valley. Schuyler served several terms in the New York State Senate, contributing to the reform of the state penal code and the development of the canal system. He advanced Federalist politics, particularly in the areas of national finance and credit, and in 1789 he became one of New York’s first United States senators. Throughout his life, Schuyler benefitted from family connections, the political and economic constructs of New York State, the disenfranchisement of lower classes, the labor of people his family enslaved, and his control of the former lands of indigenous peoples.

When listed on the National Register and designated a National Historic Landmark in 1967, Schuyler Mansion was listed under Criterion A in the areas of Military History and Politics/Government for its association with General Philip Schuyler and under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as a fine example of the fully developed Georgian mansion as it appeared in the American colonies. While brief, Section 8 fully articulates the key facts related to these areas of significance. However, not a single mention is made about the enslaved people who lived and worked at Schuyler Mansion, nor is even a passing reference made to the fact that Philip Schuyler used the enslaved labor of human beings to help amass the wealth that made the construction of Schuyler Mansion possible, the labor to construct the mansion itself, and the labor to maintain the mansion as the primary residence of someone of Schuyler’s political and social standing.

A complete reevaluation of the life of Philip Schuyler is beyond the scope of this project; the purpose of this amendment is to provide available documentation on those enslaved individuals who lived and worked at Schuyler Mansion and to add Ethnic Heritage – Black as an area of significance. This
amendment was inspired by the work of Schuyler Mansion State Historic Site staff, particularly that of Jessica Serfilippi who, in response to the national dialogue surrounding the Broadway musical *Hamilton*, conducted additional research into the question of Alexander Hamilton’s dealings in slavery on behalf of his father-in-law, Philip Schuyler, and members of the Schuyler family. Serfilippi’s report, *As Odious and Immoral a Thing: Alexander Hamilton’s Hidden History as an Enslaver*, is available in pdf form on the Schuyler Mansion parks.ny.gov website.

**Origin of Slavery in New York**

The sale of eleven African men captured from a Portuguese ship to the Dutch West India Company in New Amsterdam in 1625 marked the beginning of a two-hundred-year period of slavery as a fundamental part of the labor and economy of New Netherland, the colony of New York, and early New York State.¹ From the time of that initial purchase, the Dutch imported Africans from Angola, the Kingdom of Kongo, the island of Madagascar, and others from those areas who had been seasoned, or acclimated to the system of enslavement in the Caribbean, West Indies, or Brazil.² The British, following their takeover of the colony in 1664, increased the importation of Africans from West Central Africa and included others from the Upper Guinea Coast. This trend would continue well into the late eighteenth century.

The enslavement of Africans and their descendants increased with the growing needs of the expanding colony as it flowed up the Hudson River to the Dutch settlement of Beverwyck, later named Albany. The trade in human beings continued expanding west and north until it was outlawed by New York State law in 1827. Africans and their descendants lived in a variety of situations and environments. They ran mill operations for landowners and lived on large manorial estates and in small numbers on farms alongside tenant farmers. In many cases, they worked and lived with Europeans who had arrived as indentured servants before gaining their freedom and becoming enslavers themselves.

---

Slavery was integral to the economic success of the colony of New York and an essential part of the British colonial system. Dutch merchants and farmers who remained in the colony actively worked to ensure the continued practice of the system even as antislavery sentiments grew following the Revolutionary War. Africans and their descendants filled positions throughout society as field hands, domestics, dock workers, artisans, millers, and more, to the extent that one European visiting New York City complained, “It rather hurts a European eye to see so many negro slaves upon the streets.”3 This heavy urban presence existed not just in New York City, but also Albany and Kingston.

Southern plantations with their acres of slave cabins hidden behind the big house were spaces where, despite the brutality of the system, family and community relationships could develop and the nurturing of young children was shared by many. The enslaved in New Netherland and New York more often lived in the homes of their enslavers, in cellars, garrets or attics, kitchens, or other out-of-the-way nooks. This proximity gave the appearance of close ties, but for many enslaved this was not the case. Individuals were often bought and sold several times during their lives. The living arrangements of many enslaved men, women, and children consisted of living in close quarters with people they barely knew, making it difficult to create long-lasting bonds.4 The Dutch custom of separating young children from their mothers and gifting them to other relations, often in different households, added strain on maintaining close bonds between the enslaved who were connected by blood. Although marriage was allowed to some extent in the early Dutch period, and several were registered in the Dutch Reformed Church, it was rare that the couple was owned by the same person. There were cases where owners were encouraged to purchase their enslaved person’s partner; more often, however, relationships between the enslaved were strongly discouraged.

Despite many challenges, the enslaved managed to create communities, maintain marriages, and to some

---

extent hold onto cultural and spiritual links to Central and West African cultures. Many of these cultural ties were displayed during the annual Pinkster celebrations. Newspaper accounts, published stories, and memoirs have left a variety of evidence that point to the importance of this seasonal gathering to those enslaved across the New Netherland region well into the nineteenth century. Pinkster, the Dutch word for Pentecost, was a rare occasion where the enslaved were allowed to gather for several days to celebrate spring, renew acquaintances, and since many from Kongo and Angola were Christian, or had been exposed to Christianity, to honor the Divine as they saw fit.

People traveled to locations in Albany, New York City, Brooklyn, Long Island, and throughout the Hudson River Valley to gather for three to five days. In Albany, reigning as Pinkster king from a young man to a seasoned elder, King Charlie presided over the court and an array of drummers throughout the festivities. In New York City, Jackey Quackenboos acted as the master drummer in much the same way. One historic newspaper left us with an account of the enslaved from Schuyler Flatts, a Schuyler family estate located in present-day Menands, New York [no longer extant], tired from their labors, opting to celebrate locally rather than fight against the river tide from Menands to join others in Albany. The celebration was about community in whatever form they could create it.

Resistance to enslavement was ongoing, and the ultimate form was self-emancipation. This could be accomplished by fleeing the area by boat or ship, hiding in plain sight in another part of the colony, or venturing into Canada after 1793. Resistance more often came in the form of slowing down the pace of work, tampering with equipment, or creating other diversions. Larger scale resistance in the form of rebellions and possible conspiracies to rebel happened in New York in 1712 and 1741, resulting in horrendous punishments for enslaved men and women. Albany’s most devasting fire in 1793 sparked memories of fires set during the rebellion of 1712 and resulted in the execution of three enslaved people, one in her teens.

5 Jeroen Dewulf, *The Pinkster King and the King of Kongo* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2016), 60.
6 Dewulf, *The Pinkster King and the King of Kongo*, 62.
Every region of the colony and future state was touched by enslavement, either via economic ties, or actual presence. Laws and codes governing the lives of the enslaved grew harsher as the years went on. Even as abolitionists pushed for reform, some enslavers participated in manumission societies and efforts while continuing to hold humans as property. The system of enslavement did not legally end in the state until 1827.  

Architecture of Enslavement

When constructed in the 1760s, using both free and enslaved labor, Schuyler Mansion was part of a large working farm and estate that extended from its hillside site down to the Hudson River. Only a small, three-acre site immediately around the mansion survives today within a dense urban neighborhood, and none of the mansion’s dependencies survive. However, documentary evidence allows us to reconstruct what was present during the occupancy of the Schuyler family. Historian Andrea C. Mosterman describes the working spaces of the house as follows:

Attached to the home were a tree nursery and a kitchen on the northwest side and a building that functioned as an office on the southwest side of the main house. These structures were each one story high with small garret spaces. A 7.5-foot-high closed wall with a small roof and four windows that enclosed a work area behind the home connected to these dependencies.

According to the Schuyler Mansion historic structure report, in a 1798 “list of real property belonging to Philip Schuyler….” “Schuyler did not designate any particular structure on the property as being slave quarters, but it would have been logical for the slaves to have lived in the nursery wing and probably also in the garret over the adjoining kitchen.”

---

8 Mosterman, Spaces of Enslavement, 86.
Figure 1: Detail of 1794 Dewitt “Plan of Albany” showing Schuyler Mansion and the estate.
Recent “spatial analysis” by Mosterman provides one interpretation of the architecture of Schuyler Mansion as a “space of enslavement.” Mosterman holds that the ordering of the house was strategic because it segregated the enslaved laborers from the house proper and made their presence nearly invisible to the outside world. But, explains Mosterman, “they also created concentrated areas where most of the enslaved people's labor and lives took place as a way to help control the people they held in bondage.”

Schuyler Mansion State Historic Site staff have proposed an alternate interpretation of the relationship between the enslaved and the mansion. In this interpretation, the space was segregated to contain work that the Schuylers did not want readily visible to guests. It did provide an infrastructure for interrelated workspaces and storage, but only because of the nature of the work expected of the enslaved; it was not designed for containment. For that, the Schuylers could rely on the culture of fear and observation of the period, and the laws passed regulating the travel of unaccompanied enslaved individuals. The Schuylers intended for the dirty work to be invisible, but not the enslaved people they owned since this reaffirmed their status and power to those who visited. The enslaved people used the same stairs (no back stairway), and those in the house were well dressed in livery and appropriate dress for the women.

The cellar was a workspace and perhaps in the heat of summer a place for rest, relaxation, and sleep. Likely many of the enslaved people, especially those on-call with domestic duties, were in the attic at times when it was a livable space. The footman and others that took care of the animals, wagons, carriages, and gardens probably lived in the barn or carriage house. The enslaved at Schuyler Mansion had personal garden plots removed from the mansion, and they were often on errands, carting, or transporting a guest. CatyBetty, for example, received money for services she conducted “on the side” and Schuyler’s son served as witness to this. At least four other enslaved laborers were making money on their own time, sometimes from the garden plots Schuyler had set aside for them. In one documented case, Schuyler paid one of his enslaved men for corn (presumably grown on Schuyler's property and

**10** Mosterman, *Spaces of Enslavement*, 89.
perhaps ground in his mill).

**The Enslaved People of Schuyler Mansion**

*Who Were "The Servants"?*

The horse sleds have drawn thirty four pieces of pitch pine timber since you left this. Lisbon Dick and & Bob have cut them, they have Also cut twenty large pitch pine logs... I am this Day going with the three Horse sleds to the Mill at Batskill to Ride Logs there... The ice has broke the upper flud [sic] Gates of the Mill Race but has done no Damage to the Race. Neither Grist Mill nor Saw Mill Gone any since Saturday Last on account of the Cold...

In addition to his land speculation and the management of his property in Albany and Saratoga, Philip Schuyler derived a significant income from the operation of wheat, flax, and lumber mills at his Saratoga estate, the refined output of which was sold at a good profit in New York City and the sugar-producing islands of Jamaica and Antigua. The above letter, dated December 27, 1771, written by Philip Schuyler’s overseer, Philip Lansingh, reveals that men enslaved by the family were tasked with supplying the sawmill with cut timber. Three men are mentioned by name, Bob, Dick, and Lisbon. While the specific details of the lives of the enslaved are often lost to history, there are enough references to these individuals in Schuyler’s papers that we can begin to restore a few glimpses of their identities.

For example, at some point in the last weeks of December 1771, these three men were sent out from Schuyler’s Saratoga estate to cut timber. It was a cold day, based on Lansingh’s descriptions of ice damage to the mills, with at least enough snow on the ground to warrant the use of horse-drawn sleds. Fortunately for Dick and Bob, they had newly soled shoes to protect against the snow; both men are listed in a family business receipt for shoe repairs dated December 16, 1771. It is not clear why Lisbon did not receive new shoes or shoe repairs at that time. Perhaps his shoes were deemed to be in good enough condition at the time and did not need repairs.
The trees that they had been sent to cut were pitch pine, which was sought after for a variety of uses, principally for construction as the pitch from whence it derived its name provided lasting protection against damp conditions. Lisbon, Dick, and Bob cut thirty-four sections suitable for milling, as well as several large logs.

It is possible that these same men not only cut the wood but brought it to the mill themselves. With the ground frozen solid and snowed over, large horse-drawn sleds were used to transport the timber. While Lansingh does not specify who drove the sleds, Lisbon and Dick are both mentioned in other Schuyler documents as carters or waggoners, conveying goods and people for the Schuyler family. Lisbon is mentioned in at least four other sources, always concerning his driving, going back and forth between Albany and Saratoga. These men’s ability to drive carts and sleds was a large part of their value to the Schuylers, as this was a specialized skill set that involved being able to work with draft animals, manage tack and harness, and maintain the carts and sleds in their charge.

Lansingh’s letter to Schuyler, while brief and focused on reporting mill activity, offers a surprisingly specific look into the daily lives of Dick, Bob, and Lisbon. Bob, unfortunately, seems to disappear from the historical record after this letter. Dick and Lisbon, however, can be traced a bit farther. As mentioned, both are referenced as driving carts for the Schuyler family over the years. Dick was still enslaved by the Schuylers in 1787 when it appears that he suffered from a prolonged illness for which he was treated three different times by Dr. Samuel Stringer, who prescribed the patented cure-all of Turlington’s Balsam. He also disappears from the historical record at this point, and it is unclear whether he recovered from his illness. Lisbon seems to have been transferred to Philip Schuyler’s oldest son, John Bradstreet Schuyler, in 1787, when Philip gave his son control of the Saratoga estate but reverted to Schuyler’s possession upon the death of his son in 1795. He is last referenced on January 18, 1796, twenty-five years after the letter from Philip Lansingh.

**Navigating Agency Within Enslavement**
Of the more than forty people of African descent enslaved by Philip and Catharine Schuyler, a man named Prince has, for many years, held prominence in the interpretation of slavery and the enslaved at Schuyler Mansion. This is due, in large part, to the fact that the details of his life during the time he was enslaved by the Schuylers are better documented than are those of most of the other men, women, and children the family enslaved. He is mentioned in the personal correspondence of the family and even served as a common reference point for Philip Schuyler and John Jay when the two used his name as the key to decrypting their encoded messages during the Revolutionary War.

Before enslavement by the Schuylers, Prince was enslaved by Alexander MacCulloch. MacCulloch was not your common businessman; rather, he was the deputy quartermaster general of Quebec, an important player in the British war effort. While Prince is not, to our current knowledge, documented before he arrived in Albany, we can trace Prince’s story and his path to Albany through his much better-documented enslaver.

The autumn of 1775 was one of high hopes for Major General Philip Schuyler, as the forces of the Northern Department prepared to secure British positions at Saint-Jean, Montreal, and Quebec. In late October, Fort Chambly fell to the rebels, along with ninety prisoners of war. Among them was Commissary MacCulloch, who joined other “Men of Rank in Canada,” as described by General Montgomery following the surrender of Saint-Jean, as a prisoner of the Continentals.

Prince’s presence with MacCulloch on the front lines of the conflict provides insights into Prince as an individual. The services Prince performed for MacCulloch were important enough to MacCulloch that he considered Prince’s presence at the fort essential. Prince was likely a personal attendant to MacCulloch, assisting him with travel, dress, hygiene, and possibly even some secretarial work. Later, Prince seems to have been in close attendance upon Philip Schuyler in a similar capacity, and suggestions of Prince’s literacy can be found throughout Schuyler’s documents, including a 1791 letter in which Philip indicates that Prince may have reviewed the letter and reminded him to request boards from his son, John Bradstreet Schuyler.
His connection to a prominent military figure and businessman in Quebec raises the possibility that Prince was at least bilingual. His birthplace is unrecorded, but if he was born in Africa, as an adult he may have spoken one or more African languages, and/or possibly Arabic. We know from later sources that Prince spoke fluent English, but he might have spoken French as well. Whether he was born in Africa, the Caribbean, or in Quebec itself, he could easily have been exposed to French at a young age. This skill would have made him especially useful to MacCulloch, given the number of both English-speakers and French-speakers in MacCulloch’s social and professional interactions in Quebec. Philip Schuyler himself considered fluency in French an essential social and professional accomplishment.

Prince’s presence at Chambly is also a reminder of the agency denied to the enslaved. Prince went anywhere MacCulloch ordered—even into a warzone. A similar scenario would take place in 1777 when Philip Schuyler sent a man named Tom and another unnamed enslaved servant to sift through the ashes of his Saratoga estate for iron while skirmishing fire was still being exchanged between Crown and Revolutionary forces following the Battles of Saratoga. John Trumbull's portrait of George Washington at West Point included a portrait of Washington's enslaved valet, William Lee, who accompanied the general throughout the Revolution.

By the end of December 1775, the campaign into Canada was rapidly crumbling, and Revolutionary forces slowly began a months-long process of retreat, back toward Crown Point and Fort Ticonderoga. MacCulloch and Prince, however, had already begun their journey southwards in late November, following a decision by the Continental Congress to transport prisoners from Chambly and Saint-Jean to other colonies. While some were imprisoned in Pennsylvania, others, including MacCulloch, would end up as prisoners in New Jersey.

By late January or February, Prince and MacCulloch had traveled roughly 250 miles to reach Albany. For Prince, at least, the journey had been arduous in the extreme. Unequipped for a winter journey when they were captured in October, and unsupplied by either his captors or enslaver with the necessary clothing or blankets, Prince was in poor health, cold, unable to walk, and facing nearly 200 miles more
on the route to Princeton, New Jersey, where MacCulloch was to be held. While MacCulloch was a person of interest to the Revolutionaries, Prince was not, but, because he was enslaved, he would have to accompany MacCulloch regardless. In the face of this seeming utter absence of agency or options, Prince made a bold move. He sent a letter.

On February 5 or 6, 1776, Prince sent the following petition to Catharine Schuyler:

Most Humbly showeth that as your Petitioner is in the greatest distress... & has quite lost the use of my limbs with cold for want of Cloaths [sic] or Blanket- so to inform your ladyship that I wrote to his Excellency the General received no intelligence of My Being Released from my long & miserable confinement. I am very willing to go to work for his Excellency the General at any sort of employ or any of the Inhabitants in the Town for my vituals [sic] & Cloaths [sic]. Therefore I Humbly Beg your Ladyship would be so Good as to intercede with His Excellency for me and Get me Released as I am Informed My Master Mr. McCulough is in Remedy and for your Great & Bountious [sic] Goodness I Shall be as in duty Bound ever Pray.

Whether the letter was in his hand or not has been long debated. It has been suggested that a clerk wrote the letter on his behalf. While this is certainly possible, this interpretation assumes that, as an enslaved man, Prince was illiterate. While literacy was less common amongst the enslaved at the time, it was by no means an unheard-of skill. Africa was the home to a wealth of literary traditions, and those traditions sometimes survived the transatlantic trade well into the nineteenth century. Others, whether born here or captured and transported across the sea, acquired literacy as a skill in the Americas. Notably, it might be added that though there were laws in the Southern colonies to prevent those enslaved from reading and writing, such laws did not exist in most Northern areas, including New York.

Further, the theory that the letter was written for him also assumes that Prince would be able to solicit the assistance of a literate person, whether a clerk or someone else. Given his status as the enslaved servant of a British prisoner of war, with no known local contacts or the means to recompense an assistant, his ability to find someone willing to help him is arguably as much a matter of speculation as is his literacy, if not more so. In either case, a little more than a month later, MacCulloch sent a letter to
Philip Schuyler, dated March 20, 1776, to convey that, “...he [MacCulloch] has sent him [Schuyler] the Negro man Prince together with the Bill of Sale. The General will be so kind as to make it known to the Negro that he is now his property...”

Philip Schuyler purchased many enslaved people throughout his life, so transactions like this are all too common in Schuyler’s documents. What makes this exchange so poignant is that, whether he held the pen in his hand or not, it was Prince, and not his former or future enslavers, who initiated the process that would end with his sale to Philip Schuyler. Faced with a “no-win” scenario, he had the options of continuing a life-threatening journey with MacCulloch or of finding someone in Albany, whether the Schuylers or another household, to purchase his continued bondage. He pursued the latter option, a choice that would be safer, at least in the short term, for his life, but which meant he would likely never be reunited with any friends or loved ones in Quebec. In either case, Prince recognized that his options to escape slavery were nonexistent at that moment--he was in unfamiliar territory, imprisoned, and physically unable to walk any distance for an unknowable amount of time. Up against an institution that denied his agency and humanity, Prince found a way to exert both from within the system.\(^{11}\)

**Family in the Face of Slavery**

Will (sometimes called Bill) was enslaved by the Schuyler family at the Schuyler Mansion. Brit lived less than two miles away, on Market Street (roughly Broadway today), as an enslaved servant of the Ten Broeck family. Despite this geographic proximity, Brit and Will would have had little opportunity to see each other. They doubtless savored any moments that they could spend in each other’s company.

\(^{11}\) Prince died at some point in the 1790s. In 1897, Katherine Schuyler Baxter, great-granddaughter of Philip and Catharine Schuyler, set out the recollections of her own grandmother, Catharine, youngest of the Schuyler children, in a book titled *A Godchild of Washington*. In it, she presents a heavily romanticized view of slavery in the Schuyler household, but the only enslaved person Baxter describes by name is Prince. While Baxter’s description is deeply rooted in the racist narrative of the “happy, loyal slave,” it is striking that approximately a hundred years after his death, the memory of Prince still resonated in later generations of the family.
From their later connections to the church and the fact that both the Schuylers and Ten Broecks were part of the congregation, they probably attended church services together at the Dutch church on occasion. Their enslavers were also close friends, and Brit and Will may have accompanied them during visits to the other's property. However, Will is not mentioned as one of Philip Schuyler's regular attendants. Similarly, Brit is not mentioned as a personal attendant and may have been assigned to cooking and housework, rather than accompanying the family on outings.

The law also imposed severe limitations on their ability to be together. Strict, punitive legislation in place at various points in eighteenth-century Albany, passed out of fear that social gatherings of the enslaved could lead to escape attempts or violent resistance, prevented enslaved people from gathering outside of their duties. The holiday of Pinkster was one of the only times of the year when enslaved and free Black families were reliably able to come together for a time of celebration. This holiday may have been the only time when Will, Brit—and later their children and grandchildren—were able to spend any real amount of time together as a family. Even this holiday would have been taken from them in 1811 when the city of Albany outlawed the celebration of Pinkster (a law finally repealed in 2011).

Despite all of this, Will and Brit created a family together, and they strove to maintain those bonds over the years through the spiritual community of the church. On March 4, 1772, they celebrated the baptism of their daughter, Susannah, at the Dutch Church in Albany. Just two years later, on June 26, 1774, they celebrated the baptism of a second child, named Herry.

This is where the record falls silent on the lives of Will and Brit. It is unknown if they remained enslaved by the Schuylers and Ten Broecks, respectively, or if one of them was eventually sold away—their family separated even further. Neither of them is mentioned in later Schuyler or Ten Broeck manumissions, making it likely that they either died in bondage or were sold to another enslaver at some point after the birth of their two children.

While we may never know what happened to Will or Brit, their eldest daughter, Susannah, married a
A life-long enslaver, Philip Schuyler had little interest at the end of the eighteenth century in abolition outside of the political capital to be gained as more and more politicians embraced the idea (in theory, if not in their daily lives). Even at the time of Schuyler’s death in November of 1804, at least seven people, including three children, still labored in slavery at his estate in Albany. While these individuals were freed shortly after his death, this was entirely at the discretion of the executors of the estate, as no provision was made for their manumission in Schuyler’s will. As of December 18, 1804, the last people to be enslaved at Schuyler Mansion were free or had been transferred to the estates of other family
members, possibly including that of the youngest son of the Schuyler family, Rensselaer.

But not everyone enslaved in the Schuyler household had waited this long. At least three, possibly four, men, and one woman had already sought to escape the bonds of slavery and reclaim their freedom elsewhere. The first of these self-manumitters was a man named Haare, who fled slavery in 1768. At the time of his escape, Haare was somewhere in his early thirties, a young man still, but with many years of hard labor under his belt. Philip Schuyler placed a “runaway” advertisement in the *New York Journal* that offered a description of this individual. According to Schuyler, Haare was “short, [with] broad shoulders, large staring eyes, remarkable small legs, large feet, and walks something lame, having had his toes frozen...” Schuyler also specified that Haare spoke both English and “Low Dutch.”

While some of these descriptors, e.g. “large staring eyes,” are thought to have relied on exaggerated racial features aimed at a primarily white audience, others give us a detailed depiction of this young man and hint at the sort of work he performed for the Schuylers. For example, he walked “something lame” due to having had his toes frozen. We know from other records that Philip sent enslaved men out in frigid conditions to cut firewood. Perhaps it was a similar incident that gave Haare his notable gait. Unfortunately, we do not know what ultimately happened to Haare, and there is no indication as to whether he was able to avoid recapture.

After Haare, every other documented escape attempt by people enslaved by the Schuylers took place during the turbulent times of the American Revolution. The next person to attempt escape from the Schuyler estate was a woman named Diana. No runaway ad is known to exist for Diana, depriving us of the sorts of physical description available for Haare. All that we have to document her escape is a letter detailing its unfortunate conclusion. As John Lansing reported to Philip Schuyler on February 3, 1779:

Diana was last night brought to Town[.] From every Circumstance attending her Apprehension it is probable that she has been harboured for a considerable time by a Scotchman, who lives in the neighborhood of Mr. Amory’s farm. I have directed her to be committed to goal [jail] to prevent another Elopement, and shall keep her there until I receive your Directions respecting
The difficulties attending any effort to escape the bonds of slavery are evident here. Despite finding refuge with someone willing to aid her in her attempt, Diana was recaptured and imprisoned. No known letter survives regarding Schuyler’s directions, but Diana was likely held in jail for several days before being brought back to Schuyler Mansion. Selling an enslaved person to New York City or further south was not as common because of the war. The British—who Diana may have been attempting to flee to—occupied New York City, and the war made the sale of human beings to the south, while not impossible, more difficult. While physical punishment was not uncommon at the time, neither Schuyler nor Lansing reported whether this was the case for Diana. All that is certain is that this is the last known reference to Diana in Schuyler’s papers.

On November 4, 1782, Philip Schuyler ran another runaway ad, this time for a man named Claas:

Ran away on the 28th ultimo, from the Subscriber, a MOLATTO, named Nicholas (commonly called Claas); he is about five feet eight or ten inches high, slender made, large eyes, much given to liquor: he had on when he went off, a whitish stuff coat, striped linen waistcoat, linen breeches, blue yarn stockings, tow cloth shirt, and large silver buckles on his shoes.

This description gives us little idea of what sort of work Claas had performed before his escape. What is of particular interest here, however, is the detail with which Schuyler describes his clothing. As the eighteenth century had a thriving second-hand clothing industry, Claas would likely want and have had the opportunity, to change his clothing soon after his escape, both to alter his appearance and to fund his travels. For someone who owned no property of any kind, the clothes on his back, and especially the silver buckles on his shoes, represented his entire financial means for aiding his escape. By detailing Claas’s attire at the time of his flight to freedom, Schuyler made sure that Claas was recognizable and put him at a disadvantage in terms of selling the clothes he had.

Claas was taking a huge risk in his attempt. On November 7, 1775, to weaken the revolutionaries’
resources, the British governor of Virginia, Lord Dunmore, had issued a proclamation offering freedom to any enslaved person that was claimed as property by the revolutionaries and who made their escape behind British lines. This was reinforced in 1779 when Sir Henry Clinton passed the Philipsburg Proclamation, promising freedom for anyone enslaved by the revolutionaries. The British proclamations were met with outrage throughout the colonies. In 1775, a law was passed in Albany stating that any enslaved man found more than a mile from home without his enslaver’s permission could be shot on sight. This was in reaction to the fear that the enslaved would use the disruptions created by the war to attempt to escape or coordinate some sort of resistance to the slave-holding class. While Claas made his escape attempt later in the war, he ran the same risks. He likely sought to escape to the British, but, to this day, it is unknown if he was successful.

While Claas’s intention of joining the British can only be guessed at, the remaining two individuals did join the British during the war and traveled to Nova Scotia as free men after the end of hostilities. At the end of the war, approximately 3,000 formally enslaved who had served with the British were transported to Nova Scotia where they became known as the Black Loyalists. Their names and many personal details were listed in a British document known as “The Book of Negroes.” Among these three thousand were two men, Scipio Scuyler and Adam Way, both of whom have connections to the Schuyler family.

Scipio Scuyler listed himself as having escaped from enslavement by a man referred to as “Philip Schuyler of Albany” in 1779. Scipio gave his birth year as 1752, meaning that he was in his early thirties when he joined the British. Scipio was described as of a stout build when he sailed aboard the Prosperous Amelia for Port Roseway in 1783. Several Philip Schuylers were living in Albany in 1779, meaning that the Philip Schuyler referred to may be the Philip Schuyler of Schuyler Mansion or one of his cousins. For Adam Way, however, the evidence is much more concrete.

Adam Way was described as at least eighty years old and “worn out” when he sailed for Annapolis and St. Johns aboard the Clinton in 1783. He reported his former owner as “General Broadstreet” of Albany. This is believed to be a mistranscription of General John Bradstreet. Bradstreet was not only a close
friend of Philip Schuyler, serving as Schuyler’s commanding officer and mentor, but he helped supervise the construction of the Schuyler Mansion and lived with the Schuyler family for many years before his death in 1774. Adam Way is believed to be the same Adam listed in a December 16, 1771 “Account of Shoes” in the Schuyler Household, where his shoes were repaired for two shillings and sixpence. It is not clear whether he was enslaved by the Schuylers after Bradstreet’s death, or if he was passed through other hands before his escape, but, at long last, a man born into slavery in 1703, who had likely labored for multiple families throughout his life, was free.

As A. J. Williams-Meyers wrote in the foreword to *In Defiance: Runaways from Slavery in New York’s Hudson River Valley, 1735-1831*:

> The vast number of runaway slave notices during this period[...] speaks to the magnitude of the struggle for freedom being fought by an oppressed and enslaved people. The dangers of running and the consequences if caught were dire and had to have struck abject fear into the hearts of those contemplating such a feat. Yet, for many, the opportunity to live as a human being, out of bondage, able to breath the air in freedom, was worth the dangers. It was a courageous choice.

For many, there was no choice. Of upwards of forty people enslaved at Schuyler Mansion and the Saratoga estate, roughly half were women, but only one woman, Diana, was able to run the risk of escaping. It is important to note here that women were much more likely to be enslaved with their children in the Schuyler household, making it much more difficult to escape. Schuyler purchased men separately from other family members, which meant that they only had to coordinate their own escape. This separation from family may have even encouraged men to leave at a higher rate than women, as they sought to reunite with families they had been separated from.

*Life after Enslavement*

On December 15, 1804, seven people: Tone, Stephen, Pheobe, Silva, Tally Ho (Tallyho), Tom, and Hanover, were manumitted less than a month after Philip Schuyler’s death by the executors of his estate.
A newly manumitted individual faced many challenges. Perhaps the three most universal and potentially daunting were finding family members they had been separated from by their enslavers, finding employment or other means to support themselves and their families, and, in many cases, enduring the stipulations placed on their freedom by their former enslavers. With this backdrop in mind, it is possible to piece together some potential elements of the life of Silva and her children, Tally Ho, Tom, and Hanover, after enslavement.

Silva, Tally Ho, Tom, and Toby were purchased by Philip Schuyler on July 21, 1797. While we know Tally Ho and Tom were Silva’s children, it is unclear if Toby was related to them; however, it is possible he was Silva’s partner and Tally Ho and Tom’s father. Toby does not appear on the 1804 manumission form. There could be multiple reasons for this, but based on documentation from Philip Schuyler, it seems likely that Toby died before 1804. In 1802, Schuyler writes to Alexander Hamilton “My coachman Toby is very Much Indisposed.” He states that Anthony will serve as the coachman. While Anthony, still referred to as a coachman, appears in at least one later letter, Toby is never mentioned again.

We can best determine that Silva, in her thirties, had a toddler (Hanover), two children under the age of seventeen, and possibly no partner when she was manumitted. Based on several surviving records, there is a strong possibility that at least Silva, if not her children as well, stayed in Albany. In 1820, a woman of her age named "Sylva Zeben" was listed as head of a household on Albany’s 1820 census. In her household were two boys under 14, a boy or man between the ages of 14 and 25 (possibly Hanover), one girl or woman aged 14 to 25, a woman aged 26 to 44 (possibly Tally Ho), and a woman over the age of 45, which Silva would have been by 1820.

In 1832, a woman named Silva Zebra was listed in Child’s Albany Directory as a fortune teller working at 26 Washington Avenue. She appeared in the following directory at the same address, and in 1834 moved to “rear 165 South Pearl.” Silva Zebra was also listed on the Albany census of 1840 as head of household, with one free girl under the age of 10, another aged 10 to 25, two free women aged 35 to 55,
and one woman, who would be Silva, between the ages of 55 and 100. It also appears possible that the same Silva briefly took the last name “Bristo” from at least 1830 to 1832. In the two Albany directories covering the years 1830-1832, a “Sylvia Bristo,” a fortune teller working on Washington Avenue, is listed.

This is just one possibility for the path Silva took upon manumission. There are other possible avenues Silva may have taken as well. She may have worked for Schuyler’s son, Philip Jeremiah, who hired multiple free Black workers by 1820 according to that year’s census. We may never be able to definitively tell Silva, Tally Ho, Tom, Hanover, and Toby’s stories with the same level of specificity as the Schuylers. Even without that level of detail, telling Silva’s story and exploring how she may have asserted her agency is important.
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