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While the names Van Cortlandt and Rockefeller are enshrined throughout New York City and State, Philipse has not gained quite as much prominence as a signifier of the old New York elite. However, the Philipse family once owned thousands of acres in New York State—approximately one quarter of today’s Westchester County—and their empire encompassed highly-profitable overseas trading, mills, orchards, and other enterprises whose earnings helped make the family the richest in the state.[1] A 1977 article in The New York Times described the ascendance of the Philipse family as “one of the great rags-to-riches stories” and lamented how “few remember that when he came to America, [Frederick] Philipse, the lord of the manor, was only the immigrant son of a roofer from Bolswaert, the Netherlands.”[2] This account of the Philipse family’s accumulation of wealth in America, cast as an exemplary story of the American Dream, scrupulously erases the role of slavery and dispossession in the family’s economic and social ascendance.[3] Even the last lord of Philipsburg Manor, Frederick Philipse III, the great-grandson of Frederick Philipse—described as “[having] had little professional interest in either the mercantile, political, or legal endeavors of his forebears and was instead inclined toward the aesthetic and toward the land”—actively continued his family’s legacy by overseeing enslavement on the manor and land theft from the Wappinger tribe.[4] This essay will critically explore this legacy in conjunction with the
fact that Frederick Philipse III was a founding governor of and the father and uncle of two graduates from King’s College, the institution that would become Columbia University.[5]

In this paper, I will look at the Philipse family’s history from various angles. First, I will trace the attainment and subsequent intergenerational transfers of land and enslaved people between members of the Philipse family. Then, I will look at the inhabitants of land owned by the Philipse family, including tenant farmers, indentured white servants, and enslaved people. Finally, I will look at the contentious, decades-long dispute between members of the Philipse family and the Wappinger tribe. In order to do so, I will examine the documents from three boxes donated by descendants of the Philipse family to the Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library. In addition, I will look at documents stored at the Historic Hudson Valley archive in Pocantico Hills, NY. Through this archival analysis, bolstered by existing scholarship on the Philipses, I will show that the Philipse family accrued and sustained their wealth through slavery, dispossession, and exploitation.
Ascendance and Intergenerational Transfers of Wealth

The wills and estate records of various members of the Philipse family are key to uncovering their ascendance and the following intergenerational transfers of wealth and power within the Philipse family. Their century-long relationship to enslavement is revealed through these documents. Frederick Philipse began as a carpenter on a ship belonging to the Dutch West India Company before marrying Margrieta Hardenbroeck, a widow from a wealthy family, in 1662.[7] Shortly thereafter, he rose in the ranks and acquired several ships in his newfound role.[8] Though Frederick Philipse was also engaged in transporting goods on these ships, records from 1666 and 1669 showed
that the Dutch East India Company was engaged in “transport[ing] slaves from Angola to New Netherland” and that Philipse had become “one-fourth owner of the ship Hopewell” as well as other degrees of full and partial ownership of ships such as “Fort Albany,” “Frederick,” “Pink Charles,” and more.[9] During the same period, several deeds from the New York City Register’s Office showed Philipse purchasing “houses and yards outside the city gate.”[10] By 1680, Philipse obtained a deed “for his plantation in the County of Westchester.”[11] This rapid upward mobility continued, as did Philipse’s role in the enslavement and trading of people.[12] For example, “in instructions for a 1698 voyage to Madagascar, Philipse told the ship captain to purchase ‘two hundred good slaves or as many as the ship can carry’ and bring them back to New York City for sale.”[13] Toward the end of his life, Philipse sought to ensure that his fortunes would continue to benefit his children and grandchildren.[14]

Within the will of Frederick Philipse I, dated October 26, 1700, he leaves his property to various members of the Philipse family ranging from his son Adolphus to his grandson Frederick Philipse II.[15] He refers to “those lands and meadows called the Yonkers plantation, together with all and singular houses, mills, [illegible], orchards, gardens, negroes, negroes children, cattle, horses, and whatever else belongs to me within that Patent, as well as what is vacant,” as just some of the property being left to his grandson, Frederick Philipse II.[16] In this document, he also names specific enslaved people including individuals referred to as “Harry with his wife and child, Peter, and Man(sp.).”[17] He then refers to “all the said negroes and [illegible] estate to [Philipse II’s] heirs and executors.”[18] He gave his grandson” a tract of land [illegible] extending from [his] Yonkers Plantation to William Portuguey’s creek” to “[his] son Adolphus and heirs.”[19] He leaves Adolphus “[his] negro men called Symon, Charles, [illegible], Samson, [illegible], Billy, Mingo, Hendrick, Bahynne, and Hector, [his] negro boy Peter, an Indian woman called Hannah and her child, a negro woman Sufan the younger, the negro woman Mary.”[20] The will also contains several references to other property and various relatives who inherited various degrees of Frederick Philipse’s wealth and property upon his death.[21] This laid the groundwork for his heirs to continue his legacy through engaging in the sale and purchase of enslaved people and an expansion of his various enterprises.[22]
Frederick Philipse II and Adolphus Philipse were two of the major heirs in the will of Frederick Philipse I.[23] When descendants of the Philipse family donated three boxes of the family’s documents to Columbia University, they removed significant documents relating to the family’s role in enslavement, some critical sections of which pertained to Frederick Philipse II and Adolphus Philipse.[24] In the Index of these documents, there are highlighted sections that indicate the documents that were removed by the family prior to donation.[25] Even amid this tremendous loss, the little information recorded about the documents indicates that some of these might help answer a number of questions about Adolph Philipse and Frederick Philipse II’s relationship to enslavement in New York and beyond. Notably, among the documents removed are a “list of articles bought by Frederick Philipse at auction of estate of Adolph Philipse” in March of 1749.[26] Though it is unclear what “articles” refers to in the absence of the document, its removal is suspect.[27] There is an additional missing document that is described a “list of negroes and articles bought at the auctions of estate of Adolph Philipse in Upper Mills (Tarrytown) on April 19th, 1750.”[28] Despite this laundering of archival records, the Philipse family’s descendants did not manage to remove every mention of enslaved people from the documents donated to the University. For example, in the estate records of Adolphus Philipse from 1704 and 1705, he also documents the purchase of “a negro.”[29] Regardless of this attempt to sanitize their history, there are additional records documenting the continued sale of enslaved people by the Philipse family in other archives. A bill of sale from May 13, 1723 shows the sale of “one negro man from Frederick Philipse of the City of New York to Paulus Van der Beck.”[30] These are likely only some of the documents showing the relationship between Frederick Philipse I’s heirs and enslavement.
Upon Frederick Philipse II’s death, his son, Frederick Philipse III, became the last lord of Philipsburg Manor.[32] Frederick Philipse III subsequently inherited these lands and continued to pursue new enterprises, including silver mining, on the family’s property at Philipsburg Manor.[33] In 1766, Philipse III signed an indenture mandating that he would receive at least “two-sevenths parts of all profits” from the mining
conducted on and around the Manor.[34] Likewise, his brother Philip Philipse collaborated with “Beverly Robinson and Roger Morris [to appropriate] most of the Wappingers' territory” while they fought “for the British against the French and while the remainder of the tribe stayed with the Stockbridge Indians.”[35] At the manor, almost two dozen enslaved people were working under Frederick Philipse III around the time he became a founding governor of King’s College.[36] His son, also named Frederick Philipse, graduated from King’s College in 1773.[37] Philip Philipse’s son and Frederick Philipse III”s nephew, Nathaniel Philipse, graduated from King’s College in the same class.[38] This rise to power and privilege and its continuity throughout several generations is only one part of the Philipse family’s story. While it is clear that they owned enslaved people and a vast amount of land, the stories of tenants and enslaved people on this land provide an even greater understanding of the role of the Philipse family during this period.

Enslaved People and Tenants

The Philipse family’s vast amount of land had hundreds of inhabitants ranging from white tenants and indentured servants to enslaved people.[39] Their manor has been described as having “at its peak, thirty slaves and twenty-six white indentured servants” while other sources primarily refer to the “a community of 23 enslaved Africans” who lived there in approximately 1750.[40] Despite its centrality, the manor was also only one small part of the hundreds of thousands of acres occupied by the Philipse family and their tenants.[41] While many buildings at Philipsburg Manor, such as the mill and various worksites, are still standing today, “the former ‘Negro House,’ remains a conjectural site lacking enough structural evidence to establish either its size or appearance.”[42] However, there are a number of documents that provide glimpses into the lives of enslaved people owned by members of the Philipse family and the complex relationship and dynamics between the Philipse family and their tenants. Likewise, this is another area in which the Philipse family was able to exercise their tremendous amount of power through several means, including Frederick Philipse II’s position on the New York State Supreme Court of Judicature.[43]
There is some evidence that reveals key information about the lives of enslaved people owned by the Philipse family or others in the surrounding area. Cuffee, an enslaved person owned by Adolphus Philipse, was a key figure in an alleged plot by enslaved people, free Black people, and working class whites to bomb various sites and take over the New York City government.[44] This sparked panic and resulted in several enslaved people, including some owned by the Philipse family, being burned at the stake or hanged in 1741-2 in a heavily sensationalized trial.[45] This incident, known as the 1741 Conspiracy, involved enslaved people who were owned by Frederick and Adolphus Philipse.[46] Though “the conspiracy was reported as a plot to take over the city government by white ringleaders, assisted by slaves who were promised their freedom,” much of the trial was centered around “the dubious testimony of a sixteen-year-old Irish indentured servant who was promised a considerable reward for her cooperation.”[47] In Judge Daniel Hoardsman’s *The New-York conspiracy, or, A history of the Negro plot, with the journal of the proceedings against the conspirators at New-York in the years 1741-2*, he includes charts with the names of alleged participants, their “owners/masters,” and whether they were burned or hanged for their alleged participation.[48] Some of those individuals associated with the Philipse family include Frank, owned by Frederick Philipse II, and Cuffee, owned by Adolphus Philipse.[49] During the trial, Burton testified that Cuffee was a leader and “that Cuffee used to say, that a great many people had too much, and others too little; that his old master had a great deal of money, but that, in a short time, he should have less, and that he [Cuffee] should have more.”[50] Like Hoardsman, Frederick Philipse II was a Justice on the New York Supreme Court of Judicature, the court that heard the case.[51] This historic injustice reveals both the far reaching influence of the Philipse family in New York State and consciousness among enslaved people owned by the family about the wider social order and a willingness to organize to resist their enslavement.[52]
Though the Philipse family accrued their wealth through trading and various enterprises, they also rented their land to tenants in the Hudson Valley.[54] A rent roll from approximately 1785 lists hundreds of tenants living on the Philipse family’s land when Frederick Philipse III was overseeing the manor’s final years before the American Revolution.[55] This list of tenants corresponds to many of the names listed as slave owners on the upper part of the manor as of 1755.[56] In addition to owning and selling enslaved people, the Philipse family also profited from these tenant farmers’ use of unfree labor to tend their land and subsequently pay their rent to the Philipse family.
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Despite this commonality, the Philipse family still exercised tremendous control over their tenants. During the height of a land dispute with the Wappinger tribe, Philipse and other defendants even sought to evict their tenants who lived on the land in question.[58] When the tenant farmers were given the option of signing short-term leases by Philip Philipse’s neighboring co-defendant, Beverly Robinson, many symbolically agreed to 999-year leases with the Wappinger tribe rather than the one-year leases or other precarious options.[59] The "Report of [the] Committee on the Controversy Between Daniel Nimham et. al. and Philipse Heirs" argued that this "tract of land, granted by the Patent of his late majesty on June 10, 1697 to Adolph Philipse" was legitimate and shouldn’t be undermined, though this was also challenged later.[60] The document also accused some of the white tenant farmers who rented land from the Philipse family, particularly naming Samuel Monroe and Stephen Miller, of “stirring up several Indians to lay claim to the said tract of land as the native and original proprietors thereof.”[61] This reaction to the Wappinger tribe’s opposition to the Philipse family’ actions and the tribe’s relationship with the tenants who rented from the Philipse family showed the deep fears among the Philipses and others that likely existed as a result of their opposition to these challenges. However, the accusation of some outside pressure may not have been entirely unfounded given the rebellion of these tenants in prior years.[62] Earlier in this particular dispute, “a number of the Philipse tenants renounced their leases and, taking others from the Indians, continued to occupy the land but refused to pay rent.”[63] This short-lived and small unified act between the tenants and the Wappinger tribe represented another threat from below to the hegemony of the Philipse family in the Hudson Valley. In order to fully conceptualize the relationship between the Philipse family and the Wappinger tribe, understanding the decade-long Nimham et. al. vs. Philipse Heirs case is critical.
Though the Philipse family successfully removed many documents related to slavery from the boxes they donated to Columbia, extensive evidence of their land disputes with Daniel Nimham and the Wappinger tribe remain. Throughout the 1760s, the Philipse family battled against a Wappinger sachem, Daniel Nimham, in court over land that had been stolen from the tribe. The Philipse family’s relationship with the Wappinger tribe and other Native Americans in the Hudson Valley extends beyond the case of Daniel Nimham. However, this case took place over the course of a decade and sparked fears among New York’s elite. Nimham and the Wappinger tribe alleged that the Philipse family and other elite European settlers on the land did not have a legitimate deed and that “the tribe utterly denies that these said lands, so by them claimed and reserved that those aforesaid were ever purchased of said tribe for
any valuable or other consideration whatsoever, or with any license therefore, by the said Adolph Philipse or by any other person or persons whatsoever[69] In a "Report of [the] Committee on the Controversy between Daniel Nimham et. al. and Philipse Heirs," the case is described as having the potential to set "so dangerous a precedent for encouraging Indian claims against the right of the crown."[70] Historians Thomas Humphrey and John Smolenski elaborated that if a ruling were issued “in favor of the Wappingers” it had the potential to “reshape the distribution of land throughout New York” by legitimizing legal challenges to settlers’ claims to land.[71]

The contested land is described by historians and in a number of documents kept by the Philipse family. In a 1765 document titled “A Statement of Controversy between Daniel Nimham et. al. and Philipse Heirs,” there is a small drawing and description of the land that was contested.[72] It is identified as “a large tract of land in the southernmost part of the County of Dutchess” and has been identified by several historians.[73] The Statement also describes the Wappinger as “a tribe of native Indians, and native owners of said land” and that there are “about two hundred and twenty seven persons” who inhabit it.[74]
In his article “‘Extravagant Claims’ and ‘Hard Labour:’ Perceptions of Property in the Hudson Valley, 1751-1801,” Thomas Humphrey details the trial and its wider implications in order to show “an example of how colonists imposed their European view of land ownership on Native Americans and how those colonists denied Indians access to lands regardless of their proof of ownership, the dispute also provides an alternative vision of land use to that of New York landlords.”[76] He outlines the wider context of the case, including the original 15,000 acre land patent from 1692 that Adolph Philipse received and how he continued to settle 190,000 acres beyond the original patent.[77] The New York governor then legitimized this by giving him “an official grant for the entire territory” in 1697.[78] A copy of the petition for this land to then-Governor Benjamin Fletcher describes the land that Philipse sought in Dutchess County and documents the purchase from two men of the original piece of land.[79]
The land that the Wappinger tribe still owned was taken in 1756 when "Beverly Robinson, Roger Morris, and Philip Philipse appropriated most of the Wappingers' territory" while the tribe fought "for the British against the French" or "stayed with the Stockbridge Indians."[81] In his first petition for the land, Daniel Nimham distinguishes between which land was "annexed fully" and reiterates his denial that "these lands were ever purchased of their tribe."[82] The Philipse heirs used the earlier documents to claim that this additional tract of land was actually a part of the earlier purchase.[83] In his second petition for the land, Daniel Nimham appealed to the Wappinger tribe’s history of "defense of his majesty's English territories in North America."[84] He emphasized that the tribe had also acted in "a decent, orderly, quiet and peaceable manner toward all his majesty's subjects" and sought to appeal to the King and court on that basis.[85] However, it became increasingly clear in the subsequent proceedings that these appeals to the Council’s kindness would not suffice.[86]

Daniel Nimham based his claim to the land on three core tenets: "title, first occupancy, and use of the land."[87] In order to do so, Nimham produced documentation from different members of his family, including earlier deeds showing which lands had actually been sold and which had not.[88] Though Nimham’s father, Sancoolakkeking, sold some of the land to Adolph Philipse, other sections of the land were supposed to remain in the hands of the Wappinger tribe.[89] Additionally, Humphrey wrote that an older Wappinger sachem testified that even some of the lands that had been sold were done so illegitimately by “one or two members of the tribe” who “could not sell the tribe's land without the consent of the whole tribe.”[90] Unsurprisingly, “the Philipses did not possess such a deed” showing this type of legitimate transaction.[91] This refutation of the Philipse heirs’ evidence continued throughout the duration of the trial. Another witness brought forward a Wappinger sachem who “testified that Adolph Philipse understood that the land belonged to the whole tribe and that the whole tribe needed to agree to sell property, but the tribe never completed the deal.”[92] In the 1765 "Statement of a Controversy between Daniel Nimham et. al. and Philipse Heirs," they describe how Adolph Philipse’s seizure of the aforementioned land was also not entirely agreed upon and how "said tribe" was "deprived thereof without consent."[93] During the trial, the Philipse family’s co-defendant, Beverly Robinson, “produced a suspect
deed from his coat pocket,” that swayed the council’s decision.[94] After its presentation, that deed was “then secreted it away back in his pocket and neither Robinson nor John Morin Scott entered the deed as evidence.”[95]

Ultimately, Daniel Nimham and the Wappinger tribe lost their case before the governor and his council.[96] Nimham and many others were left with the choice to “leave the territory or submit themselves to the proprietary whims of the Philipses.”[97] This case marked a significant victory for the Philipse family, and particularly brothers Philip Philipse and Frederick Philipse III, who continued the family’s legacy of dispossession in the Hudson Valley and prevented a ruling that would spur further petitions.[98] Amid the backdrop of the seizure of land in 1756, Frederick Philipse III became a founding governor of King’s College and his son and nephew were in attendance during part of the trial and in its aftermath.[99]

Conclusion

Eventually, the Philipse family lost their standing in New York City and State when Philipse III, a loyalist, was forced to flee the country following the American Revolution.[100] Though some members of the family remained at the manor under relatively comfortable circumstances, they lost a significant portion of their land and standing in New York.[101] Nevertheless, given their century of prominence, understanding the means through which Philipse III and other members of the Philipse family acquired their fortunes is critical to a thorough interrogation of Columbia University’s history.[102] By outlining their attainment and subsequent intergenerational transfers of wealth, land, and people, their relationship with the Wappinger tribe, the inhabitants of the Philipsburg Manor and surrounding lands, and their engagement in other disputes, it is clear that the Philipse family’s legacy is far from an idyllic “rags to riches” story.[103] Rather, it is a story of enslavement, dispossession, and exploitation. Further research on enslaved people owned by the Philipse family, the tenants who rented land from the Philipse family, and their dispute with the Wappinger may unveil useful information about early class formation and other dynamics in the Hudson Valley during the eighteenth century. Likewise, unveiling more information about the
experiences and impact of Frederick Philipse and Nathaniel Philipse during their time as students at King's College and any involvement they had as alumni could be beneficial.
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