

PRECEDENCE AT HARVARD COLLEGE IN
THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

BY SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

NO institution of early Harvard has excited so much curiosity as the order of names in the graduating classes from 1642 to 1772, inclusive; for the Class of 1773 was the first to be arranged in alphabetical order. All the "authorities": Presidents Quincy, Eliot and Lowell; the Quinquennial Catalogues of 1925 and 1930; Dr. Franklin B. Dexter, in an article in this series;¹ every historian of the College since Peirce, not excepting Mr. Albert Matthews² and myself when we were less well informed than we are now; agreed that *social rank* determined this official order of precedence, both at Harvard and at Yale. The same statement can be found in many general histories, for it heightens the contrast between the "aristocratic" Colonies and the "democratic" United States to learn that a Colonial college student was ranked not by popularity, athletic prowess or even intellectual ability, but by the dignity and position of his family. Biographers, genealogists and ancestor-hunters have taken great comfort from the supposed social criteria exhibited by the Harvard and Yale class lists. If your ancestor was high up, that proves he was a gentleman, a magnate, one of the first families of New England; and even the discovery of a forefather in the supposed social cellar, inspires the

¹"On Some Social Distinctions at Harvard and Yale, before the Revolution," *Proceedings American Antiquarian Society*, new series, ix. 34-59 (Oct. 1893). Also printed in his *Historical Papers* (1918), pp. 203-22, and as a separate pamphlet. My references are to the pages of the separate. Dr. Dexter's article has generally been considered authoritative and final.

²*Publications Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, xv. pp. cxi-cxli, 82 n.; xxv. 420-27.

gratifying reflection that your family has risen in the world. A century ago, as Mr. Frederick J. Stimson relates,¹ the Harvard Triennial Catalogue was on the desk of every gentleman and scholar in this part of the country. If your name was in it, that's who you were; if your name was not in it—who were you?

It is said that Maestlin, the master of Kepler, remarked after reading the first work of his distinguished pupil: "qu'avant Kepler les savants n'avaient attaqué l'astronomie que par derrière." The same perverse practice, I have observed, distinguishes the historians of American universities. They *will* begin at the wrong end, with the "dear old College" of their own undergraduate days, and work backwards; they love to interpret the early years of the institution in the light of their personal experience a century or so later. This was natural enough in a country of many but brief collegiate annals;² but the proper approach to the history of an university, as to that of any other institution, is the genetic approach. Colleges, as well as persons, have their ancestors. Amherst, Dartmouth, and many middle-western colleges were founded by Yale men in imitation of their alma mater. Early Yale is largely explained by the Harvard of the last half of the seventeenth century; and Harvard must be approached through the Cambridge of Queen Elizabeth and the early Stuarts. Yet, whilst no competent biographer would fail to look into his subject's ancestry and parentage, it is customary for historians of American universities to ignore the earlier institutions on which their own are patterned.

This manner of *attaque par derrière* is largely responsible for the prevalent notion of social ranking in early Harvard, as it is for many other traditions in all

¹*My United States* (1931), p. 45.

²At the time of writing, Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale, alone of American Colleges and Universities, are over two centuries old; and many of our most important universities have not yet celebrated their centenaries.

kinds of history. Indeed, the whole process of historical myth- and tradition-making is largely one of explaining a doubtful or forgotten past in the light of one's own experience or emotions.¹ History is perhaps more subject to this sort of mishandling than any other discipline, since anyone who can read and write is apt to regard himself as competent to write a history of his town, college, or country.

Before beginning our historical approach, let us examine what our predecessors found in their *attaque par derrière*. Harvard precedence was one of those things that everybody knew about when it existed, only to be almost completely forgotten in the next generation. A single paragraph on the subject by Cotton Mather, Judge Sewall, or Tutor Flynt would have rendered all my research and speculation unnecessary; but these worthies like every one else simply took the system for granted. When Benjamin Peirce (A.B. 1801), the College Librarian, was writing his *History of Harvard University* in 1831, there remained only a vague tradition that precedence in each Class was regulated by the social status of the students' parents. The only person from whom Peirce could obtain any exact information was Judge Paine Wingate (A. B. 1759), whose letters, written in his ninety-second year, have always been considered the *loci classici* of "placing," as the process of settling the order of precedence in each Class was called.

Judge Wingate wrote to Mr. Peirce on 15 February, 1831, when he was seventy-two years out of college:

You inquire of me whether any regard was paid to a student on account of the rank of his parent, otherwise than his being arranged or *placed* in the order of his class?

¹Another example of this, in the field of college history, is the "tradition" reported to me by sundry old Harvard graduates, that Commencement was so called because it once commenced, not ended, the college year. The origin of this story is the fact that from 1802 to 1848 Harvard Commencement was held on the last Wednesday of August, and immediately following it the next academic year began. But Commencement was so called at Oxford and Cambridge before Harvard was founded; it is merely a translation of the medieval *Inceptio* when the thirteenth century student commenced Master of Arts. The verb to commence, meaning to take a degree, has been in use at Harvard from 1642.

The right of precedence on every occasion is an object of importance in the state of society. And there is scarce any thing which more sensibly affects the feelings of ambition than the rank which a man is allowed to hold. This excitement was generally called up whenever a class in College was *placed*. The parents were not wholly free from influence; but the scholars were often enraged beyond bounds for their disappointment in their place, and it was some time before a class could be settled down to an acquiescence in their allotment. The highest and the lowest in the class was often ascertained more easily (though not without some difficulty), than the intermediate members of the class; where there was room for uncertainty whose claim was best, and where partiality no doubt was sometimes indulged. But I must add, that although the honor of a *place* in the class was chiefly ideal, yet there were some substantial advantages. The higher part of the class had generally the most influential friends, and they commonly had the best chambers in College assigned to them. They had also a right to help themselves first at table in Commons, and I believe generally wherever there was occasional precedence allowed, it was very freely yielded to the higher of the class by those who were below.¹

In answer to some further inquiries, he wrote on March 2, 1831:

The freshmen class was, in my day at College, usually *placed* (as it was termed) within six or nine months after their admission. The official notice of this was given by having their names written in a large German text, in a handsome style, and placed in a conspicuous part of the College *Buttery*, where the names of the four classes of undergraduates were kept suspended until they left College. If a scholar was expelled, his name was taken from its place; or if he was degraded (which was considered the next highest punishment to expulsion), it was moved accordingly. As soon as the freshmen were apprized of their places, each one took his station according to the new arrangement at recitation, and at Commons, and in the chapel, and on all other occasions. And this arrangement was never afterward altered either in College or in the Catalogue, however the rank of their parents might be varied. Considering how much dissatisfaction was often excited by placing the classes (and I believe all the other Colleges had laid aside the practice), I think that it was a judicious expedient in Harvard to conform to the custom of

¹Peirce, *Hist. of Harv. Univ.*, pp. 308-09.

putting the names in *Alphabetical* order, and they have accordingly so remained since the year 1772.¹

Judge Wingate's memory was excellent, and he accurately describes the system *in the period of which he had direct knowledge*. The Faculty Records, which begin with the year 1725, show that each freshman class was formally "placed" by the Faculty, in the autumn of Freshman year until 1737, thenceforth at a date fluctuating between January and July of Freshman year until 1769, when the Class of 1772, last of this old régime, was placed.² About two years after Yale had abolished the system, a particularly annoying complaint from an aggrieved parent brought Harvard to consider the wisdom of continuing it. Alphabetical placing was adopted on the recommendation of a committee of the Overseers, read and adopted at their meeting May 1, 1770,

That the inconveniences attending the method hitherto practiced of placing the Individuals in each Class of the Freshmen *according to the supposed Dignity of the Families whereto they severall belong*, appear to the Com^{tee} to be so great that they have unanimously agreed to report as their opinion that such practice be laid aside, and that for the future the names of Scholars in each Class be placed in *alphabetical order*.³

Read and consented to.

There is other direct evidence as to "family dignity" being the principle of placing:

At a meeting of the President and Tutors (i.e., the Faculty), on April 15, 1760:

. . . Noyes's Place in his Class was consider'd & as his Father is a Justice of the Peace w^{ch} we did not know when the Class was plac'd, it was agreed the Place assign'd him was too low, & after the Matter was debated it was voted that his Place should be between Henshaw & Angier.⁴

The records of a Faculty meeting of June 10, 1755 state:

Whereas when We plac'd the Class of Freshmen, May 17

¹Peirce, *Hist. of Harvard Univ.*, pp. 310-11.

²*Publ. Colonial Soc. Mass.*, xv., p. cxli. n.

³Ms. Overseers' Records, III, 32, quoted in Dexter, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25. *Italics mine.*

⁴Ms. Faculty Records, II, 112. The student was Nathaniel Noyes, A.B. 1763.

last past, Pollock was put next before Frink, Viz the ninth in the Class, for that We had not then been inform'd of the State & Condition of his Family, He coming to us from a distant Province viz, N. Carolina; But being now satisfied that in Regard to his S^d Family, He ought to have a Place in his Class superior to w^t We then assign'd him,

Therefore Voted, That he hold the sixth place in s^d Class, viz. immediately after Wentworth.¹

Six years earlier, on October 20, 1749, General John Winslow, not himself a Harvard Graduate, wrote thus to President Holyoke in behalf of his son Pelham, who had just entered Freshman:

REVEREND AND HONOURED SIR

as I am Bound to Sea and Rank in Our way is Looked upon as a Sacred Thing and it is Generally allowed That The Sons of the New England Cambridge are Placed according to the Degrees of their ancestors I have therefore put in My Pretensions for my Son . . .²

It is certain, then, that by the second half of the eighteenth century, the rank or dignity of the student's father or family was the determining factor in undergraduate precedence.

It is no part of the present inquiry to study how this system worked in the latter half of the eighteenth century. As to that, I will simply say that the application of the principle is by no means clear, and that there was no social slide-rule by which a student's place could be scientifically determined. Also, that the order was so much disturbed on occasion by late-arrivers being added to the foot of a class, and by high-spirited students losing place for misdemeanors, that no social conclusions can safely be drawn from the printed catalogue, at any time. That the determining principle was "family dignity," which corresponded to social rank, is perfectly clear. Whether the same principle was applied before 1750, is another question.

Fortunately, we have ample materials for testing the social rank theory in the seventeenth century.

¹Ms. Faculty Records, II, 33. The student was George Pollock of the Class of 1758 who did not take a degree.

²2 *Proc. M. H. S.*, ix. 6.

Sibley's *Biographical Sketches of Harvard Graduates* have just been completed through the Class of 1700. For the period 1650-1663, and again from the Class of 1689 on, we have the steward's manuscript account books which not only record undergraduate precedence, but give us many more names that are found in the catalogue of graduates. We can, therefore, avoid the error of all previous investigators into Harvard placing, who paid no attention to the numerous non-graduates—almost forty per cent of the whole number in the classes 1651-1663—whose names never entered the Triennial Catalogue, but who were ranked in college with their classmates. Moreover, the usage of titles in seventeenth-century New England records was generally so careful that we can determine the social position of a student's parents with considerable accuracy.

In the first place, what was meant by social rank in seventeenth-century New England? Our ancestors had definite ideas of rank, which they endeavored to enforce by legislation. Their idea of social classes was functional, as in England, rather than hereditary and genetic, as in Scotland and France. A university degree, the sacred ministry,¹ and the magistracy, made a man a gentleman, and gave him the right to have a "Mr." before his name. On the other hand, a gentleman's son did not remain a gentleman if he entered a mean occupation. There was still a considerable flexibility in the class recognized as gentle. Even in England and Virginia, the idea that trade was below a gentleman's dignity came with the Restoration, not the Renaissance; as anyone may observe in the annals of English gentleness like the Verneys, or of first families of Virginia like the Byrds. The leading men in almost every occupation of repute were accorded the title of respect. Thus we find the wealthier

¹Dr. Dexter (*op. cit.*) p. 17, puzzled by the appearance of so many ministers' sons at the foot of Harvard classes, reaches the absurd conclusion that this was based on "the relatively inferior position of the parish minister in their old homes." That was one of the things that the New Englanders prided themselves in getting away from.

merchants, and the principal landowners, shipmasters, master builders, and the like honored with a "Mr." in New England records. By the laws of Massachusetts Bay, gentlemen were legally exempted from ignominious punishments such as whipping, and there is an instance in the records of one man being degraded from his gentle rank, as a punishment.¹ Property as well as education had a good deal to do with rank, as is shown by the Massachusetts law of 1651 "against excess in Apparel . . . especially amongst people of mean condition." The General Court declare their

utter detestation and dislike, that men or women of mean condition, should take upon them the garb of Gentlemen, by wearing Gold or Silver lace, or Buttons, or Points at their knees, or to walk in great Boots; or Women of the same rank to wear Silk or Tiffiny hoods, or Scarfes, which though allowable to persons of greater Estates, or more liberal education, yet we cannot but judge it intollerable in persons of such like condition: It is therefore Ordered, [that such gaudy apparell be worn only by persons whose estates shall be over £200], Provided this Law shall not extend to the restraint of *any Magistrate or publick Officer . . . or any settled Military Officer . . . or any other whose education and employment have been above the ordinary degree, or whose estate have been considerable, though now decayed.*²

In the public records of the New England colonies in the seventeenth century, even of "democratic" Maine and Rhode Island, a man's social station may generally be told from his title. Only governors and some of the other magistrates,³ together with occasional sons of knights and men who had held high position in England, had "Esquire" placed after their names; and not all magistrates, in every colony, were thus

¹On Sept. 27, 1631, Josias Plastowe, for stealing corn, was ordered "hereafter to be called by the name of Josias, & not Mr, as formerly hee vsed to be." *Records of Mass. Bay*, I. 92.

²W. H. Whitmore, *Colonial Laws of Mass. reprinted from Edition of 1672*, p. 5. Italics mine. Ministers were probably not included in the exempted classes because it was assumed that their authority, if not their means, was sufficient to restrain their families.

³I.e., the members of the upper house of the Colonial assemblies who also served as judges, and local magistrates, who under the Province Charter of Massachusetts Bay were called after the English fashion, Justices of the Peace. Deputies, i.e., members of the lower house, were not magistrates, and were not designated "Mr." unless they had other qualifications for that title.

honored. Other magistrates, ministers, university graduates, and all others who were considered gentlemen, were designated "Mr."; and their wives and daughters, "Mrs."¹ Military officers were known by their military rank. These classes constituted the gentry. It is almost a certain sign that a family was not considered gentle, in seventeenth-century New England, if the head of it was not designated in the records as "Mr.", "Esq.", or by some military title higher than Captain.

Within the class of gentry there were nice gradations of rank, based largely on official position. Samuel Sewall, Esquire, Judge of the Superior Court and Councillor of the Province, tells us in his diary about visiting Lieutenant-Governor and Chief-Justice Stoughton on his sick-bed. "When coming away, he reach'd out his hand; I gave him mine, and kiss'd his"—a very proper acknowledgment of the Lieutenant-Governor's superior position. On another occasion, Samuel Sewall and Wait Winthrop, his colleague on the Council and the Bench, visited Henry Sewall, the Judge's father. The old gentleman, who was not a magistrate, first kissed Winthrop's hand, and then his son's. Winthrop did not return the salute, since it was one from an inferior to a superior; but Samuel Sewall piously returned the father's gesture of deference to the magistracy. On the next day the father attempted to rise when his magisterial son entered the room, "but I persuaded him to sit still in his chair," records Samuel.²

Below the gentry, or "the quality," as they used to be called, came the great middle class of the New England population. All those who were considered respectable, who had some definite place or substantial property in the community, such as the average farmer,

¹On formal occasions, these titles were still pronounced "Master" and "Mistress."

²*Diary*, II. (5 *Collections Mass. Hist. Soc.*, vi) 38, 13. Cf. the rules for precedence in the American Colonies, in Anthony Stokes, *A View of the Constitution of the British Colonies* (London, 1783), p. 190; and the early New England practice of "dignifying" the pews in the meeting-house.

artisan, and tradesman—were addressed as “Goodman” This and “Goodwife” That. Sometimes they were so designated in the earliest records; but more often simply by name with no title. The goodmen and goodwives shaded off into a class of former indented servants, farm laborers, journeymen, fishermen, common seamen and the like, who were not considered of sufficient repute to be given any title of respect; and below them, but clearly marked off in status, were the indented servants.

Many have noted social discrepancies in the Harvard class lists of the seventeenth century; sons of obscure parents who are high, and sons of the mighty who are low. As degradation in the list was a well recognized punishment of students by the College authorities, historians of Harvard have always been able to wave aside these discrepancies as due to personal misconduct. The discovery that the stewards’ books list students in their Class precedence *and in Freshman year*, before any could have been degraded for misconduct, has thrown these excuses out of court. An intensive examination of those Classes which are found in the stewards’ records, show innumerable exceptions to social ranking, of which the following are the most striking.

Class of 1651¹

After the son of a magistrate of New Haven, comes (2) Michael Wigglesworth, son of a “goodman” of New Haven; (3) a son of the Reverend John Cotton; (4) a minister’s son and grandson of Governor Dudley; (5) probably son of the Deputy-Governor of New Haven; (6) a merchant’s son; (9) John Davis, “son of goodman William Davis of New Haven”; (10) son

¹See lists in appendix. Although Steward Chesholme purchased his record book, and entered the names of this Class, after Commencement 1651, he includes the names of three students who did not graduate, probably because they still owed the College money, the name of Jonathan Ince who graduated, probably by promotion, with the Class of 1650; the positions of Davis and Pelham are the reverse of the order in the Triennial. It is probable, then, that he copied both the names, the order, and the earlier accounts, from the records of his predecessor, Matthew Day.

of Herbert Pelham, the College treasurer, of an English gentle family connected with the Lords de la Warr; (11) and (12) sons of the Reverend Charles Chauncy, the future president.

This class has long been a stumbling block for the "social ranking" school of thought; and the shifts and evasions that have been made in order to twist it into some semblance of conformity with the colonial social hierarchy, are most amusing. Particularly embarrassing to the social rankers is the high position of Michael Wigglesworth, son of Goodman Wigglesworth of New Haven, ahead of a Pelham, a Chauncy, a Cotton, and a Dudley. Dean challenged the "social ranking" theory on this very ground;¹ to which Sibley replied that the elder Wigglesworth might have been a great man in England, prevented from attaining high rank in New Haven only by his "infirmities"; whilst Dexter insisted that Edward was "one of the most substantial citizens" of New Haven.² Michael's autobiography suggests that his father was a petty tradesman in England, and the Colonial records prove that he was not considered a gentleman in New Haven, although of unquestioned respectability and a pillar of the church. Fifteen times or more he is mentioned in the records, often in the same line or group with other New Havenites who are called "Mr.," but not once is Edward Wigglesworth called "Mr." His only titles are "Goodman" and "Brother," meaning a member of the church.³

Michael Wigglesworth's parents were of the same social status as those of John Davis, 9th in the Class of 1651, who was described by a contemporary as "one of the best accomplished persons for learning, as ever

¹*Sketch of the Life of Rev. Michael Wigglesworth* (1863), reprinted from *N. E. H. G. R.*, xvii. 129-46 (Apr. 1863), and in his review of Dexter's *Social Distinctions* in *N. E. H. G. R.* xlvi. 477.

²Sibley, i. 259-60, notes; Dexter, p. 21.

³*New Haven Colonial Records*, (1638-49) *passim*, esp. 281, 302, 453; (1653-65) 23, 90: "The last will and testament of Edwa: Wigglesworth . . . witnessed by Mr. John Dauenport . . . and M. Mathew Gilbert." Although Edward was lame from 1641, it would be difficult to find anywhere a case of bodily infirmity affecting one's social rank.

was bred at Harvard Colledge,"¹ a description that fits Michael equally well.

The other striking social solecism in this class is the placing of the Chauncy boys near the end. Dr. Dexter attempts to account for this on three separate grounds: (1) they came from a "poor country parsonage,"—Scituate in Plymouth Colony; (2) the Harvard authorities discriminated against students from without Massachusetts-Bay; and (3) "straitened paternal circumstances."² The first implies the snobbish nineteenth-century distinction between rich city churches and country parishes, a distinction which did not exist in 1650. The second plea is a strange one, in view of the fact that New Havenites occupied positions 1, 2, 5, and 9 in this class, all preceding the Chauncys.³ As to the "straitened circumstances," if the basis of ranking had been social, loss of property would have been the last thing to have effected it.⁴ Charles Chauncy had been one of the most distinguished scholars of his generation at Cambridge, and his family according to contemporary English values, was one of the first in rank among those who sent members to New England.⁵

¹Daniel Gookin, in 1 *Coll. M. H. S.*, i. 202-03. Davis's father is also styled "Goodman" and "Brother" in the New Haven Records (1638-49) 10, 50, 302, etc.), and was seated in the meeting house two pews below the elder Wigglesworth.

²Dexter, *Some Social Considerations*, pp. 15, 11, 9.

³This was a favorite idea of Dr. Dexter's, and like most of his conclusions, was based on two or three instances, ignoring others. A son of the Rev. William Hooke was 8th in 1655; but sons of a Massachusetts clergyman were 16th and 17th; another Hooke outranked the son of another Massachusetts clergyman by 4 places in 1656; a son of Governor Haynes outranked the sons of the Rev. Peter Bulkley and the Rev. Thomas Shepard in 1658; a son of the Rev. Samuel Stone is 2d in 1662; in 1693 the sons of Connecticut ministers are 1st and 2d; and many other instances might be given of boys from colonies outside Massachusetts Bay outranking the sons of men of similar position in Massachusetts Bay.

⁴And in the same article (pp. 7-8), Dr. Dexter asserts that the sons of decayed gentry were unduly favored in rank, although the only example he gives, that of John Still Winthrop (A.B. Yale 1737) the son of John Winthrop, F.R.S. (A.B. 1700) is apposite neither to this theory nor to the cognate notion that "aristocratic" Harvard favored the decayed gentry more than "democratic" Yale. John Winthrop, F.R.S., was a gentleman of distinction; and while Yale ranked his son first, no one of the five last Winthrops to graduate from Harvard before alphabetical order was established, graduated first in his Class.

⁵The Chauncys, Bulkleys, Clarkes, Pynchons, Harlakendens, and several other families of early New England, have longer pedigrees, and were earlier ranked as gentry in the old country, than the Winthrops and Saltonstalls.

1653 (August 9)

Willis, a fellow-commoner, heads the list. Angier (2) and Shepard (3), ministers' sons, are ranked ahead of Nowell (4), son of a prominent magistrate, Secretary of the Bay Colony, and great-nephew to a Dean of St. Paul's. Hubbard, (5) is a minister's son, (6) son of a wealthy merchant, magistrate, and Treasurer of Connecticut. Hooker (7) and Stone (8) are sons of the famous ministers of Hartford; Thomson (9), son of the minister of Braintree. The first five members of this class were easily the more prominent in later life.

1653 (August 10)

After two magistrates' sons comes Long, son of an innholder who settled in Charlestown. Whiting (4) is the son of Samuel Whiting, minister of Lynn, belonging to a prominent family from Boston, Lincolnshire; and his mother was sister to Chief Justice Oliver St. John. Then comes Joshua Moody, the son of a saddler; the Ambrose brothers, sons of an English gentleman; and Crosby, the son of a Cambridge "goodman." The high position of the Charlestown publican's son does not upset Dr. Dexter; he cites it as "emphatic testimony . . . to the honorable regard paid in the old country to that public trust of keeping a house of entertainment, which we know to have been at that date a prerogative of citizens of the first rank,"¹ a statement which almost completely reverses the facts; for although the authorities were inclined for prudential reasons to grant liquor licenses to law-abiding and responsible men, the innkeeper's calling did not make a man a gentleman; and by no stretch of imagination could a respectable tavern-keeper be supposed to outrank a minister of a good English county family.

Moody (5) and Crosby (8) attained the highest distinction of this class in after life.

¹*Op. cit.*, p. 19. An innkeeper's son headed the Class of 1667, and another is 5th out of 9 in the Class of 1696.

1655

“Mr. Brookes” (1) is a fellow-commoner; the father of (2) is unidentified; Oakes (3) is the son of a Cambridge selectman; Willoughby (4) the son of an Assistant and Magistrate of Massachusetts Bay; Bulkley (5) a son of the Reverend Peter; Utie (6) is probably the son of a Councillor of Virginia; Fownall (7) son of a miller of Charlestown; Hooke (8), son of the Rev. William Hooke of New Haven; Chickering (9), son of a baker; the next six are not sons of gentlemen, but the last two are sons of the minister of Malden. Bulkley, Hooke, and (if we have identified him correctly) Utie, were the most distinguished in later life.

1656

Thirteen out of the fourteen members of this Class were gentlemen's sons, among whom there might be many differences of opinion as to the relative rank. But it is curious that a son of Governor Haynes should here outrank a son of the “Apostle” Eliot, whilst in 1658 the position of their brothers is exactly reversed.

1657

Symmes (1) is a minister's son; Walker (2) a weaver's son; Brigden (3), son of Thomas Brigden of Charlestown (who receives no title of respect in the town records), rings the College bell and waits on table; Hale (4), a blacksmith's son, serves as waiter and monitor, yet outranks Symonds, son of an Assistant and Magistrate of the Bay. Next comes Elisha Cooke, founder of a famous family, but the son of a tailor; a son of the famous Reverend John Cotton, sometime Vicar of St. Botolph's and Fellow of Emmanuel, is (7). Numbers (8), (10) and (13) are ministers' sons, the last of Charles Chauncy. The first three members had quite undistinguished careers; the best known in later life were Hale, Cooke, and Cotton.

1658

Gatliffe (1) is a miller's son; (2) is another of the "Apostle" Eliot's offspring; (3) and (5), both sons of Governor Haynes, are separated by an unidentified Mutice; (6) a son of Major-General Denison, Assistant and Magistrate; (7) another son of the Reverend Peter Bulkley of Concord; (8), (10), and (12) are the sons of "goodmen" and (11) of the Reverend Thomas Shepard of Cambridge. The last two in the Class became the most distinguished.

1659

The order of this Class corresponds to the social hierarchy up to a certain point. The first two are fellow-commoners; the third, a son of George Alcock, Esq., physician; (4) is the son of Mr. Thomas Savage, merchant and prominent militia officer. Samuel Willard (5) son of a Magistrate and Assistant, was later Vice-President of the College and one of the intellectual lights of the Colony. But Hackbone (8), son of a "goodman" of Rowley, outranks Rogers (10), son of the famous Reverend Nathaniel of Ipswich and Belcher (11), son of a man of considerable standing and property in Ipswich. The Noyes brothers, who end the list, probably joined Sophomore year.

1660

Alline (1), a shipowner's son, and Collins (2), a Cambridge deputy and deacon's son, outrank sons of Simon Bradstreet, Esq. (3), and of the "Apostle" Eliot (4). Two sons of John Whittingham, a gentleman of Ipswich, are (13) and (14), but one of these is placed (4) at graduation. Peter Bulkley, Jr. (11) was the most distinguished member in after life.

1661

The Restoration dramatist John Crowne, son of a proprietor of Nova Scotia, heads the list. A son of

Governor Bellingham is 2nd. But a son of Reverend Samuel Whiting of Lynn and a son of the Reverend John Sherman of Watertown, then Overseer and later Fellow of Harvard College, are placed 11th and 15th, after sons of some very plain people indeed. And before this Class was placed, an English cousin of Whiting had become Lord Protector. Israel Chauncy (7), the President's son, was the most distinguished of his classmates.

1662

This Class seems to follow the social hierarchy through the first four places; but after five sons of plain people, come Addington (10), son of a gentleman of Boston; Stoddard (11), grandson of Emmanuel Downing and one of the intellectual lights of his age; Fiske (12), a son of the Reverend John; Savage (14), brother of the man who was placed (4) in 1659; and Oakes (15), brother of the man who was placed (3) in 1655. Benjamin Tompson (4), the first native-born Harvard poet, was brother of the man who was placed (9) and last in 1653, August 9.

1664

After three sons of notables comes (4) Brackenbury, a baker's son, who outranks a son of the Reverend John Woodbridge and grandson of Governor Dudley. Brackenbury was an excellent mathematician, a compiler of almanacs, as Sibley fails to note. Street (7) is a son of the Reverend Samuel of Taunton.

1665

Eliot (1) is the youngest son of the "Apostle" Eliot; and Joseph Dudley (2), the future Governor, is youngest son of Governor Thomas. Next come the son of a merchant and millowner of Ipswich, and the son of the Marshal-General of the Colony, a post much inferior to that of Major-General Atherton, Assistant and Magistrate, whose son is only (6), following a son

of Goodman William Man, constable of Cambridge. Two Indians close the list.

1666

Browne (1) is a fellow-commoner; Richardson (2), the son of a tailor, and later Fellow of the College, and a successful minister, outranks a scion of the Pynchon family of Springfield, who were landed gentry in England and magistrates in Massachusetts Bay. A son of this Pynchon heads the Class of 1692.

1667

Harriman (1), son of a tavernkeeper, Atkinson (2), son of a felt-maker, and Foster (3), son of a brewer, outrank three sons of the Reverend Peter Hobart, as well as Nicholas Noyes, nephew of the two ministers of Newbury. The last two on the list were the most eminent of this class.

For the Classes of 1668 to 1687, inclusive, we have no stewards' records or monitors' bills to amplify or check the lists of graduates in the Catalogues. I shall not, therefore, attempt to analyze these classes, since for aught we know some of the social discrepancies in them (such as ranking a son of the Governor of Connecticut after a weaver's son and a son of the college butler, in 1669), may have been due to degradation for misconduct, or to late entry. But even such possibilities cannot explain why the Class of 1671, which included Samuel Sewall, a Mather, a Danforth, a Thacher, and a Weld, should be headed by the son of a shipmaster who was followed by the son of a carpenter; even though the shipmaster was known as a "Godly Gentleman."¹

For the Class of 1689 on we have stewards' quarter-bill books which give the undergraduate precedence not only for every class, but for each quarter of the academic year. The following are some of the principal social discrepancies noted in the remaining classes of the seventeenth century.

¹Mather, *Magnalia* (1702 ed.), Bk III. 183.

1690

Near the foot of this record-breaking class of 23, was a group composed of Wadsworth, Ruggles, Goffe, and Lynde—all sons of colonial notables more distinguished than the parents of seven or eight students who preceded them, and equal to the parents of those in places (3) through (9). Timothy Edwards, son of a Hartford merchant, is placed (7) in this Class. All deductions drawn by biographers of his famous son, Jonathan, from Timothy's place in the Catalogue at the foot of 1691, into which he had been dropped, are obviously invalid.

1693

Two sons of Connecticut parsons are followed by Henry Flynt of happy memory, also a parson's son. The Wades, (4) and (5), were sons of Colonel Thomas Wade, a gentleman of property. Hodson (6) and Hunting (13), are sons of wealthy merchants; there seems no good "social" reason for placing the latter, who was the most liberal spender of his college generation, after three or four sons of very plain people.

1694

A Winthrop and two Woodbridges lead off; but Adams (4), son of the minister of Dedham, is placed above John Savage (5) of the Boston mercantile aristocracy.

1695

Two merchants' sons (Vassall and Price, the first from Jamaica), head the list, outranking the Saltonstalls, sons of a Magistrate and Colonel, and great-grandsons of Sir Richard, who founded one of the first families of New England; but Lindall (11), son of a merchant and local magistrate of at least the standing of Price's father, is found far down, as is Thomas Little (15), whose father belonged to the governing class of Plymouth Colony. The ministers' sons in this Class list fare ill compared with those in 1693 and 1696.

1696

Vaughan (1) is son of a Councillor of New Hampshire; the next three are ministers' sons; but Remington, son of a Cambridge carpenter and publican, outranks two other ministers' sons, a soldier's son, and Melyen, son of a wealthy merchant from New York. Thacher (3) seems to have been the most famous of this Class.

1697

The order is compatible with family dignity until we reach Adams (10), son of a cordwainer and recent immigrant from Ireland, who outranks Southmayd (12), the son of a wealthy shipowner, and Coit (13), son of a respectable shipbuilder and leading citizen of New London.

1698

Symmes, ranked third by the Steward, was raised by the Faculty over the heads of a Cotton and a Mather, to first place. Symmes was an unusually pious and intelligent student, son of a minister who had been first in his class (1657). Cutler (6), son of a Dutch immigrant who had become a wealthy merchant, outranks Hubbard (7), son of a merchant of older stock, and grandson of the Reverend William Hubbard (A.B. 1642). His brother in 1695 came just after the two Saltonstalls. Fox, son and grandson of ministers, was placed (11) but graduated (7), almost exactly changing places with White, another minister's son. Oxenbridge Thacher is (14), although his first cousin Peter, with a less distinguished father and mother, was ranked (3) in 1696. Thacher's career shows him to have been subnormal in ambition, if not in intelligence.

1700

Bradstreet, grandson of a governor, but son of a deceased physician of Barbados, is placed first over John Winthrop, whose parentage and ancestry were

far more wealthy, distinguished and eminent. Winthrop only attained first place at graduation by being made a fellow-commoner.

Another means of testing the "social rank" hypothesis, is to observe the places of sons of the same men. When two brothers are in the same class, they are placed one after the other, the elder first; the only Classes in which two brothers are separated, are those of 1658 and 1725. This certainly looks as if the parents counted more than the children. But if place were based on the rank of the student's father, brothers in different classes would be in a similar, though not necessarily the same, position. Let us see how this works out for families having three or more sons.

Sons of the Rev. Peter Bulkley (M.A. Cambridge, d. March 9, 1659).¹ John is (3) in a class of 9 (1642); Gershom, (5) in a class of 17 (1655); Eleazer (7) in a class of 12 (1658). Peter, son of Peter's eldest son the Reverend Edward, is (11) in a class of 15 (1660) and "littell Peter Bulckly," son of the Reverend Peter in his old age, is last in a class of 16 (1662).

Sons of the Rev. Charles Chauncy (B.D. Cambridge, d. 1672), Isaac and Ichabod are (11) and (12) in a class of 14 (1651), Barnabas last in a class of 13 (1657); the 3 others, of 1661, are not in the Steward's records, but graduate (2), (3), and (4) in a class of 17. Their father had become President of the College before they were placed.

Sons of the Rev. John Eliot of Roxbury (B.A. Cambridge, d. 1690). John is (6) in a class of 14 (1656); Joseph is (2) in a class of 12 (1658); Samuel is (4) in a class of 15 (1660); Benjamin is (1) in a class of 9 (1665).

¹The dates of the fathers' deaths are given because Dr. Dexter (*op. cit.*, p. 11) says "In some early cases it seems as though the father's death had affected the son's rank unfavorably"—a strange system of social classification to degrade a son after his father's death. The father of Glover, (2) in 1650, died before reaching America; the father of Flynt, (3) in 1693, died before he entered College; so with the father of Thacher, (3) in 1696. Samuel Nowell, son of Increase Nowell, was (4) out of 9 in 1653 (Aug. 9), but his younger brother Alexander, who entered College after the father's death, was the head of 1671!

Sons of Governor Haynes (d. January 1653/54). John is (5) in a class of 14 (1656); Roger and Joseph are (3) and (5) in a class of 12 (1658).

Sons of the Rev. Peter Hobart (M.A. Cambridge, d. 1646). The first two are (3) and (4) in a class of 9 (1650); the next three are (4), (5), and (6) in a class of 7 (1667).

Sons of Edward Oakes (d. 1689). Urian is (3) in a class of 5 (1649); Edward (3) in a class of 17 (1655); Thomas (15) in a class of 16 (1662). During all these years the father was a selectman of Cambridge. Nathaniel Mather in 1651 refers to him as "Sergiant Okes."¹

Sons of the Rev. John Rogers, the head of the Class of 1649, and who was President of the College from May 24, 1682, to his death on July 2, 1684. John is (2) in a class of 9 (1684), Daniel is (3) in a class of 8 (1686), Nathaniel (3) in a class of 11 (1687).

Sons of the Rev. Thomas Shepard of Cambridge (M.A. Cambridge, d. 1649). Thomas is (3) in a class of 9 (1653, Aug. 9); Samuel (11) in a class of 12 (1658); and Jeremiah (3) in a class of 10 (1669).

Thus, there are serious discrepancies in the placing of five out of eight sets of brothers.

Enough, I think, has been said, to prove that the hypothesis of placing according to the social or official rank of the student's father, is untenable for the seventeenth-century classes. Of the 27 classes for which we have reasonably complete lists in the stewards' records, the only classes which seem to conform to the Colonial social hierarchy are 1656 and 1699, with 13 members each, 1663, 1691, and 1692, with 6, 7, and 8 members respectively.

* * *

We may now approach the subject forward, and inductively, instead of backward and deductively, by examining the system of precedence at the English

¹⁴ *Coll. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, VIII. 3.

universities with which the founders of Harvard were familiar.

At Oxford and Cambridge there are two academic orders of seniority to be considered: the precedence, or seniority as it was called, within each college, and the university *ordo senioritatis*.

Every college of Oxford and Cambridge kept in 1600, and still keeps today, a buttery book. In this are listed in a column the names of all members of the College, in order of seniority, and against these names in parallel columns, are placed the current charges for food and drink. The names of undergraduate members were (and in some colleges still are) posted conspicuously on the buttery "tables," or "boards," as they are now called. To "cut a name out of the tables" or "put a name out of the buttery" was, and in some colleges still is, the symbol of expulsion.¹ In the modern printed Oxford University Calendar, the names of undergraduate members of each College are still listed in the order of seniority, without any regard to the alphabet, exactly as in the old Harvard stewards' accounts and in the classes 1642-1772.

The usual college order of seniority around 1600, in one of the simpler or smaller colleges such as Emmanuel and Sidney Sussex, was as follows:²

1. Master of the College
2. Fellows {
 - a. Doctors
 - b. Masters
 - c. Bachelors

¹At Christ Church, Oxford, the Dean still erases in person from the Buttery Book, the name of an expelled undergraduate.

²It was not common in 1600 for graduates to leave their "names on the books" as is done by Oxford and Cambridge graduates today; and a separate class of Noblemen then existed in few if any of the Colleges. Hardly any two colleges were organized alike; and there were several classifications peculiar to certain colleges, such as Tabedars, Demies, Senior Students, Canons, Subsizars, Choiristers, etc., which we need not here consider. Dr. Dexter (*op. cit.*, pp. 1-5) seems to have misunderstood what Dr. Venn wrote to him on this subject of college classes at Cambridge, and to have supposed that this system was what the Harvard authorities were endeavoring to follow. As we shall see presently, there is no precedent at Cambridge for ranking the students within a given class by social dignity; and the class that a student elected to enter depended entirely on the fees that he paid; except that only a noble could enter the class of noblemen, where such a class existed

3. Fellow-Commoners (called Gentleman-Commoners at Oxford)
4. Resident Bachelors of Arts
5. Scholars
6. Pensioners (called Commoners at Oxford)
7. Sizars (called Battelers at Oxford)

It will be noted that this is a vertical classification, rather than a horizontal one by classes in the American sense. Each Fellow is ranked according to the date of his admission to a fellowship, except that all Doctors precede Masters, and Masters precede Bachelor Fellows. Each Fellow-Commoner is ranked according to the date of his admission to the College, and all Fellow-Commoners, even if Freshmen, precede all other undergraduates. The Scholars are ranked among themselves according to the dates of admission to a scholarship, and the junior Scholar, even if a Freshman, precedes a Pensioner who is a Senior Sophister. Sizars and Pensioners, the classes which correspond to the great majority of Harvard students, were ranked *according to the date of their admission to College*.

This rule of determining each man's precedence *within his class* by the date of entrance, seems to have been universal at Oxford and Cambridge in the seventeenth century; and is still followed today.¹ There is not now and never has been, to the knowledge of any Oxford or Cambridge historian, any system of arranging names *within the same class* (such as Pensioners, Scholars, etc.) by social prestige, academic merit, or by any other principle than the date of the student's acceptance as a candidate, or of his actual admission.² Thus, the Emmanuel order book, in 1629, records a

¹Except that the names of undergraduates in the Cambridge Calendar have in recent years been alphabetized.

²As the maniple of _____ College, Oxford, remarked to me, "The Earl of _____'s son came here, but he was placed far down in the list among the men of his year." He admitted, however, that a presentable youth was occasionally "wangled" into the place of senior commoner, irrespective of the date of his admission, since the senior commoner represents the undergraduate body on certain occasions.

vote of the Master and Fellows that an undergraduate's seniority is to date from writing his name and county in the college register upon his admission.¹ If he neglects to do this immediately, he may lose his seniority to some later arrival who inscribes promptly. At Sidney Sussex, it was enacted that a student would "lose his seniority" if he did not begin actual residence within three months of his admission to College; and that if anyone were promoted from one "Commons" to another, (i.e., from one class to another, since each class dined at a separate table), "he shall be the junior of all those that are in commons before him of the same year, to end at the end of Easter term."² Emmanuel required that "if any ones name shalbe hereafter taken out of the Colledge buttryes upon any occasion whatsoever; he shall upon his readmission . . . loose his former seniority in his yeare and thenceforth be reckond according to his last admission, as if he were admitted from some other Colledge."³

This college seniority was very important at Oxford and Cambridge in the seventeenth century; but the difference between classes was much more significant than precedence within a class. Each class of students wore a different gown, had different rights and privileges and paid a different scale of board and tuition fees. Each ate its own commons at the same table or group of tables; except that the fortunate fellow-commoners dined at high table with the dons, and the luckless sizars often depended on scraps:

Thus a lean *Sizar* views, with gaze aghast,
The hungry tutor at his noon's repast;
In vain he grinds his teeth—his grudging eye,
And visage sharp, keen appetite imply;

¹Ms., Emmanuel muniments, 2 Feb. 1629, p. 31.

²Ms. copy of Order Book, Sidney Sussex muniments, July 17, 1609.

³Emmanuel Order Book (ms.), 2 Jan. 1656/57, p. 67. There was much passing from a lower rank to a higher at Cambridge. Thus a sizar or pensioner might win a scholarship; he then became the Junior Scholar. A sizar's father might, by paying more, make his son a pensioner. But I have never found any evidence at Oxford or Cambridge of the Harvard practice of "degradation," other than the indirect method of expelling him altogether and readmitting him to a new seniority, as provided by the Emmanuel order just quoted.

Oft he attempts, officious, to convey
 The lessening relics of the meal away—
 In vain—no morsel scapes the greedy jaw,
 All, all is gorg'd in magisterial maw;
 Till, at the last, *observant of his word,*
 The lamentable waiter clears the board:
 And inly murmuring miserably groans,
 To see the empty dish, and hear the sounding bones.¹

College statutes frequently contain a promise that every member of the College must show proper respect to his seniors, and sometimes specify that he must uncover first, yield the wall, and the like. Seniority within a class was important chiefly for preference in the assignment of studies, and for the order of performing disputations and other academic exercises.

In addition to these college hierarchies, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge had an order of seniority of their own, which much more nearly corresponded to the American system of classes. The University, as such, cared nothing for fellow-commoners, scholars, pensioners, and sizars. A student matriculated in the University of Cambridge according to his college status, and paid fees accordingly;² but members of the University were ranked by their degrees, or, if undergraduates, by their year—i.e., their class in the American sense. Thus, the lines spoken at a representation of *Ignoramus* at Cambridge in 1615 list members of the University in reverse order of their precedence:

Stabant primo loco gentes
 Quos vulg. pop. vocat *recentes*,³
 Illos subsequuntur isti
 Qui vocantur hic *sophistae*,
 Et post illos alter status
 Ordo *baccalaureatus*;

¹*The Gentleman's Magazine*, LXV, Part 1 (1795), p. 21.

²But at Oxford an undergraduate matriculated as *equitis aurati filius*, *generosi filius*, *clerici filius*, *plebei filius*, and the like, which theoretically had reference to his father's quality, and paid fees accordingly; his status in his college was completely ignored.

³Freshmen, with whom Sophomores are evidently included; but in a contemporary account of James the First's visit to the University in 1622, we read, "The young Scholars were placed . . . in this manner: the Freshmen, Sophmoors, and Sophisters, . . ." John Nichols, *The Progresses of . . . James I*, iv. 1114.

Proximas tenebant partes
 Hi qui sciunt omnes artes;
 Ubi illi desinebant,
 Non-regentes apparebant;
 Pone, gentium dii majorum
 Turba gravis stat doctorum.¹

When the Senior Sophisters took their Bachelors' degrees at determinations, they were placed by the presiding proctors in an *ordo senioritatis*, the principles of which are still as much of a mystery as Harvard precedence in the seventeenth century. Dr. Venn, editor of the monumental *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, who from his examination of the careers of tens of thousands of Cambridge alumni, was more competent than anyone to express an opinion, would not commit himself very far. "What were the grounds on which the arrangement was originally made, it is now impossible to say. In many cases priority was certainly granted to social position . . . In other cases . . . it looks as if intellectual pre-eminence was the determining cause."² Elsewhere he says, "At first, nothing more seems to have been contemplated than an 'order of seniority:' this remained the technical designation until quite recent times, and has, in fact, never been abandoned. But the list subsequently claimed to be, and was universally recognized as being, an 'order of merit.'" Dr. Venn believes that the top of the list always showed *some* merit; and that merit became the understood principle for it in the first half of the eighteenth century³—the identical period when the Harvard class lists were becoming definitely social.

Again, when the Bachelors of Arts took their Masters' degrees, those who commenced together were arranged by the proctors in a new Masters' *ordo senioritatis*, often with the names in quite a different order from that of their bachelors' *ordo* three years

¹Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, III. 87.

²Introduction to *Al. Cantab.*, p. vii.

³Introduction to *Grace Book Δ*, pp. ix-x. See also Peacock, *Observations on the Statutes*, Appendix A, pp. ix, xxxviii.

before. Dr. Venn will not even express an opinion on the basis of the Masters' arrangement. If an outsider may venture an opinion, it seems likely that merit would have entered into the M.A. order earlier than into the B.A. order, since few Cambridge men in the early seventeenth century took an M.A. unless they were aiming at a college fellowship or an ecclesiastic benefice.¹

The University of Oxford appears to have had a masters' *ordo senioritatis* similar to that of Cambridge, but as yet nobody has endeavored to solve the principles of its arrangement. Richard Peers, the compiler of the first catalogue of Oxford graduates,² says in his introduction, "The true Station of Masters of Arts among themselves is according as they are rank'd by the Proctors at Act," except that "Grand-Compoublers"—those who pay a lump sum for University fees instead of annual payments—are always put first of their year. On what principle the others were ranked, he does not say.

We may also examine the systems of precedence in the Scottish universities in the seventeenth century. At the University of St. Andrews, "There is no readily apparent method in the arrangement of names in the

¹For instance, comparing the Cambridge B.A. *ordo* of 1586 with the masters' *ordo* of 1589: numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 in the B.A. *ordo* took no M.A. Numbers 3, 7, 10 in the B.A. *ordo* ranked respectively 28, 24, and 17 in the M.A. *ordo*. Conversely, numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 in the M.A. *ordo* had been ranked respectively 95, 15, 189, 69, 161, 14, and 116 in their B.A. *ordo*. *Grace Book Δ*, pp. 396, 434. It is not often possible to make these comparisons, as the authorities were very careless in copying the *ordines* into the Grace Books, or the proctors only ranked the first ten or twelve, leaving the rest to follow in college groups according to the seniority of each College in the University. Thus, we have no *ordines* for the years in which John Harvard took his two degrees; but President Dunster stood 115th in a masters' *ordo* of 188; Peter Bulkeley was placed 11th in a bachelors' *ordo* of 122; President Chauncy stood 2d in his bachelors' *ordo* of 176, and 4th in his masters' *ordo* of 121; John Knowles, later minister of Watertown, stood 18th in his bachelors' *ordo* of 22, the top of the list alone being ranked that year; John Wheelwright stood 104th in his masters' *ordo* of 209; Walter Hooke, who left his Harvard Class of 1656 for Pembroke College, Cambridge, stands 25th out of 161 when taking his Cambridge B.A. in 1656/57. (*Hist. Register of the Univ. of Camb.*, 1910, pp. 394, 396, 398, 408; Ms. Grace Book E, Univ. of Camb. Registry.)

²*A Catalogue of all Graduates in Divinity, Law, and Physick; and of all Masters of Arts and Doctors of Musick, who have regularly proceeded or been created in the University of Oxford, 1659-1688.* Oxford, 1689. Cf. Andrew Clark, *Register of the Univ. of Oxford*, II. part I, pp. 84-85.

Matriculation Roll. Nowhere is there any attempt at alphabetical order by surname, or even by Christian name, which at one time was the regular practice . . . Even when divided by colleges the names follow each other in promiscuous order." But when graduating, the M.A.'s were separated into groups known as "circles," "Order of merit may have been the guiding principle in the arrangement of the Graduation Roll. If so it is noteworthy that the names of poor students are usually placed last in the lists."¹

At Edinburgh, which was a University of a single college like Harvard, there was "no system of classification in entry. The names are entered in different hands, presumably those of the students, who apparently signed just as they came along."² In graduation the same system of "circles" was used as at St. Andrews, and these brackets are supposed by the historian of the University to have been equivalent to classes of merit.³

In the *album studiosorum* of the Marischal College and University of Aberdeen, which begins in 1605, no special order is at first traceable in the signatures of each year's matriculants, but an alphabetical arrangement under surnames "which afterwards became characteristic of the Marischal College registers."⁴ The University and King's College of Aberdeen had this same curious alphabetical arrangement of the matriculation roll, according to the Latinized Christian name.⁵ Thus: in what we should call the Class of 1609 (and King's calls the Bajan Class of 1605), the first five matriculants are Alexander Banerman, Andreas Irvine, Georgius Leslye, Gulielmus Chessor; Valterus Ogiluy is at the foot.⁶ Truly, it was as advantageous to

¹James M. Anderson, *Early Records of the Univ. of St. Andrews, Publications Scottish Historical Society*, third series, vol. VIII, pp. xxxv, xxxiv.

²Letter of 23 Jan. 1930, from Mr. Denis W. Brogan (A.M. Glasgow and Harvard), who kindly examined the archives for me.

³Sir Alexander Grant, *History of the Univ. of Edinburgh*.

⁴Peter J. Anderson, *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae* (1898), II, 186.

⁵Anderson, *Roll of Alumni in Arts of the Univ. and King's College of Aberdeen*, pp. XII, 3.

⁶*Ibid.*

be christened Alexander in Aberdeen, as to be born an Adams in Boston—after 1772.

The matriculation rolls of the University of Glasgow are supposed by an historian of that University to have been arranged in "strictly chronological order."¹ They are in groups according to the date of entrance; but a graduate both of Glasgow and of Harvard, who has examined the rolls for me, is convinced that each group admitted on the same day is arranged by social order. "The regularity with which the names of the magnates and sons of magnates come first, and, what is more, the skill with which precedence within the ranks of the nobility is graded, can hardly be accidental."² For instance, on March 1, 1634, enter

Robertus Alexander filius Gulielmi Comitiss Sterlinensis
 Archibaldus Stirling filius natu maximus Domini Johannis
 Stirling de Bankell equitis
 Hugo Wallace filius natu maximus Vilielmi Wallace de
 Eldersley
 Georgius Rose filius et haeres Mathei Rose de Hayning
 Jacobus Conynghame
 Johannes Campbell³

The great lairds who entered the University of Glasgow seldom if ever condescended to take a degree; the rest are bracketed on the graduation roll in "circles" as at Edinburgh, according to merit.⁴

Glasgow is the only British University which can have had an order of precedence of undergraduates according to the social rank of the parents, as existed at Harvard around 1750. But it is doubtful whether anyone at Harvard had any knowledge of this,⁵ or of

¹*Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis*, III. p. vii.

²Letter of Mr. Denis W. Brogan, cited above. The first entry is an ancestor of General Lord Stirling, U. S. A.; the third of one who claimed descent from the national hero. A Hamilton or Campbell of Argyll invariably heads the list of the day when he enters.

³*Mun. Al. Univ. Glasg.* III. p. 87. Other commoners follow.

⁴*Munimenta Alme Univ. Glasguensis*, III. p. iv; confirmed by Mr. Brogan.

⁵Cotton Mather in 1710, Benjamin Colman and Joseph Sewall in 1731, all Fellows of Harvard College, received D.D.'s from Glasgow, and Samuel Mather in 1731 an M.A., but none of them ever visited Glasgow; and during the first half-century of Harvard history, there were no intellectual links between Glasgow and Harvard that I have been able to discover.

the system of precedence in any Scottish university. Presidents Dunster and Chauncy and all the Overseers of Harvard College before 1650 who were University alumni, were of the University of Cambridge;¹ and without evidence to the contrary, it may be presumed that any derived rather than original features in the Harvard system were obtained from Cambridge.

Trinity College, Dublin, might be supposed to throw some light on Harvard practices, since it was founded by Cambridge men (only forty-five years earlier than Harvard), and was similarly organized as a resident college, with the university function of granting degrees. Trinity College had classes both in the English and the American sense. The vertical classification of Fellow-Commoners, Scholars, Pensioners, and Sizars, was cut by a horizontal classification of undergraduates by years: Junior and Senior Freshmen, Junior and Senior Sophisters. It was the vertical class that counted in precedence, seniority within each class being determined by the date of entering college.²

If the Harvard authorities had followed the Cambridge system completely, they would have (1) divided the undergraduates into vertical classes such as Fellow-Commoners, Scholars, Pensioners, and Sizars; (2) arranged seniority within each of these classes according to the date of entrance; (3) rearranged the graduates of each year according to the Cambridge system, whatever that was; and (4) made a new re-

¹Excepting Richard Mather (Oxford), and John Winthrop, Jr. (Dublin), who became Overseers in 1642, and John Davenport (Oxford) who went to New Haven in 1638, before the College was organized by Dunster. Mather and the younger Winthrop had only resided at their respective universities for about a year, whilst two of the Overseers who were from Cambridge, Cotton and Wilson, as well as President Chauncy, had been Fellows of Colleges and taken an active share in the government of the University.

²John P. Mahaffy, *An Epoch in Irish History*, (1906), p. 336 and ff.; letter from Dr. Louis C. Purser, Fellow of Trinity, to the writer, May 2, 1931. Until 1637, when the Laudian statutes went into effect, and again after 1655, seniority in the class of Scholars was determined by the candidate's standing at the scholarship examination; but between those dates, a Junior Sophister Scholar would have had precedence over a Freshman Scholar, even though he took much lower standing at the same scholarship examination. John Winthrop, Jr., one of the early overseers of Harvard College, was an alumnus of Trinity; but as he never rose above the status of Freshman Pensioner, it is not to be supposed that he had a very intimate knowledge of the working of this system.

arrangement of these men when they took their second degrees. This last "order," that of the Masters of Arts, would have gone into the Triennial Catalogue, as the final order of precedence of Harvard graduates.

Now let us try to find out what actually was done at Harvard.

For the period before 1650 or 1651, very little can be definitely ascertained. Doubtless a buttery book was procured for the undergraduates' accounts, and tables (i.e., tablets) hung up in the buttery with the students' names posted thereon, as Judge Wingate relates existed a century later. Beginning with the Class of 1662, Steward Chesholme charges almost every student with 2*d* for "wrytinge his name," on the first line of his debits. This points to the practice mentioned by Judge Wingate. A "Butterie book" and "3 tables to putt names on" in the buttery are mentioned in the college inventories of 1674, 1683,¹ and subsequent years. President Chauncy records that in 1655, when three students were expelled for hanging a neighbor's dog, their names were "cut out of the tables in the buttry by the order of the President in the presence of all the fellowes."² On the bachelors' Theses Sheets of 1642, 1643, 1646, and 1647, the only examples of the first ten years that have been preserved,³ the graduates' names are arranged in that mysterious, non-alphabetical order, the principle of which we are trying to solve; and which doubtless followed the official order on the buttery tables. *Seniority* was the word used for this order of precedence, as at Cambridge; the student higher up was "Senior" to one lower down, regardless of his age; and the process of determining seniority was called "placing."⁴

¹*Pubs. Colonial Soc. of Mass.*, xv. 62, 74.

²*Proceedings Mass. Hist. Soc.*, xi. 204.

³William C. Lane, in *Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc.*, n.s., xxiv. (1914) 265.

⁴Increase Mather describes in his ms. autobiography, belonging to this Society, how he was admitted to Harvard College near the end of 1651 at the age of twelve, "and next to my elder brother [Eleazar] placed the senior of the class." When there were two students of the same name in the same Harvard class they were referred to as Blank Senior and Blank Junior in the records, according to their seniority in the class list, not according to their respective ages. *Col. Soc. Mass.* xxv. 425-27.

No records kept by the first Steward of Harvard College, Matthew Day, survive. He died in 1649; but of his successor, Deacon Thomas Chesholme,¹ we have a most precious record—a parchment-bound account book, which according to the Deacon's own statement therein, he purchased for 3s 5d on November 26, 1651. This volume went out of the possession of the College, and was used around 1800 by a schoolboy who cut out several leaves, and scrawled copybook exercises on the blank portions of others; but fortunately the greater part was spared, and recovered for the University Archives in 1860. Although promptly called to the attention of historians,² very few of those who have written on the early history of Harvard have ever looked into this most fascinating of records, and the connection between it and "placing" has never been pointed out.

Steward Chesholme began his book by entering on opposite pages the credits and debits of each resident member of the College, beginning with the Senior Fellow. Each member, whether graduate or undergraduate, has two full pages devoted to his accounts, except that brothers or close kinsmen are occasionally huddled together. The close correspondence of the order of names with that of the graduating classes shows that the Steward entered them in the order of their precedence at the time his book was purchased, in November, 1651; except that the Class of 1651 was entered in its undergraduate precedence, including the men who did not take degrees. On the following pages he added the accounts of each student subsequently admitted, again in an order closely corresponding to that in which they graduated,³ but evidently after they

¹*Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.* v. 62, 156.

²In *Proceedings Mass. Hist. Soc.*, v. 60-63, by Lucius R. Paige, who recovered it from the "library of a deceased neighbor."

³See parallel columns, in Appendix, for Classes 1653-1663. The fact that all the entries of the first quarter of each student after the Class of 1654 are written in the same hand and with the same ink, suggests that Chesholme kept some sort of rough account of Freshmen's expenditures during their first quarter; and then, after the precedence had been determined, entered their names and their first quarter's credits and debits in this book.

had been "placed." This record extends through the Freshman year of the Class of 1663, when Chesholme resigned his office; and no more buttery records are found between that date and the year 1689.

The order of Steward Chesholme's entries of those members who were in college when he purchased the book shows a close correspondence to the system of arranging precedence in the Oxford and Cambridge colleges. It may be assumed that he took the order from the accounts of his predecessor, Matthew Day, who came from old Cambridge, and may well have known the customs of college accounts; if he had not, there were men on the Board of Overseers like John Cotton who had been fellows of Cambridge colleges, and could have instructed him.

NAME IN STEWARD'S BOOK	REMARKS
Mr. Samuel Danforth fellow	Senior fellow of Harvard College
Mr. Willyam Myldmay and mr lyons	A resident A.M. of the Class of 1646, and his private tutor
mr. jonathan michell fellow	Fellow named after Danforth in the Charter of 1650
Mr Nathaniell mather	A.B. 1647, A.M. 1650
Sir ¹ Eaton fellow	The third fellow and senior tutor
sir Okes fellow	The junior fellow and tutor
Mr whitte	A resident Master of Arts (A.B. 1646)
Mr Samuel willes fellow Commoner	Junior Sophister
Mr Brookes	Fellow-Commoner and Freshman
Sir Rogers	A.B. 1649, studying for A.M.
Sir Collines	A.B. 1649, studying for A.M.

These are immediately followed by:²

Seven A.B.'s of the Class of 1650, studying for Masters' degrees.

Fourteen members of the Class of 1651, including students who had not graduated, but still owed the College money.

¹"Sir" was the title of Bachelors of Arts who had not yet taken their Masters degrees and was also given to Seniors just before Commencement.

²The names, in the order given, are in the Appendix.

Senior Sophisters (Class of Aug. 9, 1653), excepting the Fellow-Commoner.

Junior Sophisters (Class of Aug. 10, 1653).¹

A unique Sophomore (Class of 1654).

Freshmen (Class of 1655), excepting the Fellow-Commoner.

A college steward of the University of Cambridge would have found very little to criticize on this list. It is headed by the Senior Fellow. Mr. Mildmay, a resident A.M. and a knight's son, is second; Jonathan Mitchell, the Fellow next junior to Danforth, is third. Mr. Mather's accounts show that he had left College in 1650, but still owed it money. As he had been placed next to Mitchell in the Class of 1647, their names had doubtless been together in Steward Day's accounts, and so stayed together here. An English steward would have placed Mather below White. Next follow the two Junior Fellows, not yet Masters of Arts; next a resident A.M. who is not a Fellow; then the two fellow-commoners who outrank all other undergraduates, including the resident bachelors who are not Fellows. Two resident A.B.'s of the Class of 1649 come next; then the resident A.B.'s of the Class of 1650; then the Class of 1651, in their undergraduate order of precedence. An English college steward would have separated the graduates in this class from those who had left without taking a degree. The unique Bachelor of Arts in 1652, Joseph Rowlandson, does not appear; probably he studied elsewhere, but was given a degree in 1652 in order to have an excuse for a bachelor's commencement that year. Finally come the Senior Sophisters, Junior Sophisters, Sophomores, and Freshmen; all in an order closely approximating the one found in the Triennial Catalogues.

Steward Chesholme was succeeded in 1663 by a procuratorial dynasty of Bordmans, the founder of which came from old Cambridge, and doubtless knew how things were done in College butteries. Unfortunately, we have no stewards' records for Bordmans I and II, but for Bordman III (Aaron) we have what

¹See W. C. Lane's explanation of the double commencement of 1653, in *Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc.*, n.s., xxiv. 276-79.

he called the Quarter-bill accounts, from the beginning of his stewardship, in 1689. Therein the names are written in columns on the left-hand margin of each page, a new page to every quarter; hence we may observe all changes in the class order from entering freshmen to graduation. The page here reproduced, the accounts for the last quarter of the academic year 1699-1700, may be analyzed as follows:

Five "Mr.'s": the Senior Tutor, the second Tutor—both these were Fellows—, the Junior Tutor and Librarian, a resident A.M., a Fellow-Commoner who has not yet taken his first degree.

Four "Sirs," i.e., resident bachelors studying for the A.M.

Thirteen "Sirs," candidates for the A.B. at the end of this quarter.

Twenty Junior Sophisters (Class of 1702)

Fourteen Sophomores (Class of 1703)

Twenty Freshmen (Class of 1704).

It is clear, then, that Harvard Fellow-Commoners in the seventeenth century not only outranked the rest of their respective classes, but all other resident members of the College below the degree of A.M. or the status of fellow. But three of the four Fellow-Commoners of the eighteenth century were not even placed first in their respective classes.¹

After the Fellow-Commoners, there are no vertical classes of undergraduates at Harvard—i.e., classes in the English sense, such as Scholars, Pensioners, etc.—only horizontal classes, in what became the American sense of the word, divided according to the years of their prospective graduation. Harvard established no classes of Scholars, Pensioners, or Sizars. Undergraduates who received scholarships, or who were appointed to the honorable and relatively lucrative post of Scholar of the House, were not taken out of

¹Fellow-Commoners subsequent to the Class of 1655 were entered by Chesholme at the head of their respective classes, since there were no blank pages where their accounts could be placed ahead of all undergraduates and resident bachelors. Although we have no positive proof that Fellow-Commoners outranked resident A.B.'s between 1655 and 1700, the existence of the practice at these two dates presupposes continuity.

their regular order and put in a separate classification, as they would have been at Oxford or Cambridge. In the list of rooms in the College building completed about 1643, there is a Senior Fellow's "sizer's study."¹ Possibly before 1651 Harvard had undergraduates who waited on the Senior Fellow and were called his Sizar, as at Cambridge. But there is no mention of a Sizar as such in the Harvard records, and the four students who are known to have occupied the Senior Fellow's Sizar's study, were not placed at the foot of their respective classes. The Steward's book shows credits to many students for waiting in Hall, ringing the college bell, and doing such other tasks as were performed by Sizars at Cambridge; but these students are scattered throughout their respective classes, not placed at the foot.

The order of names in the Steward's book so closely corresponds to the order of graduates as printed in the Commencement Theses and in the Triennial Catalogues as to leave no doubt that each Class was "placed" early in Freshman year; at least each Class beginning with 1655, the first which is entered in Chesholm's book as Freshmen. A comparison of his lists with those of the graduates will be found in the Appendix. It will be noted that there are very few changes in the order of precedence from Freshman year through graduation; and most of these changes can be explained by the practice of degradation. Degrading an undergraduate one or more places in his class order was an ingenious and much dreaded form of punishment, which was sanctioned by the College Laws promulgated in 1655; although the first positive and specific case of it that has come to my knowledge was the degradation of Samuel Melyenof the Class of 1696.²

¹*Publ. Col. Soc. Mass.*, xv. 14.

²*Proceedings Mass. Hist. Soc.*, VIII. 34. A probable early case was that of James Ward, next to last in the Class of 1645 at graduation; he had been caught burglarizing a Cambridge house. William Mildmay's position at the foot of 1647 was not due to a degradation of this sort; he failed to take his degree with his Class, and his name was added at the foot after graduation. Timothy Edwards dropped out of the Class of 1690, but was given both degrees in 1694, and then entered at the foot of the Class of 1691.

Beginning with the Class of 1696, we find that the undergraduate list is disturbed at the end of Freshman year, and numerous changes made in the order of names. This may be the first instance of that official placing by the Faculty, that Judge Wingate describes. Before the official placing, the names were entered in the Steward's records in a non-alphabetical order which was generally not very different from that of the official placing;¹ but whether the Steward made the arrangement on his own initiative, or on orders from the faculty, we have no means of knowing.

The most surprising thing about this Harvard system is that no new *ordo senioritatis* was arranged for the graduating class. The undergraduate precedence lasted through life. Whatever the principle of the original placing may have been, it would seem that a new order on the basis of performance would have been an encouragement to industry and scholarship. For what reason we know not, this was never done.² The Steward's placing or (after 1692) the official placing of Freshman year, subject only to such changes as were made for disciplinary reasons, or by students joining late or falling by the wayside, appeared on the bachelors' Theses Sheet at Commencement, and went unchanged into the next Triennial Catalogue of graduates.³ Nor was there any rearrangement at the Masters' Commencement, three years later. The order of names on the Masters' sheet of Quaestiones is invariably identical with the order at graduation; except that seniority is accorded to any man of an earlier Class who is taking his second degree out of course. But such men, in the catalogue of graduates, were left in their original places with their old Class;

¹After about the year 1730 the Freshmen's names were placed in alphabetical order on entering and so remained until the official placing.

²Unless possibly with the Class of 1642, whose order in the Triennial Catalogue differs from that on the graduation Theses, as recorded in *New England's First Fruits*.

³The first edition of which was published in 1674. Occasionally a name was added to a class list in the Triennial which did not appear on the Thesis Sheet: e.g., William Mildmay, 1647, and Timothy Edwards, 1691, each having failed to take his degree in course.

and Bachelors of Arts, who for whatever reason failed to take a Master's degree, lost neither place nor standing in the printed catalogue. In the English universities, although the M.A. was already a perfunctory degree, it was the M.A. *ordo senioritatis* that counted most in university precedence. The lowliest and youngest English M.A. outranked the oldest and most highly placed B.A. But Harvard, although for more than two hundred years she maintained the tradition of the medieval seven-year arts course,¹ took a long step toward abolishing it when she made the A.B. lists the basis of her official catalogue, in 1674. Following Harvard, almost every American college and university has made the date of his bachelors' degree the date of a student's graduation, and the basis of a graduate's seniority.

This unprecedented importance attached by Harvard College to an order of precedence established Freshman year, makes one all the more eager to discover the basic principles of this Harvard "placing." As we have seen, the basis cannot, in the seventeenth century, be purely social. The principle we should expect to be followed, in accordance with those of Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and all the Scottish universities save one, is the order of entrance or admission into college.

It is possible that the earliest Harvard classes were so arranged; we have no evidence to the contrary save the position of Benjamin Woodbridge, an eleventh-hour arrival from Oxford, at the head of the Class of 1642; but Woodbridge may, by courtesy, have been given the seniority he enjoyed at his Oxford Hall.² But we have positive evidence in the Steward's records of the classes 1655-1657, that date of entrance did *not* determine the Harvard order.

¹The A.M. was conferred on A.B.'s of three years' standing, after a perfunctory examination or (in the 19th century) none, until 1870. At Oxford and Cambridge the old system is still maintained; and no Oxford or Cambridge man is considered a graduate, or has the right to vote in university affairs, until he commences M.A.

²It is not likely that he was a Fellow-Commoner, as he had not been one at Oxford, and his parents were not wealthy.

On the debit side of these accounts, it was the Steward's practice to enter the first day of the quarter in which the student came into residence. Occasionally there are earlier entries on the credit side, when the student's father paid something in advance. Occasionally the first date on the debit side was in the middle of a quarter, indicating probably that the student came into residence that very day. From these lists I have excluded the Fellow-Commoners, as they ranked ahead of the others, no matter when they joined the Class.

1655

NAME	DATE OF FIRST DEBIT	DATE OF FIRST CREDIT
Farmworth	12 Sept. 1651	22 Aug. 1651
Oakes	13 Dec. 1650	credits lost
Willoughby	13 June 1651	11 July 1651
Bulkley	13 June 1651	28 July 1651
Utie	13 June 1651	5 Sept. 1651
Fownall	13 Dec. 1650	8 Oct. 1650
Hooke	13 June 1651	21 June 1651
Chickering	13 Sept. 1650	6 Aug. 1650
Glover	13 March 1650/51	13 Dec. 1651
Walver	12 Sept. 1651	15 Oct. 1651
Woodward	13 June 1651	22 Dec. 1651
Brinsmead	12 Sept. 1651	15 Jan. 1651/52
Gore	12 Sept. 1651	12 Dec. 1651
Wiswall	12 Sept. 1651	12 Dec. 1651
Matthews, Sr.	12 Sept. 1651	27 Nov. 1651
Matthews, Jr.	12 Dec. 1651	used brother's credits

It will be observed that there is no chronological order either in the first debits or the first credits. Four of the students seem to have entered the winter of 1650-51; possibly as a sort of sub-freshman; possibly they were dropped out of the exiguous Class of 1654. The Class of 1655 had only two graduates, owing to the students' discontent with the lengthening of the A.B. course from three to four years; so there are possible irregularities in this list. But in view of the close correspondence of the Steward's order in other classes with the order at graduation, there is a strong presumption that this list shows the Class of 1655 as it

was "placed," not long before November 1651 when Steward Chesholme purchased his book.

1656

NAME	DATE OF FIRST DEBIT	DATE OF FIRST CREDIT
The Mathers ¹	11 June 1652	3 May 1652
Paine	11 June 1652	27 May 1652
Dummer	8 June 1652	4 Feb. 1652/53
Haynes	10 Sept 1652	20 Oct. 1654
Eliot	10 Sept 1652	10 Sept 1652
Graves	10 Sept 1652	11 Nov. 1652

All the above students graduated, and in that order. None of the following took a degree except Emerson, who graduated at the foot of his class.

Brigham	10 Sept 1652	10 Dec. 1652
Hooke	10 Sept 1652	24 Nov. 1652
Larrimore	10 Sept 1652	23 Nov. 1652
Hunt	10 Sept 1652	10 Sept. 1652
Megapolensis	10 Dec. 1652	10 Dec. 1652
Torrey	11 March. 1652/53	24 March 1653/54
Emerson	9 Dec. 1653	Credits lost

Here, again, there is not a chronological order, although it is more nearly approached; the change in place of only one student, Dummer, would have made it chronological.

1657

NAME	DATE OF FIRST DEBIT	DATE OF FIRST CREDIT
Symmes	10 June 1653	21 July 1653
Walker	10 June 1653	24 May 1653
Brigdon	10 June 1653	29 July 1653
Hale	10 June 1653	10 May 1653
Symonds	10 June 1653	9 Dec. 1653
Cooke	10 June 1653	4 June 1653
Cotton	10 June 1653	7 July 1653
Whitney	10 June 1653	17 Oct. 1653
Eyres	10 June 1653	25 Oct. 1653
Peck	debits lost	"novem" 53
Gouge	9 Sept. 1653	credits lost
Constable	debits lost	10 May 1654

¹Increase Mather states in his autobiography that he entered college at the end of 1651—i.e., in 1651/52; but he was writing over forty years later. His statement that next to his elder brother he was "placed the senior of the class" seems to indicate that most if not all that Class had entered before they were placed.

The debits of this class, such as have been preserved, are consistent with chronological order, but it must be remembered that 10 June and 9 September are not necessarily the actual *dates upon which* a student entered College, merely the first quarter-day *after* the date he entered College.

For the Class of 1658 three debit pages are missing; the first debit for eight of the other members is 9 June 1654; the first debit of the one remaining student (Denison), in the middle of the list, is September 7, 1654.

For the Class of 1659 the Steward makes an innovation by recording the actual date of the student's entry into College on the same line as the heading to one of the two pages. This is done for the two Fellow-Commoners, and for the five students who follow; but not for the remainder. The dates of entry of these five students are as follows:

3. 7 July 1655
4. 17 July 1655
5. 17 July 1655
6. 7 August 1655
7. 17 July 1655

Again, no chronological order.

For the Class of 1660, the practice of recording the date "entred" is continued. The first five students "entred" 23 August 1656. For the next student (Armitage) the date of entrance is not recorded, and the date of the first debit is 5 Sept. 1656. The next five students are recorded as having "Entred" 23 August 1656. The next (Noyes) "Entred" 9 June 1656, and the next two, 23 August again. So Noyes, who entered earlier than all the rest, is placed near the foot.

No dates of entry are given for the remaining three classes in Chesholme's book, and the dates of the first debits show no chronological progression. All those for 1662 are identical, 3 September, 1658. Aaron Bord-

man's book, beginning 1689, gives no dates of entrance, merely the dates when the quarters begin.

If, then, we accept Chesholme's order as representing the official placing of the undergraduates—and in view of its close correspondence with the graduating order I do not see how we can do otherwise—it is certain that the order was not based on the date of entering college, as at Cambridge. But there was always a slight chronological element in the Harvard precedence. A student who joined the Class late, especially if he joined after the official placing, was usually, but not invariably, placed at the foot;¹ and a student who left College and took his degree after the rest of his Class was usually placed at the foot of it in the Triennial Catalogue.

Nor was the age of the students the criterion. That can easily be confirmed by looking up their birthdays in Sibley.

What, then, was the basic principle of precedence at Harvard? I am unable to reach any definite or satisfactory conclusion. An hypothesis, a solution not incompatible with the known facts, but for which no direct evidence can be cited, is the best that I can offer the reader after this long and laborious investigation. But all my cards are on the table, and anyone is welcome to make what he will of them.

My impression is that the order was intended to be an order of merit. The motive behind it I suppose to be an endeavor to place in the front rank, at the top of their respective classes, those students who it was thought would be a credit to the College both on Commencement day and in after life. Some order of seniority there had to be, if Harvard College aspired to maintain the good order and discipline of her English progenitors. It would have been unwise to have this order depend on the date of admission, which would mean on the vicissitudes of travel; and, like an alphabetical order, would exalt the son of some godman

¹All known cases of this sort in the seventeenth century are noted in the Appendix.

Abbott or Adams who could barely pass his examination, over the brilliant offspring of a worshipful Winthrop. With a young college that had to make her way, it was important to put her best alumni forward, to encourage merit, and to avoid irritating important people. Hence the obvious solution was to arrange the lads in the order of merit, i.e., of actual performance and future promise. In any such method of rating at that time, family would count a good deal. Names such as Bulkley, Cotton, Danforth, Dudley, Eliot, Mather, Saltonstall, Shepard, and Winthrop meant much more in early New England than any names do now, and deservedly so. The founders of these families had won their places through sheer ability. They were expected to have able sons, and seldom disappointed that expectation.¹ In the families of ministers especially, high character and intellect cropped up one generation after another, often in several members of the same generation. It seems to me that the apparently haphazard way of dealing with these young men of family in the early class lists shows an effort to discriminate between those who were deemed worthy and those who were not: that the system was the same as that outlined by John Cotton in his reply, on behalf of the Massachusetts government, to Lords Brooke and Say and Sele:

“Where God blesseth any branch of any noble or generous family, with a spirit and gifts fit for government, it would be taking God’s name in vain to put such a talent under a bushel, and a sin against the honor of magistracy to neglect such in our public elections. But if God should not delight to furnish some of their posterity with gifts fit for magistracy, we should expose them rather to reproach and prejudice . . . if we should call them forth, when God doth not, to public authority.”²

There was plenty of opportunity for the College authorities to get a line on a student’s ability. Most of

¹Recent studies of lists of names such as those in *Who’s Who*, have demonstrated the objective truth of what common sense has always known, that the son of a prominent and successful family has a far greater expectation and opportunity of success than others.

²Thomas Hutchinson, *Hist. of Mass. Bay*, 1. Appendix, no. 2 (2d ed., London, 1760), p. 493.

the youths who entered Harvard were fitted for college at one of the public grammar schools, such as the Hopkins at New Haven, or the Boston Latin, whose headmasters were well known to the President and Fellows. Schoolmasters would naturally send their pupils to Cambridge with letters setting forth their respective characters and abilities. Each entering Freshman was examined orally in Latin and Greek by the President. Hence the College authorities had ample basis for a fairly definite opinion as to whether or not God had blessed a given Freshman with intellect, or "with a spirit and gifts fit for government." They could balance the probability of a bright yeoman's son being more of a credit to the College than a thick-headed and unpromising son of a magistrate. I do not for a moment suppose there was any definite rule for establishing precedence, such as so many pounds of estate or so much governmental position being equivalent to this or that grade in entrance examination. No modern group of pedagogues confronted with such a problem could possibly go on without concocting a chart, graph, I.Q., or what-not, by which every student would be measured, and his place "scientifically" assigned; but our ancestors' minds (praise God!) did not work like those of modern scientific educators. They would have taken up each case on its merits, and decided whether the obviously superior brains of goodman Wigglesworth's son would make him a greater credit to the College than the slow-witted grandson of a Governor to whom the College owed much; and they would have had little hesitation in assigning a low place to the unsatisfactory sons of a prominent minister. If this was the system, the College authorities in many instances were poor prophets; for it is difficult to predict how a boy of 16 or 17 is going to turn out. But taking the seventeenth-century Harvard alumni as a whole, the first half of almost every class was more successful in after life, judged by material as well as intellectual tests, than the second half.

There is, I admit, no direct evidence to prove this hypothesis, that Harvard students were originally placed according to the expectation of reflecting lustre on their alma mater. But there is a statement in the so-called diary of Josiah Cotton (A.B. 1698) that points in that direction. Describing his school and college days, Mr. Cotton records

“Thro. Favour, not merit I happened to be placed the second of the Class Mr. Symes being the first.”¹

Is not this an admission that merit was supposed to enter into Harvard precedence? That Cotton regarded his high place as having been secured through “pull” rather than by strict adherence to principle? The Cottons and Mathers were rather keen seekers for favors of that sort. Cotton Mather’s cousin, Rowland Cotton of the Class of 1696, got his name inserted in its undergraduate order in the Triennial Catalogue, although he did not graduate with his Class; Cotton Mather’s brother Samuel (1690) went abroad in his Sophomore year with his father, the President, and did not return until two years after his Class graduated, yet his name is found with the graduates in the Triennial.

If, then, the seventeenth-century order was based on merit, latent or apparent, why was it abandoned for an order frankly based on family rank, by 1749?

Here, again, I can offer only an hypothesis by way of explanation. After the Peace of Utrecht the enrollment of Harvard College began to increase. The Class of 1719 was a record-breaking one with 23 graduates; the Class of 1721 with 37; the Class of 1723 with 43; the Class of 1725 with 45; and although that record stood until 1762, there were few graduating classes after 1720 that fell below 30 in number. This increased enrollment would have made any complicated system of balancing scholarly performance with inherited ability very difficult to administer. At the same time, with the growth of aristocracy and a general hardening

¹*Publications Col. Soc. Mass.*, xxvi. 279.

of class distinctions, the pressure of ambitious parents to have their sons ranked high, would naturally increase. May not the Faculty have succumbed to a combination of outside pressure and inherent difficulty, and adopted the relatively simpler plan of allowing the social and official rank of the father to determine the student's place?

Whatever the reason for the change, President Leverett saw the beginning of it, and Tutor Flynt saw it through. Leverett was Fellow and Tutor from 1685 to 1700, and President from 1708 to his death in 1724. Henry Flynt (A.B. 1693) was Tutor from 1699 to 1754, and Fellow from 1700 to his death in 1760. Both were members of the provincial aristocracy: the President a grandson of Governor Leverett, and Flynt a kinsman of the Quincys. It seems to me that the classes of the 1690's much more nearly approximate a social order than the classes of the 1650's. There are exceptions, but they are neither so numerous nor so striking as those of thirty and forty years before. It seems probable that in this first decade of the provincial period in Massachusetts Bay, beginning with the Class of 1696 which was placed in 1692-93, the College began definitely, though perhaps unconsciously, to move toward a social order; and that it took a generation to complete the transition. When Sibley's Harvard Graduates is completed for the classes of the first half of the eighteenth century, we may be able to determine the approximate date when family dignity replaced other and uncertain factors as the principle of arranging the Harvard class lists.

The only principles we can be certain of in seventeenth-century placing are these:

1. Fellow-Commoners, although undistinguished from their classmates in the Catalogue of Graduates, outranked all other undergraduates and resident bachelors of arts in the seventeenth century. One became a Fellow-Commoner by payment, as in England, not by social prerogative.

2. Undergraduates were first placed at some time during the first quarter of Freshman year. Beginning at least as early as 1692 there was a preliminary placing shortly after entrance, and an official placing later in Freshman year, generally in the last quarter. The order of seniority then established normally appeared unchanged in the bachelors' commencement Thesis Sheets,¹ and in the Catalogue of Graduates.

3. Changes were made in this order at any date between placing and graduation, by (a) degradation for misconduct, (b) the addition of late-comers, (c) dropping out the names of students who did not become candidates for a degree. There are a few other changes for which there is no explanation in the records.

4. Those who joined a Class after it had been placed, whether as a promotion or degradation from another Class, or from outside the College, were placed at the foot, and there remained. But there are several exceptions to this rule.

5. The order of precedence was not determined by age, date of entering college, or the social or official position of the student's father or family.

Anyone who has followed this detailed investigation has probably asked himself long before this, "Why, in Heaven's name, did the Harvard and Yale authorities go to all this trouble about precedence? Why did they not arrange the names alphabetically from the start, and be done with it?" To which one may answer that the medieval mind, which has endured longer in collegiate and ecclesiastical circles than elsewhere, could not conceive an alphabetic order of precedence. To place, let us say, Abbot first and Zipf last, would have been as ridiculous as to put the tallest lads first, and the shortest last. And it may also be observed that precedence has by no means died out in our "democratic" Republic, as Washington hostesses know to their cost. Even in the modern catalogue of Harvard University, the Officers of Instruction and

¹Commonly but erroneously called Commencement programmes.

Administration at the beginning are "arranged, with the exception of the President, on the basis of collegiate seniority," which the uninitiated may not know, means the date of receiving the bachelor's degree. This, and other historical societies, arrange their list of members "in the order of their election"; and it is said that one of the compensations of advancing age is seeing one's name steadily climb toward the head of the column.

APPENDIX

THE HARVARD CLASS LISTS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The list of graduates is reproduced as in the Triennial Catalogue of 1700, compared with the undergraduate order given in Steward Chesholme's book for the Classes 1651-1663, with a monitor's bill which includes the Classes 1664-67, and with Steward Aaron Bordman's Quarter-bill book for the Classes 1689-1700. The reprint of the 1700 Triennial in *Proceedings Mass. Hist. Soc.*, VIII., 25-30, has been used for the Triennial column.

FELLOW-COMMONERS are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.

	1642 ¹		1644
	Benjamin Woodbridge		
	Georgius Downing		1645
	Johannes Bulklæus		Johannes Oliverus
	Gulielmus Hubbard		Jeremias Hollandus
5	Samuel Bellingham		Gulielmus Amesius
	Johannes Wilsonus		Johannes Russellus
	Henricus Saltonstall	5	Samuel Stow
	Tobias Barnardus		Jacobus Ward
	Nathaniel Brusterus		Robertus Johnson
	1643		1646
	Johannes Jonesius		Johannes Alcock
	Samuel Matherus		Johannes Brock
	Samuel Danforth		Georgius Stirk
	Johannes Allin		Nathaniel White

¹A somewhat different order for this Class will be found on its Theses Sheet, reprinted in *New England's First Fruits*. Otherwise the Theses Sheets correspond with the Triennial lists.

1647
Jonathan Mitchel
Nathaniel Matherus
Consolantius Star
Johannes Barden
5 Abrahamus Walver
Georgius Haddenus
Guilelmus Mildmay

1648
[No graduates]

1649
Johannes Rogersius
Samuel Eaton
Urianus Oakes
Johannes Collins
Johannes Bowers

1650
Guilielmus Stoughton
Johannes Gloverus
Joshua Hobartus
Jeremias Hobartus
5 Edmundus Weld
Samuel Philipsius
Leonardus Hoar
Isaacus Alltertonus
Jonathan Inceus

*Steward's Book**Triennial, 1700*

1651
Malbone
Sir¹ Wigglesworth
Sir Cotten
Sir Dudley
5 Goodyeare
Sir Glouer
Swineoke²
Sir Buttler
Sir Daus
10 Pelham
Chanceys Senior
and Junior
Sir Ince³
Sir Burr

Michael Wigglesworth
Marigena Cottonus
Thomas Dudlaeus

Johannes Gloverus

Henricus Butlerus
Nathaniel Pelhamus
Johannes DAVISIUS
Isaacus Chauncæus
Ichabod Chauncæus

Jonathan Burræus

1652

Josephus Rowlandsonus

1653, August 9

[SAMUEL WILLES]⁴
Angier

SAMUEL WILLIS
Johannes Angier

¹For significance of "Sir" see above, p. 403. The "Sirs" are added to the Class of 1651 apparently because the Steward wrote the headings after this Class had graduated.

²Misread Sennott by Sibley.

³Jonathan Ince, who graduated with the Class of 1650. Cf. Edwards, 1690.

⁴Willis is placed in the Steward's book just after the Fellows.

*Steward's Book**Triennial, 1700*1653, August 9 (*Continued*)

Shipheard	Thomas Shepardus
Nowell	Samuel Nowel
5 Hubbart	Richardus Hubbard
Whittinge Senior	Johannes Whiting
Hooker	Samuel Hookerus
Stone	Johannes Stone
Tomsone	Guilielmus Thomsonus

1653, August 10

Rawson	Edvardus Rawsonus
Broadstreatt	Samuel Bradstreet
Longe	Joshua Long
Whitting Jeunior	Samuel Whiting
5 Moudy	Joshua Moodey
Ambros Senior	Joshua Ambrosius
Ambros Jeunior	Nehemiah Ambrosius
Crosbe	Thomas Crosbæus
Shoue	

1654

Nelson	Philippus Nelson
--------	------------------

1655

[MR. BROOKES] ¹	
Farmworth	
Okes Junior	
Willoughbee	
5 Bulckley	Gershom Bulklæus
Vtye	
Fownall	
Hooke	
Chickeringe	
10 Pelletiah Glouer	
Waluer	
Woodward	
Brinsmead	
Goore	
15 Wiswall	
Mathewes Senior	Mordecai Mathewsius
Mathewes Jeunior	

1656

Mather Senior	Eleazarus Matherus
Mather Jeunior	Crescentius Matherus

¹Entered in Steward's Book after Samuel Willis.

*Steward's Book**Triennial, 1700*1656 (*Continued*)

	Paine	Robertus Painæus
	Dummer	Subael Dummerus
5	Haines	Johannes Haynesius
	Eliatt	Johannes Eliotus
	Graues	Thomas Gravesius
	Brigham	
	Walter Hooke	
10	Larremorre	
	Hunte	
	Magaplences	
	Toory	
	Emmerson	Johannes Emmersonus

1657

	Simes	Zecharias Symmes
	Walker	
	Brigdon	Zecharias Brigden
	Haill	Johannes Cottonus
5	Symons	Johannes Hale
	Couke	Elisha Cooke
	Cotton	
	Whitting Jeuner	Johannes Whiting
	Eayers	
10	Pecke	
	Gouge	
	George Constepell	
	[2 leaves missing]	Barnabas Chauncæus

1658

	Gattlife ¹	
	Eliatt Jeu	Josephus Eliotus
	Haines	
	Mutice	
5	Joseph Haines	Josephus Haynes
	Denison	
	Bulckley Jeu	
	Buncker	Benjamin Bunker
	[2 leaves missing]	Jonah Fordhamus

¹Possibly last in 1657, but same date of entrance as Class of 1658.

*Steward's Book**Triennial, 1700*1658 (*Continued*)

10	Barsham	Johannes Barsham
	Shipheard	Samuel Talcot
	Tallcott	Samuel Shepardus
	[2 leaves missing]	

1659

	MR. BENNETE	NATHANIEL SALTONSTALL
	MR. SALTINGSTALL	Samuel Alcock
	Alcoocke	Abijah Savagius
	Sauage	Samuel Willard
5	Willard	
	Thomas	Thomas Parish
	Parish	
	John Hackbone	Samuel Cheverus
	[2 leaves missing]	Ezekiel Rogers
10	Ezekell Rogers	Samuel Belcherus
	Samuell Belsher	
	Samuell Sebree	Jacobus Noyes
	[James Noyce	Moses Noyes
	Moses Noyce] ¹	

1660

	John Alline	Simon Bradstreet
	Collens	Nathaniel Collins
	Simon Brodstreet	Samuel Eliott
	Samuell Eliott	
5	Jonathan Corwine	Guilielmus Whittingham
	Armitage	
	Couke	Josephus Cookæus
	Wythe	
	Samuell Carter	Samuel Carterus
		Manasseh Armitagius
10	John Wenborne	
	Petter Bulckley	Petrus Bulklæus
	Tho Noyce ¹	
	Richard Whittinghame	
	Willyam Whittinghame	
15	John Cheeney	

¹The accounts of Moses and James Noyes, A.B. 1659, are on the same pages with Thomas Noyes, 1660. Probably all three Noyes entered together in the summer of 1656, and James and Moses were admitted to the Sophomore Class.

*Steward's Book**Triennial, 1700*

1661

	Crowne		
	Bellingham ¹		Johannes Bellingham
	Simes ¹		
	Meares		
5			Nathaniel Chauncæus
			Elnathan Chauncæus
			Israel Chauncæus
			Compensantius Osborn
	Weld		Daniel Weld
10	Joseph Cooke		Josephus Cookæus
	Joseph Whittinge		Josephus Whiting
	Watson		Caleb Watsonus
	John Parker		Johannes Parkerus
	Thomas Johnson		Thomas Johnsonus
15	Bezaliell Sherman		Bezaleel Shermannus
	John Wyborn		
	Kemberley		

1662

	MR. WINTHROP		
	Samuell Stone		
	[2 leaves missing]		Johannes Holiokus
	Benjamin Tomson		Benjamin Thomsonus
5	Ephram Flinte		
	John Flemine		
	John Oliuer		
	Josiah Haruey		
	John Holmes		
10	Isack Adington		Solomon Stoddardus
	[Salomen Stoder] ²		Moses Fiskæus
	Fisk		
	Nathaniell Willyames		
	[Ephram Sauage] ³		Ephraim Savagius
15	Thomas Okes		Thomas Oakes
	Littell Petter Bulekley		

1663

	[2 leaves missing]		Samuel Symondus
	Cobbett		Samuel Cobbet
	Rayner		Johannes Reynerus
	Blackman		Benjamin Blackman
	[2 leaves missing]		

¹Leaves missing here; but reference to them under these names in index.²Accounts are on page with his kinsman, Daniel Weld, 1661.³Accounts are on page with his brother Abijah, 1659.

<i>Steward's Book</i>	<i>Triennial, 1700</i>
	1663 (<i>Continued</i>)
5 Mighell Cuttler	Thomas Mighil Nathaniel Cutler
	1664
<i>Monitor's Bill¹</i>	<i>Triennial, 1700</i>
Nowell	Alexander Nowellus
Flynt	Josiah Flintæus
Pynchon	Josephus Pynchonus
Brackenburi	Samuel Brackenburius
5 Woodridg	Johannes Woodbridge
Estabrook	Josephus Easterbrookæus
Street	Samuel Street
	1665
Eliot	Benjamin Eliotus
	Josephus Dudlæus
	Samuel Bishop
	Edvardus Mitchelsonus
5 Michelson	Samuel Mannæus
Man	Sperantius Athertonus
Atharton	Jabez Foxius
Fox	Caleb Cheeschaumuk, <i>Indus</i>
Chischau	
Jacoms	
	1666
BROWNE	JOSEPH BROWNÆUS
Richerdson	Johannes Richardsonus
Pynchon	
Filar	Daniel Masonus
5 Browne	
Mason	Johannes Filerus
	1667
	Johannes Harriman
Atkinson	Nathaniel Atkinsonus
Foster	Johannes Fosterus
	Gershom Hobartus
5	Japheth Hobartus
	Nehemiah Hobartus
Noyce	Nicholaus Noyes

¹Of the academical year 1663-64. Printed in Franklin B. Dexter, *Misc. Hist. Papers*, 1, and *Proc. M. H. S.*, x. 403. The students omitted were probably on leave of absence.

Triennial, 1700

1668	1674
Adamus Winthrop	Edmundus Davie
Johannes Cullick	Thomas Sergeant
Zecharias Whitmannus	
Abrahamus Piersonus	
Johannes Prudden	1675
	Josephus Hauley
1669	Johannes Pike
Samuel Epps	Jonathan Russellus
Daniel Epps	Petrus Oliverus
Jeremias Shepardus	5 Samuel Andrew
Daniel Gookin	Jacobus Minot
5 Johannes Bridghamus	Timotheus Woodbridge
Daniel Russellus	Daniel Allin
Josephus Taylorus	Johannes Emmersonus
Jacobus Bayley	10 Nathaniel Gookin
Josephus Gerrish	
10 Samuel Treat	
	1676
1670	Thomas Shepardus
Nathaniel Higginson	Thomas Brattle
Ammi Ruhamah Corlet	Jeremiah Cushing
Thomas Clarke	
Georgius Burrough	1677
	Thomas Chevers
1671	Johannes Danforth
Isaacus Fosterus	Edvardus Payson
Samuel Phips	Samuel Sweetman
Samuel Sewall	5 Josephus Capen
Samuel Matherus	Thomas Scottow
5 Samuel Danforth	
Petrus Thacherus	1678
Guilielmus Adamus	Johannes Cottonus
Thomas Weld	Cottonus Matherus
Johannes Bowles	Grindallus Rawsonus
10 Johannes Nortonus	Urianus Oakes
Edvardus Taylorus	
	1679
1672	Jonathan Danforth
	Edvardus Oakes
1673	Jacobus Alling
Edvardus Pelhamus	Thomas Barnardus
Georgius Alcock	
Samuel Angier	
Johannes Wise	

1680
 Richardus Martin
 Johannes Leverettus
 Jacobus Oliver
 Guilielmus Brattle
 5 Percivallus Green

1681
 Samuel Mitchel
 Johannes Cottonus
 Johannes Hasting
 Noadiah Russellus
 5 Jacobus Pierpont
 Johannes Davie
 Samuel Russellus
 Guilielmus Denison
 Josephus Eliot

1682

1683

Samuel Danforth
 Johannes Williams
 Guilielmus Williams

1684

Johannes Denison
 Johannes Rogersius
 Gordonius Saltonstall
 Richardus Wensleus
 5 Samuel Mylesius
 Nehemiah Walterus
 Josephus Webb
 Edvardus Thompsonus
 Benjamin Rolf

Quarter-Bill Book

Allin
 Moodey
 Pain
 Davenport

1685

Thomas Dudlæus
 Warhamus Matherus
 Nathaniel Matherus
 Roulandus Cottonus
 5 Henricus Gibs
 Thomas Berrius
 Johannes Whiting
 Edvardus Mills
 Johannes Eliotus
 10 Samuel Shepardus
 Petrus Ruck
 Isaacus Greenwood
 Johannes White
 Jonathan Pierpont

1686

FRANCISCUS WAINWRIGHT
 Benjamin Lynde
 Daniel Rogersius
 Georgius Phillipsius
 5 Robertus Hale
 Carolus Chauncæus
 Nicolaus Mortonus

1687

Johannes Davenport
 Johannes Clark
 Nathaniel Rogers
 Jonathan Mitchel
 5 Daniel Brewer
 Timotheus Stevens
 Nathaniel Welsh
 Josephus Dasset
 Henricus Newman
 10 Josias Dwight
 Sethus Shove

1688

Triennial, 1700

1689

Jacobus Allen
 Samuel Moodey
 Guilielmus Payn
 Addingtonus Davenport

Quarter-Bill Book

Triennial, 1700

1689 (Continued)

5	Haynes Partridge Whittingham	Johannes Haynes Guilielmus Partrigg Richardus Whittingham Johannes Emmersonus
	Sparkhawk	Johannes Sparhawk
10	Marston Eveleth Pierpont Philips Hancock	Benjamin Marston Johannes Eveleth Benjamin Pierpont
15	Remington Swan	Johannes Hancock Thomas Swan

1690

	Dudley Mather Willard Denison	Paulus Dudlaeus Samuel Matherus Johannes Willard Daniel Denison
5	Jones Whiting Edwards ¹ Clap Belcher	Johannes Jonesius Josephus Whiting Nathaniel Clap Josephus Belcher
10	Stone Clark Buckingham Mansfield Burr	Nathaniel Stone Johannes Clark Thomas Buckinghamus Samuel Mensfield Petrus Burr
15	Selleck Newmarch Greenwood Wadsworth Ruggles	Johannes Selleck Johannes Newmarch Thomas Greenwood Benjamin Wadsworth Thomas Ruggles
20	Mix Goffe Lynde Easterbrooks ²	Stephanus Mix Edmundus Goffe Nicholaus Lynde Benjamin Easterbrookæus

1691

	Tyng Pemberton Mackartee	Johannes Tyng Ebenezer Pemberton Thomas Mackarty
--	--------------------------------	--

¹Dropped from 1690; not granted degree until 1694, when placed in Class of 1691.²Joined late.

*Quarter-Bill Book**Triennial, 1700*1691 (*Continued*)

	Lorde	Josephus Lord
5	Tapping	Christopherus Tappan
	Emery	Samuel Emery
	Atkinson	Thomas Atkinsonus
		Timotheus Edwards ¹

1692

	Pynchon	
	Pool	
	Coleman	Benjamin Colman
	Alden	Zecharias Alden
5	White	Ebenezer White
	Townsend	Jacobus Townsend
	Mors	Johannes Mors
	Cushing	Caleb Cushing

1693

	Chauncey	Isaacus Chauncaeus
	Buckingham	Stephanus Buckinghamus
	Flint	Henricus Flintaeus
	Wade ²	Simon Bradstreet ²
5	Wade	Johannes Wadaeus
	Hodson	Nathanael Hodson
	Townsend	Penn Townsend
	Williams	Nathanael Williams
	Denison	Georgius Denison
10	Woodward	Johannes Woodward
	Baxter	Josephus Baxter
	Veazie	Guilielmus Veazie
	Hunting	Nathanael Hunting
	Ruggles	Benjamin Ruggles
15	Grosvenor	Guilielmus Grosvenor

1694

	Winthrop	Adamus Winthrop
	Woodbridge	Johannes Woodbridge
	Woodbridge	Dudlaeus Woodbridge
	Adams	Eliphalet Adams
5	Savage	Johannes Savage
	Ballantine	Johannes Ballantine
	Treat ³	Salmon Treat
	Fitch ³	Jabez Fitch

¹Dropped from 1690; not granted degree until 1694, when placed in Class of 1691.²Simon Bradstreet took the place, in Junior year, of his cousin Benjamin Wade, who had left college.³Joined late.

*Quarter-Bill Book**Triennial, 1700*

1695

Vassall	Samuel Vassal
Price	Gualterus Price
Saltonstall	Richardus Saltonstall
Saltonstall	Nathaniel Saltonstall
5 Hubbard	Johannes Hubbard
Willard	Simon Willard
Savage	Habijah Savage
Noys	Oliver Noyes
Phips	Thomas Phips
10 Wensley	
Lyndell	Timotheus Lindal
Law	Jonathan Law
Lewis	Ezekiel Lewis
Blowers	Thomas Blowers
15 Little	Thomas Little
Little	Ephraim Little
Perkins	Johannes Perkins
Smith	Jedediah Andrews
Robinson	Josephus Smith
20 Andros ¹	Johannes Robinson
Green	Josephus Green
Mors	Josephus Mors
Webster	Nicolaus Webster

1696²

Vaughan	Georgius Vaughan
Cotton	Roulandus Cottonus
Thatcher	Petrus Thacher
Woodbridge	Dudlaeus Woodbridge
5 Remington	Jonathan Remington
Moleyn	
Whittman	Samuel Whitman
Easterbrooks	Samuel Easterbrookaeus
Gardiner	Andreas Gardner
10 Henchman	
	Samuel Melyen

1697

Cook	Elisha Cooke
Stoddard	Antonius Stoddardus
Stoddard	Antonius Stoddardus

¹Joined late.²The provisional placing differed from the official placing in the classes 1696-1700. See lists in Sibley, IV.

*Quarter-Bill Book**Triennial, 1700*1697 (*Continued*)

	Wakeman	Jabez Wakeman
5	Collins	Nathaniel Collins
	Burr	Samuel Burr
	Read	Johannes Read
	Moodey	Samuel Moodey
	Brown	Richardus Brown
10	Adams	Hugo Adams
	Swift	Johannes Swift
	Southmayd	Johannes Southmayd
	Coit	Josephus Coit
		Josephus Parsons ¹

1698

	Symmes	Thomas Symmes
	Cotton	Josias Cottonus
	Mather	Samuel Matherus
	Willard	Josias Willard
5	Bradstreet	Dudlaeus Bradstreet
	Cutler	Petrus Cutler
		Johannes Foxius
	Hubbard	Nathanael Hubbard
	Woolcutt	
	Swan	Henricus Swan
10	White	Johannes White
	Fox	
		Josiah Torrey ²
	Billings	
	Thatcher	Oxenbridge Thacherus
		Richardus Billings
15	Parsons ¹	
	Peck ³	

1699

	Dummer	Jeremias Dummer
	Maxwell	
	Belcher	Jonathan Belcher
	Bulkley	Johannes Bulklaeus
5	Quinsey	Edmundus Quinsey
	Taylour	Johannes Taylor
	Harsmer	Stephanus Horsmer
	Greenleaf	Daniel Greenleaf

¹Promoted from 1698 to 1697.²Not in college at time of official placing.³Joined late.

*Quarter Bill Book**Triennial, 1700*1699 (*Continued*)

	Hale	Moses Hale
10	Goodhue	Franciscus Goodhue
	Eeles	Nathanael Eels
	Nyles ¹	Samuel Niles
	Mors ¹	Josephus Moss

1700

	Bradstreet	JOHANNES WINTHROP
	Winthrop	Simon Bradstreet
	Hooker	Daniel Hooker
	Whiting	Johannes Whiting
5	Gerrish	Josephus Gerrish
	Wise	Jeremias Wise
	Breck	Robertus Breck
	Deming	David Deming
	Hunt	Samuel Hunt
10	Barnard	Johannes Barnard
	Prentice	Johannes Prentice
	Bannister	Thomas Banister
	Dodge	Daniel Dodge
	Holman	Johannes Holman
15	Veazie	Johannes Veazie

¹Joined late.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.