UCH has been written about James Logan's temper, stubbornness, arrogance, and aristocratic aloofness. Even some of the more favorable accounts of his career admit these shortcomings. The old historian, Robert Proud, says that he "was a man of considerable understanding and abilities, perhaps exceeded by few, or none in the province. . . . but to persons of inferior abilities and less acquirements, he is represented by some, not always to have conducted himself in that courteous and condescending manner, which gains respect, and is an ornament to superior parts; which rendered him somewhat unpopular. . . ."1 His own son-in-law remarks about his partiality and the "roughness of his Temper."2 The latter-day Quaker historian, Isaac Sharpless, points to "a certain pugnacity which was sometimes tactless and made him enemies."3

All this was probably true. Unfortunately for Logan's historical reputation, these characteristics were greatly magnified by the political left-wing of the province until the reputation of the man was distorted almost beyond recognition. Few recognized his greatness of mind, while nearly all phases of his political activity became unjustly suspect. The tradition of Logan as an aloof, unbending man with a frankly aristocratic distrust of "the people," and therefore (so the critics assume) a force of reaction, has colored a great many writings on Pennsylvania history. This bias has even led to accusations against Logan of dishonesty in dealing

---

1 Proud, History of Pennsylvania, I, 478. (When works cited in this chapter have been referred to in the previous chapter, I have not troubled to give the complete bibliographical identification.)
3 Sharpless, Political Leaders of Provincial Pennsylvania, 115.
with the Indians—in spite of a record, which could be lavishly documented, of his hospitality and generosity to the Red Man, his undeviating adherence to Penn's Indian policy, and the recorded praises of him by Indian chiefs.

The anti-Logan bias is compounded of several errors. First of all, his critics too generally judge him solely on the basis of his political activity by later standards of democratic theory. In the second place, since Logan has had no adequate biographer to show him as a growing rather than a static personality, too many historians fail to recognize the grievous psychological disturbances to his normal serenity arising from political battles, personal insecurity, and unrequited love, or, in his last years, from his crippled condition, gout and palsy. Finally, many of his political actions were dictated by orders from England and his unfaltering faithfulness to the Penn family. His letters contain plenty of evidence that in numerous situations he bluntly criticized his orders, but adhered to them as if he himself had made them. If he was "unbending," it was the inflexibility of an iron-like integrity.

Much of the anti-Logan bias may be traced back to a document called *An Historical Review of the Constitution and Government of Pennsylvania*. This work was produced in 1758 in London, obviously by someone well acquainted with the inner workings of the province and its recent history. There is good reason to think that the ingenious if not always ingenuous Doctor Franklin had a hand in it, if indeed he did not mastermind the greater part of it. Franklin was in London at the time as agent for the anti-proprietary Assembly to promote the conversion of Pennsylvania into a Crown colony and thus take it out of the hands of the Penns. In that year Franklin wrote to a committee of the Assembly concerning "a Work now near ready for the Press, calculated to engage the Attention of many Readers, and at the same time efface the bad Impressions receiv'd of us: But it is thought best not to publish it, till a little before the next Session of Parliament."*4

There was political dynamite in this volume, however, and some danger that its carefully calculated effect might boomerang. It presented the proprietors as rapacious absentee landlords and Logan

---

as their unscrupulous tool, "loose in principle, arbitrary in disposition, and scandalous in his private life and deportment," as well as "practised in all the arts of political disguise." The whole production suffers the crude distortions of partisan thinking. If there are evidences of hired hack work in it, the conception of the whole may very well have been Franklin's. But it seems to have overreached its aim; Franklin was shrewdly loath to acknowledge credit for it. Two years later to the philosopher David Hume he disclaims "any part of it," though Hume was favorably impressed by the piece.

If indeed framed in the mind of Franklin, this production shows the grossest kind of ingratitude, being issued only six years after Logan's death. Logan, who had a sharp eye for talent, was one of Franklin's most important patrons when the printer was still in the struggling stage, supported some of Franklin's public projects, admitted him into the inner sanctum of his library, even allowed him to borrow his own manuscripts. It was Logan as much as anyone who set the stage for Philadelphia becoming "the Athens of America," an accomplishment for which Franklin is given chief credit.

Several members of Franklin's Junto, which had such a notable civilizing influence on the tradesman class of early Philadelphia, also owed more than a passing bow to James Logan. Despite his barbed comments on their support of Sir William Keith and the general political sympathies of "the Leathern Apron faction," Logan had the good grace to support individual talent without regard to political affiliation. It is said that William Parsons, the
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7 "An Historical Review . . ." printed in Jared Sparks, ed., The Works of Benjamin Franklin (Boston, 1836), III, 184-185, 189.

8 Franklin to David Hume, September 27, 1760, in Smyth, ibid., IV, 82. This letter was the sole reason why Smyth omitted the "Review" from his collection of Franklin's works. Sparks, on the other hand, included it in its 426-page entirety. Dr. Whitfield Bell, one of the editors of The Franklin Papers, indicated to the writer that no decision had yet (summer, 1956) been reached as to Franklin's degree of involvement in preparing the "Review."

9 Perhaps the earliest reference to "the Athens of America" occurs in an address of the Library Company directors to Thomas Penn, May 14, 1733, who had just arrived. Among the closing sentences are these words: "May your Philadelphia be the future Athens of America!" Quoted in Gray, Benjamin Franklin's Library, 12. Logan's great influence on Franklin is largely neglected by Franklin's biographers, but the usually cautious Isaac Sharpless (op. cit., 150) wrote that Franklin "looked up to" Logan "for advice and aid, which was not very generously reciprocated."

humble cobbler of the Junto, learned surveying and mapmaking through Logan's support and Richard Peters' guidance, and eventually became Surveyor-General of the province. Nicholas Scull, another Junto member who rose to the surveyor-generalship, was probably also assisted by Logan. But of the eleven original members of the Junto, the one who benefited most of all from Logan's learning and guidance was the elder Thomas Godfrey.

Godfrey's remarkable mathematical talents, according to the oft-repeated story, came to Logan's attention during the finishing of Stenton, where Godfrey was employed at his trade glazing windows. According to Logan's own account, Godfrey appeared at Stenton one day to request permission to study the master's copy of Newton's *Principia*. Quick to recognize Godfrey's latent powers, Logan, whose own mathematical knowledge was extraordinary, at once set to work to help the glazier develop his mathematical talents. The eminent Dr. William Smith—under whose direction Godfrey's son, also called Thomas, became the first American playwright and a poet of some distinction—described the elder Godfrey as "a man of no education, but perhaps the most singular phenomenon that ever appeared in the learned world."

Under Logan's direction Godfrey's self-education must have been extraordinarily rapid. If we may assume that their friendship began not earlier than 1728, when Stenton was under construction, it is all the more remarkable that by the summer of 1730 Godfrey was able to invent a new type of mariner's quadrant.

This invention, so important to the maritime greatness of Britain, was first given a trial in Delaware Bay in 1730 and then tested on a ship bound for Jamaica. At Jamaica it was shown to several Englishmen, including, according to one legend, a nephew of John Hadley, vice president of the Royal Society in London.
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8 Gray, op. cit., 75; but see also the writer's comments on Parsons in *Northampton Heritage* (Easton, 1953), 99-100.

9 Precisely what Godfrey's relationship to Logan was I have not been able to determine. Keith (Provincial Councillors, 13) says he "had been Logan's servant," but in a later work (Chronicles of Pennsylvania, II, 735) he says merely that Godfrey was "occasionally employed by Logan."

10 The American Magazine for July, 1758, p. 475.

Whether the nephew passed on to his illustrious uncle information concerning Godfrey’s quadrant is not known for certain, but at any rate in 1731 Hadley completed his own quadrant on the same principle and presented an official paper on it to the Royal Society in May, 1731, giving no evidence of being aware of Godfrey’s invention. However, on May 25, 1732, Logan wrote the famous British astronomer, Dr. Edmund Halley, about Godfrey and his invention in considerable detail and recommended the glazier to the “justice and notice” of the Royal Society. This was the beginning of a series of claims and counterclaims. In June, 1734, Logan addressed to the Royal Society “A further account of Thomas Godfrey’s Improvement of Davis’s Quadrant transferred to the Mariner’s Bow,” and several months later Godfrey sent his own communication explaining the origins of the invention along with the complex mathematical equations involved.13

Dr. Halley gave little notice to Logan’s first letter and perhaps failed to present Godfrey’s claim to the Society, for Logan complained to William Jones of Halley’s “unhandsome conduct toward me.” At any rate, Hadley obtained the patent, and the device has ever since been known as Hadley’s Quadrant.14

The whole affair shows the Philadelphia fur merchant in an extraordinary light. Not only had he the temerity to press the British society, composed of the most brilliant men of England, for recognition of an uneducated colonist’s inventive genius, but he also felt the weight of his own authority to the extent of criticizing one of its most illustrious members and gaining partial recognition for Godfrey. Legend has it that finally the Royal Society sent a peace offering of £200—shipped in the form of household furniture because the aging glazier drank too much—but there are no records to substantiate the story.

The collection of mathematical classics and writings on astronomy and the physical sciences constitutes one of the most re-
Logan had special pride in his mathematical collection, and in summarizing the scope of his library he mentions first his beloved editions of ancient classic literatures and then points with pride to the books of "all the old Greek mathematicians . . . and a great number of modern mathematicians, with all three editions of Newton, Dr. Halley, Wallis, &c." His mathematical collection was probably unequaled in colonial America.

In addition to Godfrey, another poorly educated colonial who attained world fame, John Bartram, owed much to James Logan. This Quaker farmer of Kingsessing had only the most rudimentary training in a country school. One of the first learned men to befriend him, Logan gave him full access to the library at Stenton and possibly advised him on the plantings for his famous botanical garden. To Logan's friend, Sir Hans Sloane, President of the Royal Society, Bartram wrote: "The first authors I read were Salmon, Culpeper and Turner. These James Logan gave me." In 1729 the master of Stenton presented the Quaker farmer with John Parkinson's work on flowers (London, 1656), still preserved at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia.

Although Franklin helped to raise funds for Bartram's journeys, and Joseph Breinieall, scrivener and poetaster of the Junto, was responsible for recommending Bartram to Peter Collinson, the wealthy British patron of the sciences, Logan saw to it that Bartram received other opportunities. Quite likely it was he who arranged for Bartram to accompany Conrad Weiser on his peace-making journey to the Six Nations at Onondaga in 1743. Lewis Evans, first important geographer of Pennsylvania, went along, too. The three men—Weiser, Bartram, and Evans—all kept journals, each among the best of its time and kind (Weiser's on In-
than relationships, Evans’ on topography and landforms, Bartram’s with special attention to flora and fauna). The latter’s *Observations Made by Mr. John Bartram, In his Journey from Pensilvania to Onondaga* (London, 1751) became the most noted of his writings and was destined to have not a little influence on the Romantic movement of later years.

Bartram, like Logan, came to be convinced of the justification of defensive war, perhaps under the spell of Logan’s own thinking on the subject. As a pillar of Darby Meeting, Bartram was chiefly responsible for the formation of a library at Darby in 1743, probably spurred by Logan’s advice and books. It is revealing to compare the first list of books purchased by the Darby library with the first list of the Library Company of Philadelphia, made out largely by James Logan. The one most striking similarity of the two lists is the almost total absence of religious works, one of the few exceptions being Barclay’s *Apology* on the Darby list. In an age and region dominated by religious motivations, this startling omission was not so much an evidence of the secularization of the intellectual climate as a conversion of it to the gentler, more spacious identification of religious principle with the forms and forces of Nature. We are indeed on the doorstep of the Romantic movement with its cult of nature, years in advance of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

In many respects James Logan is the prototype of that many-sided eighteenth century form of genius that was shaped by a fusion of three elements: the classic regimen inherited from the Renaissance, the enlivened and spiritualized ethic of the Reformation, and the rediscovery of the laws and content of Nature. It is necessary to remember, however, that the latter force, though leading eventually to the Industrial Revolution and the dislocation of the classical and spiritual disciplines on which the architecture

---

18 E. V. Lamberton, “Colonial Libraries of Pennsylvania,” in *PMHB*, XLII (1918), 219-222. Earnest, *op. cit.*, 26-28, includes the list of the first books purchased by the Darby library. The Library Company’s first purchases were made in 1732, the Darby library’s in 1743. Most of the original Darby purchases are still kept encased at the Darby Library. While the Darby list included Milton’s *Paradise Lost and Regained* (1730 ed.) and Whiston’s *Astronomical Principles of Religion* (1717), the more ambitious Library Company ordered a few of the ancient classics, a number of specialized dictionaries, and various works on architecture, mathematics, and the sciences. Both libraries ordered Puffendorf’s *Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, the *Spectator*, and that curious Italian forgery then so popular, The Turkish Spy.
of western civilization had been formed, was in Logan's time essentially poetic and possessed a religious feeling. The poets of the age read Linnaeus and Bartram, Sir Isaac Newton was a public hero, even churchmen began to reorient their thoughts on the basis of what was called Natural Philosophy. Men like Logan were primarily interested in the totality of life rather than in the specialized knowledge of mere segments of the human setting.

Specialization in the scientific sense was, of course, required as support for the intellectual ferment of the age, and Logan probably looked upon his protégés as specialists. His assistance to men like Godfrey and Bartram was that of a master-patron possessed of broad and inclusive interests, guiding the specialized talents of apprentices with a more limited framework of reference. Though himself a superior mathematician, he looked upon mathematics primarily as a mental discipline and a "diversion." He was also an excellent practical botanist, but again this represented only a portion of his interests, though he was probably surer of himself in botanical inquiries than in any other branch of science.

While Logan's self-education in mathematics was probably cut short by a busy public life and not resumed until his retirement, that wondrous eighteenth century tradition of Gardening (capital G, of course), a source of both pleasure and food to every well-run household, may have helped him maintain an unceasing interest in botany. His botanical interests were probably known to the learned men of the province as early as 1715. In that year it is said that Francis Daniel Pastorius, who played much the same role in the Germanic settlement as Logan did in the Britannic, sent him his "Botanick Rimes." Logan's splendid garden at Stenton was probably laid out before the mansion itself was built. Along with the almost legendary botanic garden of Dr. Christopher Witt, the erratic but gifted mystic of Johannes Kelpius's commune, Logan's garden of "sundry curiosities" may have been as important to John Bartram as the Stenton library.

As an experimental botanist Logan's fame rests principally on the experiments he made on maize (in 1727) to determine the theory of sex in plants and illustrate the principles underlying the spreading of pollen. A full report of the experiments was sent to Peter Collinson in 1735, and soon news of Logan's discoveries spread through scientific circles in Europe. The great Linnaeus
wrote to Peter Collinson, March 7, 1738: “I have read with a
great deal of pleasure the ingenious Mr. Logan’s experiments
made in North America upon the sex of plants . . . good and com-
plete experiments have hitherto been very scarce, therefore it is
to be wished that those of Mr. Logan’s might be soon published
as they are made with skill and accuracy.” By 1739 his find-
ings were considered important enough to warrant publication
at Leyden in an expanded Latin version. Logan’s *Experimenta et
meletemata de plantarum generatione* became a landmark in eight-
eleventh century science, and may indeed be regarded as the basis
for the later explorations of plant hybridization which has meant
so much to the agricultural economy of the modern world. In 1747
a bilingual edition of Logan’s paper, with an English translation
by his friend Dr. John Fothergill, was issued in London. Very
likely it was the influence of the *Experimenta* that prompted Lin-
naeus to pay its author the compliment of naming a family of
trees and shrubs *Loganaceae*, containing some thirty genera in
350 species.

There was, in a sense, a pooling of brainpower among Logan’s
scientific friends that transcended national and hemispheric bound-
aries to give an intellectual momentum to the new natural philos-
ophy. Linnaeus in Sweden, Gronovius in Holland, Collinson,
Fothergill, Sloane, Jones, and others in England, and Logan,
Bartram, Godfrey, Franklin, and Cadwalader Colden in America
made up a remarkable array of genius linked together by an inter-
weaving correspondence. Perhaps above them all rose the figure
of Linnaeus—the Newton of botany who found that science “a
chaos and left it a cosmos.” He had no better champion than his
older contemporary, James Logan. Following the publication of
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20I am indebted to Frederick B. Tolles for a transcript of the quotation.
The original letter is in the Collinson Correspondence, p. 242, Linnaean So-
ciety, London.

21I have not seen a copy of the Leyden edition of 1739, but copies of the
bilingual London edition of 1747 are at the American Philosophical Society
and the Ridgway Branch Library: *Experimenta et Meletemata de Plantarum
Generatione . . . Experiments and Considerations of the Generation of
Plants (39 pages). An eight-page manuscript copy of what may be Logan’s
original communication to Collinson, November 20, 1735, is in the Logan
Papers, II, 25 (HSP), and may be found in part in the Royal Society’s
Philosophical Transactions, XXXIX, 192 195.

22It is fairly certain that Linnaeus and Logan exchanged letters over some
period of time (*Correspondence of Scientific Men, I, 288a*), but I have not
been able to trace back to its origins the tradition that Linnaeus called
Bartram “the greatest natural botanist in the world.”
the Swedish botanist’s *Systema naturae* in 1735, Logan introduced the Linnaean system to Bartram and helped him with its Latin terminology. Thus began a century that produced America’s greatest naturalists. The *princeps botanicorum* elaborated no theory of life in its entirety but, in ways that must have been mirrored in Logan’s mind, regarded Nature as an emanation of the Divine. His view of life in its grand simplicity was a reflection of his primitive Christian pietism, and Logan’s own undeveloped tendencies in that direction may have been reflected in his special regard for Linnaeus and other scientists, like Georg Ernst Stahl and Anthony van Leeuwenhoek, whose speculations combined with religious piety to carry them to the verge of the wondrously supra-scientific.

Indeed, Logan’s view of Nature was far from the cold determinism of modern science. True, he considered Nature a sure, apt, effective force: “it is manifest that Nature always makes choice of the shortest and most certain means to obtain her end.” But when he beholds the wondrous complexity of a plant, the effect upon his mind is akin to religious awe: “...such amazing Order and Beauty, it is scarcely possible to conceive, that so wonderful a Structure should be the Effect of so simple a Process. It not only exceeds the utmost Limits of human Apprehension, as indeed a great many other subjects do, but even seems absurd to Reason.”

In constant touch with members of the Royal Society in London, Logan had opportunity to send them short discourses on other subjects, too. Two curious papers—“Concerning the Crooked or Angular Appearance of the Streaks or Darts of Lightning in Thunderstorms” and “Some Thoughts on the Sun and Moon when near the Horizon Appearing Larger than when near the Zenith”—were submitted to Sir Hans Sloane and published in the Society’s *Philosophical Transactions*. The former subject also occupied the attention of Jonathan Edwards and Benjamin Franklin. But amateurish speculations of this sort were bal-
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*Experienta et meltemata, 29-30.*

*Philosophical Transactions... Abridged, VIII, 68 and 112. The two papers also appear in digest form in Armistead, *op. cit.*, 161-163. The full text of Logan’s original communications to Sir Hans Sloane on these subjects is printed in Hazard’s *Register of Pennsylvania, VIII* (1831-1832), 40.

Logan to Peter Collinson, July 1, 1749, has this to say of Franklin’s “new curiosities in electricity”: “I have seen his manuscript to thee... which I must approve notwithstanding my piece in the Transactions; but these last causes [i.e., those expressed in Logan’s paper] are also true.” Quoted in Sparks, *ed.*, *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, VII, 38-39n.
anced by Logan's advanced work on optics. Dissatisfied with the extreme complexity of determining the foci of lenses as proposed by Christiaan Huygens, he invented his own system. In a short Latin treatise, the *Canonum pro inveniendis refractionum...*, he demonstrated his new system both geometrically and analytically. Still apparently not satisfied, he expanded these experiments and issued a work called *Demonstrationes de radiorum lucis...*.

In a century which marked the end of the universality of Latin as a learned tongue, it is interesting to note that Logan remained ever faithful to it. And his Latin apparently measured up to the best stylistic standards of the day. John Fothergill, who translated Logan's *Experimienta*, wrote these fine words for Logan's Latin style in his introduction: "nervous, concise, and truly Roman."

James Logan extended his help and patronage not only to promising scientists, however. For example, he took under wing the Rev. Richard Peters, who failed to find a post in the Anglican priesthood of the province, and groomed him as his successor in the political realm. Unburdening himself of the untidy history of his earlier years in England, Peters convinced Logan, who in turn persuaded the Penn brothers, that he could be of considerable service to the province. He became Provincial Secretary and weathered many a political storm—unsteadily sometimes and not without fault, it may be said—in the troubled days ahead. Even though an Anglican cleric, and a gay one at that, he never lost the stoical Quaker's friendship and guidance.

In addition to the gay cleric mention should be made of that curious *bon vivant* Henry Brooke, whom Logan described to William Penn as "a young man of the most polite education and best natural parts... thrown away on this corner of the world."
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"A finely copied but apparently incomplete draft of Logan's work on optics, with drawings, is to be found in the Logan Papers, II, 115 (19 pages), and entitled "The principal Rules in Dioptrics for finding the Foci of Glasses, Demonstrated both by Analysis and by Geometrical Constructions." Both the *Canonum* and the *Demonstrationes* were apparently published together in 1741 at Leyden.

An illuminating account of Logan's facility as a Latinist is to be found in Frederick B. Tolles, "Quaker Humanist: James Logan as a Classical Scholar," in *PMHB*, LXXIX (1955), 427-429.


*Penn & Logan Correspondence*, I, 311.
Brooke was a castoff of a different culture—the grandson of a baronet, a spiritual child of the Restoration wits, and a dabbler in what the eighteenth century persisted in calling polite letters. Arriving in the colonies in 1702 to become Collector of Customs at Lewes in the Lower Counties, Brooke must have felt out of place from the beginning in the rarefied Quaker-Germanic spiritual climate of Penn’s dominions. To whom else but James Logan could he turn? At any rate, a friendship developed and, when Brooke died in 1736, he left Logan all the Italian books he himself had earlier received from their mutual friend, Governor Burnet of New York. It is also said that several of Brooke’s own poems were later discovered at Stenton—perhaps the only place they found an agreeable welcome.

Another raconteur and versifier, the amiable Aquila Rose, also discovered the Logan largesse. Rose, whose literary remains constituted the first volume of native poetry to be printed in Pennsylvania, was not unlike Henry Brooke, a somewhat humbler castoff of the Restoration spirit. According to the elegies of his contemporaries, Aquila was enormously popular and was adopted by some of the leading men of the province, the most prominent being James Logan. (Could Logan have been the anonymous patron who gave Rose a river boat for his own use?) Though he settled in Philadelphia apparently by chance after years of knocking about the Mediterranean ports as a sailor, Rose’s preferments came rapidly. At first he seems to have hitched his wagon to the waning star of Sir William Keith, providing a lyric accompaniment for Sir William’s visit to the Indians at Conestoga in 1717. The anti-proprietary Assembly also did its best for him by granting him a lease to operate a ferry across the Schuylkill and finally installing him as clerk of the Assembly in 1722. Doubtless Logan had his reservations about Rose’s political friends, but that did not keep him from recognizing and encouraging talent in whatever guise he found it.


Article on Rose by G. H. Genzmer, Dictionary of American Biography, XVI, 156. Rose worked for awhile as the “principal hand” of printer Andrew Bradford, and Aquila’s son Joseph was later apprenticed to Franklin, who has several scattered comments about the Roses in his Autobiography. Aquila Rose’s verses were partially collected and published as Poems on Several Occasions (Philadelphia, 1740).
Others also sought to win Logan’s approval through the medium of verse, such as Thomas Makin, who succeeded the schismatic George Keith as Philadelphia schoolmaster in 1690. Makin addressed two stiff-jointed Latin poems to Logan, descriptive of Pennsylvania. Though these were found among Logan’s papers after his death, he must have been pained by their mediocrity. There is no evidence that Makin was able, in spite of flattery, to enter the charmed Loganian circle. Though occasionally chosen clerk of the Assembly, Makin at last moved on to the frontier. Logan probably did not miss him or his uninspired, lamp-lit Latinity.

In most cases Logan extended his cultural patronage to individuals, rarely to institutions. In at least one case, however, the two forms of patronage seem to have merged. In the autumn of 1718 William Tennent, with wife and children, appeared on the Philadelphia scene. Tennent was a well-trained Scotch-Irish Presbyterian clergyman, capable of conversing in Latin as easily as in English. As a cousin to Logan on his mother’s side, he was probably attracted to Philadelphia by the advantage of so well-placed a connection, and doubtless felt that Logan would not turn away a man of learning if he needed aid. Logan gave the family a hospitable reception. Then after a decade of service to the church, William Tennent was called as pastor to the Neshaminy country in Bucks County.

Tennent probably talked over with his kinsman his dream of starting an academy in the country, one that would be sound not only in theology but also in the classical disciplines so reverenced by his benefactor. As a result early in 1729 Logan transferred to William’s wife Katherine fifty acres of land in the Neshaminy region, near present Hartsville, for a token payment of five shillings. The land was to be used as a farm residence for the family as well as the location of an academy of higher education.

The so-called Log College that Tennent built a few steps from his dwelling was a rude and humble cabin about twenty feet square. For two decades the elder Tennent continued to gather

---


3 Formal acknowledgment of this land transfer is in the Logan Papers, II, 81, dated January 11, 1728-1729. The fifty acres were part of a huge tract of 616 acres conveyed to Logan in London, 1711.
around him choice young men destined to serve the church and society in important capacities. The Tennent ideal of a sound classical education combined with a reasonable if orthodox theological grounding had a far greater influence on the development of education in America than its humble home would lead one to suspect. It was among the first of a whole rash of classical academies—and it was the embryo of one of the great educational institutions of America, Princeton University.

The records do not seem to be available to determine accurately just what Logan's role was in this enterprise. One of our earlier historians calls him “the patron and endower” of the Log College, and claims that he was faithful in sending provisions to the Tennents in Bucks County.33 Certainly he approved of William Tennent’s enthusiasm for the classics, and he did not wholly disapprove of Calvinist theology, a latent sympathy for which he probably inherited from his father.

Self-educated, without benefit of university training, Logan was nevertheless genuinely interested in the educational process. But a notable difference in emphasis becomes apparent between Logan and some of his younger contemporaries, particularly Benjamin Franklin. The difference is dramatized in the origins of the American Philosophical Society as well as the College and Academy of Philadelphia which became the University of Pennsylvania. In 1743 Franklin issued his proposal for what is now the oldest learned society in America, proposing himself as secretary. The relations between Franklin and Logan were then at their most cordial. Franklin proposed that the Society “be formed of Virtuosi or ingenious Men,” and certainly Logan would have topped the list of that class in Pennsylvania. Yet in spite of this, Logan did not join. Why?

Early the next year John Bartram wrote to Cadwalader Colden about Logan’s lack of interest in the American Philosophical Society—important in view of his possible financial support and the prestige attached to his name. “I told Benjamin,” Bartram writes, “that I believed he would not incourage it; & we should have been as well pleased with his name at ye top of our List, as his person in our meetings. however we resolved that his not favouring ye designh should not hinder our attempt & if he would not

go along with us we would jog along without him." That, according to John, was that. No reason for Logan’s reticence is given. Perhaps Logan saw no need for it; after all, the Royal Society had been performing the same task since 1662 and properly qualified colonists could and did use its resources. Franklin’s proposals were directly patterned on the charter of the Royal Society; why duplicate it? Moreover, the colonial society proposed to restrict its field of work to the observational and experimental sciences—“Experiments that let Light into the Nature of Things, tend to increase the Power of Man over Matter, and multiply the Conveniences or Pleasures of Life.” The exclusion of those fields of inquiry that now more and more absorbed Logan’s mind—morals, metaphysics, divinity, and the whole realm of the “humanities”—must have seemed to him a serious mistake. To exclude that in favor of the merely practical and pragmatic—where would it all end if the supra-scientific were excluded? Could Logan have sensed instinctively that this “practical” view of life could lead ultimately to the emptiness of scientific determinism on the one hand and senile antiquarianism on the other? Logan’s scepticism about the Society was not without foundation. Between 1744 and 1768 the Society floundered and made no progress. A new generation was then in the saddle.

Something of the same attitude may have determined Logan’s modest part in the origins of the College of Philadelphia. Franklin, the prime mover, proposed that the institution go “no farther than to procure the Means of a good English Education.” If he had had his way, Latin and Greek would have been wholly omitted from the curriculum, just as in the Library Company he helped to found only English books were provided. However, “some ... Persons of Wealth and Learning, whose Subscriptions and Countenance we should need, being of Opinion that it ought to include the learned Languages, I submitted my Judgment to theirs, retaining, however, a strong Prepossession in favor of my first Plan.” Franklin then draws a simile between the study of the

34 Bartram to Colden, April 29, 1744, in the Miscellaneous Manuscript Collection at the American Philosophical Society.
35 The quotation is from Franklin’s Proposals for Promoting Useful Knowledge among the British Plantations in America (Philadelphia, 1743). Details of the founding of the APS were gleaned largely from Edwin G. Conklin’s “A Brief History of the American Philosophical Society,” in the Society’s Year Book, 1949, 5-27.
classics and those ridiculous hats carried by men of fashion under their arms because they could not wear them over powdered curls—of little use, considerable expense, and a constant trouble. When Franklin wrote this daring but shallow comparison (1789), the spirit of a new-found independence of all Old World heritages was in the air, which nullified the authority of the ancients. He would not have dared to write thus in 1750.

In so many advances made during the eighteenth century in Pennsylvania Franklin’s name has so long been regarded as the magic key that the important contributions of others have been unduly obscured. This is what happened to Logan in respect to the college. To explain his role in its founding, we must go back to the arrival in Philadelphia of George Whitefield, the clergyman whose powerful voice sounded the clarion call to the “Great Awakening” and the colonial Methodist movement. He arrived, November, 1739, and promptly began to draw overflowing crowds to Christ Church. His ten-day stay was long enough to raise the opposition of the more conservative and rational clergy. When he again returned, April, 1740, he was excluded from Episcopal and most Presbyterian pulpits. Undaunted, he preached in the streets and fields, gathering thousands under the spell of his oratory. Franklin’s Autobiography bears witness to the spell he cast even upon Deists and the increasing numbers unaffiliated with any creed who were jokingly classified as belonging to “the Pennsylvania religion.” Whitefield’s adherents at last proposed building a chapel where the silver-voiced evangelist and any other acceptable preacher, of whatever denomination, could preach.

Meanwhile, the Charity School movement—so characteristic a phase of the middle eighteenth century—won Philadelphia’s attention. Whitefield himself was active in the movement, and so it came about that the two objectives, chapel and school, were

36 Observations relative to the Intentions of the Original Founders of the Academy in Philadelphia (1789), was one of the last things Franklin wrote; quoted in William Pepper’s introduction to a facsimile reprint of Franklin’s Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1931), xvi-xvii.

37 See Edward Potts Cheyney, History of the University of Pennsylvania 1740-1940 (Philadelphia, 1940), 17-27. Cheyney points out that Franklin, in the Autobiography, was entirely wrong in saying that “if the Mufti of Constantinople were to send us a missionary to preach Mohammedanism to us he would find a pulpit at his service.” Only “orthodox” Christian preaching was to be allowed in the chapel.
merged. The “New Building,” largest structure in the Philadelphia of that day, was constructed for this dual purpose. The Presbyterian faction favorable to Whitefield, headed by William Tennent’s son Gilbert, provided most of the funds and used it for their services. But the Charity School never really got under way, the religious excitement receded, and the whole venture languished in debt. Franklin, in spite of his Autobiography’s claim to the contrary, was not numbered among its trustees, and neither was Logan.

Financial salvation, however, appeared in 1749. James Logan and a few others bought the building outright, paid all outstanding debts, and began to plan an institution of higher learning. It is true that as early as 1743 Franklin began to formulate a plan for an academy, but his failure to convince Richard Peters to become headmaster delayed action for awhile. Then in 1749, the year Logan and others bought the New Building and began their plans, Franklin sensed the time was ripe and issued his Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth, which became a basis for discussion among the institution’s founders. Yet one of the most important of Franklin’s proposals, the emphasis on the English school, was not adopted nor did the trustees follow his advice to locate the academy in the country.

Unfortunately, Logan left no autobiography like Franklin, and letters from these last two years, when these events were taking place, are scarce, for he had reached a ripe old age when his limbs and the faculties of his mind were no longer strong. His part in these new developments is therefore not easily ascertained. But we do know that he was the first named of the Academy’s original trustees and left £500 to it in his will. As at the first meeting of the trustees, who had not yet made up their minds to take over the Whitefield chapel, Logan offered without cost his lot on Sixth Street directly beside the newly built Loganian Library. The other trustees, however, voted in favor of the New Building.

As a matter of fact, Logan’s library appears to have been a key factor in the early development of the Academy. The Library Company fathered by Franklin was already a going concern, it is true, but its resources were paltry in comparison with the Loganian. Franklin himself points out the great advantage of the Loganian.

Keith, op. cit. (II), 738.
THE LOGANIAN LIBRARY

Old print, made from designs drawn up by James Logan, 1745

From The First American Library: A Short Account of the Library Company of Philadelphia, 1731-1981
ian Library in his *Proposals*: "A handsome Building above 60 Feet in front, is now erected in this City, at the private Expense of that Gentleman, for the Reception of this Library, where it is soon to be deposited, and remain for the publick Use, with a valuable yearly Income duly to enlarge it; and I have his Permission to mention it as an Encouragement to the propos'd Academy; to which this noble Benefaction will doubtless be of the greatest Advantage. . . ." But Franklin does not even mention the name of the benefactor!

Franklin, as usual, took over the project as his own. As to old James Logan, Richard Peters may have represented his thoughts when he wrote Thomas Penn in February, 1750: "I asked Mr. Franklin, who is the soul of the whole, whether they would not find it difficult to collect masters. He replied with an air of firmness, 'Money would buy learning of all sorts'; he was under no apprehensions about masters. But for all Mr. Franklin's sanguine expectations, it is my opinion that they have undertaken what is too high for them, and will not be able to carry it on. . . . I find the matter is not wholly understood among them."

Logan would have known that learning involves a great deal more than money and its object goes beyond mere utility.

But the Academy, after a shaky start, did succeed. A great share of its subsequent success was due to the firm, scholarly guidance of the Rev. Dr. William Smith, who represented to a degree the intellectual calibre that men associated with the name of Logan.

In January, 1751, the Rev. Mr. Peters delivered the sermon at the formal opening of the Academy. Trustee Logan was not present to view the ceremony. After a lifetime of service, of seeking far and deeply for sureties of knowledge and finding at last the eternal equation of life and the inward Peace that death can-

---


"Quoted in Cummings, *ibid.*, 148.

Franklin and Hall printed the sermon in 1751 under the title of *A Sermon on Education. Wherein Some Account is given of the Academy Established in the City of Philadelphia. It is prefaced by Peters' own introduction, and is followed by the 'Constitution of the Public Academy' and Franklin's 'Idea of the English School.'"
not corrupt—finding this in spite of a rough and troubled temper and the fallibility of even the best of men—James Logan was soon to breathe his last. While Mr. Peters preached, the old man, almost deprived of the capacity for speech and with a body broken by the palsy, lay at Stenton on his deathbed. It was the end of an era.