Two popular History of Mathematics ([2],[3]) texts agree on what algebraic form represents the logarithm as defined by Napier, but a third ([1]) has something different. Why don’t they agree? Which is correct? Are the representations equivalent? If not, how are they related? Does either exhibit the “logarithmic” properties of turning products into sums and quotients into differences?

After describing Napier’s definition, this talk will address these and related questions, which the speaker has assigned students (and will again) as a nonstandard way to review properties of logarithms.