

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Writing Program

College of Arts and Sciences

Fall 9-2013

The Daw and the Honeybee: Situating Metaphors for Originality and Authorial Labor in the 1728 Chambers' Cyclopædia

Krista Kennedy
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/wp>

 Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Krista. "The Daw and the Honeybee: Situating Metaphors for Originality and Authorial Labor in the 1728 Chambers' Cyclopædia." *College English* 76.1 (2013): 35-58.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Writing Program by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

The Daw and the Honeybee: Situating Metaphors for Originality and Authorial Labor in the 1728 Chambers' *Cyclopædia*

Krista Kennedy

In the years since the Napster decision, there has been much discussion in the fields that comprise English studies and legal studies about the language we use to discuss intellectual property in digital spaces. In the highly contested landscape of contemporary copyright, words are weighted with claims to not just legitimacy but fundamental truths. Cultural property is or isn't equivalent to physical property (Lunsford; Stearns; Yen). It might or might not be considered part of an intellectual commons or public domain that can or can't be owned in traditional ways (Boyle; Cohen; Lessig). Framing the debates as pure war was a common Valenti era rhetorical move (Litman; Logie, "Copyright Cold War"). Since the end of the seventeenth century, intellectual property has been ransacked by pirates or redistributed by thieves (Logie, *Peers, Pirates, and Persuasion*; Reyman; St. Clair).

The cultural work that these metaphors perform is of particular interest to those of us who study rhetorical aspects of language, constructions of authorship, the complexities of intellectual property, and cultural understandings of the labor of writing and collaboration. The far-reaching implications of intellectual property arguments extend beyond scholarly analysis and the recent courtroom arguments of *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.*; *Authors Guild v. Google*; or *Patrick Cariou v. Richard Prince*.¹ At each turn, the chosen terminology marks the conversation with not just ethos and emphasis but the mores of our era and culture. They drive a commonsense notion of what Mark Rose has called "the unconscious of copyright law" ("Copyright and Its Metaphors" 9). "The issue is not truth so much as persuasion,"

Krista Kennedy is assistant professor of writing and rhetoric at Syracuse University, where she teaches courses in rhetorical theory, digital rhetorics, technical communication, and history of technology. Her scholarship on Ephraim Chambers has appears in *Le Monde Maconnique des Lumières* (Editions Honoré Champion 2013), and her work on digital authorship has appeared in a number of edited collections. She is currently completing a book-length historical comparison of authorship and rhetorical agency in the Chambers' *Cyclopædia* and *Wikipedia*.

he writes. “A persuasive solution is one that works because it tells us what we already know” (10). By examining these “accepted truths,” Jessica Reyman argues, “a study of the rhetorical frameworks can show how these statements arise out of particular conditions of a political and cultural context in place of other possible statements” (23). In the Western early twenty-first century, piracy and theft are integral to countless mundane rhetorical interactions that touch on intellectual property, as Reyman demonstrates in her discussion of the MPAA (Motion Picture Association of America) copyright warnings shown on DVDs distributed in the United States and Europe (67–72). These criminalized views of reuse permeate our everyday language on college campuses and in private homes, seeping into the conversations of private citizens who drive the market for cultural goods. These metaphors of intellectual property frame the ways that we and our students understand intellectual property and, by extension, the ethics of borrowing, sharing, and creating cultural artifacts. Studying them and their historical precedents offers an opportunity to examine the ways in which these beliefs arise and become seemingly self-evident.

By extension, this work also offers us a chance to reconsider the common belief that these are new metaphors that are uniquely related to the digital age. As others have shown, concerns about originality and theft date back to, at minimum, ancient Greece (Behme; Long) and Rome (Logie, “I Have No Predecessor”). Here, I demonstrate that our anxieties and theories about the sort of distributed authorship that occurs among the thousands of authors who compose *Wikipedia* are not unprecedented, but rather find one forerunner in descriptions of encyclopedic authorship from the preface of the 1728 Ephraim Chambers’s *Cyclopædia*.

Chambers’s argument also presents a focus on processes of authorial labor that is quite separate from our present-day rhetorical focus, which has settled almost entirely on issues of ownership, whether it be corporate, private, or communal. Although this focus is kairotic and vital, it elides to some extent attendant issues of invention, originality, and authorial labor. Ownership and appropriation metaphors fail to help us closely examine some foundational aspects of our larger quandaries about intellectual property: namely, widely varied rhetorical perspectives on invention and labor, which come prior to issues of ownership in the writing and publishing process.

This narrowed focus on ownership was not always the norm. Earlier arguments made by English writers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries deployed more nuanced metaphors that worked to tie labor to ownership. By necessity, these theorists of authorship were most often working writers struggling to exercise pragmatic agency concerning their work, which was not infrequently produced at the behest of patrons, publishers, or subscribers and then owned and distributed by members of the Stationers’ Company. The most prominent of these arguments are still commonly referenced within contemporary intellectual property literature, but rarely presented in full historical context. Historical metaphors that tie authorial labor

to a careful ethics of ownership can offer us some guidance regarding our current arguments, but must be understood in a situated way that considers the culture they arose within. Further, attention to less commonly cited historical arguments about intellectual property can provide deeper insight into the ways that authorship and ownership were being considered in the early eighteenth century, and the ways in which these discussions were rhetorically calibrated to be most persuasive to audiences who lived in a very specific time and place.

John Milton was one of the earliest British authors to write explicitly on this topic, publishing his *Areopagitica* (1644) “in angry response to the reinstatement of licensing by Parliament [and in the process defining] the figure of the autonomous author, the man whose authority is not based on public office or sanction but on personal experience, study, and deliberation” (Rose, *Authors and Owners* 28). Pushing against the declaration that authors could not hold the publication or distribution rights to their own work, Milton presented a proprietary author and portrayed books as “precious lifeblood” and living progeny, comparing their burning to a kind of murder. He followed this effort with *Eikonoklastes* in 1649, musing on the “human right, which commands that every author should have the property of his own work reserved to him after death, as well as living” (329). Perhaps most often cited is John Locke’s “sweat of the brow” doctrine described in *Two Treatises of Government* (1689), which argued for labor’s role in property ownership. In spite of his efforts, the writer’s individual rights remained largely unrecognized at the turn of the next century.

In the first decade of the eighteenth century, Daniel Defoe became a champion of the autonomous author’s rights to ownership, publishing his “Essay on the Regulation of the Press” as well as a series of arguments in the *Review*. He continued the paternity metaphor, famously calling books “[t]he Child of the [the Author’s] Inventions, the Brat of his Brain” (*Review* 1710).² Joseph Addison, in a 1709 piece for the *Tatler*, compared it to real property: “His Brain, which was his Estate, had as regular and different Produce as other Men’s land” (41). Although these metaphors acknowledge the importance of the author’s labor and investment, they assume that all compositional processes for all genres are similar, and consequently demand similar ethical stances on authorship and ownership regardless of the genre at hand.³

Then and now, discussions surrounding authorship and ownership could benefit from a focus on genre-based labor processes and the resulting intricacies these processes pose for ownership. Closer attention to the cultural context that gives rise to these descriptions is also essential: what makes sense to us now will not necessarily be clear to historians in even 100 years, and our appropriation of previous terms does not necessarily account for their original uses or contexts. One such historical, genre-based example can be found in Chambers’ *Cyclopædia, or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*, first published by James and John Knapton in 1728.

CHAMBERS' *CYCLOPÆDIA*

More than 275 years ago, Ephraim Chambers discussed the affordances and constraints that genre imposes on the author of an encyclopedic text, as well as implications for issues of authorship and ownership. His comparison of the encyclopedist to a honeybee is instructive because the metaphor extends across all stages of the composing process and, further, to ownership of the final product itself. His preferred metaphor also prefigures our contemporary natural metaphor of the “hive mind,” or a state of collective unconsciousness that fails to foster individual agency in communities devoted to large projects. This text merits close examination for many reasons, not least of which is the ways that it presages our contemporary discussions about distributed authorship, varied composing processes, and the ethics of owning a text that was composed of common knowledge gathered from disparate sources and recomposed into a “new” text. As he worked within the nexus of London’s publishing and knowledge work communities, Chambers deployed arguments for careful, unoriginal research; derivative works; and crowdsourcing that were forerunners of contemporary open access movements and projects such as *Wikipedia*.

The *Cyclopædia* and Chambers’s commentary also provide a rich opportunity to contextualize its metaphors and arguments as a product of their time and place: Enlightenment-era London. What at first appears to be a common metaphor that persists to this day (“busy as a bee”) instead becomes more powerful and more rhetorically astute when considered as a product of the cultural, philosophical, and scientific conversations of its day, and within the context of Britain’s long economic relationship with honeybees. The richness of this situated metaphor reminds us that, as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson have argued, all metaphors rely on physical and social experience in order to be fully understood. The work of recovering as many details as possible about historical metaphors is essential to developing an understanding of their deployment and reception.

The *Cyclopædia* does not enjoy broad attention from contemporary textual scholars, but it is central in the modern Western encyclopedic tradition, and vestiges remain with us today in common reference texts.⁴ The project received immediate acclaim when it was published in London. Chambers was inducted into the Royal Society the following year and awarded £500 by his publishers the next year (Briggs; Collison; Espinasse). The *Cyclopædia* quickly became a valuable publishing property and continued to grow as an investment. By the time of Chambers’s death in 1740, the property was given a total value of £6,400.⁵ It remained in print in subsequent UK editions until 1788 and, indeed, is still with us. A translation into French by John Mills and Gottfried Sellius formed the preliminary base of the *Encyclopédie* after the initial publisher, André Le Breton, contractually licensed the *Cyclopædia* in 1745 (Collison 119). The *Encyclopédie* in turn spurred development of Scotland’s *Encyclopædia*

Britannica; large sections were translated back into English to form part of the first edition text. A full port of the 1911 *Britannica*, which is in the public domain, served as the initial textual base of *Wikipedia*, effectively making the *Cyclopædia* its textual great-great-grandparent.

The *Cyclopædia*'s influence in British and American print culture was far-reaching throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Elements of the preface and structure are recognizable in the preface to *Johnson's Dictionary* (Espinasse; Kolb and Sledd; Mack). Several of its lengthy technical passages also appear in *Tristram Shandy*. Laurence Sterne's descriptions are only slightly modified, and might be regarded as plagiarism today (Greenberg). Scientific definitions from the *Cyclopædia* likewise appear later in Herman Melville's work, with the most notable instances occurring in *Moby-Dick* (Hillway; Leonard). The *Cyclopædia* also influenced at least two of the American founding fathers. Although a young Ben Franklin immediately discontinued the practice of running excerpts from the *Cyclopædia* on the front page of the *Pennsylvania Gazette* when he bought it, he relied on the *Cyclopædia* as a resource and continued to occasionally reprint entries (Mott). Thomas Jefferson's plans for the Montalto Observatory may also have been influenced by Chambers's entry on the topic (Donnelly).

For the purposes of this article, I focus on Chambers's descriptions of composing and owning a reference text that might be understood as an unoriginal—and even plagiarized—work. He paid particular attention to the communal nature of the text: though he listed himself as its sole formal author, he explicitly disavowed ownership of the public knowledge he had collected from myriad sources. The *Cyclopædia*'s first edition included an extensive preface with Chambers's musings on various relevant issues related to the cultural, scientific, and philosophical conversations of the day. He devoted extensive space to explaining the many merits of composing a text from disparate resources and subject matter experts, defending himself from potential charges of plagiarism and even heresy. His claim that he was the sole author of this project suggests that he both accepted responsibility for the text and expected recognition for what he understood as valid compositional work that was based heavily on arrangement and recomposition.

Chambers opens by broadly suggesting that although the Poetic Author may be inspired by both divine and human interaction (as well as by wine, which he considered as valid a means of inspiration as any), the Encyclopedic Author is instead a compiler, assessor, and recomposer of texts. This constant textual borrowing is necessary when producing what Chambers calls “a work so disproportionate to a single Person's Experience, and which might have employed an Academy” (*Cyclopædia* i). He directly acknowledges his debt to a variety of other scholarly resources, detailing his practice of drawing information from multiple dictionaries and lexicons on subjects ranging “from Medicine and Law, down to Heraldry” as well as “extracts and accounts from

a great number of authors of all kinds” that were either overlooked or too recently published to have been included in previous lexicons. He compares being the beneficiary of such a wealth of resources to being “the Heir to a large Patrimony [. . .] and the Endeavors of a long Race of Ancestors.” He also baldly says that there are very few pages in his final product that do not include several instances of this type of compilation—so few, in fact, that he will not attempt to list the pages that might be entirely original.⁶

Chambers seems to be prepared for the reader to assume that any given entry in the work was drawn from at least one other text, and indeed, he describes his work as “derived” from these materials. His use of this term does not seem out of line with our contemporary legal definition of a *derivative work*, a work that recasts or transforms one or more preexisting works (U.S.C. 17 §101). He also makes no claim on the prior texts or the information conveyed by them, instead focusing his claims entirely on the text at hand, a move which is also in line with our legal conception of derivative works. It appears in these statements that, rather than align himself primarily with the first rhetorical canon, invention, he sees his work as more closely integrated with the second canon, arrangement. (Indeed, it is through arrangement and consequent transformation that derivative works are most frequently created.) In this quote from the opening passage of the preface, he describes his primary compositional task as one of filtering and organizing materials:

Such are the Sources from whence the Materials of the present Work were derived ; which, it must be allowed, were rich enough not only to afford Plenty, but even Profusion: So that the chief Difficulty lay in the Form ; in the Order, and Economy of the Work : To dispose such a Variety of Materials in such manner, as not to make a confused Heap of incongruous Parts, but one confident Whole. (*Cyclopaedia* i)

Because he was working from a wealth of prior materials, Chambers goes so far as to cast his project as a collection, a term that speaks both to the eighteenth-century taxonomic impulse and to his understanding of his own primary contribution as one of curation. The era’s cabinets of curiosity, personal collections of natural wonders, and public museums all attempted to condense the vast wonders of the natural world in such a way that they could be easily accessed and studied. Such collections succeeded or failed on the strength of their explication and arrangement—and arrangement proved to be a difficulty, as with encyclopedias.

Chambers suggests instead that he has improved these previous lexicons and dictionaries by combining information found in individual texts as well as adding the latest information on each topic, thus transforming it into a richer, more finely detailed product. Several pages on, he again makes claims to improvement as he discusses the inevitable discovery of errors in his project (*Cyclopaedia* xxviii). He argues that a large part of his authorial contribution to the work has been the correction of

thousands of errors found in other incorporated texts. Although he acknowledges that his also certainly contains errors, he claims that readers will gain such vast knowledge from reading the *Cyclopaedia* that they will surely be able to correct those errors themselves.

This conceptualization of authorship through arrangement and transformation is best illustrated in Chambers's use of metaphor. In the final pages of this argument, he employs natural metaphors as a means of discussing the Encyclopedic Author's function as a gatherer in an information ecology. In doing so, he has worked toward rehabilitating the concept of arrangement as a means of composition that is distinct from but every bit as legitimate as the original invention we associate with the canonical Author. His chosen metaphors tend toward the organic:

Call me what you will ; a Daw and say I am stuck over with other Peoples Feathers : with all my Heart ; but it would be altogether as just to compare me to the Bee, the Symbol of Industry, as that of Pride. For tho I pick up my Matters in a thousand Places ; 'tis not to look gay my self, but to furnish you with Honey. I have rifled a thousand Flowers ; prickly ones many of 'em, to load your Hive. (*Cyclopaedia* xxix)

The daw, now more commonly known as the jackdaw, is a member of the crow family; the Western jackdaw is common across Europe and particularly England. Hunted as vermin by order of Henry VIII, the bird is omnivorous and noisy. It is perhaps most famous for its attraction to shiny objects, which it returns to its nest, much like magpies. The initial comparison to a daw can be read simply, unflatteringly implying that the author has stolen many shiny bits of information and compiled them into an encyclopedia. The daw, then, has parallels in our contemporary metaphor of piracy, which implies random collection rather than arrangement, as well as moral corruption demonstrated through the act of theft.

The honeybee, with its orderly hives and clearly, consistently arranged structures, serves as its counterpoint. Chambers plainly claims the bee as a "symbol of industry," a connotation that persists to this day as the common aphorism "busy as a bee." When read in historical context, though, this fragment reveals far more complex cultural references. We can consider these metaphors on two levels: within the narrower context of Chambers's life, and within the larger realm of the common cultural knowledge expected of learned individuals at that time and place. At various points, these metaphors can be interpreted as establishing the writer's and project's ethos in terms of social class, economic value, and the mores of the Enlightenment project, as well as explaining the labor and ethics of encyclopedic authorship.

SOCIAL CLASS

The intellectual, professional, and frequently aristocratic publishing and scientific research communities were a rather unexpected place for Chambers to find him-

self. Born in 1680, he grew up on his parents' farm in Kendal, located in Cumbria in North West England. After sending his older brother Nathaniel to Oxford, the family had no money left over to educate Ephraim. Consequently, he was sent to London to become a machinist's apprentice, presumably at the usual age of around fifteen. He was evidently not a particularly good apprentice, and no records indicate that he worked as a professional machinist. He appears to have instead had a spate of lost years, or years that were at any rate not notable. At the rather remarkable age of thirty-three, he found himself apprenticed to John Senex, who is primarily known these days as a master globe and map maker.⁷ Rather quickly, Chambers and Senex came to an agreement that he would continue as an apprentice, but that his primary occupation would be to work on expanding John Harris's *Lexicon Technicum* into an improved edition. That "improved edition" eventually became the *Cyclopædia*, which launched Chambers into the realm of the Royal Society and the upper echelons of the publishing communities of Fleet Street and Paternoster Row.⁸ He was received at court, and very likely attended the central meetings of the United Grand Lodge of London, which was then establishing the foundations of Freemasonry in England.

Despite these associations and the extensive reward from his publishers, Chambers continued to work at various commercial writing jobs while he labored on the second edition of his other, more personal project. He worked as a translator and editor for several publications, including the *Literary Magazine . . . by a Society of Gentlemen* and the *Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure*. His French translation projects included Herman Boerhaave's *A New Method of Chemistry* and an abridged edition of the *Philosophical History and Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris*. Although Chambers' childhood as a farm boy from Kendal did not necessarily mark him as working class because his family appears to have owned land and been able to afford an education for their eldest son, he spent the rest of his life as a worker (albeit an esteemed and white-collar one) among the professional and landed classes of London. He may well have remained conscious of his rural roots and the variety of ways his agrarian beginnings might be viewed by his colleagues.

Chambers was also well-read, maintaining a personal library of hundreds of volumes that probably filled the three floors of his uncommonly large apartment at Gray's Inn. Though he was not formally educated beyond basic schooling, he was an accomplished autodidact and certainly familiar with the classical canon of his time. He was likely well aware of *Aesop's Fables*, which contains no fewer than six tales of a jackdaw or crow masquerading above its station. This theme was such basic cultural knowledge in the period that the *Oxford English Dictionary* indicates that a secondary meaning of *daw* in the early eighteenth century referred to Aesop's fable "The Bird with Borrowed Feathers,"⁹ which tells of a daw in peacock's plumes. In this tale, a daw gathers tail feathers that fell from peacocks as they molted. He straps them all to his own tail and impersonates a peacock in order to join their community, but is

soon discovered and disciplined by the real peacocks. The moral of the tale is “it is not only fine feathers that make fine birds.” This jackdaw metaphor also persisted in British culture: as William St. Clair notes, “Robert Greene described his younger contemporary Shakespeare as ‘an upstart crow beautified with our feathers’” in the 1592 *Groatsworth of Wit* (384). In Chambers’s case, this sort of comparison would have insinuated that he was not learned at all and was certainly not someone who could hope to gain the inherent virtues of upper-class breeding, but instead was someone who hoped to gain a reputation for being knowledgeable by associating himself with other, truly educated individuals and stealing their knowledge for his own gain. It would have been an indication of false pride in false accomplishments. He may well have chosen this rather déclassé bird as a metaphor for one potential perception of his own place in London society. Bees, on the other hand, occupied a much more respectable rank. In Chambers’s time, bees had long been a heraldry element and a royal symbol that was frequently embroidered on royal regalia. Bees also played a central role in the English economy and culture.

BEES AS AN ECONOMIC GOOD

In making this comparison, Chambers was not just appealing to cultural associations of the day but also to the bee’s long history in England as an important farm animal, a vital economic good and property, and to bee products as essential materials across social classes and occupations. Bees, honey, and beeswax were both mundane and sacred, valued within the home and within the rituals of the church. Consequently, they were also a central economic good and had been for centuries. A general understanding of the ways honeybees were prized in English culture from the medieval period through the late eighteenth century allows us to attend to the considerable claims to ethos and value that Chambers made through this metaphor.

In the centuries before electricity, beeswax was prized for its clear, warm, light and sweet smell. Beeswax candles burned cleaner and were far more convenient to manage than more affordable light sources such as rush lights.¹⁰ The candles were needed to light the rooms of small homes and the candelabras of aristocratic great halls. Candles were so valued that they were frequently offered as allowances for members of the castles and great houses and collected as taxes or used to pay fines (Kritsky; Walker and Crane). Candle making, or chandlery, was an essential and venerated craft. The still-operational Worshipful Company of Wax Chandlers, who trace their lineage to a twelfth-century royal decree governing “German merchants trading in beeswax in London,” gained Ordinances in 1371 and were granted a Royal Charter in 1484 (Cox).¹¹ The chandlers sold wax not just for candles but also for images, figurines, and other religious objects.

The market value and virtuous associations of beeswax were further driven by the church, because candles were required for a wide variety of religious services. Beeswax was so valuable that Henry III gifted 1,000 pounds of it to Westminster Abbey in 1247 for “the making of a giant taper for Candlemas” (Cox). Monasteries also commonly kept bees, “and rents and tithes from their substantial lands could be paid by their tenants in wax,” as Hattie Ellis notes in her cultural history of honeybees. The monks produced candles for religious use, and many also became purveyors of honey and mead, bringing substantial money into the monasteries’ coffers. Honey was the central sweetening agent in England for centuries because sugar was not imported to Britain until the fifteenth century and was not common until the colonization of the West Indies in the seventeenth century (Abbott 15; Sheridan 13).¹² As a result, beehives themselves had significant market value. Wild beehives were as valuable as domestic ones, and both were considered taxable property of the landowner. Beekeeping and the processing of bee products was, until the late medieval period, an important and vital profession practiced throughout the kingdom by individuals and communities.

The economic value of apiaries fell after Henry VIII’s dissolution of the monasteries in the late 1530s, which included an injunction against the use of beeswax candles for religious purposes (Cox). However, while the number of England’s hives declined, the honeybee’s status did not. Beekeeping remained an important craft throughout the United Kingdom. As late as 1768, Thomas Wildman began his *Treatise on the Management of Bees* by writing, “As the value of honey has however lessened [due to the West Indian possession], luxury has increased the price of wax, which is now become the greatest supply of light in all polite assemblies” (c). Hives were so essential in everyday life that schoolchildren were routinely trained in their care, and housewives were encouraged to profitably include hives in their gardens, as William Lawson did in *The Country Housewife’s Garden* (1631).¹³

In comparing the encyclopedist to a honeybee, Chambers made a claim for the pervasive, mundane virtues of reference texts. The *Cyclopaedia* included information on military, legal, and religious topics, and grew to include some craft knowledge in its subsequent editions—all areas of information that were relevant to daily life. Bees’ connection to the church as a sacramental element and income source reinforced Chambers’s claim to an ethos of moral virtue that spoke to the overall value and propriety of his project as well as the transformative labor of the encyclopedic composing process. This foundation of moral virtue may have somewhat ameliorated the heretical alphabetical arrangement of the text, which imposed man’s order on God’s creation. It also put in place a counterpoint to another claim made through this metaphor: an alignment with the British Enlightenment.

BEES AND THE ETHOS OF SCIENTIFIC ENLIGHTENMENT

The problem of constructing an optimal hive became a topic of scientific inquiry in the mid-seventeenth century. Until then, domestic beehives were most often kept in either hollowed logs or woven skeps, neither of which provided a clear means of extracting the honey and comb or a way of observing the bees at their work. It was necessary, then, to destroy the hive during the honey harvest and for both bees and beekeeper to begin again each year. As the British Enlightenment dawned, gentlemen scientists turned their heads toward this task.

Their work on what was known as “rational beekeeping” began with Rev. William Mew’s construction in 1649 of an octagonal wooden hive with glass observation windows. With it, he planned to make notes on the bee’s activities as well as on meteorological events by means of the observational ornaments he placed on top of the hive (Crane 407). After commencing his observations in 1652, he gave the plans to Dr. John Wilkins at Wadham College, University of Oxford, who built one and in turn gave the plans to John Evelyn in 1654. This transfer proved precipitous, as Eva Crane points out in her comprehensive history of beekeeping: “When the Royal Society was founded in 1660, Wilkins became its joint first Secretary. Christopher Wren was also a Founder Fellow” (407). It was Wren who created the first stacked (or tiered) hive, also with observation windows, and who made the problem of building a better beehive one of the Royal Society’s areas of inquiry. Advances in beehive construction and beekeeping continued throughout Chambers’s life and the production life of the *Cyclopædia*, from John Gedde’s original patent on octagonal, tiered hives that were eventually set up in the king’s gardens at Windsor, Whitehall, and the Falkland Palace to Thomas Wildman’s public bee displays and publication of *A Treatise on the Management of Bees* in 1768.

By aligning himself with the bee, Chambers located himself and his encyclopedia at the cutting edge of science. This was a strategic claim for ethos in a project that purported in its full title to include “the figures, kinds, properties, productions, preparations, and uses of things natural and artificial.” In doing so, he aligned the *Cyclopædia* with one of the central projects of the preeminent scientific society in London and with a utilitarian area of science that most people of the time would identify as valuable. The text’s content bore out this ethos, as Chambers relentlessly grounded the articles in canonical scientific texts and the most recent advancements of the day.

Indeed, we may understand his project as a somewhat evangelistic effort on behalf of Newtonian science, which then retained a controversial aura. As the historian Margaret Jacobs argues,

The Cyclopædia gave considerable attention to Newtonian science [. . .] In the generation after the great Boyle lectures [in which preeminent minds of the day discussed

natural philosophy], it played a significant role in spreading Newtonian science to a wide and literate audience on both sides of the Channel.” (96)

The fact that the hive and its bees were a prominent focus of scientific research imbued Chambers’s chosen metaphor with connections to the leading edge of knowledge—a claim that any encyclopedia aspires to.

BEES, TRANSFORMATION, AND INDUSTRIOUS VIRTUE

Chambers’s various editing and translation projects, along with the *Cyclopædia*, ensured that he was deeply engaged in the publishing concerns of the time. Issues related to legal ownership and distribution may have also influenced his anxieties about originality and driven him to include discussion of the ways that originality functions in an encyclopedic project. Within this community, the most obvious cultural influence that Chambers faced was the relatively new codification of copyright. The long shadow of the Statute of Anne, passed eighteen years before in 1710, may have pushed him to consider the complexities of textual ownership. Concerns about ownership and intellectual property were certainly not uncommon along Fleet Street and Paternoster Row (both of which were within a short walk from his apartment), and the Statute of Anne posed implications that were not immediately clear.

Although the statute is today often commonly referred to as “the first copyright law,” this designation is not entirely correct. In his foundational account of the historical development of copyright, Lyman Ray Patterson points out that the statute was passed in order to break the monopoly of the Stationers’ Company rather than to accord any individual rights to authors. Consequently, it deeply affected the business interests of the guild members with whom Chambers kept company. Patterson asserts that

[t]he Statute of Anne is usually thought of as having vested the copyright of works in their authors; and, superficially, the language of the statute conveys the idea that the act was especially to benefit authors. It did enable authors for the first time to acquire the copyright of their works, and to this extent, it was a benefit to them. The radical change in the statute, however, was not that it gave authors the right to acquire a copyright—a prerogative until then limited to members of the Stationers’ Company—but that it gave that right to all persons [author or not]. (145)

Even though the statute was passed in 1710, it wasn’t interpreted by the courts until *Donaldson v Beckett* in 1774, so its implications remained less than clear during Chambers’s publishing career.

Throughout Chambers’s preface, the ethics of ownership and related issues of originality were a central issue. As noted earlier, Chambers claimed that the central compositional labor he performed centered on filtering and arrangement. By declar-

ing the bee his mascot, he claimed an ethos of industry and virtue as a worker devoted to gathering and transforming an important good. I turn first to the specialized work that he describes through this comparison, and then to the broader literary contexts within which he made these claims.

In his 1996 essay on Chambers, Richard Yeo points out that Chambers's comparison is remarkably similar to one Erasmus makes in *De Copia*. The structure and argument of these quotes are indeed a striking—but not unusual—example of appropriation on Chambers's part.

The student, diligent as a little bee, will flit about through all the gardens of authors and will attack all the little flowerlets from whence he collects some honey which he carries into his own hive: and, since there is so much fertility of material in these that they are not all able to be plucked off, he will select the most excellent and adapt it to the structure of his own work. (qtd. in Lechner 141)

Through this metaphor, both Chambers and Erasmus draw on a long-standing metaphor that stretches back before Lucretius's time and was most famously employed in the classical realm by Aesop as well as Virgil, whose bees symbolize virtuous, communal industry in the *Aeneid* (6.599) and the *Georgics* (4.203–9). John Dryden had produced a fresh and labor-intensive translation of the *Georgics* in the 1680s,¹⁴ and it remained in circulation. Although these texts make intertwined references to the bees' activities and industriousness, I consider them separately here in order to give closer attention to each aspect's cultural context. By casting the encyclopedist as a bee, Chambers makes a distinction between poetic authorship associated with original genius and the less original but rigorous sort of composition process undertaken by the encyclopedist. An encyclopedist, then, is a selective textual harvester who transforms gathered materials into a contribution to human knowledge and education. This composer explicitly relies on external materials and her knowledge of where they may be found, devoting a substantial portion of labor to the gathering or collection process, followed by a period of filtering and transforming the gathered materials. This aspect then also reinforces the idea of the encyclopedic author as assessor and recomposer: where daws gather objects at random for the purposes of mere collection, the bee focuses on gathering a specific substance and then working collaboratively to transform it into a derivative product by adding enzymes in the course of exchanging the nectar with other bees through their proboscises and using their wings to evaporate the water content down to 18 percent.¹⁵ The finished product enters into the economy of the hive, which is itself a precisely arranged structure.

The hive is also, as the Royal Society was documenting through its studies, a social structure reliant on the cooperation of its community for wealth and survival.¹⁶ A single bee cannot supply enough honey or heat to fuel a hive, or even just itself, through a winter. Rather, the survival of the hive depends on the full collective of

the hive, much as the success of an encyclopedia depends on a communal store of knowledge developed by many scholars and thinkers. In the first edition's preface, Chambers is explicit about his reliance on numerous previously published resources. But as he prepared the second edition over the next decade, he went himself one better by proactively working to develop a wide collective of contributors. By 1734, he was no longer so concerned about justifying the social process of building an encyclopedia. During the revision process, he placed magazine advertisements soliciting article submissions from the reading public, thus creating an early analogue version of the publicly authored encyclopedia.

He also published a pamphlet titled *Considerations Preparatory to a Second Edition, Submitted to the Publick*. The concept of public then typically meant something very different from our twenty-first-century notion of a broad, egalitarian public. English society has long been governed by a strict class structure, and this was particularly so during the eighteenth century. With upper-class access came money, and with money came access to printed materials and education, neither of which were cheap then or now. Reference materials and codified knowledge were most often accessed through extensive home libraries, religious institutions, universities, and societies—in other words, they were most typically accessible to the landed gentry who had the funds, social connections, and leisure time to use these texts. Consequently, it was these very people who were most often understood as having acquired true knowledge, and the aristocracy occupied many (although by no means all) of the formal roles within the Royal Society. The society also inducted a number of professional men during the time that Chambers was nominated, perhaps as a gesture toward a limited intellectual democracy.¹⁷ Chambers sought even more egalitarian contributions to his second edition, and when he addressed the “publick” in the title of his pamphlet, he had something much broader in mind than the common cultural definition. After meditating on what it means to undertake revision and expansion of a comprehensive encyclopedia, he actively invited contributions from the public, much like an analog version of our modern *Wikipedia*. This is his invitation, which includes his definitions:

In this Invitation are included persons of every Rank, Profession, and Degree of Knowledge ; Men of Letters, of Business, and of Pleasure ; the Universities, the Court, Country, Army, and Navy. Not a College, a Chapter, a mercantile Company, a Ship, scarce a House, or even a Man, but may contribute his Quota to the publick Instruction [. . .] the less Learned may here lay aside their Apprehensions of appearing in a Work of Literature ; being Masters of the Subject, they need not be solicitous as to the Style and Manner : Many even among the Illiterate may here find Place, and be of Use to Men of the profoundest Learning ; they will find an Amanuensis in me, who shall even think it an Honor to be dictated to by some who can neither Write nor Read. Numerous Things are wanted from the last Quarter ; and the more so, as they are not extant in Books, Libraries, and Cabinets of Curiosity ; but hid in Shops, Garrets, Cellars, Mines, and other obscure Places, where Men of Learning

rarely penetrate : Rich Fields of Science lie thus neglected under Ground ; Trades, Crafts, Mysteries, Practices, short Ways, with the whole vast Apparatus of unwritten Philosophy.

Here, we see Chambers advancing a truly radical vision of intellectual democracy, one that placed the expansion of knowledge at the center of all human concerns while issuing an open invitation to contributors regardless of class, gender, profession, or literacy level. In this definition, everyone is a potential worker with knowledge to contribute to the collective project. After quickly acknowledging the obvious resources of the aristocracy and culturally accepted institutions, Chambers includes also the professional middle class he worked and lived among. But he devotes a significant amount of print space here to the working class and their unwritten, craft knowledge. The knowledge of these groups is just as essential as the knowledge of anyone else, he argues, and represents a central contribution to the Enlightenment project. In making this call, he acknowledges the communal, hive-like nature of encyclopedia building, ratifying it with his signature and the brand of his successful, sought-after encyclopedia. By working to broaden the contributing community and resources, he also subtly highlights the transformative labor of the encyclopedic author, who filters gathered material and recomposes it into a new (and theoretically improved) text.

The honeybee metaphor's collective aspects also bridged a unique and deeply culturally situated appreciation of the hive as a way of understanding and discussing England itself. The prevalence of honeybees and their hive as a metaphor for the commonwealth¹⁸ and model society is a striking example of the differences between the ways that early eighteenth-century English culture understood and deployed honeybees in cultural discourse and the ways that our own twenty-first-century American society approaches them with suspicion of being "wild" and "killer." We retain some vestiges of this positive cultural trope: the busyness of the social labor of transforming raw materials into a finished product was frequently understood as a metaphor for both virtuous industriousness and an aspirational model of a perfect society. Isaac Watts's *Divine and Moral Songs for Children*, published in 1720, contains this familiar verse:

How doth the little busy bee
 Improve each shining hour
 And gather honey all the day
 From every opening flower! (39)

Contemporary interpretations arguably had a decidedly moral aspect that was grounded in Christian notions of proper conduct and industry that persist in traces of North American mores, but the connection with industrious virtue was also particularly prevalent in classical texts during Chambers's era. Ancient societies were certainly temporally removed from the long eighteenth century, but their central

figures and arguments still informed multiple aspects of British culture, which was then seeing the leading edge of neoclassicism.¹⁹ Contemporary editions of classical texts were in print and available from the London booksellers, and Chambers's own library contained a respectable collection of Greek and Roman texts (Osborn and Shipton). In fact, the catalogue of sale for his library emphasizes that it includes "compleat sets of the Classicks in Usus Delphini, cum Notis Variorum, and those printed by Elzevir."

This continued emphasis on classical thought had made translating Virgil's oeuvre a profitable project for Dryden and his publishers, who began distribution of the project in 1684 and continued into the next century. Chambers kept a personal copy of Dryden's translation in his home library. Though the latter sections of the *Georgics* contain an overview of beekeeping, they also include philosophical consideration of the bees as builders of commonwealths and participants in war. Their industriousness in these directed endeavors was an area of emphasis for Virgil, who focused on the connections between chaste reproduction and statecraft:

They breed, they brood, instruct, and educate,
And make provision for the future state:
They work their waxen lodgings in their hives,
And labor honey to sustain their lives.
.....
But (what's more strange) their modest appetites,
Averse from Venus, fly the nuptial rites.
No lust enervates their heroic mind,
Nor wastes their strength on wanton womankind;
But in their mouths reside their genial powers:
They gather children from the leaves and flowers.
Thus make they kings to fill the regal seat,
And thus their little citizens create,
And waxen cities build, the palaces of state. (lines 79–296)

As Virgil demonstrates, humans caught on early to the strict role structure of hives, in which worker bees serve a single queen with hard work until their deaths.²⁰ Their duties include the management of drones, which, contrary to Virgil's speculations of complete bee chastity, serve the single purpose of mating with the queen in midair during her virgin flight. The strict structure of hive life held an obvious appeal for writers who were accustomed to the similarly strict roles of English culture. The hive was cast early on as having distinct parallels with the royal and legal courts, and was also deployed as a natural, divinely created justification for monarchical government.

Shakespeare, in *Henry V*, detailed one of the earliest, and perhaps most famous, distinctly English parallels:

For so work the honey-bees,
Creatures that by a rule in nature teach
The act of order to a peopled kingdom.

They have a king, and officers of sorts;
 Where some, like magistrates, correct at home,
 Others, like merchants, venture trade abroad,
 Others, like soldiers, armèd in their stings,
 Make boot upon the summer's velvet buds;
 Which pillage they with merry march bring home
 To the tent-royal of their emperor:
 Who, busied in his majesty, surveys
 The singing masons building roofs of gold,
 The civil citizens kneading up the honey,
 The poor mechanic porters crowding in
 Their heavy burdens at his narrow gate,
 The sad-eyed justice, with his surly hum,
 Delivering o'er to executor pale
 The lazy yawning drones. (1.2.187–204)

Chambers would likely also have been well aware of this quotation, as his library contained “a large Collection of scarce old Plays in Quarto” (promotional cover quote). But even if he had never cracked a book in his library, he could not have missed the ways in which the metaphor of the hive as model society permeated the culture of the day. Over the course of the two centuries surrounding Chambers's life and work, the trope appears again and again in well-distributed texts. William Butler's *The Feminine Monarchie*, first published in 1609, is still considered a central text by honeybee historians.²¹ As a handbook for apiarists written by Elizabeth I's beekeeper, it promises the reader to show the bees' “admirable Nature, and Properties, Their Generation, and Colonies, Their Government, Loyaltie, Art, Industrie, Enemies, Warres, Magnanimitie.”²² Butler took as the book's epigraph a poem by George Wither, the first stanza of which begins,

When I had view'd this Common-wealth of Bees,
 Observ'd their Lives, their Art, and their Degrees:
 As; how, beside their painefull Vulgar ones,
 They have their Prince, Their Captaines, and their Drones:
 How they Agree ; how temp'ratly they Feed ;
 How curiously they Build ; how chastly Breed;
 How seriously their Bus'nesse they intend;
 How stoutly they their Common-good defend; (lines 1–8)

and continues,

. . . these Hony-flies,
 Instruct us better to Philosophize,
 Then all those tedious Volumes, which, as yet,
 Are Least unto us by mere Humane-wit.
 For, whereas those but only Rules do give,
 These by examples teach us how to live.
 Great God Almighty! in thy pretty Bee,

Mine Eie (as written in small letters) sees
 An abstract of that Wisdome, Power, and Love,
 Which is imprinted on the heavens above. (lines 17–26)

Butler's identification of bees with human societal structures continues in the first chapter, as he explains that bees abhor idleness, have a commonwealth, are always loyal to their sovereign, and will "endure no government but a Monarchy" (A3). A bit more than thirty years later, John Daye took up these same metaphors and expanded them further in *The Parliament of Bees*. As promised on the title page, it focuses on a bee parliament overseen by "Mr. Bee" during which "bils and complaints are referd and herd, with several restraints of usurpt freedome, instituted law, to keepe the common wealth of Bees in awe."

The adoption of the hive as an instructional metaphor for an ideal society had an insidious downside. As Tammy Horn carefully details in her historical study *Bees in America*, this attention to the social order of the hive necessarily included an emphasis on the drone as a worthless citizen. This metaphor extended to the publishing world, which applied it to plagiarists and copyright infringers (St. Clair 385). Drones' only contribution to the colony is to mate with the queen, and they are banished by the workers at the end of the summer as the hive begins its final preparations for winter. On the first cold day, the drones perish. As the seventeenth century progressed, the poor were increasingly labeled as drones. Butler's comparisons "provided a convenient analogy for seventeenth-century English writers, clerics, and politicians," Horn writes (9). Later, they were echoed and enhanced by Francis Bacon when he referred to rebellious masses as a swarm in "An Advertisement Touching upon a Holy War." Horn writes, "Bacon's essay best reflects the English mind-set regarding poor people, but many English writers found this drone image a convenient analogy to convince poor people to go to the newly emerging colonies in America," adding that the metaphor was also taken up by John Cotton when he encouraged the tradesmen to "hive off" as swarms do when a hive divides itself in two (11). The bee, then, came to signify both natural and divine order as well as social engineering.

Corrupt aspects of the metaphor continued to unfold in the most notorious bee-based allegory of the eighteenth century: Bernard de Mandeville's pamphlet *The Grumbling Hive: or Knaves turn'd Honest* (1705), republished with an essay and remarks in 1714 as *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices, Publick Benefits*. After a slow early reception, it eventually became one of the most read books of the time, and Chambers kept a two-volume 1732 edition in his collection.²³ Far from the virtuous connections drawn from the honeybee's association with the church and with literal sweetness, Mandeville's tale portrays England as a flourishing hive whose wealth is dependent on the wickedness of its recalcitrant citizens. The perfection of vice is as vital as the perfection of virtue, the writer argues: vanity, pride, and envy

are surely among man's sins, but they also create industry and wealth. His bees are "Sharppers, Parasites, Pimps, Players, Pick-pockets, Coiners, Quacks, Sooth-Sayers" whose transgressions further create employment through the justice system as well as for locksmiths, guards, and the like (3). He also targeted clerical hypocrisy and acknowledged prostitution as a trade. "Most writers are always teaching men what they should be, and hardly ever trouble their heads with telling them what they really are," Mandeville writes (25).²⁴

Chambers's choice of metaphor aligned him not just with the microcosms of honeybee aspects, but also with the macrocosm of England and its conversations about itself. In the process, he further marked his *Cyclopædia* as a particularly English contribution to knowledge. This explicit alignment with his country was repeated on other occasions: when he dedicated the text to George II and presented the text to the king and Queen Caroline shortly after the king's coronation (Yeo 38) and when, years later, he refused to contract a French edition partly because it would have been dedicated to Louis XV. Casting the encyclopedic author as a honeybee was a particularly apt political decision that placed his choice and the preface firmly within the conversations and allegiances of his time and place.

CONCLUSION

We've long considered authorship and the Author to be culturally situated notions. Intellectual property doctrine is itself also a cultural artifact, and the ways we understand and describe it are highly contextual—and demand a more contextualized understanding than is often offered. Carefully situating Chambers's metaphors for encyclopedic authorship and ownership, which are rather foreign to contemporary American understandings of the cultural worth of bees and daws, provides an opportunity to examine not just the nature of these metaphors but also his understanding of the ways that authorship processes function within a reference genre. Though the meaning of his metaphors is not entirely lost to us, neither are the nuances completely clear. Far from making simple claims for industrious gathering, Chambers was making careful rhetorical claims for his own ethos as a very specific sort of writer as well as the ethos of his project, which he cast as a recomposed collection that transformed prior texts and knowledge in order to present a new product that was at the forefront of scientific thought. In making these arguments, he claimed ethos by aligning himself with English economic history, class structures, moral virtue, scientific advancements, and the hive as a way of understanding the commonwealth itself.

Intellectual property scholars may find similar richness in careful reconsideration of more commonly cited metaphors from this period, as well as through close attention to our current ways of discussing authorial labor. In order to fully understand what it means to invoke, say, Locke's "sweat of the brow" doctrine as applied

to textual ownership, we need to not only consider the broader economic and social conditions of the time, but also employ a basic understanding of narrower aspects: the functions of the Stationers' Company and the incipient challenges to its monopoly, the ways that patronage funded written creative work, and the ways that bodily versus mental labor were understood in the late seventeenth century. A fuller contextual understanding also entails consideration of the philosophical mores of the day. In Locke's case, these might include the idea of scientific inquiry as a moral and ethical obligation, along with a cultural emphasis on societies (guilds and clubs, deleterious and not, secret and public) and the beliefs about distribution of knowledge that in turn drove the distribution of print material and the slow metamorphosis of British intellectual property law in the long eighteenth century. The ways we understand writerly labor in the twenty-first century likewise deserve closer scrutiny; we have already begun this through attention to commons-based peer production (which has its precedents in Chambers's second edition as well as in Tycho Brahe's collection processes) (Benkler; Shirky). Still, more remains to be done as we study the ways that writers work together in both close and disconnected ways, within both established and emerging genres. These sorts of situated considerations, combined with an examination of what we would today consider less prominent cultural artifacts, can yield new insight into the intricacies of authorship and ownership.

NOTES

1. In this recent suit, the artist Richard Prince stood accused of violation of fair use doctrine through wholesale appropriation of Cariou's photographs. Prince copied images from Cariou's book *Yes Rasta*, drew or collaged new elements on top of them and then sold the results as original works of art. Prince is also known for his appropriation of Marlboro ads and pulp novel covers.

2. For fuller examination of the legal context surrounding these discussions as well as more on Locke and Defoe's arguments, see Chapter 3 of Rose's *Authors and Owners*.

3. For more extensive, situated examination of these metaphors, see Rose, "Copyright and Its Metaphors," and St. Clair.

4. For the two most extensive studies of Chambers and the *Cyclopaedia*, see Collison and Yeo. Work on Chambers is limited in part due to the extremely minimal archival material that has survived. His library and effects were dispersed quickly after his death, and the relevant papers stored at the Longman Publishing House and Gray's Inn were destroyed during the Blitz.

5. This figure is based on bookseller Andrew Millar's testimony that his investment in the *Cyclopaedia* cost "no less than 100 l. Sterling for a 64th Share thereof." (Yeo 198).

6. In following this practice, he seems to have pursued a policy similar to *Wikipedia's* "no original research" rule.

7. Senex was also a scientific publisher. As Jacob notes, he had been apprenticed to the London bookseller Robert Clavell in 1695 and began publishing in 1702. He produced the first galleys for the 1726 edition of the *Principia*, among other central scientific texts (95).

8. His connections were so close that the publisher Thomas Longman invited him to stay with his family during the periods of illness that befell Chambers as he worked on the second edition (Briggs 57).

9. This title may refer to any of the six relevant fables listed separately in the Works Cited, or perhaps to them collectively.

10. Rush lights consisted of reeds dipped in tallow. Tallow produces a smoky light and a less pleasant smell. Consequently, purveyors who sold beeswax adulterated with tallow were tried and sentenced to punishment that included stints in the pillory.

11. It was later revoked in 1684 and restored in 1688. The company retains it to this day.

12. Chambers included an extensive entry on honey in the 1728 edition that provided an overview of basic bee anatomy and hive culture as well as honey production, usages, and related topics (248). He also included a basic definition for the term *apiary* (115).

13. For extensive discussion of the complicated role of gender both as civic metaphor and in instructions for the management of women in the British “bee books,” see Merrick.

14. Dryden’s process of translation and publication was spread over a number of years: “Dryden began publishing his Virgil translation in 1684—two eclogues only—and published his second (revised) edition of Virgil’s complete works fourteen years later, in 1698. He began that is, at age fifty-two or -three, and finished at age sixty-six or -seven—one way of looking at it” (Frost 193.)

15. My thanks to apiarist Kurt Stavenhagen for his explanation of these transformative steps in the honey-making process.

16. For more on contemporary scientific research on hive social structures, communication, and cognition, see the work of Cornell University biologist Thomas Seeley, particularly his book *Honeybee Democracy*.

17. For more on the nomination of professional men and the intersections between the Royal Society and the more egalitarian membership of the United Grand Lodge of London, see Berman’s comprehensive study.

18. For more on the commonwealth itself as a metaphor for intellectual property, see St. Clair.

19. For more on classical influences in eighteenth-century British society, see Agnew.

20. The proper sex of the hive monarch was not scientifically established until the seventeenth century. For more on the ways that this confusion regarding gender influenced discussions of the hive as a model or metaphor for monarchy, see Merrick. For more on this as well as British bee books as instructions for feminine nurturing, see Prete.

21. Butler’s idiosyncratic examination included a musical score that approximated the noise of a hive about to swarm.

22. For more on Butler’s positioning of beekeeping as lessons in statecraft, see Kevin Sharpe.

23. Chambers also kept a 12 volume set of Swift’s writings, along with several critical commentaries on Swift (Osborne and Shipton). He was very likely aware of Swift’s *Battle of the Books* and its fable of the spider and the bee. I do not treat this connection due to the limitations of space.

24. The controversy over the book continued for the rest of the century, and successive editions of the text permeated literate society. In 1723, the grand jury of Middlesex “declared the book a public nuisance and [accused] the author [. . .] of a blasphemy so ‘diabolical’ that it had ‘a direct Tendency to the Subversion of all Religion and Civil Government’” (Bald 106). Mandeville promptly published a pamphlet containing the jury’s presentment and added it to the next edition of the *The Fable*. It was translated into French in 1740 and into German in 1761, igniting a fresh storm of criticism across the Continent. In his extensive study of Mandeville, E. G. Hundert points out that Adam Smith referred to Mandeville in Smith’s 1756 review of *Rousseau’s Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* for the *Edinburgh Review*, telling his audience that “whoever reads this [. . .] work with attention, will observe, that the second volume of *The Fable of the Bees* has given occasion to the system of Mr. Rousseau” (qtd. in Hundert 58). “Rousseau’s conjectural history of humanity, while strenuously denying *The Fable’s* conclusions, was perhaps the most influential single text which opening injected Mandeville’s expanded naturalism into the wider Enlightenment debate on the sciences of man,” Hundert writes. “Within a generation, almost every significant

Enlightenment intellectual, from Voltaire to Turgot, Gibbon and Smith had pronounced on the problem of the morally paradoxical nature of material progress” (Hundert 59). Smith continued to wrestle with *The Fable* throughout his life. Although he does not reference it directly in *The Wealth of Nations*, editor Edwin Cannan notes a number of places where Smith appears to have been influenced by Mandeville, most particularly in “On The Division of Labour.” Smith continued to revise his attack on Mandeville in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* until the end of his life (Hundert 16).

WORKS CITED

- Abbot, Elizabeth. *Sugar: A Bittersweet History*. London: Duckworth Overlook, 2008. Print.
- Addison, Joseph. “No. 101. Thursday, December 1, 1709.” *The Tatler: By the Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq. quod.lib.umich.edu*. University of Michigan Library, 2007: 41. Web. 11 August 2012.
- Aesop. *Aesop’s Fables*. Trans. Laura Gibbs. Oxford: Oxford World’s Classics, 2002. Print.
- . “Fable 89: The Birds, the Peacock, and His Feathers” 46–47.
- . “Fable 325: The Jackdaw and the Doves” 156.
- . “Fable 326: The Jackdaw and the Peacocks” 156–57.
- . “Fable 327: The Jackdaw and the Ravens” 157.
- . “Fable 328: The Crow, the Eagle, and the Feathers” 157.
- . “Fable 329: A Beauty Contest of the Birds” 158.
- Agnew, Lois. *Outward, Visible Propriety: Stoic Philosophy and Eighteenth-Century British Rhetorics*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2008. Print.
- Bald, Margaret. *Banned Books: Literature Suppressed on Religious Grounds*. New York: Facts on File, 1998. Print.
- Behme, Tim. “Isocrates on the Ethics of Authorship.” *Rhetoric Review* 23.3 (2004): 197–215. Print.
- Benkler, Yochai. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. Print.
- Berman, Ric. *The Foundations of Modern Freemasonry: Political Change and the Scientific Enlightenment, 1714–1740*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2012. Print.
- Boyle, James. “The Second Enclosure Movement and the Construction of the Public Domain.” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 66 (Winter/Spring 2003): 33–74. Print.
- Briggs, Asa. *A History of Longmans and Their Books 1724–1990: Longevity in Publishing*. London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2008. Print.
- Butler, Charles. *The Feminine Monarchie, or, The Historie of Bees*. London: John Haviland, 1623. *Google Books*. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- Chambers, Ephraim. *Considerations Preparatory to a Second Edition, Submitted to the Publick*. London. N.p.: n.p. [1734?]. Print. Bodleian Library, Oxford: JJ Coll., D05–D08.
- . *Cyclopaedia: or, An Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences . . .* London: James and John Knapton, 1728. *digital.library.wisc.edu*. University of Wisconsin Digital Collections, n.d. Web. 5 July, 2012.
- Cohen, Julie E. “Copyright, Commodification, and Culture: Locating the Public Domain.” *The Future of the Public Domain: Identifying the Commons in International Law*. Ed. L. Guibault and P. B. Hugenholtz. Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 2006: 121–66. Print.
- Collison, Robert L. *Encyclopedias: Their History throughout the Ages*. New York: Hafner, 1966. Print.
- Cox, Jane. “A Chronology of the Wax Chandlers History.” *waxchandlers.org.uk*. Worshipful Company of Wax Chandlers, n.d. Web. 25 July, 2012.
- Crane, Eva. *The World History of Beekeeping and Honey Hunting*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Daye, John. *The Parliament of Bees*. London: William Lee, 1641. *Literature Online*. Web. 28 July, 2012.

- Defoe, Daniel. "Miscellanea," *Defoe's Review* 515–16 (1710), reprinted in *16 Defoe's Review* 515. Ed. Arthur Wellesley Secord. New York: Columbia UP, 1938. Print.
- Donnelly, Marian C. "Jefferson's Observatory Design." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 36.1 (1977): 33–35. Print.
- Ellis, Hattie. *Sweetness and Light: The Mysterious History of the Honeybee*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2004. Print.
- Espinasse, Francis. "Ephraim Chambers (1680?–1740), Encyclopedist." Rev. Michael Harris. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP. *oxforddnb.com*. Web. 28 Feb. 2006.
- Frost, William. "Dryden's Virgil." *Comparative Literature* 36.3 (Summer, 1984): 193–208. Print.
- Greenberg, Bernard L. "Laurence Sterne and Chambers' *Cyclopaedia*." *Modern Language Notes* 69.8 (Dec. 1954): 560–62. Print.
- Hillway, Tyrus. "Melville's Education in Science." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 16.3 (Fall 1974): 441–25. Print.
- Horn, Tammy. *Bees in America: How the Honey Bee Shaped a Nation*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2005. Print.
- Hundert, E. G. *The Enlightenment's Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.
- Jacob, Margaret. *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasonry and Republicans*. 2nd ed. Lafayette, LA: Cornerstone Book Publishers, 2006. Print.
- Kolb, Gwin J., and James H. Sledd. "Johnson's 'Dictionary' and the Lexicographical Tradition." *Modern Philology* 50.3 (Feb. 1953): 171–94. Print.
- Kritsky, Gene. "Castle Beekeeping." *American Bee Journal* 143.1 (2003): 26. Print.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2003. Print.
- Lawson, William. *The Country Housewife's Garden*. 1631. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- Lechner, J. M. *Renaissance Concepts of Commonplaces*. Westport: Greenwood, 1962.
- Leonard, David Charles. "Descartes, Melville, and the Mardian Vortex." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 45.2 (1980): 13–25. Print.
- Lessig, Lawrence. *The Future of Ideas: The Fate of the Commons in a Connected World*. New York: Vintage Books, 2002. Print.
- Litman, Jessica. *Digital Copyright: Protecting Intellectual Property on the Internet*. Amherst: Prometheus, 2001. Print.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003. Print.
- Logie, John. "A Copyright Cold War? The Polarized Rhetoric of the Peer-to-Peer Debates." *First Monday* 8.7 (2003). *firstmonday.org*. 2003. Web. 28 July 2012.
- . "I Have No Predecessor to Guide My Steps': Quintilian and Roman Authorship." *Rhetoric Review* 22.4 (2003): 353–73. Print.
- . *Peers, Pirates, and Persuasion: Rhetoric in the Peer-to-Peer Debates*. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2006. Print.
- Long, Pamela. *Openness, Secrecy, Authorship: Technical Arts and the Culture of Knowledge from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea. "Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Politics of Textual Ownership." *College English* 61.5 (May 1999): 529–44. Print.
- Mack, Ruth. "The Historicity of Johnson's Lexicographer." *Representations* 76.1 (Fall 2001): 61–87. Print.
- Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Public Benefits*. London: J. Tonson, 1724. *Google Books*. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- Merrick, Jeffrey. "Royal Bees: The Gender Politics of the Beehive in Early Modern Europe." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 18 (1988): 7–37. Print.

- Millar, Andrew. "The Petition of the Booksellers of London." 15 July, 1746. Session Papers. Vol. 6, no. 4: 1–3. Print.
- Milton, John. *Aeropagitica*. London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1874. *Google Books*. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- . *Eikonoklastes. The Prose Works of John Milton*. Vol. 1. London: George Bell and Sons, 1889. 301–483. *Google Books*. Web. 13 August, 2012.
- Mott, Frank L. *American Journalism*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1962. Print.
- Osborne, T., and J. Shipton, Booksellers. *A Catalogue of the Capital Collection of Prints, Drawings, and Books of Prints, of the Late Right Honorable Henry, Lord Viscount Colerane, Never Yet Expos'd to Sale; Consisting of The Most Eminent Masters of the Italian, French, and Flemish Schools. To Which is Added, The Small but Curious Library of Ephraim Chambers, Esq.; Editor of the Cyclopaedia . . .* London: n.p., 1756. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, 2003. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- Patterson, Lyman Ray. *Copyright in Historical Perspective*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1968. Print.
- Prete, Frederick. "Can Females Rule the Hive? The Controversy over Honey Bee Gender Roles in British Beekeeping Texts of the Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries." *Journal of the History of Biology* 24.1 (1991): 113–44. Print.
- Reyman, Jessica. *The Rhetoric of Intellectual Property: Copyright Law and the Regulation of Digital Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Rose, Mark. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993. Print.
- . "Copyright and Its Metaphors." *UCLA Law Review* 50.1 (2002); 1–16. Print.
- St. Clair, William. "Metaphors of Intellectual Property." *Privilege and Property: Essays on the History of Copyright*. Ed. Ronan Deazley, Martin Kretschmer, and Lionel Bently. Cambridge: OpenBook, 2010. 369–95. Print.
- Seeley, Thomas D. *Honeybee Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Henry V. The Riverside Shakespeare*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1996. 974–1021.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies*. London: Printer, 1989. Print.
- Sheridan, Richard B. *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623–1775*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973. Print.
- Shirky, Clay. *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. New York: Penguin Books, 2009. Print.
- Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Ed. Edwin Cannan. New York: Modern Library, 1994. Print.
- . "Of Licentious Systems." *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. 6th ed. 1791. Ed. D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie. New York: Oxford UP, 1976. 485–96. Print.
- Stearns, Laurie. "Copy Wrong: Plagiarism, Process, Property, and the Law." *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. Ed. Lise Buranen and Alice M. Roy. New York: State U of New York P, 1999. 5–17. Print.
- United States Code. 17 USC. Sec. 101. U. S. Copyright Office, 2010. Web. 14 April 2013.
- Virgil. *Georgics*, Book IV. Trans. John Dryden. London: Jacob Tonson, 1721. *Google Books*. Web. April 8, 2013.
- Walker, Penelope, and Eva Crane. "English Beekeeping from c 1200 to 1850: Evidence from Local Records." *Local Historian* 29.3 (2001): 130–51. Print.
- Watts, Isaac. *Divine and Moral Songs for Children*. Boston: Samuel Hall, 1720, reprt. 1796. 39. Print.
- Wildman, Thomas. *A Treatise on the Management of Bees*. 1768. *Google Books*. Web. 28 July, 2012.
- Yen, Alfred C. "Western Frontier or Feudal Society? Metaphors and Perceptions of Cyberspace." *Berkeley Technology Law Journal* 17 (2003): 1207–61. Print.
- Yeo, Richard. *Encyclopaedic Visions: Scientific Dictionaries and Enlightenment Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.