

**A DICTIONARY OF PRACTICAL APICULTURE.
GIVING THE CORRECT MEANING OF NEARLY
FIVE HUNDRED TERMS, ACCORDING TO THE
USAGE OF THE BEST WRITERS. INTENDED AS
A GUIDE TO UNIFORMITY OF EXPRESSION
AMONGST BEE-KEEPERS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9781760574468

A Dictionary of Practical Apiculture. Giving the Correct Meaning of Nearly Five Hundred Terms, According to the Usage of the Best Writers. Intended as a Guide to Uniformity of Expression Amongst Bee-Keepers by John Phin

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

JOHN PHIN

**A DICTIONARY OF PRACTICAL APICULTURE.
GIVING THE CORRECT MEANING OF NEARLY
FIVE HUNDRED TERMS, ACCORDING TO THE
USAGE OF THE BEST WRITERS. INTENDED AS
A GUIDE TO UNIFORMITY OF EXPRESSION
AMONGST BEE-KEEPERS**

SF
523
P57

Dr. S. Fuller Esq
with kind regards of
The Author
New York Jan: 10
1885

A DICTIONARY
— OF —
Practical Apiculture.

GIVING THE CORRECT MEANING OF NEARLY FIVE HUNDRED
TERMS, ACCORDING TO THE USAGE OF THE BEST
WRITERS. INTENDED AS A GUIDE TO UNI-
FORMITY OF EXPRESSION AMONGST

BEE - KEEPERS.

With Numerous Illustrations, Notes and Practical Hints.

BY JOHN PHIN,

AUTHOR OF "HOW TO USE THE MICROSCOPE," ETC. EDITOR OF
"THE YOUNG SCIENTIST."

NEW YORK:
THE INDUSTRIAL PUBLICATION COMPANY.

1884.

Copyright Secured, 1884, by John Phin

Entered According to Act of Congress, in the Year 1884,
BY JOHN PHIN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

000000

PREFACE.

THIS compilation of the following collection of terms used in Bee-keeping was commenced some years ago, when the author held the position of Professor of Agriculture in the Agricultural College of the State of Pennsylvania. We believe the first Lectures on Apiculture ever delivered in any College or Technological School in this country, and practically illustrated by bees and hives, were those given by the author, during the year 1867, at the institution just named.

In preparing his lectures, the author was impressed with the importance of securing uniformity, accuracy, and definiteness in the terms used, and as a guide for himself and students, he compiled a brief vocabulary, extending to about two hundred and fifty vocabies.

For some years subsequent to this time, he was unable to devote any attention to bee-keeping; the subject consequently dropped from his mind, the MSS. was laid away with other things, and by the merest accident escaped the disastrous fire at 37 Park Row, New York, which destroyed the author's working library. In January, 1881, as only a few days before the fire occurred the box containing it was removed to his residence. Having been recently placed in a position to resume his interest in that most fascinating of all pursuits—Apiculture—the old notes were found, and a perusal of them brought up many strange thoughts and associations. A pretty wide reading of books and journals, during the past year or two, had impressed the author more than ever with the importance of some general guide on this subject, and as the same feeling seemed to have taken possession of the minds of many prominent apiculturists, it was decided to publish it.

To this end the entire vocabulary was re-written and revised, so that the work has been brought down to the latest date. Few persons can have any idea of the amount of labor that this has involved, but notwithstanding the apparently very simple character of the volume which is the result, the number of general lexicons, special treatises on bees (from old Gervase Markham, 1610, down to Alley's work on Queen-Rearing), journals and technical works which have been laid under contribution, is a surprise to the author himself, now that the work is completed. He has taken nothing on trust, but has endeavored to refer to original authorities in every case, and as the great libraries of New York are singularly deficient in works on bee-keeping, he has been compelled to rely *wholly* on his own collection. This may possibly induce the reader to exercise more than usual leniency in regard to the shortcomings of the book.

A word or two in regard to the authorities upon whom we have relied may not be out of place. These authorities are of two very distinct kinds: 1. Works and papers on Apiculture; and 2. Dictionaries and treatises on Technology.

It is an unfortunate fact that most of the writers on bee-keeping have been deficient in general education—some of them even lamenting this fact in their works. Of course there are some notable exceptions—Markham (1610), Warder (1676), Dunbar, Cotton, Bevan, Langstroth, Cook, and a few others. We therefore find words used by such writers in different senses, and in many cases improperly—as, for example, the words hatch, hybrid, rabbit, etc. Now, while we have entered our protest against the improper use of well-known words, we must remember that in the false senses thus given to them, they have crept into general use, and such use is not to be lightly changed. As Herschel well says: "Hardly anything can counterbalance the evil of disturbing well-established names, which have once acquired a general circulation." Moreover it must be borne in mind that the functions of a technical dictionary like the present are two-fold: It should not only give the right word for the right place, but it should enable us to understand the writings of all those who have treated upon the subject. We at first proposed to confine this lexicon to those words only which are in general use, but we soon found the impossibility of so doing. The great difficulty of drawing any well-defined line rendered such a course out of the question. We have therefore given every word specially related to bee-keeping, with the exception of general botanical and entomological terms. To have included these would have doubled the size of the volume, without any corresponding practical gain. So, too, we have not deemed it advisable to discuss the names of *special* forms except in a general way. Thus we give not only *hive*, but *box hive*, *movable frame-hive*, *leaf-hive*, etc., but we have not felt that it came within the scope of our work to give descriptions of such modifications as the American hive, the Gallup hive, etc., etc. Neither have we attempted to exclude objectionable words. We have rather aimed to give every word, simply contenting ourselves with marking those that are obsolete or improper. Even such an absurd term as *moth-miller* finds its place in this Dictionary, so that the student may be warned against its use. Therefore, even the catalogues of dealers have been ransacked for terms and descriptions of various articles. Having secured the list of vocables, the next step was to note their meaning and mark those which are obsolete or improper. In this connection it will be found by the careful student that as regards technical subjects, we have, amongst our dictionaries, no ultimate authority—that is to say, none from whose decisions we do not feel perfectly at liberty to appeal without hesitation. Those who have studied our best and ablest dictionaries must have felt that in many points their deficiencies, as regards technical subjects, are so great that no independent worker will consent to be fettered by them. We acknowledge them as authorities only *when we know them to be right*.

The list of the dictionaries which have served us in the preparation of this volume, includes all those of most importance. Beginning with Bailey (1735), Walker (1798), and adding Johnson, Ogilvie ("The Imperial Dictionary," 4 vols., edited by Annandale), Richardson (editions of 1838 and 1865), Webster, Worcester, and several minor ones, we have generally been able to get not only the *usual* meaning of the word under consideration, but its scope and proper application. When any doubt occurred as to the propriety of the application of any word, we have sought firm ground through the medium of its history and etymology, and in this direction Skeats' Dictionary has proved invaluable. For special information in regard to chemical subjects we have relied upon Watt's "Dictionary of Chemistry" (8 vols.), and the works of Wagner, Muspratt, etc. The technical dictionaries of Ure (4 vols. 1878), Brande (3 vols. 1875), and the "Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Physiology," edited by Todd (5 vols. *s. d.*) have often been of service. From recent general cyclopædias, properly so-called, we have never received any very great assistance, and therefore have never made any special efforts to add them to our library. From the older cyclopædia of Rees, and the "Penny Cyclopædia," much interesting historical matter may be gleaned. These we have, as also the "Lexicon Technicum" of Harris (1710), Jamieson's "Dictionary of Arts and Sciences," Gwill's "Cyclopædia of Architecture," Nicholson's "Architectural Dictionary," etc., all of which have been occasionally consulted with good results. The Botanical Glossaries of the late Prof. Balfour, and of M. C. Cooke, we have referred to for some words. In entomology, Westwood, Burmeister, Kirby and Spence, Harris, Duncan, Packard and Shuckard have been at hand.

In matters of general apicultural practice we have depended largely upon our own experience, which began more than a quarter of a century ago, and enables us to look back with interest to the time when we procured our first Italian Queen from the early product of the importation of S. B. Parsons. This we have supplemented with the records given by others in the journals devoted to apiculture. We were among the early subscribers to the *American Bee Journal*, and although we did not take it for many years, we have now a nearly complete set of this most valuable periodical.

Throughout the work we have endeavored to reach a dispassionate and unprejudiced conclusion as to the value and significance of each word *as used by the best authorities*. It is only in a few cases that we have obtruded our own personal preferences and opinions as against the *general custom*. In some of these instances we are so clearly and decidedly right that the words we condemn will never again be used by *respectable* writers in the senses which we have condemned. Such words are *hatch*, *rabbit*, and a few others. Then we have words in regard to which we know we are right, though we are not quite so

sure of being able to convince others of the fact; *fertile* and *hybrid* are good examples of such words. And lastly, there are the compound words formed from the word *egg*: *Egg-workers*, *egg-drones*, *egg-queens*. In regard to these, all we can say is that if we are not right we ought to be. Philologically and scientifically we are correct; whether others will see it in the same light that we do is of course a question to be determined. We await the decision of the majority. It may, not, however, be out of place to present here the reasons for the change, which we have proposed. In speaking of the different kinds of eggs laid by the queen (perhaps different *conditioned* eggs would be more correct, as all the eggs are probably of one kind) it is usual to speak of "worker eggs" and "drone eggs," when we wish to designate eggs which respectively will produce drones or workers.

Now, to the ordinary reader, knowing nothing of bee-keeping, but thoroughly understanding English, these terms would signify eggs laid by workers and by drones, just as we speak of hen eggs, duck eggs, turkey eggs, when we refer to eggs laid by turkeys, ducks and hens. *And in fact the term worker eggs does sometimes mean eggs laid by workers.* The ordinary expressions, therefore, are not only nonsense, but absolutely incorrect in some cases; for example, we have no such thing as "drone eggs;" drones do not lay eggs. But if we use the word *egg* as a prefix to the words *drone*, *worker*, *queen*, we then express accurately the facts in the case and "egg-drones," "egg-workers," and "egg-queens," denote queens, workers and drones in the condition of eggs. We thus secure scientific accuracy, and avoid the double meaning which attaches at present to the expression "worker eggs."

We have included in this Dictionary the names of the different new races of bees that have been described and recommended. It is proper to say that in this department we have had little or no experience; the descriptions have been copied from the best accessible sources, and are given for what they are worth.

In sending forth this little work the author would ask those into whose hands it may fall to give him, either personally or through the *Bee Journals*, such criticisms on mistakes and omissions as their knowledge may suggest. All such criticisms will be taken kindly, where kindly meant, for no one appreciates more fully than he does the shortcomings of this work. And although it is one of the sound canons of literature—one which the writer has never yet violated—that an author should not reply to his critics, yet in this case, as he believes that the general good will be best served by so doing, he will either accept any sensible corrections that may be offered, or give his reasons for rejecting them.

JOHN PHIN.

Cedar Brae, Paterson, N. J., March, 1884.