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1. Introduction

The last installment refers to Mohan-Eiwa-Jiten (hereafter abbreviated to MoEJ) (Sansëido’s English-Japanese Dictionary) (1911) and Shokai-Eiwa-Jiten (SEJ) (A New English-Japanese Dictionary) (1912), which could be considered to be an encyclopedic dictionary and a dictionary focussing on English usage, respectively. Both were published at the end of the Meiji era.

This article deals with Inouye-Eiwa-Dai-Jiten (IEDJ) (Inouye’s English-Japanese Dictionary) (1915), published in the fourth year of the Taisho era. As will be made clear later, this dictionary could be considered to be an encyclopedic dictionary and a dictionary focussing on English usage, respectively. Both were published at the end of the Meiji era.

This article deals with Inouye-Eiwa-Dai-Jiten (IEDJ) (Inouye’s English-Japanese Dictionary) (1915), published in the fourth year of the Taisho era. As will be made clear later, this dictionary could be considered to be a work that is modeled on the two English-Japanese dictionaries above but is largely based in its contents on the British dictionary, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English (COD) (1911) which was issued at the time IEDJ was being compiled. In other words, IEDJ is a dictionary that apparently follows the form of the two preceding bilingual dictionaries but that does in fact include or copy almost all the contents of the concise British dictionary. MoEJ is a typical encyclopedia-oriented dictionary, while SEJ is the first grammar-and usage-oriented dictionary. (For more on the monumental work of SEJ as well as MoEJ, see Kokawa et al. 2000.) Inouye’s dictionary IEDJ cannot be examined without reference to the influence of these two dictionaries. IEDJ, on the whole, could be considered as a dictionary that tries to be not only lexical-oriented but also culture- or information-oriented; that is, IEDJ is a combination type dictionary that looks like both MoEJ and SEJ.

IEDJ was published in the same year another more influential and original dictionary was issued; Jukugo-Hon’i-Eiwa-Chu-Jiten (Saito’s Idiomological English-Japanese Dictionary) by Hidesaburo Saito, which will be dealt with in the next installment, and is also said to have been compiled under the strong influence of COD. Inouye’s dictionary and Saito’s dictionary, as well as MoEJ, are said to have had the most fierce competition particularly during the Taisho era (Fukuhara 1949: 125). In this respect, Inouye’s dictionary and Saito’s dictionary were the two most memorable and important mainstream dictionaries in changing the method or direction of compilation of later English-Japanese dictionaries, in that many of them would follow British dictionaries, such as COD and The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English (POD) (1924). IEDJ was issued about two months later than Saito’s dictionary, but in this installment IEDJ is first dealt with.

Here the text of the dictionary is mainly dealt with: entries or head-words, phrases and examples, grammar and usage, pronunciation, labels, translation equivalents and cultural description. Historical background and the author or editor are also briefly referred to, but, as has been the case with the dictionaries dealt with so far, no mention is made of etymology in IEDJ, though COD includes brief information. It is a fact that etymologically unrelated words came to be treated as different entries but etymology was not taken seriously in those days.

2. Historical Background

IEDJ was published in 1915, just when the world was engrossed in the battles of World War I. Japan had been through and won two important wars in the two decades preceding it: the Sino-Japanese War in 1894 and the Russo-Japanese War in 1904–5. Each war coincided with either of two stages of Japanese industrial revolutions (the first for light industries, and the second for heavy industries), and these domestic developments also helped the nation win the wars. These were the days of Japanese imperi-
alistic expansion, which culminated in and was put to an end by World War II. The victory in the war against China brought Japan reparations and Taiwan. Five years after the war with Russia, Japan annexed Korea. The results of the two wars made the world aware that Japan had transformed itself from an undeveloped, feudalistic country into a modernized, imperialistic military power, possibly on a par with European countries and the U.S.

For better or worse, that was exactly the status and the image that Japan, which had to reconcile itself with unfair treaties with the West for decades, had been craving since the Restoration of Imperial Rule in 1867. Japan had been making incessant efforts to modernize and westernize itself for nearly half a century throughout the Meiji era (1868-1912), and Japan finally achieved its goal, mainly through absorption of western knowledge and technologies. (Naturally, the existence and use of good, comprehensive bilingual dictionaries including English-Japanese were indispensable.) A number of Japanese went to Europe and America to study, while many westerners came to Japan to teach their arts and sciences, in most cases with exceptionally good reward. Between 1881 and 1898, 6,177 Britons, 2,764 Americans, 913 Germans, 619 Frenchmen and 45 Italians visited Japan as teachers and engineers at the invitation of the Japanese government (Nippon Steel Human Resources Development Co., Ltd. 1987: 57). These figures may show which countries Japan mostly turned to for what they needed, and how helpful and necessary good English-Japanese dictionaries must have been for that aim.

In the Meiji era, the Japanese education system saw an extensive development. In 1886, compulsory education started at four years and was extended to six years in 1907. ‘Compulsory’ as it was, school attendance was rather low in the early days (28.1% in 1873: male 39.9%, female 15.1%). In 1910, however, 98.1% of the Japanese children (roughly six to twelve years of age) went to school (male 98.9%, female 97.3%). It was technically allowed to teach foreign languages in these elementary schools too, but in practice English was only taught at higher levels. Access to foreign language learning at public institutions was still limited to the chosen few in those days. (Before World War II, a very limited number of families could afford higher education, such as high schools, universities, and normal schools.)

In 1886, the Imperial University (to be renamed the Tokyo Imperial University in 1897) was established as the apex of the country’s higher education. By 1939 eight other Imperial universities were set up in the major cities in Japan (Kyoto, Sendai, Fukuoka, Sapporo, Osaka and Nagoya), as well as in Korea (Seoul) and Taiwan (Taipei) under Japanese rule. Also, many private schools for higher education, including those for women and those founded by foreign missionaries, were erected in the Meiji era. Many of them became major private universities after World War II. A large number of excellent foreign teachers were employed in these public and private institutions.

Such educational developments and the absorption of knowledge from abroad certainly bore fruit in the latter half of the Meiji era. In the 1890s, Japanese scholars began to impress and contribute to the world with many of their innovative, epoch-making findings and inventions, mainly in the fields of science and technology. Sakichi Toyota devised an automatic weaver in 1897. Fusakichi Omori invented the seismometer in 1901. Umetaro Suzuki discovered vitamin B₁, while Shibazaburo Kitazato, who studied under Robert Koch in Germany, is known for his development of a pure culture of the tetanus virus and the preparation of its antibody.

The lives of ordinary people, especially of city dwellers, became fairly modernized and westernized, in such areas as food, clothing and housing. Electric lights, wireless communication, the telephone, and at the end of the Meiji era, automobiles, were imported and put in use. Railways were constructed to connect major cities and regions of the country. Japan had little participation in World War I, while European powers were fully occupied by warfare. As a result, Japanese businesses edged its way into the world market, enjoying an all-time economic boom and prosperity at home. However, the gap between the lives of urban, wealthy, educated people and those of rural, poor, common people became tremendous.

Inouye’s *IEDJ* was published in the days when Japan successfully completed its first fairly long but restless stage of modernization initiated by the government and the industries, in which the country had just estab-
lished itself as a newly emerged and growing power in the world.

(Section 2 by Kokawa)

3. The Author and the Dictionary

3.1. The author — Jukichi Inouye (1862–1929)

Jukichi Inouye, one of the three most prominent English scholars of the late Meiji and Taisho eras, was born in Tokushima Prefecture in 1862 as the second son of Takanori Inouye, a progressive politician at the time. At the age of eleven, Inouye was sent with his brother and several others from the region to study in the U.K., and being the youngest, he stood out from the group. After he finished primary education, Inouye entered Rugby School, at whose entrance examination he did so well, especially in mathematics, as to obtain a scholarship of 40 pounds a year. In 1879 he was accepted to King's College, London, and studied chemistry for two years. In 1881 (at the age of 19) he transferred to Royal School of Mines to study mining and metallurgy with the intention of becoming a mining engineer after returning to his home country.

When he came back to Japan in 1883 (at the age of 21) after studying for eleven years in England, his colourful career started. By an odd chance he embarked on a new career as a teacher. In 1886 he was appointed to a teaching post at Daiichi Koto Chu Gakko (now the Faculty of Liberal Arts at Tokyo University) and taught mathematics and English. In 1893 (at the age of 31) he worked as a subeditor for the Japan Gazette in Yokohama and his articles were well received, but he resigned because he disapproved of the company’s anti-Japanese policy on the Sino-Japanese War. The following year he was appointed to the post of secretary-translator at the Foreign Office and was four years later promoted to secretary of the Legation. Until he retired in 1918 in order to concentrate on the compilation of a comprehensive Japanese-English dictionary (hereafter IWDJ) published by Sanseido and it received much critical acclaim. This work marked the beginning of a new era of Japanese-English dictionaries, as it was the first Japanese-English dictionary entirely designed for Japanese learners of English. The dictionary sold so well that it led to the situation in which a formal complaint was filed against him by the competitive publisher Sanseido, which was suffering a drop in sales of SWJ, that the editor had promised not to compile the dictionaries.
same kind of Japanese-English dictionary (cf. Chugai Eiji Shinbun Vol. 28 No. 5).

It is said that Inouye asked for twenty percent royalties on sales of his dictionaries because of his best selling dictionaries. His smaller English-Japanese dictionaries are said to have been even used by elementary school pupils. Before and after the Taisho earthquake (1923) his dictionaries, either English-Japanese or Japanese-English, sold so well that the book titled Nihon Eiyu den, as well as Fujii (1962), says that the sales of his English-Japanese dictionaries (mainly IEDJ and IECJ) eventually amounted to more than two million copies (1936: 432). Even if what the book and Fujii say seems to be an exaggeration, it is true that Inouye’s dictionaries were the best sellers and the best known in the Taisho era.

In 1924 Inouye founded Inouye’s English Correspondence School. After he died of stomach cancer at the age of 68, he was officially commended for his long-standing and invaluable contribution to English education in 1929.

3.2. The dictionary

IEDJ is the third dictionary Inouye was engaged with. According to Fujii (1962: 109-11), Inouye was asked to work on this project by a colleague at the Foreign Office, who was a brother-in-law of the publisher’s wife. IEDJ was the first English-Japanese dictionary to include the name of the author in its official title (Kojima 1999: 382). The title was registered as a trademark in 1921 and it has been notified at the reverse of the title page since (sometime in) 1922. This was probably done in order to prevent his name from being used for any other publication without permission in the same way as ‘Webster’ was used for general English dictionaries. In any case, this also tells us that Inouye was a respected authority on English at the time.

According to the foreword, Inouye began working on the IEDJ project in 1909 when his SWJ was published. During the seven years it took to compile this work, the first edition of COD came out in 1911 and it exerted considerable influence over IEDJ (cf. Sections 4 and 6).

The dictionary measures 172 mm high x 107 mm wide x 80 mm thick (7.0 in x 4.4 in x 3.3 in) and was the popular size of the time (see the Appendix 1). It consists of the title page, two pages of ‘Foreword’ in English and one page in Japanese, 4 pages of front matter, the main text (pp. 1-2326) and the 26 pages of the appendix. The front matter contains:

- Abbreviations of Labels 2
- Key to Pronunciation 3
- Abbreviations 4
- Abbreviations of Literary Authors 4

The contents of the appendix are:

- Table of Irregular Verbs p(p). 1-4
- Table of Compound Irregular Verbs 4-5
- Table of Names that are Hard to Read 6-16
- Table of Nicknames 17-19
- Table of Currency of Different Countries 20-21
- Table of Weights and Measures 21-25
- Table of Standard Time 26

A typical entry consists of a headword with syllabication and stress marks, the pronunciation in round brackets, the indication of part(s) of speech, subject field and register labels if necessary, the Japanese equivalents, and illustrative examples. No pictorial illustrations are provided, which seems to have followed COD. All the examples are placed together after all the different word senses listed, so that it is not self-evident which examples correspond to which meanings. After phrase examples are given, the entry is divided into two columns and full-sentence examples are arranged on the left with their Japanese translations on the right, for the sake of clarity.

The dictionary sold so well that as many as 147th reprint was made in 1927. IEDJ dominated the dictionary market in Taisho period together with MoEJ (1911) and Saito’s Idiomological English-Japanese Dictionary by Hidesaburo Saito published in the same year as IEDJ.

(Section 3 by Komuro)
4. Entries

4.1. Headwords

Headwords are one of the categories in the dictionary structure that is to be mentioned in every article on lexicography, because they show the general character of the dictionary under review or examination: lexical-oriented, encyclopedic-oriented or both. To show the way a dictionary is compiled, it is preferable that as wide a sample as possible should be examined, that is, as many entries as possible. But sampling will also tell a partial character, if not the whole picture, of the dictionary and the method of random sampling is used here.

When Inouye, editor of the dictionary IEDJ, started to compile an English-Japanese dictionary, he seemed to have in mind advanced learners as dictionary users. This could be said because right after or just before he completed the work he began to compile an intermediate dictionary, IECJ, for less advanced students in middle schools, i.e. junior and senior high schools, which was to be published only a year later. As is already mentioned in section 3, Inouye had the experience of teaching university level students, and they seemed to be one of the target users of his dictionary. Based on an interview with him, the article written by Shibuya in a magazine Eigo no Nippon (The Nippon) (Vol. 8. No. 10) mentions Inouye’s advice that students should read more popular scientific books rather than literary works in order to be good students of English, which came from his experience as a student of mining and metallurgy as well as an English teacher. (Note also that Omura (1979: 178–84) says that he is also a lover of detective stories or mysteries.) His belief that extensive reading would enable students to acquire a large vocabulary naturally made him attempt a dictionary with a large number of entries as his ideal dictionary.

As had always been the case with the dictionaries dealt with in this series of the installments, Inouye probably thought that there was nothing for it but to refer to a monolingual dictionary or dictionaries. We are interested in what he consulted in compiling the dictionary. His two successive articles for a newspaper soon after the publication of his dictionary, which were also reprinted in IECJ, suggest the possible source(s) (cf. Nakao et al. 1977: 100 footnote 3). In “Jisho Hensan no Kushin” [Difficulties in Compiling the English-Japanese Dictionary] (Inouye 1915b), he refers to five concise or abridged dictionaries close at hand at the turn of the twentieth century (the following titles are given with their text page numbers excluding appendices shown in square brackets, and some of their ambiguous titles or titles on the spine are made explicit in accordance with the title page): ① Annandale’s The Concise English dictionary (1903?) (CoED) [784 pp.] (The Concise English Dictionary, edited by Charles Annandale), ② A modern dictionary of the English Language (1910?) (MDEL) [764 pp.] (A Modern Dictionary of the English Language, without the name of the editor), ③ The Students’ Standard Dictionary (1897?) (SSD) [814 pp.] (Students’ Edition of a Standard Dictionary of the English Language, edited by James C. Fernald et al.), ④ Chambers’s [sic] English Dictionary (1898?) (ChED) [1197 pp.] (edited by Thomas Davidson), and ⑤ The concise Oxford Dictionary (1911) (COD) [1041 pp.] (The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, edited by H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler), which were all published, reprinted or revised in the 1900s or 1910s. All the dictionaries except the third are British (or Scottish) dictionaries. This is partly because he had education in Britain, and was probably more familiar with the dictionaries or reference books there (cf. 4.1.3.). It also seems to be the case that at the turn of the twentieth century only a few concise dictionaries were available in the United States, except the abridged or smaller dictionaries of Websterian tradition and those of Funk & Wagnall’s Standard Dictionary of the English Language (Standard) (cf. Simpson, Algeo). It cannot be asserted that these five dictionaries are the only ones Inouye consulted, but it is quite reasonable to suppose that they were influential in compiling IEDJ.

It should not be forgotten that, before his dictionary came on the market, there were two distinctive English-Japanese dictionaries available: MoEJ, which includes a lot of encyclopedic entries (and is said to have sold well), and SEJ, which is filled with grammatical and usage information (but did not sell well) (Kokawa et al. 2000). It is taken for granted that the two dictionaries had a partial influence on Inouye’s dictionary.

The preface of IEDJ in which Inouye says it took around seven years to finish the work makes it likely that he started the work in 1909. It will be
made clear whether or not he also had an idea of referring to American dictionaries (cf. 4.1.3.), because the dictionaries in Websterian tradition were particularly influential until the end of the Meiji era (cf. Dohi et al. 1998). Inouye probably knew of The Oxford English Dictionary (OED), but not all of the fascicles were available (and the assumption this writer made is that no reference was made to OED). No explicit statement has been found that he compiled the dictionary based on a particular concise dictionary or dictionaries. A few years later after he started the compilation, COD was published. After its publication, there were found some articles to the effect that the dictionary is concise but very useful for reading. See, for example, the column of ‘Gossip’ in the issue on April 15, 1912 of Chugyo Eiji Shim bun: A Semi-Monthly Journal Devoted to the Study of English. It is conceivable that the editor’s experience as a user of the dictionary, as well as reading such articles, may have persuaded him to make good use of the concise British dictionary for compiling his work.

A brief survey and comparison was made of IEDJ and the five dictionaries above. The result clearly shows that IEDJ is far more heavily dependent, if not entirely so, on COD than on the other dictionaries: CoED, ChED and SSD include many entries that are not found in IEDJ, while MDEL does not include many entries found in IEDJ and COD.

4.1.1. Manner of presentation

The presentations in COD and IEDJ are partially the same and partially different. On capitalization of initial letters, little difference is found between the two; proper names or proper terms are capitalized. Diacritical marks are often given in headwords in COD (which is always the case with MoEJ and SEJ), but they are given not in headwords but in pronunciation in IEDJ. There seems to be some similarity of presentation between IEDJ and MoEJ or SEJ. Headword hyphenation is shown in IEDJ, but not in COD. The way of showing stress is different from COD: the turned period (·) is normally placed after the accented vowel in COD (p. xii), while in IEDJ there are found the signs of a primary accent (’) and a secondary accent ("), which are considered to have been influenced by SEJ (or Standard or N Standard). Another feature, quite the same as both MoEJ and SEJ (or Standard or N Standard), is that IEDJ adopts what (N) Standard calls the German double hyphen (\textasciitilde) as 'a means of distinguishing a hyphenated compound from a syllabicated word' (N Standard, Introductory, p. xii) (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000: Section 5.1.), while a single hyphen is employed in COD. Run-on entries or derived forms are shown in boldface in COD and IEDJ. They are all spelt out without using a dash (in MoEJ) or a swung dash (in SEJ). Some derived forms ending in -ly and -ment are sometimes given as main entries (absolutely, for instance) as well as run-on entries both in COD and in IEDJ. The layout in the text is somewhat similar to that of MoEJ in the way of utilizing the space (see Kokawa et al. 2000: Section 6.1.). The facts have led this writer to say that IEDJ is a dictionary that partly follows COD which apparently follows the form or presentation of MoEJ or SEJ. The IEDJ method of showing inflexion follows that of COD, which implies that users are required to have fundamental knowledge of English grammar.

The presentations of the two dictionaries are partially different: the headwords in COD are shown in boldface, and the run-on entries are shown in bold headword forms with light suffixes or derived forms in small capitals, such as manually. Hyphenated words and compounds are usually placed after examples (and sometimes in the definitions). In IEDJ all the entries are given in bold in an alphabetical order (cf. MoEJ). The headwords and run-on entries are sometimes systematically divided in the entries like hair and harbour, while they are sometimes not in other entries like hand and hard. The alphabetical order in IEDJ sometimes causes a difficulty in looking up words, because some entries are placed where they should not be. For example, between the headwords of hard and hare, are placed several words as if they were the main entries or headwords: hard\textasciitildelee, hard	extasciitildebake, *harden, hard\textasciitildefavoured, *hardihood, hardily, *hardly, hardly\textasciitildeearned, hard\textasciitildemetal, hardness, *hardship, hard\textasciitildetack, and *hardy. (The words with an asterisk are given as headwords in COD.) Or handily and handiness are not grouped together under the entry of handy but are placed between handicrafts and handgun as if they were the derived forms of the entry handicraft. All of this is because the alphabetical order is strictly followed. Some are derived forms, and some are com-
pounds, and users do not always find the arrangement reasonable. This arrangement reminds us of the strictly alphabetical order in SEJ (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000: Section 5.2.3). The editor should have adopted a less confusing layout like that of MoEJ when the order is used.

4.1.2. Influence of COD on IEDJ

Table 1 below shows to what extent the entries in IEDJ correspond with those in COD. All the bold entries of the seven sections in IEDJ are counted, including variants and hyphenated words and compounds, while all the bold entries in COD are counted as well as part of the hyphenated words and compounds located after the examples, such as *h.-brother* in the entry of *half*, meaning *half-brother*, in comparison with IEDJ when they are given there. The seven sections surveyed are as follows: *about¹–act¹*, *early—effusively, hackle²—head²*, *jab—jocular, mail¹—market¹*, *oaf—off*, and *tablet—tamarind*. Note also that there is not always an exact one-to-one correspondence between the entries. The principle in IEDJ is that pairs or sets of words having the same form but membership of different classes or parts of speech are assigned to separate entries: for example, in the entries *above* and *hat* there are two entries in IEDJ while there is one in COD. In a case like *off*, there are given five entries in IEDJ, while there is only one in COD. Here the counting is based on the entries in Inouye’s dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>The number of entries in IEDJ and COD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEDJ (i)</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COD (v)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards IEDJ, the figures in the first row (i) show the number of main entries or headwords, while those in (ii) show the number of run-on entries, both of which are considered to have been taken from COD. The figures in (iii) show the number of words and compounds in IEDJ that are usually given after the phrases or examples in COD, whereas (iv) gives the number of those that are not found in COD. As regards COD, (v) is the number of main entries, and (vi) is that of run-on entries, while (vii) gives the number of entries that are not found in IEDJ. (The pages surveyed amount to nearly 96 in the 2,326-page IEDJ, and 41 in the 1,041-page COD respectively, with the result that the sampled pages in both account for about four percent.)

It is estimated from the survey that IEDJ contains around 75,000 entries including run-on entries and compounds, which number is in fact larger than that of MoEJ or SEJ, though MoEJ boasts 100,000 entries (Chugwai Eiji Shimbun Vol. 18. No. 5) and SEJ says that it includes 80,000 entries (ibid., Vol. 19. No. 19), both of which are an exaggeration when the survey of Kokawa et al. (2000: Section 5.2.1.) is taken into account. But the number of 75,000 entries is also far smaller than that of 200,000 entries touted in the advertisement of IEDJ (ibid., Vol. 22. No. 17). This implies that each publisher wanted to be proud of the large number of entries because it was considered ‘the more (entries), the better (dictionary).’ The survey also shows that approximately 50,000 bold entries (and 10,000 hyphenated words) are estimated to be included in COD. The figures shown in (iv) also make us realize that IEDJ does not merely copy or follow the entries of COD as nearly one fifth of the entries surveyed (576 out of 3,103) in IEDJ do not come from COD. On the other hand, the figures in (vii) explicitly show that most of the entries in COD are included in IEDJ, and it is not at all clear why some COD entries are excluded: *happenings*, *harassment*, *talented* and *talker*, for example, were considered to be merely derived forms and unnecessary, and less than half of the entries omitted are main entries. On the whole, the figures above support the claim that the entries in IEDJ are heavily dependent on those in COD.

Here a question should be posed: Why is it that the editor Inouye mainly made use of the British dictionary COD rather than the other concise British, (Scottish) or American dictionaries close at hand? To answer the question, let the preface of COD be quoted (cf. Sugai 1941: 35–36, McArthur 1986: 136): “The book is designed as a *dictionary*, and not
as an encyclopaedia; that is, the uses of words and phrases . . . are its subject matter, and it is concerned with giving information about the things for which those words and phrases stand only so far as correct use of the words depends upon knowledge of the things . . . One of these peculiarities is the large amount of space given to the common words that no one goes through the day without using scores or hundreds of times . . .; chief among such words are the prepositions, the conjunctions, the pronouns, and such 'simple' nouns and verbs as hand and way, go and put.” (p. iii) (Emphasis is added by this writer.) COD is mainly concerned with lexical entries and a small number of encyclopedic entries like geographical names, such as Malacca and Malaga. For usage of the English language short illustrative phrase or sentence examples are provided, in addition to idiomatic phrases. Keep in mind the other parts of the preface: “The words, or senses of words, given are meant to be such only as are current . . . ” (p. iv), “. . . to include many words and senses that are fossilized, having in themselves no life or capacity for further development, but kept extant by being enshrined in perhaps a single proverb or phrase that is still in use . . .” (p. v) and “. . . if we give fewer scientific and technical terms, we admit colloquial, facetious, slang, and vulgar expressions with freedom, merely attaching a cautionary label . . .” (p. v) (This writer’s emphasis.) These claims are considered to have been influential in making Inouye think that COD includes what he wanted to be included in IEDJ, and this led him to make use of COD in compiling IEDJ. Here it should also not be forgotten that he is the author of a Japanese-English dictionary SWJ, in the preface of which he writes as follows: “Japanese-English dictionaries . . . there are in plenty; but excellent as some of them are in their way, the majority are sadly to seek with respect to the commonest words and phrases in our language . . . my plan has been to collect as far as possible all Japanese words, phrases, and sentences in common use . . . ” (p. i) (Emphasis is this writer’s.) The work of compiling a Japanese-English dictionary is radically different from that of an English-Japanese dictionary, but the way of thinking that a large number of common words with their examples or idiomatic expressions shown should be included in a dictionary and the preface in COD is considered to be related to his selection of the dictionary in compiling IEDJ.

4.1.3. Additional entries

Table 1 above shows that Inouye also tries to include additional entries. Most of such entries are assumed to be encyclopedic rather than lexical. The reason he includes more entries seems to be that the editor was fully aware of MoEJ filled with encyclopedic matter. The entries in IEDJ and MoEJ are often different⁰, because the latter is not compiled based on COD (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000). While compiling the dictionary, the editor is considered to have been conscious of the two rival dictionaries, especially MoEJ. It could be safely said that he endeavors to compile a dictionary which includes not only common usage in English but also more encyclopedic entries to compete against MoEJ.

As has often been the case in English-Japanese dictionaries dealt with, the rival dictionaries of MoEJ and SEJ include abbreviations, acronyms, and expressions from foreign languages in the appendices, but Inouye avoids their conventional method of excluding such entries in the text and includes them there. It is a forward step for users, who tend to look up the entries they consult not in the appendices but in the text. In this respect, IEDJ is more timesaving and user-friendly than the other two. (Note that MDEL as well as COD employs this arrangement.)

What kind of new entries are added in IEDJ? This writer decided to choose and examine 448 entries in four sections (A, H, J and M) that are not found in COD, granted that nothing is incorporated from the addenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Types of new entries in IEDJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words or compounds with subject field labels</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compounds without labels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign expressions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivatives</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper noun related words</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
list of its 1914 edition. The result of the brief survey is shown in Table 2, but, because not all of the entries are explicitly given subject field labels even in cases they are considered to be necessary (for example, mangbate is labeled mineralogy, whereas manganese, manganian, manganic and manganous are not), the numbers in Table 2 show the general picture of the new entries surveyed.

In A, more than half are encyclopedic: most (27 out of 32) are technical terms of plants or animals, such as Abutilon and Acalepha, labeled as (botany) and (zoology) respectively. (It could be safely said that far more entries related to plants or animals are included in IEDJ.) About one fourth consists of derivatives, abbreviations, foreign expressions, or variants. In H, one third (58 out of 171) are related to technical terms, more than half (32 out of 58) of which are concerned with plants or animals, words related to ornithology (hawk owl), conchology (hammer shell) and ichthyology (hag fish) being in the decreasing order. There are more compounds without labels, with heads or modifiers being hand-, half-, hard-, hair-, and head- (like handbreadth, half face, hard gotten, hair compasses, head hunter). In J there can be found a number of words derived from proper nouns, Japan, Jamaica or Java: Japanism, and Jamaican, for instance. Nearly the same number of compounds without labels, like jewel box and job price, are included as those with technical labels, such as Jack in prison and jacana, botanical terms being the largest. In M nearly a quarter consist of foreign expressions, abbreviations, derivatives, or variants, and about half of them are foreign expressions. (Isobe 1929b: 177 says that Inouye also had a good knowledge of Latin, Greek and French, and consequently it is conceivable that he should try to give many foreign terms, the largest number of words related to plants or animals, such as Abutilon and Acalepha, labeled as (botany) and (zoology) respectively. (It could be safely said that far more entries related to plants or animals are included in IEDJ.) About one fourth consists of derivatives, abbreviations, foreign expressions, or variants. In H, one third (58 out of 171) are related to technical terms, more than half (32 out of 58) of which are concerned with plants or animals, words related to ornithology (hawk owl), conchology (hammer shell) and ichthyology (hag fish) being in the decreasing order. There are more compounds without labels, with heads or modifiers being hand-, half-, hard-, hair-, and head- (like handbreadth, half face, hard gotten, hair compasses, head hunter). In J there can be found a number of words derived from proper nouns, Japan, Jamaica or Java: Japanism, and Jamaican, for instance. Nearly the same number of compounds without labels, like jewel box and job price, are included as those with technical labels, such as Jack in prison and jacana, botanical terms being the largest. In M nearly a quarter consist of foreign expressions, abbreviations, derivatives, or variants, and about half of them are foreign expressions. (Isobe 1929b: 177 says that Inouye also had a good knowledge of Latin, Greek and French, and consequently it is conceivable that he should try to give many foreign expressions in the text for readers.) One third out of 106 are technical terms, the largest number of words related to plants (mango tree) or animals (mantis shrimp), with some words related to navigation (main boom) or entomology (Mandibulata). The survey of the total reveals that about one third consists of technical terms, while compounds without labels come second, which amount to a quarter. Words derived from proper nouns, foreign expressions, derivatives, and abbreviations come in decreasing order. This survey supports the assumption that IEDJ endeavors to include more encyclopedic entries and compounds for reading. In this respect, the editor's claim is rationalized that inclusion of technical vocabulary, which is also touted in the advertisement, is one of the three main characteristics (The Nippon Vol. 8. No. 10.).

Where do the additional entries come from that are included in IEDJ? A survey was conducted of the 448 entries, by reference to the four concise dictionaries, but the result shown in Table 3 is not very satisfying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 Where the additional entries can be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChED only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoED only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChED &amp; MDEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEL &amp; CoED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChED, MDEL &amp; CoED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the total (253 out of 448) can be found in one or more than one of the four dictionaries, while more than forty percent (195) can be found in none of them. One thing is remarkable: contrary to this writer's expectation, the entries in IEDJ surprisingly often correspond with those in MDEL, one latest dictionary that is "specially suitable for the use of pupils in Secondary Schools and the upper classes of Elementary Schools" (p. ii), partly because "Prefixes, abbreviations, and foreign words and phrases are arranged in the body of the Dictionary in their proper alphabetical order" (p. ii), and this seems to have had an effect on the arrangement in IEDJ. See, for examples, H.C.M., hdqrs., mal de mer and Marathon race.

The survey was revised: reference was made to other encyclopedic dictionaries of WNID, Century 2 and N Standard, all of which are published not in Britain but in the United States. It seems that around the turn of the twentieth century, no dictionary in one or two volumes like WNID or Standard was published in Britain (cf. Simpson: 1963 64), and the advertisement of Inouye's dictionary refers to those large or unabridged dictionaries as other possible sources of information, though it says that Inouye's dictionary includes more entries than can be found in them. WNID was issued 1909 (11), while Century 2 was revised in 1911, the same year COD
was published. *Standard* was issued in 1893-94, but, while Inouye was engaged with the dictionary *IEDJ*, a new edition *N Standard* was published in 1913. There is no claim that Inouye made use of these (encyclopedic) dictionaries, and it would also have been possible for him to make use of various British encyclopedias available, if he had wanted to, such as *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 11th edition (1910-11). Assuming that he referred to the three most up-to-date American dictionaries or encyclopedia for more entries, this writer made a decision to compare the additional 195 entries between *IEDJ* and the three. The survey gives a more convincing or promising result that nearly three quarters (153 out of 195) could be found in one or more than one of them.

Table 4 Where the 195 entries could be found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WNID</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N Standard</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNID &amp; <em>N Standard</em></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNID, Century 2 &amp; <em>N Standard</em></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNID &amp; Century 2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 2 &amp; <em>N Standard</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the largest number of entries are to be found in *WNID* does not absolutely mean that *WNID* is the most likely source of reference for the entries, because half of its entries are given in "a lower section, in a somewhat smaller type and narrow columns, containing various minor words, foreign words and phrases, abbreviations etc" (p. vi), in contrast with those given in an upper section containing the main words of the language. (Note that the former 1890 edition of *WIDEL* does not employ such an arrangement, and includes less entries surveyed.) This survey shows that the additional entries in *IEDJ* that are not to be found in the concise dictionaries mentioned could be found in one or more than one of the three larger encyclopedic dictionaries. Further survey might show that the entries found in neither of them (accounting for nearly one fifth of the total entries), like *acajou* wood, *hair* tweezers, *javelin* wasp, and *mango* butterfly, could be found in a technical dictionary or others. *(OED* includes eleven entries, as far as the survey is concerned, and the fact leads this writer to conclude that he should also have consulted *OED* as one of the reference sources, which means that the assumption he made in section 4.1. has turned out to be wrong.)

The conclusion is that there is a strong likelihood that the editor depends on some dictionaries or reference works, such as *SSD, ChED, MDEL* and *CoED*, for additional entries. He also depends on other larger or encyclopedic reference works, such as *WNID, Century 2, or N Standard* (as well as *OED*) for more entries that are nowhere to be found in the concise dictionaries referred to. In order to boast of the large number of entries in a competitive dictionary market, it was considered to be necessary or imperative for the editor to include a larger number of words. As the result, the advertisement boastfully says that the dictionary includes more entries than could be found in *WNID, Standard or OED*. The fact clearly shows that the dictionary editor endeavors to include as many technical or special entries as possible, associating the dictionary including far more entries with a better dictionary for a large number of users, without thinking of their real (or doubtful) usefulness or the quality of a better dictionary. This writer wonders why the editor endeavors to include such entries as can be found in no dictionary. In those days no consideration was made by the editor of what the dictionary was meant for, what users would look for, or what types of user were intended. It is quite doubtful whether some technical terms or compounds were really necessary for users in reading popular scientific English, except for a small group of very advanced users or specialists who might need them. In this sense, *IEDJ* may have been compiled for specialists and may be partly conceived as a specialist dictionary. This has caused the dictionary to be a mixed blessing for both immediate or advanced learners and specialists.

4.1.4. Summary

The method of presentation of the entries and what is included in *IEDJ* is briefly referred to. The dictionary is consistent, because the entries are in principle separately given according to their parts of speech. In *MoEJ* and *SEJ*, the run-on entries or the words ending in -ly and -ness are not spelt out, while all such entries are in *IEDJ*. There is a danger in *IEDJ* that users might get the impression that some derived forms or compounds are sometimes randomly placed even though they are in a strictly
alphabetical order. The arrangement may not always be user-friendly in looking up words. Inouye made such an arrangement under the strong influence of COD and MDEL as well as MoEJ and SEJ. Inouye was wise enough to have made good use of COD, and even tries to include many encyclopedic entries for advanced users, which made the dictionary well received, popular and best-selling (cf. 3.2.). But seen from a lexicographical point of view, the important fact is ignored that entries should not be given in a confusing way for users. There is also a doubt why and whether it was necessary for the editor to compile a dictionary that includes not only those entries in some concise and larger dictionaries but also some entries that are found nowhere else. The doubtful way of thinking “the more, the better” could be traced back to around the 1910s, the early days of the twentieth century. (cf. Dohi et al. 1998: Section 10.)

4.2. Examples

As is already mentioned, Inouye had the experience of compiling a Japanese-English dictionary SWJ before he was engaged in IEDJ. The former is highly valued as it is considered to have been the first dictionary that does not follow the model of Hepburn’s Japanese-English dictionary (1867) (Kojima 1999: 375–77). Inouye gives a number of illustrative examples in it. As will be mentioned in 4.2.1, the experience led him to compile a dictionary in which are given a lot of illustrative examples in English, for the purpose of which COD was considered to be exactly the right dictionary and far more useful and invaluable than the other concise dictionaries at that time. Here the same question should be posed: Why does Inouye select COD? The preface of COD is quoted again: “Another peculiarity is the use, copious for so small a dictionary, of illustrative sentences as a necessary supplement to definition when a word has different senses . . . or when a definition is obscure and unconvincing until exemplified; these sentences often are, but still more often are not, quotations from standard authors; they are meant to establish the sense of the definition . . . .” (p. iii) (Emphasis is again this writer’s.) (cf. Allen 1986: 2)

When a comparison is made of COD with the other dictionaries referred to, there is one feature far more conspicuous: though compiled for native speakers of English, COD is full of illustrative phrases or examples. (See the Appendix 2 at the end of this installment.) Among the five dictionaries surveyed, CoED and SSD include a small number of short or phrase examples, but far less emphasis is placed on giving examples. ChED and MDEL give few or no examples. The survey makes it clear that COD surpasses the others in giving examples and idioms, especially in the usage of common words like nouns, verbs and adjectives, even if they are not always complete sentences or are given in a very condensed style called telegraphic. It is conceivable that it is somewhat doubtful whether COD without examples or idiomatic expressions was selected as an ideal or a better dictionary by the editor. When the fact is taken into account that in those days more and more attention was paid to English usage of common words and phrases (cf. Section 1 footnote 3), COD is the very dictionary Inouye was looking for or eager to depend on in the compilation of his bilingual dictionary. Another possible reason his dictionary is largely based on COD is that he might have been conscious of and followed the example of SEJ, full of instructive usage description and a number of illustrative examples and phrases. (Note that the advertisement for SEJ says that it includes 50,000 examples.) To compile a better dictionary than SEJ, he may have thought that there was no choice but to make use of the text of COD, the dictionary of dictionaries.

4.2.1. Manner of presentation

IEDJ radically differs from MoEJ and SEJ in that all the examples, whether phrases or sentences, are placed after all the sub-senses, whereas COD examples, like those in SEJ and MoEJ, are grouped together after each sub-sense. Like the order of entries or headwords, in IEDJ the phrase examples are given first and merely arranged in an alphabetical order of the first letter, with the result that phrase examples, phrasal verbs and idiomatic phrases are grouped together: in the entry make, for example, to make a journey, to make away, to make him a duke, to make or mar, and to make up one’s mind are placed in an alphabetical order, which makes it difficult for some users to distinguish which is which. It could be said that IEDJ is less user-friendly than MoEJ and SEJ because such an arrange-
ment does not always help users (with the possible exception of some advanced users) to recognize in which sense the word is used in a given phrase example. (The good point is that all the phrase examples are accompanied by Japanese translations, which is not always the case with MoEJ and SEJ.)

Square brackets [ ], single parentheses ( ), or double parentheses ( ( ) ) are used in some examples. The second device is only occasionally employed in MoEJ and SEJ. They may function well if they are applied accurately, and as long as users understand them correctly. The editor is considered to have used them to show more expressions in the available space. The square brackets are used for showing alternative expressions with similar or same meanings: to pay [settle] an account, and to fall [get] into the [a] habit (of), for example. The single parentheses are useful in marking off optional words or phrases: It is (of) no earthly good your coming, and to set (a person's) teeth on edge, for instance. The double ones are used to show alternatives: hit ((miss)) the mark, told me of ((about)) his difficulties and to spend ((lose, waste)) time, for example. But some examples are not always accurate in giving the intention: Bread is ((cut)) too thick may be an awkward example, and it could be enclosed in single parentheses. Compare the examples My hands are full [I have my hands full] and You may take it from me (take my words for it), or [to live] from hand to mouth and to talk tall [ad ], most of them confusing the users. It is not certain and sometimes doubtful whether the editor takes into account the idea of idiomatic or natural expressions. The device is useful, but accuracy and naturalness should be given precedence over showing quantities of examples.

Another form of examples, sentence examples, do not follow such an order, though the same problem arises that it is not always clear in which sense the word is used in the given example. As is mentioned in 3.2, the entry is divided into two columns: the sentence examples are given on the left, with the Japanese translations on the right. Some examples directly taken from or based on COD are typically given first and followed by some other examples. Some are short and easy to understand, some taken from other sources, some of his own inventing, and some long and taken from traditional or literary sources like the Bible (the example for abundance is taken from Matthew 12: 34; Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh) or famous authors such as Shakespeare (in the entry for accord, a sentence taken from King Henry VI (second part) iii, 1, 269; My heart accordeth [accords in IEDJ] with my tongue). But, curiously enough, which literary sources the examples come from is only occasionally referred to, and it is not clear to what extent the literary figures or authors like J. Dryden given in the front matter are explicitly shown in the text: the second example or quotation above does not refer to the author, for example.

Even though some phrases and examples are taken from COD, they have undergone some modifications in IEDJ so that users find them useful. For example, to is added in front of the infinitive, to be is added before the adjectives, the object is supplied as a thing, a person or some suitable noun is given. The subject is also sometimes provided. These are highly appreciated because users unaccustomed to English misunderstand them without any clear and supplementary indication of usage.

A small survey was made of the entries in A, H, and M that give examples in the text. As far as the sections the survey was made of are concerned, more than fifteen percent of entries (271 out of 1728) have examples. There seem to be more examples in noun entries, and the result is as follows: nouns (140 entries), adjectives (61), verbs (47), and adverbs (10), prepositions (3), and others like past participles (10) 

The survey led this writer to say that, when the proportion of the entries with each part of speech labeled is taken into account, the dictionary tries to show examples in the common words of prepositions, verbs, adjectives and nouns. A few entries have more than ten sentence examples (the figures in square brack-
ets are the number of examples given): make (v.) [40], account (n.) [21] (see the Appendix 2), hand (n.) [15], have (v.) [14], about (prep.) [13], head (n.) [13], and man (n.) [11]. 64 entries out of 271, which amount to more than a quarter, have one or more than one sentence example. Far more entries give phrase examples. 253 entries out of 271, which amount to more than ninety percent, give phrase examples. Some entries show more than ten phrase examples (the figures in square brackets are the number of examples):

Inouye endeavors to give examples in basic vocabulary or to show some technical terms (see the entry of absolute, for example). This is undoubtedly because he was not always aware in which entries sentence or phrase examples should be given because consistent principle, if any, is not always followed in the treatment of the two types of examples: for instance, in the entries of abroad, absolutely, absorb, accord, accredited, and acquit, some sentence examples are given, whereas no example is shown in the entries of ache, achieve, accurate, acquire, and abridge. Particularly noticeable is the fact that he gives at least one phrase example in more than three times as many entries, especially in the encyclopedic entries, such as maple. Phrase examples take up less space, and he clearly tried to make good use of space (cf. 4.2.).

4.2.2. Influence of COD on IEDJ

The brief survey shows that IEDJ undoubtedly makes good use of COD. It reflects the fact that in those days there was no idea of imitating or plagiarizing other dictionaries, or of copyright. As is mentioned below, COD has more influence on the phrase examples. In terms of sentence examples, the entry for have has the highest proportion of the same or similar examples as COD (11 out of 14), but the two entries for make (21 out of 40) and account (no same examples, though some of them are com-

posed or invented based on those on COD) (see the Appendix 2), with more than twenty examples, do not include so a high proportion of COD examples (cf. Kojima 1999: 377, Machida 1981: 37-39). This writer assumes that the editor was sometimes careful in that he did not plagiarize or imitate all the examples in COD, and he endeavored to show more for users, though they are often invented. In contrast, the number of entries with phrase examples is larger than that with sentence examples. What is especially remarkable is that more entries include the same phrase examples as COD: some entries with more than ten phrase examples follow COD examples, such as make (v.) (39 out of 48), hand (n.) (35 out of 46), account (n.) (25 out of 30), head (n.) (28 out of 33), hang (v.) (13 out of 17), hard (a.) (12 out of 14), man (n.) (14 out of 19), and mark (n.) (8 out of 11). The entries with five or fewer examples shown include many of the same phrase examples from COD: 20 out of 30 entries have at least half of the same examples. Let some be given here: above (prep.), acceleration, half (n.), hard (ad.), have (v.), manner, manual, many, mark (v.) and market (n.). This means that COD plays an important part in giving the examples, especially the phrase examples (see 4.2.3. below).

4.2.3. Influence of other dictionaries on IEDJ

It is also important to note that the survey has found that there are many sentence examples that do not copy those of COD, and that some entries only include phrase examples that are not found in COD. Particularly noticeable is the fact that the dictionary is conspicuously abundant in the phrase examples related to encyclopedic or technical matter: absolute, accent, accessory, act, harmonic, majesty, mallow, mantis, maple and march, for instance. Remember the Fowler's preface: "In attaching this great importance to illustration . . . we are merely acting . . . upon the principles of the O.E.D. . . . we have often followed even in that part of our book (A–R) in which the O.E.D. . . . was before us . . . ; and in the latter part (S–Z), where we had no longer the O.E.D. to depend upon . . .; for many of the more difficult . . . words, we have collected the quotations given in the best modern dictionaries (the Imperial, the Century, the Standard, Cassell's Encyclopaedic, Webster, & c.) . . . ." (p. iv) Reading this preface may have
persuaded Inouye to decide that he also tries to make use of the dictionaries for phrases and examples.

The preface also seems to suggest some possible sources of the examples in IEDJ. As far as the sections surveyed are concerned, evidence has been found that a few examples or quotations in Inouye's dictionary are influenced by WNID or (N) Standard: abroad, absolute, accent, accommodate, accredited, and acetate, for instance (cf. Machida 1981: 56). It is also true that some examples are undoubtedly taken from Century 2, some of which are naturally the same as those in Imperial: abroad, abrupt, absent, absolutely, abundance, accuse and accomplish. Only a few come from Imperial, which are not found in Century 2: absent, accelerated and accord. (There might be a possibility that some, which might also be included in other dictionaries, are taken from MoEJ or SEJ.) Not all of the sources of the examples in IEDJ could be ascertained.

It is a noteworthy feature that IEDJ includes a large number of examples, which feature is not found at all in MoEJ but is similarly found in SEJ. There are a number of examples not found in the monolingual dictionaries, but it seems quite likely that the editor often had no difficulty in inventing or composing sentence examples because he was an excellent English teacher and worked for the translation section in the Foreign Office. (Isoe (1929b: 177-78) says that Inouye was once praised for his good writing in English by a native teacher of English, who said he made no grammatical mistake.) It seems that he put great emphasis on sentence examples in some entries of core vocabulary, such as about, above, hand, have, head, and make, as if the dictionary were intended to be used for encoding.

4.2.4. Summary

There is no doubt that COD is the main source of the examples in IEDJ, but it is not the only source of reference. In the phrase examples COD is very useful as it gives a large number of examples in core or basic vocabulary, and it is quite reasonable that the editor made good use of COD, while it is also a fact that he tries to show more examples, especially the phrase examples related to encyclopedic matter. In the sentence examples, the editor also heavily depends on COD, but he endeavors to make a good use of the dictionary in that IEDJ made it possible for ordinary users to decode the difficult telegraphese content of COD. In some entries, he supplies more examples for users as if it were an active dictionary, though it is meant as a passive dictionary. It is not clear how many people knew the dictionary is heavily dependent on the British dictionary, but his effort in adapting the difficult-to-use COD for Japanese users should be highly appreciated.

In the newspaper article mentioned above (4.1.), he writes that he consulted a few German-English and French-English dictionaries for idiomatic phrases. No attempt has been made to look for such dictionaries. The brief survey of the phrases in IEDJ shows that some phrases are taken from the concise dictionaries, and that the editor endeavors to give a large number of examples not only in COD, but in other sources, so that the dictionary might be more useful in looking up usage in common words and encyclopedic matter.

4.3. Grammar and usage

Inouye had issued several books of his lectures on English (cf. 3.1.), but as is mentioned above, he owes many of the examples in the dictionary to COD, and even grammatical description in some entries are taken from or based on COD: beware on verb inflexion; blessed on pronunciation and usage difference from blest; brother on the plural form and difference from brethren; busy on the usage of its postpositional prepositions; dare on verb inflexion; and do on usage, for example. But it should be admitted that Inouye endeavors to give many sentence examples, in which basic knowledge of grammar and usage is required. He cannot have taken into account the idea such as selection restriction: compare the definitions of abridge and abrogate showing typical objects, and accede showing prepositional objects between COD and IEDJ, for example. He was not conscious of structures or sentence patterns, either. IEDJ does not give the same part of speech or description as COD: to lay hand [sic] on, to hang out, harvest (vit.) Inouye sometimes paid no attention to detailed description in COD: abysmal (in the expression abysmal ignorance), acceptor (preferred to accept.
cepter in the sense), and academe (used by mistake in poetic style for the Greek Academy, a college, university), while he sometimes did: haft (n.) (handle of dagger, knife, & c.), hair (n.) (pl. hairs in collective sense is archaic), and halcyon (on halcyon days). It is also a fact that grammatical information not found in COD is sometimes found in IEDJ: harass (v.) (sometimes with out) and hammer (v.) (with away). These facts mean that the editor was sometimes more aware of definitions, sometimes of grammatical description, and sometimes of information not found in COD and obtained from other sources, with the result that inconsistent and sometimes careless description on grammar and usage is to be found.

It must not be forgotten that some entries in IEDJ give collocation information after the translation equivalents: jealous ((+ of)) and march ((+ away, forth, past, out)), for instance. It is a very important piece of information on collocation or information on prepositions or particles, and most of this kind of information is based on COD, which is under the strong influence of OED. How useful it is for users is not certain, but it should be kept in mind that this kind of lexical information is given in IEDJ, which is based on COD. In this respect, COD is considered as the first concise dictionary that gives more lexical information on collocation. IEDJ, perhaps unconsciously, also is the first English-Japanese dictionary to give such information.

Inouye composed many examples based on the expressions in COD. Fortunately COD is more concerned with matters lexical rather than encyclopedic. IEDJ cannot be considered to be original or creative in that the dictionary does not seem to include the editor’s own observation of English usage. Without COD, usage in IEDJ could not have been so highly appreciated.

(Sections 4.1–4.2 by Dohi, Section 4.3 by Tominaga)

5. Pronunciation

This section describes the phonetic transcription of IEDJ, comparing it with that of COD, and with that of SEJ and MoEJ in particular. IEDJ employs a ‘respelling system’ in the transcription of pronunciation. The pronunciation is shown in parentheses after each headword using diacritical marks. The symbols of vowels and consonants are separately listed in ‘Key to Pronunciation’ with keywords (see the Appendix 1, Photograph 7). In some cases, a symbol used in other dictionaries, and/or a corresponding Japanese vowel is given as a reference. In addition, symbols of accents and boundaries of syllables and words are described in ‘Guide to the Dictionary.’ Table 5 is a list of phonetic symbols used in IEDJ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Consonants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>key word(s)</td>
<td>IEDJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fin</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sofa</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moment</td>
<td>é</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>œ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>village</td>
<td>å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The symbols in * are not included in ‘Key to Pronunciation’ of IEDJ.
* The symbols for foreign sounds are omitted in Table 5.
* The key words in Table 5 do not necessarily coincide with those given in ‘Key to Pronunciation’ of IEDJ.
The choice of phonetic symbols varies among dictionaries. Table 6 compares some vowel and consonant symbols used in IEDJ with those used in other dictionaries. As far as the phonetic symbols are concerned, IEDJ most closely resembles CoED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>key word</th>
<th>IEDJ</th>
<th>SEJ/MoEJ</th>
<th>COD</th>
<th>ChED</th>
<th>CoED</th>
<th>WNID</th>
<th>Century 1 &amp; 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>o, ū</td>
<td>(ū)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>uː</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>o, oō, ū</td>
<td>oō</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>oō</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lurk</td>
<td>ēr</td>
<td>ēr, ūr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>o, oō, ū</td>
<td>oō</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>(dh)</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>(ng)</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j, (d)g</td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most noticeable characteristics of the ‘respelling system’ is one-to-one correspondence between a symbol and a sound. SEJ and MoEJ mainly use the ‘diacritical system’ in which the diacritics are put on headwords. In this case, the same vowel or consonant may be represented by different symbols depending on the spelling. For instance, in SEJ and MoEJ, three different symbols are used to indicate the same vowel: (o) in move, (ō) in mān and (u) in ryde. On the other hand, in IEDJ, they are all transcribed by the symbol (ō). Both systems have advantages and disadvantages. The ‘respelling system’ may be simpler and easier for users than the ‘diacritical system’ in that the number of symbols is smaller.

Table 5 shows that breve symbols are not used for short vowels in IEDJ. The symbols (a), (e) and (u) are used in two ways. For example, (u) is pronounced [ʌ] when followed by a consonant within a syllable but is pronounced [ju] when in a syllable-final position. Compare the symbol (u) in cup (kup) and regular (reg' ū-lér). Table 6 shows that some dictionaries, such as SEJ, MoEJ and WNID, use different symbols for the two vowels. Instead of using different symbols with complicated diacritics, IEDJ uses the same symbol for both. IEDJ distinguishes the quality of the vowel in terms of the position of the vowel in a syllable. The symbols (ā) and (ē) are also used in two ways: in accented syllables and in unaccented syllables. The effort to reduce the number of symbols and to make them simple can be observed in IEDJ.

The predecessors of IEDJ, SEJ and MoEJ, seem to follow the pronunciation represented in American dictionaries. IEDJ is believed to have been greatly influenced by COD published in 1911 (Nakao et al. 1977: 100). Although IEDJ does not state the variety of English pronunciation it represents, it is interesting to see whether IEDJ adopts some aspects of Received Pronunciation (RP) under the influence of COD. Some examples will be examined in the following paragraphs.

As for rhoticity, ‘Note on Pronunciation’ of COD states that the r before a consonant or mute e is not trilled, whereas IEDJ does not mention it at all. As for the transcription of so-called ‘ask’ words, IEDJ uses the symbol (ā) as in American dictionaries. WNID and Century 1 & 2 use the symbol (ā) according to the pronunciation of Eastern New England (ENE). On the other hand, COD does not specially give the pronunciation of this group of words as written in its ‘Preface.’

Another example is a group of words which are named CLOTH words by Wells (1982: 136). The vowels of CLOTH words are currently pronounced the same as the vowel of thought in General American (GA) but the same as the vowel of lot in RP, ENE and Scottish English. Wells states that the change of vowel quality from thought to lot in CLOTH words is a twentieth-century development (1982: 234). Table 7 (i) compares the transcription of some CLOTH words among several dictionaries. The description of two vowels, (aw) and (ō), for loss and often in COD reflects the transition period. IEDJ almost always consistently uses the symbol (o) for CLOTH words. It agrees with ChED and CoED which represent Scottish English. One interesting example is the word laurel. Its vowel has never been pronounced with the vowel of thought in RP (Wells 1982: 136). In fact, COD transcribes it (ō). However, IEDJ transcribes it (g) as other dictionaries do. The influence of COD cannot be observed in this group either.

The transcription of vowels in words such as morning and mourning is interesting. They are pronounced with different vowels in GA and ENE but pronounced with the same vowel in RP. The two vowels used to be
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6. Japanese Equivalents

6.1. Microstructure

In the last installment, it was claimed that the overall format of English-Japanese dictionaries had come to be quite similar to that of the present-day English-Japanese dictionaries in the days of the publication of MoEJ and SEJ (Kokawa et al. 2000: 19). This claim can also be verified by taking a look at entries in IEDJ, a dictionary published four years after the publication of MoEJ and three years after the publication of SEJ.

In principle, a major entry in IEDJ consists of the following components: (1) a headword, (2) the pronunciation in parentheses, (3) the inflection for irregular forms, (4) the part of speech, (5) subject and usage labels, (6) Japanese equivalents, (7) phrase examples, idioms, set phrases, and phrasal verbs, (8) compounds and derivatives, and finally (9) a list of example phrases and sentences.

IEDJ used kanji and hiragana for its Japanese equivalents, while SEJ and MoEJ used kanji and katakana for their Japanese equivalents. Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educate vt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 教育する (J) (educate vt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 教育する (SEJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 教育する (MoEJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to SEJ and MoEJ, IEDJ is more similar to the present-day English-Japanese dictionaries, as the present-day English-Japanese dictionaries also use kanji and hiragana for their Japanese equivalents. IEDJ uses kanji and hiragana when giving Japanese translations for example phrases and sentences, which is also similar to the technique applied in the present lexicography:

tangible a.

-明確せるとい, しっかりしたる, 実在的. 一 tangible distinction, 確たる区別, 一 tangible scheme, 実在的要訣.
IEDJ, however, uses katakana when giving Japanese equivalents to foreign loan words. Compare:

**waffle n.**
- ワッフル (一種の菓子). (IEDJ)
- ワーフル (一種ノ菓子). (SEJ)
- わっふる (一種の菓子). (MoEJ)

Only MoEJ uses hiragana to transcribe the word waffle in Japanese. It does so to distinguish foreign loan words from Japanese equivalents written in kanji and katakana. IEDJ is also similar to the present-day English-Japanese dictionaries in this respect, for it is conventional to write foreign loan words in katakana in the present-day Japanese orthographical system.

One of the outstanding features of IEDJ is that it gives abundant examples for many of its entries (cf. 4.2.). This is a remarkable contrast to MoEJ, which gives illustrative sentences rather sporadically and unsystematically. All the example phrases and example sentences are accompanied by Japanese translations. This is another noticeable difference from MoEJ and SEJ.

Sometimes collocations with prepositions are indicated after Japanese translations, but this is done so infrequently and not very systematically (cf. 4.3.). In fact, most of these indications are merely copies from the entries in COD. Usage notes are also given every now and then, but most of them are Japanese translations of those in COD (cf. 4.3.).

**6.2. Use of furigana**

It was mentioned in the last installment (Kokawa et al. 2000: 21) that both SEJ and MoEJ used furigana to indicate pronunciation of words written in kanji or Chinese characters. This system is taken over by IEDJ; not all kango or words written in kanji are accompanied by furigana, but most kango that are difficult to read are presented with furigana. The furigana are all in katakana and are put in square brackets (for explanation of the Japanese orthographical system, see Kokawa et al. 1996: 99ff.). Consider the following examples:

**6.3. Sense discrimination and arrangement of Japanese equivalents**

**6.3.1. Presentation of Japanese equivalents**

When an entry word has several different senses, each sense group is demarcated by the Japanese numerals in IEDJ. Systematic use of numbers has also been applied in MoEJ and SEJ (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000: 6.5.), and it is still used in present-day English-Japanese dictionaries.

A brief survey reveals that the sense discrimination and arrangement of sense groups in IEDJ are quite similar to those in COD. It could be said...
that most of the Japanese definitions in IEDJ are literal translations of the word definitions in COD.

However, when the literal translation might have become lengthy or redundant, IEDJ opted for adopting concise Japanese equivalents. In choosing appropriate Japanese equivalents, it seems that IEDJ depended heavily on both MoEJ and SEJ. IEDJ typically presents several different equivalents for one sense group of an entry word. This may be because IEDJ borrowed the Japanese equivalents from both of the two preceding dictionaries. Consider the word definition in IEDJ for the entry word table.

COD provides the following definition: "Article of furniture consisting of flat top of wood or marble &c. & one or more usu. vertical supports esp. one on which meals are laid out, articles of use or ornament kept, work done, or games played; ..." Instead of translating this definition literally, IEDJ selects and adopts concise Japanese equivalents from the equivalents provided for this word in MoEJ and SEJ. IEDJ provides seven different equivalents for this sense of the word table: テーブル, 卓, 食卓, 杓, 樐, 玩戯樐, 仕事樐. Four of these equivalents (卓, 食卓, 杓, 樐) are common in both MoEJ and SEJ. Two of these equivalents (テーブル, 玩戯樐) may be from MoEJ. The equivalent 仕事樐 is the only original equivalent found in IEDJ. The influence of SEJ and MoEJ on the Japanese equivalents in IEDJ will be discussed in more detail in 6.5.1.

6.3.2. Indication of collocations

6.3.2.1. Indication of selection restriction

IEDJ indicates selection restriction for its entry words, albeit rather unsystematically. This practice is not applied in SEJ and MoEJ. The information on selection restriction is taken as it is from COD and translated into Japanese. The selection restriction is indicated either before or after the Japanese equivalents. Consider the following examples:

eat vt.
Masticate & swallow (solid food); swallow (soup); ... (COD)
● 食ぶ; 吸ふ (スープ等を) (IEDJ)
■ 食ぶ [例 to ~ bread; to ~ dinner] (SEJ)
● 食ぶ, 喫(う)ぶ, 喫(う)ス (MoEJ)

Since the information on selection restriction in IEDJ is often a literal translation of that in COD, the information in IEDJ is usually placed where the information is in COD. Thus, in the case of eat, (solid food) and (soup) are translated as (スープ等を), and placed after the Japanese equivalents 食ぶ and 吸ふ. In the case of tall, (Of person) and (of tree, steeple, mast, &c.) are translated as (人に付き) and (樹木・塔・権等の) respectively, and are placed before the Japanese equivalents of each sense group.

Neither SEJ nor MoEJ indicates the selection restriction for the verb eat and the adjective tall. SEJ, however, provides the two words with examples; thus the dictionary users are able to infer the nouns that may collocate with the verb and the adjective by looking at the examples. IEDJ is more convenient than SEJ and MoEJ in that it indicates the selection restriction explicitly by incorporating the information into its definitions of the entry words.

6.3.2.2. Indication of prepositions

IEDJ is also different from SEJ and MoEJ in that it presents prepositions that occur with main entry words. IEDJ says in the front matter (p. 2) that it provides entry words with prepositions that may accompany them and puts the prepositions or prepositional phrases in double parentheses after the Japanese equivalents. Let's take the word talent as an example:

talent n.
Special aptitude, faculty, gift, (for music &c., for doing; see Matt. xxv. 14–30), high mental ability, whence talented, talentless, aa.; ... (COD)
● 才能, 技術, 才幹, 手腕, 能力, 《+ for music, for doing》 (IEDJ)
In this case, IEDJ shows that the preposition for may follow the word and also shows the possible objects such as music and a gerund. As we can see from the above example, this practice of presenting prepositions is adopted from COD. The entry of the word talent in IEDJ is quite similar to that in COD, including the indication of the preposition. There are other similar examples, such as encroach, tarry² (v.i.), wait³.

Indication of prepositions that regularly collocate with entry words is not consistently done in SEJ and MoEJ. Thus, IEDJ is different from the other two dictionaries in this respect.

6.4. Definition of derivatives

It has been asserted by preceding students that most of the word definitions in IEDJ are literal Japanese translations of those in COD (see Kojima 1999: 383–85, Nagashima 1996: 199). The practice of providing Japanese equivalents for derivatives of main entry words is not applied in COD, but this is also a practice inherited from SEJ and MoEJ for the benefit of Japanese dictionary users. Derivatives of main entry words are often presented as run-on entry words in COD. However, IEDJ gives derivatives main entry status and provides them with definitions. This is a different principle taken by IEDJ; for COD does not give definitions to derivatives, especially in the case of the adverbs produced by the addition of the suffix -ly and the nouns derived with the addition of the suffix -ness.

Let's take the words earnestly and earnestness as examples. The adjective earnestly is a derivative of the adjective earnest and is presented as a main entry word in IEDJ. It is accompanied by the Japanese equivalents: 真面目に, 熱心に, 切に. The noun earnestness also seems to be given the main-entry status, and is provided with the Japanese equivalents: 真面目, 熱心, 本気. In COD, both earnestly and earnestness are run-on entries of the adjective earnest, and neither of them are provided with definitions. Compare:

earnest¹ a. & n. Serious, zealous, not trifling; ardent (desire &c.);
in e., serious(ly), not jesting(ly). Hence earnest² adv., earnestness n. (COD)

earnestly, ad. 真面目に, 熱心に, 切に. earnestness, n. 真面目, 熱心, 本気. (IEDJ)

IEDJ follows SEJ and MoEJ in providing Japanese equivalents to the derivatives, but it does so more consistently than SEJ and MoEJ.

When providing definitions to derivatives, IEDJ seems to have consulted MoEJ and SEJ in search of appropriate Japanese equivalents. For the word earnestness, for example, it appears that IEDJ adopted the equivalents from both SEJ and MoEJ:

earnestness n.

真面目, 熱心, 本気. (IEDJ)

熱心 [例 to seek or ask with ~; to engage in a work with ~]. 本気, 真摯, マジメ [例 a man of great ~; The charge was maintained with much ~]. (SEJ)

熱心, 熱誠, 切責. 本気, 真意, 真摯, 實儀. (MoEJ)

IEDJ presents three Japanese equivalents to the word earnestness. Of the three, the first equivalent 真面目 is also presented in SEJ, although there it is written in katakana. The second and the third equivalents, 熱心 and 本気, respectively, appear in both SEJ and MoEJ.

Needless to say, it is too rash to jump to the conclusion that IEDJ depended on SEJ and MoEJ for its Japanese equivalents based only on the above evidence; for it is difficult to think of any other appropriate Japanese equivalents besides the ones that IEDJ presented even without the consultation to the two preceding dictionaries. Sections 6.5.1. and 6.5.2. discuss the influence of SEJ and MoEJ on the Japanese equivalents in IEDJ in more detail.

6.5. Influence of SEJ and MoEJ on IEDJ

6.5.1. The base of Japanese equivalents in IEDJ

As mentioned in 6.3.1., IEDJ often adopts its Japanese equivalents from both SEJ and MoEJ. When literal Japanese translation of the definitions in COD might have made the definitions in IEDJ redundant and unclear,
IEDJ adopted concise Japanese equivalents from the preceding two English-Japanese dictionaries to avoid the situation. Take an example:

**tale n.**

True or usu. fictitious narrative esp. one imaginatively treated, story, as tell him a t., a true t. of the Crusades, old wives' tt., marvellous legendary tt., t. of a tub, idle fiction, prefer to tell my own t. (give my own account of the matter), thing tells its own t. (is significant, requires no comment, explains itself); malicious report whether true or false, as all sorts of tt. will get about, tell tt. (out of school), report esp. with malicious intention what is meant to be secret, talebearer, person who does this, so talebearer a. & n.; taleteller, one who tells tt. (in either sense); (archaic, rhet., poet.) number, total, as the t. is complete, shepherd tells his t. (of sheep). (COD)

- tale n. [a fairy-～].
- talk, word, talk, tale (n.).
- tale, story, tale (n.).
- tell (vi.).
- tale, a tale (n.).
- tale, a tale (n.).
- tale, a tale (n.).
- tale, a tale (n.).
- tale, a tale (n.).

By comparing IEDJ and SEJ, we can see that IEDJ adopted three Japanese equivalents from SEJ: 桃, 話, 故事; while, as the comparison between IEDJ and MoEJ shows, IEDJ adopted six Japanese equivalents from MoEJ: 桃, 話, 故事, 故事, 故事, 故事. It seems that IEDJ tends to adopt more Japanese equivalents from MoEJ than it does from SEJ. Examples besides the one presented above are: earth1 (n.), ease1 (n.), eccentric (a.), echo1 (n.), economic (a.); tabard (n.), tabernacle (n.), table (n.), tablet (n.), taboo (n.); waddle (vi.), wogger (n.), waft (vt.), wage1 (n.) and wail (vi.).

Nagashima (1996: 196) points out that Japanese equivalents in IEDJ are based on MoEJ. To illustrate his point he gives examples such as act (n.), adaptation, analogy, control (n.), perception, universality and validity. He continues that IEDJ can be considered a revised version of MoEJ in terms of its Japanese equivalents. He even speculates that Inouye had the commercial intention of superseding MoEJ, the most popular English-Japanese dictionary of the time. He supports his speculation by asserting that
6.5.3. Style of Japanese equivalents in IEDJ

Although Japanese equivalents in IEDJ are often based on MoEJ, their style is rather different. Specifically, they are not as colloquial as the ones in MoEJ:

\[ \text{echo}^2 \text{n.} \]

Repetition of sound by reflexion of sound-waves. \((\text{COD})\)
\[ \bullet \text{反響}^2 \text{, 木霊}^2 \text{, コダマ}. \]
\[ \text{反響}^2 \text{, 喜音}^2, 佳音, 回音, コダマ}. \] \((\text{MoEJ})\)

Comparing IEDJ and MoEJ, we notice that the Japanese equivalents 反響 and 木霊 in MoEJ are presented with furigana while in IEDJ they are not. The Japanese equivalent 木霊 is also written in kanji in MoEJ, while it is written in katakana and sounds more colloquial in MoEJ.

It was pointed out in the last installment (Kokawa et al. 2000: 21ff.) that Inouye used abundant furigana for the convenience of dictionary users. The author of IEDJ, however, seems to have had more advanced learners of English in mind when he compiled the dictionary and spared the use of furigana, taking for granted that the dictionary users would be able to read and understand the Japanese equivalents provided in the dictionary without the help of furigana. Compare the Japanese equivalents given in MoEJ for the noun want. Seven out of the thirteen Japanese equivalents provided in MoEJ are presented with furigana, while none of the Japanese equivalents in IEDJ are accompanied by furigana:

want\(^1\) n.

\[ \bullet \text{乏乏}^1, \text{無きこと}^1, \text{不足}^1. \]
\[ \bullet \text{必要}^1, \text{不自由}^1, \text{窮すること}^1, \text{貧乏}^1 (+ \text{of}). \]
\[ \bullet \text{慾望}^1, \text{需要}^1, \text{要求}^1. \]
\[ \text{【鮮・方】智力缺乏}. \]
\[ \text{【欠乏】}, \text{不自由}^1, \text{不足}^1, \text{困窮}^1, \text{貧乏}^1, \text{缺乏物}, \text{必要}^1, \text{慾望}^1, \text{需要}^1. \]

6.5.4. Description of function words in IEDJ

The entries of function words in IEDJ are mostly literally translated into Japanese from those in COD. The number and the ordering of sense groups in the entries for function words in both dictionaries are often quite similar. Let us take the preposition of as an example. The entry for the preposition of is divided into eight sense groups in COD, and each sense group has its counterpart in the entry for the preposition of in IEDJ. Moreover, the sense groups in IEDJ are in exactly the same order as those in COD:

\[ \text{of prep.} \]

\[ \bullet \text{1. Removal, separation, point of departure, privation...; 2. origin, derivation, cause, agency, authorship...; 3. material, substance, closer definition, identity...; 4. concern, reference, direction, respect...; 5. objective relation...; 6. description, quality, condition...; 7. partition, classification, inclusion, selection...; 8. belonging, connexion, possession...} \]

The example above clearly shows that the author of IEDJ literally translated the entry for the preposition of in COD into Japanese and rendered it as the entry for the preposition of in IEDJ. In each sense group, Inouye first presents the possible Japanese equivalents, and then summarizes the meanings of the equivalents in the parentheses. This summary of the meanings is the translation of the definitions in COD.

The entry for the prefix for- in IEDJ shows that even the usage note for the entry in IEDJ is the exact translation of that given in the entry for the prefix for- in COD:
for- pref.

formerly very common, but remaining only in some dozen common words. Meanings: (1) away, off, apart, (forby, forget, forgive); (2) prohibition (forbid, forfend); (3) abstinence, neglect, (forbear, forgo, forsake, forswear); (4) bad effect (fordo); (5) excess, intensity, (forlorn, forpne, forworn). (COD)


We can see that the usage note in COD (formerly very common, but remaining only in some dozen common words) is literally translated into Japanese in IEDJ as 元数多ありしも今普通語にては十二位なり. It is also worth mentioning that the illustrative words in IEDJ are mostly the same as the ones given in COD. Other examples are in (prep.), to (prep.) and with (prep.). Regarding in (prep.), the equivalents are not the exact translations of those in COD, but the examples are mostly taken from COD.

There are, however, some function words whose entry descriptions are quite different from those in COD. Let us compare the entries for the adverb in of IEDJ, SEJ and COD:

in2 ad.

expr. Position bounded by certain limits or motion to a point enclosed by them, as: come i., send him i., walk i., (into house, enclosed ground, &c.), put a notice i. (into a paper), lock him i., he is i. (the house &c., exp. = at home); i. with it, put, take, it i.; throw i. the harness (to the bargain, in addition); a coat with the woolly side i. (nearest the body); the Liberals were i. (office); (Crick.) before he had been i. (batting) five minutes; keep the fire i. (burning); train, boat, summer, is i. (arrived); (with trans.vbs) burn, cut, rub, (thing) i. (so as to penetrate into another), hem, cover, wall, (thing) i. (so as to enclose it); i. for, involved in, committed to, (usu. something unpleasant, esp. it) also, engaged in competition for (race, prize, &c.); be, keep, i. (on friendly terms) with; breed i. & i. (repeatedly within same stock); i. & out, now i., now out. (COD)

● (ある制限或は運動の)内へ. 中へ. ●在宅にて, 近く. ●【俗】その上に. ●【帆】(帆を)上げて, 収めて, ... (IEDJ)

Comparing the entries above, clearly the entry of IEDJ is not a translation of the entry in COD. The Japanese equivalents used in the entry for the adverb in IEDJ are quite similar to those used in SEJ, and it is also noticeable that the usage label used in SEJ (which means slang) is also used in IEDJ. The similar definition and the common use of the same usage label suggest that IEDJ referred to SEJ when the entry for the function word was written. Other function words with definitions similar to those given in SEJ are by (adv.), for (conj.) and from (conj.). The author of IEDJ may have been persuaded to use SEJ as a reference when writing his entries for function words because SEJ was known for its detailed grammatical descriptions of entry words (for further detail, refer to the last installment Kokawa et al. 2000). Regarding the entries for function words in particular, the descriptions in SEJ were more accurate than those given in MoEJ.

6.6. Japanese equivalents of technical terms

As noted in section 4, IEDJ includes a large number of technical terms especially those in the field of science — among its entry words. This may originate from Inouye’s intention around the time of publication of the dictionary: to encourage Japanese youth to read more scientific books written in English for general readers from the West. He believed that reading scientific books in Japanese would help Japanese youth not only learn practical English, but also acquire common sense (cf. 4.1).

6.6.1. The sample data

The first 100 main entry words for the letters E, T and W were taken as sample data to examine the technical terms in IEDJ. The words in the sample were compared with the entry words in COD, and those that were found in IEDJ but not in COD were considered entry words that Inouye chose to include without referring to COD, the dictionary upon which
There are 35 main entry words in the sample data from the letter E that cannot be found in COD. Among these 35 words, there are 14 words that have subject labels attached. These words can be considered technical terms of designated fields. Close observation reveals that there are 4 words that have the label [植] (botany) attached, and this was the largest number of words in any one designated field among the sample data. These 4 botanical words are followed by the 3 words that have the label [動] (zoology) attached.

Words labeled with either [植] or [動] are consistently large in number in IEDJ (cf. 4.1.3.). Under the letter T, there are 14 words that are in IEDJ but not in COD. There are 5 words that have subject labels attached, and 3 of them have the subject label [動]. For W, there are 16 words that are included in IEDJ but not found among the entry words in COD. Of these 16 words, there are 6 words that have subject labels attached, and of these 6 words, 2 words have the label [植] and one has the label [動]. What is interesting is that the rest have the labels [鳥] (bird), [蛾] (moth) and [蝶] (butterfly). Even though the latter three do not have the labels [植] or [動], they do carry the labels that belong to the scientific field.

Looking at the sample words that are included in IEDJ but not found in COD, the percentage of the words that have subject labels attached among those words is around 40% in all of the sample letters. This indicates that Inouye may have made an effort to include many technical words in IEDJ.

It is interesting to consider what Inouye referred to when he gave Japanese equivalents to those technical terms. One possibility is that he adopted the same equivalent that SEI and MoEJ used. It must have been a reasonable decision, for MoEJ itself was considered to be an encyclopedic dictionary (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000) and contained a large number of encyclopedic items among its entry words. If we take the main entry word Echinoidea as an example, IEDJ adopts the same equivalent that MoEJ gives:

**Echinoidea n.**

【動】海膽[2]類(學名). \( (IEDJ) \)

(動) 海膽屬. \( (SEJ) \)
By comparing the Japanese equivalents in the three dictionaries, we notice that IEDJ adopted the Japanese equivalents from SEJ and MoEJ. What is interesting, however, is the last Japanese equivalent in IEDJ. The Japanese word 脊髄病 means tabes dorsalis or locomotor ataxia. The Japanese equivalent for the word tabes is 病; therefore, it is not precise to give the equivalent 脊髄病 to tabes. In fact, COD gives the illustrative phrase dorsal t. followed by the description of the symptom of the disease in the entry of tabes. IEDJ, however, does not give this compound word as an example. It is TJ3 that gives the Japanese word 脊髄病 as the equivalent of the word tabes:

**Tabes** (Lat. tabere, to waste away; Ger. *Tabes*; Fr. *tabes*) 脊髄病 (TJ3)

IEDJ may have referred to TJ3 when giving Japanese equivalents to its technical terms and adopted the word 脊髄病 as the Japanese equivalent of tabes without realizing the inappropriateness of the equivalent.

The other example is the entry word wage-fund. This word cannot be found in SEJ or MoEJ. IEDJ gives the Japanese equivalent 労銀基金 to this compound word. TJ3 does not have wage-fund as its entry word but has wage-fund theory as its main entry word. To wage-fund theory, TJ3 gives the Japanese equivalent 労銀基金. Since Japanese word 貸 corresponds to the word theory, 労銀基金 corresponds to the word wage-fund. It may be inferred that the author of IEDJ looked up the word wage-fund in TJ3 and used the equivalent in TJ3 for his dictionary.

There are many other entry words in IEDJ that have the same Japanese equivalents found in TJ3. For example, economics (n.), edit (n.), education (n.), effeminacy (n.); tact (n.), talent (n.), Taoism (n.), taste (n.); wage (n.), want (n.). However, we cannot make the rash speculation that IEDJ depended heavily on TJ3 when giving Japanese equivalents to those entry words, for those Japanese equivalents are also used in MoEJ. It seems more likely that IEDJ used MoEJ as the primary source when giving Japanese equivalents to technical terms. In this case, TJ3 would probably have been used as the supplement; that is, Inouye might have referred to TJ3 when he couldn't find appropriate Japanese equivalents in MoEJ or

### 6.7. Summary

IEDJ was a dictionary compiled for advanced learners of English. Therefore, it did not use as much furigana as the other dictionaries, SEJ and MoEJ. The style of its Japanese equivalents was not excessively colloquial compared to the style of MoEJ.

IEDJ provided its entry words with colloquial information. It indicated grammatically compatible objects to verbs, for example. It also presented prepositions that could collocate with the entry words. The information was mostly translation of the information in COD, but it must have been of use for the Japanese users of the dictionary.

IEDJ was heavily dependent on COD when giving definitions to its entry words, including function words. Many definitions in IEDJ were Japanese translations of the definitions in COD. IEDJ was also based on SEJ and MoEJ in terms of its Japanese equivalents; IEDJ often adopted Japanese equivalents that were used in SEJ and MoEJ.

Derivatives of main entry words in IEDJ were provided with Japanese equivalents. SEJ and MoEJ also gave Japanese equivalents to derivatives, but the practice was done more consistently in IEDJ.

IEDJ included a large number of technical terms — especially in the field of science — as its entry words. This may have been due to the author's intention to encourage the Japanese youth of the time to read more scientific reading material, not only to improve their English, but also to obtain basic knowledge of science. When giving Japanese equivalents to those technical terms, IEDJ seems to have used not only SEJ and MoEJ, but also TJ3, an authorized dictionary of technical terms of the time.

In short, IEDJ can be considered a Japanese translation of COD with some improvements for the benefit of Japanese dictionary users.

(Subsections 6.1-6.5.3 by Takahashi, Section 6.5.4 by Takahashi and Tominaga, Sections 6.6-6.7 by Takahashi)
labels, many of which are not found in the former (and it should be added that COD does not always show the labels in OED) (cf. 6.6.). It should be noted that MoEJ and SRJ before IEDJ was issued give a large number of labels in the front matter, which is apparently considered to have had more influence on IEDJ (cf. Kokawa et al. 2000: Section 6.4). The fact that IEDJ tries to include a lot of encyclopedic entries (cf. 4.1.) naturally led the editor to employ more labels in his dictionary. MoEJ includes 62 specialized subject field labels and seven labels related to frequency, currency or style, while IEDJ has 68 subject field labels and 22 labels related to region, currency or style. Three fourths of the field labels in IEDJ (51 out of 68) coincide with those in MoEJ, and 41 out of 68 labels are the same as those in SRJ. The evidence reveals that the editor was more conscious of the field labels in MoEJ rather than those in SRJ.\(^1\) It should be noted that the labels related to field, currency or style follow those of SRJ, because 15 out of 22 coincide. IEDJ also includes seven labels that are found neither in any of the two dictionaries: five of them are found in one or more than one of the five concise dictionaries, such as [衆](Greek), [四](Spanish), [詩](poetic), [修](rhetorical), and [陽](jocular). Two special labels found nowhere else are also to be found: one is [小児](children) which is in fact shown in COD in a form of (used by children) in some entries' definitions, like papa, and mama, and the other is [観](Austria), but this writer is rather doubtful whether the latter is really used in the text. The above facts have led this writer to conclude that the labels in the front matter in IEDJ could be said to have been under the strong influence of the two dictionaries in appearance, but the survey shows that in reality they are mainly shown based on the description in the text of COD. It should be added that some labels in IEDJ include specific fields, such as [猟](hunting) or [蝶](butterfly).

A brief survey shows that Inouye's dictionary even contains some labels that are not referred to in the front matter: at least 30 kinds can be easily found. Some are shown in parentheses in the definition in COD: gulf • [大學・俗](University slang), hard • [聲音](Phonetics), hipe (vt.) • [相撲](wrestling), and morbidessa • [繪畫](painting), for example. Some are given by referring to the definition or etymology: gulf • [聖書](Luke xvi.26),
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Mahabharata • [梵](Skr.), mannerism • [文藝](art or literature), and matin • [英國國教](Church of England). There are some usage labels that are taken from other dictionaries: absquatulate • [米俗](American slang), which is considered to have been taken from N Standard, and (in the entry of happen) happen in with [俗] (slang) taken from WNID or N Standard, in both of which the expression is labeled (colloquial). There is a difference between COD and IEDJ: some labels are given only in COD; in abscission (surg.), absolutism (Theol.), abutter (law), acaulose (bot.), and accelerated (physics), while some are given only in IEDJ; in abscess • [腫](medicine), abscess(e) • [数](mathematics), absinth(e) • [植](botany), absolution • [法](law), hamite • [地質](geology), haugh • [蘇](Scottish), maltworm • [語](jocular or humorous), and mangy • [俗] (slang). The labels of some entries that are not given in COD are supplied by the editor by reference to the concise dictionaries or some other sources: malevolent • [占星](astrology) (from SSD), manes • [古羅馬](old Roman) (from MDEL), mercutilize • [賢](photography) (from CoED), and merlon • [築城](fortification) (from CoED or ChED) can be identified, but not in the entries like hairlead [印刷] (printing) and half=buttt [球類](billiards). Some are labeled [未](US): (in the entry handle) to fly off [at] the handle, to go off the handle and (in the entry happen) happen in, the source of which has not been identified. (Curiously enough, the advertisement of the dictionary says that it avoids Americanisms.) Note also that there is a difference of translation of labels in the text, such as slang, colloquial, and popular, which are sometimes given different translations from the present-day usage of English-Japanese dictionaries as they are so confusing.

The facts clearly show that the editor tries in every way to include more encyclopedic information with labels attached in the entries, which is in accordance with his principle of giving additional entries that are not given in COD. But the labels in the dictionary do not necessarily correspond with or include those in COD and it is not clear whether he really recognized the usefulness of labels to users. It is not clear either whether he really succeeded in making them useful for students or readers, but in principle he endeavors to give a large number of labels in COD, with the result that he often ignores the labels given in the front matter in IEDJ, and caused
them to be inconsistent and ad hoc.

(Section 7 by Dohi)

8. Cultural Information and Miscellaneous Matter

There is a prominent feature in IEDJ: giving encyclopedic, cultural or factual explanations in some entries. This is considered to have been given by the editor based on the description in COD. It is true that some explanations in the dictionary are built on COD: bell (bell, book & candle), cabal (the Cabal), city (City Company) and comedy (Old, Middle, New Comedy), for instance. In many entries he gives cultural descriptions or explains what they are, which is not at all given in COD. For example, in the entry blue, it refers to the distinction of dark blue and light blue, in association with Oxford University and Cambridge University, and Eton College and Harrow School (note that Eton is included, but Harrow is not, in IEDJ). Let some of such entries be listed: admiralty (on Admiralty in Britain), agnomen, army (on Army Council), Ave Maria, canon (in connection with the Church of England), chapel (on the kinds of chapel in the Church of England), chemist (on the difference between chemist-and-druggist), Chiltern Hundreds, college (in comparison with university), dinner (in comparison with supper), earl, fellow (in education), and public (on public school). Some of the descriptions, like Ave Maria, chapel and Chiltern Hundreds, might have been based on references with encyclopedic information, such as Century or (N) Standard, along with his life abroad. Information is given on not only education or educational institutions but also many other aspects of life, such as the armed forces and religion. Some entries even include information on the USA: cool (on the expression cooling period) and department (on the difference from office in British English), for example. This is considered to have been very instructive in a dictionary with many encyclopedia entries. Compared with MoEJ which only gives translation equivalents (though filled with illustrations), IEDJ endeavors to give as many entries of such kind as possible. Inouye thought it necessary to give an explanation for learners in some entries, especially those related to life abroad (and, probably, to be superior to its competitor MoEJ). As a result, the dictionary came to include detailed description on culture or life in Western countries, especially Great Britain (or the USA). This fact has led this writer to say that the editor endeavors to make his dictionary filled with cultural or factual information, which is not necessarily given in COD or MoEJ either. This seems to have been one of the reasons the dictionary became very popular. In this respect, the dictionary could be partially called a dictionary of culture and up-to-date information.

IEDJ is not consistent in its treatment of connotation of words, which is partially treated in COD and plays a prominent role in POD. This is pointed out by Fukuhara (1949: 111–21), who gives the example of dog in POD: “quadruped of various breeds allied to wolf & fox, noted for serviceableness to man in hunting, shepherding, guarding, & companionship, & for antipathy to cats (female, bitch; young, puppy, whelp; set of puppies, litter; sounds, bay, bark, howl, whine, yelp, yap, snarl, growl; bear young, whelp, pup, litter; cf. kennel, bow-wow; adj., canine . . . ).” (Compare the definition with COD’s “quadruped of many breeds wild & domesticated,” or that in COD 10 (1999) “a domesticated carnivorous mammal probably descended from the wolf, with a barking or howling voice, an acute sense of smell, and non-retractile claws.”) Phoenix is an example given in COD (Kunihiro 1960: 17–18): (Myth.) “bird, the only one of its kind, that after living five or six centuries in Arabian desert burnt itself on funeral pile & rose from the ashes with renewed youth to live through another cycle.” (Compare this definition with POD’s: “bird fabled to burn itself on a pyre & rise renewed from the ashes.”) For foreign learners, such information is important in recognizing the words in the culture they are used. IEDJ sometimes follows and gives a literal translation in Japanese in some entries, such as those related to animals or zoology; chameleon, halcyon, Newfoundland, while it does not in others: crocodile (in the expression of crocodile tears), mongoose, mushroom, ostrich, pelican, scorpion, swallow, swan, and turtle (dove). This means that the editor thinks that only translation equivalents should be given, and does not think it is very important to give associative or connotative explanation as part of the word. Whether he was conscious of this or not, the dictionary, under the strong influence of COD, is the first dictionary that partially gives such connota-
tive meanings in translation, more of which will be found in later dictionaries.\(^1\)

The worst or the most unreasonable thing in *IEDJ* is that it does not show encyclopedic matter in pictures or illustrations. *MoEJ* includes far more pictures in the text as if it were partly a picture dictionary. The reason *IEDJ* has no pictures is because it is more influenced by *COD* than by *MoEJ*. *COD* is a dictionary for native speakers, and not for foreign students. Even if native speakers understand encyclopedic entries by reading the definitions (but this writer suspects that it is quite doubtful whether such really is always the case), it does not guarantee that foreign students also understand only by reading the translation equivalents, especially in cases of technical terms or culture-specific vocabulary. The editor should have been more conscious of the two preceding dictionaries in the way of dealing with encyclopedic matter, especially *MoEJ*. Or possibly no picture is given because the editor tries to include more entries rather than seemingly redundant and space-consuming illustrations. He ignores the assumption that the more encyclopedic a dictionary is, the more difficult it could be for general users or students to understand or recognize the entries defined only in words.

*IEDJ* has no cross reference marker, such as an index marker, while one is given in *MoEJ* and *SEJ*. This means that the editor does not think highly of the system, though are included so many entries with no information given or with equal signs, in which users have to take the trouble to refer to another entry or other entries again.

(Section 8 by Dohi)

9. Conclusion

The advertisement in *IECJ* gives several special features of *IEDJ* as the very dictionary of dictionaries: 1) a large number of entries, 2) clear or unambiguous translation equivalents, 3) an abundance of examples, 4) detailed explanation, 5) a number of idioms or set phrases, 6) explanation of technical terms, 7) new words, 8) correct pronunciation, 9) user-friendliness for retrieval of information, 10) skillful editing, 11) clear printing, and 12) good bookbinding. Here the brief evaluation is given as our conclusive remark based on the survey. With regard to the number of entries, it is undoubtedly clear that the dictionary includes most of the entries of *COD* and also tries to include more entries, especially encyclopedic matter, some of which are overly technical. It could be safely said that the editor endeavors to give many translation equivalents, depending more on *MoEJ* than on *SEJ*, including those of technical terms. *IEDJ* often uses formal written Japanese equivalents, sparing the use of *furigana*, whereas *MoEJ* often uses rather colloquial ones. A number of examples are directly or indirectly taken or imitated from the examples in *COD*, and additional examples are also shown, and it is particularly remarkable that many encyclopedic examples are also included. As for the detailed explanation, the dictionary is considered to have been very useful for users not accustomed to life in foreign countries, especially in Britain or the United States, though the explanations are said to be given inconsistently or subjectively. With regard to idioms or set phrases, the dictionary includes most of the idioms and set phrases in *COD* as well as those taken from other sources of reference. But it is doubtful whether the dictionary gives a detailed explanation of technical terms, though it is partly a dictionary of technical terms. What does it mean by the expression 'new words'? When they are meant to be those entries that are not included in *MoEJ*, *SEJ* and other preceding dictionaries available at that time, it surely includes words that are found in neither *MoEJ*, *SEJ*, some concise dictionaries, *Century*, *N Standard* nor WNID. With regard to pronunciation, *IEDJ* is not so much influenced by *COD*. It mainly represents American pronunciation but also incorporates an aspect of British pronunciation. What does the expression 'user-friendly or user-friendliness' mean? In terms of the alphabetical arrangement, the dictionary is partly user-friendly, but not always so, as is mentioned in section 4. This writer is not sure what is meant by the term 'skillful editing'. When it means that the dictionary uses space economically, it is not the first example, but in terms of the fact that it could be considered to be a Japanese translation edition of *COD*, *IEDJ* is skillfully edited as it adapted the difficult concise dictionary for use by Japanese learners. The dictionary probably had a clear printing for a few or even several years after it was issued, but it is not certain whether later editions
or impressions were clearly printed, as it was so often reprinted. The dictionary did not wear well long in spite of the phrase ‘good bookbinding’. It is interesting to find that not only contents but also other aspects in dictionary compilation are mentioned as selling points.

Reading some essays by a few students or scholars of English such as Fukuhara (1949) has made us realize that IEDJ was one of the three most popularly known dictionaries in the Taisho era. MoEJ is said to be an encyclopedic dictionary and compiled by collaboration of many scholars especially in technical terms, while SEJ is more usage-oriented and compiled by one great man’s labor. The two dictionaries surely had an effect on the compilation of IEDJ. The survey of a small part of the dictionary shows that it endeavors to be superior to both dictionaries: it tries to be both encyclopedic and usage-oriented. The editor could not possibly ignore the two dictionaries, especially MoEJ. He was fortunate enough to obtain and make use of the British dictionary for native users, COD. COD gives mainly lexical entries with detailed definition that is very difficult to decode correctly, as well as compounds or hyphenated words, and derivatives. It is also filled with usage information with illustrative examples as well as common phrases and idiomatic expressions. It was considered to be the ideal dictionary by the editor.

But the editor was not satisfied with the information given in COD, and he tries to give more entries and information as well as encyclopedic and practical matter, partly because he was at the forefront of the study of English and thought it necessary to give worldly information since he worked for the Foreign Office while he was compiling his dictionary. In spite of the fact that he was not necessarily happy with the fame he won because of compiling some best-selling dictionaries for Japanese users (Omura 1967: 143), his experience of studying abroad, teaching at colleges or universities and working as a journalist or writer in an English newspaper and for the government all surely contributed to his practical compilation of dictionaries. His acquired sense of the English language as well as his practical knowledge of the world seems to have made the dictionary popular and well received among users in Japan.

To sum up, IEDJ is a dictionary that includes lexical information under the strong influence of COD and encyclopedic information. The dictionary is full of technical or special terms, surpassing MoEJ. It is a dictionary abundant in concrete phrase and sentence examples, as well as encyclopedic phrases. It could be seen as a trailblazing dictionary of language and culture, complete with up-to-date and factual information. It could also be said that it started to be compiled as a learners’ dictionary, ending up as a sort of a jack-of-all-trades dictionary, especially in technical terms.

COD is no easy dictionary for non-native users to decode correctly. Its information is given in the condensed, telegraphese style, and it is not clear how many Japanese users became acquainted with it. IEDJ, which may be called a dictionary that literally translated the text of COD (cf. Nagashima 1991: 3115) and was well adapted for Japanese users, is a very convenient and useful dictionary. This conversely means that COD is a superior dictionary though it is quite difficult for ordinary users to make a proper reference. In a historical perspective, MoEJ would continue to be a dictionary full of encyclopedic entries. IEDJ and another influential dictionary Jukugo-Hon’i-Eiwa-Chu-Jiten (Saito’s Idiomological English-Japanese Dictionary) would change the course of dictionary compilation in Japan, because both dictionaries made good use of COD, which is lexical-oriented rather than encyclopedic. Dictionaries issued later than 1915 would follow or imitate the method of making use of the British references, such as COD and POD as well as the great OED. In the historical development of lexicography of English-Japanese dictionaries, 1911 is the memorable year COD was issued, and 1915 is regarded as the starting point of the new period of lexicography. Since then, lexicography in Japan has been, and still is, undoubtedly under the strong influence of British dictionaries.

Notes
1) The original title is given in parentheses, and the translated title in square brackets.
2) For abbreviations of the dictionaries referred to in this installment, see the Cited Dictionaries and Their Abbreviations at the end of the article.
3) Before SEJ was published, there had already been a trend toward making much of basic or fundamental words in a dictionary around the turn of the twentieth century in Japan, especially in those works by S. Katsumata, who is the original and well known author of his collocation dictionary. His dictionaries, such as Thesaurus of Every-Day English (1915).
published at that
But the important thing to note is that the title
the second except that the latter includes an appendix of Select List of Classical and Mytho-
which we could not confirm.
Section 4
4) It took more than ten years after IEDJ was issued before the information on etymology
was included in a bilingual dictionary in Japan. The (first mainstream) dictionary that
gives etymological information, Kenkyusha's New English-Japanese Dictionary on Bilingual
Principles (*新英和大辞典*) (Kenkyusha, 1927), will be dealt with in a future installment.
Section 3
1) The preface reads: “The compilation of this dictionary has taken just four years and a
half [sic]. During the first eighteen months I worked at it in the mornings and evenings as
the daytime was spent at my office; but when I saw how slowly the work was progressing,
I resigned my post at the Foreign Office and have devoted myself exclusively during the last
three years to this dictionary.”
2) See our previous installment Dohi et al. (1998).
3) The preface quoted at 1) continues: “I should add that this work is entirely Japanese.
In its compilation I have not consulted any foreigner; indeed, I have hardly spoken to one
during the years I have been engaged on it.”
4) When the sales of IEDJ and IECJ are taken into account, the number of two million
copies could be judged to be reasonable. This writer saw the 147th edition (1927) of
IEDJ on Bilingual Grammar-School Standard Dictionary of the English Language
(1921) shows that
5) Little has been mentioned of abridged or concise editions of the Standard Dictionary,
but a brief survey in the Internet access to the Library of Congress (USA) and the British
Library (UK) has made it clear that at least several kinds of abridged editions had already
been published before Inouye's dictionary was published in 1915. Below are given in chro-
nomical order those smaller editions of the Standard Dictionary, with the respective year
of publication shown in parentheses.
- Students’ Edition of a Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1897),
- The Standard Intermediate-School Dictionary of the English Language (1899),
- The Comprehensive Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1902),
- The Office Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1902),
- The Grammar-School Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1902),
- The Concise Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1902),
- A Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1905),
- The Vest-Pocket Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1906),
- The Practical Standard Dictionary of the English Language (1914).
Two more dictionaries were published in 1915: The High School Standard Dictionary of the English Language and
The Desk Standard Dictionary of the English Language. (For the ninth book, this writer
would like to express special gratitude to Mr. Koichi OMIYA who informed him of its
copyright years of 1906 and 1913 after he made its survey in the British Library.)
No convincing reason is given by Inouye himself why the first dictionary was selected,
but there could be some reasons: (a) a reprinted edition was issued in Japan in 1899 by
Kyoeikishaoh and was readily available, (b) it is the oldest and most often reprinted
dictionary of the abridged editions of the Standard Dictionary (the 1910 impression of the
Students’ Edition gives the copyright years of 1897, 1902, 1905, 1906, and 1909), and
has the second largest number of pages, and (c) the title Students’ Edition was considered more
suitable for compiling his dictionary. This writer saw the 1898, 1905 and 1910 impressions
but he made use of the 1910 printing because there was no substantial difference in the text
between the 1898 impression and the 1910 impression.
One thing should be added. This writer wonders why it is that Inouye does not mention
any Webster's dictionaries. A Dictionary of the English Language (G. & C. Merriam),
with the title on the spine of Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, for example, was issued in 1898,
and there seems to be no reason why he makes no reference to Webster's dictionaries rather than
Standard dictionaries.
6) It should not be forgotten that around the turn of the twentieth century far more
concise dictionaries were issued in Britain than in the USA. Sakuma (1995: 4), for example,
mentions (a reprinted edition of) Nuttall’s Standard Dictionary of the English Language
(Frederick Warne, 1886) revised by J. Wood, and the name of James Stormonth though he
refers to neither Etymological and Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language (William
Blackwood and Sons, 1871), *A Dictionary of the English Language, Etymological, Pronouncing, and Explanatory* (William Blackwood and Sons, 1884), nor a few smaller dictionaries of his. Let this writer give some more examples: *Castell's English Dictionary* (Castell, 1891), *Collins' New Pocket Dictionary of the English Language* (Collins, 1912), *Blackie's Standard Shilling Dictionary* (Blackie and Son, 1903), *The Royal English Dictionary and Word Treasury* (Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1894), *An English Dictionary* by J. Ogilvie (Blackie and Son, 1867). The facts make it likely that they may also have been in some way or other influential in the compilation of bilingual (English-Japanese) dictionaries in Japan. The five concise dictionaries in the latter group except the first are mentioned in the advertisement of the monthly journal *Gakuto* (Vol. 15, No. 9) in 1911. Soon after this, the title of *COD* is found in its monthly bulletin of international bibliography (Vol. 15, No. 12).

7) Other articles in the journal include the one that makes reference to *COD* as a dictionary which is difficult to look up though cheap and instructive, and the one that reprints the review by *Modern Language Teaching* (Vol. 18. No. 21, 1911).

8) A comparison of the entries in *COD* and *IEDJ* is sometimes difficult because several kinds of entries in the former are included as main entries in the latter. In *COD* run-on entries are usually given after the expressions (whence . . . , also . . . , so . . . ). Some derived forms are shown, like (-)accred, and these compound forms are counted as one. *IEDJ* sometimes gives as an entry abbreviated forms, like *fan* (s.v. *January in COD*), and the forms shown in parentheses (also . . . ), like *acclimate* (s.v. *acclimatize in COD*). Some examples in *COD* shown in the entries of prefixes are given as main entries in *IEDJ*: *deconical, obcordate* and *obovate*. Some variant forms are shown more than once in the text: *ob* is also shown as a variant in the entry of *obeah*. Some entries in square brackets, i.e. the one related to etymology, are given as main entries, like *hatti=sherif*. Some main entries are given from the information in the definitions in *COD*: *hackneyed or marbled* is shown by reference to the explanation (esp. in p.p.) in the entry for *hackney or marble*. Part of the definition are used or given as main entries, like *economics* and *hazel-nut*. Or some examples are given as main entries, such as *east wind*. These facts led this writer to say that Table 1 gives a general picture, but from the non-native users’ point of view, it is undoubtedly clear that Inouye endeavors to make use of all kind of information related to lexical entries and to give as many entries as he could to enlarge the number, which should be constructively criticized.

9) For the sake of reference, a comparison between the entries in *IEDJ* and those in *MoEJ* is made. The figures below show the number of entries that are not to be found in *COD* but which are to be found in both *IEDJ* and *MoEJ*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A 24 (out of 58)</th>
<th>H 53 (out of 171)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J 29 (out of 113)</td>
<td>M 18 (out of 106)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result shows that the further we go, the less coincidence is to be found, meaning that the editor clearly endeavors to give more entries that are nowhere to be found in *MoEJ*. The total figure makes us realize that less than 30 percent of the same entries in *IEDJ* and *MoEJ* are to be found.

10) There are in fact to be found in *IEDJ* some entries that are given in the addenda of *COD*: for example, *Harrovon* (a.), (w.).

11) There is a title page missing in the edition of *WNID* this writer referred to. But it is regarded as the 1909 edition as it only includes the preface dated in 1909.

12) The treatment is not consistent in *IEDJ* because past participles are often given as an adjective and sometimes as a past participle.

13) As is already mentioned in section 3, in *SWJ* the editor says in the preface that he was helped by two Japanese in the work. The similar thing could also be said in *IWDJ*, because he says that "this work is entirely Japanese. In its compilation I have not consulted any foreigner, indeed, I have hardly spoken to one during the years I have been engaged on it. . . ." This means that Inouye compiled the work all by himself, supplementing the inverted examples in the text. The same thing can be applied to *MoEJ* and *SEJ*, but it is not clear why Inouye and the editors of *MoEJ* and *SEJ* chose such a method of not consulting native speakers even if they had a good command of English.

Section 5

1) *COD* does not show the pronunciation of a word when it can be easily inferred from the spelling. The pronunciation of a word is rewritten with diaritical marks only when the pronunciation cannot be inferred from the spelling.

2) *COD* uses two symbols, (or) and (ir). However, when the two groups of words are equally spelled or as in *short and port*, the difference in pronunciation is not shown.

Section 6

1) There is no numbering in the original definitions in *COD*.

2) The percentage was calculated as follows:

   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | E | 14 + 35 x 100 = 40% |
| T | 5 + 14 x 100 = 35.7% |
| W | 6 + 16 x 100 = 37.5% |

Section 7

1) At the turn of the twentieth century, some monolingual dictionaries already employed many kinds of subject field labels (for example, *CoED* includes more than 80 labels), with the result that it is also the case with some dictionaries issued here in Japan: for example, nearly 80 subject field labels are included in *英語便観共通語典* (*A Dictionary of English Phrases*) (Yubodo, 1909) by N. Kanda and T. Nannichi.

Section 8

1) Another piece of lexically important information in *POD* can be found in the latter half of the definition of *dog*. The dictionary shows some related words, which is "unmorphological techniques" (McArthur 1992: 414–15). Let what the Fowlers say in the preface be quoted: "... an experiment in collecting words that form a series and letting the reader know where to find them; he may fairly expect to be told not only the meaning of an ox . . . but also what the words for the ox of various ages and sexes . . . and so forth . . . ; an effort has been made to provide for this want by giving lists to which each word of such series contains a reference" (p. v). This kind of information may be considered, if applied wholly systematically, to constitute integrated lexical information, which is first pointed out by Watanabe (1928: 372–73) and further explained by Fukuura (1949: 120–31) and Kunihito (1960: 18–19).

*IEDJ* does not seriously take this information into account, but in the entry of *dog*, some
historically domesticated breeds are given: wolf-dog, greyhound, spaniel, hound, mastiff and terrier, which information is not to be found in COD. In this respect, IEDJ is considered to have been useful to those who have not acquired a large vocabulary.

The lexical information in COD as well as that in POD is utilized and given on large scale in the description of the entries in Kenkyusha’s New English-Japanese Dictionary on Bilingual Principles (1927).

CITED DICTIONARIES AND THEIR ABBREVIATIONS
(The number in the parentheses at the end shows the year the work referred to was issued.)

**Century 1**


**Century 2**


CoED


COD


COD 10


CoED

The Concise English Dictionary, ed. by C. Annandale. London Glasgow and Dublin: Blackie & Son Limited, 1903 (n. d. but before 1905)

IEDJ


IEDJ


Imperial


IWDDJ


MDEL


MoRJ


N Standard


OED


POD


SEJ


SSD


SWJ


TFJ


WEJ


WIDEL


WNID


**REFERENCES**

(The original title is shown in parentheses, and the translated title is shown in square brackets.)
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APPENDIX I

Reproduced here are a few pages from Inouye’s-Eiwa-Dai-Jiten, by courtesy of The Tsubouchi Memorial Theatre Museum (演劇博物館) of Waseda University (Waseda, Tokyo).

INOUYE’S ENGLISH-JAPANESE DICTIONARY

Photograph 1. Title page.
Of making many dictionaries there is no end. Another, and yet another, you exclaim; poor public, how bewildered it will be! My good sir, do not waste your breath; your poor public can take good care of itself. The lexicographer is no quack who palms off his worthless pills upon the ignorant; he trusts to the discernment of the public to make a judicious choice of the wares that are laid before it. He knows that his work must stand on its own merits. An author may labour for a few weeks, or even for a few months, to turn out a book of temporary interest, something to catch the public eye for a while; but he does not devote years and years to hard toil for a mere comet of a season; he cannot persevere so long unless he sincerely believes that his work is one of high excellence. He is aware that if it is superior, it will supplant those which have appeared before it and will hold the field until it is in its turn superseded by others of greater worth.

No book is more exposed to searching criticism than the dictionary. In other fields of literature tastes differ, and the poetry, fiction, and essays which do not appeal to some find favour with others; many read them uncritically and follow their own fancies in their choice. But it is different with dictionaries. Every one who consults a dictionary is its critic; the schoolboy and the man of business, the casual reader and the profound scholar praise or condemn it according as they find or miss in it the words they look for or the renderings they expect to alight upon. It must always meet a running fire of criticism; but it bravely holds on until, upon the appearance of a more successful rival, it reaches its field of honour. It vanishes altogether or takes refuge in the bibliophile's shelves. Its remains are sent to the paper-mill perhaps to make new sheets for its rival or are relegated to the street stall to make wrappers for trumpery articles.

But why waste the precious years on a work whose existence is so precarious? The precariousness comes of competition. Competition which is the life of trade, is as the very breath of his nostrils to the lexicographer. Though the trader knows that his goods may at any moment be outclassed or undersold, does he on that account shut up shop? And why should the lexicographer? Besides, even small service is true service while it lasts. The dictionary may help the plodding student on the path of knowledge and pull the blundering schoolboy through his lessons and examinations; and will they not, in after years when they have attained their object in life, look back with tenderness to their quondam friend in need? The gratitude of his readers is the author's highest meed. The book itself, it is true, may disappear, and with it the profits must go. But what matters? While they come in, we eat, drink, and make merry. And that is enough: what more can we hope for in this transitory world of ours?

JUKICHI INOUE

August, 1915.
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Photograph 6.
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Photograph 7. Key to pronunciation.

- sp, sp. e.g., sp. sp. sp. sp.
- sp., sp. sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp., sp. sp., sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp., sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
- sp. sp. sp. sp., sp. sp. sp.
Photograph 8. The abbreviations of grammatical terms and literary authors.

Reproduced here for comparison is the entry account from IRDJ, COD, MDEL, ChED, CeED, and SSD.

**APPENDIX 2**

In the hunt he accounted for three partridges and two hares.

His idleness accounts for his poverty.  "It is clear that there is a close connection between idleness and poverty."
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account, v.t. & l. Consider, regard as, (followed by obj. & complement or infin.; a. him a hero, wise, to be guilty). Be accounted of, be esteemed (alw. w. little, much, &c.). Account for: give reckoning (of money held in trust; answer for (conductor, performance of duty); explain the cause of; serve as explanation of (that accounts for it); sport be responsible for the death of, kill. [L. accounts, t. LL. accountable for *accomputare L = computare, the form account is due to 14th-c. correction in F passing into E, the oldest E being acounte (see ac)].

account, n. (1) Counting, calculation, in phrr. cast accounts (reckon up), money of a. (names not of coins, but of sums, as guinea). (2) Reckoning of debit and credit, in money or service. Statement of money received and expended, with balance; so open or close an a. with, render or send in, pay or settle, an a.; a. current (whence a/c = account), one kept going w. occasional entries; joint a., in which two persons not otherwise partners count as one; keep aa., enter all expenditure for comparison w. income; balance or square aa. with some one, receive or pay the balance due; cash, profit-and-loss, &c., a., headings of subdivision in ledger; sale for the a., on the Stock Exch., not for cash, but payable at next periodic settlement; A in a. with B, having credit relations with; for a. of, to be sold for (person); on a., as interim payment; on one's a., for his service; on one's own a. for and as one's own purposes and risk, whence generally on a. of, because of, and on no a., by no means, certainly not. A favourable result of the reckoning, profit; find one's a. in, profit by, turn to a., make useful. Statement of administration as required by creditor; ask, demand, yield, render, an a., call or bring to a., extended from money to conduct generally, so the great a., Day of Judgement, gone to his a., dead; give a. of, find cause of, explain, (in sport) give a good a. of, dispose of as profit, as game) successfully. (3) Estimation. Person or thing of, or held in, some or no a.; make little a. of; take into, leave out of, a.; take a. of; lay one's a. with, include in one's calculations, expect. (4) Narration, report, description, of event, person, &c. &c. [L. accounts & t. L. computare (com-putare, computum f. L. computare)].

accountable, a. Bound to give account, responsible, (for things, to persons, or abe.; explicable (sometime followed by for). Hence accountable, accountable, accountable

accountant, n. (Law) one liable to render account; defendant in an action of account. Professional keeper and inspector of accounts; a. general, chief a. in public offices; whence accountantship, n. (F. comptable, a. comptable part of account).
銀行: インカウンテッド, 人の所有者としての銀行帳の管理；個人: アカウント, 人の所有者としての個人の管理；商社: アカウント, 人の所有者としての商社の管理。