

Contrastive Research between the Folio Edition and the Abstracted Edition of Samuel Johnson's English Dictionary

MASATO KATANO

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to conduct a contrastive analysis of the folio edition of *A Dictionary of the English Language* by Samuel Johnson published in 1755 [henceforth "the folio"] and its abstracted edition published in 1756 [henceforth "the abstract"].

Section 2 in this paper will negate the concurrent-compilation presumption of the folio and the abstract, and it will affirm the presupposition of my research that the abstract was compiled through the process of abridging the folio after the folio was published.

Section 3 will conduct the contrastive analysis between the folio and the abstract.

Section 4 will conduct the research on Johnson's participation in the compilation of the abstract.

The Johnson's dictionaries used in this research are the reprinted edition of the first edition of the folio published by Yushodo Booksellers Ltd. in 1983, and the reproduced edition of the first edition of the abstract published by Kenkyusha Ltd. in 1985.

2. Negation of the concurrent-compilation presumption of the folio and the abstract

This research was conducted under the presupposition that the folio was first published, followed by the abstract which was published

through the process of abridging the folio. However, it is presumed by some scholars that the folio and the abstract were compiled concurrently. This section will attempt to negate this presumption.

Dille states that “from the outset of the *Dictionary* project, Johnson clearly conceived of different classes of dictionary users and understood that a significant proportion of the literate populace would not only find the folio dictionary too expensive but also superfluous to its language needs.¹⁾”

Hayakawa states that “it would be natural to think that as he was engaged in the lexicographical work, Johnson gradually came to hold the idea that he would publish the larger edition for the learned and the abstracted edition for the general readers²⁾” [translated by the writer of this paper].

Furthermore, Reddick states that “they [the booksellers] may have intended all along to publish an abridgement, delaying its publication in order not to discourage potential buyers from purchasing the two-volume folio edition.³⁾”

However, this concurrent-compilation presumption will be negated based on the following two points and it should be thought that the abstract was compiled anew by abridging the folio.

- (1) The typographical errors in the folio are corrected in the abstract.

Ex.: EASILY *adv.*

(folio)

(abstract)

1. Without difficulty.

1. Without difficulty.

3. Without pain;

2. Without pain;

3. Readily;

3. Readily;

Note that the number 3 assigned to the definition “Without pain” in the folio is revised to the number 2 in the abstract.

- (2) Some new information, which is not included in the folio, is added to the abstract, as is shown in (a) and (b):

(a) As is indicated in 3.2.7.(6) below, some definitions of the folio

are expanded to include some additional words in the abstract. Dille also states that “a number of definitions are subtly improved; for example, *addle-pated*, ‘having addled brains,’ is altered to ‘having barren brains’ in order to avoid repetition of the headword.⁴⁾”

- (b) As is indicated in 3.2.9.(5) below, in some cases, the definition which is missing in the folio is described in the abstract. Dille also states that “in the case of *ragamuffin* the definition was missing in the folio, and ‘A paltry mean fellow’ is supplied in the abstracted edition.⁵⁾ Dille further shows the example that “a new sense 2 for *canticle* is added, ‘The song of Solomon,’ a sense that does not appear in the folio editions.⁶⁾”

It can be assumed that if the folio and the abstract had been compiled concurrently, the revisions in the abstract indicated above would also have been incorporated in the folio.

3. Contrastive analysis of the folio and the abstract

3.1. Aim and method of the research

In order to clarify the principles in the process of compiling the abstract from the folio, the investigation was made concerning the headwords in the abstract which correspond to the headwords on every 50th page of the folio.

3.2. Results of the investigation

3.2.1. Number of pages

- (1) The folio:

There were a total of 45 pages analyzed, and after the 45th page, an additional 13 pages remained. Therefore, the total pages in the folio amount to 2,263 pages as a result of the calculation “50 pages × 45 pages analyzed + 13 remaining pages = 2,263 pages.”¹⁾

- (2) The abstract:

The first volume and the second volume comprise 540 pages and 544 pages respectively, and hence the total pages in the abstract amount to 1,084 pages.²⁾

3.2.2. Number of headwords

(1) The folio:

The number of headwords in the folio can be estimated to be 42,695 words based on the following calculation “849 words×50 pages×(2,263 pages÷(50 pages×45 pages analyzed))=42,695 words.”

(2) The abstract:

The number of headwords in the abstract can be estimated to be 40,482 words based on the following calculation “42,695 words×(805 words÷849 words)=40,482 words.”

3.2.3. Headwords

Table 1 lists the deleted headwords from the folio in compiling the abstract, which have been identified as a result of the investigation of every 50th page of the folio.

Table 1 Deleted headwords from the folio

Analysis page No.	First word	Last word	Num. of words in folio	Num. of words in abs.	Deleted words	Part of speech	Category
1	TO AGREE	AGUISHNESS	20	16	AGRESTICK or AGRESTICAL	adj.	Dictionary word
					AGRICOLA-TION	n.s.	Dictionary word
					AGUE PROOF	adj.	Compound
					TO AGUISE	v.a.	Obsolete word
2	APRONED	AQUILINE	21	19	AQUA MIRA-BILIS	(Not shown)	Foreign word
					AQUA REGIA or AQUA REGALIS	(Not shown)	Foreign word
3	TO BARBER	BARGAIN	19	18	BAREGNAWN	adj.	Compound
4	LASPHE-MOUSLY	TO BLAZON	14	13	BLATTERA-TION	n.s.	Derivative
5	BUNGLE	BURGH	32	31	BUR, BOUR, BOR	(Not shown)	Variant spelling

6	CHAIRMAN	CHAMBER	18	17	CHALK-PIT	n.s.	Compound
7	COESSENTIALITY	COFFIN-MAKER	23	22	COFFIN-MAKER	n.s.	Compound
8	CONSCIOUSNESS	CONSEQUENCE	21	20	CONSECUTIVELY	adv.	Derivative
9	CRAWFISH	TO CREATE	20	20			
10	DEFAME	DEFECTIVE	21	21			
11	DISCIPLINABLENESS	DISCOMFORT	17	17			
12	DRINK	TO DRIVE	11	10	DRIPPLE	adj.	Derivative
13	TO ENGRAPPLE	TO ENJOY	19	19			
14	EXTRAORDINARY	EXTREMITY	19	19			
15	FINE	FINERY	10	10			
16	FOUNTFUL	FRACTURE	31	31			
17	GIRASOLE	TO GISE	21	21			
18	GUNNERY	TO GUT	24	24			
19	TO HISS	TO HIT	15	14	HISTRIGNICALLY	adv.	Derivative
20	IMMINUTION	IMMURE	29	28	IMMORTALLY	adv.	Derivative
21	INSIGNIFICANT	INSOBRIETY	24	24			
22	KINGCUP	KITCHEN-STUFF	23	23			
23	LIGHTER	LIGHTSOMENESS	18	18			
24	TO MANAGE	MANDATE	18	18			
25	TO MISAPPLY	TO MISCAST	22	21	MISBEHAVED	adj.	Compound
26	NEAT	NECESSITY	19	19			
27	ONSET	TO OPE, TO OPEN	17	17			
28	TO PARSE	PART	10	10			
29	PIMP	PINCH	13	13			
30	TO PREDICATE	PREENGAGEMENT	18	18			
31	PUNICE	PUPPET-SHOW	23	22	TO PUNT	v.n.	Unclear etymology
32	TO RECOGNISE	RECOMPENSE	20	20			
33	RHETORICAL	RIB	21	21			
34	SAY	TO SCALD	21	21			
35	SETWAL	SEVERAL	16	16			
36	SLEAZY	SLEEPER	10	10			
37	TO SPIRIT	TO SPIRITUALIZE	13	13			
38	STRAIT	STRANGE	10	10			
39	SWEET	SWEETMEAT	13	13			
40	THRIFTY	THROE	13	12	THRO'	(Not shown)	Abbreviated word
41	TROUBLESOMELY	TRUANTSHIP	17	17			

42	UNAIMING	UNAPPEASED	29	7	1)		Derivative
43	UNSAFE	TO UNSEAM	27	24	2)		Derivative
44	WEAKSIDE	TO WEAR	16	16			
45	WRANGLE	WREATH	13	12	WREAKLESS	adj.	Unclear etymology
Total			849	805			

- 1) UNAIMING adj., UNAKING adj., UNALIENABLE adj., UNALLAYED adj., UNALTERABLE adj., UNALTERABLENESS n.s., UNALTERABLY adv., UNALTERED adj., UNAMAZED adj., UNAMBITIOUS adj., UNAMENDABLE adj., UNAMIABLE adj., UNANALYSED adj., UNANCHORED adj., UNANELED adj., UNANIMATED adj., UNANIMITY n.s., UNANIMOUSLY adv., UNANSWERABLY adv., UNAPPARUELLED adj., UNAPPARENT adj., UNAPPEASED adj.
- 2) UNSALUTED adj., UNSCOURED adj., UNSCRATCHED adj.

(1) Parts of speech:

The following is the number of deleted headwords shown in Table 1 in light of part of speech. It should be noted that the number of verbs is smaller than those of the other parts of speech among the deleted headwords:

Adjective	26
Noun	6
Adverb	6
Verb	2
Not shown ³⁾	4

(2) Word categories:

(a) Derivative words and compound words:

Table 2 shows the number of deleted headwords shown in Table 1 by category. It should be noted that derivatives account for the largest portion of the deleted headwords and that compounds account for the second largest. That may be because the meanings of derivatives and compounds can easily be surmised if the dictionary-user knows the meanings of the base of a derivative or the simple words for a compound. The same interpretation is presented by Dille⁴⁾.

(b) Foreign words and dictionary words:

The "foreign word" in Table 2 signifies the word whose headword is italicized in the folio. Johnson himself says that "it will

Table 2 Number of deleted headwords by category

Category	Number of deleted headwords
Derivative word	30
Compound word	5
Foreign word	2
Dictionary word	2
Words with unclear etymology	2
Obsolete word	1
Abbreviated word	1
Variant spelling	1

be proper to print those which are incorporated into the language in the usual character, and those which are still to be considered as foreign, in the Italick letter.⁵⁾

Furthermore, the “dictionary word” signifies the word which was not found in any book other than the dictionaries prior to Johnson’s folio.

(c) Obsolete words:

The only obsolete headword that was eliminated from the folio is the word “TO AGUISE.” This shows that Johnson did not regard obsolete words as a target of elimination. The same interpretation is presented by Hayakawa⁶⁾.

3.2.4. Typographic features

(1) The use of italic type:

- (a) The headwords which Johnson thinks are foreign words and therefore not established as English words are italicized in both the folio and the abstract.

Ex.: CREANCE. *n.s.*

(folio) *CREANCE*

(abstract) *CREANCE*

- (b) In the folio, the headwords in quotations are italicized, which

method is observed in some English-Japanese dictionaries of today. In the example below, the digit shown before the definition signifies the definition number for the headword.

Ex.: FINE. *adj.*

(folio) 1. Not coarse.

Not any skill'd in loops of fingering
fine, *Spenser.*

(abstract) 1. Not coarse.

(The quotation is deleted.) *Spenser.*

- (c) In the folio and the abstract, the headwords in definitions are italicized.

Ex.: CHALK. *n.s.*

(folio) *Chalk* is a white fossile,

(abstract) *Chalk* is a white fossile,

- (2) Unclear or blurred print:

Some letters are not printed clearly.

Ex.: (folio) (None of the unclear or blurred prints in
DEFEAT, DISCLOSURE are observed.)

(abstract)

DEFEAT. *n.s.*

In the etymology, the letter *e* after
the letter *d* in [from *defaire*,
French] is not printed clearly.

DISCLOSURE. *n.s.*

In the first definition, the letter *o*
after the letter *r* of the word *pro-*
duction is not printed clearly.

3.2.5. Phrasal verbs

Each phrasal verb is treated as a separate definition, and the word for an adverb is italicized.

Ex.: To DRIVE. *v.a.*

(folio) 17. *To DRIVE out.*

(abstract) 15. *To DRIVE out.*

To HIT. *v.a.*

(folio) 5. *To HIT off.*

(abstract) 5. *To HIT off.*

To WRAP. *v.a.*

(folio) 4. *To WRAP up.*

(abstract) 4. *To WRAP up.*

3.2.6. Punctuation

- (1) A semicolon is used between definitions and a colon is used between a definition and an illustrative sentence, which method is observed in some English-Japanese dictionaries of today.

Ex.: FINE. *adj.*

(folio) 6. Clear; pellucid; transparent: as, the wine is *fine.*

(abstract) 6. Clear; pellucid; transparent: as, the wine is *fine.*

- (2) In some cases, the usage of a comma differs between the folio and the abstract.

To PINCH. *v.a.*

(folio) 1. To squeeze between the fingers, or with the teeth.

(abstract) 1. To squeeze between the fingers or with the teeth. (There is no comma in the abstract.)

3.2.7. Definition

- (1) For some headwords, the definition of the abstract is newly made based on that of the folio.

Ex.: BARBER-MONGER. *n.s.*

(folio) A word of reproach in *Shakespeare*, which seems to signify a sop; a man decked out by his barber.

(abstract) A sop decked out by his barber.

- (2) For some headwords, a part of the definition of the folio is eliminated and the remaining part of the definition is written in the abstract.

Ex.: BLAST. *n.s.*

(folio) 2. The sound made by blowing any instrument of wind musick.

(abstract) 2. The sound made by any instrument of wind musick.

To ENHANCE. *v.a.*

(folio) 2. To raise; to advance; to heighten in price.

(abstract) 2. To raise; to advance in price.

- (3) For some headwords, a word in the definition of the folio is replaced by another word and written in the abstract as a definition.

Ex.: BURGEOIS. *n.s.*

(folio) 2. A type of a particular sort, probably so called from him who first used it

(abstract) 2. A type of a particular size.

(The word "sort" in the folio is replaced by the word "size" in the abstract.)

- (4) Some of the headwords which need an encyclopedic explanation as a definition have a long and detailed description even in the abstract.

Ex.: AQUA FORTIS.

- (5) Some of the headwords which need an encyclopedic explanation have a long and detailed description in the folio but have a partially eliminated explanation in the abstract.

Ex.: PARSNEP. *n.s.*

(folio) A plant with rose and umbellated flowers,

. . . .

(abstract) A plant.

- (6) Some definitions of the folio are enlarged with an additional description in the abstract.

Ex.: CONSEQUENCE. *n.s.*

(folio) 4. The last proposition of a syllogism;

(abstract) 4. The last proposition of a syllogism introduced by therefore;

- (7) In the case of polysemous words, the first definition in the folio is not necessarily incorporated in the abstract.

Ex.: HISTORICAL. *adj.*

(folio) 1. Containing or giving an account of facts and events.

2. Suitable or pertaining to history or narrative.

(abstract) Pertaining to history.

SCAFFOLDING. *n.s.*

(folio) 1. Temporary frames or stages.

2. Building slightly erected.

(abstract) Building slightly erected.

(In the case of the above-mentioned headwords, HISTORICAL, SCAFFOLDING, the first definition in the folio is eliminated in the abstract, but the second definition in the folio is described as the definition in the abstract.)

- (8) The illustrative explanation of a word in the folio is sometimes partially eliminated in the abstract. That occurs especially in the case of the explanation beginning with "as"

Ex.: MISCELLANE. *n.s.*

(folio) Mixed corn: as, wheat and rye.

(abstract) Mixed corn.

IMMURE. *n.s.*

(folio) A wall; an inclosure, as in *Shakespeare*.

(abstract) A wall; an inclosure.

- (9) Some definitions can be regarded as those which show Johnson's contempt for Scotland. Some of those definitions remain even in the abstract but others are eliminated in the abstract. However, it is possible to think that those definitions do not show his contempt for Scotland but that they merely reflect the actual usage of the words in Scotland in those days.

Ex.: TO GIRN. *v.n.*

(folio) Seems to be a corruption of *grin*. It is still used in Scotland, and is applied to a crabbed, captious, or peevish person.

(abstract) Seems to be a corruption of *grin*. Applied to a crabbe, captious, or peevish person.

(The part "It is still used in Scotland, and is" is deleted. The letter *d* after *crabbe* is not printed in the abstract.)

Ex.: KIRK. *n.s.*

(folio) An old word for a church, yet retained in Scotland.

(abstract) An old word for a church, yet retained in Scotland.

- (10) In the same headword, a word with a different etymology has its own definition with its etymological information following its definition number in the folio. However, in the abstract, the etymological information is eliminated.

Ex.: SAY. *n.s.*

(folio) 4. [*Soie*, French.] Silk. Obsolete.

(abstract) 4. Silk. Obsolete.

- (11) There is a case where a definition in the folio is carefully revised in the abstract.

Ex.: TROUT. *n.s.*

(folio) 1. A delicate spotted fish inhabiting brooks and quick streams.

(abstract) 1. Delicate spotted fish inhabiting brooks and quick streams.

(In the abstract, the indefinite article *a* is deleted from the folio.)

- (12) There is a case where an unnecessary description in the folio is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: BLAZE. *n.s.*

(folio) 3. *Blaze* is a white mark upon a horse, descending from the forehead almost to the nose.

(abstract) 3. A white mark upon a horse.

3.2.8. Etymology

- (1) The etymology of a compound word is shown as [... and ...].

Ex.: To FINEDRAW. *v.a.*

(folio) [*fine* and *draw*.]

(abstract) [*fine* and *draw*.]

- (2) When some different etymological words are shown in the folio, there is no consistency regarding which etymological word is shown in the abstract.

Ex.: IMMOBILITY. *n.s.*

(folio) [*immobilite*, French, from *immobilis*, Latin.]

(abstract) [*immobilite*, French.]

(The French etymological word is shown.)

IMMODERATE. *adj.*

(folio) [*immodere*, Fr. *immoderatus*, Latin.]

(abstract) [*immoderatus*, Lat.]
 (The Latin etymological word is shown.)

- (3) The etymology which Johnson lacks confidence in is described as such in the etymological explanation of the folio, but such an explanation is eliminated in the abstract. Moreover, the etymology itself is sometimes eliminated in the abstract when Johnson lacks confidence in it. Furthermore, such a word itself is sometimes eliminated as a headword in the abstract.

Ex.: HIST. *interj.*

(folio) [Of this word I know not the original: probably it may be a corruption of *hush*, *hush it*, *husht*, *hist*.]

(abstract) (The etymology is deleted.)

GIRL. *n.s.*

(folio) [About the etymology of this word there is much question: *Meric Casaubon*, as is his custom, derives it from . . . Dr. *Hickes* derives it most probably from the Islandick *karlinna*, a woman.]

(abstract) [Islandick *karlinna*, a woman.]
 (Only Dr. *Hickes*'s interpretation is shown.)

To THRIVE. *v.n.*

(folio) [Of this word there is found no satisfactory etymology: in the northern dialect they use *throdden*, *to make grow*; perhaps *throve* was the original word, from *throa*, Islandick, *to encrease*.]

(abstract) (The etymology is deleted.)

WREAKLESS. *adj.*

(folio) [I know not whether this word be miswritten

for *reckless*, careless; or comes from *wreak*,
revenge, and means unrevenging.]

(abstract) (The word is deleted as a headword.)

3.2.9. Typographical errors

- (1) There are some cases where the order of headwords is wrong in the folio, but it is corrected in the abstract.

Ex.: (folio) To PREENGAGE. *v.a.*
PREENGAGEMENT. *n.s.*
To PREEN. *v.a.*
To PREESTABLISH. *v.a.*

(abstract) To PREEN. *v.a.*
To PREENGAGE. *v.a.*
PREENGAGEMENT. *s.*
To PREESTABLISH. *v.a.*

- (2) The error in the description of part of speech in the folio is corrected in the abstract.

Ex.: MANAGE.

(folio) MANAGE. *v.a.*

(abstract) MANAGE. *s.*

(In the folio, the part of speech should be written as "*n.s.*" but it is mistakenly written as "*v.a.*")

- (3) In some cases, part of speech is correctly shown in the folio, but it is either missing or mistakenly written in the abstract.

Ex.: BURGANET. BURGONET

(folio) BURGANET. BURGONET. *n.s.*

(abstract) BURGANET, or BURGONET.

(The part of speech is missing in the abstract.)

- (4) Either the opening part or the closing part of a square bracket is sometimes missing in the abstract.

Ex.: BUOY. *n.s.*

(folio) [*boue*, or *boye*, Fr. *boya*, Span.]

(abstract) [*boue*, or *boye*, Fr.

(The closing part is missing.)

To DRIVE. *v.a.*

(folio) [*dreiban*, Gothick; . . . , Saxon; *dryven*, Dutch.]

(abstract) . . . , Saxon.]

(The opening part is missing.)

- (5) In some cases, the definition is missing in the folio, but it is described in the abstract.

Ex.: OPAQUE. *adj.*

(folio) OPAQUE. *adj.* (The definition is missing.)

(abstract) OPAQUE. *a.* Not transparent.

- (6) In some cases, the typographical error in the folio is corrected in the abstract.

Ex.: INSIPID. *adj.*

(folio) NSIPID. *adj.*

(abstract) INSIPID. *a.*

(The first "I" in the headword is missing in the folio, but it is printed in the abstract.)

To ENJOY. *v.a.*

(folio) To ENJOY. *v.a.* [*jouir*, *enj uir*, French]

(abstract) To ENJOY. *v.a.* [*jouir*, *enjouis*, Fr.]

(The letter "o" is missing in the folio, but it is printed in the abstract.)

3.2.10. Usage information

The usage information of a word is eliminated in the abstract.

- (1) The folio sometimes has the information as to the appropriateness of a word or usage. However, such usage information is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: To GIRT. *v.a.*

(folio) To gird; to encompass; to encircle. Not proper.

(abstract) To gird; to encompass; to encircle.

(The usage label "Not proper" is deleted.)

- (2) The folio sometimes has the information that the given word is used only by a particular author. However, such usage information is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: To IMMORTALIZE. *v.n.*

(folio) To become immortal. This word is, I think, peculiar to *Pope*.

(abstract) To become immortal.

- (3) In the folio, the definition of a word sometimes includes the usage information as to the style of the given word or the attitude in using the word. However, such usage information is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: LIGHTFOOT. *n.s.*

(folio) Venison. A cant word.

(abstract) Venison.

TROUBLOUS. *adj.*

(folio) Tumultuous; confused; disordered; put into commotion. An elegant word, but disused.

(abstract) Tumultuous; confused; disordered; put into commotion.

- (4) There is a case where the usage information as to the field in which a word is used is shown in the etymology in the folio, but it is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: To OPE. To OPEN. *v.a.*

(folio) [open, Saxon; *op*, Islandick, a hole. *Ope* is used only in poetry, when one syllable is more convenient than two.]

(abstract) [open, Saxon; *op*, Islandick, a hole.]
 (“*Ope* is used only in poetry, when one syllable is more convenient than two” is deleted in the abstract.)

- (5) The information as to the incorrect usage is shown in the folio, but it is eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: SLEDGE. *n.s.*

(folio) 2. A carriage without wheels, or with very low wheels ; properly a *sled*. See SLED.

(abstract) 2. A carriage without wheels, or with very low wheels.

To THRIVE. *v.n.*

(folio) pret. *throve*. and sometimes less properly *thrived*. part. *thriven*.

(abstract) pret. *throve*, *thrived*. part. *thriven*.
 (“and sometimes less properly” is deleted in the abstract.)

3.2.11. Names of authors

- (1) In principle, in the folio, only the name of the author’s work is shown after the quotation, whereas in the abstract, only the name of the author is shown without a quotation from the author’s work.

Ex.: DEFEASANCE. *n.s.*

(folio) 4. A defeat; conquest; the act of conquering; the state of being conquered. Obsolete.

(a quotation) *Fairy Queen*.

(abstract) 4. A defeat; conquest. *Spenser*.

ENIGMATICALLY. *adv.*

(folio) In a sense different from that which the words in their familiar acceptance imply.

(a quotation) *Notes on the Odyssey.*

(abstract) In a sense different from that which the words in their familiar acceptance imply.
Brown.

To GIRD. *v.a.*

(folio) 8. To furnish; to equip.

(a quotation) *Paradise Regain'd.*

(abstract) 8. To furnish; to equip. *Milton.*

- (2) In some cases, there is the name of an author or of the author's work in the folio, but there is no name in the abstract.

Ex.: KINSMAN. *n.s.*

(folio) A man of the same race or family.

(a quotation) *Spenser.*

(a quotation) *Dryden.*

(a quotation) *Dryden's Fables.*

(a quotation) *Addison on Italy.*

(abstract) A man of the same race or family.

FOURTEEN. *adj.*

(folio) Four and ten; twice seven.

(a quotation) *Shakespeare's Taming of the Shrew.*

(abstract) Four and ten.

3.2.12. Description of variant spellings

When a word has a variant spelling, the variant spelling is shown in the etymological information or in the definition in the folio. However, many of the variant spellings are eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: SLEAZY. *adj.*

(folio) [often written *sleazy*.]
 (abstract) (No description)

PREEMINENCE. *n.s.*

(folio) [. . . It is sometimes written, to avoid the
 junction of *ee*, *preheminance*.]
 (abstract) (No description)

3.2.13. Obsolete words

In the folio, there are some words with the label such as “not in use,” “a word out of use,” “obsolete” in order to show that they are obsolete words. However, these labels are usually eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: To FOUPE. *v.a.*

(folio) To drive with sudden impetuosity. A word
 out of use.
 (abstract) To drive with sudden impetuosity.
 (“A word out of use” is deleted in the
 abstract.)

FOURBE. *n.s.*

(folio) A cheat; a tricking fellow. Not in use.
 (abstract) A cheat; a tricking fellow.
 (“Not in use” is deleted in the abstract.)

SAY. *n.s.*

(folio) 4. [*Soie*, French.] Silk. Obsolete.
 (abstract) 4. Silk. Obsolete.
 (“Obsolete” remains in the abstract.)

3.2.14. Description of parts of speech

The descriptions of parts of speech in the abstract are abbreviated from those in the folio.

(folio) *adv.* *adj.* *n.s.*
 (abstract) *ad.* *a.* *s.*

3.2.15. Lack of consistency in descriptions

- (1) Illustrative sentences are usually eliminated in the abstract, but they sometimes remain in the abstract.

Ex.: APTLY. *adv.*

(folio) 3. Readily; acutely; as, he learned his business very *aptly*.

(abstract) 3. Readily; acutely; as, he learned his business very *aptly*.

- (2) In the folio and in the abstract, inconsistency is observed in the way of defining a word in the case where the definition means a person who

Ex.: RECOGNISOR. *n.s.*

(folio) He who gives the recognisance.

(abstract) He who gives the recognisance.

RHETORICIAN. *n.s.*

(folio) One who teaches the science of rhetoric.

(abstract) One who teaches the science of rhetoric.

3.2.16. Subject labels

- (1) Some subject labels in the folio are eliminated in the abstract.

Ex.: CONSENT. *n.s.*

(folio) 5. In physick. The perception one part has of another, by means of some fibres and nerves common to them both; and thus the stone in the bladder,

(abstract) 5. The perception one part has of another, by means of some fibres and nerves common to them both.

KINGDOM. *n.s.*

(folio) 2. A different class or order of beings. A word chiefly used among naturalists.

(abstract) 2. A different class or order of beings.

(2) Some subject labels in the folio are also shown in the abstract.

Ex.: CHALLENGE. *n.s.*

(folio) 3. In law. An exception taken either against persons or things;

(The label is shown before the definition without a square bracket.)

(abstract) 3. [In law.] An exemption taken either against persons or things;

(The label is enclosed with a square bracket. The word "exception" in the folio is revised to the word "exemption" in the abstract.)

DEFAULT. *n.s.*

(folio) 4. [In law.] Non-appearance in court at a day assigned.

(The label is enclosed with a square bracket.)

(abstract) 4. [In law.] Non-appearance in court at a day assigned.

(The label is enclosed with a square bracket.)

4. Johnson's participation in the compilation of the abstract

4.1. Aim of the research

The first edition of the folio was published on April 15, 1755, and the abstract was published on January 5, 1756. In the title page of the abstract, we see the description "Abstracted from the FOLIO EDITION, By the AUTHOR SAMUEL JOHNSON, A.M." Johnson also wrote the purpose of the publication of the abstract in the Preface of the abstract.

However, the result of the analysis between the folio and the abstract has revealed that the method of abridgment is not consistent for all the letters, and hence it is unlikely that Johnson alone was responsible for work of abridgment as a compiler.

This section of the paper will clarify inconsistencies in the method of

abridgment among the letters. Also, an attempt will be made to consider how much Johnson was involved in the process of abridgment.

4.2. Previous research into Johnson's participation in the abridgment

Dille thinks on the one hand that "the extent to which Johnson was necessarily involved in the process of abridgment is uncertain, and he could have delegated some of the work.¹⁾" She states on the other hand that "several circumstances point to Johnson having carried out the abridgment himself,²⁾" indicating the following two reasons.

For the first reason, Dille states that "the work was advertised as being 'Abridged from the Folio Edition, by the Author, SAMUEL JOHNSON, A.M.,' and the title page announces it as having been 'Abstracted from the FOLIO EDITION, By the AUTHOR SAMUEL JOHNSON, A.M.'³⁾" Relating to this description, Dille states that "it seems unlikely that Johnson, who was deeply uneasy about having misled the public over his authorship of the 'Debates in the Parliament of Lilliput' for *The Gentleman's Magazine*, would have allowed his name to appear prominently on a work in which he had little or no involvement.⁴⁾"

For the second reason, Dille states that "it should also be noted that Johnson was in straitened circumstances at this time; he had received no additional payment on completion of the folio *Dictionary* and, in March 1756, he was arrested for debt. The income from the preparation of the abstracted edition would no doubt have been extremely welcome.⁵⁾"

4.3. Present research into Johnson's participation in the abridgment

In order to clarify Johnson's involvement in the process of abridgment, an investigation was conducted as follows.

4.3.1. Research method

Contrastive research was conducted concerning the headwords in the first five pages for each letter of the folio and the corresponding head-

words of the abstract. The exception to this includes the letter Z, of which there are only two pages in the folio, and the letter X which provides no headwords in the folio.

4.3.2. Four-compiler hypothesis

As a result of the research, it is improbable that the abridgment was carried out solely by Johnson, and thus, the following hypothesis has been formulated: A team of four compilers, including Johnson, carried out the abridgment concurrently. Johnson was involved in the abridgment of the letter A to C, and the other three compilers, from D to K, L to S, and T to Z.

4.3.3. Supporting evidence

The supporting grounds for the hypothesis are the following four points.

(1) The rate of the deletion of headwords:

As is seen in Table 3, the rate of the deletion of headwords for each letter is 26.6% for A, 11.5% for B, and 7.0% for C. This shows that from A to C, there is a higher rate of deletion observed in comparison with other letters. However, from D, deletion is rarely or not observed at all. Beginning from the letter T, there are no deletions.

(2) The number of deleted headwords by letter and category:

As is seen in Table 4, the deleted headwords beginning with the letters A, B, and C are observed especially among dictionary words.

(3) The number of authors for each definition:

Basically, in the abstract, one author's name is shown for each definition. However, there are some definitions which have the names of two or more authors.

As is seen in Table 5, from A to C, there is no definition with the names of three or more authors.

There is one definition with three authors in the letter D, but from L to S, the definitions with three authors are observed more frequently.

Table 3 Rate of the deletion of headwords

	Num. of analyzed pages	First word	Last word	Num. of words in folio	Num. of words in abstract	Num. of deleted words	Rate of deletion (%)	
A	5	A	ABJURATION	94	69	25	26.6	
B	5	B	BALCONY	96	85	11	11.5	Average rate of deletion (%)
C	5	C	TO CALL	115	107	8	7.0	14.4
D	5	D	TO DANGLE	88	87	1	1.1	
E	5	E	EASY	65	65	0	0.0	
F	5	F	FAIR	76	76	0	0.0	
G	5	G	GALLOP	77	73	4	5.2	
H	5	H	TO HALT	112	103	9	8.0	
I, J	5	I	IDLE	103	103	0	0.0	Average rate of deletion (%)
K	5	K	KICKSY-WICKSEY	72	69	3	4.2	2.9
L	5	L	TO LAMENT	98	97	1	1.0	
M	5	M	MAIL	99	99	0	0.0	
N	5	N	NAVAL	74	70	4	5.4	
O	5	O	TO OBSCURE	96	96	0	0.0	
P	5	P	PALE	89	89	0	0.0	
Q	5	Q	TO QUARTER	82	82	0	0.0	
R	5	R	TO RAKE	80	79	1	1.3	Average rate of deletion (%)
S	5	S	SAINTLIKE	96	94	2	2.1	1.1
T	5	T	TO TAKE	66	66	0	0.0	
U, V	5	V	VARIANCE	90	90	0	0.0	
W	5	W	WAN	79	79	0	0.0	
X	1	X	(No word)	0	0	0	0.0	
Y	5	Y	YOUNGLING	75	75	0	0.0	Average rate of deletion (%)
Z	2	Z	ZOOTOMY	29	29	0	0.0	0.0
			Total	1951	1882	69	3.5	

From T, the definitions with two or more authors increase in number remarkably. The words beginning with the letter T have many definitions with three authors, and a definition with eight authors is also observed.

Pertaining to this, Dille states that “where Johnson typically included

Table 4 Number of deleted headwords by letter and category

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I, J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U, V	W	X	Y	Z	
Dictionary word	13	4	1																						
Compound word		2						6			1		2				1								
Derivative word	2	1						2																	
Technical word	2	1	1							1															
Variant spelling	1		3																						
Synonym			2	1						1															
Rare word							1																		
Obsolete word	2	1																1							
Idiomatic phrase		1								1															
Foreign word	1																								
Incorrect word	1																								
Incorrect spelling	1																								
Regional dialect													1												
Uncertain meaning							1																		
Abbreviated word	1																								
Others	1	1	1				2	1					1												

only one author attribution per sense in the first part of the alphabet, quite frequently three and sometimes even four or five, and in one case eight (*to take* v.a. 24), names are subjoined to senses in the later letters of the alphabet. Apart from the question of space, Johnson may also have progressively come to the view that such linguistic information as usage indicators provided useful guidance concerning register for the non-learned user.⁶⁾

With regard to Dille's interpretation, it is unlikely that Johnson gradually changed the way of abridgment, for there are marked differences in the way of abridgment among the four sections, A to C, D to K, L to S, and T to Z. It would be more natural to presume that four compilers, including Johnson, conducted the abridgment.

(4) The label of *Dict* for a definition source:

When definitions of previous dictionaries are quoted in the folio as they are, the source of the definition is indicated as *Dict*. However, the dictionary words, which have the label of *Dict*, are mostly eliminated in the abstract.

Table 5 Label for a definition source

	Number of authors for each definition in the abstract (*)					Number of <i>Dict</i> labels deleted from the folio	Number of <i>Dict</i> labels remaining in the abstract	Label for dictionary words in the abstract
	2 authors	3 authors	4 authors	5 authors	8 authors			
A	2					22	0	
B	1					5	0	
C	9					4	1	Farrier's Dict.
D	4	1				0	0	
E	6					1	0	
F	3					2	0	
G	3					2	0	
H	2					0	0	
I, J	2					1	1	Farrier's Dict.
K	7					0	0	
L	3	1				1	1	Dict.
M	6	1				2	0	
N	9					1	1	Farr. Dict.
O	1					1	1	Dict.
P	0					0	1	Dict.
Q	4	1				2	4	Dict.
R	2					1	0	
S	10	2				0	1	Farrier's Dict.
T	31	12	4	2	1	0	0	
U, V	14	1	2			0	1	Dict.
W	12	1				0	1	Farrier's Dict.
X	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Y	28	5				1	1	Farrier's Dict.
Z	6	1		1		2	1	Dict.

(*) The figures in the table indicate the number of definitions.

The second column from the right in Table 5 shows the number of the *Dict* labels for each letter remaining in the abstract. From A to K, there is one label for C and one for I/J, but no label is observed in the other letters. On the other hand, from L to Z, most letters have at least one label of *Dict*.

5. Conclusion

This research has revealed the following:

- (1) It can be thought that the abstract was compiled based on the folio, for in the abstract, the typographical errors in the folio are corrected, and the revisions and corrections are made based on the descriptions of the folio.
- (2) Despite the fact that the size of the dictionary was reduced from the folio¹⁾ to the octavo²⁾ by 75% and that the number of the pages was reduced by 52.1%³⁾, the reduction in the number of headwords was only 5.2%⁴⁾.
- (3) The majority of headwords eliminated from the folio are derivative words, while compound words account for the second highest number of deletions. Foreign words, dictionary words and obsolete words account for a small percentage of the eliminated headwords.
- (4) The usage of punctuation in the abstract is basically the same as that in the folio, with the exception of a few cases.
- (5) In the folio, the name of an author's work is shown after the quotation from the work, whereas in the abstract, quotations are usually eliminated and the author's name is shown after the definition. For each definition in the abstract, generally only one author is referenced, but from the letter T, the number increases remarkably.
- (6) In the abstract, definitions are abridged in many cases. However, some technical words have a long encyclopedic explanation.
- (7) In the abstract, the usage information as to the style, attitude, and field of a word is eliminated.

- (8) Etymological descriptions are abridged in the abstract.
- (9) The information as to variant spellings is eliminated in the abstract.
- (10) The inconsistencies between descriptions in the folio and the abstract, the inconsistencies in the method of abridgment, and the typographical errors are observed in large quantities in comparison with dictionaries of today.

As is stated in the Preface, the abstract was developed for “common readers.” Based on the aforementioned features of the abstract, we come to know the type of dictionary which Johnson thought was necessary for common readers of those days. The features of the abstract which have been revealed by this research give us the assumption that it was not the active dictionary but the passive dictionary that Johnson thought was useful to common readers. This assumption can be supported by the following two reasons:

Firstly, in the abstract, the quotations and the usage information, which are useful to dictionary-users who intend to write referring to a dictionary, are eliminated from the folio. Specifically, the elimination of usage information can be considered evidence that Johnson did not consider the significance of making the abstract active-dictionary-oriented, for usage information does not require much space.

Secondly, Johnson’s abridgment principle to avoid the elimination of headwords can be detected, for the rate of the deletion of headwords was shown to be 5.2%. Furthermore, the majority of the deleted headwords are derivative words whose meanings are discernable, while some technical words take up much space for a detailed, encyclopedic explanation. These facts imply that the aim of the abstract was to help common readers with the meanings of difficult or unfamiliar words in their personal reading. Moreover, it can be thought that the purpose of describing an author’s name instead of the name of the author’s work is, in addition to saving space, to help the common readers to read the

author's works or works written by the author's contemporaries. This interpretation of the abstract as a passive dictionary coincides with Johnson's outlook on common readers for whom the abstract was developed, as is shown in the Preface: "... the greater number of readers, who, seldom intending to write or presuming to judge, turn over books only to amuse their leisure, and to gain degrees of knowledge suitable to lower characters, or necessary to the common business of life: these know not any other use of a dictionary than that of adjusting orthography, or explaining terms of science or words of infrequent occurrence, or remote derivation."

Finally, as is stated in Section 4, there are some marked differences in the way of abridgment among the four sections mentioned in 4.3.2. Therefore, it would be natural to assume that Johnson first explained to three other compilers the principle and method of abridgment, and that the four of them, including Johnson, conducted the abridgment concurrently. Furthermore, it would be natural to assume that Johnson was involved in the abridgment of A to C, for that section shows a much larger portion of abridgment than the other three sections. Moreover, the folio was published on April 15 and the abstract was published on January 5 the following year, and hence the period of time spent on the abridgment was less than nine months. Considering the shortness of the allotted time, it is highly improbable that Johnson alone carried out the abridgment. It is my hope that the four-compiler hypothesis which I have proposed will be supported by further evidence henceforth.

NOTES

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Kiyoshi Shinkuma at Nagoya Gakuin University for the invaluable advice on my research. Section 2 and Section 4 in this paper are slightly revised versions of my oral presentation at the 2011 General Meeting of the Chubu Branch of the English Literary Society of Japan held at Nagoya University on October 29, 2011.

Section 2

- 1) Dille 2005, p. 200.

- 2) Hayakawa 2005, p. 7.
- 3) Reddick 1996, p. 86.
- 4) Dille 2005, p. 203.
- 5) Dille 2005, p. 203.
- 6) Dille 2005, p. 203. Dille uses the term “sense” to mean a headword’s definition.

Section 3

- 1) The number of the total pages includes the range from the first word of the letter A to the last word of the letter Z.
- 2) The number of the total pages includes the range from the first word of the letter A to the last word of the letter Z.
- 3) “Not shown” signifies that the deleted headword has no label as to part of speech in the folio.
- 4) “The large reduction in the letter U/V is accounted for by the fact that Johnson eliminated as unnecessary many words beginning with the prefix *un-*, . . . , since they could be consulted in the *Dictionary* under their roots. . . . Compound words, including *goatmilk* and *moneybox*, are also often omitted, presumably because readers could deduce their meaning from their constituent parts.” (Dille 2005, p. 204.)
- 5) *The Plan of a Dictionary*, par.13.
- 6) “When compiling the octavo edition, Johnson appeared to have no intention of drastically eliminating obsolete words or meanings from the folio edition.” (Hayakawa 2008, p. 11.)

Section 4

- 1) Dille 2005, p. 199.
- 2) Dille 2005, p. 199.
- 3) Dille 2005, p. 199.
- 4) Dille 2005, p. 199.
- 5) Dille 2005, p. 199.
- 6) Dille 2005, pp. 206–207.

Section 5

- 1) 43 cm × 25.5 cm.
- 2) 19.6 cm × 12.7 cm.
- 3) 1,084 pages ÷ 2,263 pages = 47.9%.
- 4) 40,482 words ÷ 42,695 words = 94.8%.

DICTIONARIES

- A Dictionary of the English Language*, 1st ed., Samuel Johnson, the reprinted ed., Yushodo Booksellers Ltd., 1983.
- A Dictionary of the English Language abstracted from the Folio Edition*, Samuel Johnson, the reproduced ed., Kenkyusha Ltd., 1985.

REFERENCES

- Dille, Catherine. 2005. "The Dictionary in abstract: Johnson's abridgments of the Dictionary of the English Language for the common reader." *Anniversary Essays on Johnson's Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press: 198–211.
- Hayakawa, Isamu. 2005. "Johnson Eigojisho Kanyakuban no Rekishiteki Imi." *Aichi-daigaku Bungakuronshu No. 131*. Aichi University.
- Hayakawa, Isamu. 2008. "Obsolete Words and Meanings in Johnson's Dictionary." *Language and Culture No. 18*, Bulletin of Institute for Language Education. Aichi University.
- Reddick, Allen. 1996. *The Making of Johnson's Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press.