

氏名	片野 正人
学位の種類	博士(英語学)
学位記番号	甲第6号
学位授与年月日	2014年9月18日
学位授与の要件	学位規則第4条第1項該当(課程博士)
学位論文題目	A Research into Samuel Johnson's Set of Two Dictionaries: the Folio Edition and the Abstracted Edition
論文審査委員	委員 教授 新熊 清 委員 教授 赤楚 治之 委員 教授 Phillip Morrow 委員 教授 清水 克正 外部審査委員 三好 楠二郎

審査結果の要旨

In this doctoral thesis, Mr. Katano presents the results of a comprehensive study of the abstracted edition of Samuel Johnson's dictionary. Mr. Katano presents research on the methods that Johnson used to make an abridged version of his dictionary, the information about word usage and pronunciation, and the extent of Johnson's participation in the compilation of the abstract. The study is organized around two research questions: the first one is about whether Johnson intended the folio and abstract to be "active" or "passive" dictionaries and the second is about Johnson's role in compiling the abstract.

Johnson himself seems to have been quite clear about his intention that the abstract would be a "passive" dictionary, so there was not much need to prove this point, and it therefore would have been better to just accept this point as a premise in order to formulate other research questions about how Johnson put his intention into practice.

While there are a few places in which the thesis could be improved by adding more details or making some revisions to make the argument clearer, in general Mr. Katano has presented a good thesis. He has investigated several areas: use of headwords, quoted authors, information about collocations and phrasal verbs, phonetic

descriptions of letters of the alphabet, and Johnson's own participation in the compilation of the abstract. In each of these areas, Mr. Katano has adopted an appropriate research method, has explained his method and his rationale for it and has presented conclusions logically based on the results of his investigation.

Mr. Katano has succeeded in clarifying the ideal image of an English dictionary pursued by Johnson, and regards the folio and the abstract as a set of two dictionaries with which Johnson contributed to 18th century England. With the folio, this great compiler aimed to promote the full development of the elegant and noble culture of those days by fixing the standard English language, whereas with the abstract, he intended to instill elegance and nobility into the general public by inculcating the standard English language into the language of the common people.

In comparing the two dictionaries, Mr. Katano deals with the headwords in the first five pages for each head letter of the folio with the exception for "X" (1 page) and "Z" (2 pages), and their corresponding headwords of the abstract. His comparative method is scientific and his analysis is logical.

Especially notable points are recognized in Chapters 2, 3 and 6. Chapter 2 shows the headword reduction in the abstract to be only 5.2%. This is because Johnson thought of incorporating as many headwords as possible into the abridged edition so that the common readers could read with the aid of the abstract. An additional notable characteristic of the abstract is that only the name of an author is shown after each definition, whereas in the folio the author or the author's work is shown after a quotation. According to previous studies, by listing an author's name for each definition in the abstract, the meaning of each word used by that author is clearly shown to the dictionary users. Mr. Katano adds another reason, discussing that the listing of various authors' names helped induce the dictionary users to read the works of those authors in order to enlighten the dictionary users about those authors.

In Chapter 3, Mr. Katano compares the two editions from the viewpoint of the authors quoted in them. No previous study has been found to deal with the contrastive analysis of quoted works and authors between the folio and the abstract. He conducts two kinds of investigation: a comparison from the viewpoint of the appearance frequency of each author and from the viewpoint of the period of time in which each author lived. The former is more significant for the interpretation of the abstract. The authors appearing in the folio are grouped into three: the authors of high frequency, those of medium frequency and those of low

frequency, each of which respectively corresponds to “the great poets and playwrights,” the medium level ones and the low level ones. The top of the first group is William Shakespeare (17,967 times) and the next is John Dryden (11,420). The abridgment percentage in the abstract is the highest in the group of low frequency, and the lowest in that of high frequency. This result implies that Johnson thought the common readers of the abstract would need to know the meanings of the words used by the authors who are frequently used in the folio, that is, representative poets and playwrights in the late 16th and 17th centuries.

Chapter 6 is particularly interesting and it could be the basis for a published research article. Previous researchers believed that the abridgment was carried out by Johnson himself. Mr. Katano says, however, that it is unreasonable to regard the abstract compiled solely by Johnson. Analyzing the rate of the deletion of headwords, the number of deleted headwords by letter and category, the number of authors for each definition, and the label of *Dict* for a definitions source, Mr. Katano supposes that Johnson and his three amanuenses respectively dealt from the letter *A* to the letter *C*, the letter *D* to the letter *K*, the letter *L* to the letter *S*, and the letter *T* to the letter *Z*. The average rate of deletion from the letter *A* to the letter *C* is 14.4%, the letter *D* to the letter *K* is 2.9%, the letter *L* to the letter *S*, is 1.1% and the letter *T* to the letter *Z* is 0.0%. On the basis of these data, Mr. Katano advances a “four-compiler hypothesis” concerning the abstract.

Overall, the examination committee is satisfied with the thesis and recommends that it be accepted as a doctoral thesis and Mr. Katano be awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.