

# Historical Development of Lexicographical Genres: Some Methodological Issues

Mirosława Podhajecka  
University of Opole

## 1. Introduction

The present paper brings to the fore some issues which emerged during my work on a dictionary of metalexigraphy which was compiled in conjunction with a team of scholars from several Polish universities. My part of the project was to describe dictionary types in line with the established lexicographical typology. More exactly, out of 100 names of dictionary types encountered in metalexigraphical discourse, that is, both the well-known types (e.g., the monolingual, bilingual or multilingual dictionary) as well as the lesser-known ones (e.g., the combinatory, morphological or rhyming dictionary), I was asked to deal with 80. Because of the breadth of the dictionary project, the task undertaken turned out to be a real challenge. Consequently, I faced many problems at this stage, but in this paper I would like to focus specifically on the histories of dictionary types and, occasionally, the lack thereof.

Although dictionary typology is a standard component in books on lexicography (cf. Zgusta 1971; Landau 1984; Svensén 1993; Béjoint 1994; Hartmann 2001; Sterkenburg 2003), it has not been explored extensively in the specialist literature. In other words, typological distinctions are not given much attention and, whenever they are, the complexity of the subject is not reflected adequately. What is more, dictionary typology is a handy concept, but there are in fact many typologies, and there are significant disproportions among them. Having evolved from relatively modest binary oppositions (cf. Ščerba 1940) into multi-level models (cf. Rey 1970), these typologies differ greatly in scope, form of presentation and use of terminology. To clarify the underlying theories, I will first touch on the emergence of major lexicographical typologies (section 2). After that, I will briefly sketch the dictionary of metalexigraphy (section 3), and will then discuss both the problems encountered, such as the inadequacy of source materials or terminological complexities, as well as the proposed solutions (section 4). It is worthy of mention that the issues will be presented from the perspective of broadly-understood European lexicography.

## 2. Dictionary typologies

Metalexigraphy, as has been underlined by Hüllen (1999: 3), did not go hand in hand with practical lexicography, because “[T]here never was lexicography without word-lists and/or dictionaries, but there were for a long time (and still are) word-lists and/or dictionaries without lexicography”.<sup>1</sup> Hüllen goes on to explain this statement by saying, in his characteristically witty manner, that dictionaries are like elephants, i.e., “everybody recognizes them at once, although it is quite difficult to define them according to genus, species, etc.” This succinct remark shows why dictionary typologies are inevitably of secondary nature, arising from developments in practical lexicography. In other words, whenever a need for specific reference works arose, dictionaries were compiled to cater to it, but the compilers did not bother to subsume their works under a general label, let alone devise a theoretical framework into which these works could fit. It was only in the mid-twentieth century that various

---

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat unexpectedly, this remark contrasts significantly with Hausmann’s claim that “metalexigraphy is as old as lexicography itself” (qtd. in Hartmann 2001: 28).

typologies were proposed in order to systematize the world of dictionaries at a conceptual and metalinguistic level.

It is time to ask what a dictionary typology is exactly. Briefly speaking, it is a simplified scheme of classification based on a number of different criteria, called otherwise dimensions, parameters or lexicographical ‘distinctive features’. Typologies are sometimes presented graphically as diagrams. Although there is no agreed-upon taxonomy for the classifications or the criteria (Landau 2001: 7; cf. Zgusta 1991), in the case of the so-called phenomenological classification, these features can be shape or content (e.g., the unabridged or desk dictionary); the so-called functional classification takes into account activity contexts (e.g., the passive or active dictionary); and a morphological typology is organized on formal characteristics, such as the title of the dictionary (e.g., the dictionary of collocations or dictionary of foreign words). Moreover, a wide range of isolated features can also be applied successfully for this purpose, like the scope of coverage (e.g., the general or special dictionary); the manner of financing (e.g., the commercial dictionary or scholarly dictionary), the access structure (e.g., the semasiological or onomasiological dictionary), the complexity of the lemma (e.g., the dictionary of idioms or collocations) or the type of target user (e.g., the learner’s dictionary or dictionary for native speakers). The use of many variables in typologies is inevitable, because reference works may be similar in some respects but may diverge in others. According to Swanepoel (2003: 45),

[T]he main aim of such typologies is to provide prospective dictionary users with a classification of existing dictionaries based on a set of distinctive features that

- provides a systematic overview of the various categories and subcategories of dictionaries that are distinguished;
- indicates what the most distinctive feature(s) of each main category and each subcategory is/are;
- makes it possible to explicate the differences and correlations of different dictionaries within a (sub)category.

The various categories and subcategories which result from such classifications are referred to as dictionary types, sometimes called dictionary genres. In fact, the latter seems more relevant as a specialist term than the former because, despite a long tradition in literary studies (‘literary genre’), musicology (‘music genre’), or film studies (‘film genre’), ‘genre’ denotes a purely metalexicographical term, while ‘type’ may designate reference works as used by both specialists and non-specialists. For example, the abridged dictionary and huge dictionary can be both treated as types, but only the former will be seen as a genre. In my paper I will apply both terms, but will treat ‘genre’ as the preferred one.

Let me now describe briefly the typologies that have exerted some influence on European metalexigraphy, and which have apparently introduced some of the genre terms. Lev Ščerba’s *Opyt obščej teorii leksikografii* (1940) is regarded as the first serious attempt at a typology of dictionaries (Zgusta 1991: 38). To categorize the existing types of dictionaries on a purely empirical basis, Ščerba proposed six theoretical oppositions, i.e., (1) dictionary of the academic type versus informative dictionary; (2) encyclopedic dictionary versus general dictionary; (3) concordance versus ordinary dictionary; (4) ordinary dictionary versus ideological dictionary; (5) defining dictionary versus translating dictionary; and (6) nonhistorical dictionary versus historical dictionary. Although few of the distinctions were found useful by his followers, Ščerba must be credited with discerning some regularities in the structure and function of dictionaries.

In *A Typological Classification of Dictionaries on the Basis of Distinctive Features* (1962), Yakov Malkiel categorized dictionaries with Spanish, following an examination of their form and contents, by means of three broad distinctive features, i.e., range, perspective, and presentation, each of which was subject to further subdivision.<sup>2</sup> Thus, range was delimited by (1) the number of entries; (2) the number of languages covered; and (3) the amount of purely linguistic data. The second criterion was linked to three additional dimensions: (1) the fundamental dimension, i.e., the time axis (diachrony versus synchrony); (2) the way of arranging entries, i.e., conventional (or semasiological), semantic (or onomasiological) or arbitrary; and (3) the levels of tone, i.e., detached (reporting facts objectively), preceptive (or didactic) or facetious. Presentation involved such subcriteria as (1) definition; (2) exemplification; (3) graphic illustration (including maps); and (4)

<sup>2</sup> It may be interesting to note that in 1976 Malkiel proposed a classification of etymological dictionaries, applying eight autonomous criteria for this purpose.

special features (e.g., localization in territorial terms or on the social scale). The value of this typology was that it suggested complex hierarchical relationships between dictionary genres, and it was praised for explicitly proposing a “factorial analysis” (Geeraerts 1984: 38). At the same time, it raised some criticism for not being “serviceable as a teaching tool” (Landau 2001: 8).

Thomas Sebeok’s classification (1962) resulted from a small-scale survey of dictionaries and wordlists with just one tongue, the Cheremis language. It was based on 17 distinctive features, which could be categorized into three subsets. Subset (1) pertained to “the relationship of the lists to the vocabulary intended to be presented [...] to the manner of selection from within the source and to the characteristics of the source itself”. According to the author, dictionaries could be “generated” (or compiled) by a lexicographer or “abstracted from” (or based on) texts, and in the second case the limits of the corpus and its internal diversity should be taken as additional criteria. Subset (2) referred to the relationships between elements within the entry, i.e., representation of the object language by either a single form (or syntagmatic representation) or a multiple form (or paradigmatic organization); the latter being related to the distinction between form (illustrated, e.g., by the dictionary of cognates) and meaning (illustrated, e.g., by the dictionary of synonyms). Subset (3) pertained to the arrangement of entries in a dictionary, based either on form or on meaning. The other features were either “closely interrelated with the source features” or “less involved in the definition of the dictionary as a type”. Sebeok’s typology marked a further growth of metalexicographical ideas, but it had clear limitations. Above all else, it was based on a small sample of dictionaries, and took into account selected criteria, such as the relationships between dictionaries and their textual sources or the relationships between the components of the entry, leaving other lexicographical aspects intact.

Alan Rey is the author of the so-called ‘genetic typology’ (1970), called the most detailed classificatory scheme ever produced (Dubois and Dubois, qtd. in Béjoint 1994: 36).<sup>3</sup> It suggested that a dictionary resulted from a series of choices that lexicographers had to make when planning and then compiling their reference works, which must be seen as its greatest merit. To describe adequately the consecutive stages of decision-making, Rey introduced distinctions between “observed dictionaries” and “observed and generated dictionaries”, explicit and implicit analysis, as well as functional and non-functional information. Apart from these innovations, he also applied sets of criteria used in other typologies, such as lexical items versus other linguistic units; the formal versus conceptual arrangement of headwords; and the metalanguage versus the object language. As has turned out, however, in real life some of the dichotomies are not mutually exclusive. For example, as has been pointed out by Hartmann (2001: 71), corpus evidence may well be combined with intuition, and linguistic and encyclopedic information may not be distinguished easily.

In his *Manual of Lexicography* (1971), Ladislav Zgusta distinguished “the most important types of dictionaries”, using a handful of parameters, such as linguistic and encyclopedic data (e.g., linguistic versus encyclopedic dictionaries); the time span (e.g., synchronic versus diachronic dictionaries); the degree of completeness (e.g., general versus restricted dictionaries); the number of languages represented (e.g., monolingual versus bilingual dictionaries); dictionary aims; and dictionary size (big, medium and small dictionaries). More elaborate is Landau’s classification (1984) based on 11 criteria, i.e., (1) the languages covered; (2) the manner of financing; (3) the age of users; (4) size; (5) the scope in terms of subject range; (6) the scope in terms of lexical coverage; (7) the complexity of the lemma; (8) the primary language of the market; (9) the period of time covered; (10) the linguistic approach; and (11) means of access. Still, like all the other typologies, it is not holistic in its approach, being only “a convenient way to highlight significant differences among dictionaries” (Landau 2001: 8). The most extensive typology so far has been presented by Hausmann (1989: 968–980), who is nonetheless aware that the world of dictionaries is largely unexplored. A discussion of typological distinctions can be found both in the above article by Hausmann as well as in a series of papers included in the three-volume encyclopedia edited by Hausmann et al. (1989–1991). (Cf. Malkiel 1962: 217–227; Zgusta 1971: 217–221; Al-Kasimi 1977: 20–33; Landau 2001: 7–42; Hartmann 2001: 68–73; Swanepoel 2003: 44–69.)

It is thus clear that a number of typological distinctions have been proposed over the last few decades, but an all-inclusive classification scheme has not been devised. In this context, Hartmann’s

---

<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, according to other researchers, Rey’s typology does not offer anything new (Al-Kasimi 1983: 16–17), and is regarded as “unnecessarily cumbersome” (Geeraerts 1984: 40).

claim that “an effort is made to classify this variety of dictionaries and other reference works that we find in the world into clearly delineated types or genres” (2005: 195) seems understandable, although it is doubtful whether such a classification is feasible at all. Firstly, despite the efforts made, none of the metalexigraphers to date has succeeded in working out a universal typology of dictionaries, the more so because completely new criteria (like ‘field’, ‘tenor’, or ‘mode’)<sup>4</sup> can be applied here. Secondly, hybrid dictionaries are becoming a characteristic element of present-day lexicography, but in fact hybridization has always been a staple of practical lexicography, and mixed-genre reference works can be found throughout each dictionary-making tradition. With fuzzy genre boundaries, a classification that encompasses clearly demarcated genres definitely seems more like wishful thinking, and innovative dictionary formats (e.g., dictionaries on CD-ROM, Internet dictionaries or hand-held dictionaries) make this project even more difficult. Lastly, even traditional metalexigraphical categories, like size, are interpreted differently (cf. Zgusta 1971: 216–217, Landau 2001: 28–32). In other words, size can refer to the overall physical size of a dictionary, the number of its entries (or the degree of exhaustiveness) or the amount of information within the entry (or information density), being a sole criterion behind the unabridged dictionary, college dictionary, desk dictionary, pocket dictionary, small dictionary or miniature dictionary, the last two of which have never been regarded as generic terms.<sup>5</sup> (Cf. Hartmann and James’ *Dictionary of Lexicography* of 2001.)

The various classifications notwithstanding, I had a ready set of terms to define, so the next step was to decide whether every genre in every dictionary-making tradition under analysis had a history that could be presented in a terminological dictionary. I assumed that most dictionary types in my term list could be traced back to their origin, at least more or less successfully; in fact, there was a good reason for it, as all the papers on dictionary genres in the encyclopaedia of lexicography edited by Hausmann et al. (1989–91) include historical accounts. It was obvious to me, however, that what could be done for one national dictionary-making tradition might not be achievable in an intercultural approach such as ours, and in many cases compromises were indeed a necessity. Difficulties in describing the histories of genres in this paper are related to three categories: the structure of presentation; the availability of source materials; and the classificatory and terminological systems. To show how I dealt with these obstacles, I provide samples of my dictionary articles, describing lexicographical facts (i.e., the titles of dictionaries, the names of their authors, as well as dates and places of publication) in the five dictionary-making traditions under consideration. The samples presented below have been translated from Polish into English specifically for this purpose.<sup>6</sup>

### 3. Dictionary of Metalexigraphy

The dictionary, under the provisional title of *Słownik metaleksykografii* (henceforth, SML), has been written in Polish, but it refers to lexicography in English, German, French, Russian and Polish. The focus on this multilingual perspective would not be possible without an extensive use of literature on lexicography, lexicology and semantics in the five languages. The whole undertaking rests on the assumption that the major European dictionary-making traditions have made valuable contributions to lexicography perceived as a specific subject field, which the target user should be made aware of. In fact, as lexicography is slowly becoming a truly international discipline, a project contrasting Western and Eastern European metalexigraphical theories and their practical applications seems particularly useful for the contemporary user.

---

<sup>4</sup> These concepts, introduced by Halliday and his colleagues in the 1960s, were applied originally to interpret the register within the functional model of language. Thus, ‘field’ refers primarily to the ideational component of meaning (what is talked about); ‘tenor’ pertains to the interpersonal component (the relationship between the speaker and the hearer); and ‘mode’ is linked to the textual component (the medium of transmission). (Cf. Halliday 2005: 217, 225). For the application of these parameters in lexicography, see Yong and Peng (2007: 72–82).

<sup>5</sup> Since class division is not fully distinct, the term ‘dictionary genre’ appears somewhat arbitrary, which becomes conspicuously clear in the multilingual and cross-cultural context of my research.

<sup>6</sup> It may be necessary to explain that the dictionary articles have sometimes been slightly shortened, which is signified by the use of ellipses. Words in capital letters are treated as cross-referenced terms.

SML is addressed to semi-experts and experts on the Polish market rather than to laymen. (Cf. Bowker 2003: 157.) To put it differently, the anticipated users are students and scholars at language faculties, translators and professional lexicographers. Determining the user needs has had direct implications for the selection of entry terms, the amount of information included in the microstructure, as well as the defining style.

The dictionary megastructure consists of the front matter, macrostructure or ‘dictionary proper’, and back matter with four bilingual glossaries (English-Polish, German-Polish, French-Polish and Russian-Polish) as well as photographs of rare dictionaries. The dictionary’s term list has been arranged alphabetically. SML can be classified as an explanatory terminological dictionary; it is not exhaustive, having approximately 600 Polish terms, but most of the terms have been described in great detail. It covers all the concepts which are crucial in metalexicographical discourse, starting from the most rudimentary terms (e.g., *słownik* ‘dictionary’, *hasło* ‘entry’, *siatka hasel* ‘wordlist’, *układ hasel* ‘arrangement of entries’, *odsyłacz* ‘cross-reference’); to entries describing lexicographical genres (e.g., *słownik synchroniczny* ‘synchronic dictionary’, *indeks a tergo* ‘reverse dictionary’), types of definition (e.g., *definicja pragmatyczna* ‘pragmatic definition’, *definicja kognitywna* ‘cognitive definition’), dictionary labels (e.g., *kwalifikator stylistyczny* ‘stylistic label’, *kwalifikator ekspresywny* ‘expressive label’); to entries describing computer corpus lexicography (e.g., *korpus* ‘corpus’, *frekwencja* ‘frequency’, *dezambiguacja* ‘disambiguation’). Since Polish lexicographical terminology is not as richly developed as that of English or German, several innovations have been added (e.g., *element pozahasłowy części zasadniczej* ‘middle matter’) with the aim of filling apparent conceptual gaps. To help the user consult different sections of the dictionary most effectively, a rich cross-referencing structure has been designed.

As to the form of publication, SML will appear first in print, but in the future it will also be available in the electronic version over the Internet, although the exact publication date is not yet known. For more information on the conception of the dictionary, see Bielińska (2005a, 2005b). Methodological problems in the compilation of the English-Polish glossary, one of the bilingual components of SML, have been described in Podhajecka and Bielińska (2008).

## 4. Mode of Presentation

### 4.1. Synchronic Versus Diachronic Description

As has been mentioned above, the first dilemma was whether histories of genres should be mentioned at all, since a diachronic component in a primarily synchronic dictionary is of little use to readers interested in contemporary lexicography only. Still, it is obvious that typological distinctions are embedded in the history of lexicographical thought. In other words, modern lexicography is greatly indebted to the thousands of both known and unknown ‘harmless drudges’ who paved the way for the myriad of reference works available today. As Bailey (1996) puts it aptly, “We live [...] in a golden age of lexicography. Never before have we had so many people working on so many different dictionaries, and the results are almost all splendid”.

It has been argued that “borrowing — even plagiarism — is no sin to lexicographers” (Reed 1962: 95), which suggests that early lexicographers compiled works, often having borrowed freely from preceding dictionaries, with little awareness of how different methodologies and compilation criteria could influence dictionary formats. Nonetheless, it is also true that innovation must have played a major role in lexicography. Without questioning and laying aside accepted older methods and models in favour of innovative ones, progress in lexicography (though rarely in quantum leaps) would have never been achieved.<sup>7</sup> For example, in the eighteenth century dictionaries in England changed from humble

<sup>7</sup> Various factors must have been intricately interwoven in the history of dictionary-making, yet a number of ‘experimenters’ and their innovative dictionaries, some of which became highly influential while others went unnoticed, could be quoted to support this hypothesis. For example, without Roget’s illuminating ideas (1852), despite the long ‘autonomous tradition’ of thematic dictionaries (Hüllen 2005: 3), there could be no thesaurus in English lexicography today. Similarly, in his *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* (1791), John Walker adopted the respelling system worked out by Sheridan; John Kersey was the first author to introduce abbreviated labels into his 1708 dictionary, which was also the first abridged dictionary; Thomas Blount’s *Glossographia* (1656) was the first

reference books for occasional use, especially by women and young students, to the scholarly, exhaustive record of the language, even though this evolution “did not take place suddenly; nor at the same time in all societies; it was sometimes slow and erratic, sometimes quick and decisive” (Béjoint 1994: 95). In principle, then, it is not borrowing but rather experimenting with dictionary form and contents that has brought such vast diversification of lexicographical products over the centuries. Tracing inspiration and influences in the development of specific genres is without doubt a challenging task, but, as many lexicographers have already shown, it can stimulate our understanding of linguistic, social and cultural factors behind changes on the lexicographical scene.<sup>8</sup>

Potential benefits notwithstanding, relatively few publications have so far described dictionaries in a vein that would be different from the chronological one. Dolezal (2007: 8) claims, quite convincingly, that “the strictly chronological narrative has the strength of being accessible and coherent in its presentation” — a model applied successfully, e.g., in Starnes and Noyes (1946) or in Stein (1985), two milestone monographs on English lexicography — but the applicability of such a narrative is clearly limited in the case of a terminological dictionary, which favours the typological perspective. Yet, it seems that, under certain conditions, dictionary typology may allow us “to both rearrange and preserve the chronological narrative” (Dolezal 2007: 9), and one of the ways in which both forms of depicting lexicographical facts can be successfully combined has been proposed by Algeo (1991).

Having taken everything into consideration, I came to the conclusion that by linking a synchronic description with a diachronic one my articles would be fuller and more informative. By combining both approaches, that is, the synchronic-typological approach and the diachronic-chronological one, I thus hope to achieve two goals. On the one hand, I want to provide the user with detailed information on the distinctive features of dictionary genres, illustrating them with samples taken from a wide range of dictionaries of English, German, French, Russian and Polish. On the other hand, I want to point out the development of the genres in the five dictionary-making traditions to make the user realise that typological distinctions can be depicted in a historical perspective. The historical outline will give the user an idea about how the given genre developed, guiding him/her to bibliographical details. These details can then be treated as a starting point for further research.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4.2. Availability of sources

It goes without saying that historical details are sometimes numerous. For instance, the printed dictionary has been described in much detail, because, together with the invention of print, it marks an era in the history of European civilisation. As a result, the historical component in my article is fairly long. However, I would like to point out that writing it involved much more than just compiling

---

work of reference to use crude woodcuts — antecedents of illustrations — even before the publication of Comenius’ influential textbook entitled *Orbis sensualium pictus* (1659); Blount was also the first compiler to record non-dictionary sources (Osselton 1990: 1949); and Hyde Clarke is the first dictionary-maker to take “draconian measures” to include 100,000 entries in a single volume, showing ways to save space (Simpson 1990: 1959). More contemporaneously, the *Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary* by Hornby et al. (1942) was the first dictionary designed specifically for foreign learners; and the *Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English* (1981) turned out to be an ingenious attempt to combine thesaurus and dictionary, again for the use of foreign learners. Clearly, the difficulty in marking the area of innovation in lexicography lies in the fact that new developments do not have to pertain to the whole dictionary structure, as they often diverge from the established models in one or more aspects (e.g., the inclusion of the preface; the addition of specific elements of the vocabulary; the arrangement and treatment of headwords; the use of defining strategies; the application of innovative typographical devices; or the tailoring of the dictionary to a specific audience).

<sup>8</sup> For instance, it has been suggested that the growth in the number of hard-word dictionaries was related to “insecurity of many speakers untutored in classical languages” (Schäfer 1970: 31), reflected by the tendency to confuse and distort polysyllabic words of Latin or Greek origin. In line with what we know about insecurity as a sociolinguistic factor (cf. Labov 1972, 1994), the dictionaries are thus indicative of the upward mobility of the lower classes in seventeenth-century England. (Cf. Zgusta 1989, Hupka 1989, Marellò 1990, Hanon 1990, Martin 1990, Hüllen 2005, etc.)

<sup>9</sup> As is clear from the analysis of the samples below, the diachronic component is sometimes patchy, because I could not always find adequate sources and dictionaries, or select the right information. Moreover, since my command of German and French is poor, my co-authors will provide examples in French and German.

information from different sources, because a synthetic description required careful evaluative judgements. One of the reasons for being cautious is that different authors provide readers with slightly different versions of the same facts, which can affect the quality of this overview negatively. The text presented below concerns the printed dictionary.

*Catholicon*, an influential encyclopedic dictionary of the Middle Ages, is recognized as the first printed dictionary. It was compiled by Joannes Balbus Januensis (known otherwise as Giovanni da Genova, Johannes de Janua or Johannes de Balbis) in 1286, and appeared in print in 1460 in Mainz. It was published soon after Gutenberg invented moveable type, and the dictionary may have even come out of Gutenberg's own print shop. A work of reference entitled *Vocabolista italiano-tedesco*, which came out in 1477 in Venice, was the first printed BILINGUAL DICTIONARY. [...] The first dictionary in England, a French-English wordbook without a title, was printed in 1480. *Promptorium Parvulorum, sive Clericorum*, a Latin-English glossary aimed at future clerics, was the next reference work that appeared in print. Although it had been written several years before the invention of printing, it was eventually published at the London press of Richard Pynson, an early servant and associate of William Caxton, as late as 1499. In 1539 *Dictionnaire françois-latin* by Estienne, a valuable dictionary for French lexicography, came out in France. The first printed dictionary in Russia, *Leksis, sireč' rečenija vkratce sobrannyj*, was compiled by Zizanij Tustanovskij and published in 1596. [...] The earliest printed dictionaries in Poland were two polyglot dictionaries: *Dictionarius variarum rerum* compiled by Mureliusz and *Dictionarium trium linguarum* by Mymer, both of which appeared in 1528. These reference works, based on earlier dictionaries, included Polish, Latin and German words arranged systematically.

A handful of genres with a long history in most European dictionary-making traditions, such as the monolingual dictionary, bilingual dictionary or historical dictionary, are represented by numerous dictionaries and have been treated fairly extensively in metalexical literature. In this case, it was unclear what information should actually be selected to satisfy the user, so as to provide him/her with the most important facts about the dictionary genre concerned. Below I include a diachronic component for the historical dictionary.

The major period in the development of historical dictionaries overlaps the period in which great NATIONAL DICTIONARIES were created (the nineteenth century). In English lexicography, the most important dictionary, covering the vocabulary from the Anglo-Saxon period to this day, is the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the first edition of which (1884–1928) was compiled on the basis of five million slips, but there are two other monumental works, i.e., *Dictionary of Old English* (1994–) and *Middle English Dictionary* (1952–2001). In the German dictionary-making tradition the best-known historical dictionary is *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1854–1960), a 16-volume work edited by the brothers Grimm. In French lexicography a renowned historical dictionary is *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (1863–72), a four-volume work compiled by Littré, whose headwords are richly illustrated with chronologically-ordered source material. The 16-volume *Trésor de la langue française* (1971–94) was compiled upon the British model and, although it is not a typical historical dictionary, it has a clear historical component and describes the French vocabulary from the end of the eighteenth century. Russian HISTORICAL LEXICOGRAPHY has also had a long tradition, inspired by the compilation of materials for the dictionary of Old Russian carried out by Sreznevskij. The three basic historical dictionaries of Russian are: *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.* (1975–98), *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka (XI–XIV vv.)* (1988–94) as well as *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XVIII v.* (1984–98). The best-known historical GENERAL DICTIONARIES of Polish are *Słownik języka polskiego* by Linde (1807–14) and *Słownik języka polskiego* by Karłowicz, Kryński and Niedźwiecki (1900–1927). Other Polish historical dictionaries, e.g., *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* (1966–), cover more restricted vocabulary. (See also DICTIONARY DIGITIZATION.)

By contrast, the next historical component is taken from the article on the national dictionary. Despite the historical dictionary and the national dictionary having had much in common, the genres are determined on the basis of different, although to some extent overlapping, parameters. As a result, not every historical dictionary is a national dictionary, but every national dictionary is indeed historical in character. Interestingly, some contemporary dictionaries add the adjective 'national' to their titles, signifying that such works may preserve and enhance the national identity (e.g., *the Scottish National Dictionary*, 1931–1976), but the national dictionary covers, as it seems, only the great dictionaries started in the era of Romanticism.

The concept of a national dictionary, perceived as the embodiment of romantic ideas, was postulated in 1812 by the German philologist Passow. The support for this idea in Britain came from Trench, who inspired the compilation of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and according to whom a lexicographer was primarily a language historian. Thus, the concept of a national dictionary was realized in Britain by Murray (*The New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 1884–1928, later called the *Oxford English Dictionary*), in Germany — by the brothers Grimm (*Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1854–1960), in France — by Littré (*Dictionnaire de la langue française*, 1863–72), in Russia — by Dal’ (*Tolkovyj slovar’ živogo velikorussskogo jazyka*, 1863–6), and in Poland — by Linde (*Słownik języka polskiego*, 1807–14). Another Polish national dictionary, *Bogactwa mowy polskiej*, compiled at the beginning of the nineteenth century by Osiński, never appeared in print. Unlike earlier reference works, whose headwords had also been richly illustrated with citations (*Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française*, 1694; Johnson’s *Dictionary of the English Language*, 1755; Richardson’s *A New Dictionary of the English Language*, 1836–7), the national dictionary not only explains the meanings of words, but also describes in detail formal and semantic changes in the development of the language. (See also HISTORICAL DICTIONARY, DIACHRONIC DICTIONARY.)

On closer scrutiny, this particular genre may be subject to various interpretations, since its underlying criteria are far less clear-cut than in the case of most dictionary types. For example, if one takes the era of Romanticism as the historical borderline, it will be impossible to treat the great lexicographical endeavours of the sixteenth (*Vocabolario degli accademici della crusca*, 1591–1612) and seventeenth century (*Dictionnaire de l’Académie Française*, 1694) as national dictionaries. Similarly, Samuel Johnson’s and Noah Webster’s dictionaries of 1755 and 1828 respectively exerted a strong influence on the English language, becoming patriotic symbols that represented what was finest in both language varieties across two continents. The question to be asked is: should they both be treated as genuine national dictionaries even if Johnson’s work preceded Romanticism, and Webster’s dictionary was not in fact based on ‘historical principles’?

While the historiographical treatment of the major genres is quite impressive, relatively little is known about the development of other genres, which could perhaps be labelled subjectively as minor. To provide a specific example, the pronunciation dictionary has had an acknowledged history in the English lexicographical tradition, but is not described adequately in the specialist literature. (Cf. Bronstein 1986.) Needless to say, elaborating on such issues required more extensive research and more time than it seemed at first sight. Below I include the historical component for the pronunciation dictionary.

Pronunciation (or pronouncing) dictionaries are most typical of English lexicography; in other traditions they have been usually replaced by or integrated into the so-called DICTIONARIES OF CORRECT USAGE. To the best-known and most renowned dictionaries of this kind belongs *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language* compiled by Walker (1791). Its FRONT MATTER included a detailed description of the phonological system of the English language. Interestingly, unlike other compilers, Walker applied numbers, not diacritic marks, over vowels to indicate their value. His dictionary was a NORMATIVE DICTIONARY, recommending correct pronunciation, and providing normative comments for incorrect variants (*decrepit* “This word is frequently mispronounced, as if spelled *decrepid*.”). Some secondary pronunciation dictionaries (*A Vocabulary of such Works [...]*, 1797) were of the ‘narrative’ kind, describing pronunciation recommended by the particular compilers (like Walker, Sheridan or Johnson). The twentieth-century pronunciation dictionaries, primarily those aimed at EFL learners (e.g., *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*, 2000), have lost their explicit normative character, but lexicographers still implicitly indicate the recommended standard forms, e.g., by the ordering of variants and applying LABELS.

One may find it incomprehensible that there is no reference in the above passage to the divergent growth of pronunciation dictionaries in the British and American markets — of which the former are aimed almost exclusively at non-native speakers, whereas the latter target native speakers of English — or to pronunciation dictionaries in the other national traditions. The point is that the differences between them are so striking that they have been described in the body of the entry, not in the historical component, which simply offers too little space.

Some other genres are more difficult to deal with, not exactly because of the unavailability of sources, but rather because their historical development is fairly dubious. This case is exemplified by

the hybrid or semi-bilingual dictionary, the main dilemma being whether the genres should be perceived as synchronic phenomena or whether one can search successfully for their roots. For example, in one of his papers published under the promising title “Pure or Hybrid: The Development of Mixed Dictionary Genres”, Hartmann (2005) discusses the development of the hybrid dictionary from the purely synchronic angle, although it is clear from his discussion that this genre goes back a long way. He admits, at the same time, that since the history (as well as the typology) of mixed genre-dictionaries has received very little attention in metalexicographical literature, it remains a desideratum (Hartmann 2005: 196). In such cases, I had to mediate between confirmed facts and fairly inconclusive observations, and the following description of the semi-bilingual dictionary belongs to the so-called ‘compromise’ solutions.

Contrary to the traditional view, semi-bilingual dictionaries are not a truly innovative dictionary genre, because as early as the sixteenth century some bilingual Latin-Italian dictionaries had features of today’s semi-bilingual dictionaries. The first ‘new-generation’ reference work was *Longman English Dictionary for Portuguese Speakers* (1982), aimed at basic and intermediate users. It included 10,000 headwords treated as the BASIC VOCABULARY. The first dictionary targeted at intermediate and advanced users was the Hebrew version of *Oxford Student’s Dictionary of Current English* (by Hornby) published in 1986. Today semi-bilingual dictionaries are widely known reference works aimed, for instance, at speakers of Arabic, Chinese, Russian, French, Italian, Polish or Portuguese, but the core of each dictionary is always based on English material.

It turned out in the course of my queries that a few genres, e.g., the active or passive dictionary, are actually too recent to have had a decent history, which is another problem that needed to be handled consistently. What I focused on in the following sample is basically the description of the provenance of these two dichotomous concepts, which was supported by the titles of the most representative dictionaries.

The distinction into active and passive dictionaries was inspired by the Russian linguist Ščerba, the author of *Russko-francuzskij slovar’* (1939), a dictionary compiled on the basis of his innovative LEXICOGRAPHICAL CONCEPTION. He claimed that for any pair of languages, four dictionaries are necessary: two EXPLANATORY DICTIONARIES, which explain foreign headwords in the user’s native language and, depending upon the user’s needs, two bilingual dictionaries, which enable the user to make a translation from his/her native to non-native language. However, today lexicographers are not unanimous as to how exactly Ščerba’s theory should be interpreted. Nonetheless, few reference works are truly active or passive, as most bilingual dictionaries are bidirectional and bifunctional, being useful both for the production and reception tasks. For example, *Das Deutsch-Russische Wörterbuch* (1983–4) is designed as a truly active dictionary.

Because of limited evidence, a handful of genres, e.g., the alternative dictionary, must be seen as controversial, although the first antidictionary was apparently published as early as 1612 (Hartmann 2001: 52). This controversy derives from the fact that the adjective ‘alternative’ suggests an opposition to ‘traditional’, but it can refer to several lexicographical features, like the defining style, format or access structure. The following component is an attempt to describe this genre as succinctly as possible, but historical details are scarce.

In most dictionary-making traditions, dictionaries of slang or vulgar words are recognized as alternative dictionaries, perhaps because such projects can now be published on the Internet without any linguistic censorship. Alternative dictionaries may also encompass other, fairly atypical, types of lexicographical publication, e.g., scrabblers’ dictionaries or ELECTRONIC DICTIONARIES that can be edited by the DICTIONARY USER himself/herself. In English lexicography, the term ‘alternative dictionary’ is also used for reference works whose structure differs from the traditional ENTRY ARRANGEMENT, i.e., ALPHABETICAL ARRANGEMENT. In this sense, dictionaries compiled in the CONCEPTUAL ARRANGEMENT, primarily the THESAURUS (cf. CONCEPTUAL DICTIONARY, THEMATIC DICTIONARY, ANALOGICAL DICTIONARY), may also be regarded as alternative dictionaries. The term also refers to dictionaries defining headwords in an unconventional way, Bierce’s *Devil’s Dictionary* (1907) being perhaps the best-known alternative dictionary of this kind.

Finally, there are a few genres for which it would simply be impractical to try to establish developmental trends. This refers in the first place to such opposing lexicographical types as the differential dictionary versus the complete / total-language dictionary, or the extensive dictionary versus the intensive dictionary, which must be seen as continua rather than well-defined, mutually exclusive genres. Similarly, it would be very difficult to provide the user with a consistent history of the special dictionary, which is a very broad genre, interpreted differently because of selected features, such as the subject of lexicographical description, type of lemma arrangement, intended purpose or type of target user. In this case, I presumed that excluding the historical description would be more reasonable than including minuscule historical notes on each of the numerous subtypes of this genre, which would make the dictionary article fairly chaotic.

### 4.3. *Classificatory and terminological systems*

#### 4.3.1. *The monolingual perspective*

Many researchers dealing with lexicographical typologies have commented on the complex task of matching dictionaries to the typological scheme. To mention just a few, Hartmann argues that “the classification of dictionaries into types is in itself an extremely complex issue” (2001: 68), and his statement is echoed by Béjoint, who claims that “dictionaries come in more varieties than can ever be classified in a simple taxonomy” (1994: 37). According to Zgusta, this state of affairs results from the fact that “the selective restrictions of dictionaries can be based on very different principles and on different combinations of principles” (1971: 209). Hence, it comes as little surprise that “the loosely defined discipline of English lexicography has no standard of measuring the universe of dictionaries” (Dolezal 1996).

That the ‘universe’ of dictionaries can hardly be measured I learned by trying to classify specific dictionaries into specific genres. What makes it difficult is that reference works often cannot be taken at face value, i.e., the title is by no means a reliable indicator of any genre. For instance, Nathan Bailey’s *Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1721) is not an etymological dictionary in our currently accepted usage.<sup>10</sup> To categorize the dictionaries analysed properly, I read the available literature on them, but — to avoid errors — I also needed access to these dictionaries in order to check their features. Taking into account the limited availability of a large number of sources, especially older ones, suffice it to say that even despite extensive library research, primarily in the impressive Cordell Collection of Dictionaries in Terre Haute (Indiana State University),<sup>11</sup> there are still plenty of dictionaries that I never saw. It goes without saying that in the era of computer technology only dictionary digitization can fill that gap.

Taking another issue into consideration, drawing a clear line between the various types and subtypes of dictionaries was fairly hard, and this is particularly true of the author’s dictionary, which encompasses three distinct subtypes: the explanatory dictionary, the frequency dictionary and the concordance. Interestingly, while in the Eastern European lexicographical tradition the explanatory dictionary has been predominant, in English, French and German tradition the concordance has been used most widely.<sup>12</sup> (Cf. Hanon 1990: 1563.) The history of the genre is presented below.

In British lexicography, Shakespeare is the best-described author, as there are several dozen dictionaries based on a collection (or selection) of his works. The first anonymous concordance to Shakespeare was published in 1787, and it was followed by many dictionaries, e.g., Clarke’s *Complete Concordance to Shakespeare* (1845) or Spevack’s *Complete and Systematic Concordance to the Works of Shakespeare* (1968–70). Most dictionaries to the works by Chaucer, Milton, Pope, Shaw, Dickens, Keats, Browning, Wordsworth, Shelley and other writers and poets in British and American literature appeared in the twentieth century (with a few exceptions, like Speght’s *The Old and Obscure Words in Chaucer*

<sup>10</sup> Because of the prestige that was associated with the label ‘etymological’ in the past, all sorts of regional vocabularies were compiled that qualified as etymological, even though “such etymologising as the authors had engaged in was — at least from our vantage — unoriginal, dilettantish, plagiaristic, or worse” (Malkiel 1976: 10).

<sup>11</sup> I would like to gratefully acknowledge a fellowship received from the Curator of the Cordell Collection, which covered my three-week library research period in 2005.

<sup>12</sup> It may be worthy of mention that throughout the history of dictionary-making the concordance was the most frequently used dictionary type for the description of the vocabulary of the Bible.

*Explained*, 1598). The German dictionary-making tradition was focused primarily on the works of Goethe (*Goethe-Wortschatz*, 1929), Schiller (*Konkordanz zu Schillers aesthetischen und philosophischen Schriften*, 1980) and Kant (*Stellenindex und Konkordanz zur "Logik Blomberg"*, 1988). [...] In Russian lexicography there are dictionaries exemplifying all subtypes of the author's dictionary (*Slovar' jazyka Puškina*, 1956–61; *Častotnyj slovar' romana D. N. Mamina-Sibirjaka "Privalovskie milliony"*, 1977; *Konkordanc k sticham A. S. Puškina*, 2000; *Slovar' krylatych vyraženij Puškina*, 1999), but the explanatory format has been most widely used. In Polish lexicography only three (explanatory) author's dictionaries have been compiled so far, i.e., *Słownik języka Jana Chryzostoma Paska* (1963–73), *Słownik języka Adama Mickiewicza* (1962–83) and *Słownik polszczyzny Jana Kochanowskiego* (1995–). Another dictionary, *Słownik języka Cypriana Kamila Norwida*, is now under way.

It may be important to note, as has also been suggested in the discussion of typological theories, that the classification systems can only partly be developed as ontological (or hierarchical) structures, even though many genres are clearly related to one another. The etymological dictionary, for instance, is a subtype of the diachronic dictionary, but because it is distinguished by a more refined set of principles, it is described in its own right. Because of the relationships between specific genres and the dictionaries they represent, the same information is sometimes found in more than one article.

#### 4.3.2. *The multilingual perspective*

Classificatory problems also concern the multilingual perspective. Since the historical component in SML had to be kept short, I could not describe the development of all the national traditions in much detail. It was agreed, however, that where the dictionary-making traditions diverge, the historical component should highlight the differences. Achieving this aim was difficult for reasons which I will briefly describe below.

The term 'explanatory dictionary', for instance, has been borrowed into English from Russian lexicography, where it became the label for one of the most characteristic types of dictionary. To English scholars it may still sound somewhat awkward, the more so because its meaning overlaps that of the descriptive dictionary to some extent. The mid-twentieth century brought the combinatory dictionary, a subtype of this genre, which was based on the principles of explanatory and combinatory lexicology of Melčuk and Zolkovskij, hence, *Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian* (1984). (Cf. Mel'cuk 1988.) Such a highly sophisticated dictionary, though apparently difficult to use, has also been compiled for French (*Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain. Recherches lexico-sémantiques*, 1984–99), and its simplified bilingual version is available for Russian and English (*A Russian-English Collocational Dictionary of the Human Body*, 1996). Interestingly, the term 'combinatory' does not have to refer to Melčuk and Zolkovskij's postulates for a synthetic description of the lexical, semantic and syntactic relations of words. For example, *BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English* (1997) or *Czech-English Combinatory Dictionary: Noun and Verb* (2005) are convenient, easy-to-use dictionaries of collocations or, more broadly, word combinations.

As has already been pointed out, not every dictionary genre is found in every dictionary-making tradition. For example, the analogical dictionary is a well-represented genre in French lexicography (e.g., *Nouveau Dictionnaire Analogique*, 1971), and can be found in American lexicography (e.g., *American Roget's College Thesaurus in Dictionary Form*, 1978), but — to my knowledge — this genre has not developed in the Polish, Russian, German or British dictionary-making traditions. Interestingly, although the type as such is non-existent in the traditions just mentioned, there are ready-made terms for it, i.e., Polish 'słownik analogiczny', Russian 'analogičeskij slovar'', and German 'analogisches Wörterbuch'. This fact clearly points to an on-going internationalization of lexicographical terminology, which has been noticed by Knowles (1990: 1645–6).

Speaking further of the differences, not every dictionary genre encompasses reference works with identical forms and functions. For example, the English 'rhyming dictionary' and its presumably corresponding Polish counterpart 'słownik rymów' denote reference works that have been structured quite differently. More precisely, the rhyming dictionary is a commercial product that lists monolingual lemmas with rhyming endings (e.g., *Merriam-Webster's Rhyming Dictionary*, 2002), whereas 'słownik rymów' is a scholarly dictionary based on the works of a well-known poet (e.g., *Słownik rymów Cypriana Norwida*, 1998), which provides, e.g., information on the frequency of headwords in the

corpus of texts. In this way, the latter becomes a subtype of the author's dictionary. As in the Polish tradition, a scholarly dictionary and its subtypes can also be found in Russian lexicography (e.g., *Slovar' rifm Iosifa Brodskogo*, 1998). Similarly, two ostensibly equivalent terms, English 'orthoepy' and Polish 'ortoepia', differ in meaning; i.e., while 'orthoepy' refers to the principles of correct pronunciation, 'ortoepia' pertains to the principles of correct pronunciation, spelling and usage. No wonder 'orthoepic dictionary' (equivalent to the pronunciation dictionary) is quite different from 'słownik ortoepiczny' (equivalent to the dictionary of correct usage).

There are also differences even if the structure of the corresponding dictionaries is similar. This refers, for example, to English 'dictionary of foreign words', Polish 'słownik wyrazów obcych' and Russian 'slovar' inostrannykh slov', which have had different, yet often intermingling, purposes, functions and target users throughout their historical developments. A part of the entry has been provided below.

This genre continues the oldest European tradition of HARD WORD DICTIONARIES dating back to the Renaissance. Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604) has been regarded as the first dictionary of hard words in English lexicography. [...] Dictionaries of foreign words in the nineteenth century included collections of Latin and Greek words (*New Derivative and Etymological Dictionary of Such English Words as Have Their Origin in the Greek and Latin Languages*, 1838), and some of them had a clear didactic function. Today's dictionaries of this kind (*Chambers Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases*, 1995) list lexical items from many languages English came into contact with. In Russian lexicography, dictionaries of foreign words describing biblical names (*Reč' židovskago jazyka* [1287]) date back to the Old Russian period; foreign words can also be found in Pamvo Berynda's *Leksikon slavenorosskij i imen tolkovanie* (1627). Eighteenth-century dictionaries of foreign words, e.g., *Leksikon vokabulam novym po alfavitu*, focused on listing and explaining primarily technical words brought into Russian in the era of Peter the Great. [...] The three-volume *Novyj slovotolkovatel', raspoložennyj po alfavitu* by Janovskij (1803–6) became the source material for subsequent dictionaries of foreign words. Among the twentieth-century reference works one can find various subtypes, such as *Slovar' inostrannykh slov dlja škol'nikov* (1995) or *Tolkovyy slovar' inojazyčnykh slov* (1998), which collect foreignisms from a wide range of fields. The dictionary of foreign words has been a popular genre in Polish lexicography, too. The superfluous use of foreign words and phrases was often criticized heavily; hence some dictionaries were clearly compiled for puristic reasons (*Oczyszczyciel mowy polskiej czyli słownik obcośłów*, 1891). Still, not all lexicographers condemned the use of foreignisms, appreciating their potential for language economy, e.g., *Nowe Ateny, albo Akademia wszelkiej scjencyji pełna* (1745–6). [...] Nineteenth-century dictionaries collected words taken into Polish from neighbouring tongues, e.g., *Źródłosłownik wyrazów [...] przeniesionych z Polski do języka tureckiego* (1858). In the first half of the twentieth century *Słownik wyrazów obcych* by Arct (1898) became a well-known dictionary of foreign words (in many editions). More contemporaneously, *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych* by Kopaliński (1967) has been a very popular dictionary, treated as a compendium of knowledge that an average language user should have.

Moreover, some dictionary types of specific lexical units, like the dictionary of eponyms, dictionary of false friends or dictionary of winged words, have not been recognized formally as genres in English lexicography, even though there are works of reference that could be labelled as such (e.g., *Webster's New Dictionary of Eponyms*, 1990; *A Dictionary of False Friends*, 1982; *The Oxford Dictionary of Catchphrases*, 2002). By contrast, some other genres cannot be distinguished in English lexicography, because they describe features which are not typical of the linguistic system of English. For example, the inflectional dictionary can only be compiled for synthetic, not analytic, languages. Therefore, an inflectional dictionary could theoretically be compiled for Old English, but, as far as I know, no lexicographical project of this sort has been undertaken so far. (Cf. Bailey 1990: 1437–46.)

Finally, some genre terms are used in the metalexical literature in a fairly inconsistent way, hence it is difficult to provide their definition, let alone their history. 'Semantic dictionary', together with its Polish counterpart 'słownik znaczeniowy', is perhaps the best example. One might wonder whether this dictionary genre focuses on the explanation of meaning or refers to the systematic ordering of headwords. As there is some evidence for both uses, in the first case I added cross-references to a few related terms, including 'definitional (defining) dictionary', 'general dictionary' or 'dictionary of synonyms'; and in the second case users are recommended to look up two terms: 'thesaurus' and 'thematic dictionary'. (Cf. Wierzbicka's *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic*

*Dictionary*, 1987.) The cross-referencing structure is, in my view, the only remedy for such ambiguous, ill-defined genre terms.

## 5. Conclusions

The present paper tackles some difficulties in describing the histories of dictionary genres, both in the English dictionary-making tradition and across the whole European tradition. The points raised in the discussion may have some practical implications both for practical lexicographers and for dictionary researchers.

First, the availability of materials was a crucial factor in my research. However, while the histories of genres are sometimes fairly well described, others still need to be at least briefly touched upon. English metalexigraphers, for instance, have not paid much attention to tracing the historical development of specific dictionary types, although several genres have been treated, more or less thoroughly, in the three-volume encyclopedia edited by Hausmann et al. (1989–91).<sup>13</sup> Many genres have been described chronologically in Russian lexicography (e.g., *Vselennaja v alfavitnom porjadke*, 2000), but it is not always the case in the other metalexigraphical discourses. When no relevant sources were found, I had to rely on my own intuition rather than on critical literature.

Second, source materials are of different quality, inasmuch as they comment variously on the state of lexicographical research. This made the task of describing the histories of genres challenging, particularly as metalexigraphy is not a fossilized field, and established opinions are naturally subject to change. To put it differently, sometimes the status of dictionaries labelled as ‘unimportant’ or ‘derivative’ may be reconsidered as more information is gained about the past. This is apparently true of at least a handful of dictionaries, including Wilkins’ and Lloyd’s *Alphabetical Dictionary* (1668) in English lexicography (Dolezal 1986) and Rykaczewski’s *Słownik języka polskiego* (1866) in the Polish dictionary-making tradition (Bańko 2002).

Third, one might argue that the historical description should only take into account the canonical works in a given lexicographical tradition. However, I prefer to speak of a spectrum of dictionaries rather than of a canon, since the latter inevitably invokes some axiological judgements. In my view, it is fairly unclear which dictionaries — and on what grounds — should be classified as the canon for the purposes of lexicographical typology. The point is that in order to illustrate the existing range of genre terms, I had to take into account both lexicographical landmarks (e.g., the OED, 1989), as well as fairly peripheral dictionaries (e.g., *Place names of the Sierra Nevada: from Abbot to Zumwalt*, 1986), which are clearly dissimilar in a number of ways.

Last but not least, not every genre developed in the five traditions under consideration, and formal features and functions of presumably parallel genres often do not overlap. Taking into account the conceptual and terminological differences between genres in a contrastive perspective, it is not surprising that the historical account in SML is not as consistent as it was originally expected to be. Nonetheless, even though consistency in a metalexigraphical project of this sort will not always be achieved, it is important that the histories of dictionary genres be given more attention, so that both similarities and differences between dictionary-making traditions could be traced in more detail. I believe that the historical description will broaden the user’s historiographical knowledge of lexicography by allowing him/her to draw a line between culture-specific dictionary traditions and trends within these traditions, and it is therefore a welcome component in an explanatory dictionary of European metalexigraphy.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Fredric Dolezal for his insightful remarks and suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper. Special thanks are also to the editors of the present volume for their helpful comments on the final draft.

---

<sup>13</sup> Another volume of the encyclopaedia, devoted primarily to recent developments in computational lexicography and edited by Rufus H. Gouws et al., is now in preparation.

## References

### A) Dictionaries<sup>14</sup>

- An Alphabetical Dictionary*. 1668. John Wilkins and William Lloyd. In *An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*. London: J. M. for Gellibrand and Martin. Reprint. 1968. (ed.) Robin C. Alston. Menston: Scolar Press.
- The American Roget's College Thesaurus in Dictionary Form*. 1978. (ed.) A. H. Morehead. New York: Signet.
- The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English*. 1997. Morton Benson, Evelyn Benson and Robert Ilson. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Catholicon*. 1460. Joannes [Johannes, Januensis] Balbus. Mainz: [von Gutenberg?].
- Chambers Dictionary of Foreign Words and Phrases*. 1995. (ed.) Rosalind Fergusson. Edinburgh: Chambers.
- A Complete and Systematic Concordance to Shakespeare*. 1968–80. Marvin Spevack. Hildesheim, NY: Georg Olms Verlag.
- The Complete Concordance to Shakespeare*. 1842. Charles C. Clarke. London: Charles Knight.
- A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language*. 1791. John Walker. London: Sold by G. G. J. and J. Robinson, and T. Cadell.
- Czech-English Combinatory Dictionary: Noun and Verb*. 2005. Aleš Klégr, Petra Key and Norah Hronková. Prague: Karolinum/Charles University Press.
- Častotnyj slovar' romana D. N. Mamina-Sibirjaka "Privalovskie milliony"*. 1977. M. A. Genkel'. Perm': Perm. Universitet.
- Das Deutsch-Russische Wörterbuch*. 1983–4. Ronald Lötzsche et al. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 1854–1960. (eds.) Jacob Grimm and Wilhelm Grimm. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- The Devil's Dictionary*. 1907. Ambrose Bierce. New York: Neale.
- Dictionarium trium linguarum: Latinae, Teutonicae et Poloniae*. 1528. Franciszek Mymerus [Mymer]. Cracoviae [Kraków].
- Dictionarius Murelii variarum rerum, tum pueris, tum adultis utilissimus, cum Germanica atque Polonica interpretatione*. 1528. Jan Murelius [Murmeliusz]. Cracoviae [Kraków].
- A Dictionary of False Friends*. 1982. Robert J. Hill. London: Macmillan.
- Dictionary of Lexicography*. 2001. R. R. K. Hartmann and Gregory James. London: Routledge.
- A Dictionary of the English Language*. 1755. Samuel Johnson. London. CD-ROM. 1996. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*. 1694. Paris: J. B. Coignard. 30 Sep 2008  
<<http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/projects/dicos/>>.
- Dictionnaire de la langue française*. 1863–72. Emile Littré. Paris: Librairie de L. Hachette. 30 Sep 2008  
<<http://francois.gannaz.free.fr/Littré/accueil.php>>.
- Dictionnaire explicatif et combinatoire du français contemporain. Recherches lexico-sémantiques*. 1984–99. Igor Mel'čuk et al. Montréal: Les presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Dictionnaire français-latin*. 1539. Robert Estienne. Paris: de R. Estienne.
- English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. 1987. Anna Wierzbicka. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary of Modern Russian. Tolkovo-kombinatornyj slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka: Semantico-syntactic studies of Russian vocabulary*. 1984. Igor A. Mel'čuk and Andrej K. Zholkovskij. Wiener Slavistischer Almanach, 14. Vienna: Gesellschaft zur Förderung slawistischer Studien.
- Glossographia: or a Dictionary, Interpreting All such Hard Words, [...] as are Now Used in Our Refined English Tongue*. 1656. Thomas Blount. London: Tho. Newcomb, Sold by Humphrey Moseley, and George Sawbridge.
- Goethe-Wortschatz. Ein sprachgeschichtliches Wörterbuch zu Goethes sämtlichen Werken*. 1929. Paul Fischer. Leipzig: Rohmkopf.
- The Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary*. 1942. A. S. Hornby et al. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Kant-Index. Stellenindex und Konkordanz zur "Logik Blomberg"*. 1989. Norbert Hinske. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Konkordanc k sticham A. S. Puškina*. 2000. D. T. Šoy. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Konkordanz zu Schillers aesthetischen und philosophischen Schriften*. 1980. Ulm G. Sanford. New York: Syracuse University.

<sup>14</sup> The alphabetic ordering of the titles gives preference to the standard Latin alphabet, and letters precede numbers. Russian words have been transliterated into English according to the ISO transliteration standards. ISO symbols include ж = ž, ц = c, ч = č, ш = š, щ = šč, я = ja, ю = ju, э = è, е, ё = e, etc. To avoid confusion with the transcription, Russian x = ch. An apostrophe (') denotes the soft sign (ь), whereas a double apostrophe (") replaces the hard sign (ъ).

- Leksikon slavenorosskij i imen tolkovanie*. 1627. Pamvo Berynda. Kiev. Vasil' V. Nemčuk. 1961. (ed.) Kiev: Akademija Nauk Ukrainskoj RSR.
- Leksikon vokabulam novym po alfavitu*. In N. A. Smirnov. 1910. (ed.) *Zapadnoje vlijanie na russkij jazyk v Petrovskuju epochu*. Sankt Peterburg: Tip. Imper. Akademii Nauk.
- Leksis, sireč' rečenija vkratce sobranny i iz slovenskogo jazyka na prosty russkij dijalekt istolkovany*. 1596. Lavrentij Zizanj Tustanovskij. Vilnius.
- Longman English Dictionary for Portuguese Speakers*. 1982. Rosa W. Konder. Harlow: Longman / Rio de Janeiro: AO Livro Técnico.
- Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English*. 1981. (ed.) Tom McArthur. Harlow: Longman.
- Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*. 2000. John Wells. Harlow: Pearson.
- Merriam-Webster's Rhyming Dictionary*. 2002. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Michała Arcta słownik wyrazów obcych: 25.000 wyrazów, wyrażeń, zwrotów i przysłów cudzoziemskich, używanych w mowie potocznej i w prasie polskiej*. 1921[1898]. Michał Arct. Seventh ed. Warszawa: M. Arct.
- Middle English Dictionary*. 1952–2001. (eds.) Hans Kurath, Sherman M. Kuhn and Robert E. Lewis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press / London: OUP. 30 Sep 2008 <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/med/lookup.html>>.
- A New Derivative and Etymological Dictionary of Such English Words as Have Their Origin in the Greek and Latin Languages*. 1835. John Rowbotham. London.
- A New Dictionary of the English Language*. 1836. Charles Richardson. London: William Pickering.
- Nouveau dictionnaire analogique*. 1971. Daniel Delas and Daniele Delas-Demon. Paris: Hachette-Tchou.
- Novyj slovotolkovatel', raspoložennyj po alfavitu*. 1803–6. N. M. Janovskij. Sankt Petersburg.
- Nowe Ateny, albo Akademia wszelkiej scjencyji pełna, na różne tytuły jak na classes podzielona, mądrym dla memoryjału, idyjom dla nauki, politykom dla praktyki, melancholikom dla rozrywki erygowana*. 1745–6. Benedykt Chmielowski. Lvov. 30 Sep 2008 <<http://univ.gda.pl/~literat/ateny/index.htm>>.
- Oczyszczyciel mowy polskiej czyli słownik obcośłów składający się blisko z 10 000 wyrazów i wyrażeń z obcych mów utworzonych a w piśmie i w mowie polskiej nie-potrzebnie używanych, oraz wyrazów gminnych, przestarzałych i ziemszczyzn w różnych okolicach Polski używanych z wysłowieniem i objaśnieniem polskiem*. 1891. E. S. Kortowicz. Poznań.
- The Old and Obscure Words in Chaucer Explained*. 1598. Thomas Speght. In *The Workes of our Antient and Learned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer*. London: Printed by Adam Islip. Reprint. 1969. Menston: Scolar Press.
- The Oxford Dictionary of Catchphrases*. 2002. Anna Farkas. Oxford: OUP.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. The New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. 1884–1928. (eds.) James Murray et al. First edition. Supplement. 1933. Supplement. 1972–1986. Second edition. 1989. Oxford: OUP. CD-ROM. 1994. Oxford: OUP.
- Oxford Student's Dictionary for Hebrew Speakers*. 1986. A. S. Hornby. Tel Aviv: Kernerman Publishing/Lonnie Kahn.
- Place Names of the Sierra Nevada: From Abbot to Zumwalt*. 1986. Peter Browning. Berkeley: Wilderness.
- Promptorium Parvulorum et Clericorum*. 1499. Galfridus Grammaticus. London: Pynson. 30 Sep 2008 <<http://www.umilta.net/promptorium.html>>.
- Reč' židovs'kago jazyka [1287] In K. F. Kalajdovič. 1824. *Ioan ekzarch bolgarskij*. Moscow. 193–195.
- A Russian-English Collocational Dictionary of the Human Body*. 1996. (eds.) Lidija Iordanskaja and Slava Paperno. English equivalents L. LaRocco, J. MacKenzie and R. L. Leed. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers. 30 Sep 2008 <[http://lexiconbridge.com/amazon/sl\\_body.htm](http://lexiconbridge.com/amazon/sl_body.htm)>.
- Russko-francuzskij slovar'*. 1954[1939]. (ed.) Lev V. Ščerba. Fourth ed. Moskva: Gosud. izdat. inostrannyh i nacional'nych slovaraj.
- The Scottish National Dictionary*. 1931–76. (eds.) William Grant and David Murison Edinburgh: Scottish National Dictionary Association.
- Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka XI–XIV vv*. 1988–94. (ed.) R. I. Avanesov. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Slovar' inostrannyh slov*. 1948[1937]. F.N. Petrov. Third ed. Moscow: Gosud. izdat. inostrannyh i nacional'nych slovaraj.
- Slovar' inostrannyh slov dlja škol'nikov*. 1998. G. A. Lebedeva. Moscow: Slavjanskij dom knigi.
- Slovar' jazyka Puškina*. 1956–61. (ed.) V. V. Vinogradov. Moskva: GIS.
- Slovar' krylatych vyražeenij Puškina*. 1999. V. M. Mokijenko and K. P. Sidorenko. Petersburg: Izdat. Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta.
- Slovar' rifm Iosifa Brodskogo*. 1998. (ed.) V. A. Rogačeva, comp. A. L. Babakin. Tjumen': Izdat. J. Mandriki.
- Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv*. 1975–97. (A-Skymda) (ed.) G. A. Bogatova. Moskva: Nauka.
- Slovar' russkogo jazyka XVIII v*. 1984–98. (ed.) J. S. Sorokin, L. L. Kutlina and E. E. Biržakova. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Słownik języka Adama Mickiewicza*. 1962–83. (ed.) Konrad Górski and Stefan Hrabec. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

- Słownik języka Jana Chryzostoma Paska*. 1963–73. (ed.) Halina Koneczna and Witold Doroszewski. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Słownik języka polskiego*. Alojzy Osiański. [Held in the manuscript form, Lvov.]
- Słownik języka polskiego*. 1807–14. Samuel B. Linde. Warszawa: u Autora.
- Słownik języka polskiego*. 1900–27. (eds.) Jan Karłowicz, Adam Kryński and Władysław Niedźwiedzki. Warszawa: Nakładem Prenumeratorów i Kasy Mianowskiego.
- Słownik języka polskiego podług Lindego i innych nowszych źródeł wypracowany*. 1866. Erazm Rykaczewski. Berlin: B. Behr (E. Bock).
- Słownik polszczyzny Jana Kochanowskiego*. 1994– (ed.) Marian Kucała. Kraków: IJP PAN.
- Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. 1966– (eds.) Stanisław Bąk and Renata Mayenowa. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich / Warszawa: Wyd. IBL.
- Słownik rymów Cypriana Norwida*. 1998. Marian Jeżowski. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych*. 1967. Władysław Kopalniński. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- A Table Alphabeticall, Conteyning and Teaching the True Writing, and Understanding of Hard Usuall English Words*. 1604. Robert Cawdrey. London: I. R. for Edmund Weaver.
- Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases, Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and Assist in Literary Composition*. 1852. Peter M. Roget. London: Longman.
- Tolkovyj slovar' inozazyčnych slov*. 1998. L. P. Krysin. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka*. 1880–2[1863–6]. Vladimir I. Dal'. Second ed. Sankt Peterburg. CD-ROM. 1998. Moskva: ETS. 15 Sep. 2008 <<http://vidahl.agava.ru>>.
- Trésor de la langue française*. 1971–94. (ed.) Paul Imbs. Paris: Editions du Centre national de la recherche scientifiques. 30 Sep 2008 <<http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm>>.
- A Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. 1721. Nathan Bailey. London.
- Vocabolario degli accademici della crusca*. 1591–1612. Venice.
- Vocabolista italiano-tedesco*. 1477. Venice: Adam von Rottweil.
- A Vocabulary of Such Words in the English Language As Are of Dubious or Unsettled Pronunciation; in Which the Pronunciation of Sheridan, Walker, and Other Orthoepists, is Compared*. 1797. London: For F. and C. Rivington, G. and T. Wilkie.
- Vselennaja v alfavitnom porjadke*. 2000. V. A. Kozыrev and V. D. Černjak. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd. RGPU im. A. I. Gercena.
- Webster's New World Dictionary of Eponyms*. 1990. Auriel Douglas. New York: Simon and Schuster/Webster New World.
- Źródłosłownik wyrazów które przeszły, wprost czy pośrednio, do naszej mowy z języków wschodnich, tudzież mających zobopólną analogję co do brzmienia lub znaczenia, z dołączeniem zbioru wyrazów przeniesionych z Polski do języka tureckiego*. 1858. Antoni Muchliński. Petersburg.

## B) Other References

- Algeo, John. 1991. American Lexicography. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 3. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1987–2009.
- Al-Kasimi, Ali M. 1983. *Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Bailey, Richard W. 1990. The Period Dictionary III: English. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1436–1457.
- Bailey, Richard W. 1996. Old Dictionaries, New Knowledge. In *Computing in the Humanities Working Papers*, B. 28. 10 Oct 2008 <<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/epc/chwp/bailey/>>.
- Bańko, Mirosław. 2002. Słownik języka polskiego Erazma Rykaczewskiego – pierwszy popularny słownik polszczyzny. In *Prace Filologiczne*, 47. 7–26.
- Béjoint, Henri. 1994. *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bielińska, Monika. 2005a. O słownikach terminologii (meta)leksykograficznej. In *Poradnik Językowy*, 1. 27–39.
- Bielińska, Monika. 2005b. Wörterbücher (meta)lexikographischer Termini – Vorstellung eines Projekts. In *Convivium*. 203–218.
- Bowker, Lynne. 2003. Specialized Lexicography and Specialized Dictionaries. In Piet van Sterkenburg (ed.) *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 154–164.
- Bronstein, Arthur. 1986. The History of Pronunciation in English-Language Dictionaries. In R. R. K. Hartmann (ed.) *The History of Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 23–33.
- Comenius, Johann A. 1659. *Orbis sensualium pictus*. Amsterdam.
- Considine, John and Giovanni Iamartino. 2007. (eds.) *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in the Historical Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Dolezal, Fredric. 1986. How Abstract is the English Dictionary? In R. R. K. Hartmann (ed.) *The History of Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 47–55.
- Dolezal, Fredric. 1996. The Canon of the English Dictionary. In *Computing in the Humanities Working Papers*, B. 20. 30 Sep 2008 <<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/epc/chwp/>>.
- Dolezal, Fredric. 2007. Writing the History of English Lexicography: Is There a History of English Lexicography after Starnes and Noyes? In John Considine and Giovanni Iamartino (eds.) *Words and Dictionaries from the British Isles in the Historical Perspective*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 1–13.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 1984. Dictionary Classification and the Foundation of Lexicography. In *I. T. L. Review*, 63. 37–63.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 2005. *On Grammar*. Jonathan J. Webster (ed.) The Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday, 1. London: Continuum.
- Hanon, Suzanne. 1990. La concordance. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1562–1567.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. 1986. (ed.) *The History of Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. 2005. Pure or Hybrid? The Development of Mixed Dictionary Genres. In *Facta Universitatis* 3(2). 193–208. 18 Sep 2008 <<http://facta.junis.ni.ac.yu/lal/lal2005/lal2005-06.pdf>>.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef. 1989. Wörterbuchtypologie. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 1. Berlin: De Gruyter. 968–981.
- Hausmann, Franz Josef et al. 1989–91. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 1–3. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hupka, Werner. 1989. Das enzyklopädische Wörterbuch. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 1. Berlin: De Gruyter. 988–999.
- Hüllen, Werner. 1999. *English Dictionaries 800–1700. The Topical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hüllen, Werner. 2005. *A History of Roget's Thesaurus*. Oxford: OUP.
- Knowles, Francis E. 1990. The Computer in Lexicography. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1645–1670.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Landau, Sidney I. 1984. *Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. New York: Scribners.
- Landau, Sidney I. 2001. *Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1962. A Typological Classification of Dictionaries on the Basis of Distinctive Features. In Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.) *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University. 217–227. [Supplement to the *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 28.]
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1976. *Etymological Dictionaries. A Tentative Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marello, Carla. 1990. The Thesaurus. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1083–1094.
- Martin, Willy. 1990. The Frequency Dictionary. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1314–1322.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. 1988. Semantic Description of Lexical Units in an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary: Basic Principles and Heuristic Criteria. In *International Journal of Lexicography*, 1(3). 165–188.
- Osselton, Noel. 1990. English Lexicography From the Beginning Up to and Including Johnson. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1943–1953.
- Podhajecka, Mirosława and Monika Bielińska. 2008. An English-Polish Glossary of Lexicographical Terms: A Description of the Compilation Process. In Elisenda Bernal and Janet DeCesaris (eds.) *Proceedings of the XIII EURALEX International Congress (Barcelona, 15–19 July 2008)*. Sèrie Activitats, 20. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra. 1041–1049.
- Reed, Joseph W. 1962. Noah Webster's Debt to Samuel Johnson. In *American Speech* 37(2). 96–105.
- Rey, Alan. 1970. *Typologie génétique des dictionnaires*. In *Langages*, 19. 48–68.
- Schäfer, Jürgen. 1970. The Hard Word Dictionaries: A Re-Assessment. In *Leeds Studies in English* [New Series]. 31–48.
- Sebeok, Thomas. 1962. Materials for a Typology of Dictionaries. In *Lingua*, 11. 363–374.
- Simpson, John A. 1990. English Lexicography After Johnson to 1945. In Franz J. Hausmann et al. (eds.) *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, 2. Berlin: De Gruyter. 1953–1966.
- Starnes, DeWitt T. and Gertrude E. Noyes. 1991[1946]. *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604–1755*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stein, Gabriele. 1985. *The English Dictionary Before Cawdrey*. Lexicographica Series Maior, 9. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Sterkenburg, van Piet. 2003. (ed.) *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Svensén, Bo. 1993. *Practical Lexicography: Principles and Methods of Dictionary-Making*. Oxford: OUP.

- Swanepoel, Piet. 2003. Dictionary typologies: A Pragmatic Approach. In Piet van Sterkenburg (ed.) *A Practical Guide to Lexicography*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 44–69.
- Ščerba, Lev V. 1940. Opyt obščej teorii leksikografii. In *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Otdelenie literatury i jazyka*, 3. 89–117. English Translation, 1995. L. V. Shcherba: Towards a General Theory of Lexicography. In *International Journal of Lexicography*, 8(4). 314–350.
- Yong, Heming and Jing Peng. 2007. *Bilingual Lexicography from a Communicative Perspective*. Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice, 9. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Janua Linguarum Series Maior, 39. Prague: Academia / The Hague: Mouton.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1989. The *Oxford English Dictionary* and other Dictionaries. In *International Journal of Lexicography* 2(3). 188–230.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1991. Typology of Etymological Dictionaries and V. I. Abaev's Ossetic Dictionary. In *Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography*, 7. 38–49.

# Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)

edited by R. W. McConchie,  
Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2009

## Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)  
© 2009 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-430-0 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

## Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.  
To place an order, go to [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com) or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA  
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com). Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Podhajecka, Mirosława. 2009. Historical Development of Lexicographical Genres: Some Methodological Issues. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 153-170. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Podhajecka, Mirosława. 2009. Historical Development of Lexicographical Genres: Some Methodological Issues. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2008 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX 2)*, ed. R. W. McConchie, Alpo Honkapohja, and Jukka Tyrkkö, 153-170. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #2174.