ABSTRACT: The aim of my work is to give a comprehensive picture of the development of Shakespeare lexicography during the past three centuries. More than 100 reference books compiled in different lexicographic forms (concordance, index, glossary and lexicon) have been analysed beginning from reference books with a limited prescriptive corpus of mainly "significant", "hard" or "remarkable" words up to a universal and complete registrative Shakespeare dictionary which combines the best features of all existing lexicographic forms. The analysis gives exhaustive material for a typology of Shakespeare dictionaries, i.e. a Shakespeare lexicography map.
Shakespeare's works was also limited and reflected the compiler's personal perception of Shakespeare's vocabulary.

M. Clark's concordance to Shakespeare's works (Clark 1845) published in the middle of the XIX c. continued the development of this lexicographic form in Shakespeare lexicography and made it wider in scope because it not only included "remarkable" words but also tried to give a reliable picture of Shakespeare's vocabulary registering even a large number of proper names.\(^4\)

This concordance opened a new era in Shakespeare lexicography giving the world another genre of an author's reference book – a comprehensive concordance to single works of the writer (Barlett 1881; Edwards 1903).

H. Furness's concordance proved to be a new type of this genre of dictionaries (Furness 1875). It appeared at the end of the XIX c. and provided a full corpus of Shakespeare's sonnets, i.e. it contained all the material from Shakespeare's sonnets.\(^5\)

Shakespeare concordances of today are represented by two main series: one in modern spelling compiled by M. Spevack (Spevack 1968-1980), the other in old-spelling created by T. Howard-Hill and known as Oxford Shakespeare concordances (Howard-Hill 1963-1973). Both series have been compiled on different type of computers. Their main aim is to give a full Shakespeare corpus and complete entry information. Their innovation is reflected in "giving separate and yet interlocking concordances – to single works, to individual characters, and to the complete works" (Spevack 1970/71, 48). The structure of all entry lines has been enriched by an additional new and important element borrowed from frequency dictionaries, i.e. statistical data, which had never been used in this lexicographic form before (Spevack 1968-1980; Howard-Hill 1973, 53-56).

Thanks to the appearance of both concordance series Shakespeare scholars got the most comprehensive Shakespeare database in a machine-readable form, which made a new step towards the most useful computer study of Shakespeare's texts.\(^6\)

Another group of Shakespeare dictionaries is represented by glossaries, the first of which also appeared three hundred years ago. They were originally reference books with a selective corpus and a limited lexicographic description including in addition to an illustrative context (as in concordances) also a word definition which was given by means of descriptive synonyms or cross-referencing.

They began their existence as the first elementary vocabularies included in various editions of Shakespeare's complete works (Edwards 1747; Shakespeare plays 1896). Later on, glossaries gave some additional information about entries, mainly etymological information and part of speech labels (Nares 1867; Mackay 1887). Their citations and definitions were also selective, and confined to the description of archaic and obscure words.

The first half of the XX c. became a "golden" age of Shakespeare lexicography in the field of glossary compilation. Many useful and original reference books to Shakespeare's works were published at that time (Dyce 1902; Foster 1908; Cunliffe 1910; Phin 1902).\(^7\) Their corpuses included about 7 000 - 9 000 entries, but the range of information in the entry line was enriched by very interesting additional semantic-functional characteristics, which combined different kinds of labels, i.e. grammatical, chronological, etymological, orphoeic, etc. The number of labels and their contents differed from one glossary to another. The glossary corpus was always limited because this lexicographic form registered and described only a certain set of words: archaisms, borrowings, etc.
Ch. Onions's glossary to Shakespeare (Onions 1911) is known as one of the most significant dictionaries in Shakespeare lexicography because the author of the glossary used the rich experience of Shakespeare concordances and glossaries published before him, and he also developed a particular system of stylistic labels, such as "first in Shakespeare", "Shakespeare unique use", "pedantic", "ironical" and the like. It was the first step in developing a new type of a "stylistic" writer's dictionary in English lexicography.

The compilers of modern glossaries have changed the contents of corpuses and actually started quite a new genre of dictionary. There have appeared a number of original glossaries, for example: sea-and naval terms in Shakespeare, the names of plants in Shakespeare's works etc. (Falconer 1960; Ryden 1978; Rubinstein 1986). Their main object has been a description of a definite set of terminology used by Shakespeare. By using a selective corpus the authors of these modern glossaries have changed the essence of the corpus data, but used the same type of lexical treatment as in former glossaries.

A lexicon or a dictionary is considered to be the most comprehensive lexicographic form in authors' lexicography because of the detailed philological characteristics of their head words. A. Schmidt's lexicon to Shakespeare, first published in 1886, is the most reliable and well-known dictionary to Shakespeare's complete works (Schmidt 1971). A. Schmidt tried to register every word in Shakespeare and define the meanings by using components of all existing lexicographic forms together with the results of numerous theoretical works on Shakespeare's language which had been published during the three centuries of Shakespeare scholarship. A. Schmidt created a historic type of writer's dictionary showing the peculiarities of Elizabethan English. As for presenting additional semantic-functional characteristics, the author of the lexicon used mainly grammatical labels.

It is only in the Shakespeare analytical dictionary project (SHAD), that Spevack's group of lexicographers have managed to develop a truly comprehensive type of writer's dictionary. The range of information in the entry block includes about 32 elements, among them: part of speech label, chronological, statistical, morphological and other labels (Neuhaus, Spevack 1975, 20-21). It may be assumed that SHAD will combine the features not only of all existing lexicographic forms of reference books, but also historic and stylistic types of a lexicon (Spevack, Neuhaus 1977, 15-22).

In my opinion, the ideal Shakespeare lexicon (or any other writer's lexicon) must be characterised by a complete corpus, with full verbal and graphic illustrations, comprehensive definitions and additional semantic-functional characteristics including as many labels of various kinds as possible.

In conclusion, it must be noted that all Shakespeare reference books may be classified according to the following criteria: 1) individual or complete works of an author, 2) a complete or a selective corpus, 3) complete or differential lexicographic treatment depending on the lexicographic form, i.e. a concordance is characterised only by illustrations or additional (statistical) characteristics, while a glossary is characterized by definitions and illustrative contexts with addresses of headwords in Shakespeare's texts. This typology is shown in Table 1.
Table 1. Dictionaries to the complete works of Shakespeare.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Lexicographic form</th>
<th>Concordance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>Complete (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Illustration</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Additional SFCh</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Shakespeare dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anonymous 1787</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ayscough 1790</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clark 1845</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spevack 1968</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Howard-Hill 1963-1973</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar types of concordances exist to single works of Shakespeare. Placing the names of all published reference books to Shakespeare’s works below, under numbers 1, 2, etc. and defining the degree of completeness of information in the corpus, illustrations and additional characteristics, one can get a comprehensive picture of concordance development (or the development of any other lexicographic form). Using this principle it is possible to get a Shakespeare lexicography map, where under figure “VI” all published and possible types of Shakespeare dictionaries may be listed.

While speaking about the future of Shakespeare reference book compilation I would like to mention different ways of creating new dictionaries; encyclopaedias, onomasticons, pronouncing dictionaries, terminological reference books, phraseological dictionaries, abbreviations in Shakespeare’s works, dictionaries of foreign words and also bilingual dictionaries, which have already appeared in Shakespeare lexicography. I mean the famous group of mainly English-German dictionaries (Jost 1830; Kellner 1922; Delius 1852) and two other lexicographic investigations: English-Italian and English-Japanese Shakespeare dictionaries (Michelagnoli 1947; Kurahashi 1972). It is interesting to note that up to now there is still no English-Russian Shakespeare dictionary, although Shakespeare’s language and style have always been in the centre of scholarly attention in our country and have resulted in numerous Shakespeare collections, translations, societies and even a Shakespeare Commission in the former Soviet Academy of Sciences.

So the sphere of Shakespeare lexicography is very wide and will be constantly spreading in the world because “... despite all that has been written about Shakepeare, we are left with the embarrassing and distressing fact that we have had no comprehensive and reliable picture of his vocabulary” (Spevack 1970/71, 47).
Endnotes

1. It should be noted that the term "dictionary" in this paper has a double meaning: 1) a reference book of any lexicographic form: concordance, glossary, index or lexicon; 2) lexicon where all head-words have additional semantic-functional characteristics, definition, illustrative examples and address of the heading in Shakespeare's texts.

2. Most of their works deal with the problems of computer-generated concordance compilation. See e.g. (Spevack 1973; 1975; Spevack & Neuhaus 1977; Howard-Hill 1966; 1969; 1979). It seems that the first attempt to investigate the history and typology together with the problems of compilation of different Shakespeare dictionaries was made in the thesis: Karpova 1990.

3. Sometimes the term "limited" is equal to the term "differential" or "selective", used in a word combination "selective corpus or "limited" lexicographic treatment of the head word, etc.

4. Registration of proper names in authors' dictionaries is a characteristic feature of English writers' lexicography, which gave rise to a special type of reference books describing place names, characters and other types of proper names. They have been compiled in different lexicographic forms, the main of which are lexicon or encyclopaedia. See e.g. (Irving 1945; Kökeritz 1959; Lothian 1966; Stokes 1924).

5. In general, writers' dictionaries to single works (no matter what lexicographic form they are compiled in) are always more suitable for presenting all language material from an author's works. Problems constantly arise in connection with dictionaries to complete works, when one must consider the question of omitted words.

6. Professor T. Howard-Hill formulated the main tasks for Shakespeare scholars while using Shakespeare materials on magnetic tapes. Among them are the problems of establishing computer-readable old- and modern-spelling texts of Shakespeare's works which began to be used in SHAD. See e.g. (Howard-Hill 1973).

7. It is interesting to note, that many dictionaries to other English writers' works also appeared at the end of the 19th c. See e.g. (Cuthberston 1886; Cleveland 1867; Ellis 1892; Lockwood 1907). For better reference see the list of published dictionaries to English and American authors in the book SLOVARIJAZYKA PISATELEJ: Karpova 1989.

8. A. Schmidt's dictionary was the first one published as a lexicon (1886 followed by a series of other editions in 1902, 1903, 1923, 1959, the easiest available now being Schmidt 1971).

9. Similar types of concordances can exist to Shakespeare's or any other writer's single works. The principle of this typology can be applied to any other national writer's lexicography, because it has, to some extent, a universal character.
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