

Gender in Slovenian Monolingual General Explanatory Dictionaries

Nina Ledinek, Mija Michelizza

Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we focus on gender as a grammatical and social category in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries and explain how the category of gender influences the selection and presentation of data included in Slovenian explanatory dictionaries, as well as their structuring at macro- and microstructural levels. We focus on the analysis of the changes that have occurred in dictionary description at the beginning of the 21st century due to the growing awareness of gender-sensitive language use, and point out some of the editorial dilemmas related to the category of gender that we face in the preparation of the eSSKJ: Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, Third Edition.

Key words: gender, lexicography, general monolingual explanatory dictionary, feminatives, gender-sensitive language use

Introduction

Gender in Slovenian was initially discussed by linguists mainly as a grammatical category^{1–4}; however, in recent decades this category has also been increasingly considered in the context of gender-sensitive language use and the analysis of social relations. Among other things, researchers have been problematizing the concept of masculine grammatical gender in nouns, which are designating persons regardless of their gender as unmarked or generic, recently also in terms of addressing issues of sexual non-binarism^{5–10}, and they have been studying the formation and use of designations for female persons in Slovenian, also in comparison with other languages^{11–16}, and exploring how language use reflects gender relations and social power relations in general, and how these relations are reflected in language reference works^{17–23}. In this way, Slovenian linguistics is joining the extremely complex, sensitive, and interdisciplinary field of research on gender in language, which views gender not only as a linguistic issue, but also through the prism of sociological, cultural, anthropological, psychological, and philosophical dilemmas. Such research was established in Slovenia at the end of the 1980s and in the 1990s^{5,24}.

Discussions about the role of women in modern society, social relations connected with sex and gender identity, and on gender-sensitive use of language have been present almost continually since then, and they gained more res-

onance a few years ago, especially with the decision adopted by the Senate of the University of Ljubljana's Faculty of Arts in mid-2018 that in the coming years the internal legal acts of this institution would alternate between the use of masculine and feminine grammatical forms (the practice will change every few years) as a neutral form for expressing gender or different gender identities. In response to the discussion thus launched, the roundtable Language and Gender²⁵ was held in the fall of 2018, organized by the University of Ljubljana's Faculty of Arts and the Committee for the Slovenian Language in Public at the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and in 2019 a special issue of the journal *Slavistična revija* was also dedicated to this topic.

Research Purpose and Methodology

This article presents the role of gender in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, explaining that it is a category that affects the selection and manner of presenting information included in dictionary entries, and their structuring at the microstructural level, and also in part at the macrostructural level. This applies to gender as both a grammatical and social category. The article does not feature a comprehensive analysis of gender

issues in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, but it outlines the key gender-related changes that have occurred in the entries in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries in recent decades, while illustrating some editorial issues connected with gender in the eSSKJ: Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, Third Edition (*eSSKJ: Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, tretja izdaja*).

Methodologically, the answers to the dilemmas presented were approached in three phases. In the first phase, based on an analysis of Slovenian and foreign scientific literature, we undertook a theoretical treatment of gender as grammatical and social category in monolingual general explanatory dictionaries. In the second phase, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of the types of explanations of entries naming occupations, especially of the female gender, in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries. At the same time, for a selected group of entries, we analyzed the examples in the dictionaries and compared them with their typical textual environment in contemporary language corpora. Corpus analysis was performed in the Gigafida 1.0 corpus using the word sketch function of the Sketch Engine tool, while in the Gigafida 2.0 corpus we examined typical collocations taking into account the statistical relevance of collocators as reflected by LL, MI³ and logDice. The final phase of the study was a synthetic treatment of the results.

Gender and Slovenian Monolingual General Explanatory Dictionaries

In analyzing the role of gender in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, we especially take into account the information in the monolingual general explanatory dictionaries of Slovenian briefly outlined below (the first Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionary was Glonar's from 1936, but, because it did not yet have an elaborate explanatory system, it is not taken into account in this review).

Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language²⁶ (*Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, hereinafter: SSKJ) is an informative-normative monolingual general explanatory dictionary that comprises approximately 93,000 entries. Together with its subentries, the dictionary comprehensively describes approximately 110,000 single-word lexical units. As part of the single-word headwords, the dictionary also provides a description of multiword lexical units. The dictionary was designed in the 1960s based on the lexicographical principles of the time. After an experimental fascicle produced in 1964, it was published in five volumes (1970–1991), and later, with minor changes, in several print and electronic editions. Today, most users access this guide through the Fran portal. The importance of this work—so far the most comprehensive and complete Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionary with an independent concept that reflects the cultural and socio-economic conditions of the time in which it was created—

is evidenced by the fact that a number of Slovenian lexicographic reference works rely on it in terms of both material and concept. Due to the changed sociopolitical circumstances and technological development at the end of the millennium, the need to update and further develop SSKJ became apparent soon after the editing work on it was completed.

Dictionary of New Slovenian Words^{27,28} (*Slovar novejšega besedja slovenskega jezika*, hereinafter: SNB) is conceptually related to SSKJ and complements it in terms of content. The dictionary includes 5,384 entries, and it contains single- and multiword lexical units and meanings that became established after 1991 and were not recorded in SSKJ. SNB is the first monolingual general explanatory dictionary of Slovenian created with the help of an electronic text corpus.

Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, Second, Augmented and Partly Revised Edition²⁹ (*Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja*, hereinafter: SSKJ2), was published in 2014. The update of the dictionary was especially dictated by the changed extralinguistic reality and different evaluative views on social phenomena after Slovenia's independence in 1991. The dictionary includes 97,669 entries. The additions and changes are based on texts created between 1991 and 2014. The dictionary retains the conceptual elements of the first edition, only the dictionary's part-of-speech labels have been partially changed (in the first edition, particles are primarily marked as adverbs), and special pronunciation features are written for the entire word, and not only its problematic part³⁰. The dictionary includes most of the headwords already contained in SNB, to which about 580 new single-word headwords that first appeared in use after 1991 were added.

eSSKJ: Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, Third Edition (*eSSKJ: Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, tretja izdaja*, hereinafter: eSSKJ), is also, like its predecessors, a comprehensive monolingual general explanatory dictionary with an informative and normative character, but it is primarily intended for use in the online environment or other digital environments. It is available in e-books and on the open-access and free central Slovenian dictionary portal Fran (www.fran.si)^{31,32}. It is a "growing dictionary," whose new entries are published online at regular intervals, usually once a year. Despite its name, the dictionary's concept and material have been completely redesigned³³. The set of information it provides is more extensive than in the first two editions (e.g., etymological and word-formational information has been added, the section with information on the inflection, pronunciation, and accentuation of words is much more extensive, the entries include a "normative tab" if necessary with a description of normative conundrums), and the information in eSSKJ is also structured and presented in a significantly different way. In terms of the issues addressed in this article, mention should also be made of the following characteristics that make eSSKJ conceptually different from its typologically related predecessors.

In eSSKJ, the headwords are usually single-word lexical units. There are no word-formational sub-entries, as in the first two editions. Such lexemes (e.g., adverbs derived from adjectives, participles, etc.) are, if used frequently enough, presented as independent headwords, and so eSSKJ also has no indirect or referential definitions (e.g., ‘participle from ...’, ‘adjective from ...’, ‘diminutive of ...’), but even with these headwords the definitions are full. eSSKJ displays syntactic-level information in a different way. For individual meanings of lexical units, it presents the most common syntactic patterns together with typical collocators with which the concrete meaning of a lexeme is usually realized in language use, and each meaning is also illustrated with at least one full sentence example.

eSSKJ places greater emphasis on multiword lexical units³⁴ than has been the case in Slovenian general lexicography until now. These units are described with the same set of information as single-word headwords. Multiword lexical units are presented in the dictionary in two sections: the first section includes semantically opaque non-phraseological (terminological and non-terminological) set phrases, and the second describes phraseological units³⁵ (idioms and proverbs). The dictionary also provides information on a selected set of words related to the headword through word formation (paired feminine forms, diminutives, possessive adjectives, etc.).

Gender in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries as a grammatical category

Gender in Slovenian, as an inherent grammatical category that allows the expression of syntagmatic relations, has an important influence on the structuring of data in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries because both the macro- and microstructural organization of the dictionary depend on it. It is characteristic of all three editions of the Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language as fundamental monolingual general explanatory dictionaries of Slovenian that the nouns with the same base and same basic form that differ in grammatical gender and inflectional paradigm (as can be seen from syntactic criteria based on the context) are treated as homographic headwords^{29,33}, that is, in separate lexical entries (e.g., *vodja* m. ‘leader’ and *vodja* f. ‘leader’; *panda* m. and *panda* f.; *brst* m. ‘bud’ and *brst* f. ‘bud’). The same applies to abbreviations (*DNA* m. and *DNA* f.; *BSE* m. and *BSE* f.) as a special set of naming elements in a language. Non-homographic nouns with the same base but different grammatical gender and inflectional paradigm (*sandala* m. and *sandala* f. ‘sandal’ or *copat* m. and *copata* f. ‘slipper’) are treated similarly in the dictionaries. With this decision, the dictionary concepts of all editions of the Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language influenced Slovenian speakers’ notions about which units can be understood as “words”; that is, as independent lexemes rather than potential morphological doublet of the same lexeme.

Gender as a grammatical category also directly affects the place among homographic and homonymous headwords where the lexemes are described. In classifying homographs and homonyms, all editions of the Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language start by taking into account the systemic aspect and not the frequency of use of an individual homograph or homonym^{29,33}. These are primarily classified according to part of speech, and for headwords that are nouns the grammatical gender is used as a secondary classification criterion (masculine nouns stand before feminine and neuter nouns, and feminine nouns before neuter nouns). Of course, these lexicographic solutions are not the only one possible, and this also applies to dictionaries of typologically similar languages. In the contemporary Slovak monolingual explanatory dictionary (*Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka*, 2006–) now being created, headwords with the same base but different grammatical gender and inflectional paradigm are treated within the dictionary microstructure³⁶.

Regarding the issue of defining and illustrating the use of headwords designating persons, especially females (which is discussed in greater detail in the following sections), the homographic headwords *starina* ‘old person’, *ničprida* ‘good-for-nothing’, *dobričina* ‘good-hearted person’, *nebodijihtraba* ‘unwanted people’, *vodja* ‘leader’, and so on are relevant from the point of view presented. Only for the headwords *vodja* m. and *vodja* f. is there an opposition in the definitions of the type *kdor* ... ‘one that ...’ and *ženska, ki* ... ‘a woman that ...’, and it is interesting that SSKJ contained only the masculine headword *vodja*, whereas the feminine headword was added in SSKJ2. In the latest written reference corpus for Slovenian, Gigafida 2.0, one already occasionally finds compounds in which it is clear from the context that those that created them believe they are also feminine and that they refer to females (e.g., *računovodja* ‘accountant’, *zborovodja* ‘choir director’, *poslovodja* ‘manager’, *skupinovodja* ‘group leader’), even though compounds that have the root *vod-* ‘to lead’ and refer to females are still strongly dominated by headwords ending in *-vodkinja*.

Grammatical gender is also important in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries from the perspective of showing conversion. Namely, in all Slovenian dictionaries mentioned above, this is shown at the level of dictionary meanings, sub-meanings, or sub-headwords, but not at the headword level^{29,33}. Given that in modern lexicography there is a tendency to present persons of either gender in dictionaries as equally as possible, in compiling eSSKJ we encounter conversion-related conceptual problems regarding how to be as socially sensitive and correct as possible in presenting lexicographic information, and at the same time to ensure that the information is not duplicated and that it is in line with the other conceptual orientations of the dictionary.

One of the editorial issues occurs, for example, when presenting nouns created through conversion. If, due to the desire for equal representation of persons of either gender in the dictionary, we would like to present pairs of

nominalized adjectives of the type *dežurni* – *dežurna* ‘person on duty’ or *invalidni* – *invalidna* ‘disabled person’—which differ in grammatical gender as well as lexically—with separate meanings of the type ‘one that ...’ and ‘a woman that ...’, which we otherwise use in the dictionary, the same requirement should probably apply to other nominalized adjectives that differ in grammatical gender (and number), whereupon we encounter a problem. Namely, in some cases the use of nominalized lexemes is (possibly) semantically differentiated by gender—for example, *belo* n. ‘white (wine)’, *črni* m. ‘black (bread)’—but for most lexemes (especially if they mainly occur in the plural) there are no such “restrictions” (e.g., *star* m. ‘old’: *stari so posedli okrog peči* ‘the old ones sat around the stove’; *staro* n. ‘old’: *staro in mlado je plesalo* ‘the old and young danced’), only that nominalized masculine adjectives, and often also neuter ones, frequently have a broader lexical and referential potential¹⁵. Separate treatment would therefore lead to duplication of information in the dictionary entry.

The decision to separately cite and define converted nouns for all three grammatical genders—which can also be justified by the fact that non-converted nouns that differ only or mainly in grammatical gender are covered in separate lexical items (i.e., grammatical gender holds a very important place in the hierarchy of dictionary information)—can also have other undesirable consequences. If the proposed method were used to present and define converted nouns formed from interjections, for example, situations would arise in the dictionary when two converted nouns that differ only in grammatical gender (as can be seen from the syntactic criteria, based on the context) would have the same lexicographic definition, which is contrary to other conceptual assumptions of the dictionary. Such a case could occur, for example, with the interjection *čiračara* ‘hocus pocus’, which is used in its basic sense when the speaker, a magician, makes something disappear, appear, or change, and as a converted masculine or feminine noun the lexeme refers to an ethical, moral, or legally questionable (apparent) act to rapidly improve poor or unfavorable conditions.

Grammatical gender also influences the organization of other information in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, especially at the microstructure level. It determines how the illustrative material is presented in the dictionaries. Namely, in eSSKJ collocators in adjectival headwords are (also) arranged based on their grammatical gender, and the same applies to the arrangement of contextual examples, especially for adjectival and adverbial headwords in SSKJ and SSKJ2³⁷.

Gender in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries as a social category

As already noted, grammatical gender has a significant impact on dictionary description, and to an even greater extent this applies to gender as a social category. The remainder of this article therefore focuses on the broader issue of gender as “social constructions of individuals about individuals in language and social practices”⁷,

analyzing how social relations between the sexes or genders, as identified in linguistic use, are projected into Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries at the level of headword selection, typologies of dictionary definitions, selected collocators, and contextual examples. In addition, it analyzes the changes that have occurred in past decades in entries in typologically similar Slovenian dictionaries due to different perceptions of social gender, and at the same time it outlines current gender-related editorial issues encountered in designing entries for the most recent Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionary: eSSKJ.

It should be emphasized at the outset that the equal representation of social genders in the dictionary is understood as very important because normative language manuals, especially comprehensive explanatory dictionaries of a language, are usually recognized in society as authoritative works. In designing them, one must therefore be especially prudent and socially sensitive³⁸. At the same time, as Landau³⁹ points out, it should be borne in mind that dictionaries—which in their lexicographic concept define how current social relations should be presented very cautiously and with social sensitivity—usually reflect the prevailing habits of the social environment and the current views (and perhaps also prejudices) of the editors of the dictionary based on their personal beliefs, especially if they are consistent with the dominant ethos of the time in which the dictionary is being created. Of course, social habits are constantly changing.

In addition to all the above, creators of contemporary dictionaries are also faced with sometimes contradictory requests from users to create a language description in which, on the one hand, the interpreted language data will reflect real language use as much as possible—although, as already noted, the social relations established in a certain period are reflected in use, whereas the conceptual world of a language is mainly manifested through the prism of socially influential and stronger social groups, often at the expense of stigmatizing the socially weaker. On the other hand, users expect a dictionary to reflect a kind of ideal, or the democratic values that we strive for as a society^{18,21}.

The influence of gender on the selection of dictionary headwords and the typology of dictionary definitions

In the professional lexicographic literature, as a result of a different understanding of social gender in modern society, changes in the typology of dictionary definitions of lexemes designating female persons are very carefully analyzed and documented^{40–43}. From the perspective of gender, the most obvious differences between the first and later editions of the Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language are also seen in the inclusion and definition of lexemes referring to female. In SSKJ, such designations have the formulaic definition of adjective + *ženska* ‘woman’ if they refer to a person according to some physical or character trait (e.g., *lepotica* ‘a very beautiful woman’), or the formulaic definition of ‘a woman that’ + verb if it is an

expression that designates a person based on the manner of speaking or behaving, or according to physical characteristics, and if the designation is derived from a verb (e.g., *bahačka* ‘a woman that (likes to) brag’, or *svetlolaska* ‘a woman that has blonde hair’). For lexemes designating a woman based on her profession, the SSKJ concept provides a formulaic definition of ‘a woman that’ + action verb, more rarely state verb (e.g., *režiserka* ‘a woman that is (professionally) engaged in directing’, *političarka* ‘a woman that is professionally engaged in politics’, *romanopiska* ‘a woman that writes novels’), but this only applies to lexemes that were in frequent enough use at the time the dictionary was made (such definitions appear in SSKJ for 545 headwords), otherwise only a referential definition of the type *ženska oblika od ...* ‘the feminine form of ...’ (e.g., *dentistka* ‘the feminine form of dentist’)⁴⁴ is provided (unless it involves a meaning that is different from the meaning of a parallel designation for a male), even in cases when, from a word-formational point of view, this involves derivations from a parallel base (e.g., *pevec – pevka* ‘singer’, *trgovec – trgovka* ‘shop assistant’, which has already been pointed out by Vidovič Muha¹²). For twenty-eight headwords, the dictionary also provides the formulaic definition *strokovnjakinja za ...* ‘female expert in ...’ (e.g., *arheologinja* ‘female expert in archeology’). For designating women according to their profession, SSKJ most often uses a referential definition (such a definition is used for 784 headwords), from which it can be concluded that designations for working women were not common. It should be noted, however, that (regardless of the type of definition) such designations are generally not labelled in the dictionary, unless other words from the same word family are labelled.

Since the publication of SNB, there have been no more referential definitions of lexemes designating females in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries²¹. These headwords have ordinary, non-referential dictionary definitions (e.g., *kolumnistka* ‘a woman that writes columns’; *bankirka* ‘a woman professionally engaged in banking’), and the same is also true, for example, for the Synonym Dictionary of Slovenian Language, which is conceptually otherwise directly related to SSKJ.

Nevertheless, the dilemmas regarding the inclusion and definition of designations for female persons in dictionaries have not yet been exhausted. Namely, in Slovenian lexicography there is still a question over whether and to what extent positive discrimination of lexemes designating female persons should take place—in the sense of their inclusion in the dictionary. Due to the neutrality of the masculine grammatical gender, these designations are still less established and often do not attain the frequency threshold for inclusion in a dictionary^{14,45}. Due to the desire for the most correct dictionary entry and demonstrated user needs (questions regarding the formation, use, and normative value of designations for female persons are often asked by users of the Language Consulting Service of the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language at ZRC SAZU)⁴⁶, eSSKJ also includes slightly less well-es-

tablished lexemes that refer to female persons. At the same time, we are faced with the question of how to correctly define such designations lexicographically because they often have too few occurrences in sources to be able to really assess their current use in the language. It is possible to use a systemic approach, and for designations for females to provide all the meanings given for parallel designations for males if they can be found attested in sources (in very rare cases, it is possible to identify meanings in sources that are characteristic only for designating females and do not have parallel designations for males; an example of such a lexeme is *čistunka* ‘prude’, which also has the meaning ‘a woman said to lack interest in sexuality’)—but in doing so a lexicographer would wonder whether the resulting effect was exactly the opposite of what was desired. With this approach, the definition of designations for female persons is “modeled” after the definition of designations for males, and the principle of showing equal relations between the sexes in the dictionary is even more difficult to implement in the lexemes presented because their limited attestation in texts for illustrating usage often make it virtually impossible to avoid stereotyping.

The exact opposite problem is encountered in lexicographies of typologically different languages; for example, in English, in which most nouns designating persons have a single form and are used in a gender-neutral sense regardless of the biological sex of those they refer to. Instead of asserting gender-specific forms for females in English (similar also applies to corresponding terms in some other languages, such as French and German⁴¹), there are efforts to neutralize them. Derivations designating women are often derogatory in English, and asymmetrical marking is understood as a deviation from “common” designations. This is discriminatory toward women and highlights their subordinate position^{14,16,42}.

Of course, editorial issues related to gender are not only connected to lexemes that designate females. One of the questions that editors face in preparing eSSKJ is how to define headwords that designate persons and are grammatically masculine but (can) also generically refer to females; for example, *zdravnik* ‘doctor’, *fotograf* ‘photographer’, *strokovnjak* ‘expert’. For such referential headwords that can designate a person of either sex, Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries usually use a definition of the type ‘one that’ + verb (e.g., *strokovnjak* ‘one that masters a profession or area, knows a lot about it’; *fotograf* ‘one that is (professionally) engaged in photography’), which focuses on the function of the working person and reflects the neutrality or generic character of the masculine grammatical gender. The solution assumes that the narrower meaning ‘a man that ...’ is implicitly understood by users due to the neutrality and generic character of the masculine gender, which some understand as linguistic sexism. At the same time, as Vidovič Muha¹² notes, it is assumed that the neutrality of masculine gender in a dictionary is understood as a reflection of social givens, which, however, must be distinguished from such linguistic identification or interpretation of these givens so that

the relationship between the cause (the social condition) and the consequence (the linguistic expression) is blurred.

Slovenian dictionaries do not generally contain formulaic definitions of the type *moški, ki ...* ‘a man that ...’, which would be parallel to the definitions for lexemes designating females, although such definition types would be possible; for example, the Croatian online dictionary *Mrežnik* explains similar headwords with definitions of the type ‘a person regardless of its gender or a man that ...’⁴⁵. A definition of the type ‘a man that ...’ is used in SSKJ for only a few designations, which were probably only really used to refer to males (e.g., *devičnik* ‘male virgin’, *gospodinjec* ‘househusband’ versus *devica* [‘female’] virgin’, *gospodinja* ‘housewife’), but the fact that the formulaic explanation of ‘a man that ...’ is also used for headwords, such as *garderober* ‘cloakroom attendant’, *mlekar* ‘milkman’, *tridesetletnik* ‘thirty-year-old’, and *pubertetnik* ‘adolescent’, is somewhat surprising from today’s point of view. It is interesting to note that, with designations for animal species, Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries include definitions for males of the species if they are common enough (e.g., *jelen* [deer] 1. ‘a fast, brownish-gray animal, the male of which has large branching antlers’, 1.1 ‘the male of this animal’).

Through the definition of the type ‘one that ...’, eSSKJ preserves the Slovenian general lexicographic tradition to date. From an editorial point of view, definitions of this type, which have additional lexical and reference potential (compared to the possibility of dictionaries also including sub-meanings with definitions of the type ‘a man that ...’) are practical because in the analysis of sources and in interpreting data there is no need to distinguish between examples in which generic masculine gender is used and those that refer only to males because such a distinction is often very difficult or even impossible. As a result, it is extremely difficult to correctly present typical collocators and usage examples for both potential meanings of a lexeme in a dictionary.

Despite the decision of the editorial teams of all editions of SSKJ to use only definitions with a generic meaning for *vzgojitelj* ‘teacher, educator’, *smučar* ‘skier’, and so on in principle, lexemes such as *prostitut* ‘male prostitute’, *gospodinjec* ‘househusband’, and also *copata* (‘a man that is too subservient and allows himself to be led by others, especially in a relationship’)—which, judging from the sources analyzed, designate only males—are defined in all editions of the dictionary with a definition of the type ‘a man that ...’ because even SSKJ has no referential definitions for nouns that designate (only) males and are derived from designations for females⁴². A conceptual problem in terms of the definition and hierarchization of meanings occurs with masculine headwords such as *klekljar* ‘lace-maker’, and so on, where the sources show that they mostly designate males, although this is not true in all cases. These are lexemes that refer mainly to activities that were originally performed mainly by women, but later, due to social changes, men also began to engage in them. A similar example is *samohranilec* ‘single parent’. For such

headwords, both the generic definition of the type ‘one that ...’ and the definition of the type ‘a man that ...’ are found in eSSKJ, with the primary meaning level using the one that proved to be more relevant based on an analysis of the material for each lexeme. The second definition has the status of a sub-meaning. A similar solution is found for only two masculine lexemes—namely, *zaročenec* ‘fiancé’ and *poročenec* ‘married man’—in SSKJ (*zaročenec* 1. ‘a man that is engaged’; 1.1 ‘one that is engaged’).

For expressive designations such as *harpija* ‘harp’, *mrha* ‘babe’, *maček* ‘hunk’, and so on—which, judging from the material analyzed, were mostly used to designate persons of one sex—SSKJ also used explanations of the type *kdor ...*, *zlasti ženska* ‘one that ..., especially a woman’ or *... človek, zlasti moški* ‘a ... person, especially a man’ (e.g., *lisica* [fox] expressive ‘a sly, cunning person, especially a woman’; *blebetulja* [chatterbox] pejorative ‘one that speaks foolishly, thoughtlessly, especially a woman’; *žival* [animal, beast] expressive ‘a cruel, evil person, especially a man’). There are no longer any such definition types in eSSKJ, and they are also being withdrawn from lexicography in other languages⁴⁰. Nevertheless, the question arises as to how stereotyping of these lexemes can be avoided at the level of usage examples if one wants the dictionary to include authentic examples of language use, as is usually expected of a modern dictionary.

The influence of gender on illustrative material in the dictionary

There are many observations in professional literature that usage examples are the least objectified part of dictionaries, in which the ideology of society, and indirectly also of the team that compiles the dictionary, is most directly reflected^{18,21}. For Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, analyses of usage examples (and definitions) for vocabulary designating members of some stigmatized social groups have already been performed^{18,20,21}. As expected, it was found that especially older reference works, which were created at a time when (as a rule) lexicography did not deal with issues of political correctness in greater depth, include information in individual entries that is understood today as directly offensive¹⁸. It was also found that in more recent reference works created in the new millennium the dictionary definition has significantly improved from the point of view of presenting social relations, including gender relations²¹.

This article focuses on an analysis of illustrative material in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries for masculine and feminine headwords that designate professions. Namely, designations for males and females are often associated with stereotypical notions about the roles of individual sexes and their appearance and character, which are reflected in the typical context of these lexemes in modern language corpora¹⁴, although lexemes may not be labelled as such in the dictionary. We were interested in the extent to which Slovenian general monolingual explanatory dictionaries reinforce stereotypical notions about “male” or “female” professions and

whether and in what way the illustrative material differs between the headwords of the type *jezikoslovec – jezikoslovka* ‘linguist’. We analyzed examples from a sample of forty-one semantically parallel headwords in SSKJ and SSKJ2 referring to female and male persons. The following pairs of headwords were selected: *direktorica – direktor* ‘director’, *fizioterapevtka – fizioterapevt* ‘physiotherapist’, *fotografka/fotografinja – fotograf* ‘photographer’, *frizerka – frizer* ‘hairdresser’, *ilustratorica – ilustrator* ‘illustrator’, *inženirka – inženir* ‘engineer’, *kuharica – kuhar* ‘cook, chef’, *logopedinja – logoped* ‘speech therapist’, *meteorologinja – meteorolog* ‘meteorologist’, *ministrica – minister* ‘minister’, *natakarica – natakar* ‘waitress/waiter’, *odvetnica – odvetnik* ‘lawyer’, *političarka – politik* ‘politician’, *sekretarka – sekretar* ‘secretary’, *tajnica – tajnik* ‘secretary’, *trgovka – trgovec* ‘shop assistant’, *učiteljica – učitelj* ‘teacher’, *vzgojiteljica – vzgojitelj* ‘teacher, educator’, *zdravnica – zdravnik* ‘doctor’, *znanstvenica – znanstvenik* ‘scientist’. For the sample, we selected pairs for which we assumed that they would reflect differences in illustrative material, we also considered units with different frequencies of use in language corpora. The dictionary material was then compared with material on the typical context of the same lexemes in the Gigafida 1.0 and 2.0 corpora and with some sample headwords in eSSKJ. Because eSSKJ is only in the initial stages of development and includes only a few dozen pairs of headwords of this type, a comparative analysis could not be performed. We evaluated the usage examples for only twenty-one sample headwords in eSSKJ: *cvetličarka – cvetličar* ‘florist’, *čistilka – čistilec* ‘cleaner’, *embriologinja – embriolog* ‘embryologist’, *filmarka – filmar* ‘filmmaker’, *kartografinja/kartografka – kartograf* ‘cartographer’, *šoferka – šofer* ‘driver’, *oboistka – oboist* ‘oboist’, *nutricionistka – nutricionist* ‘nutritionist’, *krasoslovka – krasoslovec* ‘karst specialist’, and *jezikoslovka – jezikoslovec* ‘linguist’. To analyze the typical context, which draws attention to the potential stylistic markedness of lexemes and their semantic prosody and associative meaning, we used the Sketch Engine word sketch tool in the Gigafida 1.0 corpus. The analysis used the word sketch grammar, which was designed at the Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language at ZRC SAZU for editing eSSKJ entries. In the Gigafida 2.0 corpus, statistically relevant collocators in the range of ± 3 words were analyzed, taking into account the values for LL, logDice, and MI³.

The analysis of usage examples in SSKJ and SSKJ2 showed that, in terms of demonstrating gender relations, they are mostly in line with today’s criteria regarding gender-sensitive use of language. In the case of masculine headwords, gender-indeterminate usage examples predominate, which is possible because SSKJ and SSKJ2 most often cite excerpts. Among gender-indeterminate examples we counted those in which it was not possible to determine from the (narrower) context which gender they referred to and those in which the use of generic masculine gender was involved.

We did not notice any significant differences in many semantically parallel pairs of headwords in the usage examples in SSKJ and SSKJ2 (e.g., the headwords *zdravnica – zdravnik* ‘doctor’, *direktorica – direktor* ‘director’, *inženirka – inženir* ‘engineer’, *odvetnica – odvetnik* ‘lawyer’, *znanstvenica – znanstvenik* ‘scientist’, *vzgojiteljica – vzgojitelj* ‘teacher, educator’), only that the scope of illustration for feminine headwords is generally somewhat smaller. Even if there are differences, this is usually not obvious stereotyping. With two pairs of headwords (i.e., *meteorologinja – meteorolog* ‘meteorologist’ and *logopedinja – logoped* ‘speech therapist’), SSKJ does not include usage examples referring to a female at all for the feminine headwords (for the parallel masculine headwords, the illustrative material is also very limited), and with a few more pairs of headwords the illustrative material differs to a very small extent; for example, such that for the masculine headwords a collocator is used that largely emphasizes professionalism, such as by mentioning schools or schooling (e.g., for the headword *učitelj* ‘teacher’ the entry cites *fakultetni, univerzitetni učitelj* ‘college, university teacher’, which is not cited for the parallel designation for a female), whereby the relationship is sometimes also the other way around (e.g., for the feminine headwords *fotografka* and *fotografinja* ‘photographer’, the usage examples emphasize the professionalism and importance of such a person to a greater extent than in the case of the masculine headword *fotograf* ‘photographer’). The illustrative material for feminine headwords relatively rarely presents the character traits of persons in such professions (e.g., *stroga učiteljica* ‘a strict teacher’, *prijazna natakarica* ‘a friendly waitress’, *prijazna trgovka* ‘a friendly saleswoman’). We did not observe any examples that draw attention to the appearance of those designated, and only exceptionally is there stereotyping in the sources analyzed (e.g., for the feminine headword *kuharica* ‘cook’, after the label *pog.* ‘colloquial’ the stereotypical example *farouška kuharica* ‘rectory cook, priest’s housekeeper’ is given).

The differences in SSKJ’s and SSKJ2’s illustrative material for the lexemes analyzed are sometimes the result of different semantic structures of masculine and feminine headwords. In the case of some rare masculine headwords, an additional (generic) meaning or semantic nuance is given in comparison to a parallel feminine headword (e.g., *politik* [politician; politic person] ‘one that knows how to deal with people skillfully, according to the circumstances’), whereas only one feminine headword was found in our sample with the outdated definition of the type profession-based possessive adjective + *žena* ‘wife’ (namely, *ministrica ... star. ministrova žena* ‘... arch. wife of a minister’). Obvious differences in the illustrative material were actually reflected in only the parallel semantic pairs *tajnica – tajnik* ‘secretary’ and *sekretarka – sekretar* ‘secretary’ in SSKJ.

In comparison to its feminine counterpart *tajnica*, the masculine headword *tajnik* ‘secretary’, the basic sense of which is defined as ‘one that performs administrative, organizational, or technical tasks’, has a greater emphasis

on aspects of professionalism and importance in its illustrative material. This is even more the case if one takes into account the secondary meaning of the word, ‘high-ranking official of an organization, a body’, which is not provided for the feminine counterpart. Similar is true for the pair *sekretarka – sekretar* ‘secretary’, with the difference even more noticeable. Due to the lower frequency of the use of the lexeme *sekretarka*, the lexeme is defined in SSKJ only by the referential definition ‘feminine form of *sekretar*’, and the various meanings of the headword are indicated only by a slash between usage examples, whereby the example *zaposlili so novo sekretarko* ‘they employed a new secretary’ is clarified just with the synonym for secretary *tajnica*. It is also clear from the illustrative material that people referred to with the masculine lexemes are ascribed a higher place in society and more important tasks than their feminine counterparts. In SSKJ2, these differences have been largely eliminated.

Larger differences than those in the dictionary are found if one compares the typical context of the parallel lemmas analyzed in the reference text corpora Gigafida 1.0 and Gigafida 2.0. Although none of the headwords analyzed are labelled in the dictionary, this analysis also confirmed the findings of Stopar and Ilc¹⁴ that semantically parallel pairs of headwords designating professions are of two types (although the boundary between the two cannot be clearly drawn). The first group includes lexemes for which no significant contextual differences between semantically parallel masculine and feminine headwords for occupations were observed in the corpora. This group, which does not show significant differences in associative meaning, semantic preferences, and semantic prosody between semantically parallel masculine and feminine headwords in terms of their typical contexts, comprises about 60% of the sample analyzed and includes the pairs *direktorica – direktor* ‘director’, *fizioterapevtka – fizioterapevt* ‘physiotherapist’, *fotografka/fotografinja – fotograf* ‘photographer’, *ilustratorica – ilustrator* ‘illustrator’, *inženirka – inženir* ‘engineer’, *logopedinja – logoped* ‘speech therapist’, *ministrica – minister* ‘minister’, *odvetnica – odvetnik* ‘lawyer’, *sekretarka – sekretar* ‘secretary’, *vzgojiteljica – vzgojitelj* ‘teacher, educator’, *zdravnica – zdravnik* ‘doctor’, and *znanstvenica – znanstvenik* ‘scientist’. For three pairs (i.e., 15% of the sample analyzed), a comparison was not really possible due to the distinct difference in the usage frequency of the paired lexemes (*političarka – politik* ‘politician’), due to (too) low frequency of use of either lexeme, and so there in fact were no data to compare in the word sketch (*meteorologinja – meteorolog* ‘meteorologist’), or due to the different semantic structure of the lexemes, with collocators appearing in the word sketch for one headword that were not relevant for the parallel designation.

The group that did not manifest significant differences in illustrative material mainly includes professions that are highly regarded and for which special expertise is usually required. Minor deviations were observed only occasionally. In the case of the pair *odvetnica – odvetnik* ‘lawyer’, collocators drawing attention to the person’s

appearance rarely appeared in the word sketch for the feminine headword. In the case of the pair *sekretarka – sekretar* ‘secretary’, institutions where women appear as secretaries were shown to be somewhat less important than institutions in which men hold these positions, and women mainly perform the role of secretaries in institutions dealing with education, family, and social issues—that is, in areas traditionally associated with women. In the case of the pair *znanstvenica – znanstvenik* ‘scientist’, the material showed that one of the topics problematized in society is the role, position, or share of women scientists in society, and the context for the headwords *vzgojiteljica – vzgojitelj* ‘teacher, educator (of younger children)’ shows that women in these roles are mainly involved in teaching (preschool) children, whereas men deal with education in a broader sense and in (more) diverse institutions.

The second group consists of pairs of lemmas in which asymmetry, indicating differences in social status, and stereotyping are (more) expressed in the context of semantically parallel masculine and feminine headwords designating occupations. The share of such headwords is 25% in the sample analyzed and includes the pairs *frizerka – frizer* ‘hairdresser’, *kuharica – kuhar* ‘cook, chef’, *natakarica – natakar* ‘waitress/waiter’, *tajnica – tajnik* ‘secretary’, and *učiteljica – učitelj* ‘teacher’. Although it is true that the contexts for these pairs of lexemes are similar in many respects, it is especially with feminine lemmas that collocators highlighting stereotypical character traits appear (e.g., *simpatična frizerka* ‘nice hairdresser’; *simpatična, prijazna, ustrezljiva, zgovorna natakarica* ‘nice, friendly, helpful, chatty waitress’; *razumevajoča, potrpežljiva, prizadevna, predana, stroga učiteljica* ‘understanding, patient, diligent, dedicated, strict teacher’) or define their appearance (e.g., *svetlolasa, plavolasa, blond, seksi tajnica* ‘blonde, sexy secretary’; *prikupna frizerka* ‘cute hairdresser’; *brhka, prsata, debelušna, čedna, seksi natakarica* ‘pretty, buxom, plump, attractive, sexy waitress’; *seksi učiteljica* ‘sexy teacher’), sometimes also in connection with sexuality (e.g., *tajnica in ljubica* ‘secretary and mistress’; *zaplesti, poročiti se s tajnico* ‘get involved with, marry the secretary’; *varati (koga) s tajnico* ‘cheat (on someone) with the secretary’; *afera, razmerje s tajnico* ‘affair, relationship with the secretary’; *zapeljiva natakarica* ‘seductive waitress’; *otipavati natakarico* ‘grope a waitress’), and sometimes women are even objectified (e.g., the most common coordinate construction for the headword *tajnica* ‘secretary’ is *tajnica in fikus* ‘a secretary and a rubber plant’). The less prominent position of women in society is also highlighted by the fact that lemmas designating women’s professions often appear in coordinate constructions with professions that require lower qualifications (e.g., *tajnica in receptorka, snažilka, blagajničarka*, ‘secretary and receptionist, cleaner, cashier’; *kuharica in natakarica, čistilka, sobarica, strežnica* ‘cook and waitress, cleaner, maid, server’), or it is obvious that the woman is doing work for someone (e.g. *šefova, direktorjeva, županova tajnica* ‘boss’s, director’s, mayor’s secretary’; *farovška, župnikova kuharica* ‘rectory cook, priest’s cook’).

In the case of masculine lemmas, more prominent are the collocators that indicate professional competence or the fame of the professional (e.g., *izkušen*, *spreten*, *uveljavljen*, *profesionalni frizer* ‘experienced, skilled, established, professional hairdresser’; *zvezdniški*, *slaven frizer* ‘celebrity, famous hairdresser’; *izvrsten*, *profesionalni*, *vrhunski*, *poklicni kuhar* ‘excellent, professional, top, expert chef’; *slaven*, *zvezdniški kuhar* ‘famous, celebrity chef’, *usposobljen*, *profesionalni*, *izkušen učitelj* ‘qualified, professional, experienced teacher’) and his connection with important institutions (*univerzitetni*, *fakultetni*, *visokošolski*, *habilitiran učitelj* ‘teacher at a university, at a college, in higher education, holding a faculty rank’). Of course, stereotypical semantic types (for example appearance) that typically occur with lemmas of one gender (may) also occur in semantically parallel lemmas of the other gender, but this happens less frequently.

We must also point out a discrepancy between the collocators in phrases containing verb + *natakarica* – *natakar* ‘waitress – waiter’ in the accusative case. Typical collocators for the lemma *natakar* ‘waiter’ in this structure are *zaposliti* ‘employ’, *vprašati* ‘ask’, *poklicati* ‘call’, *iskati* ‘look for’, *potrebovati* ‘need’, and *poznati* ‘know’. For the headword *natakarica* ‘waitress’ in the same structure (although the most common collocator for this headword is also *zaposliti* ‘employ’), one often finds lexemes that indicate physical or verbal violence; for example, *zmerjati* ‘call names’, *nadlegovati* ‘harass’, *žaliti* ‘insult’, *napasti* ‘attack’, *udariti* ‘hit’, *umoriti* ‘murder’. Similar collocators are also among the most common in the same structure for the feminine lexeme *učiteljica* ‘teacher’.

As it can be seen in language use, current social relations as well as stereotypical notions and speakers’ prejudices are often reflected relatively directly⁴⁵, and this fact can cause editorial issues. In preparing eSSKJ, in accordance with modern lexicographic practice, we made the conceptual decision that the dictionary would use examples of real language use (especially) from corpus sources as illustrative material, and not abstracted and adapted excerpts. However, such a decision has a significant impact on the illustrative material.

Compared to the SSKJ and SSKJ2, which strive for gender neutrality in masculine entries by selecting gender-neutral examples, the eSSKJ contains significantly more gender-specific sentence examples. In the examples shown under typical collocators alongside the most frequent syntactic patterns in which lemmas occur most frequently in texts, no stereotyping is evident, similar to the adapted excerpts in the SSKJ and SSKJ2. However, in the case of examples in the form of sentences, the representation of prevailing social customs that do not correspond to the social ideal cannot always be avoided, since the scope of the representation is larger and the examples also reflect social circumstances that are not directly related to the entry and its typical collocator alone. When the dictionary does include personal proper nouns in the examples, they are more often masculine for objective reasons, since men have historically (and to some extent still) taken a

more prominent role in society. Where possible, the dictionary engages in positive discrimination in the sense that the examples deliberately portray women and men in social roles that are stereotypically less expected of them (e.g. women as driving instructors, women in politics), but the dictionary nevertheless indirectly reflects current social conditions (e.g. it is noticeable in the entry *cvetličarka* f. ‘florist’ of the eSSKJ that women perform their work with a high degree of professionalism and creativity, but the managers of the companies where women work in their profession are usually men).

An even greater problem with illustrative material in modern dictionaries is that the inclusion of examples describing stereotypical or socially undesirable situations is often difficult to avoid for certain types of headwords because the sources contain no or very few non-stereotypical or non-offensive examples that meet other conceptual criteria for inclusion in the dictionary. This is the case, for example, with the entries *mladoletnica* ‘underage girl’ and *čistilka* ‘cleaning woman’ in the eSSKJ. Here, it was extremely difficult to find examples of real language use that did not refer to physical violence (in the case of *mladoletnica*) or to lover professional qualifications or ethnic stereotypes (in the case of *čistilka*). Kern²¹ points out that the lexicographer is often pushed into a paradoxical situation because he is expected to choose the most politically correct example among examples that are completely politically incorrect. In this sense, the issue of appropriate representation of gender is among the most prominent.

The fact is that there is often an obvious discrepancy between the social ideal that dictionaries usually strive for in their description and language use, as reflected in the latest corpus sources⁴⁵. In eSSKJ, the principle of positive discrimination of illustrative material from the perspective of presenting gender relations and social relations in general is reflected in the fact that the set of typical collocators shown and syntactic patterns they are used in—if the analysis shows that typical collocators are stereotypical, offensive, or (especially due to the imbalance of sources) unrepresentative—is very limited, and only a small number of contextual examples are given, in the selection of which editors must be particularly sensitive. By illustrating the use of lexemes in this way, eSSKJ strives for socially responsible lexicographic practice, which continues and builds on the lexicographic tradition of Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries.

Conclusion

The category of gender, whether a grammatical or a social category, is important in Slovenian monolingual general explanatory dictionaries because it influences both the selection of data included in the dictionary and the way they are presented and structured at the micro- and macrostructural levels. Dictionary issues related to the social dimensions of the category of gender need to be treated with particular responsibility and social sensitivity. In general explanatory dictionaries, this raises edito-

rial dilemmas, especially at the level of typology of dictionary explanations and selection of appropriate dictionary examples. The dilemmas are particularly challenging because lexicographers are often confronted with simultaneous, conflicting demands from users. On the one hand, they are required to produce a linguistic description that faithfully reflects actual language use; on the other hand, the description is supposed to reflect the social ide-

al to which we aspire as a society. Sometimes there is an obvious discrepancy between these two requirements.

Acknowledgements

The article was created under the program P6-0038, funded by the Slovenian Research Agency.

REFERENCES

1. LENČEK R, Slavistična revija, 20/1 (1972) 55. — 2. TOPORIŠIČ J, Slavistična revija, 20/1 (1981) 79. — 3. TOPORIŠIČ J, Slovenska slovnica (Obzorja, Maribor, 2000). — 4. DOLESCHAL U, Gender in Slovenian. In: HELLINGER M, MOTSCHENBACHER H (Eds): Gender across languages: Volume 4. (John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2015). doi:10.1075/impact.36. — 5. KOZMIK V, JERAM J (Eds), Neseksistična raba jezika (Ljubljana, Vlada RS, Urad za žensko politiko, 1995). — 6. STABEJ M, Seksizem kot jezikovnopolitični problem. In: DERGANČ A (Ed): 33. SSJLK (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 1997). — 7. KRANJC S, OŽBOT M, Vloga spolno občutljivega jezika v slovenščini, angleščini in italijanščini. In: ŽELE A (Ed): Obdobja 32 (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2013). — 8. VIČAR B, KERN B, Dialogi, 53/11–12 (2017) 223. — 9. POPIČ D, GORJANC V, Suvremena lingvistika, 44/86 (2018) 329. doi:10.22210/suvlin.2018.086.07. — 10. VIČAR B, KERN B, Slavistična revija, 67/2 (2019) 413. — 11. POGORELEC B, Slovenska skladnja in poimenovanja ženskih oseb. Dodatek k 33. SSJLK (Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana, 1997). — 12. VIDOVIČ MUHA A, Prvine družbene prepoznavnosti ženske prek poimenovalne tipologije njenih dejavnosti, lastnosti. In: DERGANČ A (Ed): 33. SSJLK (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 1997). — 13. MARKEŽIČ T, Slavia Centralis, 11/1 (2018) 61. — 14. STOPAR A, ILC G, Slavistična revija, 67/2 (2019) 333. — 15. GROŠELJ R, Slavistična revija, 67/2 (2019) 301. — 16. ŠABEC N, Slavistična revija, 67/2 (2019) 291. — 17. KRŽIŠNIK E, Kdo govori kako. In: DERGANČ A (Ed): 33. SSJLK (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 1997). — 18. GORJANC V, Družboslovne razprave XXI/48 (2005) 197. — 19. GORJANC V, Kontekstualizacija oseb ženskega in moškega spola v slovenskih tiskanih medijih. In: NOVAK POPOV I (Ed): Stereotipi v slovenskem jeziku, literaturi in kulturi (Center za slovenščino kot drugi/tuji jezik pri Oddelku za slovenistiko Filozofske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, 2007). — 20. GORJANC V, Nije rečnik za seljaka (Biblioteka XX vek., Beograd, 2017). — 21. KERN B, Politična korektnost v slovaropisju. In: ZULJAN KUMAR D, DOBROVOLJC H (Eds.): Škrabčevi dnevi 8 (Založba Univerze v Novi Gorici, Nova Gorica, 2015). — 22. LEDINEK N, Slavistična revija, 67/2 (2019) 189. — 23. MICHELIZZA M, Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovje 47/4 (2021), in print. — 24. DERGANČ A (Ed), 33. SSJLK (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 1997). — 25. GORJANC V, KALIN GOLOM B, KUHAR R, MOČNIK R, NOVAK BA, ŠORLI M, ŠTUMBERGER S, ŽELE A, Slovenščina 2.0: empirične, aplikativne in interdisciplinarne razis-
26. Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika (DZS, Ljubljana, 1970–1991). — 27. VOJNOVIČ N, Jezikoslovni zapiski 9/1 (2003) 83. — 28. HOLZ N, Jezikoslovni zapiski 9/1 (2003) 89. — 29. Ahlin M, Lazar B, Praznik Z, Snoj J, Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika: Druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja (SAZU in ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša, Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana, 2014). — 30. PERDIH A, SNOJ M, Slavia Centralis 1 (2015) 5. — 31. AHAČIČ K, LEDINEK N, PERDIH A, Portal Fran – nastanek in trenutno stanje. In: SMOLEJ M (Ed): Simpozij Obdobja 34, Slovnica in slovar – aktualni jezikovni opis (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2015). — 32. PERDIH A, Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovje, 46/2 (2020) 997. doi:10.31724/rihjj.46.2.28. — 33. GLIHA KOMAC N, JAKOP N, JEŽOVNIK J, KLEMENČIČ S, KRVINA D, LEDINEK N, MIRTIČ T, PERDIH A, PETRIČ Š, SNOJ M, ŽELE A, Koncept novega razlagalnega slovarja slovenskega knjižnega jezika (Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, 2015). — 34. PERDIH A, LEDINEK N, Slovene Linguistic Studies, 12 (2019) 113. — 35. METERC M, Jezikoslovni zapiski 25/2 (2019) 33. doi:10.3986/JZ.25.2.2 — 36. JAROŠOVÁ A, Slovo v slovníku z pohledu času a normy (Veda, vydavatelstvo SAV, Bratislava, 2015). — 37. SILVESTER M, Priročnik za tehnično stran redakcije gesel (Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, 1978). — 38. BÉJOINT H, Modern Lexicography. An Introduction (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000). — 39. LANDAU SI, Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography (Scribners, New York, 2001). — 40. COSTA PEREZ A, The Presence of Gender Issues in Spanish Dictionaries. In: ABEL A, VETTORI C, RALLI N (Eds): Proceedings of the 16th EURALEX International Congress (EURAC research, Bolzano, 2014). — 41. WESTVEER T, SLEEMAN P, ABOH EO, International Journal of Lexicography, 31/4 (2018) 371. doi:10.1093/ijl/icy013. — 42. NORRI J, English Studies, 100/7 (2019) 886. doi:10.1080/0013838X.2019.1604014. — 43. MAŁOCHA-KRUPA A, Lexikos, 31 (2021) 101. doi:10.5788/31-1-1630. — 44. JANEŽIČ M, ČERNELIČ I, SILVESTER M, GLOŽANČEV A, Napotki za redakcijo samostalnika, pridevnika in glagola v SSKJ (Inštitut za slovenski jezik SAZU, Ljubljana, 1981). — 45. HUDEČEK L, MIHALJEVIČ M, Croatian web dictionary Mrežnik: One year later – What is different? In: FIŠER D, PANČURA (Eds): Jezikovne tehnologije in digitalna humanistika 2018 (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2018). — 46. MICHELIZZA M, LEDINEK N, Collegium Antropologicum, 46 (2022), in print.

N. Ledinek

Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Novi trg 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

e-mail: nina.ledinek@zrc-sazu.si

ROD U SLOVENSKIM JEDNOJEZIČNIM OPĆIM OBJASNIDBENIM RJEČNICIMA

SAŽETAK

U radu se analizira rod kao gramatička i društvena kategorija u slovenskim jednojezičnim općim objasnidbenim rječnicima. Objašnjava se kako kategorija roda utječe na odabir i prikaz podataka uključenih u te rječnike i analizira se njihova mikrostruktura i makrostruktura. Razmatraju se promjene do kojih je došlo u rječničkome opisu na početku 21. stoljeća zbog rastuće svijesti o rodno osjetljivome jeziku te se naglašavaju pojedine uredničke dvojbe povezane s kategorijom roda tijekom rada na trećemu izdanju rječnika eSSKJ.

